INTRODUCTION

The topic of perception of Shakespeare’s work in Russia, the fate of his works in Russian literature and culture is traditionally popular. Significant episodes of Russian Shakespearean studies are associated with K.I. Chukovsky’s reception of the work of the English playwright; in his literary critical works he presented an original understanding of certain issues of perception of Shakespeare’s drama, gave an analysis of translations of his works into Russian, characterized the range of problems of Shakespearean studies in Russia, expressed his attitude to theatrical productions of plays of the English playwright as one of the forms of mastering his creative heritage.

LITERATURE REVIEW

During the period of appearance of Chukovsky’s main works on Shakespeare’s creativity in Russian, or rather Soviet Shakespearean studies, complex processes took place due to both current socio-political events and general directions of literary science development. Vulgar sociological interpretations of the English playwright’s heritage were formulated, the very existence of Shakespeare was questioned, and his works were attributed to different authors. A.V. Lunacharsky’s works were biased, in which the political propaganda and revolutionary pathos replaced the philosophical and aesthetic content (characteristic, for example, for the chapter «Prince Hamlet» of the article «In the Face of Fate. Toward the Philosophy of Tragedy», first published in 1903 in the journal «Education» (LUNACHARSKY, 1903).

Sociological approach to the study of Shakespeare’s work is presented in the book «William Shakespeare» by V.M. Fritche (FRITSCHEN, 1926), who saw a brilliant defender of the nobility in Shakespeare, whose works reflected the process of changing historical epochs at the time of the decline of the aristocracy as a class. In the book «Hamlet» and other experiences in the promotion of domestic Shakespearean study «…» in the critical works on «Hamlet» I.A. Aksenov not only expressed his understanding «of Shakespearean question», but also offered the analysis of structural forms of dramatic texts, paying attention to the reflection of the specifics of philosophical and aesthetic thought and social relations since the XVII century (AKSENOV).

A.A. Smirnov in his book «The Creativity of Shakespeare» examines the facts of biography and the main stages of Shakespeare’s work in the era of the formation and development of the humanistic concept of the Renaissance (SMIROV, 1934). M.M. Morozov (MOROZOVA, 1954) set out in his works of the 1930-1940s some interesting observations about the language and style of Shakespeare’s works. In many studies of the first half of the 20th century devoted to Shakespeare, one can see the desire of literary scholars to present the English playwright as a fighter for social justice, praising the man of labor.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The material for the analysis was the literary critical works of K.I. Chukovsky, dedicated to the work of Shakespeare, as well as the works of researchers, that carried out the literary interpretation of the Russian translation reception of Shakespeare’s legacy. The research methodology combines the principles of historical-literary, sociocultural, historical-cultural, comparative-typological, historical-genetic and biographical analysis methods. According to the principle of historicism, certain facts and circumstances are considered in connection with others, as well as taking into account historical, literary and cultural experience.

RESULTS

K.I. Chukovsky tried to avoid politicized judgments in his perception of Shakespeare’s work and took into account, first of all, the idea of the works, their style, as well as the features of the era in which they were created. As a literary translation theorist, the writer paid close attention to the specifics of translation readings of the works of the English playwright in Russia. The chapters in the...
book «High Art» and several articles of the writer - «Combat with Shakespeare» (1935), «Crippled Shakespeare: [Transl. by Anna Radlova] » (1939), «Asthma at Desdemona» (1940), «Translations of Shakespeare (To the Question of the Method of Translation of Shakespeare) » (1946) are devoted to this topic.

Most of Chukovsky's critical comments concern modern translations of Shakespeare. The more interesting are the single facts of his reference to the earliest adaptations from Shakespeare, reflecting the specifics of their perception by the Russian cultural consciousness through the prism of historical events. In the second chapter of «Translation as a self-portrait of the translator» of the book «High Art» K.I. Chukovsky characterizes the translation of «King Lear» (1808) by N.I. Gnedich as adapted to the conjuncture of socio-political perception, designed to glorify the autocratic power. For this purpose, N.I. Gnedich, in the opinion of K.I. Chukovsky, “removed from his version of “Lear”, who he called “Lair”, even his madness, in order to increase the sympathy of the audience to the monarch's struggle for his “legitimate throne”» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012).

As a result of these changes, Shakespeare’s Edmund, a bright example of an antagonist who rejects the laws of state and society for the sake of personal needs and interests, proclaims the eulogies of the monarch's power. Citing one of such statements («To die for your compatriot is commendable, but for a good sovereign - ah! You must have another life to feel the sweetness of such a death! » (CHUKOVSKY, 2012), K.I. Chukovsky thus demonstrates the degree of N.I. Gnedich’s distortion of the author's intention, as a result of which Edmund appears to be a champion of traditional forms of government, rather than a bright representative of the predatory world of feudal knights seeking to separate the state.

Discussing why Gnedich’s translation was popular in our country, Chukovsky refers to Bulgakov's study «Early Acquaintance with Shakespeare in Russia» (1934), the ideological direction of which was in line with the writer's own thoughts. The researcher believes that in the historical conditions of the early 19th century, the translation of Shakespeare's play by N.I. Gnedich, reflected «the state of the minds of the nobility and had undoubted propaganda value in the interests of this class» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012), to whom the translator sympathized and expressed support by his interpretation. As a result, as K.I. Chukovsky believes, persecutions of the elderly father by ungrateful daughters were leveled and reduced to a struggle for the throne, for the legitimate rights of the disgraced sovereign, and the play itself served the purpose of «consolidation of Russian society around the throne and the Tsar» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012).

At the same time K.I. Chukovsky is not inclined to directly correlate the worldview position of the author of the translation with his interpretation of the translated text, since at the beginning of the 19th century, Shakespeare’s works entered Russia mainly through the German and French press. N.I. Gnedich made his translation based on the French classical adaptation by J.F. Ducis. K.I. Chukovsky mentions how the works of foreign writers, including Shakespeare, were distorted in French translations, in the ninth chapter «Translations before and now» of the book «High Art»: «This dogma has reached its highest development in the then France «...». Cervantes and Shakespeare were turned into marquises by French translators» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012).

A similar story happened with «Coriolanus», staged in 1934 in Paris. According to K.I. Chukovsky, in R.L. Piacho’s translation the tragedy underwent deliberate distortions in accordance with the translator’s political preferences, as a result of which he «with the help of numerous deviations from the English text gave Coriolanus the features of an ideal reactionary dictator, tragically dying in an unequal struggle with democracy» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). Calling such a translation «the battle banner of the French reaction», K.I. Chukovsky denies its artistic value; all the changes made for the sake of the opportunistic character, the processes taking place at that time in literature and in the country, are put in the «merit» of the translator. At the same time K.I. Chukovsky believes that when translating foreign authors, the translator does not always deliberately modify the material according to his political views. In this matter the writer polemics with L.Ya. Borovoi, who in 1934 in the article «The Traitor Coriolanus», published in the pages of «Literary Newspaper», accused the translator of deliberately distorting the tragedy, referring to the fact that R.L. Piacho even entitled his version indicating the changes made, «The tragedy of Coriolanus, freely translated from the English text of Shakespeare and adapted to the French scene». K.I. Chukovsky found these accusations fair, but at the same time pointed to the possibility of unconscious changes in the general concept of the text being translated with literal, precise translation: «So in this case it may sometimes turn out that his [interpreter’s] ideological position, apart from his consciousness and will, can be reflected in his translation. And it is not at all required that he set the indispensable goal of falsifying the original» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012).
K.I. Chukovsky confirms his position by analyzing translations from Shakespeare by A.V. Druzhinin, in which the social position of the author is reflected sometimes in small, insignificant details. Thus, when A.V. Druzhinin translated «King Lear» (K.I. Chukovsky mentions this translation in his article «Druzhinin and Leo Tolstoy» (1928), calling it an important literary event), he especially admired the figure of Kent, considering him a bright example of a devoted servant. In Chukovsky’s opinion, this kind of tender emotion could not but affect the general perception of the translated text. The fact that Russian writers and literary critics also noticed the influence of the ideological position of A.V. Druzhinin on his interpretation of Shakespeare’s text is evidenced, in particular, by the words of I.S. Turgenev, quoted by Chukovsky: «I must confess that if you were not a conservative, you would have never been able to appreciate Kent as a “great loyalist”» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). Based on such comments, K.I. Chukovsky believes, that in the translation of A.V. Druzhinin, the Russian cultural consciousness perceived the monarchical beliefs of Kent, in terms of social struggle.

K.I. Chukovsky explains the generally positive attitude of critics to this possibly unintentional distortion of Shakespeare’s text by the high assessment of A.V. Druzhinin’s artistic talent, as well as by the adaptation of the language and the ideological meaning of the play of the English playwright to the aesthetic principles of the epoch. The writer quotes N.A. Nekrasov, who positively responded to the appearance in the press of the Druzhinin’s translation of «King Lear»: «If we say that such a translation of Shakespeare’s works has not yet been in Russian, then we will say a little in praise of Mr. Druzhinin’s variant. Brilliant talent, exquisite taste and ability to master the language – all the best qualities of this writer are fully and perfectly expressed in this work» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012).

Such a loyal and partly enthusiastic attitude towards A.V. Druzhinin by the writers, advocating a social understanding of reality and a rationalistic elaboration of the psychological motivations of the main characters, seems all the more surprising, because A.V. Druzhinin, according to K.I. Chukovsky, was openly fighting against Gogol’s trend in literature. Being an opponent of the perception of Shakespeare’s work from the standpoint of modern aesthetics, A.V. Druzhinin fought to preserve the metaphorical imagery of the language of his plays, expressing a poetic structure that is not comparable with the language that was stylistically deliberately belittled in Russian literature. Excessive devotion of Druzhinin in this direction, according to K.I. Chukovsky, led to the fact that “he even translated Shakespeare’s Coriolanus in order to, with the lips of Shakespeare, shame the hated plebeians, whose incarnation was Chernyshevsky to him» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). The struggle in this direction significantly worsened the quality of A.V. Druzhinin’s translations, in which, according to K.I. Chukovsky, “even his refined taste, which inspired him with so many excellent pages about Shakespeare, Fet, Turgenev, Pushkin, betrayed him» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012).

The paradox of the fact that A.V. Druzhinin’s translation of «Coriolanus», despite its conscientiousness and striving for maximum accuracy, did not go far from the «reactionary» translation of R.L. Piacho, who admired opponents of French democracy, K.I. Chukovsky explains by the specifics of the political trends of the time. The translation was made in 1858, in the historical period, which K.I. Chukovsky describes as “a time of struggle of liberal nobles with revolutionary raznochinitis, « nihilists » of the sixties» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). Therefore the readers correlated the events of Russian reality with the denunciation of rebellious niello, made by Coriolanus, hence A.V. Druzhinin’s translation was perceived as a condemnation of Russian democracy. According to Chukovsky, regardless of special intent or its absence, «with the help of Shakespeare’s tragedy Druzhinin was settling party accounts with Chernyshevsky and his supporters» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012).

It is necessary to notice that all named writers (both Democrats, and supporters of «pure art») approached to creativity of Shakespeare from close aesthetic positions, but had different ideas about the development of a society that has entailed distinctions in comprehension of works of English playwright. According to K.I. Chukovsky’s observation, the liberals in Shakespeare’s play itself saw a frankly conservative work, and therefore A.V. Druzhinin’s desire to translate «Coriolanus» was perceived as politically conditioned. In particular, K.I. Chukovsky quotes words from the correspondence of I.S. Turgenev and V.P. Botkin with A.V. Druzhinin, arguing this assumption: «It is a wonderful idea to translate «Coriolanus». You’ll find it to your liking, - oh you, the sweetest of conservatives! » (I.S. Turgnrv); «Thank you for choosing “Coriolanus”: there is the highest modernity in this play» (V.P. Botkin) (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). According to K.I. Chukovsky, the main problem with A.V. Druzhinin’s translation was the fact that despite the most precise reading of the original, the writer could not avoid imposing anti-democratic meaning on the play, as a result of which it was perceived through the prism of propaganda of reactionary ideas.

Speaking about Druzhinin’s translations from Shakespeare, Chukovsky touches upon the perception of the work of the English playwright by Leo Tolstoy, who believed that «only a person
imbuéd with a phrase can be surprised by Shakespeare and Homer» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). This statement caused a great resonance in the literary environment, because in the mid-1850s Shakespeare was particularly popular, the first collections of his works, prepared on the initiative of N.A. Nekrasov and N.V. Gerbel, were published. In his article «Druzhinin and Leo Tolstoy» K.I. Chukovsky lists some of the significant works on Shakespeare of that time, among which is the «enthusiastic» article about the English playwright by V.P. Botkin in the «Sovremennik» magazine, translations of «Julius Caesar» by A.A. Fet and «A Midsummer Night’s Dream» by A.A. Grigoriev, articles by A.V. Druzhinin and A.A. Grigoriev on Shakespeare’s verse translations.

As early as in the article «Tolstoy and intellectua ls» (1905), K.I. Chukovsky pointed to the reasons for L.N. Tolstoy’s denial of Shakespeare: «Tolstoy denies Shakespeare not because “the whole world honors the genius of Shakespeare”, but because Shakespeare preached the very “Kingdom of the World” with which Lev Nikolaevich has been fighting for a quarter of a century in the name of “the Kingdom of God”» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). A.V. Druzhinin was so carried away by the idea of introducing Shakespeare to L.N. Tolstoy that the disputes with the writer about the English playwright took place almost every day. K.I. Chukovsky believes that A.V. Druzhinin’s aspiration to join L.N. Tolstoy to Shakespeare was caused by his respect for literary traditions, in the system of which Shakespeare’s artistic heritage occupied an important place as a canonizer of eternal aesthetic values. As a result, the rapprochement of A.V. Druzhinin with L.N. Tolstoy led to the fact that «when Druzhinin’s “Lear” was published in December, Tolstoy even denied for a while his famous hatred for the author of “Lear” and under the charm of Druzhinin began to speak of Shakespeare without malice» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). K.I. Chukovsky notes that the change in the attitude of the Russian writer to the work of Shakespeare was short-lived; only during his rapprochement with A.V. Druzhinin L.N. Tolstoy «muffled the usual hatred and forced himself to love» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012).

It is noteworthy that Russian writers considered this transformation to be the result of a high-quality translation of «King Lear» by A.V. Druzhinin (in this regard, K.I. Chukovsky mentions the opinion of V.P. Botkin in his article «Druzhinin and Leo Tolstoy»). Later on, Leo Tolstoy renounced the recognition of the intrinsic value of art and in his later articles «What is art», «About Shakespeare and on Drama» he sharply commented on the writers of the middle of the XIX century, including A.V. Druzhinin. In general, K.I. Chukovsky highly appreciated the merits of A.V. Druzhinin in the creation of highly artistic translations from Shakespeare and in 1928 he noted that «the Druzhinin translations of Shakespeare still remain unsurpassed in many respects» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012).

The translation of «Julius Caesar» by A.A. Fet (1859), which appeared almost simultaneously with Druzhinin’s «King Lear», was quite sharply received by domestic critics. K.I. Chukovsky in his book «High Arts,» referring to the works of domestic critics, explains the cause for the rejection of the literal translation of A.A. Fet in the Russian literature. The poet was reproached for the obvious lack of desire to carry out stylistic and ideological adaptation of Shakespeare’s plays. In Chukovsky’s opinion, A.A. Fet, in pursuit of purely artistic tasks in his translations, did not pay attention to the tasks of public education. As a result, he obtained the most accurate translation of the vocabulary, but there was no any correlation with the style of the original source and individuality of the author of the work: «The mechanistic nature of Fet’s translation was expressed, by the way, in the fact that he translated many of Shakespeare’s lines without understanding their meaning and, most importantly, without even trying to understand» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). Confirming his opinion, K.I. Chukovsky refers to the work of the writer Vs. E. Cheshikhin «Zhukovsky as a Schiller translator» (1895), which rightly argued that in such a literal translation «not only the meaning, but also the beauty, poetry, and the inspiration of the original perishes» - what is called «poetic flavor» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012).

K.I. Chukovsky also shares the opinion of D.L. Mikhalovsky, who in the article «Shakespeare in the translation of Mr. Fet» (1859), published under the pseudonym M. Lavrensky, criticizes the multi-style character of «Julius Caesar» translated by A.A. Fet. K.I. Chukovsky quotes an excerpt from this article, which clearly demonstrates the contradictions in the translation: «In Fet’s translation of “Julius Caesar”, his wife reproaches her husband: “... You are impolite, Brutus, / You left my bed, and in the evening, / Jumping up from the meal, began to walk...”» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). The stylistic incompatibility in this poetic text manifested itself in the mixed use of vocabulary with secular, common and solemn shades, which makes the perception of the work adequate to the author’s intention difficult.

In the works of K.I. Chukovsky there are single references to the translations of A.L. Sokolovsky and A.M. Fedorov. Having first made a translation of the chronicle «King Henry IV» in the «Library for Reading» (1860), A.L. Sokolovsky continued to work on the translations of Shakespeare and in the
period from 1894 to 1898 issued an eight-volume «Shakespeare in the translation and explanation of A.L. Sokolovsky», later republished in twelve volumes. The interpreter, according to K.I. Chukovsky, did not avoid the typical omission of many specialists in Shakespeare, who could not see in the texts of the English playwright «verbal music, which is present in every authentic work of poetry» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). K.I. Chukovsky cites as an example the complaint of Queen Margarita from «Richard III», which A.L. Sokolovsky translated in accordance with the principles of literal accuracy of translation, without taking into account sound repetitions, which serve to enhance the tragedy of the events: «Killed / My spouse and son by Richard. You also / Lost both Richard and Edward,/ Slain by the same Richard». A.D. Radlova used a more successful technique to translate this passage, which allowed her to convey «the harsh rhythm of complaints», cf.: “Edward, my son, was killed by Richard, / And Henry, my husband, was killed by Richard, / And your Edward was killed by Richard, / And your Richard was killed by Richards» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012).

K.I. Chukovsky mentions A.M. Fedorov as a translator of Shakespeare in the article «Two "Queens»», dedicated to the collection of short stories and novellas «Queen» of the writer (1910). As a witness to the story of the possible plagiarism of one of the stories of the book, K.I. Chukovsky defended A.M. Fedorov, separately noting the useful translation activity among many of his merits, naming, among other things, the translations of «several of Shakespeare’s sonnets» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). According to the general tone of the article, we can conclude that K.I. Chukovsky positively evaluated the work of A.M. Fedorov in this direction.

K.I. Chukovsky briefly expressed his attitude towards Shakespeare’s transpositions by T.L. Shchepkina-Kupernik in a letter sent to the translator, presumably in late March 1937. Characterizing her translations, the writer spoke positively about «King Lear»: “‘Lear’ is both poetic and mighty – your best creation, although I do not agree with all the translations of rhymed songs» (CHUKOVSKY, 2013). K.I. Chukovsky makes a comment on the free treatment of the vocabulary also with regard to her translation of Shakespeare’s play «The Merry Wives of Windsor». Considering it done much better than other translations of «the same thing», K.I. Chukovsky cannot agree «with the distortion of speech in the German way» (CHUKOVSKY, 2013). The writer explains this fact by that T.L. Shchepkina-Kupernik aimed her translations for a stage production, as a result the translation was adjusted to the actor’s play and the emphasis was placed on the live language of the play, its euphony. K.I. Chukovsky quite reasonably notes that «it sounds not bad on stage; it is effective, but when reading - a burden for the reader» (CHUKOVSKY, 2013). In the article «Combat with Shakespeare» (1935), K.I. Chukovsky explains the essence of lexical distortions made by T.L. Shchepkina-Kupernik on a concrete example. In the play «The Tempest» Shakespeare intentionally uses in one phrase the word «womb» («You squeeze these words into my ears against the womb of my mind»), but T.L. Shchepkina-Kupernik, in K.I. Chukovsky’s opinion, in order to make the translation euphonious, replaces it with the grandiloquent, old-fashioned «does not accept: «All words are in vain. / My sanity does not accept them» (CHUKOVSKY, 1935). At the same time, K.I. Chukovsky believes that «hackneyed, dead word combinations» are more characteristic of T.L. Shchepkina-Kupernik’s original stories, while in the translations they have a single character and in general do not detract from the artistic value of the text.

In the seventh chapter of the book «High Art «Syntaxis. – Intonation. - To the Methods of Translation of Shakespeare» K.I. Chukovsky pays much attention to the specifics of reading Shakespeare by the famous Russian translator M.L. Lozinsky. The handwritten almanac «Chukokkala» contains notes in which K.I. Chukovsky mentions M.L. Lozinsky and Shakespeare in one context: describing the events of 1914, the writer calls M.L. Lozinsky an example of «a translator of Shakespeare and Dante» (ANDRONNIKOV, 2008); in the records of 1919, two names appear side by side when describing the original method of «cathedral translation» (Andronnikov, 2008).

The attitude of K.I. Chukovsky to the translations of M.L. Lozinsky is clearly illustrated by the example of his analysis of the translation of «Hamlet», presented in the above-mentioned chapter of the book «High Art» and in the article «Combat with Shakespeare». K.I. Chukovsky highly appreciates the translation talent of M.L. Lozinsky, who combines «scientific penetration into the text» with «true inspiration of the great poet», and calls the translation of «Hamlet» created by M.L. Lozinsky as a classic example of translation literature. According to K.I. Chukovsky, the great disadvantage of M.L. Lozinsky’s translations is that «the translator with excessive, I would say, fanatical jealousy serves the fetish of equilinearity» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). His following this principle was explained by the system of M.L. Lozinsky’s own ideas about the theory of literary translation (see the report «The Art of Poetic Translation», 1935), according to which the translation had to perform aesthetic (and in this case the emphasis was on the artistic component of the original) and cognitive (the work acts as a guide to another culture and another epoch) functions. According to K.I. Chukovsky, emphasis on the second
K.I. Chukovsky demonstrates M.L. Lozinsky's distortion of the meaning of «Hamlet» in accordance with the principle of equilinearity by examples taken from his translation. The writer quotes a fragment from «Hamlet» translated by M.L. Lozinsky: «For Hamlet, the King will raise the cup / And dissolve the pearl in wine / More valuable than the one with which they were married / Four kings...», which lacks important semantic units: «The "crown" is omitted, "Denmark" is omitted, the "best breath of Hamlet" is omitted, the characteristic of the four kings, who, as it turns out, did not immediately possess the pearl, but in the order of succession, is omitted» (CHUKOVSKY, 1935); There is also a distortion of the meaning of some of the original words – «the king did not dissolve the pearl in the wine, but only put it in the bowl - maybe not to dissolve it at all» (CHUKOVSKY, 1935). K.I. Chukovsky notes that along with the change in the meaning of this fragment, Shakespeare's text becomes «discolored», as a result of which the rich metaphoricity of Shakespeare’s language appears before the readers significantly impoverished and simplified. This situation takes place due to the translator's desire to «keep the number of Shakespearean lines unchanged» (CHUKOVSKY, 1935).

According to the observation of K.I. Chukovsky, the elimination of the ornate splendor of Shakespeare, characteristic of many Russian translations, one can see in reducing a large number of epithets, often carrying an important semantic load in M.L. Lozinsky's translations. Following the principle of equal lines, M.L. Lozinsky, as he believed, sacrificed the least valuable lexical units. The words of the Queen «You direct my eyes into my soul, / And there I see such black and red spots» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012) in Lozinsky's translation are given without words my and red, as a result, according to Chukovsky, the reader, first of all, have the false idea that “as if she is talking about the eyes of Hamlet himself » is (CHUKOVSKY, 2012), and secondly, the meaning of not only a specific phrase, but of the entire work changes, since the excluded word «red» contains evidence of the Queen’s bloody crime. Ophelia's words, which have become a proverb among the British, «A gift is not nice to us, / When the one who gave it falls out of love» have undergone significant changes, since M.L. Lozinsky «for the sake of brevity of speech threw out an indication that such an attitude to gifts is characteristic only of an exalted, noble mind» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012).

K.I. Chukovsky gives several more examples that demonstrate the degree of change in the meaning of the translated lines of the original work due to the exclusion of lexical units that are important for the disclosure of the author’s idea, without which «Shakespeare is not Shakespeare». In order to depict the difficult situation of Hamlet, tormented by his inability to avenge his father, Shakespeare uses a poly-semantic epithet in relation to his revenge from the English word dull - «sad, slow», which does not seem important to M.L. Lozinsky, thereby reducing the severity of the mental anguish experienced by the protagonist. A similar omission allows the translator by eliminating the word wretched in Hamlet’s address to the Queen, meaning both wretched and despicable. According to K.I. Chukovsky, «this epithet defines true relationship of Hamlet to the culprit of all his moral torments: Despicable, miserable Queen, goodbye!» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). When reading restrained lines of M.L. Lozinsky «Mother, goodbye!» the reader has a misconception about Hamlet's relationship to his mother. The epithets with which Ophelia characterizes Hamlet, having learned about his insanity, are of particular value - «madness has forever crushed such a “magnificent, proud mind” and darkened the “incomparable appearance”» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). According to K.I. Chukovsky, «all three <...> epithets are of the greatest value» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012), but M.L. Lozinsky, continuing to follow the principle of equilinearity, does not include them in his translation.

K.I. Chukovsky believes that this neglect of the translator can be seen related to different groups of epithets - both those that are designed to convey semantic shades and those that perform an ornamental function, for example, «this is <...> the role of the word “dull” in two successive remarks of the king and queen: Thank you Rosencrantz and dear Guildenstern! / Thank you Guildenstern and dear Rosencrantz!» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). And although it may seem that the epithets not included by M.L. Lozinsky in his arrangement, are not too valuable, «without them, Shakespeare’s verse is drained of blood» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012).

Analyzing the translation of «Hamlet» by M.L. Lozinsky, K.I. Chukovsky criticized the principle of equilinearity, which became especially popular among specialists who worked with Shakespeare’s texts, rather than the translator, considering his arrangement one of the best. This very principle turns the «whole translated pages into a complete mess if only, God forbid, there were not two thousand one hundred seventy-five lines instead of two thousand one hundred and seventy»
(CHUKOVSKY, 2012). As a result, the principle, designed to serve as the best compliance of the translated text with the original, turned into a hindrance and was often used «as the detriment of the meaning and style of great works of poetry» (CHUKOVSKY, 2012). Objectivism, made an obligatory prerequisite for high-quality translation by M.L. Lozinsky, depersonalized the characters of Shakespeare and led to the loss of the poetry of the original and the author's intention. K.I. Chukovsky considered the historical accuracy, determined by the poet's close attention to the details of the era, to be one of the advantages of this approach to the translation of plays by the English playwright.

CONCLUSIONS
In all the literary-critical works of K.I. Chukovsky, dedicated to the Shakespearean translations of N.I. Gnedich, A.V. Druzhinin, A.A. Fet, A.L. Sokolovsky, A.M. Fedorov, T.L. Shchepkina-Kupernik and M.L. Lozinsky, we can trace the adherence to the principles of democratization of Russian poetic speech, which is characteristic of the translated literature of the first half of the 20th century, due to the change in historical realities and the specifics of the development of Russian culture. Taking an active part in the popularization of this trend in translation art, K.I. Chukovsky did not exclude the possibility of skillful artistic processing of Shakespeare's plays based on the authors' own aesthetic views, their creative perception, and supported bold speech experiments that contribute to a deeper reading of the works of the English playwright. In this case, K.I. Chukovsky's perception of the translations from Shakespeare was based on the understanding of the general problems of Shakespeare's legacy rather than on the degree of compliance of the ongoing reconstruction of the text with the original.
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The works of K.I. Chukovsky, dedicated to the great English playwright Shakespeare («Combat with Shakespeare» (1935), «Crippled Shakespeare» (1939), «Translations of Shakespeare (On the method of Shakespeare’s translation) » (1946), etc.), became an important page in literary critical reception of Shakespeare in Russia. K.I. Chukovsky related the reason for the change in the ideological concept of Shakespeare’s works by Russian translators not only with public perceptions in Russia, but also with the quality of French and German adaptations of the works of the English playwright that came into Russian literature. From the analysis of various works of Shakespeare K.I. Chukovsky used examples to prove the degree of distortion of the meaning of the work due to literal adherence to the ideas about the maximum correspondence between the external organization of the translation and the original. This article aims to analyze the reception of the Russian translation of Shakespeare from the gaze of K.I. Chukovsky.
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