

УДК 130.2(=161.2):82.09Франко І.

## THE CULTURAL-CENTRISM OF IVAN FRANKO

Ivan TEPLYY

*Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,  
Foreign Languages Department for Humanities,  
41, Doroshenks Str., Lviv, Ukraine, 79000,  
e-mail: i\_teplyi@rambler.ru*

The culture-centrism of Franko's activities has been scrutinized. The analysis of the set problem appears impossible without introducing a broader culturological and philosophical context of Franko's activities in whole. The author has analyzed major philosophical, culturological and literary conceptions of I. Lysyi, V. Mazepa, O. Pakhliovska, O. Zabuzhko, Yar Slavutych, L. Kostenko, M. Zhulynskyi, O. Bahan and others. It has been emphasized that Franko's effortful and multifaceted work was systemic and subordinated to nation-building function of culture from introducing broad strata of population to cultural achievements of other nations and popularizing the topic of Ukraine in foreign mass media to elevating the cultural level of the overall population and hence strengthening its national identity.

*Keywords:* culture studies, culture, literature, Franko studies, nation building.

«Franko is one of the pillars in the spiritual development of the Ukrainian people. After Shevchenko who had undermined the faith in the hackneyed idea of the provincial Ukrainian culture and with the inspired word praised the glorious past of Ukraine predicting its bright future, there came Franko and with his universal hard work sought to implement Shevchenko's idea of Ukraine as equally valuable partner of civilized European nations. Hence, it fell to his lot, on the one hand, to eliminate backward Ukrainian society's prejudices, combating its conservative ideological limitations (Muscophiles, Populists), on the other – to open wide the doors for European progressive ideological currents, appropriation of the cultural heritage of other nations. Let's add that Franko himself created everlasting values that found their lasting place not only in Ukrainian culture, but also in those of other Slavonic peoples, particularly Polish», a researcher from Poland, M.Kuplowski, maintains [45, p. 111]. Regrettably, very few sources on the topic in question are available now.

### The Cultural and Philosophic Context of Ivan Franko's Translation Activity

Examination of the problem of I. Franko's foreign-language discourse, i.e familiarization of his people with other nations' literary, scientific and cultural values is impossible without the providing here of a broader cultural studies and philosophic context of I. Franko's activity on the whole. «Franko's activity as both that of translator and of original author has utterly defeated the literary theory «for home use». He cut through a «window» for the Ukrainian people, yet not only into Europe but also into all parts of the world» – such is the high appreciation of I. Franko's creative activity, that of translator inclusive, received from O. Bilets'kyi [5, p. 163].

When characterizing I. Franko's activity in terms of the present-day, O. Pakhliovska distinguishes three major «knots» whose disentanglement made him, properly speaking, the great «strategist» of the national culture. The focus, therefore, is on: a) the secularization of Galician culture; b) consistent and purposeful Europeanization of Ukrainian culture in general, its admission into the themes and patterns of the general European and world literary process on the whole. And despite the fact of this phenomenon describing the work of many protagonists of Ukrainian culture in different periods of its development, I. Franko – the researcher believes – was perhaps the most consistent here, for his Europeanization program reached not only the dimensions of the ideological empowerment of Ukrainian literature with European impulses, but, literally, *t r a n s p l a n t a t i o n* [O. P.'s emphasis] of certain genres or, say, poetic forms on the terrains of the national tradition. This, however, in no way contradicted his being convinced of the entirely peculiar nature of Ukrainian literature proper. The point lay – and it is of importance here to be stressed – in the *i n f o r m a t i v e s a t u r a t i o n* [O. P.'s emphasis. – *I. T.*] with the knowledge of an external reality of the culture divorced from the world because of political circumstances, and not at all any orientation of this culture on foreign models, for the tactics of this Europeanization was in fact subordinated to the major culturological – and innovational at the time – I. Franko's concept of world literature as a fragment of the history of civilization, then the history of national literature as a fragment of world civilization, and, finally c) *the third knot* was believed by the thinker to be quite an innovative conceptualization of political and cultural perspectives of Ukraine as an integral cultural-historical phenomenon [30, p. 21–22]. On the other hand, Franko's approach is not a system view of the cultures under research, neither is it a choice of certain works consonant to the author aesthetically or emotionally. The choice, however, is not dictated by the individual perception, but by this or that cultural paradigm. I. Franko, the researcher claims, selects from these cultures exactly that which responds by its secret mechanisms to the important demands of his own culture – thus adding it to the circulation of universal human significance issues, introduces it into the **g l o b a l d i a l o g u e w i t h cultures of different epochs and peoples** [O. P.'s emphasis]. After all, philosophers maintain too, I. Franko did not even try to formulate any kind of a monolithic integrated philosophical system: much more important for him was to listen to the winds of the era and adequately meet its needs [4, p. 246]. This way I. Franko has broadened the literary experience of his own culture, its framework of world cognition, universalized a cultural reception of the Ukrainian society. Today – O. Pakhliovska writes – from our historical perspective, we can see the laser-aiming precision of I. Franko's theoretical thinking. In fact, after the «reservation» status Ukraine was doomed to by the tsarist regime, the Soviet «ghetto» reforms soon began. Yet I. Franko, alongside Lesia Ukrayinka, having made this powerful «Europeanism injection» into the organism of Ukrainian culture, directly prepared the «Executed Renaissance» artistic revolution under the sign of Europe, and, on the whole, return of the Ukrainian society towards the reintegration into the European cultural continent. I. Franko, like other Ukrainian authors that had a similarly strong intuition for the need of breaking national boundaries of Ukrainian culture, was well aware of one thing: knowledge of the Other cures of the feeling of national loneliness, separateness,

exclusiveness, thereby opening the way to freedom – human and creative, subjective, as well as objective – the freedom of culture itself. That very freedom the great minds of our nation were not allowed to reach to the full by that very nation [30, p. 30–31].

According to Yu. Kobeletskyi, «I. Franko reigned supreme in the treasury of world literature and culture, like a master well aware of this or that thing's place, and could choose the best, most valuable diamonds of human thought and word» [14]. Being already gravely ill, the poet was busy translating A. Pushkin's works. He was full of lofty thoughts about the continuing importance of his powerful, freedom-loving poetry, *without which he did not imagine the spiritual life of his native people* [emphasis mine. – I. T.]. The translations were prepared for publication as a separate book [34, p. 132]. I. Franko was really vigilant to translations in the final years of his life.

«And one should speak generally, when we speak about translation, about a *great culture-molding mission* [our italics. – I. T.] of I. Franko who viewed culture as a complex, dynamic, contradictory yet, simultaneously, integrated system. When we speak about I. Franko, we must not speak about his having achieved or not achieved, his having reached or not reached, we must talk of a great cultural phenomenon, wherefrom it also follows what touches upon translation» [7, p. 298]. These words epitomize the methodology of the «Ivan Franko as translator» problem in the broadest sense of the word. That is to say, the talk is of the comparative literary approach. An approach like that needs a development. It does not preclude the Translation Studies one, but synthesizes two, at least, viz. that of TS and cultural philosophy. V. Radchuk seems to have spoken in a new way about the interrelation of translation and culture: «Translation is the movement of culture. It is the very essence of it – both spirit and body» [35, p. 162]. Of still greater interest is to see the way I. Franko himself viewed the problem in question: «Every time I was concerned about responding to the needs of the moment and satisfying the burning issues of the day... I have seen since childhood that nothing comes to our peasant without hard work, later on I came to know that nothing will come to us all as a nation without hard work, that we cannot favour any hope from anyone. Only what we gain by our own labor will really be our heritage, and solely what good we appropriate from another culture by our own work too, will come to be our good. Therefore I tried to give our people the cultural achievements of other peoples and acquaint others with its life... On coming to know anything I wished and did my best to get others to being interested in it and understanding it» [39, vol. 31, p. 308–309].

«Franko *expanded the creative horizon of Ukrainian literature* [our italics. – I. T.] by translations and transfusions from other peoples' literatures: Russian, Polish, German, Czech, English, French, Spanish a. o.», Yu. Smolych wrote [37, p. 147]. Through the mediation of Franko the translator, according to V. Pohrebennyk, Ukrainian literature has mastered the exotic for itself Babylonian material of the Creation epic «Enuma Elish» presented as alternative to the Biblical one [33, p. 24]. The researcher delineates very aptly and voluminously the writer's creative heritage as «the multiple artistic worlds of Franko» [33, p. 10] composed of Babylon and Indian antiquity, Greek and Roman antiquity, culture of the peoples of Europe or even the inhabitants of a faraway continent (translations from Australian literature) [33, p. 10]. Almost all the history of world culture from the earliest

times till those of Franko is represented in his translations. Monuments of Assyrian-Babylonian, Old Indian, Ancient Greek and Roman literatures, Slavonic epos and works by Polish, Czech, Slovak and Russian writers, Italian, German, French authors together with historical and cultural commentaries and original research constitute rather a full, of encyclopedic character, translation anthology of Ivan Franko» [8, p. 345].

O. Zabuzhko [13, c. 139] within the frames of «generation» division into periods of the history of New Ukrainian culture distinguishes, as the third item, the Ivan Franko (Lviv) period (late 1880s – 1910), thereby making present, according to I. Lysyi, the fervent activity of I. Franko in the spiritual space of the present-day Ukrainian nation, enormity of his ideological and intellectual accomplishments [25, p. 414]. This periodization envisages a number of stages, according to the degree of the culture's self-awareness of itself as objectification of the national existence of its subject, viz. the Ukrainian people: 1) language particularization period (I. Kotliarevs'kyi's «Aeneid» and the «Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood» members' (*Bratshchyky*) activities); 2) «Ukrainophile» cultural and enlightenment (Romantic nationalism and emergence of «The Ukrainian idea» in the Cyril-and-Methodius Brotherhood's era up till the Kyiv-based *Stara Hromada* [Old Community] (M. Drahomanov, Fedir Vovk, S. Podolyns'kyi): the highlighting of Ukraine as a subject of the historical process with respectively sovereign cultural demands; 3) Ivan Franko (Lviv) or the «Young Ukraine» period (see above), with the finalization of Ukrainian culture's structural «staffing» (O. Zabuzhko), the culture that had already proved its adequate degree of receptiveness, hence the ability to a direct intercultural dialogue of the revolutionary era one may call terminated after 1930 – that generation had already been capable of posing «on the authentically Ukrainian cultural grounds» (O. Zabuzhko) the problem of «Europeanizing» the Ukrainians' psychological dominant (Mykola Khvylovy, V. Yurynets'), transition to the national «self-authority, self-activity, self-assurance» (Zabuzhko). Next, with the advent of the totalitarian regime, until the restoration of Ukraine's independence, the tradition is interrupted [13, p. 139–140]. This is the historical and philosophic background I. Franko's sociopolitical, in fact, cultural activity majestically appears on, reception and translation playing the leading role here.

V. Mazepa, by acknowledging in I. Franko the spiritual leader of the Ukrainian community, European-style and European-scale thinker, claims, on the strength of this, a fruitful analysis of his philosophical and ideological ideas is possible within a broad European context of the epoch [27, p. 224]. «Seeking to understand the importance of I. Franko's intellectual experience, scale of changes made by him in the spiritual world of the Ukrainians, V. Mazepa did not particularly stress the distinguishing in it of historiosophical, socio-philosophical or cultural-philosophical discourses, though he understood, in the words of M. Zerov, the «multi-hypostatic nature» of Franko's genius. He saw in I. Franko an outstanding universal thinker with an articulated scientific (not Positivist!) stance; it is not accidental that I. Franko is most often referred to in the book as scientist. Besides, the Author is well aware that just as it is impossible to put Franko the writer into the Procrustean bed of a certain style – Naturalism, Neorealism, Symbolism or Neo-Romanticism, so it is that I. Franko the thinker defies an unambiguous labeling

in accordance with the tenets of a particular school of philosophy or rigidly delineated intellectual tradition» [25, p. 415]. I. Franko the researcher was capable of shelling out the rational from a particular doctrine and to include it in his own research tools, in view of which V. Mazepa notes that he never invented arbitrary theoretical constructs, and always tried to plunge into the reliable sea of the empirical. The thinker's philosophical heritage is considered in terms of the leading for I. Franko «cultural centrism» idea [27, p. 8–9], one that the researcher claims to be the most topical among his intellectual attainments. First and foremost, it is the allotment of the decisive role to culture in man's universe [27, p. 88]. Simultaneously, according to I. Lysyi, it is a setting to the consideration of any human phenomena, including the spiritual works of man in the context of culture, cultural process [25, p. 415]. Culture exists for I. Franko in all the diversity of its aspects and dimensions, it is for him a delineated way of life, and the eternal preparatory school of *free* life for both an individual and the entire community [27, c. 10]. The philosophical credo of the scientist's historical research is seen by V. Mazepa in the triune formula «man – culture – history» [27, p. 17]. So is confirmed the idea of the «emancipation» of a human entity in history and the role of a creative individuality in the cultural process is emphasized. I. Franko interpreted culture as a conceptual prism for the vision of man in history. His cultural centrism consisted, too, in transferring by him of the center of gravity from the social and philosophical discourse to the field of culture. This, in V. Mazepa's view, methodologically significant step contributed to I. Franko's transition to the liberal-democratic, cultural and humanistic positions, introduction to I. Franko's social philosophy of the national moment, recognition of the priority of the national over the social [27, p. 65; 87; 99; 104; 25, p. 416]. Four different types of centrism being influential in intercultural encounters are distinguished, viz. expansive, integrative, separative, and tentative centrism [49].

National culture is the people's «force of spirit», the culture's independence being certified by the ability to independently posit and solve the most complex human problems [27, p. 226]. On the other hand, only a self-defined national culture, I. Franko was convinced, is capable of becoming a full-fledged subject of cross-cultural interaction. Therefore this or that community, Ukraine within it, represent themselves among the nations of the world by culture [25, p. 416; 26]. The nation, according to Ivan Franko, is an «integral cultural body», civilizational and cultural system [See 27, p. 64; 100]. What is of importance, the sentiment for the ideal of the people's national independence lies, for I. Franko, «in a cultural perspective», i.e. this ideal is valid as aesthetic phenomenon [27, p. 100; 25, p. 416]. Generally speaking, I. Franko's cultural centrism has a clearly national, Ukrainian coloring, which gives rise to describing his outlook, in a way, as the Ukrainian-centered one, and for this very reason «in the foreground, there has always been for I. Franko a *concern for expanding the horizons of one's native culture and deepening the specific intelligence*» [25, p. 416–417] (emphasis mine. – I. T.). The criterion of social progress lies for I. Franko in the elevation of the people's cultural-spiritual level and the cultural status of each person [27, p. 78]. The meaning of human existence and the purpose of a progressive development of humanity is – according to I. Franko – an

attainment of happiness, and this, in its turn, is possible primarily through the formation of a harmonious highly moral personality guided by higher moral values of love and brotherhood as foundation of the Christian faith [22, p. 92; 36].

A place importance in V.Mazepa's study is occupied by the way I. Franko, in the context of social philosophy and the philosophy of Ukrainian history, treated the problem of the nation, thus making a search for the «universal model of nation-building» [27, p. 57]. Moreover, the author considers, too, a number of other related ideas of I. Franko, such as the role of community's self-awareness in the process of nation-building: the people unaware of itself is but a mob, not a nation; concern for the integrity and extensive multilevel structure in the nation-building; self-organization of the nation as the formation of civil society; *optimally carried out acculturation of foreign cultural values as a guarantee of the «national self-salvation»* [27, p. 95–121; see also 19; 20; 21; 23; 24; 28; 40; 41; 6] [emphasis ours. – I. T.]. As to the view of the driving forces of society, I. Franko shared the approach of M. Dragomanov who visualized this as a «spiritual force» whose embodiment I. Franko called an ideal which, in its essence, is the highest form of existence of values in the human society, embodiment of the material and spiritual needs and aspirations of mankind in the economic, social, cultural and political spheres of society's functioning [21, p. 150]. The monograph by A. Pashuk raising, among other issues, that of a language as means of nation-building, merits a special attention [31; 32, p. 449]. Yar Slavutych believed that «a universalistic view in the issues of culture is very much peculiar to I. Franko» [42, p. 175]. Neither can one avoid in this regard questions of the national-existential methodology in the context of I. Franko Studies. Freedom is a cross-cutting issue in I. Franko's activities (B. Kruhliy). By his works I. Franko answers the question on the need of freedom for every nation. Simultaneously, freedom is considered in the individual context as an individual's desire for liberty [18, p. 71].

There is another important factor: integration of the Ukrainian lands into a single unified state was of extreme need or «indispensable necessity» to the poet (Yar Slavutych). The researcher gives three «manifestations of I. Franko's catholicity»: a/ the relevant themes in his literary artistic works («The Great Anniversary», «Time Will Come» a.o.); b/ shaping of the literary language where «Galicia, the poet's narrower motherland, presented an intersection of many linguistic influences»; c/ translation activity, «great industriousness for translations» (Yar Slavutych) [42, p. 173–175]. Apropos, this same writer and researcher, public figure, whose real name is Hryhoriy Zhuchenko, made a very subtle observation in the acculturation aspect. Back in the early 1980s, on the occasion of I. Franko's poem *Ivan Vyshensky* seeing the light of day owing to the skillful translation of R. O. Tatchyn<sup>1</sup>, he wrote: «The Anglophone world has gone far ahead in self-expression. Foreign-language literatures are taking little interest in our heritage nowadays unless we ourselves enliven the interest by entering the foreign-land orbit. Let us say frankly that *Ivan Vyshensky's* translation would have hardly been published by a leading American journal» [43, p. 472].

The point at issue has received foreign researchers' attention as well, G.Siedina in-

<sup>1</sup> Ivan Vyshensky : a poem / by Ivan Franko ; translated by Roman Orest Tatchyn ; with an introduction by Leonid Rudnytzky. New York: Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1983.

clusive. I. Franko was among the pioneers (P. Kulish M.Drahomanov, Lesia Ukrayinka, M. Kotsiubyns'kyi, O. Kobylans'ka), turning to «the classical sources» (ad fontes) of European culture, hereby beginning the transition of Ukrainian literature into the European way of development, overcoming provincialism and narrow horizons of utilitarianism and myopia of the so called «literary protectionism», writes she [48, p. 177]. Despite the fact of familiarization with Horace beginning back in the 16<sup>th</sup> c. and continuing in the activities of H. Skovoroda, P. Hulak-Artemovs'kyi, L. Borovykovs'kyi a. o., it was I. Franko who pioneered laying the foundations for the present-day concept of referring to the original in the translation practice in Ukrainian literature [48, p. 182]. It was, in her view, the most prolific translator, the scholar of broad erudition and the talented poet, on the other hand, though, he had not yet managed to overcome completely the dominant at the time practice of «Ukrainization», i. e. domestication of translations, neither did he get rid of dialectisms in his work [48, p. 197; see also 46].

Ivan Franko when launching his large-scale activity on a comprehensive modernization and development of Ukrainian literature visualized the necessity of its full-scaled positioning in the global cultural context. M. Zerov's later formula «ad fontes» («to the [original] sources») – to the sources of European culture – best fits I. Franko's creative work in the field of translation. However, I. Franko analysed and creatively elaborated not only Antiquity – Ancient Greek and Roman – foundations of «cultural Europe», but also the Biblical world, significant phenomena of Hebrew history and literature, and the much older from the Antiquity and Old Testament eras prehistory of humanity – the literature of Sumer, Akkad, Babylon. This is how I. Franko put it: «We can almost certainly claim today that the idea of sign writing has developed in one place on the lower Euphrates and the Tigris, and from there disseminated throughout the world... Together with the writing, its first inventors largely passed down to the rest of the humanity the features of their spiritual type: up till now, we have been praying by the formulas invented in old Babylon, our religious feelings and beliefs have been unconsciously moving along the paths paved for the human spirit by the speculation of Old Babylonian and Egyptian priests; the ideas of unity and trinity, holiness and sin, overground and underground world, primeval guilt and later expiation, the grace of God and the judgment, the ideas that have now altogether become for our spirit almost the same inseparable forms of feeling as time and space have become the inseparable forms of thought – those ideas are no congenital to us forms but relics of the elaborated over many millennia cultural type that rose at the dawn of our ancient civilization in the lower reaches of the Tigris and the Euphrates» [39, vol. 40, p. 9].

«And simultaneously [with many other activities. – I. T.] – O. Bahan stresses – he constantly translates. Translates from almost all European literatures (often through the German language) and selectively from all world literatures (from Old Indian to Old Sumerian). This very work, perhaps, this unquenchable desire of I. Franko to envelope the entire breadth of the European spirit saved him shortly from the narrowness and philosophical primitiveness of socialism. [...] I. Franko believed the creative work aimed at approximation and interpretation of the heights of European literature in the Ukrainian context to have been a big challenge of his life» [1, p. 10–11].

Precedent phenomena (i. e. precedent texts) as linguocultural universal markers of intertextuality [47] seem to provide a good key to a proper interpretation of I. Franko's culture-centered creative legacy. Researchers maintain that precedent texts are texts important for a particular individual in cognitive and emotional planes, are well-known to its wide environment, they are often used in the individual's speech. Precedent texts are fixed in the minds of native speakers, presenting so-called «ready-intellectual-emotional blocks» stereotypes, samples, standards of comparison that help people navigate the mental and verbal spaces. Linguists believe that the precedent texts are of particular value to the discourse of linguistic identity in the historical, cultural and area-studies perspectives [15, p. 65]. The researcher surmises that I. Franko's corpora of precedent texts could include: 1) world folklore (sayings, proverbs, parables, fairy tales, riddles, etc.), ancient mythology inclusive; 2) works of world literature; 3) religious works, primarily the Bible; 4) scientific texts by Ukrainian and other, predominantly Slavonic researchers; 5) journalistic texts of historic-philosophical and political nature [15, p. 66].

«I. Franko did not only care for his own intertextuality – the researcher goes on to say – but also did much for the Ukrainian reader as well as a budding writer, whose world outlook is only in the making, to be able to partake of the best samples of world literature. This could solely be done through translations. This translation work was paralleled every time with an attempt at better familiarization with individual authors and relevant literary trends, and making them available to others» [15, p. 68–69]. The conclusion arrived at by the researcher is interesting and imaginative: «The culture of mankind, according to researchers, can be represented as a step pyramid whose top places the universal (terrestrial, planetary) culture, a step below are supranational (continental, supra-regional) cultures, another step below – national and sub-national (ethnic) cultures, down further – numerous subcultures and, finally, at the very bottom – ideocultures (individual cultures). *I. Franko as ideoculture has absorbed all the steps of this pyramid* [italics mine. – I. T.]. Given the above, I. Franko can also be described as the most talented intermediary in the intercultural communication. The present generation of the Ukrainians benefits from the fruits of his activity» [15, p. 69]. The topicality of I. Franko's culture-forming mission has not diminished in our time as «we should not overlook the fact of the unfolding planetary process of man's depersonalization, the shaping from him/her of a mass man, collective man driven rather deliberately, on his/her own – rather than out of compulsion, necessity of having to keep up with the times – into this huge supermarket he/she makes a choice every time... And there is no end to wishes, needs of choosing something. And what does man give? Is he/she capable of giving himself/herself? [...]. But the mass man is a standardized man, without roots, without traditions and culture, deprived of the historical memory, hence – responsibility for the future», M. Zhulyns'kyi writes [12, p. 30]. There rises here a remarkably burning problem of preserving one's national identity: «What we call «a quenching of the spiritual thirst» is nothing other than the acquisition of one's national and cultural identity, revival of the traditions, «canonization» of national and religious myths as spiritual builders of the national ideology. National culture is that same life-giving soil the systems of national inherited values and contemporary priorities, myths and heroes, traditions and beliefs, ideas and predictions majestically rise upon» [12,



p. 35]. Did not Lina Kostenko have this point in mind? «And so, the humanitarian aura of a nation. Kind of a nice to the ear combination of words, isn't it? In fact, each nation must have its humanitarian aura. That powerfully emanating complex of sciences, covering all aspects of life, including education, literature and art – in their integral involvement in world culture and, of course, unique in its national version» [16, p. 3]. When talking of I. Franko's three spiritual behests [alongside the sharp journalistic Word in its profound sense, «the idea of constant and sacrificial civil service»] he has left to the Ukrainian nation, beyond his literary artistic creativity, it is interesting to dwell on the third one, outlined by O. Bahan («Nahuyevychi Readings-2008») as follows: «The Third Behest – a broad strategy of the nation's cultural growth in the European parameters I. Franko used to constantly work for by his gigantic translational work and enlightenment. He has always been the great leader of global cultural trends in Ukraine» [2, p. 256]. Regrettably – the author goes on to say – «we are faced today with a threat of new challenges to the national culture on the part of the globalization of culture and massism. They are deep- and large-scale destroying a genuine aesthetic taste, fragmenting the process of thinking, disseminating skepticism. In this regard, a lot of work is required with the aim of extending the traditional high culture. In parallel, Ukrainian culture suffers from pressure and assimilations on account of its inefficient work for its expansion in the world. To provide an example, thousands of scientists, dozens of research centers with foreign language experts do not seem, as of today, «to have promoted» a single Ukrainian classic writer with their translations, for his works to see the light of day. All of those well-known in Europe now, have achieved this through personal connections. That is to say, there is no integral programme of strengthening our culture in the broader, Franko's dimensions» [2, p. 256].

As regards I. Franko's socio-political views, it was V. Kosyk who, among others, pioneered the research. His pattern is this: Folklorism (1874–1876) – Socialism (1877–1881) – «Ideal of the nation's life and development» (1881–1916), the chronological frames, esp. the latter ones being relative [44, p. 111; 17, p. 42–43].

The evolution of I. Franko's outlook is clearly traced in the detailed research by P. Berko, M. Reheda, and H. Prytula [3]. The periodization scheme for the writer's evolution as proposed by the authors is as follows: I. 1873–1876. Romantic Idealism. II. 1876–1889. Positivism, Anthropological Materialism, Rationalistic fighting against God, Ethics of Labour and Struggle, Community Socialism on M. Drahomanov's model. III. 1890–1900. Cultural and Historical Universalism. IV. 1900–1907. Philosophy of the «Power of the Creative Spirit» and the National Idea. V. 1908–1916. Spontaneous Nationalism, pathology-generated Mysticism [3, p. 14–17]. Universalism, to be added here, is the faith in the moral values, e.g. human rights, being largely the same always and everywhere, the opposite being Relativism [38].

Personally, I. Franko set himself the task of «awakening a sense of national unity, raising the all-Ukrainian self-cognition of the people in all parts and environs of our land» (Institute of Literature, Holding 3, No. 1615, Sheet 129) [Quoted in 34, p. 14]. Comprehending from this angle I. Franko's activity as an artist and public figure enables one, so the researcher believes, to make important generalizing observations and conclusions. First, the writer sought to strengthen the spiritual ties between disparate parts Ukraine, primarily through literary

creativity, developing in his literary artistic works [and translations. – I. T.] historical events in Dnieper Ukraine, introducing Eastern-Ukrainian themes into his works. Secondly, the literary-critical and scientific activity of I. Franko was also subject to this lofty goal. Despite some differences in the development of Ukrainian literature in Western and Eastern Ukraine, I. Franko regarded this literature as an integral whole, the cultural heritage of the people belonging to both the Galician Ukrainians and the Dnieper Ukrainians. I. Franko, to be emphasized here, was the first to have theoretically comprehended the development of Ukrainian literature in the famous work «Outline of the History of Ukrainian-Ruthenian Literature to 1890». I. Franko appraised all outstanding writers in Eastern Ukraine. His works on Shevchenko, MarkoVovchok, I. Nechuy-Levyts'kyi, M. Staryts'kyi, Lesia Ukrayinka, O. Konys'kyi, P. Kulish and many others would constitute, F.Pohrebennyk rightly claims, a thorough anthology. Thirdly, a form of struggle was for I. Franko his journalistic and publicistic activities [34, p. 14–17]. In particular, the author notes, «None of the Western Ukrainian writers and critics has done so much useful, fruitful in the the theoretical development, propaganda and systematization of literary and cultural achievements in Dnieper Ukraine, as has I. Franko. He closely followed everything that appeared on Ukrainian literature on the Dnieper, no more or less prominent literary phenomenon, be it modern or ancient, has avoided his attention [...]. In all the publications he edited and actively participated in, I.Franko promoted the ideas of unity and brotherhood, laying bare the political short-sightedness and spiritual limitation of those who «do not want to know anything beyond the black and yellow pillars separating Galicia from Russia» (Literary Scientific Herald (LNV), 1901, Book VII, p. 5) [34, p. 15–16; 17]. The paper employs the term «discourse» to refer to large amounts of texts in the translation creativity of I.Franko. «Discourse is not only respectively logically composed and pragmatically oriented text, but simultaneously the text (oral or written) with a specific cognitive, anthropologically conditioned semantics [10; 29]. Alongside being written/oral, endowed with meaning, it is also a fragment reflecting social, epistemological, and rhetoric practices of a group, language's ability to limit this practice in the group as well as influence it [11, p. 126]. The most acceptable definition is of discourse as a set of statements, cogitations related to some issues, considered in connection with those issues, and relations between them [9].

Conclusions. A comprehensive coverage of the problem in question is impossible without a broader philosophical and cultural studies background, comparative literary context, the epoch I. Franko lived in. Torn asunder between two empires, Ukraine was in bad need of unification. To this end, a conceptualization of Ukraine as a cultural phenomenon was high on the agenda. It was necessary to overcome first the cultural, and then political isolation of Ukraine. The integration of the Ukrainian lands into a single unified state being of dire necessity, the writer sought to strengthen the spiritual ties between disparate parts Ukraine, primarily through literary creativity, developing in his literary artistic works and translations the historical events in Dnieper Ukraine, introducing Eastern-Ukrainian themes into his works. I. Franko thought of awakening a sense of national unity, raising the all-Ukrainian self-cognition of the people in all parts and corners of our land.

National culture being the people's «force of spirit», I. Franko, with a laser precision, selects from other cultures all that addresses the important demands of his own

culture – thus introducing it into the global dialogue with cultures of different epochs and peoples. The choice, however, is not dictated by an individual perception, but a cultural paradigm. The largely unprecedented activity of I. Franko is culturally-centered, with a laser precision aimed at the optimally implemented acculturation of foreign cultural values as a guarantee of the national self-preservation.

I. Franko expanded the creative horizons of Ukrainian literature by translations and transfusions, to mention only some forms of the foreign text's assimilation, from other peoples' literatures. He never invented arbitrary theoretical constructs, but every time strived to plunge into the reliable sea of the empirical. I. Franko interpreted culture as a conceptual prism for the vision of man in history. His cultural centrism consisted, too, in transferring by him of the center of gravity from the social and philosophical discourse to the field of culture.

The thinker visualized the necessity of Ukrainian literature's full-scaled positioning in the global cultural context. He has absorbed, which seems to be unprecedented, all the steps of the cultural pyramid, from top (universal human culture, continental cultures etc.) down to the bottom (subcultures and ideocultures). To summarize, I. Franko's foreign language discourse including national literatures and forms of their interaction, viz. translation, reception, inter-literary ties etc. was part and parcel of his cultural centrism.

#### REFERENCE SOURCES

1. *Баган О. Жрець інтелектуалізму / О. Баган // Франко І. Вибрані твори : у 3-х т. Т. 3: Літературознавство, публіцистика / ред. кол.: Скотний В. та ін. ; упор. Баган О. – Дрогобич : Коло, 2004. – С. 5–26.*
2. *Баган О. [Круглий стіл. Нагуєвичі, 15 червня 2008 р.] / О. Баган // Нагуєвицькі читання-2008: Іван Франко і новітнє українство : Матеріали Міжнародної наукової конференції / ред. кол.: П. Іванишин, Я. Радевич-Винницький та ін. – Дрогобич : Посвіт, 2009. – С. 255–256.*
3. *Берко П. Іван Франко – системність світоглядних засад / П. Берко, М. Резеда, Г. Пригула. – Дрогобич : Вимір, 2006. – 176 с.*
4. *Берко П. Г. Іван Франко: системність світоглядних засад / П. Г. Берко, Б. С. Левик // Актуальні проблеми духовності : збірник наукових праць / ред. Я. В. Шрамко. – Кривий Ріг : Видавничий дім, 2009. – Вип. 10. – С. 237–246.*
5. *Білецький О. І. Світове значення Івана Франка / О. І. Білецький // Вінок Івану Франкові : збірник. – К. : Радянський письменник, 1957. – С. 159–168.*
6. *Возняк С. М. У пошуках суспільного ідеалу (І. Франко і соціалізм) : монографія / С. М. Возняк. – 2-ге вид., доп. – Івано-Франківськ : Видавничо-дизайнерський відділ ЦІТ Прикарпатського національного ун-ту ім. Василя Стефаника, 2007. – 176 с.*
7. *Гольберг М. Я. [Обговорення] / М. Я. Гольберг // Іван Франко і світова культура: Матеріали міжнародного симпозіуму ЮНЕСКО (Львів, 11–15 вересня 1986) : у 3 кн. / упоряд. Б. З. Якимович ; редкол.: І. І. Лукінов, М. В. Брик, Г. Д. Вервес та ін. – К. : Наукова думка, 1989. – Кн. 2. – С. 298–300.*
8. *Гундорова Т. І. Іван Франко / Т. І. Гундорова // Історія української літератури ХІХ століття : підручник: у 2-х кн. / за ред. акад. М. Г. Жулинського. – К. : Либідь, 2006. – С. 268–349.*

9. Дискурс [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: [http://hohlopedia.org.ua/inshomovnyh\\_sotsiokulturnyh\\_terminiv/page/dyskurs.94/](http://hohlopedia.org.ua/inshomovnyh_sotsiokulturnyh_terminiv/page/dyskurs.94/). – 14 бер. 2013.
10. Дискурс іноземномовної комунікації : монографія. – Львів : Вид-во Львівського національного університету ім. Івана Франка, 2002. – 495 с.
11. Енциклопедія постмодернізму / за ред. Ч. Вінквіста та В. Тейлора ; пер. з англ. В. Шовкун ; наук. ред. перекл. О. Шевченко. – К. : Вид-во Соломії Павличко «Основи», 2003. – 503 с.
12. Жулинський М. Г. Духовна спрага по втраченій Батьківщині / М. Г. Жулинський. – 2-ге вид. – К. : Видавничий дім «КМ Академія», 2002. – 67 с.
13. Забужко О. Філософія української ідеї та європейський контекст: Франківський період / О. Забужко. – 2-ге вид. – К. : Факт, 2009. – 156 с. – (Серія «Висока поліція»).
14. Кобелецький Ю. Поетичні переклади Ів.Франка / Ю. Кобелецький // Літературна газета: Орган Правління Спілки радянських письменників України. – 1941. – № 3. – 17 січня. – С. 2.
15. Космеда Т. А. Текст І.Франка у фокусі інтертекстуальності / Т. А. Космеда // Лінгвістичні дослідження : збірник наукових праць Харківського національного педагогічного університету імені Г. С. Сковороди. – Харків : ХНПУ, 2009. – Вип. 27. – С. 62–70.
16. Костенко Л. Гуманітарна аура нації, або дефект головного дзеркала: лекція, прочитана в Національному університеті «Києво-Могилянська академія» 1 вересня 1999 р. / Л. Костенко. – К. : Видавничий дім «КМ Academia», 1999. – 32 с.
17. Кравець Я. «Quae scripsi, scripsi»: романські літератури у рецепції Івана Франка / Ярема Кравець. – Львів : ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2014. – 230 с.
18. Круглій Б. Образ свободи в поемі Івана Франка «Мойсей» / Б. Круглій // Особисті цінності і переконання філософа та історико-філософський процес : тези Всеукраїнської наукової конференції «XXI Читання, присвячені пам'яті засновника Львівсько-Варшавської філософської школи К. Твардовського», 11–12 лютого 2009 року / відп. за випуск В. Л. Петрушенко. – Львів : Вид-во Нац. ун-ту «Львівська політехніка», 2009. – С. 71–74.
19. Кушнір І. О. Трансформація поглядів І.Франка на цивілізаційні процеси / І. О. Кушнір // Філософія, культура, життя : міжвузівський зб. наукових праць. – Дніпропетровськ : Дніпропетр. держ. фін.-екон. ін-т, 2003. – Вип. 20. – С. 220–234.
20. Кушнір І. О. Роль природного добору на початку розвитку людського суспільства у поглядах І.Франка / І. О. Кушнір // Філософія. Культура. Життя : Міжвузівський зб. наукових праць. – Дніпропетровськ : ДДФА, 2007. – Вип. 29. – С. 186–191.
21. Кушнір І. О. Рушійні сили розвитку суспільства у поглядах І. Я.Франка / І. О. Кушнір // Філософія. Культура. Життя : міжвузівський зб. наукових праць. – Дніпропетровськ : ДДФА, 2008. – Вип. 31. – С. 145–151.
22. Кушнір І. Віра і сенс людського буття / на матеріалах філософської спадщини І. Франка / І. Кушнір // Філософія. Культура. Життя : міжвузівський зб. наукових праць. Спеціальний випуск. – Дніпропетровськ : ДДФА, 2009. – С. 89–92.
23. Кушнір І. Погляд на проблему цивілізації у філософській спадщині І. Франка / І. Кушнір // Науковий вісник Чернівецького університету : збірник наукових праць. – Чернівці : ЧНУ, 2009б. – Вип. 466–467. Філософія. – С. 66–69.
24. Кушнір І. О. Роль національного ідеалу в прогресивному розвитку нації (на матеріалах робіт І. Франка) / І. О. Кушнір // Філософія. Життя : міжвузівський збірник наукових праць. – Дніпропетровськ : Дніпропетровська державна фінансова академія, 2010. – Вип. 35. – С. 32–43.
25. Лисий І. Оприсутнений Франко Володимира Мазепи (Рецензія на книжку В. Мазепи «Культуроцентризм світогляду Івана Франка») / І. Лисий // Могилянські історико-

- філософські студії / ред. Т. В. Нагорна. – К. : Видавничий дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2008. – С. 414–421.
26. *Лисий І.* Гуманітарна міждисциплінарність: засади і практика / І. Лисий // Людина в часі: (філософські аспекти української літератури ХХ–ХХІ ст.) // НАУКМА, упоряд.: В. Моренець, М. Ткачук. – К. : Унів. вид-во ПУЛЬСАРИ, 2010. – С. 10–31.
27. *Мазепа В. І.* Культуроцентризм світогляду Івана Франка / В. І. Мазепа. – К. : ПАРА-ПАН, 2004. – 232 с.
28. *Макаровський І.П.* Національно-державницькі погляди Івана Франка : монографія / І. П. Макаровський. – Івано-Франківськ : Видавничо-дизайнерський відділ ЦІТ Прикарпат. держ. ун-ту ім. Василя Стефаника, 2008. – 132 с.
29. *Матвеева О.О.* Наукова полеміка щодо співвідношення понять тексту та дискурсу / О. О. Матвеева // Наук. вісн. Чернів. ун-ту : збірник наук. праць. – Чернівці : Рута, 2008. – Вип. 386: Романо-слов'янський дискурс. – С. 64–67.
30. *Пахльовська О.-Є.-Я.* Творчість Івана Франка як модель культурно-національної стратегії / О.-Є.-Я. Пахльовська // Іван Франко – письменник, мислитель, громадянин : матеріали Міжнар. наук. конф., присв. 140-річчю від дня нар. Івана Франка (Львів, 25–27 вересня 1996 р.). – Львів : Світ, 1998. – С. 19–31.
31. *Пашук А. І.* Філософський світогляд Івана Франка : монографія / А. І. Пашук. – Львів : Видавничий центр ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка, 2007. – 432 с.
32. *Пашук А. І.* Франкова концепція українського націотворення / А. І. Пашук // Записки Наукового Товариства імені Шевченка. – Львів, 2008. – Т. ССLVI. Праці історично-філософської секції. – С. 447–458.
33. *Погребенник В. Ф.* Світи Івана Франка: Передмова / В. Ф. Погребенник // Іван Франко. Сотворення світу / передмова В. Ф. Погребенника. – К. : Обереги, 2004. – С. 4–34. – (Б-ка укр. раритету).
34. *Погребенник Ф. П.* Іван Франко в українсько-російських літературних взаєминах: Дослідження / Ф. П. Погребенник. – К. : Дніпро, 1986. – 301 с.
35. *Радчук В.* Рудий Панько М. Гоголя в дівчачому люстерку Лесі Українки: конгеніальність тлумачки і звітність репортерів / В. Радчук // Леся Українка і сучасність : збірник наукових праць. – Луцьк : РВВ «Вежа» Волинського національного ун-ту імені Лесі Українки, 2008. – Т. 4. – Кн. 2. – С. 161–189.
36. *Сидоренко М.* Філософсько-релігійні погляди Івана Франка та їх вплив на відродження духовності в сучасній Україні / М. Сидоренко // Філософія. Культура. Життя : міжвуз. : збірник наук. праць. – Дніпропетровськ : Дніпропетровська державна фінансова академія, 2007. – Вип. 29. – С. 83–85.
37. *Смолич Ю.* Сердечна подяка (З виступу на урочистому засіданні Радянського Комітету захисту миру в Москві 29 серпня 1956 р.) / Ю. Смолич // Вінок Івану Франкові : збірник матеріалів / редкол.: О. С. Дяченко, Ю. С. Кобилецький, А. А. Каспрук та ін. ; упоряд. А. А. Каспрук. – К. : Рад.письменник, 1957. – С. 143–149.
38. Універсалізм [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : [www.uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Універсалізм](http://www.uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Універсалізм).
39. *Франко І.* Зібрання творів : у 50 т. / Іван Франко. – К. : Наукова думка, 1976–1986.
40. *Шляхов Б. М.* Проблема соціокультурних функцій інтелігенції в спадщині І. Франка / Б. М. Шляхов // Філософія і соціологія в контексті сучасної культури : зб. наукових праць. Присвячується 85-річчю Дніпропетровського національного університету. – Дніпропетровськ : РВВ ДНУ, 2003. – С. 71–82.
41. *Шляхов Б. М.* Проблеми культурології в спадщині І. Франка / Б. М. Шляхов // Філософія і соціологія в контексті сучасної культури : зб. наукових праць. – Дніпропетровськ : ДНУ, 2006. – С. 223–237.

42. *Яр Славутич*. Соборницькі ідеї Івана Франка // Іван Франко : зб. філологічної секції для відзначення 110-річчя народин і 50-річчя смерти Івана Франка. – Т. 32 (Зап. НТШ. Т. CLXXXII). – Нью Йорк : Накладом НТШ в ЗДА, 1967. – С. 171–177.
43. *Яр Славутич*. Англійський переклад поеми Іван Вишенський // Яр Славутич. Дослідження та статті. – Едмонтон : Славутич, 2006. – С. 471–472.
44. *Kosyk V.* Evolution des idées sociales et politiques d'Ivan Franko / Volodymyr Kosyk // Actes de la Journée Ivan Franko (Sorbonne, le 12 novembre 1977) – Paris-Munich : L'uer de littérature générale et comparée de l'Université Sorbonne nouvelle (Paris III), La faculté de Philosophie de l'université ukrainienne libre (Munich, RFA), 1977. – P. 111–120.
45. *Kuplowski M.* Iwan Franko a literatura polska / M. Kuplowski // Іван Франко і світова культура: Матеріали міжнародного симпозиуму ЮНЕСКО (Львів, 11–15 вересня 1986) : у 3 кн. / упоряд. Б. З. Якимович ; редкол.: І. І. Лукінов, М. В. Брик, Г. Д. Вервес та ін. – К. : Наукова думка, 1989. – Кн. 1. – С. 111–116.
46. *Pachlovska O.* La scuola ucraina della traduzione: aspetti storici, teorici, linguistici / O. Pachlovska // Materiali del Convegno in occasione della Presidenza italiana dell'Unione Europea «Verso un'Unione Europa allargata ad est: quale ruolo per la traduzione?» (Maggio 1996, Trieste) (a cura di A. Padellaro), Ministero per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali, Divisione Editoria, Roma, 1997. – P. 153–178.
47. *Ryzhkov M. S.* Intertextuality markers as linguopragmatic phenomena in the English Internet-discourse [Electronic resource] / M. S. Ryzhkov. – Access mode : [http://www.rusnauka.com/13\\_EISN\\_2009/Philologia/40434.doc.htm](http://www.rusnauka.com/13_EISN_2009/Philologia/40434.doc.htm) – Accessed Jan. 4, 2016.
48. *Siedina G.* Una nuova epoca nella traduzione poetica ucraina: l'approccio di Mykola Zerov alla Satira II, 6 di Orazio / G. Siedina // Pagine di ucrainistica europea à cura di Giovanna Brogi Bercoff, Giovanna Siedina. – Slavica: Collana di studii slavi diretta da Giovanna Brogi Bercoff e Mario Enrietti. No.4. – Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2001 – P. 177–200.
49. Wimmer, Franz Martin. Cultural Centrisms and Intercultural Polylogues in Philosophy [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <http://www.i-r-i-e.net/inhalt/007/09-wimmer.pdf>

*Стаття надійшла до редакції 20.10.2015*

*Прийнята до друку 21.12.2015*

## КУЛЬТУРОЦЕНТРИЗМ ІВАНА ФРАНКА

**Іван ТЕПЛІЙ**

*Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка,  
бульвар Університетська, 1, Львів, Україна, 79000,  
e-mail: i\_teplyi@rambler.ru*

Розглянуто проблему культуроцентризму діяльності І. Франка. Аналіз поставленої проблеми, як видається, неможливий без уведення ширшого культурологічно-філософського контексту діяльності І. Франка загалом. Розглянуто головні філософські, культурологічні та літературознавчі концепції І. Лисого, В. Мазепи, О. Пахльовської, О. Забужко, Яра Славутича, Л. Костенко, М. Жулинського, О. Багана та ін. Підкреслюється, що вся титанічна й багатогранна діяльність І. Франка була системною і підпорядковувалася націєтворчій функції культури – від ознайомлення широких верств народу з культурними здобутками інших народів, популяризації українства на шпальтах закордонних видань – до підвищення рівня культури самого народу, отже, його національної самосвідомості.

*Ключові слова:* культурологія, культура, література, франкознавство, націєтворення.