

O. Bondareva,  
doctor of philological sciences,  
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University

## THE IMAGE OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO IN AUTHOR'S MYTH MAKING OF BIOGRAPHICAL PLOT

Nowadays playwrights have already noticed the danger of full fiction writing of drama with blurring of genre boundaries. Recently they have even tried to declare a generic identity of their works, unlike the previous accented awareness of "inevitability" processes of intergeneric diffusion. For example, a few years ago O. Irvanets called the collection of his dramatic texts as "Five Plays. Prose", but then he also gave the name for a series of dramatic books as "Non-prose" founded by the publishing house "Fact", apparently urging his colleagues to avoid the final dissolution of dramatic genres in prose world of modern literature.

Phenomenological theory has long been analyzing social life as narrated story. A postmodernist "narrator" is penetrated with distrust to metastory, then a great hero and a great goal, an epic event are "removed" from his tale. "I have no more interest in telling stories and describing ways which are experienced by some people. I am a story and a way by myself" – says one of the characters in the play by A. Shypenko "Van Halen's Death". Self-presentation of drama characters of "new wave" occurred through lengthy monologue narration (so critics accused playwrights of part-comic effect of "incontinence own essence" by a character), routine and anti-aestheticism deprived of inner dramatic effect of depicted events, triviality or even lack of feeling. Present philosopher and sociologists, however, believe that the "repertoire" of stories that can be told by a character himself is limited to certain public or cultural models which a person does not tell himself the story invented by himself.

Modern Ukrainian dramatic artists not always focused on the demands of the postmodern stylistics so blurring of genre-specific and genre boundaries occurs in some plays at a fairly specific level. One variant of such a non-traditional for a whole day of postmodern style (though not free from some of its influences) is the work "Mountain" by Ivan Drach. Previously Ivan Drach was in dramatic art as the author of only dramatic poems ("The ballad of a teacher", 1977, "Nightingale-Solveig", 1978, "Dawn and Death of Pablo Neruda", 1980), but his work "Mountain" (1997) has multi-formal features because a) the text is devoid of author's digressions and reflections, it is internally conflicting, some fragments of narrative are theatricalized, action reaches apotheosis, while it is retarded by swarming in mental labyrinths of protagonists (signs of a dramatic kind and its tragic genre with elements of melodrama, but b) most of it is a slow form of prose, the characters often voice not only outside event-pieces, but the innermost spiritual movements that make up the complicated psychological impacts of internal drama of personages (generic features of epic and genre sentimental story signs), c) minimizing the remarks (reducing dramatic strategy of the text), the author applies the principle of cumulation of documentary material (basic strategy of documentary cinematography) whereas d) the author reveals the sensual world of protagonists, he poetizes their inner world (ancestral loci lyrics), and the text as a

whole receives features (playing strategies of lyrics) as almost axiomatic documentary materials “work” in a new context, while preserving the traditional context information.

Tendencies of genre diffusion have long been stated by researchers in the territory of historical novel: yes, A. Bakanov observed that in the genre, once endowed with fixed contextual and compositional parameters, the boundaries are becoming more flexible and the interpenetration of different genre features begins to rule as a norm [1, 21]. As we can see similar processes today are fully entrenched in the drama.

Even before the main action I. Drach notes the impossibility of intervention of the author’s voice in replicated “documentary” set: “Full stops, commas, question marks and exclamation marks, installation and counterpoint are mine, the rest up to every last word is unfabled and belongs to the ancient time and circumstances”. However, the text of this hybrid genre work has the high degree of author’s interference and deliberately arranged emotional emphasis (for example, the author calls G. Kulish-Belozersky only as “Kulishyha” – with emotive negation, constantly emphasizing how it is difficult to Lukery to live and work in her house; among biographical documentary characters with a small commentary, close to the author’s voice, suddenly there is a literary character Nataalka-Poltavka and etc.).

Author’s genre marking is rather lengthy (documentary drama collage in two parts, reproduced by letters, memoirs and poetry, denunciations and directions concerning Shevchenko and his funeral at Mount Chernechna), it takes into account several genre components – a documentary drama, drama-collage, chronicle drama, tragedy (the death and funeral of the hero) and others. Documentary cinema theorist S. Drobashenko contrasts the document which has the specificity to any convention systems (fiction, myth making, stereotype) [5, 10], but he supposes the possibility of a two-level perception of the document in fiction text – organic properties of the documentary evidence and the original value ascribed to the author interpretation [4, 118]. Meanwhile documentary texture of a dramatic work thanks to the author’s interpretations strategy allows documents to perform a frame of author’s myth making, participate in the formation or breaking stereotypes, to be tied to a fictional story or myth and poetic model of the work. A similar trend is observed in the drama “The Mountain” by Ivan Drach.

Two parts symmetrically labeled as “The Passion of Taras” from various hagiographers set an intention for Easter liturgical drama plot structure: the first part describes the “earthly passions” primarily personal drama of a lonely man, “great sinner” in terms of Tarasov’s second cousin Bartholomew: accordingly, its sacred center is “a hut” which is ambivalent even in Shevchenko’s poetry (on the one hand, family shelter that is consecrated, surrounded by a “cherry garden”, on the other hand – a hell cell of poverty and hopelessness); the second part is the projection of the Resurrection and Ascension collisions of the hero: as we can see, playwright models the symbolic opposition “Dolny” and “Horn” worlds, designed to biographical facts and semiotic post-mortem state of his protagonist. Therefore, basic symbolic concepts of Ukrainian sakrum that mark both parts are mirror opposite. “Hut” in this case is a symbol of the earthly life of suffering, crucified between “quiet paradise” and “hell” in poetic mythology of Shevchenko, like most of his predecessors, contemporaries and followers: commenting on a unique mission of the

concept “hut” in Ukrainian art, J. Moiseiv draws attention to the presence of the same category in the culture of neighboring nations, noting however that there are no more nations, in whose culture “this theme was such a painful attempt, with such intense mediation with such religious holiness, with the presence in works of all authors” [10, 170]. But the “house” in this drama of Ivan Drach is neither iconographical of Ukrainian sacred mythology (as made evident and painting heritage Shevchenko) poor building or memorial or a home or shelter for a hero. This concept is perceived rather as a multiple loci, symbol, unfulfilled protagonist’s dream “to have their dwelling, hut, little wife and kids” against subconscious expectation of total despair, in the context of the author’s prophecy to “have stupor in solitude”. Indeed, the events of the first part does not have a clear topographic binding: episodes collage mounted, and without determined textually grounds they are transferred from Mesopotamia to Cherkassy, from the village Pekary to Kobzarev’s apartment-studio in St. Petersburg; occasionally other loci appeared in the collage-Ukrainian villages, the St. Petersburg apartments of Taras’ friends, unspecified topos in which human slander and gendarmerie denunciations are walking among which private correspondence is voiced. The first part of the drama, thus uniting collision of unfulfilled protagonist’s dreams against the back drop of his prophetic mission and personal distress. Shevchenko appears as happy person not focused on his own mission of a poet, a painter, an ideologist, Seer, Father of the nation, but at least attempt to some how way to get rid of fatal one liness in the world (A. Chervinska stresses syncretic literary character of historical origin and emphasizes not only on his organic connection with certain historical periods, but also on the fact that it is a certain psychological type and represents a plot as he “has a true story”. The first half of the work is finished with a symbolic final chord-non-existent, fictitious, dreamed house momentarily gain real contour and its illusory nature is more powerful than hope for its shelter – and so the last remark makes Kobzar’s happy life on the earth impossible. Eternal, unshakable, windswept “mountain” as the vertical dimension of Kobzar’s posthumous fame resists to insecurity and temporality of unattainable “hut” in the author’s version of Ivan Drach. The author of the drama “Mountain” supports national iconic model of the sacred world, the center of which from March 1861 becomes Chernechey mountain, as the axis mundi passes through it since that time, associated with the idea of freedom and independence. The mass procession on Chernecha Hill, polyphonic reconstituted in the second act of the drama, only legalizes artistically the appearance of the national pilgrimage center in Ukrainian lands, mythical “sacred mountain”, which corresponds to people’s need in miraculous protection, sent by Providence and it equates to Calvary Christian space as the top of the mountain, burial place of the mythical ancestor (Adam) and resurrection of Jesus. People’s consciousness, which fuels the philosophical resistivity of the second part of the drama by Ivan Drach, in narrations about Taras Shevchenko synthesizes both incarnation – and Adam and Jesus giving to “Taras’s Father” the ability of simultaneous taste the fruit from the tree of knowledge of good and evil. In contrast to the first part with the uncertain, vague topos of the world “Dolny”, the second part of the drama has a clear geo-referenced to the Chernecha mountain – first it is “a mountain, it is Shevchenko’s Workshop”, then – “a place of Kobzar’s new house”, then – blessed by glorious Cossack history natural “paradise” where pilgrims commemorate

“Tarasov Cossack soul”, and finally – a spiritual sanctuary, the holy land, the temple outdoors to underprivileged Ukrainian people. Thus Chernechey mount is fitted by the playwright in the ideal model of the universe designed by artistic imagination of Shevchenko.

Ivan Drach recognizing the presumption of constant current operation tries to avoid the explicit ethical assessments in the plane of “righteousness – sin”, which in the simulation dramatic conflict were often relied by his predecessors in the dramatic Shevchenkiy: their efforts in the plots devoted to unfortunate love Shevchenko fit the image of the protagonist to one or the other ethical dimension necessarily accompanied by completing a second dimension antagonistic figure of a woman. The hero of the drama “Mountain” is an ambivalent figure, “The Great Sinner” by Bartholomew Shevchenko, who was looking at his second cousin with the eyes of that officialdom and as a result wanted to bury his body near the church, yet Righteous Man and Prophet who to the Ukrainian people almost single-handedly performed the mission to which other nations spent the efforts of many generations of educated intellectuals. Accordingly, in I. Drach’s interpretation Harutya and Lusha Polusmakova do not appear as the personification of sinful female nature, they are not antagonists of the hero in his dramatic emotional collisions but they are shown as unhappy women who could not recognize in time and appreciate the greatness of Shevchenko as a poet and a person. Aiming for a documentary about “objectivity” the author of the drama “Mountain” denies the author’s voice which is presented in the text. By contrast in the text of “Mountain” there is no figure of an author-guide, a witness of events and an architect of decoration, while the hidden author appeals to the capacity of authentic documents to punch dominant stereotype and cliches in the conditions of a successful composition.

Taking into consideration a big size of the text and absence or static nature of external influence, mainly epistolary form of text items from “Mountains”, we can talk about specific intergeneric design genre labeling as a “documentary drama” is rather arbitrary, as it is on the formal semantic level contaminated principles drama and documentary newsreel novel and non-classical modern drama, the plot of which turns out not causation, and based on internal, associative, emotional and semantic patterns. Here we are dealing with a kind of “genre criticism”, with the ability to transport certain genus-specific and genre features in a relatively new, special seating design artistic imagery associated with mobility and diffusion of genre boundaries. The mutual attraction of epic prose and drama, interpenetration of generic categories of poetics has been recorded repeatedly in the previous dramatic prose (dramas of Ibsen, G. Hauptmann, A. Ostrovsky, Brecht, M. Kulish, etc.) and epic prose (prose by Dostoevsky, Andrei Platonov, Stefanik, etc.) but usually most varied and contrasted compositional forms of epic and dramatic works through architectonic markers epic or, respectively, its tragic end, because the distinction intonation – a realistic, direct, without the express author’s voice in the drama, and double-formally – realistic, both direct and indirect – in prose epic forms, which have parallel contexts of value and character of the author. In fact, I. Drachin “Mountain” uses the principle of organising of a prose and dramatic text which has been used in other national traditions. H. Böll explains the lack of author’s and narrator’s voice in the novelas false of its events: so valuable intonation of the

drama is claimed, in which the author is not directly expressed, and the characters speak on their behalf. Isolated remarks that decorate the text only occasionally notice some detail of the action. The text rich in monologues, too lush for the drama, but logical for the epic genres: the action in monologues slows or stops, then gets moving signs in dialogues. Same events subject to different modes of assessment, that's why the reader and the characters participating in the action change their attitude to events. M. Shatrov and V. Loginov, by contrast, build their work on the installation and documentary basis, originally using the power of artistic synthesis stratify some how real documentary facts, because the facts of the starting point of their interpreters are endowed with sustainable social and typical properties and tend to a certain uniqueness in the characteristics of their representants. Because of the compositional form of drama (replication, domination of monologues and dialogues, act dividing) in their text there has been modeled an architectonic form of the epic conclusion; inherent novelistic narrative structures multiscreen principle in the absence of an open strategy of the narrator makes polemical (= dialogic) nature of most scenes (drama attribute): dialogue here is somewhat different – it's more dialogue of views, concepts and ideas rather than between actual characters, and occasionally it turns into a traditional dramatic dialogue. As you can see, most innovative genre points do not belong exclusively to Ivan Drach though he obviously could not rely on the given text, and therefore potentially not follow them.

It is more important that the author of "Mountains" tries to oppose the problem of plot and thematic "exhaustion" of dramatic Shevchenkiana to its "procedure". It's quite independent and sensible artistic position, it takes into account that each new stage of the reception "traditional" historical themes or sign biography "from a new angle and a new sense of opening up new dimension and objective facts of the past "and any document in any way can not be an adequate living material because of its subjectivity. Furthermore, the "procedural" study of documentary sources in the context of the strategic pursuit postmodern era are updated by the new mission literary text as your own interpreter or editor of previous texts, rather than as the creator of an independent plot. In the text of the drama "Mountain" the hidden author acts exactly as a strategist and architect of collage forms showing the documents that express diametrically different opinions of their authors at the same appreciation events or facts: for these static estimates emerges veiled internal dynamics of action, it is estimated field sketched characters modeled the characters and their voices are summarized in a single interpreter of contextual texture begin to be perceived as a kind of "drama of ideas" (such diametrically opposed views on documented Shevchenko's talent, attitude toward "sinful" behavior of the protagonist and his inner qualities, etc.). Documentary plot and fable texture of the work makes the author prefer a mounting principle of the text but the playwright faces with some difficulty: non-literary sources of his complicated art form partially meet today's receptive reading experience: this contradiction deprives its potential to combine strategy and play installation. Perhaps it is because of this fact. Drach pointedly questions the certainty of "facts" and therefore prefer their polyphony, hoping that with a few facts-reader models bring an adequate picture of their receptive experience of facts, events, to retrospectively through the newly created art image, understand the greatness and tragedy of Taras Shevchenko. So it is obvious that the

text ofl. Drach is designed not for the stage, but for a thorough reading. However, it is overloaded by the “witnesses” story of events, because the writer does not want to appear “incompetent” historian, so he brings his own “competence” with processed array of sources, and some of these text fragments are presented discretely, separate segments blur the outline general construction of the work. Other structural features of this lengthy replicated text are in using he principles of genre wreath of sonnets for example, evidence of Lukeria Polusmakova in the epilogue, some individual fragments are presented in the earlier parts of the drama. It seems that the author has not placed the pre-segmented part of the whole, and vice versa-specifically synthesized on separate lines final chord backbone.

So based on different resources of describing Shevchenko’s image I. Drach creates a fictionalized drama text with all the characteristics of three kinds of literature and their various genre forms, being an example of multi diffusion and genre criticism when opportunities of individual genera, kinds and genres are summarized in one context and issued to new artistic whole.

### Література

1. Баканов А. Г. Современный зарубежный исторический роман / А. Г. Баканов. – К. : Вища школа, 1989. – 184 с.
2. Гей Н. К. Художественность литературы. Поэтика. Стиль / Н. К. Гей. – М. : Наука, 1975. – 471 с.
3. Драч І. Ф. Гора : документальна драма-колаж : [у 2-х ч.] : відтворена за листами, спогадами та віршами, доносими та розпорядженнями, які стосувалися Т. Г. Шевченка і його похорону на Чернечій Горі / І. Ф. Драч. – К. : Укр. письменник, 1997. – 118 с.
4. Дробашенко С. В. Пространство экранного документа / С. В. Дробашенко. – М. : Искусство, 1986. – 320 с.
5. Дробашенко С. В. Феномен достоверности : очерки теории документального фильма / С. В. Дробашенко. – М. : Наука, 1972. – 184 с.
6. Жюльен Н. Словарь символов / [пер. с фр.]. – Челябинск : Урал LTD, 1999. – 498 с.
7. Костенко Н. Культурні ідентичності: перетворення і визнання / Н. Костенко // Соціологія : теорія, методи, маркетинг (Інститут соціології НАН України). – № 4. – 2001. – С. 69–88.
8. Макаровская Г. В. Типы исторического повествования / Г. В. Макаровская. – Саратов : Изд-во Саратовск. ун-та, 1972. – 236 с.
9. Мифы народов мира : [энциклопедия : в 2-х т.] / [гл. ред. С. А. Токарев]. – М. : НИ “Большая российская энциклопедия”, 1997. – Т. 1. – 671 с.
10. Мойсеїв І. Храм української культури (Філософія семіосфери) : [посібник-дослідження] / І. Мойсеїв. – К. : Всеукраїнський фольклорно-етнографічний центр “Рідна хата”, 1995. – 464 с.
11. Червинская О. В. Функционирование в литературе традиционного образа исторического происхождения : дис. ... к. филол. н. : 10.01.08 “Теория литературы” / О. В. Червинская. – К., 1986. – 212 с.
12. Энциклопедический словарь символов / [авт.-сост. Н. А. Истомина]. – М. : ООО “Издательство АСТ” ; ООО “Издательство Астрель”, 2003. – 1056 с.
13. Эйзенштейн С. М. Монтаж 1938 / С. М. Эйзенштейн // Избранные статьи. – М. : Искусство, 1956. – С. 252–285.
14. Явчуновский Я. И. Документальные жанры : образ, жанр, структура произведения / Я. И. Явчуновский. – Саратов : Изд. Саратовского университета, 1974. – 232 с.