

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE
IVAN FRANKO NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF LVIV**

TARAS SHMIHER

**RECEPTION OF WORLD
LITERATURE IN UKRAINE**

Selected topics

Lecture notes

Lviv – 2022

**МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
ЛЬВІВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
ІМЕНІ ІВАНА ФРАНКА**

ТАРАС ШМІГЕР

**РЕЦЕПЦІЯ СВІТОВОЇ
ЛІТЕРАТУРИ В УКРАЇНІ**

Окремі теми

Тексти лекцій

ЛЬВІВ – 2022

УДК [821.091(100:477):81'25](043.3)(072)

Ш 73

Рецензенти:

д-р філол. наук, проф. Сергій Засєкін
д-р філол. наук, проф. каф. Роксолана Поворознюк
канд. філол. наук, доц. Андрій Білас

Відповідальна за випуск:

д-р філол. наук, зав. каф. Оксана Дзера

Рекомендувала до друку Вчена рада
факультету іноземних мов

Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка
(Протокол 1 з 30 серпня 2022 р.)

Шмігер Тарас

Ш 73

Рецепція світової літератури в Україні. Окремі теми
= Reception of world literature in Ukraine. Selected topics :
тексти лекцій / Т. Шмігер. – Львів : ЛНУ імені Івана Франка,
2022. – 112 с.

У лекціях представлено основні поняття та окремі теми з рецепції світової літератури в Україні: чотири теми присвячено українському літургійному перекладу, дві – рецепції англійської літератури, по одній – засадничим принципам і соціології перекладу. Завдання лекцій полягає у тому, щоб допомогти студентам усвідомити динаміку історичних процесів і виробити критичні навички для оцінки якості перекладу релігійних і часовіддалених текстів.

Розраховано на студентів перекладацького відділу.

УДК [821.091(100:477):81'25](043.3)(072)

© Taras Shmiher, 2022

CONTENTS

Preface	4
Topic 1. Translations as part of a national literature: a historical overview of theoretical views	5
Topic 2. Reception of Religious (Liturgical) Literature in Mediaeval Ukraine	14
Topic 3. Early modern time in the history of Ukrainian liturgical translation	28
Topic 4. Translation in exile: the case of Ukrainian liturgical translation	44
Topic 5. The linguacultural history of the Ukrainian translation of the Creed	68
Topic 6. Geoffrey Chaucer's text in English intralingual and Ukrainian interlingual translations	79
Topic 7. John Milton's writings in Ukrainian translations	96
Topic 8. Sociological dimensions of translation prizes: the case of the Hryhoriy Kochur Literary Prize	102

PREFACE

Translation students of the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv study the issues of translation history and reception within a number of academic courses. These lectures notes are mainly oriented at the first year of the master programme whose students already possess some knowledge in the domains of Ukrainian and foreign literatures and can offer a high level of critical considerations of the topics discussed. The additional intended group is the first year of the bachelor programme whose students can get some historical information while exploring the general history of Ukrainian literary translation.

The lectures cover essential concepts and selected topics on the reception of world literature in Ukraine. Topic 1 debates over the inclusion of translations into a national literature as its integral part. Topics 2 to 5 disclose the issues of liturgical translation in Ukraine. The information for these topics was collected as the partial result of the project which was made possible through Scholarship Grant No. 52110864 from the International Visegrad Fund. The project was implemented at the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University (Lublin, Poland) under the supervision of Dr Habil. Magdalena Mitura (the academic year 2021/2022). Topics 6 and 7 discuss the issues of translating classical English text. The lecture on Milton has been published in the form of a book review (in: *Slavia Orientalis*. 2020. T. 69, no. 4. P. 933-936). Topic 8 deals with translation sociology: the Hryhoriy Kochur Literary Prize is under study.

Each topic is accompanied with questions for discussion whose task is to boost students' interest in considering translation phenomena and elaborating the vision of the Ukrainian literary process as an integral and dynamic progress.

Hopefully, these lecture notes will be a useful guide for students majoring in English-Ukrainian translation.

Topic 1:**TRANSLATIONS AS PART OF A NATIONAL LITERATURE:
a historical overview of theoretical views**

1. Early views
2. Ukrainian context
3. Polysystem theory
4. World literature as a notion
5. Reception and perception

1. Early views

The Bible was always regarded as a text of special authority. This is not surprising that the histories of acquiring it into a national culture are millennia-long. For this reason, biblical translation contributed to a nation's spiritual salvation, and thus, the Bible was part of spiritual and societal (educational) life. It is delicately but exactly mentioned in the 1506 Czech Bible [Biblij Česká 1506:[2]]. These views are reiterated in Frantsisk Skoryna's 1517-1519 Ruthenian Bible [Францыск Скарына... 1988:118–119, 150]. The Bible in a national language is not only a way for a nation's salvation, but it is part of a national literature. The King James Version of the English Bible (1611) served as a stylebook for a long time because its style was so elegant and elaborated that it influenced the mass of intellectuals and their way of speaking.

Other texts which are accepted as native are some carols (of pre-Christian origin) and fairy tales (of Persian origin). Their plots came from Antiquity, and they are known among various nations. Due to their long life in Ukrainian national folklore, no one questions their translation status which is technically an adaptation.

2. Ukrainian context

In the 19th century, Ukrainian critics voiced their ideas about the canon of a national literature more actively. **Ivan Franko**

regarded literary translation as a means of nation-shaping. He treated a literary piece as a product of spiritual history of a society and later as a fact of the individual history of a writer [Франко т. 27:311]. Thus, the very history can be interpreted as a nation's narration about itself or nation-narration [see: Каширіна 2020] which cannot enter the target literature without being acquired as something already owned.

Earlier before Martin Heidegger, Ivan Franko saw: the language is to become 'the home of existence' of the Ukrainian nation, and translations of foreign poetry from various times and peoples enrich 'the soul of the whole nation' [Франко т. 5:7]. Surely, the 'soul' stands for a canon whose tools are understanding and co-sensation between us and other nations, between modern and ancient people [Франко т. 5:7].

Mykola Zerov was an outstanding of the era of Ukrainization in the 1920s which raised a very interesting and simultaneously necessary question about the revision and check of classics for their "classicalness" that stimulated the review of literary history and the preparation of histories of Ukrainian literature according to the aspects defined in advance. The provisional analysis of textbooks in history of Ukrainian literature revealed that M. Zerov's textbook "*Nove ukrayinske pysmenstvo*" ("New Ukrainian Literature", Kyiv, 1924) was the first book which included translated literature as an equal component of a national literature. Translations are required 1) to render the outstanding experience of the world literature, 2) to help us reassess our own literary tradition, 3) to be a good school for young authors [Зеров 1990:580].

The stimulus that had an effect of involving translated literature as a phenomenon of Ukrainian literature may have been the observation of A. Nikovskyi who remarked three stages of how Ukrainian literature approached world cultural tradition: from

travesty (time of I. Kotliarevskiy and “*kotliarevshchyna*”) through translations to original works based on world themes (starting with the 1870-80s) [Зеров 2003:13-14]. In New Ukrainian literature, namely in the development of Ukrainian poetic style, M. Zerov tries to classify 3 periods: 1) travesty; 2) translation-travesty (or transfusion); 3) translation proper.

Taking “*Eneyida*” by I. Kotliarevskiy, the researcher described the features of a travesty: a) the absence of specific [original] national element (the absence of “Roman soul”); b) opposite tone and relevant poetic means; c) ethnographical realism of Ukrainian every-day life [Зеров 2003:28-35].

The best examples of the translation-travesty period are P. Hulak-Artemovskiy and Ye. Hrebinka (activities of the 1840s) as well as P. Nishchynskiy (Sophocles’ “*Antigone*”), S. Rudanskyi (Homer’s “*Iliad*”). The main impediment of the time was that “... the literary preferences were being formed under influence of Ukrainian folklore milieu, and the talented translator [S. Rudanskyi] comprehended Homer only as Ukrainized...” [Зеров 2003:571]. Nevertheless, these translations fulfilled their missions. The translation technique of M. Starytskyi and P. Kulish show how they had to struggle with the folklore poetics in order to elaborate new Ukrainian lingual poetics [Зеров 1990:288].

The “pure translation period” is illustrated with the translations done by V. Samiylenko whose translations of Béranger’s poetry are perfect. Ethnopsychologically, V. Samiylenko **overcame** “layman’s “Little-Russian **mentality**” of Kotliarevskiy’s epigones” [Зеров 2003:467]. If Ye. Hrebinka, S. Rudanskyi and others failed to rise above the confines of the Ukrainian language, by means of the native tongue V. Samiylenko succeeded in reaching European masterpieces so closely that he was able to render the contents and rhythm of the original excellently.

3. Polysystem theory [after Nam Fung Chang in: HTS 2010:1:257-263]

In the early 1970s, Israeli scholars Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury developed polysystem theory which was later accepted as a model for descriptive translation studies. It borrowed a number of concepts from Russian formalism by discussing constituents of culture (such as language, literature and technology) as systems (and not conglomerates) of disparate elements. Thus, their elements are inter-connected, and their relations are defined by their position in the whole system. Although the system is a heterogeneous and open structure, it functions as one integrated structure. Besides, culture is a multiple system or a system of various systems which interact with each other and even partly overlap.

Cultural polysystems are not identical. Some are in a more central position and others keep peripheral ones. This means that relations between co-systems are very dynamic: as a result of tensions within the polysystem, some systems move from the centre towards the periphery, whereas others go towards the centre. This claims: as a central position may change over time in the polysystem, translated literature may replace original literature.

Any cultural polysystem is manifested via the repertoire of canonised and non-canonised strata. It is necessary to remember canonicity results from the choice of a reading community dominating in the polysystem, and it is not an integral feature of the product but its state.

Thus, the centre of the polysystem means the most prestigious canonised repertoire shaped according to the norms being operative in a specific subsystem. These norms include both the individual norms from the very subsystem in question and from those of other literary and lingual sub-systems as well as other systems of the same cultural polysystem. In this way, we approach to understanding why it is essential to differentiate culture-as-goods

and culture-as-tools for generating new subsystems. This contributes to the theoretical assessment of literary and translation histories making it possible to cover both official cultural products and other components of literary process like translated and popular literature.

Even-Zohar shaped some hypotheses on translated literature:

- 1) translated works still constitute a system of the target culture because source texts are selected according to the conditions of the target culture, and translation strategies also depend on their relations with the target co-systems:
- 2) in the polysystem with its central and peripheral literary parts, translated literature usually occupies a peripheral position.

However, translated literature has potential to become part of the centre if it introduces new repertoire into a certain target literature. These are three typical cases:

- 1) when a literature is “young” (in the process of establishing);
- 2) when a literature is weak (i.e. peripheral in a group of correlated literatures);
- 3) when there are turning points, crises or vacuums in a literature.

When translated literature takes a central position and becomes the centre of the literary polysystem, translators see their main task as the introduction of new models and repertoires and practise foreignization. When translated literature is in a peripheral position, translators more actively apply ready-made home models for the foreign text and keep to domestication.

Polysystem theory was extremely popular, though researchers traced some drawbacks like the underestimation of the relevance of power relations and ideology and the lack of attention to the translator as an operating agent.

4. World literature [after Juvan 2019:2-22]

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe is the recognized creator of the term ‘Weltliteratur’ and a promoter of the idea of world litera-

ture that also granted a feeling of cosmopolitan universality to his own writings and established his position as a classical national author in the German lands. Goethe turned out to be a nation-founding author whose classical universality at the same time transcended local parochialism and imposed the authority central to European literary scene.

Local (peripheral) authors, even those who do not use their native language (which is their primary instrument), could wish to occupy a position in the world literary space. When writing intertextually and addressing to transcultural resources, authors from local literatures and their writings in minor languages have a good chance at establishing themselves internationally, even though their entrance to the world literary process may be quite problematic and deferred.

National poets in the periphery are aware that they depend on imperial powers: the international recognition of their nascent collective identity is possible, and they represent their respective nations from the perspective of showing the Other, in the hyper-canon of world literature. This goal is reached by the intertextual transfer of universal aesthetic repertoires from the established literatures.

The applied division of world literature into hegemonic centres and dependent peripheries has been criticized because of Western-centrism secured by the domination of global English as the language of translation, the globalization of an aesthetic mode of reading, and the Eurochronology of literary history. These three points generate obstacle for any local writer who acts beyond this space.

The canon of the West is different from any national canon which still covers the highest national aesthetic achievements in this literature. The common background can be traced in the intertextual indigenization of the Greek and Latin heritage which can function as a norm-giving culture. Meanwhile, the symbolic

difference between a peripheral semiosphere in a national canon and the universality of the world classics does not disappear.

5. Reception and perception [after Elke Brems and Sara Ramos Pinto in: HTS 2013:4:142-147]

Readership can be viewed from various angles, esp. historical perspectives and individual / collective level of incorporating a foreign literature. Reception as a term of literary studies has shifted its focus from the text and the author to the reader, claiming that a text has no meaning without the contribution of the reader.

In the framework of the 'Rezeptionsaesthetik', Hans-Robert Jauss introduced the term 'Erwartungshorizont' (horizon of expectations) which stands for the set of cultural norms, assumptions and criteria that shape the way in which readers understand and judge a literary work at a given time. The very process of concretizing the potential of the text into a specific sense is reception.

Jauss' main claim was that the evolution of the audience, not the historical period of the author, explains the history of a literary text. However, texts provide only a schematic structure, leaving many things unexplained to the reader. This is the reason why Wolfgang Iser introduced the term 'Leerstelle' (textual gaps): in the reading process, the reader fills in the gaps and realizes the meaning of the text in a subjective and imaginative way.

As a text does not have meaning outside of a set of cultural assumptions, Fish Stanley claims that we interpret texts because we are part of an 'interpretive community' that imposes upon us a particular way of reading a text. This opened the way to the idea of 'interpretive communities', i.e. a collective reader with a number of dimensions and parameters like history, geography, status, education, age, gender or political stance.

Reception from a social perspective means discovering how translated texts are received on the supra-individual level. Two

approaches are relevant for multiple goals of this main purpose: in the quantitative approach, bibliographical information, maps of translation flows and inventories of translations in a certain era, by a certain translator, from a certain source culture, etc. are decisive; in the qualitative approach, literary criticism, influence and intertextuality, censorship, etc. are essential to show how the target culture received an author, oeuvre, genre or source culture.

References

- Biblij Česká 1506: Biblij Česká w Benátkách tisštěná. Venetia: in edibus Petri Liechtenstein, 1506. 1138 p.
- HTS 2010-2013: Handbook of translation studies: in 4 vols. / ed. by Y. Gambier, L. van Doorslaer. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2010-2013.
- Juvan 2019: Juvan M. Worlding a Peripheral Literature. S.l.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019. vii, 291 p.
- Зеров 1990: Зеров М.К. Твори: у 2 т. Т. 2: Історико-літературні та літературознавчі праці / Упоряд. Г.П. Кочура, Д.В. Павличка. Київ: Дніпро, 1990. 491 с.
- Зеров 2003: Зеров М. Українське письменство / упоряд. М. Сулима. Київ: Вид-во Соломії Павличко «Основи», 2003. 1301 с.
- Каширіна 2020: Каширіна І. В. Перекладацький метод Святослава Караванського: автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.16 / Київ. нац. ун-т ім. Тараса Шевченка. Київ, 2020. 18 с.
- Франко: Франко І. Зібрання творів: у 50 т. / АН УРСР. Ін-т л-ри ім. Т. Г. Шевченка. Київ: Наук. думка, 1976-1986.
- Францыск Скарына... 1988: Францыск Скарына і яго час: энцыкл. давед. / Беларус. сав. энцыклапедыя. Мінск: БелСЭ, 1988. 608 с.

Questions for discussion

1. Why is the polysystem dynamic? Can you justify this claim with an example?
2. Describe today's Ukrainian polysystem (basic areas).
3. What translation norms dominate in Ukraine's current translations?
4. What is a literary canon?
5. What canon would like to see as a reader representing your reading community (social, ethnic, regional)?
6. Why do you (not) agree to differentiate reception and perception as terms?
7. Provide any example how poetic language and intertextually can specifically refer to European aesthetic resources.

Topic 2:**RECEPTION OF RELIGIOUS (LITURGICAL) LITERATURE
IN MEDIAEVAL UKRAINE**

1. Historical landscape
2. Repertoires of liturgical literature
3. Paths to translation principles
4. Character of early religious translations

1. Historical landscape

The Mediaeval Ukrainian State – Rus (aka Kyivan Rus) – was converted to Christianity in 988. Christianity brought literacy to Slavonic lands and stimulated the development of national literatures. Early Bulgarian, Serbian, Czech and Ukrainian literatures depended heavily on religious translations whose inherent part were liturgical texts. The oldest sample of Glagolitic writing is the “Kyiv Missal” (or the “Kyiv Glagolitic Folios”) of the 10th century from Moravia which testifies to the existence of liturgical translations among Western Slavs. The recipient language was Old Church Slavonic, and this manuscript must have been one of many other liturgical books of the Roman Rite.

The Old Church Slavonic language (aka Old Bulgarian) was a language easily perceived and understood among the Slavs, but it pushed the development of other Slavonic languages and literatures where it was used as a language of the Church. In the Ukrainian territory, it immediately started acquiring a local form and transforming into the independent written language of the State. The written language paralleled the development of the vernacular from the 10th to the 18th centuries. The Old Ukrainian written variant (up to the 13th century) depended on Church Slavonic very heavily. More vernacular elements appeared in the Middle Ukrainian written language (the 14th to 18th centuries).

The Old Church Slavonic language (aka Old Bulgarian) was a language easily perceived and understood among the Slavs, but it pushed the development of other Slavonic languages and literatures where it was used as a language of the Church. In the Ukrainian territory, it immediately started acquiring a local form and transforming into the independent written standard of the State. The written language paralleled the development of the vernacular from the 10th to the 18th centuries. The Old Ukrainian written variant (up to the 13th century) depended on Church Slavonic very heavily. More vernacular elements appeared in the Middle Ukrainian written language (the 14th to 18th centuries).

2. Repertoires of liturgical literature

The earliest mentions about liturgical translations in the Slavonic world are recorded in the ninth-century lives of SS Cyril-Constantine and Methodius, Byzantine Christian missionaries for the Moravians who are also honoured as the ‘Apostles to the Slavs’. “The Life of Constantine” reads: “As soon as all the church offices were accepted [translated], he [Cyril-Constantine] taught them Matins and the Hours, Vespers and the Compline, and the Liturgy” [Kantor 1983:69]. “The Life of Methodius” refers to the same topics: “Deriving threefold joy therefrom, we considered the matter and decided to send to your lands our son Methodius, an Orthodox man accomplished in mind, whom we consecrated with his disciples in order to teach, as you requested, and to explain fully in your language the Scriptures and holy Mass, that is, the liturgy, as well as Baptism according to the entire Church Office, just as Constantine the Philosopher had begun through the grace of God and the prayers of Saint Clement” or “For previously he had translated with the Philosopher [Cyril-Constantine] only the Psalter, the Gospel together with the “Apostolos”, and selected church liturgies. And then he translated the “Nomocanon”,

that is, the Rule of the Law, and the Books of the Fathers” [Kantor 1983:69, 125]. These quotes conscribe to the view that the translated Liturgy is to be understood as a unity of all the liturgical books which are necessary for yearly and occasional servicing.

The liturgical life itself was not unified in that form, which was stabilized several centuries later and is accepted fully now. Various liturgies were spread and celebrated in Christendom. Since Moravia had experienced the contacts with the Roman Church, St. Cyril could have adapted the Greek translation of the Latin Mass, called the liturgy of St. Peter to the Church Slavonic language, but also propagated the Byzantine liturgy [Dostál 1965:77-84]. The Archbishopric of Moravia used the Slavonic liturgy very briefly, and it might even have reached Southern Poland. Unfortunately, Pope Stephen V prohibited the use of Slavonic liturgy in 885 (after St Methodius’s death). The prohibition was repeated in 968, and the appeal for permission was declined in 1080. This means the Slavonic liturgy survived somewhere in the clandestine condition, but no favourable conditions existed for the liturgical translation of the Roman Rite, and Latin was the only dominating language in use.

After St Methodius’s disciples were exiled from Moravia, they came to Bulgaria where they settled and produced the first fully-Byzantine corpus of liturgical books in Old Church Slavonic. Among them was St Clement of Ohrid who is credited with the translation of the Pentecostarion. The Bulgarian Archbishopric legitimized the use of Old Church Slavonic as a liturgical language, and this liturgical legacy was later transferred northward – to the Kyivan State of Rus at the turn of the 11th century which was called ‘the first South Slavonic influence’. St Clement’s corpus of liturgical books contained all the four groups of books: lectionary texts (Gospel, Epistle Book, Psalter, Prophetologion); hymnographic texts (Menaion, Lenten Triodion, Pentecostarion, Oc-

toechos); euchographic texts (Liturgicon, Euchologion); homiletic texts [Пентковский 2016:58-59 ff]. The originals of these translations were Greek, though rare translations from Latin and Old High German are still traced [Пентковский 2016:60], and this testifies to the initially unstable liturgical canon within a single ecclesiastical institution and the creative influences of other liturgical traditions, especially those of the Jerusalem, Palestine, South Italian and West Byzantine liturgical traditions.

Illustrious is the year 1037 in the history of Ukrainian religious translation, which is described in the “Primary Chronicle”: “He [Grand Prince Yaroslav the Wise of Kyiv] assembled many scribes, and translated from Greek into Slavic. He wrote and collected many books through which true believers are instructed and enjoy religious education” [RPC 1953:137]. The chronicler highlighted how important that translation enterprise was meanwhile it signified translations were part of a large-scale program of translating, re-translating and localizing some texts for the benefit of the Church and the State. Under the entry of the year 1051, the Chronicle [RPC 1953:142] mentions the monastic and cathedral rule of the Studion which substituted the earlier rule of Constantinople. The Studion rule (edited by the Ecumenical Patriarch Alexios Stoudites) existed till the 15th century when it was replaced by the rite of Jerusalem. All these replacements were followed by adjusting – re-translating and editing – the existing liturgical texts according to the newly-accepted demands of the liturgical life. As of the mid-11th century, the Festal Menaion was already stable, but the General Menaion was extended from Greek original and even started including hymns of local origin. The Liturgies of SS John Chrysostom and Basil the Great had not been unified by the late 11th century, and in medieval Ukrainian liturgical praxis, some texts of the essential liturgies were used from earlier times, especially created under the influence of Western Bulgarian proto-

texts. When the texts of liturgies were revised in Constantinople, that influenced the necessity of retranslating them in Ukraine [Афанасьева 2015:276-279]. Besides, the 12th and early 13th centuries were productive for specifically local liturgical activities.

The repertoire of the earliest manuscripts [Каталог 2014] reveals the then presence of all the liturgical genres from the corpus, which we know now. Besides, it contains translations of texts from the Western Church that means that Kyivan Christianity was always open to all traditions of Christendom. Translations of hagiographic and euchologic writings are found among the oldest monuments of Early Ukrainian literature [ІУЛ 2014:114-116].

“The Second South Slavonic influence” was a result of social, cultural and political conditions after the Mongols invasions in the mid-13th century, which prompted very active churchly life in the 14th century: the rises and falls of the Metropolitanates of Halych and of Lithuania; the split of the Metropolitanate of Kyiv between the Great Duchy of Lithuania and the Great Duchy of Moscow; the appointment of metropolitans who were of Bulgarian and Greek origins. These changes as well as the ecclesiastical reforms in Constantinople stimulated the rearrangement of liturgical life in all Eastern Slavonic territory as well as reactivated contacts with Southern Slavs. The influence is mostly connected with the orthographic and linguistic reform by St Evtimiy of Tarnovo which also included the correction of translated texts.

St Evtimiy of Tarnovo and Cyprian Tsamblak, who was Metropolitan of Kyiv at the turn of the 15th century, were literalists who typically translated morpheme-by-morpheme and paid attention to a word’s structure and the primary sense of the Greek root [Афанасьева 2015:282]. Still, they introduced some lexical changes connected with denoting important theological concepts, and in this way, their translations are different from those which were produced in Athonite monasteries.

During the 13th and 14th centuries in the Kyivan metropolitanate, liturgies coexisted in Old Bulgarian versions of various earlier Greek texts, preserving even some ancient prayers from South Italian liturgies which are not found in the then Greek euchologia [Афанасьева 2015:283]. Cyprian reformed liturgical praxis, so the corrected versions of liturgies after the late 14th century are identical to Greek euchologia. New services elaborated in the Great Church 'Hagia Sophia' in Constantinople were translated and distributed in novel Church Slavonic variants. The complete list of reformed texts covers those of the Liturgicon, the Euchologion, the Psalter, the Horologion and the Synaxarion with troparia and kontakia (the analysis of all the liturgical changes is in: [Мансветовъ 1882]), though it took a long time when the whole Church accepted it.

3. Paths to translation principles

Mediaeval translation theory in the Slavonic area developed indirectly under the influence of translation ideas circulating in antiquity. Manuscript culture imposed physical limitations on the dissemination and exchange of translation views. Nevertheless, the deficiency of theoretical judgments on translation praxis in mediaeval Ukraine and Poland can be explained by the simple fact that manuscripts discussing or mentioning translation matters may not have survived. The more known judgments are those by Balkan – mainly Bulgarian – writers (St Cyril the Philosopher in the 9th century, St John the Exarch and Chernorizets Hrabar at the turn of the 10th century, as well as Constantine of Kostenets at the turn of the 15th century). Balkan views incorporated those recorded in writings by Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite [Шмиреп 2018:31]. The Western Slavs who bordered on the area of the Roman Church, may have known translation views of SS Jerome and Augustine.

Traditionally, today's translation historians overlook how well the mediaeval theory of translation was developed. The 9th-century Macedonian Folio which is attributed to St Cyril contains a deep understanding of interlingual asymmetry and emphasis on the importance of the cultural interpretation of textual symbols. The bright example is connected with the story of Jesus Christ's Nativity: the masculine Greek noun 'ἄστὴρ' is rendered as the feminine Slavonic noun 'звѣзда', and the symbolical meaning of an angel, which is typically perceived as a man, is lost. Another fact is that scribes applied a term for designing the notion of *equivalence* 'истовъ' [see more: Шмиреп 2018:32]. These ideas were brought to Ukraine along with religious literature as the result of two South Slavonic influences, and they were creatively used by scribes. An additional way to disclose the mediaeval perception of translation is to peer in the lexical networks describing translation activities. The Old Ukrainian lexical network of the 11th to 13th centuries contains nine lexemes which designate translation activities:

Old Ukrainian Lexeme	Origin	Meaning
прекладати, прѣкладати преложити, преложити	Slavonic	translate
тълмачити, толмачити	Turkic	interpret
тълковати, тлъковати, тълъковати	Celtic	explain
прѣводъ	Slavonic	translation
тълкъ, толкъ	Celtic	interpretation
тълкование, тлъкование, тол- кование	Celtic	explanation
тълкарь	Celtic	interpreter
тълмачъ, толмачъ	Turkic	

The different etymological origin of the terms reflects the active intercultural communication of mediaeval Ukrainians with neighbouring lingual communities. Besides, the coexistence of the terms makes it possible to presuppose that interpreting could have been viewed as a separate and dominant activity being different from translating. The Turkic derivatives are puzzling as they repeat the system of terms, and perhaps, this is the sign of active cooperation with Turkic nomadic nations. The aims of translation activities had two main vectors focusing on interpreting and religious translation and, thus, depicting two natures of translation: oral and written. Meanwhile, what is quality in translation is also fuzzy: accurate phrasing, meaningful essence or wider interpretational space.

The Middle Ukrainian documents of the 14th and 15th centuries are scarce, that is why two recorded lexemes cannot present the real richness of translation life in this region where the whole ‘city of translators’ – *Tovmach* (now *Tlumach* in Ivano-Frankivsk Region; both names meaning ‘interpreter’) – exists supposedly in honour of the guild of translators and interpreters [Шміреп 2018:33].

Early Middle Ukrainian Lexeme

преложити
тольмачъ

Meaning

translate, interpret
translator, interpreter

4. Character of early religious translations

In mediaeval Ukraine, scribes followed the Ciceronean dichotomy of word-for-word and sense-for-sense translation types. Belles-lettres and academic treatises were texts of lower authority, and they were granted the right of translators’ licenses and dealing with a text in a freely artistic way. In contrast to literary and scientific translations, the translations of liturgical texts (prayers, hymns, homilies by St Gregory of Nazianzus) as well as the translations by John the Exarch of Bulgaria were extremely literal: a Greek text was rendered into Church Slavonic word by word copying the syntac-

tical order and constructions of the Greek original [Мещерский 1958:75-76]. Meanwhile, this does not mean that this type of translation ruined the text type of liturgical hymns. In general, the Slavonic reception of Byzantine hymns was oriented at keeping the genre form and the accurate meanings of Greek words while deviating the verse recital: unlike Greek and South Slavonic hymns compiled according to a certain poetic meter and acrostic, old Ukrainian – translated and original – hymns were based on the rhythmical oration without acrostic [Джиджора 2018:11-12].

This partially contradictory and somewhat conciliating sum of general judgements does not provide a definitive answer about the typical quality of religious translations. A. Dostál even questions the nature of rendered text, if they were really translations or mere adaptations: “the authors of the Slavonic texts may have not only translated but also adapted the Greek original for Slavic consumption” [Dostál 1965:72]. The key term is ‘consumption’ which enable us think about all the numerous parameters of the textual reception and perception in intercultural communication. The more criteria the analyst can design for assessing translations, the more insightful their analysis appears to be. The definitions of adaptation in translation studies are so numerous that this plurality creates a lot of indefiniteness and indecisiveness (see highlights of the theoretical discussions in [HTS 2010:1:3-6]).

The recent terms ‘appropriation’ and ‘localization’ may contribute to the better description and classification of early translations. Although the problem of translatorship can overlap that of authorship: in early Ukrainian literature, the collective authorship dominated, and each scribe could and did contribute to generating chain of a text’s existence. Similarly, in the domain of mediaeval manuscript culture, the issue of the collective translator is even more relevant in their search for the ideal translated text. The necessity to adapt the Greek originals to the new milieu

appeared at the time of the birth of the very Slavonic liturgy, as testified by the Kyiv Glagolitic Folios [Dostál 1965:86]. Sometimes, a translator became an original author by ‘plagiarizing’ one text for generating another one. This is the case of the Service for translating the relics of St. Bartholomew the Apostle which was allegedly composed by Joseph the Hymnographer in Byzantine, then translated into Old Church Slavonic, and later adapted into the Service for translating the relics of St. Nicholas of Myra [Темчин 2014]. St Cyril of Turiv incorporated the sticheron from the litany of the 4th Sunday after Easter into his ‘Homily on the Paralytic’: the sticheron became a literary source for the writer who developed its ideas and created partially an adaptive translation [Шумило 2016]. K. Stanchev summarizes that all the translation texts can be grouped into three categories: 1) translations proper (without intruding into the structure and imagery of the original); 2) compilations (borrowing texts from other original and translated texts); 3) adaptation (e.g. specification of a general service into a service on the feast day of a specific saint; generalization of a service on the feast day of a specific saint into a general service; adaptation of a service on the feast day of one saint into a service on the feast day of another saint) [Станчев 2017:46].

A. Dostál claims that “subsequent studies have shown that very often the translators did rearrange the Greek texts in a more or less original and independent fashion”, but the quality of these translations was not compromised:

“The quality of the Old Church Slavonic texts has been analyzed many times, and it has been repeatedly confirmed that the Slavic version represents a highly artistic text, a poetic text fit for recitation and exegesis as the basis of Christian doctrine. In this case Constantine almost literally translated the original text. [...] Nevertheless, even this text was to some degree adapted. First of all, he adjusted the text of all four Gospels linguistically (the linguistic differences which can be found in the Greek version between the Gospels disappeared in the Church Slavonic text). The direct speech of the text was respected: the spoken language with its simple turns and metaphors is reflected in the arrange-

ment of the translation into sections and in its dialogue, which is so frequent in the Gospels. This Slavic text had in its original form some words borrowed from the Greek and Slavicized. However, this fact should not be understood as meaning that the vocabulary of the Slavic language was insufficient to convey the meaning of the text, for other quite varied and demanding texts translated into Slavic show, on the contrary, great lexical richness. These foreign words, probably, were quite familiar to Byzantine Slavs (as, for instance, *vlasvimisati*, *skandalisati*, etc.). In newer transcripts these Grecisms decrease because to Western Slavs and in other non-Byzantine areas these Byzantine words were unknown. It is surprising that the first Slavic version of the Gospel is of such high quality from the point of view of the translation itself, the textual arrangement, and the artistic form." [Dostál 1965:72].

There are no two identical languages, so lexical and semantical asymmetry always stimulate the development of target languages, which is not an exception for Slavonic cultural contexts (see the influence of Christian vocabulary on mediaeval Ukrainian worldview in [Шмиреп 2018:168-170, 189-191]). Simultaneously, the appraisal of Old Church Slavonic means the high level of this language which could render all the semantic and stylistic features of Greek originals. Besides, good translation of biblical texts influenced the way how liturgical texts used biblical excerpts and followed its lexis. Another question which can contribute to the understanding of translation quality in those times is what was the knowledge of languages. The translations of Flavius Josephus's "Jewish War" which circulated in Rus testify that medieval Ukrainian translators were good connoisseurs of both Old Greek and Byzantine dialects and, besides, they even introduced them in the texts of their translations [Мещерский 1958:71 ff]. The good knowledge of the source language is an important preliminary demand for producing a good translation.

In the historical dynamics, equal rhythm in translation was a bridge to the formation of national liturgical traditions. At first, translations were equirhythmic and preserved the Greek melody. Later, literal translations (translated word-by-word) corresponded more to Greek originals, but singing demanded the modification of

the original Greek melody, and it developed local singing traditions of the Liturgy [Пентковский 2016:76]. Finally, the equirhythmic translations oriented at the Greek melody ceased active use.

Isosyllabism (the identical number of syllables in verse fragments) has been turned into a successful criterion for evaluating translations as it is the fundamental feature for preserving the original rhythmic construction and, thus, reproducing the original melody. Isosyllabism is a syntactic phenomenon, and adding the understanding of other syntactic and morphological phenomena serves as a solid base for interpreting a text via the prism of grammatical semantics. This analytic tool is profoundly exemplified by R. Krivko [Krivko 2011:718-741] who shows how a target text is the continuation of the original literary and stylistic tradition, and what new metrical demands were posed in front of translators just before the religious translation entered Ukrainian cultural space.

Not always was it possible to preserve the accurate pattern of Byzantine melody in translation. Here the translation judgments were opposite: earlier Bulgarian translators put stress on the exact preservation of the original melody and interfered into the target text, while later Ukrainian translators modified Byzantine singing patterns according to the Slavonic text which usually contained more syllables than the Greek original [Кристианс 2008:47]. The target text melody as a criterion for translation assessment is not often addressed to in religious translation researches, though the continual work on elaborating local chants started during the first steps of acquiring the Liturgy.

References

- Dostál 1965: Dostál A. The Origins of the Slavonic Liturgy // *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*. 1965. Vol. 19. P. 67-87.
- HTS 2010-2013: *Handbook of translation studies: in 4 vols.* / ed. by Y. Gambier, L. van Doorslaer. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2010-2013.

- Kantor 1983: Kantor M. *Medieval Slavic Lives of Saints and Princes*. Ann Arbor, 1983. 304 p.
- Krivko 2011: Krivko R.N. Перевод, парафраз и метр в древних славянских кондаках // *Revue des Études Slaves*. 2011. Vol. 82. No. 2. P. 169-202; No. 4. P. 715-743.
- RPC 1953: *The Russian Primary Chronicle: Laurentian text / transl. and ed. by S. H. Cross and O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor*. Cambridge, MA: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1953. [10], 313 p.
- Афанасьева 2015: Афанасьева Т. И. Литургии Иоанна Златоуста и Василия Великого в славянской традиции (по служебникам XI-XV вв.). Москва: Ун-т Дмитрия Пожарского, 2015. 447 с.
- Джиджора 2018: Джиджора Є. В. Гімнографія Київської Русі XI-XIII ст.: структурне ціле канону мінейного циклу. Одеса: Астропринт, 2018. 480 с.
- ІУЛ 2014– : Історія української літератури: у 12 т. Київ: Наук. думка, 2014–.
- Каталог 2014: Каталог памятников древнерусской письменности XI-XIV вв. (Рукописные книги) / отв. ред. Д. М. Буланин; сост. Д. М. Буланин, А. А. Романова, О. В. Творогов, Ф. Томсон, А. А. Турилов. Санкт-Петербург: Дмитрий Буланин, 2014. 944 с.
- Кристианс 2008: Кристианс Д. От подражания форме к дословному переводу: принципы параллельной адаптации мелодии в текстах византийских песнопений в славянской традиции // *Вестник ПСТГУ. Серия 3: Филология*. 2008. № 11. С. 26-53.
- Мансветовъ 1882: Мансветовъ И. Д. Митрополить Киприанъ въ его литургической дѣятельности. Москва, 1882. [4], 202, [2], хххviii с.
- Мещерский 1958: Мещерский И. А. История иудейской войны Иосифа Флавия в древнерусском переводе. Москва; Ленинград: Изд-во АН СССР, 1958. 578 с.

- Пентковский 2016: Пентковский А.М. Славянское богослужение византийского обряда и корпус славянских богослужбных книг в конце IX – первой половине X веков // *Slověne*. 2016. № 2. С. 54–120.
- Станчев 2017: Станчев К. Проблема оригинальности древнеславянской гимнографии // *Fontes Slaviae Orthodoxae*. Olsztyn, 2017. No. 1. С. 43-55.
- Темчин 2014: Темчин С. Ю. Древнейшая восточнославянская служба Перенесению мощей святителя Николая Мирликийского (9 мая) как переработка переводной службы Перенесению мощей апостола Варфоломея (24 августа) // *Slavistica vilnensis*. 2014. Т. 59. С. 17-29.
- Шмігер 2018: Шмігер Т. Перекладознавчий аналіз – теоретичні та прикладні аспекти: давня українська література сучасними українською та англійською мовами. Львів: ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2018. 508 с.
- Шумило 2016: Шумило С. М. Богослужбные песнопения в «Слове о расслабленном» Кирилла Туровского // *Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики*. 2016. № 66. С. 103-108.

Questions for discussion

1. How do you understand a translation canon?
2. Do you consider that the Ukrainian translation canon is well-balanced? Why?
3. What is the role of religious literature in today's Ukrainian literature?
4. What is the significance of medieval literature for the contemporary literary process?
5. Do you understand a mediaeval text easily? What are the main obstacles?

Topic 3:**EARLY MODERN TIME IN THE HISTORY
OF UKRAINIAN LITURGICAL TRANSLATION**

1. Texts and public recognition
2. Prayer books and their book types
3. Musical culture and sources for liturgical translations
4. Liturgical editions
5. Non-liturgical books with liturgical texts
6. 18th century: Epoch of (Non)-Enlightenment

1. Texts and public recognition

When the Great Duchy of Lithuania rose to power in the mid-13th century, it occupied the large part of today's Eastern Europe. The larger part of Ukrainian territories became its constituent. The smaller part of Western Ukraine was annexed by the Kingdom of Poland after the fall of the Kingdom of Halychyna and Volyn. Two powers – Poland and Lithuania – commenced drifting together by signing a series of unions. The 1569 Union of Lublin shaped a new formation – the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth which existed till 1795. These political movements impacted on the religious life of local population. The most drastic changes were experienced by Lithuania which moved from paganism to Eastern Christianity (Orthodoxy) under the influence of the occupied highly-civilised Ukrainian territories, but later moved again to Western Christianity (Roman Catholicism) under the influence of unions with Poland. The turbulent political life influenced the advance of liturgical praxis among institutions and believers who perceived their faith as part of their identity.

In the hierarchy of religious texts, liturgical texts are secondary to the Bible, and it is clear that biblical translation initiated book printing in countries which followed this nice invention of

the Renaissance. However, liturgical texts were among the first printed books as well, like in Poland and Ukraine.

As of 1491, in Kraków, the then capital of the Polish Crown which had incorporated a number of Ukrainian lands, the first books were published by Schweipolt Fiol, a Franconian expatriate, and they started the history of Ukrainian book printing: these were four Orthodox hymnals – the Lenten Triodion [Трьпѣснецъ 1491], the Pentecostarion [Триодъ 1491], the Horologion [Часословець 1491] and the Octoechos [Октоїх 1491]. These Church Slavonic editions used the Precarpathian manuscripts and contained a number of Ukrainian vernacular elements. They started a new era of Ukraine’s liturgical translation.

One more liturgical edition was the first printed book of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and inaugurated Lithuanian and Belarusian book printing. In 1522, in Vilnius, the capital of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania which had included most of the Ukrainian territories and all of the Belarusian lands, Frantsisk Skoryna published the so-called collection “Little Traveller’s Book” [Мала 1522]. It contains a number of liturgical texts written in Church Slavonic and accompanied with his preface in Ruthenian (Bookish Middle Ukrainian) with a great number of Belarusian lingual features: the Psalter, the Horologion, eight akathists, ten canons (eight canons are paired with eight akathists), propers of daily offices for every weekday, and the calendar.

Printing overlapped various discussions about the use of vernacular under the influences of the Renaissance and the Reformation. Translation projects paralleled major events of ecclesiastical life in Ukraine and Poland which, after the 1569 Union of Lublin, coexisted in one state – the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

The first important project which failed was the creation of the Polish national church in the 1550s. One of the fundamental demands was the request for permitting the use of Polish in

Mass, as it was allowed to the Bulgarians. The Apostolic See rejected this request, and this stopped again the initiative of massive liturgical translation into Polish. In 1564, the archbishop of Lviv, Paweł Tarło, commissioned the Polish translation of the Agenda, and the Polish humanist Jan of Trzciana made a manuscript translation (surviving till now), but the implied ban of the Council of Trident interrupted its publication. In 1577, Poland's church authorities lastly accepted the Tridentine reformed liturgical books which were all in Latin, and the first Polish-language translation of the Mass was only published two centuries later.

The formation of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth where Roman Catholicism dominated started difficult times of persecuting Orthodox and Protestant believers and even making them cooperate. Difficulties also stimulated some promising results. In the early 16th century, Orthodox book printing was centred around two places: Vilnius and Kyiv. Their major products were liturgical books. Certainly, all these books were translations, and their language was Church Slavonic which gradually got its local colouring, later called the Church Slavonic of Ukrainian reversion. Two Orthodox milieus of Vilnius and Kyiv had opposite views: Vilnius monks insisted on the domination of the Church Slavonic variant in all liturgical contexts, while Kyivan monks tried to experiment with engaging the Ukrainian vernacular into liturgical praxis [Титовъ 1918:10-12]. This is why the large-scale project of revising and retranslating liturgical books in Kyiv from the 1610s to the 1640s had a rich outcome: the Horologion [Часословъ 1616], the Hymnal [Анѳологiон 1619], the Lenten Triodion [Триѡдiон 1627], the Liturgicon [Лейтургиарiон 1629], the Pentecostarion [Триѡдiон 1631], the Euchologion [Еухологиѡн 1646]. The translators and publishers – Yelysei Pletenetskyi, Zakhariya Kopystenskyi, Pamvo Berynda, Taras Zemka, St Petro Mohyla – addressed the Greek originals, corrected the Church Slavonic

versions and periodically applied Middle Ukrainian. These editions were so authoritative that they were later republished many times in various cities during the 17th and 18th centuries. After a series of fatal acts against the Kyivan Metropolitanate caused by its transfer from the Patriarchate of Constantinople to the jurisdiction of the Muscovite Patriarchate in 1686, Ukraine's local liturgical praxis, including its translation activities, ceased finally in 1721 when it was only allowed to print books according to the Muscovite spelling and contents.

The Union of the Roman (Catholic) and Kyivan (Orthodox) Churches, which was held in Berestia in 1596, but not accepted later by the whole Orthodox clergy, created a new separate entity: the Uniate Church which is known now as the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church.¹ This church preserved and used the Orthodox liturgy and books. Some local or borrowed practices started being codified 150 years later. Being at first quite a political project aimed at further assimilating the Ukrainians, i.e. incorporating them into Polish culture and Roman Catholicism, this church was open for some Catholic influences, like the Office of the 'Read' Liturgy (*Missa Lecta*, Low Mass) which were borrowed from the Roman Missal and published in some Greek-Catholic Liturgicons [Λειτουργικόν 1733; Λειτουργιαριόνη 1755]. However, these editions were never approved of officially and remained rather private editions [Соловій 1964:77, 88].

The great event in the life of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church was the Council of Zamostia in 1720 at which the Church debated on its local liturgical practices and the necessity to revise liturgical texts according to the Greek originals. They decided to appeal to the Apostolic See in order to control and censor its liturgical books. In 1754, the new edition of the Greek Euchologion

¹ This is its official name, though a more accurate term for Anglophone speakers is the Ukrainian Catholic Church of the Byzantine Rite.

supervised and promulgated by Pope Benedict XIV [Εὐχολόγιον 1754] was published after revision according to the best Greek texts and became a standard edition for further Church Slavonic translations. It influenced two editions of the Euchologion, published in Pochayiv in 1778 and 1788 [Соловій 1964:91], and archbishop Herakliy Lisovskyi commissioned the Church Slavonic translation of the 1754 Greek Euchologion to his vicar general Yuriy Turkevych who did this during 1788-1790 [Соловій 1964:93], but it was never publicized due to new turbulent historical conditions.

2. Prayer books and their book types

In the history of book writing and printing, prayer books, which were to denote a collection of prayer forms for private devotion, could, too, be like service books containing liturgical formularies for public worship. Their varieties combined liturgical and paraliturgical texts, praying and poetry, verbal composition and singing art. Typologically, two main genres of Polish prayer books are usually selected: 'liber precum' was a collection of private prayers, and the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary was a central text in 'liber horarum'. Oriented at the laity, they tended to using vernacular more widely. Various prayer books constituted real mass literature at that time, as every composed single collection of prayers was republished numerously. In general, they greatly contributed to devotional, meditative literature, as well. Gradually, they merged in editions well-known as 'hortuli'. The 'Hortulus' took its name from the publication "Hortulus animae": it was composed in the late 15th century in Latin, at once translated into German and other languages as well republished fairly frequently for a couple of centuries. Its immense popularity was gained because it was the sum of mediaeval prayer books, containing the Hours and new offices along with a great number of prayers for various needs and those used during preparing for confession and the Eucharist.

In Ukrainian liturgical tradition, consistent prayer books appeared much later than in Poland. The major books of praying in monasteries and among the laity were the Psalter (with various prayers and offices) and the Horologion which were distributed in the forms of manuscripts and printed books: in the second half of the 16th century, these were the editions of the Psalter in Zabludiv (1570), Vilnius (1576, 1586, 1591-1592, 1593, 1595, 1596, ca. 1600), Ostroh (1598) as well as those of the Horologion in Zabludiv (1570), Vilnius (ca. 1574-1576, 1596, 1597), Ostroh (1598). The language of these translation editions was Church Slavonic which was more or less accepted as 'our' language for believers, though they did not understand it in full. Besides, it acquired local features in the areas of phonetics and semantics. Most editions were published in Vilnius, being the Capital of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania which had incorporated a large number of Ukrainian and Belarusian ethnic territories at that time. This is why it is not a surprising fact when the metropolis publishes books for the province.

Although prayers were known and even original prayers were composed much earlier, like those by St Cyril of Turiv, the new type of a prayer book appeared in the late 16th century. Stefan Zyzaniy (Kukil-Tustanovskyi) compiled a prayer book whose contents was not known before: it covered the prayers of the daily cycle and of the weekly cycle (by St Cyril of Turiv) as well as prayers for confession and for the Eucharist. It was a ca. 240-folio codex entitled "Daily Prayers" and published several times (Vilnius, 1595, 1596, 1601; Vievis, 1611, 1615). The timing and contents of this prayer book discloses the fact that it was influenced and stimulated by the rich culture of publishing Polish prayer books in other parts of the same country – the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Stefan Zyzaniy's initiative was fruitful as not only appeared a number of reeditions of his prayer book, but gradually more books were published for monastic and private worshiping. The ground-

breaking editions were “Molytovnyk: Prayer Book” (Ostroh 1606; Kyiv, 1628-1632, 1634; Lviv, 1642), “Antholohion” (Vilnius, 1613; Kyiv, 1619, 1636; Lviv, 1632, 1638, 1643), “Poluustav” (Vilnius, 1613; Chorna, 1629; Kyiv, 1643), “Akathists” (Kyiv, 1625, 1929, Lviv, 1634) and many others. These publications contributed to the mass literature of this period and helped shape readers’ religious mentality.

3. Musical culture and sources for liturgical translations

From the perspective of liturgical and paraliturgical singing, Orthodox books are not numerous. The nature of this scarcity lies deeper in the history of the Byzantine and Roman Liturgies. When Ukraine was converted to Christianity in the late 10th century, the Byzantine Liturgy had reached the peak of its development: that is why all translation solutions had been offered, debated and stabilized by the 16th century in the form of traditional Kyivan and Halych chants. The Roman Liturgy started developing actively after Poland accepted Christianity in the very 10th century. All musical forms and texts were immediately transferred to Poland where it was to be accepted and acquired. This state of matters made Polish musical culture very dynamic. Besides, a great spur was received from Protestants who propagated singing at Mass. Although Protestants were present in Ukraine’s religious scene, their influence did not antagonize the traditional Orthodox culture.

It is true, too, that book printing reached this domain rather late: the first Hirmologion was published in Lviv in 1700 [Ірмолой 1700]. It was the first musical book among Slavs of Byzantine Rite. However, the Kyivan Metropolitanate succeeded in shaping its musical school: in the late 16th century, it introduced an original musical notation (Kyivan notation) and formed a single type of the book of churchly singing. It was typically entitled the Hirmologion, but it was different from similar Byzantine and mediaeval Ukrainian books with the same title.

4. Liturgical editions

The period of the 16th to 18th centuries is not so brilliant for liturgical translation if we mean that existent translations should have become part of liturgical praxis. This partially happened in Ukraine when the eye is kept on the revising reforms of Church Slavonic texts in Orthodox liturgical praxis, but still, it was local Church Slavonic instead of Middle Ukrainian. The most fruitful achievements were connected with book printing where the well-revised text were needed and supplied, and where the demand for liturgical and paraliturgical hymnals shaped the supply.

Orthodox liturgical printing which was developing in Vilnius, was proud of some serious publications like the Octoechos (1582) and the Euchologion (ca. 1598). A lot changed in the 17th century due to the efforts of eminent personalities – Hedeon Balaban, Bishop of Lviv, and St Petro Mohyla, Metropolitan of Kyiv.

The clergy had observed discrepancies and deviation in the existing texts, and Metropolitan Mykhailo Rohoza decreed the necessity of correcting liturgical books. Hedeon Balaban implemented the main initiative: he contacted St Meletius Pegas, Patriarch of Alexandria and locum tenens of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, who sent the Greek Liturgicon and Euchologion and blessed them for publishing. The two editions which appeared as the fruit of this cooperation were the 1604 Liturgicon [Службник 1604] and the 1606 Euchologion [Требник 1606], published in the Ukrainian recension of Church Slavonic in the town of Striatyn.

These two editions defined the principles of further editing and translating activities [Власовський 1998:2:232]: 1) the textus receptus was Greek, especially in high-quality Venetian editions; 2) this text was compared with the extant old Slavonic manuscripts which reflected the liturgical praxis of Ukraine. Thus, if rites and prayers which were not found in the Greek liturgical

books, but did not contradict the praxis of the Greek Church, they remained in the liturgical praxis of the Ukrainian Church. This approach demanded a lot of endeavour from Ukrainian translators and editors, but it secured the stable progress and preservation of the Ukrainian liturgical tradition.

The new standards were followed by republishing and patterning in printing shops of Kyiv, Lviv, Ostroh and other Ukrainian cities. The printing shop of the Kyiv Caves Monastery developed gradually into the most important centre of Ukrainian intellectual and religious life. The first vital editions of this printing shop were the *Horologion* [Часословъ 1616] and the *Mineon* [Анθолоγιον 1619].

All these positive and promising enterprises were undertaken, when Ukraine's Orthodox hierarchy was discriminated and stayed on the verge of ceasing its existence due to the aggressive and delegitimizing acts of the Polish Government. In 1620, Theophanes, Patriarch of Jerusalem, helped restore the full-fledged hierarchy of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine which could continue its existence as an independent institution. It is visible how liturgical translations appeared as dissident acts of self-preservation and legitimization not only for the Ukrainian Church, but also for the Ukrainian nation.

The interim achievements of Orthodox clergy in political and societal matters intensified their work in publishing new – or newly edited and corrected – translations of liturgical books. This is when the Ukrainian recension of Church Slavonic was set up and codified by Meletiy Smotrytskyi. Actually, it remained conserved in this shape till nowadays, as the historical events of the 18th and later centuries restrained the popularity and use of this lingual variant.

The Kyivan circle of theologians and translators united such bright personalities as Yelysei Pletenetskyi, Zakhariya Kopysten-skyi, Pamvo Berynda and some others. The key figure was Petro

Mohyla, a Moldova-native Ukrainian religious leader, excellent writer and preeminent theologian. In the sphere of liturgical translation, his major contributions are the 1629 and 1639 editions of the Liturgicon [Λειτουργιαριον 1629] as well as the 1646 edition of the Euchologion [Ευχολογιων 1646]. The Euchologion is an indeed voluminous edition of about 1500 pages containing 129 offices and rubrics of Orthodox liturgical praxis. Nevertheless, 17 offices were translated from the Roman Breviary [Власовський 1998:2:236]. This fact indicates how the Ukrainian Church comprehended its place in the world of rivalry between Eastern and Western Christianity: it remembered its baptism from ‘one holy universal Apostolic Church’ and decided to stay open to all the constructive achievements of both branches of Christianity.

The bridge between Orthodoxy and Polish society passed through the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church and the Order of Saint Basil the Great. The Superior General of the Order, Rev. Dr. Pakhomiy Ohilevych, prepared a fundamental description of the Orthodox Liturgy for Roman Catholic readers [Ecphonemata 1671]. The book contained two parts. The textual part – entitled “Ecphonemata” – consisted of the Liturgies of St John Chrysostom and of St Basil the Great which were published in Church Slavonic (but in Latin characters) and in Polish translation. The second part – entitled “Harmonia” – was academic and discussed differences between the Byzantine and Roman Liturgies. The book became an important asset of the Church that the very “Ecphonemata” was reprinted several times during two centuries (Kraków 1685, Pochayiv 1784, Peremyshl 1831, 1842).

5. Non-liturgical books with liturgical texts

Liturgical texts appeared in editions which do not directly belong to the genre of liturgical writings. Catechisms better fit the paradigm of theological writings, as not only was their main focus

on theological thinking, but their main tool was theological terminology which enriched the conceptual matrix of a national language and shaped its academic style in the epoch when Latin overpoweringly prevailed in all academic domains.

Orthodox catechisms were influenced by Protestant and Catholic editions. Lavrentiy Zyzaniy, a native of Lviv Region, published his Large Catechism in Moscow in circa 1627 where he cited the Church Slavonic translations of both the Apostles' Creed [Зизаній 1627:[30-30v]] and the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed [Зизаній 1627:[31v-32]]. The publication of the Apostles' Creed shows that the text which is considered mainly Roman Catholic, circulated among the Orthodox theologians who shared the common Early Christian heritage.² The 1645 Middle Ukrainian edition of the Catechism by St Petro Mohyla [Могила 1645] followed the principle of divided presentation: the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed is divided into articles, and each article is cited in Church-Slavonic and then explained in Middle Ukrainian. Thus, the explanations in a way serve the function of translation as well, because they provide the necessary terms at least.

Polemical literature being located between academic and political writings provided some samples of liturgical translation as well. The translation of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed into Middle Ukrainian was published back in 1620 in Zakhariya Kopystenskyi's polemically theological treatise "Book on the True Faith and the Holy Apostolic Church" [Копистенський 1620:165-167]. An incomplete Polish-language paraphrase of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed appeared in Chapter 10 "Catechism of the Eastern Church" of Meletiy Smotrytskyi's "Threnos", a Ukrainian Orthodox polemical piece, written in Polish and published in 1610 [Смотрицький 2015:498, 500, 516].

² Kyivan Metropolitanate recognized the Apostles' Creed and used it in its catechetical praxis, while Moscow Metropolitanate rejected it completely [Корзо 2016:21-26].

The inclusion of biblical and liturgical prayers is observed in Ukrainian editions of the late 16th century: Ivan Fedorovych published one edition of Primers in Lviv [Федорович 1574] and two in Ostroh [Федорович 1578а; Федорович 1578b], and Lavrentiy Zyzaniy composed his very abridged Primer in Vilnius [Зизаній 1596]. Like in Catholic and Orthodox churches, Kyivan Metropolitanate also accepted the Creed by St Athanasius which was repeatedly republished in primers and horologions [Корзо 2016:27]. The first primer publication of the Creed by St Athanasius is the 1618 edition in Vievis [Букварь 1618:33v-38] which also contains the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed [Букварь 1618:32-33v] and the Creeds by St Ambrose and St Augustine [Букварь 1618:38-40]. Hypothetically, Rev. Meletiy Smotrytskyi, the author of the first textbook of the Church Slavonic language (in the Ukrainian recension, 1619), participated in preparing this primer.

6. 18th century: Epoch of (Non)-Enlightenment

In liturgical life, the Age of Enlightenment is not characterized with bright events or reforms. It was quite inertial after the waves of the Renaissance, Reformation and Counter-Reformation brought a series of innovations which were to be challenged and accepted. Finally, when the new balance was found, it was book printing that disseminated the knowledge more, and new translations appeared in response to new demands.

The 18th century in Ukrainian history cannot be called a period of Enlightenment, but it looks more like the way to the colonial existence, esp. after a series of failed attempts of national struggle (the Poltava Catastrophe of 1709, the liquidation of the Cossack Hetmanate in 1764, the introduction of the Russian administrative-judicial system in 1782). The language and praxis of the Kyivan liturgical tradition was subjugated to the Russian Orthodox Church. Although the process of exterminating the

Kyivan Christian heritage on the territories annexed by Russia lasted almost a century (1689-1800) and was implemented with censorial regulations for book printing and abrupt changes of local liturgical practices [Власовський 1998:3:54-62], it also aimed at the elimination of the Ukrainian national identity and resulted in the slowdown of liturgical translation activities.

On the other hand, the printing shops of Pochayiv and Univ monasteries, which stayed on the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, enlarged their capabilities, and during the 18th century, they have published 103 and 13 editions of liturgical books respectively. They published books in Church Slavonic of Ukrainian recension, Polish and Latin, so their main function was to preserve the Kyivan identity in liturgical books. Actually, printing shops which functioned in the Commonwealth, preserved the Kyivan printing tradition which became the foundation for the Ukrainian Greek Catholic liturgical praxis.

Liturgical and paraliturgical singing continued being an essential part of religious life in both botions. The collection of religious songs “Вохогласнык” [Богогласникъ 1790] was the first printed edition of this type among the Ukrainians and all Eastern Slavs. It contained paraliturgical songs in three languages which were sometimes use during the Liturgy as well. Highly is appreciated the collection of religious songs by Franciszek Karpiński who published a collection of religious songs (original and translated) in 1792 [Karpiński 1792]: it corresponded to the demands of the Enlightenment by preserving the calm mode and dogmatic correctness [Sinka 1983:266]. Although, these editions can be viewed as those ones summarizing the best poetical achievements as of the previous epoch, they also started a new stage of religious singing and – even wider – liturgical translation which had to function under new historical conditions, i.e. Romanticism, technological revolutions and imperial existence.

References

- Εὐχολόγιον 1754: Εὐχολόγιον σὺν Θεῷ Ἀγίῳ νεωστὶ μετατυπωθέν, καὶ μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμελείας διορθωθέν. Ρώμη, 1754. [12], 460 σ.
- Анθологіон 1619: Анθологіон. Київ: Києво-Печерська Лавра, 1619. [16], 1048 с.
- Богогласникъ 1790: Богогласникъ. Почаїв: Друкарня Успенського монастиря, 1790. [292] арк.
- Букварь 1618: Букварь Языка Славенска. Єв'є, 1618. 52 арк.
- Власовський 1998: Власовський І. Нарис історії Української Православної Церкви: у 4 т., 5 кн. Київ: УПЦ КП, 1998.
- Εὐχολογιῶν 1646: Εὐχολογιῶν албо Молитвословъ или Требникъ. Київ: Києво-Печерська Лавра, 1646. Ч. 1: [20], 890, 900-946 с.; ч. 2: [4], 263 с.; ч. 3: [2], 430 с.
- Зизаній 1596: [Зизаній Лаврентій]. Наука ку читаню. Вільнюс, [1596]. [8] с.
- Зизаній 1627: [Зизаній Лаврентій]. [Катихисисъ великий]. Москва, [бл. 1627]. [395] арк.
- Ірмолой 1700: Ірмолой, си єсть Ѡсмогласникъ. Львів: Собор св. Юра, 1700. [4], 446, [26] с.
- Копистенський 1620: Копистенський Захарія. Книга о вірі єдиної, святої апостолскої церкви. Київ: Друкарня Києво-Печерської лаври, 1620. [4], 317, 308 с.
- Корзо 2016: Корзо М. А. Апостольский символ веры и исповедание Афанасия в православной книжности Киевской митрополии (XVI-XVII вв.) // Вестник ПСТГУ. Серия II: История. История Русской Православной Церкви. 2016. Вып. 1 (68). С. 20-31.
- Леітургіаріон 1629: Леітургіаріон си єсть Служебникъ. Київ: Києво-Печерська Лавра, 1629. [28], 144, 300, [4] с.
- Леітоургікон 1733: Леітоургікон си єсть Служебникъ. Унів: Успенська Лавра, 1733. [10], 259 с.

- Лейтовргіаріонъ 1755: Лейтовргіаріонъ или Служебникъ. Почаїв: Успенська Лавра, 1755. [8], 354, [10] с.
- Мала 1522: [Мала подорожна книжка: у 22 ч.]. Вільнюс: Франциск Скорина, бл. 1522.
- Могила 1645: [Могила Петро]. Събраніе короткои науки о артикулах вѣры Православнокаѳѳлическои хрїстіянскои ведлу(г) визнаня и науки Ц(е)ркве с(вятой) Восто(ч)нои соборнои ап(осто)лскои / Первѣй языкомъ полски(м), а теперъ дїалектомъ руским з другу выданое. Київ: Києво-Печерська Лавра, 1645. 102 арк.
- Октоїх 1491: [Октоїх]. Краків: Швайпольт Фіоль, 1491. 172 арк.
- Служебник 1604: [Служебник]. Стрятин, 1604. [2], 11, 570 с.
- Смотрицький 2015: Смотрицький Мелетій. Тренос, або Плач Єдиної Святої Помісної Апостольської Східної Церкви з поясненням догматів віри... = ὉΡΗΝΟΣ to jest Lament jedynej św. Powszechniej Apostolskiej Wschodniej Cerkwi, z objaśnieniem Dogmatów Wiary... / пер. із старопол., слов. та передм. Р. Радишевського. Київ: Талком, 2015. 559 с.
- Соловій 1964: Соловій Мелетій М. о. Божественна Літургія: історія – розвиток – пояснення. Рим: ОО. Василіяни, 1964. хіv, 422 с.
- Титовъ 1918: Титовъ Ф. Типографія Києво-Печерскої Лавры: Историческій очеркъ (1606–1616–1916 г.г.): Приложенія к Т. 1 (1606–1616–1721 г.г.). Київ, 1918. 18, фмс [546] с.
- Требник 1606: [Требник]. Стрятин, 1606. [8], 681, [7] арк.
- Трівдїон 1627: Трівдїон сиєсть Тріпѣснець С[вя]тої Великої Четырдесатници. Київ: Києво-Печерська Лавра, 1627. [4], 802 с.
- Трівдїон 1631: Трівдїон сиєсть Трипѣснець с[вя]тої великої Пятдесатници. Пентикостаріон. Київ: Києво-Печерська Лавра, 1631. [22], 828 с.

- Тріодь 1491: [Тріодь цвѣтная. Краків: Швайпольт Фіоль, бл. 1491]. 366 арк.
- Трьпѣснецъ 1491: Трьпѣснецъ. [Тріодь пісна. Краків: Швайпольт Фіоль, бл. 1491]. 314 арк.
- Федорович 1574: [Федорович Іван]. [Азбука]. Львів, [1574]. [79] с.
- Федорович 1578a: [Федорович Іван]. [Азбука]. Острог, [1578]. [16] с.
- Федорович 1578b: [Федорович Іван]. Начало ученїа дѣтемь. Острог, [1578]. [96] с.
- Часословець 1491: Часословець. Краків: Швайпольт Фіоль, 1491. 384 арк.
- Часословъ 1616: Часословъ. Київ: Києво-Печерська Лавра, бл. 1616. [21], 190, [2] арк.

Questions for discussion

1. What devotional literature do you accept or 'practise' today?
2. Do you agree that liturgical texts are poetic texts?
3. Is paraliturgical poetry active today?
4. Find any imminent early modern treatise in architecture, military affairs or natural history and check if it was translated in Ukraine?
5. Why did Ukrainians not translate scientific literature at that time?

Topic 4:**TRANSLATION IN EXILE:
THE CASE OF UKRAINIAN LITURGICAL TRANSLATION**

1. Translations in diaspora
2. Historical stimuli
3. Personalities and/like Institutions: Orthodox History
4. Personalities and/like Institutions: Greek Catholic History
5. Texts and the systems of their retranslations
6. Language, Nation and Religion

1. Translations in diaspora

Exile, emigration and the formation of diaspora are caused by catastrophes which can occur rather rapidly (like wars or epidemics) or evolve during more extensive timespans (gradual economic recessions and crises). All historical factors shape translation-in-exile as a specific and separate cultural product. At the same time, the exiled translation does not exist in vacuum, but it is a continuation or negation of the previous tradition existing in the mainland.

In the complicated system of cultural connections, liturgical translation yields the highest status to biblical translation, but its assets as cultural and symbolic capital are fundamental [cf. Bourdieu 1993:67, 83], especially in the condition of migration which ruins the whole traditional polysystem, and new forms of ethnic legitimizations are called for. The hierarchy of statuses plays well in religious contexts where the priority of certain translations defines the dynamics of the appearance of other translations, but only the whole corpus marks the successfulness and completeness of the project fulfilled. The role of a personality was sometimes decisive under the conditions of the exile, though the influence (support or opposition) of academic and churchly climates

constructed lines of perception and acceptance. It is very surprising how some personalities can even change liturgical translation in the post-exile churches.

The diaspora, which efforts to be a self-producing and temporary system in awaiting the return to Home, reconstructs the mainland's cultural polysystem in new territories. Although "Luhmann replaces subject-centered reason with systems rationality" [Tyulenev 2012:5], the co-existence and co-influence of personalities and institutions defines the vitality of translator endeavour which exists in the dimensions of autonomization, legitimization and hierarchization. Thought-provoking are correspondences between diaspora and mainland translation activities: it takes some activities to perpetuate the mainland's translation system in exile; after the stabilization of the system, the system in exile may flourish and replicate the mainland's translation strategies and literary processes; however, when the strength of the diaspora gets impoverished due to inevitable assimilatory factors, the diaspora translation is about to collapse [cf. Tyulenev 2012:42]. The good luck of Ukrainian liturgical translation was delineated by timing: when the religious reading community was persecuted in the mainland (1920s), the diaspora contributed to the preservation and replication of translations; when the diaspora started losing its power in foreign environments, the mainland luckily restored its Independence (1991) and brought back main liturgical translation activities to Ukraine.

2. Historical stimuli

The first wave of Ukrainian emigration started in the late 19th century, and it was a blue-collar emigration. Eastern Ukrainian peasants travelled to Middle and Far Asian areas of the Russian Empire, and Western Ukrainian peasants moved to the Atlantic: Canada, the US, Brasilia, Argentina. The churchly life, which was

the core of Ukrainian migrants' spiritual life, was circulating around the ecclesiastic institutions shaped according to the model existing in Ukraine (the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church) or from scratch (Ukrainian Orthodox churches). The first Ukrainian ecclesiastical institutions settled in exile were the Apostolic Exarchate of Canada for Ukrainian Greek Catholic believers in 1912, the Apostolic Exarchate of the US for Ukrainian Greek Catholic believers from Halychyna and Transcarpathia in 1913, the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada in 1918, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the US in 1919 [Thousand 1988:198, 210, 211, 215]. Gradually, Ukrainian parishes organized and maintained various types of relations with the recognized church centres.

The formation of the Ukrainian National Republic during 1917-1918 and later its unification with the Western Ukrainian National Republic in 1919 stimulated the lingual and spiritual Ukrainization of the churchly life in the Ukrainian State. However, the collapse of the UNR and the rise of the Ukrainian Soviet Government created no favourable conditions for Ukrainian liturgical translation which got a great spur during the 1917-1920 Ukrainian Revolution. Biblical and liturgical translation could develop only beyond Soviet Ukraine, but even initially it covered Ukrainians from both the autochthonous Ukrainian territories annexed by Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania and large diaspora communities in Europe and Americas. In the 1920-1930s, most radical were changes in the liturgical life of the Byzantine Rite in Poland. In 1924, the Ecumenical Patriarch granted autocephaly to the Polish Orthodox Church which served Orthodox Ukrainians, Belarusians, Czechs and Poles. The autochthonous Ukrainian Orthodox community, which was the largest (2.7 million believers), became a minority in the Roman Catholic state. If the ministers of the UNR's government were exiled in Warsaw because of political reasons, the Ukrainian community turned out to be in pseudo-exile.

The same changes were experienced by the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church which had to adjust to new and sometimes quite discriminatory policies towards Eastern Christians in the Second Polish Republic: “The aggressive Polonizing actions were based on the presupposition that Poland’s Orthodox citizens were Poles who had lost their identity after the Partitions of Poland. Assimilators demanded using Polish in every-day life and in church (Polish-language homilies and catechization)” [Łoś 2021:33]. However, this Church faced the most drastic changes after the Second World War: in 1946, when Western Ukrainian territories were finally reintegrated into the Soviet Union, the Russian Orthodox Church interfered and caused the fake “dissolution” of the 1596 Union of Berestia and the 1646 Union of Uzhhorod. Factually, the official structures of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church were liquidated: some priests became members of the Russian Orthodox Church, and the rest of them were expelled into underground activities or emigration. The new centre for the Ukrainian Byzantine Catholics’ ecclesiastical life was reshaped in Rome by enlarging the existing structures and developing new ones, like the St Clement Ukrainian Catholic University (1963).

During the time of Ukraine’s Restoration of its Independence in 1989-1991, the Ukrainian Diaspora’s ecclesiastical structures returned to Ukraine and restarted their functioning which included publishing liturgical books and retranslating liturgical texts. In the late 1980s, when the religious climate in the USSR became milder for allowing liturgical praxis in Ukrainian, the diaspora texts were the main liturgical books for public use in Ukraine.

The latest sample of the live, but exiled Ukrainian liturgical translation is the Ukrainian-language Orthodox Liturgy which was served by Rev. Kyrylo Hovorun in Sweden’s main Lutheran Cathedral in Uppsala on 24 April 2022 (Orthodox Easter). This event became the aftermath of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine on 24 Feb-

ruary 2022, but it showed the great ecumenical power of liturgical translation even for joining Ukrainian Orthodox and Swedish Protestant believers.

3. Personalities and/like Institutions: Orthodox History

Identifying agency in liturgical translation brings us to the revealing of centres of power for introducing or sanctioning liturgical praxis. In 1917, Ukraine's religious life projected the necessity of creating the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, and the first Kyiv-based organ of these activities was the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council which maintained very beneficial relations with the UNR's government and managed to co-exist with Soviet Ukraine's government till the latter physically exterminated the Church after 1930. The first published book was the *Horologion* (1919) and was followed by the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom*. The Ukrainization of the Church was performed in full swing: first of all, the Russian pronunciation of Church Slavonic was substituted by the Ukrainian pronunciation; Ukrainian chants were preferred; meanwhile, liturgical texts were being translated and disseminated. A lot of texts were printed with typewriters and cyclostyles, and they did not survive by now. One source mentions that it incorporated services from the 1919 *Euchologion* and the 1922 *Additional Euchologion*, but these editions are beyond reach of wider academic public, like some other liturgical editions whose existence was witnessed by contemporaries [Завітневич 1971:67]. The main translators were Bishop (and later Metropolitan) Vasyl Lypkivskyi and Bishop (and later Archbishop) Nestor Sharayivskyi, though the linguistic expertise from other theologians was welcomed [Липківський 2018:4:155; Москаленко 2018:19-20].

The Soviet regime at first tolerated the existence of Ukrainian churches, though the environment was always hostile. The Soviets did not possess enough strength to compete with the Church,

and this is why they liquidated it through wide-scale destructions and massacres in the 1930s. The co-existence of the 1920s witness the publication of the All-Night Vigil, the Octoechos, the second edition of the Horologion, the Menaion, and services for Passiontide and Easter. Pierre Bourdieu states that “the source of the efficacy of all acts of consecration is the field, the locus of the accumulated social energy which the agents and institution help to reproduce through the struggles in which they try to appropriate it and into which they put what they have acquired from it in previous struggles” [Bourdieu 1993:78-79]. This statement absolutely completely elucidates the place of these translation in the historical line of other translations. Struggle is the key image of Ukrainian nation-shaping. Very little could have been taken from the previous epochs, but more did these translations contribute in the future prospects: almost immediately it stimulated Ivan Ohiyenko’s individual activities in Poland; Ukrainian churches in North America started using, republishing and improving these liturgical texts; finally, they remained sample texts for Orthodox translation after Ukraine restored its Independence in 1991.

Translation norms are usually defined by conventions and agreements between individual and institutional agents, and in liturgical translation, any translator strongly depend upon the permit – in the form of blessing – from the ecclesiastical authority. Ohiyenko’s project of translating liturgical texts resembles a massive, well-designed program: his activities were in the trend of preparing translations which would be used in the future after the Ukrainian Orthodox Church became fully independent (‘autocephalous’). He was a brilliant connoisseur of the Ukrainian language, literature and church history that helped him a lot in translating the Bible and a number of liturgical texts into Ukrainian [see: Пуряева 2017]. Besides, he elaborated and publicized his desiderata for liturgical translation which was a systematized specific

translation theory. His translations were approved by the church authorities, and they were considered canonical for use even by the Moscow Patriarchate in Soviet Ukraine in the late 1980s.

Historically, Ohiyenko's liturgical translation activities are fully connected with his staying in exile and can be divided into four periods:

1) early 1920s when he stayed in the Polish city of Tarnów, hosting the UNR's Government-in-Exile: Ohiyenko set up a publishing house and called it "Ukrainian Autocephalous Church" where he published prayer-books for adults and children, the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom as well as services for Easter, Pentecost, Vespers and Matins;

2) 1930s when he stayed in Warsaw and tightly cooperated with the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church: he published liturgical translations in graphically refined editions where the Ukrainian-language text was typeset by means of specifically altered Church Slavonic characters;

3) early 1940s during the Nazi occupation: becoming a monk, priest and bishop, Ohiyenko entered a new period of publishing (the second edition of his liturgical translations) and translating (a series of new texts);

4) from the late 1940s till his death in 1972, Ohiyenko stayed in a new emigration in Canada: this time he acted as a hierarch and sanctioned liturgical translations for public use while finalizing the major translation of his life, the Bible.

The Ukrainian intellectual and political emigration of the 1920s managed to organise several academic institutions, like the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Berlin (1926-1945) and the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw (1930-1939). The latter consisted of a number of commissions, among which there was the Commission of Translating the Holy Scriptures and Liturgical Books, presided by the Metropolitan of the Polish Orthodox

Church, Dionysiy Valedynsky. It had close relations with the Theological Section of the Metropolitan Petro Mohyla Society in Lutsk (1931-1939). The core of the cooperation between the two institutions was the translation activities of Mykhailo Kobryn who was a qualified theologian and a good connoisseur of ancient languages. Being a professor emeritus, he afforded to dedicate his effort to translating liturgical texts which were checked and published by the Commission and the Section.

When comparing the publishing agendas of the Commission and the Section, the Commission aimed at the fundamental stable texts of the Liturgy, while the Section cared for the musical form, the altering parts of the Liturgy and the practical needs (sacraments) as well. Yet, this division of the printing repertoire may also mean the practical necessity of dividing duties. In any case, the power of Poland's Ukrainian Orthodox translation reached its peak at the turn of the 1940s when the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church officially published the Liturgicon and the Little Euchologion. All these translations greatly contributed to the Orthodox tradition of liturgical translation in the Ukrainian Diaspora after the Second World War.

It is not surprising that during the first years after the War when a lot of Ukrainians stayed in camps for displaced people in Germany, they republished texts from Warsaw editions. Besides, they tried to publish everything which could be of lively use for Orthodox believers. The publishing activities for churchly aims was really immense [Ісіченко 2016]. The temporary centre for Ukrainian orthodox bishops was the German city of Esslingen where new emigrants managed to published some texts which were later republished in the UK. A couple of years later most Ukrainian migrants moved to America, and the Orthodox Diaspora in Europe was not so powerful, though they published the Ukrainian Orthodox Horologion which was used for praying beyond Europe as well.

Allegedly, the first Ukrainian-language liturgical edition of the Byzantine Rite in North America³ was the publication of a prayer-book [1926] whose title – “Good Shepherd” – became the title of numerous later reeditions till nowadays. It contained a wide circle of liturgical texts in two languages: Church Slavonic (published in the civil script according to the Ukrainian pronunciation) and Ukrainian. The fourth edition of 1952 deployed only one language: Ukrainian.

The development of Ukrainian communities stimulated the spread of book production: small and larger editions came out in order to satisfy the needs of Ukrainian Orthodox children, adults and priests. Liturgical publications appeared under the auspices of the Consistory. In 1948, Canada’s Ukrainian Orthodox intellectuals set up the Academic Theological Society which was shaped into the Ukrainian Academic Orthodox Theological Society in 1954. It monitored a number of high-rank liturgical editions. Generally, this cooperation was very fruitful. A similar institution existed in the US. Although these were two different churches, but they kept the spiritual and ethnic unity. Their translation and publication activities are very alike:

Canada	United States
1954 – Pontifical Service	
1954-1960 – Euchologion	1954 – Euchologion
1956 – Octoechos	
	1963 – Euchologion
	1963 – Liturgicon
1972 – Liturgicon	
	1976 – Triodion
	1976 – Euchologion
	1989 – Liturgicon

³ Amazingly, the year 1926 witnessed another liturgical publication: the Ukrainian translation of the 1918 Common Prayer Book of the Church of England in Canada which is a very rare case of rendering Anglican fundamental texts into Ukrainian.

However, the reality was that Orthodox priests used the books published in the other country: Ukrainian orthodox liturgical translation can be considered as a sample of cooperative interaction. Besides, Euchologies and Liturgicons were republished every decade to supply priests' demands. Laymen were supplied with numerous prayer-books, even for special purposes, like that for the ill. Gradually, the bilingual – Ukrainian and English – prayer-books appeared. Priests received the published edition of separate services, like the Sunday noon service or Services for Passiontide and Easter which were handy in common practice.

An extraordinary case is the use of Kobryn's 'Orthodox' translation of the Psalter from the 1930s, its linguistic modernization and publication under the auspices of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church. This act of ecumenism shows how the Ukrainian Diaspora overcome interdenominational tensions, boosted by politicians and demagogues.

Personalities and/like Institutions: Greek Catholic History

If the Ukrainian Orthodox translation was the translation of resistance (resistance to all historical conditions that negated the Ukrainian State, the Ukrainian Church and the Ukrainian Nation), the Ukrainian Greek Catholic translation was the translation of loyalty when the Church acted in the field allowed. The holder of its power was the Roman See. Thus, the Church continued its earlier practice of publishing asymmetrically bilingual prayer-books where some prayers, all explanations and the catechetical part were in Ukrainian, but the high-status texts – like the loudly-pronounced formulae of the Liturgy, troparia and kontakia – remained in Church Slavonic.⁴ Finally, the Vatican entered the tur-

⁴ During World War II, one prayer-book was published fully in Ukrainian [Чисте 1943], but its small size indicates that it was aimed at private worshiping and perhaps even for children.

bulence zone of reforming its liturgical praxis during the mid-20th century. For the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, it meant two stages of reforming or two separate reforms. The first reform, which is sometimes called “the Roman Reform”, took place within the 1940-1950s when the Ukrainian Church seeded the final right of liturgical decisions to Rome. As a result, the Roman See published new Church Slavonic liturgical books, and they are the main originals for the Ukrainian Church even now. The second reform, which was the aftermath of the Second Vatican Council, took place mainly in the 1960-1980s when the shift to the vernacular meant the immediate transfer to the languages that the Diaspora Ukrainians spoke: Ukrainian as their home language, but also English in the Anglophone communities where they lived.

In the history of this Church, the 1920s witnessed rather radical changes of mentality in the aftermath of the rise and fall of the Western Ukrainian National Republic. On the one hand, the highest clergy under the influence of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytskyi acted in support of the Ukrainians’ national strivings. The eminent Greek Catholic theologian, Rev. Dr. Havryil Kostelnyk, pondered over the evolution of nationalism in the domains of culture, politics and religion [Костельник 1922]: he showed the importance of the national language and the ecclesiastical life for the self-preservation of nations, though he was precautious in maintaining the dogmatic balance of the Universal Church. On the other hand, the public voiced their wish to pray in their native language. Oleksandr Barvynskyi, the WUNR’s Minister of Education and Religious Affairs, published a pamphlet entitled “Is the Ukrainian language convenient for translating the Holy Scriptures and prayers and for homilies?” [Барвінський 1921] where he summarized the introduction of Ukrainian into private and public liturgical use during a millennium, and he concluded that all Christian – Greek Catholic and Orthodox – Ukrainians appreciated the value of Ukrainian in the Liturgy.

Meanwhile, the hierarchy paid much more attention to quintessential liturgical reforms [see more: Васи́лишин 2014:291-298] which were imperative for religious praxis, but whose outer form was expressed in the Church Slavonic text. The Ukrainian-language translations were the exceptional activity of Rev. Dr. Yaroslav Levytskyi who translated the Bible and liturgical texts. His 1927 translation of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom into Ukrainian did not cause a reaction from priests, as it was in the case of his 1933 translation of the “Prayer-book for priests”, which contained the Horologion, troparia and kontakia of the weekly and yearly cycles, prayers before the Eucharist and the Liturgy as well as a number of other supplementary prayers. The discussion, which arose around this edition and was caused by Havryil Kostelnyk [Костельник 1933], is an extremely rare case of liturgical translation criticism. Kostelnyk pinpointed a number of serious blunders in the text and gave a general striking assessment of the translation. In reply to this severe criticism, more priests expressed their opinions about strong and weak side of the book [Ґалянт 1933; І. Н. 1935; Цегельський 1935]: they supported the positive features of this books, referred to the general principles of translation criticism and voiced their suggestions for improving the text. This discussion, caused by an initial harsh reaction, is the only case of public debate in the matters of liturgical translation. Otherwise, liturgical translation commissions usually work within their own circle, and general academic public cannot follow the logic of translation strategies or advise better options. This is especially evident in the historical perspective, when it is impossible to reconstruct translators’ exact decisions and motivation long after the publication of translations.

All these attempts are actually poor in comparison with the Church’s translation activities after the Second Vatican Council. The return of Patriarch Yosyf Slipyi from the 18-year Soviet im-

prisonment and his reinstatement in Rome renewed the Liturgical Commission, and their scrupulous work produced new fundamental Ukrainian-language texts for liturgical praxis [Тіявський 1985; Васишин 2018]. The first publication was a prayer book (1966) which was later enlarged and republished many times. The official translation of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom was published in 1968 and revised in 1988. The official translation of this Liturgy immediately started being republished in numerous smaller and larger prayer-books, i.e. those for laics and for priests. This achievement of the Church was followed by the Liturgy of St Basil the Great and the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts. Thus, when the Ukrainians celebrated the millennium of Christianity in Ukraine, the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church made an exceptionally important offering: the publication of the Book of Pontifical Services. Simultaneously, the official English-language translation of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom was published in different format for solemn public use and for average practical reading. This commission also prepared the Abridged Euchologion, whose translation continuation occurred in Ukraine after the hierarchy had returned home. Some witnesses mention about the translation of the Horologion which was almost ready, but remained unpublished, and only some parts came out in the extensive prayer-book "Let's come and bow" (1991).

The parallel translation work was done in the Order of St Basil the Great which transferred their publishing traditions in exile. Their publications show well how the shift from Church Slavonic to Ukrainian was progressing. The first edition of the Basilian Prayer-book for the inner use in the Order (1963) contained most prayers in Church Slavonic, but its second edition (1982) was already fully in Ukrainian. In 1975 and 1978, they published two parts of the Divine Office which comprised prayers and hymns from the Horologion, the Octoechos, the Triodion, the

Pentecostarion, the Menaion as well as some supplementary services and parts. It was meant for private use, but finally, it was republished in one thick, but compact volume (1990). This book is popularly famous as “Vasyliyanka” in honour of the Patron of the Order and Fathers Basilians. What concerns believers, it was accepted well both in Greek Catholic and Orthodox communities. Later, it was even translated into English.

The UGCC’s translations stimulated its shift from using Church Slavonic to Ukrainian, as it made easier the preservation of Ukrainian national and religious identity. Church Slavonic has remained the *de jure* sacred language of the Church. Earlier diaspora prayer-books happened to contain both the Church Slavonic and English texts, and they actually prepared the ground for shifting from Church Slavonic into English. When that occurred in 1964 as the outcome of interpreting the decisions of the Second Vatican Council, parishioners in the US started protesting and reached a compromise when there is a separate Ukrainian service, a separate English one and a mixed English-Ukrainian one. This balance has survived till now. In Poland, the UGCC used Church Slavonic till the late 1980s, and when the Communist regime fell, the national revival of Ukrainian communities in Poland was endorsed by the shift to the Liturgy in the native language.

In Argentina, Ukrainian Greek Catholic priests published the Easter Service in Ukrainian and Spanish (1974). This translation seems to be oriented at local non-Ukrainian believers who can come and share the joy of this feast with Ukrainians. It is very interesting if more Spanish translations connected with Ukrainian communities appeared. A rare case is the Italian translation of the Liturgies of St John Chrysostom and St Basil the Great in the “Byzantine-Ukrainian Rite”, as it was called officially on the title page (1990). In other words, these translation repertoires are not known.

Texts and the systems of their retranslations

The idea of a sustainable system, which self-regenerate in different environments, can disclose how the liturgical translation traditions shaped their identity and repertoire. Having summarized the experience of developing or reforming two traditions and their regeneration after World War II around the world, it is possible to claim that the translation stages corresponded to fundamental religious texts or collections:

1) prayer-books influenced believers' private life, and they shaped the positive acceptance or strong necessity of high-status texts in the language of the prayer-books;

2) the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom is the most frequent public text of the Church which is supported by the Bible;

3) the Euchologion as well as prayers and hymns for various cycles of worshipping are the texts of the third line whose partial presence or absence does not threaten the existence of the whole native-language system of worshipping, and the first two stages inevitably trigger the appearance of the third stage.

The full set of liturgical books contains a great amount of prayers and hymns. However, the successful religious life of a parish, especially when a parish does not celebrate all daily feasts, but limits its visiting church on Sundays and great feasts, demands much less texts, and this is why abridged liturgical books or even large collections of several such books were very handy for priests.

Traditionally, events and personalities impacted liturgical translation, but places have their potential to design the directions of translation development. The centres of liturgical translation were the sees of synods or eparchies. The city of Prudentópolis in the Brazilian state of Parana has played a lively role in Ukrainian liturgical translation, too. 75 % of its residents are of Ukrainian origin that means a vibrant sustainable community whose forms of cultural and spiritual life are successful realized in the religious domain. Its

Ukrainian population consists of both Orthodox and Greek Catholic believers. The community has maintained a working system, and the Greek Catholics seem to be quite productive in the theological domain. One of the first translational try-outs was the fully Ukrainian-language Horologion with the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom compiled by Rev. Vasyl Zinko (1963). The initiative was continued with the Ukrainian-language Liturgy of St James (1973), which is a peculiar liturgy in the Eastern Christian calendar: this ancient liturgy is mainly served once a year on the feast day of St James (October 23), but not even everywhere. Besides, it is not popularized in massively printed Liturgicons. The story of translating exceptional liturgical texts continued due to the efforts of Rev. Vasyl Zinko who translated four Oriental liturgies from German (1990-1991): the Chaldean Malabar Liturgy, the Alexandrian-Coptic Liturgy, the Holy Qurbana Liturgy of the Syro-Malankara Rite, the Armenian Liturgy. The interest in these liturgical texts, which looks definitely extraordinary for average Ukrainian laics and clergy, reflects the very translator's preferences, but it could generate more curiosity in Ukrainian theologian communities around the globe.

A question of intersemiotic retranslation overlaps the Church's memory policies in the area of exiled Ukrainian liturgical translation. Because of ban on religious music in the USSR, Diaspora Ukrainians had an opportunity to preserve what had been composed earlier and further develop it. They regarded traditional Ukrainian chants and Ukrainian composers' religious music as a key asset for preserving their identity and paid a lot of attention to the musical aspect of liturgical praxis [see in detail: Карась 2020]. The model edition for preserving and presenting Ukrainian religious melodies was prepared by Vasyl Zavitnevych (1963): separate prayers and hymns of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom were accompanied by up to 16 melodies (i.e. music interpretations or retranslations). Along with the traditional Ukrainian local chants,

the religious music editions revealed two types of composers whose opera entered Ukrainian liturgical use in exile. The first group consists of mainland composers who worked and stayed in Ukraine:

- 1) Maksym Berezovskyi (1745-1777);
- 2) Dmytro Bortnianskyi (1751-1825);
- 3) Artem Vedel (1767-1808);
- 4) Mykhailo Verbytskyi (1815-1870);
- 5) Havrylo Muzychenko (Musicescu, 1847-1903);
- 6) Semen Panchenko (1863/1867-1937);
- 7) Hryhoriy Davydovskyi (1866-1952);
- 8) Vasyl Fatiyev (Fateev, 1868-1942);
- 9) Yakiv Yatsynevych (persecuted, 1869-1945);
- 10) Stanislav Liudkevych (1879-1979);
- 11) Mykola Leontovych (murdered, 1877-1921);
- 12) Kyrylo Stetsenko (1882-1922);
- 13) Petro Honcharov (1888-1970);
- 14) Pylyp Kozytskyi (1893-1960).

This group is the largest, but it covers various stages of the progress of religious singing when the classical choir singing was enriched with local folk melodies. Besides, the topmost period of composing Ukrainian church music was the decade after 1917, and it was so important to save this heritage for the time of Ukraine's full Independence.

The second type comprise composers whose talent survived or matured in exile:

- 1) Oleksandr Koshyts (1875-1944);
- 2) Hryhoriy Pavlovskyi (1884-1967);
- 3) Mykhailo Haivoronskyi (1892-1949);
- 4) Andriy Hnatyshyn (1906-1995);
- 5) Hryhoriy Kytastyi (1907-1984);
- 6) Myron Fedoriv (1907-1996);
- 7) Symon Vasylaki-Vozhakivskyi (1911-1984);

- 8) Ihor Sonevytskyi (1926-2006);
- 9) Zinoviy Lavryshyn (1943-2017).

These composers aimed at creating musical opera which would oppose official Soviet Ukrainian music which neglected and avoided religious themes. The opposition was to restore the integrity of Ukrainian religious musical culture. A special case is the composing activities of Roman Hurko (1962–) who is an American-Canadian of Ukrainian descent, born in Toronto, but continues fostering Ukrainian traditions far beyond Ukraine.

Language, Nation and Religion

The first Ukrainian Rite Liturgy was celebrated in North America (City of Shenandoah, Pennsylvania) on 22 December 1884 while the first Verspers service took place a couple of days earlier, on 19 December 1884 [Krawczeniuk 1984:9]. As it was part of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Rite, the Liturgy was definitely served in the Ukrainian recension of Church Slavonic. It was aimed at Ukrainian blue-collar emigrants in Pennsylvania.

The first Ukrainian-language liturgy is connected with the history of Ukrainian Orthodoxy. On 22 May 1919, it was served in Kyiv [Thousand 1988:211]. This liturgy was at first partially Ukrainian: readings from the Gospel, the Epistle Lectionary and the Psalm Book were pronounced in Ukrainian, but in July, 1919, the whole Liturgy was already served completely in Ukrainian [Липківський 2018:4:109-110]. It was the initiative of the hierarchical authority and even actively promoted by the UNR's Minister of Religious Affairs, Ivan Ohiyenko. The first Ukrainian-language liturgy in Canada (and perhaps in North America) was served on 18 June 1922 [Мулик-Луцик 1989:158]. It is known exactly that Ohiyenko's 1922 translation was used. It was an official translation of the Polish Orthodox Church, and the official status means a lot for reception at the level of public use.

Another anecdotal fact happened in Lviv's Transfiguration Church (the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church) when the first Ukrainian-language liturgy according to Ohiyenko's translation was served on 26 March 1922 [Тименик 1997:31-32]. It was the Polish Police that reacted and accused the very translator of initiating the revival of the Greek-Catholic Church, though the translator was an Orthodox believer. Ohiyenko was persecuted: he was dismissed from his teaching position at once.

The Ukrainian language of the Liturgy coincidentally added an identifying feature to Ukrainian Orthodoxy in America. An interesting memory is recorded among believers of the first Ukrainian churches during the 1920s: in Dauphin (Manitoba, Canada), Ukrainian Greek Catholics, who were not afraid of expulsion from the Catholic Church, attended the Liturgy in their native language [Історичний 1967:19]. Gradually, the native language even helped some of them reconvert to Ukrainian Orthodoxy. However, the fear of expulsion is a striking moment in the history of liturgical translation. It turns out that the restriction for changes in the Ukrainian Rite were really introduced by Pope Pius IX's encyclical "Omnem Sollicitudinem" (1874) which called for the scrupulous retainment of the ancient religious habits and banned any liturgical innovations (which also meant the introduction of the vernacular into liturgical praxis). This state of affairs did not act beneficially for a nation that was overcoming its colonial conditions and heritage.

The demand for the Ukrainization of the Liturgy was a call from local grassroot activism. In case of Volyn, a curious fact is cited by Rev. Orest Kupranets [Купранець 1974:199]: in the late 1930s, Poland's Orthodox parishioners threatened their priests that they would join the Protestants (Baptists) if the priests shifted to preaching in Polish and discontinued preaching in Ukrainian or Russian. This approach testifies how quickly people started regarding their language in the Liturgy as an axiological asset of their identity.

By contrasting prayer-books, one easily deduce what tendencies rose in front of Ukrainian diaspora believers in the 1960s. The Ukrainian Orthodox prayer-book “Good Shepherd” contained one language which served both religious and ethnic needs of Ukrainian communities: like in old times, monolingual prayer-books could serve as primary books for teaching Ukrainian. The Ukrainian Greek Catholic priests gradually came to publishing trilingual prayer-books: one part was fully in English; another part was both Ukrainian and Church Slavonic. The division between Ukrainian and Church Slavonic was not equal: the very Liturgy of St John Chrysostom was published in both languages when all the instructions, comments and explanations were in Ukrainian, and all loudly pronounced prayers remained in Church Slavonic. It is quite dubious that this book type could not help Ukrainian retain their language in the Diaspora, because they were to keep three languages in their mind instead of two. The reality was that not all believers comprehended the Church Slavonic text indeed well, and they definitely referred to the English text for elucidating difficult phrases. Thus, the book of the Ukrainian Rite paradoxically stimulated Ukrainians’ shift into English.

The places of the holder of power defined the favourable or unfavourable dynamics of liturgical translation. When the holder was connected with the Ukrainian State, liturgical translation developed very actively even if general historical conditions were not constructive: the Ukrainian National Republic boosted Ukrainian translation, but the results of Ukrainian liturgical translation were also impressive despite the obstacles created by the Ukrainian Soviet Government (before its aggressive atheistic campaigns which occurred in the 1930s). When the holder stayed beyond Ukrainian national matters, the development of liturgical translation depended on universal translation tendencies: after the Roman See sanc-

tioned liturgical translations into the vernaculars, the Ukrainian Greek Catholic hierarchy shifted to the liturgical use of the Ukrainian language almost immediately, because they fulfilled the decisions of the Second Vatican Council. The shift required the availability of Ukrainian-language liturgical books, and the translating process was really extremely active during the 1960-1980s.

Liturgical translations are part of a nation's cultural capital, as these texts shape a specific religious mentality and form a high poetical culture within a literature. They help believers feel being members of the common Christian European tradition and exercise this membership as a tool for own development, though ecclesiastical structures are quite conservative, and they do not always manage to follow the dynamics of societal development. At the same time, liturgical translations provide ground for a language to perform a function of symbolic capital when it gains prestige and recognition among other similar languages that guarantees the preservation of the national identity and the shaping of the nation itself. This is why some political holders of power were so eager to limit the spread and strength of liturgical translation.

Although liturgical texts belong to the classical literature, their classicalness can turn into being old-fashioned due to the asymmetry of translation reception: linguistic changes in original texts are tolerated better than those in translations, and linguistic modernizations as well as the implementation of some theological preciseness stimulated and continue stimulating numerous retranslations of liturgical texts. In this aspect, the functions of exiled ecclesiastical institutions were the same as those in the mainland: their main task was to administer the power of theological correctness, but in the diaspora, these institutions were to administer the preservation of collective memory as well. In the area of musical interpretations which can be regarded as intersemiotic translations, churchly leaders supported diaspora composers'

original creativity as well as cherished traditional chants and melodies by mainland composers. This double policy also opened way to more intensive ecumenical communication between exiled churches in the sphere of using liturgical books. When the time came to return Home, each ecclesiastical hierarchy had a corpus of liturgical books which could be deployed mutually.

References

- Bourdieu 1993: Bourdieu P. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 1993. viii, 322 p.
- Krawczeniuk 1984: Krawczeniuk O. *The Ukrainian Church in America: Its Beginnings* / transl. by V. Andrushkiw and M. Stefaniuk. Detroit: The Ukrainian Millennium Committee, 1984. 43 p.
- Łoś 2021: Łoś Jarosław ks. *Próby delegalizacji Kościoła prawosławnego w II Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej // Świadczyć o wierze naszych ojców: Prawosławna Diecezja Lubelsko-Chełmska w latach 1989-2019* / red. abp Abel. Lublin, 2021. S. 31-38.
- Thousand 1988: *A Thousand Years of Christianity in Ukraine: An Encyclopedic Chronology* / ed. by O. Zinkewych and A. Sorokowski. New York; Baltimore; Toronto: Smoloskyp, 1988. 312 p.
- Tyulenev 2012: Tyulenev S. *Applying Luhmann to translation studies: translation in society*. New York; London: Routledge, 2012. xv, 235 p.
- Барвінський 1921: Барвінський А. Чи українська мова пригідна до перекладу св. Письма і молитов, та духовної проповіді? Перемишль: Кнолер і Син, 1921. 32 с.
- Василишин 2014: Василишин І. *Нові видання богослужбових книг у ХХ столітті як плід літургійної реформи // Reformy liturgii a powrót do źródeł: Ad fontes liturgicos 4*. Kraków: Wyd-wo Nauk. Un-tu Papieskiego Jana Pawła II, 2014. S. 285-299.
- Василишин 2018: Василишин І. *Літургійно-богослужбові видання Патріарха Йосифа Сліпого у II половині ХХ ст.* Петро-

- спектива // Матеріали Міжнародної наукової конференції до 100-річчя ієрейських свячень Йосифа Сліпого / упоряд. Ю. Скіра. Львів: Колесо, 2018. С. 113-129.
- Ґалянт 1933: Ґалянт М. Переклад єрейського молитвослова // Нива. 1933. Т. 28. С. 435-437.
- Завітневич 1971: Завітневич В. Видавнича діяльність Української Православної Церкви в США (з анотаціями найголовніших видань) // Ювілейна Книга: 50-річчя Відродження Української Автокефальної Православної Церкви, 1921-1971. Бавнд Брук, 1971. С. 63-71.
- І. Н. 1935: І. Н. В справі українського перекладу єрейського молитвослова // Нива. 1935. Т. 30. С. 399-400.
- Ісіченко 2016: Ісіченко Ігор архієп. Українське церковне служіння і роль служителя на поселеннях: минулий досвід і пріоритети на майбутнє // [posted on 13 Dec 2016] https://www.religion.in.ua/zmi/ukrainian_zmi/34905-ukrayinske-cerkovne-sluzhinnya-i-rol-sluzhitelya-na-poselennyax-minulij-dosvid-i-prioriteti-na-majbutnye.html
- Історичний 1967: Історичний нарис Української Греко-Православної Церкви Св. Юрія в Давфіні в сорокліття громади від 1927 до 1967 р. Вінніпег: Тризуб, 1967. 103 с.
- Карась 2020: Карась Г. Церковна музика композиторів української діаспори у відродженні національно-культурної та релігійної ідентичності православної і греко-католицької церкви в сучасній Україні // European vector of modern cultural studies and art criticism: the experience of Ukraine and the Republic of Poland. Włocławek; Riga: Baltija Publishing, 2020. С. 55-72.
- Костельник 1922: Костельник Г. Народна чи вселенська Церков? // Нива. 1922. Т. 17. С. 20-25; 64-68, 109-122, 170-178, 209-214.
- Костельник 1933: Костельник Г. Український переклад єрейського молитвослова о. Яр. Левицького // Нива. 1933. Т. 28. С. 343-351, 376-380.

- Купранець 1974: Купранець О. Ф. Православна церква в міжвоєнній Польщі. 1918-1939. Рим, 1974. ххі, 235 с.
- Липківський 2018: Липківський Василь. Вибрані твори: у 6 т. Київ: Укр. пропілеї, 2018.
- Москаленко 2018: Москаленко М. Переклади 1920-1930-х років // Слово і Час. 2018. № 12. С. 19-31.
- Мулик-Луцик 1989: Мулик-Луцик Ю. Історія Української Греко-Православної Церкви в Канаді. Т. 4. Вінніпег: Екклесія, 1989. 829 с.
- Пуряєва 2017: Пуряєва Н. В. Богослужбові переклади Івана Огієнка // Іван Огієнко і сучасна наука та освіта. Серія: Філологічна. 2017. Вип. 14. С. 296-305.
- Тиявський 1985: Тиявський І. Літургічна комісія та її переклади під проводом Патріарха Йосифа // Богословія. Рим, 1985. № 49. С. 151-166.
- Тіменик 1997: Тіменик З. Іван Огієнко (Митрополит Іларіон). 1882-1972: життєписно-бібліографічний нарис / Наук. т-во ім. Шевченка у Львові. Львів, 1997. 227 с.
- Цегельський 1935: Цегельський Т. Довкруги українського перекладу єрейського молитвослова // Нива. 1935. Т. 30. С. 432-434.

Questions for discussion

1. How do you estimate the impact of diaspora translations on the mainland's literary life?
2. What sample in the world history can you recall when diaspora cherished their literature, because their mainland failed?
3. What is more important in translation praxis: a personality or an institution?
4. Can you provide any sample of how translations shaped a nation?
5. Present your favourite literary genre and explain how its translation canon was shaped in Ukrainian culture.

Topic 5:**THE LINGUACULTURAL HISTORY
OF THE UKRAINIAN TRANSLATION OF THE CREED**

1. What is the Creed?
2. Liturgical texts between politics and people
3. Theory and text
4. Christian and cultural dogmas

1. What is the Creed?

The Creed is one among three most recited prayers along with the Lord's Prayer and the Hail Mary. The Lord's Prayer and the Hail Mary are formed on the basis of biblical texts and can be considered the domain of biblical translation; the Creed which exists in two main variants – the Apostles' Creed and the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, is a product of Christian theology and part of the Liturgy. The Byzantine Rite uses only the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, while the Roman Rite peruses both variants: the most popular version is the Apostles' Creed, and the text used during the Mass is the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. The Apostles' Creed has some common phrases with the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, so it may look that the Apostles' Creed is incorporated the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed with slight modification, though these texts have different histories.

2. Liturgical texts between politics and people

In Ukraine, the sacred Church Slavonic version of the Creed was dominant for a much longer time, but it was also much more understandable among the Ukrainians than the Latin sacred text among the Poles. The text of the Creed was fundamental not only for religious praxis but also for primary education: it was included in primers for teaching reading, e.g. Ivan Fedorovych's Primers of

1574 and 1578 [Федорович 1574:52-54; Федорович 1578a:11-14; Федорович 1578b:52-55] and Lavrentiy Zyzaniy's Primer of 1596 [Зизаній 1596:7-8]. Some excerpts of the translated Creed are found in catechisms.

The allegedly first translation into Middle Ukrainian appeared in 1620 during the peak of theological polemics between the Catholics and the Orthodox in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The translation of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed was published in Zakhariya Kopystenskyi's 'Book on the True Faith and the Holy Apostolic Church' [Копистенський 1620:165-167], and this fact is one of many that characterize the flourishing translation activities of early 17th-century Kyiv Orthodox Metropolitanate whose translation heritage has not enjoyed much attention from translation experts. Zakhariya Kopystenskyi was a notable figure in the Ukrainian polemical literature of the early 17th century. Besides, he was a connoisseur of Greek and Latin and translated several Greek religious books, including the 'Horologion' (1617), 'Nomocanon' (1625), and the writings of St John Chrysostom. This is why the translation of the Creed was not an occasional translation but a powerful tool in the Orthodox-Catholic polemics.

In Ukraine, a wave of polemics between the supporters of the exclusive usage of Church Slavonic as a liturgical language and those of the introduction of New Ukrainian into liturgical praxis occurred at the turn of the 1870s. In 1869, the eminent Ukrainian physicist (by trade) as well as theologian (by education), Ivan Puliui, published a very abridged edition of a prayer-book [Молитвослов 1869]. Two years later, he published the first full-fledged prayer-book in New Ukrainian [Молитовник 1871] which started a new period of the history of publishing prayer-books in Ukraine. The emergence of the independent state – the Ukrainian National Republic – influenced the restoration of Ukraine's eccle-

siastical independence. The new efforts started with the Ukrainian-language Liturgy and prayerbooks, which continued after priests had to emigrate and work in the Diaspora. Thus, the Creed was translated by Rev. A. Herashchenko [Молитовник 1917:12-13], by exiled minister I. Ohiyenko [Свята 1922:59-60], by the Ukrainian Greek-Orthodox Church in Canada [Добрий пастор 1952:12-14] or by the Ukrainian Catholic (Greek-Catholic) Church in exile [Священна 1988:50-51]. In 2021, two years after the proclamation of the autocephaly of Ukraine's Orthodox Church (2019), its Synod adopted a new version of the Creed with some 'minor' changes [Офіційне 2021]. This fact signifies the importance to maintain the high authority of this text.

3. Theory and text

One of the views of retranslations is that it helps to build "a gradual move from an initial rejection of the foreign, via a tentative but nevertheless appropriating foray into the source culture, culminating in an idealized move which privileges the source text and all its alterity" [Deane-Cox 2014:3]. Religious texts hold a separate place among other texts: their high status is unquestioned. The authoritative power is sealed by the emotionality of worshippers who treat prayers as a dialogue with God, thus, these texts cannot be foreign. To understand Christianity and God was a very successful motto for the most recent liturgical reforms.

A stimulus claimed for new retranslations is ageing. In religious translation, it is reversed. Tradition is sanctified by time. The Greek and Latin texts were shaped in the early 1st millennium, and the Church Slavonic ones were written in the late 1st millennium. At the turn of the 3rd millennium, they are still practiced that gives them such a particular sense of life and power.

Translating the texts of power should turn a translation analyst's attention from the spectrum of gradually approximation to

the complicated nexus of social, cultural and theological visions. Can we consider the adding of the Filioque as a unique fact of translation from Orthodox into Catholic? Nevertheless, “the most recent retranslation strives towards a reconfiguration of the field by asserting the value of the source text” [Deane-Cox 2014:78], but this happens only when the whole translation program is realized.

Multiple retranslations were the consequence of complicated real-life conditions and attitudes. These conditions always aimed at resolving problems of the domination and legitimization of a nation and its institutions like the Church and the language. From the typological perspective of Ukrainian and Polish translation history, the conditions of supporting the search for a new text in the target language can be grouped in the following way:

first, political reasons show how a military invasion (Poland, the 13th century) or the defence of a ‘national’ church (Ukraine, the early 17th century) can stimulate the necessity to refer to the Creed as a text being fundamental both for the Church and a nation;

second, social motives reveal that a nation survives different boons and crises, but when a necessity of search for national self-identity arises, main efforts initially focus on religious text as the reflections of a nation’s worldview (the 19th century when Poland was divided between Prussia, Russia and Austria, and Ukraine was divided between Russia and Austria);

third, cultural life pushes new challenges when the Church has to introduce some religious revisions of its fundamentals both for the better perception and reception of Christian dogmas (esp. Poland after the 1960s and the Second Vatican Council) and for the additional legitimization of its authority (esp. Ukraine after 2019 and the proclamation of the autocephaly of Ukraine’s Orthodox Church);

fourth, historical background cannot be avoided as every language develops and deviates from its older standards, and this

objective mutability is not usually radical (see Polish texts from the 19th and 20th centuries), but chaotic existence does create space for lingual experimenting (see Ukrainian texts during and after the 1917-1920 Ukrainian Revolution).

4. Christian and cultural dogmas

Although dogmas definitely belong to theology, some theologians ignore the fact that any language is a system of codes, and their believing in very peculiar – dogmatic – senses of a word does not mean that this belief is shared by the whole community. This actually has raised a lot of heresies in ecclesiastical history. This is why the connection between dogmatics and culture is no sheer occasion, but a tight and mutually dependent influence.

The biblical vocabulary is a core issue for liturgical translation. In general perspective, the discrepancies between biblical and liturgical texts are not permissible because they do not only change the codes of religious communication (allowing space for additional and unnecessary interpretation), but may cause some dogmatic turmoil. The verse “φῶς ἐκ φωτός” is rendered “свѣтлость з свѣтлости” (1620) which is contradictory to today’s “світло від світла” (1871 and all later translations). In the Polish texts of the Creed this formula sounds in the version “światłość ze światłości” which correlates with the biblical statement: „Bóg jest Światłością i nie ma w Nim żadnej ciemności” (1 J 1, 5). The 1581 Ostroh Bible fixes the lexeme “свѣтъ” which could have been used in the Creed’s translation as well. The question is open if any pre-1620 Polish text (e.g. the Polish translations of the Bible or the translation of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed) influenced the Middle Ukrainian text, as neither the Early Polish dictionary [Słownik staropolski 1982: t. 9, z. 1:51-54] nor the Early Ukrainian dictionary [Тимченко 2003:313] substantiates the advantage of the lexeme ‘światłość / світлість’ over the lexeme

‘światło / світло’, though the first variant was much more widely used. In New Ukrainian, the lexemes ‘світло’ (light) and ‘світлість’ (lightness) are clearly differentiated in use.

The epithet ‘Παντοκράτωρ’ created a dogmatic difference in translation back in the time when it was translated into Latin. Power can be interpreted twofold: strength or sovereignty. Western Christianity followed the way of strength as it is in the Latin form ‘omnipotens’ which has been retranslated into Polish as ‘wszechmogący’ since the earliest manuscripts. The same tradition is recorded in the English-language Missal: ‘almighty’ [Roman Missal 2011:527]. However, the Patristic Greek speak more in the direction of authority and supremacy, which was literally rendered in Church Slavonic as ‘вседержитель’ (1574). The authority and tradition of Church Slavonic defined that the major translation variant in New Ukrainian was ‘вседержитель’ (1871, 1988, 2021). Meanwhile, in the revolutionary times influencing lingual matters, interesting translation variants also emerged. A. Herashchenko suggested ‘Вседержавець’ (1917) which elegantly renders the political tradition of presenting the authority: the supreme ruler. I. Ohienko initiated a translation tradition which tends more to powerfulness and, thus, is even more Catholic: ‘Всемогучий’ (1922, 1952).

One more case of lingual experimenting is connected with the epithet ‘Ζωοποιών’ (‘the giver of life’) whose translations ranged from a very Church-Slavonic-like option (‘Господь Животворящий’ 1917) via rather a domesticated form (‘Господь оживляющий’ 1922, 1952) to a well-balanced morphological solution (‘Господь животворний’ 1988; ‘Господь Животворчий’ 2021). A hard phrase was ‘became man’ which was rendered in Church Slavonic as one word ‘въчеловѣчшася’ (1574). The Ukrainian translations hesitated between a Church-Slavonic-like but artificial form ‘стався’ (‘self-became’: ‘людиною стався’,

1917; ‘стався людиною’ 1922, ‘стався чоловіком’, 1952) and a normative form ‘став’ (‘became’: ‘став чоловіком’, 1988; ‘став людиною’, 2021). The hesitation between ‘чоловік’ (‘man’, 1952, 1988) and ‘людина’ (‘human’, 1917, 1922, 2021) overlaps with two tendencies: one is deliberate digression from Church Slavonic where ‘чловѣкъ’ means both a man and a woman; another is an undeliberate pro-feminist trend of incorporating gender-free lexis.

The Ukrainian text cannot exist independently from the Church Slavonic version. Some important dogmatic notions-terms had been incorporated into the vernacular and considered as typically Ukrainian back in the time of Middle Ukrainian: “Богъ Отець”, “вседержитель”, “въскресеніє”, “грѣхъ”. The 1620 text contains some evident Polish words or those changed under the influence of Polish: “кrolewство”, “збавеня”, “правдивий”, “вшистки”. The origin of these words is – as of today – unknown and, thus, possibly remains between two options: firstly, the Ukrainian text could have been influenced by the existing – and unknown today – Polish translations; or, secondly, it was defined by the lingual praxis of the then Ukrainian speakers living in the polylingual society where Polish had an official status. Thus, the 1620 Ukrainian text emerged as a node of many lingual practices: Ukrainian vernacular which claimed for the necessity of translations into it; Church Slavonic which donated a number of dogmatic terms; Polish vernacular which influenced the choice of some lexemes (perhaps, motivated by the existing Polish and Czech translations or by common lingual practices).

The influence of the common lingual praxis is a reliable explanation of the use of some Polish words in the Middle Ukrainian text. The earliest texts, however, indicate a very essential terminological feature which can be considered antidogmatic in today’s Polish Catholic texts: this is the usage of the word ‘cerkiew’. According to the dictionaries of contemporary Polish,

'cerkiew' designates a number of notions ('group of people', 'institution', 'place for worship') connected with Orthodoxy. Meanwhile, the 'Early Polish Dictionary' does not register any specific sense connected with Orthodoxy [Słownik staropolski 1954: t. 1, z. 4:218-219]. While the Middle Polish translations were influenced by the Czech or – less probably – Church Slavonic translations, the standard term in newer Polish translations is only 'Koscioł'.

The choice for the lexeme 'cerkiew' claims for reconsidering some ideas about the New World Translation of the Bible (by Jehovah's Witnesses) which is criticized, for example, because of the substitution of the well-acquired 'Koscioł' for 'ogólne zgromadzenie' [Zajęc]. Here one discrimination is to be borne in mind – between biblical and liturgical vocabulary. The patristic writings developed the new sense of the Christian institution for the Greek 'ἐκκλησία', but in the time of the New Testament, the sense 'assembly duly summoned' dominated.

The interesting difference between the current Polish translations of the Apostles' Creed and the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed refers to the Greek 'ἀνάστασις' or the Latin 'resurrectio' which sounds identically in both texts in the two languages. In the Polish translations of the Apostles' Creed and those of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed done from the earliest times to the mid-20th century, the resurrection of the dead is called 'zmartwychwstanie' which is a rather exact rendering of the Greek original lexeme connected first of all with 'rising up'. The very lexeme can be viewed a key to Jesus Christ's success story when after trouble and obstacles, i.e. falling down, He could 'rise up' to success and glory. The Ukrainian 'воскресіння' as well as other Slavonic terms of this root mean first of all 'returning to life': this word signifies God's mystical act where humans are not involved. This is why the aim of involving believers for repenting for sins and deserving an eternal life is better promised in the term

‘zmartwychwstanie’ which remind them that they should follow and appreciate Jesus Christ’s path from sufferings to happiness. In the newer Polish translations of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed (1956, 1983), the idea of resurrecting is translated as ‘wskrzeszenie’ which limits the rich variety of means for obtaining life after death to the bare process of revivification.

Concluding the lines of historical development in two superficially opposite Christian traditions, we face a lot of striking similarities. The texts of the Creed functioned as tokens of extreme authority sharing the same importance for the nations and the national churches: retranslation activities got active in the times of national and societal crises (foreign expansions and occupations). The major ecclesiastical reforms also coincide more or less in temporal periods: Ukraine’s claim for its autocephalous church at the turn of the 1920s and Poland’s reflections of the liturgical movement finalized during the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s. The historical changes of the target languages did not play a decisive role in stimulating new retranslations, but the results were sometimes bright and unusual from the viewpoint of lingual reception and interpretation.

References

- Deane-Cox 2014: Deane-Cox Sh. *Retranslation: translation, literature and reinterpretation*. London et al.: Bloomsbury, 2014. xi, 210 p.
- Roman Missal 2011: *The Roman Missal / English translation according to the third typical edition; Approved by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and Confirmed by the Apostolic See*. Washington, D.C., 2011. 1514 p.
- Słownik staropolski 1953-2002: *Słownik staropolski: w 11 t. / PAN*. – Warszawa, 1953-2002.

- Zajac: Zajac R. Na drogach i bezdrożach przekładów Pisma Świętego // http://www.bu.kul.pl/art_15512.html [accessed on October 5, 2021].
- Добрий пастор 1952: Добрий пастор: Укр. православ. молитовник / Консисторія Укр. греко-православ. церкви в Канаді. Вид. 4-е, доп. Вінніпер, 1952. 464 с.
- Зизаній 1596: [Зизаній Лаврентій]. Наука ку читанню. Вільнюс, [1596]. [8] с.
- Копистенський 1620: Копистенський Захарія. Книга о вірі єдиної, святої апостолської церкви. Київ: Друкарня Києво-Печерської лаври, 1620. [4], 317, 308 с.
- Молитвослов 1869: Молитвослов и коротка наука о християнсько-католицькій вірі. Відень: Вид. оо. Мехітаристів, 1869. 16 с.
- Молитовник 1871: Молитовник для руського народу. 2-е вид., побільшене. Відень, 1871. 245 с.
- Молитовник 1917: Молитовник: Ц.-славянський та український тексти (з поясненням) / пер. А. Геращенко. Вид. 2-е, без одмін. Б.м., 1917? 30 с.
- Офіційне 2021: Офіційне повідомлення про засідання Священного Синоду 27 липня 2021 р. / Православ. церква України // <https://www.pomisna.info/uk/vsi-novyny/ofitsijne-providomlennya-pro-zasidannya-svyashhennogo-synodu-27-lipnya-2021-r/> [Accessed on 7 February 2021].
- Свята 1922: Свята Служба Божа Св. Отця нашого Іоана Золотоустого мовою українською. [В 2 ч.]. Ч. 1 / На укр. мову з грец. пер. І. Огієнко. [Тарнів], [Львів], 1922. 95 с.
- Священна 1988: Священна і божественна Літургія святого отця нашого Іоана Золотоустого / Синод Ієрархії Укр. Католическої Церкви. Торонто: Basilian Press, 1988. 147 с.

Тимченко 2003: Тимченко Є. Матеріали до словника писемної та книжної української мови XV-XVIII ст. – Київ; Нью-Йорк, 2003. – Кн. 2. – 512 с.

Федорович 1574: [Федорович Іван]. [Азбука]. Львів, [1574]. [79] с.

Федорович 1578a: [Федорович Іван]. [Азбука]. Острог, [1578]. [16] с.

Федорович 1578b: [Федорович Іван]. Начало ученїа дѣтемь. Острог, [1578]. [96] с.

Questions for discussion

1. What other translated texts are so important for Ukrainian and Slavonic cultures?
2. Explain how well you understand the Church Slavonic translation of the Creed without a Ukrainian translation.
3. Is the Creed more important for you or for the Church? If it is more important for your moral, emotional or spiritual essence, specify these factors of impact?
4. What is the space for lingual experiments in high-status texts?
5. Do you approach religious texts through the prism of Old Greek or Latin poetics?

Topic 6:**GEOFFREY CHAUCER'S TEXT IN ENGLISH INTRALINGUAL
AND UKRAINIAN INTERLINGUAL TRANSLATIONS**

1. Intralingual translation, interlingual translation and Geoffrey Chaucer
2. Biblical intertextuality
3. Liturgical hymnography
4. Divinity in the detail

1. Intralingual translation, interlingual translation and Geoffrey Chaucer

Translation is not only the way of heteroglossic people(s) to communicate between themselves, but translation can also contribute to a more insightful interpretation of a text in its original language. Meanwhile, translations within the same language are often regarded to be not 'fully-fledged' translations and ignored without comprehending that intralingual and interlingual translations shares the same perils of losses and gains. The objective of this paper is to compare the ways of receiving Chaucer's text by today's English and Ukrainian readers by assessing the possibilities of rendering the poetic techniques applied in Prioress's Prologue of Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales'.

Intralingual translation is underestimated in comparison with interlingual translation. The case of Chaucer's writings is a decent example given the amount of translations, modernizations and adaptations since the 18th century and lacking profound interest in assessing their quality⁵. The application of the term 'modernization' also misguides the reader as, on the one hand, it may dimin-

⁵ Some recent publications just on this topic are those by Steve Ellis [2000]; Serhiy Sydorenko [2011; 2019]. The whole dissertation dedicated to 18th-century translations is by Eric Larson [2016].

ish the authority of its translation status, but, on the other hand, every translation is a text ‘modernised’ or transformed according to the values of a very specific reading community, and translator-modernizer face all the same problems as the interlingual translator does. Translations from Chaucer might have produced a fruitful background for delineating between genres of translation, modernization and adaptation, but such a generic scale is rarely discussed in translation studies. This paper focuses on texts of Prioress’s Prologue translated by William Lipscomb (1795), William Wordsworth (1882 edition), John Urban Nicolson (1934), John S. P. Tatlock (1940 edition), Vincent F. Hopper (1970 revision), Nevill Coghill (1977 revision), A. S. Kline (2007), and Gerard NeCastro (2007). In Ukrainian culture, the first excerpts of ‘The Canterbury Tales’ were translated by Yevhen Kryzhevych in 1978, while the full translation by Maksym Strikha came out in 2019 only. This explains the fact why Ukrainian researchers wrote about Chaucer’s oeuvre, but avoided writing about their translations.

The objective of this lecture is to consider the challenges which translators face when they have to deal with an author’s historical and cultural experience encoded in the text. Laurel Broughton [2005:584] describes the textual knot of the truly Marian-like hymn shaped in the form of the Prologue: “The *Prologue* richly reflects medieval Marian devotion and bears a strong relationship to liturgical sources as well as to the *Prologue* to *The Second Nun’s Tale* and Canto XXXIII of Dante’s *Paradiso*”. The translator will take no pain at collating the two prologues (if the whole text of the Tales is translated by the same translator). Given the amount of existing commentaries, the identification of Dante’s fragment is not problematic, either. The situation is very special with the Ukrainian translation as Maksym Strikha is the translator of both Dante’s ‘Paradiso’ and Chaucer’s ‘Canterbury Tales’, so he easily traced the relevant fragment (as he commented himself [Чоцеп 2019:153]).

The act of reading for both today's English and Ukrainian reader involves great intelligibility, so if a reader is not very careful, they will miss out this Dantean line among other liturgical sources.

The intertextual genesis of the Prologue to Prioress's Tale advances a primary translation principle: a translation should reflect the intertextual network of an original. However, intertextual milieu in cross-cultural communication may initiate a request for the use of authoritative texts, which trigger no cultural response in the target literature or may impact a different cultural effect on the recipient. Meanwhile, some texts which are to be requested for may stay never requested.

The intertextual richness can also be explained by the fact that Chaucerean literary culture was strongly aural; thus, medieval readers or listeners picked up the right association rather easily. The literary canon appearing in Chaucer's era looks very obscure for today's reader. Similarly, the gap is even larger when a reader from a different national literary tradition is meant. At the same time, Chaucer's poetic technique can be described as 'collage', i.e. layering disparate literary pieces to a poetic framework [Boyd 1987:148]. This technique triggered a number of associations in listeners' and readers' mind, and this is why it is so important to summarize what power authoritative texts lost or acquired in intertemporal and interspatial dimensions and to identify to what extent a receiver of the text can interpret or overinterpret or underinterpret a poetic piece.

2. Biblical intertextuality

The heaviest implemented text in the Prioress's Tale is that of Psalm 8 which is quoted in Latin as an epigraph, then reworded in English as the initial part of the Prioress's Prologue and later reverberated in key words along the main text of the Tale. This state of arts shapes a dictum for a translator that their translation

should correlate with the well-accepted and deeply-known text of the Psalm. Simultaneously, it redirects our attention to the translated text of this Psalm which was of the highest authority for readers in Chaucer's time.

Epigraphs are rarely used in the Tales, so the translator is to pay a very close attention to its symbolism. The epigraph to the Prologue discloses how Chaucer's artistry can reverberate Psalm 8 in 35 lines (the Prologue) and 29 stanzas (the Tale).

The first quote in Latin engages the game of language statuses: Latin being the language of the authorized and blessed Vulgate as well as of magical treatises and religious chants, the epigraph brought a symbolical blessing to Prioress's deed. This peculiar symbolism can be supported by the fact that later the longer context of the phrase is translated as the words of Prioress.

Most English translators kept the original Latin phrasing, some modifying it with an added reference (Coghill, Kline) or a paralleled translation (Kline). Lipscomb and Wordsworth omitted it: while the former behave very freely with the text, the latter might not have considered it important for the textual integrity as he just translated only Prioress's tale. The Ukrainian translator preserved the Latin phrasing which is an obvious marker of a Catholic text (as contrasted to the traditions of Ukrainian Orthodoxy). Understandably, Chaucer did not intend to stress the Catholicity of his writings, but this is the denominational opposition which arises in the English-Ukrainian cross-cultural communication as the Ukrainians used at first the Bible in the Church Slavonic translation (esp. the 1581 authoritative edition in Ostroh) and later in New Ukrainian translations.

Nevertheless, political overtones should also be reconsidered while remembering what was happening in the early 1380s: John Wycliffe was struggling with the Church and simultaneously translating the Bible, while Chaucer was writing Prioress's Tale. At

that time, English literature had possessed the complete translation of the Psalter done by Richard Rolle, but the choice of the key word 'merueilous' in Psalm 8:1 hints some connection with the earlier version of the Wycliffite Bible: Rolle used the word 'selkouth', a native and poetic but inappropriate correspondent; early Wycliffite version reads 'merueilous' which can be considered a perfect biblical equivalent describing 'illustrious nature of God' (the correspondent 'wonderful' from the later Wycliffite version is theologically misleading, and some contemporary translations successfully render it as 'majestical'). Thus, Chaucer (in)directly supports Wycliffe's endeavour to translate the Bible in his native tongue. The context of struggle for the English-language Bible is absolutely irrelevant for the Ukrainians, even those who lived during the Reformation under the Crown of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: ardent fights for the Bible in Polish vernacular did not echo with high political overtones in the Ukrainian milieu where the Church Slavonic Bible was more or less comprehensible for commoners, and Ukrainian men of letters were elaborating the local variant of the sacred Church Slavonic language.⁶

Developing the idea of Chaucer's incorporating a translated piece of a psalm, we face another facet of such incorporation: do translators treat the Chaucerean text as an original or search for a ready biblical translation to incorporate? This is relevant for understanding the level of theological insightfulness and religious perception. Theologically, the variant 'merueilous' from the early Wycliffite Bible is exact equivalent of the original Hebrew 'אדיר' that comes from the adjective 'wide, great, high, noble' (by The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew Lexicon) and leads to the idea of 'glory, magnificence' (ibid.). The lexeme 'merueilous' is applicable

⁶ For the detailed account of the then various translation projects and views, see David Frick [1989:288].

both for human and for the God (by *The Middle English Dictionary* of the University of Michigan), but the explanation ‘worthy of admiration, illustrious’ indicates the self-sufficiency of the bearer of this feature that does not require any approval (wordy admiration) from others, namely humans.

The Anglophone biblical tradition renders the idea of God’s illustrious nature exactly, but differently at various periods of the history of the English language. The once fully equivalent ‘wonderful’ (Miles Coverdale, 1535), ‘admirable’ (Douay-Rheims Bible, 1582) and ‘excellent’ (King James Bible, 1611) have lost the semantic component ‘superiority’, and this is why the 20th- and 21st-century translations deploy mostly the word ‘majestic’ (New International Version; New Living Translation; New American Standard Bible; World English Bible) or rarely ‘greatness’ (Good News Translation). This semantic change happened around the 17th and 18th centuries and was to influence the Anglophone translators. Successfully, Limpscomb applied the form ‘glorious’, Wordsworth experimented with ‘wondrous’. The more recent translators returned to the Chaucerean variant ‘marvellous’ (Nicolson, Tatlock, Hopper, Coghill, Kline, NeCastro). This return does not only show the translators’ option for staying closer to the original but their relation to and understanding of the biblical tradition. The earlier translators must have been in the stalemate: they were to incorporate a well-known text which was ready, but had become obsolete. They chose a way-out of more poetical license. The later translators did not feel so much obliged to insert the Bible into ‘their’ text, so while choosing between the authority of the Bible and the authority of Chaucer, they chose the author.

The Ukrainian biblical tradition offers a range of variants for a Ukrainian translator, though mainly highlighted is the human admiration of God by perceiving His essence as a wonder: ‘чюдъно’ (Frantsisk Skoryna, 1517), ‘чюдно’ (Ostroh Bible, 1581),

‘предивне’ (Rev. Ivan Khomenko, 1963), ‘подиву гідне’ (Rev. Rafayil Turkoniak, 2006). The theologically correct variant is found in newer translations: ‘величне’ (Metropolitan Ilarion (Ohiyenko), 1962; New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures, 2014). The third option deploy the idea of glory: ‘дивна твоя слава’ (Panteleimon Kulish, 1871) and ‘славне’ (Kulish–Puliui–Nechui-Levytskyi, 1903). The latter variant is not the best option from the interpretational perspective. As of today, the English lexeme ‘glory’ is more honourable than the Ukrainian ‘слава’, as the sense ‘disposition to claim honour for oneself / desire for fame’ had been dropped by the mid-18th century. ‘Слава’ stands for ‘wide popularity as a sign of general appraisal’ or ‘reputation’ (by the academic Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language, 1978) that designate the dominant importance of recipients, thus, indicating that God is illustrious because people think so, but not because He is such due to magnitude.

This background demonstrates why the Ukrainian poetical variant ‘слава’ introduced by the Ukrainian translator is not the best option if the whole historical and theological context is judged. The translator, however, comments this line by referring to the theologically exact translation and, supposedly, triggers a reader’s association between ‘слава’ (glory) and ‘велич’ (majesty).

Additional multifariousness is observed in the biblical metaphorical phrase ‘thy name’ which stays here not as much as a title for glorification, but indicates the existential essence of the God. The theologians explain that ‘thy name’ means ‘thy revealed character’, and ‘a name comes to be the equivalent of all that we know about the person who bears it’ [A Commentary 1978:331]. This perfectly fits the idea that it is not ‘name’ which is majestic but the very essence of God. Although this symbol is bright and open for general interpretation, as well as the common readership may easily slip the deep theological reason and concentrate on the poetical description of the name, the overexplicitation of this

symbol will not be accepted by poetry readers. This state of art refers to both Anglophone and Ukrainian readers, and neither Anglophone nor Ukrainian translators changed this symbol.

3. Liturgical hymnography

Why Beverly Boyd suggested the term ‘collage’ was because Chaucer integrated a number of quotations from medieval English liturgical texts which circulated mainly in Latin but sometimes in Middle English as well. This discloses the author’s attitude to his text by addressing to texts of very high authority. Chaucer’s montage technique must have evoked direct and bright associations for his then listeners and readers. The key text is the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary and other connected text in a missal and canonical hours, as it was revealed by Sister Mary Madeleva [1965:31-33].

Yet, one should bear in mind that the service was exercised in Latin and the complete English version was introduced back in the 18th century. So, Chaucer could also act as a peculiar translator of liturgical text and even experiment with vocabulary without fearing life-threatening sanctions from the Church. Besides, more changes happened as the aftermath of the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s which revised the Missal. A lot of congregations stopped using the Little Office in favour of the revised Liturgy of Hours. A different challenge for identifying excerpts from Catholic liturgical texts is posed by religious practices of Protestant and Orthodox population who experience different histories of shaping their rites. All these contemplations help draw some borderlines limiting the completeness of appreciating the artistic mastership of Chaucer in the Prologue. Still, interlingual and interdenominational differences may be considered to be not so critical as their liturgies and imagery share the common root – the biblical proto-text – which distribute the successful decoding for all Christians.

The image of 'bussh unbrent' is an easy for deciphering: originating from Moses' Pentateuch, it is known among all Christians and interpreted in the same way when it symbolizes the virginity of Mary. The contemporary spelling is 'bush unburnt' and it was used consequently by all Anglophone translators. Suddenly, here arises an intercultural difference caused by Orthodox liturgical practices. The difference is sometimes stressed in the way of naming as in the Orthodox Christianity, the stable term is 'burning bush' ('неопалима купина'). The venerating service dedicated to the 'Unburnt Bush' Icon of the Mother of God contains readings from the Bible on Jacob with the ladder (Gen. 28), Moses and the burning bush (Ex. 3) and the gate through which the Lord may only enter (Ez. 44). These quotes enriched the symbolism of the burning bush with some extra symbols, so it was even sealed in the later form of the typical design of the 'Unburnt Bush' Icon.

Ukrainian religious translations offer to keep the variant borrowed from the Church Slavonic service, i.e. 'неопалима купина' which is only associated with the religious context under discussion. Strikha used the shortened form 'купина' (the noun without the adjective) which has one unmistakable sense in the religious context and is a perfect functional match for the original full phrase. We observe the emergence of another verbally different tradition which renders 'bush' as a literal and non-poetic 'кущ' ('кущ, що горить і не згорає'), e.g. in the Divine Office of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church [Молитвослов 2015:1011]. It is not applicable to claim that this violates the existing tradition of Ukrainian religious translation as it is the very Church that insert and blesses this tradition, but the usage of a non-highly formal lexeme will disperse the condensed power of this word which it has acquired by the millennium-long accepted usage. The readership will have more loosely associations for interpreting this passage from Chaucer, if the variant 'кущ' acquire a wider currency among believers and speakers.

The Anglophone liturgical tradition gives no space for translators to experiment with the word 'mayde'. All the translators used the accepted term 'maid' (sometimes paralleled with the variant 'maiden'), which is a good equivalent for the Old Hebrew 'עלמה', similarly being ambivalent by combining an unmarried woman's young age and her possible, but non-obligatory virgin status. This is the word from the Bible (Is. 7:14) that caused so much disputes and disasters later on. Like the translators of the Septuagint, Matthew (1:23) mistranslated the biblical verse and employed the Greek 'παρθένος', accidentally stressing the sexual semantics [Seidman 2006:39]. Taking in account the age and typical behaviour of a young Christian, it is highly probable that a young unmarried woman is a virgin, though this is not a most important precondition as it is in pagan and courtly stories about dragons and virgins.

Chaucer was in a difficult situation: from the semantical perspective, the lexemes 'mathen' and 'virge' might act better as an opposition to 'moder', but their usage was rather limited, so the author opted for the wide-spread word 'mayde' to build his poetic opposition on. Although this word is very good for Mary's biblical contexts, the opposition 'maid-mother' could also stand for an unmarried mother or seduced girl.

The Ukrainian translation is very expressive: Strikha introduced the phrase 'діва-мати' (virgin-mother) which sharply divided the marital status. Strikha's translation provoked a question whether a similar ambivalent word exist in today's Ukrainian. The question can be resolved by referring to the Church Slavonic hymns and their translations into New Ukrainian. The Church Slavonic 'отроковица' (teen-girl) [e.g., Великий сборник 1990;242], which can be taken as a full equivalent for the Old Hebrew lexeme, is rarely rendered almost as transliteration: 'отроковиця' [e.g., Малий октоїх 1938:6]. In the General Regionally Annotated Corpus of

Ukrainian (Version 9) [Shvedova 2017-2020], the lexeme ‘отроковиця’ is recorded 31 times (0,05 per million). It is very rare, because the male counterpart ‘отрок’ is recorded 1969 times (3.11 per million) but it can prepare ground for popularizing the female-gendered form. Besides, the analysis show that ‘отроковиця’ is used in today’s texts, so it has a chance to get a wider currency, too, and contribute to the application of synonyms which denotes ‘діва’ (recorded 10058 times, i.e. 15.90 per million).

In the religious domain, intercultural analysis draws interesting conclusions every now and then. Preliminarily, Chaucer’s simple phrase ‘blissful Queene’ does not cause a lot of pain for translators as it is so easy to address to everyday religious praxis and deploy a cliché. Both English and Ukrainian translators reproduced the original image well: in New English, it is ‘queen’, in New Ukrainian, it is ‘цариця’. Both lexemes are supported by quotes from liturgical books. Yet, the etymological perspective can always play a trick. While ‘queen’ derives from the Old English ‘cwen’ (woman, wife), ‘цариця’ is a transformation of the name of the Roman Emperor Julius Caesar [cf. Shmiher 2019:227]. Thus, it sounds that the usage of this lexeme reverse the order and puts the human nature before the Divine essence. A better option without any etymological reverberation of the human essence is ‘владичиця’ (sovereign lady) which is another widespread title of the Virgin Mary.

4. Divinity in the detail

Sister Mary Madeleva connecting the second stanza of the Prologue with an antiphon of Matins (more traditionally Compline and Prime) of the Little Office, a researcher’s attention may skip the text which was a direct prototext for Chaucer. This is Oratio LVI (al. LV) of St. Anselm of Canterbury from which the image of ‘lily flour’ was borrowed. Considering Chaucer’s abun-

dant translation activities, he appreciated such popular Marian prayers written by St Anselm and transfused some lines into English that fit Madame Eglentyne's devotional intentions.

The prototext 'florens ut lilium' was transformed into 'lily flour' which is labelled as a tautology by a pedantic reader, but which can be explained by the difficulty of interpreting Palestinian botany. What is translated traditionally as 'lily' in European languages is not a botanical lily (*Lilium candidum*, Madonna lily), but rather a flower in general [Nelson's 1995:1005]. In West European civilization, St Ambrose, St Jerome, Venerable Bede and many others symbolically connected Jesus Christ and chastity via the white lily that later started denoting the Virgin Mary. This merged image 'whyte lily flour' also symbolically combined both the theological truth and the Catholic tradition.

In translations, thus, translators have three options: a) to preserve 'lily'; b) to keep to 'flower'; or c) remain the merged tautological image. Lipscomb applies the general term 'Flower' and – by rhyming with 'Power' – gives it an additional associative overtone. Wordsworth kept the merged image 'white Lily-flower' (also rhymed with 'power' and 'dower') and his example was followed by later translators, among which only Coghill modified the phrase with the superlative 'whitest'.

St Anselm's prayers and meditations have not been translated into Ukrainian and they do not circulate as texts in Ukrainian religious discourse. So, in the Ukrainian translation, Strikha used the term 'лілея' (lily), thus staying the only one who tried to avoid unnecessary excessive and tautological poeticity. Taking into account the power of rhyming, rhymes for 'лілея' are not very successful (inflected forms: 'Лілеї' (lily) – 'моєї' (my) – 'усієї' (whole)), as the rhymed words cannot serve as key words for interpretation. In Ukrainian religious culture, lily is similarly associated with purity and love as well as the Annunciation [Жайво-

ронок 2006:338], which is a very fortunate coincidence that in English, white lilies are called Annunciation lilies. The Ukrainian image of the lily is rather a good equivalent as some scholars believe that the biblical lily is the lotus, which can be translated by the Ukrainian term 'водна лілія' (water lily).

Time-distance texts hide a lot of riddles for contemporary readers, sometimes it refers to openly understandable textual fragments which turn to be misconceptions. Line 467 contains an interesting albeit mysterious image: 'mayde Mooder free'. The final 'free' is rhymed with 'Deitee' and 'lighte' that are also important for divine description. The MED UofM suggests a bundle of interpretations connected with the noble status contrary to enslavement. As the Virgin Mary was never an object of slave-themed discussions, we should tend to see the underlining of Her noble status where She is noble in manner and appearance. This usage is accepted in Middle English as an epithet of compliment, but later this sense died out.

Not all translators felt the necessity to substitute this word for a more impressive and obvious phrase. Wordsworth, Nicolson and Kline preserved the original, but already misleading 'free'. Most translators did translate this lexeme: Tatlock and NeCastro opted for 'noble'; Hopper, for 'gracious'; Coghill invented the phrase 'chaste and free'.

However, what if the word 'free' stays here for another pagan survival or Chaucer's pun joke? What if 'free' is not an adjective, but a noun? It could have been a name, i.e. the name of the goddess of love, sex and marriage – Frie (alternative spellings: Fre, Frea) whom we are grateful for the name of Friday. Could it be a secret message that Frie is the Deity of Light? Or vice versa: in appraising the Virgin Mary, did Chaucer apply long-left but not forgotten pagan poetics? This way of reasoning looks like overinterpretation, especially in the context of a sheer coincidence that

Frie is the goddess of Friday, and the hero of the hypothesized allusion in the phrase 'on the brest soukyngē' – St Nicholas – as an infant would suckle but once on Fridays.

The Ukrainian translation was impacted on by the rules of prosody: Strikha translated the puzzling 'free' as 'щасна' (happy, lucky). It is rhymed with 'незгасна' (undimmed) and 'безмежна' (infinite) that render the aura of Christian divinity. However, the initial key 'щасна' is not satisfactory as the image of the 'happy Theotokos' is not typical in Ukrainian liturgical tradition. The emotional scale of the Virgin Mary is disbalanced towards the solemn and tranquil feelings. The phrase 'Rejoice, Mary' reiterated in Marian akathysts and troparia presupposes the change of Her mood from sadness to joy. Thus, Strikha's choice is unmotivated from the perspective of liturgical discourse, but his usage of the supportive rhymes shadows the analysed emotion-term and makes the general impression which exactly correlates with Ukrainian religious perception.

The Middle English 'quethen' was conjugated variably, among them it was 'quod' which was chosen by Chaucer, though it was not a dominant form, but, coincidentally, it looks the same as the Latin word 'quod'. Did it happen because Chaucer wanted still to give a touch of Latin into his text? Perhaps, as Latin was not only the official language of the Church, but also the Sacred Language? This lingual choice finally caused the translators' triple attitude to the original word. Omission was a way-out for Tatlock and NeCastro. Lipscomb reduced the whole poem by half, so it is not surprising that this 'inconsistency' is not in his text. The rest translators can be divided into archaizers and modernizers: Wordsworth and Kline rediscovered the archaic form 'quoth', while Hopper, Coghill and Nicolson used the modern form 'said'. The modernizers lost a flavour of separating the speech of the narrator. In Ukrainian, the very passage reads poetically smoothly and evokes no excessive thoughts.

Madame Eglentyne tells a very painful story: it is very gentle and kind in the beginning and bloody and dirty in the end. This contrast laid in the story cannot exist without a contrast in the Prologue, but the Prologue's contrasts are very delicate and based on the play of interpretations. This influences translation quality assessment as an analysts' attention should not only attend to semantical and grammatical challenges but also try rendering the historical and cultural experience of the author writing their literary piece. This advances the point that the so-called 'modernizations' are an undefined genre which can find its place in the scale of translation genres, somewhere between translation, transfusion, adaptation and imitation. The translations from Chaucer show that all the 'modernizations' are fully-fledged translations, and the range of translation solutions does not provide the background for dividing the long history of translations of Chaucer's into the periods of modernizations and of translations. The change of historical and cultural experience which generate the necessary emotional impact is identical from the 18th century up till now.

All the translators faced the problem of the changed status of liturgical texts which is eased by the stable status of the biblical prototext. The use of different languages is also important due to their status, but now their status has changed, and so has the textual flavour. The reader is getting more distant from the original text in the cultural sense, and the original values are not values any more for contemporary readers. This also means that the original text has changed its status by losing old sacred blocks and acquiring new – but still doubtful – senses.

Thus, Chaucer's collage technique is, too, in danger when only plain text is seen, imagined and interpreted. The significance of comments rests unchanged, but comments usually reach the prepared reader and stay unattended by lay readers. Considering

today's British or American Anglicans and Ukrainian Orthodox or Catholics of Byzantine Rite, the underappreciated Catholicism-based collage artistry in the Prologue is not mourned by many. What is more, there is more similar than dissimilar in its English-Ukrainian cultural juxtaposition when one has to discuss the Prologue's impact on contemporary emotional and aesthetical tastes.

References

- Boyd B. Our Lady according to Geoffrey Chaucer: Translation and collage // *Florilegium*. 1987. Vol. 9. P. 147-154.
- Broughton L. "The Prioress's Prologue and Tale" // *Sources and analogues of The Canterbury Tales*. Vol. 2. Cambridge; Rochester, NY: D.S. Brewer, 2005. P. 583-648.
- Чосер Дж. Кентерберійські оповіді: у 2 ч. Ч. 2. Львів: Астролябія, 2019. 544 с.
- A Commentary on the Holy Bible by various writers / ed. by J. R. Dummelow. New York: Macmillan Co, 1978. cliv, 1091, [1] p.
- Ellis S. Translated Chaucer // *Chaucer at Large: The Poet in the Modern Imagination*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000. P. 98-120.
- Frick D. Polish Sacred Philology in the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation: Chapters in the History of the Controversies (1551–1632). Berkeley: University of California, 1989. XI, 288 p. (Publications in Modern Philology 123).
- Larson E. Telling New Tales: Modernizations of Chaucer in the Eighteenth Century, PhD thesis. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas, 2016.
- Madeleva Mary. Chaucer's Nuns and other essays. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press. 1965. 147 p.
- Малий октоїх / укр. пер. М. Кобрина. Луцьк, 1938. 195 с.
- Молитвослов: Часослов – Октоїх – Трійдь – Мінея. Львів, 2015. 1373 с.

- Seidman N. *Faithful Renderings: Jewish-Christian Difference and the Politics of Translation*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 2006. 312 p.
- Shmiher T. *St. Petro Mohyla's Catechism in Translation: A Term System via the Prism of Axiological Modelling and Cultural Matrix // Languages – Cultures – Worldviews: Focus on Translation / ed. by A. Glaz. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. 2019. P. 221-236.*
- Shvedova M., Waldenfels von R., Yaryhin S. et al. *GRAC: General Regionally Annotated Corpus of Ukrainian*. Kyiv, Lviv, Jena, 2017-2020. Available at uacorp.us.
- Sydorenko S. *Rewriting Chaucer: Some Dimensions of Middle English – Modern English translation // Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences. 2011. Vol. 10 (4). P. 1462-1472.*
- Sydorenko S. *A victim of prudishness: Chaucer's Miller's Tale re-told over the centuries // Babel. 2019. Vol. 65 (2). P. 200-221.*
- Великий збірникъ. Ужгород, 1990. 974 с.
- Nelson's new illustrated Bible dictionary / ed. by R. F. Youngblood. Nashville et al., 1995. xii, 1128 p.*
- Жайворонок В. *Знаки української етнокультури*. Київ, 2006. 703 с.

Questions for discussion

1. How well do you know biblical poetics? Why?
2. Can you decode main biblical symbols in any literary text?
3. How knowledgeable are you about the liturgical practices of your Church?
4. Provide samples of religious poetry from Ukrainian and other literatures. What are their poetic similarities and dissimilarities?
5. Explain why the time span is so great between Chaucer's original and Strikha's translation, though 'The Canterbury Tales' were considered a classic text in the 15th century.

Lecture 7:**JOHN MILTON'S WRITINGS IN UKRAINIAN TRANSLATIONS**

1. Overview of translations
2. Oleksandr Zhomnir as the translator of *Paradise Lost*
3. Stylistic problems of translation
4. 'Royal' English style

1. Overview of translations

John Milton being a renowned epic poet since his lifetime, his translated writings became part of Ukrainian literature much later: at first via Russian-language translations (by Ukrainian writer Petro Hulak-Artemovskiy in 1817), later the greatest Ukrainian literatus Ivan Franko started translating Milton's *Samson Agonistes* and published the full Ukrainian translation in 1913 (remaining the only one till today). Despite the time span between the then publication and today's reader, this translation does not sound outdated, and it can satisfactorily perform all informative and aesthetic functions. The twentieth-century translations of Milton's writing were neither numerous, nor scarce, but nobody managed to perform a deed for Ukrainian literature in translating *Paradise Lost*.

2. Oleksandr Zhomnir as the translator of *Paradise Lost*

Only after 30 years of translational pursuits was the task completed due to the talent of Oleksandr Zhomnir (1927-2018), a native of Rivne Region in Ukraine, alumnus of the Ivan Franko University (Lviv) and the Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages (Kyiv), "candidate of linguistics" (equal to PhD) at the Mykola Hohol Pedagogical Institute (Nizhyn). The span of the translator's life was dedicated to teaching and translating, so Ukrainian readers can enjoy masterpieces by British and American authors

like William Shakespeare, Somerset Maugham, Emily Dickinson and John Steinbeck. The area of his academic interests was the poetical and stylistic issues of translating Taras Shevchenko's poetry into English. This is why his understanding of verse translation goes in depth and becomes very insightful.

This is no surprise that the translator approached his task with numerous and enormous precautions and reached very good results. Milton's text sounds like a symphony of Baroque tonalities and associations (that is mention in Translator's Note (p.7)). Simultaneously, it elucidates some reasons why some textual strategies of Milton's writings stay untranslatable for Ukrainian lingual poetics as of today. The regained religiosity after the fall of Communism opens the door wide for guessing and acquiring the emotional overtones of Christian associations by Ukrainian common readers.

3. Stylistic problems of translation

It is real pleasure to read the text which is full of combined haughty lexis and everyday vocabulary, though in the original the highly formal style is followed in the whole piece. Let us compare the excerpts from Book 10:

Meanwhile the hainous and despightfull act
Of *Satan* done in Paradise, and how
Hee in the Serpent, had perverted *Eve*,
Her Husband shee, to taste the fatall fruit,
Was known in Heav'n; for what can scape the Eye
Of God All-seeing, or deceive his Heart
Omniscient, who in all things wise and just,
Hinder'd not *Satan* to attempt the minde
Of Man, with strength entire, and free Will arm'd,
Complete to have discover'd and repulst
Whatever wiles of Foe or seeming Friend.

Про підле злодіяння Сатани –
Як той, ввійшовши серед Раю в Змія,
Звів Єву, котра спокусила мужа
Покуштувати доленосний плід, –
Дізнались Небеса, бо все відкрите
Для Божого всевидячого Ока
І серця всепроникного. Творець
Через диявольську спокусу зволив
Провести новостворених людей.
Суворо остерігши, Він їм дав
Розважний розум, вільну волю й силу
Долати вражі підступи й спокуси.

The striking inversion enables Milton to be extremely flexible and precise. Ukrainian inversion is not so impressive as an atypical gesture, but practicing it very often, the Ukrainian appreciate the true value of emotional power in inverted sentences. The lexis of the translation has absorbed a great amount of that of the Ukrainian recension of the Church Slavonic language ('*муж*', '*небеса*', '*все-видящий*', '*вражий*'). The translated imagery correlates with images which are living in Ukrainian folklore and original poetry (e.g. All-Seeing Eye in Taras Shevchenko's classical poem 'Half-Wit'). The image of the 'omniscient heart' is rendered as 'all-entering heart', and it is a good match to the way of speaking about the 'eye'. The translator paid a colossal attention to prosodic features of the original: although the Ukrainian translated line is one or two syllable longer than the English original one, the number of sounds is even less (app. 25 sounds) than in the original (app. 28) that makes the text easier for pronouncing and, thus, reciting.

Religious discourse does not share a stable unified standard of verbal expression. Its genres often intertwine with poetic text types that it becomes difficult to claim the typological orientation and function of a text. The following excerpt (Book 1) seems to have been misjudged by the translator who saw the author's poetic meditation over his place in the world instead of the author's prayer-appellation to the Lord as a sign of the sincerest piety:

What in me is dark	Ожить
Illumine, what is low raise and sup- port.	Дозволь померлому і засіяти Погаслому в мені.

Dark sides of a person be wiped out by the illumination of God's benevolence and mercy while God's aid is always necessary. In the translation, the text is miraculous triggering the idea of resurrecting the past or some past images. Evidently, there is more Christian hope to become a better person in the original

than in the translation. This strategy shows how subtle some religious genres are and what delicate strategies they can demand to be rendered to the full extent of their interpretative potential.

4. 'Royal' English style

Mainly untranslatable stayed the 'Royal' English style, as Ukraine has millennia-old republican traditions which cherished verbal culture focusing on individual and national freedom, but neglecting the importance of the stately and social hierarchy. Partially, it is visible in the beginning of Book 2:

High on a Throne of Royal State, which far
Outshon the wealth of *Ormus* and of *Ind*,
Or where the gorgeous East with richest hand
Shows on her Kings *Barbaric* Pearl and Gold,
Satan exalted sat, by merit rais'd
To that bad eminence; and from despair
Thus high uplifted beyond hope, aspires
Beyond thus high, insatiate to pursue
Vain Warr with Heav'n, and by success untaught
His proud imaginations thus displaid.

Powers and Dominions, Deities of Heav'n,
For since no deep within her gulf can hold
Immortal vigor, though opprest and fall'n,
I give not Heav'n for lost. From this descent
Celestial vertues rising, will appear
More glorious and more dread then from no fall,
And trust themselves to fear no second fate.

Високо на врочистому Престолі
У блиску срібла, злата й самоцвітів,
Що геть потьмарили б усі скарби
Країн Ормузу й Інду чи палаців,
Де осипає перлами владик
В пишноті варварській застиглий Схід, –
Сів Сатана. Піднявшись гордовито
З безодні безнадії та відчаю
В нестримнім пориванні щонайвище,
Не зрікшись боротьби проти Небес,
Зневаживши жахне падіння в Пекло, –
Він гордо мовив так: «Небесні сили!
Хоча пригнічені ми, се ім'я
За правом – наше. Бо нема тюрми,
Щоб небожителів замурувала.
Достойна доблесть вирветься відсіля
Іще славніша й неподоланна,
Ніж до Війни, і наша честь і слава
Яскравіше засяє, ніж було
Колись. Тепер нам нічого втрачати.»

The point is not only in rendering terms like '*Royal State*' or '*Powers and Dominions*', but even the collocations 'exalted sat', 'high uplifted', 'displaid his proud imaginations' evolve aristocratic or kingly associations. The lexeme '*Barbaric*' may not show the

derogatory, uncivilised nature of remote lands, but stress their otherness and non-possession of 'our' realm. The Ukrainian text is more frivolous by incorporating formulaic folklore phrases (cf. 'срібла, золота й самоцвітів', 'честь і слава') and low colloquial senses ('зеть' vs. Eng. 'far'). Thus, translating this literary piece into Ukrainian, the translator contributes to the Ukrainian linguoculture by stimulating searches for highly formal vocabulary.

However, this text is much more hero-centered. In this aspect, it does correlate with Milton's view of the main conflict in *Paradise Lost* where the battlefield is not the place for struggle between the Evil and the Good, but between the Hero and the Conditions. England's knightly culture is not so vivid in the original as the Ukrainian heroic Cossack-like poetic style in the translation. The idea of heroic deeds and hopes is reiterated too frequently: 'піднявшись гордовито з безодні безнадії та відчаю, 'не зрікшись боротьби', 'зневаживши жахне падіння'.

Ivan Franko used to remark that 'Samson Agonistes' is more patriotic, than religious. Similarly, 'Paradise Lost' is more than a religious poem: it mirrors England's struggle between Republic and Monarchy in the mid-17th century. That is why extended commentaries to this writing are so critical. They should show the informative background lacking among today's readers and the emotional supremacy of the images selected.

Further reading:

Andričik M. The long journey of Milton's "Paradise Lost" into the Slavic world // World Literature Studies. 2021. Vol. 13, no. 3. P. 68-80.

Questions for discussion

1. What other texts from English Restoration Literature can you name?

2. What is the correlation between the styles of English Restoration and Ukrainian Baroque?
3. What other stylistic problems did you track in the cited fragments?
4. Is there any way of creating 'Royal Ukrainian'?
5. Are other Slavonic histories of translating Milton's writing the same like the Ukrainian one or different? Why?
6. Provide your assessment of Milton's writings in today's canon of world or European literature.

Topic 8:**SOCIOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF TRANSLATION PRIZES:
THE CASE OF THE HRYHORIY KOCHUR LITERARY PRIZE**

1. Overview of translation prizes in Ukraine.
2. Personalia of the Laureates
3. Sociological calculations and comparisons
4. Prospects

1. Overview of translation prizes in Ukraine

In the Ukrainian literary space, several awards aim at honouring the work of translators. The oldest one is the Maksym Rylskyi Prize, founded in 1972. It is awarded by the National Union of Writers of Ukraine for achievements in the domain of Ukrainian artistic translation. Since 1989, the literary magazine 'Vsesvit' has been granting the Mykola Lukash Prize 'Ars Translationis' for the best translation or the best paper on translation which is published within the year in the very magazine. Another prize to distinguish poetic translation as well as poetry is the Vasyl Mysyk Literary Prize (established in 1995 under the aegis of the National Union of Writers of Ukraine). The French Embassy in Ukraine celebrates the best Ukrainian translation from the French language in the framework of the Hryhoriy Skovoroda Prize (since 2001). In 1981, the National Union of Writers of Ukraine initiated the Ivan Franko International Literary Prize, which is awarded for translations and for the popularization of Ukrainian literature abroad. Locally, there are a number of prizes awarded by Ukraine's Regional Councils, and these prizes celebrate a wide range of literary activities, including translation. The Mykhailo Vozniak Prize of Lviv Regional Council awards achievements in the domains of literary studies, criticism and translation; the Fedir Potushniak Prize of the Transcarpathian Regional Council includes

the nomination 'Literary translation'; the Panas Myrnyi Prize of Poltava Regional Council celebrates important publications in literature and literary studies which can incorporate translations.

In 2009, the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine established a new Prize – the Hryhoriy Kochur Literary Prize. Its task was to mark outstanding achievements in the field of poetic translation and translation studies. The first laureate was named in 2010. The prize was suspended in 2016 and 2017, and it was resumed in 2018, following the updated regulations. This prize is important in Ukrainian cultural space as it is a Ministry-level prize and it is the only prize which focuses specifically on translation research.

2. Personalialia of the Laureates

The prize has been existing for nine years (excluding a two-year break). It has been awarded seven times, and twice it was awarded to two laureates simultaneously. The merits dealt with various aspects of verse translation as well as some features of translation research.

2010 – Andriy Sodomora (born in 1937, resident of Lviv) was awarded this prize for his translations from Old Greek and Latin literatures [*cf.* Андрій Содомора 2013]. He has been translating for over 55 years. His translations of Horace's poetry were distinguished by the Maksym Rylskyi Prize in 1986.

2011 – Roksolana Zorivchak (1934–2018, resident of Lviv) was distinguished with prize for a sum of papers dealing with translation history and especially for recognizing her contribution to the foundation of Kochur Studies as a separate branch of translation history [*cf.* Роксолана Зорівчак 2011]. Her academic interests were connected with translating idioms and realia as well as the contribution of artistic translation to Ukrainian nation-shaping.

2012 – Vsevolod Tkachenko (1945–2018, resident of Kyiv) was acknowledged for his translation anthology of the French

love poetry 'A Garden of Divine Poems: A topical anthology from the 11th to 20th centuries' [Сад божественних поезій 2011]. He is known for translating a lot from Francophone literatures. He also compiled a pioneering translation anthology 'The Poetry of Africa' [Поезія Африки 1983].

2012 – Olena O'Lear (born in 1976, resident of Kyiv) was honoured the Kochur Prize for her translations of the Anglo-Saxon epic 'Beowulf' [Беовульф 2012] and of 'The Legend of Sigurd and Gudrún' by J. R. R. Tolkien [Толкін 2010]. She is a prolific translator from Anglophone literatures, esp. Irish belles-lettres. As a researcher (PhD in Literary Studies), she focuses on the theoretical study of verse and prosody.

2013 – Roman Hamada (1961–2017, resident of Lviv) received the prize for the translation series 'Treasures of the Orient' [Антологія перського гумору 2010; Алі Сафі 2011; Бахтіяр-наме 2012]. Studying at Lviv University (Russian Studies), he became interested in Persian, attended a two-year optional course in Persian and continued mastering this language by himself. Within the years 2007-2016, he published 11 translation collections of writings, translated into Ukrainian directly from Persian (sometimes from the original medieval manuscripts).

2013 – Olena Kryshtalska (born in 1943, resident of Lutsk) was awarded the prize for her translation anthology of the Spanish and Latin American poetry of the 16th to 20th centuries under the title 'Pulsing cords' [Пульсуючі струни 2010]. She started her professional career as a nurse, but her interest in foreign languages made her learn Spanish, Italian and Portuguese. She published three collections of her own poetry and three bilingual anthologies of 20th-century Argentinean poetry, the Spanish poetry from the 12th to 20th centuries and, finally, the above-mentioned volume. What is more, Olena Kryshtalska also translates Ukrainian poetry into Polish.

2014 – Serhiy Borshchevskiy (born in 1946, resident of Kyiv) was distinguished for his translations of poetic works by Pedro Calderón de la Barca (1600-1681), Amado Nervo (1870-1919), Leopoldo Lugones (1874-1938) and Jorge Luis Borges (1899-1986) [Борхес 2013; Кальдерон 2013]. He is a poet, translator and diplomat, who is famous for his contribution to the popularization of Spanish and Latin American authors in Ukraine.

2015 – Taras Shmiher (born in 1980, resident of Lviv) was awarded the Kochur Prize for his bibliographical research and edition 'Ukrainian Translation Studies in the 20th century' [Українське перекладознавство ХХ сторіччя 2013]. His academic interests focus on the historiography of translation studies as well as on translation quality assessment (as based on Early Ukrainian literature and its translations into contemporary Ukrainian and English).

2018 – Volodymyr Poyata (born in 1936, resident of Kyiv) received the prize for his translation anthology 'Reverberations' [Відлуння 2015] which contained Ukrainian translations of poems by Moldovan and Romanian writers of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century. He also published some collections of his translations of poetry by Mihai Eminescu.

3. Sociological calculations and comparisons

The first incomplete decade of the prize's existence may offer some ideas for consideration, evaluation and insights for prognostic development.

The **territorial presentation** of the locations connected with the laureates does not correspond with the existing translating centres in Ukraine. The comparable table looks in this way:

City of the laureate	Number of laureates
Kyiv	4
Lviv	4
Lutsk	1

Evidently, the capital always takes the highest position, taking into account the concentration of academic institutions, publishing houses and other conditions for successful careers and activities. This position of Kyiv is competed by Lviv that can be explained by two factors: 1) Lviv always rivalled for the stance of being the protector of the Ukrainian identity (as opposed to some Russified cities of Ukraine's South and East), so Lviv appreciated the social value of this prize; 2) possessing the cultural history of an overtly Ukrainian city, Lviv has collected powerful Ukrainian personalities since the Soviet time that this number of laureates is not a coincidence, but still a result of decades of volunteered cultural planning.

Lutsk is rather a coincidence, as this city is not so powerful on the contemporary intellectual map of Ukraine, though its literary traditions go back to the Ukrainian mediaeval state. Meanwhile, the absence of the representatives of Kharkiv really sounds odd because some largest publishing houses dealing with translations – 'Folio' and 'Klub simeinoho dozvillia' – are located in Kharkiv. At the same time, Uzhhorod has rich translations tradition, as it is the meeting point of Ukrainian, Hungarian, Slovak and Romanian cultures. Perhaps, the advertising policy of this prize is to be more active, especially during the stage of inviting candidates.

The prize is awarded to mark two **nominations**: translations and researches. These nominations are not distinguished equally and annually. The jury of the prize announces one winner (or two co-winners), but there is no condition to announce two laureates in each nomination every year. That is why the Hryhoriy Kochur Prize is the only prize which celebrates achievements in translation studies. The shares of prizes for translation and for translation papers are not equal:

Nominations	Number of laureates
Translation	7
Research in translation	2

The higher number of translations reflects the higher social request for translations instead of academic papers. In any case, the prize could have been expected to award purely theoretical topics, while the 2011 and 2015 prizes are dedicated to the branches of translation scholarship which are not regarded to be its centre. Both translation history and the bibliography of translation studies are still nation-oriented projects, which can assist directly or indirectly state-shaping, thus this choice of research areas was motivated by the social request as well.

English is a main language of translations in today's world, although the Kochur Prize has shown an attention-grabbing balance of **languages**:

Language of translation	Number of laureates
Spanish	2
Latin	1
French	1
English	1
Persian	1
Old Greek	1
Romanian and Moldovan	1

This table demonstrates the quality potential of the Ukrainian translation school. English is still a greatly prevailing language of the texts translated into Ukrainian, but openness to various civilizations secures the inner power of Ukrainian culture. The domination of European languages over Asian ones (6 vs. 1) is the result of repressive conditions for Ukrainian cultural construction which has been following its inertia since the late Soviet period. Writings in Oriental languages used to be translated only into Russian which was considered – and guaranteed in this way – to be a language of a higher status among other languages of the USSR. However, we have to admit the prevalence of the Romance

group of languages: 5 or 6 (the inexact number is caused by the controversy over the correlation between the Romanian and Moldovan languages).

The choice of languages influences the reception of literatures and the expansion of the possible canon of Ukrainian literature. A separate observation deals with how the **translated world literature** can be divided **into periods**. More laureates translated works of the pre-18th century than those of the post-19th century. This may be a sensitive craving for classicalness and canonicity that can be explained either by the wish to fulfill some niches which stay empty due to the colonial conditions of Ukrainian cultural progress or by the fear of identifying and searching for current 'classics'. Anyway, this attitude leaves space for founding a separate prize for honouring translations of writings by today's authors.

4. Prospects

Public reverberations depend a lot on mass media coverage. The quickest and most successful way of informing is via the Internet (albeit it is not regarded as always official and, thus, reliable). The phrase 'Literaturna premiya imeni Hryhoriya Kochura' (the official Ukrainian title of the Hryhoriy Kochur Literary Prize) had 290 online hits as of 19 September 2018, and its number increased up to 325 hits as of 30 December 2018. This increase is obvious as the regular prize was awarded on 16 November 2018.

The data about the numbers of applicants for the prize is not available for the public. These data would provide a more accurate vision of how the state's information policy covers Ukraine's cultural and academic space. The laureates' biographies do reveal some connections between the prize and Kyiv and Lviv Universities as well as the Shevchenko Scientific Society, but the wider reaching potential is to be built. Social awareness still needs more stimuli and motivating spurs which can both distinguish the exist-

ing achievements and generate new discoveries (new translations, new theoretical visions) in the future.

One of the promising outcomes of the Kochur Prize is the establishment of the Roman Hamada Literary Prize in 2018 which forms a succession line of initiative. As Roman Hamada was the Kochur Laureate in poetic translation, the prize in his honour is to especially stimulate translations in the domain of Oriental literatures. The prize was founded by the National Union of Writers of Ukraine and the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, and the 2018 awards celebrated translations from Arabic and Spanish.

Hopefully, all the prizes will contribute to shaping (reshaping, expanding or preserving) the translation component of Ukrainian literature. In any case, this can become visible only in the long-term perspective.

References

- Алі Сафі. Захоплюючі розповіді / з перс. пер. Р. Гамада. Тернопіль: Богдан, 2011. 247 с. (Скарби Сходу).
- Андрій Содомора: біобібліогр. покажч. / уклад. М. Кривенко; Львів. нац. ун-т ім. Івана Франка, Наук. б-ка. Львів, 2013. 348, [16] с. (Укр. біобібліогр. Нова серія; чис. 31. Біобібліогр. вчених ун-ту).
- Антологія перського гумору / пер., упорядкув. та заг. ред. Р. Гамади. Тернопіль: Богдан, 2010. 528 с. (Скарби Сходу).
- Бахтіяр-наме / з перс. пер. Р. Гамада. Тернопіль: Богдан, 2012. 124, [3] с. (Скарби Сходу)
- Беовульф / пер. Олена О'Лір. Львів: Астролябія, 2012.
- Борхес Хорхе Луїс. Вибрані поезії / з ісп. пер. С. Борщевський. Львів: Кальварія, 2010. 160 с.
- Відлуння / пер. В. Поята. Київ: Пульсари, 2015.
- Кальдерон Педро. Стейкий принц. Дама-примара: п'єси / пер. з ісп. С. Борщевського. Київ: Кордон, 2013. 249 с.

Поезія Африки / пер. з фр. В. Ткаченко. Київ: Дніпро, 1983. 267 с.
Пульсуючі струни / пер. О. Криштальська. Луцьк: Волин. обл.
друкарня, 2010.

Роксолана Зорівчак: біобібліогр. покажч., 2004-2011 / уклад.:
Г. Домбровська, О. Пилипчук, У. Романюк; авт. передм. А. Со-
домора; Львів. нац. ун-т ім. Івана Франка, Наук. б-ка. Львів,
2011. 365, [8] с. (Укр. біобібліогр.: нова серія; чис. 30. Біобі-
бліогр. вчених ун-ту).

Сад божественних поезій: тисячоліття французькомов. любов.
лірики: темат. антол. XI-XX вв.: у 2 т. Т. 1. Київ: Просвіта,
2011. 187 с.

Толкін Дж. Р. Р. Легенда про Сігурда і Гудрун. Львів: Астроля-
бія, 2010. 480 с.

Українське перекладознавство ХХ сторіччя: бібліогр. / уклад
Т. Шмігер; Львів. нац. ун-т ім. Івана Франка, Наук. т-во ім.
Шевченка. Львів, 2013. 626 с.

Questions for discussions

1. What is the role of literary prizes for propagating specific writings?
2. How can prizes contribute to the quality of translations?
3. Do they have any impact on translators, their life and recognition?
4. Do you have any experience of benefitting from any literary prize as a reader?
5. What are relations between literary prizes and the book market? Can you share some specific observations?

Навчальне видання

ШМІГЕР ТАРАС
Рецепція сітрової літератури в Україні.
Окремі теми

Тексти лекцій
(Англійською мовою)

Формат 60×84 ¹/₁₆. Умовн. друк. арк. 6,51.

Зам. Наклад 100 прим.

Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка,
вул. Університетська 1, м. Львів, 79000.

Свідоцтво про внесення суб'єкта видавничої справи
до Державного реєстру видавців, виготівників
і розповсюджувачів видавничої продукції.

Серія ДК №3059 від 13.12.2007 р.

Шмігер Тарас

Рецепція світової літератури в Україні. Окремі теми = Reception of world literature in Ukraine. Selected topics : тексти лекцій / Т. Шмігер. – Львів : ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2022. – 112 с.

У лекціях представлено основні поняття та окремі теми з рецепції світової літератури в Україні: чотири теми присвячено українському літургійному перекладу, дві – рецепції англійської літератури, по одній – засадничим принципам і соціології перекладу. Завдання лекцій полягає у тому, щоб допомогти студентам усвідомити динаміку історичних процесів і виробити критичні навички для оцінки якості перекладу релігійних і часовіддалених текстів.

Розраховано на студентів перекладацького відділу.

УДК [821.091(100:477):81'25](043.3)(072)