

## “To thine ownself be true”: dealing with opacity and solving riddles in the Ukrainian translations of *Hamlet*

**Darya Lazarenko**

---



**Electronic version**

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/shakespeare/3344>  
DOI: 10.4000/shakespeare.3344  
ISSN: 2271-6424

**Publisher**

Société Française Shakespeare

**Electronic reference**

Darya Lazarenko, « “To thine ownself be true”: dealing with opacity and solving riddles in the Ukrainian translations of *Hamlet* », *Actes des congrès de la Société française Shakespeare* [Online], 33 | 2015, Online since 10 October 2015, connection on 02 June 2020. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/shakespeare/3344> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/shakespeare.3344>

---

This text was automatically generated on 2 June 2020.

© SFS

---

# “To thine ownself be true”: dealing with opacity and solving riddles in the Ukrainian translations of *Hamlet*

Darya Lazarenko

---

- 1 In his insightful account of *Hamlet*, Lev Vygotskii, an outstanding psychologist, writes:

It is very easy to show that the puzzle is drawn in the tragedy itself, that the tragedy was deliberately constructed as a puzzle, that it must be interpreted and understood as a puzzle, unyielding to logical exegesis, and if the critics want to remove the puzzle from the tragedy, they deprive the tragedy of its essential part.<sup>1</sup>

Here the great scholar tells us that after having tried to solve innumerable riddles stemming from, for instance, the differences between the quartos and the folio or engendered by the conflicting interpretations and contradictory views of Shakespeareans we are left in a state of even greater bewilderment and confusion, facing the innate mystery of *Hamlet*, which defies rational discursive analysis. Probably, this very transcendental core has been the underlying, deep source of appeal that has inspired the Ukrainian translators who have specific Slavonic notions of “ДУХ” (spirit) and “ДУША” (soul) to make numerous attempts at translating *Hamlet*.

- 2 Almost every translation of this great tragedy in Ukraine had its own *Hamlet*, which was responsive to specific aesthetic and ethical demands of the epoch. And at the same time *Hamlet* in Ukraine never stopped speaking the language of the English Renaissance. In this paper I will focus exclusively on the versions which can be deemed the key-texts for the modern reader, available for sale, in libraries around the country and occasionally on-line, these being translations by H. Kochur, L. Hrebinka, Yu. Andrukhovych and O. Hriaznov. I will explore the ways in which these translators tried to solve the mysteries of *Hamlet* while at the same time creating new riddles.
- 3 The problems that the Ukrainian translators are tackling are of heterogeneous nature: linguistic, artistic, historical, ideological and cultural. Some of them are inherent in the text, others are induced by the demands of the time or aesthetic preferences of the interpreter.

4 Some of the problems are quite trivial: the choice of personal pronouns could be a dilemma when translating from modern English, but not from Shakespeare's English. Nevertheless, you can find a wide selection of options in the Ukrainian translations. The closest variants belong to L. Hrebinka and H. Kochur who follow the original pattern of the tragedy: for example, in their translations Claudius first addresses Hamlet as "ВИ" (you) and then shifts to "ТИ" (thou) after Hamlet's killing of Polonius. The editor of Hrebinka's translation, Mykhailo Tupailo, preferred to use exclusively "ТИ" (thou). The same strategy was chosen by Yu. Andrukhovych and O. Hriaznov. Thus, from the very beginning the communication between the King and the Prince is quite intimate in these translations and there is no dramatic shift from "you" to "thou", which signals a new phase in their relationship.

5 A universal problem of linguistic and artistic nature is connected with Shakespeare's wordplay. A vivid example is offered by a fragment from Hamlet's verbal skirmish with Claudius:

A little more than kin and less than kind.<sup>2</sup>

L. Hrebinka and G. Kochur, the translators who wield the most authority in the field of Ukrainian translations of *Hamlet*, both find an elegant solution – L. Hrebinka:

ПОВІЛЬШЕ **РОДИЧ**, А ПОМЕНШЕ **РІДНИЙ**.

G. Kochur:

ХОЧ МИ Й **РІДНЯ**, ПРОТЕ НЕ **РІДНІ** ЗОВСІМ.<sup>3</sup>

Ukrainian words "РОДИЧ" (a relative), "РІДНЯ" (relatives), "РІДНИЙ" (dear, kin) all stem from "РОД" (family, kin, clan). Thus, by juxtaposing "РОДИЧ" (a relative) and РІДНЯ (relatives) with РІДНИЙ (dear, kin) the translators show that Claudius is Hamlet's relative, but not too dear to him. In this way the original effect is achieved.

6 Yu. Andrukhovych chooses a more radical means:

ОЦЕ ТАК **РІД** – УСЯКЕ В "**РІДНІ**" ЛІЗЕ!<sup>4</sup>

("I say, what a family – everything is thrusting its way into the kin"<sup>5</sup>).

It should be noted that "УСЯКЕ" in Ukrainian is neuter and highly derogative when applied to human beings.

7 While Yu. Andrukhovych retains the traditional solution "РІД – РІДНІ", his contemporary O. Hriaznov rejects it and tries to compensate for the lack of pun by repeating the word "ПЛЕМІННИК" (nephew) and opposing it to "МИЛИЙ" (darling, dear, nice, sweet). With his "dear, nice" rather than "dear, kin" nephew, the translator comes closer to the original usage of "kind", but omission of the play on words "kin – kind" is a significant loss for the fragment, as it has already been bereft of the initial poignancy of Hamlet's artful repartee, which made use of the "son – sun" pun.

8 A problem of a similar kind is encountered by the translators in Hamlet's line:

Sir, I lack advancement. (*Hamlet*, III.ii.327)

"Advancement" can be viewed here both as "a promotion" and as "moving forward", so it is quite important to preserve the ambiguity. L. Hrebinka copes with the task in a masterly fashion by giving an almost equivalent translation:

ДОВРОДИЮ, МЕНІ БРАКУЄ **ПОСТУПУ**<sup>6</sup>

"ПОСТУП" in Ukrainian means "onward movement" and can be used to signify progress, promotion. Thus, it seems strange that Hrebinka's editor chose to substitute this variant for

МОЄ МАЙБУТНЄ ТАКЕ НЕПЕВНЕ<sup>7</sup>

("My future is so uncertain")

The ambiguity is still here, but the translation certainly lacks the underlying irony.

- 9 An inventive variant is given by H. Kochur:

МЕНІ НЕ ДАЮТЬ ХОДУ.<sup>8</sup>

Here the original meaning is slightly modified through the usage of an indefinite personal sentence structure: "[They] are tying me up" / "[They] do not let me go forward". Such a translation sounded rather natural in the Soviet times when lives of common people depended on the decision of the mysterious "them".

- 10 Yu. Andrukhovych and O. Hriaznov try to modernize the text employing the up-to-date business communication clichés:

ПРОСТО Я НЕ БАЧУ ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ ЗРОСТАННЯ<sup>9</sup>

"I just do not see any **promotion prospects**" (Yu. Andrukhovych)

and

Я ПОТРЕБУЮ СЛУЖБОВОГО ПІДВИЩЕННЯ<sup>10</sup>

"I need professional advancement" (O. Hriaznov)

These variants may seem amusing, but they lose the ambiguity and irony of Shakespeare's original.

- 11 One of the brightest examples of translators' resourcefulness when dealing with the puns can be found in the renderings of the First Clown's joke about the noble origin of Adam:

A was the first that ever bore **arms**. (*Hamlet*, V.i.33)

H. Kochur and O. Hriaznov try to retain the original lexeme "arms" in the meaning of weaponry. But here the whole pun is lost as it becomes unclear what any sort of military weapon has to do with working in the field, or, in other words, if a spade can really be considered a weapon. L. Hrebinka finds a creative way out:

ВІН ПЕРШИЙ У СВІТІ НОСИВ **ЗАЛІЗА**.<sup>11</sup>

"ЗАЛІЗО" (iron) can equally denote weaponry and iron tools so it fits in quite well.

- 12 Curious indeed is that a totally new approach is suggested by Yu. Andrukhovych in his rendering of the fragment:

ТО АДАМ ТЕЖ БУВ **БЛАГОРОДНИЙ?**

КРАЩЕ СКАЗАТИ – **БЛАГОЛІПНИЙ, ВИЛПЛЕНИЙ** ТОБТО.<sup>12</sup>

"БЛАГОРОДНИЙ" (of noble origin) is derived from two words "БЛАГО" (good, blessing) and "НАРОДИТИСЬ" (be born), thus, the adjective "БЛАГОРОДНИЙ" points to somebody whose birth was a blessing. "БЛАГОЛІПНИЙ" has the same stem "БЛАГО", while the other part of the compound comes from "ЛПИТИ" (sculpture, shape), so the meaning of the word "БЛАГОЛІПНИЙ" is "somebody, who was shaped / sculptured as a blessing", in our case, out of clay. This solution is rather unexpected and witty, and on the whole it duly reflects the innovative, ingenious nature of Andrukhovych's approach to solving *Hamlet's* poetic riddles.

- 13 The other type of puzzles is linked not only to specific linguistic details and poetic peculiarities of the text, but rather to the general interpretation of its separate parts and integral understanding of the text as a whole. The translators' choices here depend on their views on the author's intentions, so the selected devices reflect the subjectivity and creativity of the translator.

- 14 It is interesting to detect the translation strategies based on the translator's understanding of the character of Hamlet, his peculiar mission, destiny and worldview. It is known that L. Hrebinka's original text was substantially reworked by the editor of the volume Mykhailo Tupailo. The changes he introduced led to considerable shifts in

the meanings of the source text, some of them being essential for the reader's reception of the key-concepts of the tragedy. The obvious case is the rendering of one of the famous fragments:

The time is out of joint. O cursed spite  
That ever I was born to set it right! (*Hamlet*, I.v.189-190)

These two lines are translated by Hrebinka in the following way:

Our epoch has gone out of joint. O wicked destiny!  
It is predestined that I have to set the things right.<sup>13</sup>

Tupailo transmits the lines in the following way:

The time has gone out of joint... O wicked destiny of mine!  
Why should I direct it? (Or: Why should the one to direct it be me?)<sup>14</sup>

Thus, we see that in Hrebinka's translation politically charged concretization is easily perceivable: the more generalized and universal “*the time*” is replaced by the specified and concrete “*our epoch*”. Tupailo eliminates this move of the translator and restores the original word “time” to its rights. Still, he adds something that shifts the semantic accents in a quite different way. He introduces pronouns “mine” and “me” and places stress upon them by putting them at the end of the line in the semantically strong position. It could significantly change the recipient's understanding of Hamlet's disposition and ethos. In Tupailo's variant Hamlet opposes not the universal evil but only his own lot. His speech hints at faint-heartedness and cowardice.<sup>15</sup>

- 15 An original variant was offered by H. Kochur. His translation can be roughly rendered as follows:

Out of joint is our time. It is my cursed fortune  
that I have to put that bone into joint again.<sup>16</sup>

Several modifications can be observed here. First of them is the opening inversion, which places the stress upon the very critical state of – again – “our time” or our epoch. Secondly, the dramatic tension is heightened through the ambivalence of the lexical unit “ТАЛІА” (fortune): in Ukrainian it can denote “fate; good luck (fortune); talent”. The reader keeps wondering if it is Hamlet's lot to put things back in order or if he was destined to do so because of his special talents in this sphere. In the third place, the translator's usage of the anatomic metaphor adds vividness and acuteness to the translation. Thus, the variant offered by G. Kochur is rather artistic and profound, yet at the same time it creates even more ambiguity than the original text.

- 16 Yu. Andrukhovych, in his usual vein, looks for alternative ways of rendering the famous lines:

This time is like a dislocation. But it is as if someone has cursed me (bewitched me)  
to put it back into joint again!<sup>17</sup>

Here the semantic accent is slightly shifted: the other translators show that there is some problem with the time which has to be sorted out, but in Andrukhovych's version the epoch itself is a problem, a painful malfunction, which breaks the continuity of time. Moreover, the original topos of Hamlet's predestination (“that ever I was born to ...”) dissolves into somebody else's malicious and powerful will. This new Hamlet looks like a puppet that has to move on the strings and fight not the evil forces, but the epoch itself.

- 17 As for O. Hriaznov, he offers a variation on the motive of discontinuity of time, strongly influenced by the Russian translation tradition:

The connection of times has come apart, and I  
Have to unite the days again.<sup>18</sup>

Here the sense of painful abnormality of the time which seems to be a living creature is lost, instead, Hamlet functions as a binding link for the "days". It creates certain confusion as it proves unclear if "the times" are "different generations" or "different epochs", and how Hamlet is supposed to put them together again.

- 18 A revealing example of the difficulties created in the course of translating and editing the text can be observed in relation to the following famous line

Something is rotten in the state of Denmark. (*Hamlet*, I.iv.89)

It is translated by Hrebinka through the analogous Ukrainian structure

Something in the Danish state has rotten<sup>19</sup>

which is transformed by Tupailo into a different sentence

The rot has infested the Danish state.<sup>20</sup>

The change in the meaning seems to be slight but at the core it is much more serious. In the original and Hrebinka's variant this line implies that the rottenness is an organic part of the state inseparable from it and produced by it while Tupailo's variant shifts the semantic stress – in his translation the rottenness seems to come from the outside and the state is not to blame for the disaster that has befallen it.

- 19 As Hamlet accepts the challenge of the time that "is out of joint", he embarks on a bloody and violent "campaign". Trying to justify his actions in the face of his own conscience or some higher power, Hamlet says:

I must be cruel only to be kind. (*Hamlet*, III.iv.162)

The Ukrainian translators of Hamlet cannot bring their views "to a common denominator" in their interpretations of this fragment. While G. Kochur sticks to the original "ЖОРСТОКИЙ" (cruel), in L. Hrebinka's variant Hamlet plans on becoming "ЛИХИЙ" (evil, mischievous) and Yu. Andrukhovych sees the Prince as someone "ЖАХНИЙ" (horrific, frightful). A most obscure variant is given by O. Hriaznov:

I have to be cruel out of pity.<sup>21</sup>

It remains unclear who Hamlet feels pity for and it is for the reader to decide.

- 20 Thus, in line with the transformative processes apparent in the other European reception traditions, in the Ukrainian translations of the great tragedy the reader faces a choice where he has to select the proper Hamlet from a rather assorted variety of princes: L. Hrebinka's desperate and conscious Hamlet, M. Tupailo's equivocal and politically correct Hamlet, H. Kochur's intelligent and discreet Hamlet, Yu. Andrukhovych's brusque and witty Hamlet, or O. Hriaznov's chameleon Hamlet.

- 21 The "authentic Ukrainian" problems can be found in our translations of some of the culturally, socially or politically "precarious" fragments. One of such issues arises in the rendering of a phrase which would seem unlikely to cause problems:

Her father and myself, lawful espials... (*Hamlet*, III.i.32)

In the Soviet historical context word-combination "lawful espials" could invoke sore associations. Hrebinka translates the phrase as "ПЛАСТУНИ ЗАКОННІ" (lawful scouts) where "ПЛАСТУНИ" means a special kind of military scouts. Kochur picks another variant "ШПИГУНИ ЗАКОННІ" (lawful spies): here "ШПИГУНИ" (spies) is a word with a distinct negative connotation<sup>22</sup>. But M. Tupailo and O. Hriaznov choose to ease tension by omitting the phrase all together.

- 22 Not surprisingly, the most extraordinary variant is suggested by Yu. Andrukhovych:

And now both her father and I, **lawful fathers that is "sleuths in law"**, will see everything from the shelter.<sup>23</sup>

As it seems, new mysteries appear out of the thin air here. The phrase "lawful espials" unfolds into a very strange structure "lawful fathers, that is sleuths in law" where "a lawful father" possibly alludes to certain religious (fathers of the church), social (fathers as an archaic dialectal way of address in Ukraine) and political (the head of the Communist party as the Father of the people) notions. The clarification paradoxically introduces even more ambiguity. "Sleuth in law" refers the reader to one of the bywords of the Soviet and post-Soviet people "БОР В ЗАКОНИ" – "thief in law" (lord of the underworld; kingpin): these people were the elite of the criminal world and lived in accordance with special laws. The allusion creates a certain paradox: the Ukrainian word "ШПИГ" denotes a police spy that is a servant of the law, while "thieves in law" served the law of the criminal world. This paradox, no matter how ambiguous, launches a cognitive mechanism which brings the reader to a better understanding of the policy of the hypocritical "fathers", votaries of their own maleficent laws.

- 23 Such curious examples of implementing some modern cultural allusions can be observed in a number of other fragments. For instance, when translating the speech of the Player Queen

Where little fears grow great, great love grows there (*Hamlet*, III.ii, additional passages, D),

which other translators choose to modify and moderate, L. Hrebinka demonstrates his unparalleled courage by closely following the original:

The fears are growing – love is growing too<sup>24</sup>

and precisely characterizing in such a way the ideological strategy of the Soviet regime. No wonder that the editor of the volume has to significantly mollify the phrase:

One who lays everything to heart truly loves.<sup>25</sup>

The brilliant translator goes on playing with fire in the consequent speech of the Player King:

The great man down, you mark his favourite flies;

The poor advanced makes friends of enemies (*Hamlet*, III.ii.195-196)

by translating "the great man" as "ГЕРОЙ" (hero) which visibly stands out in the general context of the fragment:

A hero falls – friends run away from him, a poor man advances – and enemy is on the threshold.<sup>26</sup>

This translation certainly twists the original meaning, but in such a way that it introduces the reader into the reality of the contemporary world: in the Soviet times many of the generally recognized and respected heroes – the military and political leaders – instantly fell into disfavor if they were thought apt to become potential rivals and constitute a threat to the ruling regime. Often family and friends abandoned the disgraced "public enemies", not allowed or willing to even greet them in the street.

- 24 As has been shown the Ukrainian translations of *Hamlet* provide innumerable opportunities for "literary detectives" eager to solve all kinds of textual riddles: both inherent in the original text and created in the course of translation due to the cultural, social and historical factors. And while O. Hriaznov and M. Tupailo mostly choose the path of least resistance by omitting ambiguous places or offering neutral variants, L. Hrebinka, H. Kochur and Yu. Andrukhovych sharpen the blade of satire directed at the leading topics of the hour by saturating the text with eloquent ambiguity and ironic semitones perceptible only for the responsive and thoughtful reader. It seems to be a cunning way to preserve the puzzle initially "drawn" in the text of *Hamlet* by Shakespeare's hand.

## NOTES

1. Lev Vyhotskii, *Psikholohiia iskusstva (The Psychology of Art)*, M., Iskusstvo, 1986, s. 208.
2. William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, I.ii.65. All quotations from Shakespeare's plays are taken from *The Complete Works*, eds. John Jowett, William Montgomery, Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, 2nd edition, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005.
3. Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. H.P. Kochur, in Viliam Shekspir, *Trahedii (Tragedies)*, Kharkiv, Folio, 2004, s. 176.
4. Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. Yu. Andrukhovych, K., A-BA-BA-HA-LA-MA-HA, 2008, с. 23-24.
5. All the translations from Ukrainian into English in this paper are prose translations done by the author and are presented in the line-by-line format for the sake of convenience.
6. Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. L. Hrebinka, *op. cit.*, s. 110.
7. Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. L. Hrebinka, in Viliam Shekspir, *Tvory v shesty tomakh (Works in six volumes)*, tom 5, K., Dnipro., 1986, s. 66.
8. Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. H.P. Kochur, *op. cit.*, s. 244.
9. Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. Yu. Andrukhovych, *op. cit.*, s. 128.
10. Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet (Hamlet)*, per. O.A. Hriaznov, in Viliam Shekspir, *Trahedii ta khroniky (Tragedies and History plays)*, Knyha I, K., TOV "Zadruha", 2008, s. 77.
11. Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. L. Hrebinka, *op. cit.*, s. 161.
12. Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. Yu. Andrukhovych, *op. cit.*, s. 194.
13. "ДОБА ЗВИХНУЛАСЬ НАША. ДОЛЕ ЗЛА! // СУДИЛОСЬ ВИПРАВИТИ МЕНІ ДІЛА" (Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. L.Hrebinka, *op. cit.*, s. 48).
14. "ЗВИХНУВСЯ ЧАС... О ДОЛЕ ЗЛА МОЯ! // ЧОМУ ЙОГО НАПРАВИТИ МУШУ Я?" (Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. L.Hrebinka, *op. cit.*, s. 32).
15. Such a transformation could be caused by the influence of the Russian translations as in the Russian interpretative tradition Hamlet was often associated with representatives of the Russian intelligentsia incapable of resolute revolutionary actions (V.G. Belinsky, I.A. Goncharov, I.S. Turgenev and others). See Eleanor Rowe, *Hamlet: A Window on Russia*, New York, New York University Press, 1976, p. 53-64, and N. N. Liotina "Hamletizm" v kulturnom opyte rubezhei ("Hamletism" in the Cultural Experience of Boundaries) in Yaroslavskii pedagogicheskii vestnik, 2013, № 1, Tom I (Humanitarnie nauki), s. 259-263.
16. "ЗВИХНУВСЯ ЧАС НАШ. МІЙ ТАЛАНЕ КЛЯТИЙ, // ЩО Я ТОЙ ВИВИХ МУШУ НАПРАВЛЯТИ!" (Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. H.P. Kochur, *op. cit.*, s. 199).
17. "ЦЕЙ ЧАС – ЯК ВИВИХ. ТА ЧИ ХТОСЬ ЗАКЛЯВ // МЕНЕ, ЩОБ Я НАЗАД ЙОГО ВПРАВЛЯВ!" (Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. Yu. Andrukhovych, *op. cit.*, p. 58).
18. "ЗВ'ЯЗОК ЧАСІВ РОЗПАВСЯ, І МЕНІ // НАЛЕЖИТЬ ЗНОВУ ОБ'ЄДНАТИ ДНІ" (Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet (Hamlet)*, per. O.A. Hriaznov, *op. cit.*, s. 40).
19. "ЩОСЬ У ДЕРЖАВІ ДАНСЬКІЙ ПІДГНИЛО" (Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. L.Hrebinka, *op. cit.*, s. 39).
20. "В ДЕРЖАВІ ДАТСЬКІЙ ЗАВЕЛАСЬ ГНИЛИЗНА" (Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. L.Hrebinka, *op. cit.*, s. 26).

21. “Я повинен // жорстоким быть від жалості” (Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet (Hamlet)*, per. O.A. Hriaznov, *op. cit.*, s. 88).
22. Its positive analogue is “розвідник”, i.e. a scout.
23. “А ми удвох із батьком // її, отці законні, тобто шпиґи // в законі, все побачимо зі сховку” (Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. Yu. Andrukhovych, *op. cit.*, s. 102).
24. “Ростуть страхи – любов також зростає” (Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. L.Hrebinka, *op. cit.*, s. 101).
25. “Хто все бере до серця, той кохає” (Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. L.Hrebinka, *op. cit.*, s. 62).
26. “Герой паде – і друзі геть від нього, // бідак піднявсь – і ворог край порога” (Viliam Shekspir, *Hamlet, prints danskii (Hamlet, Prince of Denmark)*, per. L.Hrebinka, *op. cit.*, s. 102).
- 

## ABSTRACTS

The history of the Ukrainian *Hamlet* shows that in Ukraine the tragedy’s cognitive resources have always been efficiently employed as a means of intellectual campaigning. Today *Hamlet* keeps attracting the most gifted and charismatic translators who attempt to decipher the messages encoded in this masterpiece. The result differs each time depending on the aim and epistemological priorities of the translator. Sometimes new riddles are created. By means of singling out those special ambiguous moments this paper tries to clarify how the opacity of Shakespeare’s twilight can be deliberately turned into either a bright day, or a dark night.

L’histoire de l’*Hamlet* ukrainien montre que les ressources cognitives de la tragédie ont toujours été efficacement utilisées, en Ukraine, comme un moyen pour manifester ses convictions intellectuelles. Encore aujourd’hui, *Hamlet* attire les traducteurs les plus doués et les plus charismatiques, qui essaient de déchiffrer les messages codés dans ce chef-d’œuvre. À chaque fois les résultats divergent, puisque ceux-ci dépendent des objectifs et des priorités épistémologiques des traducteurs. Parfois, de nouvelles énigmes voient le jour. L’objectif de cette analyse est donc de repérer les points ambigus des traductions ukrainiennes, afin de montrer comment l’opacité du crépuscule shakespearien peut être intentionnellement associée soit à une journée ensoleillée soit à une nuit sombre.

## INDEX

**Mots-clés:** ambiguïté, énigmes textuelles, Hamlet, traductions ukrainiennes

**Keywords:** ambiguity, Hamlet, Ukrainian translations, textual riddles

## AUTHOR

DARYA LAZARENKO

Zaporizhzhia National University, Ukraine