

УДК 821.161.2 Танюк – 94.09

PERCEPTION OF OLES HONCHAR'S PERSONALITY IN LES TANIUK'S DIARY «LIFE LINE»

Stadnichenko O.O., Candidate of Philological Science, Associate Professor

Zaporizhzhya national university, Zhukovsky str., 66, Zaporizhzhya, Ukraine

stadnichenkoo-1@ukr.net

The article is dedicated to the study of Les Taniuk's diary "Life Line" in terms of comprehension of writers' and artists' perceptions, specifically, Oles Honchar's perception. It is an endeavour to study of the characteristics of the author's narrative, its correlation with the content of historic realities described at the time, it was defined as a genre and specificity of the diary as a genre of memoir prose. A special attention is paid to the interpretation of the Oles Honchar's personality in the context of the events of the late 1960 s, associated with the Communist Party's criticism of the novel "The Cathedral". The article observes that the deliberations of L. Taniuk about O. Honchar demonstrates his deep understanding not only of Ukrainian literary processes, but also of the social and political situation in the 1960 s–70 s, which account for the creative activity of the author.

Key words: memoirs, diary, recollections, interpretation, canon, genre and stylistic specificity.

РЕЦЕПЦІЯ ПОСТАТІ ОЛЕСЯ ГОНЧАРА В «ЩОДЕННИКУ» ЛЕСЯ ТАНЮКА

Стадніченко О.О.

Запорізький національний університет, вул. Жуковського, 66, м. Запоріжжя, Україна

Стаття присвячена вивченню щоденника „Лінія життя” Л. Танюка з погляду осмислення особливостей рецепції постатей письменників, зокрема Олеса Гончара. Здійснено спробу дослідження особливостей авторської оповіді, співвіднесеності її змісту з історичними реаліями описуваного часу, визначено жанрово-стильову специфіку щоденника як жанру мемуарної прози. Особливу увагу приділено інтерпретації постаті Олеса Гончара в контексті подій кінця 1960-х рр., пов'язаних із компартійною критикою роману „Собор”. У статті зауважується, що роздуми Л. Танюка про О. Гончара свідчать про його глибоке розуміння особливостей не тільки українського літературного процесу, а й суспільно-політичної ситуації 1960-70-х рр., на які припадає творча активність письменника. Автор вважає, що цей твір може бути віднесеним до белетризованого типу щоденника, у якому попри те, що витримані норми щоденникового канону, наявні новаторські риси.

Ключові слова: мемуаристика, щоденник, спогади, інтерпретація, канон, проблематика, жанрово-стильова специфіка.

РЕЦЕПЦІЯ ЛИЧНОСТІ ОЛЕСЯ ГОНЧАРА В «ДНЕВНИКЕ» ЛЕСЯ ТАНЮКА

Стадніченко О.А.

Запорожский национальный университет, ул. Жуковского, 66, г. Запорожье, Украина

Статья посвящена изучению дневника „Линия жизни” Л. Танюка с точки зрения осмысления особенностей рецепции личностей писателей, в частности Олеса Гончара. Произведена попытка исследования авторского повествования, соотнесенности его содержания с историческими реалиями описываемого времени, определена жанрово-стилистическая специфика дневника как жанра мемуарной прозы. Особое внимание уделено интерпретации личности Олеса Гончара в контексте событий конца 1960-х годов, связанных с компартийной критикой романа „Собор”. В статье отмечается, что размышления Л. Танюка об Олесе Гончаре свидетельствуют о его глубоком понимании особенностей не только украинского литературного процесса, но и общественно-политической ситуации 1960-1970 годов, на которые приходится творческая активность писателя.

Ключевые слова: мемуаристика, дневник, воспоминания, интерпретация, канон, проблематика, жанрово-стилистическая специфика.

Diary as a meta-genre of memoir is in the focus of most literary critics both in terms of genre specific and concrete manifestations of each author. E.g., D. Zatonsky proposes to consider the diary “as a specific form of autobiographical and memoir genre. Because actually the author tells in the diary, about his own life and the lives of people with whom he met and talked” [1, p. 41]. Literary critic Olexandr Halych notes that “at the turn of the XX–XXI centuries diary covers different aspects of human life – from the recesses of the inner world of the author – up to the

reproduction at the landmark events of national and world history. The personal things interest the reader as much as the author's subjective vision of socio-historical processes at a critical stage of social evolution" [2, p. 21].

In Kotsiubynska's opinion, "diary implements a conscious or unconscious desire and true reality. This is his significance both for the author (interpretation of the luxury and self-awareness), and for the readers. The very fixation of the events, either external, real or internal (emotions, subjective impressions and reactions, psychological notes, world of individual emotions and introspection), is important as the act of cognition. These blocks built environment image, worldly atmosphere, the world of feelings and reactions. That is a self-portrait of the author and character of the day" [3, p. 21].

For example, Les Taniuk's diary "Life Line" contains fragments of nearly two hundred volumes of journals, covering all sorts of artistic events and socio-political life of 1960–1980-ies.

In the diary the character of the day is created through reproduction in chronological order with some frequency events that took place before the eyes of the author, and through their interpretation, firstly, actually by the author, and, secondly, through images and estimation of other participants.

An interesting feature of diaries is a reception of personalities of writers, artists and public figures. Then, apart from the author's image of a diary, we consider diverse system of emotional and evaluative judgments about his own colleagues who are somehow involved in his life and creative work, and cause him some reflection, worthy of being recorded in a diary. Often the author of the diary refers to the understanding of the nature and importance of a more or less significant figures in his life and society, especially what occurs during crucial moments in the political processes. The relevance of this article is to highlight the need for the reception of figures' features of writers and artists, including Oles Honchar in his memoirs of Ukrainian writers, e.g. the L. Taniuk's memoir. The purpose of the article is to analyse the diary "Life Line" by L. Taniuk in terms of revealing the reception of O. Honchar's figures in the context of Ukrainian literary and socio-political processes of the second half of the XX-eth century.

In his diary "Life Line" L. Taniuk attention is especially paid not only to the writers but also to the artists, including actors, directors, cultural workers of various ranks, thus creating quite varied, but at the same time an objective picture of life. Among those who inhabit living space in the diaries are: T. Shevchenko, M. Kulish, L. Kurbas, M. Bazhan, Yu. Smolych, O. Honchar, M. Rylskiy, A. Korniiichuk, V. Nekrasov, V. Wysotskii, A. Malyshko, H. Kuziakina, A. Horska and many others.

L. Taniuk, describing exile when he as a young director was forbidden to work in Ukrainian theaters, paid much attention to self-education, reading creative works and perceiving his role in society. On May 24, 1968 having read the "Diary" by Shevchenko, he notes: "There was no monument in Taras life with his strict static view as in Kiev, where he was down and out. He was a man, and nothing human was alien to him. I know the people who are disappointed by his «Diary». [...] For me, who cannot imagine the environment and epoch, the diary of Shevchenko did not scattered with things that emerges through poetry. Even more, in poetry he does not exhaust himself. Talent has never played on one string, talent is always a chord. Talent certainly, even at least slightly, mystifies. Because talent is the reincarnation of transformation (Kurbas - conversion)" [4, p. 187].

The Taniuk's diary "Life Line", in our judgment, is a meta-genre work, since it consists of notes, thoughts, letters, articles, reviews, journalistic assessments, excerpts from forthcoming works and author's own impressions of what was happening around. His reflections on concrete writers, assessment of their work under totalitarian system and the corresponding atmosphere in literature and art deserve professional attention. On reading the article about Ivan Dziuba by Malyshko A., L. Taniuk notes in his diary audacious and unexpected at that time things:

“Malyshko is a tool. A good tool. But tool. Well, are Tychyna and Rylskiy and Bazhan also tools? No, here lies the drama. Malyshko can even find refuge in raising his elbows. Tychyna lives on day in – day out cycle: people are completely different, completely” [4, p. 39]. And he continues: “Bazhan finds the draft of fresh air, sitting by Rilke and Holderlin. Rylskiy is a sage, he has understanding eyes, but he misses the «routine», he is there, with them, with the eternity. By nature Tychyna is apt for explosion, Bazhan is capable for memories, Rylskiy – for the general patron activity... But each of them is not asleep... Tychyna dreams of Kurbas, Rylskiy dreams of Zerov, Bazhan... I do not know if he sleeps at all. It’s not only Smolych who catches day by its coat-tails” [4, p. 39]. Separately, the author of the diary focuses on the meaning and value – artistic and social – memories of classical writers, who gave a clue to that time. “His memories (Smolych A.) is a selfless work... not some kind of self-image. Also, he is too dependent on his assessment of Ukrainian Olympus with its temperatures change on Olympus of today’s politics... It’s evident while analyzing when this or that part was written... does Maxim Tadeyovych write memories? He does not just have to remember that they might restore (at least in style) that day that they finished off. Today it is very necessary for us to understand them, the people of the XX-eth and thirties, to penetrate into their stories, understand them psychologically. Perhaps then we will feel the distance between literature and life, between the phantom and reality, between reality edited real” [4, p. 39].

As L. Taniuk’s diary was written in exile, mostly in Moscow, where he worked in various theaters, and felt something detached, judging as if from the other side, what happened in Ukraine, although through his deep knowledge of the state of Ukrainian literature and its individual most iconic representatives. His perspective seems quite objective, without personal bias and dependence on those about whom he writes. From this point of view his reflections about the classicist of Ukrainian literature O. Honchar in the very turning point of his work – when the novel “The Cathedral” was created.

In his note on January 17, 1968 Les Taniuk indicated that he started to read the new novel of O. Honchar “Cathedral” in the magazine “Fatherland” (№ 1). And stated his first, still rather vague impressions of it. Then, on January 20, 1968, he returned to “Cathedral” again. He dared to express the more certain assessment: “As Sholokhov in the «Pacific Don» builds everything on immutability psychology of a Cossack [...], so Honchar writes here about himself. [...] About himself, who reflects the age-old conservative Ukrainian Cossack spirit. He was the one who didn’t allow to destroy the nation: Zaporozhye, myths of Cossack’s liberty, «not my business» – and instant spontaneous revolt of how to touch this business, lyricism and sentiment as kind of a family, the absolute inability to adapt to the bureaucratic establishment, not to the worship of God but of the cultural values as a song, an old church and Shevchenko, a try an attempt not to interfere, but to act prudently, by persuasion” [4, p. 79].

L. Taniuk thinks on the meaning of the figures of O. Honchar, especially about the fact that what factors put him in such a place: “I have often thought about whether Honchar was made as a classic or if he is a really classic type of writer. For some of his stuff just didn’t go... But it is something that others do not. You read Honchar and get into something not average, it is Ukraine. There are crumbs of irritating admiration but it is desirable as a song. If he was a rebel and a prophet, he certainly would have made a breakthrough in the evolution of writing. But he is an evolutionist, and he finally got to the edge as things for which he lives disappear: language, culture, national values, history” [4, p. 79–80].

Notes by L. Taniuk about O. Honchar demonstrate his deep understanding of not only Ukrainian literary process, although this time he was in Moscow, but also social and political situation of the 1960s and 70s, which account for the creative activity of the writer. He said that under the rule of socialist realism, O. Honchar tries to balance its populist nostalgia sketches of metallurgy and friendship of peoples as “arkoduzhne perevysannya”. At the same time, L. Taniuk perceives these pages as “preaching of the Ukrainian life and influence”. And he continues: “The desire

to cultivate, Ukrainize the range is also from this series. Of course, it is wishful thinking when he draws a Zachiplanika (as a simple model of Ukraine), all long rest. But sometimes people should be reminded of what they do not have, pretending as if it exists, but they, the people, do not see it. Admission of a priest and preacher” [4, p. 80].

L. Taniuk can't help his delight created by image of Volodka Loboda in O. Honchar's novel "The Cathedral", which in his view is important for the establishment of citizenship of the artist: "Well, frankly, Volodka Loboda is brilliant! A portrait, a true portrait, and an accurate individual and expressive portrait of the painter of the day, because he was not afraid of him... It's important for straightening the back. Oles Terentiyovych cuts a sharp sense of humor... This is finally bugged him" [4, p. 80].

Next to the notes regarding exactly Honchar, L. Taniuk goes to the characteristics of the epoch and especially writers who were forced to adapt to it. And against this background he recalls the national spirit's invincibility. Certainly this was a topic discussed in the intelligent circles: "And this is a testimony that our "old men", such as Tychyna, Rylskyi, Malyshko, Bazhan and the new generation after them – starting from Honchar and Novychenko also feel their alienation from their identities which was offered to them by the epoch. And the protest against their own activism appears at the every stage of the establishment movement in the Ukrainian life. It fires up, maybe, outside their will. As this is an impersonal process. This happened in the 30's and in the 50's and now as well. All together it is called the invincibility of the Ukrainian cause. The talent (heroism) in shine is the very title of the novel. This is the protest word written in capital letter" [4, p. 80].

Commenting the Margarita Malinovska's review about the novel "Cathedral" (newspaper "Literary Ukraine" issue of 21st of January, 1968) L. Taniuk notices that she did a nice "introductory song" in the critical understanding of this work as a phenomenon in the world literature. Following M. Malinovska assessment the author of the diary draws the parallel between the evaluation of Honchar's novel and figure: "This is the very meaning that he appeals not to the humans but to the dark abysses, to the living and not living nature, – a father against his son, appeals to something superhuman... The father is a dissident but he believes in a petition for he believes in God and Nature. Honchar reminds somehow of Nechuiviter – in his faith" [4, p. 81]. Analyzing O. Honchar's work, which resulted in dissent among the party leaders, yet L. Tanyuk notes that a concept of the soviet reality created in the work met all party criteria as if everything lay upon the official of some rank: "Honchar wants to phase but the meaning of Volodka Loboda from great to small, – he still believes in the possibility of the petition but he appeals to good supervisor, who still can correct the bad one" [4, p. 82].

L. Taniuk made interesting notes on 21st, August 1968 after the conversation with Oles Honchar when they discussed everything that happened after the novel "Cathedral" had seen the light. It seemed for Honchar that the situation started to stabilize, Shelest the party boss to stop denigrating the novel, but Vatchenko was behind all of this. As a result of the conversation L. Taniuk makes a brave and subjective characteristic of Honchar: "A little child this Honchar is. Just a little child! So have and so direct. Sometimes he is likely to be shy about his spontaneity. This is a talent. A talent to be oneself. The other laureates make you run a mile with their gentlefolk. It is not like that here. [...]. A sorrow lives within Honchar – I can feel that. He is like comforting me – for him to calm down" [4, p. 158].

In May 1968 L. Taniuk comes to think that it was a support to Honchar if his novel were to be printed in the peripheries and in metropolis. He thought that "...this story of the CATHEDRAL will be considered as a protection of the national values, as a protection of "oneself". The authorities may support this". [...]. Honchar is sure that Shelest supports him, – and so does Ovcharenko. "Fresh legend... but had to believe". If Shelest wanted that, who would dare to contradict him?" [4, p. 181].

Taniuk stands up for the “Cathedral” more than once, trying to understand better that situation, giving characteristics both to O. Honchar and the entire Ukrainian literature of the late 1960’s: “Reading “Cathedral” again I barely could hold back my tears with chagrin. If only all those Zachiplianka’s heroic actions had a little of irony! Our romanticism shall kill us. Virunka “in the singlet” speaks in the very way as Vasyl Barka or at best as Oles Terentiiovych at the plenum. Though it is people, but... [...] It is also unpleasantly here: when Oles’ Honchar starts a good fragment, but stops at a parody. I mean the overdose of this romanticism” [4, p. 374], we read in the record from 7th of January 1969. Oddly enough that Taniuk being outside of Ukraine still characterises the problems, that accompany Ukrainian art and literary life, objectively. Unpleasant characteristics relate to many contemporary writers, who, as Taniuk thinks, should have treated the depiction of reality. He sets “Cathedral” apart as a phenomenon which can be an exemplar of Ukrainian artistic word, making a careful note: “But that is still not Hvylyovyi’s and not Yanovskyi’s word and not Kulish’s. Talented person he is, between two poles, between top and bottom, between reality and officialdom (fictional reality)” [4, p. 374].

L. Taniuk thinks over a thing that became a reason to victimise “Cathedral” and makes a conclusion that Vatchenko started everything, being offended with the allusions to parents, to the asylum, and the basis of the baiting was the politics, and not the literature. And speaks about the assumptions: “If he had narrated the same without pathos, not chasing the idea to describe a “positive personage”, if he poured all the pain and despair onto the paper, which I saw... If he could get rid of the inner editor...” [4, p. 374]. From the other hand, the diary author is like trying to find irrefutable arguments on behalf of “Cathedral” and its author and convinces himself, a reader in the originality of its historical meaning: “...this talent, this ability to picture our nostalgia for history, for our roots, for our culture and church! This is what excites the most (of course, not only adherents, but adversaries as well). [...] But there is a problem: those who will reduce the novel critique only to the art motives exclusively [...] – don’t they create another legend around “Cathedral”? In the historical sense, “Cathedral” is still in the scaffolding. And one can only realise the structure only moving away from it to some distance. Standing right under it and looking up, you won’t see a cross: a cap shall cover your eyes. The conclusion is to reread “Cathedral” and scaffolding...” [4, p. 374–375].

Later the diary author addresses O. Honchar’s figure only occasionally, recalling him only in the framework of the context. For instance, evaluating the sixties movement’s meaning, L. Taniuk wrote down this: “The Sixtiers, I suppose, were sent to Honchar, Rylskyi, Bazhan, Tychyna, (and also to Symonov and other masters) for realising the new time, where they wouldn’t be so engaged to write about party matters and wouldn’t depend on the party scream.” [4, p. 463].

Among the important figures in literary and art Ukrainian life, who are analysed in Taniuk’s diary, O. Honchar deserves a special position. From the Taniuk’s diary one may read his own attitude for what was happening. Whatever the official party critique may have been for the author of the diary O. Honchar and his novel “Cathedral” is a symbol of Ukrainian spiritual revival, invincibility of the Ukrainian spirit and the tocsin novel.

The reception of Honchar’s figure in the society is represented by the author of the diary in the forms of meditation, pondering, evaluation, characterising, even the elements of portraying – is a witness of Les Taniuk’s experience. It is worth noting that the work “Life Line” not completely may be related to the fictionalised type of the diary, where the laws of composing the diary are kept, but some traces are innovative, which let communicates diary on the background of images of the time described in chronological order the images of those who created it appear and the image of the author as a bearer of the philosophical, moral, ideological values. According to the formal characteristics pertaining to the works of the different genres and their kinds – chronological records, letters, notes, dialogues, the excerpts of the works, reviews – Taniuk’s work may be considered to be the compilation of genres. In Taniuk’s diary from the beginning

till the end one may see as a consistent endeavour of the author to picture his own view of the time, which would reflect his conceptual and ideological understanding of what was happening, and his own view of the figures, who surrounded him.

As a result of the efforts put into learning this work we may state that Les' Taniuk's "Life Line" gives much room for the researchers of the memoirs, like interpretation of the reception of the writers and artist in the period of the late 60's-80's.

REFERENCES

1. Zatonskii D.V. Stseplenie zhanrov (mesto avtobiografii, memuarov, dnevnika v stanovlenii i zhyzni sovremennogo romana) (rus) [The compilation if the genres (a place of autobiography, memoirs, diary in the incipience and life of the contemporary novel)] / D.V. Zatonskii // Genre Peculiarities of the Western Prose – Kyiv, 1989. – pp. 4–85.
2. Halych O.A. U vymirakh non fiction: schodennyky ukrainskykh pysmennykiv XX stolittia: Monohrafiia (ukr). [In the non Ficion Dimensions: the Diaries of the Ukrainian Writers of the XX Century: Monograph. / O.A. Halych. – Luhansk, Znannia.
3. Kotsiubynska M.Kh. Istoriia, orkestrovana na liudski holosy. Ekzystentsiine znachennia khudozhnoi dokumentalistyky dlia suchasnoi literatury. (ukr) [History Orchestrated by Human Voices. Existential Meaning of the Artistic Documentaries for the Contemporary Literature] / M.H. Kotsiubynska – Kyiv, Publishing House "Kyivo-Mohylianska Akademia.
4. Taniuk L.S. Liniia Zhyttia: (Z schodennykiv): U 2 t. (ukr) [Life Line (taken from the diaries): in 2 vol.], Vol.1. : 1964–1970 – Kharkiv, Folio.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Затонський Д.В. Сцепление жанров (место автобиографии, мемуаров, дневника в становлении и жизни современного романа) / Д.В. Затонский // Жанровое своеобразие прозы Запада. – К., 1989. – С. 4–85.
2. Галич О.А. У вимірах non fiction : Щоденники українських письменників ХХ століття : Монографія / О.А. Галич. – Луганськ : Знання, 2008. – 200 с.
3. Коцюбинська М.Х. Історія, оркестрована на людські голоси. Екзистенційне значення художньої документалістики для сучасної літератури / М.Х. Коцюбинська. – К. : Видавничий дім „Києво-Могилянська академія”, 2008. – 70 с.
4. Танюк Л. С. Лінія життя : (З щоденників) : у 2 т. / Л.С. Танюк. – Т. 1. : 1964–1970 – Х. : Фоліо, 2004. – 557 с.

УДК 821.161.2 – 94 (045)

ПЕРША СВІТОВА ВІЙНА У ТВОРЧОСТІ МАРКА ЧЕРЕМШИНИ

Стеф'юк І.І., аспірант

*Чернівецький національний університет імені Юрія Федьковича,
вул. Коцюбинського, 2, м. Чернівці, Україна*

ivanka.stefuk@ukr.net

У статті аналізується вплив Першої світової війни на особистість. Художня література кінця ХІХ–початку ХХ століття є, по суті, документом доби, оскільки фіксує тогочасні суспільно-політичні реалії та їх відображення у свідомості індивіда. Творчість українського письменника Марка Черемшини дуже добре висвітлює війну як суспільного руйнатора.

Ключові слова: Перша світова війна, література, Галичина.