

M. Bogdanova,
candidate of philological sciences,
Berdyansk State
Pedagogical University

SPECIFICITY OF THE INTERPRETATION THE PERIOD OF RUINS (DOBY RUIINY) IN BOGDAN LEPSKY'S HISTORICAL NOVEL "KRUTIZH"

Bogdan Lepky's Ukrainian historical prose is devoted to the period of Cossachyny (Cossacks). The series of historical novels about the Ukrainian hetman Ivan Mazepa takes a special place in the writer's heritage: the trilogy "Mazepa" ("Motrya" – Volume I, II, "Do not kill", "Baturin"), "Poltava" (Volume I – "Over the Desna"; volume II – "The Battles"; "Mazepa" ("From Poltava to Bender"). The tragic pages of the period of Ruin are described in the novel "Sotnykivna" and in the last novel called "Krutizh", which was published in Krakow when the poet was still alive (1941). It must be noted that those events attracted the attention of other authors, too, namely Ivan Nechuy-Levitsky ("Hetman Ivan Vyhovsky"), Panteleimon Kulish ("Chorna Rada"), Michael Staritsky ("The Ruin"), Lesya Ukrainka ("Boyarynia") and others.

Not only one generation of scientists have researched the history and the poetics of historical prose, among them are Lyudmila Alexandrova, Stephaniia Andrusiv, Eugene Baran, Anatoly Guliak, Ivan Denysiuk, Victor Donchyk, Mykola Ilnytsky, Fedor Keyda, Galyna Pavlenko, Mykola Syrotyuk, Viktor Chumak and others.

The scientific circle of systematic analysis of the historical prose has been significantly expanded by such linguists scientists as Tatiana Blednykh, Ksenia Ganiukova, Natalia Gorbach, Svetlana Dziurman Valentina Nikolaenko, Volodymyr Polishchuk, Oksana Protsenko, Liudmila Romashchenko and others.

The evolution of the historical prose in the Ukrainian literature of the XIX–XXth centuries has been researched in Kseniia Ganiukova's dissertation and, what is more, the genre and stylistic peculiarities of the Ukrainian historical novels of the 20–30s years of the XXth century have been studied by Victor Radzhyvin.

The works by Bogdan Voloniuk, Roman Horak, Mykola Savitsky, Nadia Bilyk, Tatiana Lytvynenko, Bohdan Melnychuk, Victor Radzhyvin, Fedor Pogrebennyk and some others have been dedicated to Bogdan Lepky's historical novels.

The most frequent object of the researches has been the pentology "Mazepa" by Bogdan Lepky. In fact, it was the first edition of the Western Ukrainian fiction which includes lots of volumes in which the author tried to rehabilitate Hetman Ivan Mazepa who had been vandalized by the historians and linguists.

Other works of the writer such as historical novels "Sotnykivna" and "Krutizh" leave much to be literarily analyzed in a profound way, as there have been less reviews, collective works and monographs dedicated to them.

The aim of the article is the analysis of the historical events shown in the novel "Krutizh" and the artistic interpretation of the real facts which are closely interpenetrated into the author's imaginations, as well as the research of the plot and peculiarities of modeling of Valentiy Bosakovsky's image, who is the main character of the novel.

The reasons of the author's choice of the theme ruins was explained by Roman Gorak in his article "Bogdan Lepky's Tragedy" [4]. He says that being in the emigration Bogdan Lepky was well informed about the arrest of the CPWU members and later of the intelligentsia and all those people who had been showing their social activity or national conscientiousness during the years of Polish-fascist regime [4]. The writer couldn't ignore the theme of unity of the Ukrainian people, in any way. That is why we can observe Bogdan Lepky's own historiosophical concept in the historical novel "Krutizh" reflected in the author's asides and in the dialogues of Valentiy Bosakovsky, who is the main character of the book. It looks like he looks for the reasons of the Ruins in the XVII-th century projecting the problems of the past in present days: fratricide, betrayal, defending personal interests of Cossack foremen, people's enslavement for their own interests.

The name of the story is also symbolic, it means "swirl, maelstrom" [3, 469]. The explanatory dictionary gives the definition of it as the same thing as whirlpool, or in other words "a place in the river, or in the sea and all that with circular movement of water formed as a result of opposing currents" [3, 107].

In this case the name declares the main topics and problems of the work, and also points to the controversial historical and social issues which were raised and conceptualized by the author. The stated theme of swirl and the historical and social maelstrom is expanding by the deployment of the plot and the main thing is that the topic acquires the symbolic meaning.

Taking into consideration Evgen Baran's classification of the historical works which subdivides them into "fiction-historical", "historical-fiction" and historical fiction-documentary, the novel by Bogdan Lepky "Krutizh" tends to belong to the "historical-fiction". It is the kind of works as the events in this novel refer to the real historical personalities of Yuriy Khmelnytsky and Ivan Vygovsky's hetman period, however, they are not the main characters of the novel. The historical facts and the personalities are presented in the novel from the point of the author's interpretation, his own ideas and convictions. It has been clarified by the author's interweaving of the historical truth proved from the characters' dialogues, monologues and the author's imaginary facts, thus, it helps the author transfer the historical truth into fiction. Although the events of the novel are taking place somewhere far from the main centres of political life, neither of two hetmans are involved in any plotline. Together with the imaginative main character, – a Cossack, and in the past a shliakhtych Valentiy Bosakovsky, – the real historical personalities such as Olena Nechaeva, the youngest daughter of hetman Khmelnytsky, act side by side. The characters' dialogues help us understand better the real historical processes that are supposed to show the fight ("perehony") for the hetman's bulava: Vygovsky, Pushkar, Yury Khmelnytsky, who is called "Yuras" by the author himself, considering the weakness of spirit and infirmity of mind. Bogdan Lepky puts forward common problems of the disintegration of the Ukrainian people and inability of the Cossack starshyna to unite themselves for the sake of common interests of the country. The attitude to Ivan Vygovsky, his activity and the events are demonstrated by ordinary Cossacks, who sometimes remain even nameless. We can agree with Roman Horak who said "The author seems to encompass all the layers with them, he gives everyone an opportunity to say, thereby, creating the illusion of objectivity and at the same

time demonstrating excellent knowledge of the history and the primary sources which have been based on M. Grushevsky studies and his historical school" [4,75].

Bogdan Lepky studied thoroughly historical sources, he knew the history very well. Working on the story "Motria" he started collecting the materials such as "The History of the Russ", "The History of Malorosy" by M. Marcovich, "The History of Malaia Russia" by D. Bantish-Kamensky, "The Works of Russian Geographical Society", "The History of Ukrainian people" by O. Yefymenkova, "The History of Ukraine-Russ" by M. Grushevsky, the works by P. Kulish, M. Kostomarov, Sreznevsky and German and Polish historians.

The events of the novel "Krutizh" were developing in times of Yuriy Khmelnytsky's hetmanship, whom Bogdan Khmelnytsky had given the mace to, trying to keep the power in the family. Realizing that his son was "young and immature for power", the latter was sent in custody to Ivan Vygovsky, his yeoman and scribe. The reader can find out the historical facts from the dialogue between Valentiy Bosakovsky and the Cossacks, in particular about Vygovsky's redemption: "– Виговського покійний Хмель у татарів за сиву кобилу купив" [5, 234]. In fact, it is known from the history that Ivan Vygovsky came from the noble family, the coat of arms Abdank; his father Ostafiy was the owner of Gogol in Kiev region. Ivan Vygovskiy studied at the Kyiv Academy, then he entered the army, where he was promoted to poruchnyk degree; after that he started working in the government. In the battle at Zhovti Vody he was wounded and caught in Tatar captivity. Khmelnytsky bought him from the slavery and entrusted him to be a scribe [1]. Vygovsky was elected the Hetman by the council in Chyhyryn in 1657, then by the council in Korsun. The newly elected hetman had great intentions to break away from Moscow; however, it was impossible without the unity of Ukrainian. The disunity at that time was at all social levels of the society segments: fight of the hetmanship, fight between common people and the Cossacks, between the elders and ordinary Cossacks. The evaluation of the events in the novel is made by the characters themselves. Thus, while the Cossacks were staying in an inn, that is considered to be the exposition of the novel, the author pays appropriate attention to their passionate dialogue and polylogue. It should be noted that the characters do not belong to those who decide the fate of the state and influence on the political processes. Having come from the hetman, Cossack Zhurba talks about the events: "... що сталися від несподіваної смерті покійного Богдана Хмельницького. Як то козаки не могли погодитися, кому гетьманом бути, і як Пушкар збунтувався, і як царські люди каламутили воду, щоб Україну під свою владу прибрати. Що ж мав тоді робити Виговський? З крицями та поляками на царя пішов, побив його під Конотопом, а за поляками в Гадячі замирився. Київське, Браславське й Чернігівське воєводств дістало волю, вони стали окремими незалежними князівствами. А раз ті три воєводства незалежності добули, то згодом інші землі волю дістали б... Та куди! Чорні духи свою роботу почали. Коверзують, троюдять, доносами до царя шлють, буцімто вони Юрася за гетьмана хочуть" [5, 229]. Describing the discussion in the inn, the author expands the local space by means of reproduction the political processes, which can be found out by the reader listening to the Cossacks' polar opinions. It helps the author depict complete disunity because the Cossacks support both the hetmanship of Bogdan's son, "він Богданова кров", and Ivan Vygovskiy [5, 229]. Bogdan Lepkiy does not intentionally mention the surnames and thus he tries to generalize the

described historical situation because Ukraine of that time had hesitated politically looking for the salvation and could not choose between Poland and Russia. Ivan Vygovskiy's Polish invasion, signing the Hadiach postulate caused firstly the riot of Ivan Bezpaly's united troops with the tsar's one and soon then the riot that had ended Ivan Sirko's victory. In October 1659 Ivan Vygovskiy was dethroned from the hetmanship. It is known from Zhurba's words that Briukhovetsky "нацькував, що буцімто Виговський хоче Хмельницьких їх насліддя позбавити, що мільйон талярів, закопаних покійним гетьманом, відкопав і розтратив, що він шляхтич, а не козак... І добряга Івась повірив Брюховецькому, підбурили Січ і хороброго, але палкого, Сірка підняли і таку пожежу роздули, яку й угасить не легко" [5, 230]. Later Zhurba is telling about Barbash, Tsytsiura, Somko and Zolotarenko as "ім також булавою запахло" [5, 230]. It goes here about the upheaval in September 1659 when those, who were supporting the Moscow tsar, fought against hetman Ivan Vygovskiy because many of them were really afraid of that new union with Polish. Disappointment made Ivan Vygovskiy refuse from the hetman mace for Yury Khmelnytsky's sake. Sich under Ivan Sirko' leadership played not least but last role in those events. From Zhurba's words a reader is aware Yury Nemyrych's tragic death who "...під Світильневом, між Биховим і Кобицею допали. Сплячого на шаблях рознесли, на шматки порубали" [5, 231]. The author tries to reflect the historical truth because Zhurba, one of the novel characters, did not point it was Tsytsiura who could have killed Yury Nemyrych but it assassination fulfilled by Tsytsiura's people and the provoked cherni: "До них пристала чернь, бо її підняти не важко. "Панів б'ємо" – казали, і вона йшла, безтяменна" [5, 231]. In these "quasi-authorial" commentaries one can observe the tragic events of those time of Ruins and the Revolution of 1917, the consequences of which were well known to the author. The character's speech is interpenetrated with the writer's voice: "Так загинув чоловік гідний і вчений, один із тих, що могли Україну поставити на ноги" [5, 231]. It is known from the history that Ivan Vygovskiy was under great Yury Nemyrych's influence, who is regarded as one of the most educated person among the shliashtha. He studied sciences *in Holland, Oxford, Cambridge and Paris*, he tried to take to literature career and had some experience in diplomacy; being first arian, he later returned to his parent' Orthodox faith, came to Chygyryn and became the hetman's counselor. What is known about Tymish Tsytsiura that he was born in Pereiaslavshchyna, and he had been a Pereiaslav colonel since 1658. At the beginning he supported hetman Ivan Vygovskiy (he helped to crash Moscow troops near Konotop), later he prepared the riot against him and he did much in promoscov policy willing to obtain hetmanship for himself. Some historians suppose that it was particular he who organized Yury Nemyrych's murder. Later in 1660 he took part in the military walk of Moscow vovoda Vasil Sheremetyev against Poland (so called hetman who was ruling the left-bank divisions). After Sheremetyev's losing the battle he left him and joined Yury Khmelnytsky and the Polish, but the Polish took him to Krakow. Having been free Tsytsiura came back to Pereiaslav and from that place he was sent to Moscow and in 1667 to Siberia.

The author puts forward the problem of fight for the bulava, when Zaporizhzhia Cossacks supported the candidate of Yury Khmelnytsky. It was the beginning of real ruining of Ukraine. The Polish king Yan-Kazimir signed Olivsky Pact with Sweden making sure that the Crimean khan would support him and occupy Ukraine. In the south the Crimean khan

was moving. Yury Khmelnytsky surrendered to the king and he was made to renew the Hadiatsky postulate. Moscow did not take Yury Khmelnytsky's betrayal and the fierce struggle started again on the territory of Ukraine, although it was already between Yakym Somko and Vasil Zolotorenko and later Ivan Briukhovetsky was involved in it. Zaporizhzhia Cossacks forced again against Yury Khmelnytsky and made him renounce the bulava. Thus, Ukraine became divided between Somko and Teteria, and again Sich was against. On the 17th of January the bulava was given to Ivan Briukhovetsky. Those event are the historical background of the novel, which the reader learns about of the Cossacks discussion in the inn, as well as of Valentiy Bosakovsky's inner monologues, who is the main character of the work, and that is direct exposure of the plot.

The main character of the novel Valentiy Bosiy-Bosakovsky, whose name accurate reflects his present position which is quite opposite to his noble background. His political views are on Vygovsky's side and those Cossacks who care about the development and independence of Ukraine at any cost, even the union with Poland and Turkey. This is the evidence not only by his behavior, but the thought that the author presents: "Босаковський вийшов від шинкарки сумний, як осіння ніч". He has heard all sorts of bad news which was reached to their centesimal, as the author says "глухого городка", but he does believe Zhurba. Valentiy Bosakovsky is thinking about the political processes with sorrow and sadness. "Україна в огні і крові". Valentiy monologue itself reveals the humanistic author's position who accuses Tsiutsiura's "kainsky" act "Всяке у нас бувало, але такого ще не було!" [5, 237].

First, the main character appears to the reader as a chatter-box and fool: "Сотенні товариші любили його, збіднілого шляхтича, за жарти, побрехеньки й вигадки всілякі, до правди не подібні" [5, 238]. The author emphasizes the ignorance and short-sightedness of Ukrainian ordinary Cossacks because "скільки намагався Босаковський промовити їм до серця, сміялися або зчиняли бешкет" [5, 238]. An intelligent, experienced and noble man lies behind a sort of a fool. The Cossacks aggressiveness to the shliakhta is easily clear from Valentiy's monologue: Який народ! Тут тільки божевільним будь або дурного вдавай, а розум показувать не смій, бо вб'ють. Маєш бути такий дурний, як усі. Це їх рівність" [5, 238]. Valentiy Bosakovsky does not belong to the Cossacks who are trying to have more goods been private, depicting the character the author focuses on the clothes which he considers quite significant, for example, a coat (kapтан) "ледве купи тримався": "Порубаний був і позшиваний від гори до долини" [5, 247]. His decency, the purity of thoughts is confirmed by his actions. So being in the circle of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, "...другий на його місці пригадав про свої заслуги, а він про себе навіть словечком ніколи не писнув" [5, 242]. His exclusivity is shown even in his portrayal characteristics at the beginning of the novel, where it is mentioned that "...ціла його поява була настільки дивна і незвичайна, що хто його вперше побачив, то не знав, чи боятися того чоловіка, чи сміятися з нього" [5, 223]. Laughter is caused by his high growth, "закарлючений довгий ніс", "вус, як у сома", і головне неоднаковий колір очей "одне пивне, а друге зеленкувате" [5, 223], that completely corresponds to the protagonist's characteristic features, since the choleric often have brown and green eyes. It is also believed that brown-eyed people are self-contained whereas green-eyed ones reserved, determined, focused and patient.

Further development of events introduces the acquaintance of the main character with Boris, who was looking for his beloved girl Marusia Bohatkivna. The girl disappeared while she was fulfilling the order of the “стапої гетьманихи” (Vygovsky’s wife). Crucial for the further development of the events is the news of Ivan Vygovsky’s escape. The beginning of the plot is the decision of Valentiy Bosakovsky and Boris set off to Bilrogod and Bila Tserkva at first, and from there – to Smila and Chyhyryn. Henceforth, the motive of the route determines the further development of the plot, which is characteristic of the author’s technique and allows to describe wider and deeper the problems of the society, generalize them, reveal the nature of the main character, his inner personality, eventually, the motive of the road is the concept of movement of the whole Ukraine. Whereas Boris’s motivation is private factors – the rescue of his sweetheart, Valentiy’s intentions are patriotic, as he considers his mission is to save Ukraine.

In the second part of the novel the author creates the image of the main character from various time and space positions. Thus, due to the retrospection, Valentiy Bosakovsky’s poor childhood in noble estate has been known. Valko’s family that came from “сенаторського коліна” on his mother’s side had eleven children, four boys of them, and Valko was the eldest. Cumber made the boy leave the parents’ home and first went to one noble (velmozha). Fervent temper and evil character made him leave the estate: “Валько душею кривити не міг. Правду в очі рубав, а люди правди не люблять. Незлюбили і його, а він не любив і їх” [5, 317]. After severe ordeal Valentiy puts on a mask of a jester: “Тоді-то і лічину на себе натягнув. Бо мусив. Бачив, що без того жити не можна” [5, 317].

Further development of the events takes place through various situations. Thus, the first stop of the trip has become a small village (khutor) where Ulas lived with his family – seven sons who returned “порубані та постріляні з-під Конотопу” [5, 253], his daughter-in-law, wife and valety. Valentiy’s character is revealed at the time of his meeting with hartsyzes. He instinctively feels the danger, pays suspiciously attention to the enemy dressed in a nun; Bosakovsky is attentive and indifferent. In the battle he behaves like a tiger “мов тигр”; having military experience he leaves the defense for himself. Valentiy is brave and determined; he is going to rescue the girls-captives from hartsyses where he is seriously wounded but nevertheless, despite his injuries, a sense of happiness is overwhelmed the main character: “Його розпирала радість, що несподівано став хуторові у пригоді” [5, 272]. There is Olena-Stepanyda Nechaeva, Bohdan Khmelnytsky’s younger daughter, among the distinguished Ukrainian women, for liberation of whom hartsyses try to obtain a significant ransom. It is known from historiography that she was Ivan Nechay’s wife. During the siege in Bykhov Stephaniia together with her husband were captured and exiled to Tobolsk, but after the signing of Andrusiv truce Ivan Nechay was released with his family members in 1667. Having transformed the real historical facts, the author skillfully involves historical personality into the fiction and draws our attention to the tragedy of the situation showing the helplessness of the famous human who once belonged to the upper power. At the meeting with Olena the author shows Bosakovsky from the other side adding him new romantic traits which have not been characteristic to him before; his love and friendly attitude can be observed even in his behavior that causes absent-

mindness: “Випрямився, подався кроком назад, обличчя його стало не те, що було перед хвилиною, здивування, непевність, радість промайнули по ньому, він стрепенувся, і підбіг і крикнув не своїм голосом”. The character firstly worries what he looks like – clothes, hairstyle: “Соромився своїх неслухняних вусів, свого полатаного лоба...”, his behavior resembles the behavior of Kyiv “спудея перед співом...” [5, 281]. For Olena Nechayeva, Bogdan Khmelnytsky’s daughter, who turns up to be “...у хуторі незнайомих людей, без челяді, без грошей, тільки в тім, що на собі має...” [5, 288], Valentiy is a knight, a savior, she can’t even believe that “...доля опікуна післала, єдину людину, що вона знала з давніх кращих часів” [5, 288]. Due to the time excursus in Olena’s past one learns about being “смішного Валька” at Sich. As a small girl Olena used to be afraid of his moustache and oseeledets, and his sword and unequal beauty of his eye... “і треба було чимало часу, заки зважилася потягнути його за ті вусиська і сказати: – Який смішний Валько!” [5, 289]. В osakovsky played with the girl, “за кожним разом щось нове вигадував, а батько після походів все про нові його подвиги розказував”. Тільки звикнути Олена не могла до його аристокритизму, він наче рицар: дякував, встаючи зі столу, руки жінкам цілував [5, 289].

Bosakovsky does not remove his mask even at Sich: “Хоч рубака першої міри, сміливий, як чортяка, хитрий, як Одисей, а сильний, як Голіят, не те полку, а навіть сотні не дістав” [5, 317], since everybody talks with ridicule about him, “хоч яке лицарське діло зробив” [5, 317]. The only consolation for Valentiy is Bogdan Khmelnytsky’s youngest daughter Olena-Stepanyda. And it is no coincidence that Valentiy leaves the place after Bogdan Khmelnytsky’s daughters – Olena and Kateryna have got married: “Тоді й “смішний Валько” також із Суботова пішов” [5, 317]. Bogdan Lepsky focuses on the psychological conflict, paying attention that Valentiy has left with a new wound: “Але тим разом не на тілі, а на душі. Сміхом її гоїв” [5, 318]. Depicting portrait and behavioral characteristics of Olena Nechaeva, the author compares her with the ancient goddesses and Christian Madonna. Unlike her sister Katria, Olena is quiet and modest. In depicting of the portrait features, the author notes: “Уста малі, не скорі до сміху”, а очі “ великі й сині, як фіалки” [5, 277]. Від матері успадкувавши тиху вдачу, була доброю та м’якосердою, усім допомагала: “Кому і коли тільки щось доброго могла зробити, робила, але, борони Боже, щоб дякувати їй за це” [5, 280]. Bogdan Lepsky summarizes the image of Olena Nechaeva raising it traditionally to the long-suffered image of Ukraine, whereas “за всіх терпіла, всі болі в своє добряче серце брала” [5, 280]. Love to Olena is something extraordinary and divine that is the feeling which gives Valentiy Bosakovskiy strong emotional reliance in future. Help Olena-Stepanyda Nechay return to her husband, as well as the search of Marusia Bogatkivna serve motivating factors of further travel.

If Valentiy Bosakovskiy professes humanistic values, inhuman traits are given to the Polish pan Faldovsky by the author. The complete image of Faldovsky is solved through the actions and due to time excursus in the background of his butler, his servant Luka, Palashka and others. The symbolic importance has special places called lovy – they are, first of all, the purpose of the castle where the guests, invited by the pan, come: “І тоді в мисливському замку гучно було і бучно, бо Фалдовський любив забавитися широко, а гості його також”, and, secondly, that is Faldovsky’s lifestyle. They characterize his actions which resemble

more hunting for beautiful women who are the crucial attribute of his celebrations. In his hunting castle, "острові розкоші", as Faldovsky used to say, there is hidden Marusia Bogatkivna, Boris's bride. The butler, who served in the days of the old pan, remembers: "На яку жінку або дівчину оком кинув, та вже пропала" [5, 350]. Marusia Bogatkivna "стає жертвою свята", just the same fate happened to Palashka, hireling, one day.

Faldovsky is strong, stocky and in the actions – "кровопивець". He is the personification of a true demon and evil spirits that brings together him with the image of Markura Pupan created masterfully by Todos Osmachka in the story "Senior Boyar" ("Старший Боярин"). The author writes about Faldovsky's irresistibility: "Його ні куля не влучає, ні шабля не береться, бо він дитиною у зачарованих зелах купався і в неповинній крові" [5, 341]. He had absolute power throughout the neighborhood and "ніхто не смів супротивлятися, бо на такого він або "наїзд учинив", або при дорозі засівся і "право собі творив". І було з ким, оскільки мав стрільців і гайдуків: "Одчайдушних смільчаків і жаклих горлорізів на десять миль в окрузі не було" [5, 341]. Не один раз в "жаклих пригодах" бували вони зі своїм паном, але завжди щасливо, "обвантажені кривдою, до лісового замочка верталися" [5, 341]. And catching up "хамське кодло" (F.) – Bosakovskiy with Marusia Bogatkivna, a prisoner, and her fiancé Boris and Palashka, Faldovsky was sure that happiness of the victory would not turn away from him that time too, he did not see any reasons for it. The combat fight between Valentiy Bosakovskiy and Faldovsky when there is a clash of different opinions, life positions and interests, is the culmination of the novel. It was the first time when fortune turned away from Faldovsky. The butler, who had amused his master since childhood, asked a permission to bury the body. Blooded Faldovsky, being deathly wounded, asked the butler to fulfill his last request – give the money to Teteria that "усе хмелеве кодло пропало", since Faldovsky hated Bohdan Khmelnytsky. He had had hatred for the Khmelnytsky for all his life and with it for the entire Ukraine – "козаків, гетьманщини, булави, він чекав нагоди помститися: "З усіма ворогами України накладав, щоб лиш їй вільною не бути"" [5, 352].

The highest point of emotional exaltation has been accomplished by the author at the end of the novel when the main character is appealing with a prayer to the sun, which brings Bohdan Lepky's work with the best samples of hagiographical and oratorical and preaching prose of old Ukrainian literature. The landscape submitted by the author through the protagonist's perception, characterizes his psychological state which shown with the help of tropes: "густа, біла, як молоко, мряка", лісок "бовванів", як "осіння, чорна хмара". Bohdan Lepsky's faith in the victory of good over evil is presented by changing the landscape: "...на горбі, за ліском" небопоступово змінюється з "сірого, фіолетового" до "зеленаво-синього" і нагадує морську воду. Незважаючи на криваву смугу, що палахкотіла, розширювалася, усе ж таки почало сходило сонце. Bosakovskiy is saying a prayer for the Ukrainian people, and saying it, he is changing himself: "Обличчя його прояснювалося й кращало. Він перероджувався і не той ставав, що був... Немов личина, яку довго носив, нараз зіснулася з нього й лежала на землі, під ногами". Очі Босаковського "горіли палким внутрішнім огнем, а його високий лоб променів загравою сходячого сонця..." [5, 357]. It seems quite symbolic when the main character is appealing to the sun as God. When disbelief was prevailed in Ukraine and there was the destruction of

Christian values, there was the only thing for people left – faith. Appeal to the sun started since the days of paganism. In mythology the sun is a symbol of eyesight (зрячості), sunrise – the awaking of darkness, of night, which is a kind of synonymous with evil and lies. With the first rays of the sun, according to the superstition, evil spirits disappear. Saying a prayer for Ukraine, Bosakovskiy believes in the victory of justice and mercy.

It is known that Bohdan Lepsky was greatly influenced by the ideas of the historian Vyacheslav Lipinsky about the appealing of the polished shliakhta to native nation, whom Bohdan Lepsky got acquainted in Krakow with (1907). As Roman Horak says, “...сам Липинський був втіленням того, що проповідував” [4]. In his works “Our state in Rus-Ukraine” (“Наше становище на Русі-Україні”), “Shliakhta in Ukraine” (“Шляхта на Україні”), “From the Past of Ukraine” (“З минулого України”) he gave a positive assessment of Bohdan Khmelnytsky’s activity in Polish historiography for the first time. It should be noted that Vyacheslav Lipinsky’s political views sound the same as the historiosophical concept of Bohdan Lepsky, which are skillfully shown through Valentiy Bosakovskiy’s thoughts and monologues. Vyacheslav Lipinsky could have been a prototype of the main character of the novel because Valentiy, like Lipinsky, came from the Polish aristocracy, in early years he became Ukrainian, however, he stayed Pole both mentally and culturally. The originality of ideas that can be observed through the whole novel is the representation of the concepts of “elite” and “state” and the contrast to them is the ideological concept of “people”. If the Ukrainian thinkers of the beginning of the XX-th century paid attention to “волі” and assigned it the main role in their studies, what is more considered it as “сваволю”, and then V. Lipinsky prefers “discipline”. In the work the concept of humanism, advantages of law and order, keeping the unity under the command of the elected, experienced hetmans is represented by the main character Valentiy Bosakovskiy, who not once “...крізь сльози..., крізь гіркий плач” accused the ordinary Cossacks for indifference: “Буйний та бійкий ви народ, нема що казати! А чи буде Україна, чи ні – нехай журиться Барабаш і Цицюра. Якось воно буде!... поріжуть ваш край, розпанахають, пошматують, або вам що?.. Якось воно буде! А далі як заклик промовляє: “...схаменіться, поки ще час!”” [5, 233]. Valentiy’s thoughts are imbued with patriotic motives: “– Двір якийсь палять...Ріжуться і мордують, чорти б їх різали в пеклі та мордували. Це вони так Україну будують...” [5, 238]. In the conversation with Pomela Bosakovskiy develops his political opinions. He believes in the experienced hetman, accuses the people since “люди самі чортові в зуби лізуть. Мали свою державу, тільки тримай її, скріпи, уладжуй, – ні! То гетьман їм не до вподоби, то гетьманича, то його вус, то її спідниця. Гетьман не п’є, а гетьманича не лається. Алексія їм подавай! Бо любіший для них чужий кнут, ніж своя булава. Такий народ!”. In contrast, Pomela defends other views. He does not blame the people and compares them with “плесом” as “...якщо кинеш камінь, то сколишеш його. Винні ті, що нашу воду колотять і коло мутять. На них ти в першу чергу нарікай. На тих, що за булаву деруться, і на їх прислужників і наймитів. Народ – стихія, а вони, чорні духи, вони всьому злому причина” [5, 345]. The critics see “український варіант знаменитого Дон-Кіхота” (M. Ilnytsky) or “запізнілий образ українського Дон Кіхота” R. Horak) in Bosakovskiy’s image. In our opinion, Bogdan Lepsky offers his own interpretation of Don Quixote’s image that similar to the ideas Fridrich

Buterverk, German aesthetician, philosopher and writer, A. V. Shlegel, the representative of German romanticism, and French historian Sysmondi, who saw, first of all, “героя-ентузіаста” and a friend of mankind in a well-known knight. Valentiу Bosakovskiy as well as Don Quixote are symbols of people’s faith in goodness, the pursuit to beauty, victory of idealism over practicism.

Література

1. Апанович О. Наступник Богдана Хмельницького – Іван Виговський [Електронний ресурс] / О. Апанович // Гетьмани України і кошові отамани Запорозької Січі. – К. : Либідь, 1993. – 288 с. – Режим доступу : <http://exlibris.org.ua/apanowicz/wyhowski.html>.
2. Бахтин М. Формы времени и хронотопа в романе [Электронный ресурс] / М. Бахтин. – Режим доступа : <http://philologos.narod.ru/bakhtin/hronotop/hronotop10.html>.
3. Великий тлумачний словник сучасної української мови / [уклад. і гол. ред. В. Т. Бусел]. – К. ; Ірпінь : ВТФ “Перун”, 2004. – 1440 с.
4. Горак Р. Трагедія Богдана Лепкого / Р. Горак // Дзвін. – 1990. – № 10. – С. 71–86.
5. Лепкий Б. “Крутіж” : [історична повість : літературно-художнє видання] / Б. Лепкий // Вибрані твори : [у 2-хт.]. – Тернопіль : Збруч, 2006. – Т. 2. – С. 223–359.
6. Литвиненко Т. “Прокленуть мене нині, але завтра благословити стануть” (Образ Мазепи в однойменній пенталогії Б. Лепкого) / Т. Литвиненко // Дивослово. – 1998. – № 9. – С. 11–13.
7. Литвиненко Т. Історіософські аспекти пенталогії “Мазепа” / Т. Литвиненко // Слово і час. – 1997. – № 11–12. – С. 31–32.
8. Мисик Ю. Рідня Богдана Хмельницького в Білорусі [Електронний ресурс] / Ю. Мисик // Соціум : альманах соціальної історії. – Вип. 4. – С. 189–192. – Режим доступу : <http://history.org.ua/JournALL/socium/4/10.pdf>.
9. Пронкевич О. “Дон Кіхот” : роман-міф-товар / О. Пронкевич. – К. : НаУКМА4 Аграр Медіа Груп, 2012. – 197 с.
10. Ромащенко Л. Жанрово-стильовий розвиток сучасної української історичної прози : основні напрями художнього руху / Л. Ромащенко. – Черкаси : Вид-во Черкаського держуніверситету ім. Б. Хмельницького, 2003. – 388 с.
11. Шакиров С. М. О смысловой парадигме мотива дороги в русской лирике XIX–XX веков [Электронный ресурс] / С. М. Шакиров.– Режим доступа : http://www.lib.csu.ru/vch/2/2001_01/002.pdf.