

ПЕРЕКЛАДОЗНАВЧІ СТУДІЇ

УДК 811.111'255.4(045)

DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2023-1-25-20

YANA BOIKO

*PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
at Department of Translation
Dnipro University of Technology*

TRANSLATORS' INTERPRETATIONS OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS IN THE LIGHT OF INFORMATION ENTROPY

У статті розглядається феномен перекладацької інтерпретації віддалених у часі оригінальних текстів на прикладі трагедій Вільяма Шекспіра у ході творчого відтворення перекладачами випадків інформаційної ентропії. *Метою* роботи є обґрунтування чинників, які зумовлюють різницю в перекладацьких інтерпретаціях, що постає чинником множинності хронологічно віддалених українських ретрансляцій XIX–XXI ст. Для досягнення мети залучаються як загальнонаукові *методи*, так і спеціальні методи дискурсивного, літературознавчого, лінгвістичного і перекладацького аналізу. Матеріалом дослідження слугували конотативно забарвлені одиниці оригіналу, виокремлені із трагедій Шекспіра «Ромео і Джульєтта» (1594) і «Гамлет, принц Датський» (1600), які є зразками англійської мови на рубежі XVI–XVII ст., та їхні відповідники у хронологічно віддалених українських перекладах XIX–XXI ст.

У статті стверджується, що відмінність у інтерпретаціях перекладачів і, як наслідок, різноманіття повторних перекладів пояснюється різними об'єктивними та суб'єктивними екстралінгвальними факторами, які впливають на процес і результат повторного перекладу у випадках інформаційної ентропії. Об'єктивними чинниками постають історично різні соціальні та культурні контексти, в яких створено оригінальні тексти і ретрансляції; панівні у відповідні епохи літературні напрями, що впливають на художню манеру автора та перекладачів. Суб'єктивними чинниками є творчі індивідуальності перекладачів, що відображають їхнє сприйняття навколишнього світу та особисті світоглядні позиції, зумовлені різним життєвим досвідом і соціальним походженням. У статті продемонстровано, що якщо всі чинники збігаються, тобто перекладачі належать до того самого історичного періоду, дотримуються тієї самої літературної течії та мають однакове культурне та соціальне походження, то інтерпретації перекладачів збігаються. Якщо принаймні один із факторів відрізняється, то виникає різне трактування перекладачами випадків інформаційної ентропії та представлення різного обсягу інформації, що є передумовою діахронічної множинності перекладів віддалених у часі трагедій Шекспіра українськими перекладачами XIX–XXI ст.

Ключові слова: перекладацька інтерпретація, інформаційна ентропія, діахронна множинність перекладів, хронологічно віддалені ретрансляції, віддалений у часі оригінальний твір.

For citation: Boiko, Ya. (2023). *Translators' Interpretations of Shakespeare's Plays in the Light of Information Entropy*. *Visnyk Universitetu imeni Alfreda Nobelya. Seriya: Filologicni Nauki*, vol. 1, issue 25, pp. 274-290, DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2023-1-25-20

The multidisciplinary connection between the fields of translation studies, on the one hand, and, on the other, psychology and cognitive sciences, which have become relevant and play a significant role in the process of creative reproduction of the original work in the target language [Borshchovetska, 2018], has been strengthened in recent years [Munday, 2012]. W. Wilss considers translation as a process of psycholinguistic formulation by

which the translator reproduces the ideological content of the original work in the target language [Wilss, 2005]. The translator has to reproduce two languages, two cultures, and sometimes two completely different worldviews [Рибій, 2012]. In the process of translation, dealing with different cultures and ethnic groups, the translator needs to convey the author's intention into the new culture, adding a layer of cultural sensitivity and personal awareness. The translator's task becomes even more difficult while translating time-remote original texts which are associated with remoteness in time and space and therefore are characterised by a high degree of information entropy (information indeterminateness). As translation is intended for the modern reader, it is of great importance that not only linguistic specifics (poetic, lexical-grammatical, stylistic) and historical, social and cultural contexts of the chronologically distant original work should be considered [Benjamin, 1992], but also the apprehension of the modern reader, his / her background knowledge and especially his / her prior awareness of the history and socio-cultural development of the country where the original text is created [Aranda, 2009; Hewson, 2006].

Since the translator is a key figure in reconstruction of the cultural realities of the original text, the outcome of the translation depends on his / her ability to perceive the content of the original text, choose a general translation strategy and translate the original text on a semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic level. In order to fulfil this task properly, the translator must have experience and talent in interpreting the original texts, especially time-remote ones, to achieve the adequacy of translation by preserving the same scope of information in translation that was intended by the author of the original work.

Despite the considerable amount of research in modern translation studies regarding the translator's choice of adequate translation strategies for reproducing literary works by means of the target language, the study of the factors that influence the translator's interpretations, caused by the information entropy of the time-remote original text, in the process of his / her creative approach to presentation of the original work in the target language is still an urgent problem.

The *aim* of the research paper is to identify and substantiate the factors that determine the difference in translators' interpretations of the cases of information entropy in time-remote original texts on the example of William Shakespeare's plays and their manifestations in chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries.

Achieving the goal involves solving the following interrelated *tasks*: 1) to describe the theoretical basis of the research, namely, to determine the specifics of translator's interpretation as an independent creative act of the translator and to characterise the phenomenon of information entropy from the standpoint of translation theory and practice; 2) to analyse and compare different chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of Shakespeare's plays as samples of time-remote original works in order to show the influence of different extralingual factors on the process and result of translators' interpretations of the cases of information entropy in Shakespeare's plays.

The **research material** is taken from two tragedies by William Shakespeare (1564–1616), namely, "Romeo and Juliet" (1594), and "Hamlet, Prince of Denmark" (1600), which serve as samples of Early Modern English at the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries, and their chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries. The *units of analysis* are connotatively loaded language and speech units (words and free phrases correspondingly) in the original texts and in Ukrainian retranslations.

The *research methodology* incorporates the methods of different linguistic sciences in studying Ukrainian retranslations of Shakespeare's works [Бойко, 2022], including not only general scientific methods of induction and deduction, observation and abstraction, description and systematisation, as well as empirical methods of analysis and synthesis in order to substantiate the theoretical basis of the research, but also methods of discourse analysis (cultural and historical, comparative-linguistic-cultural) – to clarify the extralingual situations of the creation of Shakespeare's works in the 16th–17th centuries and their Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries, which determine the translators' worldviews. Methods of literary analysis (biographical, hermeneutic, interpretive-textual) are used to characterise the stylistic parameters of the retranslations, which manifest both the literary trend dominant in Ukraine in 19th–21st centuries

(romanticism, realism, neoclassicism, futurism, neo-baroque, and postmodernism) and the individual artistic style of the translator's creative personality. Methods of linguistic analysis (etymological, contextual, descriptive, semantic, and stylistic) are applied to reveal the scope of information expressed by the units of analysis in the original texts and in Ukrainian retranslations. Methods of contrastive translation and transformational analysis are used to compare the units of analysis in the original texts and in retranslations in order to determine the changes in the scope of information which distinguish different chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations.

The problems of text interpretation are considered in the philosophy of language and semiotics, philosophical and philological hermeneutics, cognitive and interpretive linguistics, psycholinguistics and translation studies.

In semiotics, many researchers have devoted their works to the problem of interpreting signs as semiotic units, among which such scholars as R. Barth [Барт, 2002], E. Benveniste [Бенвеніст, 2017], U. Eco [Lechte, 1998], Ch. Morris [Reisch, 2005], Ch. Peirce [Wible, 2008] and others have made a significant contribution to the science.

In philological hermeneutics (M. Heidegger [Гайдергер, 1998], G.-G. Gadamer [Гадамер, 2001] and others), interpretation is viewed as an intermediary between explanation and understanding: the interpretation of one part of the text, which presupposes its understanding, explains other parts and / or the whole text, and, vice versa, the whole text, which becomes intelligible as a result of interpretation, makes clear its separate parts. The correlation between understanding and interpretation is as follows: understanding precedes interpretation; in its turn, interpretation potentially contains understanding.

In literary criticism ([Hopkins, 2005; Кухаренко, 2004] and others), text interpretation is defined as the process of mastering various kinds of information of the literary work (ideological and aesthetic, semantic and emotional), based on personal cognitive experience and study of the author's position [Кухаренко, 2004, p. 8]. Text interpretation is considered as a complex activity that includes perception, understanding of the text and its elements, as well as certain results of these processes, analysis and evaluation of their contents. The text, as the object of these processes, acts as a unity of the rational and the emotional, at the same time affecting the intellect and emotions of the recipient. In the process of interpretation of the text, the recipient understands its "personal meaning". The possibility of different interpretations of the same literary text creates prerequisites for development of speech creativity in the process of interpretation. However, one way or another, this variety of interpretations must be reduced to a common semantic "core" due to the presence of a certain general idea in the interpreter's mind.

In translation studies, the increasing attention of the scholars to the problems of interpretation is focused on the interrelation of translation and interpretation in its various aspects [Sternberg, Lubart, 2004; Torop, 2008]. This is accounted for the fact that the translated text, as a result of the translation process, has a certain imprint on it of the translator's interpretative processes and therefore becomes a unique field for the study of interpretation, which, in turn, can be useful for the theory and practice of translation studies as well.

In relation to translation, the term "interpretation" can have several meanings. It can be understood as: 1) contextual interpretation of language units; 2) interpretation by using dictionaries and reference books; 3) interpretation as an independent creative act of the translator, which takes into account the described reality, the situation of the act of translation; 4) interpretation of meaning, which does not directly constitute the content of the statement, but is derived from it in the conditions of a specific act of communication [Кикоть, Дахно, 2023].

Contextual interpretation has, in a certain sense, a personal character. The same can be said about the interpretation of the third type, which is defined as finding a new correspondence through an independent creative act by taking into account the context of the described real situation. At the same time, the inevitability of transforming the linguistic content of the source text is emphasised.

The interpretation of the meaning is opposed to the actual translation as the translation version, on the grounds that the task of the translator is to reproduce as precisely as possible what the author of the original text actually said, and not what he meant to say or what follows from what was said. In contrast to actual translation, interpretation of the meaning deals neither with language units, nor with ideas, nor with content, and in every way ignores formal cross-lin-

guistic correspondences. Interpretation presupposes the presence of the appropriate text of a given meaning in particular situation / context, regardless of the fact that the way of expressing this meaning in this situation / context and the same meaning that was used in the original text may be different under other conditions. In other words, interpretation involves the selection of significant meaning elements in the original expression and the re-expression of this meaning by means of another language in such a way that the true original text and the translation could coincide in content only under certain conditions and necessarily include formal language equivalents. Any translation is a process of interpretation and at the same time its component.

The interpretive theory of translation, developed by the French translators D. Seleskovitch [Seleskovitch, 1976] and M. Lederer [Lederer, 1990], considers that communication of people is not carried out through the exchange of language units, but with the help of language statements-texts that have certain meanings. According to this theory, the translation process includes the following stages: the creation of the original text, the translator's understanding of its meaning (and the meaning extracted by the translator should be identical to the meaning inserted into the initial message by the author of the original), the creation by the translator of a translation text that reproduces the original meaning [Seleskovitch, 1976, p. 97]. As in many other models of translation, the translator is presented as a person who fulfils two roles: the recipient of the source text (interpreter / listener) and the creator of the translated text (interpreter / speaker). The central stage in this model is the stage of the translator's understanding of the meaning of the original message. This process is interpretation, that is, extraction of meaning, bypassing its linguistic expression.

Since interpretation is the art of understanding, the translator must have experience and talent in interpreting the original text. The translator's creative individuality becomes even more significant when it comes to interpretations of chronologically distant original texts, such as Shakespeare's plays, distinguished by numerous cases of information entropy [Narashimha, 1994; Boiko, 2022], which cause different translators' interpretations of the original text and, accordingly, presentation of different scope of information in their translations.

Before characterising the phenomenon of information entropy from the standpoint of translation theory and practice, it is worthy to mention that the term "entropy" was originally used by German physicist Rudolf Clausius who defined it as "the world of chaos of the system" [Соколовский, 2014, p. 335]. Later on, the notion of "entropy" was developed by Ludwig Boltzmann, Josiah Gibbs, and James Maxwell – scientists who gave entropy its statistical basis understanding it in a more general scientific way as a world of discord of the system [Angrist, Hepler, 1967, p. 4]. What is more, they considered that entropy always increases with time.

The notion of entropy has become widely used in many scientific fields and academic studies, including translation studies. Entropy in translation is described as the translator's uncertainty in choosing units of translation for units of the original text [Vanroy, De Clercq, Macken, 2019, p. 924]; a measure of the information uncertainty of the source text, consisting of the amount of information per message unit and the number of possible options for expressing / interpreting the same meaning [Андрієнко, 2014, p. 29]; the degree of the information uncertainty about the object of translation (the translator's lack of information), which causes erroneous decisions about translation at any level of the translation as a self-organisation system [Дорофеева, Андрущенко, 2019, p. 98].

The purpose of translation in cases of information entropy is the transmission of the message, that is, of all components of information that are significant for this type of communication. Therefore, the source text is considered not as an object of interlingual transformation, but as an embodiment of various types of information. In turn, the process of translation is associated not with translational transformations, but with the search and transmission of information. The higher the lack of information in the source text (entropy), the lower the quality of its translation, leading to complete misunderstanding and rejection of the translation at all. On the contrary, if the entropy of the source text approaches zero, there are no difficulties during its translation [Дорофеева, 2016, p. 10]. Consequently, there is a discrepancy between the information provided by the addressee to materialise his / her thoughts and the information intended for transmission. In other words, the semantic content of the source text does not always coincide with its meaning [ibid., p. 9]. For example, newspaper texts are characterised as speech products

with a low degree of entropy, as they contain many linguistic clichés. Literary texts, especially poetic ones, on the contrary, have a high degree of entropy, as they are evaluated according to the criterion of unpredictability of lexical composition and stylistic devices.

In the theory of translation studies, there have been distinguished three levels of the text at which entropy occurs: the micro-, macro-, and mega-system of translation of the text [Дорофеева, 2016]. Microsystem is understood as the source text intended for translation; macrosystem means the internal and external level of the self-regulating system of translation, i.e. the translated text itself and its relevance to the situation / context, in which it was created; mega-system refers to the target culture, into which the translated text enters [ibid., p. 10].

The levels of entropy manifestations, which occur at each stage of the translation of a literary text as the communicative act, are the following [Гусева, 2023, p. 8]: 1) addressee: entropy at this stage may arise due to the author's deliberate complication of the text; 2) context: existing differences in the background knowledge of the sender and recipient of the message, because what is well known to the reader of the original text may be unknown to the reader of the translation belonging to a different culture; 3) message: it often turns out to be impossible to express by the means of the translation language what has already been expressed by the means of the foreign language, for example, a play on words; in addition, entropy here may arise as a result of the multiplicity of possible interpretations, some of which may be lost in translation; 4) code: in the code (i.e., in the language), there are certain restrictions on combinability, as well as the probability of the appearance of certain units in a given type of speech, and therefore, again, it often turns out to be impossible to express by the means of the translation language what is expressed by the means of the foreign language; 5) addressee: the main problem is the difference in the background knowledge of the sender and recipient of the message, because the background knowledge of the recipient is often not enough for a complete and correct interpretation of the received message. It should be noted that the "recipient" here means both the recipient of the final text and the translator, and if the loss of information for the final recipient can be minimised during subsequent readings, then the loss of information by the translator at the recoding stage is irreparable.

Thus, entropy can occur at all levels of the translation of a literary text as the communicative act. The notion of entropy (measure of uncertainty) presupposes a kind of parallelism of the original text and its translation. That is why we can distinguish structural isomorphism, information isomorphism and entropy isomorphism in translation [Razumovskaya, 2010, p. 264]. In translation, information entropy causing multiple interpretations of the original text manifests itself in variability in the reproduction of information expressed in the original text by the means of the translated language, i.e. in plurality in translations [Venuti, 2003]. Different retranslations of one and the same original text are distinguished by explication in the target language of different scope of information expressed in the source text. The information entropy of a source text arises on the basis of a number of factors, both objective, language-determined, factors and subjective factors of information perception by the translator [Дорофеева, 2016, p. 11]. As far as chronologically distant original works, such as Shakespeare's plays, are concerned, translators' information perception of the source texts is determined by translators' personal worldviews formed in different socio-historical and cultural-aesthetic environments [Boiko, 2022a].

This study postulates that a decisive factor for overcoming information entropy of the chronologically distant original texts is the creative personality of the translator [Рибій, 2012, 2010; Бойко, 2021], who formulates the message created by the author of the original text in one way or another.

The history of Ukrainian translations of the plays of the great English playwright William Shakespeare that were created in the late 16th and early 17th centuries began in the 40^s of the 19th century and proceeds to the present days [Boiko, 2021]. Different Ukrainian retranslations of the playwright's works are marked by the specifics of national self-awareness and self-identification of Ukrainian people in the three radically different historical epochs – the second half of the 19th century; the 20th century; the beginning of the 21st century [Бойко, 2022a]. Significant differences in local, chronological, cultural and ideological framework of the original texts (England of the Elizabethan era) and their Ukrainian retranslations during three centuries (the end of the 19th century, the 20th century, and the 21st century) performed in different conditions both on the

territory of Ukraine and in emigration cause, obviously, differences in translators' understanding and interpretation of the original texts, in particular, the cases of information entropy revealed in connotatively loaded language and speech units (words and free phrases correspondingly) in the original texts and in retranslations, which serve as units of analysis.

To illustrate the above discussed, let's consider the fragment taken from Hamlet's soliloquy "To be or not to be..." in Shakespeare's tragedy "Hamlet" (Act III, Scene 1), and its chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations performed by P. Kulish (1899), L. Grebinka (1939), V. Ver (1941), O. Gryaznov (2001), and Yu. Andrukhovych (2008):

(1) **W. Shakespeare:** *Who would these fardels bear, to grunt and sweat under a weary life, but that the dread of something after death, the undiscovered country, from whose bourn no traveller returns, puzzles the will, and makes us rather bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of?* [Shakespeare, 2015, p. 75].

(2) **P. Kulish:** *Хто би ніс той тягар, стогнав і прів під туском життя, якби не страх чогось по смерті? Якби не той нещасний край, з котрого ще не вертав ніхто, мутив нам волю? То й радше зносим біди ті, що маєм, аніж тікати до інших, нам незнаних* [Шекспір, 1899, p. 72].

(3) **L. Grebinka:** *Хто стогнав би під тягарем життя і піт свій лив, коли б не страх попасти після смерті в той край незнаний, звідки ще ніхто не повертався? Страх цей нас безволить, і в звичних бідах ми волієм жити, ніж линути до не відомих нам* [Шекспір, 1986, p. 55].

(4) **V. Ver:** *Хто б тягнув ярмо, спливаючи і бідканнями й потом? Ні, страх чогось, що після смерті буде, країна невідкрита, звідки жодний мандрівник не вернувся, – крише волю, примушує терпіти всі нещастя, а не спішити до незнаних лих* [Шекспір, 1041, p. 111].

(5) **O. Gryaznov:** *Хто би захотів під тягарем життя чвалати далі, коли б таємна безвість після смерті, одвічний страх країни, звідкіля ніхто не повернувся, не схилили миритись краще зі знайомим злом, ніж навмання тікати в невідомість!* [Шекспір, 2023].

(6) **Yu. Andrukhovych:** *І хто тягнув би далі життєву лямку і стікав би потом, якби не страх – а що там, після смерті, у тій країні з інших географій, що з неї не придуть мандрівники? І страх нам каже витерпіти муки тутешні, добре знані, й не шукати незнаних, потойбічних* [Шекспір, 2008, p. 107]

Fragment (1) from the source text focuses on the understanding of life expressed by connotatively loaded units of analysis which represent cases of information entropy:

– metaphor *these fardels bear* (*fardel*, syn. bundle, n. 1. a group of things fastened together for convenient handling; 2. a considerable number; 3. a sizable sum of money; 4. a person embodying a specified quality or characteristic [Gove, 2023]);

– metaphor *to grunt and sweat* (*grunt*, v. to utter a grunt; n. 1. the deep short sound characteristic of a hog; 2. one who does routine unglamorous work [Gove, 2023]; *sweat*, v. 1. to excrete moisture in visible quantities through the openings of the sweat glands; 2. to labour or exert oneself so as to cause perspiration; 3. to emit or exude moisture; to undergo anxiety or mental or emotional distress; 4. to become exuded through pores or a porous surface [Gove, 2023]);

– epithet *a weary life* (*weary*, adj. 1. exhausted in strength, endurance, vigour, or freshness; 2. expressing or characteristic of weariness; 3. having one's patience, tolerance, or pleasure exhausted [Gove, 2023]);

– metonymy *bear those ills* (*ills*, n. 1. misfortune, distress, ailment, sickness; 2. something that reflects unfavourably; 3. the reverse of good [Gove, 2023]).

Life is associated with difficulties (*to grunt and sweat under a weary life*). It is noticeable here that life for Shakespeare's character is inseparable with physical suffering (*to grunt and sweat*), that is, life is so difficult that Hamlet physically feels its heaviness, like a person who works hard. The idea of life is verbalised with the metonymy *ills*, which means that life is evil to the character, causing him to suffer.

Information entropy of these units of analysis gives rise to different translators' interpretations in chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations, which belong to three different historical periods: the end of the 19th century, the 20th century, and the 21st century, each of which is characterised by its own specificity [Бойко, 2022a].

Panteleimon Kulish, who translated “Hamlet” in 1899, is the representative of the first period (the second half of the 19th century), which is characterised by the increase of the influence of Russian culture on Ukrainian one and predominance of romantic styles in literature and translation. In Kulish’s translation (2), life is also associated with hard physical labour (*стогнав і прів під тиском* ‘groaned and became damp under pressure’). However, the translator makes the character’s effort more passive than in the source text: if in (1) the word *grunt* means the result of a momentary strong effort, Kulish uses the word *стогнав* ‘groaned’ as a representation of the character’s constant suffering. The notion of hard work is marginalised here, so this translator concentrates on suffering rather than on effort. In addition, in (2), the presentation of sweat as a result of hard work is replaced by the words *прів під тиском* ‘became damp under pressure’, which also shifts the focus from hard work to simply sweating as a result of an undefined physical process (cf.: *to grunt and sweat under a weary life – ніс той тягар, стогнав і прів під тиском* ‘carried that burden, moaned and became damp under pressure’). Kulish in his translation (2) represents the hardships of life as *то й радше зносим біди ті, що маєм* ‘we rather endure the troubles that we have’, stressing that life is rather a human misfortune than an evil. Kulish’s concentration on passive suffering rather than active effort may be accounted for the difficult political, socio-economic situation and cultural decline, in which the Ukrainian people found themselves at the end of the 19th century [Бойко, 2022a], as well as the ideology of Ukrainian romanticism, which focuses on the sublimity of the main character giving him the aura of martyrdom and sacrifice, and romantic manner of narration, characterised by a high-flown style with its wide palette of artistic techniques and pathos.

The second period (the 20th century) is represented by retranslations of L. Grebinka (1939) and V. Ver (1941). Though these two translators adhered to different literary trends (Grebinka – to neo-baroque poetics, Ver – to futurism), their retranslations were performed at one and the same historical period – the time of the Second World War, when the categories of patriotism and nationalism varied and were manipulated depending on the socio-political situation, the period of weakening Russification and developing of the spoken Ukrainian language, the time of active struggle for national freedom and independence.

In Leonid Grebinka’s translation (3), though the character also accepts life as suffering, as in (2), which is conveyed both verbally (*стогнав* ‘groaned’) and non-verbally (*і піт свій лив* ‘and poured his sweat’), we may notice a more active life position than in (2): *прів під тиском* ‘became damp under pressure’ means a process that does not depend on a person, while *піт свій лив* ‘poured his sweat’ is the result of a purposeful effort to change something in life. In Grebinka’s translation (3), life is represented by the lexeme *біда* ‘trouble’: *і в звичних бідах ми волиєм жити* ‘and we prefer to live in habitual troubles’. Thus, the emphasis shifts to suffering due to accidental causes, since the word *біда* ‘trouble’ does not imply intentional evil.

On the other hand, Victor Ver in (4) uses the word *нещастя* ‘misfortune’, thus representing life as a lack of happiness: *примуше терпіти всі нещастя* ‘it forces one to endure all misfortunes’. But at the same time, the lexeme *лихо* ‘calamity’, which characterises human life in his translation, is also worth paying attention to: *а не спішити до незнаних лих* ‘not to rush to unknown calamities’. Thus, in Ver’s translation, life is not only evil, but precisely such evil that deprives a person of the opportunity to be happy. In (4), Ver also represents a more active position of a person, presenting life as a difficult activity, but such activity in which a person has his own role: *хто б тягнув ярмо, спливаючи і бідканнями й потом* ‘who would pull the yoke, drenched with sweat and hardships’. In this case, life is a yoke that a person chooses to pull in order to somehow improve the conditions of his life.

O. Gryaznov (2001) and Yu. Andrukhovych (2008) are the representatives of the third period (the beginning of the 21st century), which is the time when Ukraine finally acquired its independence, and the Ukrainian culture is fast evolving in the new conditions of blurring the boundaries between the styles of art [Boiko, 2022a, p. 5]. They both adhere to one and the same literary trend at the end of the 20th – the beginning of the 21st century – postmodernism. But their artistic styles differ.

In Oleksandr Gryaznov’s opinion, poetic translations cannot be accurate, because “the translator must create his / her work from completely dissimilar language material that would reflect the content, beauty and sound of the original” [Шекспір, 2008a, p. 3], and therefore Gry-

aznov often paraphrases linguistic units of the original source, based on his own understanding of the work [Коломієць, 2015, p. 151]. Therefore, in Gryaznov's translation (5), life is associated with not just physical tests, but with a journey full of troubles: *хто би захотів під тягарем життя чвалати далі* 'who would want to toil along under the burden of life'. In this case, life is perceived as the road, which the character is forced to toil along, because he has no other way out. Only Gryaznov in (5) uses the full equivalent – *зло* 'evil', creating the least entropic translation of this fragment: *мириться краще зі **ЗНАЙОМИМ ЗЛОМ*** 'to put up better with the familiar evil'.

Instead in (6), Yuri Andrukhovich uses the word *муки* 'torment' – *і страх нам каже втерпіти **МУКИ*** 'and fear tells us to endure torment', which means suffering without specifying the reasons. Andrukhovich, when translating Shakespeare's tragedies, resorts to anti-intellectualism, a figurative simplification of the expression compared to the original [Коломієць, 2009, p. 179]. Therefore, L.V. Kolomiets considers Andrukhovich's translations as a re-creation of the original, an example of arbitrariness in dealing with a classical text, its interpretation with a clear reference to the conversational culture of a living contemporary [Коломієць, 2009, p. 179]. In Andrukhovich's version (6), life is also complicated, but the word *grunt* is completely omitted. So, in (6), just like in (5), Shakespeare's hero simply endures the difficulties of life without any verbal reaction, only physical actions (*тягнув би далі **ЖИТТЄВУ ЛЯМКУ*** 'he would pull on the leash of life') that cause physical reactions of the body (*і стікав би потом* 'and drip with sweat'). This makes the reader of this version perceive the hero as a more passive person who simply submits to fate.

Comparing cases of information entropy expressed by the units of analysis in the original text and by their correspondences in chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries allows us concluding that the ways of representation of the idea of life and, consequently, the scopes of information about life in the given fragments differ, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

The scope of information about life in Hamlet's soliloquy and its chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations

Author / Translators	Information components
W. Shakespeare	Difficulty, weariness, suffering, physical work, physical reaction, activity, deliberate evil, verbalization
P. Kulish	Difficulty, pressure, suffering, physical work, physical reaction, passivity, unintended misfortunes, verbalization
L. Grebinka	Difficulty, pressure, suffering, physical work, physical reaction, activity, unintended misfortunes, verbalization
V. Ver	Difficulty, suffering, physical work, physical reaction, activity, unintended misfortunes, non-verbalization
O. Gryaznov	Difficulty, travelling, deliberate evil, physical work, absence of physical reaction, activity, non-verbalization
Yu. Andrukhovich	Difficulty, suffering for unknown reasons, physical work, physical reaction, activity, non-verbalization

Thus, in the translation of P. Kulish (2), the idea of life is connected with a more passive perception of everyday reality, a certain fatalism characteristic of the Ukrainian national character of the 19th century. On the contrary, L. Grebinka (3), V. Ver (4), O. Gryaznov (5), and Yu. Andrukhovich (6) present life in the categories of certain actions, but still preserve the idea of fatalism inherent in the consciousness of Soviet and post-Soviet Ukraine of the late 20th and early 21st centuries.

Let's consider Ukrainian retranslations of the fragment from Shakespeare's tragedy "Romeo and Juliet" (1594), Act I, Scene 5, proposed by P. Kulish (1901) (including adaptation by M. Voronyi, 1928), V. Mysyk (1932), A. Gozenpud (1937), I. Steshenko (1952), and Yu. Andrukhovich (2016):

(7) **W. Shakespeare:** *My only love sprung from my only **hate!** Too early seen unknown, and known too late! **Prodigious** birth of love it is to me, that I must love a **loathed enemy*** [Shakespeare, 2004, p. 52].

(8) **Р. Kulish**: *Єдина любов з єдиної вражди... Ой рано-ж я його вбачала, та й не знала! Ой пізно-ж я його пізнавши покохала! О дивная любов! Мені ти дивно сталась, що з клятим ворогом моїм я покохалась* [Шекспір, 1900, р. 33].

(9) **Р. Kulish (M. Voronyi)**: *З єдиної злоби – єдина і любов... Не знаючи хто він, його я стріла рано, та пізно я про це дізналась, безталанна! Як наді мною ти, зла доле, насміялась, що з ворогом своїм я вперше покохалась!* [Шекспір, 1998, р. 31].

(10) **V. Mysyk**: *З ненависті любов моя повстала, побачила я рано, пізно взнала. Предивно почалась любов моя, що маю ворога любити я* [Шекспір, 2023a].

(11) **A. Gozenpud**: *З ненависті єдиної – встає любов єдина, побачила його, але в страшну годину. Мені гірке судилося життя, бо ворога кохати мушу я* [Шекспір, 1937, р. 48].

(12) **I. Steshenko**: *Злоба єдина у душі буяла, і зі злоби любов єдина встала!.. Не знаючи, зустріла надто рано, та пізно я дізналась, безталанна! Ох, не на радість ти, любов моя, бо ворога кохаю ніжно я!* [Шекспір, 1985, р. 336].

(13) **Yu. Andrukhovych**: *Любов одна, як ненависть одна – її б не знати краще, та вона сама прийшла – і спробуй відведи це щастя, повне знаками біди* [Шекспір, 2016, р. 98].

In the fragment from the source text (7), the textual implementation of the idea of love is realised by connotatively loaded units of analysis, which are epithets with positive evaluation *prodigious birth* (*prodigious*, adj. 1. causing amazement or wonder; 2. extraordinary in bulk, quantity, or degree; 3. resembling or befitting a prodigy; 4. *obsolete* being an omen [Gove, 2023]) and negative evaluation *a loathed enemy* (*loathe*, v. to dislike greatly and often with disgust or intolerance [Gove, 2023]) as well as words with a very strong negative evaluation: *hate* (*hate*, n. 1. intense hostility and aversion usually deriving from fear, anger, or sense of injury; 2. extreme dislike or disgust; 3. a systematic and especially politically exploited expression of hatred [Gove, 2023]) and *enemy* (*enemy*, n. 1. one that is antagonistic to another, *especially*, one seeking to injure, overthrow, or confound an opponent; 2. something harmful or deadly; 3. a military adversary, a hostile unit or force [Gove, 2023]). In (7), love is associated with fate (*prodigious birth of love it is to me*), moreover, with evil fate (*that I must love a loathed enemy*). Juliet's love is so unpredictable that it arose from a completely opposite feeling (*My only love sprung from my only hate!*).

Information entropy of these units of analysis gives rise to different translators' interpretations in chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations.

In Panteleimon Kulish's translation (8), love is associated not with fate, but with a miracle, i.e., with something supernatural (*о дивная любов! мені ти дивно сталась* 'oh strange love! you have become strange to me'). At the same time, the idea of enmity that grows into love is expressed quite clearly (*єдина любов з єдиної вражди* 'the only love from the only enmity'), and the degree of hatred for the enemy is conveyed as precisely as possible with the use of a adverbial adjective (*що з клятим ворогом моїм я покохалась* 'that I fell in love with my cursed enemy').

In the later retranslation of Kulish's version, in the adaptation of Mykola Voronyi (9), love is already associated with fate (*як наді мною ти, зла доле, насміялась* 'how you, evil fate, laughed at me'). However, the translator makes fate clearly evil (*зла доле* 'evil fate'), while in the original text this meaning is implicit (*prodigious birth of love it is to me*). Fate in (9) is a living creature that laughs at people (*зла доле, насміялась* 'evil fate, laughed'). The idea of hatred in Voronyi's adaptation is weakened, hatred is replaced by malice (*з єдиної злоби – єдина і любов* 'out of only malice is only love'). In addition, the idea of the enemy in (9) is also weakened (*що з ворогом своїм я вперше покохалась* 'that for the first time I fell in love with my enemy'), while in the original text (7) strong hatred is expressed (*that I must love a loathed enemy*). M. Voronyi tried to renew and modernise Kulish's translation, to make it more suitable for reading and possible performance.

Retranslations of Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliet" (1594), performed by V. Mysyk (1932), A. Gozenpud (1937), and I. Steshenko (1952) at one and the same historical period of time, differ in the scope of information implied by the author and presented in retranslations. This explains the distinction in the translators' worldviews, their artistic styles, and different literary trends to which they adhere.

Vasyl Mysyk translated the play in 1932, but due to the arrest, the translator was unable to publish this translation in time, and then there was not enough time to make proper corrections. For the first time, Mysyk's translation was published posthumously in "Prapor" magazine in 1988. The translation work of V. Mysyk is specified as neoclassical poetics, which is characterised by the preservation of the brightness of the image and the structural clarity of the original work [Гриців, 2017, p. 14]. V. Mysyk, as a translator, tried to be an "objective" translator throughout his creative life in translation, exerting minimal influence on the original text during translation [Коломієць, 2015, p. 294]. In Mysyk's translation of fragment (10), love also seems strange (*предивно почалась любов моя* 'my love began very strangely'). Like the previous translators, V. Mysyk quite precisely conveys the opposition of the feelings of love and hatred (*з ненависти любов моя повстала* 'my love rose from hatred'), at the same time weakening the level of enmity when talking about Juliet's lover (*що маю ворога любити я* 'that I have an enemy to love').

Abram Gozenpud, who was a musicologist and a theatre critic, devoted his great attention to issues of the stage history of the tragedy, in particular, its musical and stage design and interpretation. Little is known about Gozenpud's creative preferences, but his translations were made in the neo-baroque style, since the formal stylistic features of the original work were not only preserved, but also significantly strengthened: metrical size, alliteration, and rhythm. However, in some places the distorted meaning of the original cancels out the author's intention and causes the reader to wonder. In his translation (11) of the analysed fragment, A. Gozenpud does not touch the theme of either fate or miracle. Love, in (11), is only a part of life (*мені гірке судилося життя* 'I had a bitter life'), and at the same time, in this difficult period – the period of enmity between families (*в страшну годину* 'in a terrible hour'). The idea that love grew out of hatred is preserved in an unchanged form – the translator fully conveys the opposition of these feelings (*з ненависті єдиної – встає любов єдина* 'from only hatred – only love arises'), however, as in the translation of P. Kulish in the adaptation of M. Voronyi (9), the idea of enmity is somewhat softened (*бо ворога кохати мушу я* 'because I must love the enemy').

Iryna Steshenko, an actress herself in the past, knows the stage very well, and theatricality (in the good sense of the word) is a significant positive feature of her translations: they equally take into account the interests of the actor who utters the text and the interests of the viewer who perceives this text [Кочур, 2008, p. 726]. As a translator, I. Steshenko "reproduces not words, but thought, strictly adhering to the idea" of the translated text, taking care of the readability and staginess of the work [Яценко, 1997, p. 27]. In order to preserve the rhyme or emphasise the emotional state of the hero, the translator sometimes deviates from equilinearity, but her translation is refined, filled with capacious, multi-meaningful words [ibid.]. In Steshenko's opinion, a work in a foreign language should sound in translation into another language as if it were written in that language: only the stylistic originality, peculiarities of thinking and details of everyday life should indicate that the reader is facing the work of a writer from another country, another of the people [Кочур, 2008, p. 727]. In (12), I. Steshenko presents love as a problem and a source of unhappiness (*ох, не на радість ти, любов моя* 'oh, you are not happy, my love'), just like Gozenpud (11), depriving love of its mysticism. In this translation, love is opposed to malice (*злоба єдина у душі буяла, і зі злости любов єдина встала* 'malice was the only one in the soul, and from malice only love arose'), and enmity is weakened not only by the omission of the adjective, but also by the addition of another one, which denotes tender feelings (*бо ворога кохаю ніжно я* 'for I love the enemy tenderly').

In Yuriy Andrukhovich's version (13), love is also associated with fate (*щастя, повне знаками бід* 'happiness full of signs of trouble'), and the idea of love is conveyed through the idea of signs of fate. Fate in (13) is similar to its perception in the original source – it is only the development of events beyond human control, which is considered as determined by a supernatural force, and not by a human being that does something. In Andrukhovich's version, the phrase *that I must love a loathed enemy* is omitted altogether, but the idea of hatred is presented in the phrase *любов одна, як ненависть одна* 'love alone, as hatred alone'. In addition, the phrase *вона сама прийшла – і спробуй відведи* 'and she herself came – and try to take away' forces the reader of this translation to perceive the character as a victim of love, and not a person who loves.

Comparing the units of analysis which express the idea of love in the original text and in chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries also allows us concluding that the ways of representation of the idea of love and, consequently, the scopes of information about love in the given fragments differ, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2

The scope of information about love in Juliet's soliloquy and its chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations

Author / Translators	Information components
W. Shakespeare	Hatred, unpredictability, fate, miracle, hostility
P. Kulish	Hatred, unpredictability, enmity, miracle, strangeness, hostility
P. Kulish (M. Voronyi)	Malice, unpredictability, fate, evil creature that mocks at people, hostility, first love
V. Mysyk	Hatred, unpredictability, strangeness, perplexity, hostility
A. Gozenpud	Hatred, fear, unpredictability, fate, enmity, compulsion, hostility
I. Steshenko	Malice, unpredictability, unhappiness, misfortune, perplexity, hostility, tenderness
Yu. Andrukhovych	Hatred, disappointment, unpredictability, fate, uncontrollability, hostility

Thus, the study shows that in P. Kulish's translation, love is more connected with the game of evil fate, which, again, is characteristic of the fatalism of the Ukrainian national character of the 19th century. The fact that in the retranslations of the 20th century love is also associated with fate (A. Gozenpud, V. Mysyk) or, on the contrary, with something more down-to-earth, vital (I. Steshenko), reflects the contradictions of the national character of the 20th century. In the 21st century, Yu. Andrukhovich presents love through loss of control, preserving the idea of fatalism characteristic of post-Soviet Ukraine, but at the same time preserving the idea of warding off evil.

To summarise, information entropy, understood in translation studies as a measure of the information uncertainty of the source text, is explained by the fact that the source text, as any literary one, conveys a certain amount of information verbalised by the linguistic means of the original work. The degree of the information entropy (uncertainty) of the source text rises greatly in cases of connotatively loaded linguistic means – language (words) and speech (free phrases) units in the source text, especially, in time-remote source texts, such as Shakespeare's plays. The high degree of information entropy of such linguistic means causes different translators' interpretations which result in plurality in translation as translators present different amounts of information encoded by the author of the original text in their retranslations perceiving the source text in different ways. The difference in translators' interpretations and, consequently, the variety of retranslations are taken into account by different objective and subjective extralingual factors that influence the process and result of retranslations in cases of information entropy.

The objective factors that determine the difference in Ukrainian translators' interpretations of the cases of information entropy in Shakespeare's plays are the historically different social and cultural contexts in which the original texts of the 16th–17th centuries and their chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries are created; the literary trends dominating at the corresponding epochs that influence the author's and translators' artistic styles. The subjective factors are translators' creative personalities that reflect their perception of the surrounding world and personal worldviews determined by their different life experience and social background.

Objective and subjective factors, which cause different interpretations of the cases of information entropy in the time-remote original text and presentation of different scope of information in chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations, are interrelated and interdependent. If all the factors are the same, i.e. the translators belong to one and the same historical period of time, adhere to the same literary trend and have the same cultural and social background, the translators' interpretations and, consequently, the scope of information transmitted coincide. At least one of the factors being different, the translators' interpretations of the cases of information entropy differ which is a prerequisite for the diachronic plurality in translation of time-remote Shakespeare's tragedies by Ukrainian translators of the 19th–21st cent.

To reveal the influence of translators' interpretations of the cases of information entropy on the ways of direct expressing translators' ideas by choosing the means of expressing them in translation and, consequently, on the whole ideology of translation of time-remote original work regarding the translator's choice of adequate translation strategies for reproducing literary works by means of the target language seems promising for further research.

Bibliography

- Андрієнко, Т.П. (2014). Інформаційні характеристики тексту як фактор реалізації стратегії перекладу. *Мовні і концептуальні картини світу*, 48, 25-36.
- Барт, Р. (2002). Від твору до тексту. М. Зубрицька (Ред.), *Антологія світової літературно-критичної думки ХХ ст.* (с. 491-496). Львів: Літопис.
- Бойко, Я.В. (2021). Креативна особистість перекладача як фактор діяхронної множинності перекладів (на матеріалі українських ретрансляцій трагедій У. Шекспіра). *Проблеми гуманітарних наук. Серія «Філологія»*, 45, 41-52. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4565.2021.45.4>
- Бойко, Я.В. (2022). Конструювання когнітивно-дискурсивної множинності перекладів часово віддаленого першотвору як інтерпретаційно-евристична діяльність. *Visnyk Universitetu imeni Alfreda Nobelya. Seriya: Filologichni Nauki*, 1, 23, 249-258. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/2523-4463-2022-2-24-21>
- Бойко, Я.В. (2022a). Соціально-історичний контекст як фактор діяхронної множинності перекладів часово віддаленого першотвору. *Науковий вісник міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Серія «Філологія»*, 58, 240-243.
- Гадамер, Г.-Г. (2001). *Герменевтика і поетика*. Київ: Юніверс.
- Гайдегер, М. (1998). Будувати, проживати, мислити. Т. Возняк (Ред.), *Тексти та переклади* (с. 313-332). Харків: Фоліо.
- Гриців, Н.М. (2017). *Василь Мусик: Різносторонній діамант українського художнього перекладу*. Вінниця: Нова Книга.
- Гусева, А.А. (2023). *Основные источники энтропии при переводе интертекстуальных элементов*. Відновлено з https://lomonosov-msu.ru/archive/Lomonosov_2008/11_6.pdf
- Дорофєєва, М. (2016). Інформаційна ентропія у перекладі спеціальних текстів. *Іноземна філологія*, 1, 49, 9-14.
- Дорофєєва, М., Андрущенко, Т. (2019). Інформаційна ентропія у перекладі: психолінгвістичні аспекти. *Психолінгвістика*, 26, 2, 91-113.
- Кикоть, В.М., Дахно Я.В. (2023). *Інтерпретація при перекладі художнього тексту*. Відновлено з http://www.rusnauka.com/4_SND_2014/Philologia/6_158397.doc.htm
- Коломієць, Л.В. (2009). Українські перекладачі «Гамлета» В. Шекспіра: Пантелеймон Куліш, Юрій Клен, Леонід Гребінка, Михайло Рудницький, Ігор Костецький, Григорій Кочур, Юрій Андрухович. *Ренесансні студії*, 12-13, 164-189.
- Коломієць, Л.В. (2015). *Український художній переклад та перекладачі 1920-30-х років*. Вінниця: Нова Книга.
- Кочур, Г. (2008). Шекспир на Украине. А. Кочур (Ред.), *Література та переклад: Дослідження. Рецензії. Літературні портрети. Інтерв'ю* (Т. 2, с. 704-729). Київ: Смоло-скуп.
- Кухаренко, В.А. (2004). *Інтерпретація тексту*. Вінниця: Нова Книга.
- Ребрій, О.В. (2012). *Сучасні концепції творчості у перекладі*. Харків: ХНУ ім. В.Н. Каразіна.
- Ребрій, О.В. (2010). Когнітивний підхід до вивчення проблеми креативності у перекладі. А.Г. Гудманян, С.І. Сидоренко (Ред.), *Соціокультурні та етнолінгвістичні проблеми галузевого перекладу в парадигмі євроінтеграції* (с. 358-363). Київ: Аграр Медіа Груп.
- Руда, Н. (2017). Бенвеніст Еміль. Л.Л. Звонська (Ред.), *Енциклопедичний словник класичних мов* (с. 62-63). Київ: ВПЦ «Київський університет».
- Соколовский, В. (2014). О значимости категории энтропии для лингвистического описания процесса синхронного перевода (пропедевтические замечания). А.Г. Гудманян, С.І. Сидоренко (Ред.), *Фаховий та художній переклад: теорія, методологія, практика* (с. 334-338). Київ: Аграр Медіа Груп.

- Шекспір, В. (2008). *Гамлет*. Пер. Ю. Андруховича. Київ: АБА-БА-ГА-ЛА-МА-ГА.
- Шекспір, В. (2023). *Гамлет*. Пер. О. Грязнова. Відновлено з <https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/world/printit.php?tid=9048>
- Шекспір, В. (1899). *Гамлет, принц данський*. Пер. П. Куліша; передмова і пояснення І. Франка. Львів: Українсько-руська видавнича спілка.
- Шекспір, В. (1986). *Гамлет, принц датський*. Пер. Л. Гребінки. Київ: Видавництво «Дніпро».
- Шекспір, В. (2008а). *Король Лір*. Пер. О. Грязнова. Київ: За друга.
- Шекспір, В. (1901). *Ромео та Джульєтта*. Пер. П. Куліша. Львів: Видане Українсько-руської видавничої спілки.
- Шекспір, В. (1937). *Ромео і Джульєтта*. Пер. А. Гозенпуда. Київ: Мистецтво.
- Шекспір, В. (1985). *Ромео і Джульєтта*. Пер. І. Стешенко. Київ: Дніпро.
- Шекспір, В. (1998). *Ромео і Джульєтта*. Пер. П. Куліша в переробці М. Вороного. Київ: Альтерпрес.
- Шекспір, В. (2016). *Ромео і Джульєтта*. Пер. Ю. Андруховича. Київ: А-ба-ба-га-ла-ма-га.
- Шекспір, В. (2023а). *Ромео і Джульєтта*. Пер. В. Мисика. Відновлено з <https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/world/printit.php?tid=1>
- Шекспір, В. (1941). *Трагедія про Гамлета, принца данського*. Пер. В. Вера. Київ: Мистецтво.
- Яценко, М.Т. (Ред.). (1997). *Історія української літератури* (Т. 3). Київ: Либідь.
- Angrist, S.W. Nepler, L.G. (1967). *Order and Chaos: Laws of Energy and Entropy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Aranda, L.V. (2009). Forms of Creativity in Translation. *Cadernos de Tradução*, 1, 23, 23-37.
- Benjamin, W. (1992). The Task of the Translator. H. Zohn, R. Schulte, J. Biguenet (Eds.), *Theories of Translation* (p. 71-82). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Boiko, Ya. (2021). Diachronic plurality of Ukrainian retranslations of Shakespeare's tragedies in the light of translation style. European Conferens (Ed.), *Modern approaches to the introduction of science into practice* (p. 196-198). San Francisco: European Conferens.
- Boiko, Ya. (2022). Information Entropy of Shakespeare's Plays in the Light of Plurality in Translation: Cognitive Perspective. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18, 2, 1218-1228.
- Boiko, Ya. (2022a). Interpretation Module in the Framework of the Cognitive-Discursive Model of Diachronic Plurality in Translation of Shakespeare's Plays. *Topics in Linguistics*, 23, 1, 1-14.
- Borshchovetska, V. (2018). Psycholinguistic Considerations on Translation Process: Analysis, Challenges and Further Development. *Вісник Київського національного лінгвістичного університету. Серія «Педагогіка та психологія»*, 28, 28-34.
- Gove, Ph.B. (2023). *New Webster's Dictionary and Thesaurus of the English Language*. Danbury: Lexicon Publications Inc. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/worthy>.
- Hewson, L. (2006). The Vexed Question of Creativity in Translation. *Palimpsestes*, Hors série, 54-63.
- Hopkins, J. (2005). *Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lechte, J., Eco, U. (1998). *Fifty Key Contemporary Thinkers: From Structuralism to Postmodernity*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Lederer, M. (1990). The role of Cognitive Complements in Interpreting. D. Bowen, M. Bowen (Eds.), *Interpreting: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow* (p. 53-60). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Munday, J. (2012). *Evaluation in Translation. Critical Points of Translation Decision-making*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge.
- Narashimha, R.N. (1994). *Linguistic Entropy in Othello of Shakespeare*. New Delhi: M D Publications Ltd.
- Razumovskaya, V.A. (2010). Information Entropy of Literary Text and its Surmounting in Understanding and Translation. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences*, 2, 3, 259-267.

- Reisch, G.A. (2005). Morris, Charles William (1901-79). J.R. Shook (Ed.), *Dictionary of Modern American Philosophers* (p. 1740-1742). Bristol: Thoemmes.
- Seleskovitch, D. (1976). Interpretation: A Psychological Approach to Translating. R.W. Brislin (Ed.), *Translation: Applications and Research* (p. 92-116). New York: Gardner Press.
- Shakespeare, W. (2004). *Romeo and Juliet*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Shakespeare, W. (2015). *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*. Adelaide: University of Adelaide.
- Sternberg, R.J., Lubart, T.I. (2004). The Concept of Creativity: Prospects and Paradigms. R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Creativity* (p. 3-15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Torop, P. (2008). Translation as Communication and Auto-Communication. *Sign Systems Studies*, 36, 2, 375-397.
- Vanroy, B., De Clercq, O., Macken, L. (2019). Correlating Process and Product Data to Get an Insight into Translation Difficulty. *Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 27, 924-941.
- Venuti, L. (2003). Retranslations: The Creation of Value. *Bucknell Review*, 47, 1, 25-39.
- Wible, J.R. (2008). The Economic Mind of Charles Sanders Peirce. *Contemporary Pragmatism*, 5, 2, 39-67.
- Wills, W. (2005). Decision Making in Translation. M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (p. 57-60). New York: Routledge.

TRANSLATORS' INTERPRETATIONS OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS IN THE LIGHT OF INFORMATION ENTROPY

Yana V. Boiko. Dnipro University of Technology (Ukraine)
e-mail: yana.boiko.85@gmail.com
DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2023-1-25-20

Key words: *translators' interpretations, information entropy, diachronic plurality in translation, chronologically distant retranslations, time-remote original work.*

The article substantiates the problem of translators' interpretations of information entropy cases in time-remote original texts on the example of William Shakespeare's plays in the process of translators' creative reproduction of the original works in the target language. *The purpose* of the article is to identify the factors that determine the difference in translators' interpretations and their manifestations in chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries. The tasks of the research are the following: to describe the theoretical basis of the research by determining the specifics of translator's interpretation and the phenomenon of information entropy from the standpoint of translation theory and practice; to show the influence of different extralingual factors on the process and result of Ukrainian retranslations.

The research material is taken from Shakespeare's tragedies "Romeo and Juliet" (1594) and "Hamlet, Prince of Denmark" (1600), which serve as samples of Early Modern English at the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries, and their chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries.

The *research methodology* incorporates not only general scientific methods, as well as empirical methods in order to substantiate the theoretical basis of the research, but also methods of discourse analysis (cultural and historical, comparative-linguistic-cultural), methods of literary analysis (biographical, hermeneutic, interpretive-textual), methods of linguistic analysis (etymological, contextual, descriptive, semantic, and stylistic) and methods of contrastive translation and transformational analysis, which are used to determine the changes in the scope of information expressed by the units of analysis in the time-remote original texts and in chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries.

The article argues that the difference in translators' interpretations and, consequently, the variety of retranslations are taken into account by different objective and subjective extralingual factors that influence the process and result of retranslations in cases of information entropy. The objective factors are the historically different social and cultural contexts in which the original texts of the 16th–17th centuries and their chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries are created; the literary trends dominating at the corresponding epochs that influence the author's and translators' artistic styles. The subjective factors are translators' creative personalities that reflect their perception of the surrounding world and personal worldviews determined by their different life experience and social

background. Objective and subjective factors, which cause different interpretations of information entropy cases in the time-remote original text and presentation of different scope of information in chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations, are interrelated and interdependent. If all the factors are the same, i.e. the translators belong to one and the same historical period of time, adhere to the same literary trend and have the same cultural and social background, the translators' interpretations coincide. At least one of the factors being different, the translators' interpretations of information entropy cases differ which is a prerequisite for the diachronic plurality in translation of time-remote Shakespeare's tragedies by Ukrainian translators of the 19th–21st centuries.

References

- Andriienko, T.P. (2014). *Informatsijni kharakterystyky tekstu iak faktor realizatsii stratehii perekladu* [Informational Characteristics of the Text as a Factor in the Implementation of the Translation Strategy]. *Movni i kontseptual'ni kartyny svitu* [Language and conceptual pictures of the world], vol. 48, pp. 25-36.
- Angrist, S.W. Hepler, L.G. (1967). *Order and Chaos: Laws of Energy and Entropy*. New York, Basic Books, 228 p.
- Aranda, L.V. (2009). Forms of Creativity in Translation. *Cadernos de Tradução*, vol. 1, issue 23, pp. 23-37.
- Bart, R. (2002). *Vid tvorbu do tekstu* [From the work to the text]. In: M. Zubrytska (ed.). *Antolohiia svitovoi literaturno-krytychnoi dumky XX st.* [Anthology of World Literary and critical thought of the twentieth century]. Lviv, Litopys, pp. 491-496.
- Benjamin, W. (1992). The Task of the Translator. In: H. Zohn, R. Schulte, J. Biguenet (eds.). *Theories of Translation*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp. 71-82.
- Boiko, Ya. (2021). Diachronic plurality of Ukrainian retranslations of Shakespeare's tragedies in the light of translation style. European Conferens (ed.). *Modern approaches to the introduction of science into practice*. San Francisco, European Conferens, pp. 196-198.
- Boiko, Ya. (2022). Information Entropy of Shakespeare's Plays in the Light of Plurality in Translation: Cognitive Perspective. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, vol. 18, issue 2, pp. 1218-1228.
- Boiko, Ya. (2022a). Interpretation Module in the Framework of the Cognitive-Discursive Model of Diachronic Plurality in Translation of Shakespeare's Plays. *Topics in Linguistics*, vol. 23, issue 1, pp. 1-14.
- Bojko, Ya.V. (2021). *Kreatyvna osobystist' perekladacha iak faktor diakhronnoi mnozhynnosti perekladiv (na materialy ukrains'kykh retransliatsij trahedij U. Shekspira)* [Translator's Creative Personality as Determinant of Diachronic Plurality in Translation of Shakespeare's Plays]. *Problemy humanitarnykh nauk. Seriiia "Filolohiia"* [Problems of humanities. Series "Philology"], vol. 45, pp. 41-52. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4565.2021.45.4>
- Boiko, Ya.V. (2022). *Konstruiuvannia kohnityvno-dyskursyvnoi mnozhynnosti perekladiv chasovo viddalenooho pershotvoru iak interpretatsijno-evrystychna diial'nist'* [Construction of Cognitive-Discursive Model of Diachronic Plurality in Translation as Interpretative-Heuristic Activity]. *Visnyk Universitetu imeni Alfreda Nobelya. Seriya: Filologichni Nauki* [Alfred Nobel University Journal of Philology], vol.1, issue 23, pp. 249-258. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/2523-4463-2022-2-24-21>
- Boiko, Ya.V. (2022a). *Sotsial'no-istorychnyj kontekst iak faktor diakhronnoi mnozhynnosti perekladiv chasovo viddalenooho pershotvoru* [Social and historical context as a factor of diachronic plurality in translation of time remote original text]. *Naukovyj visnyk mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Seriiia "Filolohiia"* [International Humanitarian University Herald. Philology], vol. 58, pp. 240-243.
- Borshchovetska, V. (2018). Psycholinguistic Considerations on Translation Process: Analysis, Challenges and Further Development. *Visnyk KNLU. Seriiia "Pedahohika ta psykholohiia"* [Bulletin of KNLU. Series Pedagogy and Psychology], vol. 28, pp. 28-34.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (2001). *Hermenevtyka i poetyka* [Hermeneutics and Poetics]. Kyiv, Yunivers Publ., 288 p.
- Gove, Ph.B. (2023). *New Webster's Dictionary and Thesaurus of the English Language*. Danbury, Lexicon Publications Inc. Available at: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/worthy> (Accessed 10 April 2023)
- Hajdegger, M. (1998). *Buduvaty, prozhyvaty, myslyty* [Build, Live, Think]. In: T. Vozniak (ed.). *Teksty ta pereklady* [Texts and translations]. Kharkiv, Folio Publ., pp. 313-332.
- Hewson, L. (2006). The Vexed Question of Creativity in Translation. *Palimpsestes*. Hors série, pp. 54-63.
- Hopkins, J. (2005). *Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1016 p.
- Hrytsiv, N.M. (2017). *Vasyl' Mysyk: Riznohrannyj diamant ukrains'koho khudozhn'oho perekladu* [Vasyl Mysyk: The Multifaceted Diamond of Ukrainian Artistic Translation]. Vinnytsia, Nova Knyha Publ., 296 p.
- Huseva, A.A. (2023). *Osnovnye ystochnyky entropyy pry perevode yntertekstual'nykh elementov* [The Main Sources of Entropy when Translating Intertextual Elements]. Available at: https://lomonosov-msu.ru/archive/Lomonosov_2008/11_6.pdf. (Accessed 10 April 2023)

- Dorofieieva, M. (2016). *Informatsijna entropiia u perekladi spetsial'nykh tekstiv* [Information Entropy in the Translation of Special Texts]. *Inozemna filohiia* [Foreign Philology], vol. 1, issue 49, pp. 9-14.
- Dorofieieva, M., Andruschenko, T. (2019). *Informatsijna entropiia u perekladi: psyholingvistychni aspekty* [Information Entropy in Translation: Psycholinguistic Aspects]. *Psyholingvistyka*, vol. 26, issue 2, pp. 91-113.
- Kykot, V.M., Dakhno Ya.V. (2023). *Interpretatsiia pry perekladi khudozhn'oho tekstu* [Interpretation when Translating an Artistic Text]. Available at: http://www.rusnauka.com/4_SND_2014/Philologia/6_158397.doc.htm (Accessed 10 April 2023).
- Kolomiets, L.V. (2009). *Ukrains'ki perekladachi «Hamleta» V. Shekspira: Pantelejmon Kulish, Yurij Klen, Leonid Hrebinka, Mykhajlo Rudnyts'kyj, Ihor Kostets'kyj, Hryhorij Kochur, Yurij Andrukhovych* [Ukrainian Translators of "Hamlet" by W. Shakespeare: Panteleimon Kulish, Yuriy Klen, Leonid Grebinka, Mykhailo Rudnytskyi, Ihor Kostetskyi, Hryhoriy Kochur, Yuriy Andruhovych]. *Renesansni studii* [Renaissance Studios] vol. 12-13, pp. 164-189.
- Kolomiets, L.V. (2015). *Ukrains'kyj khudozhnij pereklad ta perekladachi 1920-30-kh rokiv* [Ukrainian Artistic Translation and Translators of the 1920th and 30th]. Vinnytsia, Nova Knyha Publ., 360 p.
- Kochur, H. (2008). *Shekspyr na Ukrainy.* [Shakespeare in Ukraine]. In: A. Kochur (ed.). *Literatura ta pereklad: Doslidzhennia. Retsenzii. Literaturni portrety. Interv'iu* [Literature and Translation: Research. Reviews. Literary portraits. Interview]. Kyiv, Smoloskyp Publ., vol. 2, pp. 704-729.
- Kukharenko, V.A. (2004). *Interpretatsiia tekstu: navch. posibnyk dlia studentiv starshykh kursiv fakul'tetiv anhlijs'koi movy* [Interpretation of the Text]. Vinnytsia, Nova Knyha Publ., 272 p.
- Lechte, J. (1998). *Fifty Key Contemporary Thinkers. From Structuralism to Postmodernity.* London, New York, Routledge, 268 p.
- Lederer, M. (1990). The role of Cognitive Complements in Interpreting. In: D. Bowen, M. Bowen (eds.). *Interpreting: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow.* Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp 53-60.
- Munday, J. (2012). *Evaluation in Translation. Critical Points of Translation Decision-making.* Abingdon, New York, Routledge, 208 p.
- Narashimha, R.N. (1994). *Linguistic Entropy in Othello of Shakespeare.* New Delhi, M D Publications Ltd, 226 p.
- Razumovskaya, V.A. (2010). Information Entropy of Literary Text and its Surmounting in Understanding and Translation. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences*, vol. 2, issue 3, pp. 259-267.
- Rebrij, O.V. (2012). *Suchasni kontseptsii tvorchosti u perekladi* [Modern concepts of creativity in translation]. Kharkiv, KhNU im. V.N. Karazina Publ., 376 p.
- Rebrij, O.V. (2023). *Kohnityvnyj pidkhid do vyvchennia problemy kreatyvnosti u perekladi* [A cognitive approach to studying the problem of creativity in translation]. In: A.G. Gudmanyan, S.I. Sydorenko (eds). *Sotsiokulturni ta etnolingvistychni problem galuzevogo perekladu v paradygmi yevrointegratsii* [Socio-cultural and ethnolinguistic problems of industry translation in the paradigm of European integration]. Kyiv, Agrar Media Group Publ., pp. 358-363.
- Reisch, G.A. (2005). Morris, Charles William (1901-79). In: J.R. Shook (ed.). *Dictionary of Modern American Philosophers.* Bristol, Thoemmes Publ., pp. 1740-1742.
- Ruda, N. (2017). *Benvenist Emil* [Benveniste Emile]. In: L.L. Zvonska (ed.). *Entsyklopedychnyj slovnyk klasychnykh mov* [Encyclopedic Dictionary of Classical Languages]. Kyiv, Kyiv University Publ., pp. 62-63.
- Seleskovitch, D. (1976). *Interpretation: A Psychological Approach to Translating.* In: R.W. Brislin (ed.). *Translation: Applications and Research.* New York, Gardner Press, Inc., pp. 92-116.
- Shakespeare, W. (2004). *Romeo and Juliet.* New York, Riverhead Books, 249 p.
- Shakespeare, W. (2015). *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark.* Adelaide, University of Adelaide, 165 p.
- Shakespeare, W. (2008). *Hamlet* [Hamlet]. Transl. by Yu. Andrukhovych. Kyiv, A BA-BA-HA-LA-MA-HA Publ., 242 p.
- Shakespeare, W. (2023). *Hamlet* [Hamlet]. Transl. by O. Hriaznov. Available at: <https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/world/printit.php?tid=9048> (Accessed 10 April 2023)
- Shakespeare, W. (1899). *Hamlet, prynts dansky* [Hamlet, Prince of Denmark]. Transl. by P. Kulish. Lviv, Ukrainsko-ruska vydavnycha spilka Publ., 197 p.
- Shakespeare, W. (1986). *Hamlet, prynts datsky* [Hamlet, Prince of Denmark]. Transl. by L. Hrebinka. Kyiv, Dnipro Publ., 118 p.
- Shakespeare, W. (2008a). *Korol Lir* [King Lear]. Transl. by O. Hriaznov. Kyiv, Zadruha Publ., 320 p.
- Shakespeare, W. (1901). *Romeo ta Dzhulietta* [Romeo & Juliet]. Transl. by P. Kulish. Lviv, Ukrainsko-ruska vydavnycha spilka Publ., 156 p.
- Shakespeare, W. (1937). *Romeo i Dzhulietta* [Romeo & Juliet]. Transl. by A. Hozenpud. Kyiv, Mystetstvo publ., 202 p.

- Shakespeare, W. (1985). *Romeo i Dzhulietta* [Romeo & Juliet]. Transl. by I. Steshenko. Kyiv, Dnipro Publ., 485 p.
- Shakespeare, W. (1998). *Romeo i Dzhulietta* [Romeo & Juliet]. Transl. by P. Kulish, interpret by M. Voronoho. Kyiv, Alterpress Publ., 234 p.
- Shakespeare, W. (2016). *Romeo i Dzhulietta* [Romeo & Juliet]. Transl. by Yu. Andrukhovych. Kyiv, A-ba-ba-ha-la-ma-ha Publ., 208 p.
- Shakespeare, W. (2023). *Romeo i Dzhulietta* [Romeo & Juliet]. Transl. by V. Mysyk. Available at: <https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/world/printit.php?tid=1> (Accessed 10 April 2023)
- Shakespeare, W. (1941). *Trahediia pro Hamleta, pryntsa danskoho* [The tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark]. Transl. by V. Ver. Kyiv, Mystetstvo Publ., 271 p.
- Sokolovsky, V. (2014). *O znachymosti katehoryy entropyy dlia lynhvystycheskoho opysanyia protses-sa synkhronnoho perevoda (propedevtycheskye zamechanyia)* [On the significance of the entropy category for the linguistic description of the process of simultaneous translation (propaedeutic remarks)]. In: A.G. Gudmanyan, S.I. Sydorenko (eds). *Fahovy ta hudozhniy pereklad: teoriya, metodologiya, praktika* [Professional and artistic translation: theory, methodology, practice]. Kyiv, Agrar Media Group Publ., pp. 334-338.
- Sternberg, R.J., Lubart, T.I. (2004). The Concept of Creativity: Prospects and Paradigms. In: R.J. Sternberg (ed.). *Handbook of Creativity*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-15.
- Torop, P. (2008). Translation as Communication and Auto-Communication. *Sign Systems Studies*, vol. 36, issue 2, pp. 375-397.
- Vanroy, B., De Clercq, O., Macken, L. (2019). Correlating Process and Product Data to Get an Insight into Translation Difficulty. *Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, vol. 27, pp. 924-941.
- Venuti, L. (2003). Retranslations: The Creation of Value. *Bucknell Review*, vol. 47, issue 1, pp. 25-39.
- Wible, J.R. (2008). The Economic Mind of Charles Sanders Peirce. *Contemporary Pragmatism*, vol. 5, issue. 2, pp. 39-67.
- Wills, W. (2005). Decision Making in Translation. In: M. Baker (ed.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. New York, Routledge, pp. 57-60.
- Yatsenko, M.T. (Red.). (1997). *Istoriia ukrainskoi literatury* [History of Ukrainian literature]. Kyiv, Lybid Publ., vol. 3, 432 p.

Одержано 21.12.2022.