

Features of Shakespeare's works interpreted by the Russian translator Dmitry Minh

Dmitry N. Zhatkin¹

¹Penza State Technological University, Penza, Russia
ivb40@yandex.ru

Olga S. Milotaeva²

²Penza State University Architecture und Construction, Penza, Russia
milo124@rambler.ru

Abstract

The article is devoted to consideration of features of Shakespeare's works interpreted by the Russian translator Dmitry Egorovich Minh. In the course of the analysis social, cultural, comparative, historical and typological methods are used. As a result, appearance of complete translations of Richard II, created by V.D. Kostomarov and A. L. Sokolovsky in 1865, led to stopping D.E. Minh's work on his interpretation of the chronicle Richard II. In conclusion, he was significantly late in comparison with A.V. Druzhinin and A.L. Sokolovsky's translations which had appeared in the middle of the 1860s. Therefore D.E. Minh's work remained unnoticed by public.

Key words: Russian-English Literary, Cultural Communications.

Características de las obras de Shakespeare interpretadas por el traductor ruso Dmitry Egorovich Minh

Resumen

El artículo está dedicado a la consideración de las características de las obras de Shakespeare interpretadas por el traductor ruso Dmitry Egorovich Minh. En el curso del análisis se utilizan métodos sociales, culturales, comparativos, históricos y tipológicos. Como resultado, aparición de traducciones completas de Richard II, creado por V.D. Kostomarov y A. L. Sokolovsky en 1865, llevaron a detener a D.E. El trabajo de Minh sobre su interpretación de la crónica Richard II. En conclusión, llegó significativamente tarde en comparación con A.V. Las traducciones de Druzhinin y A.L. Sokolovsky que aparecieron a mediados de la década de 1860. Por lo tanto D.E. El trabajo de Minh pasó desapercibido por el público.

Palabras clave: Comunicación Literaria Ruso-Inglesa, Cultural.

1. Introduction

Studying creative works of the Russian poet-translator of the second half of the 19th century Dmitry Egorovich Minh is caused by strengthening of attention to the problems of Russian-Western European literary communications and literary biography of Russian writers of the second plan who were unfairly forgotten and underestimated in the previous time. Translating from the Italian, German and English languages, Minh, on the one hand, contributed to the development of Russian-European literary and cultural dialogue, and on the other hand – to professionalizing of Russian poetic translation, improvement of approaches and demands to translations. The volume of Minh's creative heritage is extensive, however the most considerable of his works was Dante Alighieri's *The Divine Comedy*. This work took away a lot of time and forces from him. Minh translated such English authors.

2. Literature Review

The leading Russian scientists such as M.P. Alekseev (the articles *Problem of Literary Translation*, *The First Acquaintance with Dante in Russia*, *Russian Meetings of William Morris*), R.M. Gorokhova (the article *Dante's Hell in Minh's interpretation and imperial censorship*), Rovda (1965) (the chapter *Years of Reaction* from the collective monograph *Shakespeare and Russian Culture*), Levin (his monographs *Russian Translators of the 19th Century* and *Development of Literary Translation, Shakespeare and Russian Literature of the 19th Century*, the article *Burns in Russian*, the article *Minh Dmitry Egorovich* for the fourth volume of the biographic dictionary *Russian writers. 1800 – 1917*), Dzhivelegov (the monograph *Dante Alighieri. Life and creative work*), Golenishchev-Kutuzov (the monograph *Dante's Creative Work and World Culture*), Asoyan (the monograph *Honor the greatest poet.... The fate of Dante's The Divine Comedy in Russia*) and some others wrote or mentioned about Minh's creative works in their researches. In particular, Rovda (1965) noted the fight of two tendencies in making translations, alterations and retellings of Shakespearean works in 1880s: one of them reflected the aspiration to adapt Shakespearean creativity for the lowered tastes of bourgeois readers and viewers, the other was directed to mastering true Shakespeare. Along with Averkiyev and Yuryev Minh was ranked to the translators of the second group whose creative works corresponded to the tendencies of development of philological science in respect of Shakespeare's perception in particular and translated works in general.

3. Methodology

The theoretical and methodological source of the article is based on works of classics of domestic literary criticism, works on problems of Russian-English historical and cultural and literary interaction, the theory and history of the literary translation, history of the Russian translated fiction, cross-cultural communication (Rovda, 1965). In the course of the analysis, social and cultural, comparative and historical, cultural and historical and comparative and typological methods are used.

4. Results

For the first time, Minh addressed to W. Shakespeare's creative works. He translated a monologue of King Richard from the historical chronicle Richard II for the 300th anniversary of the great English playwright. Minh's translation was published in *Russky Vestnik* under the title *Monologue of King Richard II before His Death in a Dungeon* (from scene 5, act V of Shakespeare's drama Richard II) the same year. This translation was added by the note correlating creation of the translation to the Shakespearean holiday and reporting about its reading by the author in a meeting of Moscow University on April 23, 1864 (Minh, 1864).

The historical chronicle Richard II was translated in Russia as separate fragments <in prose>, act V, scene 3 (Shakespeare, 1831); an anonymous translator, 1831, act I, scenes 1 – 6 (The fragment from Shakespeare's tragedy..., 1831); Ustryalov, act I, scene 4 Shakespeare (1841a) and completely – in prose by Katcher Shakespeare (1841b) and Kanshin (Shakespeare, 1865). It was also completely translated in verses – by Kostomarov (Shakespeare, 1865), Sokolovsky (Shakespeare, 1865), Mikhalovsky (Shakespeare, 1831), Holodkovsky (Shakespeare, 1865), Tchaikovsky (Shakespeare, 1865), Kurosheva (Shakespeare, 1841a), Donskoy (Shakespeare, 1841b). As we see, by the time of appearance of Minh's fragmentary translation, Richard II had been translated in Russia a little. And as we can also see the translations were executed in prose except the anonymous author of the *St. Petersburg Bulletin*. Only Katcher addressed to the text of act V scene 5 before Minh. Minh had to offer Russian readers the first poetic interpretation of the chosen fragment from Shakespeare's historical chronicle that was poorly known in Russia.

It is known that Richard II was created by the great English playwright after Henry IV and Richard III, in which the events of the War of Scarlet and White Roses and also a triumph of York house over Lancaster were described. Intending to introduce the complete history of governing and death of the Plantagenets in his chronicle about King Richard II Shakespeare showed the Lancasters' rising preceding the York dynasty. Reducing digress from historical truth to a minimum, he created a surprisingly exact and expressive image of the main character. He guessed his character, having completely rejected reproaches to Richard in emptiness, negligibility, delicacy, admiring by his high position, his passion to pleasures, impetuousness in prodigality, changeability in mood, causeless willfulness, cruelty and ruthlessness. Overcoming indecision Richard appeared as a courageous and strong-willed person, besides differing from the predecessors in education (he was the first English king who was able to read and write). He was also characterized by his patronage of arts and tolerance in religious affairs. Shakespeare, basing all the drama on subtle analysis of a difficult character of the main hero, skillfully revealed deep features of Richard's attitude. Finally, the author induces quietly, without contempt to be respectful to the main hero's need who had unpleasantly struck with his arrogance and self-admiration among the general atmosphere of gloss and greatness.

Having been taken prisoner, the Shakespearean hero delivers his well-known monologue. It completely disclosed positive streaks of his character, showed his ability to deeply analytical mental work. It was the monologue filled with bright metaphors and comparisons (for example, *My brain I will prove the female to my soul/ My soul the father; and these two beget/A generation of still-breeding thoughts, And these same thoughts people this little world, / In humors like the people of this world, / For no thought is contented that was chosen for the translation by Minh. Translating a Shakespearean metaphor Minh, and after him Holodkovsky, refuse literalism, accurately correlating nouns taking into account their formal features. At the same time Minh favourably embellishes the text by means of repetitions, cf.: ... My mind, be the father! / Be the mother, my soul! And both /*

Beget a long, long line all new all of still-breeding thoughts! (Minh, 1864) –... My brain – the spouse of my soul, / the soul – his wife; from them the lineage of prolific thoughts will be begotten, / which can fill with themselves / All this small world ... (Shakespeare, 1841a). On this background Sokolovsky's translation is less advantageous. He did not pay attention to the absence of accurate gender categories in the English original and as a result in his translation brain is <...> the wife of spirit: ... let my brain become/ The wife of spirit, the spirit – the father; let them together / Beget a swarm of eternally new thoughts/ And thoughts will inhabit my dungeon / By crowd of residents. Donskoy refused detailed distribution of roles, thereby having a little simplified understanding of the English original: ... my brain with my soul / Are in matrimony. From them thoughts, / Giving further generation will be born.

The solution of involuntary sympathy for this king is concealed in prevalence of imagination in Richard's mind, in his bent for an inspired poeticizing of his emotional experience Anikst (1958) Owing to what the most exact interpretation of Shakespearean comparisons was a task of the Russian translators: ... Let them / Fill all this small world, / Where, as well as people in the world, they will not be able to have peace ... (Minh, 1864); ... Thoughts are – the same as people. / Like them, they are not able to / Have peace in any way or to be satisfied with themselves ... The people of those thoughts / Are similar to all the people in the Universe, / In order to, not anyone of them / is not satisfied; There is a tribe that lives in this small world, / Is similar surprisingly / To the tribe that lives in that external world, / Thoughts are eternally dissatisfied too (Nevertheless Holodkovsky when translating comparison about impossibility to reach God It is as hard to come as for a camel/ to thread the postern of a small needle's eye significantly departed from the original, having digressed a mention of a camel: <...> it is more difficult to come there, / than to thread a rope through a needle's eye. Other Russian translators tried to keep the English idiomatic expression which looked ridiculous in Russian speech: <...> It is more difficult to come / To me, than for a camel to pass/ Through a needle's eye (Minh, 1864); <...> a camel will pass through a needle's eye/ Rather, than we will come in God's dwelling (It is more difficult to enter, than for a camel to pass/ Through a narrow needle's eye; To come to me is not easier, than to pass / Through a needle's eye for a camel.

Minh digressed the original metaphor comparing the king with hours. At the same time the interpretation of false sounding of music as a symbolical sign is embellished in the final part of the monologue by means of comparison: For 'tis a sign of love; and love to Richard/Is a strange brooch in this all-hating world –... This is the sign of/ Love to Richard, and love to me is – / that a pearl of a crown which has lost its value / in a crowd of people where all hate (Minh, 1864). Between dryish observation of the original text and Minh's pathos description there are no real semantic distinctions, however an essential verge is at the level of emotional perception that the translators of the next years could not but notice. So, Holodkovsky's translation with a characteristic motive of love as a strange thing in the cruel world is closer to the original (... it serves a sign of / Love to me, and to Richard love is – /A strange thing in this cruel world, / Where hatred reigns in all hearts. And Sokolovsky's translation with his motive of loss of love's value is closer to Minh's translation (That is the sign of love; and love to Richard / is not appreciated more in this world. Kurysheva characterizes love to Richard as rare embellishment in the spiteful world, Donskoy cardinaly changes sense of the fragment strengthening it with repetition: It is the sign of love, / And to Richard love is – such rarity, / such value in this angry world (Shakespeare, 1841a).

In 1864-1865 Minh began working on the poetic translation of the other Shakespeare's historical chronicle –King John (Between 1594 to 1597). By that time only one translation of this work had been known. It was translated in prose by Katcher (Shakespeare, 1831). However Druzhinin and

Kostomarov Shakespeare (1865) whose poetic translations for the first time were issued in 1865 along with Minh addressed to the interpretation of King John almost synchronously. Minh who used to complete his translations for a long time became the witness of how his translation lost its relevance both for publishers and for the reader's audience. Druzhinin's translation was especially successful which was repeatedly reissued in the subsequent years. In 1880 Minh reported to Gerbel that the complete poetic translation of King John is stored in his briefcase (National Library of Russia; Anikst, 1958). Gerbel (1880) who was quite satisfied with Druzhinin's translation in reply suggested Minh to translate the tragedy Anthony and Cleopatra for the third issuing of Shakespeare's compositions prepared by him. Minh admitted in his reply letter that he did not learn Shakespeare too much, and the translation of a blank verse is <...> not an easy task. He offered the publisher the following... I will start translating the drama < Anthony and Cleopatra> and one of the poems <Venus and Adonis>. And if it is successful, and I am satisfied, then I will continue; if it is not, then I will inform you on the failure (Anikst, 1958; Shakespeare, 1865). However, Minh's translations of the tragedy Anthony and Cleopatra and the poem Venus and Adonis were not created; in the third issuing of Shakespeare's compositions these works were translated by Sokolovsky.

Minh was succeeded to publish his translation only in 1882 on pages of Russky Vestnik (Russian Bulletin) and the separate edition. Minh's hope for inclusion of his translation to Shakespeare's collected works published both in 1880s and in the next years did not come true, – A.V. Druzhinin's authority as a translator of Shakespearean dramas continued to dominate over publishers. The only republication of Minh's translation was in 1901 and was connected with A.S. Suvorin's promotional activity editing his well-known cheap library. Almost unnoticed other translations of King John written in prose by Kanshin Shakespeare (1841a) and in verses by Sokolovsky. In the Soviet years new translations for the most considerable editions of Shakespeare's works were made.

Contrary to the descriptions, which are contained in the historical chronicle Richard II descriptions in the play-chronicle King John are not aimed at disclosing of character of the main hero, being quite often accented on portraits and the fate of certain minor characters. Cowardly, flabby, arrogant, despotic, defiant, haughty and humiliated excessively for the sake of deduction of the crown King John is represented by some relief features. His hypocrisy best of all reveals in relationship with the chamberlain Gubert. At first, in scene 3, act III, John orders Gubert to kill the nephew and the heir-at-law of the throne Artur: «King John. Good Hubert, Hubert, Hubert, throw thine eye / on yon young boy: I will tell thee what, my friend/ He is a very serpent in my way; / and whereso'er this foot of mine doth tread, / He lies before me: dost thou understand me? / Thou art his keeper. Hubert. And I will keep him so, / that he shall not offend your majesty. King John. Death. Hubert. My lord? King John. A grave. Hubert. He shall not live» (Shakespeare, 1865). Then, in scene 2, act IV, having become the witness of the revolt caused by rumors about Artur's death, King John shifts all responsibility for the incident to the servant: «It is the curse of kings to be attended / By slaves that take their humours for a warrant / To break within the bloody house of life, / And on the winking of authority / To understand a law, to know the meaning / Of dangerous majesty, when perchance it frowns / More upon humour than advised respect».

King John's behavior is similar to the actions of that snake to which he compares the nephew in the monologue. In this monologue the main hero persistently suggests an idea to him about the necessity of the child's death having repeated the servant's name three times: I trust, kind Gubert. / Oh Gubert, Gubert! Whether you have looked at that child/? Shall I tell the truth, my friend? / That a real snake in my way, / and where I would not put a leg, everywhere / He is in front of me <...>

(Minh, 1864); Will you execute everything? I know it, Gubert, / my Gubert, kind Gubert, have a look / At this child; my faithful friend, / I will tell you, the that child is – a snake: / Where on the way I would not step my foot, / Everywhere he will lay down as a dragon in front of me. The translators of the Soviet period reduce a number of repetitions of Gubert's name and also allow other inaccuracies, in particular, they use a lexeme friend when the king addresses to the servant, and they also choose an inappropriate epithet in this context to the word snake; My kind Gubert! Gubert ... have a look / at the boy. I admit to you, my friend: / He on my way – as a snake; / Where I would step my foot, – / He is in front of me everywhere <...> My Hubert, my friend Hubert! Have a look / at the boy. I want to admit to you: / He is on my way – a dashing snake/ where I would move, he is everywhere.

Druzhinin used repetition of the word slaves in the translation of the fragment about John's refusal of his own words, despite the order assured by his sign and seal. Thereby he emphasized the aspiration of the king to humiliate the servant: For sin and evil the slaves crowd at tsars / Whom the higher authority / Is an occasion on bloody affairs; / The slaves safely treating the law, / With a wave of king's hand / Are always ready to give a start for dangerous actions / That the emperor ordered. The intricate definition given to the murder by the king –to break within the bloody house of life, was quite reasonably simplified by Druzhinin. He used the phrase bloody affairs, whereas the other translators interpreted this English expression almost literally and it is possible to see obvious lexical call-over of Rykova's translation with Birukova's earlier translation: To take their whim as the order to rush / into the dwelling of blood! (Minh, 1864); the slaves that take their whim / as power to intrude in a bloody way / into a dwelling-place of life <...> (the slaves whom any their whim is – / the directions to ruthless invasion / into a dwelling-place of life.

The hero of the second plan, but nevertheless the bright character of the drama – Philip Falconbridge [Bastard], the illegitimate son of Richard the Lion-Heart, appears as the true patriot of the country who implicitly executes the decrees of King John. He refused property rights on a rich inheritance for the sake of his recognition as the king's illegal son. Philip is not only brave, but also clever, – in the final of act II after the transaction with John he says a tirade that the world is governed by the benefit, self-interest (commodity). This speech is interesting as an expression of Shakespeare's views on the society. It has something in common with the well-known monologues of the main character of the other Shakespearean tragedy –Timon of Athens. This tragedy is about the power of gold, which, by the way, was also condemned in other Shakespeare's plays, for example, in *The Merchant of Venice* (Anikst, 1958): Not that I have the power to clutch my hand, / When his fair angels would salute my palm; / But for my hand, as unattempted yet, / Like a poor beggar, raileth on the rich. Only Birukova and, partly, Rykova supported the author's word-play concluded in the word angels used in the meaning of gold coins: Whether it will be enough power to clutch my hand, / When golden angels of Self-interest / would come to solute my palm? (Whether I will be able to clutch my hand, / When chervonets, angels of Self-interest, / Try to solute my Palm? At the same time it is possible to see absolutely inappropriate mention of the Russian monetary unit – chervonets, not correlated to the English realities at all in Rykova's interpretation. The same disadvantage can be seen also in early Russian translations, including Minh's ones where it is not mentioned the attractive force of golden angels at all: And whether it <benefit> pour a handful of chervonets into my palm, / shall I clutch my hand not to take? (Minh, 1864); and I – when chervonets are offered to me – / Will I clutch my hand not to take the money?

In the gallery of female images of King John the leading place belongs to passionate Constance, Artur's mother. Her portrait is described more vividly than the portraits of King John's niece Blanche of Spain and her mother – Queen Eleonora. The love to the son destroys all other feelings

in this deeply tragic nature. Her seeming ambition, ingenuity, resourcefulness in the aspiration to take possession of a throne is supported only with thirst of the crown for the son, and therefore, having lost Artur, she also loses the meaning of life. In scene 4, act III Shakespeare shows that after the loss of the son Constance cherished only the grief and was eager for death: Death, death; O amiable lovely death! / Thou odouriferous stench! Sound rottenness! / Arise forth from the couch of lasting night, / Thou hate and terror to prosperity/ And I will kiss thy detestable bones / And put my eyeballs in thy vaulty brows / And ring these fingers with thy household worms / And stop this gap of breath with fulsome dust / And be a carrion monster like thyself; / Come, grin on me, and I will think thou smilest / And buss thee as thy wife. Misery's love, / O, come to me! The original anaphora intended to emphasize thirst of death in all its horror was not reflected in Russian translations. Minh introduced in the description the oxymoron showing an intended Constance's feelings of doom for the sufferings and death: Death, death. Oh, lovely delight! / Oh, odouriferous stench! Sound rottenness! / Oh, death, arise from the couch of eternal night, / you are the hatred, you are the fear of all happy! The translators of the Soviet period use the same device and at E.N. Birukova's translation the lust for death is even more emphasized (Death, death! Amiable lovely death. / Fragrant rottenness! Desired stench! And at Rykova's translation death is correlated to blissful tranquility Death, death! I love and call death. / Fragrant stench! Blissful decay! According to the content Druzhinin's translation is most successful. He could subtly feel Shakespeare's intonations. He could also reproduce all nuances of the heroine moods, having refused implicit acceptance of death as an ideal and a final result of human existence: Death, death is necessary to me. Lovely death! / Your stench is sweet, your rottenness is eternal! / You are hated and terrible for happiness! / Oh, arise from the couch of eternal night – / And I will kiss your detestable bones, / I will put my eyes in your skull, / And ring the fingers with sepulchral worms, / I will stop my breath with ashes, / And as a carrion monster I will lay down in a coffin / Such one as you are! Come to me! As a drawback of Druzhinin's translation it is possible to note verbosity, lack of a necessary laconicism leading to increase in a total number of poetic lines of this fragment.

Constance's appeal to heaven, which is contained in scene 1, act III («Arm, arm, you heavens, against these perjured kings! / A widow cries; be husband to me, heavens! ») Becomes the appeal to God, the heavenly father in Druzhinin's translation: Hear entreaty of the widow, the heavenly Father! / Oh, burst out perjured kings! / Be husband to me. Having translated a lexeme heavens as sky Minh avoids the risky phrase of Druzhinin containing the appeal of the widow to God with a request to be her husband. He is also able to translate her words in two original verses preserving significant repetition: Burst, the sky, burst into perjured kings! / The widow calls, to the widow be a husband, the sky; Birukova and Rykova incline to Minh's option, but omit repetition that results in need to correlate two poetic lines in a different way. Rykova successfully copes with it replacing the noun sky with the pronoun you (Punish, the sky, kings-liars! / The widow asks you be her husband! In Birukova's translation these poetic lines are not connected directly among themselves (Execute, execute the liars-monarchs, the sky! / Hear widow's entreaty, be a husband to me! Kanshin's translation is more precise than most of other works as he uses the plural form of the noun (heaven), however, his prosaic translation does not accept repetitions: Take up to me the place of husband, – Constance addresses to the heavens (Rovda, 1965).

To attach historical color to the description Minh uses the Old Slavonic language that is not typical of other translators of the Shakespearean chronicle. For example, Pandolf's words in scene 4, act III predicting a popular uprising in connection with Arthur's death («And kiss the lips of unacquainted change / And pick strong matter of revolt and wrath / <...> / Methinks I see this hurly all on foot») are translated by Minh with characteristic forcing of the Old Slavonic words (<...> having rushed to

kiss in lips sedition, / The reason for rough revolts was extorted / <...> / It seems to me to be beholding that tempest with own eyes! As we can see, that is not present in the other interpretations of the Shakespearean work: < hearts of the people > Will desire kisses of change – / and < the king's hand > Will give a pretext on an angry revolt / <...> / It seems to me, I see common people in the revolt! And all will meet change with delight / and will pull out the reason for the revolt and anger / <...> / It seems to me I see the revolt; Will bless any change / and will pull out reasons for revolt / <...> / I see this terrible burst.

In some cases Minh as a translator creates phrases either unclear on sense or breaking logic of the figurative speech, for example, in scene 1, act II property is mentioned in the speech of King Philip instead of royal possession: Or shall we give the signal to our rage / And stalk in blood to our possession? –If we have to give the signal to our rage / and to rush into our property with blood? The other translators managed to avoid the use of the term in the poetic speech correctly: Druzhinin in this regard has just lowered separate nuances of the description (If we give the sign to attack – / and move in a bloody way. Birukova and Rykova used a lexeme our, and Rykova used it as a substantive noun: <...> we will give the signal to rage / and we will intrude in the city in a bloody way; <...> we will give the signal to the battle / and, shedding blood, we will win.

Sometimes Minh's aspiration to accuracy led to incorrect understanding of the original. So, at a judgment of Anger's proposal to marry Blanche and dauphin Ludovik (act II, scene 2) Two such controlling bounds shall you be, kings, / to these two princes, if you marry them [Minh's literal translation is wrong: You, monarchs, / would give two defenses to / these princes, having married them. Druzhinin and Birukova avoid interpretation of lexeme princes: In you, kings, we see coasts / For those two rivers when they merge, / When they marry due to your wisdom <...> to the coast, comprehensive streams, / That are combined, I will assimilate / you, kings if you marry them (Shakespeare, 1841a) – Rykova, on the contrary, goes on the way of a specification of this word and receives the most correct result both in relation to the original and to the Russian language features: And you will become the coasts of the regal river /, oh, kings, having married / the prince and the princess.

Minh's translation of Shakespearean King John is complete, close to the original, is notable for the rhythmic features of English verse, and however at the same time is characterized by inexact expressions for the sake of metre. Minh's translation is more compact and in many respects more exact than Druzhinin's translation characterized by numerous author's digressions from real historical events but it was considered to be the best in the 19th century (Gerbel, 1880). At the same time Druzhinin's translation is more literary. He skillfully manages to avoid many difficulties of the English original. This last circumstance led to the fact that Minh's translation, despite all the accuracy and thoroughness, could not force out Druzhinin's translation from Shakespearean editions of the end of the XIXth – the beginning of the XXth century (about other Minh's translations, his translation principles see (Zhatkin & Milotaeva, 2015a; Zhatkin & Milotaeva, 2015b; Zhatkin et al., 2016).

5. Discussion

Special art skill and delicate taste in the image of children were required from Shakespeare to describe Artur in the historical chronicle King John. Contrary to historic facts, according to which Artur was a fifteen-year-old young man, Shakespeare represented him as a little boy, clever and

kind-hearted, having a noble fine soul with great heroism and wisdom. In scene 1, act II where grandma and mother serially try to side Artur, he proposes the only politically correct solution for adults: I would that I were low laid in my grave: / I am not worth this coil that is made for me. Minh precisely interpreted the boy's presentiment of his tragic destiny. We can see that in comparison with other translations accenting not a real lack of other solution but the spontaneous desire of the boy who is ashamed of the behavior of his own relatives: Ah, it would be better for me to lay down in a grave! / I am not worth that someone rustled for me (Minh, 1864) – I would wish to die, to lay down in the earth: / I am not worth these quarrels and confusions – I would prefer, frankly speaking, to lay down in a grave; / I am not worth this confusion; oh, it would be better for me to lie in a grave! / I am not worth such cruel conflicts.

Translating scene 1, act IV where Artur saving the eyes from dazzle, eloquently convinces Gubert not to commit a crime and softens the heart of the severe guard Minh accurately felt the simplicity of the original text: O heaven, that there were but a mote in yours, / A grain, a dust, a gnat, a wandering hair, / Any annoyance in that precious sense! / Then feeling what small things are boisterous there, / your vile intent must needs seem horrible – Oh, heaven! if a thin hair, / A mote, a midge – everything that is so dangerous / To the best of feelings – has got into your eye, / Feeling how a small thing is also burning, / You would understand how your intent is terrible. As we can see, despite the undoubted success of the translator, a number of examples of the original text are unfairly reduced. In Druzhinin and Birukova's translations the use of lexeme grain is represented unsuccessfully. It is deprived a diminutive-hypocoristic suffix unlike others: Oh, My God! If you / have a mote or a midge in your eye, / a grain, a grain of sand or hair / it would be a torture for the priceless feeling! / You would understand suffering due to trifles – / and you would be horrified with a vile intent; O heaven! If a grain, a mote, a midge, a thin hair / or something else gets into your eye /, you would see, / as these trifles are unpleasant, / and you would be terrified with a vile intent. Rykova, wishing to emphasize a distance between the servant and the successor of a royal throne uses in her translation singular and plural forms of personal pronouns. You, yours is used addressing to Gubert and us – to the high assessment by the hero of himself: O heaven! If a mote, a midge, a hair or a grain of sand has got into your eyes / – / you would understand how this trifle can / Exhaust us, – and the dashing intent / would seem to you terrible.

6. Conclusions

Summing up the results, we will note that Minh's translations from Shakespeare had been of essential interest by the time when he began working on them as they allowed to complete considerable lacunas in such many-sided and difficult phenomenon as Russian Shakespeare. However, his work on poetic Richard II was represented by the interpretation of only one fragment. It was finished because of Kostomarov and Sokolovsky's complete translations having forestalled Minh. The translation of the historical chronicle King John, because of Minh's creative features, his aspiration for constant improvement, not hurrying to publish his works, did not find reader's popularity. He was a little late in comparison with Druzhinin and Kostomarov's translations. Druzhinin's work determined the perception of Shakespearean works in Russia. Minh's characteristic feature when his translations, having lain low for several years or even decades after their completion, at last became available to Russian readers on pages of journal editions. It played a fatal role in this case: if during its creation Minh's translation of King John would cause alive reaction of readers striving for discovering new sides of Shakespeare's creativity and personality, at

the time of its first publication in 1882 this translation stayed unnoticed because of certain readers' satiation. Noting undoubted advantages of Minh's translations from Shakespeare among which there were felicitous lexical and semantic, stylistic devices, a masterful recreation of separate motives, images, art details, nevertheless it is necessary to recognize that owing to external circumstances finally they have not made glory to their translator.

7. Acknowledgements

The article is made within the project # 17-18-01006 «The Evolution of the Russian Poetic Translation (the XIXth - the beginning of the XXth centuries) » of the Russian Science Foundation.

References

GERBEL, N. 1880. **King John. Introductory article to Druzhinin's translation of Shakespeare's play. Shakespeare's complete works in translation of Russian writers:** In 3 v. The 3rd edition, added and corrected. St. Petersburg: printing house, Vol. 2, pp. 28–30. Russia.

MINH, D. 1864. **Monologue of King Richard II before his death in a dungeon (from scene 5, act V of Shakespearean drama Richard II).** Russky Vestnik. Vol. 4, pp. 753-754. USA.

ROVDA, K. 1965. **Years of reaction. In: W. Shakespeare and Russian culture.** Leningrad: Science, pp. 627–698. Russia.

SHAKESPEARE, W. 1831. **King Richard II Act V, scene 3; I.Ya. Kroneberg's prose translation.** In Kroneberg I.Ya. (Ed.). Brochures. No. VII. Kharkiv: in University printing-house, 36–37. Russia.

SHAKESPEARE, W. 1841a. **King John. Shakespeare: In 4 parts. In N.F. Katcher's translation from English.** Moscow: N. Stepanov's printing house, Vol.1: 1–110. Russia.

SHAKESPEARE, W. 1841b. **King Richard II. Shakespeare: In 4 parts. In N.F. Katcher's translation from English.** Moscow: N. Stepanov's printing house, Vol. 2: 111–229. Russia.

SHAKESPEARE, W. 1865. **King John: drama chronicle in verses. In V.D. Kostomarov's translation, preface and notes.** St. Petersburg: V. Bezobrazov's printing house, p. 174. Russia.

ZHATKIN, D., and MILOTAEVA, O. 2015a. **Minh's Creative Work in the History of the Russian Literary Translation of the XIXth Century.** Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. Vol. 6, N° 3: 383–389. USA.

ZHATKIN, D., and MILOTAEVA, O. 2015b. **The History of Perception and Studying. D.E. Minh's Creative Works in the Russian Literary Criticism.** Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. 6, N° 5: 106–113. USA.

ZHATKIN, D., MILOTAEVA, O., and KRUGLOVA, T. 2016. **Morris's Poem the Earthly Paradise in the Russian Translation of Minh.** Indian Journal of Science and Technology. Vol. 9, N° 27: 318–326. India.

ANIKST, A. 1958. **King John. Shakespeare W. Complete works:** In 8 v, Art, III, p. 553. Russia.