

Не варто однак і надто захоплюватись “забуттям рідної традиції”; Ю. Луцький, закликаючи до цього наших біографів та автобіографів, і в страшному сні не гадав, що його апеляція — мов сіль на рану, і яким невітшим чином здійснено її українськими читачами та видавцями: більшість української автобіографістики та мемуаристики таки забута, й місце цих важливих розпізнавчих знаків епохи Забужко, 1999: 152 закономірно зайняте як на обрії авторитетів, так і на книжковому ринку. У цей час “мемуари Є. Чикаленка, повну “Книгу спостережень” Є. Маланюка, “Дар Евдотеї” Докії Гуменної, “Дім над кручею” І. Качуровського ... , “На карнавалі історії” Л. Плюща — все беззастережно добра, часами й першорядна література! — так у нас досі й не перевидано...” Забужко, 1999: 154 . Акцентуємо, отже, на діалектичній двобокості підходу до українського автографу: у ньому має відбутись заперечення та ствердження авторитету як передумова до впровадження вітчизняної автобіографії у ранг культурності й знаковості.

### ЛІТЕРАТУРА:

1. Забужко, 1999: Забужко О. Людина й культура: коментар до одиссеї українського космополіта // Луцький Ю. На перехресті. — Луцьк: Ініціал, 1999. — С. 152-159.
2. Зубрицька, 2004: Зубрицька М. Homo legens: читання як соціокультурний феномен. — Львів: Літопис, 2004.
3. Луцький, 1999: Луцький Ю. На перехресті. — Луцьк: Ініціал, 1999.
4. Философ. словарь, 1981: Философский словарь. — М.: Политиздат, 1981.
5. Философ. словарь, 1983: Философский словарь. — М.: Сов. энциклопедия, 1983.
6. Танчин, 2005: Танчин К. Художній потенціал щоденника / Наукові записки. Серія: Літературознавство. — Тернопіль: ТНПУ, 2005. — Вип. 15. — С. 255-265.
7. Amann, Wagner, 1998: Autobiographien in der österreichischen Literatur: von Franz Grillparzer bis Thomas Bernhard / hrsg. von Klaus Amann und Karl Wagner. — Innsbruck; Wien: Studien-Verl., 1998. — S. 7-10.
8. Goethe, 1993: Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. Aus meinem Leben. Dichtung und Wahrheit: Eine Auswahl. Nachwort vom Herausgeber Walter Schlafarschik — Philipp Reclam jun. Stuttgart, 1993.
9. Misch, 1969: Misch, Georg. Geschichte der Autobiographie. Band 4 / 2. Hälfte. — Frankfurt am Main: 1969.
10. Schlösser, 1998: Schlösser, Hermann. Dichtung oder Wahrheit? Literaturtheoretische Probleme mit der Autobiographie // Autobiographien in der österreichischen Literatur: von Franz Grillparzer bis Thomas Bernhard. — Innsbruck; Wien; Studien-Verl., 1998. — S. 11-26.

*Iryna PLAVUTSKA*

□ 2006

### TO THE PROBLEM OF TRANSLATION OF THE W.M. THACKERAY'S NOVEL “VANITY FAIR” INTO THE SLAVIC LANGUAGES

The stature of W.M. Thackeray is one of the outstanding figures in the English literature of the XIX-th century. The significance of his creative activity is determined not only by his individual contribution that includes such masterpiece of the world literature as "Vanity Fair", but also by the affect of the literary activity and the life collisions of the novelist upon cultural consciousness of European countries, including Russia and Ukraine, exist-

ing within common geopolitical and cultural space at that time. Available literary and critical discourse, the materials of scientific investigations of some modern researchers (V.Ivasheva, V.Vahrushev and some others) affirm that Thackeray was extremely popular in Russia in the XIX century; during the short time (1850-1860) all his main novels were translated and published; periodicals of different directions and orientations printed everything written by the sharp pen of this great novelist.

However, in spite of all these circumstances, the problems of the reception of W.M. Thackeray's creative activity in the literatures of Eastern-Slavonic region and the phenomenon of his "presence" among the reading public were not analyzed by scholars. Except some articles by S.Nuralova, V.Vahrushev, L.Ahchemet, the question of the reception form and functioning of Thackeray's works of art in Russian and Ukrainian culture were not completely observed. The translation discourse of W.M. Thackeray is limited by a few scientific works (I.Bushkanets, I.Levyy, Z.Eshmambetova), in which the aspects of translation of this English writer's works of art are being considered only in the process of enlightening of the activity of Thackeray's translators, first of all, of I.Vvedenskyy.

The translations of Thackeray's novels and essays as a form of existence of foreign masterpieces within the frames of perceiving literature were not taken into consideration. That is why in this scientific research we are going to underline several aspects of this problem, especially, the problem of translation of the title of "Vanity Fair".

In the literary heritage of W.M. Thackeray, "Vanity Fair" occupies a special place. This novel not only brought a great fame to the English writer and made the name of the author famous among all cultured public: due to the peculiarity of its ideological conception and originality of its outer form, this work of art turned out to be one of the masterpieces in the treasure of the world belles-lettres. It has become a sign of a creative individuality of William Thackeray among all people. Once James Oliphant wrote: "That Thackeray was one of the chief literary figures of our century, and that his individuality has had a marked influence on the work of his successors there can be no manner of doubt. As a painter of manners, as a satirist, a critic, a stylist, he takes a very high rank... If he must also be called a great novelist, it is not because he possessed in an eminent degree the special gifts which form the chief glory of the artist, but that his genius in certain faculties which should be subsidiary to the main purposes of creative art..."[5, p.201].

In 1850 "Vanity Fair" and the creative activity of William Makepeace Thackeray in whole has become the fact in cultural life within the frontiers of the Russian and Ukrainian geopolitical space. At that time two the most popular Russian literary and critical journals "Otechestvennyje Zapisky" and "Sovremennik" published two different translations of "Vanity Fair" in Russian. So, the acquaintance of the readers of the Eastern-Slavonic region with the creative activity of the English novelist started only from "Vanity Fair". Exactly this work of art represented in the European literature a novel of a new "analytical", "psychological" type, converted by James-Oliphant.

The first Thackeray's piece of art, which appeared in the Russian translation, was "Proposals for a Continuation of "Ivanhoe" ("Otechestvennyje Zapisky", 1847, v.51, p. 4). However, it was published under the pseudonym of Michael Angelo Titmarsh and did not tell the Russian reader about such creative personality as William Thackeray.

W.M. Thackeray as a "master of thoughts" of all reading public, guaranteed his constant presence in the cultural consciousness of all Eastern —Slavonic people. Thackeray called "Vanity Fair" a novel without a hero, in keeping with his belief that most people are a mixture of the heroic and the ridiculous: 'In Thackeray's opinion there can be no hero in a society where the cult of money rules the world. The subtitle of the book shows the author's intention not to describe separate individuals, but English bourgeois-aristocratic society as a whole. The title of the book is borrowed from "The Pilgrim's Progress", an allegoric novel written by John Bunyan, one of the greatest writers of the second half of the 17-th century. The hero of Bunyan's novel comes to a great city where there is a fair, where everything is

on sale. "... A fair wherein should be sold all sorts of vanity, and that it should last all the year long. Therefore at this fair are all merchandise sold as houses, lands, trades, places, honours, preferments, titles, countries, husbands, children, masters, servants, lives, blood, bodies, souls, silver, gold, pearls, precious stones, and what not. And, moreover, at this fair there are at all times to be seen jugglings, cheats, games, plays, fools, apes, knaves and rouges, and that of every kind..." [6, p.56]. Everybody at the fair thinks only of his own interests. Such qualities as honour and dignity are of no value. To achieve his aim a man is ready to kill or devour any of human being, no matter whether he be friend of enemy. The same idea is expressed by Thackeray in his masterpiece "Vanity Fair", one of the greatest examples of the 19-th century Critical Realism. It is exceedingly rich novel.

It is unsurprising that from all Thackeray's works of art only "Vanity Fair" exists in a big amount of publications and republications, written in the Russian language.

During the period from 1859 to 1886 it was published 19 (!) times in the interpretations of many translators (by L. Thay, V. Stein, and M. Dyakonov). It became the only work among whole W. Thackeray's creative activity translated and published into the Ukrainian in the XX-th century by Olha Senyuk. Moreover, the last edition was made in 2003 by Kharkiv publishing firm "Folio".

Careful study shows the whole range of versions in translation of the title of the novel into Russian:

"Bazar Zhytejskoy Sujety" - translation, made by I. Vvedenskyy;

"Yarmarka Tshcheslavia" - the translation made by the journal "Sovremennik" (1850);

"Torg Zhytejskoy Sujety" - the translation of T.P. Danylevskyy, 1901;

"Yarmarka Zhytejskoy Sujety" (made by L. Thay, 1901). The variety of the Ukrainian translations is not so wide:

"Torgovytsya Pustoty" (firstly made by I. Franko);

"Yarmarok Pyhy" (in the comments to the letters, written by I. Franko);

"Yarmarok Sujety" (translation by Olha Senyuk, 1979, 1983).

In Russian literary criticism M. Katarskyy in the article, observing general problems of translation art, considers the title "*Bazar Zhytejskoy Sujety*", offered by I. Vvedenskyy, more precise than "*Yarmarka Zhytejskoy Sujety*", which became widely used. About this version of translation partly spoke M. Aleksejev.

V. Ivashева in her book "Thackeray-satirist" maintains that "*Yarmarka Zhytejskoy Sujety*" is the most comprehensive title, because it absorbs the fact of a fair as a theater, scene of action, includes the image of a puppeteer, which is the most important for the understanding of the content of the novel.

We suppose that the existence of such amount of translation versions of the novel "Vanity Fair" and its title is conditioned from one side by the complication, multilayer of an artistic structure of the novel, synthetic and allegorical meaning of its title and, on the other hand, by the divergent historical approaches to the essence of translation art, by the orientation to the reproduction, first of all, either a letter or spirit of the original.

Analyzing closer the problems, which arise during the process of interpreting of "Vanity Fair", it is necessary to say some words about the basic aspects of translation of works of art. Translating from one language into a foreign one, an interpreter should learn not only the language of a certain piece of art, but also the life, history, manners, tastes of the people, speaking this language. In this case the English language is the most difficult and its learning becomes more complicated because of the fact that our life differs much from the life of those "islanders". We speak easier and faster French, German and even Latin and Italian than English. But, let us presume even the community of our mode of life with that of the English people we can not come to a conclusion about the possibility of literal or adequate translations from English into Ukrainian (or Russian) and vice versa. As there are no two things completely identical in the nature, there are no worlds, completely adequate in the language.

Even the simplest words, invented for denotation the simplest notions and things, differ in various languages by hardly visible connotations.

We should also notice that creating an image of a certain author a talented translator, first of all, pays his attention to the spirit of the author's personality, to the essence of his ideas and then to the corresponding way of expression of these thoughts and ideas. The translator's task is not just "dig out" to the national logic, but to be able to preserve and reproduce it by the means of another language in the system of other ethno cultural values. But one more problem arises - we should take into consideration the national historic system of notions and values that is to suggest that not only the representatives of another people but the representatives of another historic epoch perceive and understand the world differently. On the basis of a common psychological and under the action of extremely complicated social-historic processes, some specific forms of historical and social behavior, social types of reactions the images about right and wrong, permitted and unauthorized, valuable and unworthy deeds are forming among the representatives different countries. To the consciousness there complicated ethnic, religious, aesthetic, mode of life and other semiotic standards are added.

The significant is also the fact at what time the translation was made; either in the epoch, when the original appeared (then a translator is an author's contemporary, versed in the environment) or in the epoch (when the interpreter is the reader's contemporary, does not completely understand the historical concreteness. More often the researcher is interested in the accuracy of reproduction of artistic and imaginary structure of the text, not only in understanding of the original by the author, but how correctly he managed to render in the translation his understanding of the primary source, that is adequacy of interpretation. The principle knot of the translation art is hidden here.

Intending to translate a monograph or a work of art, you have to peruse into your author, think the way he does it, live with his ideas, think the way he thinks; feel with his heart and deny your personal way of thinking to get the best interpretation version of any book.

The formula of a positive mark for the translation of the work of art is the following: the ideal translation will be that in which we can not see or recognize the stature of the translator and it can be perceived as an original.

In summary it is important to remark that "Vanity Fair" among all outstanding works of art regularly draws the attraction of the researchers from the viewpoint of its existing translation. Every new translation, if it is made thoroughly and giftedly opens a new edge of the original, helps to get to know it deeper and this process of perception is endless.

#### LITERATURE:

1. Ивашева В. Теккерей-сатирик. – М.: Изд-во МГУ, 1955. – 304 с.
2. Катарский И. Противоречивое издание: Любовь к писателю и мастерство перевода // Мастерство перевода. – М., 1968. – С. 301-334.
3. Ковганюк С. Практика перекладу. – К.: Дніпро, 1968. – 276 с.
4. Коптілов В. Першотвір і переклад. – К.: Дніпро, 1972. – 216 с.
5. 5. James-Oliphant. Criticisms and Interpretations. The Harvard Classics Shelf of Fiction, 1999. - 201 p.
6. John Bunyan. The Pilgrim's Progress. : University of Illinois, 1678. - 516 p.

While William Makepeace Thackeray may indeed be best known as the author of *Vanity Fair*, to examine all of his novels is to understand why his contribution to the history of the novel is singular. His use of the intrusive narrator, although presaged by Henry Fielding, was developed so carefully that it became a new form of fiction, a "genuine creation of narrative experiment," as critic Alexander Welsh calls it. In addition, his panoramic realism—although creating that anathema of Henry James, the novel that is "a loose and baggy monster"—explored, both seriously and satirically, a number of things I haven't read "*Vanity Fair*", but I'm guessing that this subtitle means that there is no one character who "wins" or achieves greatness in the story. I believe the author is talking about either male or female here. The word hero can be used to refer to either. K. Kenny74. Hero is often used to refer to the main character in a book. This person may not have performed any particularly heroic acts. *Vanity Fair* was a turning point in Thackeray's life and career. A gentleman by birth and education, Thackeray was forced to earn his living by writing because most of his money had been lost in a financial crash. The articles, reviews, essays, and sketches he produced for magazines and newspapers did not provide sufficient income either to support a gentleman's status or to provide for the futures of his two daughters. Contemporary reviewers and novelists appreciated the brilliance of the novel. John Forster wrote, "*Vanity Fair* is the work of a mind, at once accomplished and subtle, which has enjoyed opportunities of observing many and varied circles of society. . . his genteel characters have a reality about them