

УДК 81'25= 111

DOI 10.34142/2312-1076.2022.2.100.06

Olena Pavlenko

THE NOTION OF THE UNSPOKEN IN VOLODYMYR MYTROFANOV'S LITERARY TRANSLATIONS

Abstract

The article highlights the key vectors of the literary and translation activities of the famous Ukrainian translator Volodymyr Mytrofanov, outlines the aspects of his reviewing skills as well as discloses the motives for choosing literary works for translation. The facets of Mytrofanov's translation practice is represented in a spatio-temporal perspective with the artistic world of a literary work in the centre and a multiple receptive horizon opened to transformation around it.

The conceptual dominant of Mytrofanov's translation practice proves to be the problem of comprehending the means the translation addressed – applying to the reader, that provides him with the opportunity to adjust his own perception of the work of art chosen for translation as well as to find all meanings available and decode the symbols hidden in it. It is the reader who comes for Mytrofanov to be a constant in determining the semantic continuum of a literary work, thus the fact of his response to a certain literary phenomenon actualizes the problem of choosing a text for translation. As the author of numerous works on Translation Studies, he highlights its constitutive categories and offers his own translation concepts with the view to attest to an elusive sense implied by the author and provide an equal response to his intent.

The translator's literary, editorial and publishing activities determine the general lines of his reviewing skills – to identify

“errors and oversights” in the translator’s work (the use of language stamps, outlining words and expressions not typical of the Ukrainian language, unjustified ‘weighting the flow’ of the original, ‘excessive bookishness’, ‘stylistic complexity’, etc.) and thereby “contribute to the improvement and perfection of the original text.

It is the improvement of the original text, the articulation of the unspoken that disclose the internal and external parameters of the functioning of the text created by the translator. The decoding of the meanings and senses hidden by the author is carried out by Mytrofanov through his skills, translation tact, careful selection of linguistic means regulated by a sense of measure and artistic taste, reproduction of the ‘spirit’ of the original, adherence to the principle of equivalence with the exclusion of possible different readings and ambiguities, which can be traced in his translations of English and American prose, in particular, E. Hemingway “A Farewell to Arms!”, R. Bradbury “Dandelion Wine”. Literary texts reproduced by the translator testify to his perception of a new artistic space in terms of the depth of unfolding the fictional world, which proves to be equivalent to the author’s intention when creating the original text.

Keywords: translation, literary work, means of addressing translation, translation concepts, translation evaluation.

Анотація

У статті визначено ключові вектори літературно-перекладацької практики відомого українського перекладача Володимира Митрофанова, окреслено аспекти його рецензійної майстерності, висвітлено мотиви вибору літературних творів для перекладу. Площина перекладацької діяльності В. Митрофанова представлена в просторово-часовій перспективі: у центрі – художній світ літературного твору, навколо – множинна і відкрита до змін рецептивна площина.

Концептуальною домінантою перекладацької практики В. Митрофанова постає проблема осмислення засобів адресації перекладу – орієнтація на читача, яка надає йому можливості скоригувати власне сприйняття обраного для перекладу художнього твору, відшукати усі наявні значення та декодувати приховані в ньому символи. Саме читач для В. Митрофанова є константою у визначенні смислового континууму твору, отже факт його відгуку на певне літературне явище актуалізує проблему вибору перекладача. Автор низки праць із теорії та практики перекладу, у яких висвітлено конститутивні його категорії й запропоновано власні перекладацькі концепції, В. Митрофанов засвідчує тонке відчуття мови автора оригіналу та рівнозначну реакцію на його поклики.

Літературна і редакторсько-видавнича діяльність перекладача визначила генеральні лінії його рецензійної майстерності – виявити в роботі перекладача «похибки й недогляди» (використання мовних штампів, калькування невластивих українській мові слів і виразів, невинуватене «обважнення плину» оригіналу, «зайва книжність», «стилістична кострубатість» тощо) й тим самим сприяти «поліпшенню і вдосконаленню тексту». Саме вдосконалення тексту оригіналу, артикуляція невимовленого розкривають внутрішні й зовнішні параметри функціонування створеного перекладачем тексту. Декодування прихованих автором значень і смислів здійснюється В. Митрофановим через майстерність, перекладацький такт, ретельний добір мовних засобів, регламентований почуттям міри й художнього смаку, відтворення «духу» оригіналу, дотримання принципу еквівалентності з виключенням можливих різночитань і двозначностей, що простежується у здійснених ним перекладах англomовної прози, зокрема, Е. Хемінгуея «Прощай, зброе!», Р. Бредбері «Кульбабове вино». Відтворені перекладачем літературні тексти свідчать про

сприйняття ним нового художнього простору за глибиною розгортання фікційного світу, що є рівноцінним авторському задумові в момент творення тексту першоджерела.

Ключові слова: переклад, літературний твір, засоби адресації перекладу, перекладацькі концепції, оцінка перекладу.

Introduction

Literary translations have always been recognized as an ultimate fabric to interweave cultures together. However, traditional criteria to analyze the above-mentioned phenomenon within the framework of translatability to preserve the author's original style necessitates further re-assessment not only in the context of interpreter's critical reflection, but also regarding the issues of meaning-making as well as translator's voices in their respective literary environment. This comes to be the case while studying literary translations in a broader rather than a narrow perspective, in particular, as an artistic and powerful tool to impact the target reader. In this regard, the emphasis is placed on the translator's holistic awareness of historical and socio-cultural context of the original text that often uncovers its hidden senses veiled by the author and, thus making translation versions function as certain means of power. Imperative mission for literary translations in Ukrainian comes to be especially crucial today, thus bringing them closer to the target audience as well as articulating Ukrainian voices via translation to the recipients in the West.

The article aims to provide an insightful overview of Volodymyr Mytrofanov's translation techniques that prove to create the content of the original and represent the dynamic nature of his translations. Mytrofanov's translation and literary activities have not been sufficiently studied and there is a relatively small body of literature on the problem in question apart from archive materials and very few accessible and relevant reports presented by a young Ukrainian researcher A. Trygub, mainly regarding the

author's reviewing practice (Tryhub, 2014) with some glimpses of linguistic and stylistic aspects of his translations (Tryhub, 2015). Hence, the key contributor to the problem investigated was Mytrofanov's wife Valentina who kindly provided first-hand facts, data and evidence from the author's letters as well as the study of his prose translations.

Methodology and methods

The article represents an application of descriptive and interpretive methods, as well as conceptual fundamentals of the cultural turn in translation theory. In this regard, the extent of openness of the original text is traced through its the projection on translator's aesthetic experience constrained within the frameworks of his artistic choice

Results and discussions

The impact of various factors on the creation of aesthetic canon of the Ukrainian prose in the second half of the 20th century presented by a variety of genres and genre modifications underlined the necessity of defining the role of literary translations in Ukrainian cultural landscape. The growth of readers' requests and challenges in key areas of Ukrainian literary translations of the period mentioned required immediate reconsidering of translator's status aimed to cultivate refined aesthetic values and artistic preferences and thus, giving him greater freedom and responsibility.

Sharing common theoretical and methodological grounds with Ukrainian and foreign researchers, Mytrofanov suggests his own approach to translation and presents interpretive content analysis of Ukrainian translations of English prose by defining genre scenes projections reflected in them as well as filling gaps by identifying lexical and semantic correlations between source and target texts. Mytrofanov's recognition of a new status of translator of the period in question, makes him closely aligned with scholars and researchers who consider translation as "multiple and constantly dynamic and creative" (Brodzki, 2007: 4) and "cultural

communication in increasingly fragmentary world (Bassnett, 2013: 17). That gives grounds to reflect upon megapersonal character of relationship between the reader (translator) and the author of the original. In particular, there is an assumption articulated by U. Eco that “a work of art created by the author organizes a flow of combined impressions, so that each potential recipient could understand in his own way its primary form, conceived by the author (Eco, 2001: 526). In this sense, the author produces a closed form to be used and understood as he had intended. At the same time, translator’s deep penetration into the text array is not always aimed at identifying his artistic experience with the author’s. Hence, the meaning of the text comes no longer to be “the intention of the author and the life experience of the writer, but rather what the text means for those who carry out its instructions”, i.e., “to interpret means to follow the path of thinking the text opens and follow the way to it” (Eco, 2001: 523).

For Mytrofanov, the search for possible meanings and ways to decode hidden symbols comes to be an utmost intrigue of prospective translation. Consequently, he draws attention to the assumption proposed by P. Tooper: “the more the translator is related to the work in its historical and cultural aspect, the more multifaceted his ‘creative lens’ through which the primary perspective of the original text is refracted” (Tooper, 2000:127). Gradually, in translation, it unfolds a contextually valuable source of knowledge of a certain epoch, as well as leaves the space for meaning-making translation initiatives. Hence, the translator becomes a constant participant in determining the semantic continuum of the original work, thus, the fact of his response to a certain literary phenomenon articulates a new meaning, new feelings and experiences, which in the process of translation acquire clear emotional contours.

It is in this regard that we consider Mytrofanov’s creative activity known for his brilliant translations of English and American novelists. Some of the most noteworthy examples

include "The Adventures of Tom Sawyer" by M. Twain, "The Old Man and the Sea", "The Snows of Kilimanjaro", "A Farewell to Arms", "Eden Garden", "Islands in the Stream" by E. Hemingway, "Headless Horseman" by M. Reid, "All the Kings Men" by Robert P. Warren, "The Dead Zone" by S. King, "The Grass Harp", "Breakfast at Tiffany's", "Cold Blood" by T. Capote, "Dandelion Wine", "One Timeless Spring", "Any Friend of Nickolas Nickleby Is a friend of Mine", "The Utterly Perfect Murder", "Farewell Summer", "Death Is a Lonely Business" by R. Bradbury "The Pencil" by R. Chandler, "Peter Pan and Wandy" by J. Barrie, "Uncle Tom's Cabin" by H. Beecher Stowe and others.

Such a choice comes to be justified not only by the translator's aesthetic tastes and artistic preferences, but also by the need to combine the textual material of the original with his own receptive competence. According to Mytrofanov, "the translation can be considered a certain perfection on the original, especially in the context of the epoch's requirements" (Mytrofanov, 1995: 2). As the author of numerous works on the theory and practice of translation (articles "For Creative Search", "Invitation to Dispute", reviews of translations from English by I. Korunets, L. Solonko, M. Kharenka, etc.), he offers his own interpretive concepts and basic categories that testify to a subtle sense of the author of the original's language and an adequate reaction to his intentions. Mytrofanov's translations and editorial-publishing practice determined the key vectors of his reviewing skills, that are generally characterized by "identifying 'errors and oversights' in the translator's work (using language stamps, outlining words and expressions not typical of the Ukrainian language, unjustified 'weighting of the flow' of the original, 'excessive bookishness', 'stylistic complexity', etc.) and thereby contribute to the "enhancement and perfection of the original text" (Mytrofanov, 1981: 6).

Mytrofanov constantly warned against the danger of mechanical recoding of a source text, regarding 'dictionary'

translation to be a philological limitation and a methodological error. As he put it in his article “Invitation to Dispute”: “It’s time to prove to someone what power and what an enormous impact the printed word has on the reader. Therefore, it is clear that speaking on the pages of the press, and especially on such delicate issues as the issue of literary creativity, to which artistic translation has long been included, it is necessary to carefully weigh every word and every statement” (Mytrofanov, 1995: 2). On realizing that the aesthetic dialogue within the limits of the author’s historicity – literary work with vividly expressed author’s originality and translator competent in the system of values the epoch – form two equal components, Mytrofanov outlines the contours of this communication in a more visible, extensive, and thus, in a substantial time perspective, with imaginative world of a literary work in the center, and a manifold receptive space opened to obstacles and complications around it.

Such a perception was traced in his translations of E. Hemingway’s novels (“The Old Man and the Sea”, “The Snows of Kilimanjaro”, “The Garden of Eden”, “Islands in the Ocean”, “Farewell to Arms!”). In particular, on recognizing the ‘iceberg principle’ introduced by the writer and projected on original text, which he further reflected in the translation: the artist should not say everything, most of the content should be embedded in the subtext. Therefore, creating his own philosophies embodied in artistic consciousness, the translator projects his own emotional experiences onto the artistic reality implied by the author of the original. These give him the opportunity to reproduce texts not in a ‘codified’ language, but in one that has a wide range of interpretations. In this regard, Mytrofanov defines the cognitive-aesthetic mission of translation in the synthetic discourse of cultural communication, where each object is “overgrown with the living flesh of artistic endowment” (Lisniak, 1991: 1), which actualizes the idea of a balanced relationship between the original

work and the translation on the ideological, contextual and stylistic level. This is realized via:

1) rhyming and rhythmic addition of certain words and phrases («у Мілані, Флеренції, Римі, Мессіні, Таорміні... » – “Milano, Firenze, Roma, Napoli, Messina, Taormina”; «де ви бували, що поробляли»? – “where did you go and what did you do?”; «отам і отам, а тепер отут і отут» – “there, and there... now over here and here”, etc.);

2) decoding the poetic subtext of the original by reproducing the imagery of the author's language («темні гори з обрідною зеленню на схилах» – “brown mountains with a little green on their slopes”; «виноградні лози пустили зелені пагінці» – “small green shoots on the vines”; «всіяне зорями небо»; – “star-powdered sky”; «теплий дух смаженого тіста» – “the warm scent of fried batter”; «обводив поглядом, мов променем маяка» – “flashed his gaze like a beacon”, etc.);

3) contextual replacement and decompression of linguistic elements (“said” – «мовив», «відказав», «прошепотів», «гукнув», «сказав», «запитав», «пробурмотів», «закричав», «повторював», «волав», «промовив», «простогнав», «повідомив», «поінформував», «зауважив», «відзначив», «попросив», «відрубав», «випалив», «заперечив», «визнав», «базікав», «заборонив», «висловив», «процідив крізь зуби»; «дасть тобі чосу» – “would fix my wagon”; «не міс Траляля, а міс Трулюлю» – “to be called Mrs. Something Another”; «розчинені двері станційного буфету» – “the open door into the bar” etc.);

4) smoothing the level of disparity of expressive names and titles («Малюк Даффі» – “Tiny Duffy”; «Ласунчик Ларсон» – “Sugar Boy”; «Шоколад» – “Hershey”; «місцевий клуб» – “the 4-N Club” etc.);

5) reproducing the rhythm of the original combined with the intonation determined by the order of words, logical emphasis, punctuation, etc. («Кульбабове вино» – “Dandelion Wine”, «Все

королівське військо» – “All the Kings Men”, «Вершник без голови» – “Headless Horseman”, «Лугова арфа» – The Grass Harp”, «Сніданок у Тіффані» – “Breakfast at Tiffany’s”, «З холодним серцем» – Cold Blood”, «Прощавай, зброе!» – “A Farewell to Arms” та ін.).

Insinuations, allusions and idioms that determine poetics of the original have been skillfully decoded by the translator. Mytrofanov reproduces the author’s neutral remarks in the novel “A Farewell to Arms” as well as represents emotional dramas and complex psychological state of the main characters using expressiveness and brevity of Ukrainian words: «Коли я повернувся на фронт, ми все ще стояли в тому місті. Тільки тепер в околиці було куди більше гармат, і настала весна. Лани зазеленіли, виноградні лози пустили зелені пагінці, дерева край дороги вкрилися дрібним листячком, і з моря повівав легкий вітерець. Я побачив місто, а над ним старий замок між пагорбів, за якими здіймалися гори – темні гори з обрідною зеленню на схилах. У місті побільшало гармат, з’явилося кілька нових госпіталів, на вулицях траплялись англійці, а деколи й англійки, та ще трохи будинків поруйнувало артилерійським обстрілом. День був теплий, посправжньому весняний, і я пройшов тією довгою вулицею поміж деревами, відчуваючи тепло від нагрітих сонцем стін, і побачив, що ми досі в тому самому будинку й що все довкола має такий самий вигляд, як і тоді, коли я від’їжджав» (Е. Хемінгуей, 1985: 2). – «When I came back to the front we still lived in that town. There were many more guns in the country around and the spring had come. The fields were green and there were small green shoots on the vines, the trees along the road had small leaves and a breeze came from the sea. I saw the town with the hill and the old castle above it in a cup in the hills with the mountains beyond, brown mountains with a little green on their slopes. In the town there were more guns, there were some new hospitals, you met British men and sometimes women, on the

street, and a few more houses had been hit by shell fire. It was warm and like the spring and I walked down the alleyway of trees, warmed from the sun on the wall, and found we still lived in the same house and that it all looked the same as when I had left it» (Hemingway, 1995: 8).

The internal strain the writer conveys through intonation patterns or the break of the phrase, the ambiguity of pauses as well as automatic repetition of one and the same expression, finds its harmonious reflection in the translation, where in the moments of the highest emotional pressure the hidden senses burst out, highlighting every detail of the original text: «Де ви були, що поробляли? Зараз же розкажуйте про все». «Скрізь був. У Мілані, Флоренції, Римі, Неаполі, Вілла-Сан-Джованні, Мессіні, Таорміні... Ви наче розклад поїздів читаєте. А якісь цікаві пригоди мали? Так. У Мілані, Флоренції, Римі, Неаполі... Годі, годі. А скажіть по правді, де було найкраще? У Мілані. Тому що найперше» (Е. Хемінгуей, 1985: 2). – «Where did you go and what did you do? Tell me everything at once». «I went everywhere. Milan, Florence, Rome, Naples, Villa San Giovanni, Messina, Taormina». «You talk like a time-table. Did you have any beautiful adventures? » «Yes». «Where? » «Milano, Firenze, Roma, Napoli». «That's enough. Tell me really what was the best». «In Milano». «That was because it was first» (Hemingway, 1995: 9).

Mytrofanov considers it essential to create the text that would enable him to reproduce the communicative value of the original in all its completeness and integrity. Reflecting on the main layers of his own translation activities, he notes: “While working on translation it is compulsory to reproduce the content and form of the original as much as possible with the means available in the native language”, <...> “uncovering to the reader his search for truth and meaning, when the mind is so deeply absorbed in the search that it does not need anyone's involvement and understanding” (Mytrofanov, 1995: 2). In this regard, the

translator noted that most critics, while analyzing linguistic material of translations <...>, “completely forget about the first key requirement: correspondence to the original in the broadest sense of the word, viewing it as the norm to “consider the translation being entirely detached from the original and subjectively ‘pulling out’ individual elements from the language texture and operating with them as an evidence” (Mytrofanov, 1995: 3). Mytrofanov also claims, “this is most evident when translators distort not only the Ukrainian language, but also the original (emphasis added by Mytrofanov), with their conscious and consistent plastering, thus creating not translations, but “variations on the topic, because after giving the content, they ‘impose’ on the author their own style, that is alien to him, ultimately deforming the very essence of the translation as such, when the latter acts as art for art’s sake, and therefore the coefficient of its positive effect equals zero, if not integral” (Mytrofanov, 1995: 3).

For Mytrofanov, the study of the specifics of linguistic, stylistic and cultural actualization of a literary work in a textual translation comes to be a kind of a tour into the study of deep processes of the mechanism of recoding the content of an artistic piece of work in general. That is what distinguishes certain components of the author’s concept which is in agreement with the experience of representatives of the recipient culture. The events of the novel “Farewell to Arms!”, directly related to the war, are revealed through the prism of real facts from the life of the writer himself. Based on this, the translator allegedly appropriates the author’s experiences, which he uses not only as the basis of the plot of the work, but also as a source that ensures the artistic authenticity of the of the main characters’ inner world: «Другого дня я повертався з нашого підгірного посту й зупинив машину біля smistimento, де поранених і хворих розподіляли за їхніми паперами й записували їм призначення до різних госпіталів. Усю дорогу я вів машину сам, ото ж і тепер сидів за кермом, а водій, що був зі мною, пішов відмітити документи. День був

гарячий, небо напрочуд ясне й блакитне, а дорога біляста й курна. Я сидів на високому сидінні «фіата», ні про що не думаючи. Дорогою проходив полк, і я дивився, як ідуть солдати. Вони геть упріли й спливали потом. Деякі були в сталевих касках, та більшість попричіпляла їх до ранців. Майже у всіх каски були завеликі й налазили аж на вуха. Офіцери всі йшли в касках – їхні пасували краще. То був один з двох полків Базілікатської бригади. Я визначив це за смугастими червоно-білими петлицями солдатів. Полк пройшов, але за ним ще довго тяглися відсталі – ті, що знеслили й відбилися від своїх взводів. Вони були мокрі від поту, запорошені й виморені. Деякі мали зовсім кепський вигляд. Останнім із тих відсталих плентав один солдат. Він сильно накульгував. Тоді спинився й сів при дорозі. Я виліз із машини і підійшов до нього» (Хемінгуей, 1985: 6). – «I came back the next afternoon from our first mountain post and stopped the car at the smistimento where the wounded and sick were sorted by their papers and the papers marked for the different hospitals. I had been driving and I sat in the car and the driver took the papers in. It was a hot day and the sky was very bright and blue and the road was white and dusty. I sat in the high seat of the Fiat and thought about nothing. A regiment went by in the road and I watched them pass. The men were hot and sweating. Some wore their steel helmets but most of them carried them slung from their packs. Most of the helmets were too big and came down almost over the ears of the men who wore them. The officers all wore helmets; better-fitting helmets. It was half of the brigata Basilicata. I identified them by their red and white striped collar mark. There were stragglers going by long after the regiment had passed – men who could not keep up with their platoons. They were sweaty, dusty and tired. Some looked pretty bad. A soldier came along after the last of the stragglers. He was walking with a limp. He stopped and sat down beside the road. I got down and went over» (Hemingway, 1995: 42).

Mytrofanov's idea of harmonious translation is based on source-centricity with a clear ethical dominant. That which gives all grounds to talk about translation ethics closely related to translator's goal, when he is persistently guided by the principle of careful selection of linguistic means in his search, and never for a moment losing his sense of measure and artistic taste. This means that imposing a categorical veto on some words, forms, and inflections, the translator must overcome the illusion of a multiplicity of options correlated with his emotional state, the degree of creativity, the situation of perception as well as unfolds this creativity as a kind of way of recognizing his own Self and the world. Creating his individual metaknowledge, embodied in artistic consciousness, the translator, projects "refracted emotional experiences" (Mytrofanov, 1995: 3) onto the artistic reality implied by the author of the original. This is what gives him the opportunity to reproduce Ukrainian texts not in a 'codified' language, but in one that has a wide range of interpretations. At the same time, Mytrofanov attached particular importance to a real creative search, precisely aimed at rendering all the features of the original, when <...> "it is not possible to do without completely reliable and tested precedents", as, according to him, "this is what makes the translator's work attractive when each new translation appears to be a new search – a search for style, rhythm and a search for a word... Without this search an artistic translation is impossible – it is dead" (Mytrofanov, 1995: 4). Such considerations encourage the translator to expand the communicative paradigm of the original text (the new translation versions come to be related to the study of the needs of a target reader).

The latter can be most vividly seen in Mytrofanov's translation of R. Bradbury's novel "Dandelion Wine". The translator changes the megatextual and architectural structure of the original work, which can be traced both at the level of its graphic structure (paragraph parcellation of the text, compression

of the text array, compositional division of the text, etc.) and graphic pattern (division markers, interline intervals, shifts above baselines, bold lines and other selections in the text that signal the presence of separate text fragments, etc.). As seen from the material studied, graphic compactness of the translated text vs. the extensiveness of the original, proves to be the result of Mytrofanov's exquisite translation skills. Neglecting the author's division of the text into subsections, as well as the deliberate non-use of additional information (preface, epigraph, dedication, note, comment, etc.) which does not affect the content of the main message (the text of the original as such), focus the reader's attention on the adequate placement of semantic accents in order to provide its integral comprehension.

The original version of the novel "Dandelion Wine" (1957) by R. Bradbury include the main (text of the novel) and two additional messages (preface, dedication, contents of the novel with a register containing 40 chapters). The Ukrainian-language version of "Dandelion Wine" reproduced by Mytrofanov, on the one hand, expands the megatext structure of the original, supplementing it with comments (local history realities, general cultural phenomena, etc.: Tayep (the Tower) – an ancient fortress in London, «Марімба» ("Marimba") – a cheerful dance melody; «Loteria nacional para hoy» "Loteria nacional" (Spanish) – national lottery tickets for today's draw; «Втеча з Пенсільванської в'язниці» "Escape from a Pennsylvania prison" – the name of an American film, etc.) and on other – attests its sound due to the registration of some components, in particular, the preface and content. Removing these from the architectural structure of the original, the translator clarifies their zero communicative value. However, his opinion regarding the informativeness and semantic completeness of the acknowledgement does not come in correspondence with traditionally formed assessments about its low-slung content. Giving preference to acknowledgement as a source of effectiveness

of the communicative process, Mytrofanov harmoniously reproduces this component of the text in the translation: «Уолтерові А. Бредбері – не дядькові, і не двоюродному братові, але, поза всяким сумнівом, видавцеві й другові» (Бредбері, 2004: 3). – «For Walter I. Bradbury, neither uncle nor cousin but most decidedly editor and friend» (Bradbury :1).

The harmony of the translation and its formal equivalence to the original comes to be recognized by Mytrofanov's preservation of writer's narrative style, which can be traced, in particular, in the consistent description of the facts and events of the literary work: «О восьмій годині приїхав лікар і, виходячи з дому, знову хитав головою. О дев'ятій Том, мати й батько поставили надворі під яблунею складане ліжко, знесли Дугласа вниз і поклали спати просто неба. До одинадцятої вони раз по раз виходили до хворого, а тоді поставили будильник на третю годину ночі, щоб устати й наколоти свіжого льоду, і пішли спати» (Бредбері, 1998: 46) – «At eight o'clock, the doctor came and went again shaking his head. At nine o'clock Tom and Mother and Father carried a cot outside and brought Douglas down to sleep in the yard. Then they went back and forth until eleven o'clock to wake them at three and chip more ice to refill the packs» (Bradbury: 120).

Among other correspondences, it is worth singling out the paragraph division of of the text, which emphasizes their subordination to the expanded semantic blocks and at the same time emphasizes the interdependence of the information units contained in the text: «Нарешті в домі стало темно й тихо, всі послули. О пів на першу повіки в Дугласа здригнулися. Зійшов місяць. І десь далеко хтось заспівав. Слів було не розібрати» – (Бредбері, 1998: 119) – “The house was dark and still at last, and they slept. At twelve thirty-five, Douglas's eyes flinched. The moon had begun to rise. And far away a voice began to sing. You couldn't make out the words” (Bradbury:20).

Mytrofanov's sophisticated artistic skill and translation tact is also proved by the capitalization of the language message, which has a certain aesthetic weight in the original text with its adequate reflection in the translation: «ОТЖЕ, КОЛИ ТРАМВАЇ, І БРОДЯГИ, І ЗНАЙОМІ, І ДРУЗІ МОЖУТЬ ПІТИ НА ЧАС ЧИ ПІТИ НАЗАВЖДИ, АБО РОЗВАЛИТИСЬ, АБО ВМЕРТИ, І КОЛИ ЛЮДЕЙ МОЖУТЬ УБИВАТИ, І КОЛИ ТАКІ ЛЮДИ, ЯК ПРАБАБУСЯ, ЩО МАЛИ Б ЖИТИ ВІЧНО, ТЕЖ МОЖУТЬ УМЕРТИ... КОЛИ ВСЕ ЦЕ ПРАВДА... ТО І Я, ДУГЛАС СПОЛДІНГ, КОЛИСЬ... МАЮ...» (Р. Бредбері, 1998: 101) – “SO IF TROLLEYS AND RUNABOUTS AND FRIENDS AND NEAR FRIENDS CAN GO AWAY FOR A WHILE AND GO AWAY FOR EVER, OR RUST, OR FALL APART OR DIE, AND IF PEOPLE CAN BE MURDERED, AND SOMEONE LIKE GREAT GRANDMA, WHO WAS GOING TO LIVE FOREVER, CAN DIE, <...> IF ALL OF THIS IS TRUE... THEN... I DOUGLAS SPAULDING, SOME DAY MUST» (Bradbury: 171).

Thus, Mytrofanov's ability to decode the author's intention is carried out via: 1) mastery (a sense of intuition, rather than 'bare' technique); 2) translation tact (refusal of any manifestations of voluntarism and, hence, the so-called 'gags'); 3) overcoming the artificiality of the translation (organic sound with maximum correspondence to the original, careful selection of linguistic means regulated by a sense of measure and artistic taste); 4) reproduction of the 'spirit' of the original (adherence to the principle of equivalence with the exception of possible different readings and ambiguities).

The translator's conscious understanding of the artistic and aesthetic experience of the author of the original provide him with opportunities to create texts with the help of which the mental representation of images takes place within the cognitive system, thus forming a figurative and stylistic specificity for making certain generalizations about the depth of reproduction of reality of the original text as well as an intuitive sense of its axiological

significance. Such ‘revival’ appears thanks to the individual emotional activity of the translator, which indicates that his ontological eagerness to perceive a new literary environment to unfold the fictional world comes to be equal to the author’s intention at the time of the creation of the original text. In other words, Mytrofanov always makes sure to “be able to see the original through the author’s eyes and to feel the flow of his thoughts in each specific case” (Mytrofanov, 1995: 4), and only then, if certain doubts or objections arise, to agree with them through their own epistemological profiles with the author, <...> “leaving the method of crude ‘operational’ intervention in the text of the original for unqualified translations” (Mytrofanov, 1995: 4). In this regard, the translator focuses on the need to generalize and solve imperative issues of translation and editorial practice, and at the same time, rejecting the assumption of “too subjective and insufficiently substantiated conclusions, sometimes straying from a debating tone to a kind of directive-circular manner (Mytrofanov, 1995: 4), which, as he claims, proves to be in contradiction with the living, creative activity called artistic translation.

Conclusions

Mytrofanov’s creative activity proves that translator’s functions are transformed and expanded: in addition to understanding the actual content of the original, which concentrates on the search for the primary meaning, there is a need to study its further ‘attributes’, which in their entirety formed the creative process of translation (choice of linguistic means in accordance with the style of the original, situational vision of its individual phenomena and events, arrangement of semantic accents, optimal preservation of the architectural structure of the original, explicit interpretation of relevant textual phenomena, etc.). Cognitive-aesthetic mission of translation is defined as a synthetic discourse of cultural communication.

At the same time, Mytrofanov outlines new aspects of the original work through the act of translation, fitting it into general

cultural, aesthetic and value context. On the one hand, it can be recognized that the translator appropriates the textual structure of the original, on the other, he assimilates created text into general cultural and historical context, and therefore his own perception becomes part of a complexly synthesized view of the source text. In this regard, Mytrofanov persuasively claims that the presence of a translator in the traditional chain 'author – text– reader' proves to be communicatively relevant, and without him the long-term functioning of a newly created text in the communicative space is impossible. Thus, the translator's mission is extremely responsible, as it allows not only to keep a certain literary work in the space of intellectual and aesthetic interest, but also to enrich and modify its direct and hidden semantic nuances. In the oppositional structure of the literary process, the phenomenon of the translator equally belongs both to the constant-attributive factors, without which literature cannot fulfill its purpose, and to the historical-variable ones that make the work of art exist for long, and therefore make the readers discover the cultural traditions and unspoken notions embedded in it.

References

- Bassnett, S. (2013). *Postcolonialism and /as Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bradbury, R. (1998). *Kulbabove vyno [Dandelion Wine]*. Retrieved from: https://read-online.in.ua/read/kulbabove_vino/
- Bradbury, R. *Dandelion Wine*. Retrieved from: <http://avidreaders.ru/book/dandelion-wine.html/>.
- Brodzki, B. (2007). *Can these Bones Live?* Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Eko, U. (2001). *Poetyka vidkrytoho tvorcu. Antolohiia svitovoi literaturno-krytychnoi dumky XX st. Slovo. Znak. Dyskurs*.

- [*Poetics of an open form. Word. Sign. Discourse*]. Lviv: Litopys [in Ukrainian].
- Hemingway, E. *Farewell to Arms*. Retrieved from: http://www.kkoworld.com/kitablar/Ernest_Heminquey_Elvida_silah_eng.pdf
- Hemingway, E. *Proshchavai, zbroie!* [*A Farewell to Arms*]. Retrieved from: <https://nemaloknig.net/read-14474/?page=6#booktxt>
- Lisniak, Yu. (1991). *Pratsia perekladacha. Rukopys*. [*Translator's work*]. Manuscript. Kyiv: Home archive of Halyny Lozynska [in Ukrainian].
- Mytrofanov, V. (1995). *Za tvorchyi poshuk (kilka sliv do krytyky khudozhnogo perekladu)*. [*For a creative search (a few words on criticism of artistic translation)*]. Manuscript. Kyiv: Home archive of Valentina Mytrofanova [in Ukrainian].
- Mytrofanov, V. (1995). *Zaproshennia do superechky (perekladach-redaktor-krytyk)*[*Inviting for discussions (translator-editor-critic)*]. Kyiv: Home archive of Valentina Mytrofanova [in Ukrainian].
- Mytrofanov, V. (1981). *Retsenziia na ukraïnskyi pereklad z anhliiskoi movy romaniv F. Skotta Fitsdzheralda "Velykyi Hetsbi" i "Nich lahidna"* [dlia vyd-va "Dnipro", 10 kvit. 1981 r.] [*Review of the Ukrainian translation from English of F. Scott Fitzgerald's novels 'The Great Gatsby' and 'Tender is the Night' [for Dnipro, April 10, 1981]*]. Kyiv: Central State Archive-Museum of Literature and Art of Ukraine [in Ukrainian].
- Toper, P. (2000). *Perevod v systeme sravnytel'nogo lyteraturovedenya* [*Translation in the system of comparative literature*]. Moscow: Nasledye [in Russian].
- Tryhub, A. M. (2014). Zhanrove riznomanittia perekladnykh tvoriv Volodymyra Mytrofanova [Genre diversity of translated works of Volodymyr Mytrofanov. Language and

culture]. *Mova i kultura*, 17 (175). Kyiv: Vydavnychy dim Dmytra Buraho [in Ukrainian].

Tryhub, A. M. (2015). *Stratehiia perekladu Volodymyra Mytrofanova: lnhvostylistychnyi aspect* [Volodymyr Mytrofanov's translation strategy: linguistic stylistic aspect]. *Science and Education a New Dimension*, 68(15). Budapest [in Ukrainian].

Рукопис статті отримано 03 липня 2022 року

Рукопис затверджено до публікації 16 жовтня 2022 року

Інформація про автора

Павленко Олена Георгіївна – доктор філологічних наук, професор кафедри англійської філології Маріупольського державного університету; пр. Повітрофлотський, 31, м. Київ, 03037, Україна; e-mail: pavlenkoelena2017@gmail.com; h.pavlenko@mdu.in.ua; <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3747-4651>; Scopus ID 57216902076

Pavlenko Olena Heorhiivna – Doctor of Philology, Professor of the English Philology Department, Mariupol State University; pr. Povitproflotskyi, 31. Kyiv, 03037, Ukraine; e-mail: pavlenkoelena2017@gmail.com; h.pavlenko@mdu.in.ua; <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3747-4651>; Scopus ID 57216902