
INTERLINGUAL AUTHORIAL INTERPRETATION OF SHAKESPEARE IN THE UKRAINIAN LITERATURE OF THE 19TH-21ST CENTURIES

Boiko Ya. V., Nikonova V. H.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-590-7-4>

INTRODUCTION

The time-remote source text, which exists in a final and independent form, differs from its foreign versions, which cannot be uniform since each author interprets the source text in his / her way by adding his / her nuances and distinctive features. The enormous difference between the source text and its foreign versions is also indicated by their belonging to different historical periods that causes the variance and diversity in their communicative functions. The problem of time and space distance is one of the most difficult practical problems in interlingual authorial interpretation of the time-remote source text. At the same time, the interlingual authorial interpretation is viewed as an interlingual transmission of national identity associated with spatial distance.

The problem of interlingual authorial interpretation of the time-remote source text was discussed by lots of researchers in Ukraine (George Gachechiladze, Maryna Novykova, Yana Boiko, etc.) and abroad (Siobhan Brownlie, Farzaneh Farahzad, Lei Feng, Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, Reinhard Kaiser, Kaisa Koskinen, Lawrence Venuti, etc.). To produce an adequate interlingual authorial interpretation of the time-remote source text, the author should consider specificity of the source text (its language features, its historical, social and cultural contexts, etc.) as well as peculiarities of the target-language reader (his / her background knowledge and awareness of the history and socio-cultural development of the countries where the source text was created).

This research aims to explore the reception, adaptation, and influence of William Shakespeare's works in Ukrainian literature from the 19th to the 21st century with a focus on the language variability of the diachronic plurality of Shakespearean plays reproduced in Ukrainian. This study argues that the most successful Ukrainian interpretations of Shakespeare are the most recent

ones, particularly those performed by Oleksandr Hriaznov (2001)¹ and Yurii Andrukhovych (2008)² that embrace diachronic interlingual interpretations. These modern interpretations better reflect linguistic evolution and cognitive styles of the Ukrainian authors-interpreters, leading to more nuanced and culturally resonant adaptations. The study further posits that plurality in interlingual authorial interpretations – both across time and within contemporary translations – yields richer and more dynamic readings of Shakespeare in Ukrainian. To substantiate this claim, the paper analyses the chronologically distant Ukrainian versions of Shakespearean tragedy “Hamlet, Prince of Denmark” (1600)³, performed from the 19th to the 21st century, with a particular focus on the two most recent Ukrainian interpretations as exemplary cases of a significant evolution in the Ukrainian reception of Shakespeare.

1. Background information about interlingual authorial interpretation

A plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations leads to richer and more dynamic interpretations of the source text compared to a singular interpretation. This paper strongly concurs with scholars who argue that translation is not a mere linguistic substitution but an interpretative act that reflects the translator’s cognitive and stylistic decisions.

The phenomenon of plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations, which is viewed as the juxtaposition of a single source text and its several versions in a foreign language, began attracting scholarly attention in the latter half of the 20th century and is associated with researchers such as Siobhan Brownlie⁴, Farzaneh Farahzad⁵, Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar⁶, Kateryna Mehela⁷, and Ruslana Sytar⁸. The interplay of multiple interpretations

¹ Шекспір В. Гамлет. Переклад О. Грязнова. URL: <https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/world/printit.php?tid=9048>

² Шекспір В. Гамлет. Переклад Ю. Андруховича. Київ : А-БА-БА-ГА-ЛІА-МА-ГА, 2008. 242 с.

³ Shakespeare, W. *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*. URL: <http://shakespeare.mit.edu/hamlet/full.html>

⁴ Brownlie, S. Narrative theory and retranslation theory. *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2006. № 7(2). P. 140–170.

⁵ Farahzad, F. Plurality in Translation. URL: https://www.academia.edu/49470028/Plurality_in_Translation

⁶ Gürçağlar, Ş. T. Retranslation. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London – New York : Routledge, 2008. P. 232–236.

⁷ Мегела К. І. Чинники множинності відтворення дискурсивних маркерів (на матеріалі українських перекладів твору Р. Л. Стівенсона «Острів скарбів»). *Мовні і концептуальні картини світу*. 2011. № 37. URL: http://www.philology.kiev.ua/library/zagal/Movni_i_konceptualni_2011_37/055_062.pdf

⁸ Ситар Р. А. Множинність перекладів як варіантність відтворення жанрово-стилістичних особливостей часово віддаленого першотвору. *Науковий вісник Чернівецького університету. Серія : Германська філологія*. 2014. № 692–693. С. 237–240.

provides readers with a broader spectrum of meanings, enhancing the reception of Shakespearean works in Ukraine.

Western researchers such as Reinhard Kaiser⁹, Kaisa Koskinen & Outi Paloposki¹⁰, Lawrence Venuti¹¹, Siobhan Brownlie¹², Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar¹³, Lei Feng¹⁴, Farzaneh Farahzad¹⁵ refer to the term *re-translation*, indicating that each new foreign version of a particular source text is more and more approaching the source text¹⁶. As Farzaneh Farahzad¹⁷ notes, “the existence or possibility of several re-translations of the source text in the target language is evidence of the fact that translation by its nature has, among other things, the quality of being indeterministic”. Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar¹⁸ stresses that the same original work can exist in several translations, albeit of different artistic value, but still different, and each of these translations can be legitimate in its own way. According to Reinhard Kaiser¹⁹, re-translation is a fact of real coexistence in translated literature of two or more translations of the same source text.

According to Lei Feng²⁰, re-translation is a natural attribute of literary translation, related to the concept of creative personalities and talent competitions of translators. Containing ambiguous aesthetic information, the original literary text implies the existence of many variants of its understanding and interpretation at the stage of perception and decoding it within the native culture and using other languages and cultures.

Ruslana Sytar²¹ suggests that the main reason that complicates the translator's task is the plurality of meanings and the lack of an unambiguous correlation between form and meaning because language is a complex set

⁹ Kaiser, R. The dynamics of retranslation: Two stories. *Translation Review*. 2002. № 63. P. 84–85.

¹⁰ Koskinen, K. & Paloposki, O. Retranslations in the age of digital reproduction. *Cadernos de Tradução*. 2003. № 1(11). P. 19–38.

¹¹ Venuti, L. Retranslations: The creation of value. *Bucknell Review*. 2003. № 47(1). P. 25–39.

¹² Brownlie, S. *ibid.*

¹³ Gürçağlar, Ş. T. *ibid.*

¹⁴ Feng, L. Retranslation hypotheses revisited: a case study of two English translations of Sanguo Yanyi – the first Chinese novel. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*. 2014. №43. P. 69–86.

¹⁵ Farahzad, F. *ibid.*

¹⁶ Berman, A. (2000). Translation and the trial of the foreign. *The Translation Studies Reader*. L. Venuti (Ed.). London: Routledge, 2000. P. 284–297.

¹⁷ Farahzad, F. *ibid.*

¹⁸ Gürçağlar, Ş. T. *ibid.* P. 234.

¹⁹ Kaiser, R. *ibid.* P. 84.

²⁰ Feng, L. *ibid.* P. 73.

²¹ Ситар Р. А. *ibid.* P. 238.

of indirect interactions between meaning (semantics) and form (vocabulary and grammar).

The act of interlingual authorial interpretations of a literary text, according to Kateryna Mehela²², is not limited to the selection of interlingual equivalents, which causes different interpretations of the original work. The emergence of plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations of the source text is determined by each author's approach to the interpretation process as the author's individuality, his / her literary talent and language sense sharply manifest themselves during the reconstruction of both figurative means of the source text and writer's stylistic features²³. Kaisa Koskinen & Outi Paloposki²⁴ note in this regard that everyone can successfully interpret in his / her way, missing one or another feature of the source text and emphasizing another, which seems the most essential to him / her. According to Lawrence Venuti²⁵, the main goal of the author-interpreter is to minimize his / her subjective intervention in the source text and to get as close as possible to the objective essence of the interpreted work. Siobhan Brownlie²⁶ considers that the main task of the author-interpreter is not to create his / her individual style but to preserve and improve the imperfect interpretation creatively combining already adopted authorial decisions to get a higher level of adequacy.

Hence, all hypotheses and theories of the phenomenon of plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations identify two *main factors*: the desire of the author-interpreter to make a better interpretation than the existing one in which he / she could offer his / her understanding of the source text; the constant change of social context, which cause the emergence of new interpretations. The first factor explains the competition of authors-interpreters when transmitting the same source text, the result of which is the plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations. The second factor is determined by the evolutionary nature of the process of re-translation of the source text, which contributes to the accumulation of traditions both in the literary and cultural spheres.

Several interlingual interpretations help to understand the source text better, as they illuminate and emphasise its different aspects. In addition, the interlingual interpretation of the source text in the target language "speaks" to the readers in their native language, in particular non-verbal, but also in

²² Мегела К. І. *ibid.*

²³ Boiko, Ya. Translators' interpretations of Shakespeare's plays in the light of information entropy. *Alfred Nobel University Journal of Philology*. 2023. №. 1(25). P. 274–290. <https://doi.org/10.32342/2523-4463-2023-1-25-20>

²⁴ Koskinen, K. & Paloposki, O. *ibid.* P. 22.

²⁵ Venuti, L. *ibid.* P. 32.

²⁶ Brownlie, S. *ibid.* P. 154.

the language of culture, which will always be different from any other, no matter how close its verbal presentation may be. Therefore, it is advisable to consider the plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations as both a subjective phenomenon, related to the individual characteristics of the author-interpreter, and an objective one, caused by the necessity of one culture to be in dialogue with another. The objectivity of plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations also lies in the fact that a work of art is a dynamic phenomenon; it can exist in different historical and cultural planes, and has its destiny in space and time.

2. Factors for the diachronic plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations

This paper argues that, when examining interlingual authorial interpretations through both synchronic and diachronic lenses, diachronic plurality proves more effective than synchronic approaches in interlingual interpretation because it allows for linguistic and cultural evolution to be reflected in interpreted texts. This paper asserts that diachronic interlingual authorial interpretation is a more effective means of preserving the richness and complexity of Shakespearean drama within Ukrainian literary discourse. Unlike synchronic approaches, which prioritize fidelity to a single historical moment, diachronic interpretations engage with past and present linguistic shifts, enabling texts to resonate across different generations of readers. This approach aligns with scholarly discourse on the evolving nature of language and interpretation, as seen in the works of Kateryna Mehela²⁷ and Farzaneh Farahzad²⁸. The reconceptualization of interlingual interpretation through a diachronic lens thus allows for greater adaptability and cultural relevance in contemporary Ukrainian interpretations of Shakespeare.

According to Ruslana Sytar²⁹, the fact of the plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations, both in time and in space, is proof of the genius of the original work. The researcher distinguishes three types of plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations: *competing* (simultaneous coexistence of several foreign versions of the same original source text, published in a relatively short period of time); *active* (synchronous functioning of several foreign versions of the same original source text, published at different times); *passive* (one of the existing foreign versions serves as a substitute text for the original source text, while most of the foreign versions have become the property of literary history).

²⁷ Мегела К. І. *ibid.*

²⁸ Farahzad, F. *ibid.*

²⁹ Ситар Р. А. *ibid.* P. 237–240.

Maryna Novykova³⁰ clearly distinguishes three types of plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations: *in space* (when the same original source text is re-translated into different languages); *in the stylistic spectrum* (when there is a rivalry between contemporary foreign versions and compatriots – synchronous plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations); *in time* (when the original work is re-translated in different epochs – diachronic plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations).

The synchronic and diachronic plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations has different origins. Sjk Sorina³¹ notes that if synchronic plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations is a consequence of the ambiguity of the original source text, the belonging of the authors-interpreters to different schools, the desire to compete with contemporary authors, then diachronic plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations arises as a result of significant changes in the system of target language, the social sphere, the aesthetic norms of the target culture, views on the task of interpretation, which causes a new perception of the original source text.

Interlingual authorial interpretations become obsolete over time. The reasons for this phenomenon are often related to specific historical circumstances. Each specific period distinguishes certain language and style canons that depend on the recipient of the interpreted work. The metatext is created with a focus on the modern reader, under the influence of criteria determined by the perception of a given generation of readers³². A set of cultural, ideological, political, economic, and social parameters of the interpreted text is determined by the canons of the reader's perception and cannot be disregarded during interpretation. Being a representative of a specific generation, an author-interpreter is also subjected to the time factor, which causes changes in reality, internal processes of language development, enrichment of expressive means, etc. So, the diachronic plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations of a time-remote source text is determined by a complex of factors.

Let's consider some of them.

The influence of the epoch. An author-interpreter, as any artist, does not exist in a timeless dimension, but belongs to his / her epoch and interacts

³⁰ Новикова М. О. Перекладач і класика. Про форми і межі перекладацької інтерпретації. «Хай слово мовлене інакше...»: статті з теорії, критики та історії художнього перекладу. Київ : Дніпро, 1982. С. 40–50.

³¹ Sorina, S. *Diachronic Analysis of the Translation and Retranslation of C. S. Lewis's Chronicles of Narnia – The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*. Iași: Universitatea "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" din Iași, 2016.

³² Boiko, Ya. Interpretation module in the framework of the cognitive-discursive model of diachronic plurality in translation of Shakespeare's plays. *Topics in Linguistics*. 2022. № 23. P. .1–14.

with a certain socio-cultural environment. Socio-cultural values and norms shape the concept of creativity, which, in turn, can affect how the artistic method of the author-interpreter is combined with the literary trend of the epoch and becomes embodied in the specific individual style which the author-interpreter adheres to. Since each epoch and each culture bring something different to the set of these tools, the interlingual authorial interpretation of the same source text changes over time, which creates the possibility of the existence of a diachronic plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations of a time-remote source text.

The influence of the recipient culture. Culture, as a set of material and spiritual achievements of society, includes all the multifaceted aspects of human existence and consciousness (historical, social, and psychological features of the ethnic group, its traditions, views, values, institutions, behaviour, everyday life, living conditions, etc.).

Robert Sternberg & Todd Lubart³³ draw attention to the fact that in the process of interlingual authorial interpretation, two cultures interact, having both common features and national specificity. In this context, interlingual authorial interpretation is understood as a mental interpretive activity, as the central mechanism of intercultural communication. Researchers have convincingly shown that interlingual authorial interpretation is not a simple replacement of the source language words with the target language words. Interlingual authorial interpretation is always associated with certain transformations that depend on the ratio of languages.

At the end of the 20th century, the concept of the dialogue between cultures became almost the main object of philosophical reflection and acquired various definitions. Sandra Halverson & Martín Muñoz³⁴ substantiate the dialogue between cultures as a complex creative process of interaction between people who reflect different cultures and different value systems. At the same time, a peculiar communicative situation is created, when comparison and exchange of meanings take place at the same time. In the dialogue between cultures, such a combination of meanings occurs between representatives of different identities formed in a certain historical period under the influence of certain cultures.

The creative personality of the author-interpreter. It is the most important element in the process of interlingual authorial interpretation, as the authors-interpreters rearrange and interpret the original source text differently during interlingual authorial interpretations. When reproducing

³³ Sternberg, R. & Lubart, T. The concept of creativity: prospects and paradigms. *Handbook of Creativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. P. 5–8.

³⁴ Halverson, S. & Muñoz, M. The times, they are a-changin'. *Multilingual Mediated Communication and Cognition*. 2020. P. 3–5.

the source text in the target language, the author-interpreter deals with the uniqueness of the source language and the target language. And therefore, the creative personality of the author-interpreter is considered as a key factor for the diachronic plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations. According to Oleksandr Rebrii³⁵, the concept of the *creative personality* (a figurative form of thinking in the process of solving complex creative tasks caused by the difference in author's and interpreter's cognitive structures both in terms of reality categorization / conceptualization, and in structures of the mental thesaurus) is inextricably linked with the concept of the *linguistic personality* (a system that arises and develops in society based on the ability to express and consolidate social relations and interactions, as a condition and product of culture).

An author-interpreter acts as a bilingual person whose linguistic personality is shaped by the knowledge of two languages and two cultures. For a comprehensive study of the bilingual personality of the author-interpreter, Robert Sternberg & Todd Lubart³⁶ create a system of contexts as a dynamic set of objective elements of reality and subjective elements of personality. The researchers distinguish the following aspects of the linguistic personality of the author-interpreter: *personal* (biographical and professional with all experience, skills, moral and ethical norms), *cultural* (artistic, worldview, ethnic, religious, as well as the context of a certain language situation) and *existential* (political, economic, social and historical), expanding in this way the understanding of the multifaceted linguistic personality of the author-interpreter and implying the importance of all these aspects of the personality for his / her activity. Accordingly, the linguistic and intercultural competence of the author-interpreter is related to his / her personality, which, in turn, is directly dependent on his / her psycho-mental personal traits, such as memory, the ability to concentrate and overcome stress, and, especially, creativity.

The influence of the literary trends of the epoch. A literary trend is understood as something which a creative personality (namely, a writer or an author-interpreter) adheres to in his / her creative activity in regards to the literary forms, themes, ideologies, and expressions. A literary trend as a component of spiritual culture mirrors the general (or prevailing) course of a particular period and is reflected to some extent in the works of creative personalities living at this particular period. The literary trends dominant in Ukraine from the 19th to the 21st century are known to be Romanticism, Neoclassicism, Neo-Baroque, and Postmodernism. These literary trends,

³⁵ Ребрій О. В. Когнітивний підхід до вивчення проблеми креативності у перекладі. URL: <https://er.nau.edu.ua/bitstream/NAU/22982/1/.PDF>

³⁶ Sternberg, R. & Lubart, T. *ibid.* P. 3–15.

each of them having its specific features and system of forms and expressions, greatly influenced the diversity of interlingual authorial interpretations of Shakespearean plays in Ukraine³⁷. The adherence of the author-interpreter to this or that literary trend prevailing at a particular period appears to be an important factor for the diachronic plurality of Ukrainian interlingual authorial interpretations of Shakespearean plays.

3. Core argument and analysis of the diachronic plurality of Shakespearean tragedies in Ukraine

The effectiveness of diachronic interlingual interpretations of a time-remote source text is especially apparent in the Ukrainian adaptations of Shakespearean plays. This section examines chronologically distant Ukrainian versions of Shakespearean tragedy *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* (1600), performed from the 19th to the 21st century by Ukrainian authors-interpreters, such as Mykhailo Starytskyi (1882), Panteleimon Kulish (1899), Yurii Klen (1930), Hryhorii Kochur (1935), Leonid Hrebinka (1939), Oleksandr Hriaznov (2001), and Yurii Andrukhovych (2008) with a particular focus on the two recent interpretations of the 21st century that exemplify the success of diachronic approaches in interlingual interpretation. By comparing these with older Ukrainian versions, the study highlights how linguistic evolution enhances interpretative depth. The findings suggest that the diachronic plurality of interlingual interpretations not only preserves the integrity of Shakespearean works but also enriches their accessibility and impact in Ukrainian literary and theatrical traditions.

The tragedies of the great playwright William Shakespeare (1564–1616) were created in the late 16th and early 17th centuries and belong to the treasure of world literature. The creation of Shakespearean tragedies is known to have occurred during the following three periods:

- the 1st period (1591–1601), which is Shakespeare's "early start" in following the Greek tragedy tradition: *Titus Andronicus* (1591), *Romeo and Juliet* (1594), *Julius Caesar* (1599);

- the 2nd period (1601–1608), which is marked by Shakespeare's interest in tragic conflicts and tragic heroes: *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* (1600), *Troilus and Cressida* (1601), *Othello* (1604), *King Lear* (1605), *Macbeth* (1605), *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606), *Coriolanus* (1607);

- the 3rd period (1608–1612), which is characterized by Shakespeare's fantasy and allegory: *Cymbeline* (1609).

The language of Shakespearean tragedies is a sample of Early Modern English, which covers the period of the second half of the 16th century and the first half of the 17th century and is characterized by the formation and

³⁷ Boiko, Ya. *ibid.* P. 7–11.

further development of the standard norms of the national English language. Since the playwright wrote for the public theatre, the language of his plays was simple enough and comprehensible to the general public.

Let's consider a fragment from Shakespearean tragedy *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, act 3, scene 3:

(1) Up, sword; and *know thou* a more *horrid hent*: / When he is *drunk asleep*, or in his rage, / Or in the *incestuous pleasure of his bed*; / At gaming, swearing, or about some act / That has no *relish of salvation* in't; / Then *trip him*, that *his heels may kick at heaven*, / And that his *soul may be as damn'd and black* / As *hell*, whereto it goes. My mother stays³⁸.

This fragment vividly demonstrates the lack of a standardized English language which is manifested in parallel existence of archaisms (*thou*) and neologisms (*hent*) in Shakespearean dramatic text; phrases of high style (*Up, sword; and know thou a more horrid hent; relish of salvation*) and colloquial lexicon (*then trip him; when he is drunk asleep*), living folk images (*that his heels may kick at heaven; in the incestuous pleasure of his bed*) and images of high poetry (*that his soul may be as damn'd and black / As hell*). Stylistic differentiation was not proper to Early Modern English. Only with the English language normalization in the process of its historical development, these words were accepted as archaisms or neologisms, poeticisms or colloquialisms, etc.

In the 16th century, such a language was spoken and understood by both the characters of Shakespearean plays and the spectators of these plays, but such stylistic indiscrimination of the playwright's language presented a lot of problems for authors-interpreters who tried to solve these problems under the influence of this or that literary trend – Romanticism, Realism, Neoclassicism, Futurism, Neo-Baroque, and Postmodernism.

In ***Ukraine***, the reception of Shakespearean works began only in the 40^s of the 19th century and was connected with the specifics of national self-awareness and self-identification. In Ukrainian literature, Ukrainian versions of Shakespearean tragedies, which were created in radically different historical epochs – the second half of the 19th century; the 20th century; the beginning of the 21st century³⁹, are connected with the names of famous Ukrainian authors-interpreters whose artistic methods and individual styles

³⁸ Shakespeare, W. *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*. URL: <http://shakespeare.mit.edu/hamlet/full.html>

³⁹ Boiko, Ya. & Nikonova, V. Cognitive model of the tragic in Ukrainian retranslations of Shakespeare's plays. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*. 2021. № 17(21). P. 1040.

were greatly determined by the literary trends prevailing at these corresponding periods.

The second half of the 19th century in Ukraine is characterized by Romanticism which Ukrainian authors-interpreters adhere to in this period.

Romanticism (French: *romantisme*) is a trend in literature, science and art that emerged at the end of the 18th century in Germany, England and France, and then spread to Poland, Russia, Austria and Ukraine at the beginning of the 19th century. The epoch of Romanticism in Ukraine (the end of the 18th century – the beginning of the 19th century) is associated with the increased influence of Russian culture, since most of Ukraine was part of the Russian Empire, which caused the Russification of the upper layers of Ukrainian society. Due to the decline of the Slavic-Ukrainian literary language in the 18th century the middle classes of Ukraine used folk colloquialisms with a “vile style and burlesque form”, which determined a certain specificity of the romantic Ukrainian style of the time⁴⁰.

The representatives of this literary trend are: Panteleimon Kulish (1819–1897): *King Lear* (1880), *Troilus and Cressida* (1881), *Othello, the Moor of Venice* (1882), *Coriolanus* (1882), *Julius Caesar* (1886), *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* (1899), *Macbeth* (1900), *Antony and Cleopatra* (1901), *Romeo and Juliet* (1901); Mykhailo Starytskyi (1840–1904): *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* (1882).

Let's consider Kulish's⁴¹ version of the given above fragment (1):

(2) Сховайся, мечу, й знай *страшнішу* пору. / Як буде *пятий* він чи *біснுவатий*, / Чи *сонни на кровозмісивім* ложі, / Чи в *грі, в божбі*, або в якому *ділі*, / Що *грішній* не дає душі *спасення*, / Тоді *штовхни* його, щоб він *пятами* / *Брикав* до неба, і нехай проклята / Душа його на вік і чорна буде, / Як пекло те, куди летить *поганець*. / *Паньматка* жде мене.⁴²

[Hide, sword, and know *the worst time*. / When he will be *drunk or demonized*, / Or *sleepy on a bloody bed*, / Whether in a *game, in prayer*, or in some *business*, / That a *sinner* does not give *salvation to the soul*, / Then *push him* so that he *kicks his heels* / *to the sky*, and may his soul be *cursed* /

⁴⁰ Зеров М. Українське письменство / упор. М. Сулима. Київ : Основи, 2003. С. 235.

⁴¹ Шекспір У. Гамлет, принц данський. Переклад П. Куліша; передмова і пояснення І. Франка. Львів : Українсько-руська видавнича спілка, 1899. С. 94.

⁴² Skhovaysya, mechu, y znay *strashniyshu* poru. / Yak bude *pyaty* vin chy *bisnuvatyy*, / Chy *sonny na krovozmisyvym lozhi*, / Chy v *hri, v bozhbi*, abo v yakomu *dyilyi*, / Shcho *hrishniy* ne daye dushi *spasennya*, / Todyi *shtovkhny* yoho, shchob vin *pyatamy* / *Brykav* do neba, i nekhay proklyata / Dusha yoho na vik i chorna bude, / Yak pекlo te, kudy letyt' *pohanets*'.

His soul will be black forever, / Like hell, where the *heathen* flies. / Mother is waiting for me].

The literary activity of Kulish is distinguished by a high degree of pathos, the sublimity of the main character, and a great number of artistic techniques. The emphasis is put on the issue of national consciousness and spirit. In his version, Kulish created a special poetic language that combined the resources of the old bookish language (Old Russian or Old Ukrainian) and folk poetic language, which was determined not only by the epoch, but also by the effort of the author-interpreter to distinguish the Ukrainian language as a separate and independent language system. The fragment vividly demonstrates the combination of the bookish vocabulary (Old Russianisms, Old Ukrainianisms, Church Slavonicisms: *не дає душі спасення* [does not give salvation to the soul]; *в божбі* [in prayer]; *біснுவатий* [demonized]; *паньматка* [mother]) with localisms and colloquialisms (*Тоді штовхни його, щоб він пятами / Брикав до неба* [Then push him so that he kicks his heels / to the sky]; *поганець* [heathen]) as well as author's coinages and formal experiments (*знай страшнішу пору*; / *Як буде пятий він*; / *Чи сонни на кровозмісивім ложі* [know the worst time; / When he will be drunk, / Or sleepy on a bloody bed]; *п'ятами* [heels]). Adhering to the principle of maximal lexical equivalence with the source text, Kulish focuses on the historical epoch of the time-remote source text. Consequently, his version demonstrates the parallel use of literary and colloquial lexicon as evidence of non-normalization of Early Modern English.

Let's consider Starytskyi's⁴³ interlingual authorial interpretation of the fragment above (1):

(3) Меч в піхви: *Чигаймо* на хвилину / Найстрашнішу: як засне він п'яний, / Чи була розсатаніє в гніві, / Чи потоне у *заласних втіхах*, – / Чи за грою, чи за словом марним, / Чи за ділом, котре *тхне прокльоном*, / Оттоді пройми його ти, мече, / Але так, щоб *сторчача* в безодню / Полетів він *догори п'ятами* / І поніс прокляту, чорну душу, / Як те пекло, де він має бути. / Мати жде.⁴⁴

[The sword in the scabbard: *Let's wait* for a moment / The most terrible: how he will fall asleep drunk, / Whether he will be disintegrated in anger, /

⁴³ Шекспір В. Гамлет / переклад М. Старицького ; стаття С. Родзевича ; ред., стаття й примітки А. Ніковського. Київ: Книгоспілка, 1928. С. 111.

⁴⁴ *Mech v pikhyu: Chyhaymo* na khvylynu / Naystrashnishu: yak zasne vin p'yanyy, / Chy buva rozsataniye v hnivi, / Chy potone u zalasnykh vtikhakh, – / Chy za hroyu, chy za slovom marnym, / Chy za dilom, kotre tkhne prokl'onom, / Ottodi proymy yoho ty, meche, / Ale tak, shchob storchaka v bezodnyu / Poletiv vin dohory p'yatamy / I ponis proklyatu, chornu dushu, / Yak te pекlo, de vin maye buty. / Maty zhde.

Or drown in *self-indulgent comforts*, – / Whether for a game, or for an idle word, / Or for a deed that *reeks of a curse*, / From then on, you sword, but in such a way that he plunged into the abyss / He flew *with his heels upwards* / And carried a cursed, black soul, / Like that hell, where he should be. / Mother is waiting.]

Starytskyi made a valuable contribution not only to the development of the Ukrainian literary language, but also to Ukrainian culture in general, through his public activities, artistic practice, and translation activities. Starytskyi believed that the Ukrainian language played an exceptional role in the life of society, in the development of science, culture, and education, which is why he tried to level up its intellectual and expressive capabilities. Starytskyi was a great connoisseur of the national vocabulary; he understood the semantics of words subtly, the norms of their creation, and the sphere of application. He used little-known, seldom-used, and vernacular words, resorted to word formation, neologisms, bookish and abstract vocabulary. Starytskyi, in his romantic manner, strove to create a high style; adhering to the original source text, the author-interpreter combined the accuracy of the interlingual authorial interpretation with the naturalness of the source text. He tried to accurately reproduce not only the originality of the content, but also the form of the original source text. Under Starytskyi's pen, interlingual authorial interpretation becomes a kind of laboratory for the creation of new means of poetic language, in particular neologisms. Starytskyi's linguistic innovation can be deduced in the use of all the wealth of Volyn and Polis lexical means (*чужаймо* [*let's wait*]), which reveal the depth of the writer's knowledge of the national vocabulary, in masterful versification along with non-observance of the principle of equilinearity, in a wide usage of occasionalisms (*догору н'ятому* [*he flew with his heels upwards*]), archaisms (*заласних втихах* [*self-indulgent comforts*]) and neologisms (*сторчака* [*upwards*]).

The 20th century in Ukraine is characterized by Neoclassicism and Neo-Baroque.

Neoclassicism (Greek: νέος 'new') is a neostyle in the world art of the late 18th – early 19th centuries, which takes the “classic norm” as a basis. Neoclassics adhere to the perfection of form and clarity of language, concentrate on the eternal principles of existence, and focus on the best examples of art, created in previous epochs. In Ukraine (1960^s–70^s), the neoclassical literature tries to convey images, ideas, and a worldview based on the European language, literature, and culture model. The neoclassical strategy is genre-stylistic integrity in perception and reproduction of the original; subjectivity in the reproduction of culture in the original; the choice

of the form of reproduction, justified and motivated by the target culture tradition⁴⁵.

The representatives of this literary trend are: Yurii Klen (Oswald-Eckard Burghardt, (1891–1947): *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* (1960); Maksym Rylskyi (1895–1964): *King Lear* (1941); Borys Ten (Mykola Khomychevskyi, 1897–1983): *Antony and Cleopatra* (1966), *Macbeth* (1986); Iryna Steshenko (1898–1987): *Othello* (1950), *Romeo and Juliet* (1952); Vasyl Mysyk (1907–1963): *Romeo and Juliet* (1932), *Timon of Athens* (1964), *Julius Caesar* (1986); Hryhorii Kochur (1908–1994): *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* (1964).

Let's consider Klen's (4)⁴⁶ and Kochur's (5)⁴⁷ interlingual authorial interpretations of the fragment above (1):

(4) Сховайся, мечу, і чекай хвилини / страшнішої, коли він буде п'яний, / чи гнівний, чи на ложі нечестивім / віддасться втіхам, грі або клятьбі, ділам безбожницьким і сатанинським, / тоді врази його, мій вірний мечу, / щоб він сторчма у пекло полетів / з душею чорною, мов та безодня. / На мене мати вже давно чекає.⁴⁸

[Hide, sword, and wait for a moment / more terrible, when he will be drunk, / or angry, or on the wicked bed / indulge in pleasures, games or curses, godless and satanic deeds, / then strike him, my faithful sword, / so that he upwards flew to hell / with a soul as black as the abyss. / My mother has been waiting for me for a long time].

Klen's interlingual authorial interpretation appears as a unique fusion of rationalist and romantic principles. He avoids artificiality and vulgarization of the target language, preserving the content of the source text as much as possible. In his poetic style, Klen adhered to the preservation of rhythm, melody, and content of the source text. He leaned towards the conversational sincerity and singing melodiousness of the poetic phrase. The author-interpreter got rid of complex syntax, pseudo-nationality, and excessive borrowings. In his interlingual authorial interpretation, Klen opposed the

⁴⁵ Неокласицизм. *Українська мала енциклопедія*: 16 кн.: у 8 т. Ред. Є. Онацький. Буенос-Айрес, 1962. Т. 5, кн. IX, Літери На – Ол. С. 1123–1124.

⁴⁶ Шекспір В. Трагедія про Гамлета, принца данського. Переклад Ю. Клена. URL: <https://www.myslenedrevo.com.ua/uk/Lit/K/KlenJu/Transl/Hamlet.html>

⁴⁷ Шекспір В. Гамлет, принц данський. Переклад Г. Кочура. Київ : «Альтерпрес», 2003. С. 94.

⁴⁸ Skhovaysya, mechu, i chekay khvylyny / strashnishoyi, koly vin bude p'yanyy, / chy hnivnyy, chy na lozhi nechestyvim / viddast'sya vtikham, hri abo klyat'bi, dilam bezbozhnyts'kkym i satanyns'kym, / todi vrazy yoho, miy virnyy mechu, / shchob vin storchma u peklo poletiv / z dusheyu chornoyu, mov ta bezodnya. / Na mene maty vzhe davno chekaye.

artificiality and vulgarization of the target language. His version is full of colourful folk expressions (*на ложі нечестивім* [on the wicked bed]), nationally coloured equivalents (*віддається втіхам* [indulge in pleasures]), synonymous and antonymous adjectives (*ділам безбожницьким і сатанинським* [godless and satanic deeds]), specification of meanings of the original units (*з душею чорною, мов та безодня* [with a soul as black as the abyss]), and occasionalisms (*клятьбі* [curses], *сторчма* [upwards]), *знівний* [angry]).

(5) Сховайся, мечу, на страшнішу дію: / Коли він п'яний спить, або лютує, / Чи поринає в кровозмісні втіхи, / Чи в карти грає, чи блюзнить словами, / Тоді без жалощів його вражай, / Щоб неба він черкнув хіба п'ятою, / Щоб чорний був душею, наче пекло, / Куди впаде він.⁴⁹

[Hide, sword, for a more terrible action: / When he sleeps drunk, or rages, / Or immerses himself in *bloodthirsty pleasures*, / Or plays cards, or *blasphemes with words*, / Then strike him without pity, / So that he may *scratch the sky with a heel*, / So that the soul is black, like hell, / Where will he fall].

Kochur's interlingual authorial interpretation focuses more on the original source text as the literary basis. Kochur combines the classic stylistic interpretation of the original source text, in which prevails noble rhetoric (*чорний був душею, наче пекло* [the soul is black, like hell]), with a variety of individual authorial solutions (*на страшнішу дію* [for a more terrible action]). Kochur's style is characterized with literary vocabulary and idioms (*блюзнить словами* [blasphemes with words], *кровозмісні втіхи* [bloodthirsty pleasures], *черкнув хіба п'ятою* [scratch the sky with a heel]); complex literary syntax; slender rhythmic structure; exact end rhyme. Kochur skilfully and consistently reproduces Shakespeare's ideas, observing equivalence at the lexical level, cultivating the balance of the poetic line and the nobility of rhetoric, preserving the tonality and sublimity of the utterance.

Neo-Baroque (Greek: νέος 'new') is a neo-style that developed in European art in the 19th century and combined elements of other neo-styles of this century, such as Rococo Revival and Renaissance Revival. Ukraine was also involved in the Neo-Baroque literary trend in art. In the language,

⁴⁹ Skhovaysya, mechu, na strashnishu diyu: / Koly vin p'yanyy spyt', abo lyutuye, / Chy porynaye v krovozmishni vtikhy, / Chy v karty hraye, chy blyuznyt' slovamy, / Todi bez zhaloshchiv yoho vrazhay, / Shchob neba vin cherknuv khiba p'yatoyu, / Shchob chorny buv dusheyu, nache peklo, / Kudy vpade vin....

the Neo-Baroque style is characterized by formal innovation, increased metaphorization, aphorism, and paradoxical poetic expression⁵⁰.

Representatives of this literary trend are: Todos Osmachka (Teodosii Osmachka, 1895–1962): *Macbeth* (1930); Abram Hosenpud (1908–2004): *Romeo and Juliet* (1937); Leonid Hrebinka (1909–1942): *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* (1975); Mykola Lukash (1919–1988): *Troil and Cressida* (1986).

Let's consider Hrebinka's⁵¹ interlingual authorial interpretation of the fragment above (1):

(6) У піхви, меч; на мить страшнішу жди. / Коли ун'ється він, чи буде в гніві, / Чи в кровозмісних втіхах на постелі, / У грі, в блюзнірстві чи за іншим ділом, / Далекий від спасіння, – ось тоді / Убий, щоб і зоглядітись не встиг він, / Щоб душу, кляту й чорну, ніби пекло, / У пекло він поніс... Ба, матір жде.⁵²

[In the scabbard, a sword; for a moment, wait for something more terrible. / When he gets drunk, whether he is in anger, / Or in blood-soaked comforts on the bed, / In a game, in blasphemy or on some other business, / Far from salvation, then / Kill, so that he does not even have time to look back, / So that the soul, cursed and black, like hell, / To hell he carried... Well, the mother is waiting].

Hrebinka's interlingual authorial interpretation demonstrates a truly vernacular Ukrainian language with stylistic expression of the lower Baroque element and its inherently natural manner. Hrebinka's creative style is characterized by increased metaphorical and paradoxical images. Hrebinka's interlingual authorial versions are designed for the average Ukrainians of the 1930^s, and therefore the neo-baroque style of his interpretation is distinguished with a vivid stylistic expression of the vernacular Ukrainian language (*Коли ун'ється він* [When he gets drunk]; *У грі, в блюзнірстві чи за іншим ділом* [whether he is in anger, / Or in blood-soaked comforts on the bed]; *Далекий від спасіння* [Far from salvation]; *матір* [mother]), prosaic lexical-grammatical constructions (*на мить страшнішу жди* [for a moment, wait for something more terrible]; *в кровозмісних втіхах на постелі* [in blood-soaked comforts on the bed]; *щоб і зоглядітись не встиг він* [so that he does not even have time to look

⁵⁰ Літературознавча енциклопедія: у 2 т. / авт.-уклад. Ю. І. Ковалів. Київ : ВЦ «Академія», 2007. Т. 2: М – Я. С. 114–115.

⁵¹ Shekspir, V. Шекспір В. Гамлет, принц датський / переклад Л. Гребінки. URL: <https://translate-ua.livejournal.com/10577.html>

⁵² У піхви, меч; на мить' страшнішу жди. / Koly up'yet'sya vin, chy bude v hnivi, / Chy v krovozmisnykh vtikhakh na posteli, / U hri, v blyuznirstvi chy za inshym dilom, / Dalekyy vid spasinnya, – os' todi / Ubyy, shchob i zohlyaditys' ne vstyh vin, / Shchob dushu, klyatu y chornu, niby peklo, / U peklo vin ponis... Ba, matir zhde.

back]) and down-to-earth imagery (*Щоб душу, кляту й чорну, ніби пекло, / У пекло він поніс* [So that the soul, cursed and black, like hell, / To hell he carried]).

The beginning of the 21st century in Ukraine is characterized by Postmodernism.

In *Postmodernism*, as a reaction to the ideas of the Age of Enlightenment, the boundaries between high and mass art are blurred; themes, styles and genres are combined; mass culture is dissociated from elitist one, author is distanced from viewer (reader), etc. Ukrainian postmodernism marked a new approach to the interlingual authorial interpretation of literary source text – there is a departure from established canons, irony at classics and theft of the symbols of national memory. Authorial interpretations are full of stylistic devices; there is a wide variety of lexicon: from generally accepted normative lexical units to slang, dialect, vulgar and abusive words, etc.⁵³

Representatives of this literary trend are: Oleksandr Hriaznov (1940–2021): *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* (2001), *Macbeth* (2008), *King Lear* (2008), *Othello* (2008); Yurii Andrukhovych (born in 1960) *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* (2008), *Romeo and Juliet* (2016), *King Lear* (2021).

Let's consider Hriaznov's (7)⁵⁴ and Andrukhovych's (8)⁵⁵ interlingual authorial interpretations of the fragment above (1):

(7) Чекай, *rapiro!* Буде інша зустріч, / Коли *нап'ється* він, чи буде в гніві, / Або у насолодах кровозмісних, / За картами, чи в *помислах нечистих* / Про інше зло. Тоді його коли, / Щоб він упав, *задравши ноги вгору*, / До чорта в пекло, *чорний від пороків*. / Але чекає мати на синочка.⁵⁶

[Wait, *rapier!* There will be another meeting, / When he *gets drunk*, or will he be in anger, / Or in the pleasures of bloodthirsty, / At cards, or *in the impure thoughts* / About other evil. Then slaughter him, / So that he fell *with his legs up*, / To devil in hell, *black with vices*. / But the mother is waiting for her son.].

⁵³ Літературознавча енциклопедія. *ibid.* С. 253–256.

⁵⁴ Шекспір В. Гамлет. Переклад О. Грязнова. URL: <https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/world/printit.php?tid=9048>

⁵⁵ Шекспір В. Гамлет. Переклад Ю. Андруховича. Київ: А-БА-БА-ГА-ЛА-МА-ГА, 2008. С. 136.

⁵⁶ Chekay, *rapiro!* Bude insha zustrich, / Koly *nap'yetsya* vin, chy bude v hnivi, / Abo u nasolodakh krovozmisnykh, / Za kartamy, chy v *pomyslakh nechystykh* / Pro inshe zlo. Todi yoho koly, / Shchob vin upav, *zadravshy nohy vhoru*, / Do chorta v peklo, *chornyy vid porokiv*. / Ale chekaye maty na synochka.

Hriaznov treats the source text somewhat freely, often resorting to paraphrasing original lexical units, due to his own reception (*задравши ноги вгору* [with his legs up]). The author-interpreter pays more attention to the content than to the style, and does not reproduce all the features of Shakespearean language such as repetitions, exclamations, etc. Hriaznov often omits individual lines and images, which distances his interpretation from the original source text. In order to reproduce Shakespearean poetic style, the author-interpreter uses Old Slavonicisms, archaisms (*в помислах нечистих* [in the impure thoughts]), morphological substitutions, alliteration, ellipsis (*Чекай, паніпо!* [Wait, rapier!]). Almost a third of the epithet constructions are transformed in his version: the position of the attribute is changed from preposition to the postposition of the signified word, which gives his work a poetics.

(8) Назад з мечем і вичекай хвилину, / Щоб він упився, вгрався, спав у ліжку / Гріховному, в блюзнірстві, блювотинні, / За картами, у шалі, в ейфорії, / Щоб мав усе, крім думки про спасіння – / Тоді його звали, щоб аж задерлись / Підшови, щоб огидну чорну душу / Забрала чорнота...Чекає мати.⁵⁷

[Back with the sword and wait a minute, / So that he got drunk, played, slept in a bed / Sinful, in blasphemy, vomiting, / At cards, in a shawl, in euphoria, / So that he had everything except the thought of salvation – / Then knock him down, so that his soles may go up / So that the disgusting black soul / Blackness took away...The mother is waiting.].

Andrukhovych's interlingual authorial interpretations are considered as a re-creation of the source text, an example of arbitrariness in the reproduction of the classic text. His interpretations refer to the conversational culture of a living contemporary. Andrukhovych impresses with the modernization of the stylistics of the source text, figurative simplification. The author-interpreter chooses the strategy of avoiding stereotypes by adding colloquial intonation and spatial vocabulary to the tragedy, thus reducing the artistic distance between the author and his creative manner. Radical modernization of the classic time-remote source text takes place at the expense of modern colloquial vocabulary and phraseology. The author-interpreter simplifies the imagery of the original source text (*спав у ліжку / Гріховному; За картами, у шалі, в ейфорії; щоб огидну чорну душу / Забрала чорнота*. [slept in a bed / Sinful, in blasphemy, vomiting, / At cards,

⁵⁷ Nazad z mechem i vyche kay khvylynu, / Shchob vin upyv s ya, vhrav s ya, spav u lizhku / Hrikhovnomu, v blyuznirstvi, blyuvotynni, / Za kartamy, u shali, v eyforyii, / Shchob mav use, krim dumky pro spasynnya – / Todi yoho zvaly, shchob azh zaderlys' / Pidoshvy, shchob ohydnu chornu dushu / Zabrала chornota...Chekaye maty.

in a shawl, in euphoria]), bringing it closer to a mass Ukrainian audience. Andrukhovych uses ethno-cultural allusions to certain features of the Ukrainian national character and system. Colloquialisms (*Щоб він упився, вгрався* [So that he got drunk, played]; *Тоді його звали, щоб аж задерлись / Підшови* [Then knock him down, so that his soles may go up]) and frank physiological connotations (*в блюзнірстві, блювотинні* [in blasphemy, vomiting]) cause the appearance of sarcastic irony in the general tonality of Andrukhovych's interlingual authorial interpretation.

The research argues that Hriaznov's and Andrukhovych's interpretations of Shakespearean drama mark a notable development in how Shakespeare is perceived and received in Ukrainian literature for several key reasons.

Stylistic and linguistic richness. Andrukhovych and Hriaznov enrich the Ukrainian adaptations of Shakespeare through bold stylistic choices and emotional nuance. **Andrukhovych** employs a modern, occasionally provocative style that revitalizes Shakespeare's language to resonate with today's Ukrainian readers and theatre-goers. For example, in *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, he takes **creative liberties and experiments with poetic form, uses contemporary vernacular**, replacing traditional, archaic phrases with modern slang or expressive idioms. This makes the text feel vibrant and emotionally present, rather than something distant or preserved like a museum artifact. Hriaznov, though more reserved than Andrukhovych, moves away from the rigid and overly didactic style characteristic of earlier versions in the 20th century. His work, especially his interpretation of *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, reveals a heightened awareness of rhythm, metaphor, and emotional subtlety.

Cultural and historical contextualization. Soviet-era authors-interpreters, especially in the 20th century, were often restricted by Soviet ideology, portraying Shakespeare's characters as moral exemplars or victims of class struggle, which narrowed the interpretive scope of Shakespearean texts. As a result, their versions tended to be more rigid and moralistic, focusing on political clarity rather than embracing artistic nuance. In contrast, both Hriaznov and Andrukhovych were freed from Soviet censorship as they worked within a post-Soviet, culturally **pluralistic environment**. This freedom enabled them to reinterpret Shakespeare from a uniquely Ukrainian perspective, weaving in local cultural elements and linguistic richness while embedding Shakespearean works with a modern Ukrainian worldview to make the plays more relevant and resonant for Ukrainian audiences. For example, **Andrukhovych** might inject a scene with references to **modern Ukrainian politics or cultural attitudes**, subtly altering tone or emphasis to reflect post-Soviet sensibilities. **Hriaznov** might use **Ukrainian folk metaphors or rhythms** in his verse, creating a uniquely

local flavour – turning universal lines into something that feels born out of Ukrainian soil.

Theatrical Dynamism. Both Hriaznov and Andrukhovych empower modern performances with emotionally charged and theatrically flexible texts. In productions featuring Andrukhovych's interpretation of *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, Hamlet is raw and sarcastic, he mocks power and tradition. The character's existential struggles feel more immediate and relevant, partially due to the interpreter's use of playful **irony, colloquialisms, and** streetwise language. Audiences hear characters speak in voices that reflect **their own time, place, and emotions** – whether it's a revolutionary Hamlet or a sorrowful Ophelia grounded in Ukrainian poetic tradition. A staging of Hriaznov's version of *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* maintains the original's poetic solemnity while integrating a psychological depth that earlier versions lacked. The production emphasizes slow-burning tension, with Hamlet's lines delivered with deep emotional gravity. The text is noted for its intense, brooding energy, which enhances the emotional power of the tragedy.

Together, Hriaznov and Andrukhovych reshaped the Ukrainian Shakespearean tradition. They infuse the plays with linguistic richness, cultural contemporaneity, and performative vitality, making them more resonant for modern Ukrainian audiences than their Soviet-era predecessors. Their interpretations break away from didactic, ideologically rigid approaches; enrich the texts with poetic vigour and contemporary relevance; empower performers and directors to explore Shakespeare's themes in a more dynamic, emotionally resonant manner. As such, their work does not merely translate Shakespeare – it **transforms** him for Ukraine's contemporary cultural moment.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper has argued that the most successful Ukrainian versions of Shakespearean *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* are those that engage in diachronic interlingual interpretation. By embracing linguistic and cultural plurality, these adaptations offer a more dynamic and resonant understanding of Shakespearean tragedy. The study concludes that the adaptability of Shakespeare's language over time allows modern interpretations to better capture the complexities of the playwright's text, ensuring its continued relevance for Ukrainian audiences.

The diachronic interlingual interpretations of the time-remote source text reflect the individualities of authors-interpreters, shaped in various historical conditions, their aesthetic views, different from the author of the source text. Shakespearean works belong to the Renaissance period, when there was

a turn from theocentrism to anthropocentrism, which caused a new understanding of the world and a man in it, a new meaning of life and beauty. Ukrainian interlingual authorial interpretations of Shakespearean tragedies were formed under the influence of significantly different literary trends which were prevailing in the respective centuries – Romanticism (Panteleimon Kulish, Mykhailo Starytskyi), Neoclassicism (Yurii Klen, Hryhorii Kochur), Neo-Baroque (Leonid Hrebinka), and Postmodernism (Oleksandr Hriaznov, Yurii Andrukhovych). The literary trends are embodied in each interlingual authorial interpretation that reflects the creative personality of the author-interpreter and his/her linguistic variability. Different creative personalities of authors-interpreters, working even with the same source text, created different interlingual authorial interpretations, which justifies the existence of a diachronic plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations of the same source text.

In the study, the problem of diachronic plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations of the same source text was considered on the material of the time-remote source text – Shakespearean tragedy *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* (1600) and its Ukrainian chronologically distant versions performed by Starytskyi (1882), Kulish (1899), Klen (1930), Kochur (1935), Hrebinka (1939), Hriaznov (2001), and Andrukhovych (2008) during three centuries. The literary and stylistic parameters of Shakespearean tragedy and its Ukrainian versions were determined by specifying the reflection of the worldviews of Shakespeare and Ukrainian authors-interpreters, as well as by revealing the adherence of the authors-interpreters to particular literary trends existing in Ukraine at that time.

The linguistic variability of Ukrainian chronologically distant versions of Shakespearean tragedy *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* reflects the creative personalities of the Ukrainian authors-interpreters, whose manners are different even if the interlingual authorial interpretations were produced in the same literary trend and epoch. Thus, Kulish, belonging to Romanticism, created a special poetic language that combined the resources of the old bookish language, balanced clear style and inherently natural manner while Starytskyi, who also adhered to Romanticism, strove to create a high style, referring to the source text, combining the accuracy of the reproduction with the naturalness of the source text. The representatives of Neoclassicism, Klen and Kochur, both focused on the source text, but Klen avoided artificiality and vulgarization of the target language while Kochur cultivated the poetic language balance and the rhetoric nobility. Hriaznov's and Andrukhovych's interlingual authorial interpretations also belong to the same literary trend – Postmodernism. Both authors-interpreters modernized the source text and did not reproduce all the features

of Shakespearean language. Hriaznov paid more attention to the content than to the style by using Old Slavonicisms, archaisms while Andrukhovych used modern colloquial vocabulary and phraseology, and sometimes extremely brutal vocabulary, somewhat simplified figurative expressions and images.

The research emphasizes that the latest Ukrainian interpretations of Shakespearean *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* by Hriaznov and Andrukhovych in the 21st century stand out as the most successful modern **versions**. Their updated adaptations bring a fresh, vivid, and dynamic energy to the play, largely due to the fluid and expressive language of these new versions. Directors and actors appreciate **the greater performative flexibility** these versions provide, as they avoid **archaic phrasing or ideological overtones** of the previous interpretations. This opens up **new emotional and dramatic possibilities** in the staging and interpretation of Shakespeare's play.

Future research should further explore the interplay of linguistic evolution and cognitive adaptation strategies to refine approaches to interlingual interpretation.

SUMMARY

This study delves into the diverse and evolving Ukrainian interpretations of Shakespearean tragedy *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* (1600) from the 19th to the 21st century with particular attention to the recent versions, which prove to be the most successful due to their artistic depth and cultural resonance. Tracing a rich tradition of Ukrainian reception of Shakespeare across three centuries, the paper examines the diachronic plurality of interlingual authorial interpretations of the same time-remote Shakespearean source text, reproduced in Ukrainian by Ukrainian authors. The research highlights how Ukrainian authors-interpreters reimagined Shakespeare's themes and characters within their own cultural and historical contexts as well as literary trends that prevailed in Ukraine in the respective centuries – Romanticism in the 19th century, Neoclassicism and Neo-Baroque in the 20th century, and Postmodernism in the 21st century. This article addresses the life and literary contributions of the Ukrainian authors-interpreters of Shakespearean works, offering insight into their individual linguistic and cognitive styles, the historical evolution of artistic forms and cultural contexts in which chronologically distant Ukrainian versions were created. Beginning with the 19th century, the analysis reveals the role of Shakespeare in shaping national identity during periods of political oppression and cultural revival. In the Soviet era of the 20th century, Ukrainian interpretations of Shakespeare frequently conveyed hidden or symbolic messages, reflecting broader struggle for intellectual and artistic freedom.

The study focuses on the contemporary Ukrainian literature of the 21st century, where Shakespearean motifs are recontextualized to address modern concerns such as war, displacement, and globalization. The recent Ukrainian interpretations prove to be the most successful as they reveal how cultural and aesthetic shifts across time have shaped diverse Ukrainian adaptations of Shakespearean works. Ultimately, this study demonstrates Shakespeare's enduring presence in Ukrainian literature and underscores the dynamic dialogue between global literary heritage and national literary development.

Bibliography

1. Зеров М. Українське письменство / упор. М. Сулима. Київ : Основи, 2003. 1302 с.
2. Літературознавча енциклопедія: у 2 т. / авт.-уклад. Ю. І. Ковалів. Київ : ВЦ «Академія», 2007. Т. 2: М – Я. 624 с.
3. Мегела К. І. Чинники множинності відтворення дискурсивних маркерів (на матеріалі українських перекладів твору Р. Л. Стівенсона «Острів скарбів»). *Мовні і концептуальні картини світу*. 2011. № 37. URL: http://www.philology.kiev.ua/library/zagal/Movni_i_konceptualni_2011_37/055_062.pdf
4. Неокласицизм. *Українська мала енциклопедія* : 16 кн. : у 8 т. / ред. Є. Онацький. Буенос-Айрес, 1962. Т. 5, кн. IX, Літери На – Ол. С. 1123–1124.
5. Новикова М. О. Перекладач і класика. Про форми і межі перекладацької інтерпретації. «Хай слово мовлене інакше...»: статті з теорії, критики та історії художнього перекладу. Київ : Дніпро, 1982. С. 40–50.
6. Ребрій О. В. Когнітивний підхід до вивчення проблеми креативності у перекладі. URL: <https://er.nau.edu.ua/bitstream/NAU/22982/1/.PDF>
7. Ситар Р. А. Множинність перекладів як варіантність відтворення жанрово-стилістичних особливостей часово віддаленого першотвору. *Науковий вісник Чернівецького університету. Серія : Германська філологія*. 2014. № 692–693. С. 237–240.
8. Berman, A. Translation and the trial of the foreign. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London : Routledge, 2000. P. 284–297.
9. Boiko, Ya. Interpretation module in the framework of the cognitive-discursive model of diachronic plurality in translation of Shakespeare's plays. *Topics in Linguistics*. 2022. № 23. P. 1–14.
10. Boiko, Ya. Translators' interpretations of Shakespeare's plays in the light of information entropy. *Alfred Nobel University Journal*

of Philology. 2023. № 1(25). P. 274–290. <https://doi.org/10.32342/2523-4463-2023-1-25-20>.

11. Boiko, Ya. & Nikonova, V. Cognitive model of the tragic in Ukrainian retranslations of Shakespeare's plays. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*. 2021. № 17(21). P. 1034–1052.

12. Brownlie, S. Narrative theory and retranslation theory. *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2006. № 7(2). P. 140–170.

13. Feng, L. Retranslation hypotheses revisited: a case study of two English translations of Sanguo Yanyi – the first Chinese novel. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*. 2014. № 43. P. 69–86.

14. Farahzad, F. *Plurality in Translation*. URL: https://www.academia.edu/49470028/Plurality_in_Translation

15. Gürçağlar, Ş. T. Retranslation. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London – New York: Routledge, 2008. P. 232–236.

16. Halverson, S. & Muñoz, M. The times, they are a-changin'. *Multilingual Mediated Communication and Cognition*. 2020. P. 1–17.

17. Kaiser, R. The dynamics of retranslation: Two stories. *Translation Review*. 2002. № 63. P. 84–85.

18. Koskinen, K. & Paloposki, Q. Retranslations in the age of digital reproduction. *Cadernos de Tradução*. 2003. № 1(11). P. 19–38.

19. Sorina, S. *Diachronic Analysis of the Translation and Retranslation of C. S. Lewis's Chronicles of Narnia – The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*. Iași: Universitatea “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, 2016.

20. Sternberg, R. & Lubart, T. The concept of creativity: prospects and paradigms. *Handbook of Creativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. P. 3–15.

21. Venuti, L. Retranslations: The creation of value. *Bucknell Review*. 2003. № 47(1). P. 25–39.

Sources

22. Шекспір В. Гамлет. Пер. Ю. Андруховича. Київ : А–БА–БА–ГА–ЛІА–МА–ГА, 2008. 242 с.

23. Шекспір В. Гамлет / пер. О. Грязнова. URL: <https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/world/printit.php?tid=9048>

24. Шекспір В. Гамлет. Пер. М. Старицького; стаття С. Родзевича; ред., стаття й примітки А. Ніковського. Київ : Книгоспілка, 1928. 264 с.

25. Шекспір В. Гамлет, принц данський / пер. Г. Кочура. Київ : «Альтерпрес», 2003. 162 с.

26. Шекспір У. Гамлет, принц данський / пер. П. Куліша; передмова і пояснення І. Франка. Львів : Українсько-руська видавнича спілка, 1899. 197 с.

27. Шекспір В. Гамлет, принц датський / пер. Л. Гребінки. URL: <https://translate-ua.livejournal.com/10577.html>

28. Шекспір В. Трагедія про Гамлета, принца данського / пер. Ю. Клена. URL: <https://www.myslenedrevo.com.ua/uk/Lit/KlenJu/Transl/Hamlet.html>

29. Shakespeare, W. The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. URL: <http://shakespeare.mit.edu/hamlet/full.html>

Information about the authors:

Boiko Yana Viktorivna,

Doctor of Science in Philology,
Associate Professor at the Philology and Translation Department,
Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design
2, Mala Shyianovska (Nemyrovycha-Danchenka) str., Kyiv, 01011,
Ukraine

Nikonova Vira Hryhoryvna,

Doctor of Science in Philology,
Professor at the Department of Romance and Germanic Languages,
National Academy of the Security Service of Ukraine
22, Mykhaila Maksymovycha str., Kyiv, 03066, Ukraine