Consolidating Anton Popovič's "metacommunicational context of translation" as a conceptual cluster

IRYNA ODREKHIVSKA

INTRODUCTION

The re-contextualization of the Central and Eastern European traditions of translation theorization, relevantly presented as "East meets West" (Jettmarová 2005, 95), has gathered momentum in contemporary translation studies, which can be attested by a series of large-scale conferences that led to the publication of landmark collective monographs *Translation Theories in the Slavic Countries* (Ceccherelli – Constantino – Diddi 2015) and *Going East: Discovering New and Alternative Traditions in Translation Studies* (Schippel – Zwischenberger 2017). Furthermore, leading journals in translation studies have organized thematic issues (*Mutatis Mutandis* 2016/9; *World Literature Studies* 2016/1) or published contributions (see Špirk 2009) that open avenues for further incorporation of Slavic theories into the world spectrum of research. One cannot but mention that, along with the publication of the English translation of Jiří Levý's ground-breaking volume *The Art of Translation* (2011), in 2014 the EST translation prize was awarded for the English rendition of Andrei Fedorov's *Introduction to Translation Theory.* A noticeable tendency is the anthologization of seminal works in each Central and Eastern European tradition so as to reconstruct its "profile", as well as trace the trajectories of the development of ideas and redefine the process of institutionalization of research on translation (see Hrdlička – Gromová 2004; Bończa Bukowski – Heydel 2013). On top of this, of considerable value are the inquiries aimed at correlating the historical accounts of nationally framed theoretical traditions with the present-day state of research in translation studies, which testifies to the continuity of the paradigms developed therein (see Kusá 2013; Králová – Jettmarová 2008).

The circuit of the above-mentioned "events" marks the complexity of the present translation studies discourse in the global spectrum, unearthing the ultimate need to effectively integrate re-visited alternative translation conceptualizations into mainstream paradigms in order to relate them in equilibrium to the worldwide debate. This paper argues that it is time to move from the general revisionist approach that brought to light nation-based translation "conceptual terrains" towards a framework of "concept-specific problematization", i. e. the "dialogic" discussion of theoretical concepts that presupposes their consideration not as closed – discrete in time and place – entities, but as "open texts" that actualize broader and new interpretations.

The contention adequately put by Gideon Toury more than 20 years ago about a remarkably heterogeneous and loosely connected series of paradigms and over-riding tendency to regard different paradigms as mere alternative ways of dealing with "the same thing" still seems to be valid (1995, 135). Such a perspective alludes to the stance developed by Theo Hermans: "Translation Studies need translation, in more than one sense" (2014, vii), where the other senses of "translation" as re-consideration, re-conceptualization and re-articulation of "background" or "bypassed" research programmes with their central conceptualizations reveal the utmost importance for achieving, as Daniel Gile (2012, 74) has aptly put it, "cohesiveness" in translation studies discourse.

With this in mind, the present paper aims to revitalize the concept of the *meta-communicational context of translation*, coined by Anton Popovič, perhaps in passing, in his 1971 monograph, and to extend its scope to the cluster level. In our view, conceptual clustering strategy, which lies in grouping translation concepts that in a way "interact" or may be positioned closely together in meta-discussions, can generally be quite productive for translation studies in order to counteract the growing tendency of fragmentation in the scholarly discourse. It is argued in this study that the cluster *metacommunicational context of translation* invites the consideration of the translation-metatext alongside the notions of motif and theme transposition, retranslation and translation multiplicity. The cluster might also be viewed within a complex three-dimensional coordinate system, i. e. x-y-z space, casting light on its recursive and procursive character. To substantiate the potential and assert the explanatory capacities of the conceptual cluster under discussion, extensive data is presented based on the Ukrainian translation tradition.

RE-READING ANTON POPOVIČ'S COMMUNICATION-BASED CONCEPTION OF TRANSLATION

Anton Popovič elaborated his translation conception on the basis of modelling relations between texts, collectively referred to as *intertextual continuity* (1976, 225). All types of processing and/or manipulating a source text, i. e. a "prototext", which becomes an object of intertextual continuity – an impulse that conditions under varied reasoning (agency, etc.) the genesis of another text, be it a translation or a derived literary production such as imitations, parodies etc. – are termed by the Slovak theoretician as *metacommunication* (226–227). A translator is hence treated as the "meta-communicant", while the editors, publishers, translation scholars and critics become "metacommunicative agents" as put elsewhere (122). In accordance with the Popovič-based approach, metatextual operation can be discussed in terms of several principal aspects, namely: *semantic* (the ratio of meaning invariants to variants is different in various metatexts, which defines the relations between proto- and metatexts); *stylistic* (the degree of homology between the source and metatext may vary from affirmative to polemical attitude); *axiological* (either positive or negative evaluation of the prototext is embodied in the metatext, the latter named as "text destruction"); *authorial* (it manifests author's strategy in concealed or open linking his/her metatext to the original one), *spatial and temporal* one (229–230).

Of primary importance, metaphorically speaking of "meta-power", is the following typology of transformations which the prototext undergoes in the metatext, put forward by Anton Popovič: *imitative continuity*, i. e. the metatext sensu stricto which implies translation or plagiarism; *selective continuity*, i. e. a selection of certain elements of the text construction which may lead to fragmentary translations; *reducing continuity*, i. e. a text condensation which may result in intentionally shortened translations; and *complementary continuity*, i. e. a metatext completes invariant qualities of the prototext in the form of overviews, literary commentaries, introductory notes and appendices (231–232). At first glance, the scholar makes a rigorous delineation between the surface differences between texts; however it is still apparent that for Anton Popovič, all relations on the scale *text-metatext or metatext-metatext* have an underlying common basis which stimulates numerous "inferential" possibilities.

The theoretician also operates on the assumption that a diachronic projection of the metatext may make it feasible to depict the literary continuity in tradition (234), a matter which still leaves room for thinking and empirical verification.

A PRODUCTIVE MOVE IN REVERSE: FROM *INTERTEXT CONTINUITY* TO THE *METACOMMUNICATIONAL CONTEXT OF TRANSLATION*

In Anton Popovič's vision, the *metacommunicational context of translation* is the secondary literary context in which either the reproduction of the invariant features of the source texts takes place or the translation modifications are implemented on the basis of the functional principle. In other words, the *metacommunicational context* encompasses the translated text (metatext) and the communicative context it sets (1971, 30). It offers a flexible and "dynamic" understanding of the metatext surrounding ("orbit"), explicitly positing that boundaries are constantly shifting since texts are in a constant dialogue. What counts here is not "the label, but the concept it applies to" (Toury 1995, 135), and the initial problematization elaborated by Anton Popovič seems quite constructive and relevant. In his "mature theorization", specifically in the 1975 monograph, the concept of *meta-communicational context of translation* fell somewhat into the background and was indeed modified into *inter-text continuity* in his 1976 paper on the aspects of metatext. In our view, the term *continuity* presupposes a linear causality in modelling the development of the metatext out of the prototext, exhibiting a succession and continuation of textual progression in one direction. In one of his few position-takings, Anton Popovič made quite a telling observation: "It would be an oversimplification to explain the text-metatext relation from the immanent standpoint, i. e. the text → text sequence, only. Without the relation to reality, the proper stimuli of continuity could not be realized" (1976, 233).

Developing this stance beyond the relation text-metatext-reality, we posit that the initial concept of the *metacommunicational context of translation* has an inherent added value and appears to be quite productive in opening the vantage point of complex secondary metacommunication of translation-metatext. Specifically, it enables not only linear and unidirectional viewing as well as the contextual placing of the

continuity from text to metatext (translation), but also the clustering of the inter-textual space established with the emergent translation-metatext. In order to represent multiple relations and interactions of the metatext in question with other metatexts as well as with the prototext, the consolidation of the metacommunicational context of translation as an integrative conceptual cluster will enhance explanatory capacities of complex linkages of the text in question.

Re-framing Anton Popovič's conceptual position-taking on literary synthesis, it is possible to claim that metatexts further enter particular communicative relations (secondary metacommunication) that lead to the creation of new consolidated wholes. To put it differently, metatexts undergo literary synthesis, resulting in their import to collections, anthologies, new texts and narratives etc. under the prevalence of three criteria: character (motivation), relationship to meta-tradition and relationship to cultural reality (Popovič 1977, 117–123).

In fact, the *metacommunicational context of translation* allows the projecting of the metatext within a three-dimensional coordinate system, i. e. x-y-z space. Three coordinate axes cross at the point of their origin which is the metatext under discussion. The x-dimension analyses the recursive relations of the translation-metatext with its prototext and/or protoliterature, as, for instance, there are metatexts whose "communicative impact depends on the reader's reference to the prototext" (Popovič 1976, 230). To illustrate, in the process of translational transposition of a source text that has already an inherently transposed biblical or Shakespearean motif, the translator is not only to detect the authorial variation in the contextual treatment of the motif but also to decode its invariant proto-meaning from the Bible or the Shakespearean canon, so that the reader will be able to interpret the proto-reference both on the thematic and stylistic levels.

From another standpoint, a strong argument is that there are translated texts which do not only function in the target culture but also stay tangible within the source one. That is the situation typical of the present-day Ukrainian literary field, as the selection of contemporary Ukrainian novels generally chosen for English and German translation or even for the inclusion in foreign anthological projects leads to their re-consideration in central positions on the domestic literary market. Given this scenario, metatexts "construct" their prototexts, making them no longer stable timeless referent points but rather "reciprocal products of interactive rethinking in a shifting present" (Robinson 1999, 4).

The y-dimension stands for the "secondary" metacommunication of the translation-metatext with already existing metatexts of the prototext, with non-translations and with the tradition that "covers all metatextual operations" (Popovič 1976, 235) or metaliterature, in James S. Holmes' argumentation. Anton Popovič posits tradition to be a "superconcept" that encompasses relations to foreign literatures, to one's own literature and the ways of manipulating the original work by means of "reserve texts", i. e. secondary texts of reproductive (plagiarism), liquidatory (censorship) or interpretational (literary criticism) character (234–245). In this line of reasoning, the emergent translation is becoming by definition a "meta-sign" of metatexts and reserve texts already in existence. A case in point is the phenomenon of retransla-

tion which is a varience-oriented secondary metacommunication with the existent translation-metatext, being simultaneously an invariance-oriented metacommunication with the prototext. So the retranslation-metatext has an implicit addition – variance to previous translation-metatexts. On the one hand, this variation poses an ever-present tension between multiple metatexts of one prototext, whereas, on the other hand, it is the dialogue within the space of alternative metatexts, predominating even the dialogue outside the metaliterature, which generates new meaning and hence empowers the target culture, specifically the target literary field. What is more, some translations can be treated as secondary metatexts due to their hybrid character: they consist of chunks of earlier translations and chunks of re-translation (see Paloposki – Koskinen 2010).

The z-axis is of a procursive character, sketching the receptivity and capacities of the metaliterature to enter new dialogues. It deals either with the potentiality of prospective metacommunication of the same prototext, yet treated as a polemical secondary metacommunication to the translation-metatext in question, or with the possibility of the metatext itself becoming a prototext that would bring about a "secondary metatext" (a case of intermediate, indirect translations). Furthermore, the z-dimension uncovers the potency of one metatext to become an impetus, a so-called "catalyst", to a new metacreation that would derive from the same prototext.

Following this, a move back towards the topicality of the conceptual cluster *metacommunicational context of translation* lies in the shift in contemporary metascience from a linearity (causality) model to a complexity one, which is targeted at displaying multi-perspective textual interactions. The application of the three-dimensional system offers a stereoscopic vision of textual dynamics, namely recursive and procursive relations between texts.

METACREATION AS THE ORIGIN OF MODERN UKRAINIAN LITERATURE

In the 19th century an epoch of nation-state building took prominence in Europe which had a considerable influence on Ukraine, where the idea of a self-governed state not under the colonial dominance of the Russian empire, started to give rise. The Ukrainian language was then spoken mostly by peasants, yet in the spirit of Romantic movements it was destined to be transformed into a standard literary language. The first attempt at such a "turn" was made by Ivan Kotliarevsky in his 1798 burlesque, travestied translation of Virgil's *Aeneid,* entitled *Eneida.* By means of, paradoxically, a transposition of a classical epic text, the discovery and forming of the identity of Ukrainian literature took place.

In this rendition the translator resorted to exercising artistic freedom in poetic license that testified to the young and immature translation tradition at that time in Ukraine. What is evident, a style-lowering translation, which was, as a matter of fact, a polemical metatext, actually began the "history of modern vernacular Ukrainian literature"; in other words, a translation, albeit unusual, laid the foundation of modern Ukrainian literature (Chernetsky 2011, 38). Therefore, besides stemming from rich folklore, the modern Ukrainian literary field originated from "metatextual"

IRYNA ODREKHIVSKA

manipulation of a classic Virgil prototext, which set up the dialogic space for further metatextual productions. This burlesque style of over-interpretation and radical stylistic substitution in metacreation was later labelled in Ukraine as *kotliarevshchyna*.

Interestingly, in the middle of the 1980s, under the liberalization tendencies in Ukrainian society, burlesque as a literary device for satire and free laughter (after an epoch of severe control due to the Soviet regime) returned and gained its momentum in the writings of the cult "Bu-Ba-Bu" literary group (Semkiv 2015, 109). Such a revival unearths a deep, implicit footing in the burlesque style of Ukrainian culture, presenting the secondary metacommunication of this theme in the target literary tradition. Thus, the procursive z-dimension of the metatext *Eneida* (based on x-axis) attains significance due to the opening of a new avenue to Ukrainian literary development.

FRAGMENTARY TRANSLATIONS AS SELECTIVE METATEXTS IN UKRAINIAN CULTURE

Fragmentary translations are instances of selective continuity in metacreation, which refers to making use of an extract of the prototext for further translation by choosing it according to literary, cultural and ideological motivations (Popovič 1976, 232; 1977, 125). Arguably, the secondary communication of such selective translation-metatexts enables their acquisition of a new ideational entity when viewed in one meta-set, however they lose this meta-essence if they are considered in mere continuity terms. Selective metatexts exhibit shifting needs and changing perceptions on the part of target readers, so the intertextual relations between metatexts disclose the shifts in situational contexts.

Taking into account that there is no full Ukrainian translation of Percy Bysshe Shelley's lyrical drama *Prometheus Unbound*, studying three Ukrainian translations of the excerpts, performed by Ivan Franko (1880s), Victor Koptilov (1972) and Oleksandr Mokrovolskyi (1987) reveals how translators selected and discovered "virtual and concealed" (Popovič 1976, 233) meanings in the metatextual process.

In the year 1880, Ivan Franko translated under an altered title *Budushchyi zolotyi vik* (The Future Golden Age) the end of Act III and some initial lines of Act IV from Percy Bysshe Shelley's magnum opus. It tells the story of the overthrown Jupiter and Prometheus, released from imprisonment. Demogorgon heralds the news of newfound harmony and an age of peace and prosperity for all. It is essential to mention that Ivan Franko was working in the epoch of the Austro-Hungarian empire, which in the late 19th century provided some opportunities (in contrast to the Russian *e*mpire) for the development of Ukrainian literature, both original and translated, that alluded to the motif of Prometheus unbound. In November 1880, the First People's Council in Lviv was held, having devoted its agenda to the legal state of Ruthenians (Galician Ukrainians) in Austria with the resolution to grant them rights and facilities to nurture their language and allow its official use as well as develop their culture. Under the impressions, Ivan Franko selected Percy Bysshe Shelley's epilogue of the drama for the Ukrainian rendition, replacing the original titles with rather evocative ones which allude toevents occurring at the time: *Spirit of the Hour* turned

into *Nove cholovitstvo* (New Mankind) and *The Earth* was intensified with an added adjective *Obnovlena zemlia* (New Land).

In 1972, Victor Koptilov translated the "opening" from Shelley's drama – the monologue of Prometheus, where the titan, chained to the Caucasus Mountains, curses Jupiter for having sentenced him to this fate of torture, both physical and mental. Selecting this part for the Ukrainian translation has a direct relation to Ukrainian reality in 1972: ideological purges in the Ukrainian Writers' Union and in academic institutions; political repression and "excommunication" from the literary process for the majority of leading Ukrainian writers; excessive dominance of "dogmatic" publications according to the party line; the arrest of Ivan Dzuba for his work *Internationalism or Russification?*, published by Samvydav in 1965. The extratextual ontology influenced the choice of the excerpt of the prototext for translation.

In 1987, a separate collection of Percy Bysshe Shelley's poetry was published. The poems included in the edition were chosen according to one criterion, i. e. elicitation as a representative of Romanticist lyricism. The translator Oleksandr Mokrovolskyi selected a monologue of Asia, Prometheus's beloved, from Act II, the only "lyric voice" within the whole drama. Typical of English Romanticism, it became very popular in musical adaptations (especially a piece by Herb Weidner), and many paintings were created based on the motif of Asia's speech. In this regard, the late 1980s created an incentive to negate the "lethargic" socialist realist trend and to experiment and open new paths in translating world classics; thus Oleksandr Mokrovolskyi consciously chose the passage featuring Asia to displace the "traditional", political image of Percy Bysshe Shelley presented in previous metatexts.

Given this, the dialogue – "autocommunication" in Peeter Torop's (2008, 375) vision – along the y-dimension within the metacommunicational context between all three translations becomes a central mechanism in viewing a space of complex interacting relations among existing metatexts.

BETWEEN TRANSLATION-METACREATION AND TRANSLATION-RESTORATION: FOX *REYNARD*, *REINEKE* AND *MYKYTA* IN THE UKRAINIAN LITERARY FIELD

In 2000, the series "Cultural Diversities and Intersections" presented a collective volume on *Reynard the Fox* which was premised on the cultural metamorphoses of the fox epic from the Middle Ages till the present (see Varty 2000). A multitude of contributions proved that every adaptation, "re-working" and translation of this famous plot could rely on different prototexts but have an implicit conceptual duality to preserve the traditional plot and create satire in the socio-political setting in target cultures.

In this view, it turns out to be a fascinating undertaking to firstly "diagnosticate" a selection of prototexts Ukrainian translators dealt with and then see the secondary metacommunication of translation-metatexts within the target culture.

Ukrainian "readings" of the fox epic started in 1886-1887 with the poem-fairy tale by Ivan Manzhura *Kazka pro hytroho Lysovyna i pro druhykh zviriv ta pro te, scho vin yim, a vony iomu koily* (A Tale about a Sly Fox and other Animals and about how

he Treated Them). It was a re-writing of six songs of Goethe's *Reineke Fuchs*, but the Ukrainian translator based it on a Russian 1848 translation by Mikhail Dostoyevsky, so in fact Manzhura's work was a secondary metatext.

In 1890 the first publication of Ivan Franko's *Lys Mykyta* (Fox Mykyta) appeared in the journal *Dzvinok* (The Bell). After Taras Shevchenko's *Kobzar, Fox Mykyta* has been and is the most popular and highly rated Ukrainian book. For the second edition of his work, Ivan Franko authored a preface, *Who is Fox Mykyta and where is he from?* in which he denied translating literally any line from any "pretext", sharing that he did not wish "to translate but rather to re-create an ancient tale about the fox, making it our cultural asset" (1902, XV). Ivan Franko asserted that only a frame of a Middle Dutch poem by Willem was adopted (the same one Johann W. Goethe relied on) and filled "freely", borrowing from Old French versions, Flemish *Isengrimmus*, Latin *Reinardus* and rich tradition of Ukrainian folk tales. In addition, Ivan Franko admitted comparison with Johann W. Goethe's German re-framing of the fox narrative, yet his Ukrainian metatext is not a translation of the German poem (a traditional misconception); furthermore, it is not a reconstruction of one lost or missing text. *Fox Mykyta* is rather a literary synthesis performed by a translator (meta-communicant) of various texts, resulting in one thematic and compositional texture which serves as a prototext and its transposition into the metatext by conforming to the interests of the potential target audience. Such a treatment intorduces quite a novel understanding of the x-dimension in the metacommunicational context of translation. To trace the journey of Ivan Franko's metatext, it was even later translated into other dominant languages; several English renditions are available which, taking a broader perspective, are secondary metatexts.

In 1941, an anonymous complete translation of Johann W. Goethe's *Reineke Fuchs* was published in Lviv, and sixty years later, in 2001, a translation-reconstruction of the Old French epic poem *Le Roman de Renard* was published in a journal of translations, *Vsesvit* (Universe). In the foreword *Lys Renar i yoho pryhody* (Fox Renard and His Adventures), the translator Victor Koptilov admitted that it could be hard to imagine the contemporary translation of such a colossal work as *Le roman de Renard* without the curtailment of some details from the Middle Ages, since their preservation would require the introduction of extra commentaries (Koptilov 2001). Moreover, he added that the present translation relies on plots "unknown" to the Ukrainian reader and can be a valuable addition to the two former translations – Ivan Franko's and the anonymous rendition of Johann W. Goethe's *Reineke Fuchs*.

So, these alleys of the metatextual "growth" of the fox epic in the Ukrainian culture pinpoint the complex, relational nature of the phenomenon of a secondary metatext (x-axis), a dialogic space established at the interplay of different existent metatexts (y-dimension) which offers certain visions of further possible metacommunication (z-axis), e. g. the compilation of a Ukrainian-language anthology that would unite under one cover all metatexts based on this universally known story.

WHEN A METATEXT BECOMES A PROTOTEXT: *PINOCCHIO* AND *BURATINO*

The scenario of a metatext becoming a permanently referencing prototext was considered by Anton Popovič and, in our case, belongs both to the y- and z-dimensions. A case in point is Carlo Collodi's (1826–1890) famous Italian story *Pinocchio*, first published between 1881 and 1883 in sequels in a children's magazine. After completion of the series in 1883, the first book-edition came out. Yet, only after 1914, when it was called a classical piece of Italian literature in the "Revue des deux mondes", did it gain wide acclaim. By 1937 there were almost 200 translations–metatexts of this Italian work.

The famous Russian writer Alexei Tolstoy, who had emigrated, in 1923–1924 witnessed the great recognition of Carlo Collodi's work and decided to translate it into Russian. However, a close content-based translation turned out to be boring and "dry" for Alexei Tolstoy, so he accepted the challenge to rewrite the prototext for Russian readers under the changed title *Buratino* (*Буратино*). In 1935 Alexei Tolstoy's version-variation was published as a separate edition and in the newspaper *Pionerskaya pravda* (Pioneer's truth). A year later he authored the play *Golden Key* for the Central Children's Theatre and in 1939 wrote a script for the film. It is noteworthy that until 1986 Alexei Tolstoy's metatext was re-published in the Soviet Union 182 times with a total circulation of 14.5 million copies. What is more, this metatext appeared to gain the status of the prototext and was translated into 47 languages.

Currently in Ukraine, the readers can enjoy a direct Ukrainian translation *Піноккіо* of Carlo Collodi's Italian masterpiece, having simultaneously available the "secondary metatext" – Ukrainian *Buratino,* translated from Russian. Furthermore, the audiovisual multiplicity should be exposed: Ukrainian children may watch both the Ukrainian dubbed version of the 1940 Disney classic *Pinocchio* and the Ukrainian subtitled translation of the 1975 Moscow production *Buratino*, a Soviet-epoch classic. To note, the secondary metatext *Buratino* is much more popular among the Ukrainian audience due to its ideological soliciting in the former Soviet Union (the factor of agency in translation is undeniable) as well as the lack of Carlo Collodi's Ukrainian translation until the 1990s.

This sample explicitly manifests the interconnectedness of the x-axis (*text – metatext*, the latter having a polemical character) with the y-axis, showing a frequent occurrence of translation as a secondary metatext in literary fields. Furthermore, by taking a relativist viewpoint, one can argue that even such "secondary metatextual" translation can develop into a prototext set for new metacreative processes (z-dimension). It brings us to the conclusion that not only prototexts but quite often metatexts become a force for text-generating activity.

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this article has been twofold: 1. to provide an insightful analysis of Anton Popovič's concept of *inter-text continuity* and bring to the re-reading the concept that indeed predated it, namely the *metacommunicative context of translation*, as well as 2. enhance the theoretical framework of the latter with convincing and capti-

vating historical data taken from Ukrainian literary tradition. The ultimate aim has been to reinforce the validity of the *metacommunicational context of translation* as it enables not only a unidirectional view as well as contextual placing of the continuity from text to metatext (translation), but also a clustering of the inter-textual space established with the emergent translation-metatext. For this reason, a three-dimensional coordinate system, i. e. x-y-z space, has been suggested, soliciting an integrative "clustering" approach towards treating the inter-text relations of a metatext. From this parameter, a developed multi-perspective mechanism allowed the description of various translation acts in terms of metacommunication, particularly re-translations, fragmentary and indirect renditions, unearthing the understanding of translation as a complex multifunctional phenomenon.

Undoubtedly, this paper is only a partial and quite limited reflection on the theoretical and methodological potential of Anton Popovič's conception of the metacommunicational context of translation. Among promising fields are further studies of the factual materials that would empower methodological and meta-critical premises of the concept under discussion.

LITERATURE

Bończa Bukowski, Piotr – Heydel Magda, eds. 2013. *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza:* antologia. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersitetu Jagiellońskiego.

Ceccherelli, Andrea – Lorenzo Constantino – Cristiano Diddi, eds. 2015. *Translation Theories in the Slavic Countries.* Salerno: Università di Salerno.

Chernetsky, Vitaly. 2011. "Nation and translation: Literary translation and the shaping of modern Ukrainian culture." In *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*, edited by Brian James Baer, 33–55. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Franko, Ivan. 1902. *Lys Mykyta*. Lviv: Drukarnia Naukovoho Tovarystva Shevchenka.

Gile, Daniel. 2012. "Institutionalization of Translation Studies." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, vol. 3, edited by Yves Gambier – Luc van Doorslaer, 73–80. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hermans, Theo. 2014. *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained.* London – New York: Routledge.

Hrdlička, Milan – Edita Gromová, eds. 2004. *Antologie teorie uměleckého překladu (výběr z prací českých a slovenských autorů).* Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita.

Jettmarová, Zuzana. 2005. "East Meets West: On Social Agency in Translation Studies Paradigms." In *New Trends in Translation Studies. In Honour of Kinga Klaudy*, edited by Krisztina Károly –Ágota Fóris et al., 95–105. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Koptilov, Victor. 2001. "Lys Renar i yoho pryhody." *Vsesvit* 1–2: 137–139.

Králová, Jana – Zuzana Jettmarová, eds. 2008. *Tradition versus Modernity: From the Classical Period of the Prague School to Translation Studies at the Beginning of the 21st Century.* Prague: Charles University.

Kusá, Mária. 2013. "The Current State of the Slovak Thinking on Translation." In *Present State of Translation Studies in Slovakia*, edited by Libuša Vajdová, 7–16. Bratislava: Slovak Academic Press.

Levý, Jiří. 1963/2011. *The Art of Translation.* Edited by Zuzana Jettmarová, and translated by Patrick Corness. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Paloposki, Outi – Kaska Koskinen. 2010. "Retranslation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, vol. 1,

edited by Yves Gambier – Luc van Doorslaer, 294–298. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Popovič, Anton. 1971. *Poetika umeleckého prekladu. Proces a text.* Bratislava: Tatran.

Popovič, Anton. 1976. "Aspects of Metatext." *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* III, 3: 225–235.

Popovič, Anton – Francis M. Macri. 1977. "Literary Synthesis." *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*, CRCL Spring: 117–132.

Robinson, Douglas. 1999. "Retranslation and ideosomatic drift." A keynote lecture at Modern Language Association. Philadelphia, PA. Accessed November 20, 2016. www.umass.edu/french/people/profiles/documents/Robinson.pdf.

Schippel, Larisa – Cornelia Zwischenberger, eds. 2017. *Going East: Discovering New and Alternative Traditions in Translation Studies.* Berlin: Frank & Timme.

Semkiv, Rostyslav. 2015. "The Return of Burlesque: Comic Forms in Contemporary Ukrainian Literature, 1985 – 2010." *Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal* 2: 109–120.

Špirk, Jaroslav. 2009. "Anton Popovič's contribution to translation studies." *Target* 21, 1: 3–29.

Torop. Peeter. 2008. "Translation as Communication and Autocommunication." *Sign Systems Studies* 36, 2: 375–397.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. "The Notion of 'Assumed Translation' – An Invitation to a New Discussion." In *Letterlijkheid, Woordelijheid*, edited by Henri Bloemen – Erik Hertog – Winibert Segers, 135–147. Antwerpen – Harmelen: Fantom.

Varty, Kenneth, ed. 2000. *Reynard the Fox. Social Engagement and Cultural Metamorphoses in the Beast Epic from the Middle Ages to the Present.* New York – Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Consolidating Anton Popovič's "metacommunicational context of translation" as a conceptual cluster

Anton Popovič. Metatext. Translation. Metacommunication. Intertext continuity.

Following a Popovič-based approach to modelling translation, the paper foregrounds the topicality, possible extension and applicability of the conceptual cluster the *metacommunicational context of translation* presented by the Slovak theoretician in a 1971 monograph in the backdrop of his widely accepted concept of inter-text continuity. In the line of the contemporary methodological de-throning of linearity modelling with proving the validity of complexity models, the potential and versatility of the concept of the metacommunicational context of translation is insightfully analysed. Based on empirical data taken from Ukrainian translation culture, the provided case study advocates the rationale of the conceptual cluster under study.

Iryna Odrekhivska, PhD
The Hryhoriy Kochur Department
of Translation Studies and Contrastive Linguistics
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv
Universytetska Str. 1
79000 Lviv
Ukraine
irynaodr@gmail.com