

**BIBLICAL ARCHETYPES IN WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE’S
TRAGEDY “KING LEAR”
AS THE IMPLICIT REFERENCE TO THE HOLY SCRIPTURE:
VERBALIZATION AND PECULIARITIES OF REPRODUCTION**

Mariia Kravtsova

*Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,
1, Universytetska Str., Lviv, Ukraine, 79000
mariia.kravtsova@lnu.edu.ua*

The article presents the Translation Studies analysis of William Shakespeare’s tragedy “King Lear” and its five Ukrainian translations done by Panteleimon Kulish, Panas Myrnyi, Maksym Rylskyi, Vasyl Barka and Oleksandr Hriaznov. The attempt has been made to outline the Biblical archetypes in the source text and to trace the level of their reproduction in the Ukrainian target texts. On the basis of the research conducted, it has been assumed that by means of various allusions and themes parallel to the Biblical ones, the reader of the tragedy encounters the Biblical archetypes of the Christ, Job, Devil, Cain and Abel. The author of the article also scrutinizes how these archetypes are actualized in the text in question through various verbal images and examines the level of their reproduction in the target texts.

Key words: Shakespeare, “King Lear”, translation, biblical archetypes, Bible, allusion.

Introduction. In W. Shakespeare’s tragedy “King Lear”, the motive of filial ingratitude occupies the central role, resonating through two parallel stories: the primary plotline of King Lear and his three daughters and the secondary one of the Earl of Gloucester and his two sons. The motive in question is constantly intensified by the playwright by means of hidden biblical allusions, with the help of which the reader creates the corresponding biblical archetypes in his/her mind, identifying the characters of the play with them. Thus, the inference of these encoded archetypes is among the primary tasks of the translator, who has to maintain for the target language reader the intertextual character of the source text in question.

Theoretical Background. The issue of the allusive character of W. Shakespeare’s creativity and its reference to the Holy Scripture, as well as the implicit presence of biblical archetypes in playwright’s works has long been researched by various scholars. Thus, for instance, O. V. Dzera researches the Biblical intertextuality through the paradigm of Translation Studies, where she also addresses the question of the implicit biblical intertext in W. Shakespeare’s tragedy “Hamlet” [9]. Another researcher, O. M. Selezinka, examines language means of expressing biblical allusions in W. Shakespeare’s works [11]. O. Filonenko analyzes the archetypal structure of the verbal image in W. Shakespeare’s

play “The Tempest”. Myriad of other scholars devoted their works to the biblical aspect of W. Shakespeare’s works, among them are R. A. L. Burnet, A. Murrey, H. Hamlin, P. Milward, B. Nicholson, L. V. Kolomiets, V. P. Komarova, S. Yu. Ditkova, et al. Nevertheless, peculiarities of reproduction of biblical archetypes in the Ukrainian translations of W. Shakespeare’s tragedy “King Lear” has not been scrutinized before.

Methods. This research presents the Translation Studies analysis of William Shakespeare’s tragedy “*King Lear*” and its five Ukrainian translations done by Panteleimon Kulish, Panas Myrnyi, Maksym Rylskyi, Vasyl Barka and Oleksandr Hriaznov. On the basis of this material, the author of the present article conducts the contrastive analysis of the source text and its target language equivalents, applying the methods presupposed by the Translation Studies analysis, so as to identify the level of reproduction of the implicit biblical archetypes of the original.

Results and Discussion. Through various allusions and themes parallel to the Biblical ones, the reader of the play encounters the Biblical archetypes of the Christ, Job, Devil, Cain and Abel.

The Christ archetype is portrayed in the play through the image of Cordelia. Cordelia’s kind heart (*cor* < Latin ‘heart’) forgave all the wrong doings of her father, even though it was because of his decision that she endured so many sufferings (*cordolia* is the Nominative case, plural form of the Latin word *cordolium*, meaning ‘a suffering of the soul’). Cordelia, who demonstrates Christian virtues, suffers and is put to death in prison suggesting the Biblical story about the Christ, who was arrested by the Jewish officials and sentenced to be crucified. Moreover, the passage where Lear holds the body of his dead daughter alludes to the Biblical Pietà: “Cordelia’s patience is not only appropriate to her character in general terms, but it also links her, through a number of prominent biblical allusions, to the Passion of Christ. For instance, in both Quarto and Folio Cordelia states to her absent parent, from whom she has been separated. ‘O dear father, / It is thy business I go about’ (4.4.23–4). This is an allusion to Christ’s remark to his parents in the Temple, where they found him after becoming separated: ‘Knewe ye not that I must go about my father’s business?’ (Luke 2:49)” [3, p. 324]. Cordelia’s words in prison also allude to the Holy Scriptures: “*We are not the first / Who, with best meaning, have incurr’d the worst. / For thee, oppressed King, am I cast down*” (5.3.103–105) [7, p. 919]. The image of Christ is created through the allusion to the archetype plot about the Christ who was sent to earth to save the oppressed people, and who, having the *best meaning*, was crucified. The lexeme *cast down* here may refer to “send forth”, “to throw or cause to fall (light, etc) *on* or *over* any object, or in some particular direction” [1, vol. 2, p. 155] and “to deject in spirits, disappoint, dispirit” [1, vol. 2, p. 155]. In the Ukrainian translations we read: “*Не перві ми, що в задумах найлучших / Найгіршу мусимо терпіти долю. / Я об тобі, придавлений королю, / Болію серцем*” [16, p. 141], “*Не перші ми, кого лихая доля / Взяла під догляд свій, не дивлячись на те, / Які найкращі ми заміри гонobili. / Жаль серце розрива моє тільки за тебе, / Лихою долею пригнічений королю!*” [17, p. 662], “*Не першим нам, боровишия за правду, / В лиху біду потрапить довелось. / За тебе, батьку, я душею мучусь*” [14, p. 322], “*Ми не перші, / хто з наміром найкращим наволік найгірше. / За тебе я, королю згнічений, прибита*” [13, p. 137], “*Не перші ми, кого в тенета зла / Жага добра і правди привела.*

/ Сумую я, що батько у неволі” [15, с. 110]. Thus, if the reference to crucifixion is almost equivalent in all the translations, then the Christian reading of the lexeme *cast down* is preserved only in the translation by Vasyl Barka, who also reproduces the pun: “За тебе я, королю згнічений, прибита” [13, p. 137]. The Ukrainian lexeme *прибитий* means both ‘depressed’ and ‘nailed down’. Vasyl Barka substitutes the reference to the Christ being sent down to earth with his crucifixion when he was nailed to the cross, however preserves the allusion.

Another Biblical archetype is that of Job: “Shakespeare connects Job and Lear through allusions involving patience. While Job proverbially is patient, however, Lear’s patience is obviously lacking” [3, p. 322]. What we observe is the projection of the Biblical plot realized on the content level, as well as by means of allusions. In the same way as God deprived Job of his family, wealth, health, King Lear was deprived of his daughters and kingdom and became insane: “Lear may wish to be the ‘pattern of all patience’, but the pattern had already been established for Shakespeare’s audience by the proverbial ‘patience of Job’, a familiar idiom in Early modern English” [Ibid., p. 319–320]. However, contrary to Job, the King did not stand firm in his faith. The real sample of patience and, thus, the projection of the story of Job is Kent, who, despite all the hardship, remained loyal to the King and even disguised himself so as to stay with Lear and help him. Here is an example of the allusion to the Book of Job on the lexical level taken from act II, scene II, when Kent tells the Earl of Gloucester: “*A good man’s fortune may grow out at heels*” (2.2.4) [7, p. 899]. This line serves as the signal of the poetic verbal image of the Job archetype. Here W. Shakespeare creates a pun using the lexeme *out at heels*, which means “with stockings or shoes worn through at the heel; also, of persons wearing such; *fig.* in unfortunate or decayed circumstances; in trouble or distress” [1, p. 191]. Thus, Kent speaks both about his poor fate and his worn out heels that also show his condition. This alludes to how Job addresses the God: “*Thou puttest my fete also in the stockes, and lockest narrowly unto all my paths, and makest the printe thereof in the heeles of my fete*” (Job 13:27) [6, p. 458]. In the Ukrainian translations one can find the following: “в колоді. / Сніткає й доброго часом пригода” [16, p. 53], “Я знаю, що фортуна / До доброго не дуже-то прихильна: / Часом його рядном і мокрим вкриє!” [17, с. 569], “Десь заблукала доля, / А раптом, знайде шлях сюди, до мене?” [14, с. 274], “Зрости за п’ятами і доля може” [13, с. 64], “Велике горе – ноги зацемить. / Ні, значно гірше зацемити серце.” [15, с. 41]. None of the Ukrainian translators preserved the pun, excluding the allusion and, thus, weakening the image of Job archetype. P. Kulish reproduces the same *stockes*, Panas Myrnyi introduces the idiomatic expression *мокрим рядном накрити*, which means “to scold sb. or to catch, find sb. unexpectedly” [12, vol. 8, p. 923], where the semantic component *to scold* can only partially correspond to the original meaning. M. Rylskiy’s translation is equivalent to the source text only to some extent – on the one hand, he preserves the semantic component of movement and that of faith in a better future which can be deduced from the context, but, on the other, he reproduces neither the pun, nor any of the actualized meanings. Vasyl Barka uses occasional idiomatic expression not registered lexicographically, rendering the immediate contextual meaning of the passage, – Kent is talking about his tiring trip and the necessity to have a rest. Thus, the possible meaning of this line can be the following: one

can travel all the time without actually living their life. Even though the translator opts for the exact word used in the original, i.e., *heels* – *н'яму*, still he fails to reproduce the pun and the allusion to the Bible. In O. Hriaznov's translation, we observe the implicit realization of the lexeme *stockings*, while the second line provides for the broader contextual sense. One should also mention that the translator introduces the lexeme *серце* which, in our viewpoint, is one of the main symbols of the tragedy. Thus, "Shakespeare's 'constellation' of allusions to Job and its interpreters serves primarily to provide the audience with a familiar and authoritative 'pattern of patience' – patience in its root sense of 'suffering' (from the Latin *patiens* and ultimately *patior*, 'to suffer')" [3, p. 319].

The plotline of the Earl of Gloucester and his sons provides us with the reference to the archetypes of Cain and Abel. Thus, Edmund who betrays his brother and makes the father hate him and banish his illegitimate son, personifies the archetype of Cain, while Edgar correspondingly acts as Abel. In the same way as God favoured Cain's sacrifice and Abel envied it, Edmund was envious of the attention Gloucester paid to Edgar and coveted to be the only son and the only heir. Nevertheless, if in the Biblical story Cain murders Abel, then in the play everything is reversed. It is Edmund who is fatally wounded by Edgar. Another contradiction is that in the Bible it is Cain who is forced to wander all his life being punished for the murder of his brother, while in the tragedy it is Edgar (the archetype of Abel) who is compelled to stroll as a Poor Tom. In a similar way as Cain addresses God: "*My punishment is greater, then I can beare*" (Genesis 4:13) [6, p. 10] talking about God's opposeless will to make him a fugitive and a wanderer on this earth as the punishment that afflicts Cain and that he renounces to accept – the Earl of Gloucester says: "*(kneeling) O you mighty gods! / This world I do renounce, and, in your sights, / Shake patiently my great affliction off: / If I could bear it longer, and not fall / To quarrel with your great opposeless wills*" (4.6.53–58) [7, p. 914]. The Earl of Gloucester also expresses his wish, adding: "*If Edgar live*" (4.6.60) [Ibid., p. 914]; the same wish Cain might have had with regard to Abel, so as not to be punished. In the Ukrainian translations we observe the following: "*О ви, боги потужні / Зрікаюсь я сієї життя; перед вами / Я струшую з себе моє нещастє, / І не ропщу. Коли б я міг ще довше / Нести його, не впавши в суперечність / Із всемогутством судєб небесних*" [16, p. 118], "*Боги могуті! Я самохїть наміривсь / Покинути тепер цей світ злиденний / І перед вашими очима доконать / Своє велике горенько. Не можу більше я / Змагатись з долею, що ви мені послали! / Якби я лишенько своє ще волочити зміг*" [17, p. 637], "*Боги високі! / Зрікаюсь цього світу і тяжке / Своє скидаю горе перед вами. / Коли б я міг чинити опір вам / І вашій волі, що мене карає*" [14, p. 317], "*О ви, боги могутні!... / (Стає навколїшки.) / Від світу відрїшаюсь і під ваші зори / скидаю, терплячи, моє велике горе: / коли б я далі міг нести його й не взятись / успротив вашій безперечній волі*" [13, p. 117], "*(встаючи навколїшки) / О боги всесильні! / Свої рахунки зводючи з життям, / Тягар страждань скидаю самовільно. / Коли б я міг терпіти, я б не йшов / Наперекір незламній вашій волі*" [15, p. 91–92]. In the line under question W. Shakespeare uses the collocation '*to renounce the world*' which means 'to withdraw from worldly interests in order to lead a spiritual life' [1, vol. 8, p. 449] and which, according to the New English Dictionary on Historical Principles, can be traced back to 1450. Thus, it was already in use in the time when the play was written. The first semantic level can

also be actualized in the context. i.e., *to abandon* [Ibid., vol. 8, p. 449] this world, as Cain was banished to the land of Nod. It is only Vasyl Barka and O. Hriaznov who preserve the element of kneeling which is important as a certain ritual of addressing the God. The translation of P. Kulish, in our point of view, can be considered as an equivalent one where both Gloucester and Cain accept the punishment without complaint, while in the translation of Panas Myrnyi it is not the gods/God, but the character himself who decides to renounce this world: *самохимь*, i.e., "on one's own accord" [Ibid., vol. 9, p. 50]. The same situation we observe in the translation by O. Hriaznov, where it can also be deduced from the context that the hero in fact opposes the will of the gods/God. In M. Rylskyi's and Vasyl Barka's translations, the allusion can be inferred from the lines of the Earl of Gloucester which, correspondingly, refers to the Cain archetype.

The archetype of the Devil is represented in the play by the images of Regan and Goneril and is most often depicted on the verbal level as compared with other Christian archetypes in the tragedy. Not only are there multiple allusions that create Biblical intertextuality, but W. Shakespeare also apparently uses the lexemes that historically referred to Satan, especially when describing two elder sisters: *devil, monster, sea-monster, monster of the deep, dragon, serpent, prince of darkness, beast, fiend, evil, rascal, rogue, knave*. "Goneril and Regan are intimately linked to three creatures – the serpent, the tiger, and the vulture, setting up a monstrous imaginary space which supplements the staged representation of their ingratitude" [4, p. 108–109]. To our way of thinking, King Lear's reference to *high-engender'd battles* (3.1.110) when talking about his two elder daughters, might also be the allusion to the Revelation 12:7 – "*And there was a battle in heaven. Michael & his Angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon, and the dragon fought & his Angels*" [6, p. 1188]. One can draw a parallel between Goneril, Regan and Satan, who was an angel but after he rebelled against his Creator he was banished from Heaven. In the same way two elder daughters rose against their father. It is only P. Kulish and Vasyl Barka, who preserve the sense of altitude, while in all other cases the semantic loading is narrowed. Another allusive extract which leads us to the Devil archetype in the tragedy is the reference to the Revelation 12:12 – "[...] *for the devil is come downe unto you which hathe great wrath, knowing that he hathe but a short time*" [Ibid., p. 1188]. In act I, scene I, King Lear utters: "*Come not between the dragon and his wrath*" (1.1.24) [7, p. 886]. On the one hand, this line shows how powerful the King thinks he is, comparing himself with a dragon – a mighty and immortal creature. On the other hand, it is "the embodiment of the spirit of evil" [8, p. 174], allusion to the Devil. It is often that Goneril and Regan are referred to another synonymic name of Satan, i.e., *serpent*, the lexeme which is considered to be one of the emblems of ingratitude in the play [Ibid., p. 257]. In act V, scene III, the Duke of Albany calls Goneril "*This gilded serpent*" (5.3.101) [7, p. 920]. The archetype of the Devil is embodied here through the verbal image of a snake. What we observe in the Ukrainian translations is the following: "*золоту сьу гадину*" [16, p. 145], "*цю лиху сичавую гадюку*" [17, p. 667], "*гадюку / Цю позолочену*" [14, p. 334], "*цю позолочену змію*" [13, p. 139], "*цією золоченою змією*" [15, p. 113]. Similarly, Lear compares Goneril's speech with a bite from a snake: "*struck me with her tongue, / Most serpent-like*" (2.4.36–37) [7, p. 901]. In the Ukrainian folklore, snakes "like all other reptilian, belong to the Devilry; Devils are born from snakes" [10, p. 125]. All

the Ukrainian translators, with the exception of O. Hriaznov who resorts to generalization, preserve the source language lexeme. Vasyl Barka manages to use the same part of speech as in the original, introducing the nonce word *якнайзміїніше* – the device (i.e., coinage of new words) that was particularly usual for W. Shakespeare’s style and that was also typical for Vasyl Barka’s own creativity. In act II, scene IV, Lear calls Regan’s unkindness *sharp-tootht* and even though Shakespeare does not indicate the lexeme *serpent*, this adjective instantly creates the corresponding image, correlating with another extract from the tragedy: “*How sharper than a serpent’s tooth it is / To have a thankless child*” (1.4.27–28) [7, p. 894]. In both cases, we observe that the lexeme *serpent* symbolizes *filial ingratitude* in the tragedy. Panas Myrnyi, P. Kulish and Vasyl Barka opt for the equivalent source language adjective – *зострозубий*, i.e., ‘with sharp teeth’, while M. Rylskiy and O. Hriaznov shift the accent to another source language epithet used by the King about Goneril, thus eliminating the image of serpent – *яструб* (‘hawk’) and *кориун* (‘kite’). Even though a kite in the Ukrainian language is traditionally used in simile to refer to “cruelty, rapacity, malice [...]”; it is used to talk about cruel, cunning, malicious people” [10 : 652], omission of the adjective *sharp-tootht* excludes from the translation the allusion, the symbolism that the lexeme bears and weakens the Biblical archetype created in readers mind. On the other hand, in act I, scene IV, when accusing Goneril of her lies, Lear calls the daughter *detested kite*. A simile construction in the lines “*How sharper than a serpent’s tooth it is / To have a thankless child*” (1.4.27–28) [7, p. 894] once again highlights the close correlation between the verbal image of a serpent and the motive of ingratitude, and also contributes to the development of the Devil archetype in the tragedy. The simile is eradicated in the translation by Panas Myrnyi with no verbal image of a serpent and, thus, Biblical allusion. The translator resorts to the method of generalization by providing such a sentence: “*Яка гірка бува дитяча зневага*” [17, p. 548]. In all other translations we observe equivalent reproduction of the original extract with proper preservation of the simile and the image created.

In act III, scene IV, the lunatic King is obsessed with the treason of his children to such an extent that he believes that the poor condition of Edgar is the result of filial ingratitude as well. Even though Kent explains that the man has no daughters, Lear cannot believe it, as he thinks it is only unkind children who can *subdue nature to such a lowness* (3.4.95) [7, p. 905]. Yet again praying here for the *judicious punishment*, he calls his children *unkind, pelican daughters*. All the translators, except Vasyl Barka, introduce the epithet with derogative connotation as the characteristic feature of Lear’s children which can be viewed as contextually justified. The collocation *unkind daughters* is here equivalently reproduced by all the translators except O. Hriaznov, who excludes the epithet from the target text. Still, the introduction of the lexeme *паскудний*, i.e., ‘nasty’, earlier in the passage can compensate for this loss. Another epithet construction that Lear uses when talking about his elder children is *pelican daughters*: “In the Renaissance, the Christian image of the pelican was routinely understood as an allegory of the ideal parent who tears his or her own flesh to nourish his or her children” [4, p. 115]. The medieval fable reflects the story about pelican birds. The young after they had been brought up in care and love showed all their ungratefulness. They pecked the face of their father who was so infuriated that killed his children. In three days the father came back being extremely grieved and he pierced himself

and brought back to life his children with his own blood. As H. Hamlin states, “Christians appropriated this bit of fictional zoology as a symbol of Christ, who feeds his ‘children’ with his own blood, in the sacrifice of the Crucifixion and its re-enactment in the Eucharist” [3, p. 190]. W. Shakespeare might have used the reference to this fable only partially, thus alluding to ingratitude of children and self-sacrifice of a parent.

In the translation by M. Rylskyi and O. Hriaznov we observe the method of generalization when the translators opt for the explicature of the encoded meaning. P. Kulish resorts to one-to-one equivalent where the implied meaning can be deduced from the explanations to the translation prepared by I. Franko. As far as there are neither explanations in the end of the text, nor footnotes to the translation by Vasyl Barka, the translator preserves the source language unit supplementing it with a lexeme which leads the reader to the hidden sense and at the same time creates the verbal image concealed by the original author that alludes to the medieval fable. Vasyl Barka introduces the lexeme *кровоїдки* (literally ‘those, who eat (drink) blood’) which is not registered in the dictionaries; however we cannot state that the very word is a nonce word created by the translator, as far as it was used in the 17th century by I. Vyshenskyi. Panas Myrnyi, in his turn, changes the animal image substituting a *pelican* with a *snake*. One should also stress the choice of the translator in terms of the collocation used: instead of *змійне кубло* (‘snakes’ nest’) he uses *змійне кодло* (literally ‘snakes’ kin’), as far as in the Ukrainian language the lexeme *кодло* means *kin* (the lexeme bears the negative emotional colouring) and also collocates with “*відьомське (дідькове)*” [12, vol. 4, p. 207] – ‘*witches (Devil’s, etc.)*’. Creating such collocability, the translator establishes the allusion to the symbolic *snake*, as well as to *the Devil*. Not only Lear’s elder daughters, but also women as such are referred to, throughout the play, as *monsters* (3.7.8–10) [7, p. 910]. Panas Myrnyi and P. Kulish translate the lexeme in question as *звірюки*, i.e., ‘beasts’, thus preserving the Biblical reference, as well as the connotation of the source language lexeme. In all other translations, the corresponding Ukrainian equivalent is chosen, with Vasyl Barka introducing the nonce word *страшидода* which is formed from the Ukrainian lexeme *страшидо* (i.e., ‘monster’).

Another discrepancy that can be found in the passage under analysis is the reproduction of the *third servant* as *другий слуга* in the translations by Panas Myrnyi and P. Kulish. There are two versions of the tragedy: the Quarto, 1608, and the Folio, 1623. But for the different titles – in the Quarto it is “*His True Chronicle of the life and death of King Lear and his three daughters. With the unfortunate life of Edgar, sonne and heire to the Earle of Gloster, and his sullen and assumed humor of Tom of Bedlam*”, while in the Folio it is “*The tragedy of King Lear*” – there are also certain textual discrepancies – in the Quarto there are 300 additional lines, and in the Folio there are 100 lines that are different from those in the Quarto. The disparity also occurs in act III, scene VII. The passage between the second and the third servant after Regan killed the first servant as he was trying to defend the Earl of Gloster from Cornwall’s attack is omitted from the Folio. Thus, one can assume that all the Ukrainian translators used the Quarto. However, in the translations of Panas Myrnyi and P. Kulish, instead of the third servant, the lines are uttered by the second one. It is known that Panas Myrnyi got acquainted with the translation of P. Kulish when he completed most of his work, and thus, he may have used his translations. Nevertheless, it is also known that

both translators used the Russian renderings available at that time. These might have been the translation of A. Druzhynin of 1857. In the latter, it can also be found that the words of the third servant in the translation are pronounced by the second servant. Moreover, for their father, monsters are not only Regan and Goneril; in act I, scene II, Gloucester also refers to his son as a monster (1.2.104) [Ibid., p. 889]. Here all the translators opted for the corresponding Ukrainian equivalents.

Another epithet that the King uses when talking about Regan and Goneril is *tigers* (4.2) – animals, that “had long been proverbial models of fierceness, cruelty, and mad, murderous fury” [5]. It is only Panas Myrnyi, who substitutes *tigers* with *wolves*, also adding the adjective *fierce* – *люті вовчиці*. Changing the verbal image, the translator still preserves the connotation, even explicating it by means of the additional lexeme, as far as in the Ukrainian language *a wolf* symbolizes cruelty and fierceness. The Ukrainian translation might also bear the allusion to the Bible and contribute to the creation of the Devil archetype in the play, as far as in Ukraine “if the cattle were a sign of peasant welfare, then the wolf, as a symbol of predation, an irrepressible famine, was the embodiment of evil power, the creation of Satan [...]; the folklore tells about the Devilish nature of the wolf” [10, p. 103]. In the translations by P. Kulish and O. Hriaznov, there are also additional lexemes that explicated the meaning of the original – a noun *перевертні* (‘werewolves’) and an adjective *жорстокі* (‘fierce’). correspondingly. Overall, the tragedy contains rich animal imagery; for instance, one can encounter the following bestiary: *a kite, hedge-sparrow, cuckoo, pelican, tiger, dragon, dog, snake, wolf, fox, hog, worm, sheep, cat, etc.* Therewith, the protagonists are compared with predators with the purpose of adding the emotive colouring and negative connotations to the creation of the image. Nature generally occupies an important place in the tragedy and carries positive connotations being the ruler of the destinies. The references to *nature, natures, natural, unnatural, unnaturalness, disnatured* are met 51 times in the play. According to A. Ballesteros González, “[t]he animal world, belonging to the scope of Nature as well, is portrayed with monstrous connotations and linked to ingratitude, the paroxysm of monstrosity” [2, p. 267].

The explicit realization of the archetype of the Devil can be found in the following lines: “*See thyself, devil! / Proper deformity seems not in the fiend / So horrid as in woman*” (4.2.113–115) [7, p. 911]. Lear calls Goneril a Devil and generally refers to women as such that disguise their Devil nature in woman’s shape. In Panas Myrnyi’s translation the lexeme *fiend* is substituted with neutral pronoun *твоя* (‘yours’), while two other lexemes *Devil* and *fiend* have their equivalent reproduction. P. Kulish and M. Rylskiy translate all three lexemes of the original preserving the allusive character of the source text. In Vasyl Barka’s translation, the equivalent lexemes are chosen for the translation, however two of them acquire the feminine gender, thus referring both to the way of addressing Goneril and the Devil. In O. Hriaznov’s translation, one source language lexeme in question is omitted.

Conclusions. The conducted Translation Studies analysis has shown that the Christian reading of the play which is encoded in the source text through Biblical archetypes is characterized by very few subtle references to the Holy Scripture in the translations. Even though all Ukrainian texts intertextually allude to the Bible in certain lines, they still do not depict the whole picture of the implicit Christian reading of the tragedy. Nevertheless, the

translations by Vasyl Barka and P. Kulish are considered to be the most equivalent ones in terms of the level of reproduction of the Biblical archetypes of the source text. Most obviously, this is due to the fact that P. Kulish himself translated the Bible into the Ukrainian language together with I. Puliui and I. Nechui-Levytskyi, and therefore, he might have recognized the allusive character of the text. Vasyl Barka translated the Book of Revelation into the Ukrainian language for the new edition of the Bible published in Rome in 1963, and the reference to this book of the New Testament is the most frequent one in the play.

REFERENCES

1. A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles; founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society [ed. by J. A. H. Murray]. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1888–1933. V. 1–11.
2. Ballesteros González A. The ominous fate of monstrosity in *King Lear*. *Spanish Society for English Renaissance Studies* 9. 1998. P. 265–270.
3. Hamlin H. The Bible in Shakespeare. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2013. 378 p.
4. Lafont A. Monstrous hybrids in Shakespeare's *King Lear*. *IMAGO Revista de Emblemática y Cultura Visual*. 2016. Núm. 8. P. 107–123.
5. Teague A. Shakespeare's monsters of ingratitude. *The Shakespeare Review*. 1990. Vol. 17. URL: <http://hompi.sogang.ac.kr/anthony/Ingrate.htm>.
6. The Bible and Holy Scriptures Contained in the Old and New Testament. Geneva : Rouland Hall, MDLK [1560]. 1224 p.
7. The Complete Works of William Shakespeare. Hertfordshire : Wordsworth Editions, 1996. 1263 p.
8. Thiselton-Dyer T. F. Folklore of Shakespeare. New York : Harper & Brothers, 1884. 559 p.
9. Dzera O. Bibliina intertekstualnist i pereklad : anhlo-ukrainskyi kontekst. Lviv : LNU imeni Ivana Franka, 2017. 490 s.
10. Zhajvoronok V. V. Znaky ukrajinsjkoji etnokuljтуры: slovnyk-dovidnyk [Signs of Ukrainian Ethoculture: A Dictionary]. Kyiv : Dovira, 2006. 703 s.
11. Selezinka O. M. Bibliini aliuzii v tvorakh Viliama Shekspira. Lviv : Ukrainski tekhnolohii, 2011. 234 s.
12. Slovnyk ukrajinsjkoji movy [Dictionary of Ukrainian]: v 11 t. / red. koleh. I. K. Bilodid (holova). Kyiv: Nauk. dumka, 1970–1980.
13. Shekspir V. Korol Lir [King Lear]. V. *Shekspir*; per. Vasylia Barky [W. Shakespeare]. Shtutghard; New Jork; Ottava : Na hori, 1969. 151 s.
14. Shekspir V. Korol Lir [King Lear]. V. *Shekspir* [W. Shakespeare]; per. M. Rylskoho. Tvory: v 6 t. T. 5. Kyiv : Dnipro, 1986. S. 235–343.
15. Shekspir V. Korol Lir [King Lear]. V. *Shekspir: tragedii ta khroniky* [W. Shakespeare: Tragedies and Khronicles]; per. O. A. Griaznova. Kyiv : Zadruha, 2008. Kn. 2. S. 3–125.
16. Shekspir U. Korol Lir [King Lear]. U. *Shekspir* [W. Shakespeare]; per. P. A. Kulisha. Lviv : Ukrainsko-ruska vydavnycha spilka, 1902. XVI. 164 s.
17. Shekspir. Korol Lir [King Lear]. *Shekspir* [Shakespeare]; per. Panasa Myrnoho. Panas Myrnyi (P. Ja. Rudchenko): zibr. tvoriv u 7 t. T. 6. Kyiv : Naukova dumka, 1970. S. 511–682.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles; founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society / ed. by J. A. H. Murray]. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1888–1933. P. 1–11.
2. Ballesteros González A. The ominous fate of monstrosity in *King Lear*. *Spanish Society for English Renaissance Studies* 9. 1998. P. 265–270.
3. Hamlin H. The Bible in Shakespeare. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 378 p.
4. Lafont A. Monstrous hybrids in Shakespeare's *King Lear*. *IMAGO Revista de Emblemática y Cultura Visual*. 2016. Núm. 8. P. 107–123.
5. Teague A. Shakespeare's monsters of ingratitude. *The Shakespeare Review*. 1990. Vol. 17. Access mode: <http://hompi.sogang.ac.kr/anthony/Ingrate.htm>.
6. The Bible and Holy Scriptures Contained in the Old and New Testament. Geneva : Rouland Hall, MDLX [1560]. 1224 p.
7. The Complete Works of William Shakespeare. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions, 1996. 1263 p.
8. Thiselton-Dyer T. F. Folklore of Shakespeare. New York : Harper & Brothers, 1884. 559 p.
9. Дзера О. Біблійна інтертекстуальність і переклад : англо-український контекст. Львів : ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2017. 490 с.
10. Жайворонок В. В. Знаки української етнокультури : словник-довідник Київ : Довіра, 2006. 703 с.
11. Селезінка О. М. Біблійні алюзії в творах Вільяма Шекспіра. Львів : Українські технології, 2011. 234 с.
12. Словник української мови: в 11 т. / ред. колег. І. К. Білодід (голова) та ін. Київ : Наук. думка, 1970-1980.
13. Шекспір В. Король Лір ; пер. Василя Барки. Штутгард; Нью Йорк; Оттава : На горі, 1969. 151 с.
14. Шекспір В. Король Лір ; пер. М. Рильського. *Вільям Шекспір: твори : в 6 т. Т. 5. К.*: Дніпро, 1986. С. 235–343.
15. Шекспір В. Король Лір ; пер. О. А. Грязнова. *В. Шекспір: трагедії та хроніки*. Кн. 2. Київ : Задруга, 2008. С. 3–125.
16. Шекспір У. Король Лір ; пер. П. А. Куліша. Львів : Українсько-руська видавнича спілка, 1902. XVI. 164 с.
17. Шекспір. Король Лір ; пер. Панаса Мирного. *Шекспір*. Панас Мирний (П. Я. Рудченко): збір. творів у 7 т. Т. 6. Київ : Наукова думка, 1970. С. 511–682.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 28.02.2020

Прийнята до друку 31.03.2020

БІБЛІЙНІ АРХЕТИПИ В ТРАГЕДІЇ ВІЛЬЯМА ШЕКСПІРА “KING LEAR” ЯК ІМПЛІЦИТНЕ ПОСИЛАННЯ НА СВЯТЕ ПИСЬМО: ВЕРБАЛІЗАЦІЯ ТА ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ВІДТВОРЕННЯ

Марія Кравцова

*Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка,
вул. Університетська, 1, м. Львів, Україна, 79000
mariia.kravtsova@lnu.edu.ua*

У статті здійснено перекладознавчий аналіз трагедії В. Шекспіра “King Lear” та її п’яти україномовних перекладів, зроблених Пантелеймоном Кулішем, Панасом Мирним, Максимом Рильським, Василем Баркою та Олександром Грязновим. Автор статті робить спробу шляхом використання перекладознавчого аналізу виокремити в тексті-джерелі біблійні архетипи та простежити рівень їхнього відтворення в українських цільових текстах. Проведене дослідження дає змогу припустити, що завдяки різноманітним алюзіям і суголосним зі Святим Письмом темам читач зустрічається в трагедії з біблійними архетипами Ісуса, Іови, Диявола, Каїна та Авеля. У статті також розглянуто актуалізацію згаданих архетипів у тексті завдяки різним словесним образам і проаналізовано рівень їхнього відтворення в перекладі. Незважаючи на те, що в усіх українських текстах подекуди збережені біблійні алюзії першотвору, все ж вони не відображають повної картини імпліцитного християнського прочитання трагедії. Тим не менше, переклади Василя Барки та П. Куліша найбільш повно відтворюють алюзивність тексту-джерела та присутні у творі архетипи. Вірогідно це пов’язано з тим, що П. Куліш сам перекладав Біблію українською мовою разом з І. Пулюєм та І. Нечуєм-Левицьким. Василь Барка переклав українською мовою Книгу Одкровення для нового видання Біблії, виданого в Римі в 1963 році, а алюзії на цю книгу Нового Завіту трапляються у трагедії найчастіше.

Ключові слова: Шекспір, “King Lear”, переклад, біблійні архетипи, Біблія, алюзія.