

Turgenev's appropriation of *King Lear*: A case of medieval transmission and adaptation¹

MANEL BELLMUNT SERRANO
Universitat Jaume I Castelló, Spain / GREMI

Abstract

This paper tries to provide a thorough analysis of Ivan Turgenev's appropriation of *King Lear*, the Shakespearean tragedy, as it appears in the novella *King Lear of the Steppes* (1870), from the perspective of translation and adaptation studies, and how this was adapted to 19th-century Russia. This analysis highlights the role of cross-cultural relations and its influence on the evolution of target literatures. The comparison with Shakespeare's source text shows evident similarities but also differences, all of which raise multiple questions from the perspective of philosophy, history and ideology, among others. In fact, the interpretation of Shakespeare's work, in Turgenev's work and in the Russian literature as a whole, has become essential to understand the intellectual development of this country since the 19th century, as well as the rise of some debates about the Russian cultural identity, which still continue today. By focusing on Turgenev's novella *King Lear of the Steppes*, the relevance of processes such as appropriation and adaptation for the development of national literatures will be underscored and how these foster debate and discussion within cultural systems. And, in order to illustrate this, it will also be highlighted that Shakespeare's *King Lear* was in fact based upon several previous medieval sources and suffered multiple changes and adaptations over the centuries, which proves that knowledge transforms and adapts to the literary, cultural and ideological features of each period of time and society.

Key words: Ivan Turgenev, *King Lear of the Steppes*, translation and adaptation studies, comparative literature, William Shakespeare.

1 Introduction

The cross-cultural transference of knowledge is not a contemporary phenomenon, but one that has historically influenced, shaped and determined the evolution of societies and nations. Over the centuries the world has witnessed, directly or indirectly, the cultural collision of multiple groups of population and communities. This contact has not always been peaceful and the result is anything but predictable, as history shows. Although the capacity of cultures to outlive the people who created them should not be disregarded, a harmonious coexistence has not often taken place. Conversely, cultural clash and social tensions are the most recurrent consequences when two societies collide. However, these cross-cultural conflicts are not necessarily fought on the battlefield, and they are sometimes to be found in the fields of fashion, literature, music, painting or philosophy. For example, French continued being the language of literature and the arts long after the loss of

¹ This research article is within the project 'La traducció medieval europea: models i autoritats' (The European Medieval Translation: Models and Authorities) (Reference number UJI-B2018-83) and is developed at Universitat Jaume I of Castellón.

Manel Bellmunt Serrano – " Turgenev's appropriation of King Lear ... "

driving, and streamed with a rushing sound over the panes ... Suddenly I fancied I saw a bear dash across our yard ... (Turgenev 2017: 76).

As it is known, Lear's end comes after the death of Cordelia, who is hanged as a consequence of Edmund's command:

And my poor fool is hanged! No, no, no life! / Why should a dog, a horse, a rat have life, / and thou no breath at all? ... Do you see this? Look on her! Look, her lips, / Look there, look there (5.3.304-309).

In Turgenev's work, Martin Petrovitch Harlov plays a more active role in the denouement and dies because of his uncontrolled fury and rage. Although Evlampia looks for his forgiveness, his unfinished words leave the question unanswered. Perhaps this is probable (the narrator himself interprets it so), but not granted. The fact that Evlampia leaves the estate soon after Martin Petrovitch's death and joins a religious sect could imply a search for an unfulfilled forgiveness, but also a connection with the divinity:

She goes on to emulate and surpass her father: he had seen himself as God's deputy only in relation to his family; she has herself acknowledged as an incarnate deity by a much larger 'family' (Seeley 1991: 293).

Precisely the character of Evlampia, as it was previously mentioned, exhibits a double nature. On the one hand, it portrays Cordelia's tenderness and inability to express love for her father appropriately:

'Evlampia!' ... 'Upon my word, madam, she was like a stone! Nothing but a statue! ... Can it be she's no feelings for me! It's clear I'm in a bad way; it's clear I've a feeling that I'm not long for this world, since I make over everything to them; and yet she's like a stone! She might at least utter a sound! Bows—yes, she bows, but there's no thankfulness to be seen' (Turgenev 2017: 52-3).

This tenderness comes back at the end of the story, while her father is destroying the roof of the house and she realises that they have mistreated him. Then, the quest for forgiveness and pardon begins and Evlampia offers Harlov everything that has been taken away from him:

'Stop, father; come down. We are in fault; we give everything back to you. Come down!' ... 'I give you back my share. I give up everything. Give over, come down, father! Forgive us; forgive me ... Come, trust me; you always trusted me. Come, get down; come to me to my little room, to my soft bed. I will dry you and warm you; I will bind up your wounds; see, you have torn your hands. You shall live with me as in Christ's bosom; food shall be sweet to you' (Turgenev 2017: 96-7).

In the previous section the ambiguous relationship between King Lear and his daughters was discussed, a situation that has not escaped the scrutiny of academics for centuries. That ambiguity had made some scholars think that the love contest

was in fact much more than a simple test on fraternal love. The same uncertainty is also present in Turgenev's work, as it can be seen in the previous quotation. Evlampia's words suggest a startling amorous overtone which clearly reminds the reader of the relationship between Lear and Cordelia (Seeley 1991: 290).

But, if Evlampia performs the part of Cordelia, it is also true that she plays Goneril's. As it is the case of Edmund in Shakespeare's *King Lear*, both sisters seem to fight for Slyotkin. Although he is married to Anna, the text suggests that he is Evlampia's lover too. One day, the narrator is hunting and finds Slyotkin and Evlampia in the forest. They are resting and playing, but Evlampia's song is quite revealing: 'Hither, hither, threatening storm-cloud / slay for me the father-in-law / strike for me the mother-in-law / the young wife I will kill myself' (Turgenev 2017: 67-8).

Consequently, Evlampia embodies four main traits in the novella: sensuality, pride, lust and spirituality (Seeley 1991: 293). At the end of the story, many years after Harlov's incident, the narrator finds Evlampia again. The description well embodies these four main traits:

She turned her head a little, and I recognised Evlampia Harlov. I knew her at once, I did not doubt for one instant, and indeed no doubt was possible; eyes like hers, and above all that cut of the lips—haughty and sensual—I had never seen in any one else. Her face had grown longer and thinner, the skin was darker, here and there line could be discerned; [...] It is difficult to do justice in words to the self-confidence, the sternness, the pride it had gained! (Turgenev 2017: 112).

Another fundamental character in order to understand the work of both writers is the fool. He plays a significant role, not only in highlighting what seems evident for the reader, but also in anticipating what is to come. In Shakespeare's *King Lear*, the fool is a combination of a clown and a soothsayer, as he is capable of foreseeing the future but also of making people laugh:

'I marvel what kin thou and thy daughters are: they'll / have me whipped for speaking true, thou'lt have me / whipped for lying; and sometimes I am whipped for holding my peace' (1.4.170-3).

[...]

'I am better than thou art now; I am a Fool, thou art nothing' (1.4.181-2).

As Jan Kott points out, in *King Lear* the reader is faced with two types of fool: the jester who has accepted the fact that he is at the service of someone, and the clown, the greatest fool, that one who does not know that he is a fool (Kott 1965: 130). In order to illustrate this dichotomy, he rescues Leszek Kolakowski's words on the nature of buffoonery and humour:

The Clown is he who, although moving in high society, is not part of it, and tells unpleasant things to everybody in it; he, who disputes everything regarded as evident. He would not be able to do all this, if he were part of that society himself [...] The Clown must stand aside

and observe good society from outside, in order to discover the non-evidence of evidence, the non-finality of its finality [...] The philosophy of Clowns [...] reveals contradictions inherent in what seems to have been proved by visual experience; it holds up to ridicule what seems obvious common sense, and discovers truth in the absurd (Kott 1965: 131).

In quoting Kolakowski, Kott is referring to the opposition king-fool present in Shakespeare’s tragedy. Lear’s position is absurd, as he cannot foresee that, when he divided the kingdom, he was giving away his power too, so he could not remain a king. It is the fool who reminds this absurdity when he says ‘thou art nothing’ (1.4.182). In Turgenev’s work, *Souvenir* exhibits the same qualities as the Shakespearean fool. He is capable of speaking what the main characters cannot foresee, and his capacity to see the future contrasts with Harlov’s short-sightedness:

‘Generous-hearted! Generous-hearted!’ he began croaking; ‘but we shall see whether this generosity will be much to his taste when he’s stripped naked, the servant of God... and out in the snow, too!’ ... ‘Fool! fool! repeated Souvenir. ‘God Almighty alone knows which of us is the real fool. But you, brother, did my sister, your wife, to her death, and now you’ve done for yourself... ha-ha-ha!’ (Turgenev 2017: 48)

In conclusion, it can be stated that the similarities between both texts are more than coincidental, which implies that Turgenev was consciously producing a text which clearly exhibited elements from the source text, while others were definitely Russian: the bear, the religious sect, the landlord-peasants structure, the Russian folklore or the symbolism of dreams, among others. The fact that the tragedy takes place in rural Russia and that is compared to one of the greatest symbols of Western literature implies that there is a certain cultural belonging to Europe which deserves being emphasised. If the same archetypes and prototypes are valid and can be found at both ends of the continent, then it must be assumed that the same origin is shared. In the next section, the ideological purposes which could have influenced Turgenev’s appropriation of *King Lear* will be illustrated.

5 The importance of the 19th-century Russian Context

5.1 Slavophiles and Westernisers

As it was stated in the introduction, the cross-cultural transference of knowledge is not a contemporary phenomenon and, in many occasions, it has led to cultural clash and social tensions. When analysing the importance of Ivan Turgenev for the evolution of Russian literature in the 19th century, it is essential to pay attention to his context and how philosophical and ideological tensions had a significant impact on literature. In order to understand this clash, it is of paramount importance to bear in mind the role of the *intelligentsia*, a group of educated people who were engaged in shaping the culture and the ideology of the country. Its members were divided into two main perspectives, which somehow embodied the identity conflict of Russia as a country: the Slavophiles and the Westernisers. The former considered that the pathway towards Russia’s salvation was close to the peasantry, the simple people, the land, the Russian Orthodox religion and the ideal of communality (Chances 2001: 112):

The etymological meaning of ‘Slavophilism’ is love of Slavs.’ [...] This term has come to be applied in a more narrow sense to a group of ideologists belonging to the conservative nobility, whose outlook was formed in the late 1830s in opposition to the trend known as ‘Westernism.’ [It] denoted in this case not so much a feeling of solidarity with brother Slavs as a cultivation of the native and primarily Slavic elements in the social life and culture of ancient Russia (Walicki 2015: 167).

The most important members of this ideological doctrine were Konstantin Aksakov, Ivan Kireevsky, Yury Samarin and Aleksei Khomiakov. For them, one key element was the relationship between Russia and Western countries. According to Kireevsky, the fabric of European civilisation was made up of three strands, which he connected to Christianity, the barbarian peoples that destroyed the Roman Empire and the classical heritage (Walicki 2015: 168-9). The fact that Russia had been excluded from the heritage of Rome was seen as a kind of blessing by some of these thinkers, because the ancient Roman civilisation was based upon the principles of rationalism, what explains their developments in jurisprudence; but this dependence left all the other social bonds aside. This is precisely why Western private and social life was, according to Kireevsky, ‘based on the concept of an individual and separate independence that presupposes the isolation. Hence the external formal relations of private property and all types of legal conventions are sacred and of greater importance than human beings’ (Walicki 2015: 169). In order to understand these words appropriately, it is important to state that the Slavophiles distinguished two types of truth: the inner and the external. The former referred to values such as religion, traditions or customs, which forged social bonds; the latter was represented by the state and the law, and was regarded as artificial. According to the Slavophiles, Russian people were superior to the Western Europeans because their convictions depended on moral and social values, instead of just legal ones (external):

All the finest minds in Europe bemoan the present state of moral apathy, the lack of conviction, the widespread egoism, and demand a new spiritual force beyond reason, a new motivation in life higher than calculated self-interest. In a word they are seeking faith, but they cannot find it among themselves, for Christianity has been distorted in the West by individual thought [...] This is even more evident if we compare the fundamental principles of European social and personal life with those basic principles which, even if they were not fully developed, were at least clearly seen in the social and personal life of ancient Russia (Kireevsky 1852: 82).

The Slavophiles recognised that a civilisation as the Western, based on rationalist criteria, had evolved faster than Russia, but this circumstance did not make it superior in any moral aspect. Peter the Great’s reforms to imitate the Western models had provoked a cut between the upper classes and the common people, which had caused a cleavage in Russian life: the antithesis between the people (*narod*) and the society (*obshchestvo*). This last group, which integrated a great part of the enlightened nobility and the elites, had greatly adopted Western customs, traditions and values. But, in doing that, according to Chaadaev and other

Slavophiles, they had abandoned their roots and had become men without a fatherland, strangers in the own country and homeless wanderers (Walicki 2015: 173). This description is especially interesting for us, and it refers to the so-called 'superfluous men.'

For their part, the Westernisers (*zapadniki*) did not form in any case a homogenous group, but a loose alliance of divergent trends which were opposed to Slavophilism. In general, the members of this ideological movement believed that the modernisation of the country required the adoption of West European laws, traditions and values (Chances 2001: 112). Visarion Belinsky and Aleksandr Herzen were the most important thinkers among the Westernisers. Although they agreed with the Slavophiles that Peter the Great's reforms had provoked a cleavage in Russian life, they understood it as a necessary step towards the modernisation of the country:

There is no point in blindly believe in the future; every embryo has the right to develop, but not every one succeeds. The future of Russia does not depend on Russia alone. It is bound up with the future of Europe (Herzen 1851: 148).

The attitude of Westernisers towards literature is highly representative of their attraction for European models. They considered that Russian writers should escape from folk poetry and bring Russian literature closer to that of the European countries, which were 'historical nations' and superior. This Hegelian concept was important during this period of time and was used to designate those nations which were understood to be true representatives of human kind:

The enthusiasm for Western culture among the Russian educated class naturally precipitated debate about the relationship of that culture to Russian culture and the degree to which Western culture could or should be accommodated in Russia. Consideration of these questions was in any case encouraged by the growth of interest within Western thought and literature in national distinctiveness and in the relative contribution of different peoples to the development of human civilization. This interest, which emanated from Germany in the late eighteenth century, found expression in the early nineteenth century among European peoples in a curiosity in their language, history, literature, music and customs, everything that gives a people its specific cultural identity (Offord 2001: 127).

Although Russian literature had potential, this had to copy and imitate the European models because, according to Belinsky, even 'Gogol [...] was without universal significance and could not be compared to the work of such 'world-historical' artists as James Fenimore Cooper and George Sand, let alone Homer and Shakespeare' (Walicki 2015: 227).

This intellectual and ideological debate which still continues today is of paramount importance for the purpose of this paper because it had a great influence on the literary development of some of the greatest 19th-century Russian writers. Although they did not belong formally to any of these two groups, it is well known that both Turgenev and Dostoevsky reflected some of these ideas in their novels, being the former a convinced Westerniser and the latter, a Slavophile.

5.2 Turgenev's Westernism

As it was previously stated, the character of King Lear is not the only appropriation of Western literature in Turgenev's literary career. Hamlet, Don Quixote or Faust played an important role in his work and, in some cases, have had a tremendous influence on the development of Russian literature since the 19th century. For reasons of space, only the dichotomy Hamlet-Don Quixote will be referred to.

'Hamlet of the Shchigrovsky District' is a short story included in one of Turgenev's most celebrated works, *Sketches from a Hunter's Album* (1852). The character, a self-defined 'unoriginal man' who is unable to act or be useful for those who surround him, initiated the study of Hamletism in Russian Literature. The concept of Hamlet-type characters or 'superfluous men' is still influential in contemporary Russian literature and could be define as:

'an ineffectual aristocrat at odds with society [...] 'dreamy, useless' [...] an 'intellectual incapable of action', an 'ineffective idealist', 'a hero who is sensitive to social and ethical problems, but who fails to act, partly because of personal weakness, partly because of political and social restraints on his freedom of action' (Chances 1978: 112).

In practice, the description referred to certain literary characters present in Russian literature who followed the ideals of Westernism, studied in Europe and returned to their homeland. However, when they did it, they realised that they did not fit anywhere, nor in Europe nor in Russia. These extremely selfish characters did not contribute to the modernisation of the country nor adapted to it. Because of their egotism and extreme inability to act, they were associated to Shakespeare's Hamlet. Since the publication of aforementioned short story and another of Turgenev's novellas, *The Diary of a Superfluous Man*, Hamlet has become the symbol of rational thought and individualism (even isolation) in Russia, and has been known as the superfluous man.

In one of his most famous speeches, 'Hamlet and Don Quixote' (1860), the Russian author provided a more detailed description of these two archetypes, while emphasising their importance for the development of Russian literature and the country as a whole. In that beautiful speech, he gave more details about these two types of characters. According to him, Don Quixote embodied faith and the belief in something eternal, an ideal that, although it is beyond human comprehension, it can still be achieved. Besides, he understood quixotic characters as those who try to institute justice and truth on earth, and because of that, they become an inspiration for the rest (Turgenev 1960: 94). These characters live and sacrifice for others, so there is no trace of egotism in them; and, although people laugh at them or find them ridiculous, they become leaders who are followed by the rest of society, as it is the case of Sancho Panza. In contrast, Hamlet-type characters live only for themselves and, although they lack faith in themselves, they resist to abandon this world. They embody egotism, disbelief and rational analysis, but they don't believe in anything (Turgenev 1960: 95).

Although Don Quixote could be considered as ridiculous and a madman, he has integrity and faith in an ideal, and that is something Hamlet could never achieve. In fact, Hamlet’s main tragedy is that he cannot be Don Quixote (Terras 1991: 330). Hamlet-type characters are nostalgic and gloomy and will never reach happiness:

As an unoriginal person, I don’t deserve an individual name... But if you really want to give some title, call me... call me the Hamlet of the Shchigrovsky district. There are many such Hamlets in every district, but perhaps you haven’t come across others (Turgenev 2013: 298).

It is obvious that Turgenev used several Western archetypes to create some of his most powerful novellas and short stories, as it is the case of *King Lear of the Steppes* or ‘Hamlet of the Shchigrovsky District.’ In the particular case of *King Lear*, bearing in mind everything that it has been previously stated, the appropriation had a double mission: on the one hand, it created a particular type of Russian tragedy based on a Western archetype; and, on the other, the adaptation of this model proved and gave support to the cultural link between Russia and the West. If the same type of tragedy could be found at both ends of the continent, the connection and the cultural belonging of Russia to Europe was more than evident. A third reason could be added: that of adopting Western models to contribute to the development of Russian literature, as it was considered at the beginning of the 19th century that this had not achieved yet the same level of maturity as its European or North-American counterparts.

Consequently, Turgenev did not just copy or imitate these archetypes and their stories, but adapted them to Russia and, at the same time, created something that could only be regarded as original. In order to do so, he made use of two creative processes described in this paper: appropriation and adaptation. As this example clearly proves, both of them are highly creative and capable of fostering discussion and debate, thus contributing to the development of target cultural systems. His ideological views on the development of Russia, and how this country should follow the Western model, as this paper tries to show, could have served as an important leitmotiv in the literary construction of some of his most important works. The ideas of Westernism, hidden behind a unique genius and the talent of one of the most important authors in the 19th century, can still be perceived.

6 Conclusions

The appropriation of King Lear, as an archetype, shows Turgenev’s effort to mirror his age and, at the same, and perhaps more importantly, exert some influence on its development. Conscious that the literary and the philosophical had a tremendous impact on the Russian cultural life, which was by the time debating itself, and still does, between the incorporation into Europe or the preservation of its Asian legacy, Turgenev’s appropriation of *King Lear* has to be understood as an example of how these processes of rewriting can foster debate and help develop target cultural systems.

In this paper a thorough analysis of the processes of appropriation and adaptation has been provided, highlighting and giving evidence to understand how they work.

These processes are not merely imitations or reproductions of previous existing works, as they have been sometimes considered, but highly creative and suggestive devices. They underscore the importance of cross-cultural relations and show that, although limited, the dialogue between the arts and society is still possible and can change the world.

References

- Bassnett, Susan & André Lefevere (1990), *Translation, History and Culture*. New Yorker: Pinter.
- Bloom, Harold (2003) (ed.), *Ivan Turgenev*. Broomall: Chelsea House Publishers.
- Bradley, Andrew Cecil (1992), *Shakespearean Tragedy. Lectures on Hamlet Othello, King Lear, Macbeth*. New York: Macmillan Education.
- Brumfield, William Craft (2015), "Two Hamlets: Questioning Romanticism in Turgenev's Bazarov and Sleptsov's Riazanov", *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities and Social Sciences* 9(8):1792-1802.
- Cartmell, Deborah & Imelda Whelehan (2007) (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cattrysse, Patrick (1992), "Film (Adaptation) as Translation: Some Methodological Proposals", *Target* 4(1):53-70.
- Chances, Ellen (2001), "The Superfluous Man in Russian Literature", in Cornwell, Neil (ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Russian Literature*. London and New York: Routledge, 111-122.
- Cheresh-Allen, Elizabeth (1992), *Beyond Realism. Turgenev's Poetics of Secular Salvation*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Seeley, Frank Friedeberg (1991), *Turgenev. A Reading of his Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gentzler, Edwin (1993), *Contemporary Translation Theories*. New York: Routledge.
- Griggs, Yvonne (2009), *Screen Adaptations. Shakespeare's King Lear*. London: Methuen Drama.
- Halio, Jay L. (2005), "Introduction", in Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of King Lear*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-94.
- Herzen, Aleksander (1851), "The Russian People and Socialism", in Leatherbarrow, William (1987) (ed.), *Russian Thought*. Michigan: Ardis Publishers, 147-8.
- Hutcheon, Linda (2006), *A Theory of Adaptation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jaques, Thomas (2002), "Ideological Transformation through Translation", *NUCB JLCC* 4(1):13-9.
- Kahan, Jeffrey (2008), "Introduction: Shakespeare's *King Lear*", in Kahan, Jeffrey (ed.), *King Lear. New Critical Essays*. London and New York: Routledge, 1-103.

- Kireevsky, Ivan (1852) "A Reply to A.S. Khomyakov." In Leatherbarrow, William (ed.), *A Documentary History of Russian Thought* (1987). Michigan: Ardis Publishers, 79-88.
- Knights, Lionel Charles (1963), "King Lear as Metaphor", in Slote, Bernice (ed.), *Myth and Symbol*. Nebraska: Nebraska University Press, 21-38.
- Kott, Jan (1965), *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd.
- Leitch, Thomas (2012), "Adaptation and Intertextuality, or, What isn't an Adaptation, and What Does it Matter?", in Cartmell, Deborah (ed.), *A Companion to Literature, Film, and Adaptation*. West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing, 87-104.
- _____ (2008). "Adaptation Studies at a Crossroads", *Adaptation* 1(1): 63-77.
- Lefevere, André (1992), *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Milton, John (2009), "Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies". In Pym, Anthony & Alexander Perekrstenko (eds.), *Translation Research Projects 2*. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, 51-58.
- Offord, Derek (2001), "Nineteenth-century Russian Thought and Literature", in Cornwell, Neil (ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Russian Literature*. London and New York: Routledge, 123-135.
- Perdikaki, Katerina (2017), "Film Adaptation as Translation: An Analysis of Adaptation Shifts in *Silver Linings Playbook*", *Anafora* 4(2):249-265.
- Sanders, Julie (2006), *Adaptation and Appropriation*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge
- Shakespeare, William (2004), *King Lear*. London: Wordsworth Classics.
- Terras, Victor (1991), *A History of Russian Literature*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Turgenev, Ivan (2017), *King Lear of the Steppes*, Melbourne: Skomlin.
- _____ (2013), *Sketches from a Hunter's Album: The Complete Edition*. Wrocław: Simon & Brown.
- _____ (2009), *The Diary of a Superfluous Man and Other Stories*. Rockville, Maryland: Tark Classic Fiction.
- _____ (2003), *Fathers and Sons*. London: Wordsworth Classics.
- _____ (1860), "Hamlet and Don Quixote", *Chicago Review* 17(4) (1965):92-109. Speech translated by Moshe Spiegel.
- Tymoczko, Maria (2006), "Translation: Ethics, Ideology, and Action", *The Massachusetts Review* 47(3) (Fall):442-461.
- Venuti, Lawrence (2007), "Adaptation, Translation, Critique", *Journal of Visual Culture* 6(1):25-43.
- _____ (2000) (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Verschueren, Jef (1999) (ed.), *Selected Papers from the 6th International Pragmatics Conference*. Vol. 1. Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association (IprA).

Manel Bellmunt Serrano – "Turgenev's appropriation of King Lear ..."

Volkov, Ivan O. (2018), "The Shakespeare Text of the Story 'A Lear of the Steppes': Characters' Images. *Вестник Томского государственного университета* 426:5-13.

Walicki, Andrzej (2015), *The Flow of Ideas. Russian Thought from the Enlightenment to the Religious-Philosophical Renaissance*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.