

UDC 821.111-313.2:81'255

GEORGE ORWELL'S FAIRY STORY "ANIMAL FARM" IN UKRAINIAN VARIATIONS IN TERMS OF RETRANSLATION HYPOTHESIS

Votina D. O.

Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University

The article highlights the specifics of the dystopian novella "Animal Farm" by George Orwell from the perspective of the retranslation hypothesis developed by a French theorist of translation Antoine Berman. George Orwell, an English novelist, may be deservedly called the master of dystopian novels for his talent to reveal the disadvantages of a society and to foretell the consequences of political regimes in an implicative way. The analysis is held on the basis of five Ukrainian translations made in different ideological environments, the chronological distance between the first one made in 1947 and the last one accomplished in 1992 comprising 45 years. The retranslation hypothesis admits the existence of multiple translations of the same literary work, the first one tending to employ the domestication strategy, every following appealing to the strategy of foreignization. The individual author's lexical and stylistic devices comprise the background for justifying or rejecting the validity of the hypothesis. The analyzed phenomenon functions within a framework of the cultural approach in translation which has ushered a new era in treating the individuality of a translator as a creator of a target text which is equated with the authentic one. The multiplicity of translations forms the boundaries of the genre specifics, provides a reader with a right of option and presents an enormous space for a translation theoretician to conduct the analysis and to define the prevailing tendencies in translation at a certain time period. The retranslation hypothesis establishes an intercultural dialogue due to the relevance of a certain author or genre in a certain culture delivering the world masterpieces to the target audiences.

Key words: dystopia, retranslation hypothesis, George Orwell, global translation strategies.

Вотінова Д. О. Роман-притча "Animal Farm" Джорджа Орвелла в українських варіаціях з перспективи ретрансляційної гіпотези. Статтю присвячено дослідженню казкової повісті "Animal Farm" Джорджа Орвелла крізь призму ретрансляційної гіпотези Антуана Бермана. Перекладознавчий аналіз здійснено на матеріалі п'яти українських перекладів твору, що дало змогу зробити висновки стосовно перекладацьких стратегій та тенденцій, у межах яких інтерпретовано повісті-антиутопії.

Ключові слова: антиутопія, гіпотеза перекладної множинності, Джордж Орвелл, глобальні стратегії перекладу.

Defining the problem and argumentation of the topicality of its consideration. Modern translation studies is characterized by a peculiar interest in the plurality of the interpretations of a literary work and the problem of the translator's individual style. The multiplicity of translations has become a major focus of both Ukrainian (A. Fedorov, O. Cherednychenko, M. Novykova, O. Rebrii, S. Zasiakin) and foreign (A. Berman, K. Koskinen, H. V. Dastjerdi, A. Mohammadi) researchers. The topicality of the research is predetermined by the necessity to highlight the specifics of the lexical and stylistic devices of the dystopian genre on the basis of the Ukrainian translations from the perspective of Antoine Berman's retranslation hypothesis which hasn't yet been involved into the interpretational analysis of a literary dystopian work.

Setting the goals and tasks of the article. The article is aimed at verifying the validity of the retranslation hypothesis on the basis of dystopian novella "Animal Farm" (1945) by a prominent English novelist and essayist George Orwell and its Ukrainian translations made by I. Shevchenko (1947), I. Dybko (1984), Yu. Shevchuk (1991), O. Drozdovskiy (1991) and N. Okolitenko (1992). The object of the research is represented by the lexical and stylistic means of the dystopian novella "Animal Farm", the subject is specifics of their rendering into Ukrainian.

The outline of the main research material. According to R. A. Sytar, every translation inevitably bears trans-

lator's imprint – his individual perception of the original text distinct from the author's view. The individualization of the target text forms the preconditions for the reinterpretation of the original text, creating new stylistics, implication of individual artistic means and devices [4].

The phenomenon of retranslations is referred to the plurality of existing chronologically remote interpretations of a literary work. T. P. Andrienko assumes that despite the objectiveness of the linguistic content of any message, the real fact of communication presupposes the plurality of its interpretations: "If the plurality of possible interpretations is not desirable for the informative texts, ambiguity is a common characteristic feature of the literary texts, as far as many other 'creative' texts. Thus there is an option for different interpretations and, respectively, different translations" [1].

Antoine Berman, a French theorist of translation, was the first to introduce and describe the retranslation hypothesis. According to it, the first translation of a certain literary text is treated as an unaccomplished action; hence, it is to be completed by means of retranslation. Every first translation tends to be more naturalizing, more assimilative to the target culture, more domesticating; every next translation, on the contrary, reveals the exceptionality of the authentic text and preserves its linguistic and stylistic specifics [5].

The Persian researchers H. V. Dastjerdi and A. Mohammadi testify to the efficiency of the hypothe-

sis stressing the "otherness" of the original text in every following translation. [6, 180] Ukrainian researcher S. Zasiiekin comes to the same conclusion admitting the validity of the hypothesis. Moreover, he states that the phenomenon of retranslations may be explained due to the shifts of ideological paradigms with every new historical period [2, 72].

According to O. V. Rebrii, in the majority of cases the works that are subjected to the process of retranslation are the classical masterpieces of a certain author or genre. The researcher elaborates four approaches to define the phenomenon of retranslation treating it as realization of the source text potential, translator's potential, recipient's potential and target culture potential [3, 309]. In any case, the retranslation process is perceived as a positive phenomenon as far as it serves as a means of enriching the culture, unveiling the translator's creativity, analyzing different translation approaches, etc.

The fairy story "Animal Farm" was published in five Ukrainian variations: 1) "Колгосп тварин" by Ihor Shevchenko (1947); 2) "Хутір тварин" by Iryna Dybko (1984); 3) "Ферма "Рай для тварин" by Yurii Shevchuk (1991); 4) "Скотоферма" by Oleksandr Drozdovskyi (1991); 5) "Скотохутір" by Natalka Okolitenko (1992). The novella is endowed with deep allusiveness and symbolism, biblical motifs and the grotesque depiction of the literary reality. In addition to the ruling class embodied in pigs representing the Soviet communist leaders, the Manor Farm is inhabited by domestic animals standing for the social working class (Orwell draws a parallel with the Soviet phenomenon *proletariat*): two cart-horses named *Boxer* (6) (*Гнідко* (4) / *Добрилов* (3, 14) / *Боксер* (2) / *Боксер*(1) / *Боксер* (5)) and *Clover* (6) (*Конюшина* (4) / *Конєва* (3, 14) / *Конюшина* (2) / *Конюшинка* (1) / *Кловер* (5)). The only motto of the working horses is "I will work harder!" (6), which symbolizes the blind obedience of the working class and the humility before the dictatorship. The pretty but stupid white horse nicknamed *Mollie* (6) (*Марічка* (4) / *Мілочка* (3, 14) / *Моллі* (2) / *Моллі* (1) / *Моллі* (5)) embodies the image of bourgeoisie. The tame raven *Moses* (6) (*Мойсей* (4) / *Алексєєв* (3, 15) / *Мойсей* (2) / *Мойсей* (1) / *Мозус* (5)) encapsulates the image of the clergy and religious leaders, who were at the totalitarian power's beck and call. The zoonyms in the first interpretation of the novella by I. Shevchenko, namely *Гнідко and Марічка*, reveal the over-naturalizing translation tendency, as a result of which the animals from England are moved to the Ukrainian Carpathians, and the nickname of the goat *Muriel* (6) interpreted by the translator as *Дереза* (4) refers the readers to the Ukrainian folklore for children, namely the fairytale *Коза-Дереза*. On the contrary, N. Okolitenko's translation equivalents made by the means of transcription, remotes the original text from the recipient and is excessively foreignizing. I. Dybko's "free interpretation" provides individual modifications of the nicknames resembling last names of the communist party leaders. Some of the anthroponyms offered by the translator may be referred to the category of loaded names. For instance, the donkey *Benjamin* (6) turns in Dybko's translation into *Молчазніков* (3, 14), the nickname exposing the characteristic feature of the animal to be calm and quiet all the time despite the rapid

development of the revolution. The transformation of the goat from *Muriel* into *Мурка* (3, 14) most probably reveals the translator's specific intention to draw a parallel with the activity of the *Московский уголовный розыск* (*Moscow Criminal Intelligence*) agent operating during the revolution and World War I. However, such characterization fails in this case either due to the flawed associations or to the fact that this nickname is common for a cat rather than a goat.

George Orwell introduces numerous committees established by the animals, each carrying the responsibility for different spheres of social activity, namely *the Egg Production Committee for the hens, the Clean Tails League for the cows, the Wild Comrades' Re-education Committee, the Whiter Wool Movement for the sheep* (6).

The author espousing outspoken anti-fascist, anti-communist, anti-totalitarian views despised the USSR despotic leaders and their methods, thus, he expressed his political fury in the form of allegory, satire and grotesque concerning everything connected with the Soviet realia. The committees, the central governing bodies so common for the USSR period, are interpreted by the translators as *комітет виробництва яєць для курок, Ліга Чистого Хвоста – для корів, Комітет Перевиховання диких товаришів, Рух Білішої Вовни для овець* (4) / *Комітет продукції яєць для курей, Ліга чистих хвостів – для корів, Комітет перевиховання для неприсвоєних товаришів, Комітет за білішу вовну для овець* (3, 31) / *Комітет по виробництву яєць для курей, Ліга Чистих Хвостів для корів, Комітет приручення диких побратимів, Рух Білішої Вовни для овець* (2) / «Комітет по виробництву яєць» («Комвірай») для курей, «Спілка чистих хвостів» (Спілчисхвіст) для корів, «Комітет перевиховання диких товаришів» (Компервихдикт), «Рух за білу вовну» (Рухбілов) (1) / *Комітет з виробництва яєць, Ліга чистих хвостів для корів, Комітет з вторинної освіти диких товаришів, Рух за білу шерсть серед овець* (5).

The interpretation of the committees doesn't make any difficulties for translators. However, O. Drozdovskyi decides to make the allusion to the USSR more obvious providing the telescopic words commonly coined in the Soviet period. N. Okolitenko's translation *Комітет з вторинної освіти диких товаришів* is quite debatable as far as the wild animals could hardly receive *the primary one*, but probably could be domesticated by means of reeducation or rehabilitation.

Of peculiar interest are *the instituting classes in reading and writing* (6) provided for liquidation of animal illiteracy reproduced as *курси ліквідації неписьменності* (4) by I. Shevchenko and *курси ліквідації неписьменності, інакше – Лікнепи* (1) by O. Drozdovskyi. The translators refer the readers to the Ukrainian campaigns in the 1920–1930-s aimed at forced elimination of illiteracy, the evasion carrying a criminal responsibility. Other interpretations suggest the culturally unmarked equivalents *уроки читання й писання* (2) / *кляси, де навчались читати й писати* (3, 31) / *курси читання й письма* (5).

The approaches to the translation of the toponyms denoting other farms, located in the neighborhood with the Manor Farm, comprise a sufficient field for research:

One of them, which was named *Foxwood*, was a large, neglected, old-fashioned farm, much overgrown by woodland, with all its pastures worn out and its hedges in a disgraceful condition. [...] The other farm, which was called *Pinchfield*, was smaller and better kept (6).

The translators demonstrate creative approach to reproducing the toponymic units: *Foxwood* is translated as *Лисичий Гаї* (4) / *Лисичі* (3, 35) / *Лисячий Гаї* (2) / *Лисячий гаї* (1) / *Фоксвуд* (5), *Pinchfield* is reproduced as *Деруполе* (4) / *Куцополе* (3, 35) / *Лужок* (2) / *Вовче поле* (1) / *Пінчфілд* (5). To interpret the name of the farm *Foxwood* I. Shevchenko, Yu. Shevchuk and O. Drozdovskiy involve calquing; I. Dybko presents an analogue of an average country name characteristic of Ukrainian toponymy, N. Okolitenko applies transcription. The second example, *Pinchfield* I. Shevchenko and I. Dybko apply the calquing technique with the element *pinch* being stylistically marked. However, I. Dybko's variant *Куцополе*, obviously intended to describe the farm involving the adjective *куций* in the meaning of *small*, creates a wrong impression of a poor and effete farm despite the original description of it as a kept one. Yu. Shevchuk implies the diminutive noun *Лужок* apparently pointing at the small territory of the farm. O. Drozdovskiy's variant is probably formed in contrast to *Лисячий Гаї* opposing the neglected and the kept farms. N. Okolitenko yet again makes her choice to the advantage of transcription. Taking into consideration the variety of interpretations of the toponyms, Berman's hypothesis is recognized valid due to the domesticating strategy preferred by I. Shevchenko, N. Okolitenko tending to apply the strategy of foreignization.

The stylistic expressivity in the first translation made by I. Shevchenko demonstrates the abundance

of Ukrainian chronologically and territorially marked lexicon: *kicked off his boots at the back door* (6) – *Хвищнувши раз – другий, він скинув черевики біля заднього входу* (4), *drew himself a last glass of beer from the barrel* (6) – *хильнув останню склянку пива з бочки* (4), *barn* (6) – *клубня* (4), *began to chew the cud* (6) – *почали ремітати* (4), *to prance about* (6) – *пиндючтисся* (4), *cart-load* (6) – *бідка* (4) etc. Stylistic expressivity also saturates the target texts interpreted by the following translators; however, the percentage as compared to the first translation is relatively poor.

Conclusions and perspectives of further research in this field. The global reevaluation of the five translation variations of the dystopian novella by George Orwell has proved the validity of Berman's hypothesis. The first translation by I. Shevchenko dated 1947 is conducted under the motto of total naturalization. The applied strategy leads to substantial deviation of the literary images on the macro level and destroys Orwell's original stylistics. The chronologically lattermost interpretation by N. Okolitenko is made according to the principles of foreignization strategy neglecting the semantic specifics of the analyzed units which, consequently, degrades the aesthetic impression of the novella. The free interpretation in the performance of I. Dybko, made public in Smolenskyp Publishing House (USA), is quite a free-wheeling translation. Nicknaming the animals Романов, Марков, Джесов, Белов, Пінков, Конева, Молчазніков etc. the translator reveals the images intentionally veiled by George Orwell. The prospects of further research are predetermined by analyzing the literary works in terms of retranslation hypothesis on the basis of other dystopian novels and different genres to define the common translation approaches, tactics and strategies.

REFERENCES

1. Андрієнко Т. П. Інформаційні характеристики тексту як фактор реалізації стратегії перекладу / Т. П. Андрієнко // Мовні і концептуальні картини світу. – 2014. – Вип. 48. – С. 25–36.
2. Засєкін С. Динаміка художнього перекладу в контексті «гіпотези новотлумачення» / Сергій Засєкін // Актуальні питання іноземної філології. – 2015. – № 2. – С. 71–76. – Режим доступу: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/akpif_2015_2_15.
3. Ребрій О. В. Сучасні концепції творчості у перекладі : [монографія] / О. В. Ребрій. – Х. : ХНУ імені В. Н. Каразіна, 2012. – 376 с.
4. Ситар Р. А. Множинність перекладів як варіантність відтворення жанрово-стилістичних особливостей часово віддаленого першотвору / Р. А. Ситар // Науковий вісник Чернівецького університету. Германська філологія. – 2014. – Вип. 692–693. – С. 237–240.
5. Berman A. La retraduction comme espace de traduction / Antoine Berman // Palimpsestes. – 1990. – № 4. – P. 1–7.
6. Dastjerdi H. V. "Revisiting «Retranslation Hypothesis»: A Comparative Analysis of Stylistic Features in the Persian Retranslations of *Pride and Prejudice*" / H. V. Dastjerdi, A. Mohammadi // Open Journal of Modern Linguistics. – 2013. – № 3 (3). – P. 174–181.

SOURCES OF ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

1. Орвелл Дж. Скотоферма [Електронний ресурс] / пер. з англійської О. Дроздовського. – Режим доступу: http://95.46.98.226/lib/o/orvell_skotoferma.pdf.
2. Орвелл Дж. Ферма «Рай для тварин». Небиліця [Електронний ресурс] / [з англ. мови пер. Юрій Шевчук] / Джордж Орвелл // Всесвіт. – № 1. – К., 1991. – С. 75–112. – Режим доступу: <http://ukrlife.org/main/minerva/orwell1.htm>.
3. Орвелл Дж. Хугір тварин (вільний пер. з англ. І. Дибко, передмова Р. Кухара) / Джордж Орвелл. – Балтімор; Торонто : Укр. вид-во «Смолоскип» ім. В. Симоненка, 1984. – 98 с.
4. Оруел І. Колгосп тварин [Електронний ресурс] / [з англ. мови пер. І. Чернятинський] / Георг Оруел. – Мюнхен, 1947. – 91 с. – Режим доступу: <http://litopys.org.ua/novela/kolgosp.htm>.
5. Оруел Дж. Скотухугір: Казка [Електронний ресурс] / [пер. з рос. Н. Околітенко, передм. Н. Околітенко] / Джордж Оруел // Вітчизна. – 1992. – № 9. – С. 38–72. – Режим доступу: http://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Orwell_George/Skotokhutir/.
6. Orwell G. Animal Farm [Electronic resource] / George Orwell. – Access Mode: http://msxnet.org/orwell/animal_farm.pdf.