

УДК 811.111'225 .4

**Olena Pavlenko**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3747-4651>

## **ANALYTICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF KACHUROWSKY'S NOVEL "BECAUSE DESERTERS ARE IMMORTAL"**

*This article offers a critical examination of Yuriy Tkach's English translation of Ihor Kachukowsky's novel, *Because Deserters Are Immortal* by scrutinizing the core strategies employed to achieve artistic integrity in the target text. Drawing particularly on Victor Koptilov's four-stage model for systematic engagement with the source text, the study highlights the translator's holistic approach and his commitment to preserving the author's style. Analysis of the direct correspondence between author and translator further elucidates Yuriy Tkach's nuanced lexical and stylistic choices, demonstrating his adeptness in conveying historical and cultural realia, authorial neologisms, and colloquialisms. Furthermore, the article explores instances of untranslatability stemming from grammatical discrepancies between English and Ukrainian, evaluating the translator's innovative solutions to these challenges.*

**Keywords:** literary translation, translation strategies, cultural accessibility, linguistic equivalence, dimensions of untranslatability.

**DOI 10.34079/2415-3168 -2025-18-32-199-210**

### **Introduction**

The profound role of translation, far from being diminished in our interrelated world, continues to resonate with incomparable relevance. Indeed, in an era demarcated by increasingly permeable national boundaries and the unfettered, often torrential, flow of information and knowledge, the art of transposing one language into another assumes an even more pivotal role. The very essence of the word, in its common sense and myriad forms, recognizes no geographical or cultural bounds, and it is through the nuanced act of translation that these linguistic barriers are gracefully dissolved. The central point here is not purely about linguistic substitution but rather on how translations foster intercultural understanding and enrich the global landscape of human knowledge. By accurately bringing previously inaccessible texts to new audiences, translators prove to become crucial agents in broadening intellectual horizons, enabling readers to immerse themselves in diverse cultural scenarios and perspectives that would otherwise remain inaccessible. Within its vital role of cultural exchange, literary translation, in particular, distinguishes itself by signifying an insightful dialogue between cultures. Specifically, it exemplifies an intricate conversation where the translator, as a skilled interlocutor, navigates the subtle shades of meaning, sentiment, and aesthetic intention to confirm that the original author's voice (though re-articulated) retains its authentic resonance. This 'dynamic exchange' enhances both the source and target cultures, introduce new ideas, narrative forms, and artistic expressions, thereby cultivating a more profound and empathetic appreciation for the world's multifaceted literary heritage. In this ongoing global discourse, the translator is not just a facilitator but a co-creator, methodically fashioning the spirit and substance of the original literary text within a new linguistic framework.

The article **aims** to examine Yuriy Tkach's English translation of Ihor Kachukowsky's novel "Because Deserters Are Immortal" through a critical analysis of the translator's strategies to achieve artistic integrity in the target text. Specifically, the study seeks to highlight the role

of direct author-translator correspondence (Kachurowsky – Tkach) to reveal insights into translational decision-making, authorial intent, and external critical input.

### **Results and findings**

Scholarly discourse has robustly engaged with the multifaceted dimensions of various aspects of translation, evidenced by an extensive body of research regarding, in particular, the visions of translation as interliterary interaction and cultural dialogue (Đurišin, 1995, Лановик, 2004, Snell-Hornby, 2006), translator's semiotic competence (Torop, 2007; Jacobson, 1985; Levý, Althoff & Vidal, 2012), strategies and philosophy (Рєбрії, 2012; Searls, 2024; Pavlenko, 2025) as well as translator's reflections and practical tips on the art of translation (Ткач, 1992; Kachurowsky, 2005; Searls, 2024). These studies not only highlight the dynamic and formative role of literary translation beyond mere linguistic transfer but also assert its function as an instrument of cross-literary interaction and cultural exchange. They align with a comprehensive perspective to critically examine the functioning of translated works within target literatures, thereby expanding the genre range of Ukrainian literature available in English and enriching the global literary landscape. Furthermore, these analyses shed light on how inherent translational challenges and the restrictions of equivalence contribute to optimizing efforts towards embracing the holistic engagement and poetic fidelity of the original.

### **Background**

To contextualize the subsequent analysis of Yuriy Tkach's translation of Ihor Kachurowsky's novel, *Because Deserters Are Immortal*, and the strategies he deployed, this study will delineate Victor Koptilov's theoretical framework for translation analysis, with particular emphasis on his foundational model. This methodological approach is essential for demonstrating, through specific textual instances, its value in examining the translated version.

Fundamentally, the comprehensive understanding of a literary text, essential for its effective translation, stems from a meticulous critical interpretation. Accordingly, Victor Koptilov distinguishes two schemes for the structural-comparative analysis of a literary work. His first schema involves the separate analysis of the original text and its translation, with a subsequent comparison of their respective overall findings. The second approach, which this study accepts as its primary methodology, entails a systematic, *level-by-level comparison* of the source text's analysis outcomes with its translation, thereby "each time establishing points of proximity or divergence of the translation from the original" (Коптілов, 2003, p. 48). The latter is predicated on evaluating how accurately the ideological, aesthetic, and stylistic concept of the translation as a literary work corresponds to the concept of the original (Коптілов, 2003, p. 184).

By stylistic analysis of a text, we mean discerning its fundamental construction, identifying all its constitutive elements, and comprehending their intricate interrelation. Crucially, these elements are exclusively linguistic, employed specifically for their stylistic function. However, stylistic analysis represents the initial phase of a translator's engagement with an original text and this comes to be a necessary precondition for a profound grasp of the original. Yet, it's vital that the transition from analyzing the source text to synthesizing the target text doesn't devolve into a mere word substitution or a mechanical search for lexical or syntactic equivalents. As Koptilov puts it, "between the source and the target text there is a certain 'intermediate instance' constructed by the translator's consciousness, which emerges from the analysis of the first text and simultaneously serves as a working blueprint for constructing the second. This 'instance' represents semantic and stylistic structure of the text, engaging with a higher-order concept rather than individual words, phrases, phonemes, or syntactic elements" (Коптілов, 2003, p. 117). This aligns with the scholar's assertion that, "<...if, however, this model fails to fully account for all textual constituents – a limitation predicated on the aforementioned challenge of exhaustively transferring all explicit and implicit meanings from one language to another – then any observed translational divergences, whether



augmentative or reductive, may simply be construed as products of the translator's idiosyncratic stylistic choices" (Коптілов, 2003, p. 116-117).

When considering the process of translation as a dialectical reorganization of the original into a newly formed, integrated construct of meaning, it's crucial to acknowledge that far from being a chaotic endeavour, it is equally far from a simple, linear progression. This nuanced standpoint highlights the intricate challenges involved in transposing and re-envisioning the essence of a text across linguistic and cultural boundaries. Indeed, this systematic undertaking typically comprises several distinct stages, a view corroborated by scholars in translation studies (Коптілов, 2003; Torop, 2007; Searls, 2024). Accordingly, Koptilov posits a four-stage model for the translator's systematic engagement with the source text (Коптілов, 2003, p. 65-81). The *initial stage* necessitates a comprehensive analysis of the original. This involves a meticulous examination of its content, encompassing the author's chosen modes of expression – specifically meaning, semantics, and style – alongside an assessment of all fundamental constructive elements of its form. Furthermore, this analytical phase extends to situating the work within the broader context of the author's complete 'product', its relevant literary movement, and the encompassing source literature. The *second stage* of the translation process focuses on the selection of equivalent linguistic means from the target language and its literary tradition. The aim here is to effectively reproduce the salient features of the original. More broadly, this stage serves as a crucial preparatory phase, equipping the translator with the appropriate tools for the subsequent, concluding the *third stage*. The latter is characterized as a synthesis, representing the inverse of the initial analytical phase. It involves weaving the features identified in the original into a new artistic unity, meticulously transformed to align with the specificities of the target literary language.

Beyond these core stages, the scholar identifies a *fourth, recursive stage*, in which the translator assumes the role of a researcher and critic of his own translated work, even following its publication. This perpetual re-evaluation stems from the conviction that "<...a conscientious translator constantly revisits the chosen variant, striving to replace it with a new, better option" (Коптілов, 2003, p.79-80). Consequently, the translator re-engages with the analytical process, even though at a more advanced level, by critically comparing the translated version with the original. This renewed scrutiny then leads to a subsequent selection of linguistic means, initiating a fresh cycle of analysis. Thus, the fourth stage fundamentally constitutes a repetition of the preceding three phases, operating on a new turn of the dialectical spiral of development. According to Koptilov, the translation process can be schematically represented as: Original Text → Analysis → Search → Synthesis → Target Text → Evaluation.

Drawing from the above-mentioned conceptual framework, particularly the dialectical and iterative nature of the translation process, this study aims to meticulously outline the specific translation strategies employed by Yuriy Tkach in rendering Ihor Kachurowsky's novel into English. By analyzing Tkach's approach through this lens, we endeavour to shed light on the nuanced lexical and stylistic choices that underpin the translator's construction of the English-language version, thereby contributing to a deeper understanding of his interpretive methodology and its impact on the reception of the target text. The manner in which Yuriy Tkach embraces the holistic engagement and poetic fidelity of the original text is profoundly articulated in his essay "Reflections on Translation", published in the journal "Theory and Practice of Translation" (1992) in which he underscores "<...an organic immersion into the author's psyche" (Ткач, 1992, p.191). The translator explicitly avoids any attempt to "remount" or "simplify" the original, viewing such approaches as "vulgarisation and destruction of the author's intent" (Ткач, 1992, p.191). This profound respect for inherent architecture of the source text, echoing the canonical perception emphasizing the indivisible unity and dialectical relationship between content and form through rigorous stylistic analysis appears to be a cornerstone of Yuriy Tkach's practice. Extending this point, the translator asserts that his approach to translation "<...stems from his own *psyche*", and "<... the main thing here is... to

put your whole soul into the work. Sometimes a draft translation may turn out to be too literal. But that is what editing is for later, to smooth everything out” (Ткач, 1992, p. 191). This serves as a certain evidence of how the translator affirms the concept of ‘re-reading’ and a ‘new critical reception’ of the updated, self-created text. This perspective, intricately shaped by his individual reading experience, explicates the comprehension of newly created text as a holistic sign-semantic construct that conveys profound culturological meaning, thereby substantiating the author’s deep engrossment in national, regional, and global literary traditions.

A comprehensive analysis of Yuriy Tkach’s artistic endeavors necessitates a thorough examination of his personal reflections as well as the external critical appraisals of his English translation. As he himself admits, *Shliakh Nevidomogo* (translated as *Because Deserters Are Immortal*) is “the best book I have ever translated” (Ткач, 1992, p. 191). The English version truly adheres to the structural integrity of the source text with its poetics and rhythm being the translator’s a paramount concern. In this context, Yuriy Tkach’s argues for the importance to retain the original sentence length, asserting that the latter “<...reflects the rhythm of the original” (Ткач, 1992, p. 192) despite the editor’s recommendation to avoid short sentences (according to him, they were difficult to read and should be combined). However, Yuriy Tkach insisted on his stylistic choice and upon the publication of *Because Deserters Are Immortal*, the editor accepted the translator’s argumentation noting that “<...the freshness and dynamism of translation stemmed precisely from the brevity of its sentences” (Ткач, 1992, p. 191). Yet, the reception of Tkach’s translation has not been consistently positive, with some critics and reviewers providing a contrasting assessment of its artistic quality. Marta Tarnawsky, in her article “Ukrainian” in the English-language quarterly *World Literature Today*, comments on Yuriy Tkach’s English version that “<...the translation, however, is unimaginative, much too literal, at times a little awkward. The choice of title seems too unfortunate and the cover design is too melodramatic – in a style resembling the worst traditions of socialist realism, that does a positive disservice to the book (Tarnawsky, 1980, p. 7). At the same time, she asserts that “*Shliakh Nevidomogo*” has the making of a bestseller. It deserves the attention of a major American publisher, a good translation, and perhaps, even eventually, a film maker” (Tarnawsky, 1980, p. 7).

Alternatively, Ihor Kachurowsky (the author), and his wife Lidia Kachurowska, a certified translator proficient in German, English, and Spanish, positively appraised the stylistic fidelity of the English version to the original text. This is evidenced by the extensive direct correspondence between the author and the translator. In his letter to Yuriy Tkach dated March 8, 1979, Ihor Kachurowsky exposes his principal aspiration for the translation: “Dear Mr. Yuriy! I would like to accentuate that my concern is in no way with the financial gain or any other profit, but rather with ensuring the high quality of the translation, guaranteeing that the English version of my novel *Shliakh Nevidomogo* stands as a truly representative work. It possesses the distinct potential to achieve this, given the exemplary quality of your translation: it is highly readable (and so is the original text, after all), and you have skillfully captured and conveyed the lively, directly conversational stylistic delivery” (Качуровський, б.д.а). Upon receiving the initial draft of the translation, Kachurowsky shared it with his American and Australian associates who were unanimous in their assessment of its efficacy. Nevertheless, one notable exception was an English professor of literature, whose critical appraisal focused on the perceived lack of naturalness and sincerity within the linguistic register. In particular, he asserted that “<...Yuriy Tkach’s version represents an Australian variant of the English language...> and <...if produced within a truly English context the translation would possess a dissimilar accent” (Качуровський, б.д.б).

The direct correspondence between Ihor Kachurowsky and Yuriy Tkach, with a specific focus on the translation of *Shliakh Nevidomogo*, offers helpful insights through which one could systematically investigate the nuanced aspects of Yuriy Tkach’s translation methodology and determine the degree of fidelity (congeniality) presented in his English version. To facilitate

this analysis, we consider it essential to articulate the core principles that would characterize the translator's engagement in creating a genuine literary work. In line with this perspective, the translator's 'creative journey' implicitly reflects the aforementioned stages that create the whole process of interconnected phases. Accordingly, concerning the abovementioned stages of translator's engrossment into the original text, the translator presents this process as a combination of the four of them via "dialectical spiral of development" to determine the degree of translational adequacy established in the English version of the novel "*Because Deserters Are Immortal*". To positively achieve this, we consider it relevant to make a comprehensive analysis of each story comprising the novel, examining it via lexical, grammatical, and stylistic level, as well as considering its aesthetic dimensions. Despite numerous scholarly debates, the profound importance of a lexical level of the literary work is commonly acknowledged, thus warranting particular attention in our analysis of the translation. We therefore focus on the distinctive characteristics of the vocabulary of the original text and the principles governing its translation into English.

Starting from translating the title of the novel *Shliakh Nevidomogo* ("*Because Deserters Are Immortal*" in English) we find it is evident, that Yuriy Tkach doesn't merely seek direct linguistic equivalents such as "*Travels in Futility*" or "*Stranger's Travels*" nor aims for transliteration, like "*Shliakh Nevidomogo*" which, in our view, would have been inadequate, as a target reader would likely perceive it just as a chain of unfamiliar Ukrainian words, devoid of any discernible meaning. Therefore, we claim that the title "*Because Deserters Are Immortal*" constitutes a truly adequate translation. For this Yuriy Tkach used the heading from the first novella, "*Deserters*", however, with a deeper, more nuanced interpretation. This choice thoughtfully draws upon the words of Red Army soldier Vanya from the story "*Comrade*", while preserving the core essence of the book (e.g., "We are the Unknown Deserters! It's something more than your unknown warrior... No one has yet built memorials to fallen deserters, nor brought flowers to their grave. Because deserters are immortal!" Vanya said (Kachurowsky, 1979, p. 50). As it seen, such translator's decision lines up a thematic resonance and cultural accessibility over strict linguistic equivalence, signifying an awareness of the target reader's engagement with the translated text beyond its mere denotation.

Yet, in line with pragmatic adaptation, Yuriy Tkach predominantly employs transliteration and transcription for proper names (e.g., "*Volodka*" for (Ukr.) "Volod'ka", "*Petro Matviyovich*" for (Ukr.) "Petro Matviyovich" as well as for reproducing specific ethno-realia (e.g., "*kolkhoz couplets*" – (Ukr.) "kokhozniy kuplety", "*papakha hat*" – (Ukr.) "papakha" "horilka" – (Ukr.) "horilka", "*kulak*" – (Ukr.) "kurkul", "*Tretia Mischanska*" street – (Ukr.) "Tretia Mischanska" etc). Though this option normally upholds the authentic Ukrainian sonant quality, the translator often uses explanatory notes at the end of the book to provide all necessary contextualization and bridge the cultural gap for the English-speaking reader.

At the same time, the structural and cultural divergences between Ukrainian and English reason to inherent translational challenges that limit regular equivalence and the prospect to preserve full semantic and aesthetic spectrum of the original text. They include, in particular, *ethnic and historical realia, author's neologisms, phraseological units, dialects, and other stylistically marked words*. To navigate cultural nuances in his translation version Yuriy Tkach was deeply engaged in studying the historical context of Ukraine across diverse periods. That enabled him to produce the text that proved to be not only linguistically accurate but also culturally relevant and effectively resonated for the target audience. Here are the examples from Kachurowsky's novel: "*Trajanus road*" – "troja Trojana" (Ukr.); "*The Tale of Igor's Campaign*" – "Slovo o Polky Igoreviym" (Ukr.); "*Tsar Ivan Grozny*" – "Tsar Ivan Grozny" (Ukr.); "*hetman*" – "Hetman" (Ukr.); "*gendarmerie*" – "zhandarmeriya" (Ukr.); "*derevnya*" (not a "village") – "derevnya" (Ukr.); "*dacha*" – "dacha" (Ukr.); "*home guardsmen*" – "opolchentsy" (Ukr.); "*political leader*" – "politruk"; "*housing administrator*" – "upravdom" (Ukr.); "*sheepskin*" – "kozuhk"; "kufaika" – "kukhfaika" (Ukr.); "*NKVD agent*" –



“enkvedyst” (Ukr.); “*quilted jacket*” – “vatyanka” (Ukr.); “yoke” – “koromyslo” (Ukr.); “*Our Father*” – “Otche nash” (Ukr.); “*small pantry*” – “komirchyna” (Ukr.); “*chulanchik*” – “chulanchik” (Ukr.); “*chekist’s wrinkles round the mouth*” – “chekistsky sklyady bilya ust” (Ukr.); “*in honour of the Five-Year plans*” – “na chest p’tyrichok” (Ukr.); “*half-blatis*” – “polublatny”; “*member of the CPSU (b) or Komsomol*” – “chlen VKP(b) chy VLKSM” (Ukr.); “*non-party man*” – “bezpartyiny” (Ukr.); “*Bolshevism*” – “bolshevism” (Ukr.); “*burgomaster*” – “burgomystr” (Ukr.); “*gestapo*” – “gestapo” (Ukr.); “*starosta*” – “starosta” (Ukr.); “*birth certificate*” – “metryka” (Ukr.); “*Ausweis*” – “Ausweis” (Ukr.) арбайт самт [80] – “*employment bureau*” – “Arbeitsamt” (German); “*Gorono*” – “Gorono” (Ukr.) and others.

A further category of lexemes that cause obstacles in translation are author’s neologisms. Regarding their word-formation and genesis, Kachurowsky himself observes that “<...a penchant for word-creation rarely accompanies great talents” and that “one should be very cautious regarding the authorship of new words” (Качуровський, І., б.д. б). This stems from the inherent difficulty in stating with absolute certainty that a novel term was coined by one specific author rather than another. Nevertheless, the translator accurately preserved the author’s distinctive style, which is vividly represented in the English version: (Ukr.) “*Sdreifyl*” – “Can’t you see the fellow’s *lost his head*”; (Ukr.) “*lyapmiv*” – “*Flurled out the parole*”; (Ukr.) “*khulmula*” – “It looked as if she’d *had a good swig*”; (Ukr.) “*tynyatysya*” – “to *knock on doors*”; (Ukr.) “*zmyvatysya*” – “I *had to make tracks*”; (Ukr.) “*Peredystoriya tsiyei zustrichi*” – “The *circumstances of this meeting*”; (Ukr.) “*bovanyily dvi skyrdy solomy*” – “I *emerged in a sheltered clearing where I could see two haystacks*”; (Ukr.) “*chudernatske znayomstvo*” – “*quaint friendship*”; (Ukr.) “*borodan*” – “the *bearded fellow*”; (Ukr.) “*napybkyamu*” – “*knock around*”. In certain instances, as is seen, Yuriy Tkach endeavours to compensate for lexical inadequacy through the deployment of synonymy, a strategy that, to some extent, lessens the emotional impact of the original.

Another notable translator’s achievement lies in the adequate interpretation of colloquialisms, vulgarisms, dialects, and euphemisms that the author incorporates to imbue individual artistic images and the work as a whole with an extraordinary style. These typically necessitate translation into neutral literary words if a direct contextual equivalent is lacking in the target language. This approach is often adopted because rendering them with specific sociolects of the target language risks an excessive and impermissible localization of the original. Therefore, at this stage, the translator was required to pay significant attention to sociocultural and psychological factors, a demand to which Yuriy Tkach demonstrated precise adherence in his translated version: (Ukr.) “*Kudy lizesh bez ocheredy? Ty, mordo?*” – “Where you *pushing in*? You *mug!*” offers a compelling instance of semantic and stylistic equivalence. Here “*morda*” (meaning “human face”) finds a robust English counterpart in “*mug*” (referring to “the face”, “the mouth” similarly with colloquial or informal style). In other instances, however, the translator frequently opts neutral contextual substitutions rather than direct vulgarisms: (Ukr.) “*Na kakoy zhe khren takaya vlast!*” is translated as “*What good is such a government!*” (Ukr.) “*Nimtzi rozsrilyut zhydiv*” as “The Germans were *executing Jews*”; (Ukr.) “*z madyaramy otchebutchiyt*” as “...they’re *fooling around with the Hungarians*”; and (Ukr.) “*Ty, gad, chivo tut shlayaishysi?*” as “You *scum of the earth*, what are you *crawling round* here for?” To some extent, these translational choices invariably lead to a loss not only of precise semantics of the original but also its imagery, connotation, and stylistic peculiarities. In our view, such an approach is not always reasonable, as English possesses adequate slang expressions that could have maintained a closer register (e.g., “*yid*” for “*zhyd*”, “*gad about*” for “*shlayaishysi*” potentially rendered as “*You jerk*, what are you *loitering* here for?”). Conversely, the colloquial (Ukr.) “*Mo, Dumayu vchitel?*” – “P’haps, I thought, he’s a teacher” and (Ukr.) “*Maliy, khto dav komandu bigom?*” – “Eh, squirt, do you know who gave the order to run?” are demonstrably well-rendered, successfully preserving the abbreviated form of the adverb “perhaps”, which is highly characteristic of conversational style.

When addressing further dimensions of untranslatability, we consider the specific challenges of pun translation. Kachurowsky frequently employs wordplay, yet deliberately avoids the elaborate complexity and baroque allegorical flourishes typical of modernists. Concurrently, the writer engages with philosophical antithesis, infused with a spectrum of irony ranging from subtle mockery to overt, biting sarcasm. This irony, however, is invariably steeped in astute observations of life, which translators often struggle to perceive and render faithfully: “We’ve lost the war. Though someone, contravening the laws of euphemy, replaced the letter ‘g’ in ‘*prograly*’ (Ukr.) with another”. The current English translation (“We’ve lost the war”) doesn’t fully reproduce all the nuances implied in the original text. In our view, a more nuanced option might be: “We’ve *pAssed* the war. Yet, with all respect to euphemism, somebody claimed we ‘*pIssed*’ it.” The latter (referring to “pissed it away” in British slang) conveys the sense of being totally ruined or lost, and in this instance, the slight vowel alteration mirrors the single-letter change of the original Ukrainian. The key here is that the English word substituted for “lost” should be phonetically close and carry a vulgar or extremely negative connotation, while the translated abstract presents a subtly “delicate” adjustment that mirrors the irony of the Ukrainian original.

A further example of a pun in the original text, “*vid polIna – vid polOnu*” (Ukr.), translated as “from *captivity*– from the *log*” (“He didn’t save me from captivity, rather I saved him from the log”), represents a mere literal rendering. While this effectively conveys the denotative meaning, it fails to demonstrate the emotional and intellectual playfulness of the original message. This highlights the challenge of reconciling semantic fidelity with stylistic ingenuity, particularly where the “intermediate instance” guiding synthesis cannot fully bridge the gap. Regarding this, we attempted to preserve the pun comprised in the original by changing a lexeme: “He didn’t save me from the *bUllet*, rather I saved him from the *biLlet*”. This translational decision was highly appreciated by the author in our personal correspondence (Pavlenko, O., n.d.).

Kachurowsky’s work is uniquely characterized by its aphoristic quality, where virtually every word resonates with an explosive force and profound beauty. This distinctive style draws heavily on the author’s rich life experience, replete with extraordinary situations, pervasive paradoxes, and striking dilemmas. The majority of these merge into “an intriguing microcosm, reflecting one or another facet of an ironic-intellectual interplay” (Сопока, 1998, с. 102). In Yuriy Tkach’s translation, these aphorisms are competently rendered, even preserving their inherent genre characteristics, such as philosophical reflections, aphorism-novellas, and ironic generalizations. Notable examples include: “But, gentlemen, *the most foolish thing is to trust one’s own judgement*”; “*How easy it is to submit to another person’s will! How difficult it is to lead others and make them obey!*” “*Truth is never with everyone, almost never – with the majority, very rarely it is with the minority*, a little more often it is with single people, but most often – with no one”; “A strong will is possessed by one who smiles at their sufferings”; “War is a historical regularity”; “*Silence is very rarely a sign of agreement*. Most often it is a protest that *people are afraid to voice aloud*”; “The most shameful justification is to say: ‘*If I didn’t do this act, someone else would have*’”; “Unspoken words and unfulfilled actions *lie like boulders on our soul*”; “Desperate audacity, gentlemen, is undoubtedly *the best remedy against any danger*” (Kachurowsky, 1979).

A further challenge encountered by the translator stems from the distinct grammatical structures of Ukrainian and English. Among these, the substantivization of adjectives proved particularly problematic for Yuriy Tkach. While this phenomenon is characteristic of both languages, it is notably more prevalent in Ukrainian. The grammatical framework of English often precludes rendering a substantivized Ukrainian adjective with an equivalent in translation, which consequently resulted in certain semantic losses. For instance: “The face of third, the young one, whom I took for a teacher, was hidden under bandages,” and (Ukr.) “A *beznosa tsokotila do mene*” translated as “The woman with no sign of a nose”. Furthermore, the lexeme

(Ukr.) “baba” is not consistently conveyed with full semantic accuracy. Consider: “The oldest, a *broded-backed baba* with the yoke on her shoulders”. Here, “baba” is employed as a colloquial and pejorative term, deliberately chosen by the author instead of “zhinka” (woman/lady). The translator opted for transliteration, reproducing the lexeme directly into English. In a different context, the translation “I still haven’t worked out whether you’re *a man or an old woman*” reveals a discrepancy between the Ukrainian and English lexemes. The rendering “old woman” conveys “elderly woman”, which fails to fully capture the nuance of “baba” in the original (Качуровський, 1956). To maintain the original meaning and the character’s uncertainty in distinguishing between a man and a “baba” (with its specific connotations), “I still haven’t worked out whether you’re a man or a woman” might have been a more appropriate choice. The difficulty here lies in “baba” typically meaning “an old woman”, but often carrying colloquial, sometimes dismissive implications, suggesting a lack of masculine qualities, a weak or effeminate man, or simply a tough, somewhat crude woman.

A significant challenge in adequately rendering the original into English lies in reproducing formal/informal address. The absence of a direct English equivalent for Ukrainian’s formal (“*vy*” – “*you*”) and informal (“*ty*” – “*you*”) second-person pronouns posed a considerable difficulty. This translational barrier is vividly illustrated by an untranslated episode from the conversation between the protagonist and Nina in the novella “The Golden Cellar”. The excerpt reads: “Suddenly, the expression in her eyes changed; a detail, unusual for our previous interactions, registered in her mind: ‘Since when have you been on “*thou*” terms with me?’ she demanded sternly, and immediately changed her intonation – Oh, well, damn you, let it be ‘*thou*’, then”. In our view, the complete omission of this crucial dynamic, leading to such an inadequacy, is not entirely justifiable. While the provided English rendition of the dialogue effectively captures the shift, the broader issue of the untranslatability of such grammatical nuances – which carry significant social and emotional weight – persists. This underscores the inherent difficulty in bridging this linguistic gap. Therefore, we propose that the situation could be partially ameliorated by incorporating a footnote to explain the formal and informal forms of address in Ukrainian. Such a compensatory strategy would enable the English-speaking reader to more profoundly grasp the work and appreciate the unique stylistic specificities of the writer.

Despite the author’s high appraisal of the English version of the book, his correspondence to the translator subsequently pointed out several shortcomings. These pertained to grammatical and stylistic discrepancies between Ukrainian and English that could potentially mislead the reader regarding the nuances of the original text. In particular, the original sentence reads: “Potym ya polklav u *porozhnyu* valizku *povnu* plyashku” (“Then I put a *full* bottle into the *empty* suitcase”). The author employs a stylistic figure grounded in antithesis. However, the initial translational version omitted the crucial information that the suitcase was empty (“Then, placing a *full* bottle in *my suitcase*”), when it should have been rendered as “in my *empty* suitcase”.

While the translation normally succeeds in conveying the core narrative of the novel, a closer examination reveals instances where the translator faces specific linguistic and stylistic intricacies, particularly those concerning allusions, deliberate grammatical irregularities, and nuanced lexical choices. Thus, numerous foreign-language insertions in the original text significantly complicates the translator’s work. For instance, the exclamation of a mad girl, “Isaiya, likuy!” is repeated five times. Here, Kachurowsky uses Church Slavonic in a russified pronunciation. In Ukrainian, this would be “Isaiya, lykuy!” Se diva imi v chrevy i rody syna I nareche yemu imya Adolf...” This phrase, meaning “Isaiah, rejoice, triumph!”, is a formula of profound joy, typically proclaimed by a priest during a wedding, though “Immanuil” is sung instead of “Adolf”. Such a formula is understood as an Old Testament prophecy concerning the advent of Christ. Given that the madwoman substitutes “Immanuil” with ‘Adolf’, it implies her perception of Hitler as a new Christ figure. Yuriy Tkach, mistaking the russian lexeme “likuy”



(“rejoice”) for its Ukrainian homograph (“heal”), produced a semantically inadequate equivalent for this lexeme. Instead of “rejoice”, he used “heal me”, resulting in the translation: “Isaiah, rejoice. The virgin has concerned and will bear a son and his name will be... Adolf” (Kachurowsky, 1979).

In some cases, the translator faces the need to preserve the authorial intent in deliberate illiteracy when the latter uses ungrammatical writing as seen in a pass episode. Specifically, this involved the omission of commas and an incorrect sentence structure in the final episode: “The Jewish Communist Government, headed by Dzhugashvili-Stalin, has violated its treaty with Germany. The bearer of this pass not desiring thoughtless bloodshed has voluntarily left the Red Army and is crossing to the German side, assured that a good reception awaits him. This pass is valid for crossing territory under German control to the place of one’s residence”. However, when the book reached the publishing house, the editor made all necessary corrections of the text by adding the omitted commas. Kachurowsky subsequently appealed to the translator, insisting that “in translation, the text must be ungrammatically constructed and without punctuation marks” (Качуровський, б.д.а). Despite this explicit instruction, the translator, as observed, did not adhere to these requirements.

### Conclusion.

The in-depth analysis of Yuriy Tkach’s translation of Ihor Kachurowsky’s novel “Because Deserters Are Immortal” has illuminated several avenues for further scholarly inquiry into the intricacies of literary translation, predominantly within the framework of Ukrainian-English linguistic and cultural transfer. Ultimately, the study demonstrates that Tkach’s translation is a nuanced and truly successful endeavor, exemplifying crossliterary communication and cultural dialogue. Despite some intrinsic untranslatability (e.g., wordplay, navigating informal addressing, neutralizing vulgarisms and colloquialisms, deliberate authorial ‘illiteracy’) the translator’s strategic choices characterized by his holistic approach to the art of translation ensured a largely effective transmission of Kachurowsky’s exceptional artistic vision. The direct correspondence between the author and translator proved to be an invaluable source in unveiling the author’s explicit intent and elucidating specific translational decisions. Further perspectives build upon the principal insights gained from this study, as well as a comparative stylistic analysis across a broader array of Kachurowsky’s works and their translations. Such an extended scope would undeniably provide a more comprehensive understanding of the complexities inherent in rendering the writer’s individual voice.

### Бібліографія

- Качуровський, І., 1956. *Шлях невідомого*. Мюнхен: Дніпрова хвиля.
- Качуровський, І., б.д.а. *Листи до Ю. Ткача*. Особистий архів О. Павленко.
- Качуровський, І., б.д.б. *Листи до О. Павленко*. Особистий архів Олени Павленко.
- Коптілов, В., 2003. *Теорія і практика перекладу*. Київ: Юніверс.
- Лановик, М., 2004. Художній переклад: діалог національних культур, історичних епох та мистецьких світів. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія філологічна*, (33, 2), 18.
- Ребрій, О., 2012. *Сучасні концепції творчості у перекладі*. Харків: ХНУ ім. В. Н. Каразіна. 216 с.
- Сорока, П., 1998. *Психологічна проза Ігоря Качуровського*. Тернопіль: Тайп.
- Ткач, Ю., 1992. Роздуми про переклад. В: *Теорія і практика перекладу: Республіканський міжвідомчий науковий збірник*, 18, с. 190–193. Київ: Вища школа.
- Đurišin, D., 1995. *Teória medziliterárneho procesu*. Bratislava: SAV.
- Jacobson, R., 1985. *Selected Writings*. Berlin; New York; Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers.
- Kaczurowsky, I., 1979. *Because Deserters are Immortal*. Translated by Yuri Tkach. Bayda Books.
- Levý, J., Althoff, G., & Vidal, C., 2012. Translation as a decision process. *Scientia Traductionis*, (11), 72–96.

- Pavlenko, O., 2025. *The Ukrainian Translation Heritage of the Second Half of the 20th Century: Educational Guide for the Self-Study Work of Applicants at the Third (Educational and Scientific) Level of Higher Education*. Kyiv: MSU.
- Pavlenko, O., n.d.. *Lysty do I. Kachurovskoho* [Letters to I. Kachurovskoho].
- Searls, D., 2024. *The Philosophy of Translation*. Yale University Press.
- Snell-Hornby, M., 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 205 p.
- Tarnawsky, M., 1980. *World Literature Today. A Literary Quarterly of the University of Oklahoma*, pp. 7–11. Available at: <<https://diasporiana.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/books/17087/file.pdf>>
- Torop, P., 2007. Methodological Remarks on the Study of Translation and Translating. *Semiotica*, (1/4), 163.

### References

- Đurišin, D., 1995. *Teória medziliterárneho procesu*. Bratislava: SAV. [In Slovak].
- Jacobson, R., 1985. *Selected Writings*. Berlin; New York; Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers.
- Kachurovsky, I., 1956. *Shliakh Nevidomogo* [The path of the unknown]. Munich: Dniprova Khvilya.
- Kachurovsky, I., n.d.a. *Lysty do Yu. Tkacha*. [Letters to Yu. Tkach]. Personal Archive of O. Pavlenko. [In Ukrainian].
- Kachurovsky, I., n.d.b. *Lysty do O. Pavlenko*. [Letters to O. Pavlenko]. Osobystyi arkhiv Olenu Pavlenko. [In Ukrainian].
- Kachurovsky, I., 1979. *Because Deserters are Immortal*. (Translated by Yuri Tkach). Bayda Books.
- Koptilov, V., 2003. *Teoriia i praktyka perekladu* [Theory and practice of translation]. Kyiv: Universe. 280 c. [In Ukrainian].
- Lanovyk, M., 2004. Khudozhnii pereklad: dialoh natsionalnykh kultur, istorychnykh epokh ta mystetskykh svitiv [Literary translation: a dialogue between national cultures, historical eras and art worlds]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Serii filolohichna*, (33, 2), 18. [In Ukrainian].
- Levý, J., Althoff, G., & Vidal, C., 2012. Translation as a decision process. *Scientia Traductionis*, (11), 72–96.
- Pavlenko, O., 2025. *The Ukrainian Translation Heritage of the Second Half of the 20th Century: Educational Guide for the Self-Study Work of Applicants at the Third (Educational and Scientific) Level of Higher Education*. Kyiv: MSU.
- Pavlenko, O., n.d.. *Lysty do I. Kachurovskoho* [Letters to I. Kachurovskoho]. [In Ukrainian].
- Rebrii, O., 2012. *Suchasni kontseptsii tvorchosti u perekladi* [Modern concepts of creativity in translation]. Kharkiv: KhNU im. V. N. Karazina. 216 c. [In Ukrainian].
- Searls, D., 2024. *The Philosophy of Translation*. Yale University Press.
- Snell-Hornby, M., 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Soroka, P., 1998. *Psykhologichna proza Ihoria Kachurovskoho* [Psychological prose by Igor Kachurovsky]. Ternopil: Taip. [In Ukrainian].
- Tarnawsky, M., 1980. *World Literature Today. A Literary Quarterly of the University of Oklahoma*, pp. 7–11. Available at: <<https://diasporiana.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/books/17087/file.pdf>>
- Tkach, Yu., 1992. Rozdumy pro pereklad [Reflections on translation]. In *Teoriia i praktyka perekladu: Respublikanskyi mizhvidomchyi naukovyi zbirnyk* (Vol. 18, c. 190–193). Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola. [In Ukrainian].
- Torop, P., 2007. Methodological Remarks on the Study of Translation and Translating. *Semiotica*, (1/4), 163.



Стаття надійшла до редакції 20 травня 2025 р.

Олена Павленко

### АНАЛІТИЧНІ ВИМІРИ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ РОМАНУ ІГОРЯ КАЧУРОВСЬКОГО «ШЛЯХ НЕВІДОМОГО»

У статті окреслено перекладацькі стратегії Юрія Ткача на прикладі перекладу роману Ігоря Качуровського «Шлях невідомого» англійською. Особливу увагу зосереджено на висвітленні ключових аспектів інтерпретації перекладачем тексту оригіналу для досягнення художньої цілісності цільового тексту на лексичному, граматичному, стилістичному та естетичному рівнях. Прагнення Юрія Ткача наблизити твір до реценції англomовного читача, зберігаючи при цьому форму, зміст, образність та художній світ оригіналу, здійснюється через критичну саморефлексію перекладача. Основні засади такого підходу висвітлені у його статті «Роздуми про переклад», а також у приватному листуванні з автором оригіналу щодо прийняття певних перекладацьких рішень.

Комплексний аналіз перекладацької діяльності Юрія Ткача представлено, зокрема, крізь призму розробленої В. Контіловим чотириетапної моделі (стадія аналізу, пошуку, синтезу та оцінки створеного тексту), що надає перекладачеві можливості відстежити межі адекватності/ конгеніальності цільового тексту і здійснюється ним за такими критеріями: 1) перекладацько-читацьке сприйняття (перекладач в ролі читача) – дослівний переклад з метою виявлення відхилень й подальшим аналізом доречності/недоречності їх використання (концепція «повторного читання»); 2) мовна відповідність, єдність форми і змісту (передача думок, образів, емоцій, а не переклад ізольованих слів); 3) художня якість перекладу (літературність мови); 4) історичність мови перекладу (відтворення «духу» епохи через використання архаїзмів); 5) збереження ритму оригіналу (використання коротких речень попри рекомендації редактора видання щодо їх об'єднання).

Відчуття Юрієм Ткачем внутрішньої архітектури тексту оригіналу дозволяє систематично дослідити тонкі аспекти його перекладацької методології та визначити ступінь точності (конгеніальності), представлений у його англійській версії. Осмислюючи процес перекладу як діалектичну реорганізацію тексту оригіналу, іншу (нову) конструкцію смислів, яка не зводиться до лінійної прогресії (механічного «перемонтування» твору), Юрій Ткач працює над «перенесенням» тексту через лінгвістичні та культурні кордони, наголошуючи на «інакшості» свого підходу. При цьому він акцентує на «органічному входженні в психіку автора», уникає будь-яких спроб «перемонтувати» або «спростити» оригінал (канонічне сприйняття вихідного тексту / «поетична» точність перекладу), розглядаючи такі підходи як «вульгаризацію» та «руйнування» авторського задуму. Це також знайшло своє відображення у перекладі назви роману «Because Deserters Are Immortal» (використання заголовку з першої новели «Дезертири», однак з глибшою, більш тонкою інтерпретацією, відмова від простих лінгвістичних еквівалентів), відтворенні етнічних та історичних реалій, передачі авторських неологізмів, фразеологічних одиниць, діалектизмів, вульгаризмів, просторічних слів та іншої стилістично маркованої лексики.

Проте критична реценція перекладу Юрія Ткача не виявилася однозначною позитивною й була позначена розбіжними науковими поглядами щодо його художньої якості. Так, Марта Гарнавська схарактеризувала переклад як надмірно буквалістський, проте водночас визнала значний потенціал перекладеного твору стати бестселером. Натомість автор роману, Ігор Качуровський разом із дружиною, Лідією Качуровською, яка є дипломованим перекладачем, високо оцінили англійську версію за її стилістичну

*відповідність та жваву, автентично розмовну презентацію, що підтверджується прямим листуванням автора і перекладача.*

*Попри наявність певних лексичних розбіжностей та окремих випадків неперекладності (зокрема, каламбури, іронічні звертання, відтворення формального/неформального звертання), кожний з яких має обґрунтоване об'єктивне пояснення, переклад Юрія Ткача відповідає критеріям конгеніальності. Це пояснюється сприйняттям перекладу не як технічної передачі мовних одиниць, а як комплексної міжлітературної/міжкультурної взаємодії.*

**Ключові слова:** *художній переклад, перекладацькі стратегії, мовна еквівалентність, соціокультурна відповідність, виміри неперекладності.*