

UDC 811.161.2'25:001.89-051(477)“18/19”O.Finkel

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.30970/fpl.2024.137.4502>

OLEKSANDR FINKEL AND THE EMERGENCE OF TRANSLATION STUDIES IN UKRAINE

Taras Shmiher

*Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,
1, Universytetska Str., Lviv, Ukraine, 79000
taras.shmiher@lnu.edu.ua*

The paper is a tribute to Oleksandr Finkel's significant role in establishing Ukrainian translation studies as an independent academic discipline. Finkel's pioneering work introduced a methodological approach to analysing linguistic aspects of translation, marking him as one of the early adopters of this approach. As a leading scholar based in Kharkiv, he produced the research in Ukraine which had a ripple effect throughout the Soviet Union and beyond. Finkel's extensive exploration of translation as a scholarly pursuit aimed at creating a distinct academic field within Ukrainian academia utilizing a burgeoning linguostylistic methodology.

Drawing primarily from Finkel's published works and manuscripts, the paper organizes his perspectives around the core areas of translation studies: theory, criticism, and pedagogy. His application of linguostylistics delves deep into fundamental translation phenomena such as equivalence, text types, translation multiplicity, the translator's role, intertextuality, and textual dynamics.

In the framework of George Steiner's classification of translation studies periods, Finkel's ideas align most closely with the third period, characterized by a linguistic approach to translation theory. Early on, he interconnects translation with stylistics and linguistics, later evolving into linguostylistics. Key inquiries in his work include the nature of translation, the smallest unit of translation, the linguistic structure of text elements like words and sentences, and how linguistic elements shape historical cultural realities.

Key words: translation theory, equivalence, text types, translation quality assessment, translation didactics.

Introduction. The emergence of translation studies as a discipline in Ukraine can be allocated somewhere between the 1910s and the 1920s, and in particular between two personalities: Ivan Franko (1856–1916) and Oleksandr Finkel (1899–1967). Finkel's contribution is immense as he was one of the first to adopt a methodological approach to the analysis of linguistic issues in translation. As a pioneering Kharkiv-based scholar, he conducted research in Ukraine, which impacted on the rest of the Soviet Union and beyond. He extensively examined translation as his main object of scholarly inquiry and sought to cultivate a new, distinct academic field for studying translation in Ukrainian within an emerging linguostylistic methodology.

When characterizing a figure of a scholar in translation studies, one does not always realise that there should be a system that could present the activities of an individual. The

task of creating a method of presenting a personality in the system of other translation disciplines is still open, a classification of the very disciplines can be used for this purpose. A logical consequence of the declared order prevents a mixture of quoted, researched and analysed assertions by the studied author as well as adapts them to the elaborated system of knowledge that facilitates the search for the required information. Interdisciplinary statements undoubtedly necessitate additional research and commentary.

Methodology. The methodology of describing and researching the historiography of translation studies involves the application of three key principles: academic climate, immanence and correspondence. They make it possible to explain and substantiate the views of translation studies in the context of a certain historical period, to reveal their characteristics and to establish interpretive links with modern theoretical views and principles. Historiographical analysis involves the interpretive study of a personality's contribution via the prism of the taxonomy of translation research, which makes it possible to identify the relevant principles and characterise the causes of the diversity of terms.

Finkel's Life¹. Oleksandr Finkel (Олександр Мойсейович Фінкель) was born on 2 October 1899 in the town of Bakhmut (now in Donetsk Region). His father worked for the Zinger Company, later reorganised in the "Holovshveimashyna"; his mother kept house. Both parents died in 1921.

After graduating from the Bakhmut Technical school, where he studied from 1910 to 1917, Finkel simultaneously entered Kharkiv Agricultural Institute and Kharkiv University (the Philological Faculty), but studied at first at the Agricultural Institute. He never graduated from this institute, as in 1920, after the third year of his studies, he was transferred to Kharkiv Institute of Public Education, which was reorganized on the basis of the University. Among Finkel's most outstanding teachers were Prof. Oleksandr Biletskyi ("History of Russian literature (18th century)"), Prof. Oleksa Syniavskyi ("Ukrainian dialectology"), Prof. Mykola Plevako ("History of Ukrainian literature"), Prof. Pavlo Ritter ("Comparative grammar of Indo-European languages"), Prof. Dmitry Zelenin ("Russian dialectology"), and Prof. Oleksiy Vetukhiv ("Social foundations of language").

In 1924, Finkel graduated from the Institute of Public Education and was granted the postgraduate studies at the Department of Linguistics, his choice being the Russian language. The postgraduate studies were finished in 1928 with the qualification of a researcher of the first category. He worked as a researcher of the Chair for Linguistic Research (1928–1930), a docent of the Institute of Public Education (1930–1931), a docent of the Communistic Institute of Journalism (1931–1934), an acting professor, a chairperson of the Institute of Foreign Languages (1934–1941) in Kharkiv. The dissertation, presented in 1939 for receiving a scholarly degree of a candidate of linguistics (comparable to PhD), covered the topic of self-translation and was entitled "H. F. Kvitka-Osnovyanenko as a translator of his own writings".

During the Second World War, Finkel at first worked at the Teachers' Institute in the city of Chimkent (Kazakhstan), but in 1943 was mobilised and did military service in Namangan and other cities. Demobilised after the war, he returned to Kharkiv Institute of Foreign Languages as a chairperson and from 1948 worked as a docent of the Russian Department

¹ The biography is mainly compiled on the basis of the archive materials [15; 18; 19].

at Kharkiv University. In 1965 he presented the doctoral dissertation “Productive causal prepositions in contemporary literary Russian”; in 1967, he was awarded the title of professor. Finkel died on 8 October 1968.

Finkel researched various aspects of translation studies, prepared textbooks of Russian for pupils and students, translated poems by William Shakespeare, George Byron, Paul Verlaine, Jacques Prévert and others, and contributed to the first book of parodies in the Soviet Union: “Parnassus on End”.

Sources and Previous Research. Judging by the sources, a researcher will easily trace the corpus of primary sources ((his monograph “Theory and Practice of Translation” (1929)) and about twenty scholarly essays as well as the candidate dissertation “H. F. Kvitka-Osnovyanenko as a translator of his own works” presented at Kharkiv University in 1939¹). Secondary sources represent academic criticism (the study and analysis of Finkel’s views separately or in the mainstream of translation process in Ukraine). One publication is a contamination of the two natures: the article by Yarema Aizenshtok, where the author both writes about Finkel, shares his memories, and also quotes some rare articles, published in Kharkiv magazines of the 1920s and practically unavailable to the majority of readers, and a manuscript project of a future book in translation studies.

Virtually, we can speak of three major research projects by Finkel, realised in a book, a dissertation and a series of articles accompanying his book and dissertation.

The title of the book “Theory and Practice of Translation” (1929) [23] indicates the very structure of the book, i.e. the division into theoretical and practical parts. The book contains four chapters:

1) theoretical part: the author discusses the cultural and literary values of translation, contrasts classical and romantic theories of translation, and shapes his own stylistic approach to translation;

2) prosaic non-literary translation: the scholar raises important questions about the genre characteristics of sci-tech texts and relevant problems (e.g. term systems, new coinages and syntactic features).

3) prosaic literary translation: in literary texts, a word causes challenges both in the social perspective (namely, *couleur locale*) and in the aesthetic construction (synonymy, lexical registers, stylistic devices and means, etc.); paraphrases, amplifications, and omissions are significant as well;

4) verse translation: the chapter applies the translation quality assessment which is grounded on the tripartite structure, i.e. phonology (euphony, rhyme and rhythm), semantics, and syntax.

The book was particularly valuable because it brought together all the information known about solving translation problems; on the other hand, it is an attempt to provide a solid system, a kind of philosophical and practical consideration. Many of the problems discussed remained theoretically the same, as formulated 70 years later by Andrew Chesterman, who even entitled his subchapter “Narrowing the gap between theory and practice” [2, p. 52–54].

¹ I express my gratitude to Prof. Vitaliy Oleksandrovych Finkel, son of Oleksandr Finkel, for his help with the search of his father’s works.

In fact, Finkel and Chesterman use the same terms in their research, such as “hermeneutics”, “problem- solving”, “typology”, etc.

The candidate dissertation “H. F. Kvitka-Osnovyanenko as a translator of his own writings” (1939) dealt with the question of self-translation on the basis of the stories by Hryhoriy Kvitka-Osnovyanenko, translated by the author himself in 1838–1842. The dissertation was partly published in articles [14], but the very text is kept as a manuscript in the Central Academic Library of the Vasyl Karazin National University of Kharkiv [24]. One copy, a manuscript of its Russian translation by Finkel, is preserved in the Central State Archive-Museum of Literature and Arts of Ukraine [13].

The research includes two parts:

1) historical and theoretical one where the scholar studied Kvitka’s authorship as a translator, his own perception of his work, and covered some theoretical issues such as importance of self-translation for translation theory;

2) special one which is dedicated to specific problems of Kvitka’s translations, e.g. lexis and translation-imitation, couleur locale, idioms, rhymed and rhythmic passages, syntactic phenomena, melioration of a translation, amplifications and paraphrases.

The phenomenon of self-translation is quite rare in translation praxis. The old myth that a translator should write in such a way as if the original author had written in the target language is absolutely false. Oleksandr Kalnychenko draws our attention to such a perspective: “The changes that the author-translator introduces into the translation can lead to significant discrepancies with the original. In the standard translation, this is considered a drawback, because it turns into an adaptation or imitation” [3, p. 326]. Finkel examined how the translator had overcome their own style in their original native language, and how translations could remain translations proper, but not adaptations.

The third research project – the writing of a new book on translation – was destined not to come to fruition. The scheme, however, is known to us from Finkel’s book proposal [16]. The book was aimed to consist of three chapters:

1) issues of translation theory;

2) analysis of translations: a) H. Kvitka-Osnovyanenko as a translator of his own works; b) I. Franko as a translator of Nekrasov’s poetry; c) Shakespeare’s sonnets in Russian translations; d) Shakespeare’s sonnets in Ukrainian translations;

3) application of translation in secondary school.

As far as much material was presented, now we can reconstruct a larger part of the book, although the chapter on Ukrainian translations of Shakespeare is not known to exist in any draft.

The reception of Finkel’s theoretical legacy was initiated by the reviews of his 1929 monograph. His reviewers were the prolific Ukrainian researchers of the time: Mykola Zerov was an insightful researcher of Ukrainian literature and translation history as well as a translator and a preeminent translator and a leader of the Ukrainian literary neoclassicism group [8]; Hryhoriy Maifet combined methods of close reading and mathematical observation in translation quality assessment [12]; R. Hertsfeld was a literary critic [5]; Petro Horetskyi was a professional linguist and lexicographer [6]. The reviews popularised the book, pointed out its positive features, and found some drawbacks (not always fair, as seen from the perspective

of history). The academic monograph even served as a main textbook for translation courses at the Ukrainian Institute of Linguistic Education in Kyiv. It was a good start which was interrupted by the acts of the Ukrainian Genocide in the 1930s. Later, the book was unjustly considered outdated and rarely mentioned.

Stepan Kovhaniuk voiced his judgements about the book 40 years later [10, p. 23–28]. Emphasising the “stylistic approach”, he avoids the very definitions of stylistics, used by Finkel [21; 22] (this could be explained by the ideological prohibitions that limited the citation of the Ukrainian-language publications of the 1920s). Accurate are his remarks on the syntactic slips, selected by Finkel; nothing is said about the methodology of analysing a translation nor about a translator’s work, nor about genre peculiarities of literary and sci-tech texts.

The scholar’s death gave a new impetus to the study of Finkel’s academic legacy. Numerous obituaries and commemorative articles appeared, but they all intended to write about his personality in general. The most profound article, which combined a good word of memory with a deep understanding of the importance of the scholar’s theoretical views, was that by Yarema Aizenshtok. This paper also included a short bibliography of Finkel’s translation research.

A detailed analysis of Finkel’s translation views is also avoided by Volodymyr Ivanenko [9, p. 179–181], since he attempted to outline the development of translation studies during 60 years. That is why he paid his attention to Finkel’s involvement in the translation discussion of the 1920s. Ivanenko discloses the eclectic method in translation and analyses Finkel’s comments on the translation principles of Fyodor Batiushkov, Ivan Kulyk, and Volodymyr Derzhavyn, presented in his book “Theory and Practice of Translation”. Nevertheless, the main corpus of Finkel’s publications was not mentioned due to the size of the article.

The real return of Finkel’s academic legacy to active debate occurred in the 2000s. Initially, rare unknown archival papers were republished. Taras Shmiher reconstructed a solid conception of Finkel’s translation views per se and in the context of the general progress of translation studies in Ukraine [30; 31]. The significant accomplishment was the republication of Finkel’s papers in one collection [29]. The collection republished the 1929 book and eight major articles by Finkel that produced a good presentation of the researcher. Gradually, other articles appeared where scholars attempted to discuss some broad or specific aspects of Finkel’s translation research [e.g. 11; 4].

Results and Discussion. *Theory of Translation.* Every epoch has its own view of translation, its own ideology of what the place and function of translation is. Now we can easily assert a structuralist or cognitive translation theory, but back in 1939, Finkel spoke about the limits of time, language, literary genre, style that generate a specific theory for these specific requirements [14, p. 78]. This was caused by the accurate observation of how translation was treated in previous centuries and of its actualised consequence in a literary process. On the other hand, the literary process itself practically determined the principles, applied to translation.

What is translation? Since the task of translation is easy to define, i.e. to present works in one language to readers in another language, the definition of translation always lies in the approach to the phenomenon itself. Each approach, each tendency, each theory looks at the subject from different angles, using different terms and concepts. The boiling pot of ideas

about translation in the 1920s was mainly heated up by the principle of rendering the style of the author/text, which a number of men-of-letters looked in this direction (esp. Volodymyr Derzhavyn [7]).

Finkel, hence, postulates that “the art of translation consists not only in reproducing the stylistic differences of the original in one’s own language, but also in reproducing them while maintaining the given themes” [23, p. 15–16]. This basic definition was accepted once and for ever; we find it in his later works, namely [14, p. 65, 68; 25, p. 46], with the slightest modifications of expression. The key positions from which Finkel approached the problems of translation can be schematically outlined in the following set of guidelines.

1. Translation starts where Word ends. ... Since rendering the meaning of a word as well as the meaning of a sentence or even a text (themes of a literary piece) is not a great difficulty, translation is a stylistic problem, which deals with correlating stylistic means of languages in contact. A separate word, a sentence and a subject in the text are extralinguistic factors (i.e. beyond the translator’s competence), the absence of words and terms is occasional and does not influence the process of translation and does not constitute a translation problem per se [23, p. 13].

This view clearly declares that the researcher does not concern the semantic ground of equivalence, and thus it is easy to translate a single word. However, this statement contains a discrepancy: Finkel raises anyway the problem of *couleur locale* and *realia* which do not directly correlate with stylistic loading [23, p. 87, 90]. And secondly, Oleksandr Potebnia’s viewpoint that a translation evokes a thought, different from the original one, but does not render it, receives indistinct criticism [23, p. 30–31; 14, p. 78–79].

2. Possible are different translations [23, p. 12; 28, p. 68; 14, p. 75; 17, p. 2; 26].

In fact, Finkel voices an idea of translation multiplicity (or multiple retranslations) which was later developed within more specific parameters of time, place and a translator’s personality. One of the most important *raison d’être* of translation is the existence of various translation variants of one original. This situation causes bipartite relations: original-translation relations with a complex of bilingual and bicultural issues and translation-translation relations which are to reveal the influence of a national literary process as well as that of an individual personality.

3. The textual recreating of an original into a translation is viewed as solving problems between two poles – contents and form [23, p. 19, 26 ff].

Posing a text between these two extremes – and, at the same time, two fundamental components – goes back to Tycho Mommsen’s classification of texts on the basis of these two constituents. The Ukrainian scholar views the question of adjusting an original to different readership from the perspective of that opposition. As a result, he declares that the (re) comprehension of the contents impacts on the stylistic adjustment [14, p. 61].

4. Among the specific tasks of translation, one can find a chain of crucial prerequisites: what to translate, for whom to translate, and for what to translate [14, p. 60].

This approach to the translation repertoire helps us to see the same two-part matter: one way is to explore a personal choice of the translator (see his study of Ivan Franko’s Ukrainian translations of Russian poetry by Mykola Nekrasov, another one is to cast a general look at the national literary process and the role of a specific foreign literature in it. Bibliographical

reviews create a kind of bridge between wide readership and another historical culture.

5. Exactness is a historical value: what was exact at one epoch may not be so at another [14, p. 66].

Finkel was the first to fully apply to translation theory the so-called opposition of Classicism-Romanticism texts partially generated by H. Hukovskyi [23, p. 19 ff] which is a factual opposition between domestication and foreignisation. This argument was a good basis to delimitate the limits of translation equivalence and start the debate about the proper criteria of adequacy in translation.

What is equivalence? “It is absolutely clear that every translator and every translation have as a goal the rendering of the original with maximum closeness and exactness in all its components: its contents, literary images, sentence constructions, lexis, etc.”, Finkel wrote in 1952 [25, p. 46].

The main criterion for the quality of a translation is stylistic adequacy. As mentioned above, the concept of style was quite popular at that time. Finkel chose the topic of theoretical stylistics as a postgraduate student. The paper was published in 1927 and 1928 (in two parts) [21; 22]. His position on this question was as follows: if a language has two functions, i.e. constructive (communicative-cognitive) and aesthetic (communicative phenomena which in a peculiar way substitute for constructive ones, leaving space between a standard language system and that under consideration in the text) [23, p. 15]); style is, thus, defined as “correlation between constructive and aesthetical lingual phenomena in all their variety” [ibid.]¹.

The term for describing of equivalence in Finkel views must contain the constituent “eclectic” as a symbol of covering all relative parts of a text to be translated and a balance of their expression in a target language. However, he is not such an idealist as to equate convergence and adequacy in all – semantic and morphological – components of the translation with the original [14, p. 82].

Text-Type Restricted Translation Theory. Following his definition of style, Finkel distinguishes three types of text, each with a specific set of problems that arise in the process of translation. In the 1929 book, which was intended as a collection of materials, he arrived at an overview of all text types. Later on, he focused his attention mainly on the subject of verse translation, but the discussion of other text types, which had found a place in his book, appeared sporadically in some later articles.

1. Sci-tech translation whose language is exclusively constructive, i.e. aimed at fulfilling communicative and cognitive functions, is based mainly on two means of expression: a term (concerning lexis) and a formula (concerning syntax) [23, p. 46–47]. This type includes three subtypes: academic, administrative and publicist texts. Certainly, an aesthetic side of these genres is not so important for sci-tech translation (a publicist genre is an exception) as it is not so obviously present. A necessary condition is to be familiar with a branch of knowledge

¹ In contrast, Shleiermacher emphasised the semiotic essence of style without paying much attention to aesthetic deviations. He described style as “the art of communicating our ideas by means of signs”, and thus, “good style means imposing on the writer a rigor which will enable him to express his thoughts in an orderly and clear form that facilitates the reception of the message” [1, p. 35–36].

in which a text is produced, as this prevents numerous mistakes, which could be caused by a translator's ignorance [23, p. 52].

Coining new terms was a burning issue in the Ukrainian terminology of the 1920s when the Ukrainian language was strengthening and gaining new positions in all public spheres. Finkel suggests three ways of filling terminological lacunae: through borrowing, calques, and coining new terms in accordance with the "language's spirit" [23, p. 54–55], the last one being most dangerous, but all the competence belongs to the relevant institutes, not to a single translator.

2. Literary prosaic translation should start with an analysis of an original and its translation, as here – unlike in sci-tech translation – the main focus is on the stylistics and composition of a literary piece. The analysis includes four components-foci: semantics, syntax, phonology and composition [23, p. 75].

The tight spot of lexical distortions is caused either by a translator's simple ignorance or by the lack of semantic accuracy in rendering a specific word. This is a place where one faces a great predicament: the dilemma of choosing the most appropriate one among a number of synonyms [23, p. 82]. Synonyms are also one of the criteria that ensure the stylistic adequacy of a translation.

On the background of the lingual tissue of a text, the local genesis of a word manifests itself in culture-specific words (*couleur locale*). Their use in a target text has a double nature: in the first case, a translator has to deal with linguistic and cultural realia; in the second case, s/he implements them as exoticisms for creating a peculiar atmosphere [23, p. 86 ff]. Undoubtedly, this choice is made from the perspective of cultural closeness/distance; where realia have their similar notions in the target culture, there is no reason to apply them with many comments as the reader may not understand all the subtleties of the given notions. In the same line, one can see the issue of interpreting greetings. The techniques of translation suggested by Finkel for *couleur locale* are transcription, calques and substitutes [23, p. 88].

The word performs its literal function in two ways [23, p. 92]:

- a) the change of a word without a change of meaning: the usual manifestation of a notion is rejected, instead the author deploys a stylistically marked lexeme. The difference between these lexemes in the linguistic system and their concrete realisation in the text constitutes an aesthetic component of the word. With this approach, Finkel discusses a number of translation problems, how to render neologisms and archaisms, barbarisms and dialectical words, vulgarisms and curses;
- b) the change of meaning: the scholar regards the problem of stylistic renomination when one meaning is used instead of another, and it is our task to decipher it. In practice, one has to deal with all stylistic devices and phraseology.

3. Verse translation is analogously seen from the viewpoint of three kinds of phenomena: phonological (euphony, rhyme, rhythm), syntactic (stylistic means – enjambement, parallelism, etc. – and theme-rheme division) and semantic (lexical choice vs. stylistic correspondence). The transformation of an original poem into a prosaic genre in translation is beyond the limits of translation; it may be possible for academic purposes, but it ruins the literary quality of a text [23, p. 139]. These ideas voiced for the first time in 1929 were slightly modified later, but the basis remained practically unchanged [*cf.* 27].

Translating and Translator. Finkel regarded the process of translation as a tripartite structure:

- a) work of a scholar-hermeneutist which has to do with a verbal (lexical and grammatical semantics), historical (ideological loading of a text in a national literal process of a source / target culture) and technical (a composition of a text) interpretation of a textual organisation;
- b) higher hermeneutics, i.e. a perfect comprehension of a literary piece as a symbol, as a sign of general worldview (the author-readership opposition);
- c) a process of synthesis, creating an ultimate form of a literary work in the target language [23, p. 41–42].

That is a complicated process of rendering a text from one language into another, but what about reexpressing a text from one culture into another? Here we can speak of the activities of a translator as a personality. Finkel's scheme was aimed at describing a) a translator's repertoire, a translator's motivation and choice of original works, personal preferences in a contemporary literature; b) his/her technique, peculiarities of his/her style and his/her translation position; c) a role of these translations in the literature of a given time and place [20, p. 2].

All Ukrainian translators longed for the proper place of the Ukrainian language among other languages under imperialist regimes; Hryhoriy Kvitka-Osnovyanenko struggled with Russian chauvinists for the right to call Ukrainian a language, not a jargon or dialect; Ivan Franko, who was the most prolific translator, polished the Ukrainian language and enriched Ukrainian literature. These two outstanding figures of Ukrainian culture were the subject of a study by Finkel.

Translation and Language Teaching. Pedagogy and translation studies meet in two situations: in training a translator and in teaching a foreign language. In his articles "Translation in the secondary school" [25] and "On a textbook in Russian for schools with the Ukrainian language of instruction" [26], Finkel elaborates a new domain of translation studies, but deals with the latter aspect.

Since translations teach a pupil to use a language consciously [26, p. 48], they have a double effect. Firstly, the language is mastered, and even both languages as for these exercises the adequate level of fluency and knowledge of both languages are required. Secondly, a pupil learns to formulate his/her thought clearly. In this case, translation moves from linguistic exercises into intellectual (one knows the famous method of problem-solving. Here the pupil faces problems as well, only of lexical and grammatical character.)

To express a thought, we follow procedures of analysis and synthesis of material in both – always! – languages. Both a source language and a target language are better understood, as we carry out a complex process of adapting the lexis and grammatical constructions of the languages in all their stylistic variety [ibid.].

Understandably, it is nonsense to set the same tasks for mastering a language to pupils of different ages (actually, we should include the scale of foreign-language learners of different levels from that of beginners up to an advanced one; the age issue correlates only with specific aims of translation exercises, the assumptions about the use of translation according to the language level remaining analogous). For example, there is a little reason to use translation for spelling rules at the beginner's level although translation mainly provides for

checking more than one rule [25, p. 49–50]. It is worth applying translation in such directions: vocabulary (lexis and phraseology), grammatical structure (syntax), and stylistics (connection of morphology with lexis and syntax).

In the case of vocabulary, translation serves three purposes: 1) quantitative increase of a learner's vocabulary; 2) realising word polysemy and being able to apply an appropriate word in an appropriate context; 3) normative word combinability. A learner should treat a language's lexicon as a solid synonymic dictionary, and his/her task is to find the most accurate – i.e. best – synonym [25, p. 50]. As for syntax, translation is the best type of exercise, aimed at the practical acquisition of grammatical cases, prepositions, conjunctions, etc. [25, p. 53].

Concerning the age division, Finkel argues that on the basis of a secondary school, translation exercises must become systematic in grades 5–7 (of the 10–grade school) [25, p. 50], so that later, in grades 8–10, their complexity increases depending on the genre peculiarities of publicist, sci-tech or literary texts.

Another important point discussed by the scholar is ideological and educational significance of translation [25, p. 54]. On the one hand, the set of examples and texts projects the pupil's taste, sometimes make him/her think about an author's style and try to decipher original implications; on the other hand, a foreign language stimulates thinking. In this way, an international language influences a less developed language, partially intervening in a process of creating new concepts.

Analysis of an Original and a Translation. A general stylistic analysis is found indirectly through a study of a number of translation difficulties and their examples on phonological, semantic, syntactic and compositional levels [23, p. 75]. Morphology is included either in the sphere of semantics, if one appreciates the meaning of grammatical forms, or in syntax, if a stylistically important component is a grammatical construction. At the highest level of abstraction and literary artistry, there is the composition of a literary piece which defines the role and degree of significance of stylistic means and devices.

Finkel prepared a number of translation quality analyses [28]. Such analyses help to establish a notion of adequacy in a certain literary situation, as the main idea is not only to contrast an original and a translation, but also a translation with other translations. Secondly, they can be used in school as well.

Conclusions. Referring to George Steiner's classification of periods in the development of translation studies, we could say that Finkel's views best fit the third period, a period of linguistisation of translation theory. From the beginning, he relates translation to stylistics and linguistics, and later to linguostylistics. He poses questions such as 'what is translation', 'what can be the smallest unit of translation', 'what is a word and a sentence in the linguistic organisation of the text', 'how do linguistic phenomena become facts of historical culture', and many others.

Another question arises: what was the relationship between Finkel's view and the Marxist-Leninist methodology, which, as a methodology, is quite questionable. Although it was an absolute doctrine in the Soviet Union, translation theorists managed to adapt the real principles of translation to Marxism-Leninism in such a way that they could avoid extensive reference to this philosophy. Finkel cannot be described as a Marxist theorist. Certainly, he addressed many social issues related to the functions of translation, but he never seriously

grounded his theory as a Marxist one. It is more fruitful to look for its roots in German philosophy of language and German Classical philology.

Ukrainian translation research existed before and after Finkel. The medieval translator had a deep understanding of the cultural problems of translation. Franko synthesised many promising ideas from literary criticism and reshaped them for the perspective of translation. However, Finkel's legacy was destined to lay such a solid foundation that, despite ideological persecutions, it continued to serve as a guideline for further research and became a cornerstone in the history of the progress of translation studies in Ukraine.

REFERENCES

1. Bończa Bukowski P. de. Friedrich Schleiermacher's Pathways of Translation. De Gruyter, 2023. vi, 274 p.
2. Chesterman A. Reflections on Translation Theory. Amsterdam; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2017. x, 396 p.
3. Kalnychenko O. History of Ukrainian thinking on translation (from the 1920s to the 1950s). *Going East: Discovering New and Alternative Traditions in Translation Studies*. Berlin : Frank & Timme, 2017. P. 309–338.
4. Rysicz-Safranec Ju. Олександр Фінкель в історії українського перекладознавства. *Slavia orientalis*. 2021. Т. 70, nr. 2. S. 401–420.
5. Герцфельд Р. Рец. на: Фінкель О. Теорія й практика перекладу. ДВУ, 1929. 168 с. *Критика*. 1929. № 11. С. 125–129.
6. Горецький П. Рец. на: Фінкель О. Теорія й практика перекладу. ДВУ, 1929. 168 с. *Вісник Інституту української наукової мови*. 1930. Вип. 2. С. 62–64.
7. Державін В. Проблема віршованого перекладу. *Плужанин*. 1927. № 9/10. С. 44–51.
8. Зеров М. Рец. на: Фінкель О. Теорія й практика перекладу. ДВУ, 1929. 168 с. *Життя й революція*. 1929. № 12. С. 249–253.
9. Іваненко В. Розвиток методології українського радянського перекладознавства. “Хай слово мовлено інакше...”: *Статті з теорії, критики та історії художнього перекладу / упоряд. В. Коптілов*. Київ : Дніпро, 1982. С. 176–200.
10. Ковганюк С. Практика перекладу (З досвіду перекладача). Київ : Дніпро, 1968. 276 с.
11. Коломієць Л. В. О. М. Фінкель як теоретик перекладознавства. *Вісн. Харк. нац. ун-ту*. 2010. № 896: Романо-германська філологія. С. 150–156.
12. Майфет Г. Рец. на: Фінкель О. Теорія й практика перекладу. ДВУ, 1929. 168 с. *Червоний шлях*. 1929. № 10. С. 192–194.
13. Фінкель О. М. Г. Ф. Квітка-Основ'яненко як перекладач власних творів. Дис. ... канд. філол. наук / пер. 1939 р. Центральний державний архів-музей літератури і мистецтва України. Фонд 273. Оп. 1. Од. зб. 17.
14. Фінкель О. М. Про деякі питання теорії перекладу. *Наукові записки*. Харків. держ. педагог. ін-т інозем. мов. Харків, 1939. Т. 1. С. 59–82.
15. Фінкель О. М. Автобіографія / 20 квітня 1949 г. Центральний державний архів-музей літератури і мистецтва України. Фонд 273. Оп. 1. Од. зб. 76.
16. Фінкель О. М. Заявка на книгу: Теорія й практика перекладу 1963 г. (?) Центральний державний архів-музей літератури і мистецтва України. Фонд 273. Оп. 1. Од. зб. 45.

17. Фінкель О. М. “Заповіт” Т. Г. Шевченка в російських перекладах. Березень 1964 г. Центральний державний архів-музей літератури і мистецтва України. Фонд 273. Оп. 1. Од. зб. 46.
18. Фінкель О. М. Особовий листок з обліку кадрів / 3 вересня 1964 г. Центральний державний архів-музей літератури і мистецтва України. Фонд 273. Оп. 1. Од. зб. 103.
19. Фінкель О. М. Запис студента Харківського інституту народного господарства. 1920–1924. Центральний державний архів-музей літератури і мистецтва України. Фонд 273. Оп. 1. Од. зб. 94.
20. Фінкель О. М. Іван Франко – перекладач. Центральний державний архів-музей літератури і мистецтва України. Фонд 273. Оп. 1. Од. зб. 53.
21. Фінкель О. Короткий вступ до теоретичної стилістики. *Наукові записки Харківської науково-дослідчої катедри мовознавства [ХІНО]* / за ред. П. Г. Ріттера, Л. А. Булаховського. Харків, 1927. С. 111–121.
22. Фінкель О. М. Семантико-стилістичні етюди. *Наукові записки Харківської науково-дослідчої катедри мовознавства [ХІНО]* / за ред. П. Г. Ріттера, Л. А. Булаховського, О. Н. Снявського. Харків, 1929. С. 97–112.
23. Фінкель О. Теорія й практика перекладу. Харків : ДВУ, 1929. 168 с.
24. Фінкель О. М. Г. Ф. Квітка-Основ'яненко як перекладач власних творів: дис. ... канд. філол. наук. Харків, 1939. 109 с. Центр. наук. б-ка Харків. нац. ун-ту ім. В. Н. Каразіна. Шифри зберігання: Д-345 і Д-346.
25. Фінкель О. М. Переклад у середній школі. *Українська мова в школі*. 1952. № 5. С. 44–54.
26. Фінкель О. М. Про підручник російської мови для шкіл з українською мовою навчання. *Українська мова в школі*. 1952. № 4. С. 39–48.
27. Фінкель О. М. Про критерії точності віршованого перекладу. *Питання літературознавства та мовознавства. Тези доп. та повідом. республікан. наук. конф. (травень 1967 р.)*. Харків : Вид-во ХДУ, 1967. С. 230–232.
28. Фінкель О. М. “Заповіт” Т. Г. Шевченка в російських перекладах. *Мовознавство*. 1975. № 2. С. 67–75.
29. Фінкель О. Забутий теоретик українського перекладознавства. Вінниця : Нова книга, 2007. 438 с.
30. Шмігер Т. Олександр Фінкель – теоретик українського перекладу. *Григорій Кочур і український переклад: матеріали міжнар. наук.-практ. конф.* Київ; Ірпінь, 27–29 жовт. 2003 р. Київ; Ірпінь: Перун, 2004. С. 272–278.
31. Шмігер Т. Олександр Фінкель – теоретик перекладу. *Шмігер Т. Історія українського перекладознавства ХХ сторіччя*. Київ : Смолоскип, 2009. С. 105–116.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. Bończa Bukowski P de. Friedrich Schleiermacher's Pathways of Translation. De Gruyter, 2023. vi, 274 p.
2. Chesterman A. Reflections on Translation Theory. Amsterdam; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2017. x, 396 p.
3. Kalnychenko O. History of Ukrainian thinking on translation (from the 1920s to the 1950s). Going East: Discovering New and Alternative Traditions in Translation Studies. Berlin : Frank & Timme, 2017. P. 309–338.
4. Rysicz-Safranec Ju. Oleksandr Finkel v istoriyi ukrayinskoho perekladoznavstva [Oleksandr Finkel in the history of Ukrainian translation studies]. *Slavia orientalis*. 2021. T. 70, nr. 2. S. 401–420.
5. Hertsfeld R. Rets. na: Finkel O. Teoriya y praktyka perekladu [Review of: Theory and Practice of Translation]. DVU, 1929. 168 s. *Krytyka*. 1929. № 11. S. 125–129.
6. Horetskyi P. Rets. na: Finkel O. Teoriya y praktyka perekladu [Review of: Theory and Practice of Translation]. DVU, 1929. 168 s. *Visnyk Instytutu ukrayinskoyi naukovoyi movy*. 1930. Vyp. 2. S. 62–64.
7. Derzhavin V. Problema virshovanoho perekladu [A problem of verse translation]. *Pluzhanyn*. 1927. № 9/10. S. 44–51.
8. Zerov M. Rets. na: Finkel O. Teoriya y praktyka perekladu [Review of: Theory and Practice of Translation]. DVU, 1929. 168 s. // *Zhyttia y revolyutsiya*. 1929. № 12. S. 249–253.
9. Ivanenko V. Rozvytok metodolohiyi ukrayinskoho radyanskoho perekladoznavstva [The development of the methodology of Ukrainian Soviet translation studies]. "*Khai slovo movleno inaksh...*": *Statti z teoriyi, krytyky ta istoriyi khudozhnogo perekladu / uporyad. V. Koptilov*. Kyiv : Dnipro, 1982. S. 176–200.
10. Kovhanyuk S. Praktyka perekladu (Z dosvidu perekladacha). [Translation praxis (A translator's experience)] Kyiv : Dnipro, 1968. 276 s.
11. Kolomiyets L. V. O. M. Finkel yak teoretik perekladoznavstva [O. M. Finkel as a theoretician of Translation Studies]. *Visn. Khark. nats. un-tu: Romano-hermanska filolohiya*. 2010. № 896. S. 150–156.
12. Mayfet H. Rets. na: Finkel O. Teoriya y praktyka perekladu [Review of: Theory and Practice of Translation]. DVU, 1929. 168 s. *Chervonyi shliakh*. 1929. № 10. S. 192–194.
13. Finkel O. M. H. F. Kvitka-Osnov'ianenko yak perekladach vlasnykh tvoriv [H. F. Kvitka-Osnovyanenko as a translator of his own writings]. Dys. ... kand. filol. nauk / per. 1939 r. Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv-muzei literatury i mystetstva Ukrainy. Fond 273. Op. 1. Od. zb. 17.
14. Finkel O. M. Pro deiaki pytannia teorii perekladu [On some issues of translation theory]. *Naukovi zapysky*. Kharkiv. derzh. pedahoh. in-t inozem. mov. Kharkiv, 1939. T. 1. S. 59–82.
15. Finkel O. M. Avtobiohrafyya [Autobiography] / 20 kvitnia 1949 r. // Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv-muzei literatury i mystetstva Ukrayiny. Fond 273. Op. 1. Od. zb. 76.
16. Finkel O. M. A book proposal: Teoriya i praktyka perekladu. 1963 r. (?) // Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv-muzei literatury i mystetstva Ukrayiny. Fond 273. Op. 1. Od. zb. 45.
17. Finkel O. M. „Zapovit” T. H. Shevchenka v rosiyskykh perekkladakh [T. H. Shevchenko's poem “Testament” in Russian translations] / berezen 1964 r. // Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv-muzei literatury i mystetstva Ukrayiny. Fond 273. Op. 1. Od. zb. 46.
18. Finkel O. M. Osobovyi lystok z obliku kadriv [A personnel data sheet] / 3 veresnia 1964 g. Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv-muzei literatury i mystetstva Ukrayiny. Fond 273. Op. 1. Od. zb. 103.

19. Finkel O. M. Zapys studenta Kharkivskoho instytutu narodnoho hospodarstva [A transcript of a student of Kharkiv National Economy Institute] / 1920–1924. Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv-muzei literatury i mystetstva Ukrainy. Fond 273. Op. 1. Od. zb. 94.
20. Finkel O. M. Ivan Franko – perekladach [Ivan Franko as a translator]. Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv-muzei literatury i mystetstva Ukrainy. Fond 273. Op. 1. Od. zb. 53.
21. Finkel O. Korotkyi vstup do teoretychnoyi stylistyky [A brief introduction to theoretical stylistics]. *Naukovi zapysky Kharkivskoyi naukovo-doslidchoyi katedry movoznavstva [KHINO]* / za red. P. H. Rittera, L. A. Bulakhovskoho. Kharkiv, 1927. S. 111–121.
22. Finkel O. M. Semantyko-stylistychni etyudy [Semantic and stylistic studies]. *Naukovi zapysky Kharkivskoyi naukovo-doslidchoyi katedry movoznavstva [KHINO]* / za red. P. H. Rittera, L. A. Bulakhovskoho, O. N. Syniavskoho. Kharkiv, 1929. S. 97–112.
23. Finkel O. Teoriya y praktyka perekladu [Theory and Practice of Translation]. Kharkiv : DVU, 1929. 168 s.
24. Finkel O. M. H. F. Kvitka-Osnovyanenko yak perekladach vlasnykh tvoriv [H. F. Kvitka-Osnovyanenko as a translator of his own writings] : Dys. ... kand. filol. nauk. Kharkiv, 1939. 109 s. Tsentr. nauk. b-ka Kharkiv. nats. un-tu im. V. N. Karazina. Shyfy zberihannia: D-345 i D-346.
25. Finkel O. M. Pereklad u seredniy shkoli [Translation in the high school]. *Ukrayinska mova v shkoli*. 1952. № 5. S. 44–54.
26. Finkel O. M. Pro pidruchnyk rosiyskoyi movy dlia shkil z ukrayinskoyu movoyu navchannia [On a textbook of Russian for schools with Ukrainian as a language of instruction]. *Ukrayinska mova v shkoli*. 1952. № 4. S. 39–48.
27. Finkel O. M. Pro kryteriyi tochnosti virshovanoho perekladu [On accuracy criteria in verse translation]. *Pytannia literaturoznavstva ta movoznavstva. Tezy dop. ta povidom. respublikan. nauk. konf. (traven 1967 r.)*. Kharkiv : Vyd-vo KHDU, 1967. S. 230–232.
28. Finkel O. M. “Zapovit” T. H. Shevchenka v rosiyskykh perekladakh [T. H. Shevchenko’s poem “Testament” in Russian translations]. *Movoznavstvo*. 1975. № 2. S. 67–75.
29. Finkel O. Zabutiy teoretyk ukrayinskoho perekladoznavstva [A Forgotten Theoretician of Ukrainian Translation Studies]. Vinnytsia : Nova knyha, 2007. 438 s.
30. Shmiher T. Oleksandr Finkel – teoretyk ukrayinskoho perekladu [Oleksandr Finkel as a Theoretician of Ukrainian Translation]. *Hryhoriy Kochur i ukrayinskyi pereklad: materialy mizhnar. nauk.-prakt. konf., Kyiv; Irpin, 27-29 zhovt. 2003 r.* Kyiv; Irpin: Perun, 2004. S. 272–278.
31. Shmiher T. Oleksandr Finkel – teoretyk perekladu [Oleksandr Finkel as a Translation Theoretician]. *Shmiher T. Istoriya ukrayinskoho perekladoznavstva XX storichchia*. Kyiv : Smoloskyp, 2009. S. 105–116.

Article submitted 23.05.2024

Accepted for publication 12.06.2024

ОЛЕКСАНДР ФІНКЕЛЬ І СТАНОВЛЕННЯ ПЕРЕКЛАДОЗНАВСТВА В УКРАЇНІ

Тарас Шмігер

*Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка,
вул. Університетська, 1, м. Львів, 79000, Україна
taras.shmiher@lnu.edu.ua*

Мета статті – оцінити значну роль Олександра Фінкеля у становленні українського перекладознавства як самостійної наукової дисципліни. Новаторська робота О. Фінкеля запровадила методологічний підхід до аналізу лінгвістичних аспектів перекладу, а сам дослідник був одним з перших прихильників цього підходу. Хоча науковець працював у Харкові, його дослідження з України мали вплив на весь Радянський Союз та навіть далі. Фінкелеве широкомасштабне дослідження перекладу як наукового явища мало за ціль створити окрему наукову галузь в українському академічному середовищі, використовуючи лінгвостилістичну методологію, що саме зароджувалася.

Спираючись насамперед на опубліковані праці та рукописи О. Фінкеля, стаття висвітлює його погляди на основні сфери перекладознавства: теорію, критику та дидактику. Його застосування лінгвостилістики глибоко занурюється у базові явища перекладу, такі як еквівалентність, типи тексту, множинність перекладу, роль перекладача, інтертекстуальність і динаміка тексту.

У рамках класифікації перекладознавчих періодів Джорджа Штайнера ідеї О. Фінкеля найбільше збігаються з третім періодом, який характеризується лінгвістичним підходом до теорії перекладу. Спочатку він пов'язує переклад зі стилістикою та лінгвістикою, згодом розвиваючи лінгвостилістику. Ключові питання його роботи включають природу перекладу, найменшу одиницю перекладу, лінгвістичну структуру елементів тексту, таких, як слова та речення, і те, як мовні елементи формують історично-культурну дійсність.

Ключові слова: теорія перекладу, еквівалентність, типи тексту, оцінка якості перекладу, дидактика перекладу.