

THE FOREIGN-LANGUAGE DISCOURSE OF IVAN FRANKO: CREATIVE REVERBERATIONS

Ivan TEPLYY

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

The paper highlights the specificity of Ivan Franko's foreign-language discourse in terms of creative development of themes, motifs, character-sketches etc. Much has been written on I. Franko as translator, yet a great number of his works, nearly 900, present, at a low estimate, the oeuvre based on the motifs of, say, Ancient Greece or Ancient Rome, transfusions, rehashes, reverberations etc. The research focuses on reception as a major form of dealing with a foreign-language discourse, the basis being I. Franko's poems. It is in the Preface to the "Poems" collection [Vol. 5, p. 7] that a programmatic view on the problem epigraphed by T. Shevchenko's words, "Of course, the stolen", is presented. I. Franko demonstrates, hereby, differing degrees of developing the material borrowed, methodology, as it were, of this process. The poems in question are "Ishtar", "Satni and Tabubu", "The Poor Henry", "The Poem of the White Shirt", "Funeral". The other poems are analysed following the thorough monographic research by A. Skots' [Poems by I. Franko, Lviv, 2002 (in Ukrainian)]. Other forms of mastering a foreign-language discourse, such as creative development, precedent text, figurative analogy, etc. are dealt with too.

Key words: reception, translation, intertextuality, creative development, figurative analogy, creative borrowing, interliterary connections.

"Penetration into the underlying processes of interaction of different cultures is primarily contributed by its most typical main lines, such as inter-literary communication, reception, and translation, the latter, among other things, acting as the most productive link of the former ones. Both inter-literary communication and translation serve as a major dominant for the mutual enrichment of national cultures, interpenetration of the national and the international in the world literary process" [18, p. 27]. One of the major functions of translation is to ensure the internal coexistence of artistic values in the developing literary systems: "We refer translation, as one of the most important manifestations of inter-literary coexistence, to the sphere of genetic contacts since its main function is to maintain the link between national literature and the foreign literary process, and to ensure the internal co-dimensionality of the artistic values of two or more literary systems under development" [17, p. 127]. The same author referred comparison to epistemological categories, maintained it is a basis for integration, way of thinking/non-thinking, comparative studies as a prehistory of global thinking, and influence – as ontological problem [83, p. 25–33 ff.].

Generally speaking, “the process of the author’s interaction with the “foreign” word is nowadays regarded as a dialogue of its own kind. The dialogic interaction between ongoing and foregoing texts, those of one time, but different cultures – it is the problem of intertextuality formation, that of the theory of intercultural communication, which has found a vivid reflection in I. Franko’s works yet requires a careful and consistent study projected on the entire creative heritage of the great writer” [32, p. 69]. The problem requires a broader examination in the comparative literary plane, taking heed of the fact that the very translations, even though occupying a leading position, do not exhaust the creative interaction of I. Franko with other literatures, broader speaking – cultures. The paradigm meeting these requirements seems to be that of Comparative Literature [4; 10; 12; 25; 28; 27; 30; 82; 84; 61; 96], as well as from the standpoint of communicative competence [31], for “the major subject of Comparative Studies” (Dmytro Nalyvayko) is “the coming together of “the native” and “the other”, and the processes occurring hereby, explication of how “the other” becomes “the native”. Nowadays these processes have come to be global in nature and enormous in terms of significance, which enhances the status of Comparative Studies, and simultaneously its topicality in today’s world” [50; 65]. The issue of “international horizons and the comparative discourse of present-day literary theoretical studies” is rightly posited at a monographic level [46], which guides our research in the specified direction. In the perspective of the problem “Translation as a means of intercultural communication” the former is viewed as “a semiotic system of culture” (Olha Dovbush) with the relevant “mechanism of recoding and transportation in the translation of texts of another national culture by taking into account the effect of a comparative factor” [15, p. 366; See also 79–80; 82]. When translation is talked of, culture should be mentioned as well: “Why did I. Franko translate Jolović, a Montenegrin writer, beginner, his first work, almost unknown even among Serbs and Montenegrins? “Because he found in the works of Jolović the unity of international and national, which is an important moment in the history of culture. And one should speak, generally, when speaking about translation, of *I. Franko’s major cultural-shaping mission* [emphasis ours. – *I. T.*] who regards culture as a complex, dynamic, contradictory, and, simultaneously, integral system. Talking about I. Franko, we must not talk about him as having attained or not attained, reached or not reached, we must talk about a *great cultural phenomenon* [emphasis ours. – *I. T.*], and this, hence, is also followed by what concerns translation” [7, p. 298–299].

Still earlier, in 1940, L. Ivanov posited the problem: “Amid an enormous number of works on Ivan Franko, we could not find a special research on the ideological and literary connections of Franko’s oeuvre with the literary output of masters of world literature. [...]. Therefore, the question of the circle of Franko’s literary interests, connections of his work with world literature seems to us quite relevant and worthy of a detailed study” [25, p. 83]. Question is posed to clarify Ivan Franko’s place in world literature, esp. conceptual relations between the works of I. Franko and other writers in general parallels, I. Franko’s closeness to Russian writers of the 19th c., give a general literary analysis of the writer’s works, where need be to reveal their originality [25, p. 84]. The issue of intertextuality, creative connections, is, undoubtedly, of relevance in this work.

However, despite the huge number of publications and a long (more than one hundred years) history of Ivan Franko Studies, the writer’s receptive work proper (reception, inter-

literary connections, the phenomenon of intertextuality, etc.), whose most widespread and most well-known form is translation has not been the subject of *a systematic and thorough* research.

“Ivan Yakovych has translated into Ukrainian the works of about 200 authors from 14 languages and 37 national literatures” [53, p. 4]. His creative work, written predominantly in Ukrainian (most of the texts), Polish, German, Russian, Bulgarian, Czech is assessed, by low estimate, to be several thousand works totaling to more than 100 volumes. In the whole of Ivan Franko’s lifetime, more than 220 editions, including 60 collections of his original and translated works, various in genre, appeared in separate books and brochures [78; 53, p. 3–4].

Conceptual tenets. I. Franko, according to scholars, resorted to all acceptable to him forms of mastering foreign works – from translations to figurative analogies – and was the first to distinguish between them [52, p. 29]. Figurative analogy is “one of the forms of creative interaction and reverberation of the authors: the writer’s drawing the reader’s attention of to a world-famous work of literature or art somewhat resembling this work, being somehow associated with it through an idea, a figurative system, and sometimes through composition and style” [38, p. 279]. Sometimes this analogy appears even in the title of works, e.g. “Khodyt’ Faust...” [Faust Going...] by P. Tychyna, “Smert’ Hamleta” [Hamlet’s Death] by M. Bazhan a. o. Invoking various kinds of aesthetic associations in the reader, such analogies make it possible to deeper understand the work in question [38, p. 279].

In the preface to the “Poems” collection, having taken as epigraph T. Shevchenko’s: “Of course – stolen”, I. Franko outlines a programmatic view of the problem: “When it is true that the major significance of poetry lies in the fact that it expands our individuality, enriches the soul with such impressions and feelings it would not experience in an ordinary life or would not experience in such a strength and clarity, then I think that the rendition of foreign-language poetry, that of all ages and nations, into the mother tongue enriches the soul of the whole nation, appropriating to it such forms and expressions of feeling it has not had hitherto, building a golden bridge of understanding and mutual feeling between us and distant people, generations of old. / With this view, I offer these poems to our community” [70, vol. 5, p. 7].

The poems meant are these – “Ishtar”, “Satni and Tabubu”, “The Poor Henry”, “The Poem of the White Shirt”, “Funeral”. “Ishtar” – I. Franko proceeds – is an extract from the Old Babylonian cosmogony epic that had been originated some 2000 years before Christmas and had as its main theme the heroic deeds and adventures of the Babylonian national hero Izdubar. [...]. What is given here is *as much faithful as literal translation* [emphasis added. – I. T.] of the Babylonian text, some paragraphs only being added by me to fill in the gaps” [70, vol. 5, p. 7]. The second poem “Satni and Tabubu” may be considered the precursor of the modern novella, despite being written some 200 or 250 years before Christ [...]. Here, too, I give as much as possible a faithful translation, without adding a word of my own, except for the concluding two lines substituting for another, fairy-tale ending in the original, where Tabubu in the last minute changes into a terrible monster” [70, vol. 5, p. 7–8]. The three other poems are based on medieval Western European stories. “The share of my own effort in these works differs. In the “Poor Henry” I could make use of almost foreign samples, whereas in “The Poem of the White Shirt” I had to *lend almost all color to the story, and something still*

more [emphasis added. – I. T.] in the “Funeral”. After all, in the notes to each poem I give its sources, and one who is interested may clear out which in them is mine, and which I have found ready” [70, vol. 5, p. 8]. These words, like a droplet of water, if schematically, reflect the variety of creative forms, based, in addition, on foreign sources. And a warning of principle – *what* to translate: “I may meet with a reproach what for I fly my fancy to so distant times and lands, why I don’t sing of the nearby. Sorry! But how can I help it? I can crow as I know. After all, the thing, I believe, is not in the barrel the poet takes the drink he offers his people from, but in *what kind* [emphasis added. – I. T.] of the drink he offers them – whether a pure reinforcing wine or a slumbering drug. I do not traffic in drugs” [70, vol. 5, p. 8].

Translation was found to occupy the leading place among the three main forms of assimilating a foreign-language text. It is advisable that one should accept the following as a working definition of it as the important form of inter-literary relations: “reproduction of the text in another language, transcoding it from the original language into that of the receptor” [28, p. 67] and, in the framework of the genetic-contact approach, of reception as one of the categories of interliterary communication, along with influence and borrowing, viz. “reception is a synthetic form of genetic-contact relations, which consists in the perception of ideas, motifs, images, plots from works of other writers and literatures and their creative rethinking in national writing or creativity of the author” [28, p. 59; 64].

It is hard to disagree with the thesis that “along with translation, there are other forms of assimilation of foreign literature. And they are in Ivan Franko. For example, the rendition of “Deutschland – Ein Wintermärchen” is translation, but “The Poem of the White Shirt” – a variation completely original on the theme of world literature. Likewise “The Poor Henry”, etc. There is translation, there is transfusion, there is filiation, there is adaptation – all these forms are in Ivan Franko” [7, p. 299]. **Transfusion** is characterized by the method of **transposition**, i.e. transference of original semantic units into ethno-linguistic components reflecting the target-language picture of the world, and changing the intentional direction of the text to the topical for the target reader [14, p. 12]. A number of other terms such as domestication, paraphrase, imitation, free variation, version a.o. are proposed as genres of translation in terms of a literary polysystem, deep and surface structures etc. [14, p. 12–13]. In the theory of literary comparative studies, it is accepted to distinguish between several forms of reception, such as: borrowing, imitation, stylization, translation. Being an objective-subjective process of interaction and confrontation of linguocultures, reception leads to the creation of such a text in which there is an intersection of conceptual systems of both cultures with orientation to the conceptual features of the recipient one [6, p. 297, 301]. Every translated literature needs an appropriate literary context in order to establish functional communication with the recipient literature, enter its orbit and become an integral part of it [6, p. 299; 48]. The term is used as synonym of “understanding, interpretation” [36, p. 101], in particular within the context of defining the relationship of verbal art with conscious manifestations of collective memory, its roots in the past, and also analysis of the effects of different traces of memory on the process of writing original and translated works, and their reception (in the scholar’s understanding).

“School of the Poet” by I. Franko is known to many. The poem was first published in the book “Iz dniv zhurby. Poeziyi Ivana Franka” [From the Days of Sorrow. The Poetry by

Ivan Franko]. Lviv. At the author's expense, 1900. – P. 61–69 [76]. It is believed to be a *free translation* [70, vol. 3, p. 398], but, rather, it is an imitation. The publication opened with the author's "Foreword", placed at the beginning of volume 5 in the 50-volume edition [70, vol. 5, p. 7–8]. It is based on H. Ibsen's Norwegian original as translated into German. In the German edition of H. Ibsen's poem authored by Christian Morgenstern the structure of the poem is quite different (18 eleven-syllable lines of the distich as opposed to 60 seven-syllable quatrain-lines in I. Franko's imitation):

Macht der Erinnerung

Henrik Ibsen
Hört, wißt ihr wohl, wie ein Bärenbändiger
Wird seines Tieres Vergeßlichkeit Endiger?

Er läßt es in einen Braukessel sitzen;
Drauf läßt er den Kessel mit Kohlen hitzen; [...].

Ich fühl's wie ein Stechen unter den Nägeln, –
Und da tanz' ich auch schon nach der Verskunst Regeln.

Übersetzt von Christian Morgenstern [88, 31].

There exists, simultaneously, another translated version into German – the one I. Franko might most probably use, for the poem was written in 1900, whereas that by Ch. Morgenstern is dated 1913 (it might, though, come into being earlier). L. Passarge's translation was issued without the indication of its publishing date. Moreover, it is written in Gothic characters, which suggests that it had been out of the press. And its rhythm is closer to I. Franko's – most likely, he made use of this "original":

**H. Ibsen, Norwegen
(1828–1906)**

Die Macht der Erinnerung

Ihr weißt wohl schon, wie man Tiere dressiert;
Wie der Bär sich zuletzt als Tänzer geriert?

In einen Braukessel schnürt man den Kunter,
Und macht ein helles Feuer darunter.

Der Bär strebt über den Rand vergebens;
Doch der Führer spielt! "Freut Euch des Lebens!"

Vor Schmerz faßt ohne Besinnung der Zottige,
Er kannt nicht stehn und muß tanzen im Bottiche.

Und spielt man später die Melodie bloß,
So wird in ihm das Tänzergenie los.

**Г. Ібсен, Норвегія
(1828–1906)**

Сила спогаду

Чи знаєте гаразд вже ви, як звірів дресирують,
Як із ведмедя врешті танцівника формують?

У чан великий отакий вже вуйка затягають,
Огонь яскравий унизу тимчасом розкладають.

Дарма на стінку лізе він – ба, вирватися годі,
"Радійте жить!" – вожатий гра ведмедеві мелодій.

Від того болю Волохач свідомість утрачає,
Стояти більш не може він, тож танцювати має.

Звучить уже мелодія щоразу то вільніше,
І геній танцю проступа у нім щораз то більше.

Mir ist selber bekannt, wie herrlich man schwitze, Bei voller Musik und entsprechender Hitze.	Але відомо і мені, як тут пітніть чудово При відповідній спекоті і музиці навколо.
Auch verbrannt' ich mir damals mehr als die Sohlen; Der Teufel soll die Heizer holen!	Не стопи я тоді попик, – огнем щось більше взяло; А паліїв отих мені прислав був сам диявол!
Und klingt mir ins Ohr das Lied der Lieder, So sitz' ich in glühenden Kessel wieder.	І пісня із пісень ота все стугонить у вусі, – Знов у розпеченім котлі отак і я варюся.
Es brennt mir unter den Füßen und Nägeln; Da tanz' ich wie toll nach der Metrik Regeln.	Під стопами і нігтями пече щораз то гірше; У танці мов шалений я під метрику двовіршів.
<i>Aus dem Norwegischen übersetzt von Ludwig Passarge [87, p. 42].</i>	<i>Translation ours. – I. T.</i>

Given below is the English version of the poem made by John Northam:

THE POWER OF MEMORY

Hi, do you know, if a trainer's clever,
how he'll teach his bear something that sticks
forever?

He binds the beast in a brewer's hopper; –
then starts a fire beneath the copper.

His hurdy-gurdy starts grinding a hearty
tune out for Bruin: "Life's one long party!"

The beast soon senses a pain that is lancing;
he can't stand still, so he must start dancing.

And if the melody's played again, –
a demon of dance starts to drive him insane.

I found myself once in the copper, seated
with music full-blast, fire equally heated.

I burnt more than hide on that occasion;
the memory sticks, it defies erasion.

And each time *that* distant memory's called on,
I feel I'm bound in a red-hot cauldron.

It feels like one's quick when a sharp thorn's in it; –
I *have* to dance with my verse-feet, that minute.

Written in Genzano, 1864 [97, p. 202].

(Note: to save space, the text is presented in two columns, traditionally – in one).

This is how the English translator ends his *Preface* (p. 2–5): “As to form, I have risked the hazards of reproducing as nearly as possible the verse structures, rhyme schemes and meters of the original” [97, p. 5], and that, really, springs to the eye, without the closeness being too risky.

It looks as if, according to the content, L. Passarge's translation, in Gothic script, were closer to the original. Such, as we assume on the strength of the three translations from the Norwegian original, is the structure of the poem. As a basis, we take L. Passarge's version as a probable source of translation, maintaining that of K. Morgenstern's rendition does not differ substantially in terms of content and form, being, perhaps, stylistically “heavier” as too formally close to the original. The degree of I. Franko's free employment of this plot can be judged from a comparison of his own work and the German “original” (see below):

Г. Ібсен (за Л. Пассарге)

Чи знаєте гаразд вже ви, як звірів дресирують,
 Як із ведмедя врешті *танцівника* формують?
 У чан великий отакий вже вуйка затягають,
Огонь яскравий унизу тим часом розкладають.
 Дарма на стінку лізе він – ба, вирватися годі,
 “Радійте жить!” – вожатий гра ведмедеві мелодій.

Під стопами і нігтями пече щораз то гірше;
 У танці мов шалений я під метрику двовіршів.

[...].

[For greater detail see 64, p. 110–111].

І. Франко

Чи знаєш, брате, як учать
 медведя *танцювати*?
 На бляху на залізную
 Веде його вожатий.

Під тою бляхою *огонь*
 розпалює помалу,
 а скрипкою збуджа в душі
 любов до ідеалу.

Та не один медвідь отак!
З ним, брате мій, посполу
і кождей з нас, поет-співак,
таку проходить школу [...].

і піднімається бідак
на віршовії стопи.

We italicize the common features of the “original” and I. Franko’s poem: out of I. Franko’s **15 quatrains only 6 partially reverberate** with the translation of L. Passarge. Consequently, it is a transfusion, or, rather, a version, i.e. the interpreter adheres to the original as a sample, but involuntarily, as a result of incomplete or erroneous interpretation, or deliberately, as a result of incomplete interpretive instruction, removes dominant semantic-stylistic components [14, p. 12–13]. On the other hand, the publication of K. Morgenstern is available in I. Franko’s library (Institute of Literature, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine), which suggests a strong assumption: this is the “original” of the adaptation in question.

By the way, the third volume alone, alongside this well-known poem, includes a number of suchlike works, viz.: “The Knight (from Heine)”, first known as “The Prologue from Heine”, “The Scottish Song (From Pushkin)”, “The Unhappy [Lady] (From A. K. Tolstoy)”, “Mermaid” (From Pushkin); “Revenge for the Killed Man” (Arabic Duma from Goethe) [70, vol. 3, p. 304–305; 311; 316; 318–320; 320–324]. So, we have 5 more such transfusions, perhaps even 6: it is not certain whether “Meleager. An Excerpt of the First Song” (1905) is not a transfusion [70, vol. 3, p. 351–356]. Under the influence of H. Heine’s poetry, the poem *Akh, kob to ya був musykantom* [Ah, were I but a musician] was written, as we learn from the letter to O. Roshkevych (Lviv, end of August 1878): en route to Lviv, “all way along, lying on the bench and hitting my head against the board [...], singing to myself to the tune of “Du hast Diamanten und Perlen” [You Have Diamonds and Pearls (G.)], a song gradually composed on the model of Heine’s “benevolent follies” that, as a “corpus delicti” [proof of evidence – Ed.], I’m sending to you” [70, vol. 48, p. 107].

The full text of the “School of the Poet” may be found in I. Franko’s work “From the Last Decades of the 19th Century” too [70, vol. 41, p. 528–529], where the author writes: “But let us not forget that the school we have passed so far was an artistic school, the very one that Henrik Ibsen so well illustrated in his parable”. Further, at the end of the work, the text of the poem is given, and it is added that now, too, we must pass a political school, a good lesson of which has already been given by the “great teacher” K. Badeni”.

We assume, generally, that the number of transfusions is much larger: 893. Along with the now well-known “School of the Poet” it is also worthwhile to refer them to the “Poetic Works Based on the History of Ancient Rome” [70, vol. 3, p. 48–49; vol. 6, p. 191–516; vol. 7, p. 7–573]. The “ancient” echo is traced with Horace as well (“Ad Melpomenem”): “Non omnis moriar, *multaque pars mei* / Vitabit Libitin(am)...” [86]. I. Franko’s poem *Ukrayina movyt’* [Ukraine Speaks] reads: “Thy “ego’s” *very finest share*” / Will not be laid down in grave with thee” [75, p. 81] (italics added. – *I. T.*). Likewise is Seneca “echoed” [67; see also 68].

It should be noted here that I. Franko is the author of translations proper from H. Ibsen, viz. the three poems – *Do zaplakanykh potomkiv* [To the Descendants in Tears], *Metelyk* [Butterfly], *Do moho druha, revoliutsiyynoho besidnyka* [To My Friend, the Revolutionary Interlocutor] [22–24], where there is no borrowing of only one or two semantic macrocomponents of the source text, on whose basis a new poetic structure is constructed (genre **free variation**) [14, p. 12–13], but are fully reproduced both semantic (deep-structural) and structural (surface-structural) components of conditional primary sources, albeit with the help of the German language as the intermediary one. In the original (“Literary-Scientific Herald”), however, the author’s last name runs as “Henrik Ibzen”. To quote an extract from the first poem – *To the Descendants in Tears*: “Тепер його слава у вас на устах, / Тоді як від ваших ударів поляг. Він світло зажег, де ви в п’їтмі корпили, / За теж його першого ви й осліпили” [43, p. 538]. (His glory from your lips so well now flows / Whereas he has died from your very blows. / He burnt the light for you, where you groped in darkness, / For which was the first whom you rendered to blindness).

The best, probably, example of I. Franko’s intertextuality is his translation of G. Byron’s dramatic mystery “Cain” (Lviv, 1879), followed, 10 years later (1889), by the publication of his own work, *Smert’ kayina* [The Death of Cain]. In the letter to M. Drahomanov dated March 20, 1889 the poet wrote: “I wonder a lot what you will say about the “Cain”? It had been sitting in my brain since I was translating Byron’s “Cain”, and only last year did I somehow cope with this Jewish legend, mingling with it a piece of the legend of Faust who inspected the paradise from the heights of the Caucasus. With the rehash – I will say boldly – I tired myself out thoroughly: the whole thing had been twice reworked fundamentally, so that from the originally written there hardly remained untouched up to 200 verses, some parts being reworked three and four times, the craftsmanship completely cold, like that of an apprentice. Many traces of that craftsmanship have remained visible, I’m afraid” [70, vol. 49, p. 203–204]. Another graphic, perhaps, example, is “The Poem of the White Shirt” [7, p. 299]. There is also “a free rehash of the drama by the prominent Spanish playwright Pedro Calderón de la Barca (1600–1681) “El Alcalde de Zalamea” [70, vol. 24, p. 432] known under the title “Viyt zalameys’kyi” [The Village Elder of Zalamea]. The first mention of the work at it occurs in I. Franko’s letter to the theatrical section of the *Rus’ka besida* [Ruthenian Conversation] (December 6, 1893). Three months later, in his letter to M. Drahomanov dated 11 March 1894 I. Franko wrote: “I have meanwhile finished *the rehash* [italics added. – *I. T.*] of Calderón’s “Alcalde de Zalamea”. Will, do you think, the police and Polish censorship release it? If they did, I would have a compensation for both of my original pieces (“Riabyyna” [The Rowan-Tree] and “Uchytel” [Teacher] – *Ed.*), though the fee for the rehash is meager –

50 guilders” [70, vol. 49, p. 473]. As is evident from the cited letter, I. Franko worked at the rehash of *Alcalde de Zalamea* till March 1894 [70, vol. 24, p. 432]. Of great interest to us is that “For his rehash I. Franko made use not of the Spanish original, but of the German versification: “Der Richter von Zalamea. Schauspiel von Don Pedro Calderon de la Barka. Übersetzt von J.G. Gries. Halle a. d. Saale, Druck und Verlag von O. Hendel”. This publication is stored in the personal library of the writer (No. 56). It is likely, however, that I. Franko had before him other texts by P Calderón” [70, vol. 24, p. 432]. “In contrast to the versified Spanish original and German translation, the rehash of I. Franko is in prose. After the first performance of “Viyt Zalameys’kyi”, the newspaper “Kurjer Lwowski” (May 30, 1894), reported: “The rehash consisted in some abridgements of monologues and dialogues, on such a grouping of scenes that out of the ten scenes of the Spanish drama there turned out to be 5 acts in 7 scenes, followed by the reworking of the huge story of Isabella taking up several printed sheets, to a scenic image that is not in the original, and, finally, on the rendition of the rhymed 8-syllabic original verse – by Ukrainian prose. As far as we could judge by the recent performance, this rehash suits well for the Ukrainian stage, and Calderón’s masterpiece looks like the image of our present-day reality on the stage elevated one scale above the level of everyday life and sparkled by the glitter of immortal poetry” [70, vol. 24, p. 432]. In late May, 1894 I. Franko, shortly after the completion of “Viyt Zalameys’kyi”, handed the drama’s manuscript to the “Rus’ka besida” [Ruthenian Conversation] theatre “in whose repertoire it lasted a longer than other plays did time, and, as the press reported, had a considerable success with the audience” [70, vol. 24, p. 432]. An explanation as to the elaboration of the plot was adduced by I. Franko to the third edition of his transfusion (22 May 1913): “We have hitherto no full Ukrainian-Ruthenian translation of “Don Quixote” and are likely to wait for it years to come. What I offer the readers here is a free rehash of the main basis of the first part and the completion of the second part of the short novel, rehash from prose to poetry, composed on the model of Spanish folk romances” [70, vol. 4, p. 170]. As to his work on this and some other pieces I. Franko writes in a letter to the editor of the “Herders Konversations Lexicon” Publishers (18 January 1909) [70, vol. 50, p. 364]. It is of interest to note that the second, corrected and supplemented, edition of the poem (“Don Quixote’s Adventures” *rehashed from Spanish* [italics added. – I. T.] by I. Franko) came out in Lviv (1899) [35, p. 180–181]. The translations from Spanish literature include the transfusion in prose of P. Calderón’s masterpiece “Alcalde de Zalamea” i. e. *Salameys’kyi al’kal’d (Zalameys’kyi viyt* in I. Franko). As compared to the text of the original, I. Franko’s transfusion done from a German versification contains a whole number of differences described, in detail, by Ya. Kraveć. By giving, however, two additional acts to his transfusion, I. Franko has lent more dynamics to the work, greater fitness for scenic presentation, made it more accessible to the spectator [35, p. 186–187]. In addition, 11 more Spanish romances, among which the ballad “Alcanzor and Zayda” defined as “a Moorish romance, which is I. Franko’s translation from an English rehash” have been translated [35, p. 189; 92, p. 43–48]. As to the Portuguese writer, **Luís de Camões, I. Franko makes a mention of him in his work *Soychyne krylo* [“Jay’s Wing (From the Hermit’s Notes)”]** [35, p. 190–191]. The work is researched in comparison with K.Hamsun’s novel *Pan* [60]. It is assumed that I. Franko’s drama *The Dream of Prince*

Sviatoslav, published in 1895 (*Zhytie i slovo*, Vol. 3, Book 1, p. 21–45; Book 2, p. 198–215, and as separate book in Lviv, with only a verse dedication added) is marked by the influence of a foreign source: “The story of “How King Carl the Gr[eat] Went to Steal” (apparently translated by Ivan Franko from a foreign source), whose plot is close to the drama *The Dream of Prince Sviatoslav* has survived (No. 2185, p. 72–74)” [70, vol. 24, p. 433]. I. Franko as playwright holds an honorary place in Ukrainian literature [91, p. 30]. It has long been noted that I. Franko is known not only as translator. Much of what is in world literature he used in his own oeuvre, employing as a plot for would-be works [25, p. 56; 57; 91, p. 28–29; 20]. In the same way I. Franko established himself as “one of the most prominent Ukrainian writers for children and youth” [89, p. 600], using material from world literature and folklore. First of all, these are the unsurpassed “Fox Mykyta”, “Abu Kasim’s Slippers”, “Bassim the Blacksmith” a. o. Among them is a graceful rehash (“zgrabna przeróbka”) of “Don Quixote” by Cervantes [89, p. 600]. There are also works written on the historical motifs of Ancient Greece and Rome. Volume 6 of the 50-volume edition presents 62 poetic works after the motifs of the history of ancient Rome written in about 50 days – from August 9 till September 29, 1915 [13, p. 108]. Moreover, in the last years of his life (1914–1916) I. Franko worked intensively on translations and transfusions from world literature: Ovid, Dante, Old Scottish, Old Icelandic, Old Norwegian, Old English ballads; Old Greek poems; Albanian, Italian, Portuguese, German folk songs; Spanish romances; plays by A. Pushkin. A very prominent place in this enormous oeuvre is occupied by poetic works based on the history of Ancient Rome. In 1963, the Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences issued the third volume of “Literary Heritage”, in which 129 works of the poet devoted to this theme were published for the first time [13, p. 107]. Works in Vol. 7 complete the cycle of I. Franko’s poetic transfusions based on the history of Ancient Rome, written from 29 September 1915 till 13 March 1916 [74]. Generally speaking, the last period of his life “launched, for I. Franko, the epoch of translations, transfusions, and remakes of works” [91, p. 28]. The best, perhaps, way of expressing the essence of the above-mentioned is in I. Franko’s own words from “Bassim the Blacksmith” [70, vol. 5, p. 91]:

And now, having a free minute,
Brethren dear, if you please it,
Listen to my fairy tale
Of one Bassim, of the cheeky –
This is no invention tricky,
But recount without fail.

Yet, when talking to you this way,
Not in Arabic, my own lay,
I will put it as I see:
Larger here, abridged there,
Adding of my own elsewhere,
That the tale in order be.

(The *Prologue*’s English rendition is given below, in the Appendix). In general, highly appreciating I. Franko’s translations of civic and intimate lyrics by M. Nekrasov, F. Pohrebennyk assumes: “One of the guarantees, perhaps, of I. Franko’s deep penetration into N. Nekrasov’s poetry was *the inner affinity* [italics added. – I. T.] of the Ukrainian poet’s civic lyrics with the ardent muse of the author of the poem “Who Can Be Happy in Russia?”. The works by N. Nekrasov had a profound influence on Ukrainian poetry of the second half of the 19th and the early 20th cc., including I. Franko, who, struggling for

Realism and commitment to the people in Art, civic vocation of literature relied, too, on the experience of his Russian literary associate. One may notice an inner like-mindedness between N. Nekrasov's "In the Village", "The Native Parts", "The Unmowed Strip", "From Work" etc., and I. Franko's civic and revolutionary poetry ("Thoughts on the Edge", "Spring Songs", "Nightly Thoughts", "The Native Village" a. o.). I. Franko's poetry and N. Nekrasov's works reverberate with the harshness and truthfulness in depicting the images of folk life, ruthlessness in exposing the world of evil and injustice, deep sympathy for the fate of the insulted and the destitute, revolutionary orientation. No wonder, I. Franko opened "The Great Din" short novel with the epigraph as extract from N. Nekrasov's poem "The Green Din" by filling it in with a new social content: "Here's going, buzzing a great din!.. The great din, the green din! The people's soul was getting noisy, roaring, and seething, in no way worse than the frenzied nature... Better death than a bondage like that..." [55, p. 129].

Also, the *Withered Leaves* collection includes poems written on the motifs of works in other languages, which gives rise to such a peculiar phenomenon as back translation, one of these being the poem "Lines" by the English Romantic author P. B. Shelley [For greater detail, see 64].

Here, thus, the talk is of *free variation*, formed, by way of reminder, through borrowing one or two semantic macrocomponents of the source text on whose basis a new poetic structure is built [14, p. 12–13]. It is, by the way, the very author I. Franko mentions of in the letter to O. Roshkevych (15.01.1879): "I've just got the poem of the English poet Shelley which I've undertaken to translate" [*Tsarytsia dukhiv* [The Queen of Spirits]. – *I. T.*] (...). But to prevent the second card from looking so unbearably empty, I'll do the following – copy for you the beginning of the poem I'm translating at this moment, amid the happy hopes which I cannot even think of as being unfulfillable. May the spirit of the poet Shelley whose thoughts I'm venturing *to remake* [in the original: the dialectal *perekabachuvaty*, italics ours. – *I. T.*] fly over you and inspire you with such a love, such a tenderness I was burning with while writing the following lines..." [70, vol. 48, p. 144]. To the next letter, I. Franko adds an extract from his own translation of P.B. Shelley's poem "Queen Mab" and the translation into German of the above-mentioned selfsame author's poem "Lines": "In conclusion, I'll write for you Shelley's poetry in Strodman's German translation. Its title is "Elegie", and I came to like it such a great deal. Particularly the first verse, its frantically trembling rhythm and syllable – that's really a miracle. Listen!

ELEGIE

Wenn die Lampe zerschmettert,
Ist ihr Licht im Staube verglüht,
Wenn die Ros' entblättert,
Ist ihr Duft im Winde versprüht;
Wenn die Laute zerbrochen,
Ist ihr lieblicher Klang verhallt;
Wenn die Lippen gesprochen,
Ist ihr Wort vergessen, wie bald!"
[70, vol. 48, p. 151].

ЕЛЕГІЯ

Як у друзки вже лампа,
Світло те в пилюзі догора,
Як одквітне троянда,
Аромат вітерець забира,
А як лютно зламали,
Її любим мелодіям край,
Як уста замовчали,
Їхне слово забулось, на жаль!
(Translation ours. – *I. T.*)

That concluding “Listen!” (in writing!) springs readily to the eye: These are, in fact, unique acoustic images, and “frantically trembling rhythm and syllable”. But the most important thing of what this letter gives to the researcher is the invaluable source of knowledge about the creative laboratory of the interpreter, writer and scholar: what an interlacing of languages, literatures, methods, motifs, themes, images! And this translation served for I. Franko, first and foremost, perhaps, as an impetus for writing the aforementioned verse from the third cycle.

Some researchers maintain that “Ivan Franko translated for Olha [Roshkevych. – I. T.] Shelley, Byron, Goethe, launching, practically, a highly artistic, adequate translation from foreign languages in Ukrainian literature” [53, p. 26]. Still earlier, in 1982, R. Horak expressed the likewise opinion as follows: “Ivan Franko translates, for Olha, from Shelley, Byron, Goethe, starting, in fact, a highly artistic adequate translation from foreign languages in Ukrainian literature” [9, p. 26].

Similarly, I. Franko creatively developed a number of the French poet’s Jean Richepin’s works, having translated but one of them – “An Old Hare” [Un vieux lapin. – I. T.] (*Beggars’ Songs* cycle – La Chanson des gueux) [70, vol. 12, p. 333–335]. As far as J. Richepin’s works are concerned, worth mentioning is, first and foremost, the poem “L’Apologie du diable” [94; 95, p. 129–142], also used later in the third cycle (verse 12) of the “Withered Leaves” (*Ziviyale lystia*):

I. Франко “Зів’яле листя”

3, XII

І він явивсь мені. Не як мара рогата,
З копитами й хвостом, як виснила багата
Уява давніх літ,
А як приймний пан в плащі і пелерині,
Що десь його я чув учора або нині –
Чи жид, чи єзуїт [71, p. 118, 120].

I. Franko’s “Withered Leaves”

3, XII

And he appeared. Not as hallucination
With horns and hoofs, the tail, as rich imagination
Of bygone days once drew.
But as fine gentleman in cape he was and cloak,
One that I heard as he today or last night spoke, –
A Jesuit or a Jew.
[71, p. 119, 121].

Still earlier, in 1927, “The Pathways of Franko’s Poetry” article (first published in the *Ivan Franko* collected papers (ed. by I. Lakyza, P. Fylypovych, P. Kyuanytsia), Kyiv 1927) [69, p. 42] authored by P. Fylypovych parallels poem XII of the third cycle with J. Richepin’s poetry *L’apologie du Diable* (“Les Blasphèmes”, 1884), and the poem “Deuce, the Demon of Separation” – with J.-W. Goethe’s *Faust* [69, p. 43–45], remarking, besides, in the footnote that “in Franko it is not exactly so (may have cited from memory): “Ne croyant pas á Dieu, je ne crois pas au Diable”, i. e. “Without trusting in God I do not trust in Devil”. It would be of interest to dwell on Richepin’s influence in greater detail. The *ultra*-realism of some of Franko’s poems, particularly from “Prison Sonnets” (“decorations from cloaca”) was condemnably compared, by V. Shchurat, with “Richepin’s pictures”. But this is the subject of a special investigation [69, p. 45]. The paper in question was republished in 1991 (See: Филипович П. Шляхи... // Літературно-критичні статті / Упоряд., авт. передмови і приміток С. С. Гречанюк. – Київ : Дніпро, 1991. – С. 84–87) [26, p. 42].

Deep social conflicts and severe personal tragedies in I. Franko's life found – it is believed – a deep reflection in his lyrical drama “Withered Leaves”. This is another point indicating the relation of this drama to “The Sorrows of Young Werther” (*Die Leiden des jungen Werthers*), both works being imbued with a concrete, taken from life, material [99, 69]. Hence – the somber colouring of the drama as a result of I. Franko's constant confrontations with the *Narodovites* (friends of the people), the clergymen, Polish chauvinists, his ousting from the editorial office of the *Zoria* [The Star] magazine and the newspaper *Dilo* [The Cause], fraud in parliamentary elections, severe persecutions and, to cap it all, a serious illness. Those insurmountable obstacles designated in everyday life by the word “fate” occur, according to V. Zyla, throughout the whole drama. Despite I. Franko's personage taking such an attitude on life, people, social struggle, his personal fate demanded staunchness, a force of character. However, as soon as the lyrical hero severs his connection with life, those of others and their struggle for happiness become indifferent to him – there insues a moral and even physical death (“I'm most indifferent today”, 3, III). Willy-nilly, a strong connection is felt here with the fate of Werther, who left the world not because Lotta had refused him, but because he was overpowered by a great mental insult and humiliation. Moral death comes. He loses his faith in life and in struggle, in himself and in the milieu. Under the circumstances, he reconciles with injustice, which transforms love into death. In view of that the spiritual affinity of J.-W. Goethe and I. Franko gets stronger. They compete for the best way to express, to clearly explain love and for the ability to show contradictions between the influx of unrestrained feelings, and the difficult and unsettled life, in order to recreate the complexity and opposition in the world of the one hopelessly in love. Werther and I. Franko's lyrical hero are despaired of life, primarily of public justice, and think about death. In I. Franko, his character meets with the devil for whom he, like Goethe's Faust, will sell (sign away) the soul (“Deuce, the demon of separation”, 3, XI). The acme of tension is in the final stanza: that's the price the hero is ready to pay for delaying his death. The parallel in Goethe: Werther speaks of sin and the Almighty, before whom he would like to unfold all his suffering. In conclusion, another motif – that of mother, which finds its deep reflection in both of the masterpieces under comparison. It gets a pronounced significance, because the heroes are approaching the final end. I. Franko embodies this motif in a separate verse, where it stands out starkly and expressively (“Mummy dear of mine, most beloved!” (3, XIII) [99, p. 69–71; See also 72, p. 122–124]. As early as 1885, I. Franko devoted his “Monologue of the Atheist” – so P. Fylypovych writes – to the problem of reviewing the scientific thought destroying religion (by the way, the author notes, “one should mention here Richepin's *La prière de l'athée* [The atheist's prayer. – I. T.]), only in this case, “Franko is not fascinated by anti-religious campaigning, but his own agitations: “Devil”, by reminding the unfortunate lover of his convictions (“Ne croyant pas au Dieu ...”), starts raking in the poet's soul (“Prepared for a hundred thousand years' burning ...” [72, p. 120]). It's as if a new Myron, one of the character-sketches inherent to Ivan Franko, that of a double [69, 45]. And by way of summing up: “Thus, in the “Withered Leaves” we have not only the poetization of love suffering. The woman's troubadour, poet of the “beautiful lady” [...] – happy or unhappy – could not have been the author that put in the terza rimas

“Woman” – “Allegory to Congratulate the “The Ruthenian Women” Society in Stanislaviv (1884) the following words into the mouth of the “genius”: “I’ll make a woman from the goddess, human being / And from the pedestal of deity thrust off” [...]. It is not Werther before us – not of hopeless love was the idea of suicide born. There happen much more tragic adventures in life... We come to know from S. Vityk’s reminiscences [...] that as early as 1896, Franko appeared to get a serious illness which later paralyzed him and drove to the grave ... He said then: “It would have been better for me to receive a bullet than this illusion have had to come about”. That time saw the concluding verse from the “Withered Leaves” written, viz. “This instrument of smaller style...” (*Otsey malen’kyi instrument*) [69, p. 46]. In cases like this, one can talk about intertextuality, i.e. “the echoing of a work with a literary tradition, artistic forms, genre conventions, stylistic trends [...]. Intertextuality is an aspect of the the work’s structural self-organization, and denotes the involvement into the text of the literary tradition’s context through stylization, parody, travesty, paraphrase, quotation, collage, allusive references or hints, etc.” [28, p. 193; 1]. Probably, intertextuality most manifests itself in the ideas and motifs of work A affecting work B. On the other hand, these are numerous points of contact, or similarity between individual works. This phenomenon is promising on French-speaking grounds [35, p. 38–42; 46]. Moreover, the process of a new work’s entry into a foreign environment can be expressed by the formula below: $XA Sin(wt)$, where “X” refers to the direction of the reception [$A Sin$], and Sin is a function expressing the normativity of the receptive process, w being the frequency, i.e., typicality of the characteristics (a constant value), t – the chronological period, during which the receptive movement takes place. The authors use this general formulation: $D - F At$ [19, p. 127–129].

However, not all researchers accept it: “In my opinion, this term does not reflect the complex interaction of artistic systems, their dialogue, does not make it possible to see the functional nature of the phenomenon they try to analyse with its help. In addition, not *texts* as static sign system interact, but *works* as *factors* of culture that are dialogic as to their nature” [8, p. 47]. In this case, the “text” is likely to require an expanded interpretation, there being no alternative. For our research it is highly interesting to look at “translation in the context of intertextuality”, based on renditions of one work [90]. Intertextuality may be manifested on different levels of the text structure, and rendered not only through tropes and stylistic figures, but also word-formation patterns, spelling or punctuation deviations from the norm, phonic and rhetorical means [57, p. 16]. On the other hand, one should pay attention to the interaction of temporal planes “in cases where the intertextual element (allusion, reminiscence, quotation, epigraph, character-sketch, etc.) appeals to the text of the contemporary writer, the temporal planes of both texts will coexist in parallel; in the case of an appeal to works of predecessors, however, intertextuality predetermines a temporal shift from the time of the work to that of the original source” [54, p. 19], i.e. there occurs an interaction of several time-planes. I. Franko, particularly, in the above-mentioned work from the “Withered Leaves” collection made use of a quote from J. Richepin “As I do not trust in God, I do not trust in devil” (see above), including the individual elements of the surface textual structure. At that time, generally speaking, it was a parallel coexistence of time-planes, because J. Richepin (1849–1926) is I. Franko’s contemporary, whereas such an intertextuality

is already obscured for the general reader of our time. A similar parallelism can be traced in I. Franko's poem "A Talk in the Forest" (collection "From the Days of Sorrow", Lyrical Cycle "Reminiscences", Verse X) [70, vol. 1, p. 26–30], where the ghost of a woman (delusion), standing up for the insulted peasants (perhaps as symbol of freedom, representative of the freedom-loving French people, noblewoman), speaks French. As there are no possible sources, nor any assumptions in the "Comments" to the volume are adduced, it is most likely that I. Franko himself has authored this stylization as a form of intertextuality, i.e. "a work [...], built up from linguistic, figurative, genre, ideological forms, carefully selected from the stylistic milieu under reproduction" [28, 198]. In general, this and many other aspects are the domain of Comparative Literature, i.e. "analytical description, methodological and differential comparison, synthetic interpretation of interlingual and intercultural literary phenomena with the help of history, criticism and philosophy in order to better understand Literature as a specific function of human consciousness" [4, p. 211]. In this regard, comparative literary research in one aspect or another is of interest [See, in particular, 32; 5]. It is worthwhile distinguishing a comprehensive study by V. Korniychuk on the contexts and intertexts of I. Franko [31]. To return to the verse "Conversation in the Forest" (cycle "Memoirs", verse 10), where the heroine is a mysterious French woman whose language is an irresistible avalanche of French and touchingly distorted Ukrainian words" [3, p. 118–119]: *Que ce que'est c'est? Que ce que'est c'est? / Що тут сталося у нас? / Mais pourquoi? Mais pourquoi? Фі, дівчат! Ну, не соромно, Панас? / Mais c'est lâche! C'est affreux / Так тручачи жінкам* [70, vol. 3, p. 26]. (The Ukrainian phrases could be rendered as follows: What's up here? [...]. Blimey, girls (harmed)! [...]. Isn't it shameful, Panas? [...]. Shove so much for women). The happy end (the cows are released) has come for the women, and for the poet? We don't know. What we do, is that his heart was "captivated for good" by the unknown French beautiful lady who had finally noticed a young boy, the involuntary witness of her so touchingly funny and desperately bold (in French!) feminine attack on the cruel offenders of the destitute [3, p. 122]. Has it not got concealed here (let's hope, not forever? – *I. T.*) the biggest mystery of Franko's love? ("First and Last Love") [3, p. 125]. In his letter to Uliana Kravchenko (No. 5) I. Franko writes about the ideal of female companions, "who would not just stop a man from th... struggle, but, on the contrary, attract him to it, encourage ..., accompany in it. I knew one such woman, ... I still remember her as a holy one, though she lives but far away, in Paris, or somewhere in France" [44, p. 154]. "There's no date – D. Lukyanovych comments – the lady recipient's list runs as follows: XII 1883" [44, p. 154]. This is one thing. As for "one such woman", D. Lukyanovych writes: "A woman's name – "Mariya" – has been cut out by scissors. I. Franko's letter written in January 1879 to Olha Roshkevych informs that the talk here is of the woman "Mariya". Franko wrote about her enthusiastically. He came to know in her a Russian revolutionary woman" [44, p. 173–174]. In a letter to O. Roshkevych (Lviv, 2 / I 1879), I. Franko himself describes this as follows: "As for the women who have been here with me, I will tell You this: 1) Olha Kosacheva, Drahomanov's sister [...], Mariya [...], en route from Warsaw, a Polish citizen, Socialist woman, a girl of about twenty-two, is not nice-looking, but very talkative, intelligent and emancipated. In her, one can really see an example of what women are in Russia. [...]. The

second Mariya – very talkative, brunette – smiles loudly – came almost every day, while Anna was in. I really liked to talk to her and make jokes. Oh, what a nice person, though she is 55 years old, and is just a simple maid, sweeping and washing floor in our place” [41, p. 88]. A German-language text is a stylization means too (excerpts from the poem “New Life”) [70, vol. 1, p. 454]. The impetus for writing I. Franko’s novel “The Petriys and Dovbuschuks” were, by his own acknowledgement, the works by E. Hoffmann: “In the *Druh* [Friend], meanwhile, my “Petriyi” has ended, commenced under the impression of the fantastic stories by E.A. Hoffmann, but finished gradually in already other spirit (at the end the importance of reading-rooms and economic unions is highlighted)” [70, vol. 49, p. 244–245]. In view of this, T. Kosmeda’s investigation is of interest as an attempt to “characterize the outlined feature of Franko’s idiostyle”. The point is the phenomenon of intertextuality, “understood as a correlation of one text with others which largely determines its completeness and semantic plurality. The study of this phenomenon as one of the major properties of the text is associated with the names of B. Tomashevsky, Yu. Lotman, A. Zholkovsky, M. Yampolsky a. o. As is known, communicative activities in terms of intercultural communication present a kind of “activity in activity”, which I. Franko did brilliantly throughout his life. It is intercultural communication, intercultural activity that motivate the emergence of a characteristic feature of Franko’s discourse – intertextuality” [34, p. 63]. It is worth putting this set of problems in the perspective “Issues of receptive aesthetics and poetics in I. Franko’s creative heritage” [2]. Intertextuality is referred to text categories reflecting the correlation of one text with others, dialogic interaction of texts in the process of their functioning, and in the artistic text, this category provides for an increase in values, “senses” (T. Kosmeda). The key to understanding intertextuality is the term “precedent text”. Researchers believe that precedent texts are texts important to a particular individual in cognitive and emotional terms, well-known for his/her milieu at large, such that this individual makes frequent use of in speech. Precedent texts are recorded in the minds of the native speakers and are so-called “ready-made intellectual-emotional blocks”, stereotypes, samples, and comparative measures that help a person navigate in mental and verbal spaces. Linguists believe that precedent texts have a special value for the discourse of a linguistic personality in historical, cultural, country studies perspectives [34, p. 65]. The corpora of I. Franko’s precedent texts could include: 1) folklore of the peoples of the world (sayings, proverbs, parables, fairy tales, riddles, etc.), mythology of the Antiquity; 2) works of world fiction; 3) religious works, primarily the Bible; 4) scientific texts of Ukrainian and other, mainly Slavonic, researchers; 5) journalistic texts of historical-philosophical and political character [34, p. 66]. “I. Franko cared not only for his own intertextuality – the author goes on to say – but did a lot to make the Ukrainian reader, as well as the young writer whose worldview was only shaping, could join the best samples of world literature. This could only be done owing to translations. This translation work was always coupled with an attempt at trying to get to knowing better individual authors as well as the corresponding literary trend, and making them accessible to others” [Cit. by 34, p. 68–69]. Also, a successful use of precedent texts is the matching of one’s own pattern against a foreign basis or canvas. Hence the following figurative conclusion: “The culture of mankind, according to researchers, can be depicted in the form of a stepped pyramid, on top of which

there is the human (terrestrial, planetary) culture, a step below being supra-national (continental, supraregional) cultures, another step below – national and subnational (ethnic) cultures, further on – numerous subcultures and, finally, at the very bottom – idiocultures (individual cultures). I. Franko as idioculture embraced all the steps of this pyramid [italics ours. – I. T.]. Given the foregoing, Ivan Franko can also be called the most talented mediator in intercultural communication, the fruits of whose activity are also used by the present generation of Ukrainians” [34, p. 69]. Transformation of the Faustian motif of the limits of knowledge in the works of I. Franko, in particular the image of land as “all-breeding mother”, is a promising trend in the study of intertextuality 27, p. 73–90; 73].

The intertext has become a sphere of scholarly research [5; 63], even by one author [59]. Question is posed on the typology of intertextuality of certain genres, first of all, sonnets in view of the functioning of individual means, e. g. allusions [61]. Close to intertextuality, too, is the notion of “interdisciplinarity”, defined by the philosopher I. Lysi as “examination of one and the same problem in various domain planes, which seeks to dock these planes and create a qualitatively new, three-dimensional view of the object under study” [40, p. 22]. Franko Studies as an interdisciplinary field does require such an approach. It is noted that the precedent text (PT) is of dual dynamic character: it preserves the features of the linguistic sign, esp. predicativeness, i.e. connection of the PT with the dynamics of linguistic thinking: expression of modally-framed reasoning information. Secondly, PTs possess a much greater genetic potential. Examples of predicative PTs: proverbs, paroemias, prayers, lyrics, oaths, etc. Clichéd sentences present the most mature PTs. [39, p. 81–83]. The phenomena of intertextuality and precedence are also considered as linguistic ways of realizing the discourse, this time scientific in nature: “By intertextuality [...] *an actualization of intertextual connections of the linguistic unit in its semantic deployment in a new context* is meant. In this case, the linguistic unit is interpreted quite broadly – from the word to the small text – acting as expression of a certain meaning (quotation, proverb, saying, aphoristic meditation, etc.) entrenched in culture” [20].

Turning to one or another writer in the author’s own literary creativity is a manifestation of intertextuality (the influence of P. Verlaine’s works in the story “Odi profanum vulgus”) [35, p. 57] or that of Bulgarian folklore (poem “Surka”) [11, p. 91]. In a letter to M. Dragomanov (15 Sept. 1891) I. Franko requests to acquaint him with the methodology of folkloric research in Bulgaria, reporting on his own poem “Surka”, written on the grounds of Bulgarian folklore: “It was here [in jail. – I. T.] that the horse-thief Hershon’s story about Surka turned up, and I took it live and elaborated in the lyrics of Bulgarian songs” [70, vol. 49, p. 297; 11, p. 91; 47; 62, p. 33–34].

Another example is the typological affinity of the poem *Bogotokudy* [The Botocudos] and *The History of a Town* by M. Saltykov-Shchedrin [62, p. 18–19]. When translating a chapter from this “History...” I. Franko entitled it “Z yakoho korenia Duren’ky” (From What Root is Foolsborough [85, p. 228]) and subtitled “Nailed down a bit to the Galician life”, owing to which “In the creative processing of I. Franko its ideological mobility has increased and the reader’s audience expanded (Cf.: “O koreni proiskhozhdeniya glupovtsev”), [On the Root of Foolsborough Residents’ Origination]. Saltykov-Shchedrin, who “laughed at human

stupidities in Russia, by laughing lays bare, scourges, and stigmatizes them in Galicia". I. Franko himself speaks about the relation of his *Botokudy* to *The History of a Town* by Shchedrin. In particular, the talk is about the genesis of the Polish gentry representatives' character-sketches – Krzeprzyciulski and Przekrzyciulski. The foot-notes to a variant of the poem note that Shchedrin gives a detailed story of Krzeprzyciulski. And the text of the complete edition of Part I serving as a basis for the first print in the collection "From the Heights and the Depths" also noted that the affairs of these two characters are more widely presented in the *Litopys Hlupova* [Chronicle of Foolsborough] by Saltykov-Shchedrin. From "The History of a Town" I. Franko also borrowed some elements of composition and style, form of the chronicle, name of the Botocudian capital (Foolsborough) etc. The unit mentioned above goes third (cf: From the Publisher. Address to the Reader). All in all, there are 15 units [21]. But all these Shchedrin's components of the literary-artistic contents and form the Ukrainian writer made his own, typically Franko's, having adapted to the conditions of Galician life, employed them creatively, skillfully. In Franko's satirical story "The Smorgon Academy" (1878), satirical fairy tale "How It Was That Concord Built a House" (1890) – works thematically echoing with *Botokudy* – the researchers see, not without a reason, the influence of Saltykov-Shchedrin. In the school of the outstanding master of "the great historical satire" (so he called "The History of a Town", considering it to be the greatest parody of the history of Russia in the 18th c.), I. Franko, as far back as a youth, polished his satirical talent and directed his satirical anger not only against the Galician Botocudos, but also against the whole Austro-Hungarian "prison of nations" [62, p. 18–19]. It is very valuable that the sources of the fairy tale of the blackthorn (the poem "Moses"), in particular the German-language one, are adduced, as well as their scientific development [62, p. 164–170]. "There is every reason to believe that I. Franko was also acquainted with the German translation of the biblical "The Parable of the Thornbush". For his library, he acquired the "Anthology of Eastern Classical Poetry – Chinese, Indian, Persian, and Hebrew Literature" in Ernst Meier's translation, where the text of the parable was placed" [62, p. 164, 165]. The text of "How the Trees Elected a King for Themselves" is in Gothic characters ("Wie die Bäume sich einen König wählen") [93, p. 166]. By the way, Aesop in his fable "Trees and Olive" made use of the plot basis of the ancient apologist on how the trees elected a king for themselves [62, p. 166]. "I. Franko was well-versed in Aesop's fables, having even used some of them creatively in his poems. Thus, for instance, the literary origins of Franko's fairy tale about the fox and the She-wolf in the well (poem "Fox Mykyta") are found in the fable of Aesop "The Fox and the Goat". And I. Franko's tale "On the Farmer and the Grass-Snake" (poem "On St. George Cathedral's Mountain") originates from the same-titled work by the Greek fabulist too. On the basis of such a creative interest of the Ukrainian writer in Aesop's fables, Yu. Mushak rightly concludes that alongside the story placed in the Old Testament's *Book of Judges* the primary foundation of Franko's "Parable of the Thornbush" was also Aesop's fable "The Trees and the Olive" [62, p. 166; 49, p. 158–159]. Beside the biblical text of the "Parable of the Thornbush" I. Franko also knew a somewhat different variant of the ancient apologist, found in a Chronicle of the Pidhirtsi Monastery. In 1886, on the occasion of the 900th anniversary of the baptism of Rus' approaching, the Lviv Stauropigian Brotherhood

organized a jubilee archaeological and bibliographic exhibition. I. Franko participated in its arrangement. As V. Shchurat noted, here he became acquainted with the chronicle of the Pidhirtsi Monastery, from which he copied down the “Parable of the Trees”, wonderfully elaborated afterwards in the poem “Moses” [62, p. 166–167]. The parable was in an ancient monument written in Cyrillic. The full name of the manuscript is also given [62, p. 167]. Moreover, “I. Franko became interested in the ancient manuscript and subsequently published in the *Kievskaya starina* [Kievan Antiquity] journal some excerpts from it. The publication was preceded by a preface where he gave a general characterization of the *Synopsis*. The manuscript was completely published by Josaphat Skruten’ – who added his preface – in the *Papers of the Order of St. Basil the Great*. The parable, put in the *Synopsis of the Plisnesk-Pidhirtsi monastery*, shows the olive tree and the vine in a positive light: they renounced the honors, did not accept the royal crown as they believed the basic calling of their lives to be in the service for God and humans” [62, p. 167]. There is no mention of the blackthorn in the “Synopsis”. In the Biblical original, it is a bad character encroaching on the rights of other trees. I. Franko, abandoning the motive of being at the service of God, borrowed from the biblical archetype only the motive of serving the people, lent it a clearly articulated civic content, greatly deepened and developed it. In I. Franko, the blackthorn is an allegorical personification of a human who is selfless in his work for the sake of the community and the people. In quite a different way does the poet interpret the very concept of “reigning”. It is synonymous with pre-eminence, domination in the Biblical original. I. Franko interprets “reigning” as a self-denying service in the name of the people” [62, p. 168]. The modest blackthorn is the indefatigable worker, ready to die on the path for the other trees to grow up and “soar to the sky”. It is with this humanistic understanding of the philosophy of its existence on Earth that the image of the people-blackthorn attracts and moves. As a complete, in terms of composition and plot, work “The Parable...” was separately published in the *Literary-Scientific Herald* [42, p. 1–3]. If we compare it with the poem’s publications of publication in 1905 and 1913, the eye is struck by the difference in the poetic strophe talking about how the trees requested the Cedar of Lebanon to become the King [62, 168 (emphasis added by A. Skots’):

Literary-Scientific Herald

Ти зійдеш з тих *скалистих вершин*,
Йди до нас царювати.

Moses’ editions (1905, 1913)

Ти зійдеш з своїх *гордих висот*,
Йди до нас царювати.

This at first sight allegedly insignificant difference helps us grasp the way the poet’s thought is proceeding. The attribute *rocky peaks* replaced by the epithet *proud heights* emphasizes still more the Cedar’s superciliousness and bombast, pride and inaccessibility as one who has ignored the other trees’ request. In a contraposition like this, the blackthorn’s self-sacrifice, who gave his consent to be the king without the slightest hesitation, appears even more brilliantly [62, p. 169]. The main pathos of the “Parable...” is not in moralizing and sermonizing. The trees’ relations have been transferred from the religious plane to the social and national ones [62, p. 169]. “Thus, into the narrow framework of the ancient parable

I. Franko puts a great deal of significance, solves problems of considerable political weight hereby enriching and updating this genre. We came across here a highly poetic example of Franko's "dense" writing, a work with "the second and the third depths" (O. Honchar's statement – A. Skots')" [62, p. 170]. One can make just a reference here to the paper by V. Korniychuk on the origin of another of I. Franko's poems – "Parable of Friendship" [29].

Intertextuality is also manifest in I. Franko's folkloristics, which we owe to his Shakespeare Studies. In particular, I. Franko pointed to the motif common to a Ukrainian folk song and "Titus Andronicus", as well as the thematic similarity between one of Western Ukrainian folklore tales and "The Taming of the Shrew". Moreover, letters from I. Franko to M. Drahomanov are replete with valuable notes on Shakespeare Studies in Ukraine [81, p. 49]. Of interest is from this point of view the paper *Starynna romans'ko-hermans'ka novela w ustakh rus'koho narodu* (The Ancient Romance-Germanic Novella in the Mouth of the Ruthenian People) [70, vol. 26, p. 266–279].

Traditionally, translation is considered to be an intermediary between cultures in Comparative Literature [17, p. 159–172], which, however, causes some reservations in contemporary researchers: I. Vladova arrives at the conclusion that only a relation to the formal aspect of the literary contact is put into the notion of translation, and, consequently, the functioning of the transformation process associated with translation, accompanying the act itself is ignored. Referring to the Bulgarian scholar B. Nichev, the researcher provides the definition of translation as a form of contact between two literatures, during which there is an exchange of artistic values and their assimilation by the recipient literature. This circumstance attributes to translation the role of the most important link in the process of reception of literary-artistic works [6, p. 297]. It is worthwhile, however, to specify: translation is not only a process, but also the result of this process, i.e. process of interaction and interpenetration, identification and confrontation of the individual elements of contact cultural systems in order to come to the realization of this contact in a relevant lingual form and cultural context. Text reception is a structure composed of two interrelated links: 1) verbal work as reflection of reality; a sign information system about material and ideal objects, as phenomenon of this culture; and 2) recipient who identifies the sense put into the received text as a result of deciphering its sign system and interpretation of the content in accordance with his values' orientation. The structure of the "reception chain" (I. Vladova) includes one more link working as intermediary between the two cultures, as well as the role of a transcoder and interpreter of content from the standpoint of another culture. The reception process is subject to the specifics of a national culture and causes their correlation, provided that the recipient culture is ready for an open dialogue, as well as the availability of a suitable basis for their mutual understanding. There must also be an appropriate context in order to establish functional communication with the recipient culture, to enter its orbit and become an integral part of it. In the process of reception, the so-called "reading" of the received text occurs, which determines the presence of a multivariate factor. The multivariateness of such a reading depends on objective social and historical preconditions and the subjective features of the recipient having his own, as well as the value orientation of the addressee, to whom the text of another culture is assigned. Conceptual systems of different cultures cross in the

text of the translation. The conceptual system testifies to the specifics of the space occupied by the bearers of this culture, their character and the psychic peculiarities having formed in this space. If there are no concepts in the recipient culture, their absence constitutes gaps in its linguocultural space. Such lacunae are compensated for by corresponding counterparts, which are then integrated into the translation text [6, p. 298–301]. As an objectively-subjective process of interaction and confrontation between two linguocultures, reception leads to the creation of such a text with an intersection of conceptual systems of two cultures oriented to the conceptual features of the recipient culture. Therefore the text is, according to the researcher, a verbal formation through which the relation “native-foreign”, “we-others”, “our world-other world” and, finally, another cultural experience is transformed. For this reason, even if the translation text has already been created, the reception process does not stop because the assimilated spiritual product of the foreign language culture transmits its creative impulses to the recipient culture, provoking the creation of new texts, and thus directs its movement and development, its evolution [6, p. 301–302]. In the theory of literary comparative studies it is acceptable to distinguish between several forms of reception, such as: borrowing, imitation, stylization, translation [6, p. 297]. The latter is given a special place among the forms of interliterary perception. The definition of reception as “synthetic form of genetic-contact relations, which consists in the perception of ideas, motifs, images, plots and works of other writers and literatures, their creative rethinking in national literature or the author’s writings” presented by M. Il’nytskyi and V. Budnyi seems to be exhaustive [28, p. 59]. Translation is viewed in the dimension of intertextuality [16] or deconstruction [37]. It looks appropriate to indicate, within the context of I. Franko’s literary artistic activity, another yet kind of a creative assimilation of foreign-language material, such as *rehash* (according to I. Franko), or the method of free transposition, i.e. introduction of ethnolinguistic components into the originally unmarked levels of the text [14, p. 12]. In the well-known afterword to the publication *Khto takyi Lys Mykyta i vidky rodom?* [What kind of individual is Fox Mykyta and where he comes from?], I. Franko wrote: “I didn’t wish to translate, but to remake the old tale about the fox, make it our people’s good, lend to it our national identity. *I, to put it so, laid on someone else’s, borrowed picture our Ruthenian colors* [italics ours. – I. T.]. Literally I did not translate a single line from anywhere [73, p. 8]. Traditionally, “Fox Mykyta” is considered to be a rehash, but the talk here is more likely of a “genre borderline” (M. Moskalenko): “In I. Franko, on the genre borderline between original and translated works there repeatedly appeared free poetic rehashes and transfusions: this was the case with the literatures of the Ancient World, the same can be said about both the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and the centuries to come. Such works include, in particular, the poem *Sviatyi Valentiy* [Saint Valentine] (1885, printed posthumously) – rehash of an old Christian legend; the verse fairy tale *Lys Mykyta* [Fox Mykyta] (1890) is a reworking of Goethe’s poem “Rainecke-Fuchs”, which, in its turn, had a complex genealogy, from Babylonian and Egyptian plots and the “animal epic” of different peoples of the world to the Old French “Le roman de Renard” and its later German transformations; “Adventures of Don Quixote” (1891) – a versified transfusion of excerpts from the famous novel by Cervantes; the poem “Der arme Heinrich” (1891) – a free rehash (according to A. Chamisso) of the poem by Hartmann von Aue, a

German poet of the 12th c.; variation to the folklore version of the old Christian apocryph "The Legend of St. Marin" (1897–1914); transfusions of two Cumans-related plots from the Kyivan Chronicle – "Or and Syrchan" and "Konchak's Glory" (both 1915). Free rehashes and transfusions by I. Franko, the direct heir to the centuries-old traditions of assimilation and transformation of "foreign" plots and motifs on the Ukrainian grounds, can be simultaneously regarded as a kind of prototype of the original works in new Ukrainian literature written on the "world", borrowed themes, such as Franko's "Moses" or poetic dramas by Lesia Ukrainka, a master of genius in the development of biblical stories and those of antiquity. However, still more energy did I. Franko give for the work on translations proper, as evidenced by the comprehensiveness of his translation plans and interests, and attention to the most diverse, in their nature, phenomena of world literature" [48, p. 186]. "The Parable of Friendship" appeared, probably, from the famous work "*El Conde Lucanor*" [Count Lucanor] by Juan Manuel [29, p. 53–54; 98, p. 12–13]. Intertextuality also rises as a translation problem [10], or is considered as a special reception form of the biblical text [45, p. 14].

"When speaking about I. Franko, we must not speak about his having attained or not attained, reached or not reached, we must speak about a great cultural phenomenon – hence it follows herewith what concerns translation" [7, p. 298] (See also p. 2–3). These words mirror the methodology of the problem "I. Franko-translator" in the broadest sense of the word, i.e. in terms of the comparative literary approach. An approach like this is in want of further development. It does not preclude translation studies, but synthesizes three at least, viz. those of TS, comparative literature, and cultural philosophy. The way translation and culture are interrelated has once been in a novel way expressed by V. Radchuk: "Translation is a movement of culture. It is the very essence of it – both spirit and body" [58, p. 162].

However, the primacy in this issue, as in a number of others, belongs to I. Franko ("History of Ukrainian Literature. Part One..."): "Here rises the first series of difficulties a present-day literary historian is to struggle. In each literary rise, esp. every new trend, he is to tell the originally national apart from the generally international: national content in the international form, and the national form in which the international content is cast. Each national literature is to a larger or lesser extent an organic creation of one's own local, original and unique with the imported, foreign, learnt from ages-long international relations. Therefore a literary historian trying hard to present a certain national literature as completely original and unique spiritual creation of that nation, or even admitting some foreign, international influences on it, left them aside as a thing unimportant or disagreeable to the ambitions of his native people, would discredit the foundations of a scientific research" [70, vol. 40, p. 10].

Conclusions: Despite repeated addresses to this problem, new facets of it lie ahead. It seems expedient to systematize the forms of I. Franko's foreign language discourse. Much has been written about I. Franko's translations, the major aspect of the problem, but other forms of his creative development of the riches of world literature (reception, inter-literary connections) do not get a systematic study, which leaves a number of white spots. The issues of reception, intertextuality and translation need more clarification in terms of their interrelationships.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. Біловус Л. І. Теорія інтертекстуальності: Становлення понять, тлумачення термінів, систематика. Тернопіль: Видавешь Стародубець, 2003. 36 с.
2. Боднар В. Т. Проблеми рецептивної естетики і поетики у творчій спадщині І. Я. Франка: автореф. дис... канд. філол. наук. Спец. 10.01.06. теорія літератури. Київ: НАН України; Ін-т літератури ім. Т. Г. Шевченка, 1999. 18 с.
3. Бондар Л. Французька помана // Під знаком Хреста : франкознавчі студії: зб. статей. Серія "Франкознавчі студії". Львів: ВЦ ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2008. Вип. 4. С. 116–125.
4. Брунэль П. і інші. Што такое параўнальнае літаратуразнаўства? / пер. с фр. А. Дынька, С. Барысевіча. под ред. В. Булгакава. Мінск: Эўрофорум. Бел. Фонд Сораса, 1996. 240 с. (Адкрытае грамадства).
5. Віват Г. Лірика дисидентів в інтертекстуальному полі множинності: монографія. – Одеса: ВМВ, 2010. 368 с.
6. Владова И. Перевод и рецепция // Научни трудове / Пловдивски ун-т "Паисий Хилендарски" [България]. – Пловдив : Паисий Хилендарски, 2003. Т. 41. Кн. 1: Филология (Международен славистичен симпозиум, Пловдив, 1-4 ноемвра 2003 г.). С. 297–302.
7. Гольберг М. [Обговорення] // Іван Франко і світова культура: матер. міжнар. симпозиуму ЮНЕСКО (Львів, 11–15 вересня 1986): у 3 кн. Київ: Наукова думка, 1989. Кн. 2. С. 298–300.
8. Гольберг М. Я. Оповідання Івана Франка "Борис Граб". До проблеми: Іван Франко про читача і читання // Українське літературознавство. Львів: ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2010. Вип. 72. С. 43–51.
9. Горак Р. Лодин... // Шляхами Івана Франка на Україні: Путівник / упоряд. М. О. Мороз; наук. ред. Ю. Г. Гошко. Львів: Каменяр, 1982. С. 22–31.
10. Грек Л. В. Інтертекстуальність як проблема перекладу (на матеріалі англійських перекладів української постмодерністської прози): автореф. дис... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.16. Київ: КНУ ім. Тараса Шевченка, 2006. 19 с.
11. Гьораш Н. Украинската литературоведска българистика от XIX и средата на XX век: Личности и школи. Велико Търново: Св.св. Кирил и Методий, 2007. 167 с.
12. Грицик Л. Українська компаративістика: концептуальні проєкції. Донецьк: Юго-Восток, 2010. 298 с.
13. Гузар З. Поема Івана Франка "Ціцерон і Філіск": Антична історіографія – поетична ідея // Українське літературознавство. Львів: ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2011. Вип. 74. С. 107–114.
14. Дзера О. В. Індивідуально-авторське трактування біблійних мотивів як перекладознавча проблема (на матеріалі українських перекладів творів Дж. Г. Байрона): автореф. дис. ... канд.філол.наук. Спец. 10.02.16 – перекладознавство. Київ: КНУ імені Тараса Шевченка, 1999. 21 с.
15. Довбуш О. Переклад як засіб міжкультурної комунікації // Гуманітарний вісник. Серія: Іноземна філологія: Всеукр. зб. наук. праць. Черкаси: ЧДТУ, 2005. С. 366–369.
16. Драпак Г. Б. Інтертекстуальні виміри в перекладах І. Шанковського поезії В. Симоненка. URL: [book.net/index. php?p= achapter&bid =18204&chapter=1]. – 2009.
17. Дюришин Д. Теорія сравнительного изучения литературы. Москва: Прогресс, 1979. 320 с.
18. Зимомря М. І. Переклад як ідейно-художня структура у творчій концепції Івана Франка // Українське літературознавство. Львів: Світ, 1990. Вип. 54. Іван Франко. Статті і матеріали. С. 27–32.

19. *Зимомря М., Білоус О.* Освоение литературного опыта. Преемственность традиции восприятия творчества Тараса Шевченко. Дрогобыч: КОЛО, 2003. 280 с.
20. *Иноземцева Н. В.* Прецедентность и интертекстуальность как маркеры англоязычного научно-методического дискурса (на материале англоязычных статей по методической проблематике). URL: 21 січ. 2012 р.
21. *Салтыков-Щедрин М. Е.* История одного города. URL: [<http://ilibrary.ru/text/1248/index.html>]. – Назва з екрана. Доступ: 06.10.2017.
22. *Ібсен Г.* До заплаканих потомків // Франко І. Зібрання творів: у 50 т. Київ: Наукова думка, 1978. Т. 12. Поетичні переклади та переспіви. С. 684.
23. *Ібсен Г.* До мого друга, революційного співбесідника // Франко І. Зібрання творів: у 50 т. Київ: Наукова думка, 1978. Т. 12. Поетичні переклади та переспіви. С. 685.
24. *Ібсен Г.* Метелик // Франко І. Зібрання творів: у 50 т. Київ: Наукова думка, 1978. Т. 12. Поетичні переклади та переспіви. С. 684–685.
25. *Іванов Л. Д.* Іван Франко і світова література // Научные записки Днепропетровского гос. ун-та.: сб. работ филолог. ф-та Днепропетровского гос. ун-та. Днепропетровск: Днепропетров. гос. ун-т, 1940. Том XXIV. Вып. 2. С. 83–120.
26. Іван Франко. “Зів’яле листя”: тексти, матеріали, дослідження / упоряд. П. Салевича. Львів, 2007. 425 с. (Серія “Українська філологія: школи, постаті, проблеми”; Вип. 7).
27. *Ільницький М. Й.-В. Гете й І. Франко: антиномія природи і духу // Франкознавчі студії. / С. Пшеничний (голов. ред., Л.Винар) та ін. Дрогобыч: Коло, 2015. Вип. 6. С. 73–90.*
28. *Ільницький М., Будний В.* Порівняльне літературознавство: в 2 ч. Ч. I. Лекційний курс: навч. посібник. Львів: ВЦ ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2007. 280 с.
29. *Корнійчук В.* До джерел “Притчі про приязнь” Івана Франка // Українське літературознавство. Львів: ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2014. Вип. 78. С. 49–59.
30. *Корнійчук В.* Іван Франко та Ян Каспрович: поетичний дискурс // Українсько-польські мовні контексти. Київські полоністичні студії. Київ, 2003. Т. IV. С. 221–238.
31. *Корнійчук В.* “Мов органи в величному храмі...”: Контексти й інтертексти Івана Франка (Порівняльні студії). Львів: ВЦ ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2007. 304 с.
32. *Косило Н.* Порівняльний аналіз натуралістичних тенденцій в англійській та українській літературах кін. XIX – поч. XX ст. (на матеріалі творчості Джорджа Мура та Івана Франка) // Сучасні проблеми мовознавства та літературознавства. Ужгород, 2005. Вип. 9: Українська література в загальноєвропейському контексті. С. 165–171.
33. *Космеда Т. А.* Комунікативна компетенція І. Франка: конфліктні ситуації та гумор // Лінгвістичні дослідження: зб. наук. праць. Харків, 2006. Вип. 20. С. 126–133.
34. *Космеда Т. А.* Текст І. Франка у фокусі інтертекстуальності // Лінгвістичні дослідження: зб. наук. праць Харків. нац. пед. університету ім. Г. С. Сковороди. Харків: ХНПУ, 2009. Вип. 27. С. 62–70.
35. *Кравець Я. І.* “Quae scripsi, scripsi”: романські літератури у рецепції Івана Франка. Львів: ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2014. 230 с.
36. *Лановик М. Б.* Категорія “національної пам’яті” як форманта художнього перекладу // Питання літературознавства. Вип. 11 (68). Чернівці: Рута, 2004. С. 101–106.
37. *Лановик М. Б.* Переклад як деконструкція тексту. Проблеми літературного перекладознавства у час кризової доби // Питання літературознавства. Чернівці: Рута, 2005. Вип. 12 (69). С. 112–124.
38. *Лесин В. М., Пулинець О. С.* Словник літературознавчих термінів. Вид. третє, перероб. і доп. Київ: Рад. школа, 1971. 488 с.
39. *Лещак С., Лещак О.* Прецедентный текст: от цитаты к модели (эволюция клишированных предложений) // Эволюция как методологична та світоглядна пробле-

- ма в гуманітарних науках: зб. наук. праць. Кам'янець-Подільський: Кам'янець-Подільський нац. ун-т імені Івана Огієнка, 2010. С. 81–90.
40. *Лисий І.* Гуманітарна міждисциплінарність: засади і практика // Людина в часі: (філософські аспекти української літератури ХХ–ХХІ ст.) / упоряд. В. Моренець, М. Ткачук. Київ: ПУЛЬСАРИ, 2010. С. 10–31.
 41. Листування Івана Франка з Ольгою Рошкевич. Подав Михайло Возняк // Іван Франко. Статті і матеріали. Львів: Вид-во Львів. ун-ту, 1956. Зб. 5. С. 5–131.
 42. Літературно-науковий вісник. Львів, 1905. Річник VIII. Т. XXXI. Кн. 7. С. 1–3.
 43. Літературно-науковий вісник. Львів, 1906. Річник IX. Т. XXXIV. С. 538.
 44. *Лук'янович Д.* Листи Івана Франка до Уляни Кравченко // Іван Франко. Статті і матеріали. Львів: Вид-во Львівського університету, 1956. Зб. 5. С. 132–178.
 45. *Мельник Я.* Іван Франко й *biblia apocrypha*. Львів: Вид-во Українського Католицького Університету, 2006. 512 с.
 46. Міжнародні горизонти і компаративістичний дискурс сучасних літературознавчих студій: монографія / за ред. Р. Гром'яка. Тернопіль: Ред.-видав. відділ ТНПУ, 2005. 320 с.
 47. *Мінчин Б. М.* Франко і Салтиков-Щедрін // Творчість Івана Франка: зб. статей / відп. ред. Є. П. Кирилюк. Київ: Вид-во АН УРСР, 1956. С. 214–276.
 48. *Москаленко М.* Нариси з історії українського перекладу // Всесвіт. Київ, 2006. № 5–6. С. 174–194.
 49. *Мушак Ю.* Джерела Франкової “Притчі про терен” // Життя і знання. 1939. № 5. С. 158–159.
 50. *Наливайко Д.* Компаративістика й історія літератури. Харків: Акта, 2007. 426 с.
 51. *Науменко А. М.* Від рецепції через інтерпретацію до аналізу // Нова філологія. 2000. № 1. С. 305–319.
 52. *Новосядла Е. И.* Иван Франко и англоязычные литературы (К истории культурных связей Украины и англоязычных стран конца XIX – начала XX столетий): диссертация... канд. филол. наук. Спец. 10.01.03 – Литература народов СССР / Украинская литература. Львов: ЛГУ им. Івана Франко, 1979. 193 с.
 53. *Панасенко Т. М.* Іван Франко / Худож.-оформлювач Є. В. Вдовиченко. Харків: Фоліо, 2009. 124 с. (Знамениті українці).
 54. *Перетяцько М.* Інтертекстуальність як темпоральна форма вираження авторської свідомості // Донецький вісник Наукового товариства імені Шевченка. Донецьк: Український культурологічний центр, Східний видавничий дім, 2009. Т. 27. С. 17–31.
 55. *Погребенник Ф.* Іван Франко в українсько-російських літературних взаєминах: Дослідження. Київ: Дніпро, 1986. 301 с.
 56. *Погребенник Ф. П.* З невичерпної Франкової криниці // Всесвіт. 1986. № 8. С. 167–170.
 57. *Просалова В. А.* Інтертекстуальні зв'язки і тропи // Донецький вісник Наукового товариства імені Шевченка. Донецьк: Український культурологічний центр, Східний видавничий дім, 2009. Т. 27. С. 7–17.
 58. *Радчук В.* Рудий Панько М. Гоголя в дівчачому люстерку Лесі Українки: конгеніальність тлумачки і звітність репортерів // Леся Українка і сучасність: зб. наук. праць. Луцьк: РВВ “Вежа” Волинського національного ун-ту імені Лесі Українки, 2008. Т. 4. Кн. 2. С. 161–189.
 59. *Рихло П. В.* Поетика діалогу. Творчість Пауля Целана як інтертекст: монографія. Чернівці: Рута, 2005. 584 с.
 60. *Саєнко В.* Іван Франко і скандинавські літератури. URL: <http://dspace.onu.edu.ua:8080/bitstream/123456789/9073/1/43-53.pdf> [Слово і час. 2016. № 8. С. 47–53].

61. *Семешко Н. М.* Типологія інтертекстуальності сонетів Е. Спенсера: форми і функції алюзії // *Наук. записки Харків. ун-ту ім. Г. С. Сковороди. Серія літературознавство.* Харків : ППВ “Нове слово”, 2010. Вип. 4 (64). Част. перша. С. 9–18.
62. *Скоць А.* Поеми Івана Франка: монографія. Львів: ВЦ ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2002. 253 с.
63. *Ступінський В.* Інтертекст як сфера наукового дослідження // *Наук. записки Тернопіль. Педун-ту ім. В. Гнатюка. Серія: Літературознавство.* Тернопіль: ТНПУ, 2011. Вип. 31. С. 476–479.
64. *Теплий І.* Форми засвоєння іншомовного тексту у літературно-науковій діяльності Івана Франка // *Парадигма: зб. наук. праць на пошану М. Ільницького.* Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, 2010. Вип. 5. С. 107–128.
65. *Тетеріна О.* Переклад у концепції національної літератури Івана Франка. URL: www.slovoichas.in.ua/index.php. – 2010.
66. *Тетеріна О.* Художній переклад як проблема українського порівняльного літературознавства XIX – початку XX століття // *Національні варіанти літературної компаративістики.* Київ: Стилос, 2009. С. 374–386. URL: www.geelc.net/.../national_versions_of_the_comparative_literature.
67. *Ткачук О.* Іван Франко і Луцій Анней Сенека: стоїцизм у художній філософії Франка // *Іван Франко: дух, наука, думка, воля: Матер. Міжнар. наук. конгресу, присвяченого 150-річчю від дня народження Івана Франка (Львів, 27 вересня – 1 жовтня 2006 року).* Львів: ВЦ ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2008. Т. 1. С. 246–254.
68. *Трофимук М.* Неолатиністична проблематика у працях Івана Франка // *Іван Франко: дух, наука, думка, воля: Матер. Міжнар. наук. конгресу, присвяченого 150-річчю від дня народження Івана Франка (Львів, 27 вересня – 1 жовтня 2006 року).* Львів: ВЦ ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2008. Т. 1. С. 400–409.
69. *Филипович П.* Шляхи Франкової поезії // *Іван Франко. “Зів’яле листя”: тексти, матеріали, дослідження.* Львів, 2007. С. 42–46. (Серія “Українська філологія”: школи, постаті, проблеми”, вип. 7).
70. *Франко І.* Зібрання творів: у 50 т. Київ, 1976–1986.
71. *Франко І.* Зів’яле листя: Лірична драма / перекл. англ. І. Теплий. Вид. третє, доп. Львів: СПОЛОМ, 2009. 140 с. (До 150-річчя від дня народження Івана Франка).
72. *Франко І.* Зів’яле листя: Лірична драма / перекл. англ. І. Теплий. Вид. четверте, переробл. і доп. Львів: СПОЛОМ, 2011. – 140 с. (До 155-річчя від дня народження Івана Франка).
73. *Франко І.* З післямови до видання 1896 року “Хто такий “Лис Микита” і відки родом?” // *Франко І. Я. Казки: Лис Микита. Коли ще звірі говорили / худож. С. К. Артюшенко.* Київ: Веселка, 2008. С. 6–8.
74. *Франко І.* Зібрання творів: в 50 т. Т. 1–10: URL: <http://www.twirpx.com/file/566294/>.
75. *Франко І.* Україна мовить // *Франко І. Вибране / упорядкув. текстів, передм. К. Г. Борисенко.* Київ: Школа, 2005. С. 81.
76. *Франко І.* Школа поета (За Ібсенем) // *Із днів журби. Поезії Івана Франка.* Львів. Накладом автора, 1900. С. 61–69.
77. *Франко І.* Школа поета (За Ібсенем) // *Франко І. Зібрання творів: у 50 т. Київ: Наукова думка, 1976. Т. 3. С. 48–49.*
78. *Франко Іван Якович.* URL: https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Франко_Іван_Якович. [Назва з екрана] – 7 жовтня 2013 р.
79. *Яр Славутич.* Соборницькі ідеї Івана Франка // *Іван Франко: зб. філолог. секції для відзначення 110-річчя народин і 50-річчя смерті Івана Франка.* Нью-Йорк: Накладом НТШ в ЗДА, 1967. Т. 32 (Зап. НТШ. Т. CLXXXII). С. 171–177.
80. *Яр Славутич.* Англійський переклад поеми Іван Вишенський // *Яр Славутич. Дослідження та статті.* Едмонтон: Славута, 2006. С. 471–472.

81. *Bida C.* A Quest for the Dramatic. Ukrainian Authors Turn to Shakespeare / Constantine Bida // *Symbolae in Honorem Georgii Y. Shevelov* / 36. на пошану проф. Д-ра Юрія Шевельова. Наук. зб. УВУ. Мюнхен, 1971. Т. 7. С. 45–53.
82. Colloque International “Perspective Comparatiste Orient–Occident en théorie littéraire” / International Colloquium “The Orient – West Comparative Perspective in Literary Theory”. Institute of the Theory of Literature, Theatre and Film, Dpt. of Literature, University of Łódź, Łódź, 16-17. X. 1990 / Institut de la Théorie de la Littérature, du Théâtre et du Film, Département de la Théorie de la Littérature, Université de Łódź. Les actes furent redigés par Sławomir Cieślowski et Teresa Cieślowska. Łódź: BiblioTeka, 1993. 220 p.
83. *Červeňak A.* Život a dielo. Tridsať statí o slovenskej literature. 1. vyd, slovensky. Nitra, Bratislava: Filozofická fakulta UKF, Spolok slovenských spisovateľov, 2007 127 s.
84. *Dumoulié C.* Litterature comparée, philosophie et psychanalyse. URL: www.revue-silene.com/.../30/extrait_68.pdf / – 14 Sept. 2012.
85. *Dzyuba I.* Internationalism or Russification? A Study in the Soviet Nationalities Problem. Second Edition. Ed. by M. Davies. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970. 263 p.
86. Exegi monumentum. URL: <https://books.google.com.ua>.
87. *Henrik Ibsens.* Sämtliche Werke in deutscher Sprache. Erster Band. Gedichte. Deutsch von Christian Morgenstern et al. Berlin: S. Fischer Verlag, 1903. 567 S.
88. *Ibsen Henrik.* Sämtliche Werke. Volksausgabe in fünf Bänden. Erster Band. Herausgegeben von Julius Elias und Paul Schlenther. Einzige autorisierte deutsche Ausgabe. Berlin: S. Fischer Verlag, 1913. 438 S.
89. *Jakóbiec M.* Iwan Franko (1856–1916) // Franko I. Utwory wybrane. Tłumaczyli Zofia i Stanisław Głowiakowie. Posłowiem opatrzył Prof. Marian Jakóbiec. Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1955. T. II. S. 569–601.
90. *Kaźmierczak M.* Przekład w kręgu intertekstualności. Na materiale tłumaczeń poezji Bolesława Leśmiana. Warszawa: Instytut Lingwistyki Stosowanej Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2012. 273 s.
91. *Korniychuk V.* Iván Frankó, orgullo y gloria de Ucrania // Iván Frankó. La pluma ucraniana de los clásicos hispanos. (Іван Франко. Українське перо іспанських класиків). Упорядники: А. Якубів у взаємодії з Сантіаго Гарсією-Контей та Луїс-Марією Санчо-Перес. Валенсія, 2015. С. 21–34.
92. *Kravets Ya.* Iván Frankó y el mundo hispano // Iván Frankó. La pluma ucraniana de los clásicos hispanos (Іван Франко. Українське перо іспанських класиків) / упорядники: А. Якубів у взаємодії з Сантіаго Гарсією-Контей та Луїс-Марією Санчо-Перес. Валенсія, 2015. С. 43–58.
93. *Morgenländische Anthologie: Klassische Dichtungen aus der sinesischen, indischen, persischen und hebräischen Literatur.* Uebersetzt von Ernst Meier. Leipzig: Verlag des Bibliographischen Instituts, 1880. 271 S. URL: https://archive.org/details/bub_gb-6Nov.2017.
94. *Richepin J.* L'Apologie de diable. URL: <http://paroles2chansons.lemonde.fr/auteur-jean-richepin/poeme-l-apologie-du-diable.html>
95. *Richepin J.* Les Blasphèmes. Nouvelle édition. Paris: Bibliothèque Charpentier, 1922. 343 p.
96. *Reis J. E.* Comparative Literature: a discipline under construction. URL: repositorio.utad.pt/.../Comparative%20Liter.../ – 14 Spt. 2012.
97. The Collected Poems of Henrik Ibsen. Translated by John Northam, 287 p. P. 202. URL: http://ibsen.nb.no/asset/34498/1/34498_1.pdf
98. *Yakubov A.* Prólogo // Iván Frankó. La pluma ucraniana de los clásicos hispanos” (Іван Франко. Українське перо іспанських класиків) / упорядники: А. Якубів у взаємодії з Сантіаго Гарсією-Контей та Луїс-Марією Санчо-Перес. Валенсія, 2015. С. 11–15.

99. Zyla W. T. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe in der ukrainischen Literatur. München, 1989. 96 S. (Ukrainische Freie Universität. Reihe: Monographien, Band 49).

REFERENCES

1. Bilovus, L. I. (2003). *Teoriia intertekstualnosti: Stanovlennia poniat, tлумachennia terminiv, systematyka*. Ternopil: Vydavets Starodubets.
2. Bodnar, V. T. (1999). *Problemy retseptivnoi estetyky i poetyky u tvorchii spadshchyni I. Ya. Franka: avtoref. dys...*kand. filol. nauk. Spets. 10.01.06. teoriia literatury. Kyiv: NAN Ukrainy; In-t literatury im. T. H. Shevchenka.
3. Bondar, L. (2008). Frantsuzka pomana. In: *Pid znakom Khresta: frankoznavchi studii: zb. statei. Seriiia "Frankoznavchi studii"*. Lviv: VTs LNU imeni Ivana Franka, vyp. 4, 116–125.
4. Brunel, P. i insh. (1996). *Shto takoe paraŭnalnae litaraturaznaŭstva? / per. s fr. A. Dynka, S. Barysevicha. pod red. V. Bulhakava*. Minsk: Эўроforum. Bel. Fond Sorasa. (Adkrytae hramadstva).
5. Vivat, H. (2010). *Liryka dysydentiv v intertekstualnomu poli mnozhynnosti: monohrafiia*. Odesa: VMV.
6. Vladova, Y. (2003). Perevod y retsepsyia. In: *Nauchny trudove / Plovdyvsky un-t "Paysyi Khylendarsky" [Бълһарыа]*. Plovdyv: Paysyi Khylendarsky, t. 41, kn. 1: Fylolohyia (Mezhdunaroden slavystychen sympozyum, Plovdyv, 1–4 noemvra 2003 h.), 297–302.
7. Holberh, M. (1989). [Obhovorennia]. In: *Ivan Franko i svitova kultura: mater. mizhnar. sympoziumu YuNESKO* (Lviv, 11–15 veresnia 1986): u 3 kn. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, kn. 2, 298–300.
8. Holberh, M. Ya. (2010). Opovidannia Ivana Franka "Borys Hrab". Do problemy: Ivan Franko pro chytacha i chytannia. *Ukrainske literaturoznavstvo*. Lviv: LNU imeni Ivana Franka, vyp. 72, 43–51.
9. Horak, R. (1982). Lolyn... In: *Shliakhamy Ivana Franka na Ukraini: Putivnyk / uporiad. M. O. Moroz; nauk. red. Yu. H. Hoshko*. Lviv: Kameniar, 22–31.
10. Hrek, L. V. (2006). *Intertekstualnist yak problema perekladu (na materialii anhlomovnykh perekladiv ukrainskoi postmodernistskoi prozy): avtoref. dys... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.16*. Kyiv: KNU im. Tarasa Shevchenka.
11. Hryhorash, N. (2007). Ukraynskata lyteraturovedska bĭlharystyka ot XIX y sredata na XX vek: Lychnosty y shkoly. Velyko Tĭrnovo: Sv.sv. Kyryl y Metodyi.
12. Hrytsyk, L. (2010). *Ukrainska komparatyvistyka: kontseptualni proektsii*. Donetsk: Yuhovostok.
13. Huzar, Z. (2011). Poema Ivana Franka "Tsitseron i Filisk": Antychna istoriohrafia – poetychna ideia. *Ukrainske literaturoznavstvo*. Lviv: LNU imeni Ivana Franka, vyp. 74, 107–114.
14. Dzera, O. V. (1999). *Indyvidualno-avtorske traktuvannia bibliinykh motyviv yak perekladoznavcha problema (na materialii ukrainskykh perekladiv tvoriv Dzh. H. Bairona): avtoref. dys. ... kand.filol.nauk. Spets. 10.02.16 – perekladoznavstvo*. Kyiv: KNU imeni Tarasa Shevchenka.
15. Dovbush, O. (2005). Pereklad yak zasib mizhkulturnoi komunikatsii. *Humanitarnyi visnyk. Seriiia: Inozemna filolohiia: Vseukr. zb. nauk. prats. Cherkasy: ChDTU, 366–369*.
16. Drapak, H. B. *Intertekstualni vymiry v perekladakh I. Shankovskoho poezii V. Symonenka*. Retrieved from [bo0k.net/index. php?p= achapter&bid =18204&chapter=1]. – 2009.
17. Diuryshyn, D. (1979). *Teoryia sravnytelnoho yzuchenia lyteratury*. Moskva: Prohress.
18. Zymomia, M. I. (1990). Pereklad yak ideino-khudozhnia struktura u tvorchii kontseptsii

- Ivana Franka. *Ukrainske literaturoznavstvo*. Lviv: Svit, vyp. 54. Ivan Franko. Statti i materialy, 27–32.
19. Zymomria, M., Bylous, O. (2003). *Osvoenye lyteraturnoho opyta. Preemstvennost tradytsyy vospriyatiya tvorchestva Tarasa Shevchenko*. Drohobych: KOLO.
 20. Ynozemtseva, N. V. *Prezydentnost y yntertekstualnost kak markery anghloiazыchnoho nauchno-metodycheskoho dyskursu (na materyale anghloiazыchnykh statei po metodycheskoi problematyke)*. Retrieved from [www.ssc.smr.ru / media / journals / izvestia / 2010 / 2010_3_167_169.pdf](http://www.ssc.smr.ru/media/journals/izvestia/2010/2010_3_167_169.pdf). – 21 sich. 2012 r.
 21. Saltykov-Shchedryn, M. E. *Ystoryia odnogo horoda*. Retrieved from [<http://library.ru/text/1248/index.html>]. – Nazva z ekrana. Dostup: 06.10.2017.
 22. Ibsen, H. (1978). Do zaplakanykh potomkiv. In: Franko I. *Zibrannia tvoriv: u 50 t*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, t. 12. Poetychni pereklady ta perespivy, 684.
 23. Ibsen, H. (1978). Do moho druha, revoliutsiinoho spivbesidnyka. In: Franko I. *Zibrannia tvoriv: u 50 t*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, t. 12. Poetychni pereklady ta perespivy, 685.
 24. Ibsen, H. (1978). Metelyk. In: Franko I. *Zibrannia tvoriv: u 50 t*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, t. 12. Poetychni pereklady ta perespivy, 684–685.
 25. Ivanov, L. D. (1940). Ivan Franko i svitova literatura. In: *Nauchnye zapysky Dnepropetrovskoho hos. un-ta.: sb. rabot fyoloh. f-ta Dnepropetrovskoho hos. un-ta*. Dnepropetrovsk: Dnepropetrov. hos. un-t, t. XXIV, vyp. 2, 83–120.
 26. *Ivan Franko. "Ziviale lystia": teksty, materialy, doslidzhennia*. (2007). / uporiad. P. Salevycha. Lviv. (Seriia "Ukrainska filolohiia: shkoly, postati, problemy"; vyp. 7).
 27. Ilnytskyi, M. (2015). Y.-V. Gete y I. Franko: antynomiia pryrody i dukhu. In: *Frankoznavchi studii / Ye. Pshenychnyi (holov. red., L. Vynar) ta in. Drohobych: Kolo, vyp. 6, 73–90*.
 28. Ilnytskyi, M., Budnyi, V. (2007). *Porivnialne literaturoznavstvo: v 2 ch. Ch. I. Lektsiinyi kurs: navch. posibnyk*. Lviv: VTs LNU imeni Ivana Franka.
 29. Korniiichuk, V. (2014). Do dzherel "Prytchi pro pryiazn" Ivana Franka. *Ukrainske literaturoznavstvo*. Lviv: LNU imeni Ivana Franka, vyp. 78, 49–59.
 30. Korniiichuk, V. (2003). Ivan Franko ta Yan Kasprovych: poetychnyi dyskurs. In: *Ukrainsko-polski movni konteksty. Kyivski polonistychni studii*. Kyiv, t. IV, 221–238.
 31. Korniiichuk, V. (2007). *"Mov orhany v velychnomu khrami...": Konteksty y interteksty Ivana Franka (Porivnialni studii)*. Lviv: VTs LNU imeni Ivana Franka.
 32. Kosylo, N. (2005). Porivnialnyi analiz naturalistychnykh tendentsii v anghliiskii ta ukrainskii literaturakh kin. XIX–poch. XX st. (na materialy tvorchosti Dzhordzha Mura ta Ivana Franka). In: *Suchasni problemy movoznavstva ta literaturoznavstva*. Uzhhorod, vyp. 9: Ukrainska literatura v zahalnoievropeiskomu konteksti, 165–171.
 33. Kosmeda, T. A. (2006). Komunikatyvna kompetentsiia I. Franka: konfliktni sytuatsii ta humor. In: *Linhvistychni doslidzhennia: zb. nauk. prats*. Kharkiv, vyp. 20, 126–133.
 34. Kosmeda, T. A. (2009). Tekst I. Franka u fokusi intertekstualnosti. In: *Linhvistychni doslidzhennia: zb. nauk. prats*. Kharkiv. nats. ped. universytetu im. H. S. Skovorody. Kharkiv: KhNPU, vyp. 27, 62–70.
 35. Kravets, Ya. I. (2014). *"Quae scripsi, scripsi": romanski literatury u retseptsii Ivana Franka*. Lviv: LNU imeni Ivana Franka.
 36. Lanovyk, M. B. (2004). Katehoriia "natsionalnoi pamiaty" yak formanta khudozhnogo perekladu. *Pytannia literaturoznavstva*. Chernivtsi: Ruta, vyp. 11 (68), 101–106.
 37. Lanovyk, M. B. (2005). Pereklad yak dekonstruktsiia tekstu. Problemy literaturnoho perekladoznavstva u chas kryzovoi doby. *Pytannia literaturoznavstva*. Chernivtsi: Ruta, vyp. 12 (69), 112–124.
 38. Lesyn, V. M., Pulynets, O. S. (1971). *Slovnyk literaturoznavchykh terminiv*. Vyd. tretie, pererob. i dop. Kyiv: Rad. shkola.

39. Leshchak, S., Leshchak, O. (2010). Prezentnyi tekst: ot tsytaty k modeli (evoliutsiia klyshyrovannykh predlozhenyi). In: *Evoliutsiia yak metodolohichna ta svitohliadna problema v humanitarnykh naukakh*: zb. nauk. prats. Kamianets-Podilskyi: Kamianets-Podilskyi nats. un-t imeni Ivana Ohiiienka, 81–90.
40. Lysyi, I. (2010). Humanitarna mizhdystyplinarnist: zasady i praktyka. In: *Liudyna v chasi*: (filosofski aspekty ukrainskoi literatury KhKh–KhKhI st.) / uporiad. V. Morenets, M. Tkachuk. Kyiv: PULSARY, 10–31.
41. Lystuvannia Ivana Franka z Olhoiu Roshkevych. Podav Mykhailo Vozniak. (1956). *Ivan Franko. Statti i materialy*. Lviv: Vyd-vo Lviv. un-tu, zb. 5, 5–131.
42. *Literaturno-naukovy vistnyk*. (1905). Lviv, *richnyk VIII*, t. XXXII, kn. 7, 1–3.
43. *Literaturno-naukovy vistnyk*. (1906). Lviv, *richnyk IX*, t. XXXIV, 538.
44. Lukianovych, D. (1956). Lysty Ivana Franka do Uliany Kravchenko. In: *Ivan Franko. Statti i materialy*. Lviv: Vyd-vo Lvivskoho universytetu, zb. 5, 132–178.
45. Melnyk, Ya. (2006). *Ivan Franko y biblia apocrypha*. Lviv: Vyd-vo Ukrainskoho Katolytskoho Universytetu.
46. *Mizhnatsionalni horyzonty i komparatyvistychni dyskurs suchasnykh literaturoznachykh studii*: monohrafiia. (2005) / za red. R. Hromiaka. Ternopil: Red.-vydav. viddil TNPU.
47. Minchyn, B. M. (1956). Franko i Saltykov-Shchedrin. In: *Tvorchist Ivana Franka*: zb. statei / vidp. red. Ye. P. Kyryliuk. Kyiv: Vyd-vo AN URSR, 214–276.
48. Moskalenko, M. (2006). Narysy z istorii ukrainskoho perekladu. *Vsesvit*. Kyiv, № 5–6, 174–194.
49. Mushak, Yu. (1939). Dzherela Frankovoi “Prytchi pro teren”. *Zhyttia i znannia*, № 5, 158–159.
50. Nalyvaiko, D. (2007). *Komparatyvistyka y istoriia literatury*. Kharkiv: Akta.
51. Naumenko, A. M. (2000). Vid retseptii cherez interpretatsiiu do analizu. *Nova filolohiia*, № 1, 305–319.
52. Novosiadla, E. Y. (1979). *Ivan Franko y anghloiazыchnыe lyteraturы (K ystoryy kulturnykh svyazei Ukrainy y anghloiazыchnykh stran kontsa XIX – nachala XX stoletyi)*: dySSERTatsyiia...kand. fylol. nauk. Spets. 10.01.03 – Lyteratura narodov SSSR / Ukrainskaia literatura. Lvov: LHU ym. Yvana Franko.
53. Panasenko, T. M. (2009). *Ivan Franko / Khudozh.-oformliuvach Ye. V. Vdovychenko*. Kharkiv: Folio. (Znameniti ukraintsi).
54. Peretiatko, M. (2009). Intertekstualnist yak temporalna forma vyrazhennia avtorskoi svidomosti. *Donetskyi visnyk Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*. Donetsk: Ukrainnyi kulturolohichniy tsentr, Skhidnyi vydavnychiy dim, t. 27, 17–31.
55. Pohrebennyk, F. (1986). *Ivan Franko v ukrainsko-rosiiskykh literaturnykh vzaiemynakh: Doslidzhennia*. Kyiv: Dnipro.
56. Pohrebennyk, F. P. (1986). Z nevycherpnoi Frankovoi krynytsi. *Vsesvit*. № 8, 167–170.
57. Prosalova, V. A. (2009). Intertekstualni zviazky i tropy. *Donetskyi visnyk Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*. Donetsk: Ukrainnyi kulturolohichniy tsentr, Skhidnyi vydavnychiy dim, t. 27, 7–17.
58. Radchuk, V. (2008). Rudyi Panko M. Hoholia v divchachomu liusterku Lesi Ukrainky: konhenialnist tlumachky i zvitnist reporteriv. In: *Lesia Ukrainka i suchasnist*: zb. nauk. prats. Lutsk: RVV “Vezha” Volynskoho natsionalnoho un-tu imeni Lesi Ukrainky, t. 4, kn. 2, 161–189.
59. Rykhlo, P. V. (2005). *Poetyka dialohu. Tvorchist Paulia Tselana yak intertekst*: monohrafiia. Chernivtsi: Ruta.
60. Saienko, V. *Ivan Franko i skandinavski literatury*. Retrieved from <http://dspace.onu.edu.ua:8080/bitstream/123456789/9073/1/43-53.pdf> [Slovo i chas. 2016. № 8. S. 47–53].

61. Semeshko, N. M. (2010). Typolohiia intertekstualnosti sonetiv E. Spensera: formy i funktsii aliuzii. In: *Nauk. zapysky Kharkiv. un-tu im. H. S. Skovorody. Seriiia literaturoznavstvo*. Kharkiv: PPV "Nove slovo", vyp. 4 (64), chast. Persha, 9–18.
62. Skots, A. (2002). *Poemy Ivana Franka: monohrafiia*. Lviv: VTs LNU imeni Ivana Franka.
63. Stupynskiy, V. (2011). Intertekst yak sfera naukovooho doslidzhennia. In: *Nauk. zapysky Ternopil. Pedun-tu im. V. Hnatiuka. Seriiia: Literaturoznavstvo*. Ternopil: TNPU, vyp. 31, 476–479.
64. Teplyi, I. (2010). Formy zasvoiennia inshomovnoho tekstu u literaturno-naukovii diialnosti Ivana Franka. In: *Paradyhma: zb. nauk. prats na poshanu M. Hlynskoho*. Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha NAN Ukrainy, vyp. 5, 107–128.
65. Teterina, O. *Perekklad u kontseptsii natsionalnoi literatury Ivana Franka*. Retrieved from www.slovoichas.in.ua/index.php. – 2010.
66. Teterina, O. Khudozhnii pereklad yak problema ukrainskoho porivnialnoho literaturoznavstva XIX – pochatku XX stolittia. In: *Natsionalni varianty literaturnoi komparatyvistyky*. Kyiv: Stylos, 374–386. Retrieved from www.reelc.net/.../national_versions_of_the_comparative_literature.
67. Tkachuk, O. (2008). Ivan Franko i Lutsii Annei Seneka: stoitsyzm u khudozhnii filosofii Franka. In: *Ivan Franko: dukh, nauka, dumka, volia: Mater. Mizhnar. nauk. konhresu, prysviachenoho 150-richchiiu vid dnia narodzhennia Ivana Franka (Lviv, 27 veresnia – 1 zhovtnia 2006 roku)*. Lviv: VTs LNU imeni Ivana Franka, t. 1, 246–254.
68. Trofymuk, M. (2008). Neolatynistychna problematyka u pratsiakh Ivana Franka. In: *Ivan Franko: dukh, nauka, dumka, volia: Mater. Mizhnar. nauk. konhresu, prysviachenoho 150-richchiiu vid dnia narodzhennia Ivana Franka (Lviv, 27 veresnia – 1 zhovtnia 2006 roku)*. Lviv: VTs LNU imeni Ivana Franka, t. 1, 400–409.
69. Fylypovych, P. (2007). Shliakhy Frankovoi poezii. In: *Ivan Franko. "Ziviale lystia": teksty, materialy, doslidzhennia*. Lviv, 42–46. (Seriiia "Ukrainska filolohiia": shkoly, postati, problemy", vyp. 7).
70. Franko, I. (1976–1986). *Zibrannia tvoriv: u 50 t.* Kyiv.
71. Franko, I. (2009). *Ziviale lystia: Lirychna drama / perekl. anhl. I. Teplyi*. Vyd. tretie, dop. Lviv: SPOLOM, 140 s. (Do 150-richchia vid dnia narodzhennia Ivana Franka).
72. Franko, I. (2011). *Ziviale lystia: Lirychna drama / perekl. anhl. I. Teplyi*. Vyd. chetverte, pererobl. i dop. Lviv: SPOLOM. (Do 155-richchia vid dnia narodzhennia Ivana Franka).
73. Franko, I. (2008). Z pisliamovy do vydannia 1896 roku "Khoto takyi "Lys Mykyta" i vidky rodom?" In: Franko I. Ya. *Kazky: Lys Mykyta. Koly shche zviri hovoryly / khudozh. S. K. Artiushenko*. Kyiv: Veselka, 6–8.
74. Franko, I. *Zibrannia tvoriv: v 50 t. t. 1–10*: Retrieved from <http://www.twirpx.com/file/566294/>.
75. Franko, I. (2005). Ukraina movyt. In: Franko I. *Vybrane / uporiadkuv.tekstiv, peredm.* K. H. Borysenko. Kyiv: Shkola, 81.
76. Franko, I. (1900). Shkola poeta (Za Ibsenom). In: *Iz dniv zhurby. Poezii Ivana Franka*. Lviv. Nakladom avtora, 61–69.
77. Franko I. (1976). Shkola poeta (Za Ibsenom). In: Franko I. *Zibrannia tvoriv: u 50 t.* Kyiv: Naukova dumka, t. 3, 48–49.
78. *Franko Ivan Yakovych*. Retrieved from https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Franko_Ivan_Yakovych. [Nazva z ekrana] – 7 zhovtnia 2013 r.
79. Yar Slavutych. (1967). Sobornytski idei Ivana Franka. In: *Ivan Franko: zb. filoloh. sektiis dlia vidznachennia 110-richchia narodyn i 50-richchia smerty Ivana Franka*. Niu-York: Nakladom NTSh v ZDA, t. 32 (Zap. NTSh. T. CLXXXII), 171–177.

80. Yar Slavutych. (2006). Anhliiyskiy pereklad poemy Ivan Vyshenskiy. In: Yar Slavutych. *Doslidzhennia ta statii*. Edmonton: Slavuta, 471–472.
81. Bida, C. (1971). A Quest for the Dramatic. Ukrainian Authors Turn to Shakespeare. In: *Symbolae in Honorem Georgii Y. Shevelov / Zb. na poshanu prof. D-ra Yuriiia Shevelova*. Nauk. zb. UVU. Miunkhen, t. 7, 45–53.
82. *Colloque International "Perspective Comparatiste Orient–Occident en théorie littéraire"*. (1993). / International Colloquium "The Orient – West Comparative Perspective in Literary Theory". Institute of the Theory of Literature, Theatre and Film, Dpt. of Literature, University of Łódź, Łódź, 16-17. X. 1990 / Institut de la Théorie de la Littérature, du Théâtre et du Film, Département de la Théorie de la Littérature, Université de Łódź. Les actes furent redigés par Sławomir Cieślowski et Teresa Cieślowska. Łódź: BiblioTeka.
83. Červeňak, A. (2007). *Život a dielo. Tridsať statí o slovenskej literature*. 1. vyd, slovensky. Nitra, Bratislava: Filozofická fakulta UKF, Spolok slovenských spisovateľov.
84. Dumoulié, C. *Litterature comparée, philosophie et psychanalyse*. Retrieved from www.revue-silene.com/.../30/extrait_68.pdf / – 14 Sept. 2012.
85. Dzyuba, I. (1970). *Internationalism or Russification? A Study in the Soviet Nationalities Problem*. Second Edition. Ed. by M. Davies. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
86. *Exegi monumentum*. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.ua>.
87. Henrik Ibsens. (1903). *Sämtliche Werke in deutscher Sprache. Erster Band. Gedichte*. Deutsch von Christian Morgenstern et al. Berlin: S. Fischer Verlag.
88. Ibsen, Henrik. (1913). *Sämtliche Werke. Volksausgabe in fünf Bänden. Erster Band*. Herausgegeben von Julius Elias und Paul Schlenther. Einzige autorisierte deutsche Ausgabe. Berlin: S. Fischer Verlag.
89. Jakóbiec, M. (1955). Iwan Franko (1856–1916). In: Franko I. *Utwory wybrane*. Tłumaczyli Zofia i Stanisław Głowiakowie. Posłowiem opatrzył Prof. Marian Jakóbiec. Warszawa: Czytelnik, t. II, 569–601.
90. Kaźmierczak, M. (2012). *Przekład w kręgu intertekstualności. Na materiale tłumaczeń poezji Bolesława Leśmiana*. Warszawa: Instytut Lingwistyki Stosowanej Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
91. Korniychuk, V. (2015). Iván Frankó, orgullo y gloria de Ucrania. In: *Iván Frankó. La pluma ucraniana de los clásicos hispanos*. (Ivan Franko. Ukrainske pero ispanskykh klasykiv). Uporiadnyky: A. Yakubuv u vzaiemodii z Santiago Garsiieiu-Konteit ta Luis-Mariieiu Sancho-Peres. Valensiia, 21–34.
92. Kravets, Ya. (2015). Iván Frankó y el mundo hispano. In: *Iván Frankó. La pluma ucraniana de los clásicos hispanos* (Ivan Franko. Ukrainske pero ispanskykh klasykiv) / uporiadnyky: A. Yakubuv u vzaiemodii z Santiago Garsiieiu-Konteit ta Luis-Mariieiu Sancho-Peres. Valensiia, 43–58.
93. *Morgenländische Anthologie: Klassische Dichtungen aus der sinesischen, indischen, persischen und hebräischen Literatur*. (1880). Uebersetzt von Ernst Meier. Leipzig: Verlag des Bibliographischen Instituts. Retrieved from https://archive.org/details/bub_gb - 6 Nov. 2017.
94. Richepin, J. *L'Apologie de diable*. Retrieved from <http://paroles2chansons.lemonde.fr/auteur-jean-richepin/poeme-l-apologie-du-diable.html>
95. Richepin, J. (1922). *Les Blasphèmes*. Nouvelle édition. Paris: Bibliothèque Charpentier.
96. Reis, J. E. Comparative Literature: a discipline under construction. Retrieved from [repositorio.utad. Pt /.../ Comparative % 20 Liter... /](http://repositorio.utad.pt/.../Comparative%20Liter.../) – 14 Spt. 2012.
97. *The Collected Poems of Henrik Ibsen*. Translated by John Northam. Retrieved from http://ibsen.nb.no/asset/34498/1/34498_1.pdf
98. Yakubuv, A. (2015). Prólogo. In: *Iván Frankó. La pluma ucraniana de los clásicos hispanos* (Ivan Franko. Ukrainske pero ispanskykh klasykiv) / uporiadnyky: A. Yakubuv

u vzaiemodii z Santiago Garsiieiu-Kontei ta Luis-Mariieiu Sancho-Peres. Valensiia, 11–15.

99. Zyla, W. T. (1989). *Johann Wolfgang von Goethe in der ukrainischen Literatur*. München. (Ukrainische Freie Universität. Reihe: Monographien, Band 49).

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 28.11.2018

Прийнята до друку 14.05.2019

Appendix:

Іван Франко (1856–1916), Україна

Коваль Бассім. Арабська казка.

Пролог

З новим роком, браття милі,
В новім щасті, в новій силі
Радісно вітаю вас
І бажаю, щоб в здоров'ю,
В мирі, з братньою любов'ю
Відтепер ішов вам час.

І бажаю, щоб трудяще
Те життя вам якнайкраще
Без біди минало всім,
Щоб думками ви міцніли,
Багатіли, не бідніли,
Щоб веселий був ваш дім.

І бажаю, щоб ми згідно,
Сміло, свідомо, свобідно
Йшли до спільної мети:
В своїй хаті жить по-своmu,
Не коритися нікому,
Лад найкращий завести.

Сим бажанням вас вітаю,
І по давньому звичаю
Повну чарку догори!
Щирій праці бог допоможе.
Дай вам боже все, що гоже!
Що негоже – чорт бери!

А тепер при вільній хвилі,
Коли ласка, браття милі,
Казку слухайте мою
Про Бассіма, про зухвальця –
Я її не виссав з пальця,
А як чув, так вам даю.

Та, балакаючи з вами,
Не арабськими словами,
А по-своmu розкладу:
Де розширю, де вкорочу,
Дещо з власного приточу,
Щоби вийшло до ладу.

Ivan Franko (1856–1916), Ukraine

Bassim the Blacksmith. An Arabic tale

Prologue

Happy New Year, brethren dear,
In new happiness, new cheer
Joyfully will I ye greet,
And in good health, so I wish you,
Love of brethren withal, peaceful
Time for you from now proceed.

And I wish your working-life mode
Should at best be, at its utmost,
With no hardships go for all,
That in thoughts you may get stronger,
Richer grow, poor no longer,
Joyful home to your lot fall.

And I wish that we, concerted,
In a brave, a conscious effort,
For the common goal should strive,
In one's home like masters reigning,
In no bondage more remaining,
Start the choicest way of life.

I greet you with this wish mentioned,
And so by the custom ancient
“Bottoms up” full glasses make!
Honest work by God helped will be,
Grant you, God, all that is seemly,
Devil the unseemly take!

And now having a free minute,
Brethren dear, if you please it,
Listen to my fairy-tale
Of one Bassim, of a cheeky –
This is no invention tricky,
But recount without fail.

Yet, when talking to you this way,
Not in Arabic, my own lay,
I will put it as I see:
Larger here, abridged there,
Adding of my own elsewhere
That the tale in order be.

ІНШОМОВНИЙ ДИСКУРС ІВАНА ФРАНКА: ТВОРЧЕ ВІДЛУННЯ

Іван ТЕПЛИЙ

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

У статті йдеться про особливості іншомовного дискурсу Івана Франка з погляду творчого опрацювання тем, мотивів, образів тощо. Багато написано про І. Франка як перекладача, однак майже 900 творів, за приблизними підрахунками, – це твори за мотивами, скажімо, Стародавньої Греції чи Стародавнього Риму, переспіви, творче наслідування тощо. У центрі уваги дослідження – рецепція як одна із провідних форм реалізації іншомовного дискурсу. Основою дослідження стали поеми І. Франка. Саме у передмові до збірки “Поеми”, взявши за епіграф Шевченкове: “Звичайно – крадене”, І. Франко викладає програмний погляд на проблему, показуючи різний ступінь опрацювання запозиченого матеріалу, методику, так би мовити, цього процесу (стосувалося це, зокрема, поем “Істар”, “Сатні і Табубу”, “Бідний Генріх”, “Поема про білу сорочку”, “Похорон”). Інші поеми розібрано під цим оглядом за методикою, що її випрацював А. Скоць у ґрунтовному монографічному дослідженні “Поеми Івана Франка”. Розглянуто й інші форми засвоєння іншомовного дискурсу, як-от: творчий розвиток, прецедентний текст, образна аналогія тощо.

Ключові слова: рецепція, переклад, інтертекстуальність, творчий розвиток, образна аналогія, прецедентний текст, міжлітературні зв'язки.