

LITERATURE

Classification of the image of an artist in the novel by Y. Stelmakh “Blue Car”

L. I. Sydorenko

National Aviation University

Corresponding author. E-mail: lesia.sydorenko@ukr.net

Paper received 23.09.16; Accepted for publication 05.10.16.

Abstract: The article considers classification forms of metadrama, characteristics of peculiarities of auto reflection of the literature, which are determined by the search for a new identity by the art of word. In the result of the investigation each model of self identification, which is used in the dialogue by Yaroslav Stelmakh is find out, where in practice sign meta code is being made and also peculiarities of auto reflection of the literature, which are determined by the search of new identity by the art of word in the demolition of cultural and artistic paradigms, are summarized.

Key words: *classification of image, meta discourse, metadrama, metacode, innovation of form, typological features, auto reflection of the literature.*

One of the challenging aspects of literature studies is discovery of classification forms of metadrama, characteristics of peculiarities of auto reflection of literature, which are determined by the search of a new identity by the art of word.

«New wave» of dramaturgy absorbed artistic searches of writers-innovators Y. Stelmakh, P. Vysotsky, Y. Vereshchak, M. Virginska, L. Khorolets, A. Dyachenko and others. It represents a difficult and not thoroughly examined phenomenon. The aim of this article is a try to separate classification models of artistic self-determination of the artist, diversify author's attitude towards them in drama by Y. Stelmakh “Blue Car”.

The novel “Blue Car” was created on the edge of 1980-1990s. The wide discussion of the novel started after its publishing in the journal “Contemporary Dramaturgy” in 1991. The writing influenced much the formation of monodrama and peculiarities of metadrama in Russian and Ukrainian literature.

One of the models, discovered in the result of the investigation, is a model which we qualify as “aesthete”, underlining its connection with re-thinking of traditional for Romanticism and Modernism view of the poet. Aesthete “A” names oneself and the hero of one of the invented subjects – an artist, apart from that, the writer uses this example periodically appealing to creation of images of artistic personalities.

The existing of the fatal characteristic of the artist by the high spirits is a stock phrase, expression of the some weak point, illness, extravagance, dramatic subject of fate, which allows him and others to understand exclusiveness and special aim of this person. As it is underlined by the researchers of the transition period (A. Toynbee, N. Khrenov, S. Moskovichi) the attention to these signs is especially distinctive for the transition times, as exit of the artist from the periphery to the centre of the culture's concept sphere. Frequently, “great artists enter the world of culture with the aura of heretic. But after time passes the image of heretic is able to transform into the image of charismatic leader, who becomes the centre of attention. <...> he is more close to utopia than to ideology”. This occasion puts the artist in the special situation towards power, on the one hand, and towards society, on the other hand. It is clear that on the first stage of his activity the artist is lonely and exists in isolation. But this loneliness becomes a special precondition for his transformation into charismatic leader. Placing oneself in opposition towards

power the marginal artist provokes activation of collective unconsciousness in the mind of the society.

The writer “A” chooses doubtful problem – genius artist suffers from AIDS, which should touch the reader, his fears and make the writing more conceptual. The existence of these “signs” of exclusiveness has principal character for “A”, proves difficulty in matching of the same characteristics for the heroine. She is idealized and has not to have physical or psychical problems, but her surrounding creates the corresponding projection. Pressing in and exaggeration of problems, “signs” of exclusiveness creates a comic effect and states a question in subtext about the essence and re-thinking of the initial ideas about the marginality in transition time. “Her father is handicapped, mother is in a psychiatric hospital, brother is an alcoholic...no, too obvious. Drug addict! Also is...Glue-sniffer, or what? Homosexual? Hell, who is her brother? I will think later. Dissident? No, it's too positively perceived. And the secretary of district party committee. No, regional committee. The first one [Stelmakh, 1991, 60].

Let us underline apophatic (from the opposite) way of thought delivery, which allows to avoid pathos and didacticism. Here Y. Stelmakh frequently uses absurdism. Thus traditional romantic and modernist conflict of the artist with the world travesties to the battle of the hero with pigeons, which detain him to work in “the tower made from elephant ivory” and personify rudeness of the external reality. Let us draw attention to how in fantasies “A” romantic motives noteless grow into heavy-footed and naturalistic, that fully discredits aesthetic discourse. “Penthouse! <...> pigeons ... He poisoned pigeons a while ago: stupid mumbling, spiritual emptiness, primitivism of thinking, live fully based on their instincts, no fly, I tell about creative, they deliver something, some infection. And defecate. On benches. It is ugly to watch. To add they stare at one another. Have not seen each other for a long time! Go to hell! They traumatize the soul of aesthete”. [Stelmakh, 1991, 60].

Model of aesthete is used several times with growing and variation of semantics. For instance, in the third subject romantic and modernist example is driven to extremes and simultaneously is combined with national perceptions about victims of creativity and symbolic demonism. The hero is bare boned, unshaved, there is a frightening fire burning in his eyes, which, on the one hand, can burn to ashes all humankind, and on the other hand show fanatic focus on serving to this humankind.

In contrast to landmark “aesthete” the parody model “writer-gastarbeiter” is used. This artist knows for sure what the mass reader expects from the “literature” (love scenes, adventures, entertainment, scandalous behavior) and tries to realize own commercial projects. This model is fully discredited in monologues which comment the process of text modeling. For instance: “And now is the most exciting: love scene for forty minutes <...> Here close a “Kamasutra” was placed (comes closer to shelves, searches). Now we will use scandalous behavior <...>” [Stelmakh, 1991, 60].

Accent is being made on artificiality, combined pseudo literature text. For instance, stock phrases are placed on the necklace of love intrigue. Sometimes, feeling with exaggeration the writer “A” uses contrasts to something that doesn’t correspond with world literature formulas, but then still comes to banality. These contrasts only make the situation weirder and show the aim far from creativity. As an example can be used the scene of love hero to seduce and the logic of new-old turn of “victim” love intrigue with reeducation of the villain and keeping of women’s virginity. “<...> in the soul of this villain something appears <...> But why he is called a villain? Because it’s more efficient. What is interesting about that good well-brought up people meet? But try to be a villain and try to wake up something pure, humane!” [Stelmakh, 1991, 60].

The writer of this type easily changes subjects, characters, transforming literature into plastic material. He can assure himself in everything and justifies everything. This model is the lowest point in spectrum of examples of artist’s identification. The hero as a person and writer is more complicated than the scheme and is in inner conflict with this model.

Easy change of roles brings together Khlestakov and “A”. But in the novel by Y. Stelmakh there is visible and important difference of the hero-writer’s character and literature example. While the hero of “The Inspector” is an inner empty person, “A” has a contrast side of the character; he is existentially fulfilled with important memories and thoughts, which noteless for him formed a personality and give chance for development, inner growth. Associations with Khlestakov make weirder only one negative tendency of possible dynamics, prove from the opposite no perspectives for such creative behaviour and show author’s position regarding creativity and models of the artist.

Y. Stelmakh models opposite pairs in the spectrum of the artist’s models which demonstrate connections of mutual addition, contrast and weirdness. This proves the system character of artistic solution of the problem of artistic identification.

In our opinion, one can distinguish the following pairs of oppositions: first – “true creator” / “graphomaniac”, other – “genius” / “lack of talent”, the third –high “romantic madman” / heavy-footed type “miser”.

Let’s closer examine semantic filling of each of the oppositions and their correlation.

“A” tries to play role of “true creator”, therefore from time to time he performs with moral sentences and loves to think about special difficulty and responsibility of art of word comparing to other languages of culture. But hero quickly gives away, envies to those who he considers

have a more easy life and unconsciously enlightens complex of own less value. The responsibility of the writer and his special mission lowers to unfair burden, which irritates the hero. “A” in his throes of creation envies to painters, which, to his mind, can not to think, but to change flowers in still-life paintings depending on mood and only them create something new. He envies composers because their works can’t be comprehended (something like “pa-ba-ba-ba!!”), and as for him, a literature worker, he needs to invent subjects and speak about characters and circumstances, what “A: actually does by “synthesizing though” at reader’s eyes. But in critical auto reflection “A” recognizes that these feelings are unworthy of “true creator” and returns once again to his role.

Contrast part of the pair – “graphomaniac”. As a proof to this one can use texts which “A” originates. But this model is fixed in auto reflection of the hero. The thoughts about own lack of talent diminish literature worker, becomes the point of pain and inner conflict of self determination. For instance, the writer deeply suffers from that all themes and motives are, to his mind, realized by someone else, frequently “A” doesn’t even notice it, contrary to the reader. But the pitiful discoveries of own secondariness also happen, which need excuse, explanations, accusations of others, philosophizing and modeling of certain type of artistic behaviour. “Hey, here is where I found myself, also this was. “Otello” (angry) And so what? All has taken place. There was nothing that didn’t happen. <...> they use and use the theme unashamed. The use and use...” [Стельмах, 1991, 70]. The exit from the situation is seen in remaking, re-phrasing of already opened, in the end, not to notice the same things. Let us note that Y. Stelmakh not only comprehends the “graphomaniac” type, but shows the information shock, tiredness of culture, inability to invent something new, “the death of the author”, his transformation into “scriptor”, who remakes something already invented – principle problems for postmodern vision of the world. This vision of the world becomes weird itself, it is not accepted and is proved by contrast: the existence of realistic, tragedy plan of memories of the author, which noteless for him are transformed in innovative writing with bright personal origin.

The previous models are added by the opposition “genius” / “lack of talent”. The writer “A” in auto reflection “is caught” between two peaks of self identification. Once he thinks that he is genius (“my though works perfectly!”) [Стельмах, 1991, 64]), then – a lack of talent, as natural taste and common sense suggest the real evaluation of his “writings”. “To work! <...> this is the only way to reach success, recognition and realization of creative ideas. Which creative ideas, poor talent? During half of the day you can’t find the theme. No image, no character. Take Gogol, for instance. I come at Nevskiy and feel twenty themes with my nose. To tell you the truth, he had a nose far better than mine. <...> He beaten me.” [Stelmakh, 1991, 64].

Serious theme is carnivalised, the funny effect is deepened (the talent and success is correlated with the length of the nose), but all this doesn’t discredit, it shows the image of artistic searches and auto reflection, definition of stable artistic and moral priorities of the literature.

Comic modus of auto reflection marks another opposition “genius” (“king”) / “fool”, which, in researchers’

opinion is characteristic for postmodernism with its play and total irony. In "Blue Car" opposition is realized in memories which create philosophical deep and highly artistic text about House (and here the writer shows himself as a real creator) and in subjects of mass product (here hero ionizes) The marked contrast landmarks ("aesthete" / "gastarbeiter", "Khlestakov", "genius" / "graphomaniac") are correlated with such opposition but widen its semantic borders.

In particular, this widening of semantics one can see in differentia of contrast pair "madman" / "miser". The appearance of grotesque two-sided model in the novel reflects the overall liking of dramatist to unite contrast beginnings, high and low plans of existence and interpretation of creativity, appealing to carnival and replacing of the centre and periphery.

On the one hand, the writer identifies himself with high creator who falls into saint ecstasy. But, according to the will of the author, this sacrificing process lowers to the funny fantasizing and mixture in thoughts, stock phrases of formula literature, and subject lines of "gastarbeiter's" texts. This models the situation of parallel thinking, specific for schizophrenics. Thus, for instance, heroine of the first love "novel" has a husband from somewhere, who has to be taken away to develop the main romantic subject. The husband is transformed into genius inventor-looser who is well-known in the world (in Korea, Taiwan, who succeeded due to his inventions), but is wrecked by scientific circles at home until the total alcoholism. This twist in the subject surprises even the inventor "A", after the creative ecstasy he comes to mind. "Hey, stop, what about am I? And why is this jerk here? Some inventor...South Korea, Taiwan...here you don't know what is happening in your own head. Inventor! Well, well! Hell, how many times had I said to myself: buy a voice recorder, buy a voice recorder, don't be greedy, spackhead, when it is needed. Start work with a voice recorder, jerk" [Стельмах, 1991, 61].

The realization of this parallel schizophrenic thinking becomes the interaction of common, real and invented plans of existence. Frequently from common low reasons (absence of goods, queues, inability to place a child into kindergarten, the widening of women's figure after maternity) which the writer "A" is familiar with, grow unexpectedly into almost fantastic subjects of "soap operas", which claim to be romantic, to be high level. For instance, pushing off from complaints about the hardness of way of life and fatality of elegant artist to speak with the traders in order to buy tape recorder and other goods, "A" unexpectedly goes over to "romantic" subject: rich foreigner falls in love with post-Soviet woman in the queue for mayonnaise, and then after their separation looks for her in the queue for Pollock.

The high romantic model of the artist-madman who feels the connection with other words gained specific meanings of "schizophrenia discourse" in which the resistance to the press of foreign to the personality metanar-

rative is accented. Y. Stelmakh plays with this variant of reinterpretation. High model is connected not with "metastories", other aggressive ideas, powerful daily life, which rises to gigantic numbers. This daily life and low plan at all is shown in contrast model "miser". The greediness had not allowed to buy a voice recorder, and now "the artist" gets mixed up in his subjects, heroes, wonders to schizophrenic chaos, grotesque interaction of characters and therefore (and not a sacred service to the art) he feels himself "spackhead" and "jerk". Thus, romantic and modernist landmark of artist-"madman" and postmodernist "schizophrenic discourse" is rethought regarding the challenges of cultural crisis and contemporary for the author social deformations. Laughter rethinking is synthesized with serious landmark of "ancestor of classics" who is realized in auto reflection (starting with the memories about House. "A" recalls Dickens and Lev Tolstoy) and intertextual field. Writings of Pushkin, Proust, Kuprin, Chagall all the time appear in the memory of "A", fulfilling different functions, but they always remain unique and true criteria of evaluation of artistic works and the highest landmark for self identification of the writer.

Thus, metadiscourse of the writing forms wide intertextual field. The strategy of intertextuality is used by Y. Stelmakh with the aim of cultural self identification, differentiation of landmarks of artistic identification (for hero this is Proust, Tolstoy, Dickens, Chagalle) and parody. The effectiveness of auto reflection is tried and other means of creation of comic effect.

As a result of the investigation it is shown that each model absorbs sign ideas about traditions of artistic self identification and its today's variants, with them Yaroslav Stelmakh leads a dialogue. In fact a new sign metacode is created. Model "aesthete" shows the dialogue of the artist with modernist tradition. Model of "exclusive", "marked" and opposition "marginal" / "charismatic leader" shows transition artistic thinking of the writer and a try in apophatic way to higher status of literature in crisis times. Model "graphomaniac" demonstrates rethinking of postmodern thesis about "death of author", which is neutralized with the appearance of original text. In the same way the content field of postmodern opposition "genius" (king) / "fool" is widened by introducing the discourse of daily life and high artistic text, not affected by the total irony. Yaroslav Stelmakh introduces new image models of the artist: "gastarbeiter" and modified "Khlestakov", which reflect crisis realities of the end of the XX century. In general system he differs sign oppositions "true creator" / "graphomaniac", "genius" / "lack of talent", "romantic madman" / "miser". This differentiation of contrasts demonstrates transitional artistic thinking of dramatist of 'new wave'. Metadiscourse of the writing forms not only wide intertextual field, but also high theatricality (poses of the hero, roles that he plays) and literature using (author's reflection about the effectiveness of certain artistic means), which will be the subject of future research.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Бондарева О. Є. Міф і драма у новітньому літературному контексті: поновлення структурного зв'язку через жанрове моделювання. Монографія / О. Є. Бондарева. – К. : "Четверта хвиля", 2006. – 512 с.
2. Бондар Л. О. Творчість Ярослава Стельмаха в контексті "нової хвилі" української драматургії 80-х років ХХ століття. Автореф. дис. канд. філол. наук, 10.01.01 – українська література / Л. О. Бондар. – Херсон: Херсонський державний університет, 2007. – 20 с.

3. Эпштейн М. Постмодернизм в России. Литература и теория / М. Эпштейн. – М. : Изд-во Р. Элинина, 2000. – 368 с.
4. Мережинська Г. Ю. “Східноєвропейська” модифікація постмодернізму / Г. Ю. Мережинська // Філологічні семінари. – Вип. 5. – К. : Київськ. ун-т, 2002. – С. 16–25.
5. Московичи С. Век толп. Исторический трактат по психологии масс / Серж Московичи ; [пер. с франц.]. – М. : «Центр психологии и психотерапии», 1998. – 480 с.
6. Стельмах Я. Синий автомобиль / Ярослав Стельмах // Современная драматургия. – 1991. – №1. –С. 59–78.
7. Хренов Н. А. Культура в эпоху социального хаоса / Н. А. Хренов. – М. : Едиториал УРСС, 2002. – 448 с.

LITERATURE

1. Bondareva O.E. Myth and drama in the latest literary context, structural renovation communications through simulation genre. Monograph / OE Bondareva. - K: "Fourth Wave", 2006. P. 512 .
2. Bondar L.O. Yaroslav Stelmakh in works in the context of "new wave" Ukrainian drama 80s of the twentieth century. Author. Dis. candidate. Philology. Sciences, 10.01.01 - Ukrainian literature / L.O. Bondar Cooper. - Kherson: Kherson State University, 2007. P. 20 .
3. Epstein M. Postmodernism in. Literature and Theory / M. Epstein. - Moscow: Publishing House R. Эlynyna, 2000. P. 368.
4. Merezhinska G.Y "Eastern European" postmodern modification / G.Y Merezhinsky // Philological workshops. - Vol. 5 - K: Kyiv. University Press, 2002. - P. 16-25.
5. Moscovici S. Century crowd. Historically treatise on mass psychology / Serge Moscovici; [Lane. with the French.]. - M., "Center for Psychology and psychotherapy», 1998. P. 480.
6. Stelmakh J. Blue car / Yaroslav Stelmakh // Modern dramaturgy. - 1991. - №1. -WITH. 59-78.
7. Khrenov N.A Culture in the era of social chaos / N.A Khrenov. - Moscow: Edytoryal URSS, 2002. –P. 448 .

Типологізація образу художника в пьесе Я. Стельмаха «Синий автомобиль»

Л. И. Сидоренко

Аннотация. В статье рассмотрены типологические формы метадрaмы, характеристику особенностей авторефлексии литературы, обусловленные поиском искусством слова новой идентичности. В результате исследования выявлено каждую модель самоидентификации, с которыми Ярослав Стельмах ведет диалог, где фактически создается знаковый мета код, а также обобщенно особенности авторефлексии литературы, обусловленные поиском искусством слова новой идентичности на рубеже культурных и художественных парадигм.

Ключевые слова: типологізація образу, метадискурс, метадрaма, мета код, новаторство форми, типологіческие черты, авторефлексия литературы.