ISSN 0130-528X. Українське літературознавство. 2017. Випуск 82. С. 98–107
Ukrainian Literary Studies. 2017. Issue 82. P. 98–107

УДК 821.161.2.09Франко093:П.Куліш.03

IVAN FRANKO THE TRANSLATOR PANTALEIMON KULISH THE ESTIMATION

Ivan TEPLYY

The Ivan Franko National University of L'viv,
Foreign Languages Department for Humanities,
1, Universytets'ka Str., L'viv, 79000, Ukraine,
e-mail: i_teplyy@yahoo.co.uk

The paper presents Ivan Franko's views on the personality of P. Kulish primarily in the translation aspect. The research is based on the scholarly, translation studies papers by Ivan Franko himself, as well as those of other researchers, which enables to highlight the problem posed with sufficient completeness. In this regard, one can talk about a dialectic evaluation of P.Kulish as an outstanding creative personality.

Keywords: foreign-language text, evaluation, translation, dialectics, creativity.

«No matter how far our language might go forward in its development – H. Kochur wrote – not only a researcher, but a present-day littérateur and translator should turn to the translations of Kulish and Starytskyi, as the stylistic experience of both these classics of our literature has not been exhausted, studied to a sufficient extent. This particularly concerns Kulish» [4, p. 38]. The words by our leading translator, author, and scholar (1908–1994) may well serve as lodestar for the research into the problem posed, the subdivisions being as follows:

I. Franko as the editor of P. Kulish's translations from English. The 1890s witnessed P. Kulish's finally completing the translation of W. Shakespeare's dramas, along with many years of his work on the Bible. Back in 1882, the first, L'viv-based, volume of *Shekspirovi tvory* [Shakespeare's Works] saw the light of day, these works composing it, viz. «Otello», «Troyil i Kressida», and «Komediya pomylok». Another ten plays – «Hamlet, prynts dans'kyi» (1899), «Pryborkana hostrukha», «Makbet», «Koriolan», «Yuliy Tsezar» (1900), «Antoniy i Kleopatra», «Romeo ta Dzhulyetta», «Bahats'ko halasu znichevya» (1901), «Korol' Lir», «Mira za miru» (1902) with I. Franko's direct participation had already been published – following P. Kulish's death – in L'viv. Alongside the above-mentioned 13 dramas, there are mentions of two more works rendered by P. Kulish («Tsymbelin» and «Venetsiys'kyi kupets»), but their fate is unknown [4, c. 36]. This is what I. Franko says himself: «As to the editorial side, I put the condition: prior to the printing to compare Kulish's translation with the original, adding, wherever necessary, explanations, supplying each drama with a guide study popularly narrating all to understand and evaluate it, the study being based on the latest critical and literary-historical research. Kyiv compatriots agreed to this, but nobody being found in Kyiv as having time and wish to busy himself with this hard work, I had to shoulder it, having, though, admitted to the compatriots no special training for the job, still

ISSN 0130-528X. Українське літературознавство. 2017. Випуск 82

less extra time, and very little scholarly apparatus at hand. And for good reason: arme Leute kochen mit Wasser [(G.) Poor people cook on water (Ed.). – *I. T.*]; remembering thereby Prof. V. B. Antonovych's words having once by the simple, well-known saying "Not God but man makes pot and pan" more encouraged me to scholarly work than had other scholars with their warnings or angry predictions: "You shall write absurdities" ("Shakespeare's Foundation")» [7, c. 371].

Ivan Franko, the editor and author of prefaces to the above-mentioned Shakespeare's publications of 1899–1902, highly appreciated P. Kulish's translations (including that of *Hamlet*), not infrequently hereby remarking what did not satisfy the reader even of that time: «I must say that Kulish's translation, too, is far from the ideal one, not what our language would be capable of already now. Of course, anyone from now on wishing to undertake the job of translating from Shakespeare will have the path paved by Kulish, a lot of turns forged by him, great many words and figures introduced into our literary treasure. However, I doubt not that a new translator will be able to still more closely adhere to the original, translate one verse by another without splitting into two or at least one and a half, as the case with Kulish more than once has been. On the other hand, though, Shakespeare's language wealth and the incomparable precision of English[1] repeatedly render it utterly impossible even for a German – let alone French or Slavonic – translator to squeeze his one poem into his own one... Something in Kulish has not been rendered correctly either, some such places being indicated in our notes, where the text is presented word-for-word. Yet such places are so few, and in contrast to the fact that Shakespeare's text itself is unstable, and looks different in different editions, they are so unimportant that, generally, this translation can be called more faithful to the original than, for instance, the Polish ones I know of or in some parts even more than the German translations of Schlegel and Dingelstedt» [8, вип. 32, с. 169–170]. «P. Kulish, a pioneer in the elaboration of many linguistic, as well as poetic forms, is credited with an outstanding historic merit: under the circumstances of the unrelenting imperial pressure and persecutions of the Ukrainian language he managed to elevate it to a new level for the sake of its further strengthening and perfection» [6, с. 189–190].

In the preface to Kulish's translation of «Hamlet» I. Franko wrote: «That the translation we right here offer to the public's hands, [...] gives to understand and experience the beauty of the original, is warranted by the very name of P.O.Kulish. Kulish is the paramount star in our literature, a great connoisseur of our popular language, being, simultaneously, a good expert in languages and literatures of European nations ... By sticking far closer to the original than his predecessors Kulish can lend, at the same time, his individual color to the original, something at once enabling one to identify in it the work of Kulish, and no other Ukrainian poet. There is a kind of quiet pathos, measured breath today in the original writings and translations of this author, something like broad, powerful movements of a large ship on a big river ... By his translation Kulish opens before us the broad vistas our language can reach by itswealth, its melodiousness, and diversity of its rhythm – this alone contributes to his tremendous merit» [8, вип. 32, с. 169].

---

[1] Later research into the problem has only corroborated this. The prominent U.S. Slavicist exemplifies, by the way, on the strength of I. Franko's «Pavers of the Way» and other works [14, p. 6–7, 27–31].

The «Preface to W. Shakespeare's edition "Romeo ta Dzulyetta" (translated by P. Kulish)» reads: «Passing by some deviations from the English text mentioned by us in the notes, we must recognize Kulish's translation of this tragedy as extraordinarily apt and beautiful» [8, вип. 33, с. 155]. When reviewing the «Preface to *Childe Harol'dova mandrivka* I.Franko writes that "the beginnings of 1894 had already seen the translation ready, when exactly Kulish accomplished it, I don't know […]. What matters to us is what has induced Kulish to undertake the translating of this poem. His preface written in the Great Russian, or, as he puts it, "New Russian" language the paper is further printed in, suggests his having been guided by an exceptionally linguistic interest, that, while translating from Shakespeare and Byron, he wished to prove the flexibility of the Ukrainian language in rendering great foreign authors.[…]. All that might have been thought to be rather formal motives, ones unable to kindle the translator's heart with that hot passion for the translated author, without which no translation will come out really live and beautiful» [8, вип. 35, с. 405]. These words present a *conditio sine qua non* of a felicitous translation presented, if covertly, by P. Kulish. In real fact, however, «Contrary to the assurance of Kulish himself as to the flexibility of that "old-lingual" language it proves by him to be clumsy, ungainly-scholastic, naive and actually little capable of rendering the true original.

A good example of how Kulish treated this language in his translations of the latest period is evident in "Childe Harold". The "flexible and rich" Kulish's language was not only insufficient to render Byron's poem in rhymed strophes; moreover, discarding the rhymes, it has deprived Byron's text of half of its beauty; being too narrow even in Byron's meter, and in place of a 10-foot verse we have everywhere here a 13-foot one – *a bad damage to the precision and sharpness of the Byronian expression* (our italics. – *I. T.*). As to the vocabulary, we're silent – it was left unchanged, and think that here Kulish has reduced his theory of the "old lingual" language to the absurd[1]. One was unable to proceed along this path anymore» [8, вип. 35, с. 407].

There's a more detailed coverage of this issue in the «Literaturno-Naukovyi Vistnyk» [Literary Scientific Herald, LNV], under the «Bibliography» heading: «The immortal Byron's poem "Childe Harold's Pilgrimage" was of tremendous significance for its time as a voice of protest of a of genius, a living personality against the pressure of the reaction having ensued all over Europe upon Napoleon's decline". And irrespective of that socio-political significance has the poem, esp. in Cantos II and IV, so many poetic delights that coming to know it is also now considered necessary for every educated man. Kulish has set himself no small amount of labor at rendering this hard work requiring today, esp. for our audience, far more explanations than has the Kulish-translated *textus receptus*. The target language is cumbersome, heavily mixed with the Church-Slavonic vernacular – a typical product of Kulish's senile reasoning on the "Old Rus" language, allegedly the primary one, coming eventually to be reflected in the "New Rus", i.e. "New Russian" language (It should be noted that alongside the two prefaces to this edition Kulish has also placed his own poetic dedication for V. Bilozers'kyi, his friend and wife's brother)» [5, с. 595]. The author has touched upon major linguistic and translation studies issues here, viz. the origin of Russian, history of Ukrainian, a translator's

[1] For critical analysis of the vernacular, see I.Franko's *Poema pro sotvorenie svita* (Poem on the Genesis of the World) [8, вип. 35, с. 266–300]. Also, E. Nida's work is very instrumental here [15].

ISSN 0130-528X. Українське літературознавство. 2017. Випуск 82

choice motivation, and the selection of the corresponding meter, which is so important to the reproduction of the original's style.

In a number of prefaces to translations I.Franko offers the background, source-base etc., as was the case with the edition «Hamlet, prints dats'kyi». L'viv, 1999 [8, вип. 32, с. 156–170], cf.: I. Sources (p. 156–182). II. Shakespeare's treatment (p. 162–167). III. Ukrainian translations from Shakespeare (p. 167–170). Similarly, in the preface to the publication of «Macbeth. Translation by P. Kulish» Franko, noting that «The text of "Macbeth" is unusually difficult to translate, owing to its lapidary nature, diversity of style and wealth of allusions to various relationships we are little familiar with» [8, вип. 32, с. 192], supplies I. «Time of writing the work» (p. 180–182), II. «Historical background of "Macbeth"» (p. 182–186), III. «Shakespeare's treatment» (p. 186–190). IV. «The text of "Macbeth"» (p. 191–192). In what concerns the publication of «Pryborkana hostrukha» [The Taming of the Shrew], the preface's author furnishes: I. Sources (p. 172–174), II. Shakespeare's rehash (p. 174–177), III. Autobiographic hints (p. 177–179). IV. "Pryborkana hostrukha" in Ukrainian Literature (p. 179) [8, вип. 32, с. 171–179]. By the way, the genre of the «Venetsians'kyi kupets» was defined by I. Franko as «tragic comedy» (See his review on the occasion of staging the play in the «Rus'ka beside»[1] Society Theatre's on 5 Feb. 1892, published by the «Kurjer Lwowski» in its issue of 1892, No. 37, 6 Feb., p. 4–5) [8, вип. 28, с. 222; 413].

In the «Preface to "Macbeth"» I. Franko writes: «In general, with the incomparable skill Shakespeare has managed here to provide his language, too, with a somber, turbulent, wild color determining the event in the tragedy and all its scenery – Scotland. Therefore "Macbeth" is the true "stumbling block"[2] for translators; in German literature, for example, a poet of genius, such as Miller, gave the example of skillful sometimes, but generally infelicitous translation of the tragedy, where the wild colors of the original have been made coherent, smooth, sleek – and this way weakened. The translation by Kulish, in view of the great difficulties that it was necessary to grapple with, can be considered on the whole apt. In any case, it is the talented first attempt at rendering this tragedy into our language; but one should admit that it is still a very far cry from that force and diversity of the tone determining the English original» [8, вип. 32, с. 192]. This quotation, thus, generalizes a number of major translation studies and comparative-literary ideas, viz. author's style (strength and diversity of color etc.), requirements to the translator (inadmissibility of smoothing, «sleeking» of the original), comparison with the German translation by F. Schiller a. o. I. Franko the editor's notes are of no small translation studies value: In the «Preface», for instance, to Kulish's translation of «Hamlet» (Chapter «Ukrainian translations of "Hamlet"») I. Franko writes: «The versification by P. Sviy [Pavlyn Svientits'kyi. – *I. T.*] is so unpoetical that prose would have been better: there's neither rhythm, nor poetry in that verse» [8, вип. 32, с. 167]. In the summary, I. Franko expresses a very subtle observation and an important suggestion: «Maybe Shakespeare should have a translator with faster and more agile movements, more diverse rhythm» [8, вип. 32, с. 169]. His *Preface* to the translation of *Pryborkana hostrukha* by P. Kulish reads: «We have nothing to talk about this Kulish's translation. It is a quite

[1] Ruthenian Conversation / Club (Ukr.)

[2] Russian in the original: «камень преткновения».

faithful to the original and has in itself a high poetic and linguistic value [...]. What could most be desired is for the translator to keep closer to the original where rhymed places are, for greater or smaller number of such places is of some value when investigating the time the work was written in» [8, вип. 32, с. 179]. Secondly, the major issue of equilinearity is touched upon here, but this is the year 1899 or 1900 – the era of free treatment with the original text: free translation, rehashing or imitations. I. Franko's alterations were varied [12, с. 124]: a/ withdrawal of the pictogram stress, b / substitution of phonetic spelling for the traditional, graphic, c / considerable lexical corrections; g / syntax replacements which, moreover, helped to clarify the imagery, interpretation of the work or a particular character, etc. It important to emphasize that I. Franko removed from the translations the words Kulish endowed with negative semantics causing hereby the distortion of the content [12, с. 126]. In particular, I. Franko vehemently protested against the replacement of English songs by Ukrainian ones in P. Kulish's translations [12, с. 128–129]. Greater detail is provided in the above-mentioned monograph by M. Shapovalova [12, с. 126–131; See also 11].

The same very problem is raised in the article by I.Franko "Shakespeare with the Ukrainians" [7, вип. 52, с. 1005 ; 8, вип. 34, с. 383–384]. It would be of interest to cite that part of Kulish's poem which I. Franko, by the way, rendered into German, for the paper came out first, as is known, in the Vienna-based weekly «Die Zeit» – Bd. 35. – No.446 in its issue of 18 April 1903. The author intended to familiarize the German-language reader with the selfless work of P. Kulish. The 9 rhymed lines of poetry cited here present a translation of an extract from the poem «To the Native People Presenting Him a Ukrainian Translation of Shakespeare's Works» by P. Kulish (from the «Farmstead Poetry»[1] collection).

There is a later edition of this poetry (collection «Dzvin» [The Bell], 1893) erroneously cited in the Ukrainian translation of I.Franko's article [8, вип. 34, с. 383–384]. In the same article, I. Franko cites another poem by P. Kulish – «To Shakespeare Caring for the Ukrainian Translation of his Works» («Farmstead Poetry» collection), yet presents it in prose. The paper has never been published until recently [7, вип. 52, с. 777; 1005]:

П. Куліш «До рідного народу, подаючи йому український переклад Шекспірових творів»	**Пантелеймон Куліш «An das eigene Folk bei der Darbringung der ukrainischen Übersetzung von Shakespeares Werken»**
Народе без пуття, без честі і поваги,	Volk ohne Halt, noch Ehr, noch Selbstachtung,
Без правди у завітах предків диких,	Noch Recht in der Geboten wilder Ahnen,
Ти, що постав з безумної одваги	Entstanden aus sinnloser Mutentfaltung
Гірких п'яниць та розбишак великих!	Verrückter Säufer, großer Raubtyrannen!
……	…….

[1] «Хуторна поезія» in the original [Khutorna poeziya].

чНа ж дзеркало всесвітнє, – визирайся,	Da nimm den Weltenspiegel, sieh dich selber,
Збагни, який ти азіят мізерний,	Welch elender Asiate du doch bist,
Своїм розбоєм лютим не пишайся,	Und brüste dich nicht mehr mit grimmem Raube,
Забудь навіки путь хижацтва скверний	Vergiß auf ewig schnöde Räuberpfade
І до сім'ї культурників вертайся.	Und kehr' zurück zu der Kulturgemeinschaft.
[Cit.: 8, вип. 34, с. 383–384].	[Cit.: 7, вип. 52, с. 777].

[People with no sense, no honor, no respect, / No truth in the wild ancestors' bequests, / Thou that hast risen from prowess direct / Of drunkards bitter and the robbers great! / Of worldly mirror take your gazing track, / Aware be of what a miserable you are Asian, / Take you no pride in rabid looters' pack, / Forget for good the way of filth, predation / The family of cultured peoples join back].

This is the context in which one should examine some of I. Franko's alterations in Kulish's translations. Despite, however, a distorted treatment of our history like that, which I. Franko protests against, he still gives a part of this unattractive poetry (9 lines translated into German), stating: «As we can see, the pills that Kulish added to his translation of Shakespeare were not sweet» [8, вип. 34, с. 384].

Ya. Hordyns'kyi, on comparing the manuscripts of Shakespeare's dramas in P. Kulish's rendition, counted about 6,000 of all sorts of alterations to P. Kulish's translations noting that his painstaking editorial work, particularly linguistic and stylistic editing had greatly contributed to increasing the literary value of Kulish's translations [2, с. 55–164; See also 13, p. 49].

All in all, I. Franko has edited ten Kulish's translations from W. Shakespeare having authored about 100 pages of introductions alone [8, вип. 32, с. 156–206, вип. 33, с. 146–171; 199–221][1]. This is how I. Franko's describes his editorial work in the article «Shakespeare with the Ukrainians»: «Only two years following P. Kulish's death was it possible to obtain from his legacy the translations from Shakespeare and publish them in print. […]. The author of these lines was entrusted with the editing of these translations. Verse by verse, he contrasted the translation against the original, and, though having to leave much of what had a deviation from the text, had none the less altered many a place, and explained much in the notes. Besides, the introductory articles furnished to each drama offer in a popular form the necessary information about the given work on the basis of the latest research into Shakespeare's works. This way, a foundation has been laid for the acquaintance with Shakespeare among the Ukrainians as well, and though they cannot as yet boast of the complete translation of Shakespeare's works, the most eminent works by the great Briton are accessible to them in their mother tongue too» [8, вип. 34, с. 384–385]. As of now, there is a research devoted to P. Kulish-the translator [3]. It was I. Franko – researchers note – who undertook the responsibility of editing Kulish's translations. He painstakingly compared each line of the translated text making necessary comments. Each play was supplemented with a lengthy preface [13, p. 48].

[1] It appears, in the later papers (See below) I. Franko refers to the number 13 [8, вип. 39, с. 7─8].

The article «Shakespeare with the Ukrainians» was first published by I. Franko in German in the Vienna-based «Die Zeit» weekly in its issue of 18 April 1903 under the title «Shakespeare bei den Ruthenen» (p. 32–34). The Ukrainian edition saw the light of day abridged (*Literaturna hazeta*, Apr. 18, 1941) [8, вип. 34, с. 521; 10]. The footnote to the article in the *Literary gazette* in question reads: «Translation from the German. This article is published in Ukrainian with some abridgements. Full publication is made in Volume XX of I. Franko's works as prepared by the Shevchenko Institute of Ukrainian Literature, Academy of Sciences of the Ukr. SSR» [10, с. 2]. Some spelling discrepancies are observed between the 1941 and 1981 editions [8, вип. 34; 10].

The paper under review intended to familiarize the German-language reader with the selfless work of the Ukrainian author P. Kulish at the translations of Shakespeare's plays whose editing and publishing I. Franko had to join [7, вип. 53, с. 1005]. One may note a dialectical, contradictory at first sight, nature of P. Kulish's evaluation. Even at the beginning of this article, let alone others (Cf., e. g.: «Kulish is the paramount star in our literature […]» [8, вип. 32, с. 169]), P. Kulish is high in I. Franko's esteem as to, particularly, the competence in a number of European languages («Shevchenko's fellow-labourer and fellow-sufferer, P. Kulish was the one who, many years following Shevchenko's death, decided to give to the Ukrainian people the first complete translation of Shakespeare's works. Kulish was a person of great talent and ambitious plans […]. Besides, he was an outstanding expert on the Ukrainian language as hardly anyone else, and, owing to self-study gained an extraordinary knowledge in the Russia of that time of many European languages to such an extent that he could translate from the languages to follow, viz. German, Polish, English, French, and Latin)» [8, вип. 34, с. 382]), adding, in conclusion, a lengthy specification, such as: «Kulish was, both in historiography and foreign languages, self-taught; he had mastered many languages out of need, without having a perfect command of neither, and had not grown to match such an outstanding master of language as Shakespeare was. Besides, Kulish had a complete lack of humor and a kind of conceited, callous manner of speech he had elaborated as a result of the constant pursuit of Scripture, and then he transferred it to his translation of Shakespeare. Which resulted in his translating of Shakespeare by really employing the original, but mostly from Russian translations and proved himself to be totally helpless in the translation of many Shakespeare's jokes, puns, and linguistic hints; subtle turns of phrase were rendered by him in an ugly, on the whole, way; making use in his work, at that, of an ancient, ill-mannered vernacular, resulting in a difficult, often even unpleasant, reading of his translations» [8, вип. 34, с. 384]. «The news of Kulish's working at Shakespeare's translation had awakened joyful hopes in Ukraine – I. Franko proceeds – Soon, too, a patron having donated 6,000 rubles for the publication of this work was found. With that money Kulish came to the city in 1881, and began to publish the already prepared translations while completing others for printing. But it turned out differently» [8, вип. 34, с. 382]. The disruption of so majestic and necessary projects was caused extralinguistic, political factors as well [8, вип. 34, с. 382, 384; 10].

I. Franko the Scholar. I. Franko is considered to be the founder of Ukrainian Shakespeare Studies, launched by a ban on the Ukrainian language, primarily translated, scenic in Russian Ukraine. His works were pioneering ones in the theoretical research of Shake-

ISSN 0130-528X. Українське літературознавство. 2017. Випуск 82

speare's works. Having, in particular, profoundly studied P. Kulish's translations I. Franko arrives at the conclusion that «Kulish had approached the original closer than Fed'kovych or Steshenko, but having an inadequate command of English proved unable to convey the richness of Shakespeare's vocabulary» [1]. Moreover, Franko was an ardent advocate of W. Shakespeare, having set up the Shakespeare Foundation in Lviv, which became the centre for the Ukrainian language publications of translated works of foreign authors. The Foundation published 9 works of the playwright [12, с. 131–142].

Not only in the Shakespeare context, as it were, is P. Kulish presented by I. Franko: Volume 16 of the 20-volume edition mentions the former's name 16 times [9, с. 458]. Two merits, if not without some reservations, should be ascribed to P. Kulish, viz. 1) he was the first to draw the Ukrainophiles' attention to the need of a thorough study into the history of Ukraine, and 2) the Galicians'[1] attention was drawn to the need of literature for the common people (*Ukrainian Populists and Radicals*) [9, с. 166]. In his polemics with Chaychenko (a *nom de plume* of B.Hrinchenko) I. Franko writes: «It is a pity to say that in Ukraine the older generation alone (Kulish, Nishchyns'kyi) are still manifesting this job, unafraid to gain really new fields for the Ukrainian word» (*When Attacking the Wolf, Let us Talk for the Wolf*) [9, с. 177]. The activity meant is that of translation. Also, P. Kulish, together with T. Shevchenko and M. Kostomarov, is credited with the elevation of Ukrainian literature to a higher *niveau* of originality and strength, thus proving that it is no more a fragment of Russian literature (*The Ruthenian-Ukrainian Theatre*) [9, с. 222] etc.

Finally, I. Franko's major translation studies exploration «Pavers of the Way. Ukrainian Text and Polish Translation. Something on the Art of Translating» reads, in particular: «How much the Western European peoples, Frenchmen, Germans, Englishmen, and Italians have benefited from the translations of the works of Greek and Roman antiquity – that is known to everyone busying himself only a little with the literary and cultural history of these peoples. […]. Our Ukrainian-Ruthenian literature in its first beginnings of the princely era began and long lived almost exclusively by the translations from Greek. In more recent times, the development of this literature proceeded under such extraordinary and abnormal circumstances that amid other branches of spiritual activity the art of translating from other languages could not much develop either. Irrespective of that, during the one hundred years of its development, our new national literature has, alongside brilliant original authors, acquired for itself quite a respectable number of translators, among whom worthy of mention are particularly Stepan Rudans'kyi as the translator of the *Iliad*, Petro Nishchyns'kyi as *Odissey*'s translator; *Kulish as the translator of 13 dramas by Shakespeare* […]» [8, вип. 39, с. 7–8].

One can trace the dialectics of I. Franko's evaluation of P. Kulish. The estimation is, generally speaking, quite high, if contradictory at first sight. It is stressed that the contribution made by P. Kulish is epoch-making, despite the particular historical views, and the specific vernacular used by the latter.

---

[1] Residents of the Western area of Ukraine [Galicia, Halychyna], under the Austro-Hungarian rule at the time.

Listings from the Bibliography Employed

1. *Ваніна І.* Іван Франко і українське шекспірознавство / І. Ваніна // Літературна газета: Орган Правління Спілки радянських письменників України. – 1956. – №26 (1281). – 28 червня. – С. 2.
2. *Гординський Я.* Кулішеві переклади драм Шекспіра / Я. Гординський // Записки НТШ. – Львів,1928. – Т. CXLVIII: Праці історично-філологічної секції. – С. 55–164.
3. *Девдюк І. В.* Англійська література у творчій діяльності Пантелеймона Куліша (Переклади. Критичне сприйняття. Творче засвоєння): дис... канд. філол. наук: 10.01.05 / Іванна Василівна Девдюк ; Прикарпатський ун-т ім. В.Стефаника. – Івано-Франківськ, 1999. – 191 с.
4. *Кочур Г.* Шекспир на Украине / Г. Кочур // Мастерство перевода. – 1966. – Москва: Сов. писатель, 1968. – С. 36–43.
5. Літературно-науковий вістник: Видає Наукове Товариство імени Шевченка у Львові. Відповідає за редакцию Михайло Грушевський. – Річник IX. – Том XXXIII. Львів, 1906. З друкарні Наукового Товариства імени Шевченка.
6. *Москаленко М.* Нариси з історії українського перекладу / М. Москаленко // Всесвіт: Незалежний літературно-мистецький та громадсько-політичний місячник. – Київ : Видавничий Дім «Всесвіт», 2006. – №5–6. – С. 174–194.
7. *Франко І.* Додаткові томи до Зібрання творів у п'ятдесяти томах / Іван Франко ; редкол.: М. Г. Жулинський (голова) та ін. – Київ: Наукова думка, 2006–2010. – Том 54: Літературознавчі, фольклористичні, етнографічні та публіцистичні праці, 1896–1916 / ред. тому Є. К. Нахлік. – 2010. – 1216 с.
8. *Франко І.* Зібрання творів : у 50 т. / Іван Франко. – Київ : Наукова думка, 1976–1986.
9. *Франко І.* Твори : в 20 т. Том XVI. Літературно-критичні статті / Іван Франко. – Київ : Держ. вид-во худ. л-ри, 1955. – С. 574–577.
10. *Франко І.* Шекспір в українців / Іван Франко // Літературна газета: Орган Правління Спілки радянських письменників України. – 1941. – 18 квітня. – № 16. – С.2.
11. *Шаповалова М. С.* Франко как исследователь и переводчик Шекспира (Борьба Ивана Франко против извращения Шекспира буржуазными комментаторами и переводчиками) : автореф. дисс. …канд. филол. Наук / М. С. Шаповалова. – Львов : Львовский госуниверситет имени Ивана Франко, 1950. – 16 с.
12. *Шаповалова М. С.* Шекспір в українській літературі : монографія / М. С. Шаповалова ; відп. ред. В. А. Моторний. – Львів : Видавнич. об'єднання «Вища школа», 1976. – 212 с.
13. *Bida,* Constantine. A Quest for the Dramatic. Ukrainian Authors Turn to Shakespeare // Symbolae in Honorem Georgii Y. Shevelov : Збірник на пошану проф. д-ра Юрія Шевельова. Наук. зб-к УВУ. – Філософічний ф-т. Том 7. – Мюнхен / München, 1971. – С. 45–53.
14. *Manning C. A.* English tenses and Slavic aspects [Текст] / Clarence A. Manning; Ukrainian Free Academy of sciences. – Winnipeg: [б.в.], 1959. – 40 p. – (Slavistica; 34).
15. *Nida E.* Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating [Electronic resource] / E. Nida. – Leiden, E.J.Brill, 1964. – 335 p. – Access mode : www.google.com.ua/books?hl=uk&lr=&id=YskUAAAAI/

ISSN 0130-528X. Українське літературознавство. 2017. Випуск 82

ПАНТЕЛЕЙМОН КУЛІШ В ОЦІНЦІ ІВАНА ФРАНКА

Іван ТЕПЛИЙ

Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка,
кафедра іноземних мов для гуманітарних факультетів,
вул. Університетська, 1, Львів, Україна, 79000,
e-mail: i_teplyy@yahoo.co.uk

Проаналізовано погляд І. Франка на постать П. Куліша насамперед у перекладацькому розрізі. Дослідження проводиться на матеріалі науково-критичних, перекладознавчих праць насамперед самого І. Франка, а також інших дослідників, що дає змогу висвітлити поставлену проблему з достатньою повнотою. У зв'язку з цим можна говорити про діалектику оцінки П. Куліша як визначної творчої особистості.

Ключові слова: іншомовний текст, оцінка, переклад, діалектика, творчість.