

UDC 821.353

## TRANSFORMATION OF I. FRANKO'S POETIC FORMS OF *WITHERED LEAVES* IN RAUL CHILACHAVA'S TRANSLATION

*Oksana Asadchykh*<sup>1</sup>

DSc (Pedagogy), Professor

Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

14, Taras Shevchenko Blvd, Kyiv, 01601, Ukraine

asadchih@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-1238-7180

*Oksana Dyn*

PhD student (Philology)

Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

14, Taras Shevchenko Blvd, Kyiv, 01601, Ukraine

oksana.dyn@gmail.com

ORCID: 0009-0002-5571-0010

Translating the poetic masterpieces of each literature into other languages has been and remains an important task, as it allows every nation to discover the richness of different cultures and expand its horizons. Due to numerous talented translations, I. Franko has secured his place in the history of world literature in Georgia. The article examines the transformation of Ivan Franko's poetic forms in the Georgian context by Raul Chilachava. The Georgian poet and translator has dedicated his life to translating and popularizing Ukrainian literature in Georgia. R. Chilachava is considered a bridge builder between two cultural worlds, enabling deeper mutual understanding through his work. The author draws attention to the peculiarities of the translation process and the ways of adapting poetic forms in a new linguistic environment, providing the reader with the opportunity to gain an in-depth understanding of the unique features of Ivan Franko's work through the prism of Georgian translation. The researcher investigates why the Georgian poet chose this particular author and the collection *Withered Leaves*. Special attention is given to the rhymes, themes, stylistics, and metaphors of the Ukrainian writer's poems in their Georgian translations. The article addresses the issue of bilingualism because Raul Chilachava is known to be proficient in both Ukrainian and Georgian languages, particularly focusing on the influence of bilingualism on the translation process and the faithful reproduction of the internal and external matrices of the original. The researcher analyzes how Raul Chilachava conveys the Ukrainian flavor, language features and depth of Ivan Franko's thought through the prism of Georgian culture and language.

**Keywords:** Ivan Franko; Raul Chilachava; *Withered Leaves*; translation; original; stanza; sonnet; rhyme; quatrain; lexeme

### *Introduction*

With the introduction of Franko's works into Georgian literature, a new stage began in the history of translation practice between Georgia and Ukraine – an interesting stage

---

© 2024 O. Asadchykh and O. Dyn; Published by the A. Yu. Krymskyi Institute of Oriental Studies, NAS of Ukraine on behalf of *The World of the Orient*. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

rich in many facts. It is known that I. Franko was the first Ukrainian prose writer to have his works translated into Georgian at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. A thorough and informative study of the translations of short stories and poetic works by the author was conducted by O. N. Mushkudiani and published in his book *The Georgian Upper Room of Ivan Franko*. In his study, he noted that most translators based their translations not on the original works but on Russian translations, as a result they

couldn't avoid new deviations largely due to differences between Russian and Georgian languages. Among the scientific research, it is notable that translators endeavored to preserve the Ukrainian flavor as much as possible. They appeared to "guess" certain passages overlooked by Russian translators O. Ruvimova and R. Olgin, and guided by intuition (especially I. Yevdoshvili), made "appropriate" adjustments to the translation [Mushkudiani 2006, 60].

Famous translators of I. Franko's prose works are I. Yevdoshvili, K. Japaridze and N. Kipiani. As for the translation of poetic works, they appeared a little later, predominantly there were poems from the collection *From the Peaks and Lowlands*, including "You Develop, High Oak" (translated by M. Topchishvili (Kharkheli)), excerpts from the poem "Moses" translated by R. Gvetadze and K. Lordkipanidze, and in 1940, several other poems translated by Yasamani (M. Kintsurashvili) such as "Berkut" and "Boat", "To Friends", and "Sistine Madonna"; as well as poems "A. P." and "To Olha", translated by G. Abashidze, R. Gvetadze, K. Lordkipanidze, N. Lordkipanidze, I. Agladze, and others. Translation of "Moses" was done by R. Gvetadze and K. Lordkipanidze. Raul Chilachava joins the ranks of these translators.

Raul Chilachava (born on May 15, 1948 in the village of Chitatskari, Georgia) is a Georgian poet and translator, literary scholar, doctor of philological sciences, diplomat, laureate of the Maksym Rylsky prize, statesman, and one of the bright representatives of bilingualism. He not only thoroughly knows Ukrainian culture, literature, and history, but also has a perfect command of the Ukrainian language, – according to Viktor Koptilov, – "as a flexible tool for expressing deep feelings and thoughts, becoming a famous Ukrainian poet. Moreover, he became a Ukrainian, without denying his Georgianness, his native language and culture, becoming a famous Georgian poet" [Chilachava 2002, 53]. The first mention of R. Chilachava appears in 1968 on pages of O. Novitsky's (compl.) book *Rainbow bridges*, where V. Koptilov in the article "Lifelong friendship – to strengthen" notes: "R. Chilachava is a young poet – will translate contemporary Ukrainian poets into Georgian" [Novytskyi 1968, 76]. This is how Ukrainian readers began to get to know Chilachava's work. In the same year, Ukrainian translations of Chilachava's poems were published with brief information about the author.

Considering the translation of fiction literature as a source of ideological-thematic, genre-stylistic enrichment and the impulse to create new values on native soil, R. Chilachava realizes his intention to renew both Georgian and Ukrainian literature. He is a poet, and a translator, who consciously works to represent every culture in the field of the "Other". As a result, collections were published: in the Georgian language – a small anthology of young Ukrainian poetry "Flowers of Good", a collection of poems by Ukrainian poets about "Iberian Traction", *Kharkiv's Fairy Tales* by H. Skovoroda, "წიტელი გაზაფხული" (1970) by V. Sosiura, "მზიანი კლარნეტი" (1979) and "არფით, არფით..." by P. Tychyna, "ფიქრნი ზემო..." (1987) (selected) by T. Shevchenko, "მკენარი ფოთლები" (1988) by I. Franko, "შვიდი სიმი" (1991) by Lesia Ukrainka, *The Ways of Georgia* by M. Bazhan, *The Lesson* (lyrics and the poem of the same name) by B. Oliynyk, *I Give My Heart to Children* by V. Sukhomlynskyi, *The Word of Loss* by V. Boyko, "აგვისტო. 55 უკრაინელი პოეტი" (2001), "დიდი სამეფო" (2005), "ღანისპირებით გაფოთლილ ბაღში. 100 უკრაინელი პოეტი" (2014). And collections in the Ukrainian language: *Georgian Proverbs and Sayings* (1975), *Two Capitals* (2002), *Georgian Tales, Sayings and Proverbs* (2005), *Georgian*

*Folk Tales, Akakii Tsereteli. Lyrics* (2000, 2017), poetic and prose works by G. Tabidze, K. Gamsakhurdia, G. Pandzhikidze, G. Chichinadze, G. Khukhashvili, E. Magradze, R. Mishveladze, D. Guramishvili, K. Gamsakhurdia, I. Abashidze, H. Abashidze, K. Kaladze, N. Dumbadze, T. Chiladze, R. Inanishvili. Among the collections in the Georgian language, one should pay special attention to “აგვისტო. 55 უკრაინელი პოეტი” and “დანისპირებით გაფოთლილ ბაღში. 100 უკრაინელი პოეტი”, since the main translation of R. Chilachava’s work is presented here. The works of 100 Ukrainian poets have been translated into Georgian, from Hryhoriy Skovoroda to Marianna Kiyanovska.

This article deals with new horizons for understanding intercultural connections and transformations of literary texts in the context of translation. It will consider the appropriation of cultural elements, the impact on reception, and a comparative analysis of the original and translation.

### ***The History of the Translation of Withered Leaves by Raul Chilachava***

Chilachava chose lyrical poems that had not been translated before him. Translation “შჰკნარი ფოთლები” (*Withered Leaves*) is a self-translation. It was published in 1988 in two languages (Ukrainian and Georgian) (Tbilisi – Lviv) [Franko 1988]. Later, in 2001, the translator placed some of the poems in the book *August*. In 2005, another book titled “დიადი სამეული” (*The Great Trinity*) was published, which included the entire collection “შჰკნარი ფოთლები” (*Withered Leaves*) by I. Franko along with translations of works by T. Shevchenko and Lesya Ukrainka.

According to R. Chilachava, the desire to translate this masterpiece of Ukrainian literature arose in 1972, when his friend, the poet Roman Lubkivskyi, showed him the writer’s estate and house and told the impressive story of *Withered Leaves* creation. The choice to translate this work is not accidental, as R. Chilachava is primarily a lyricist. Therefore, it is the lyrics that attract him most of all to the reproduction of the lyrical element in the works of the authors translated by him.

R. Chilachava was well aware that the works of the great Ukrainian poet had already been translated into Georgian by such outstanding poets as G. Abashidze, I. Abashidze, R. Gvetadze, K. Lordkipanidze, Sh. Nishniadze, Yasamani and many others. As the study demonstrates, R. Chilachava is acquainted not only with the complete works of Ivan Franko and the literature of his own country but also with its historical and everyday realities – in short, the very milieu referenced in the poems of the great writer. In this regard, R. Chilachava is a typical representative of the school of realistic translation.

The objective of this scientific investigation is to examine the transformation of Ivan Franko’s poetic forms in the Georgian context by Raul Chilachava.

The collection *Withered Leaves* is a masterpiece of intimate lyrics by I. Franko. It received well-known rave reviews from P. Tychyna and M. Rylskyi. According to D. Pavlychko, *Withered Leaves* is a book

of pain, longing, and struggle, characterized by the same trembling soreness and fever as the *Song of Songs* of Solomon, old Arab love lyrics, poems by Sappho, sonnets of Petrarch, Camoens, Shakespeare, Ronsard, and endowed with the same beautiful incurable passion as *The Book of Songs* by Heine, the gazelles of Hafiz and Rudaki, and the intimate poetic messages of Pushkin and Mickiewicz. It is this collection of Franko’s that also enters our Ukrainian literature in the world’s most heartfelt songs of a loving soul for all peoples and generations [quoted from: Chilachava 2005, 140].

And another great Ukrainian writer, M. Kotsyubynskyi, wrote the following about this collection: “These are such light, tender poems, with such a wide range of feelings and understanding of the human soul, that when reading them, you don’t know who to give preference to: either the poet of struggle or the lyric poet, the singer of love and wariness” [quoted from: Franko 1988, 155]. The translation of I. Franko’s collection *Withered Leaves* presented R. Chilachava with a difficult creative task: to convey an impressive

lyric-dramatic story rich in symbols, images, and philosophical reflections. Understanding the complexity of the task, as he admitted himself, it was extremely interesting and attractive for the translator to “reflect in translation not only the feelings and emotions of the original works, to convey not only their poetic essence but also to recreate the artistic form” [Chilachava 2005, 141]. It was this translation that became, as he notes further, “a farewell to his own youth” because through it he “experienced and endured the great pain, sadness, and suffering woven into the lines”. It is no secret that translation is only possible when there is a strong ideological and aesthetic unity between the original author and the translator. In other words, a highly artistic translation is possible only when a “common language” emerges between these two individuals. Without a certain common platform and certain mutually acceptable principles, it is impossible to reach an agreement in a dispute. And translation is always a dispute. A dispute between modern ideas and new ones that have not yet been learned. But they need to be learned. R. Chilachava's dispute, as always, arises with the text and during the selection of the most suitable word in this case. At the same time, obviously, preference is given to a word that is undergoing or has already undergone a new filtering process in the collection of related words. Only then does this word fit into the context of other words, creating or completing a line of poetry with a natural, relaxed Georgian sound. Raul Shalvovich is well aware that the language of art has always been and will always remain a somewhat generalized language, though not entirely universal. When the complexities of specific cultural values are compounded by the challenges of the national language and art in perception, the psychology of their reception becomes more intricate.

Regarding the general assessment of the translation of this collection, O. N. Mushkudiani notes: “This publication should certainly be considered one of the brilliant pages in the centuries-old history of Georgian-Ukrainian literary and artistic relations” [Mushkudiani 2006, 89]. Let's turn to the translation itself.

*Withered Leaves*, according to Franko's own definition, is a lyrical drama. It should appear the same way, of course, in translation. The translator, we note here, successfully reproduced it. R. Chilachava translated all 61 poems. “მკვანარი ფოთლები” both in the original and in translation consists of three bundles: პირველი კონა (the first bundle), comprising 21 poems; მეორე კონა (the second bundle), which includes 20 poems, and მესამე კონა (third tuft), also containing 20 poems. At the same time, the translator selects the equivalent term and title “Withered Leaves” as accurately as possible – “მკვანარი ფოთლები”.

R. Chilachava encountered significant challenges in creating an adequate reflection of the original work. First, it concerns reproducing the original metric. We emphasize this because, as it is known, Ukrainian verse is syllabic-accentual and relies on both an equal number of syllables and a specific arrangement of stressed syllables. However, the Georgian poem is syllabic and based on a uniform arrangement of syllables. Therefore, the foot in the Georgian poem is not formed in the same way as in the Ukrainian one. The Franko's qualitative poem is reproduced in Georgian by Chilachava aiming for a character closest to Ukrainian verse, rather than through direct, mechanical imitation of the metric scheme. The *Withered Leaves* presents various forms of poetry known in European literature, including, as noted by D. Pavlychko, “poems structured according to exquisite schemes of accents such as Horace, sonnet and tercet forms, typical iambic, trochaic, dactylic stanzas with diverse rhyme systems and line syllable counts, blank intonational verse, and virtuoso imitations of folk songs” [quoted from: Franko 1988, 161]. Reproduction of these qualities is possible only after a long painstaking work, since a properly selected meter “can give the translator a ‘stylistic key’ to translation” [Gachechiladze 1980, 220] and thus indicate the path to interpretation. In our opinion, R. Chilachava arrived at the correct conclusion that the ten-syllable Georgian verse most closely corresponds to Franko's verse. Using it, R. Chilachava endeavors to convey to the Georgian reader not

only the ideas but also all the poetic features of the original works. Reflecting on his emotional experiences and work on the translation, the young translator later wrote:

I will never forget those unique evenings in Gagra, when the entire beau monde of the House of Creativity spread out in restaurants and bars, while I, in my cozy room, struggled with the lines of the Ukrainian genius, saturated with boundless passions. Along with him, I experienced and endured the great pain, sadness, and suffering woven into them, and at the same time, I felt an incomparable relief when I took the last sheet out of the typewriter. This translation became for me a farewell to my own youth, the end of an important stage of my long-term translation activity [Chilachava 2005, 141].

The centuries-old practice of the Georgian translation school, through hundreds and thousands of examples, convinces R. Chilachava that the creative personality of the brilliant Ukrainian poet can be successfully and fully reproduced in Georgian. And indeed, what would happen if we concluded that it was impossible to transfer poetic intonation to another language, in this case, Georgian? Then, in order to appreciate the richness of the poetry of T. Shevchenko, I. Franko, Lesya Ukrainka, and many others, so beautifully translated by R. Chilachava into Georgian, we would have to learn the melodious Ukrainian language, the native tongue of the great Ukrainian classical poets. Then the horizons of numerous Georgian readers-connoisseurs of Ukrainian poetry, who derive great aesthetic pleasure while reading Chilachava's translations and are nurtured by them, would be limited, and at the same time, it would become more difficult in terms of mutual understanding and enrichment between the Georgian and Ukrainian peoples.

### *Reproduction of the Outer Inner Matrix of Withered Leaves*

The first bundle of *Withered Leaves* presents three sonnets, “the widespread introduction of which, according to P. Volynskiy, in Ukrainian poetry is associated with the name of I. Franko” [Volynskiy 1956, 141]. These are sonnets such as “Why, beauty, I love you so much...” (“მზეთუნახავო, რად მიყვარხარ ამგვარად შენა...”), “Yes, you are my only true love...” (“დიახ, ერთი ხარ, გულმართალო ჩემო ტრფიალო...”), and “More than once in a dream appears to me...” (“მომეახლება სიზმარში ხშირად...”). Let's note right away that R. Chilachava adheres to all the nuances of the sonnet.

მზეთუნახავო, რად მიყვარხარ ამგვარად შენა,  
რად ბორგავს მკერდქვეშ გული ჩემი, გიჟად ქცეული,  
როცა ამაყად გვერდს ჩამივლი პირშექცეული?  
რად დამებედა სევდისა და წამების თმენა?

იმ მშვენებისთვის, რასაც კაცის ვერ იტყვის ენა,  
იმ რალაცისთვის, შენს თვალბში ალად რწეული  
იღუმალებით რომ ჩურჩულებს: “გამომწყვდეული  
აქაა სული სულიერი, ამ ვიწრო სენაკს?”

ზოგჯერ მგონია, შფოთავს, ოხრავს ის სულიერი  
სული და მაშინ უნებურად ღრმა მწუხარებით  
მოიბურები, შეგეცვლება სახის იერი.

მე მზად ვარ სულიც შემოგწირო და უცებ სურვილს  
მიქარწყლებ, მზერით ჩემს დაცინვას დაეჩქარები  
და უკუქცეულ მემსჭვალება ტკივილით სული.

This sonnet is translated into Georgian in a sonnet form and sounds as melodious as in Ukrainian. At the same time, the translation does not reproduce the iambic meter, which is not inherent in the Georgian verse. In this case, the Georgian lines are structured in a fourteen-syllable verse, divided into feet (5+4+5). The fourteen-syllable verse also translates the sonnet “დიახ, ერთი ხარ, გულმართალო ჩემო ტრფიალო...” (“Yes, you are my only true love...” – 5+4+5). But the sonnet “მომეახლება სიზმარში ხშირად...” (“More than once in a dream appears to me...”) was translated into a completely different

meter. Here, a ten-syllable Georgian verse is used. However, the stanza “regulation” here is more of a formal aspect; the main focus is on the content. “As the sonnet consists of the maximum number of rules (concerning rhymes, strophics, metre, sometimes even themes), there are a maximum number of possibilities to alter,” said R. Lotman [Lotman 2013, 327]. Regarding the content in the sonnet and the poetry, J. Bekher wrote: “In the sonnet, content is the law of the movement of life (and it manifests itself in different ways due to the content), which consists of a position, anti-position, and denouement in the conclusion, or of a thesis, antithesis, and synthesis” [Bekher 1965, 438]. The translation fully reproduces the content. Thus, the thesis, the main position, is revealed in the first quatrain, where “young love” matures, and the “awakened libido”, as V. Korniiichuk rightly notes, causes surprise to the lyrical hero, embarrassment by the incomprehensible, unconscious power of erotic feeling [Korniiichuk 2004, 225]: “Sun-like, Why do I love you so much, – we read in translation – // Why does my heart rebel in my chest, so crazy // When you proudly pass me by? // Why am I allowed to suffer torment, sadness?” The second quatrain serves as the antithesis: “For the beauty that the human tongue will not speak about // For something secret that sways like a flame in your eyes // and whispers secretly: ‘I am captured // Here I live in a small cell?’” And finally, the denouement, or synthesis, is presented in two tercets, where the lyrical hero seeks to “merge” into the object and fill it with a probable sense of the world. His feelings are sacrificial, as the hero seeks to give his soul for his beloved: “Sometimes, it seems that this living // Soul is raging, moaning, and then suddenly with deep sadness // Envelops, changes the expression of his face. // I am ready to sacrifice my soul for you, and suddenly the desire // with the worthless vision, you mock // And my soul is turned back, I am rubbed with pain”.

Each poem has its own compositional structure, which is subject to more general laws. R. Chilachava consistently strives to comprehend these patterns and, once understood, to faithfully recreate in Georgian the originality of each of Franko's poetic compositions. However, every poet-translator prioritizes the faithful recreation of the original work over self-reflection and diligently strives toward this goal. For R. Chilachava, this is both the foremost and most significant task he sets for himself. R. Chilachava should serve as an exemplar or a “model” of a poet-translator of such an objective type, in which his creative focus is directed toward the reproduction of the original work rather than self-expression.

In his sonnets, R. Chilachava preserves the rhyming system intact: for instance, in the sonnet “Why, beauty, I love you so much...” (“მზეთუნახავო, რად მიყვარხარ ამგვარად შენა...”), the two quatrains employ ring rhyming (abba<sup>2</sup>), while the tercets follow the scheme (cdc/ede). In the sonnet “მომეახლება სიზმარში ხშირად...” (“More than once in a dream appears to me...”) we observe the following rhyming scheme: two quatrains have cross-rhyming (abab), and tercets according to the scheme (cdc/dcd). However, in the sonnet “დიახ, ერთი ხარ, გულმართალო ჩემო ტრფიალო...” (“Yes, you are my only true love...”) we observe the following: the first quatrain remains constant and is implemented by cross-rhyming (abab), tercets have the following scheme (ccd/eed), but in the second quatrain the translator replaces ring rhyming with cross-rhyming:

Ти той найкращий спів, що в час вітхнення сниться,	<b>a</b>
Та ще ніколи слів для себе не знайшов;	<b>b</b>
Ти славний подвиг той, що я б на нього йшов,	<b>b</b>
Коб віра сильная й могучая десниця.	<b>a</b>

**Translation**

შენ ის ჰანგი ხარ, სიზმრად რომ არ მესაკლიხება,	<b>a</b>
და ვერ ამოვთქვამ, ცხადში რაგინდ რომ ვუტრიალო;	<b>b</b>
საგმიროდმიხმობ, ასეთიაშენი თვისება,	<b>a</b>
მაგრამ მარჯვენა მეურჩება, ეს სატიალო.	<b>b</b>

The content itself is preserved, but the general system of rhyming the entire sonnet is destroyed. However, such a replacement should not be considered too erroneous, because

the translation does not suffer many losses – “the sonnet must reinvent its metre every time it enters a new language” [Lotman 2013, 328].

R. Chilachava accurately selects and conveys the semantic components of the lexeme “love”, accentuated by the rhythmic structure: both in the original work and in the translation, love is – ერთი ხარ – *one*, გულმართალი – *fair*, რომელით დატკობაც არასოდეს არ მეღირსება – *pleasure I’m never meant to be satisfied with*. “The reader – according to O. N. Mushkudiani – is constantly struck by the careful attitude of the translator to each word” [Mushkudiani 2006, 89].

R. Chilachava excels in situations that demand precise word choice, which helps create vivid images – he retrieves a specific word whatever it is, he performs them from layers of archaic, literary, and everyday language, and sometimes even from contradictions, and he can even often invent it himself based on existing linguistic models. R. Chilachava, through his translations, including the works of I. Franko, pushes the boundaries of the Georgian language used for translating poetry by incorporating rare Georgian words that translators typically avoid, as well as newly created words adjacent to such archaisms.

Non-compliance with the rhyming system in the first bundle is also observed in the poem “ნეტა, ისეთი რა ვნახე შენში...” (“I don’t know what attracts me to you...”), which is reproduced using a ten-syllable Georgian poem. Here, the translator uses cross-rhyming in two stanzas (I and VI) instead of ring rhyme:

**Ukrainian text:**

Не знаю, що мене до тебе тягне,	a
Чим вчарувала ти мене, що все,	b
Коли погляну на твоє лице,	b
Чогось мов щастя й волі серце прагне	a

**Translation:**

ნეტავ, ისეთი რა ვნახე შენში,	a
ანდა ეს ხიბლი სადაურია,	b
თვალს შეგავლებ და ჭკუიდან შემშლი,	a
გულს ბედნიერად ძგერა სწყურია.	b

In the fifth instead of cross-rhyming we see adjacent:

**Ukrainian text:**

Якби ти слово прорекла мені,	b
Я б був щасливий, наче цар могутий,	a
Та в серці щось порвалось би на дні,	b
З очей би сліз потік поллявся рвучий	a

**Translation:**

შენ ერთი სიტყვა რომ გეთქვა თუნდაც,	a
ვიგრძნობდი მეფურ შევბას იახაც,	a
გული დაფშვნიდა შემბოჭველ ზღუდარს,	b
თვალნი დასძრავდნენ ცრემლთა ნიაღვარს.	b

Similar substitutions occur in some other poems: “თუმც არასოდეს მოისხამ ყვავილს...” (“Although you won’t bloom like a flower...” XVIII; II), “ეს იარაღი პაწია...” (“This is a small tool...” XX; III). Sometimes, the translator manages to reproduce not only the rhyming system but also the internal rhyme scheme within Franko’s poems:

**Ukrainian text:**

Та вітер повіяв і попів розвіяв...  
І серце най рветься, та вільно най ллеться.

**Translation:**

ქარმა გაფანტა და აფარტატა...  
გულის მწეწავი ხუნდის მღეწავი...

When analyzing the translation of the second stanza, we notice the appearance of a new image ხუნდი – shackles. Such examples of stylistic individualization are not often

found in R. Chilachava's translations; however, they are a manifestation of the translator's idiolect. Here is another example. In the original poem we read:

Полудне.  
Широкее поле безлюдне,  
Довкола для ока й для вуха  
Ні духу!

**Translation:**

შუადღე ცხელი  
უკაცური ტრიალი ველი  
მიჯაჭვულია სმენა და მზერა  
მიდამოს ვერანს!

The word “ცხელი” appeared in the poem. The translator aims to intensify the sensation of midday heat, thereby prompting the reader to experience profound silence, so he falls back on stylistic reinforcement.

The second bundle, as known, is an unsurpassed example of the masterful assimilation of rhythmic and melodic motifs from folk lyrics. Interesting examples here include the couplets “Oh, you girl, from the nut grain...” and “Oh, you curly oak...” Reproducing the rhythm of these poems, on the one hand, should not pose any difficulties, as Ukrainian folk song lyrics are characterized by quantum versification. The first of them, according to O. Dei, is close “to kolomyiki, and the second is an abbreviated carol tune” [Dei 1955, 300]. On the other hand, these poems are similar to the eastern genre of poetry – Beit. Beit is known to be able to form ghazals, qasidas and rubais. In them, R. Chilachava showed himself as a real virtuoso (the collection “ზელების კვალი” (*Traces of hands*, 1999) was published in Georgian), 100 rubais were published in Ukrainian in the book *Two capitals*, 2002) [Chilachava 2002].

The poem “Oh, you, girl, from the nut grain...” (“პოი, თხილის გულივით პირმწყაზარო გოგონავ...”) in Georgian sounded as a fourteen-syllable couplet, and “Oh, you, curly oak...” (“პოი შენ ხუჭუჭა მუხავ...”) is an eight-line poem that is considered folk.

**Ukrainian text:**

Ой ти, дівчино, з горіха зерня, (5+5)<sup>3</sup>  
Чом твоє серденько – колюче терня? (6+5)

**Translation:**

პოი, თხილის გულივით პირმწყაზარო გოგონავ (4+3+4+3)  
გულში რატომ გინთია რისხვის ჭიკოკონა? (4+3+4+3)

It should be noted here that, in addition to preserving the poetic meter, Chilachava also maintains the rhetorical appeal, often reinforced by an interrogative sentence, which is among the most distinctive features of Franko's poetic language. Through his use of appeals to objects and phenomena of the surrounding world, he “imbues his poetry with life, infusing inorganic nature with feelings and personifying natural forces and phenomena” [Shakhovskiy 1956, 115].

The translator endeavors to retain the poetic devices that amplify the emotional background of the original works. The comparisons sound identical both in the original and in the translation:

**Ukrainian text:**

устьоньки – тиха молитва  
слово остре, як бритва  
серце бентежить, як буря люта  
გრიგალი

ой ти, дівчино, ясная зоре

**Translation:**

ბაგე ლოცვების მოჩურჩულე რა დარი  
სამართლებლის სადარი  
გულს რომ მიფორი აქებს, ოგორც შლეგი

პოი, გოგოვ, გოგონავ ცისკრის მანათობელო

Folklore epithets hold a significant place here. “The epithet gives a special expressiveness. (...) a well-chosen epithet is one of the means of poetic art that creates a plastic image



that transports the reader to the poet's imagination" [Slavutych 1964, 24]. Although this trope is considered very simple, it is during its translation that the danger of distorting the author's style most often lies in wait. The fact is that these definitions are always very precisely attached to the language styles that are characteristic of the national language.

We also find interesting examples in the poems: "ალისფერო ძახველო, მდელიოზე რადქანაობ?" ("Red viburnum, why are you bending in the meadow?"), "მწვანე ჩინარი, მწვანე ჩინარი..." ("Green maple, green maple"), which are also filled with comparisons and epithets coming from the people, because they contain a vividly depicted image. Knowing the Ukrainian and Georgian languages well, R. Chilachava easily finds equivalents in folk vocabulary:

**Ukrainian text:**

дубочку кучерявий  
густі лози  
чорні очі  
вітер зимний  
листочки зів'ялі  
голосні дзвони

**Translation:**

ხუჭუჭა მუშავ  
ქეწნები ხშირი  
შავთვალა  
ზამთრის ქარი  
ფოთლები მჰკნარი  
რეკენ ზარები

As you can see, in some cases it is difficult for the translator to find matches. This is mainly due to language differences. However, R. Chilachava tries to replace them or choose those that are understandable for the Georgian reader. For example: *eternal parting* passed by two synonymous nouns გაყრა, განშორება, which means just – *parting*.

*Golden stars* in translation – ანთებული ვარსკვლავთ კრება, which means – *inflamed vision cluster*. This difference suggests that Chilachava is not a supporter of literal translation, but of creative translation.

Deeply, with all his inner life, R. Chilachava serves poetry and creates it himself, he soulfully feels the first glimpse, the first pause, the first skin of the original work. In his translations, we are once again convinced of the high talent of the poet-translator R. Chilachava. That is why his translations are always close to the grandeur and beauty of the original. R. Chilachava believes that each nation and generation interprets Ivan Franko's works uniquely, drawing from his rich and generous legacy what resonates most with contemporary people amidst the ancient shade of history.

The research has shown that another means of poetic syntax is common for Franko, such as frequent use of verbs to establish gradation. Verbs are known to

expand concepts that become the focus of the speaker's attention. Therefore, the verb gives the text dynamics and emotional expressiveness. The study of various writers' styles has proven that works where emotionality and affect prevail are characterized by a particularly high frequency of verb use [Laslo-Kutsiuk 1983, 391].

The Georgian language is also characterized by frequent use of the verb, which conveys all the power of poetics. Therefore, Chilachava skillfully selects equivalents:

**Ukrainian text:**

Упустив я голубочку,  
та вже не спіймаю.  
Скучерявили густі лози,  
Підмили корінь дрібні сльози

**Translation:**

გაფრენილა ჩემი მტრელი  
აწ ვერ დავიჭერო  
მეხვია ქეწნები ხშირი  
მათ ცრემლით დამიღბეს ძირი

Exploring the translation of the poem "ალისფერო ძახველო, მდელიოზე რადქანაობ?" ("Red viburnum, why are you bending in the meadow?"), it should also be mentioned that R. Chilachava reproduces the visual structure of the poem, the lines are placed in the same way as in the original. A similar example is the poem "ქვეყნად არაფრის იმედი მრჩება" ("I don't expect anything...")

We should also highlight another of Franko's favorite poetic forms – tercets. Two poems are written in this meter: "Three times appeared Love to me..." and "My dear mother..."

First of all, it should be emphasized that Raul Chilachava preserves the rhyming scheme of the poem “სამჯერ მეწვია ცხოვრებაში მე სიყვარული...” (“Three times appeared Love to me”). Tercets in the original and in the translation have the following rhyming scheme: aba/bcb/cded. Here the translator coped with the task successfully.

It is known that in *Withered Leaves*, Franko creates a generalized and abstract female image. In this verse, we see his three Loves. The strength of Franko's skill lies in the fact that he cares about integrity, about the only monumental portrait of his beloved, to which, according to D. Pavlychko, – his tragic “I” is constantly addressed. Chilachava preserves this image, he tries to reflect three silhouettes of the same figure, selects the appropriate epithets and comparisons.

So first Love :

**Ukrainian text:**

як ліля біла  
мов метелик  
невинна, як дитина  
пахуча, як розцвілий свіжо гай

**Translation:**

პირთეთრი, როგორც შროშანი  
ვითბეპელა  
უმანკონებით მაგონებ და პატარა იგი  
სურნელით – ახლა და ყვავებულ  
ჭალებს და სერებს

Second Love:

**Ukrainian text:**

гордая княгиня  
бліда, мов місяць, тиха та сумна  
იყო მკრთალი და მოწყენილი  
таємна й недоступна, мов святиня  
ცხრაკლიტულსიქით

**Translation:**

ამაყი მთავრის ქალი  
ის, როგორც მთვარე,  
დაიდუმალი, ვითღვთაება

Third Love:

**Ukrainian text:**

женщина чи звір  
мара  
сфінкс

**Translation:**

ქალია თუ ნადირი  
ხილვა  
როგორც სფინქსი

The proximity of the translation to the original work is extreme here, but there is no sense of literal copying: the lines of the translation sound natural in Georgian. It is known that Franko attaches great importance to epithets because they contain a vividly depicted image. In the dialectical unity of varied, not always readily defined morals and traits both in translation and in the original, a captivating, dignified, and yet pristine image of a woman from *Withered Leaves* lives and emerges.

The other verse “დედაოჩემო, სულზე უტკბესო!” (“My dear mother...”) is written in free verse. R. Chilachava translates it in free verse. At the same time, he endeavors to retain Franko's use of anaphoras, which thread together adjacent lines.

**Ukrainian text:**

Матінко моя ріднесенька!  
Не тужи ти за мною, не плач в самоті..  
Не клени своє бідне, безсиле дитя!

**Translation:**

დედაოჩემო, სულზე უტკბესო!  
ნუ შემახნებ ნუ ატირდები.  
ნუ გემეტება საწყარო შვილო!

As it is known, Franko's poetry is also rich in refrains. We see vivid examples in the poem “ალისფერო ძახველო, მდელოზე რადქანაობ?” (“Red viburnum, why are you bending in the meadow?”) and “იმედი ნუ გაქვს” (“Don't hope for anything”). The translator managed to accurately capture this poetic technique as well:

**Ukrainian text:**

Червона калино,  
чого в лузі гнешся?  
Чого в лузі гнешся?  
Чи світла не любиш,  
до сонця пнешся  
До сонця пнешся

**Translation:**

ალისფერო ძახველო,  
მდელოზე რადქანაობ?  
მდელოზე რადქანაობ?  
ნუთუ შუქი არ გიყვარს,  
მზეს არ ელტვი განაო?  
მზეს არ ელტვი განაო?

In Franko's texts, lexical repetitions are also quite common, which are accurately reflected in translations:

Now in vain you ask, you catch...  
(Тепер *надармо* просиш, ловиш...)

ახლაამაოდ მენუკი, მვედრი...  
In vain you beckon everyone to yourself...  
(*Надармо* всіх маниш ти к собі...)

ამაოდ უხმობ, იზიდავ ყველას...

Certainly, alliteration is known to imbue a poem with emotional coloring. However, it depends on the vocabulary of the language and therefore is an integral element of the national form of a literary work. For the translator, as well as for the original creator, it is natural to use euphonic means.

An interesting example of alliteration in Franko's poetry can be seen in the poem "Why do you appear to me in a dream?" The sonorous consonant -n- (-н-) contributes to the emergence of the so-called Germanic-style alliteration. There is no point in searching for adequate Ukrainian sound combinations in Georgian: Ukrainian and Georgian do not belong to the same group of languages. The difference between Georgian and Ukrainian phonemes is too great. Therefore, the reproduction of the phonic side seems impossible. However, the translator achieves this by relying on phonemes of the Georgian language: he alternates sounds t, T.

**Ukrainian text:**

Чого являєшся мені  
У сні?  
Чого звертаєш ти до мене  
Чудові очі ті ясні,  
Сумні,  
Немов криниці дно студене?  
Чому уста твої німі?  
Який докір, яке страждання,  
Яке несповнене бажання  
На них, мов зарево червоне,  
Займається і знову тоне  
У тьмі?

**Translation:**

რატომ ყოველთვის სიზმარში გხედავ,  
ნეტავ?  
რად მოგიპყრია ჩემკენ თვალები,  
სავსე ხიბლით და ათელით ნეტარ  
დღეთა,  
თან ჭის ფსკერივით იღუმალები?  
რად იწყე მდუმარ ბაგეთა კვნეტა?  
ხვწნა რომელი, ტანჯვა რომელი,  
რომელი ნატრი მიუწვდომელი,  
მათ ერკალება ცეცხლის ალებად,  
იფეთქებს, მერე მიეძალება  
ღეთა?

R. Chilachava closely follows Franko, considering it essential and important. The meter of R. Chilachava's translation is flexibly favorable to the shades of the author's mood and content. The rhythmic correctness of the Chilachava's translation seems to us indisputable.

Rhythm, as a phonetic phenomenon, is governed by a higher law that also regulates syntax. This is the law of artistic arrangement of verbal material, its compositional construction, which is equally obeyed by both phonetics and syntax. The composition of the form of lyrical poetry is determined by the conceptual use of this law [Zhirmuns'kiy 1921, 95].

R. Chilachava has drawn upon all the positive aspects of both Georgian and Ukrainian translation traditions. On the one hand, he meticulously recreates all semantic components of poetry, on the other hand, he avoids any disruptions to the natural poetic flow of the Georgian language believing that a translation should be considered successful when it transforms existing text material into an artistic creation within the literature of the target language. It is important to note that R. Chilachava views translation not only as a creative work in Georgian poetry but also as a means to preserve quite full information about foreign literature.

The question of equilinearity is also intriguing. Upon observing the translations in this regard, we have concluded that the number of lines always coincides with that of the

original. The translator himself confirmed it by the statement that “nowhere did he violate the principle of equilinearity” [Chilachava 2005, 141].

### Conclusion

The study of the transformations of Ivan Franko's poetic forms in his work *Withered Leaves* through the prism of the Georgian translation of Raul Chilachava allowed us to reveal the multifaceted and complex nature of the translation process, which takes into account both linguistic and cultural aspects.

The translation not only preserves the emotional charge of the original but also adapts it to the Georgian cultural tradition, which testifies to the author's deep understanding of both Ukrainian and Georgian poetry. The analysis showed that Raul Chilachava successfully introduced Georgian literary elements while preserving the main themes and motifs of Franko's poems. This marks him as a master translator, capable of creating a bridge between two cultures. Established intercultural ties emphasize the importance of intercultural exchange and representation of Ukrainian literature in the world, opening up new spaces for research and interaction. Thus, this article not only reinforces the importance of Ivan Franko's work in the context of world literature but also points to the role of the translator as an active participant in the process of cultural dialogue. The translation of *Withered Leaves* becomes evidence that literature can serve as an important means of mutual understanding and community between peoples, providing new perspectives for further research in the field of literary translation.

---

<sup>1</sup> The author's contribution includes the study of the significance and impact of I. Franko's collection *Withered Leaves* on Ukrainian literature and culture, as well as the analysis of publications on this research topic.

<sup>2</sup> Here and further we give examples of schemes for the arrangement of rhymes in a poem.

<sup>3</sup> Here and further we determine the rhythm of the poem by alternating stressed and unstressed elements.

### REFERENCES

- Bekher I. (1965), *Lyubov' moya poeziya: o literature i iskusstve*, IKhL, Moscow. (In Russian).
- Chilachava R. Sh. (2002), *Dvi stolytsi: Ukrainska tvorchist hruzynskoho poeta. Poezii. Perekladny. Marhinalii. Ese. Monohrafiu*, Vydavnychiy tsentr Akademiia, Kyiv. (In Ukrainian).
- Chilachava R. Sh. (2005), “Vichno nevianuche ‘Ziviale lystia’”, in *Velyka triitsia: Taras Shevchenko, Ivan Franko, Lesia Ukrainka*, Etnos, Kyiv, pp. 137–235. (In Ukrainian and Georgian).
- Dei O. I. (1955), *Ivan Franko i narodna tvorchist*, Derzh. vyd-vo khudozhnoi literatury, Kyiv. (In Ukrainian).
- Franko I. (1988), *Ziviale lystia*, Transl. in Georgian by R. Chilachava, Kameniar and Sabchota sakartvelo, Lviv and Tbilisi. (In Ukrainian and Georgian).
- Gachechiladze G. R. (1980), *Khudozhestvennyy perevod i literaturnyye vzaimosvyazi*, Sovetskiy pisatel', Moscow. (In Russian).
- Korniichuk V. (2004), *Lirychnyi universum Ivana Franka: horyzonty poetyky*, Lvivskii natsionalnyi universytet im. I. Franka, Lviv. (In Ukrainian).
- Laslo-Kutsiuk M. (1983), *Zasady poetyky*, Kryterion, Bucharest. (In Ukrainian).
- Lotman R. (2013), “Sonnet as Closed Form and Open Process”, *Interlitteraria*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 317–334. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12697/IL.2013.18.2.03>
- Mushkudiani O. N. (2006), *Hruzynska svitlytsia Ivana Franka*, KyMU, Kyiv. (In Ukrainian).
- Novytskyi O. (compl.) (1968), *Raiduzhnymy mostamy. Ukrainsko-hruzynski literaturni zviazky*, Dniro, Kyiv. (In Ukrainian).
- Shakhovskiy S. (1956), *Maisternist Ivana Franka*, Rad. pysmen., Kyiv. (In Ukrainian).
- Slavutych Y. (1964), *Shevchenkova poetyka*, Slavuta, Edmonton. (In Ukrainian).
- Tkachuk M. P. (2006), *Liryka Ivana Franka*, Preface by A. Tolstoukhov, Svit Znan, Kyiv. (In Ukrainian).

Volynskyi P. (1956), "Poetychna maisternist I. Franka", *Vitshyzna*, No. 8, Kyiv, pp. 129–146. (In Ukrainian).

Zhirmuns'kiy V. M. (1921), *Kompozitsiya liricheskogo stikhotvoreniya*, Opyaz, Petersburg. (In Russian).

*O. V. Asadchykh, O. V. Dyn*

### **Трансформація поетичних форм збірки Івана Франка "Зів'яле листя" у перекладах Рауля Чілачава**

Поетичний переклад шедеврів кожної літератури на інші мови був і залишається важливим завданням, оскільки це дає можливість кожному народу відкривати багатство іншої культури та розширювати свій кругозір. Завдяки численним талановитим перекладам І. Франко посів у Грузії належне йому в історії світової літератури місце. У статті досліджується трансформація поетичних форм Івана Франка у грузинському контексті Раулем Чілачавою. Грузинський поет, перекладач присвятив своє життя перекладу та популяризації української літератури в Грузії. Р. Чілачава вважається мостобудівником між двома культурними світами, який завдяки своїй праці дає змогу глибше пізнати одне одного. У статті звернено увагу на особливості перекладацького процесу та шляхи адаптації поетичних форм у новому мовному середовищі, що дають читачеві змогу поглиблено ознайомитися з унікальними особливостями творчості Івана Франка крізь призму грузинського перекладу. Зв'язок перекладача з оригінальним текстом визначається певними суб'єктивними моментами, як-от індивідуальний смак, тип перекладацького мислення тощо, а також чинниками об'єктивного характеру (зіткнення двох часто відмінних поетик і мов). З'ясовано, чому грузинський поет обрав саме цього автора і саме збірку "Зів'яле листя". Особлива увага приділяється римам, темам, стилістиці та метафорам поезій українського письменника у грузинському відтворенні. У статті порушується питання двомовності, адже відомо, що Рауль Чілачава володіє досконало як українською, так і грузинською мовою. Акцентується вплив білінгвізму на процес перекладу та відтворення внутрішньої та зовнішньої матриці першотвору. Проаналізовано, як Рауль Чілачава передає український колорит, мовні особливості та глибину думки Івана Франка крізь призму грузинської культури та мови.

**Ключові слова:** Іван Франко; Рауль Чілачава; "Зів'яле листя"; переклад; оригінал; строфа; сонет; рима; чотиривірш; лексема

*Стаття надійшла до редакції 11.10.2024*