

## **Tetiana Holiak**

ORCID: 0000-0002-1930-101X

The Shevchenko Institute of Literature, Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv

E-mail: tetiana.holiak@gmail.com

DOI: 10.55159/tri.2023.0102.10



## **Insights Into Reconstructing the History of the Making of Ivan Franko's Collected Works in 25 Volumes**

### **Abstract**

The article outlines the stages of the history preparing an edition of Ivan Franko's works in 25 volumes by systematizing literary studies and studying archive sources. The events are described in organic connection with historical and socio-political circumstances, which made it possible to show the meanders of Franko's legacy reaching his readers. Some of the unknown documents are introduced into scientific circulation. The research methods of choice were textual and source analysis and synthesis. The use of these tools made it possible to establish little-known facts about the history of the collected works, trace the announcement of the contents of the individual volumes in the press, analyze the obstacles encountered, and find out the reasons for the sudden collapse of this publishing initiative.

### **Keywords**

Ivan Franko, anniversary edition, multi-volume collection, textual and source history, multi-volume collection.

Suggested citation: Holiak T. (2023). Insights Into Reconstructing the History of the Making of Ivan Franko's Collected Works in 25 Volumes. *Trimarium. The History and Literature of Central and Eastern European Countries*, 2(2), 243–264.

DOI: 10.55159/tri.2023.0102.10

Submitted: 16.03.2023 / Accepted: 21.03.2023

Ivan Franko's legacy and the fates of the people who prepared the editions encountered many difficult, dramatic, and even tragic moments, and therefore studying the history of the multi-volume collections of his works remains relevant. The details of this complicated process have to be assembled like a mosaic and the puzzle pieces of a complete picture have to be carefully put together. The edition of Franko's works in 25 volumes never saw its conclusion: only volumes 2 and 12 have been published. Even today, it is difficult to exhaustively recreate the course and conditions of the collection's preparation. Some questions remain unanswered, some episodes are hypothetical because witnesses and participants in the events have passed away, and many sources have been lost forever through history. However, the history of this project is marked not only by tragedy and impossibility, but also by the professionalism, the scientific apparatus, the selection of texts to be published, and the extraordinary responsibility of the team whose desire was to complete the complex task in a short time.

The source base for the reconstruction of the history of preparing Ivan Franko's works in 25 volumes was the publication of materials by Yevhen Pshenychnyi (Pshenychnyi and Trehub, 2007), Maria Trehub (Trehub, 2005), Maria Valio (Valio, 2006), historical and analytical research and publications of documents by Oleksandr Lutskyi (Lutskyi, 2006, 2020), memoirs of Volodymyr Doroshenko (Doroshenko, 1955), Lviv periodicals of 1940–1941 and archival materials from the collections of the Vasyl Stefanyk National Scientific Library of Ukraine in Lviv (LNSL), the Central State Archive-Museum of Literature and Art of Ukraine (CDAML), and the Central State Archive of Higher Authorities and Governments of Ukraine. The general literary study, the use of source and textual tools, and a thorough study of the array of archives and documentary sources have made it possible to analyze and systematize little-known facts about the history of the twenty-five-volume set of Franko's works of 1940–1941, to outline the textual foundations of the publication, to demonstrate the scale and complexity of the work done, and to emphasize the complexity of reasons that prevented the introduction of hitherto unexplored documents into scientific circulation.

Lutskyi (2006) claims that the stimulus for the new publishing initiative of a scientific edition of Ivan Franko's works dedicated to the celebration of the 85th anniversary of the writer's birth and commemorate the 25th anniversary of his death, was not so much in the anniversary dates as the socio-political circumstances that arose in Western Ukraine after its accession to the USSR in 1939. Thus, the publication of Franko's works was intended to demonstrate the Soviet government's loyalty to its cultural achievements. The Protocol Resolution of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CC CP(b)U) of January 10, 1940, obliged the State Literature Publishing House of the Ukrainian SSR to provide readers with the complete works of Ivan Franko by May 1941, and the Institute of Literature (IL) to participate in the selection and verification of the writer's texts (Lutskyi, 2006). This became a priority of the activities of the Lviv Department of the T. Shevchenko Institute of Ukrainian Literature, which was founded on 1 February 1940 (Onyshchenko, 2003, p. 244). According to the profile of the department (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 255/1. Ark. 5), in 1940, within the framework of the general theme ("Scientific publication of the heritage of the classics of Ukrainian literature"), the work was planned in two directions: preparation and printing of artistic works by Ivan Franko and his scientific and critical writing in 10 volumes. In a fairly short period of time (March 1940–April 1941), they were going to present Franko's artistic heritage to readers (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 255/1. Ark. 5). The first edition of the writer's scientific and critical works was to be published by scholars of the Institute of Literature in Kyiv together with the Institute of Folklore of the Academy of Sciences. The deadlines were also set: May 1, 1940–1942; during 1940, it was planned to prepare the first 3 volumes of Franko's literary studies (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 255/1. Ark. 5).

The composition of the editorial board was not determined immediately. By the aforementioned Political Office resolution of January 10, 1940, it was approved as follows: Oleksandr Biletskyi, Mykhailo Vozniak, Kyrylo Studynskyi, Oleksandr Korniiichuk, [Y.]. Lysenko, Yurii Kobyletskyi, and Ivan Kolohoyda (Onishchenko, 2003, p. 243). The thematic plan of the Lviv branch of the IL for 1940 was somewhat different: O. Korniiichuk, O. Biletskyi, P. Tychyna, M. Vozniak,

K. Studynskyi, Yu. Kobylecky, Y. Lysenko (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 255/1. Ark. 5). According to the documents, a meeting devoted to the problems of editing Ivan Franko's works would be attended by Petro Panch (LNSL. F. 29. Op. 1. Od. zb. 671. Ark. 34), Academy Member Filaret Kolesa also expressed his point of view on the upcoming edition (CDAML. F. 379. Op. 1. Spr. 171. Ark. 2-3).

The first meeting of the editorial board members, who discussed general textual principles (type of publication, its content, volume, structure of the scientific apparatus, etc.), the timing of publication and distribution, took place on February 10, 1940 (LNSL. F. 29. Op. 1. Od. zb. 671. Ark. 34-36).

The question of the language of the works immediately arose. The decision was made to bring the prose texts closer to the current spelling, if possible, and to make no changes to the poetry. During the discussion, a proposal was made to print some of Franko's works and a collection of selected poems from the same edition in parallel. Mykailo Vozniak was instructed to draw up a prospectus for the future edition and present it at the next meeting on February 15, 1940, in Lviv. His plan for the jubilee edition of Ivan Franko's works in 15 volumes, which was to include fiction, is preserved (LNSL. F. 29. Op. 1. Od. zb. 671. Ark. 42-46). Hypothetically, this could have been a preliminary plan. The concept for the new edition was borrowed from the thirty-volume collection edited by Ivan Lyzanivskyi and Serhii Pylypenko, despite the fact that it needed to be scientifically verified. However, at that time it was the most complete collection of a writer's works, and it was of great social and cultural significance.

A prospectus of literary and critical works by Ivan Franko was also made this way. In Vozniak's archive, there is a typewritten outline of works on literary studies and folklore, designed for 15 volumes (LNSL. F. 29. Op. 1. Od. zb. 671. Ark. 56-66). It could serve as a starting point for further discussion. During the publication of the thirty-volume set (1924-1931). I. Lyzanivskyi put a lot of effort into the project, and according to his plan, the corpus of literary and critical works was to be published (Holiak, 2020). Rewrites of articles and essays were organized; eventually, the general vision of the series was presented by the compiler in the form of an advertisement on the pages of the book of articles by I. Franko about Emile Zola (Lyzanivskyi

(ed.), 1931). A detailed prospectus for 11 volumes titled *Literatura (statti, rozvidky, zamitky, retsenzii)* was published in a collection of Franko's works on Leo Tolstoy (Lyzanivskiyi (ed.), [no year]). The history of the thirty-volume collection and its editors ended tragically, but their work has become a solid foundation, an important basis for additions. The plan drawn up by scholars in 1940 was to cover 15 volumes. It is identical to the prospectus of Lyzanivskiyi, starting with volume 3, and this shows that the principle of continuity was followed.

The next extended meeting of the editorial board was held on April 27, 1940. A letter by Davyd Kopytsia to O. Biletskyi of 3 May 1940 (CDAMLM. F. 379. Op. 1. Spr. 171. Ark. 2-3). It is known that a meeting was held at the Central Committee with Y. Lysenko. M. Vozniak and Yu. Kobyleckiyi reported. During the discussion, they approved the prospect with a note that M. Vozniak would finalize it. The proposal to publish literary and scientific works separately was rejected, specifying that this editorial board would concentrate its efforts on preparing an anniversary edition of Ivan Franko's works, not a complete one. Therefore, it was proposed to include only 4-5 volumes of Franko's selected literary studies and other scientific works. Professor Kolesa argued that one volume should be devoted to the writer's works on folklore, although M. Vozniak opposed this idea (CDAMLM. F. 379. Op. 1. Spr. 171. Ark. 2-3).

At this meeting, the editorial board approved an instruction (Pshenychnyi and Trehub, 2007, 494-495). In 11 points, they revealed the basic textual principles of the future anniversary edition. The compilers developed a scheme of the collection's scientific apparatus. The multi-volume collection of Ivan Franko was to include fiction texts (with the exception of his first childhood attempts and his last works), selected literary criticism and scientific writing. There were no plans to include prose translations, only poetry. The editors wanted to divide all the material into 20 volumes, each 30 printing sheets long. The format of the volumes and their artistic design were based on the five-volume set of Taras Shevchenko's works of 1939. The first volume would be opened with a preface by the editorial board on the principles of publishing Ivan Franko's works and a literary and biographical study of the writer. According to

V. Doroshenko, this part of the work was to be done by M. Vozniak: "... it was the responsibility of M. Vozniak as editor-in-chief also to compile a detailed sketch of Ivan Franko's life and work, which was to head the publication in volume I. It was a very responsible work, on which the late [editor] worked hard" (Doroshenko, 1955, p. 2). The principle of arrangement of the material is genre-based and chronological, but also "... preserving the principle of collections compiled and published by Ivan Franko himself and the genre division of the writer's entire work" (Pshenychnyi and Trehub, 2007, p. 494). They decided that each volume should have indexes, a concise explanation of the least used literary language or specific Western Ukrainian phrases and lexemes. Each volume would be accompanied by notes with information about the time, circumstances, and printing of each work, while the editorial board warned against turning them "... either into an explanation of the meaning of a given work or into imposing a certain understanding of its idea on the reader" (Pshenychnyi and Trehub, 2007, p. 495). Original explanations to individual texts and prefaces to the collections were also included in the notes.

This was the first multi-volume edition in which scholars could use the writer's archive in the course of preparing it. Therefore, the editorial board emphasized the principle of taking into account the author's last creative stage of work on the text: "Prosaic texts must be printed according to the latest editions by Franko himself, usually preserving Franko's language, phraseology, and style, and in no case changing his language" (Pshenychnyi and Trehub, 2007, p. 494). The ways to solve the problem of the language design of the writer's works were demonstrated in paragraphs 5-7 of the instructions. On May 3, 1940, in a letter to O. Biletskyi, D. Kopytsia did not note that from the very beginning this issue was one of the most troublesome and controversial ones, causing a wave of misunderstandings and generally showing the existence of completely opposite views. At different times, M. Vozniak, P. Panch, and K. Studynskyi expressed their opinions. Panch emphasized that the prose works of Ivan Franko should be closer to the current language and spelling, but this should concern only the author's language, while the dialogs should be fully preserved. He warned not to make changes to poetry, except in cases where there are no violations of verse size (LNSL. F. 29. Od. zb. 671.

Ark. 34). Academy scholar K. Studnytskyi emphasized the importance of caution when making corrections to texts and the importance of preserving Franko's linguistic flavor (LNSL. F. 29. Od. zb. 671. Ark. 34). M. Vozniak had his own position, and even in his articles of the 1950s it remained unwavering: he insisted on the publication of Ivan Franko's works, first as a strict academic edition and then as a popular one (Vozniak, 2007a, p. 539). In the end, it was decided to publish the works in the modern spelling. Deviations were allowed only in poetic texts, if such an intervention disrupted the rhythmic organization of the poetry and led to the destruction of rhyme.

A week later, on May 8, 1940, D. Kopytsia informed O. Biletskyi that the total volume of the publication had changed and would consist of 25 volumes: 15 would present the works by I. Franko, while the others would include selected literary critical works. However, he admitted that he could not fully visualize the whole process (CDAML. F. 379. Op. 1. Spr. 171. Ark. 6). This skepticism was due to the task of encompassing the incredible complexity of the project and the tight deadlines. V. Doroshenko mentioned that "in order to hurry up the printing of Franko's works, the government of the Ukrainian SSR ordered them to be sent to printing houses not only in Kyiv or Lviv, but also in Kharkiv, Katerynoslav, and Odesa" (Doroshenko, 1955, p. 2). Therefore, despite pressure from the publisher, Kopytsia deliberately delayed the signing of the contract (CDAML. F. 379. Op. 1. Spr. 171. Ark. 6).

The 25-volume anniversary edition was included in the working schedule of the Department of the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences in Lviv for 1941. According to the documents, the compilation was to be completed by May 1, 1941; the executors were the Lviv branch of the Institute of Literature, the IL in Kyiv, and the branch of the Institute of Linguistics at the Academy of Sciences in Lviv. The composition of the working group was determined: Kyrylo Studynskyi, Yakym Yarema, Volodymyr Radzykevych, Veniamin Hufeld, Stepan Shchurat, Maria Derkach, Mykhailo Tershakovets, Mykhailo Sonevytskyi, Hryhorii Luzhnytskyi, and others. O. Biletskyi and M. Vozniak were appointed as executive editors. The general management was entrusted to the editorial board consisting of O. Kornychuk, [Y.] Lysenko, K. Studynskyi,

Yu. Kobyletskyi, M. Vozniak, and O. Biletskyi (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 255/1. Ark. 6). However, it was difficult to manage the process from a distance, impossible to control its implementation, and the distrust among the team, which was growing every day, also hindered the work. That is why D. Kopytsia came up with the idea to send Kyiv employees headed by Ilia Stebun to Lviv, despite the fact that V. Hufeld was already there (CDAMLM. F. 379. Op. 1. Spr. 171. Ark. 6).

In the collections of the Manuscripts Department of the Vasyl Stefanyk National Scientific Library of Ukraine in Lviv (F. 55. Od. zb. 255/2. 71 ark.; F. 29. Op. 1. Od. zb. 671. 103 ark.; Od. zb. 778/p. 180. Ark. 1-17) and the collections of M. Derkach at the CDAMLM (F. 167. Op. 1. Spr. 18. 28 ark.; Spr. 16. 8 ark.) contain several versions of the plans and prospects of the twenty-five-volume edition and its individual volumes. Numbered and unnumbered, handwritten and typewritten, fragments and records that look relatively complete, they all illustrate the complex way in which the whole was formed. Without dwelling on their detailed analysis (this may be the subject of a separate study), it should be noted that the compilers had to take into account the ideological requirements of the time. The documents demonstrate hesitations in developing the content of individual volumes of literary and critical works by I. Franko. Confirmation that the bulk material was formed under the watchful eye of the Central Committee is also found in D. Kopytsia's letter to O. Biletskyi of 8 May 1940 (CDAMLM. F. 379. Op. 1. Spr. 171. Ark. 7).

The preparation of the anniversary edition, according to all the canons of the party nomenclature, was supposed to be widely publicized, but this story can be viewed from two perspectives: public information and the behind-the-scenes of working days, hidden from prying eyes, but no less interesting, intense and dramatic. Periodicals played a major role in shaping public opinion. It is an important source for studying official messages designed to create an informational picture of reality in accordance with specific political objectives. They help recreate the chronology of events and trace the announcement of the content of individual volumes of the future twenty-five-volume set.

Preparations for the celebration of Ivan Franko's anniversary and commemoration of his memory were reported in the pages of the

*Vilna Ukraina* and *Literatura i mystetstvo*. Formal and concise, they fully met the requirements of the information field of the time: to attract attention, arouse interest and trust in the reader, and at the same time demonstrate loyalty to the government and emphasize the party's achievements.

Details of the ambitious and socially significant publishing project were published in the press in August 1940. The news of the first volumes being printed were published on August 14, 1940 ([no author], 1940). "Pershi tomy yuvileinoho vydannia tvoriv Ivana Franka" [Announcement]), reported that the Lviv branch of the Institute of Literature of the Ukrainian SSR prepared 12 volumes, and the first five would be published that month. This included poetic collections *Z vershyn i nyzyn*, *Ziviale lystia*, *Mij Izmarahd* in addition to the short stories "Borys Hrab", "Panshchyzniani khlib", "Bez pratsi", "Kazka pro Dobrobyt" and others. Also, the stage of preparation of the volumes was outlined, emphasizing that they are undergoing literary editing.

Almost two weeks later, on August 25, 1940, the same newspaper reported that all 15 volumes of Franko's fiction were ready, and 10 volumes of literary criticism, journalism, and translations from foreign languages were to be submitted to the publishing house by the end of the year. The content of the first five was different: short stories, lyrical poetry, and early novels by Franko ([no author], 1940. "Yuvileine vydannia tvoriv Ivana Franka" [announcement]).

The readers were intrigued and eagerly awaited the announced publication. However, the announced first books did not appear either in August or by the end of the year. The stage of preparedness of the 15 volumes of fiction and three volumes of translations was confirmed on February 28, 1941, by the *Literaturna Hazeta* ([no author], 1941. "Vchasno vydaty tvory Franka" [announcement]).

The author partially outlined the causes and consequences of the delay in the publication, one of which is an inadequate assessment of the scale of the work, especially the segment related to translations and compilation of volumes of literary criticism:

Proofreading should take two weeks, but having received the first prints in mid-January, the institute continues to keep them... In addition,

the publishing house has not yet received Franko's critical works on Ukrainian literature and Western European literature. Many developments require further notes ([no author], 1941. "Vchasno vydaty tvory Franka [announcement]).

This resulted in the printing house being idle. The completion of the work was postponed until March 15. However, in April 1941 the first volumes had not yet been published. On April 4, the *Literaturna Hazeta* once again reminded that the State Literary Publishing House was tasked by the governmental anniversary committee to publish a twenty-five-volume set of works by Ivan Franko. It was hinted that meetings with the public of writers and scholars working on the texts of Franko's works and an exhibition of projects for the artistic design of the anniversary collection would be very appropriate and interesting ([no author], 1941. "Do yuvileiu Ivana Franka" [announcement]).

On April 11, 1941, the *Vilna Ukraina* again reported that the preparation of 20 volumes of the collection was nearing completion, and that five volumes of short stories, four volumes of novels, a volume of dramatic works, four volumes of poetry, and three volumes of literary criticism on Ukrainian literature had already been sent to Kyiv. They emphasized that some of the materials are unknown or little known to readers. Thus, it was planned to publish the work *Literatura, ii zavdannia ta naivazhnishi tsikhy*, articles on Lesya Ukrainka, M. Kotsiubynskyi, I. Karpenko-Karyi, V. Stefanyk and others ([no author], 1941. "Do yuvileinoho vydannia tvoriv Ivana Franka" [announcement]). Earlier, the newspaper *Vilna Ukraina* reported that the multi-volume collection would include an unknown translation of *The Tale of Igor's Campaign* found by IL researchers in Lviv in the writer's manuscript archive ([no author], 1940. "Yuvileine vydannia tvoriv Ivana Franka" [announcement]).

Meanwhile, a real drama was unfolding behind the scenes. Organizing Ivan Franko's works based on scientific and critical review of the texts was a great challenge, requiring a well-developed archive, a frantic pace of work and dedication of the performers, and most importantly, coordination at all levels. The timing of the publication of the twenty-five-volume work depended on the precise organization and close cooperation of scholars from the Department of

Ukrainian Literature, the Manuscripts Department of the Lviv Academic Library, and the printing house. The state, structure and content of the complex archive of I. Franko was estimated already in 1941 by M. Derkach in the journal *Literatura i mystetstvo* (Derkach, 1941). The researcher paid tribute to the titanic work of M. Vozniak. One can get an idea of the difficult conditions and the ascetic work of the staff of the manuscripts department thanks to the publication by Tetiana Hutsalenko (Hutsalenko, 2005). Despite all the difficulties, the research of the archive continued. In 1941, the compilers and members of the editorial committee presented a number of unknown works by Ivan Franko to the readers of the journal *Literatura i mystetstvo*, printed from manuscripts. M. Derkach and Oleksandr Kyselov published the poem “Shevchenko i poklonnyky” (Derkach, Kyselov, 1941), which was to be included in volume xv; also poems “Shche ne propalo” and “Pryvit” were included in this volume (Franko, 1941. “Shche ne propalo”, “Pryvit”) and the poetic work “Rubach”, preserved between the manuscripts of Osyp Makovei (Franko, 1941. “Rubach (z narodnykh perekaziv)”). The publication of these materials was also reported by the newspaper *Vilna Ukraina* on May 28, 1941. ([No author], 1941). “Literatura i mystetstvo – Frankovi”). On April 16, 1941, the *Literaturna Hazeta* published an abridged article translated from German, “Shekspir v Ukraintsiv” with a note that readers would be able to read the full text in the twentieth volume of the anniversary edition (Franko, 1941. “Shekspir v Ukraintsiv”). However, archives show that the publication’s prospectus was constantly being revised. The volumes of translations and literary criticism were marked by particular imperfections, although corrections were made to the volumes of fiction.

Many misunderstandings arose during the formation of the translation corpus. Along with ideological factors, the compilers faced the scarcity of professional translators (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 246. Ark. 16). Most of the contracts were signed by Pylyp Derkach, a translator from Polish and German. According to his payroll documents, he translated the following works of Ivan Franko from Polish: “Nove vydannia tvoriv Shekspira”, “Kupets venetskyi”, “Narysy z istorii ukrainskoi literatury v Halychyni”, “Ukrainska literatura v Halychyni za rik 1886”, “Step”,

“Veselka”, “Ukrainska almanakhova literatura”, “Ukrainskyi teatr v Halychyni”, Lesia Ukrainka”, “Shekspir v Ukraintsiiv”, “Z dilianky nauky i literaury”, “Halytsko-ukrainski narodovtsi i radykaly”. The articles “Maria Konopnytska” and “Hlib Uspenskyi” were translated from German (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 246. Ark. 6, 7, 9–11). In addition, agreements were signed to translate theater reviews for the years 1888, 1889, 1890, 1892 and 1893, on top of articles “Dopovidi Miriama” (on Belgian literature), “Yan Kasprovych” (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 247. Ark. 2). The number of translated theater reviews remains unclear. On April 21, 1941, the deputy head of the department of the Institute of Ukrainian Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, V. Hufeld issued a request to the accounting department to pay for the work performed, totaling only 2 printed sheets (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 247. Ark. 16). The contract for the following translations: “‘Na storozhi’ B. Prusa”, “Yulij Slovatskyi i yoho tvory”, “Nove vydannia tvoriv Slovatskoho”, “Nove vydannia tvoriv Mitskevycha”, “Moi falshuvannia”, “N. Zaionchkovska-Krestovska”, “S. Kravchynskyi-Stepniak” and “Neshchasne kokhannia” were dated 30 April 1941. On 14 May 1941, V. Hufeld turned to the accounting department to pay P. Derkach 400 Soviet rubles for them (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 247. Ark. 17, 18).

Also, V. Doroshenko translated from Polish: “Shevchenko v osvittenni p. Ursina”, “Poetychni tvory Shevchenka”, “Legenda pro Pylata”, “Bezhuзде vorkotinnia ‘Chervonoi Rusi’”, quotations in Franko’s articles on T. Shevchenko and about Mordovets’ stories (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 246. Ark. 8, 18).

Mykhailo Rudnytskyi’s involvement was also used to translate the article “Ukraintsi” from Hungarian (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 246. Ark. 19).

The translation prospectus also aroused controversy. According to a letter from D. Kopytsia’s to O. Biletskyi, the bibliography was compiled by Ida Zhuravska, assisted by Abram Hozenpud (CDAML. F. 379. Op. 1. Spr. 171. Ark. 6–7). However, the compilers of the volumes expressed criticism regarding the choice of articles, as it was virtually impossible to quickly prepare little-known texts and high-quality notes to them.

Along with this, in some cases, there was also the problem of attribution. The Question of Franko’s translations from old literature is a research topic explored by M. Sonevtskyi (LNSL. F. 55.

Od. zb. 255/1. Ark. 16–17), which, in particular, included the study of manuscripts and printed translations, and the authentication of texts preserved in the archive that were not written by Franko's hand. The writer's son, Taras Franko, was asked to help establish the authorship of a number of works (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 246. Ark. 17).

However, most of the disputes and clarifications arose during the discussion of the principles of reproducing the language of I. Franko. As already noted, on April 27, 1940, the instruction on the basic textual principles of the publication was approved, and 5–7 paragraphs dealt with this issue. However, the general provisions did not contribute to the resolution of the controversial issues. There was a constant need to settle misunderstandings, as evidenced by the staff's official correspondence (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 246. Ark. 12–13). D. Kopytsia also admitted to the sensitivity of this topic to O. Biletskyi on March 14, 1941 (CDAMLM. F. 379. Op. 1. Spr. 171. Ark. 8zv.) Even after a year of hard work, a clear position on language transfer has not been formed. On June 10, 1940, at a regular meeting, Vasyl Simovych, a senior researcher at the Lviv Department of the Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, expressed his vision of solving this problem. After the discussion, the commission consisting of Ahatanhel Krymskyi, M. Vozniak and V. Simovych headed by D. Kopytsia, adopted a number of resolutions concerning the phonetic, grammatical, and lexical levels of language design of works on June 11, 1940 (Pshenychnyi and Trehub, 2007, pp. 496–500). The course of those events was outlined in later publications by M. Vozniak and O. Kyselov during a discussion that broke out on the pages of the Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in 1951 during the preparation of the publication of works in 20 volumes during 1950–1956. M. Vozniak was outraged by the chaotic linguistic design of Ivan Franko's works (Vozniak, 2007b).

I. Stebun and V. Hufeld were responsible for the work schedule and its observance (Lutsky, 2006). Given the limited time for preparing manuscripts (until January 1, 1941), the schedule was very busy. As V. Doroshenko mentioned, "... the work on Franko went smoothly, like on an assembly line, volume after volume" (Doroshenko, 1955, p. 2). The work was organized as follows: one or two scholars were assigned to each volume to prepare the texts and

develop the scientific apparatus. The results were reviewed by the volume editors. The review usually lasted 5 days, although in some cases up to 10 days. Next came literary editing and, finally, the work of the editor-in-chief. The entire stage of compiling the volume was supposed to last one and a half months. However, the possibility of returning the material to the editors after the literary editor was also discussed in order to increase the responsibility of the latter (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 246. Ark. 12-13). An article in the *Vilna Ukraina* reveals that all fiction was read by literary editor Fedir Havrysh, literary criticism by V. Tatarinov, and Stepan Kovhaniuk worked on the volumes of translations (Kuzmiv, 1941).

The composition of the working group was not permanent. The compilers of the volumes organized mutual checks, made comments, corrections, expressed dissatisfaction, and often changed due to inadequate professional training and irresponsible attitude to the work (Vozniak, 2007b).

O. Lutskyi published the conclusion of the planning commission to audit the state of preparations of the publication for print, dated February 15-17, 1941 (Lutskyi, 2020). The text of the document refers to 14 volumes of Ivan Franko's works. The rest were at different stages of readiness. The desperate letter from D. Kopytsia to O. Biletskyi on March 14, 1941 (CDAMLM. F. 379. Op. 1. Spr. 171. Ark. 8-10) leads to the conclusion that the publication was actually on the verge of collapse. The addressee complained that he was forced to bear the brunt of the burden because the State Literary Publishing House had not taken care of organizational issues and had not appointed a person responsible for bringing the texts to a common denominator. It was simply unrealistic to prepare such a collection in such a short time. According to the letter, from January to March 1941, the publishing house handed over 7-8 volumes of proofreading, which had to be checked against the originals, dictionaries and notes revised, indexes compiled, and literary editing done. D. Kopytsia complained about the presence of numerous errors, repetitions, unprofessionally prepared indexes and comments, etc. This made it impossible to publish even one volume in a form that would not discredit the Institute. He considered it impossible to hire another literary editor.

He recognized that this state of affairs was a huge tragedy, because there were only four months left before the anniversary. The printing house was on the verge of shutting down. It should also be borne in mind that each volume, each note had to undergo a censorship review. This dramatic situation was primarily a consequence of the party ideology of the time: to set an ambitious and unrealistic task, disregarding local interests and capacities, and in case of failure to fulfill it, to deliberately divide the participants into “friends” and “foes”, the heroes and the guilty. The team of compilers of the 1940 edition was thanked for their diligent work (Lutskyi, 2020). But now the situation has changed. The tone of the letter suggests that D. Kopytsia realized that he could be included in the cohort of the “perpetrators”. He admitted to O. Biletskyi that the team was trying to protect themselves by signaling the authorities, but he did not believe that the case would be resolved positively. It is worth noting that the division into “friends” and “foes” was not long in coming, and M. Vozniak was accused of bourgeois nationalism, who should not participate in the next project of a multi-volume edition.

The distance also slowed down the work. Scholars in Kyiv and Lviv were constantly in dialog, as evidenced by the letters and telegrams of their colleagues, but they could not act according to instructions and meet deadlines (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 259/p. XII. Ark. 3).

Finally, the names of the scholars who made the titanic efforts to compile 15 volumes of Ivan Franko’s works are recorded in a letter to D. Kopytsia on March 20, 1941: “Volume I: prepared for publication and compiled according to the scientific apparatus by S. V. Shchurat; [volume] II: prepared and compiled according to the scientific apparatus for publication by V.P. Radzykevich and Ya. Yarema; [volume] III: prepared and compiled according to the scientific apparatus for printing by V.P. Radzykevich; [volume] IV: prepared by Savytska and V.P. Radzykevich; [volume] V: stories prepared by Yu. Stefanyk and M. Sonevytskyi; the first editing of Petriiv: V.I. Simovych; [volume] VI: V.I. Simovych and M. Bernshtein; [volume] VII: “Zakhar Berkut” – V.I. Simovych and M. Tershakovets; “Lelum i Polelum” – M. Vozniak; “Heroi po nevoli”, “Hutak” – V. P. Radzykevich; “Ivas Novitnyi” – S. F. Havrysh; [volume] VIII: “Osnovy suspilnosti” – V.I. Simovych and M. Tershakovets; “Dla

domashnoho ohnyshcha”, “Velykyi shum” – Ya. Yarema; [volume] ix: V.I. Simovych and M. Tershakovets; volume x: H.L. Lyzhynskyi (texts checked afterwards against the originals by Ya. Yarema); volume xi: V.I. Simovych; [volume] xii: M.D. Derkach (texts checked afterwards against the originals by Ya. Yarema); [volume] xiii, xiv: Ya. Yarema; [volume] xv: O. Kyselov and M. Derkach” (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 246. Ark. 14–15).

The first volume of Ivan Franko’s critical works was ready on April 1, 1941, as evidenced by a letter from D. Kopytsia’s letter with that date. It also states that three more volumes were ready (it is not specified which ones) and expresses the hope that all volumes of critical works will be delivered by the end of April 1941 (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 246. Ark. 15). But in June 1941, the war broke out.

Oleksandr Lutskyi (2006), considering the conditions of preparation of the twenty-five-volume set from the perspective of a historian, emphasized a complex set of important circumstances that burdened and finally made it impossible to successfully fulfill the ambitious goals set: disorganization of scholars’ efforts on many research topics, writing monographs, etc. Almost all employees combined their work at the research institution with teaching at universities. According to the text of the explanatory note to the plan of the Institute of Ukrainian Literature at the T. H. Shevchenko signed by O. Biletskyi and D. Kopytsia, “... compared to 1940, the 1941 plan was significantly increased, almost twice” (Onyshchenko, 2003, p. 327). It was an unrealistic scale of work related to the writing of original research papers with a total volume of 225 pages, a scientific bibliography and scientific description of manuscripts stored at the Institute (up to 70 pages), two volumes of a textbook on the history of Ukrainian literature (up to 120 pages), publication of textbooks (80 pages) and scientifically verified works of classical literature with comments (to complete the publication of T. Shevchenko, I. Franko, V. Stefanyk and to start publishing Lesia Ukrainka’s works), along with holding 8 scientific institute sessions devoted to significant dates in the history of Ukrainian literature, at which 50 reports were published (Onyshchenko, 2003, pp. 326–327). Facing the insane amount of work, limited time, constant pressure, unfavorable moral and psychological climate and disciplinary and punitive measures

for lateness, absenteeism or unauthorized absence, nervous tension, and overcoming everyday difficulties, they had to sacrifice weekends, vacations, and leisure time, which led to overwork, misunderstandings, and constant stress. The discomfort was exacerbated by the totalitarian policy of the Soviet government, which deepened the feeling of uncertainty about the future.

M. Vozniak complained that one of the main reasons for the suspension was a banal delay: "Because some members of the editorial board were in no hurry to fulfill the task entrusted to them, only two volumes were published: the second and the twelfth" (Vozniak, 2007a, p. 536). D. Kopytsia admitted to negligence in the performance of his duties, not by him, but by his superiors (CDAMLM. F. 379. Op. 1. Spr. 171. Ark. 8-10).

The number of volumes ready for printing varies among the sources. According to V. Doroshenko, "... if not for the outbreak of the German-Soviet war, then perhaps not within the time frame determined by the government, but still in a fairly short time all 36 volumes would have appeared" (Doroshenko, 1955, p. 2). He was mistaken about the number of volumes, but his testimony leads to the conclusion that an incredible amount of work was done.

Vozniak reports on 20 volumes: "... of the twenty volumes signed and sent from Lviv to Kyiv, fifteen had time to be published" (Vozniak, 2007b, p. 555). His words can be confirmed by the text of the telegram of April 16, 1941: "All the volumes are ready, and I am looking for an opportunity to provide you with them" (LNSL. F. 55. Od. zb. 259/p. XII. Ark. 5). According to the results of O. Lutskyi's research, the readiness of 20 volumes was later confirmed by the director of the T.H. Shevchenko Institute of Ukrainian Literature, Professor O. Biletskyi and academic secretary Hryhorii Verves (Lutskyi, 2020). According to the 1940 report of the IL branch in Lviv, the staff submitted 19 volumes, one volume prepared by K. Studynskyi was half finished at the time of reporting on the results of the work (Onyshchenko, 2003, p. 296). Chairman of the Planning Commission of the Vice-President of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, A. O. Sapiihin reported that "... out of 25 volumes, only 13 were submitted for publication" (Onyshchenko, 2003, p. 313). Among the main reasons he mentioned miscalculations in work planning and

overestimation of the strength of researchers. F. Havrysh noted in his autobiography that on behalf of the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, he carried out the literary editing of the first seventeen volumes of the edition (Lutskyi, 2020).

The question also arises regarding the preservation of materials during the war. In her diary of October 8, 1942, M. Derkach wrote: "I went to Mr. Dryhynych for the archives of the Institute of Literature. I brought materials for the IX volume of Ivan Franko, two final corrections of the first correction, materials for the seventeenth volume, translation of the Nibelungen, Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*, *My Familiar Jews*, *Faust*, etc." (LNSL. F. 259. Op.1. Kor. III. 72). In M. Vozniak's archive (LNSL. F. 29. Od. zb. 778/p. 180. Ark. 1-17) a handwritten plan with a list of the contents of the volumes of the scientific publication is kept. The title page states that it was received from the Ukrderzhlitvydav and preserved by the efforts of the manuscript department of the Shevchenko Institute of Ukrainian Literature. The collection contains only a plan, although a note on the folder suggests that it was drawn up in accordance with the materials received. Records indicate that materials in volumes I-X, XII, and XXI were presented in the form of typescript and facets, while others were presented only as typescript. For volume XXII there is a note that four folders of materials were prepared, but with many pages missing. V. Doroshenko recalled that M. Vozniak also made efforts and saved some of his work: "... The late (M. Vozniak. - T. H.) managed to acquire it during the German occupation thanks to Mr. Kostiuk, who worked as a translator for the Germans in the Dnieper Ukraine, those volumes that he could find in the destroyed printing houses" (Doroshenko, 1955, p. 2). The fact that the work was saved is evidenced by the undated draft No. 1 of the meeting of the editorial board of the twenty-five-volume collection of Franko's works. The issue of academic editions of works by T. Shevchenko and I. Franko were submitted to the Bureau of the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR for consideration in the third quarter of 1945 (TSDAVO of Ukraine), Materials of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. F. P-2. Op. 7. Tom III. Od. zb. 2739. Ark. 6), so there is no doubt that this document dates from 1945. According to the records, at the meeting, Yu. Kobyletskyi reported that he had taken

out 20 volumes of Ivan Franko's works from Kyiv and Kharkiv and handed them over to the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR for preservation. He also handed over all the portraits to the works of Ivan Franko for safekeeping. Ye. Kyryliuk confirmed the readiness of 20 volumes and their satisfactory condition (CDAMLM. F. 52. Op. 1. Spr. 112. Ark. 1). The surviving materials were also discussed in government offices. An appeal to the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR by a full member of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, M. Ptukha is dated July 4, 1945. (Lutskyi, 2020, p. 118). He confirmed that a significant part of the twenty-five-volume scientific edition of Ivan Franko's works had been fully prepared, edited, and submitted to the State Publishing House. At the time, volumes I, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XIX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV were kept in prints and manuscripts in the IL; the rest of the work was lost in Lviv and Kharkiv printing houses.

Scholars have made titanic efforts to process the archive, search for texts, first editions, select the main text, write commentaries, compile indexes, and eventually prepare the 20 volumes of I. Franko's works. The surviving materials became a solid basis, foundation, and experience for the next edition in 1950–1956. Not devoid of miscalculations and mistakes, brutally interrupted by military operations, the history of this collection should take a worthy place in the general textual and source history of Franko's multi-volume collected work.

### **Bibliography**

- [No author] (1941). Do yuvileiu Ivana Franka. [announcement]. *Literaturna hazeta*, iss. 14 April.
- [No author] (1941). Do yuvileinoho vydannia tvoriv Ivana Franka. [announcement]. *Vilna Ukraina*, 11 April, 1.
- [No author] (1941). Literatura i mystetstvo – Frankovi. *Vilna Ukraina*, 28 May, 4.
- [No author] (1940). Pershi tomy yuvileinoho vydannia tvoriv Ivana Franka: [announcement]. *Vilna Ukraina*, 14 August, 4.
- [No author] (1941). Vchasno vydaty tvory Iv. Franka. [announcement]. *Literaturna hazeta*, 28 February, no. 9, 4.

- [No author] (1940). Yuvileine vydannia tvoriv Ivana Franka: [announcement]. *Vilna Ukraina*, 25 August, 1.  
Central State Archive-Museum of Literature and Art of Ukraine, CDAMLM. F. 167 (Derkach M.). Op. 1. Spr. 16 (Project of the anniversary edition of Ivan Franko's works). 8 ark.
- Central State Archive-Museum of Literature and Art of Ukraine, CDAMLM. F. 167. Op. 1. Spr. 18 (Lists of works by Franko I. Ya.). 28 ark.
- Central State Archive-Museum of Literature and Art of Ukraine, CDAMLM. F. 379 (Kopytsia D.D.). Op. 1. Spr. 171 (Letters from D. Kopytsia to O.I. Biletskyi). 13 ark.
- Central State Archive-Museum of Literature and Art of Ukraine, CDAMLM. F. 52 (Kobyletskyi Yu.). Op. 1. Spr. 112 (Report of the meeting of the editorial board of the 25-volume collection of works by Ivan Franko). Ark. 1.
- Derkach, M. (1941). Sered bloknativ i zapysok Ivana Franka. *Literatura i mystetstvo*, no. 5, 38–42.
- Derkach, M., Kyselov, O. (Eds.). (1941). Franko I. Shevchenko i poklonyky. *Literatura i mystetstvo*, no. 3, 25.
- Doroshenko, V. (1955). Akademik Mykhailo Vozniak (Yoho zhyttia i diialnist). *Svoboda*, no. 60, 30 March, 2.
- Franko, I. (1941). Rubach (z narodnykh perekaziv). *Literatura i mystetstvo*, no. 1, 26–27.
- Franko, I. (1941). Shekspir v Ukraintsi. *Literaturna hazeta*, iss. 16, 16 April, 2.
- Franko, I. (1941). Shche ne propalo, Pryvit. *Literatura i mystetstvo*, no. 5, 12–13.
- Holiak, T. (2020). Spivpratsia Ivana Lyzaniivskoho ta Mykhaila Vozniaka pry pithotovtsi trytsiatytomnoho vydannia tvoriv Ivana Franka. *Slovo i Chas*, no. 5, 36–52. DOI: 10.33608/0236-1477.05.36-52.
- Hutsalenko, T. (2005). Viddil rukopysiv Lvivskoi naukoovoi biblioteky im. V. Stefanyka NAN Ukrainy u 1940–1949 rr.: Postati ta podii. *Zapysky Lvivskoi naukovoii biblioteky im. V. Stefanyka NAN Ukrainy*, iss. 13, 175–238.
- Kuzmiv, P. (1941). V hostiakh u akademika Vozniaka. *Vilna Ukraina*, 1 February, 3.
- Lutskyi, O. (2006). Dvadsiatyiatytomne vydannia tvoriv Ivana Franka: nerealizovannyi proiekt? *Zapysky Lvivskoi naukovoii biblioteky im. V. Stefanyka*, iss. 14, 433–454.

- Lutskyi, O. (2020). Dvadsiatyiatytomne vydannia tvoriv Ivana Franka: Lvivskiy vnesok. *Novitnia doba*, iss. 8, 88–122. DOI: 10.33402/nd.2020-8-88-121.
- Lyzanivskiy, I. (Ed.). (1931a). *Ivan Franko. Pro E. Zola*. Kharkiv: Rukh, 170.
- Lyzanivskiy, I. (Ed.). (1931b) *Ivan Franko. Pro L. Tolstoho*. Kharkiv: Rukh, 111–119.
- Onyshchenko, O. (Ed.). (2003). *Istoria Natsionalnoi akademii nauk Ukrainy (1938–1941): Dokumenty i materialy*. Kyiv: NBUV, 920.
- Pshenychnyi, Ye., Trehub, M. (2007). Vid 25-ty do 100-tomovky Ivana Franka (Tekstolohichni prychnyky). *Frankoznavchi studii*, iss. 4, 486–573.
- Trehub, M. (2005). Materialy z pidhotovky odnogo z yuvileinykh vydan tvoriv Ivana Franka. *Frankoznavchi studii*, iss. 3, 368–376.
- Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv vyshchyykh orhaniv vldy ta upravlinnia Ukrainy. Materialy Akademii nauk URSR. F. R-2. Op. 7. Tom III. Od. zb. 2739. Ark. 6.
- Valio, M. (2006). Unpublished work by M. Vozniak on the manuscript of Ivan Franko's heritage. *Zapysky Lvivskoi naukovoii biblioteky im. V. Stefanyka*, iss. 14, 260–283.
- Vasyl Stefanyk National Scientific Library of Ukraine in Lviv (LNSL), f. 29. Od. zb. 778/p. 180 (Institute of Ukrainian Literature. Bibliography of the works of I. Franko). Ark. 1-17.
- Vasyl Stefanyk National Scientific Library of Ukraine in Lviv (LNSL), f. 55. Od. zb. 246 (Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR in Lviv. Outgoing correspondence of the branch of the T. H. Shevchenko Institute of Literature (1940–1941)). Ark. 81.
- Vasyl Stefanyk National Scientific Library of Ukraine in Lviv (LNSL), f. 55. Od. zb. 247 (Contracts drawn up by the Institute of Literature with various individuals to process materials for the anniversary edition of Ivan Franko's works (1940–1941)). Ark. 31.
- Vasyl Stefanyk National Scientific Library of Ukraine in Lviv (LNSL), f. 55. Od. zb. 255/1 (Business manuscripts (1940–1941, 1945–1946)). Ark. 36.
- Vasyl Stefanyk National Scientific Library of Ukraine in Lviv (LNSL), f. 55. Od. zb. 255/2 (Plans and prospectuses for the anniversary edition of Ivan Franko's works (1940–1941)). Ark. 71.

- Vasyl Stefanyk National Scientific Library of Ukraine in Lviv (LNSL), F. 55. Od. zb. 259/p. XII (Telegrams and copies of telegrams from the department of the T.H. Shevchenko Institute of Literature (1940-1941)). Ark. 41.
- Vasyl Stefanyk National Scientific Library of Ukraine in Lviv (LNSL), F. 259 (Derkach M.). Op. 1. Kor. III. 72 (The project is under development).
- Vasyl Stefanyk National Scientific Library of Ukraine in Lviv (LNSL), Department of Manuscripts, F. 29 (Vozniak M.). Op. 1. Od. zb. 671 (Materials for the anniversary collection of Ivan Franko's works). Ark. 103.
- Vozniak, M. (2007a). Pro pryntsyty vydannia tvoriv Ivana Franka. *Frankoznavchi studii*, iss. 4, 520-539.
- Vozniak, M. (2007b). Shche pro pryntsyty vydannia tvoriv Ivana Franka. *Frankoznavchi studii*, iss. 4, 551-556.

**Tetiana Holiak** – PhD, junior scientific cooperater of the The Department of Manuscripts and Textual Studies of the Shevchenko Institute of the National Scientific Academy of Ukraine. Scientific interests: Ivan Franko studies, the history of the multi-volume editions of I. Franko's works.

Scientific works:

Holiak, T. (2019). Poza kadrom: Istoria pidhotovky do druku trytsiatytomnoho vydannia do druku trytsiatytomnoho vydannia tvoriv Ivana Franka. *Molodyi vchenyi*, no. 3, 110-116.

Holiak, T. (2020). Dotrymannia avtorskoho prava pry pidhotovtsi tvoriv Ivana Franka u 30-ty tomakh. *Aktualni pytannia suspilno-humanitarnykh nauk ta istoi medytsyny*, no 1(25), 103-107. DOI: 10.24061/2411-6181.1.2020.170.

Holiak, T. (2020). Spivpratsia Ivana Lyzanivskoho ta Mykhaila Vozniaka pry pithotovtsi trytsiatytomnoho vydannia tvoriv Ivana Franka. *Slovo i Chas*, no. 5, 36-52. DOI: 10.33608/0236-1477.05:36-52.