

# TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT AT THE CROSSROADS OF ETHNOLINGUISTICS AND ETHNOGRAPHY

## TARAS SHEVCHENKO'S *IRZHAVETS* IN ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

TARAS SHMIHER

*Faculty of Foreign Languages  
Ivan Franko National University  
in Lviv, Ukraine  
t\_sbmiher@ua.fm*

Ethnographic approaches to understanding a text and its cultural values have been scarcely developed from the viewpoint of linguistic verification in translation criticism. Methods of studying cultural material which focus on the environment and behaviour can be borrowed from Ethnography for identifying and assessing cultural values in the texts of an original and a translation. The case study is performed on the key personality in Ukrainian cultural history, the poet, artist and thinker Taras Shevchenko (1814–1861) whose poetic texts turned out to be prophetic for constructing the Ukrainian political nation out of ethnic mass and building the future Ukrainian nation-state.

‘Translation is museum’ is no longer an eloquent metaphor, but a multi-layered concept in the system of text typology. The starting point for the ethnographic analysis of the original-translation relations is collective memory as a textual category. Close to intertextuality which is oriented toward a variety of existing and connected texts, collective memory enables one to focus on the selectiveness of cultural information as actualized – really or probably – in a newly generated text.

Axiological values in the text should be interpreted via the symbolization of an event. This symbolization along with cultural compatibility, implications and misunderstandings offer a close set of criteria for textual comparisons. The finalized ethnographic system of contrasting an original and a translation contribute to the cultural interpretation of a text, so needed in translation criticism.

*In memoriam of  
200<sup>th</sup> birth anniversary of  
TARAS SHEVCHENKO,  
Ukrainian national Poet and Prophet*

Ethnolinguistics, ethnography and translation studies (TS) can be merged on several planes of cultural evaluation of writing. A piece of poetry, prose or drama will share poetics

common to the whole nation and generated by its social experience. Writings may be studied as demonstrations of shared philosophical space and contested ideologies (polysystems) or as acts of a person, raised according to everyday-life stereotypes and verbal clichés. A text will join everything in the smallest detail. This observation leads us to the basic rule of ethnolinguistic analysis: “each detail is worth studying, and each detail is important in order to understand other details and the contextual whole” (Sturge 2007, 80).

Many would argue that thinking or language-thinking<sup>1</sup> is mostly universal that makes any translation theoretically possible. Designing a method for cultural translation, Yengoyan differentiates culture as a potential set of categories of thought (the mental ability to categorize and abstract; culture's capacity to operate in situations not specifically given in a particular culture context) and culture as consciousness (part of the total mental capacity which is actualized or realized by or ‘in’ a particular culture) that are constructed on universal cognitive principles:

Universal forms of thought occur not only in terms of categories of thought, but also as intersecting structures of categories. In either case, the universal refers to the ability and potential of the mind to abstract, conceptualize and categorize in terms of various combinations of thought which are not determined by the content of thought. Most important is the assumption that this universal set of thought is a mental process characteristic of and shared equally by all human cultures” (Yengoyan 2003, 33).

However, a nation's experience is still unique, and it constructs structures that can be abstracted and understood, but may not be accepted by the target reader or culture. Here we come back to the principle of Linguistic Relativity that “the linguistic structures of different languages, which can be very diverse, encourage or oblige their speakers to pay greater attention to certain aspects of the world at the expense of others” (Armstrong 2005, 16). Language eases the perception of one type of information and resists another. Recent research supports the view that language does influence our thought regarding our perception of space, time, objects, substances, numbers, colours, shapes, and – what is more important for the translation analyst – events and other minds. As Boroditsky summarizes, “the private mental lives of people who speak different languages may differ much more than previously thought” (Boroditsky 2003, 920). Contemporary research makes us more attentive to the ways and contents of rendering source-language structures in target-language experience.

## METHODS

Two general methods of gathering evidence – or directions for providing comparative criteria – can be borrowed from ethnographic description: “the environmental strategy” and “the behavioural strategy”. The former means “observing external conditions that are

<sup>1</sup> This term was introduced by Ihor Kostetskyi (Костецкий 2001, 124).

thought to cause certain unseen states of affairs to result, according to certain general regular patterns or laws” (Jones 2003, 46). Here all attention is focused on such – perceptual – circumstances and situations in which the ethnographic phenomena are usually met. The latter method is based on the assumption that “only certain sorts of things can *cause* certain resulting actions” (Jones 2003, 47). The ‘cause-result’ scheme reveals certain hidden ethnographic facts (beliefs, historical events) that impact action. In fact, a translation analyst can refer to these methods as spatial and temporal axes of searching for a text’s cultural criteria and constructing a scheme for contrasting original and translated texts.

## TARAS SHEVCHENKO – THE POET OF THE VOICELESS

Bassnett’s depiction of the Chilean poet Pablo Neruda perfectly matches all poets who raised their voices against injustice and oppression:

Neruda saw the role of the poet as speaking for those who had no power to speak. The poet, for him, gave a voice to the voiceless. Elsewhere the poet has taken on the role of the conscience of a society, or as its historian. In some cultures, the poet is a shaman, a creator of magic, a healer. [...] If we consider how many times poets have been imprisoned, tortured, even killed, then we have some sense of the power that poet can hold (Bassnett Lefevre 1998, 58).

Taras Shevchenko (1814–1861) has become Ukraine’s national poet by deeply penetrating into Ukrainian mental structures and projecting the image of Ukraine as an independent and sovereign state. Living in the colonial period of Ukrainian history, Shevchenko laid the foundations of the contemporary national – read: political, social and psychological – worldview in his poetry. His poetry expresses his most significant ideas, addressed to the core of the Ukrainian essence – heart as a measure of all acts.

Highly educated, but imprisoned and exiled, Shevchenko could best serve his Motherland through his writing. He revolutionized the old means, giving them new conceptualizations; he was building a new vision of the whole social life, applying existing stereotypes and exploiting their ambiguities and implications.

His poem “Irzhavets”, written in imprisonment, refers to one of the most tragic events in the history of Ukraine. The 1709 Battle of Poltava, aka the Poltava Catastrophe, between the joint Ukrainian-Swedish military alliance and the Russian army, deprived Ukraine of the gradual and harmonious shaping of its statehood and turned it into Russia’s colony until 1917. The protagonists of this episode – Hetman Ivan Mazepa and Tsar Peter I – received the opposite characterizations in the discourses of the defeated and the winner: in Ukrainian historiography, the Ukrainian Hetman is a hero, and the Russian Tsar is an occupier; in Russia’s view, Mazepa is a traitor, and Peter is a strong ruler. However, Ukrainian political thought, which could be relevant for building an

independent state, was dynamic and changing. The formation it has now was much influenced by Shevchenko's genius and continued by later Ukrainian political thinkers.

#### NOTE ON TRANSLATORS

Shevchenko's "Irzhavets" had no chance of being translated in the Soviet Union, though his other poems were translated into many foreign languages and published in the USSR many times. Soviet Ukraine, with the formal sign of state power, was regarded as an inseparable part of the Soviet 'Empire', and additional thoughts about its separateness were dissident, harmful and persecuted.

The first English-language translation of this poem appeared in Toronto through the common efforts of Professor Constantine Henry Andrusyshen (1907–1983), a Canadian Slavist of Ukrainian origin, and Watson Kirkconnell (1895–1977), a Canadian poet and translator (Shevchenko 1964). The translation process usually proceeded in the following way: Andrusyshen made an interlinear of a poem, and Kirkconnell versified the prepared text. The outcome is very positive: the translators kept in mind the difference between Ukrainian and English-language readership and included sufficient commentaries to be very useful.

Vera Rich (1936–2009) was a British poet, journalist, historian, and translator of Ukrainian and Belarusian poetry. Her first translated collection of Shevchenko's poetry was published in 1961 under the supervision of the eminent Ukrainian linguists and literary scholars – Victor Swoboda and Pavlo Zaitsev. She translated Shevchenko's poems all her life, and her translations are recognized as the best translations of Shevchenko's poetry into English. The poem "Irzhavets" was translated in 1994 and included in the 2007 bilingual deluxe edition (Shevchenko 2007).<sup>2</sup>

#### COLLECTIVE MEMORY

Collective memory has not been used as a concept in Translation Studies. It intersects with another term, 'intertextuality', which has a lavish tradition of application. In the meantime, intertextuality is oriented toward a variety of existing and connected texts, while collective memory enables one to focus on the selectiveness of cultural information as actualized – really or probably – in a newly generated text. This turn to anthropocentrism previews some amount of motivated subjectification in allocating attention and specifying the most important pieces of a message.

The mention of Ukrainian hetman Ivan Mazepa's name immediately directs us to a specific stream of political and historical discourse where Mazepa is either a failed warrior for Ukraine's independence, or a betrayer of Russia's interests.

<sup>2</sup> The translators' different origins can open the discussion of regional features in their translations. As the selected excerpt for analysis is rather small, the application of the ethnographic term 'regionalism' cannot be verified in this article.

The analysis of Ukrainian collective memory in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century distinctly separates these two discourses from the real perceptions and evaluations, which are evident for the memory of the early 21<sup>st</sup> century. Thus, the identification of some resemblance between Shevchenko's poem and the Ukrainian historical folk song "Ой полети, галко..." grounds the intertextual – thus, poetical, lexical, ideological – connection between the two texts, but it also offers the key to understanding the real political observation and the way that Shevchenko modified it for creating a new nation-oriented discourse.

In reality, "a current society only recalls an event that has some sort of transhistorical value useful in helping its people make sense of their own lives" (Slampyak 2002, 19–20). Drahomaniv described the political essence of early 18<sup>th</sup>-century Ukrainian historical songs, stressing that the Ukrainian people were more analytical, enumerating all the hardships and injustices they suffered under the Russian government, and they were not politically synthetic, overlooking the loss of state independence as the source of all calamities (Політичні пісні 1885, VIII–IX).

The closest song about Semen Paliy and Ivan Mazepa corresponds with the general feeling of the then Ukrainians who paid more attention to personalities – Mazepa as part of the gentry and Paliy as representing the common people – they were unready for, and astonished by, Mazepa's striving for Ukraine's independence, thus staying suspicious or misled and leaving the critical Battle of Poltava outside public attention (Політичні пісні 1885, 68–69)

The cited song cluster about enslaved Cossacks and their chieftain Kost' Hordiyenko ("Ой полети, галко..." and other varied titles) describes the destruction of the Zaporozhian Host in Oleshky – a symbol of Cossack and Ukrainian freedom. The Cossacks lose their home, wealth and liberty; they cannot defend their rights because their weapons are now possessed by the occupants ('the lords'), and the Cossacks are either imprisoned or in the underground ('in the forest') (Політичні пісні 1883, 36–37).

The Poet took the line "Не стриміли б списи в стрісі" from the very song and applied it as a reproach for losing not their military power but their freedom and, thus, statehood. The connection with the folk song uncovers this orientation of Shevchenko's attention.

Evidently, collective memory is a dynamic phenomenon. That is why in the history of perception of Shevchenko's work we can define different types of Ukrainian readers:

- The Ukrainian reader during Shevchenko's lifetime knew folk songs very well, and the image of the Poet served the function of a Nation-Maker – along with the Ruthenian Trinity (1833–1837) in the context of the 19<sup>th</sup>-century Slavonic Renaissance – stressing the preponderance of the interests of the state and its key influence on the life of every individual though still on the abstract level in the direction to the past;
- The Ukrainian reader before and during the 1917–1920 National Revolution apprehended the appeal to unity for the independent state's sake, and the

collective memory, still being strong, could offer now some new incentives in the direction of the future;

- The Ukrainian reader of the Soviet times lost a great amount of folkloric memory. The new conditions (Communist Genocide, Nazi occupation, dissident movement) offered several interpretations of Shevchenko's works, often contradictory, but based on purely political grounds;
- The Ukrainian reader after the 1991 independence sees Shevchenko's *Irzhavets*' through the political prism where Mazepa is not so much a complicated historical figure, but an idealized and heroized person where motivated reasons do not always find proper in-depth explanations.

This very rough scheme shows what Shevchenko did for the Ukrainian nation, and how the Ukrainians (could) have interpreted his appeals. In this way, we approach a call for judging, which can be identified as the analysis of values. The text as a dynamic entity evokes specific values among specific readers at specific times.

## ANALYSIS OF VALUES

The traditional folk evaluation of the Poltava Catastrophe stayed within individualistic quotidian needs because that is what people saw with their eyes. Shevchenko's text marks a great political progress through a symbolic interpretation of the event. This symbolization also has an axiological value.

## THE SYMBOL OF 'REAPING THE WHEAT'

Wheat is one of the most symbolic plants in Ukrainian rituals and mentality. For the peasant, a good harvest always stands for well-being during winter life (compare the proverb "One summer day feeds the whole winter") and, thus, life in general. In Ukrainian (and Polish) apocryphal Christmas carols, reaping the wheat means the blessing of worthy work and an important enterprise.<sup>3</sup> In Shevchenko's text, the importance of fighting for Poltava is stressed by the fact that the blessing comes from Mother, the most important person in the family. The act of fighting is essential for Ukraine and its independence, entering the sphere of sacred duties and honourable chivalry.

The notion of blessing is not explained in any translation and is considered lost for an Anglophone speaker. The English idiom 'to reap the/a harvest of something', logically meaning 'to receive the good or bad results of past actions' (Free Dictionary), is also motivated by the Biblical reference "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" (KJV Galatians 6, 7). The reader's background is both positive (overlapping of knowledge) and negative (misleading conclusions). What is perceived as blessing in Shevchenko's text,

<sup>3</sup> I am grateful to Prof. Jerzy Bartmiński for this information.

is the pure outcome of the protagonists' deeds in the translations. Subsequently, the logic of the poem is reproduced well, but the author's judgement is annulled.<sup>4</sup>

### SYMBOL OF 'SPEARS IN THE THATCH'

The idiom "spears in the thatch" is one of Shevchenko's most obscure quotations. Researchers have correctly identified its link to the abovementioned folk song "Ой полети, галко..." that literally says: "Our spears are in the enemy's thatch, and we (Cossacks) are in the forest". A thatch is an ideal place for hiding this type of weapon, but as the Cossacks are weaponless and the enemy possesses it, they cannot continue the struggle. So, the sense of keeping weapons and preparing a battle is groundless. Another interpretation could be viewing spears as trophies (as in Andrusyshen and Kirkconnell's translation). There are two arguments against it: 1) thatches were not typical for buildings where landlords (mostly Poles, "enemy") resided; 2) trophies were usually kept on walls to be shown in public, while 'in the thatch' implies being hidden from direct sight. That is why the second interpretation does not sound plausible, either.

So, what did the spears do in the thatch? We can voice a belief that they were symbolically used as roof carriers, meaning: the Cossacks lost their battle, and the enemy wisely used their weapon for peaceful purposes. It compares with another Bible reference "they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks" (KJV Isaiah 2, 4). In the Ukrainian context, the situation, however, is absolutely negative: the Cossacks can't fight for the nation's independence anymore. Interestingly, tsar Peter I exploited Cossacks for building Saint Petersburg where 25 thousand Ukrainian Cossacks and peasants died under inhumane conditions.

The translators searched for an option, containing the sense of lost battle and the image of spears and thatches. The solutions may sound partially unrealistic: Andrusyshen and Kirkconnell explicated the suggestion about trophies; Rich overtly indicated the lost chance of fighting, but preserved the mystic image of "the roof of Tsar Peter". In any case, the idiom stayed open for readers' individual interpretation, supplied with sufficient information on the historical context.

### SYMBOLIC MOTHERS

In the first 27 lines of the poem, the author used three different variants of the same word 'mother': *мати* – *Матер* – *матір*. These phonetic variants share a common history and grammatical declination. They all come from the same Old Slavonic root 'mati' which is 'materē' in Genitive case (ЕСУМ 1989, 3:414), and in the historical perspective, 'мати' and 'матер' (newer form 'матір') were intermingled (*cf.* Срезневский 1902, 2:118).

<sup>4</sup> Andrusyshen and Kirkconnell mistranslated one phrase, writing "his Mother would give no counsel", while the academic text says "Mother advised him". The origin of this mistake may not be the translators' fault, but a misprint in the edition of Shevchenko's poetry, used for translation.

We can also judge that the semantics of these variants are not strictly discriminated, assuming that 'мати' is a basic noun, 'матер' refers to Church Slavonic and has dialectal colouring, and 'матір' is neutral or obsolete. All the three lexemes are used in religious discourse and may stand for Theotokos. However, Shevchenko did apply them differently, as shown by his other poems: 'мати' – mother in the family; 'Матер Божа' – Theotokos; 'матір' – solemnly or in historical context (СМШ 1964, 1:395–397). One could also doubt whether the division was not motivated by euphonic rules, but it really could be in one case ('мати' – 'пожати' – 'достати') while the parallel citation 'Матер Божа' – 'матір Січ' then contradicts the very rules. It makes us pay more attention to the semantic and symbolic discrimination of these three images.

Thus, in the poem there are three symbolic mothers:

1. The Nurturing Parent who cares for her children. This can be Mother Ukraine in relation to the Cossacks, but this reference goes deeper and dimmer. This could also be a metaphor for family relations among participants in the war (see discussion below) where Mother acts as the Highest and Fairest Judge, blessing the battle for independence.
2. Theotokos (God's Mother) is the protectress of the Cossacks and the suffering symbol for Ukraine. In Shevchenko's text, the Theotokos icon from the city of Irzhavets' is referred to as a historical fact: this icon shed tears before the Poltava Catastrophe and afterwards, auguring misfortunes for the Cossack land. The Divine interference here is associated with the blessing of the war for liberty.
3. Zaporizhian Sich, a Cossack military formation between the 16th and 18th centuries in Ukraine, was equivalent to a democratic republic where the Ukrainians could fully enjoy their rights and liberties. The Sich-as-Mother metaphor underlines that liberty is the basic value for the Ukrainians.

In translation, Andrusyshen and Kirkconnell linked the obliqueness of the Nurturing Parent with the previously mentioned chieftain Hordiyenko, but deciphered in the next phrase – "his Mother, our Ukraine". The Theotokos icon is named directly twice, but with different names – "the Virgin's icon" and "the icon of God's Mother". It is questionable whether these names have the same theological and ideological value. "Their Mother Sitch" is a loan-image followed by a historical and cultural note that introduces an Anglophone reader into the Ukrainian cultural context. Similarly, due to the textual closeness, Rich connects Hordiyenko and the 'first' mother, but that makes oblique space for the Ukraine-as-Mother interpretation without additional indication or explanation. Rich, too, keeps the image of "Mother Sich" which is eloquent in Ukrainian poetry and folklore. As for the Theotokos icon, the translator leaves Shevchenko's metonymies: "God's Mother would shed tears" and "They took God's Mother on their journey" as though it were not an icon, but the very Mary. This trope makes the text accessible for perception.



## CULTURAL COMPATIBILITY

Another criterion for evaluating a text's cultural components can be cultural compatibility (Jordan 1985, 109–110) which can offer an interpretation of proper names in the text. Proper names constitute a problem of perception as they involve background knowledge, lack of which turns an emotionally-loaded text into a historical description.

Shevchenko's text is deeply allusive even in place names. The excerpt under analysis contains 10 references to historical places indicating how literate and knowledgeable a reader should be in order to understand the poet's message.

Table 1. The list of references to the historical places referred to in Shevchenko's text

<i>Полтава</i> : The city of Poltava symbolizes the loss of Ukrainian independence after the 1709 battle when its residents supported the Russian army and the Ukrainian-Swedish alliance was defeated.	HCA and WK, VR: <i>Poltava</i>
<i>Бендери</i> : The city of Bender (Bendery) is a symbolic marking for political emigration, as it was here that the defeated Ukrainian and Swedish retreated. After Mazepa's death, the newly-elected hetman Pylyk Orlyk proclaimed the Ukrainian Constitution in 1710 here.	HCA and WK, VR: <i>Bendery</i>
<i>Фастів</i> and <i>Прилуки</i> : Fastiv and Pryluky were district and military towns where Cossack regiments were located.	HCA and WK: <i>Khvastiv</i> <sup>5</sup> , <i>Prilutsk</i> (mistakenly instead of Pryluky) VR: Fastiv, Pryluky
<i>Запорожся</i> , <i>Хортиця</i> and <i>Січ</i> : All the three names refer to the Cossacks' military formation 'Sich', located on the island of Khortytsia in the region of Zaporizhzhia (the territory 'beyond' the rapids of the Dnipro River). They stand for Cossacks' freedom-loving and independent state.	HCA and WK: <i>Zaporozhian camp</i> , <i>Khortitsia</i> , <i>Sitch</i> VR: –, <i>Khortysia</i> , <i>Sich</i>
<i>Великий Луг</i> : The Great Meadow was a vast territory along the Dnipro down from the island Khortytsia. It was very important for Sich, as it protected the Cossacks from danger and was an inexhaustible source of food.	HCA and WK: <i>the Great Meadow</i> VR: <i>Meadow</i>

<sup>5</sup> The variation of the town's official spelling explains why the translators transliterated the name differently.

<p><i>Україна</i>: Ukraine is the main topos of Shevchenko's Ukrainian-language writings which he projected as a political entity. In total, he used 'Ukraine' along with its several phonetic variants (<i>Україна, Україна, Вкраїна</i>) 263 times and 'Hetmanate' (<i>Гетьманщина</i>) 12 times while the place name 'Little Russia' (<i>Малоросія</i>), maintained by the Russian government, is mentioned only three times (СМШ 1964).</p>	<p>HCA and WK, VR: <i>Ukraine</i></p>
<p><i>Крим</i>: The Crimean Khanate was a real disaster for the Ukrainian population. Under the protection of the powerful Ottoman Empire and not having sufficient economic basis for its existence, it made predatory military expeditions and slave trade the major sources of its income. That is why the Crimea was the last place for the Cossacks to retreat, and it underlines the desperateness of the situation.</p>	<p>HCA and WK, VR: <i>Crimea</i></p>

Despite some minor – usually graphemic – distinctions, the success of both translations is rooted in the accessibility of cultural background, partially resolved through notes and commentaries and through a reader's general erudition.

#### IMPLICATIONS AND MISUNDERSTANDINGS: A CONCEPTUAL BLEND OF FAMILY-MAKING

Applying the mental space of the situation under description (overlapping with a wider or hypothetical context), we can project the probable interpretation(s). A specific word deploys a specific mental space, so the substitution of words / spaces will lead to another perceived reality. Thus, 'safe space' implies that the space may be unsafe (Sweetser 1999, 142 ff). This approach to the understanding of a text goes beyond direct interpretation, and it involves additional interpretative efforts and knowledge which may (or not) be directed by general contemplation.

An analogous play of interpretations occurs when a translator faces Shevchenko's metaphor "*У Петра у свага*": 'Tsar Peter as a matchmaker / father of the daughter/ son-in-law'. The Ukrainian social nomen 'сваг' is lexically ambiguous: 1) a matchmaker who organizes a marriage on behalf of the man's family; 2) a father of one spouse in relation to that of another spouse (СУМ 1978, 9:66). The lexeme provides space for misunderstanding: should we regard Peter as arranging a new political life, or does Peter act as a participant of some previous *mésalliance*?

In the language-based ethnography, “[m]isunderstanding, with its conceptual aura of mistake, error, failure, and falsity, serves conceptions of knowledge that measure validity with a standard, if not of absolute truth, then of the degree of match between representations (ethnography in this case) and realities. If this measure is applied rigorously, validity becomes a matter of either/or (true or false)” (Fabian 1995, 48). In TS, misunderstanding could be a relative axiological criterion: a misunderstanding is a drawback of a translation; an avoided one is its virtue. Though, in our case study, potential poetical and historical misunderstanding is veiled space for further search of the essence.

The ‘family’ metaphor is very frequent in Russian narration on Ukraine: Russians are extremely eager to come into close blood relations, calling the Ukrainians their brothers (the very Ukrainians are similarly eager to shift those assertions to neighbour relations); Russia is always claimed as the Mother (the additional outcome of playing on the phonetic resemblances of the mediaeval Kyivan state – *Rus’* and the post-Peter Muscovy – *Russia*). It is worth mentioning that in Russian culture, the Tsar was often called Father.

In the approximate perspective, Ukrainian narration could present the Ukrainian Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, leader of Ukraine’s 1648–1657 Liberation War, as Father, whom Shevchenko also treated as a complicated personality in Ukrainian history.

So, wishing to indicate all the participants, we could produce two frames, regarding Peter in different roles. But, factually, those frames are almost identical, and the only difference is in the description of Peter.

Table 2. An interpretative metaphoric conception of the phrase “У Петра у свата”

[Ukr. Father] <b>?Bohdan Khmelnyskyi</b>	[Ukr. Mother] <b>Ukraine<sup>6</sup></b>	[Rus. Father] vs. [matchmaker] <b>Peter I</b>	[Rus. Mother] <b>Russia</b>
[Ukr. Child/Children] <b>Cossacks</b>		[Rus. Child/Children] <b>?</b>	

The frame is a further extension of the blend ‘Peter=matchmaker/father-in-law – Ukraine=Mother – Cossacks=Children’ which unveil social, cultural and political stereotypes hidden in language.

Now, a critic can question how those stereotypes along with Peter’s efforts to conquer Ukraine by all means are reproduced or evoked in translation. Unfortunately, they are absent in both translations. The translators either misunderstood the significance of this

<sup>6</sup> Interestingly, the image of Ukraine, quite often visualized as a young girl, does not fit this frame, as most Ukrainians would think just after hearing the stimulus ‘marriage’. Shevchenko reiterated the image of Ukraine as Mother with rich experience, generosity and one who has survived hardships. This will give an additional argument to regard one mother of the excerpt as Ukraine, and it shows how delicately Shevchenko combined the tangled structure of poetic narrative.

metaphor or sacrificed it for the sake of metrics. Andrusyshen and Kirkconnell allowed for the additional concept 'crony', reflecting some interpersonal closeness, but implying some derogatory emotiveness which is not marked in this excerpt. Later in the text, Shevchenko names Peter once again in the same structural and euphonic pattern: "[Бор] Побив Петра, побив ката" ("[God] smote Peter, smote the Hangman [executioner]").

## SIGNIFICANCE FOR TRANSLATION THEORY AND ASSESSMENT

The objective of this paper was to present an ethnographic approach to interpreting a text in the cultural perspective, thus, trying to see if a linguistic verification of cultural values by ethnographic methods is possible in Translation Criticism.

The ethnically-centered approach in translation analysis evokes a new metaphor of 'translation as museum' where a new text loses its value without objects and events that are evident and later interpreted in a nation's collective memory. This metaphor gets transformed into an analytical tool due to the critical application of the concepts 'collective memory' and 'axiological system'.

The theoretical reconsideration of the ethnographic approach in Translation Criticism covers the issues of equivalence and transfer, especially referring to faithfulness (seen by Horace as symbolic negotiation between the author and the reader) and authenticity of a text/translation as an interpreted value. This can lead to further elaboration of power factors like ownership, authority and sensibility that are fundamental hints for choosing a translation strategy.

A translation analyst will mostly benefit from a compound scheme of criteria which are offered for studying the original-translation relations. The very analysis can consist of five layers:

- historical references;
- symbolic references;
- cultural compatibility;
- ethnographic implications;
- ethnographic misunderstanding.

From the viewpoint of the statistical approach, each layer can give a larger number of contrasting features. They are regarded as objective ground to claim the equivalent rendering of a text. Meanwhile, they also explicate the production of linguistically cultural hybrids which is another direct function of Translation Theory. Simultaneously, a fault-finding reader will stay satisfied with this multifaceted and in-sighted presentation of the translated text.

Critical and theoretical views also possess some historiographical value, as they contribute to the scholarship of the very author. The present case study shows the magnificence and accuracy of Shevchenko's vision of national essence and ethnic hardships, actual facts and historical intrigues that greatly outstripped the intellectuals of the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century and changed the flow of Ukrainian history.

## REFERENCES

- Armstrong N. 2005. *Translation, Linguistics, Culture: A French–English Handbook*. Clevedon/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Bassnett S., Lefevere A. 1998. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon/Philadelphia/Toronto/Sydney/Johannesburg: Multilingual Matters.
- Boroditsky L. 2003. Linguistics Relativity. *Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science*, ed. Nadel L. London: MacMillan Press, 917–921.
- Fabian J. 1995. Ethnographic Misunderstanding and the Perils of Context. *American Anthropologist: New Series* 97 (1), 41–50.
- FD – *The Free Dictionary*. Farlex, Inc. <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/> [Accessed on 22 March 2011].
- Jones T. 2003. Translation and Belief Ascription: Fundamental Barriers. *Translating Cultures: Perspectives on Translation and Anthropology*, eds. Rubel P. G., Rosman A. Oxford/New York: Berg, 45–73.
- Jordan C. 1985. Translating Culture: From Ethnographic Information to Educational Program. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 16 (2), 105–123.
- Shevchenko T. 1964. Irzhavets / transl. from the Ukrainian by C.H. Andrusyshen and W. Kirkconnell. *The Poetical Works: The Kobzar*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 325–328.
- Shevchenko T. 2007. Irzhavets / Transl. by Vera Rich. *Selected Poems. Paintings. Graphic Works: Bilingual Edition*. Kyiv: Mystetstvo, 357–363.
- Slampyak D. E. 2002. “As I Hafe Herde Telle”: *Collective Memory and Translation in Medieval English Romances*: PhD Dissertation. Manuscript. University of California, Riverside.
- Sturge K. 2007. *Representing Others: Translation, Ethnography and the Museum*. Manchester, UK/ Kinderhook (NY), USA: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Sweetser E. 1999. Compositionality and Blending: Semantic Composition in a Cognitively Realistic Framework. *Cognitive Linguistics: Foundations, Scope, and Methodology*, eds. Janssen Th., Redeker G. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 129–162.
- Yengoyan A. A. 2003. Lyotard and Wittgenstein and the Question of Translation. *Translating Cultures: Perspectives on Translation and Anthropology*, eds. Rubel P. and Rosman A. Oxford: Berg, 25–43.
- ЕСУМ 1982 – *Etymolohichnyi slovnyk ukrayinskoyi movy*. 1982–2012. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Костецький И. 2001. Мий Юрий Клен. *Kuryer Kryvbasu*. Serpen, 118–136.
- Політичні пісні 1883 – *Politychni pisni ukrayinskoho narodu 18–19 st.* Ch. 1, rozd. 1. Geneva: Hromada.
- Політичні пісні 1885 – *Politychni pisni ukrayinskoho narodu 18–19 st.* Ch. 1, rozd. 2. Geneva: Hromada.
- СМШ 1964 – *Slovnyk movy Shevchenka*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- СУМ 1970–1980 – *Slovnyk ukrayinskoyi movy*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Срезневській 1893–1912 – Sreznevsky I. I. *Materialy dlia slovaria drevnerusskaho yazyka po pismennym pamiatnikam*. Sanktpeterburg.

## VERTIMO KOKYBĖS VERTINIMAS ETNOLINGVISTIKOS IR ETNOGRAFIJOS SANKIRTOJE: TARASO ŠEVČENKOS *IRZHAVETS* VERTIMAI Į ANGLŲ KALBĄ

TARAS SHMIHER

Santrauka

Vertimo kritikos praktikoje etnografinis principas tekstui ir jo kultūrinėms vertybėms suprasti taikomas retai, nors studijuojant kultūrinę medžiagą, pvz., aplinką ir elgseną, pasiremti lingvistiniais faktais yra labai pravartu. Tokie metodai taikomi ir etnografiniuose tyrimuose, kurių tikslas – nustatyti ir įvertinti, kaip tos pačios kultūrinės vertybės perteikiamos originalo ir vertimo tekstuose. Šiame straipsnyje pristatoma ypatingos Ukrainos kultūros istorijoje asmenybės, poeto, menininko ir mąstytojo Taraso Ševčenkos (1814–1861) atvejo analizė, nes būtent jo poetiniai tekstai tapo pranašiški formuojant Ukrainos tautinės sąmonės politiką ir kuriant būsimą Ukrainos valstybę. Straipsnyje autorius analizuoja raktinius Taraso Ševčenkos poemos *Irzhavets* žodžius, kurių kultūrinės atminties daugiasluoksniškumas pateikia skaitantiems istorinę retrospektyvą, pavyzdžiui, atskleidžia besikuriančios Ukrainos valstybės santykį su Petru I-ju, parodo, jog ir praeityje būta netolygių jėgų susidūrimų, su kuriais tauta susitaikė ar juos įveikė, ir tokiu būdu skatina nacionalinę savivoką.

„Vertimas yra muziejus“ jau nebėra tik daili metafora, bet daugiasluoksnius konceptus teksto tipologijos sistemoje. Etnografinės teksto originalo ir jo vertimo santykių analizės išeities taškas – kolektyvinė atmintis kaip teksto kategorija. Kolektyvinė atmintis, panašiai kaip ir intertekstualumas, kuris grindžiamas esamų, kažkuo susijusių tekstų įvairove, padeda atsirinkti kultūrinę informaciją pagal tai, kaip ji aktualizuojama (faktiškai ar hipotetiškai) naujai sukurtame tekste. Aksiologinės vertės tekste turėtų būti interpretuojamos per įvykio simbolizavimą. Šis simbolizavimas kartu su kultūriniu suderinamumu, implikacijomis ir nesusipratimais sudaro uždarą tekstų palyginimo kriterijų sistemą. Užbaigta originalo ir vertimo tekstų lyginimo etnografinė sistema padeda interpretuoti tekstą kultūrinu požiūriu. Tokia interpretacija vertimo kritikoje yra būtina.