

Контекст

Context

УДК 821.161.2-2.09Koch

ABSTRACTION OF DAILY LIFE AS THE BASIS OF THE TEXTUAL INTEGRATION: THE EXPERIENCE OF IVAN KOCHERHA

Ihor Yudkin-Ripun

Оповідна стратегія у драмах І. Кочерги сповна використовує можливості абстрактного тлумачення побутових деталей у театрі. Перехід до абстрактних уявлень дозволяє віддалятися від реалій сьогодення й убачати в драматичних конфліктах узагальнений сенс. Мотивація вчинків у площині цих уявлень визначає цілісність твору.

Ключові слова: метаязык, метасуб'єкт, сюжет, дійова особа, персоніфікація, ідеал, конфлікт, мотив.

Повествовательная стратегия в драмах И. Кочерги полной мерой использует возможности абстрактного толкования бытовых деталей в театре. Переход к абстрактным представлениям позволяет отдаляться от реалий современности и усматривать в драматических конфликтах обобщенный смысл. Мотивация поступков в плоскости этих представлений определяет целостность произведения.

Ключевые слова: метаязык, метасубъект, сюжет, действующее лицо, персонификация, идеал, конфликт, мотив.

The narrative strategy in I. Kocherha's dramas uses perfectly the opportunities of the abstract interpretation of customary details peculiar for theatre. The transition to abstract notions enables making a distance towards the reality of current life and to conceive dramatic conflicts in generalized meaning. The motivation of the deeds within the space of these notions determines textual integration.

Keywords: metalanguage, metasubject, plot, dramatis personae, personification, ideal, conflict, motif.

It has been already ten years ago when T. Sverbilova has attracted attention to the paradoxical state of the researches of I. Kocherha's legacy. The playwright is appreciated chiefly as the author of historical plays («The Fairy Lady of Bitter Almonds», «The Diamond's Millstone», «The Marriage of the Candle», «Yaroslav the Wise», «The Prophet» and the stylized miracle «Marcus in Hell»). At the same time his customary and «problematic» pieces remain beyond the attention of the researchers and seem to remain underestimated. Meanwhile the similar verdict is repeated without sufficient grounds: «Духом мелодрами пройняті абсолютно всі його п'єси, які лише за непорозумінням вважаються психологічними драмами» (Absolutely all his pieces are imbued with the melodramatic spirit, and they are regarded as psychological dramas only due to their misunderstanding) [7, p. 21]. Such statement seems to simplify the real narrative strategy of

the playwright and subsequently needs to be reconsidered.

It would be suitable to remind that at least three plays dealing with the contemporary topics were forbidden between 1927 and 1940 years. With «Nature and Culture» (1927) the author had been blamed of sympathy for the great farmers (the so called «kurkuli»), and it was regarded as unpardonable fault (reported in the letter of V. Vasylo to the writer [5, p. 74]). «The Masters of Time» (1930–1933) with the primary title «The Watchmaker and a Hen» was forbidden while it had been sharply criticized by the contemporary communist leader I. Kulyk [5, p. 139]. Then the play was anonymously represented at the competition and won the award that enabled the removal of the prohibition. «The Choice» (1938) had been primarily supported by M. Rylski (1939) but after three performances it was excluded from the plays recommended to be staged [5, p. 178].

КОНТЕКСТ

The very story of the prohibitions shows the discrepancies existent between I. Kocherha's intentions and the demands of the contemporary power. It attests also the existence of «Aesopian language» that deserves and needs special analysis. It is apt to compare the author's attitude with that of M. Rylski who has mastered the ways of applying multidimensional score of voices and of verbal disguises in lyrics (in particular with citing different stylistic quotations) [11]. In difference to the poet the opportunities of a playwright are of other kind; therefore the approach must be corrected. It goes about very deeply concealed attitude that must be explored with special devices. That I. Kocherha's position was very personal and autonomous could be proved with his utterance written in 1939 in regard to dramatic essence: *«Основною драми за Аристотелем є дія. Ця дія повинна <...> прагнути до якоїсь мети <...> Проте ніякої драми не буде, коли ця дія <...> легко і щасливо до цієї мети доходить. Драма виникає лише тоді, коли ця дія, це прагнення натрапляє на перешкоди»* («According to Aristotle it is action that is the basis of drama. This action must strive for some goal. But there won't be any drama if this action, this desire achieves its goal easily and happily. Drama arises only when this action, this desire dashes against the obstacles»), therefore *«...твір може мати прекрасний сюжет <...> але, якщо в ньому немає конфлікту – це не п'єса»* («a work can have a nice plot, but it won't be a play if there lacks a conflict») [4, p. 69]. To evaluate the risky meaningfulness of this statement it must be taken into account that it was the year when the doctrine of the so called «lack of conflicts» was proclaimed, so that I. Kocherha's words bear the verve of protest.

To disclose the latent intentions in a scenic work the special textual analytic devices would become useful. In particular one should take into consideration the opportunities for latent conflicts' representation that dramatic text provides. It goes about the heterogeneity and the integration of dialogical text connected with the dramatic phantom of action and the intentional conflict. The general scheme of dramatic action (as it has been elaborated in the treatises of script-makers from G. Freitag to J. Lawson with their indispensable scenes

and the overcoming of obstacles as the rhetorical confutation that's the refutation of objections) presupposes the development of predicative hierarchy. Therefore predicative abstractions mark necessarily the structure of indispensable scenes. The entirety of action can't be represented without predicative abstraction. The effectiveness of such approach has been demonstrated in the researches of I. Franko's prosaic works [13]. It is the metasystem of abstractions that needs to be taken into consideration in a dramatic work as the necessary premise of textual integration. The dialogue presupposes the existence of arbiter together with partners and therefore the interpersonal prerequisites that are of abstract and generalized nature, otherwise the communion would become impossible. In particular it is the motivation of deeds that refers to abstract presupposition as the norms to be fulfilled. Then the so called spontaneous event looks like a miraculous phenomenon and refers to the power of wonder or fate. Adventures can be regarded as a kind of fairy tales' wonders.

Predicative abstractions (represented in particular with the plot schemes) in its turn do not exist autonomously; they presuppose subjects as the condition of their existence. Meanwhile dramatis persona as a participant of action can't appear other than the carrier of abstract features exerting special functions within the whole. In this respect it represents the implicit abstraction derived from the existent predicates. In particular in linguistics one regards the so called «metasubject» in the manner of the phenomenological reduction as the residuum of textual part that is not included in the predicative part [2, p. 87]. Such «metasubject» refers to the presupposed prototypes [2, p. 113] that represent abstract images. One can easily recognize here the concept of ideal as it has been suggested by I. Kant in the treatise «The Critics of the Faculty of Judgement». In opposite to predicates the abstraction of subject consists in its identification (in particular as the identification with a class of names or with a role of person) as the act of appertaining to a certain type. For instance a personal noun indicates together with the reference to a person the indication of

IHOR YUDKIN-RIPUN. ABSTRACTION OF DAILY LIFE AS THE BASIS OF THE TESTUAL INTEGRATION...

the class, feminine or masculine, this person belongs to.

Meanwhile if predicate designates the abstraction immediately subjects only presuppose implications that would refer to the abstract classes. This subjective identification is the necessary implication of the designation and not the designation itself. It is of derivative nature determined with the preceding predication. Subjective perspective brings into play the whole classificatory schemes that appear as the necessary implications. Within the dramatic text it is already the mask that promotes such implicit subjective abstraction derived from the primary predicative abstraction of plot. The function (and the respective role) within the situation can by no means coincide with the character of the dramatis person neither exhaust it. Therefore the distinction between role and character is always to be aware of with the ensuing consequences for the abstractedness produced at stage. A character produces one's own satellite of abstraction (as of a certain role, mask or function within the action) that can be seen in reference to the situation. Vice versa the implicit abstractions arising from functional load are to be personified and can be represented with the text of role or a series of cues that is unrealizable without the whole dramatic text. Personality gives also the abstraction of higher order due to its integration, as the consequence of its entirety. Moreover the protagonist bears the reasons for the whole textual integration and subsequently becomes the carrier of the respective abstraction necessary for the unity.

Thus a particular duplicity of dramatic subject appears where the explicit integrity of personal character presupposes also the existence of implicit abstraction of scenic mask with its intentions that refers to a generalized type. This constant opportunity of implicit abstraction provides wide space for semantic interplay that is obvious in scenic cues. As far as these cues are quotations, they bear both literal sense and that depending upon the intentions of the dramatis persona which are of abstract nature and render the implicit ideal. Then the existence of the two kinds of abstractions within a dramatic work is to be taken into account. One builds up

the abstractions of situations (plots) founded upon the hierarchy of predicates and the abstractions of subjects (dramatis personae).

Such approach enables tracing the transformation of characteristic details into symbols through metonymy as the device most apt for stage. It was already Ya. Mamontov who pointed to the special importance of metonymy in drama the reasons being the significance of action and of deeds with real things: *«Щодо метонімії, то вони <...> мають речовий або причинний зв'язок з тими поняттями, до яких стосуються <...> Можна сказати, що виразність та образність драматичної мови будується переважно на метоніміях»* («As to the metonymies they have substantial or causal connections with the notions they concern. The expressiveness and imagery of scenic speech can be said to be founded chiefly upon metonymies») [6, p. 174]. According to V. Vasyloko it is the detail that becomes the source for metonymy: *«Вдала деталь завжди дає <...> матеріал для домислювання»* («A lucky detail always gives stuff for supplementing with reconsideration») [1, p. 174]. These statements of I. Kocherha's contemporaries can be aptly supported with the works of the playwright where the details become impetuses for their reconsideration and supplements with implicit abstract images that build up a free space for artistic thought.

«Nature and Culture» (1927) can astonish with its seeming incoherence: the protagonist Mokryna divorces her husband Kucheryavy who turns to be a scoundrel and slanderer, meanwhile the man whom she supposed to be her bridegroom turns to fall in love with her daughter and confesses her about it. It results in unexpected and spontaneous transition from anger to joy and ends with triumphant banquet of reconciliation where she blesses the newly married couple. Such spontaneity comes back still to T. Shevchenko's «Nazar Stodola» where the spontaneous reconciliation is enrooted still in the baroque dramatic principle of the so called donated grace as the emanation of the God's will.

Mokryna represents a natural human being free from the deterioration of urban life in the sense of Enlightenment and as such she inevitably becomes victim. She is an overt

КОНТЕКСТ

incarnation of sincerity for whom any falsehood remains intolerable. Therefore from the viewpoint of abstractedness this play is by no means the narration about the contradictions of rural and urban life only. The tragedy of the distortion of human soul becomes evident. The pretext for the divergence and further quarrel with the husband gives the following comic comparison. Mokryna: «...якого я бачила бугая <...> морда біленька та гладенька <...> мов у тебе, мій любий» («...what a piece of a bull I've happened to see <...> white and smooth muzzle <...> as if that of thou, darling»). Husband: «Бугай на розплід – от моя доля!» («Bull for production – that's my fate!») (act 1). This misunderstanding gives the first split that is deepened further. Mokryna's questions and suspicions in regard to the husband's departure for city concern the contents of his luggage: «Та навіщо ж ти стільки білизни набираєш <...> одягу?» («And why take you so much linen <...> clothes?»). Here linen becomes the metonymic designation for the expected divorce. The suspicion develops into accusation where again the motif of linen is repeated: «Я тобі просто обридла, тобі потрібні панянки в шовкових панчишках» («Thou hast merely bothered with me, thou want ladies with silk stockings»). The motif of URBAN SEDUCTION here arises as the generalization of such metonymic abstractions. Finally the initial attempt to make a joke turns into the bitter offence and the disclosure of the husband's deceit and ingratitude: «М.: Ти брешеш! Ти хочеш зовсім уїхати від мене! <...> Ти, мабуть, забувся, яким ти прийшов до мене. Який ти був голодний <...> Іди, іди від мене (You lie! You want to leave me at all! You must have forgotten what had you been when you come to me. How hungry were you <...> Go, go away from me). К.: Не турбуйся, не повернуся! (Don't worry, I won't return!)».

In the next act that takes place in the city where Mokryna comes to visit her former husband the device of scene upon scene is used to show his moral degradation. One of the sweethearts says to him: «Неодмінно приходіть увечері, чоловіка не буде вдома» («Come to me this evening obligatorily, my

husband will be absent»). It refers immediately to the motif of ADULTERY. The heroine involuntarily becomes the witness of her husband's treason. The decisive scene of the divorce at the end of the 2nd act attests the transition from generalities of predilection to the deeds of the husband that appertains to criminal area: «М.: Зараз же оддайте мені гроші! (return me my money right now). К.: Зараз же геть звідси! (come away right now). М.: І на що ж пішли ці гроші <...> На гульню, на розпусту <...> щоб плювали тобі в очі! (And what had been paid with this money. It was debauchery, luxury, to spit in your eyes)».

In the 3d act after the final disruption with the husband she is informed by her newly arrived friend that actually he is going to marry her daughter and not her. The changes of the attitude of the heroine come from the accusation of daughter to the reconciliation. «Це ти, ти, невдячна дитина, ти навчила його, ти забажала <...> веселого життя <...> так ось воно, значить, те золоте жниво мого життя, що я так чекала сьогодні <...> Але дорого мені коштувала ота наука» («It is thou, the ungrateful child, thou hast taught him. Thou want <...> a merry life <...> and it is here, I mean, this golden harvest of my life that I awaited so today <...> And it is high price that I've paid for this science»). Here the outlook of the reasonability of fate is comparable with the category of grace as the explanation of the following spontaneous decision: «земля <...> не може все давати і давати, не маючи нічого взамін, і перестала б вона родити, якби місто не вертало їй сил» («the earth can't only give and give all over without getting something in return, and it would stop produce if the city didn't return the forces to her»). The image of earth acquires here the properties of an ancient mythological category where the necessity of engendering powers (as those of rain) becomes the basis for the acceptance of urban culture.

This statement has the outlook of a consolation that proves to become false in view of the urban moral degradation described in the previous act and therefore it remains unsubstantiated. It is already the existence and career of the former husband and his adherents

IHOR YUDKIN-RIPUN. ABSTRACTION OF DAILY LIFE AS THE BASIS OF THE TESTUAL INTEGRATION...

that represents the real jeopardy for such idyllic expectations. It becomes too obvious that the reconciliation remains uncertain and actually all suspends in indefinite state. In this respect the work is to compare with the prosaic works of S. Vasylychenko [12]. Mokryna personifies the abstraction of victim and reveals her defenselessness before the antagonist of her husband. The praised urban culture is ruled with the scoundrels as this antagonist so that she turns to leave unprotected before dangers. The ominous anxiety remains the terminal sentiment after the seemingly happy end.

«The Masters of Time» (1930) deal with the existential situation of a human being between the irretrievable flow of time and the vanity of daily life. In a way the play can be evaluated as the polemics with the well known H. Wells' «The Time Machine» that had been written thirty five years ago. The series of examinations of Lydia Zvantseva and her boyfriend Les' Yurkevych is related, that begins (after the preliminary exposition in the 1st act) in the prison where they are captured as the spies during the civil war, wait for death and are occasionally set free due to the invasion of their forces (act 2). Then the episode within the peaceful life takes place where their attitudes turn out to be different: Lydia continues her heroic way while Les' implores her in vain to stay with him (act 3). Meanwhile Lydia ends as the manager of a hen-farm while Les' has married her earlier girlfriend and visits Lydia together with his child (act 4). It demonstrates tragic fate that dissolves in the chaos of fortuity symbolized with the hen-coop.

In this respect one ought to refute the accusations as to the lack of compositional entirety. Strangely enough, such accusation has been supported by contemporary researcher for whom there takes place «семантична неузгодженість поняття часу» («the semantic incoherence of the concepts of time»), because the playwright «змішав символістський <...> час із реалістично-історичним часом» («the playwright has blended the symbolic time with the realistic historic time»). The author repeats the critical words of V. Ya. Kirpotin (the former manager of the literature department of the Central Committee of the

communist party) accusing I. Kocherha with the hesitations between symbolism and realism: «...в останніх двох актах він, наче зрозумівши необхідність дати пряме, безумовне реалістичне відображення нашої дійсності, відмовився від допомоги символічного прийому» («in the last two acts after realizing the necessity to give a direct, immediately realistic reflection of our reality, he refused from the aid of symbolic device») [9, p. 208]. First of all it is necessary to remark that contraposition of symbolism and realism is too obsolete and incorrect. As to the play of I. Kocherha, the symbolic concept of time is here present in all episodes. In particular the mentioned last two acts are marked with deeply symbolic abstractions: the 3^d act takes place at the railway station that symbolizes the divergence of the ways of the heroes; and as to the 4th act, the hen-coop is the old symbol of vanity. Besides, it is necessary to admit that the first act doesn't concern the dramatic action immediately; it introduces only the dramatis personae as a kind of prologue that serves as a parable for the future.

The principal conflict seems here to arise between Yurkevych and the person that acts only here and becomes further a commenter – the German Karfunkel, conceived as the incarnation of evil. It is only a detail of daily life that initiates this conflict: Yurkevych waits for the train to leave for Paris on a commission of the owner of hen farm Lundyshev and has not closed the door while entering the hall. Then the remarkable cues follow: «Ю.: Даруйте – свіже повітря! (Sorry, it's fresh air). К.: Повітрю і дурням двері завжди відкриті (The doors are always open for air and idiots)». The symbolic nature of these details conceived as metonymies is easily understandable: it goes about free space in opposite to the determination. Then a series of occasional events follows that destroys all plans and gives for Karfunkel a pretext for the conclusion: «А ваші двадцять чотири хвилини <...> Стережіться – ха-ха! – щоб в них не поналазили події, від яких ви так старанно ховалися» («And as to your twenty four minutes. Beware – ha-ha! – so that the events wouldn't creep into them that you kept yourself hidden so zealously before»).

КОНТЕКСТ

Yurkevych meets his girlfriend Sophia who blames him with jealousy, then appears Lundyshev with the commission, and at last the unexpected meeting with Lydia ruins all his plans. The hero demonstrates hesitation. In particular the episode when Lundyshev brutally renounces the appeal for help of the miserable Olya Cherevko (the wife of the railway worker with children) makes Yurkevych to reject the commission, and it all is summed up in Karfunkel's cue: «Ваш поїзд уже пішов, мій любий друже» («your train is already departed, my dear friend»). The time of prologue belongs to daily life and can be evaluated as the chaos of vanity resulting in the continuous hesitations of the hero.

Meanwhile the next acts where the action begins to proceed introduce another time, the time of history, and it gives pretext for the retort to Karfunkel: «Ваш годинник розбитий» («your watch is broken») (act 2). It is the time of history as opposed to the customary time that determines the conflict of this drama. Therefore one can trace the conflict between Yurkevych and Lydia as the habitual and historic time that finds no solution within the circle of dramatic events and ends as tragedy. After the adventurous 2nd act, when they both are miraculously rescued, the necessity for the declaration of love fails. It is of importance that the motif of HEART arises that discloses the split between the both partners: «Ю.: ...проміж нас тільки один суддя – серце» («there is only one judge between us, it is the heart»). «Л.: Для тебе наша любов тільки епізод, – а для мене вона велика радість <...> І коли моє серце спливає кров'ю, ти думаєш лише про себе» («L.: Our love is only episode for you, and for me it is the great joy. And when my heart bleeds you think only about yourself») (act 3). The motifs of BLOOD and FIRE then arise as the vestiges of the time of history. The hero with sorrow makes farewells to his sweetheart: «Ю.: Лети у свої пожежі, невловима жар-птице» (Yu.: Fly away to your fires, you elusive Firebird») (act 3). Here the mention of the fantastic bird becomes a paradoxical mediation to the future fate where the motif of hen-coop arises.

The final act where Lydia becomes the manager of hens and with sorrow meets

the child of her former sweetheart who has founded another family gives pretext for an eloquent self-consolation: «Л.: ...яєчко – це ж час, запечатана потенція часу» («L.: egg is the time, the sealed possibility of time»). Here the old contestation is mentioned as to the priority of egg or hen. This utterance implies the justification of Lydia's contemporary business and rejects the obvious connotations as to the vanity of hen-coop. Vice versa; the superficialities of evident facts turn out to be delusive: it must be meant that it is Yurkevych who has made the real hen-coop of his life with forgetting his oath with heart and returning to the jealous bride Sophy who appeared in the prologue. That is why the solution of the conflict remains absent as Lydia's words attest: «Л.: Час – великий суддя...» («L.: Time is the great judge»). As to the perspectives of the judgments, the last word belongs again to Lydia: «Л.: А простір, простір який попереду!» («L.: And what a space is forward!») These words that terminate the play refer to the history as the force capable of removing the chaos of vanity. The play ends with question without answer, and it is time that must retort to this question.

The play «If Thou go, Thou Will not Return» (1935, as well as the previous version «The Ransom», 1924) represents the early romantic «tragedy of fate»: one of the partners of «the eternal triangle» commits suicide during the departure of the girl with another sweetheart, the message about it compels the heroine (and, in the later version, the rival too) to return from the travel, and it rescues the life because the train smashes. This central situation of the both plays can exemplify the meaning of dramatic abstraction. The motif of SUICIDE AS RANSOM arises that is abstracted from the flow of other events. There are grounds to regard this motif as the fatalistic one as far as the fortuitous powers of hazard come into play. The spontaneity introduces here the concepts of fate and miracle that is especially observable in the fate of the central heroine Lyubusha and her boyfriend Shalimov.

I. Kocherha says that he has depicted the real persons seen by him that bear very particular traits of his personal experience: «Я знав і бачив їх ще тоді, коли вони були:

IHOR YUDKIN-RIPUN. ABSTRACTION OF DAILY LIFE AS THE BASIS OF THE TESTUAL INTEGRATION...

Шалімов – дуже молодим студентом, а Любуша – підлітком <...> Вже тоді Шалімов був тим замкнутим і жовчним педантом («I knew and saw them still when they were – Shalimov as a very young student and Lyubusha as a teenager <...> It was already then that Shalimov was that secluded and acrimonious pedant») [3, p. 54]. These observations enabled the creation of one of the most tragic pairs in the history of world theatre.

Lyubusha becomes the allegory of feminine stoicism, she discloses her invincibility before the fate's trials. She seems to represent in the initial scenes the so called weak person and passive victim at the beginning of the play, meanwhile such impression becomes erroneous. Such initial conjecture becomes refuted with the development of her deeds and cues that demonstrate a very clear intensified development. Her first arrival is introduced with a faint complaint addressed to Shalimov: «Л.: Папа вмер. У мене ж нікого не лишилося, крім тебе» («L.: The father has died. Nobody is retained at me but you») (act 1). Weakness and credulity of a poor child who seeks for support in the far town give the first traits of the portrait. Then after quarrels with the sweetheart she retorts him with rebukes: «Л.: ...хіба не ти сам покинув мене в цій страшній пустелі?» («L.: ...whether it is not thou that have forlorn me in this awful desert?») (act 2). In this cue the writer has taken the liberty of using a very sharp expression in regard to the urban environment. The reproach of the poor child attests her sincerity and fidelity. In spite of all discrepancies with the sweetheart she forgives her sweetheart's excesses of conduct: «Л.: Образив, тому що любить. Він умре, коли я поїду. А зостанусь – зненавидить знову» («L.: He has abused me because he loves me. He'll die when I depart. And if I remain he'll hate me again») (act 3). The last words immediately precede Shalimov's suicide supporting her certitude as to his love.

As to Shalimov, his tragedy is initiated with a seemingly unimportant detail: «Ш.: Розбили мою нову лампу!» («Sh.: They have broken my new lamp!») (act 1). The lamp becomes the metonymic abstraction of individual freedom. That this concept of

freedom is inherent for Shalimov's character can be proved in his contestation with his rival Malvanov: «Ш.: З мене досить того простору, що може освітлювати моя лампа» («Sh.: For me the space suffices that my lamp can enlighten»). «М.: ...потрібно простори, в яких не заходить сонце» («M.: we need spaces where there are no sunsets») (act 1). The last cue is an overt allusion to the definition of the empire of Karl V. At the same time it makes reminding the famous lines from T. Shevchenko's «The Sleep» concerning the monument of Peter 1: «А він руку простягає / Мов світ увесь хоче / Загарбати» («And he stretches out his arm as if he would want to catch the whole world»). With these allusions the seeming heroism of Malvanov's philosophy of action becomes dethroned. Of an importance is Malvanov's refusal from his love to Lyubusha in the cue that shows him as a simple seducer: «Коли той безумець повернув її назад – до своєї могили – я зрозумів, якою помилкою була ця любов для нас обох» («When that madman has returned her back to his grave I understand what an error was this love for us both») (act 4). The falsehood of this utterance about the grave becomes evident because it is already known that Lyubusha is pregnant and waits a child from Shalimov.

And finally the initial weakness of Lyubusha is clearly refuted with her last cue addressed to the seducer Malvanov when she is already pregnant from the dead Shalimov and waits for the future child: «Ні, тепер я не зовсім самотня, Ігорє. В мене вже є з ким іти. Це моя пісня і моя дитина <...> Можливо, вони ще зйдуться колись, наші шляхи. Але поки, але поки вони не зійшлися, і не треба їх з'єднувати насильно» («No, now I am not fully alone, Ihor. I have already with whom to go. It is my song and my child <...> Perhaps they will gather together sometime, our ways. But till now, but till now they aren't converged, and one oughtn't to make them converge forcibly») (act 4). These are extremely strong words against the false industrial pathos personified by Malvanov. The noblest human mission of motherhood is opposed to the spiritless philosophy of activity. The principal conflict of drama takes place between Lyubusha and

КОНТЕКСТ

Malvanov that represent the ideas of pure love and of false heroism of activity. The ideal of Lyubusha turns to be much more persuasive.

«The Name» (1937, in the remade version «The Oath», 1949) represents a complicated interplay with the typical schemes of different generic species of drama. At one side it seems to follow the detective story, meanwhile it rejects at least two obligatory peculiarities of the canonic detective composition. Firstly, the crime is demonstrated for the spectators in the particular scene – the murder of the medical scientist Hrechukhin (who has invented an effective remedy against epilepsy) by his enemy Lipski and the robbery of his papers simulated as a suicide (act 1, scene 2.4). Secondly, the investigation of the crime and the very detection of the murderer actually fail and are replaced with the defense of the authorship of the invention and its implementation accomplished by the scientist's daughter Zhura. Therefore one encounters here crime without punishment. Subsequently it lacks the standard happy end that would crown the successful investigation. The falsehood remains active with very pessimistic implications.

At another side the work resembles the so called «drama of honor» (that has been developed in particular by V. Vynnychenko [10]), but in opposite to honor it is quite other human qualities that are defended. Of an extreme importance is in this respect the dialogue between the scientist and his daughter about the future fate of the invention (act 1, scene 2.3) immediately before the scene of the pretended suicide. The daughter Zhura recollects the history of the building of the Strasbourg temple that becomes a genuine parable. She mentions the story of the constructor and continues: «...у нього була дочка і звали її Сабіна. І вона допомагала йому будувати <...> І ось бачиш – собор стоїть і досі, а про неї ніхто не чув ...Я б хотіла брати участь у якійсь великій, великій роботі» («...he had a daughter who was called Sabine. And she assisted him to build <...> And now you see – the temple stands till now, and nobody has ever heard about her <...> I would like to participate in some great, great work»). It is ACTION, DEED instead of HONOR that is appreciated

as the most important in this explanation. This feminine person incarnates the concept of honor conceived as the ACTION to which the life is dedicated. She prefers to victimize the name and honor (as well as her personal love as it happens for her to fall in love with the son of her enemy) in favor of ACTION.

The events are summed up in the final monologue (act 3, scene 7) where the murderer is disclosed (but without special consequences). Zhura: «...я знайшла вбивцю <...> Він сказав Гречухіну: “а, ти хочеш моєї смерті, тобі вигідно усунути суперника” <...> Тоді Гречухін зробив великий вчинок. Щоб мати право плюнути в обличчя <...> він зрікся свого авторства. Злочинець скористався цим і вбив Гречухіна. В боротьбі він загубив одну з своїх запонок, дорогоцінну ізумрудну ящірку <...> Кілька днів тому я випадково побачила таку саму ящірку в галстуці в одного іноземця» («...I have found the murderer <...> He said to Hrechukhin: oh, thou want my death, it will be profitable for thee to remove the rival <...> And then Hrechukhin committed a great deed. To have the right of spitting in the face <...> he has renounced his authorship. The offender has availed himself of it and killed Hrechukhin. During the struggle he has lost one of his cuff-links, a valuable lizard of emerald <...> Some days ago I saw the same lizard at the necktie of one foreigner»). The consequences of the disclosure don't follow. Only in the epilogue (4.2) it is mentioned that «...студентка виліковує від епілепсії сина знаменитого Стоней» («...the student cures the son of the famous Stoney»). Thus a kind of «sad detective», of efforts without victory is related where the presence of evil forces leaves the world dangerous in the same manner as in the already mentioned plays: the solution remains open for time.

«The Truth» (1948) gives a version of the previous plot where the thief comes to the scientist's daughter already after the death of scientist, and his intentions are detected by her friend Nina Almazyan (of Armenian origin) who rescues her. The connection of the both works is attested in particular with the circumstance that the chief antagonist (the murderer in the previous case) bears

IHOR YUDKIN-RIPUN. ABSTRACTION OF DAILY LIFE AS THE BASIS OF THE TESTUAL INTEGRATION...

the same name – Lipski. The mentioned Nina incarnates the redemption as Nemesis of the myth and becomes the protagonist. The paradoxical fate of this work is aggravated with the complication of its creative history. There are in the archive of the playwright in the T. Shevchenko Institute of Literature of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine some manuscripts that build up the earliest versions of the work. In particular one could point to the manuscripts of the Fund 103 № 29 dated with the 10th of October, 1917 year as the 4th act of the drama (4 pages and 1 insertion), and № 28 also of the 1917 year (without more precise date) as the 3d act (6 pages with one insertion). N. B. Kuzyakina has suggested to identify them as the parts of the drama that the playwright mentioned under the title «The Woman without Face» in the enumeration of his works in 1944 year [5, p. 40]. Besides, she mentions (without further references) that «the critics did call it conventionally 'Doctor Muss' (from the name of the principal dramatis persona)» [5, p. 40]. The first two acts would then be the manuscripts № 27 (21 pages) and № 30 (28 pages) that were rewritten in the 1920s. Then it appears that the text was being transformed for thirty years and retains now the vestiges of metamorphoses.

All they demand particular researches that would become a task for future. As to the events of the latest (and published) version of the play it is worth stressing that it goes about personal vindication and not societal obligations that propel the action. Nina recognizes Lipski as the murderer of her husband three decades ago. Of importance are also the cues of Lipski that literally repeat those of Karfunkel in «The Masters of Time»: «Doors are open for air and idiots» (2.2.4) and «Chaos knocks at the door» (3.4). It underlines the inheritance of the images of evil as the vehicles of abstractions.

«The Choice» (1938) arrogantly depicts the Great Terror with its atmosphere of irresolution and hesitation, and the justification of the arrested scientist is treated as a kind of wondrous event in the manner of baroque miracle. The protagonist – the scientist's wife Vera – ventures to give to the institute the packet left by her husband because she is disappointed with her friend and is in the

state of depression that becomes the abstract motivational force. The essence of conflict is conceived as a purely personal risk of adultery whereas societal circumstances become only the pretext. The husband (scientist) gives a packet for her wife Vera to hide during his absence. The scene ends with his eloquent cue: «Зрада – це наклеп на жінок» («Treason is the calumny against women») (1.4). It is worth reminding that the cited words allude to the famous Shakespearean utterance (*Frailty, thy name is woman*). There is still more important implication: with the cue the motif of sexual behavior comes into play. The husband utters in reality his certitude as to the risk of adultery and not only of the papers' fate.

Meanwhile Vera has the boyfriend Yavorsky, and it is the development of their reciprocal sentiments that plays the key role for her decision to bring the husband's papers to the institute. The immediate provocative impetus gives the conversation of the heroine with Zina who also has a boyfriend together with the husband and hesitates as to her sentiments. Vera remarks concerning these attitudes: «Тільки ж хіба <...> ваш хазяїн, що може прогнати вас за кепську поведінку» («When only <...> your master that can drive you away for your bad behavior») (2.2). Thus the motif of seeming dependence arises that gradually gains intensification. In the next scene the heroine reflects already over her own state: «То невже ж я повинна соромитися своєї любові і шкрябатися у двері» («Whether I must be ashamed with my love and to scratch at the doors») (2.3).

All it prepares the arrival of Yavorsky who brings the message about the pretended arrest of the heroine's husband with a cynical joy and the restrained retort of the heroine. «Яв.: Доля вирішила за нас. Це її подарунок» («Jav.: The fortune has decided for our favor, It is her gift»). «В.: Та пожалійте мене! Дайте мені розібратися в моїх думках» («V.: Have a pity for me! Give me the license of coping with my thoughts»). «Яв.: Корюся, бо знаю, що ви далі згадаєте про мене» («Jav.: I obey because I know that you'll remind me»). The next message refutes the precedent one, it turns out that the husband has not been arrested. Then

КОНТЕКСТ

it is this self-confidence and impudence of the boyfriend that make the heroine again to change her mind. Her monologues in the 3d act give the bright examples of the so called psychological protection where the self-justification is provided with the appeal to sublime and pathetic expressions. The verdict as to Yavorsky becomes the decisive argument: «*І весь час тільки про себе*» («And he always thinks of himself only») (3.5). The conflict between Vera and her husband, results in reconciliation, where the transportation of the husband's papers in institute is motivated with feminine curiosity and the disappointment in the risk of adultery.

«The Night Alarm» (1943) is the parable on the contestation for the fate of the adult son Orestes (who serves in the air forces) between the woman that has born the son (Lyubovytska) and the woman that has brought him up (Eugenia). The solution praises the educator in opposite to the native person, and it has given for N. Kuzyakina the pretext to accuse the author with the artificial plot (Eugenia and Orestes are reconciled immediately before her death) and to remark that «Eugenia conceals her cowardly hatred to Lyubovytska» [5, p. 203]. Meanwhile to come to such conclusion would ignore the existence of a deeper and more essential layer of the drama and to reduce it to the well known parable about the feminine rivalry. There exists still one person who not only observes the events but participates in them as the sympathizer of Orestes. It is Eugenia's adopted girl Lena (Helene, Heltsya) who becomes the arbitrator and the bride of Orestes. Strangely enough, E. Starynkevych also has not observed the importance of Helene, neither has she mentioned her [8, p. 85–87]. Meanwhile one could say about the effect of scene upon scene that is staged before Helene who can be regarded as the protagonist of the work.

First of all, it is Lena (Helene) who becomes the only person meeting Lyubovytska, Orestes and Eugenia, and who says the truth in the exposition of the drama: «Л.: *Як вам не соромно! Зустріти так сина, та ще пораненого <...> Тепер я вірю тому, що казала ця жінка <...> Рідна мати не вижене сина з дому*» («L.: For shame! To meet your

son in such a manner who is wounded. Now I believe to what this woman has said. The native mother won't drive her son away from the home»). It is only after this exclamation that Eugenia is informed on the arrival of her rival. Then Helene participates in the decisive scene (2.7) with the recognition of Orestes' visit to Lyubovytska (who didn't recognize him): «Л.: *Моя хустка! <...> для чого ж ви тоді брешете, що не бачили його в очі! <...> Та це ж був він, Орест!*» («L.: My kerchief! <...> Then what for do you lie that you hadn't seen him with your eyes! It is Orestes who has been there!»). And at last, Helene determines the events in the final scenes with Eugenia's daughter: «Л.: *Цей юнак <...> Що приходив до вас поранений <...> Це ж Орест <...> син вашої матері*» («L.: This lad that came to us being wounded <...> He is Orestes, your mother's son»). It would be reasonable to define the decisive conflict of drama as that between Helene and Lyubovytska which is easily identifiable as that between mother and bride (or, furthermore, of mother-in-law and wife).

«The Exam in Anatomy» (1940) demonstrates the examination of the relations between the poet Shelest and the professor Nina Topolya. Shelest has come to the town where Nina works now, whom he knew earlier, but now he gets incidentally acquaintance and falls in love with the student Tamara who has left her bag in the hotel. The situation is complicated still with the facts that Shelest has the rival professor Tovstolis who has expelled his son from home together with his bride Lena, at the same time Tamara has Nina's son Max as her sweetheart and must pass exam at Nina. It is worth mentioning that these complications give opportunities for very bitter realistic pictures of societal relations taken without decorations as in the complaint of Lena for Shelest: «Л.: *Мене звільнили <...> За <...> за ваш номер <...> Я поки влаштувалася до подруги. А Стьопа нема де. Хоч консерваторію кидай <...> Я хотіла побалакати з батьком мужа <...> Кажуть, що це під впливом однієї <...> однієї жінки*» («L.: I'm dismissed. Due to your apartment. I have managed for the time being to settle at my friend. And Styopa has nothing to do. As if to end with his studentship in the

IHOR YUDKIN-RIPUN. ABSTRACTION OF DAILY LIFE AS THE BASIS OF THE TESTUAL INTEGRATION...

conservatory. I wanted to have a chat with my husband's father. It is said to be done under the influence of one woman») (2.3). Such bitter picture of misfortunes is very seldom in the literature of the epoch and attests I. Kocherha's critical viewpoint.

The situation is rescued due to Nina's resolution of rejecting Tovstolis' courtesies in the conversation: «Н.: ...коли всі навколо говорять, що це я примусила вас вигнати сина, – то, воля ваша, – це вже не забобони <...> Нам з вами час зрозуміти, що любов – це не звичайний термін <...> як це роблять недосвідчені лікарі, наприклад, з подагрою» («N.: When all around say that I compelled you to drive your son away from home – then, if you please – these are prejudices no more. It is high time for us to understand that the love – it is not a usual term in the kind of, say, gout»). «Т.: Жодна хвороба не зустрічається в чистому вигляді» («T.: Any illness does not appear in pure outlook»). «Н.: Ну, якщо любов, по-вашому, хвороба, тоді лікуйтесь» («N.: Well, if you keep love for illness, then cure yourself») (2.5). The heroine wins moral victory because she discloses the ability of critical evaluation of her own deeds. After the exam of Tamara she confesses to herself: «Н. (сама): В мене немає молодості, але як я могла забути своє вище благо – честь ученого» («N.: I have no youth, but how could I forget my highest boon – that of the scientist's honor») (3.1). It lacks happy end in the play, and the solution of the conflict between Shelest and Nina remains unfound. As earlier the presence of time is presupposed that would bring the solution.

«The Chinese Flask» (1944) as a fairy play introduces in the contemporary customary life the magic oriental thing that makes sleep those opening it and detects the genuine nature of them. The protagonist here is the painter Susan whose relations to the poet Ocheret are tested with the disappearances and the finds of the flask. The initial event is reported in a story retold by the owner of the flat Kryvtsova where live the resettled persons from the house destructed after the bombardment (the action takes place during the war): «...заходжу в антикварний

магазин <...> На полиці стоїть мій флакон <...> та в нас цей флакон тридцять років <...> Скільки не пробували відкривати, не піддається» («...I enter the old curiosity shop. There stands my flask on a shelf <...> it is thirty years at us, this flask <...> How many times did one try to open it, it didn't yield») (1.7). Then different messages arrive with the demands of giving the flask to scientists. Thereafter Kryvtsova suddenly manages to open the flask and falls into sleep (2.3), her neighbor Sima steals the flask when Ocheret sleeps after having opened it (2.6), then he departs in searches for it, Susan is suspected, meanwhile she finds it under Sima's kerchief (3.9), Ocheret returns and sums up the events: «В цьому чудесному флаконі живе така сама сила, як та, що чарує нас в поезії <...> Зникає все випадкове <...> а все правдиве виникає з новою силою» («There lives in this flask the same power that enchants us in poetry. All occasional disappears and all genuine reappears with new force») (4.6).

There is no action while it is replaced with wondrous disappearances and returns of the flask. Indeed in the drama the so called reduced action is introduced where the heroes endure examinations as to their qualities instead of pursuing their active purposes. In particular it concerns the love between Ocheret and Susan that endures purification as in the analogous situation in «The Exam in Anatomy». Here the active heroes depend upon the circumstances that disclose their inner deep abilities. In this respect the play can be regarded as the drama of fate. It is the flask that assists in discovering these abilities as the incarnation of the upper forces. The Fortune becomes the invisible dramatis persona that take parts in the events and brings redemptions for the heroes' life.

These examples bring persuasive witness as to the fact that I. Kocherha took wide advantages of dramatic abstractions in his narrative strategy. The peculiarity of dramatic text as the personification of conflict procures to the disposal of the playwright the opportunities of dealing with abstract ideas behind the portraits of dramatis personae and respectively to stay in certain remoteness from

КОНТЕКСТ

actual realities of the contemporaneity. The details of personal behavior give pretext for the abstraction of ideals represented with persons and for discussion about them comparatively independent from the actual demands.

This comparative freedom in constructing ideals has resulted in the unexpected prevalence of feminine dramatis personae that have become the undisputable protagonists of the playwright. We have seen the whole gallery of extremely beautiful feminine protagonists – Mokryna, Lydia, Lyubusha, Zhura, Vera, Helene, Nina, Susan, not to mention the secondary dramatis personae. Such exploration of feminine psychology is very singular under the conditions of the epoch. All they are marked with the prevalence of tragic features attesting the evident disagreement with the official optimistic doctrines.

In delineating these portraits the writer uses the most widespread and customary utterances reconsidered in abstracted plane. Subsequently the ordinary situations become the metonymic designations of abstract notions. The author becomes able to leave far away the realities of contemporary life and to explore its essence within the abstract space. The unity of a work is determined with such abstractions that are to be found and incarnated in the respective personalities. The basis of this unity becomes delineated with the interrelations of the dramatis personae as the incarnations of such abstractions.

Sources

1. *Василько В. С.* Фрагменти режисури / Василь Степанович Василько. – Київ : Мистецтво, 1967. – 384 с.

2. *Касевич В. Б.* Семантика. Синтаксис. Морфологія / Вадим Борисович Касевич. – Москва : Наука, 1988. – 312 с.

3. *Кочерга І. А.* Моя робота над п'єсою / Іван Антонович Кочерга // *Кочерга І. А.* Радість мистецтва. Збірник театральної публіцистики. Рецензії, статті, промови. – Київ : Мистецтво, 1973. – С. 53–57.

4. *Кочерга І. А.* Із творчої спадщини (1939) / Іван Антонович Кочерга // *Кочерга І. А.* Радість мистецтва. Збірник театральної публіцистики. Рецензії, статті, промови. – Київ : Мистецтво, 1973. – С. 65–87.

5. *Кузякіна Н. Б.* Драматург Іван Кочерга. Життя. П'єси. Вистави / Наталя Борисівна Кузякіна. – Київ : Радянський письменник, 1968. – 260 с.

6. *Мамонтов Я. А.* Театральна публіцистика / Яків Андрійович Мамонтов. – Київ : Мистецтво, 1967. – 328 с.

7. *Свербілова Т. Г.* П'єси Івана Кочерги та проблема визначення соцреалізму як масової культури / Тетяна Георгіївна Свербілова // *Слово і Час.* – 2006. – № 10. – С. 8–21.

8. *Старинкевич Є. І.* Драматургія Івана Кочерги / Єлизавета Іванівна Старинкевич. – Київ : Мистецтво, 1947. – 116 с.

9. *Хороб С. І.* Типологія символізму в драматургічних творах Івана Кочерги і зарубіжна драматургія / Степан Іванович Хороб // *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія : Філологія. Соціальні комунікації.* – 2013. – Вип. 1 (29). – С. 205–210.

10. *Юдкін-Ріпун І.* Від сценічної репетиції до літературного тексту: джерела струменя свідомості в творах В. Винниченка / Ігор Юдкін-Ріпун // *Студії мистецтвознавчі.* – 2015. – Чис. 2. – С. 7–23.

11. *Юдкін-Ріпун І.* Неокласицизм Максима Рильського як феномен української культури / Ігор Юдкін-Ріпун // *Студії мистецтвознавчі.* – 2015. – Чис. 3. – С. 80–87.

12. *Юдкін-Ріпун І.* Аспектні особливості прози С. Васильченка як джерело сценічних можливостей / Ігор Юдкін-Ріпун // *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Серія : Філологія.* – Одеса, 2015. – Вип. 14. – С. 48–51.

13. *Юдкін-Ріпун І.* Ієрархія предикатів у готичній поезії Івана Франка / Ігор Юдкін-Ріпун // *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Серія : Філологія.* – Одеса, 2016. – Вип. 24. – Т. 1. – С. 78–82.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Головні досягнення І. Кочерги звичайно вбачають в історичних драмах, натомість його побутові та «проблемні» п'єси перебувають поза увагою дослідників. Утім, заборона між 1927 та 1940 роками принаймні трьох його творів на тогочасні теми свідчить про «езопову мову», яка потребує спеціального аналізу. Коли М. Рильський вдавався в ліриці до вербального маскування (зокрема, у використанні стилістичних цитат), то для виявлення прихованого змісту в драматичному творі потрібно враховувати метасистему абстракцій, необхідних для цілісності самого тексту. Зокрема, вибудовуються абстракції ситуацій

IHOR YUDKIN-RIPUN. ABSTRACTION OF DAILY LIFE AS THE BASIS OF THE TESTUAL INTEGRATION...

(сюжетів) на основі ієрархії предикатів та абстракції суб'єктів (персонажів). Такий підхід дозволяє простежити перетворення характерних деталей на символи шляхом метонімії як найбільш придатного для театру засобу.

Так, у п'єсі «Натура й культура» (заборонена в 1928 р.) ситуація примирення розлученої жінки – селянки Мокрини – з другом, що стає нареченим її доньки, відсилає до абстракції так званої дарованої благодаті з барокової драми (відтвореної також у фіналі «Назара Стодоли» Т. Шевченка). Мокрина персоніфікує абстракцію жертви і виявляє беззахисність перед її антагоністом – чоловіком, залишаючи очікування небезпеки (як у тогочасній прозі С. Васильченка). Драма «Майстри часу» (первинна назва – «Годинникар і курка», під якою була заборонена в 1933 р.) подає екзистенціальну ситуацію людини між нездоланим плином часу та марнотою повсякдення. Головний персонаж – Лідія – демонструє трагічну долю, що розчиняється в хаосі марноти, символізованого курником. Драма «Підеш – не вернешся» (1935 р., як і попередня версія «Викуп», 1924 р.) постає як рання романтична трагедія долі: один з коханців «любовного трикутника» вчиняє самогубство, звістка про яке змушує вертатися героїню (а також, у пізнішій версії – другого коханця) з мандрівки і рятує життя, оскільки потяг зазнає катастрофу. Центральний персонаж – Любуша – постає як алегорія жіночого стоїцизму, за зовнішніми ознаками «слабого» характеру, виявляє незламність перед випробуваннями долі. «Ім'я» (1937 р., у переробленому варіанті – «Клятва», 1949 р.) становить «драму честі» (розвинену, зокрема, В. Винниченком), де здійснюється гра з каноном детективу: замість розслідування злочину він демонструється в окремій сцені (вбивство науковця з викраденням його паперів, симульоване як самогубство), а викриття вбивці поступається місцем захисту авторства донькою науковця – Шурою. Саме цей жіночий персонаж втілює розуміння честі як справи, якій присвячено життя. «Істина» (1948) подає варіант попереднього сюжету, але крадій приходиться до хворої доньки вже покійного науковця, а розкриває його наміри і рятує її приятелька – Ніна. Саме вона уособлює помсту як міфологічна Немезида і стає протагоністом твору. Драма «Вибір» (1938 р., заборонена 1940 р. після трьох вистав) зухвало змальовує ситуацію років Великого Терору, позначену непевністю й хитаннями, а виправдання звинуваченого науковця подається за схемою дива барокового міраклю. Центральний персонаж – дружина науковця Віра – наважується передати залишений її чоловіком пакет до інституту через розчарування в другові, у стані депресії, що постає абстрактною мотиваційною силою.

«Нічна тривога» (1943) є притчею про сперечання жінки, яка народила сина, з тією, яка його виховала. Така абстракція подається очима спостерігачки – своєрідного арбітра, усиновленої дівчини Гелени, яка стає нареченою цього сина. «Екзамен з анатомії» (1940) демонструє драму випробування стосунків професора Ніни Тополі та поета Шелеста. Перемагає Тополя, яка знаходить здатність критичної оцінки власних учинків. Окреме місце посідає феєрія «Китайський флакон» (1944), де в сучасному побуті знаходиться чарівний далекосхідний предмет, який виявляє справжнє єство тих, хто його відкриває. У цій драмі випробування центральний персонаж – художниця Сусанна, ставлення до якої поета Очерета випробовується зникненням і знайденням флакона.

Отже, звичайні побутові ситуації стають метонімічними позначеннями абстрактних уявлень. Автор здобуває можливість відходити далеко від реалій сучасності й досліджувати суть явищ в абстрактному просторі. Єдність твору визначається саме такими абстракціями, які необхідно відтворити. Її основою стають взаємини між персонажами як втіленнями абстракцій.

Ключові слова: метасуб'єкт, сюжет, дійова особа, персоніфікація, ідеал, конфлікт, мотив.