

Dr. Sci. (Philol.),
Prof. Liudmyla Hrytsyk,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

**BORYS TEN IN THE CONTEXT OF THE UKRAINIAN-GEORGIAN LITERARY RELATIONS OF
THE TWENTIETH CENTURY: ON THE UKRAINIAN "TAMARIANI" BY CHAKHRUKHADZE**

The name of Borys Ten (Mykola Khomychevsky) is still well known to specialists and readers of ancient and European literature. A well-known Ukrainian historian, theorist, and practitioner of literary translation, M. Strikha, about the Iliad and Odyssey translated by Borys Ten, noted: "... hardly anyone will undertake to translate Homer's poems anew, since Borys Ten seems to have revealed in his translations all the possibilities of classical Ukrainian prosody, having adequately completed the work that Rudansky and Navrotsky and Nishchynsky once started" [7, 279]. Researchers are turning to the lessons of the great Master, a man of tragic fate. The literature on Borys Ten includes a number of thorough works by S. Bilokon, H. Bukhal, H. Zlenko, I. Drach, M. Klymenko, L. Kolomiets, M. Rylsky, D. Pavlychko, memoirs ("Desires and Plans of Uneasiness," 1988; "The Storm of the Fleeting Years," 1998), etc. "Homer, both in character and in the spirit of creativity," Borys Ten shared his thoughts in his last interview with the writer O. Opanasiuk in November 1982, "turned out to be the closest to me of all the hundred poets, prose writers, and playwrights I have translated [8, 119]. This segment of the Master's rich translation heritage, including translations of Aristophanes, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Virgil, and others, has most often been the focus of researchers' attention. At the same time, Borys Ten's multifaceted interests extended to work on other pieces of literature: Latvian (G. Karklin), Moldavian (I. Drutse), and what was considered at the time to be "translations from the languages of the peoples of the USSR," including translations of opera texts.

Georgian monuments translated in Ukraine by Borys Ten have yet to be considered by scholars of Ukrainian-Georgian relations or literary translation. The exception was "Poetry of the Georgian People. An Anthology in Two Volumes" [4], which presented the poetry of the ancient ages in Ukrainian translations and made a complete impression of the development of secular literature, in particular, the works of Khoneli, Shavteli, Chakhrukhadze, with Rustaveli as its "crown."

The name of the "harbinger" of Chakhrukhadze's "The Knight in Tiger's Skin" has appeared more than once in Ukrainian-language works by I. Lutsenko, O. Baramidze, J. Tsintsadze, and O. Mushkudiani. Still, for obvious reasons, the translator was not named, or his pseudonym, Borys Ten, was given. However, Georgian classical poetry in Ukrainian translations became the material of a thorough study by R. Chilachava, which focuses on the creative practice of M. Bazhan, the translator of Rustaveli's "The Knight in the Tiger's Skin." Moreover, although neither Chakhrukhadze nor his translator Borys Ten was

the subject of a separate study by the author, the problem of translating works of ancient Georgian literature as "a kind of model of reconciliation between two linguistic and cultural elements, when the translator manages to demonstrate both similarities and differences between them" [15, 30], became important in understanding the peculiarities of the reception of Chakhrukhadze's "Tamariani" by Borys Ten.

The proposed paper traces the path of the Ukrainian translator to "Tamariani"; the reasons for choosing the work for translation, motivation; the role of M. Zerov, M. Rylsky, M. Bazhan in the creative life of Borys Ten; lessons of M. Bazhan, the translator of Rustaveli's "The Knight." The study uses elements of biographical, comparative, historical, and typological methods and specific methodological approaches to poetic translation. The analysis of materials related to the work of Borys Ten, in particular the archive, will allow us to write the name of the translator in the history of Ukrainian-Georgian relations of the twentieth century to emphasize the originality of the individual translation project, including the conceptual and methodological foundations of the twentieth-century Ukrainian translation from Georgian.

I started working on this material by chance. The library of the National Literary and Artistic Archive in Zhytomyr received a thirty-page manuscript of an untitled translation by Borys Ten (Mykola Khomychevsky) from Georgian. The first few lines of the translated text made it possible to "hear" the voice of a contemporary of the famous author of "The Knight in Tiger's Skin" by Shota Rustaveli, the twelfth-century Georgian poet Chakhrukhadze [12]. The author finally edited the text in pencil in neat handwriting; some corrections, clarifications, and comments indicate this. As we know, the work appeared in the first book of the anthology "Poetry of the Georgian People" edited by M. Bazhan, O. Novytsky, and S. Chikovani, with a foreword by famous Georgian scholars O. Baramidze and G. Margvelashvili. The unofficial curator of the anthology, judging by his many years of experience in the field of translation from Georgian, was, of course, M. Bazhan. The collection did not go unnoticed: it was warmly received by the public in Georgia and Ukraine [6]. It includes works that still need to be translated and are known to Ukrainian readers. Among them is Chakhrukhadze, Chakhrukha, as A. Khakhanov called the author of "Tamariani" [9, 305], a collection of odes imbued with a single creative idea that became a "harbinger" of the appearance of "The Knight in Tiger's Skin." The translation was made by Borys Ten, whose name did not often appear in the context of Ukrainian-Georgian literary contacts, whether as a translator or researcher, as, for example, those involved in the preparation of the publication by P. Tychna, L. Pervomaisky, V. Mysyk, M. Rylsky, O. Novytsky, D. Kosaryk, and others. M. Strikha called Borys Ten of that time "a figure not of the "first plan" who worked professionally and conscientiously on a certain area" [7, 276]. Antiquity and European literature were like this. Among the documents stored in the Central State Archives of Literature and Art (they were transferred there by B. Ten himself) [10], there is, however, a

translation of the libretto by P. Mirianashvili of Z. Paliashvili's opera "Abesalom and Eteri" (typewritten, 80 pages, the 1960-s).

M. Strikha suggests it was M. Rylsky, who in 1946 "tried to contract" Borys Ten at Goslitvydav for translating Homer's "Iliad" and later opera translations, engaged him in work on "Abesalom and Eteri." He had experience in such work and musical education, and M. Bazhan's lessons on translating the libretto of Z. Paliashvili's opera "Daisy" were also important [7, 348]. Finally, the experience of O. Varavva (O. Kobets), an emigrant poet who translated the libretto of Z. Paliashvili's opera "Abesalom and Eteri," was also helpful. Still, it was never realized in the 1938-1939 season [7, 349]. The archive also contains Borys Ten's publication about Ilya Chavchavadze on the 40th anniversary of his death and a translation of Gr. Orbeliani's poem "To My Sister Eutymia." While working on it, Borys Ten wrote to M. Bazhan, hoping for advice: "I translated it, of course, using a contractor, and I ended up with thirteen stanzas, while in Zabolotsky's Russian translation, there are only nine, and the division of the text into stanzas does not coincide. Who took liberties here - me or Zabolotsky" [10, fund 167]. Nevertheless, the problem of translating "The Iliad" and "The Odyssey" dominates in this letter and other letters by Borys Ten. Even if we take into account the fact that due to circumstances (arrest, bans, persecution) in specific periods of his creative life, the author was forced to resort to pseudonyms (V. Tomashivsky, T. Vernivola, etc.) [16, 184], the reference to other Georgian works is not noticeable. And then another question arises, the answer to which will clarify not only Borys Ten's "path" to Chakhrukhadze but also certain pages of his creative life. It is still intriguing why M. Bazhan, O. Novytsky, and S. Chykovani, who prepared the anthology for publication, entrusted the translation of a significant work in the Georgian Middle Ages to Borys Ten, who had not translated from Georgian at that time. Does this work reveal a specific connection between the Other that the translator, who was already called "a creator who contained the worlds of many cultures" (Dmytro Pavlychko) in the sixties (when the anthology was published), and the commission received from the editorial board? And finally, how does all this relate to Chakhrukhadze's "Tamariani"?

When the anthology first started, the most critical and recognized representative of Georgian classical and contemporary literature on both sides – Ukraine and Georgia – was undoubtedly M. Bazhan, who gained fame for his many years of work on Rustaveli's "The Knight in Tiger's Skin," D. Guramishvili's "Davitiani," and twentieth-century literature. "M. Bazhan 'transferred' the Georgian word to Ukraine, 'grew a Georgian garden in Ukraine' [13, 239] and cherished it. In particular, his detailed work on the poem by Rustaveli convinces us of this. Observing the process of reproducing the original, R. Chilachava noted: "Bazhan tirelessly delved into the artistic world of Rustaveli, compared the lines of his translation with the original work, sought to get as close as possible to their essence ..." [14, 22]. And then, following the translator's "long work," he repeatedly pointed to the "results of active self-editing." Another point in the process of creating the Ukrainian "The Knight" emphasized by M. Bazhan himself in the article "Difficulties

of translating "The Knight in Tiger's Skin," published in the newspaper "Literaturuli Sakartvelo" in 1937 [14, 16], is striking, related to the "excessive help" of Georgian scholars, in particular S. Iordanishvili, K. Chichinadze, S. Nutsubidze, P. Ingorokva, K. Kekelidze, and, certainly, a professional contractor, who was "the first stage of good work" for him, "something more than just translation from one language to another" [14, 43]. These are the most important moments of the work process, beyond which the "first step" or "beginning" makes no sense.

I will project all this onto Borys Ten's work on Chakhrukhadze's poem: no materials in the archive attest to the translator's close cooperation with M. Bazhan (letters, notes). It is difficult to say who prepared the contractor: B. Ten did not speak the original language. Most likely, the same S. Iordanishvili did the contractor for "The Knight in Tiger's Skin." In any case, other texts available in M. Bazhan's archive, such as I. Shavteli's "Abdul-Messiah" [11, f. 535] and the contractor for the translation of the "Davitiani" [11, f. 535], lead to this idea. I assume that such a responsible work, the preparation of an anthology that reproduced the picture of Georgian poetry from ancient times to the twentieth century, was carried out at the highest level (the scholars and translators involved in it are tellimasterng) and a skillfully executed contractor accompanied this time. After all, it was about a work that, according to Sh. Nutsubidze is not only a landmark in the Georgian poetry of the twelfth century: "from a national and cultural monument, it grows into an international monument of the development of the Eastern Renaissance" [3, 239].

And further: "Chakhrukhadze in the literature of the Eastern Renaissance," the scholar reasoned, "stands between Nizami and Rustaveli. This is a "turning point" in the development of the Georgian Renaissance. As we know, Borys Ten was not involved in the work on the 1939 anthology "Poetry of Soviet Georgia" edited by M. Bazhan. The situation could have been more conducive to this. The fabricated cases against him and his exile to the Far East kept reminding him of himself for a long time. The support of Knigospilka, Siaivo, and DVU could not compensate for the ambitious plans of the talented master: literary translation, especially from ancient Greek, remained "the main field of activity" [16, 184] of Borys Ten, which, for obvious reasons, was not fully realized. However, his knowledge of European languages, music, theater, the world of antiquity, and his poetic work did their part. His interest in antiquity brought Borys Ten closer to M. Zerov, M. Rylsky, and M. Bazhan. Already in the 20s, his original poems and translations appeared. They appeared in an anthology of new French poetry by S. Savchenko. However, the real fame of the translator came to him with the appearance of "Prometheus in Chains" by Aeschylus, "The Odyssey," and "The Iliad" by Homer, in which Borys Ten "found his versioning, stylistic, scientific, and historical approach" [10, 21].

Borys Ten's archive contains a manuscript entitled "What I owe to Zerov," which shows that he was involved in translation work by M. Zerov, whom he met in Kyiv in 1924 [10, 289]. It was M. Zerov who recommended Tenov's translations from French to S. Savchenko. He also introduced Borys Ten to O.

Biletsky, intending to involve him in the textbook preparation. However, due to circumstances, Borys Ten had to sign his work with pseudonyms, as already mentioned. And when, as the author recalled, "the question of translating ... Aeschylus' tragedy "Prometheus in Chains" arose, he (Biletsky - L.H.) immediately recommended that I perform this work" [10, 289]. Borys Ten will recall M. Zerov's patronage in his memoirs about his translations of Sophocles, Aristophanes, and Homer's "The Odyssey," which Zerov loved so much; he will repeatedly return to his "invaluable, benevolent advice." In the person of Borys Ten, Zerov found the right candidate to realize his plans.

In March 1930, on behalf of the Cabinet for the Comparative Study of Literature, chaired by O. Biletsky, M. Zerov sent a letter to the sector of literature and art in which he recommended "a list of works of foreign literature preferable for immediate translation." The letter specified, in particular: "There is a huge gap in the plan: there is no literature of the East and literature of the Slavic peoples, but the Cabinet considers these two sections, especially the first one, extremely necessary... ." Similar initiatives/thoughts by M. Zerov paved the way for the then-disgraced translator. Conceptual ideas concerning the translation would find their fullest expression over time. In a handwritten version of "Kundzic and the Question of Literary Translation in Ukraine," Borys Ten presents his view of translation, reflecting on many theoretical issues. In particular, the choice of works, the adequacy of the translation to the original, the essence of realistic/anti-realistic translation, the reflection of semantic and sensual associations, and the transmission of names - "all these issues require solving according to the internal quality in the system of the language into which they are translated." [10. 289, 71]. He is impressed by the position of O. Kundzic, a translator whom Borys Ten considers one of the first theorists of the art of translation [10. 289, 71]. The support of M. Zerov and, through him, O. Biletsky opened the possibility of moving forward: they gradually lifted the veil of prohibitions and doubts. The preparation for the 1938 publication of the textbook "Ancient Literature. Samples of Ancient Greek and Roman Fiction," compiled by O. Biletsky, was significant: it included the work of Borys Ten.

The archive materials show that M. Rytsky supported Borys Ten in every way possible with his translations. In his letters to him, Borys Ten repeatedly delicately hinted at his willingness to translate. In addition to his desire to work in the field of creativity, he was also motivated by material difficulties caused primarily by "the wreckage of the literary past." "Bring Slovak's translation and let's talk to Korniiichuk about Homer," wrote M. Rytsky [10. 289, 72]. Similar letters concerning translations from Mickiewicz, Żulawski, and Becher supported Borys Ten morally. M. Rytsky believed in the translator, "wreathed him with crowns of thorns" for his difficult work: there were few such specialists in Ukraine. A fragment of one

* This material was found in the archive of the literary museum of Hryhoriy Kochur in Irpin. Lada Kolomiets published the first edition on the pages of the "Bulletin of the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Foreign Philology." Issue 1 (53), 2021. pp. 12-13.

of M. Rylsky's letters to Y. Kobyletsky of September 20, 1946, is eloquent: "There is also a suitable person (for the translation of "The Iliad" - L.H.), the poet and translator Borys Ten (M.V. Khomychevsky). He knows the Greek language well and has a good command of Ukrainian verse; many of his translations were in Biletsky's "Chrestomatika," and now "The Mystetstvo" publishing house has taken his translation of Aeschylus' "Prometheus." Acad. Biletsky, in my opinion, shares this candidacy. It is worth, by God, thinking about it" [5, 255]. In the translation practice of Borys Ten, M. Rylsky, who himself translated a lot at that time (Mickiewicz, Slovak, Tuwim, Heine, Shakespeare), found a talented colleague, an individual, and an encyclopedic poet. L. Novychenko once said about M. Rylsky: "As a translator, he possessed the gift of artistic transformation, a subtle sensitivity to the manner, style of various authors, the national and historical color of the reproduced text" [2, 356], which the poet also noticed in Borys Ten. And at the right time, as seen from his letters, supported him.

In my opinion, M. Bazhan noticed not only the echoes of already published translations but also the assessment of his translation talent: Dante, Whitman, Verharn, Hoffmann, and Shakespeare, to whom Borys Ten turned, were among his favorite authors. Borys Ten's profound reflections on literary translation were intriguing and balanced by practice. No less so were the opinions of authoritative specialists and their "spheres of influence" (M. Zerov) initiatives. In preparing the Georgian anthology, everything mattered in addition to the level of translation skills that Borys Ten reached when working with works of Greek and Roman antiquity and the concept of literary translation realized by the author; his familiarity with the Renaissance in the East was equally important. Chakhrukhadze was a "senior contemporary" (Sh. Nutsubidze) of Rustaveli. As can be seen from the archival notes, including the work born of the need to "comprehend this process" and "to provide a theoretical basis for it" [10. 289, 71], Borys Ten carefully looks at the lessons of Ivan Franko, the experience of S. Rudansky, and J. Parandovsky. He repeatedly touches upon the problem of transmitting the hexameter into Ukrainian, mentally enters into a polemic with them, and returns to the advice of M. Zerov ("I have mentioned him more than once with regret that I cannot turn to him and take advantage of his invaluable and benevolent advice," Borys Ten writes [10. 289, 359.2]) and finally concludes that "the ambiguity of prosodic systems - metrical among the Greeks and Romans and syllabic-tonic among us" [10.289, 359.2] creates specific difficulties in reproducing the prototext. Here he is impressed by O. Kundzic, whose quote is: "To translate realistically means to convey using one's language everything felt and realized by the author of the original" [10. 289, 71].

M. Bazhan, who was "the expert" working on Rustaveli, I. Shavteli (fragments from the poem, translated and written down by hand), and D. Guramishvili (a contractor's manuscript, completed for further work) [11. 535.46, 21], made his choice. "Rustaveli," S. Nutsubidze reasoned, "is much closer to Chakhrukhadze than to anyone else in terms of forms, images, aphorisms, as well as formal and technical aspects" [3, 202]. Rustaveli followed Chakhrukhadze "decisively." M. Bazhan opted for Borys Ten. In

addition, scholarly literature has repeatedly emphasized the "church moods of the soul" of Chakhrukhadze. And this was close and organic to Borys Ten, a priest of the UAOC, a protopriest. Another thing was also in line: in Chakhrukhadze's fate, who, according to scholars, found his way into poetry, where the determining factor was talent, which did not always appeal to the system, Borys Ten felt much in tune with his muse. The most valuable here were the lessons from Rustaveli's poetry that Borys Ten could learn from reading "The Knight in the Tiger's Skin" in Ukrainian. In this, the translator, an expert in antiquity, "felt the spirit of ancient philosophy," the ideas of Aristotle, Plotinus, Socrates, and the poem's music. The experience he gained from translating treatises, works of art, and reflections on the material he was working on, brought him closer to "Tamariani," as did the reflections of A. Khakhanashvili (Khakhanov), who had read it more than once. Analyzing "Tamariani," the scholar in his well-known "Essays on the History of Georgian Literature" [9, 303] observed that Chakhrukhadze tried to glorify Tamar by appealing to Homer, Plato, and especially Aristotle: "He, like other authors, does not find an object with which to compare Tamar," wrote A. Khakhanov. Hence the appeals to Socrates, Plato, Ephraim, Ariosto" [9, 311]. Translations of Aeschylus's "The Odyssey" and "The Iliad," work on "The Dictionary of Mythological Names and Place Names in Homer's Odyssey" (with edits by O. Biletsky), lessons-observations on translations by A. Sodomora, E. Drobyazko, O. Kundzich, O. Popovych, M. Bilyk and others (the archive contains twelve materials-articles related to Borys Ten's translation activities), and finally, work on the translation of P. Mirianashvili's libretto brought him to the ring where he tried out different translation options. "The Creator of the Ukrainian Cultural Space" [1, 95].

M. Bazhan entrusted "Tamariani" by Chakhrukhadze, whose poetics is close to Rustaveli's, to Borys Ten ("all elements of the poetics of the Georgian Renaissance," stated Sh. Nutsbidze, "are obvious" [3, 232]). The author often refers to "The Bible" and other books popular at the time. Researchers of "Tamariani" pay special attention to various artistic techniques used in the poem, particularly similes, which, according to A. Khakhanashvili has an "oriental, exaggerated character" [9, 311]; episodes created by the author's imagination, such as travels to Abkhazia, indicate Chakhrukhadze's acquaintance with Nizami Ganjavi's "The Khamsa," in particular his romantic poems, Chakhrukhadze's erudition, his familiarity with Hellenic mythology, monuments of Byzantine culture, ancient philosophy, works of P. Iver, E. Tsiren, and others are also striking. Iver, E. Mtsire, and Petrytsia affected the fabric of the original work; therefore, the translation had to reflect it. Specific difficulties were, of course, caused by the peculiarities of the poem's architectonics, the absence of a plot core, etc. Judging by the way Borys Ten "entered" the process of transferring the Georgian work (from notes and letters), the author sought to reflect the peculiarities of the source as accurately as possible. The most complicated aspect of the work was how Chakhrukhadze's poem was transmitted. The author, as A. Khakhanashvili noted, "created a special size of chakhrakhauli" - a twenty-syllable poem [9, 305]. S. Nutsbidze did not share the scientist's opinion, considering the term

"chakhrakhauli" to be "a small historical inconsistency chronologically and ... in essence" [3, 221]. "Chakhrukhadze," the scholar notes, "does not have any one size that could be named after him [3, 221]."

Nutsbidze explains the diversity of the poem's sound, which the author states in verse, by the peculiarities of literature development of that time, particularly poetry. "Tamariani" is associated with the period when the verse "breaks away from bookishness" and approaches the folk poem, when the poetry technique is significantly improved, and the size is diversified. The scholar's view of "Tamariani," assessing the major and minor modes used by Chakhrukhadze, allowed Sh. Nutsbidze reflects on the peculiarities of the work's "poetic orchestration," and the translator looks for ways to convey it, first of all, in the experience of working on Rustaveli's "The Knight in Tiger's Skin," its high and low shayri. "Rustaveli," the scholar concluded, "is much closer to Chakhrukhadze than to anyone else - Shavteli, Tmogveli, Khoneli [3, 202], not only in terms of folk shayri, poetic forms, images, aphorisms, but also formal and technical aspects. And another observation, a hint from the researcher to the translator: "the artistic unit in chakhrakhauli is not a twenty- but a ten-syllable line. The internal rhyme introduced within the ten-syllable line is decisive" [3, 217], contributing to the diversification of the poem's sound. For example, a fragment from Chakhrukhadze's twelfth ode:

*Дивна Тамаро,
Сонячна хмаро,
Неба престоле,
Й людям світило!*

translated by Borys Ten

For Borys Ten, as can be seen from his translation studies, it was important not to "substitute" one poem for another, his own for someone else's; he did not share any "Ukrainization" tendencies in translations either [10. 251, 34], trying to find his way in the variety of stylistic and compositional authorial decisions, develop his approach to transmitting the original work, and find a "creative dominant" when translating from a contractor. He learned this from M. Rylsky; the author's main feature is the most characteristic and leading for him [5, T. 16, 218].

Literature

1. Kodak M. 2013. *Semiosfera Mykoly Bazhana*. Lutsk: Tverdynia.
2. Novychenko L. 1993. Maksym Rylskiy. *Istoriia ukrainskoi literatury XX stolittia*. Kn. 1. Kyiv: Lybid.
3. Nutsbidze Sh. 1947. *Rustaveli i Vostochnyy Rennans*. Tbilisi: Zarya Vostoka.

4. Za red. M. Bazhana, O. Novytskoho, S. Chikovani. 1961. Poeziia davnikh vikiv. Poeziia pochatku XX stolittia. T. 1. In *Poeziia hruzynskoho narodu. Antolohiia v 2-kh tomakh*. Kyiv: DVKhL.
5. Rylskiy M. 1988. *Zibrannia tvoriv u 20-ty tomakh. T. 19*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
6. Synychenko O. 1968. Hruzynska literatura na Ukraini u povoienni roky (1945-1967). Bibliohrafichni pokazhchyk. In *Raiduzhnymy mostamy. Ukrainsko-hruzynski literaturni zviazky*. Kyiv: Dnipro.
7. Strikha M. 2020. *Ukrainskyi pereklad i perekladachi: mizh literaturoiu i natsiivorenniam*. Kyiv: Dukh i litera.
8. Ten B. 1998. *Skoromynushchykh rokiv burevii*. Rivne: Azaliia.
9. Khakhanov A. 1897. Drevnyaya literatura do kontsa XII veka. Vyp. II. In *Ocherki po istorii gruzinskoy slovesnosti*. Moskva: Universitetskaya tipografiya.
10. Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv literatury i mystetstva Ukrainy. Arkhiv Borysa Tena. Fond 289 opys 1. inv. 359/2
11. Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv-muzei literatury i mystetstva Ukrainy. Arkhiv M. Bazhana. Fond 535
12. Chakhrukhadze. 1961. Tamariani (Ody). Perekl. Borysa Tena. In *Poeziia hruzynskoho narodu. Antolohiia v 2-kh tomakh*. Kyiv: DVKhL.
13. Chykovani S. 1980. Pisnia pro Davyda Huramishvili. In *Koleso khystkoi doli. Fotopoema Yevhena Derlemenka za motyvamy «Davytiani» D. Huramishvili ta «Pisni pro Davyda» S. Chykovani*. Kyiv: Mystetstvo; Tbilisi: Khelovneba.
14. Chilachava R. 2004. «Maizhe kolo virshiv, ta vsi khoreiamy vosmystopnymy», abo narodzhennia ukrainskoho «Vytiazia». In *Rustaveli Sh. Vytiaz u tyhrovii shkuri*. Kyiv: Mystetstvo.
15. Chilachava R. 1995. Hruzynska klasychna poeziia v ukrainskykh perekladakh (na materiali tvorchoi praktyky M. Bazhana). PhD diss., Kyiv.
16. Shevchuk V. 1995. Borys Ten. Ukrainske slovo. Kn. 4. In *Khrestomatiia ukrainskoi literatury ta literaturnoi krytyky XX st. U 4-kh knyhakh*. Kyiv: Ros.