

**Published:** Kalnychenko, Oleksandr. *Ukrainian Translation Thought of the 1920's/ Oleksandr Kalnychenko// Наукові записки КДПУ ім. В. Винниченка. – Випуск 116. – Серія: Філологічні науки (мовознавство) – Кіровоград: РВВ КДПУ ім. В. Винниченка, 2013. – С.133 – 141. It reproduces in brief my Ukrainian Introduction to the anthology of Ukrainian reflections on translation in the 1920's*

*Oleksandr Kalnychenko*

### **Ukrainian Translation Thought of the 1920s**

Hryhoriy Kochur (1908–1994), a Ukrainian translator and cultural studies scholar, one of the best Ukrainian translators ever who translated from 33 literatures, stated in 1965 that

“We know our translational ‘household’ little and do not make particular efforts to get to know it better. But the high level of the art of translation marked by the names of M. Ryl’s’kyi, M. Bazhan, M. Lukash is the outcome of not only their work ... it is the sequel of the work of several generations. This is only the peak of the development of the translation business in Ukrainian literature. Every translator (and not only a translator) ought to be aware of our translation tradition and of the history of the Ukrainian translation development” (Kochur, 1965: 132).

To systematize data from the history of Ukrainian translation and to analyze them in accordance with substantial considerations, Kochur has proposed the periodization of the development of the Ukrainian art of translation (Kochur, 1968: 92–97). Dealing with the so-called pre-October Modern Ukrainian translation, Kochur considers it necessary to differentiate three stages: 1) the initial period when “an insignificant level of the development of the then literary language and the profound influence of the style of Ivan Kotliarevs’kyi<sup>1</sup> drove the translators of the time on the way of travesty” (Kochur 1968: 92) (e.g., Yevhen Hrebinka, Petro Hulak- Artemovs’kyi); 2) the period of translation based on folk song foundations, the period of rehash, of Ukrainianized translation (Kochur 1968: 92) (e.g., Stepan Rudans’kyi ” (Kochur, 1968: 93)); 3) the third period that “placed Ukrainian translation on the All-European level (represented by P. Kulish, P. Nischyns’kyi, M. Staryts’kyi, I. Franko, B. Hrinchenko, Lesia Ukrayinka and others around her). That is, in the 1890s “translation shifted from

---

<sup>1</sup> Ivan Kotliarevs’kyi (1769–1838), popularly known as the “father” of modern Ukrainian literature, published in 1798 his travesty of Virgil’s *Aeneid*, the burlesque *Eneyida*, which ushered in the new Ukrainian literature in the vernacular.

being a preoccupation of a few individual authors to a major segment of the mainstream literary process” (Chernetsky, 2010).

Strategies of translation involving the basic tasks of choosing the foreign text to be translated and developing a method to translate it undoubtedly emerge as a response to the inner situation in the culture and are determined by a number of factors: cultural as well as economic and political. So, to realize better the nature and significance of the boom of the Ukrainian translation during the Struggle for Independence, as the years 1917–1920 are known in Ukrainian historiography, and later in the 1920s during the indigenization policy that brought Ukrainian language spreading into all the spheres of life and all the genres of literature, it might be well to consider the background of those translation activities.

Hence, what makes the case of the Ukrainian translation in the 1800s different from that of its neighbors (Russians, Poles, or Hungarians)?

Firstly, it is the long-standing policy of bans and restrictions against the use of Ukrainian language promulgated by Russian imperial authorities, which resulted in the Russification of Ukrainian towns and in reducing Ukraine to a peasant nation.<sup>2</sup> Incidentally, the status of the Ukrainian language in the Austrian Empire, and after the Compromise of 1867 the Austrian-Hungarian Empire, was also precarious.

Secondly, the readers of translations in Ukrainian comprised the narrow strata of national intelligentsia. Pavlo Fylypovych in his seminal paper “*The social physiognomy of the Ukrainian reader in the 1830–40s*” wrote

«Works by Kharkiv romanticists hardly ever reached out the upper crust and could not find their consumer among the have-nots, those whose social order they satisfied belonged right to the middle class – to the country squires, and civil servants, mostly with university education”(Fylypovych, 1930b).

---

<sup>2</sup> In 1627, Moscow Church authorities prohibited Ukrainian books; in 1672, the secular arm ordered the burning of Ukrainian books; in 1720 the Russian tsar Peter I by his edict banned the printing of books in Ukraine in local idiom with the purpose (stated in the edict) to Russify the people there, and as a result throughout the 1700s no Ukrainian book was published on the territory of the Russian Empire; during the 1700s the schools in Ukraine were transferred to the Russian language of instruction and an absolute veto on teaching in Ukrainian was exercised in 1782; a circular of 1863 by P. Valuev, Russia’s minister of internal affairs, to the censorship committees once again imposed restrictions on Ukrainian-language publications in the Russian Empire: the Censorship Administration could license for publication in this language only such books that belonged to the realm of fine literature; at the same time, the authorization of books in Little Russian with either spiritual content or intended generally for primary mass reading should be ceased; the Ems Decree from 1876 by the Russian tsar Alexander II banned the printing and distribution of any original works or translations in the “Little Russian dialect” (as well as the import of Ukrainian publications and the staging of plays or lectures) “with the exception of (a) historical documents and monuments; (b) works of belles-lettres but with the provision that in the documents the orthography of the originals be retained; in works of belles-lettres no deviations from the accepted Russian orthography are permitted”; a period of leniency after 1905 was followed by another strict ban in 1914, which also affected Russian-occupied Galicia.

They were mostly multilingual. Thus, the function of this translation was not merely for information, but primarily the function of nation building (Strikha, 2006) or as Vitali Chernetskiy (Chernetskiy, 2010) put it

... when in the late eighteenth – early nineteenth century Ukrainian authors produced translations of Virgil, Horace, Pushkin, and Mickiewicz, their goal was not to bring these texts to a *new* audience, but rather to make their audience appreciate the capacity of their native language to express these familiar texts. In other words, it was an argument for strengthening their national aspirations.

Thirdly, the sphere of translation was practically confined to belles-lettres and literary translation, which played a pivotal role in shaping the national identity of Ukrainians. To overcome the censorship they often had to rehash or adapt and hide the names of the translated authors. For example, Hrinchenko turned Leo Tolstoi's story "The Prisoner in the Caucasus" into the story "The Black-Sea Men in Captivity" (Raliv 1929: 24). Ukrainian literary translation was a conscious project of resistance, and it is traced from the beginning of the nineteenth century through the Soviet era (Strikha 2006).

Fourthly, it is the artistic translations that formed the Ukrainian lexicon in many fields where this vocabulary could not be formed because of the lack of Ukrainian-speaking upper classes, army, administration, science, clergy etc. (Strikha 2006).

In Post-October times H. Kochur distinguishes three stages: 1) the first 15 post-revolutionary years (that is, up to 1933) saw "great enthusiasm and an upsurge in translation activities" (Kochur 1968: 95) (with translation activities of Mykola Zerov, Maksym Ryl's'kyi, Pavlo Fylypovych, Mykhailo Drai-Khmara, Osva'd Burghardt, Valerian Pidmohyl'nyi, Dmytro Zahul, Ivan Kulyk, Volodymyr Samiylenko, Mykhailo Kalynovych, Mykola Bazhan, Pavlo Ritter being singled out), the publication of many-volumed collected works of translated authors (Anatole France, Guy de Maupassant, Jack London, Émile Zola, and others) and an increase "in the development of translation theory" (Mykola Zerov, Serhiy Rodzevych, Pavlo Fylypovych); 2) the 7–8 years before the war and the first post-war years (that is, 1933–1953) was a period of decline in translation activities, with translations often made from the intermediate language (usually Russian), in spite of some advances (Yuriy Korets'kyi's translations from Byron and Shakespeare and an anthology of foreign literature compiled by Oleksandr Bilets'kyi and Mykola Plevako); 3) a period of activization of translation activities and "the emergence of translations which are models for the authors of the original writers (Boccaccio's "The Decameron" translated by Mykola Lukash and "Odyssey" by Borys Ten), and of upsurge of critical thought around the translation issues" (e.g., Oleksiy Kundzich) (Kochur 1968: 96).

Roksolana Zorivchak rightly asserts that the modern history of Ukraine has witnessed that “translations play a compensatory role for the country’s own literature that was being purposefully and systematically destroyed” (Zorivchak 2001).

Taras Shmiher, who suggests the periodization of the Ukrainian Translation Thought History of the 1900s, divides this into four periods: 1) the critical and theoretical period (early 20<sup>th</sup> century up to WWI) characterized by the search of the foundations of translation theory, its term system and methods of analysis within the general framework of Literary Studies; 2) the period of the establishment of *Perekladoznavstvo* (literary “Translation Studies”) as a scholarly and academic discipline in Ukraine (from the end of WWI to the end of WWII) with the systematization and theoretization of the scholarship performed under the influence of higher educational and research institutions when the National Revival of the 1920s inspired the study of historical and sociological aspects of translation; 3) the period of the development of Ukrainian Translation Thought within the context of the Soviet Union (late 1940s – early 1970s) when Ukrainian scholarly discourse, a part of the Soviet school of Translation Studies, focused on literalism and general methodological prerequisites; 4) the period of transformation of Translation Studies into an interdisciplinary field of scholarship (mid-1970s up to the present time) distinguished by the expansion of the methods and topics of translation analysis due to the application of developments in psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, cultural studies etc. The years following Ukrainian Independence (1991) radically changed the nature of translation research making possible the activities which had previously been regarded as inadmissible on ideological grounds, like consideration of the nation-shaping role of translation as well as some historical issues and sci-tech translation.(Shmiher 2009).

Translation can support the formation of national identities through both the selection of foreign texts and the development of discursive strategies to translate them (Venuti, 2005). Our theory and practice of translation are determined by the tasks to be resolved. That means that various assignments give rise to various theoretical constructions. No less important is the fact that when we encounter the theories of the past times we are bound to ask ourselves which particular problems those theories had to solve.

Within the Ukrainian translation tradition, as indicated above, the 1920s (1917–1932) witnessed a great development and zeal in translation activities and in the advance of translation theory. Important social and political events of the time (national awakening and Ukrainian independent governments of 1917–1920, the Civil war, Ukrainization – indigenization policy of 1923–27 and its gradual phasing out, Stalin’s repression and the Holodomor or Ukrainian Holocaust) and outstanding dealings of scientific character (formation of the Academy of

Sciences of Ukraine in 1918, introduction of the Ukrainian language and Ukrainian Studies in schools, and then the ruin of the national establishments) effected the fate of Ukrainian translation studies. The establishment of the Ukrainian state and the Ukrainization policy encouraged the spreading of the Ukrainian literary language to all spheres of life and to all genres, in the broad sense. The abrupt termination of the policy of Ukrainization in late 1932 and early 1933, and the utter rout of cultural life, brought numerous attempts of the Bolshevik government to restrict the usage of the Ukrainian language (for example, excluding it from military and technical spheres) and to purify it from European elements unknown in the Russian language. This was accompanied by massive oppression and discrimination against Ukrainophones, with major repression starting as early as 1929–30, when a large group of Ukrainian intelligentsia was arrested and most were executed.

Translation thought of the so called Period of “Executed Renaissance” (*rozstriliane vidrodzhennia*) is topical for contemporary researcher, because translation scholars in Ukraine in the 1920s were conceptualising about translation in terms very similar to those taken up by Western Translation Studies only recently, for the national revival of the 1920s inspired the study of historical and sociological aspects of translation, in particular, such issues as the reception of translations by the reader and the shift in translation strategies (Tykhovs’ky 1924; Chaplia 1924; Arasymovych 1926; Lazurs’ky 1929; Fylypovych 1930a) and the readers of translations themselves (Bilets’ky 1928; Aizenshtok 1928: 46–59; Fylypovych 1930b), the importance of the translated literature for the target culture (Zerov 1924; Shamrai 1928), the role of the translator in the literary process etc.

As early as in October, 1918, the first sizable Ukrainian translated book review (“Gerhart Hauptman in Ukrainian translations”) published in the *Knyhar*’s 14 Issue by Pavlo Bohatsky (1883–1962), a famous literary critic and the Editor-in-Chief of the prewar *Ukrayins’ka khata* journal, who was at that time the Ataman (commandant) of Kyiv, called for the Publishing Houses to be demanded of

“ doing two things: to print the work itself and to supply it with a capacious and detailed critical review ... because different though they are kinds of work, their cause is nevertheless common...Otherwise, in the society of low artistic culture, it will happen so that the finest pieces of art, yet works which are elaborate and profound, be they, by way of example, the compositions by the same Hauptman, will remain incomprehensible. It is so with the masterpieces of our native writers, it will be so with the translations of the oeuvres of European authors. They will not attract the desirable attention or will become hollow, insignificant, superficial talk – shell without its core” (Bohatsky, 1918).

And the policies of publishers of books in translation were virtually always like that: almost without exception a book in translation was accompanied by a large introduction or

afterword which regularly included the matters of translation. The 1920's when the new names emerged in the Ukrainian literature as well as the new approaches towards the incorporation of the wealth of the Weltliteratur through the Ukrainian translations of its best specimens witnessed the heyday of translation reviewing and translation criticism. It was in the wake of those new and numerous translations that the translation criticism developed and flourished. Requirements to translation criticism were overtly advanced by Volodymyr Derzhavyn, the most prolific translation reviewer of the 1920s, the author of about 35 translation reviews in five years (1927–1931):

«At determining the appropriateness and accuracy of translations, particular emphasis is to be given to specific argumentation in reviews of translated poetry and fiction; here one should take as their rule the following guideline: if the reviewer do not point to any specific instance (neither positive, nor negative), then, he or she has not compared a translation with its source and thus is incompetent for translation evaluation» (Derzhavyn 1929).

The abundant translation reviews, among whose authors mention should be made of Andriy Nikovs'ky, Pavlo Bohats'ky, Borys Iakubs'ky, Mykola Zerov, Pavlo Tykhovs'ky, Serhiy Rodzevych, Volodymyr Derzhavyn, Hryhoriy Maifet, Ielyzaveta Starynkevych, Oswald Burghardt, Dmytro Rudyk, Oleksandr Bilets'ky, Iuriy Savchenko, Ahapiy Shamray, Hryhoriy Kovalenko-Kolomats'ky, Ivan Kulyk, Sydir Sakydon, and others, contributed to the refinement of translation analysis, shaping the approaches to the elucidation of the verse translation difficulties, to the rendition of a dialect and argot speech, of archaisms and slang, paying attention to the transfer of punctuation, of proper names, but for the most part elaborating translation norms, specifically of the selection of the source texts for translation. Translation reviews were regularly published by such periodicals as *Knyhar'*, *Chervonyi Shliakh*, *Krytyka*, *Zhyttia ta Revoliutsiya*, *Krasnoye Slovo*. Of paramount interest for a contemporary researcher are parallel monthly reviews dealing with the novelties of literature in translation (often with the same books) by Volodymyr Derzhavyn from Kharkiv in *Krytyka*, the specialized journal of literary criticism, set up in Kharkiv in February 1928, edited by V. Desniak, and by Serhiy Rodzevych from Kyiv in the *Zhyttia ta Revoliutsiya* literary and scholarly monthly, which had been published during 1925–34 in Kyiv.

The new epoch brought about the revision of the Ukrainian literary heritage and the rewriting of literature history. Of vital significance for the emergence of the theory of translation were the works on literature history that viewed translation as an important and formative part of the literary system. The perception of translation as a factor in nation formation in the works of Mykolay Saharda (Saharda 1919a, b) (1870–1942?), the former professor of St Petersburg

ecclesiological academy, famous specialist in patristics, and translator, on the Ukrainian Bible translations marked the advent of translation history as a new branch in translation research in Ukraine.

It is customary to assume that the first scholar who called attention to the role of translation in the history of literature was Edmond Cary, who claimed that, as a rule, translation came before original literature and “had been the great midwife of literatures” (Cary 1956: 126), and that only recently had translation and literature scholars recognized the significance of studying translation as a part of literature history. Moreover, it is the research on translation in its relation to literature which reveals the true history of contacts and influences, which is essentially a literature history. But as early as the 1920s in his manual *Nove Ukrayins'ke pis'mentstvo* (New Ukrainian Writings, vol 1, 1924), Mykola Zerov (1890–1937), a prominent Ukrainian poet, translator of numerous works of Latin poetry and the works of J.-M. de Heredia, P. de Ronsard, J. du Bellay, Adam Mickiewicz, Ivan Bunin, and others, and literary historian, regarded translation as a valid component of the national literature (Zerov 1924) and approached the history of Ukrainian literature of the 1800s as an integrated process, “viewing the development of high poetic style on the basis of original and translated genres” (Shmiher 2005: 97).

Among topics of interest for contemporary researchers in TS is not only Mykola Zerov's examination of translations as an integral part of the national literature and their function in nation formation (Zerov 1924), but as well Volodymyr Derzhavyn's articles on language jobs and translation types (Derzhavyn 1927) and requirements for translation reviews (Derzhavyn 1929), first investigations into self-translation (Finkel' 2006 [1929b]) and into newspaper translation by Oleksandr Finkel' (Finkel' 1929a), power and translation in prefaces by Ivan Kulyk (Kulyk 1928), who admits that a literary text undergoes a chain of transformation depending on the stance of the translator, etc. For example, in his preface to his own “Anthology of American poetry, 1855–1925”, Ivan Kulyk (Kulyk 1928: 37) notes down

Grasping originals to some extent in accordance with our outlook, when translating, we unintentionally emphasized one or other ideological aspects in them, not purposely and deliberately, but rather as we felt them. For a translator belonging to a different class category apparently would have highlighted other sides and features of the original than we did. Moreover, we sometimes attempted to adopt our translations to the comprehension and perception of the audience which we destined them for. We meant that we had been translating for the Ukrainian reader and in addition to that to our contemporary Soviet reader. That made us willfully introduce some alterations in the translations in comparison with the source texts as it is impossible to write in the same way to an American and a Ukrainian reader, since they have dissimilar psychology and dissimilar inclination to perception of artistic works resulted from the predominance of different economic systems and the influence of unlike opposite political factors and social systems. ... In the same way,

the verses of American poets, faithfully translated, would have one sense in New-York and another in Kharkiv.

Recently, translation scholars' attention has been attracted by a number of the texts which because of such a controversial prerequisite of research throughout most of the twentieth century as the existence of a source text have been excluded so far from the subjects for study in the discipline: they are pseudo-translations, that is, texts, which have been presented as translations although the corresponding source texts have never existed; texts whose source texts have not existed as independent texts but only served as bases for the translations; texts for which the linearity between the source and target texts has been difficult to establish for some reason. One more area so far very little attended to, even clearly neglected and overlooked is the phenomenon of *self-translation*, defined by Anton Popovic as "the translation of an original work into another language by the author himself" (Popovic 1976: 19), and characteristic of such personalities as Thomas More, Du Bellay, John Calvin, the philosopher Spinoza, the Italian playwright Carlo Goldoni, the French poet Mallarmé, James Joyce, and the Nobel Prize recipients Mistral, Tagore, Pirandello, Beckett, Singer, Brodsky, and Milosz, and the Ukrainian writers Kvitka-Osnovyanenko, Panteleimon Kulish, Lesia Ukrainka. Plus Romain Gary, and Elsa Triolet in France, Aitmatov and Bykov in the USSR, and an endless list of authors, particularly within the world of literature. But the first researcher in the world who directed attention to the problem of self-translation was Oleksandr Finkel' from Kharkiv University. In his 1929 seminal article "H.F. Kvitka as the translator of his own works", Finkel' argues that neglect of the problem is not rightful and that the thought that '*there is no difference between the author-translator and the conventional translator at all*' is "*the simplification of the matter*" (Finkel' 1929b: 107), that

common translation norm which is compulsory for everybody is nonexistent ... these norms fluctuate – depending upon the general literary views of a certain epoch ... There is not any objective criterion for distinguishing between translation and artistic adaptation, there is not any objective criterion for determining qualitative shades and that which is sometimes posed as such a decisive factor is actually a statement of reviewer's personal predilection; it has neither objectivity, nor categoricity. Due to all those circumstances – even if not very comforting, but actually existent – the author's solution of translation problems unexpectedly acquires particularly acute interest and significance (Finkel' 1929b: 107–108).

The 1920s saw the establishment of the Ukrainian translation thought as a scholarly and educational discipline in Ukraine embracing translation history, theory, criticism, and didactics within national scientific school. About the appearance of first articles in translation theory Mykola Zerov wrote in his article "On Verse Translation Matters" which also became an important contribution to the verse translation theory (and not only verse translation)

A good sign for the future is the fact that hand in hand with the practical work in the field of translated poetry there also appears a theoretical interest in its problems. We mean three articles: by



V.M. Derzhavyn – “Verse translation problem”, by Iuriy Savchenko – “Beginning” (Pluzhanyn monthly, 1927, # 9-10, P. 44-50, 63-71) and by Hr. Maifet “From remarks on the theory of translation” (Krytyka monthly, 1928, vol. 3, P. 84-93). To them we should add as well some reviews that in one way or another have touched on some theoretical issues (by V.M. Derzhavyn – on Knyhospilka Publishers’, by O. Burghardt and by P.I. Tykhovsky – on Ulesko’s translation of Faust, and some others)” (Zerov 1928: 133).

*“From the today’s point of view one can hold that first of all I.Kulyk, M.Zerov with his realistic views and requirements towards poetic translation and Hr. Maifet were at the outset of the Ukrainian translation studies, and undoubtedly, Derzhavyn, the most proficient and vigorous reviewer of prosaic and poetic translations of that time”, - maintains Il’ko Korunets’ (Korunets’ 2008: ), patriarch of translation studies in Ukraine. In his article “Verse translation problem” (1927), the first article (as it turned out to be) on the translation theory in Ukraine, Volodymyr Derzhavyn (Derzhavyn 1927: 44-45) developed the translation classification based on the language functions, half a century before Katharina Reiß’s similar classification and six years before Karl Bühler’s (1933) most influential typology of language functions.*

A human language performs simultaneously (but in every particular case to various extents) three functions: communicative, cognitive, and artistic, which are predisposed to translation not in the same degree... So there exist three types of translation: translation-account, translation-transcription (not used separately), and translation-stylization, only the last one being artistic in one degree or another (Derzhavyn 1927: 44).

In the article, Derzhavyn Derzhavyn (Derzhavyn 1927: 45) also names three functions of artistic translation

Translations of works of art are generally made with the aim of: 1) making the nation familiar with the content of some foreign literature: under the heading there is, for instance, a great number of belles-lettres translations that annually appears at the book market and naturally does not pretend for any artistry; 2) developing and enriching of one’s own literary language; in the case, the content of the work under translation becomes the object of literary imitation and, so to say, the ground for the realization of the expressive potential hidden in the native language...; 3) artistic translation in the narrow sense of the word, stylizing translation, occurring relatively rarely and demanding the high level of culture and language from his translator as well as from his reader...

The article triggered a remarkable discussion on poetry translation, with Mykola Zerov, Hryhoriy Maifet, Oleksander Finkel’, and Andrey Fiodorov participating in it.

The issues of policy of translation also received a fair amount of attention then in Ukraine (S.Petliura, O. Khodzits’ky, O.Bilets’ky, M.Zerov, Ie. Starynkevych, V.Derzhavyn, and others).

The construction of a truly modern translation theory is unattainable without writing its modern history beforehand, and the best way to do it is to study national traditions of the development of the translation practice and thought. It is in the 1920s when the history of

translation emerged as a component of translation studies, historical researches being most numerous among the investigations into the discipline. There grounds to assume (Kochur 1967) that Mykola Zerov may be considered the father of Ukrainian translation history, since in his historical and literary essays he

“extensively elucidated the translation activities of the classics of the Ukrainian literature, strived to develop periodizations of the Ukrainian translation – so brilliantly and thoroughly as nobody among literature historians had done before and would do after him”.

And it is legitimate because “one of the major concerns in writing the history of translation, as in any history, is how to structure the events of the past” (Woodsworth, 1998: 101), and “*the historical nature of translation is first apparent in the succession of varying methods that define it within a single culture*” (Venuti, 2005: 801).

In the *Westöstlicher Diwan* (1819), or to be precise, in his comments to it, Goethe distinguished between three methods of translating poetry practiced by German translators in three different periods. Goethe clearly based his historical distinctions on the adequacy of the translation to the foreign text. And since none of the translators he cited would have considered their work less than accurate, his account suggests that changing translation methods reflect changing standards of accuracy. Indeed, what constitutes an accurate translation in one period may later come to be regarded not as a translation at all, but as an adaptation or even as a wholesale revision of the foreign text (Venuti 2005: 801–802). Stating of alterations in the method of translation is the first sign of a historical approach to the phenomenon and Hryhoriy Ivanytsia in his 1921 review on Zerov’s translations from Latin underlined the change of strategy in ancient poetry translation: “instead of the recent slavish attitude to the source text” (Ivanytsia 1921: 210) a focus on the modern reader appears.

In his study of the history of Ukrainian translations of Adam Mickiewicz, Pavlo Tykhovs’kyi (1866–1938) distinguishes two periods: “old” translators (P. Kulish, O. Navrots’kyi) would rehash and Ukrainize, while “new” translators (M. Staryts’kyi, I. Franko) try to render the poet’s poetics (Tykhovs’kyi 1924)

the oldest translators (e.g., Kulish, Navrots’kyi) having the goal to incorporate Mickiewicz’s romanticist works into Ukrainian poetry repeatedly introduced into them elements of the Ukrainian coloring (in the mode of life, in the names), and sometimes even remade them”. (“Meanwhile, those translations were free by their form (by meter, rhyme) and happened to be much bigger than the source poems (by the number of lines in them)”, “nevertheless, they reproduced the romanticist stance of Mickiewicz’s poetry well” and 2) “...more faithful to the source and much more literal new translations (by Staryts’kyi, Franko, and others”. («Nowadays, Mickiewicz is looked on as a classic, as a great poet”).

Voluminous preface to the Anthology of Ukrainian translations of Pushkin (*A. Pushkin Vybrani tvory*) by Pavlo Fylypovych (1891–1937), a professor of Kyiv University (1917–35), poet and literary critic belonging to the nucleus of the group of Neoclassicists consisting of Mykola Zerov, Maksym Ryl's'ky, Pavlo Fylypovych, Mykhailo Drai-Khmara, and Osvald Burghardt (Yurii Klen), explaining the varying methods and approaches to translation by the example of the numerous Ukrainian translations of Pushkin as well as the changes in readers' reception and in the expressive means, became an extension of Zerov's conception of translation history in Ukraine. (Of interest for a modern researcher, both with respect to methods and to the facts, are also Fylypovych's investigation into "the social face of the Ukrainian reader of the 1830-40s", specifically, of the list of the subscribers for the collection of translations by A. Metlyn's'ky). The abovesaid invalidates the words of Andrey Chernetskiy (Chernetskiy 2010) that

despite their strong investment in translation activities, the Neoclassicists wrote surprisingly little *about* translation; their views can be primarily gleaned from scattered remarks in their critical writings on other topics, personal letters, and book reviews, including Zerov's fairly negative review of Oleksandr Finkel's 1929 volume *Teoriia i praktyka perekladu* (Theory and practice of translation), a book that nevertheless holds the distinction of being the first book on translation theory published in the Soviet Union.

The theories and practice of translation of the Neoclassicists and other translators, the publication of many-volumed collected works and anthologies of translated authors, the development of the University course in "Translation Methodology" by Mykhailo Kalynovych and Mykola Zerov who had been delivering lectures in translation theory at the Ukrainian Institute of Linguistic Education (1930–33), the publication by Oleksandr Finkel' (Finkel' 1929a) (in 1929 in Kharkiv) of the book on the theory of translation entitled "Theory and Practice of Translation", the first such book on the territory of the former Soviet Union, in which the author distinguished three types of translation – non-literary prosaic, literary prosaic, and poetic – thus, forming the basis for studies in the special translation theories, and at last the introduction by Kalynovych and Zerov of the name for the discipline – *perekladoznavstvo* (literally, *translation studies*) might have been changing the habitus of the literary translator in Ukraine. It is also vital to note that while elaborating the University course for the 1932/33 academic year Kalynovych divided Translation Studies into a theoretical aspect (methodology of translation, history of translation, and history of translation thought) and a practical aspect (general theory of translation, special theories of translation from a foreign language into the mother tongue and from the mother tongue into a foreign language, and the study of cliché and stereotypes of official speech) (Shmiher 2009: 15–16). Kalynovych and Zerov were also the first to introduce the History of Translation Studies in Ukraine. Revealing is also the assessment of the translation business in Ukraine in late 1920s by the contemporary of those events literature

critic I.Kahanov (Kahanov 1929) in his review on the Ukrainian translation of Charles De Coster's "*Thyl Ulenspiegel*":

Enormous work of translating of the pieces of the Weltliteratur into Ukrainian is in its heyday. The conditions of our publishing activities are such that they enable to introduce in this work the elements of planning. Owing to this we practically have very few translations that have provoked negative assessment; likewise, we have practically no editions that could be considered pointless and unnecessary, repeating each other, etc.... Exceptions are rare.

But then everything stopped abruptly: it was forbidden to mention most of the names, their owners were exiled or executed, and their works were banned and withdrawn from the libraries. The abrupt termination of the policy of Ukrainization in late 1932 and early 1933, and the utter rout of cultural life accompanied by massive oppression and discrimination against Ukrainophones, with major repression starting as early as 1929–30, when a large group of Ukrainian intelligentsia was arrested and most were executed, brought numerous attempts of the Bolshevik government to restrict the usage of the Ukrainian language (for example, excluding it from military and technical spheres) and to purify it from European elements unknown in the Russian language and incorporate some purely Russian words and structures attempting to turn it into a regional "second language", that is to establish the language hierarchy like in the Middle Ages, which led to increase in literalness in translation. The amount and quality of the reviews on translation dramatically reduced. Certain changes in translation norms were also observed, for instance, translations from the Russian language as a language-mediator became a casual thing, and even obligatory in the field of social sciences, what previously was considered undesirable (see, for example, Maifet's review on the translation of Decameron from French (Maifet 1930)). Since the early 1930s, Stalin's regime attempted to openly regulate literary expression, including not only the textual choices, but even the translation methods. Many newly translated into Ukrainian works were retranslated (e.g., works by Lenin or Gogol) to near them to Russian. Especially moody became the picture after publications of accusations of the "nationalistic translators".

"The first edition of Ukrainian translation of Lenin's works edited by Skrypnyk has been distorted and perverted by the nationalists. Nationalistic translators supported by Skrypnyk pursued the course on separation of the Ukrainian language, on its artificial limitation, the course in the direction of the language of German and Polish fascists. The sense of Lenin's works has been falsified"

wrote Naum Kahanovych in his article "Nationalistic distortions in Ukrainian translations of Lenin works" (Kahanovych, 1934). During the next period the Soviet cultural, language and translational policies deprived the Ukrainian language of its free development and caused a formation of a kind of parallel language, the only source for which must have been Russian.

## References

- AIZENSHTOK Yermiya 1928. *Kotliarevshyna. – Ukrayins'ki Propilei*, T.1, 7–121.
- ARASYMOVYCH Liubov 1927. *T.H. Shevchenko v pol's'kykh perekladakh. – Zapysky ist-filil. viddilu UAN*, 12, 78-102.
- BAKER Mona; SALDANHA Gabriela (eds.) 2008. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. 2nd Edition* – London and New-York: Routledge.
- BILETS'KY Oleksandr 1929. *Perevodnaya literatura na Ukraine. – Krasnoye slovo*, 2, 87-96.
- BOHATS'KY Pavlo 1918. *Gerhardt Hauptmann v ukraïns'kykh perekladakh*. – *Knyhar'*, 14, columns 821-832.
- CARY Edmond 1956. *La traduction dans le monde moderne.*– Geneva: George & Cie.
- CHAPLIA Vasil' 1927. *Pushkin ukrayins'koyu movoyu.* – *Zorya*, 3, 18–21.
- CHERNETSKY Andrey 2011. *Nation and translation: Literary translation and the shaping of modern Ukrainian culture.* - Brian J. Baer, ed., *Contexts, Subtexts, and Pretexts: Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia.*-John Benjamins: Amsterdam and Philadelphia. – 33 – 54.
- DERZHAVYN Volodymyr 1927. Problema virshovanoho perekladu. – *Pluzhanyn*, 9/10, 44–51.
- DERZHAVYN Volodymyr 1929. Do pytannia pro suchasnu literaturnu retsenziyu: Krytyka chy informatsiya? – *Krytyka*, 3, 91–103.
- D'HULST Lieven 1994. Enseigner la traductologie: pour qui et à quelles fins? – *Meta*, 39 (1), 8–14.
- FINKEL' Oleksandr 1929a. *Teoriya i practika perekladu.* – Kharkiv: Derzhvydav Ukrayiny.
- FINKEL' Oleksandr [1929b]. H.F. Kvitka – perekladach vlasnykh tvoriv. – O.Kal'nychenko (ed.). *Proteus. V.I.* Kharkiv: Vydavnytstvo NUA, 400–438.
- FYLYPOVYCH Pavlo 1930a. Pushkin v ukrayins'kiy literaturi. – P. Fylypovych (ed.) *Pushkin A. Vybrani tvory.* Kharkiv–Kyiv: Knyhospilka.
- FYLYPOVYCH Pavlo 1930b. Sotsyal'ne oblychchia ukrayins'koho chytacha 30–40 rokiv XIX viku. – *Zhyttia y revoliutsiya*, 1, 155–172.
- IVANYTSIA Hryhoriy 1921. Mykola Zerov. Antolohiia ryms'koyi poeziyi [Retenziya]. – *Holos druku*, 1, 187– 88.
- KAHANOV I. [Review on: Charles De Coster's "*Thyl Ulenspiegel*"]. - *Chervonyi shliakh*, 12
- KAHANOVYCH Naum 1934 *Natsionalistychni perekruchennia v ukrayins'kykh perekladakh tvoriv Lenina.* – *Movoznavstvo*, 2, 9–24.
- KOCHUR Hryhoriy 1965. Na perekladats'ki temy. – *Dnipro*, 6, 128–136.
- KOCHUR Hryhoriy 1967. Zdobutky i perspektyvy. – *Vsesvit*, 1, 92–97.
- KOERNER E. F. K. 2004. *Essays in the history of linguistics.* – Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- KORUNETS' Il'ko 2000. *Theory and Practice of Translation.* – Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha.

- KORUNETS' Il'ko 2008 *Bilia vytokiv ukrajyns'koho perekladoznavstva*. - Vsesvit, 1-2. , 188–194.
- KULYK Ivan 1928. *Suchasna poeziya Pivnichnoyi Ameryky : Peredmov.* – *Antolohiya amerykans'koyi poeziyi 1855–1925*. Kharkiv: DVU, 9–38.
- LAZURS'KYI Volodymyr 1929. *Shekspir Ukrayins'koyu movoyu.* – *Zapysky Odes'koho naukovohto tovarystva. Sektsiya ist.-filol.*, 3, 22–38.
- LUKASH Mykola 2009 [1956]. *Prohresyvna zahidnoyevropeis'ka literatura v perekladakh na ukrajins'ku movu.* – O.Kal'nychenko (ed.). *Protey. V.2*. Kharkiv: Vydavnytstvo NUA, 560–605.
- MAIFET Hryhoriy 1930 [Review on *Boccaccio Decameron*. - *Kharkiv DVU, 1929*]. - *Chervonyi shliakh*, 2, 252–258.
- RALIV M. 1929. Lev Tolstoy v ukrajins'kykh perekladakh. – *Zapysky Odes'koho naukovohto tovarystva*, 2, 24–34.
- REISS Katharina\_ 1976 *Texttyp und Übersetzungsmethode*. Kronberg/Ts.: Scriptor Verlag.
- LAZURS'KYI Volodymyr 1929. *Shekspir Ukrayins'koyu movoyu.* – *Zapysky Odes'koho naukovohto tovarystva. Sektsiya ist.-filol.*, 3, 22–38.
- MOSKALENKO Mykhailo 1995. *Tysiacholittia: Pereklad u derzhavi slova.* – M.Moskalenko (ed.). *Tysiacholittia: Poetychnyi pereklad Ukrayiny-Rusi*. Kyiv: Dnipro, 5–38.
- NIKOVS'KYI Andriy 1913. *Don Zhuan v ukrajins'kiy literaturi.* – *Rada*, 7.
- POPOVIČ Anton 1976. *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*. – Edmonton: University of Alberta.
- SAHARDA Mykolay 1919a. *Perekłady Sviatoho Pys'ma na ukrajins'ku movu v XVI-XVII vikakh.* – *Knyhar'*, 20, columns 1245–1258.
- SAHARDA Mykolay 1919b. *Perekłady Sviatoho Pys'ma na ukrajins'ku movu v XIX i XX vikakh.* – *Knyhar'*, 21, columns 1337–1350.
- SHAMRAI Ahapiy 1930. *Kharkivs'ka shkola romantykiv tom. 1–3.* - Kharkiv: Literatura i mystetstvo.
- SHEVELIOV Yuriy 1954–1989. *Literaturna mova.* – V. Kubyovych (ed.). *Entsyklopediya ukrajinoznavstva – II. Tom 4*. Paris, New-York: Molode Zhyttia, 1361–1363.
- SHMIHER Taras 2005. *Perekladoznavchy dorobok Mykoly Zerova.* – *Visnyk L'viv. Universitetu*, 12, 289–296.
- SHMIHER Taras 2009. *Istoriia Ukrayins'koho perekladoznavstva*. Kyiv: Smoloskyp.
- STRIKHA Maksym 2006. *Ukrayins'kyi khudozhnii pereklad: Mizh literaturoiu i natsiietvorenniam*. Kyiv: Fakt.
- TIRKKONEN-CONDIT Sonja 2002. *Translationese – a myth or an empirical fact? A study into the linguistic identifiability of translated language.* – *Target*, 14 (2), 207–220.
- TYKHOVS'KYI Pavlo 1924. *Adam Mitskevych v ukrajins'kykh perekladakh.* – *Nauk. zbirka Kharkiv. nauk-doslid. katedry istorii Ukrayiny. Ch. 1*, 99–122.
- VENUTI Lawrence 2005. *Translation, History, Narrative.* – *Meta*, 50(3), 800–816.

VERNADSKY V.I. 1912. Iz istorii idey. – *Russkaia mysl'*, 10, 123–138.

WOODSWORTH Judith 1996. Teaching the History of Translation. – C.Dollerup; V.Appel (eds.).  
*Teaching Translation and Interpreting 3: New Horizons. Papers from the Third Language  
International Conference*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 9–18.

YEFREMOV Serhiy 1995 [1911]. *Istoriia ukrayins'koho pys'menstva*. Kyiv: Femina. – Tom 1. – 21– 24.

ZEROV Mykola 1924. *Nove Ukrayins'ke pys'menstvo*. Kyiv: Slovo.

ZEROV Mykola 1928. *U spravi virshovanoho perekladu*. – *Zhyttia y revoliutsiya*, IX, 133-146.

ZORIVCHAK Roksolana 2001. Khudozhniy pereklad v Ukraini i buttia natsiyi. – *Zapysky  
perekladats'koyi maisterni. 2000 – 2001. Tom 1*. L'viv: Prostir-M, 9–17.