

Новелістика Василя Стефаніка в іномовній інтерпретації

УДК 821.161.2'04.09(092)

DOI: 10.31471/2304-7402-2022-16(63)-292-303

VASYL STEFANYK'S WRITINGS IN A FOREIGN INTERPRETATION

Stepan Khorob

*Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University;
76000, Ivano-Frankivsk, Shevchenka St., 57;
e-mail:stepan.khorob@gmail.com*

The aim of this study is to reveal the peculiarities of functioning of translations of Vasyl Stefanyk's novellas in other languages: both in the Slavic and in the Romance-Germanic world, elucidate a translational toolkit in old and contemporary interpretations. The research methods lie in employing a philological method and linguistic principles, as well as the principles of reader-response criticism through the prism of comparative approaches and comparative-historical principles of analysing the foreign language material, created by translators on the basis of Vasyl Stefanyk's novellas. The results of researching into the posed problem led to the discovery of quite different methodological strategies of the foreign interpretation of different periods of translations of Vasyl Stefanyk's works, the delineation of the whole complex of issues connected with a fictional being of Vasyl Stefanyk's translated novellas, for example, in Polish, Bulgarian, Czech, Russian or English, German, French, Spanish languages. It is proved that foreign translators, first of all, used Stefanyk's word as a fictional unit and succeeded the cases where the translation of Stefanyk's text was done not literally, but, first and foremost, adequately for the writer's ideological-aesthetical conceivment. Having implemented Russian and English translations of Vasyl Stefanyk's novellas for analyzing the posed problem, there are made the conclusions as to creative successes and failures of numerous translators of Vasyl Stefanyk's novellas into these languages. The scientific novelty of the article lies in the fact that it

actualizes an important problem of being of the Ukrainian author's prose in other languages in different cultural-historical environments, in the lingual space of these or those literatures.

Key words: *translation, functioning of the Ukrainian text in other languages, translatology, foreign interpretation.*

Translations of Vasyl Stefanyk's writings have an old and long history. About them, in comparison with the issue of Vasyl Stefanyk's translational activities, there have been written numerous researches both by Ukrainian scholars specialising in Stefanyk studies (continental as well as diasporan) and by foreign literary scholars. We will not have recourse to the elucidation of time and place of the appearance of his novellas in other languages, we will only remark that the writer's creative works are translated into more than twenty languages of the world. We will, certainly, be interested in the fact how felicitously such foreign interpretations were performed both in the Slavic and in the Romance-Germanic verbal world, what is lost, and what is gained meanwhile, what foreign translators concentrate their attention on. Vasyl Stefanyk's prose is really sufficiently complicated (and not only because of the Pokuttian dialect) for being translated. Here one cannot do without usual mechanical interlinear translations in their foreign interpretation, the verbal richness of a language, through which the Ukrainian author's writing "implants" into the foreign ground and becomes a phenomenon of a different culture, which is both received and evaluated in the light of its experience.

Here the translator's skill to penetrate themselves into the worldview and psychological bases of Vasyl Stefanyk's fictional thinking, into the psychological foundations of his epic creating, into the elucidation of these and those social-historical, national-spiritual circumstances, that gave birth to his novellas, short stories or prose poetry, becomes a very important factor. And that, as it was shown by translated Stefanyk-related works and editions, is within the power of not every translator of Vasyl Stefanyk's works at all. Hence, though they exist (starting from the translations made in the writer's lifetime and finishing with current national variants other than his own) and possess a certain historical-literary and aesthetical value, nevertheless, they "do not solve the problem of foreign Stefanyk-related works and editions in an isofunctional, fictional-universal aspect" [1 p. 312].

To that let us also add the following contemplations on the translations of Vasyl Stefanyk's works in other languages. And the foremost thing, worthy of directing our attention to, – is the very writer's act of creative work: thanks to it the Ukrainian author's prose must necessarily gain new features, that were not characteristic of its original until then, in this way becoming a phenomenon of already not merely the national Ukrainian literature, but also of national letters and culture other than his own, that both receive and evaluate

it in the world of their experience. That was taken into account and expressed as a peculiar guideline for future translators by Vasyl Lesyn, Fedir Pohrebennyk, Yaroslava Pohrebennyk, Roksolana Zorivchak, as well as, finally, by Polish researchers in translations of Vasyl Stefanyk's novellas Elżbieta Wiśniewska, Maria Markowska and others in their time.

Still another methodological guideline of the science of translation studies on the matter of fictional transformation of Vasyl Stefanyk's novellas into other languages lies in the fact that the conducted translation of his writings and their taking root into the depths of the national ground other than his own will obligatorily lead to at least two distinctly outlined consequences. The translator must definitely direct their attention to that. Firstly, the change of the lingual texture of the Ukrainian author's prose does not only somewhat "tears it away" from the essentially national (Pokuttian) midst, so to speak, the autochthonous source (social-historical, daily, cultural-spiritual), but also, secondly, assists the reader of Vasyl Stefanyk's translated writings to collate them with their own similar literary phenomena, with the creative activities of those, who are integral to the given reader-recipient's environment.

In such a processal interaction between the translation of Vasyl Stefanyk's novellas and similar literary phenomena as well as their receptions in a different linguistic environment one can obligatorily trace "natural" losses of the Ukrainian author's prose in a translational interpretation. If we synthesize them, then all too often they are linked with solely verbal and linguistic-rhythmical discrepancies, as well as with emotional-psychological and social-historical inadequacies. The translators and researchers of Vasyl Stefanyk's creative activities frequently remark that certain difficulties in the national being of his writings other than his own arise when a sentence structure is rendered (it is known that impersonal sentences – and one may notice quite a good many of them in Stefanyk's novellas – exist merely in Slavic languages, and this creates obvious additional obstacles in their translations in English, German, French, Spanish, or Italian). Concerning this, translations of Vasyl Stefanyk's prose are more "naturally" perceived in Polish, Czech, Slovak, Bulgarian, Belarusian, Russian, Croatian and other Slavic languages.

Lastly, it is necessary to note that Vasyl Stefanyk's translated creation (no matter in what language it was done, in a talented or mediocre way, in the past and now) always arises as an innovative one, since in it there are, to a greater or lesser extent, synthesized two creative beginnings: on the one hand, – the author's bright individuality and his imperishable talent, and, on the other, – the translator's individuality. But as any artistic personality always creates within the mainstream of the national literature and culture, aesthetic traditions and tendencies, schools of style and creative methods, characteristic of this or that time, then in the translation of Vasyl Stefanyk's novellas there necessarily coexist different or absolutely opposite influences-mutual impacts,

layers, etc. Hence the principal contradiction in the Ukrainian novella author's translated creations, as, properly, also in translation studies in general (including here both comparative literature, and linguistics, and literary studies), is and will be the problem of a "free" and "literal" translation, the issue of artistic congruity and wordable precision, so to speak, speech adequacy.

And, indeed, how should the entirely imperishable prose by Vasyl Stefanyk be translated? What does the translator need to direct attention to in the first turn, when they take up such no simple activity as a fictional transformation of the Ukrainian writer's novellas in other languages? Finally, how can fictional idead-imagerial equivalents be found in order to draw closer to the prose writer's conception, reveal his aesthetics and poetics, his unique creations in general, that have been arousing translational foreign imagination throughout more than one hundred years already? Let us try at least partially to answer these more than rhetorical questions by analysing, on the one hand, the translations of his works in Slavic, and, on the other, – in Romance-Germanic languages. Such a selection is certainly arbitrary, hence in it one cannot find out any universal regularity for translations of Vasyl Stefanyk's prose in different languages. Here there will rather emerge some single attempt at analytics of translations in Slavic (for instance, Russian) and Romance-Germanic (say, English) languages. Otherwise there is need in a complex synthetical research in all nowadays existing translations of the creations by the Ukrainian novella author, performed in different languages and in different times, with their history, peculiarities, reception, interpretation, etc., that will certainly be perceived as a rather complicated and not one-dimensional as well as completed process at all.

Finally, even a single attempt at analytics of a foreign interpretation of Vasyl Stefanyk's creative works, considering that their original arises in a translational transformation as a various and diverse fictional world that systematically dialogises with every time a new generation of readers, is inexhaustible. Nevertheless, such an approach to studying Vasyl Stefanyk's translations – the fictional text (creative work), the interpreter (translator) and the recipient (reader) – is as much as possible directed at comprehending "the movement of texts in a wide space of cultures, the combination of contextual principles with the principle of the hermeneutic circle" [2, p. 313]. It is, properly, a defining moment for translational creative activities, and a fully-fledged interpretation of the Ukrainian writer's prose is impossible without it.

Let us take Vasyl Stefanyk's translations in the Russian language as an example. In different times (starting from 1989 and finishing with 2001) they were performed by V. Kozynenko, V. Matvieiev, M. Liashko, H. Shypov, A. Dieiev, V. Rossels and others, who built a process of translation from usual principles of text analytics ("the interpretational strategy") up to the principle of synthesized ideas about it ("the anatomy of text"). On their trans-

lations there is an imprint of the gradual grasp of Vasyl Stefanyk's creative work: to begin with, through the theme and thematical ties, then an attempt at immersing themselves in social and psychological (almost devoid of an aesthetic conception) urges of the author to write this or that composition, still later his employment of the means to depict the social-historical reality and the character creating psychology of the novella heroes of the Ukrainian writer (it was least succeeded in).

The scientifically persuasive conclusion as for that was made by Mariia Shcherbak, a contemporary researcher in Vasyl Stefanyk's translations in the Russian language: "Merely the synthetical, holistic reception of the text in all its "holistic totality", that envisages an element of modelling a fictional world on the basis of a profound and acute interpretation, leads translation onto a qualitatively new level. Polysemantic dialectal words, realia, headings, verbal images underwent significant losses in translations, because they were frequently verified by pragmatics, but not poetics, examined as separate lingual elements beyond the entirety, beyond the uniting fictional beginning. For Stefanyk such a uniting fictional beginning emerges as the local-psychological cycle of the human being and of the earth, the impressionistic momentaneity of effect, principles of the "white spot" in the psychological construction of a situation, the parabolic method of an expression, where behind a concise narrative there hide several planes of the content, semantic reaccentuation of a word in the system of personal poetic speech, the absolute unity of style and genre" [3, p. 313–314].

However, not each of here mentioned and unnamed translators of Vasyl Stefanyk's prose into Russian supported exactly this way of its cognition and understanding in their interpretations. Some of them (for example, V. Kozynenko, M. Liashko, A. Dieiev) attempted to make a translation, so to speak, "literally", not penetrating into the grounds of the Ukrainian writer's fictional thinking too much, not taking into account the concreteness of social-historical realia, among which he was creating. For instance, M. Liashko renders Stefanyk's outstanding "Mariia" somewhat superficially, without appropriate understanding of the role and participation of Sich riflemen in the War of Independence. "Khoruhvy i prapory shelestily nad nymy (sichovymy striltsiamy. – *S. Kh.*), i hrymiv spiv pro Ukrainu" [4, p. 124] ("Flags and banners rustled above them, and songs about Ukraine resounded"; transl. by J. Wiznuk, C. H. Andrusyshen¹), we read in Vasyl Stefanyk's writing. In the Russian translator's rendition this sentence is absent altogether, evidently, through ideologemic warnings. The next fragment of the novella "Mariia", that is tied up with the depiction of solemnities of the people, who were sing-

¹ Stefanyk Vasyl. *The Stone Cross* / Transl. from the Ukrainian by Joseph Wiznuk, in collaboration with C.H. Andrusyshen. – Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1971. – P. 132.

ing Sich riflemen's songs, is conveyed in the following way in Vasyl Stefanyk: "Probudylasia (Mariia. – *S. Kh.*) azh, yak zemlia dudnila pid dovhymy riadamy, shcho spivaly sichovu pisniu" [5, p. 194] ("She regained consciousness when the earth rumbled beneath the long columns of the Sich troops who were singing their military song"; transl. by J. Wiznuk, C. H. Andrusyshen¹). M. Liashko instead renders it, this fragment, in this way: "Ochnulas, kohda zemlia hudela uzhe dlinnymi riadami poiushchikh pesniu sechevikov" [6, p. 164] ((*Mariia. – S. Kh.*) Woke up when the ground was already rumbling under the long rows of Sichmen, singing a song). For the Russian translator the word "sichovyk" (Sichman) is vividly associated with the kozak from "Zaporizhian Sich". But it does not accord with the original of Stefanyk's work one whit.

And the same refers to the following lines from M. Liashko's translated writing that do not correspond to it (the original) either: "Vperedi yeio synovia, i ona idiot s nimi na Ukrainu, – ved ona, Ukraina, plachet po svoiim detiam i khochet, chtob oni byli vmeste" [7, p. 167] (In front of her there are her sons, and she is coming with them on to Ukraine, – because she, Ukraine, is weeping for her children and wants them to be together). Meanwhile, in the novella's text by the Ukrainian writer it is not simply accentuated on the psychological condition of the main heroine, but a profound sense is put in her understanding of the war years of calamities in the times of the First World One: "Na peredi yii syny, i vona z nymy jde na tuiu Ukrainu, bo vona, taia Ukraina, plachyt i holosyt za svoimy ditmy, khoche, shchoby vony vsi buly vkupi" [8, p. 194] ("Her sons are in the lead, and, together with them, she is marching to Ukraine, for it is she, that Ukraine of theirs, that weeps for her own children and desires them all to be united"; transl. by J. Wiznuk, C. H. Andrusyshen²). As we become convinced, in the Russian interpretation of these lines there are missing two important pronouns "tuiu" (that; the accusative case, the feminine gender) and "taia" (that; the nominative case, the feminine gender) that are not merely indicators of Mariia's emotional, in the given case elated, state, but also the direct concreteness towards the unity of the eastern and western part of Ukraine, finally towards the Ukrainian nation's tragedy, separated by two hostile empires. It is appropriate to remark that already in the later Russian translations of these writings by V. Rossels such translational inaccuracies were successfully avoided.

As we can see, M. Liashko consciously or unintentionally, however, retreated from the historical truth of Vasyl Stefanyk's novella "Mariia", that in its turn had a negative effect on the ideal-aesthetical value of his translation. Let us address ourselves to another translator Heorhii Shypov who aspired to

¹ Ibid. – P. 132.

² Ibid. – P. 137.

interpret the Ukrainian prose writer's novella "Did Hryts" (*Grandfather Hryts*) lingually. Moreover, let us collate the original of the text and its Russian analogue, at least in such lines: "...Yak budut zhortaty kistky nashykh striltsiv u kupy, to aby i za mene khto tam zhornuv kilka lopat, ale vysoko, bo na tykh kostiakh tsvite nasha zemlia" (V. Stefanyk) [9, p. 219] ("... when the time comes to gather up the bones of our soldiers into heaps, he is to rake up several shovelfuls for me. But they must be piled up high, because on those bones our land will blossom again!"; transl. by J. Wiznuk, C. H. Andrusyshen¹).

"...Kohda budut sobirat vmeste kosti nashykh voinov, pust i za menia brosit na kurgan kto-nibud neskolko lopat. No vysoko-vysoko, ibo na etikh kostiakh zatsvetet nasha zemlia" (H. Shypov) [10, p. 190] (... When the bones of our warriors are gathered together, let someone throw several spadefuls on to the kurgan for me. But high-high, because on these bones our land will blossom).

In the (Russian) translation the nouns "striltsi" (riflemen) and "kupa" (heap) (it is about the grave) are named "voiny" (warriors) and "kurgan". However, the original deals with no ordinary warrior, but with the Sich rifleman, and with no usual raised mass of earth, but with the mounded (especially in the land of Halychyna) grave to perished Sich riflemen. Here the discrepancy of the tonal narrative in the original and in the translation is obvious: in the first one – tragedical-solemn, in the second one – down to earth-workaday. And again another translator Volodymyr Rossels managed to translate these lines with the help of the found apt expression: "... Kohda budut sobirat v bratskuiu mohilu kosti nashykh voinov, to pust i za menia brosiat neskolko lopat... I pust kurgan budet vysokii, na etikh kostiakh zatsvetiot nasha zemlia" [11, p. 10] (When they gather the bones of our warriors into the mass grave, let them throw several spadefuls for me too... And let the kurgan be tall, on these bones our land will bloom). In the translated lines the pronoun "nashykh" (our) fits into the authorial narrative miraculously aptly, and in its context it focuses all emotional perceptions and feelings – of love, memory, admiration, immortality, audacity and heroism. Only one word, but how much it weighs for conveying the ideal and aesthetic pathos of the novella "Did Hryts" (*Grandfather Hryts*) in its Russian interpretation!

The researches of Mariia Shcherbak, a modern scholar specialising in Stefanyk studies, deal with these or those accomplishments and miscalculations of Russian translations of Vasyl Stefanyk's prose, having an old and rich history (see, e.g., her publications "Vasyl Stefanyk's Russian translations". – *Word and Time*, № 4–5, 1996, P. 20–25 and "Vasyl Stefanyk in Russian translations: gains, losses, perspectives (the attempt at synthesis)" // "The Po-

¹ Ibid. –P. 152.

kuttian Trinity” and the literary process in Ukraine of the end of the XIXth – the beginning of the XXth centuries. – Drohobych: “Dimension”, 2001, P. 311–322). This is, properly, one (and it is not complete) of the examples of the creative daily presence of the Ukrainian novella author in the Slavic world. As collation, it is well worth addressing ourselves to translations of the writer in the Romance-Germanic lingual surroundings. Furthermore, they have their history and their experience, their achievements and losses there as well. Yaroslava Pohrebennyk, Mykola Zymoria, Anna Halia-Hobach, Yaroslav Baran, Danylo Husar Struk, Leonid Rudnytzky and others remark on that in their works.

Let us again address ourselves to the existent translations of Vasyl Stefanyk’s novellas, say, in the English language, meantime, referring to the famous work by Leonid Rudnytzky, the American scholar specialising in Ukrainian studies, “Vasyl Stefanyk in the English-speaking world (To the reception of the master of Ukrainian prose in Canada and the USA)”, that was for the first time in Ukrainian wording printed in the collection of scientific works “Shevchenko. Franko. Stefanyk” (Ivano-Frankivsk: “Plai”, 2002, P. 226–275). The scholar does not merely give examples of how the bibliographical data on the publications of translations of Ukrainian writers in English, particularly Vasyl Stefanyk, were collected and systematised at the University of Ottawa and in the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta. He seeks to understand mechanisms of different translators in their rendition of the ideal-imagerial world of the Pokuttian master of the fictional word and to work out general concepts in the analysis of Vasyl Stefanyk’s translated works. Really, by the beginning of 2000s there has been approximately one hundred of such attempts at an English interpretation of the Ukrainian writer on the American continent. Not all of them are of high quality (some used an interlinear translation and this conditioned a failure for them), however, there are also a good few ones that witness a level of good quality of the Ukrainian original’s translation in English.

To the latter we refer Constantine Andrusyshen, Joseph Wiznuk, Mariia Skrypnyk, Danylo Husar Struk (Ukrainians in origin), who were knowledgeable about Vasyl Stefanyk’s creative work, and, what is the most valuable, they knew in what conditions and at what time the great master of the novella lived and created. They were capable of communicating ethnographic-daily and social-historical details of Halychyna of the end of the XIXth – the beginning of the XXth century. However, even they could not avoid certain difficulties in rendering some actions of characters, lexemes of their subdialect, etc. Leonid Rudnytzky provides one of the introductory paragraphs of the novella “Kaminnyi khrest” in the original as well as two of its English variants “The Stone Cross”, translated by Joseph Wiznuk, and “A Stone Cross”, translated by Danylo Husar Struk, as an instance of that, commenting (giving

an assessment of the translation) on each one and indicating their separate accomplishments and miscalculations.

We read in the original: “*Vidkoly Ivana Didukha zapamiataly v seli gazdoi, vidtodi vin mav use lysh odnogo konia i mali vizok iz dubovym dyshem. Konia zapriahav u pidruku, sam sebe v boroznu; na konia mav reminnu shleiu i nashylnyk, a na sebe Ivan nakladav malu motuzianu shleiu. Nashylnyka ne potrebuвав, bo livoiu rukoiu spyrav, mozhe, lipshe, yak nashylnykom*” [12, p. 105].

“These lines are rather typical of Stefanyk’s prose: a concise, laconic description of the action, a vividly in detail depicted image of the peasant reality and lexemes. “Taken from the Pokuttian subdialect,” remarks Leonid Rudnytzky.

As to his conviction, both translators felicitously rendered this paragraph into the English language, but their translations principally differ from each other. The titles themselves already indicate it.

In Andrusyshen’s wording there is the definite article **the**, and in Struk’s one – the indefinite **a**. But it is not the sole distinction between them, although a very important one. Wiznuk writes, “*For as long as the villagers could remember Ivan Didukh as a landholder, he had always owned only one horse and a small wagon with an oak shaft. He would hitch the horse on the near-side and himself on the off-side. For the horse Ivan had a breast-band and neck-strap of leather, and on himself he would put a small breast-band made of rope. He did not need a neck-strap because he could come to a stop with his left hand, perhaps better*” [13, p. 21].

The first four words are also the same in Struk’s translation: “*For as long as people in the village remembered, gazda Ivan Didukh always had only one horse and a small wagon with an oak shaft. He harnessed the horse on the left side and himself on the right; for the horse he had leather breeching and a breast collar, and on himself he placed a small rope breeching. He had no need for a breast collar for with his left hand he pushed perhaps even better than he would with a collar*” [14, p. 145]. But the distinction begins with the fifth word already and indicates the translator’s difficulties. “Used without a noun or pronoun, the Ukrainian verb “zapamiataty” (remember. – *S. Kh.*) cannot be rendered accurately and felicitously into English. The translator has to compensate it somehow,” Leonid Rudnytzky supposes, “Wiznuk makes it, adding the noun “villagers” (the peasant, inhabitants of a village), and Struk with the phrase “people in the village” (...). The American scholar specialising in Ukrainian studies remarks that both introduce a new element into the text and by that somewhat expand it, although they simultaneously limit the lexical meaning: the verb “zapamiataty” (remember) in the original (in the view of the fact that the subject is not specifically identified) is more universal – it refers to everyone; in the translations the meaning is restricted to “the

inhabitants of a village” and “the people of a village”. The next word “gazda” is even more complicated. Wiznuk translated it as “landholder” that historically is not in accordance with the Ukrainian notion. Being aware of this inaccuracy, Struk decided to include the Ukrainian word in the English translation. At all events, it, alas, remained beyond the English-speaking reader’s understanding, – Leonid Rudnytzky reaches a just conclusion.

While comparing the translations, he directs attention to single words from the rural way of life – “dyshel”, “borozna”, shleia” which, in his opinion, are generally conveyed satisfactorily in both texts. But, he remarks, the verb “spyrav” causes a problem. Wiznuk translated it with the help of the phrase “come to a stop” (diity do zatrymky), and Struk with the verb “pushed” (pkhav). The contemporary literary scholar is of the opinion that, thus, the translations contradict each other. Hence, he logically addresses himself to other aspects of English translations as well. As it seems to him, the most important difference between the original and the translation is the impression, or rather a certain flavour they arouse in the reader. Vasyl Stefanyk’s prose is lucid, transparent, easy to understood; he has a felicitous, impressively genuine fictional image. Leonid Rudnytzky supposes that both translations, instead, lack this aesthetical attribute. They are read with the feeling of office reports. He has a conviction that in Wiznuk’s translation the reasons for that ought to be sought in compound words (near-side, off-side, breast-band, neck-strap) that sound rather artificial in the context. In Struk’s translation (although he does not evince these compound words) – the fictional image is also a mere distant echo of the original.

We will remark that these observations of Leonid Rudnytzky should not be treated as criticism. Making them, he was rather willing, according to his confessions, only to point out to difficulties, facing every translator of Stefanyk’s prose, particularly into English. Especially, when the text’s words are, for the most part, dialecticisms or a rarely employed local subdialect. In the example he analyses such lines from Vasyl Stefanyk’s text in the Pokuttian dialect: “Ta tsu nohu sapov shkrebchy, ne ty ii slynov promyvai”. He remarks that both translators present this line with the help of a standard English expression (and this, in his opinion, is right), though in a somewhat different form: Wiznuk, “*Bah! It would be better to scrape this foot with a hoe rather than wash it with spit*” [14, p. 21]; Struk: “*You should scrape this foot with a hoe instead of washing it with your spittle*” [15, p. 145].

In conclusion, analysing English translations of Vasyl Stefanyk’s prose through the view of Leonid Rudnytzky, the literary scholar from the Ukrainian diaspora, the substantive conclusion can be drawn: they must not be interpreted by means of any specially discovered foreign mixed language (it will never substitute the Pokuttian dialect) or artificially created verbal constructions. It should be performed according to the laws of the English literary

language with the employment of lexemes, notions, etc., approximating to the original. Really, before interpreters Vasyl Stefanyk's creative works always arise just as the original with an incredibly rich and inexhaustible fictional world, that, entering dialogical interrelations with every time a new generation of recipients, reveals its interpretative potential in more all-embracing and all-sided ways.

Here there are provided only separate examples of Vasyl Stefanyk's "entrance" into the Slavic or Romance-Germanic world through recreating specific lexemes or through rendering the general ideal-aesthetical pathos of the prose originals by the Ukrainian novella author (outside the framework there remained translators' searches to convey genre ties of the novella, the sketch story, prose poetry by Vasyl Stefanyk, the evolution of his fictional thinking, the polyphony of the imagerial system and the adequacy of their rendition). However, they also witness a rather out of simple process of a fictional transformation, without exaggeration, of Vasyl Stefanyk's genius prose by national lingual means other than his own. At all events, ahead there is work of no single generation of scholars specialising in Stefanyk studies upon translations of his writings into various languages.

ТВОРИ ВАСИЛЯ СТЕФАНІКА В ІНОМОВНІЙ ІНТЕРПРЕТАЦІЇ

Степан Хороб

*Прикарпатський національний університет імені Василя Стефаника;
76000, м. Івано-Франківськ, вул. Шевченка, 57;
e-mail: stepan.khorob@gmail.com*

***Мета** цієї студії – розкрити особливості функціонування перекладів новел Василя Стефаника іншими мовами: як у слов'янському, так і в романо-германському світі, з'ясувати транслятологічний інструментарій у давніх та сучасних інтерпретаціях. **Дослідницька методика** полягає у тому, що крізь призму компаративістських підходів та порівняльно-історичних принципів аналізу іномовного матеріалу, створеного перекладачами на основі новел Василя Стефаника, застосовується філологічний метод та лінгвістичні принципи, а також принципи рецептивної естетики. **Результати** дослідження поставленої проблеми привели до того, що виявлено в різні періоди перекладів творів Василя Стефаника доволі різні методологічні стратегії іномовної інтерпретації, окреслено цілий комплекс питань, пов'язаних з художнім буттям перекладених новел Василя Стефаника, приміром, польською, болгарською, чеською, російською або ж англійською, німецькою, французькою, іспанською мовами. Доведено, що зарубіжні перекладачі здебільшого ви-*

користували Стефаникове слово як художню одиницю й успіху досягали там, де переклад Стефаникового тексту здійснювався не буквально, а передовсім адекватно до ідейно-естетичного задуму письменника. Використавши російськомовні та англомовні переклади новел Василя Стефаника для аналізу поставленої проблеми, зроблено висновки про творчі успіхи і невдачі численних перекладачів на ці мови новел Василя Стефаника. **Наукова новизна** статті полягає в тому, що в ній заактуалізовано важливу проблему інонаціонального буття прози українського автора в різних культурно-історичних середовищах, в мовному просторі тих чи тих літератур.

Ключові слова: переклад, інонаціональне функціонування українського тексту, транслатологія, іномовна інтерпретація.