



УДК  
DOI:

## ПРОБЛЕМАТИКА НАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ ІДЕНТИЧНОСТІ В ІНШОМОВНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ ІВАНА ФРАНКА

Іван ТЕПЛИЙ

У статті розглянуто проблему національної ідентичності в діяльності І. Франка в рамках ширшої проблематики; охоплено важливі аспекти проблеми, як-от: мовознавчі, літературознавчі, культурознавчі, перекладацькі, перекладознавчі. Висвітлення перелічених аспектів і є **метою** цієї статті.

**Наукова новизна.** У роботі вперше, на підставі праць самого І. Франка та уведення широкого, включно з філософським, контекстуального тла його багатогранної діяльності у працях сучасних і минулих дослідників: філософів, мовознавців, літературознавців, культурознавців, перекладознавців, перекладачів – висвітлено заявлену проблему у всій її повноті, на різномовному матеріалі. Розглянуто, зокрема, головні мовознавчі праці І. Франка, аналіз здійснено у творчому перегуку з працею Е. Сепіра «Статус лінгвістики як науки»; також висвітлено проблему мовної особистості І. Франка.

Для з'ясування всіх цих проблемних аспектів використано системний підхід із застосуванням історико-літературного, генетичного, порівняльного, словникових дефініцій, компонентного аналізу та культурно-історичного **методів**.

Автор дійшов **висновку**, що питання мови та операцій над нею (переклад, перекладознавство) лежать в основі тотожності будь-якої нації. Поставлена проблема пронизує означену діяльність І. Франка у всій її цілісності, будучи серцевиною, двигуном, сприятливим чинником цієї діяльності. Іван Франко вишукував ці механізми, потайні пружини та досліджував їх. Проблема національної ідентичності є й телеологічною. Іншими словами, доцільно заглибитись у поставлену проблему, застосувавши методи пізнання (включно з формами наукової експлікації), задіявши категорію мети і похідні концепти. Питання мовознавчих і перекладознавчих досліджень у спадщині І. Франка вимагають подальшого дослідження із застосуванням дедалі нових дослідницьких парадигм.

**Ключові слова:** ідентичність, тотожність, телеологія, мова, іншомовний, мовознавчий, літературознавчий, перекладознавчий.

“Antiquum tuum cordia sentient vim” (The hearts will feel thy power of days of yore, *Lat.*) – The problem posited here is incorporated into the one larger in scope, embracing the set of problems raised at the 34<sup>th</sup> Annual Ivan Franko Scholarly Conference viz. “The Hearts Will Feel Thy Power of Days of Yore...”: I. Franko’s Dimensions of National Identity” [L’viv, L’viv Ivan Franko National University, Ivan Franko Studies Institute, 23 Oct. 2020]. On the other hand, comparando cognoscitur [52], i. e. cognition goes by comparison.

The problem is all-pervasive, i.e. it permeates the entire, without exception, *oeuvre* of Ivan Franko. This is a teleological problem. Two issues attributed to this concept are meant here, viz. philosophic idealistic teaching following which development is an implementation of a predetermined goal and all is expedient in the development of nature and society. The expediency is accounted for by teleology as workings of immaterial forces, God.

Aimed against the causal explanation of phenomena, teleology is employed by supporters of the religious worldview. Of much greater relevance to us is, however, methodological teleology, viz. methods of cognition (including forms of scientific explanation) employing the category of goal and derived concepts [34].

National identity is a nation feeling as a single whole, embodied through distinctive traditions, culture, language and politics. A person's national identity is his or her identity and a sense of belonging to one state or one nation, regardless of the legal status of citizenship [19].

The nation, first and foremost, manifests itself through language, hence – linguistic, literary, cultural aspects of the problem, the most important one being linguistic, followed by linguistic-operational: that of translation as theory and translation as activity.

Ivan Franko seems to have covered the issue at its best himself, speaking programmatically on it:

“We must learn to feel ourselves Ukrainians – not Galician, nor Bukovynian Ukrainians, but Ukrainians without official borders. And this feeling should not be a bare phrase for us, but should lead to practical consequences. We must – all without exception – first of all get to know that Ukraine of ours, all within its ethnographic borders, in its current cultural state, familiarize ourselves with its natural means and social ills and assimilate that knowledge firmly, to the extent that we may ache each of its partial, local pain and rejoice in every, even if small and partial success, and most importantly, that we may understand all the manifestations of its life, feel, in point of real fact, almost a part of it”. [39, vol. 45, p. 405].

Written in 1905, on the occasion of the revolution in Russia, the text was first published in the *Literary-Scientific Herald*; printed with minor abridgements following the edition (in Ukrainian): Franko I. Collected Works: In 50 Volumes [39, vol. 45; p. 401–409; 12].

It is the national identity that enables a full-fledged existence of an ethnic community:

“Anything that goes beyond the frames of a nation is either the Pharisaism of people gladly enjoying to cover with international ideals their struggles for one nation to dominate over another, or the painful sentimentalism of science-fiction writers who would enjoy to cover their spiritual alienation from their own nation behind broad “universal” phrases” (“Beyond the Limits of the Possible”) [39, vol. 45, p. 284].

The posited problem *seems to permeate the entire work of Ivan Franko, is pervasive*. Its further examination is impossible without taking into account of a broader cultural and philosophical context of Ivan Franko's activity in general [4]. “Franko's work, both as translator and original author, completely smashed to smithereens the theory of literature “for home use”. It was he who hacked through a “window” for the Ukrainian people, yet not only on Europe, but also on all the points of the world” – this is how O. Biletsky appreciated I. Franko's creative activity, including translation [2, p. 163].

Oksana Pakhliovska distinguishes three main “knots” in this gigantic, multifaceted activity, having unraveled which, he, in fact, became a great “strategist” of the national culture. The point is, hence, in: a) *secularization* of Galician culture; b) consistent and purposeful *Europeanization* of Ukrainian culture in general, its involvement in the themes and models

of the European and world literary process on the whole. And although this phenomenon, according to the researcher, characterizes the activities of many, in her opinion, protagonists of Ukrainian culture in different periods of its development, I. Franko was here perhaps the most consistent. After all, his program of Europeanization reached the size not only of the ideological inspiration of Ukrainian literature with European impulses, but also literally of *t r a n s p l a n t a t i o n* [O. P.'s emphasis] of certain genres or, say, poetic forms into the field of the national tradition. But this in no way contradicted his conviction in the very peculiar nature of Ukrainian literature proper. The fact lay – and it is important to emphasize – in the *i n f o r m a t i v e I n s p i r a t i o n* [O. P.'s emphasis] with the knowledge of the external reality of the culture detached due to political circumstances from the world, and utterly not about the orientation of this culture to foreign models. After all, the tactics of this Europeanization was in fact subordinated to the important culture studies – and innovative at the time – I. Franko's concept of world literature as fragment of the history of civilization, hence the history of national literature as fragment of world civilization, and, finally, c) the *third knot* is believed by O. Pakhliovska to be the quite innovative *conceptualization* of the cultural perspective of Ukraine as an integral cultural and historical phenomenon [27, p. 21–22]. On the other hand [ibid.], I. Franko's approach is not a systematic view of the studied cultures, nor is it a choice of individual works aesthetically or emotionally consonant with the writer. However, the choice is, again, dictated not by individual perception, but by certain cultural paradigms. I. Franko selects from these cultures what precisely answers, by its secret mechanisms, the important demands of his own culture – and thus attaches his own culture to the circulation of the problems of universal importance, introduces it into **the global dialogue with the cultures of different epochs and peoples** [O. P.'s emphasis].

“And we need to talk in general, when talking of translation, about *the great cultural creative mission* [our italics. – *I. T.*] of I. Franko considering culture as a complex, dynamic, contradictory, but simultaneously integral system. When talking about Ivan Franko, we should not talk about whether he has achieved or whether he has not, whether he has reached or whether he has not, we must talk about a great cultural phenomenon, and from this follows what concerns translation” [5, p. 298].

In these words – the methodology of the problem “I. Franko the translator” in the broadest sense of the word, i.e. we are talking about a comparative literary approach. This approach needs to be developed. It does not exclude the translational aspect, but synthesizes at least both – that of translation studies and that of culturoscopy.

An interrelationship between translation and culture was in a novel vein spoken of in its time by the translation scholar V. Radchuk: “Translation is a movement of culture. This is the very essence of it – both spirit and body” [31, p. 162].

It is expedient to concretize the further course of the exposition by the foreign discourse of I. Franko, i.e. his activity aimed at mastering achievements in the field of literature, science, journalism, culture on the whole, the major forms of this activity being translation, creative development, inter-literary connections, etc.

In the preface to the “Poems” collection, resorting to T. Shevchenko for the epigraph: “Of course – stolen”, I. Franko presents a programmatic view of the problem:

“When it is true that the principal meaning of poetry consists in the latter’s expanding our individuality, enriching the soul with such impressions and feelings that it would not experience in ordinary life or would not experience in such a strength and clarity, then I think that the rendition of foreign poetry, poetry of different ages and peoples in the native language enriches the soul of the whole nation, vesting it with the forms and expressions of feeling it did not have before, building a golden bridge of understanding and common sentiment between us and distant people, ancient generations. / In this consideration, I present these poems to our community” (Preface to the “Poems” collection) [39, vol. 5, p. 7].

These words, if schematically, reflect a variety of creativity forms, based on foreign-language sources, at that. And a stipulation of principle – *what* to translate:

“A reproach may meet me as to what for I fly my fancy into so distant times and lands, why I don’t sing of the nearby. My fault! But how can I help it? I can crow as I know. After all, I daresay, the point is not in the barrel from which the poet takes the drink he offers to his people, but in the fact *which* [italics ours. – I. T.] drink he offers it, whether a pure invigorating wine, or a lulling drug. I don’t trade in drugs” [39, vol. 5, p. 8].

“I. Franko’s translations into Ukrainian embrace works by ca. 200 authors from 14 languages and 37 national literatures” [25, p. 4]. His creative output, for the most part in Ukrainian, as well as in German, Polish, Russian, Bulgarian numbers, according to rough estimates, several thousand works with a total amount of more than 100 volumes. In total, during Ivan Franko’s lifetime, more than 220 editions had appeared in separate books and brochures, including 60 collections of his own and translated works varying in genre [25, p. 3–4]. Western European poetry alone accounts for 210 works by 60 authors as translated by I. Franko [9, p. 104].

“Extremely rich in its volume, genre diversity, breadth of coverage of world cultural heritage, I. Franko’s translation work was not intended for a select circle, but for a wide readership, being thoroughly imbued with humanism and democratic ideals. It expanded the conceptual and artistic horizons of Ukrainian culture, enriched its universal meaning *and national identity* [emphasis added. – I. T.], contributed to the perfection of his skills as a writer” [22, p. 233].

A number of scientific translations (2,461 pages, 83 titles), almost 2,500 pages [53], are added to those of fiction, as well as transfusions, creative development of motifs, etc. (5,051 pages). In total, therefore, approx. 7,550 pages have been translated. The figures also emphasize the qualitative side: concern for the expansion of national horizons of the native, Ukrainian culture, thus solidifying the national identity.

However, all the above-given is underlain with language, for it is the latter that determines the face of the nation.

“In the area of linguistics Franko produced several studies of the Ukrainian literary language, including ‘Etymolohiia i fonetyka v iuzhno-rus’kii literaturi’ (Etymology and Phonetics in

Southern Ruthenian Literature, 1894), ‘Literaturna mova i diialekty’ (The Literary Language and Dialects, 1907), and ‘Prychynky do ukrayins’koyi onomastyky’ (Materials on Ukrainian Onomastics, 1906). He defended the view that there is only one Ukrainian literary language, based primarily on the Dnieper dialects and enriched with dialects from Western Ukraine. For his philological contributions Franko was awarded an honorary doctorate by Kharkiv University in 1906. He was also elected to a number of Slavic scholarly associations. Aleksei Shakhmatov’s and Fedor Korsh’s recommendation to admit Franko to the Russian Academy of Sciences was rejected by the tsarist government” [48].

Noteworthy, if short, is the list of I. Franko’s linguistic works [14; 21; 8; 6]. His interest in linguistic issues is evident from a letter to A. Krymsky (L’viv, 25 September 1894): “For the present, I would ask you to get for me Buslaev’s *Istoricheskaya grammatika russkogo yazyka*, [i.e. “Historical grammar of the Russian language” – I.T.] [39, vol. 49, p. 518]. The other linguistic papers by I. Franko, such as *Hovorimo na vovka – skazhimo i za vovka* (Talking against the wolf, let us also speak for the wolf), *Z polia nashoyi poeziyi* (From the field of our poetry) and suchlike require a paramount examination. [39, vol. 28, p. 167–175; 40].

An interesting observation of I. Franko is worthy of attention (*The Literary Language and Dialects*):

“Let’s take at least the history of our not so ancient literature. Its prime and beauty grew over the Dnieper, in Russia, where an intelligent or semi-intelligent Ukrainian did not hear or see the grammar of the Ukrainian language, but drew samples of that language simply from a living source, from the mouths of the people. And here in Galicia, where a very long series of grammars from Mohylnytskyi to Ohonovskyi was printed and written, where those grammars were pushed into the heads of thousands of intelligent children on the school bench, the knowledge of our vernacular is nevertheless very small, the language is confused and tainted, the linguistic feeling of all those writing and speaking our language is completely darkened and blunted. They have produced such a lot of miraculous theories, yet all of them have one source – ignorance of the living vernacular and the desire to forge from it something as close to a corpse as possible”. And in response to the meeting with Mr. Więckowski, a Polish visitor from St. Petersburg, mentioned at the beginning of I. Franko’s article, the following problem of grammar is raised: “Ah, don’t tell me about grammar! – Mr. Więckowski as much as cried. – Thank God you have no grammarians yet. For grammarians are the gravediggers of a living language ... Many times afterwards, when I was to think about linguistic issues, I remembered the words by Mr. Więckowski” [41].

Highlighted too is the role of dialects: “As a result of its historical development, the Ukrainian language generally has few dialects. In the vast space between the Kuban, the Don and the San throughout the history of the Ukr[ainian] people human movements went now from east to west, now from west to east, and in that incessant movement dragging on until the mid-19<sup>th</sup> c. there was neither way, nor locality for dialects to work out, as these rise only in places separated and detached from movement” [41]. However, strange as it may seem, the dialects are understandable all over the Ukrainian territory: In the article “Ukrainian Literature in the year 1904” that originally saw the light of day in German (*Österreichische*

*Rundschau*. 1904. Bd. 1. № 5. 1. XII. S. 269–271; 1905. Bd. 2. № 20. 16.III. S. 327 – 336, entitled *Die ruthenische Literatur im Jahre 1904*. One may also find it published in: *Franko I. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur der Ukraine*. – Berlin, 1963. S. 112–130.) [11; 38, vol. 54, p. 555–577]. Ivan Franko writes:

“Though anthropologically it [the Ukrainian people. – *I. T.*] shows a great variety of types, historically, in its entire expanse, it had never constituted a single statal integrity, and in the ethnologic dimension also presents very diverse pictures as a result of adapting to various living conditions, on the other hand, however, *in the language and in folk traditions, in customs and the way of life it demonstrates an in-depth unity* [emphasis ours. – *I. T.*] such as you will hardly find elsewhere to an extent like this and in the people so much numerous and settled over so vast expanses, under so varied political and national influences. This *unity of language* [italics ours. – *I. T.*] leads to literary works written in the Kuban, the Desna or the San are published on the Dniester or the San and *unconditionally comprehensible not only to the educated strata, but the masses as well* [italics ours. – *I. T.*]” [38, vol. 54, p. 556].

Of interest is also the dialectics characterizing the ability of this or that language to live:

“Each literary language is alive and viable as long as it is capable of absorbing all cultural elements of today, that is, to enrich itself with new terms and expressions appropriate to the progress of modern civilization, without losing at that its basic type and without passing into the jargon of some special stratum or group of people, and on the other hand, as long as it tends to be enriched by increasingly new elements from the specific national life and from the differences and dialects of the vernacular” [41].

Here are some evaluations or assessments of I. Franko’s linguistic output authored by present-day leading professionals in the field:

“Ivan Franko considered the literary language to be “a representative of national unity”. Also, the issue of what the Ukrainian literary language is, what it should be, on what basis it should be formed in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> c. finds other writers and scholars thinking. The fact is that at the time of Ivan Franko’s active creative and scholarly work, two variants in the development of the Ukrainian literary language had been outlined – the Dnieper and the Galician ones, which, despite their commonality, carried a lot of the different in phonetics, vocabulary and grammar. The problem was exacerbated by the fact that after the infamous Valuev circular and the Ems decree, almost all literary and publishing activities were transferred to Lviv, more broadly – to Galicia. Orthography issues are not fully resolved either” [6, p. 3; see also 21; 26].

This problem is traced from the very beginnings of I. Franko’s activity: In connection with the translation of *Faust*, Kesar Bilylovskyi, a well-known translator of German poets at the time, corroborated Ivan Franko’s apprehension expressed in the preface to the translation [35, p. XII] that his language would not find supporters among the Ukrainians of eastern Ukraine:

“For us, the Ukrainians of Russia – he wrote – in addition to the Galician grammatical forms that can be seen, there is another “stumbling block” [kamen’ pretknoveniya (Rus.) in the original. – *I. T.*] for an easy and convenient

understanding of this translation, another obstacle, more important than forms in -ov, etc., it is the very mass of words, utterly incomprehensible to us, the structure of the language and phrases strongly alien to our language, deviation from the grammar of the living word, etc.” (Yarema Ya. Ivan Franko and Goethe’s *Faust*). [Cited after: 45, p. 107].

However, I. Franko defends the “right of citizenship” of these forms in Dnieper Ukrainian literature.

To put in a nutshell I. Franko’s linguistic output, let us turn to the Austrian researcher H. Bieder who, on analysing ca. 20 papers on historical grammar of the German and Slavonic languages, arrives at the conclusion that in the field of contact linguistics and social linguistics I. Franko acted as creator of new terminology owing to printed journalistic works in which he elucidated the linguistic situation in Ukraine [10, p. 178–179].

The reverse holds true as well: familiarization of the foreign reader (mainly German-, Polish- and Russian language one) with the best achievements of our literary and scholarly thought [39, vol. 35, p. 189–196; 39, vol. 38, p. 525–530; 20; 28; 49 et al.]. In this connection, N. Velychko’s statement sounds almost sensational, yet true to fact: “He studied foreign languages first of all in order to present a story about his native land among foreign citizens” [3, p. 100].

Let us illustrate I. Franko’s academic research [49]. Firstly, it will be a graphic example of the valuable contribution to Western European (German-language) scholarship. The paper was written from 24 December 1911 till 5 January 1912, revised in March 1913. This is how I. Franko substantiates his intention:

“Out of this intention of mine grew naturally also the resolution to communicate the most important results of my studies and research to a broader European public as well, in as concise and precise a form as possible, in the hope that herewith I will contribute something to the general Slavistic studies, for which multiple interests arise in scientific circles beyond the Slavonic world as well” [49, p. 151; see also 14; 33, pp. 716, 669–670].

Ivan Denysiuk notes, among other things, the following:

“Five languages studied Franko in the Drohobych Gymnasia: Ukrainian, Polish, German, Greek and Latin. And not only did he study them, but also knew them so well that he could become a writer, not only Ukrainian, but German and Polish one, for he as much as wrote poetry in these three languages [...]. Back in the secondary school, he translated the entire *Kraledvor Manuscript* from the Czech, knew the Old Slavonic language, read, and later on wrote in Russian. He could also speak Yiddish to his Jewish colleagues. Thus, the knowledge of nine languages back at school (and afterwards he will also learn French, English, Hungarian, Italian et al.) was a whole bundle of golden keys to the treasury of world culture” [7, p. 9].

It is not out of place here to talk of I. Franko’s linguistic personality, if only in brief, respecting the genre of a scholarly article. The languages operated with in his activities, incl. research and translation ones, were: Ukrainian, German, Polish, Russian, Belorussian, Bulgarian, Latin, Greek, Czech, Slovak, Serbian, Croatian, English, French, Italian, Yiddish, Hebrew, Lithuanian, Old Bulgarian, Old Polish, Old Russian – all told, more than 22 languages

and dialects [30, p. 125–130; see also 1; 13; 17; 42; 43; 29; 18; 44 et al.]. The present-day assessment as provided by R. Karpishka corroborates G. Pocheptsov's data: 19 languages, without mentioning the dialects [50, p. 2]. If Hungarian and Spanish are added to G. Pocheptsov's list, as well as Old Ukrainian, Old Slovak (R. Karpishka), Old Slavonic, the whole number will rise to at least 27, let alone the respective dialects of the Slavonic languages.

In 1929, 13 years after I. Franko's death, E. Sapir's work "The Status of Linguistics as a Science" was published, claiming, among other things:

"Language is a guide to "social reality". Though language is not ordinarily thought of as of essential interest to the students of social science, it powerfully conditions all our thinking about social problems and processes. *Human beings do not live in the objective world alone, nor alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood, but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society* [emphasis added. – I. T.]. It is quite an illusion to imagine that one adjusts to reality essentially without the use of language and that language is merely an incidental means of solving specific problems of communication or reflection. The fact of the matter is that the "real world" is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group. No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached" [51, p. 209].

This way the role of a language is emphasized as much as in the above-quoted papers by I. Franko. More vividly still seems to be the same problem presented in I. Franko's paper on the issue of Muscophilism:

"How to explain it? In my opinion, here lies a deep psychological problem, whose roots reach hitherto little-explored secrets – the connection of the human psyche with those supposedly conventional, but so strangely organic sound systems, which we call the native language. What does the native language seem like? What is it better for me than any other by and what bothers me when I replace it with any other? The practitioner, utilitarian, without giving it even a minute's thought, will say: an empty question! Language is a way for people to communicate with people, and when I have a choice, I take the one that gives me an opportunity to communicate with a greater number of people. Meanwhile, some secret force in the human nature says, "Pardon, y o u h a v e n o c h o i c e [I. Franko's emphasis. – I. T.]; the language you were born and brought up in, you cannot leave without mutilating your soul, the same way as you cannot exchange your own skin with someone else". And the higher, thinner, subtler the person's organization is, the harder is such a change given and the more severely punished. Take, for example, two Ukrainians of genius – Gogol and Shevchenko" [36, p. 233].

Launching a scathing attack on Ivan Naumovych, Galician Muscophile, "a man, no doubt talented, energetic and tirelessly hardworking, but with little education, while very vulnerable and prone to all sorts of winds blowing, he was a victim of various suggestions, jumped from one contradiction to another, and all with the same fervour, with the same sincerity and passion." [37].



“This internal bifurcation – so I. Franko summarizes – was also, as it were, a tragedy of our Galician Muscophilism. People who could become useful figures in the native field, talented and hard-working people, having adopted an unfortunate mania – to change their native language to another, suddenly became as if in a way spiritually paralyzed, lost a living sense of living needs of the native people and requirements of the present day, stuck in the dead and even scientifically fruitless antiquity, like Petrushevych, they squandered their talents, like Mykola Ustyianovych and Hushalevych, or abandoned their native land and went to where their internal bifurcation could at least partially be, if not eliminated, then silenced (Holovats’kyi and many other renegades, the last one being Yu. Yavors’kyi). The most tragic, perhaps, yet by no means most attractive was in this series the fate of Ivan Naumovych” [37].

The only “anchor of rescue” for a man like that in addition to basic education could be “an ardent and steadfast love of the mother tongue and the native people. It would give his wobbly boat that necessarily needed ballast, without which there is not an even, and sure course” [36, p. 234]. The title of the article is too eloquent to be left without its English translation: “Bilingualism or bifacialism [i.e. two-facedness]?”

Moreover, I. Franko’s gigantic translation activities had provided more than plenty of material for scholarly theorizing in translation studies [39, vol. 39, p. 7–20; 39, vol. 29, p. 492–544; 35; 40].

The paper *Shevchenko v nimets’kim odiazi* (Shevchenko in German clothing) [39, vol. 35, p. 189–196] presents two reviews of two issues, yet with a single pagination, of T. Shevchenko’s works translated into German by S. Szpojnarowski. The first one (under the same title) was published in the Literary-Scientific Bulletin (hereinafter – LNV) for 1904, vol. 27, book 8, p. 118–120, the second one entitled *Schewtschenkos ausgewählte Gedichte. Aus dem Ruthenischen von Sergius Szpojnarowski. Zweites Heft. Czernowitz, 1906* was also published in the LNV for 1906, vol. 35, book 9, p. 505–508. The author notes that *Ruthenische Revue* (Ukrainian socio-cultural and literary German-language magazine published in Vienna (1903–1905, since 1906 – as *Ukrainische Rundschau*)), raised one important issue, viz. acquainting the wider European public with the best works of Ukrainian literature in translations. This case is, undoubtedly, important, but not easy, particularly when it comes to the translation of such of its national to the backbone and original works as those by Shevchenko.

“The extraordinary simplicity of Shevchenko’s expression, his picturesqueness and naturalness attract the translator, yet simultaneously bring him to despair when he wants to render not just mechanically the meaning of Ukrainian poems, but at least approximately the Ukrainian melodiousness, impression made by the original” [39, vol. 35, p. 189]. Criticizing S. Szpojnarowski’s translation for the excessive “mechanistic”, I. Franko provides a number of graphic examples whose most essential features should in their present-day interpretation be presented as follows: “The translator translates only what he comprehends in the text as an integral linguistic unit” [24, p. 111–112].

The article *Shevchenko po nimet’ky* [Shevchenko in German] has been, like the previous one, in the centre of translators’ attention [39, vol.38]. The talk is of 30 poems by Taras Shevchenko as translated by Yu. Virginia [39, vol. 38, p. 528].

Of importance is also I. Franko's reservation in terms of linguistics and local lore (speaking in modern terminology) planes: "One cannot call true an interpretation of the grave as a mass burial place for the Cossacks, given by the author on p.31. This is how Shevchenko could understand graves, but more recent experiments [the latest research. – I. T.] on those monuments of ancient Ukrainian culture show traces of prehistoric times in all the graves. The Cossacks fallen in battles with the Tatars had never been buried in graves, nor were graves made with soil amassed over their bodies" [39, vol. 38, p. 529–530].

Ivan Franko's reflections here and before bring us close to those of E. Sapir regarding the people living in distinct worlds:

"The understanding of a simple poem, for instance, involves not merely an understanding of the single words in their average significance, but a full comprehension of the whole life of the community as it is mirrored in the words, or as it is suggested by their overtones. Even comparatively simple acts of perception are very much more at the mercy of the social patterns called words than we might suppose. If one draws some dozen lines, for instance, of different shapes, one perceives them as divisible into such categories as "straight", "crooked", "curved", "zigzag" because of the classificatory suggestiveness of the linguistic terms themselves. We see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation. For the more fundamental problems of the student of human culture, therefore, a knowledge of linguistic mechanisms and historical developments is certain to become more and more important as our analysis of social behavior becomes more refined. From this standpoint we may think of language as the *symbolic guide to culture*. In another sense too linguistics is of great assistance in the study of cultural phenomena. Many cultural objects and ideas have been diffused in connection with their terminology, so that a study of the distribution of culturally significant terms often throws unexpected light on the history of inventions and ideas. This type of research, already fruitful in European and Asiatic culture history, is destined to be of great assistance in the reconstruction of primitive cultures" [51, p. 209–210].

Thus, what I. Franko for the most part outlined, posited, pinpointed, empirically, intuitively observed in a number of his papers on linguistics, particularly ethnolinguistics, linguocultural and translation studies came later to be conceptualized and systematized in E. Sapir's works.

This is how *Encyclopaedia Britannica* presents E. Sapir: "**Edward Sapir** (born January 26, 1884, Lauenburg, Pomerania, Germany [now Łębork, Poland] – died February 4, 1939, New Haven, Connecticut, U.S.), one of the foremost American linguists and anthropologists of his time, most widely known for his contributions to the study of North American Indian languages. A founder of ethnolinguistics, which considers the *relationship of culture to language* (emphasis mine. – I. T.), he was also a principal developer of the American (descriptive) school of structural linguistics" [47].

In a letter to O. Roshkevych (Lviv, February 29, 1876), I. Franko, a 19-year-old young man, wrote:

“My scholarship has been increased by 210 zł[otys]. The Messrs Poles have done a very nice thing! For this intention, there have gathered three such persons like we, beggars in rags, to publish prose works, namely Ustianovych’s short novels. You will not believe how laudingly our Ruthenians speak about it. F[athe]r. Ohonovs’kyi, my teacher, promised us his help. *In parallel with this, we plan to publish in books works translated from other literatures* [emphasis added. – I.T.]. The beginning should be made by Goethe’s *Faust* in my translation. That work is so memorable to me that I couldn’t fail to make a start with it – and I think it will be (for the second time) happy” [39, vol. 48, p. 46–47; see also 39, vol. 49, p. 302–306, 528–531 et al.]. It is in this letter that I. Franko for the first time declares this very desire of his [16, p. 51].

Undoubtedly, I. Franko the translator’s creative method deserves attention, in particular as “identity’s identity” of its own kind. In this connection, V. Korniyshuk notes that I. Franko translated quite “boldly”: while elaborating a foreign-language text, he tried to “Ukrainianize” it, transfer someone else’s soil onto his own. He “deprived” the text of unnecessary details, creating the appropriate colour [15, p. 134].

Translating, in particular, T. Shevchenko into German, I. Franko aimed at “rendering the spirit of Shevchenko’s poetry in translation” [28, p. 83]. This statement, as an indisputable feature of Ivan Franko’s creative method, extends to other works, other languages from which or into which he translated. When translating, I. Franko always tried to recreate the syntactic pattern of the original [20, p. 218]. Even in scientific translations some belletristic elements are observed.

Having neither time nor sufficient material means to print the translations in full – Khr. Palanytsia notes – I. Franko selected from them only those pages in which the progressive tendencies of this or that work most strongly manifested themselves, so he very often set before his translations *an educational goal* [italics added. – I. T.]. Striving to trace as fully as possible the fate of one character in the novel, he selected only those passages that characterized him/her to the largest extent. This is how excerpts from the novels *Rome, Paris, La faute de l’Abbé Mouret* rose [23, p. 9–10].

Conclusions. Issues of language and operations with it (translation) underlie the identity of any nation. The posited problem permeates the activities of Ivan Franko, being its core, motor, promoter. I. Franko felt for these mechanisms, secret springs and researched them. The issue of national identity is a teleological one as well, i.e. it is expedient to delve into the problem posed by applying methods of cognition (forms of scientific explication inclusive) employing the category of goal and derived concepts.

Linguistic and translation studies issues in Ivan Franko’s activities are in need of further studies employing ever new research paradigms.

---

### Список використаної літератури

---

1. Бігеляйзен Г. Мої спомини про Івана Франка // Спогади про Івана Франка / Упоряд., вступ. ст., прим. М.І. Гнатюка. 2-ге вид., доп., перероб. Львів: Каменяр, 2011. С. 337–344.
2. Білецький О.І. Світове значення Івана Франка // Вінок Івану Франкові. Збірник. Київ: Радянський письменник, 1957. С. 159–168.

3. *Величко Н.* «Де б він не був, що б не робив, він скрізь був самим собою і не міг бути нічим иньшим» («Рідний край» про Івана Франка (1905–1916, 1999–2007 рр.) // *Рідний край*. Наук., публіцист., худ.-літер. альманах. Гол. ред. В. Пашенко. Полтава: ПДПУ ім. В.Г. Короленка, 2008. № 1 (18) С. 97–102.
4. *Вернудіна І.В.* І.Я. Франко: роль особистості митця і креативна діяльність як вияв творчих сил особистості // *Актуальні філософські та культурологічні проблеми сучасності: альманах. Збірник наукових праць*. Вип. 13. Відп. ред. М.М. Бровко, О.Г.Шутов. Київ: ВІПОЛ, 2004. С. 69–77.
5. *Гольберг М.* [Обговорення] // *Іван Франко і світова культура: матеріали міжнародного симпозіуму ЮНЕСКО (Львів, 11–15 вересня 1986 р.): у 3 кн.* / Упоряд. Б.З. Якимович; редкол.: І.І. Лукінов, М.В. Брик, Г.Д. Вєрвєс та ін. Київ: Наукова думка, 1989. Кн. 2. С. 298–300.
6. *Грещук В.* Роль Івана Франка у формуванні єдиної української літературної мови // *Вісник Прикарпатського університету. Філологія*. Вип. XI – XII. Івано-Франківськ: Видавничо-дизайнерський відділ ЦПП, 2006. С. 3–12. [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: <http://lib.if.ua/franko/1311683953.html>. Доступ: 20.08.2018.
7. *Денисюк І.* На далеку дорогу життя Франкове візьмемо слово: вступна стаття // *Франко І.Я. Твори*. Упоряд. та вступ. стаття І.О. Денисюка. Львів: Каменяр, 1991. С. 5–20. (Серія «Шкільна бібліотека»).
8. *Довбня Л.Е., Довбня Д.П.* Мовознавчий доробок Івана Франка // *Гуманітарний вісник ДВНЗ «Переяслав-Хмельницький державний педагогічний університет ім. Григорія Сковороди»*. Науково-теоретичний збірник. Переяслав-Хмельницький, 2006. С. 192–194.
9. *Дорошенко В.* ПОКАЗНИК ДО ІВАНА ФРАНКА. І. 3. БОЙКО, «Іван Франко». Бібліографічний показник. Видання 2-е, переробл. й доп. Видавництво АН УРСР, Київ, 1956, 8°, стор. 286 + 2 непаг. // *Сучасність*. 1962. № 6. С. 103–109 (Критика і бібліографія). [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: [[http://shron2.chtyvo.org.ua/Suchasnist/1962\\_N06\\_18.pdf](http://shron2.chtyvo.org.ua/Suchasnist/1962_N06_18.pdf)]. Доступ: 20.08.2018.
10. *Іван Франко: дух, наука, думка, воля*. Матеріали Міжнародного наукового конгресу, присвяченого 150-річчю від дня народження Івана Франка (Львів, 27 вересня – 1 жовтня 2006 року). Львів: Видавничий центр Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка, 2010. Т. 2. 1150 с.
11. *Іван Франко*. Енциклопедія життя і творчості. [Електронний ресурс]. Доступ одержано 17.11.2020. Режим доступу: <https://www.i-franko.name/uk/HistLit/1905/UkrLiteratura1904.html>.
12. *Іван Франко*. Одвертий лист до галицької української молодіжі. [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: <http://www.ji.lviv.ua/n23texts/franko.htm>.
13. *Кедровський В.* Іван Франко в Одесі // *Спогади про Івана Франка / Упоряд., вступ. ст., прим. М.І. Гнатюка*. 2-ге вид., доп., перероб. Львів: Каменяр, 2011. С. 592–593.
14. *Кобилянський Б.В.* Про мовний аналіз Івана Франка у статті «Дрібні знахідки» // *Іван Франко. Статті і матеріали*. Збірник дванадцятитий. Львів: Вид-во Львівського університету, 1965. С. 132–135.
15. *Корнійчук В.* «Мов орган у величному храмі...» (російська поезія у збірці «Баяди і ро-скази» Івана Франка) // *Російське слово в українському тексті. Українське слово в російському тексті: збірник наукових праць / за ред. Т.А. Космеди*. Львів, 1998. С. 132–138.
16. *Кравець Я.І.* «Quae scripsi, scripsi»: романські літератури у рецепції Івана Франка. Львів: ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2014. 230 с.
17. *Кулеба Е.* Мелодичност српских народних песама у преводима Ивана Франка // *Іван Франко и срби: зборник радова са међународног симпозијума одржаног у Новом Саду*

- 25-27. новембра 1996. Главни уредник др. Б.Косановић. Нови Сад: Српско-українсько друштво: Архив Војводине, 2006. С. 108–113.
18. Москаленко М. Нариси з історії українського перекладу // Всесвіт. Незалежний літературно-мистецький та громадсько-політичний місячник. Київ: Видавничий Дім «Всесвіт», 2006. № 5–6. С. 174–194.
19. *Національна ідентичність*. [Електронний ресурс]. Доступ одержано 23.10.2020. Режим доступу: <https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki>.
20. Неділько В.Я. Поема Т.Г. Шевченка «Кавказ» у перекладі І.Я. Франка на німецьку мову // Тарас Шевченко. До 100-річчя з дня смерті. Збірник наукових праць викладачів кафедр історико-філософського та філологічного факультетів / відп. ред. проф. Ф. Ф. Сневич. Київ, 1961. С. 205–223.
21. Павлюк М.В. І.Я. Франко і питання українського мовознавства // Іван Франко і історико-літературний процес: матеріали наукової конференції / відп. ред. А.В. Недзвідський. Київ: Видавництво Київського ун-ту, 1968. С. 59–61.
22. Павлюк М.М. Концепція художнього перекладу в літературній і науковій спадщині Івана Франка // Іван Франко і світова культура: матеріали Міжнародного симпозіуму ЮНЕСКО (Львів 11–15 вересня 1986 р.): у 3-х кн. / Упоряд. Б.З. Якимович; Редкол.: І.І. Лукінов, М.В. Брик, Г.Д. Вервес та ін. Київ: Наук. думка, 1989. Кн. 2. С. 232–234.
23. Паляниця Х. В. Иван Франко – критик, популяризатор и переводчик французской литературы XIX века на Украине: автореферат дисс.... канд филол. наук. Львов: ЛГУ им. И. Франко, 1967. 19 с.
24. Панасенко Н. Комплексный анализ художественного текста (лексический, стилистический, фонетический и гендерный аспекты) // Типологія мовних значень у діяхронічному та зіставному аспектах: збірник наукових праць / В.Д. Каліушенко (ред. кол.) та ін. Донецьк: ДонНУ, 2008. Вип. 18. С. 110–122.
25. Панасенко Т.М. Иван Франко / Художник-оформлювач Є.В. Вдовиченко. Харків: Фоліо, 2009. 124 с. (Знамениті українці).
26. Панько Т.І. Мова і нація в естетичній концепції І. Франка: монографія. Львів: Світ, 1992. 192 с.
27. Пахльовська О. Є.-Я. Творчість Івана Франка як модель культурно-національної стратегії // Іван Франко – письменник, мислитель, громадянин: матеріали Міжнар. наук. конф., присв. 140-річчю від дня народження Івана Франка (Львів, 25–27 вересня 1996 р.). Львів: Світ, 1998. С. 19–31.
28. Погребенник Я. М. Шевченко німецькою мовою: монографія / Відп. ред. Є.П. Кирилук. Київ: Наукова думка, 1973. 300 с.
29. Походзіло М.У. Иван Франко в школі / 2-ге вид. Київ, 1970. 232 с.
30. Почепцов Г.Г. Иван Франко як знавець іноземних мов // Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного інституту ім. М.О. Островського. Т. VIII. 1957. С. 125–130.
31. Радчук В. Рудий Панько М. Гоголя в дівчачому люстерку Лесі Українки: конгеніальність тлумачки і звітність репортерів // Леся Українка і сучасність: збірник наук. праць. Т. 4, кн. 2. Луцьк: РВВ «Вежа» Волинського національного ун-ту імені Лесі Українки, 2008. С. 161–189.
32. *Словник іншомовних слів* / за ред. члена-кореспондента АН УРСР О.С. Мельничука. Київ, 1977. 776 с.
33. *Старославянский словарь* (по рукописям X – XI веков) / под ред. Р. М. Цейтлин, Р. Вечерки и Э. Благовой. Москва, 1994. 842 с.

34. *Телеологія* // Словник іншомовних слів. [Електронний ресурс]. Доступ одержано 23.10.2020. Режим доступу: <http://slovopedia.org.ua/36/53410/249057.html>.
35. *Фавст*. Трагедія Йогана Вольфганга Гете. Часть перша. З німецького переклав і пояснив Іван Франко. У Львові: Заходом редакції «Сьвіта», 1882. 222 с. (+1 с.).
36. *Франко І.* Двоязычність і дволичність // Літературно-науковий вістник. 1905. Т. 30, кн. 1–3. С. 231–244. [Електронний ресурс]. Доступ одержано 23.10.2020. Режим доступу: <https://docs.google.com/viewer?url=https%3A%2F%2Fshron2.chtyvo.org.ua>.
37. *Франко І.* Двоязычність і дволичність. [Електронний ресурс]. Доступ одержано 21.10.2020. Режим доступу: <http://prostir.co.ua/ivan-franko-dvoyazychnist-i-dvolichnis-16263/>.
38. *Франко І.* Додаткові томи до Зібрання творів у 50 томах. Т. 54. Літературознавчі, фольклористичні, етнографічні та публіцистичні праці, 1896 – 1916 / Ред. тому Є.К. Нахлік. Київ: Наукова думка, 2010. 1216 с.
39. *Франко І.Я.* Зібрання творів: у 50 т. Київ: Наукова думка, 1976–1986.
40. [Франко І.] З поля нашої поезії (IV. «Słowo o pułku Igora przełożył Bohdan Łepki. Kraków. Nakładem autora, 1905») // ЛНВ, 1906. Р. IX. Т. XXXIII. С. 588–594.
41. *Франко І.* Літературна мова і діалекти // Літературно-науковий вістник. 1907. Т. 37. Кн. 2. С. 225–230.
42. *Франко П.* Спогади про батька // Спогади про Івана Франка / упоряд., вступ. ст., прим. М.І. Гнатюка; 2-ге вид., доп., перероб. Львів: Каменяр, 2011. С. 649–657.
43. *Франко Т.* Мої спогади про батька // Спогади про Івана Франка / упоряд., вступ. ст., прим. М.І. Гнатюка; 2-ге вид., доп., перероб. Львів: Каменяр, 2011. С. 657–662.
44. *Хримова С.І.* Іван Франко – вчора, сьогодні і завжди // Русская литература. Исследования: сборник науч. трудов / Киев. нац. ун-т им. Тараса Шевченко; Ин-т л-ры им. Т.Г. Шевченко. Киев, 2006. Вып.10. С. 93–105.
45. *Ярема Я.Я.* Іван Франко і «Фауст» Гете // Дослідження творчості Івана Франка / відп. ред. І.П. Крип'якевич. Київ, 1956. С. 68–107.
46. *Bieder H.* Die sprachwissenschaftliche Terminologie Iwan Frankos. Aspekte sprachlicher und wissenschaftlicher Kontakte // *Іван Франко: дух, наука, думка, воля: матеріали Міжнародного наукового конгресу, присвяченого 150-річчю від дня народження Івана Франка* (Львів, 27 вересня – 1 жовтня 2006 р.). Львів: Видавничий центр Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка, 2010. Т. 2. С. 164–179.
47. *Edward Sapir.* American linguist (online), accessed 15 November 2020. Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Edward-Sapir>.
48. *Franko Ivan* // Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine (Online). Available at: <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%20FrankoIvan.htm>.
49. *Franko Ivan.* Kleine Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kirchenslawischen Literatur. In: *Archiv für slawische Philologie*. 1914. Vol. 35. S. 150–179.
50. *Franko I.* “Moses” and other selected poems / [transl. by R. Karpishka]. Lviv; New York, 143 p. [Manuscript].
51. *Sapir E.* The Status of Linguistics as a Science / Language. Vol. 5. No. 4 (Dec., 1929). P. 207–214. [Online]. Available: <http://www.bible-researcher.com/sapir1.html>.
52. *Stephani Bubali de Cancellariis.* [Електронний ресурс]. Доступ одержано 23.10.2020. Режим доступу: <https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=Agl-hhSePE0>.
53. *Теплий І.* The Foreign-Language Discourse of Ivan Franko: Analytics of the Scientific Translated *Oeuvre Accomplished* // Українське літературознавство. Збірник наукових праць. 2020. Вип. 85. Львів: ЛНУ імені Івана Франка. С. 295–318.

## References

1. Biegeleisen, H. (2011). My Reminiscences on Ivan Franko. In: *Spohady pro Ivana Franka* / Compiled, introduced, furnished with notes by M.I.Hnatiuk. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, supplemented, revised. L'viv: Kameniar Publ., 337-344. (In Ukrainian).
2. Bilets'kyi, O.I. (1957). The World Significance of Ivan Franko. In: *Laurels for Ivan Franko. Collected papers*. Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk publishers, 159-168. (In Ukrainian).
3. Velychko, N. (2008). "Wherever Staying, Whatever Doing, He Had Been His Own Self Everywhere and Couldn't Be Anything Else" (The *Ridnyi kray* [Native Land] Magazine on Ivan Franko (1905–1916, 1999–2007)) / Nina Velychko. In: *Ridnyi kray: Scholarly, publicistic, literary-artistic almanac*. Editor-in-Chief V.Pashchenko. Poltava: The Poltava V.H. Korolenko State Pedagogic University. Issue 1 (18), 97-102. (In Ukrainian).
4. Vernudina, I.V. (2004). I. Ya.Franko: Role of the Artistic Personality and the Creative Activity as Manifestation of the Individual's Creative Forces. In: *Topical Modern Age Issues of Philosophy and Cultural Studies: Almanac / Scholarly collected papers*. Issue 13. Edited by M.M.Brovko, O.H.Shutov. Kyiv: Vipol Publishers, 69-77. (In Ukrainian).
5. Hol'berh, M. (1989). [Discussion]. In: *Ivan Franko and World Culture: Materials of the UNESCO International Symposium (L'viv, 11-15 September 1986)*: In 3 books / Compiled by B.Z. Yakymovych; Editorial Board: I.I. Lukinov, M.V.Bryk, H.D. Verves et al. Book 2. Kyiv: Naukova dumka Publishers, 298-300. (In Ukrainian).
6. Greshchuk, V. (2006). Ivan Franko's Role in Forming the Single Ukrainian Literary Language. In: Visnyk of Subcarpathian University. Philology. Issue XI-XII. Ivano-Frankiv'sk: Publishing and Design Department at the Investment and Innovation Programmes Centre, 3-12. [Online]. Available at: <http://lib.if.ua/franko/1311683953.html> (In Ukrainian).
7. Denysiuk, I. (1991). For the Long Path of Life Let Us Take Along the Word of Ivan Franko: Introductory article. In: *Franko I.Ya. Works. Compiled and introduced by I.O.Denysiuk*. L'viv: Kameniar Publishers, 5-20 (School Library Series). (In Ukrainian).
8. Dovbnia, L.E., Dovbnia, D.P. (2006). The Linguistic Oeuvre of Ivan Franko. In: *The Humanities Bulletin of "The Pereyaslav-Khmel'nyts'kyi Hryhoriy Skovoroda State Pedagogical University" State Higher Educational Establishment: Scholarly-theoretical collected papers*. Pereyaslav-Khmel'nyts'kyi, 192-194. (In Ukrainian).
9. Doroshenko, V. (1962). INDEX TO IVAN FRANKO. I. Z. BOYKO, "Ivan Franko. Bibliography index. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, revised and extended. Published by the Academy of Sciences, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Kyiv, 1956, 8°, p. 286 + 2 sheets unpaginated. In: *Suchasnist'*. No.6, 103-109 (Critique and Bibliography). [Online]. Available at: [[http://shron2.chtyvo.org.ua/Suchasnist/1962\\_N06\\_18.pdf](http://shron2.chtyvo.org.ua/Suchasnist/1962_N06_18.pdf)]. Accessed 20 August 2018. (In Ukrainian).
10. Ivan Franko: *Spirit, Learning, Thought, Liberty (2010): Materials of the International Scholarly Congress dedicated to the 150<sup>th</sup> Birthday Anniversary of Ivan Franko (L'viv, 27 September – 1 October 2006)*. L'viv: Ivan Franko National University of L'viv Publishing Centre, Vol. 2, 1150 p. (In Ukrainian).
11. Ivan Franko. *Encyclopaedia of Life and Creative Activity* (2020). [Online]. Accessed 17 November 2020. Available at: <https://www.i-franko.name/uk/HistLit/1905/UkrLiteratura1904.html> (In Ukrainian).

12. Ivan Franko (1905). *A Sincere Letter to the Ukrainian Galician Youth* [online]. Available at: <http://www.ji.lviv.ua/n23texts/franko.htm> (In Ukrainian).
13. Kedrovs'kyi, V. (2011). Ivan Franko in Odesa. In: *Reminiscences on Ivan Franko* / Compiled, introduced, furnished with notes by M.I.Hnatiuk, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, supplemented, revised. L'viv: Kameniar Publishers, 592-593. (In Ukrainian).
14. Kobylans'kyi, B.V. (1965). On Ivan Franko's Linguistic Analysis in the Article "Small Finds". In: *Ivan Franko. Articles and Materials. Collected papers. Issue 12*. L'viv: L'viv University press, 132-135. (In Ukrainian).
15. Kornychuk, V. (1998) "Like an Organ in a Majestic Temple ..." (Russian Poetry in the collection "Baliady i roskazy" [Ballads and Tales] by Ivan Franko). In: *The Russian word in the Ukrainian text. The Ukrainian word in the Russian text: Collected scholarly papers* / Ed. by T.A. Kosmeda. Lviv, 132-138. (In Ukrainian).
16. Kravets', Ya.I. (2014) "*Quae scripsi, scripsi*": *Romance Literatures in the Reception of Ivan Franko* / L'viv: The Ivan Franko National University of L'viv Publishing Centre, 230 p. (In Ukrainian).
17. Kuleba, E. (2006). Melodiousness of Serbian Folk Songs as Translated by Ivan Franko. In: *Ivan Franko and Serbs: Proceedings of the International Symposium Held in Novi Sad on 25-27 November 1996*. Editor-in-Chief, Dr. B. Kosanović. Novi Sad: Serbian-Ukrainian Society: Archives of Vojvodina, 108-113. (In Serbian).
18. Moskalenko, M. (2006). Outlines on the History of Ukrainian Translation. In: *Vsesvit: Independent literary-artistic and socio-political monthly*. Kyiv: "Vsesvit" Publishing House, No.5-6, 174-194. (In Ukrainian).
19. National Identity (2020) [Online], accessed 23 October 2020. Available at: <https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/>. (In Ukrainian).
20. Nedil'ko, V.Ya. (1961). T.H. Shevchenko's Poem "The Caucasus" as Translated into German by I.Ya. Franko. In: *Taras Shevchenko. Towards Death Centenary: Collected scholarly papers authored by lecturers at the departments of the Historico-Philosophical and Philological Faculties* / Edited by Prof. F.F.Yenevych / Kyiv: The Taras Shevchenko University of Kyiv, 205-223. (In Ukrainian).
21. Pavliuk, M.V. (1968). I.Ya. Franko and Questions of Ukrainian Linguistics. In: *Ivan Franko and Historico-Literary Process: Materials of Scholarly Conference* / Edited by A.V.Nedzvids'kyi. Kyiv: Kyiv University Press, 59-61. (In Ukrainian).
22. Pavliuk, M.M. (1989). The Concept of Literary Translation in the Literary and Scholarly Heritage of Ivan Franko. In: *Ivan Franko and World Culture: Materials of the International UNESCO Symposium (L'viv, 11-15 September 1986)*: In 3 books. Book 2 / Compiled by B.Z. Yakymovych; Editorial Board: I.I.Lukinov, M.V.Bryk, H.D. Verves et al. Kyiv: Naukova dumka Publishers, 232-234. (In Ukrainian).
23. Palianytsia, Khr. V. (1967). *Ivan Franko as Critic, Popularizer and Translator of 19<sup>th</sup> c. French Literature in Ukraine: Synopsis of Dissertation for ... Candidate of Philology*. L'viv: The Ivan Franko State University of L'viv, 19 p. (In Russian).
24. Panasenko, N. (2008) Complex Analysis of the Literary-Artistic Text (Lexical, Stylistic, Phonetic and Gender Aspects). In: *Typology of Linguistic Meanings in Diachronic and Contrastive Aspects: Proceedings* / V.D. Kaliushchenko (Ed.Board) et al. Donetsk: Donetsk National University Publishers. Issue 18, 110-122. (In Russian, Ukrainian).



25. Panasenko T.M. (2009). *Ivan Franko / Artistic decorator* Ye.V. Vdovychenko. Kharkiv: Folio Publishers, 124 c. ("Famous Ukrainians"). (In Ukrainian).
26. Pan'ko, T.I. (1992). *Language and Nation in the Aesthetic Concept of I. Franko: Monograph*. L'viv: Svit Publishers, 192 p. (In Ukrainian).
27. Pachlovska, O. Je.-Ja. (1998). Ivan Franko's Creativity as a Model of Cultural and National Strategy. In: *Ivan Franko – Writer, Thinker, Citizen: Materials of the International Conference Dedicated to the 140<sup>th</sup> Birthday Anniversary of Ivan Franko* (L'viv, 25-27 September 1996). L'viv: Svit Publishers, 19-31. (In Ukrainian).
28. Pohrebennyk, Ya.M. (1973). *Shevchenko in German: Monograph*. Editor-in-Chief Ye.P.Kyryliuk. Kyiv: Naukova dumka Publishers, 300 p. (In Ukrainian).
29. Pokhodzilo, M.U. (1970). *Ivan Franko at School / 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. Kyiv: Radians'ka shkola Publishers, 232 p. (In Ukrainian).
30. Pocheptsov, H.H. (1957). Ivan Franko as Expert in Foreign Languages. In: *Proceedings of the Vinnytsia M.O.Ostrov's'kyi State Teacher-Training Institute*. Vol.VIII, 125-130.
31. Radchuk, V. (2008). M.Gogol's Rudy Panko in the Looking-Glass of Lesia Ukrayinka as a Girl: The Translatress's Cognate Gift and the Accountability of Reporters. In: *Lesia Ukrayinka and Modern Age: Collected scholarly papers. Vol. 4. Book 2*. Luts'k: The "Vezha" Editing and Publishing Department, Volhynia Lesia Ukrayinka National University, 161-189. (In Ukrainian).
32. Dictionary of Foreign Words. (1977) Edited by O.S. Mel'nychuk, Corresponding Member, Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. Kyiv: Main Editorial Office of the Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopaedia, 776 p. (In Ukrainian).
33. Old Slavonic Dictionary (*Based on 10<sup>th</sup> -11<sup>th</sup> cc. manuscripts*). (1994) / Edited by R.M.Tseytlin, R. Večerka and E.Blagova. Moscow: Russki Yazyk Publishers, 842 p. (In Russian).
34. Teleology (2020). In: *Dictionary of Foreign Words*: [Online], accessed 23 October 2020. Available at: <http://slovopedia.org.ua/36/53410/249057.html> (In Ukrainian).
35. Favst. (1882). *Tragedy by Johann Wolfgang Goethe. First Part*. Translated from the German and explicated by Ivan Franko. In L'viv: Owing to the S'vit Publishers Editorial Office, 222 p. (+1 p.). (In Ukrainian).
36. Franko I. (1905). Bilingualism and Bifaciality. In: *Literaturno-Naukovyi Vistnyk, vol.30, book 1-3*, p. 231-244 [online], accessed 23 October 2020. Available at: <https://docs.google.com/viewer?url=https%3A%2F%2Fshron2.chtyvo.org.ua> (In Ukrainian).
37. Franko, I. (2020). *Bilingualism and Bifaciality* [online], accessed 21 October 2020. Available at: <http://prostir.co.ua/ivan-franko-dvoyazychnist-i-dvolychnis-16263/>. (In Ukrainian).
38. Franko, I. (2006-2010/2010). *Additional volumes to the Complete Works in 50 vols.* / Editorial Board: M.H. Zhulyns'kyi (Chairman) et al. Kyiv: Naukova dumka Publishers, vol. 54: *Literary-theoretical, folkloristic, ethnographic and journalistic works, 1896-1916* / Ed.by Ye.K.Nakhlik. – 2010. – 1216 p. (In Ukrainian).
39. Franko, I.Ya. (1976-1986). Complete Works: In 50 volumes. Kyiv: Naukova dumka Publishers.
40. [Franko, I.] (1906). From the Field of our Poetry (IV. «Słowo o pułku Igora przełożył Bohdan Łepki. Kraków. Nakładem autora, 1905»). In: *Literaturno-Naukovyi Vistnyk. Annual Issue IX. Vol.XXXIII*, 588-594. (In Ukrainian, Polish).
41. Franko, I. (1907). Literary Language and Dialects. In: *Literaturno-Naukovyi Vistnyk*, vol. 37, book 2, 225-230. (In Ukrainian).

42. Franko, P. (2011). Reminiscences on Father. In: *Reminiscences on Ivan Franko* / Compiled, introduced, furnished with notes by M.I.Hnatiuk. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, supplemented, revised. L'viv: Kameniar Publishers, 649-657. (In Ukrainian).
43. Franko, T. (2011). My reminiscences on Father. In: *Reminiscences on Ivan Franko* / Compiled, introduced, furnished with notes by M.I.Hnatiuk. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, supplemented, revised. L'viv: Kameniar Publishers, 657-662. (In Ukrainian).
44. Khramova, S.I. (2006). Ivan Franko – Yesterday, Today and Ever. In: *Russian Literature. Research: Collected scholarly papers* / Kyiv Taras Shevchenko National University; T.H.Shevchenko Institute of Literature. Editorial Board: A.Yu. Merezhinskaya et al. Kyiv, Issue 10.
45. Yarema, Ya.Ya. (1956). Ivan Franko and Goethe's "Faust". In: *Ivan Franko's Works Researched. Editor-in-Chief I.P.Krypyakevych*. Kyiv: Publishing House, Academy of Sciences, Ukrainian SSR, 1956. – С. 68-107. (In Ukrainian).
46. Bieder, H. (2010). Ivan Franko's Linguistic Terminology. Aspects of Lingual and Scholarly Contacts. In: *Ivan Franko: Spirit, Learning, Thought, Liberty (2010): Materials of the International Scholarly Congress dedicated to the 150<sup>th</sup> Birthday Anniversary of Ivan Franko (L'viv, 27 September – 1 October 2006)*. L'viv: Ivan Franko National University of L'viv Publishing Centre, Vol.2, 178-179. (In German).
47. Edward Sapir. *American linguist* (2020). (online), accessed 15 November 2020. Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Edward-Sapir>.
48. Franko, Ivan (2020). In: *Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine* (online), accessed 23.11.2020. Available at: <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%FrankoIvan.htm>.
49. Franko, Ivan (1914). Small Contributions to the History of Church Slavonic Literature. In: *Archiv für slawische Philologie*. Vol. 35, 150-179. (In German).
50. Franko, I. (2016). "Moses" and other selected poems / [transl. by R. Karpishka]. Lviv; New York, 143 p. [Manuscript].
51. Sapir, E. (1929). The Status of Linguistics as a Science / Language. Vol. 5. No. 4 (Dec., 1929). P. 207-214 [online], accessed November 25, 2020. Available at: <http://www.bible-researcher.com/sapir1.html>.
52. Stephani Bubali de Cancellariis (2020) [Online], accessed 23 October 2020. Available at: <https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=Agl-hhSePE0>.
53. Teplyy, I. (2020). The Foreign-Language Discourse of Ivan Franko: Analytics of the Scientific Translated *Oeuvre* Accomplished. In: *Ukrainian Literary Studies: Collected scholarly papers. Issue 85*. L'viv: The Ivan Franko National University of L'viv, 295-318.

---

**Іван Теплий** – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри іноземних мов для гуманітарних факультетів Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка (вул. Університетська, 1, м. Львів, 79000, Україна).

**Ivan Teplyy** – Cand. Sc. (Philology), Associate Professor, Foreign Languages Department for Humanities, The Ivan Franko National University of Lviv (1 Universytets'ka Str., 79000, L'viv, Ukraine).

E-mail: [i\\_teplyy@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:i_teplyy@yahoo.co.uk)

## ISSUES OF NATIONAL IDENTITY IN THE FOREIGN-LANGUAGE DISCOURSE OF IVAN FRANKO

Ivan TEPLYIY

The article touches upon the issue of national identity in Ivan Franko's activities within the framework of a broader set of problems, viz. "The Hearts Will Feel Thy Strength of Days of Yore...": I. Franko's Dimensions of the National Identity". It embraces the following facets of the issue: linguistic, literary-theoretical, cultural-studies, translation, translation studies. The paper, properly speaking, **aims at** covering the above-mentioned aspects.

**Novelty.** The paper pioneers contextualizing the posited problem in all its entirety, with multilingual background involved. The exposition is based on I. Franko's own oeuvre on the issue and the introduction of a broader, philosophic inclusive, contextual background of his multifaceted activities in the works of present-day and yesterday researchers – philosophers, linguists, literary theorists, cultural students, translation scholars, translators. In particular, I. Franko's major linguistic works have been analysed, in creative dialogue, at that, with E. Sapir's paper "The Status of Linguistics as a Science". The issue of I. Franko's linguistic personality has received its coverage too.

To clarify all these problematic aspects, the **system approach**, with the application of literary and historical, genetic, comparative, cultural and historical methods, those of dictionary definitions, componential analysis, has been employed.

Conclusions arrived at: The issues of language and operations on it (translation, translation studies) underlie any nation's identity. The posed problem pervades the declared I. Franko's activities in all their entirety, being the core, motor, promotor of the activities in question. I. Franko searched for those mechanisms, their hidden springs, and explored them. The problem is equally teleological. In other words, it's expedient to tackle the problem by applying cognition methods (including scientific explication forms), having enacted the goal category and derived concepts.

The issues of linguistics and translation studies in I. Franko's activities require further research, with increasingly novel research paradigms applied.

**Keywords:** identity, sameness, teleology, language, foreign-language, linguistic, literary-theoretical, translation studies.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії: 31.01.2024.

Прийнята до друку: 24.02.2025.