REPRESENTATION OF PSYCHIC TRAUMA IN UKRAINIAN MODERNIST PROSE

by

Daria Polianska

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

SLAVIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies
University of Alberta

Abstract

Trauma is unspeakable and hard to comprehend. Thus, it is through the artistic expression of the internal and external conflicts caused by traumatic events that we can come to a deeper understanding of trauma. I consider three Ukrainian texts about WWI and the Revolution of 1917 as important literary testimonies of a people's traumatized psyche. Therefore, this dissertation focuses on the representation of psychic trauma in works by Osyp Turians'kyi, Mykola Khvyl'ovyi and Borys Antonenko-Davydovych.

I discuss how these authors write about subjective traumatic experiences as having roots in social life. To do that, I perform close readings of their texts from the perspectives of modernist styles, I employ the analysis of narrative modes for presenting consciousness (Dorrit Cohn) and I explore the role of literary dreams and dreamlike states in indicating the protagonists' psychological breakdown. I claim that modernist writers depict the shift from conscious to unconscious states of mind, revealing the invisible effects of collective political and ideological pressures on a person's consciousness. I suggest that by presenting the personal trauma of their protagonists' through daydreaming, hypnagogic imagery, hallucinations, and madness—as well as dreams *per se*—these writers delineate the collective tragedy of the Ukrainian nation during war and revolution.

Ergo, this study considers the relationship between psychological, stylistic and narrative aspects of trauma prose as well as the literary devices used by the writers. The analysis of artistic ways to represent traumatic experiences aids in recognizing the transhistorical impact of trauma as well as the connection between past events and their effect on the realities of the present.

For my mother and father, Larysa and Andrii.

Acknowledgments

A number of people helped me to complete this project. My sincere and immeasurable gratitude goes to my supervisor Dr. Oleh Ilnytzkyj who worked with me from the very beginning. He supported my ideas and maintained high standards for me as a scholar. His comments and guidance throughout every step of the way helped make researching and writing a pleasant endeavour for me.

I have been honoured to work with my co-supervisor Dr. Natalia Pylypiuk, who supported me greatly throughout the program and whose timely suggestion that I befriend the best companion a researcher can have—"Discipline!"—definitely kept me on track. Her feedback and advice helped me to thematically connect my chapters together.

I am grateful to Dr. Donald Kuiken for assisting me in understanding the connection between dream theory and literature. I am thankful to Dr. Alla Nedashkivska and Irene Sywenky for their encouragement and comments. I also extend my thanks to Dr. Natalie Kononenko and Dr. Peter Holloway for their recommendations and support. I am indebted to Dr. Jeanette Bayduza for her assistance and kindness. I am grateful to my friend and colleague Dr. Shanna Mumm, who helped proofread some excerpts for me.

I owe my sincere gratitude to my husband Rahul Patel for his ongoing support, patience, encouragement and advice. His question "How much did you write today?" kept me intact with my writing conscience. I am very grateful to my dear friends Ievgeniia Vincent-Zhelezniak, Romain Vincent, Sergii and Natalia Sukharovy, who helped me tremendously throughout my studies. Finally, my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation go to my family and friends in Canada and in Ukraine, and especially to my parents who are my inspiration and example.

Note on Transliteration

The Library of Congress transliteration system for Russian and Ukrainian words is used throughout this study. Diacritical marks and ligatures are omitted. To distinguish the soft sign in Ukrainian from the possessive case in English I used the stroke mark (') and the apostrophe (’) respectively. The names of famous writers (e.g., Tolstoy, Dostoevsky) are left according to their largely accepted spelling.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Trauma by nature drives us to the edge of comprehension, cutting us off from language based on common experience or an imaginable past

Bessel Van der Kolk

The catastrophic consequences of the Great War (1914-1918) exceeded all expectations that it would be a short conflict. Instead, the war spread internationally, causing a "ripple effect" around the world (Winter 1:11). For about fifty months, the world's great empires were at war. Because the war spawned revolutions, its actual end is hard to define.[1]

Even though the Armistice of 11 November stopped violence along the Western Front, in Eastern Europe the Great War was transformed into a series of civil and revolutionary wars: "The sudden withdrawal of German and Austrian-Hungarian troops left a power vacuum. Ukraine and Belarus became battlefields in the Russian civil war; in the Baltic region Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians [...] defended their countries against the Red Army; in East Galicia war was raging between Poles and Western Ukrainians" (Mick 1:171). WWI "transformed the limits of state power," and physical force became a legitimate tool for dictatorship regimes (Winter 2:3).

The Russian Revolution of 1917 (and the subsequent civil war) contributed to post-war mobilisation and was one of the major factors in the "brutalisation of interwar European

[1] "[...] a set of formal declarations of hostilities set in motion forces which broke through the conventional moment of the eleventh day of November 1918 as the time when the conflict came to an end. It did no such thing in Eastern Europe or in Russia, in Turkey, nor in colonial or semi-colonial settings ranging from Egypt to India to Korea to China" (Winter 1:15).

politics": "Bolshevism quickly became synonymous with the elusive threats and underhand enemies that menaced European post-war societies" (Gerwarth 2:643; 661).[2]

The events of WWI and the Russian Revolution traumatized millions of people. Violence on this scale, directed by one group of humans against another, amplified feelings of unfairness and injustice. It damaged the collective memory and consciousness and was accompanied by physical symptoms as well as a wounded sense of 'self.' Rage, anger, sorrow, despair, guilt, paralysis, fear, dislocation, numbness, and muteness: these are just a few of the feelings that can vaguely describe what we call "trauma." In his autobiographical novel *Poza mezhamy boliu* (*Beyond the Thresholds of Pain* [1917]), the Ukrainian modernist writer Osyp Turians'kyi states the following about the impact of WWI: "Я й мої товариші впали жертвою жахливого злочину. Це був злочин, якого люди і природа допустилися на нас і який і нас приневолив стати злочинцями супроти духа людства. І судилося нам пройти за життя пекло, яке кинуло нас поза межі людського болю – у країну божевілля і смерті"[3] (42).

Trauma is unspeakable and hard to comprehend.[4] Therefore, this is where artistic

---

[2] "Over the following years, up to 5 million people were recruited into the Red Army (of whom more than 700,000 died), and roughly 1 million men were drafted into the White Armies where casualty rates may have been as high as 225,000. In addition, up to 1.3 million people perished as a result of Bolshevik repression and pacification measures, and up to 100,000 in consequence of the White terror. Disease wiped out up to an estimated further 2 million, including 280,000 Red Army soldiers" (Gerwarth 645).

[3] "My friends and I became victims of a terrible crime. This crime was brought down on us by people and nature. It forced us to be villains in opposition to the human spirit. And we were destined to go through hell while we were still alive, and it transported us beyond the threshold of human pain – into a country of madness and death" (Translation of this passage into English is mine—DP).

[4] Bessel Van der Kolk explains the unspeakable nature of trauma: "All trauma is preverbal […] Under extreme conditions people may scream obscenities, call for their mothers, howl in terror, or simply shut down. Victims of assaults and accidents sit mute and frozen in emergency rooms; traumatized children 'lose their tongues' and refuse to speak. Photographs of combat soldiers show hollow-eyed men staring mutely into a void. Even years later traumatized people often have enormous difficulty telling people what has happened to them. Their bodies reexperience terror, rage, and helplessness, as well as the impulse to fight or flee, but these feelings are almost

expression (portraying both internal and external conflict) comes into play and finds ways of articulating resistance and of depicting the toxic consequences of violence. I will consider three Ukrainian texts about WWI and the Revolution of 1917 as important literary testimony of a people's traumatized psyche, its dissociation from the self to escape brutal reality.

Corpus Justification

Modernism in Ukrainian literature is a very broad phenomenon. I, however, focus on a narrower, relatively unexplored aspect. I show that modernism was a platform for Ukrainian writers to escape the boundaries of realism and explore protagonists through dreamlike states of mind and subjective perspectives, often through the help of *defamiliarization,*[5] metaphoric images, and sudden shifts in narrative modes. These features of Modernism were initially used to privilege the aestheticized inner life of the creative individual, their noble and extraordinary emotions. In this work, the emphasis will be on socially and politically provoked disasters that lead to human trauma and suffering.

My primary sources consist of the following texts: Osyp Turians'kyi *Poza mezhamy boliu* (*Beyond the Thresholds of Pain* [1917]); Mykola Khvyl'ovyi "Ia (Romantyka)" ("My Self (Romantica)" [1924]); Borys Antonenko-Davydovych *Smert'* (*Duel* [1927]). I chose these authors for two reasons. First, they lived at a time of war and/or Revolution and reflected on their own experiences or those of other people. Second, the three selected texts reveal a shift from the external world of their protagonists to the internal, depicting unconscious states of mind or self isolation, which I consider one of the attributes of

---

impossible to articulate" (34). See Van der Kolk, Bessel. *The Body Keeps the Score: Brain, Mind, and Body in the Healing of Trauma*.

[5] The term *ostranenie* was introduced by *Viktor Shklovskii*. In this study, I use its generally accepted English translation – "defamiliarization."

modernist style. Thus, Turians'kyi delineates protagonists who live through the suffering of WWI. Khvyl'ovyi and Antonenko-Davydovych write about the Revolution and its effect on the protagonists' identity and conscience. In short, while there are works of prose that may fit one or two of the criteria outlined above, only these three works contain all the aspects that I am interested in: they belong to the period of Modernism; they have social and/or political elements; they deal with the protagonists' dreamlike states of mind; and they involve a crime.

"Ia (Romantyka)" and *Smert'* are well-studied. The novelty of my research consists in revealing a specific type of narrative, that is, "trauma narrative" as seen from the perspective of a fictional perpetrator that focuses on representing the unconscious mind, a stunned personality, and with concern for the metaphysical and ethical aspect of his dilemma.

Methodology

My work emerges from the trauma theory developed by scholars like Cathy Caruth, Dominick LaCapra and Dori Laub. One of the key concepts used in this study is the notion of trauma in literature discussed by Michelle Balaev and Geoffrey Hartman.

Griselda Pollock defines trauma as "a perpetual present, resilient in its persistent and timeless inhabitation of a subject who does not, and cannot, know it" (42). Because of its timelessness, the traumatic experience and memory cannot be transformed into a story with a beginning, a middle and an end (Van der Kolk and Van der Hart 177). Consequently, one of the problems in the study and treatment of trauma, as Caruth formulates it, is how to understand the nature of trauma and how to treat it (VII). She claims that the task is to find ways to "listen to trauma beyond its pathology for the truth that it tells us, and how we might perhaps find a way of learning to express this truth beyond the painful repetitions of

traumatic suffering" (VIII). From a literary perspective, trauma study "explores the relation of words to wounds" (Hartman, "Trauma" 259). Because of its ability to depict reality by the means of metaphors and symbols, literature can become a medium to verbalize the ineffable experience of trauma which makes "the wound perceivable and the silence audieble" ("Trauma" 259). It is known that a response to a traumatic event can take the form of invasive hallucinations, dreams and thoughts (Caruth 4). Ergo, I pay close attention to how literary dreams and dreamlike states help to delineate trauma.

After Sigmund Freud's publication of *Die Traumdeutung* (The Interpretation of Dreams) in 1899, the symbolic content of dreams and the ability of the mind to communicate compex and subtle things through dreams became even more evident (McFarlane 85). It is not surprising then that many modernist artists and writers used dreams as the way to represent "reality and unreality, logic and fantasy, the banal and the sublime" (McFarlane 86) which justifies my focus on the unconscious dreamlike states of mind and various forms of withdrawal from the external world. In this dissertation, I consider daydreaming, hypnagogic imagery, hallucinations—as well as dreams *per se*—to reflect subjective traumatic experiences with roots in social life. I show how modernist texts display a "sharp opposition between conscious 'surfaces' and unconscious 'depths,' between ordinary experience and a hidden realm of mental life of which we are generally unaware" (Schwartz 5).

As will become evident, collective and personal trauma overlap. Modernists depict the shift from conscious to unconscious states of mind, revealing the invisible effects of collective political and ideological pressures on a person's consciousness. Hence, I examine the collective tragedy of the Ukrainian nation during the times of warfare and rapid changes of governments through the analysis of personal trauma as expressed in a literary text. While

Poza mezhamy explores the time of Austro-Hungarian rule in Ukraine during WWI, "Ia" and *Smert'* reflect on the realities of War Communism.

Through close reading of the texts, I aim to explore how such authors as Turians'kyi, Khvyl'ovyi and Antonenko-Davydovych write trauma. Their focus on their protagonists' mental life often employs fragmentation and estrangment which in the context of this study calls for the analysis of the defamiliarization technique ("making things strange"), defined by Viktor Shklovskii.

One of the challenges is how to distinguish subtle fluctuations of the fictional psyche in a text. In his essay "The Brown Stocking," Erich Auerbach analyzes the narrative voice in Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* (1927) and argues that Woolf uses external events to interpret the internal processes of the protagonists, something that differentiates modernism from previous literary traditions:

> It is all, then, a matter of the author's attitude towards the reality of the world he represents. And this attitude differs entirely from that of authors who interpret the actions, situation, and characters of their personages with objective assurance, as was the general practice in earlier times. Goethe or Keller, Dickens or Meredith, Balzac or Zola told us out of their certain knowledge what their characters did, what they felt and thought while doing it, and how their actions and thoughts were to be interpreted. […] The content of the individual's consciousness was rationally limited to things connected with the particular incident being related or the particular situation being described. (535)

Indeed, I think that the analysis of the change of the narrative voice allows us to

examine the representation of traumatic experiences. Therefore, I use Dorrit Cohn's apparatus to identify narrative modes for presenting consciousness. Overall, I follow postmodern narratology which "pays attention to everything that does not fit into a neat system, anything that undermines itself" in the text (Herman and Vervaeck 111). I consider the literary narrative an open system and treat even familiar texts as subject to reinterpretation and re-reading.

Research questions

The following are some of the questions I will be exploring: 1) How is psychic trauma represented in a modernist text? 2) Why and how do modernists "write" dreams? 3) What is the role of dreams, dreamlike states of mind, metaphoric images, effect of defamiliarization and modes of consciousness representation in depicting identity crisis and trauma?

Dissertation outline

In chapter 1, I present a theoretical foundation for my research. I talk about European and Ukrainian modernism, trauma theory in literature, dreamlike states of mind and the ways they are presented in a literary text. I also discuss the effect of defamiliarization, and Cohn's theory of modes for consciousness representation.

The next three chapters are textual analysis based on concepts of trauma and dream theories. The analysis is done with respect to the following themes: identity crises, the problem of victim-perpetrator, the impact of trauma on self-perception, and the notion of perpetrator trauma. Identifying the modes of consciousness representation aid in the analysis of the representation of trauma through metaphoric images and dreamlike states.

In each chapter, besides the narrative modes and dreamlike states, I focus on a specific problem or set of problems. Thus, in chapter 2, I analyze Turians'kyi's novel *Poza mezhamy*, concentrating on the connection between poetic catharsis and collective trauma of war, protagonists' dreams and visions. I pay attention to the characters' defamiliarized reality that aids in writing trauma and narrating human suffering.

In contemporary scholarship, the notion of perpetrator trauma in fiction is underdeveloped. In chapter 3 and 4, I investigate the possibility that a fictional perpetrator can experience trauma, a "divided" self. I discuss this in the context of the Soviet totalitarian regime in Ukraine during the 1920s-1930s. I also examine the problem of Ukrainian national communism and Bolshevism.

In chapter 3, I briefly discuss Mykola Khvyl'ovyi's role in Ukraine's cultural and political life. I look at how perpetrator trauma is represented in his short story "Ia" through dreams, flashbacks, irrational moments and the problem of morality and delinquency. I suggest that the impressionistic style *per se*, prevalent in the story, is a strategy to depict trauma.

In chapter 4, I analyze Antonenko-Davydovych's novel *Smert',* focusing on the binary opposition "Ukrainian nationalist *versus* Bolshevik" that leads to the protagonist's split personality. As in the previous chapter, I investigate the concept of perpetrator trauma and show how the writer overlays social and psychological trauma within his character. I look at how dreams present the protagonist's guilty conscience and propose to define *Smert'* as a trauma novel (using M. Balaev's definition).

In the conclusion, I examine similarities and differences between all three texts that contribute to the representation of psychic trauma in literature and show the transgression of

boundaries between morality and immorality.

Chapter 1. Trauma in Literature or Literature in Trauma

1.1. European and Ukrainian modernism

The era of modernism in literature coincides approximately with the end of the nineteenth century and the first third of the twentieth. The term "modernism" has many definitions and different scholars focus on various things. For example, Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane name such modernist elements as "the shock, the violation of expected continuities, the element of de-creation and crisis" (24). They claim that modernism is the period when art responds to the chaos of the world, the destruction of civilization and the impact of WWI, and turns from realism towards "style, technique, and spatial form in pursuit of a deeper penetration of life" (25). Writers like Joseph Conrad *Heart of Darkness* (1899), Ezra Pound *Hugh Selwyn Mayberley* (1920), T.S. Eliot *The Waste Land* (1922), James Joyce *Ulysses* (1922), Virginia Woolf *To the Lighthouse* (1927) helped to establish the modernist style.

For instance, one of the innovative techniques used by James Joyce in *Ulysses* is stream of consciousness (also called "interior monologue") – "an associate evocation of a character's thought patterns without the usual transitions found in conventional narratives" (Gillespie 388). The protagonists' unconscious processes become more "visible" in a text because of the "fractured narrative" and "the collapse of plot": "The apparent randomness of associative thought prompts the reader to question the submerged 'logic' of connection, to listen for the unconscious poetry of repressed desire" (*The Johns Hopkins Guide* 659). Virginia Woolf, too, paid special attention to precise evocations of states of mind. She moves away from the linear plots and objective descriptions of nineteenth-century realism. Rejecting 19th century realism as a documentary style, she rearranges the blocks of time,

providing incomplete perspectives and alternating modes of narration (Caughie 489).

Eric R. Kandel suggests that modernism started in the mid-nineteenth century not only as reaction to realism, but also as a reaction to the Enlightenment's emphasis on the rationality of human behavior: “The Enlightenment, or Age of Reason, was characterized by the idea that all is well with the world because human action is governed by reason. It is through reason that we achieve enlightenment, because our mind can exert control over our emotions and feelings” (11). After the Industrial Revolution, it was clear that “modern” life is not as perfectly, rationally organized as everyone expected. The reasoning mind now was opposed to irrational emotion:

> The modernist reaction to the Enlightenment came in the aftermath of the Industrial Revolution, whose brutalizing effects revealed that modern life had not become as mathematically perfect, or as certain, rational, or enlightened, as advances in the eighteenth century had led people to expect. Truth was not always beautiful, nor was it always readily recognized. It was frequently hidden from view. Moreover, the human mind was governed not only by reason but also by irrational emotion. (Kandel 12)

Among the main themes of modernism, Kandel identifies the complexity of relationships between the sexes and between fantasy and reality (12). He gives examples of the paintings by Manet, Cézanne, and their techniques of collapsing several dimensions into one. Kandel points out the following characteristics of modernism: the belief that the human mind is largely irrational by nature, that unconscious conflicts are present in everyone; the principle of self-examination and the exploration of inner worlds: “By bringing these

conflicts to the surface, the modernists confronted conventional attitudes and values with new ways of thought and feeling, and they questioned what constitutes reality, what lies below the surface appearances of people, objects and events" (Kandel 14).[6]

Elliott Antokoletz names such modernist trends as a new emphasis on the internal (unconscious), as well as the link between external and symbolic, or "transformational" (3). He especially attributes this problem to modernist and avant-garde movements, alluding to the connection between the creative work of art and emotional trauma that is inevitable in our everyday life: "We can view the creative process and the work of art itself as a means of resolving painful emotional dilemmas and arriving at symbolic representation of a primitive intuition or awareness that remains unformulated prior to the artist's engagement with the artwork" (Antokoletz 4).

In his article "Ukrainian Symbolism and the Problem of Modernism," Oleh Ilnytzkyj emphasizes the key role of the modernist ideology and aesthetic in the transformation of the nineteenth-century literary process (115). He claims that modernism influenced the first two decades of the twentieth century and even extended into the late twenties. The scholar points out that during the modernist period Ukrainian art started being perceived as a separate institution in society and on par with European literatures ("Ukrainian Symbolism" 116). The exact timeline of the modernist era is hard to demarcate but it does overlap with changes in political regimes and the fall of empires (Ilnytzkyj, "Responses II" 285).

The definition of *modernism*[7] in Ukrainian literary criticism is still being debated.

---

[6] Kandel notes that the role of the unconscious processes was not new. It was already brought up by Plato in the fourth century B.C. Then, in the nineteenth century by Arthur Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and Freud (15).

[7] By modernism in Ukrainian literature Pavlychko understands the fusion of issues and features from various periods, often antipodal. Modernism of the XX century in Ukrainian culture was a system of experiments, continuous decanonization, a conflict of ideas within the same culture (19). Pavlychko identifies a few waves of modernism. The initial stage was approximately from 1897-1898 to 1902-1903. The contributing factors that

One reason for the ambiguity of the term, according to George Grabowicz, is the fact that Ukrainian modernism appeared as a reaction to populism. This stirred a conflict between modernists, populists and the "more reductive and vulgar, Soviet critics" (Grabowicz 274).

Already during the first years of the twentieth century an active discussion about the nature of Ukrainian modernism and its principles[8] took place. Realists, such as Ivan Nechui-Levyts'kyi, Ivan Franko, Panas Myrnyi, Ivan Karpenko-Karyi, criticized the modernist tendencies to depict the inner psychology of a person, individual moods, and sensations. Instead, realists insisted that literature and art should be for and about the "people." Therefore, literature should reflect a rational, objective truth about life (Luts'kyi 56). Tamara Hundorova emphasizes that the establishment of early modernism was connected to emphasis on subjectivity. Modernism, as a style, "distorted" forms of language, introduced ambivalence in meaning, synthesized imagery, opposed descriptive and rational structures ("Modernists'kyi dyskurs" 143).

Ostap Luts'kyi, a modernist and member of the *Moloda Muza* group (*Young Muse*), points out that modernists (i.e., Ol'ha Kobylians'ka, Petro Karmans'kyi, Vasyl' Pachovs'kyi, Mykola Voronyi and others) paid attention not so much to form as to the depiction of inner psychological states. Modernist literature, thus, aspired to break with the demands to follow a certain structure, and opened new horizons for experimentation. Luts'kyi explains that they wanted to create a literature for the intelligentsia, not the *narod* [people], they wanted to

---

prompted it were Lesia Ukrainka's article about "Malorusskie pisateli na Bukovine" and Serhii Iefremov's article "V poiskah novoi krasoty" as well as the emergence of such writers as Vasyl' Stefanyk, Hnat Khotkevych and Ol'ha Kobylians'ka (Pavlychko 88). At that stage, new modernist tendencies were not shaped into any particular schools and streams. Pavlychko also identifies the modernist waves of 1910s, 1920s and 1940s, emphasizing their distinguishing features (89).

[8] See also Doroshkevych, Oleksandr. "Do istorii modernizmu na Ukraini." *Zhyttia i revoliutsiia,* no. 10, 1925, p.71.

break free from the established templates and give sanctuary to their refined egos[9] (Luts'kyi 56-58).

During the first few years of the 1900s, Ivan Franko and Mykola Voronyi engaged in a famous polemic about the role of literature and the purpose of the poet. Their poems, devoted to each other (Franko's "Lisova idyliia (Posviata Mykoli Voronomu)" ["Forest Idyll (Message to Mykola Voronyi)," 1900] and Voronyi's "Ivanovi Frankovi" ["To Ivan Franko," 1902]), represent their divergent views. While Franko insists that the purpose of literature is to be real and truthful,[10] Voronyi says that it is time for the poet's soul to be free and explore the metaphysical, namely, that which cannot be comprehended by the rational mind, only by the heart.[11] Thus, the realist and modernist traditions were arrayed around the opposition of rational and irrational, tangible, and abstract art.

A tendency toward subjective and mysterious themes was especially noticeable in modernist poetry. In his poem "Sometimes I would like" ("Chasamy khochet'sia meni"),

---

[9] "вирватись від офіціяльних шаблонів і шукати приюту для свого 'я'" (Luts'kyi, "Moloda muza" 58).

[10] "Не думай, як поет покине
Загальних питань море синє
І в тихий залив свого серця
Порине, мов нурець заб'ється,
Що там він перли і алмази
Знайде тепло, і розкіш раю,
І світло, й пахощі без краю.
А як знайде гидкії черви
І гіркість сліз, розбиті нерви,
Докори хорого сумління,
Прокляття свого покоління..." [Emphasis mine—DP] (Franko, "Lisova idyliia" 108)

[11] "Душа бажає скинуть пута,
Що в їх здавен вона закута,
Бажає ширшого простору –
Схопитись і злетіти вгору,
Життя брудне, життя нікчемне
Забути і пізнать надземне,
Все неосяжне – охопити,
Незрозуміле – зрозуміти!" [Emphasis mine—DP] (Voronyi, "Ivanovi Frankovi" 163)

Petro Karmans'kyi refers to the state of drunkenness, or half-dream, and aspires to attain an ecstatic state beyond the rational world.[12] Later in his writing, even Ivan Franko would also use the poetics of modernism to depict the inner state of his protagonist (for instance, in his novel *Dlia domashnioho ohnyscha* [For the Home Hearth*,* 1892], the protagonist—Antin Anharovych—wanders aimlessly around the city, as if dreaming, after he finds out the truth about his wife's unsavory business affairs).

The shift from the real to the metaphysical and the irrational is often seen in the modernist genre, poetry in prose. It is characterized by a certain rhythm, poetic images, themes, sophisticated style, or as Solomiia Pavlychko calls it "word fetishism," along with sentimentalism, emotionality. Poetry in prose is often associated with psychological prose (Pavlychko 118). According to Pavlychko, the use of prose poetry helped modify the narrative traditions of Ukrainian literature, as authors focused not on chronology and documentation of events, but on feelings, impressions, and associations. In general, the mode of Ukrainian modernist prose can be described as indeterminate, unclear, ambivalent, and thoughtful (Pavlychko 126-127). Pavlychko also speaks of the discourses of irrationalism, psychopathology, and psychoanalysis as attributes of Ukrainian modernism. She explains that the theme of madness and disappointment in the logical rational mind became dominant and helped shape the symbolic persona of modernity – a persona on the edge of two worlds, rational and irrational (218, 235).

---

[12] "… І хочу жити,
Пірнути в пустку самоти
І жить оманою й нести
Мою утому до німої
Містерії снояв і ночі,
І хочеться примкнути очі,
Не бачить дійсности сумної
І мандрувати в полусні." [Emphasis mine—DP] (Karmans'kyi, "Chasamy" 685)

The discourse of irrationalism is often linked to the influence of Nietzschean philosophy. To a certain extent, the Nietzschean view of aesthetics fits my own focus on dreamlike states. Thus, Nietzsche encourages artists to perceive aesthetics not only through the logical mind, but also by the means of intuition. Such an approach, he believes, helps to reveal the duality of art and life, as well as the ever existing "perpetual conflict" of the rational and irrational. To understand this juxtaposition, he refers to "art-worlds of *dream* and *drunkenness*" (Nietzsche 28). He compares these two states to the contrast between the Apollonian (rational) and the Dionysian (sensual, emotional). Nietzsche compares the artist and his relation to dreams to the philosopher and his relationship to existence. The artist, therefore, can "read the meaning of life" through dreams and thus destroy the Maya[13]: "The illusion of our daily 'reality' is revealed to us in a dream" (Nietzsche 29).

During the first two decades of the 20th century, the desire to escape from reality is triggered by the severity and unfairness of social conditions. Violence and despair cause the depreciation of a human life. Ergo, the notion of trauma should be an inevitable part of modernist narratives about the Great War and Revolution.

1.2. Trauma theory: the nature of trauma and responses to it

Having emerged around the 1990s, trauma theory was based on the writings of Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub (*Crisis of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History* [1992]), and Cathy Caruth's edited collection, *Trauma: Explorations in Memory* (1995). The complex notion of trauma has been also explored extensively by clinical work with the survivors of trauma and input from neuroscientists, primarily in the USA (Van der Kolk, Van

[13] "Sanskrit term used in Hinduism for the illusory appearance of the physical world" – editor's note (Nietzsche 39).

der Hart, to name a few).[14] Today, scientists, therapists and scholarly critics attempt to grasp the effects of trauma on the brain, consciousness, body, as well as its representation in art and literature.

A traumatic event—for example, witnessing a murder—becomes the ground for trauma theory. A number of topics have been explored thus far: the timelessness of trauma; trauma as the "eventless event" (Pollock); trauma on the edge between the real and unreal; problem of temporal location in trauma and transhistorical awareness (Hartman G.); the theory of intergenerational trauma (Balaev); post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)[15] as a delayed response to trauma (Ballinger, Caruth, Van der Kolk); the overlap between individual and "collective" representation of the past (Ballinger); repressed memory (Freud, LaCarpa, Ballinger); repressed memory versus dissociation in regards to trauma (Van der Kolk, Van der Hart); neuroscientific perspective on trauma and its effects on the brain, mind and body (Van der Kolk, Van der Hart); the notion of psychic trauma (Furst); the difficulty of listening and responding to traumatic stories; role of listener and witness (Van der Kolk, Van der Hart, Radstone, LaCapra, Caruth); the trauma novel (Balaev, Hundorova); trauma in contemporary literature (Nadal, Calvo); post-totalitarian memory and its representation in Ukrainian literature (Hundorova).

The key concepts of trauma theory that I use in my study include trauma narrative and representation (Felman, Laub, Caruth, Radstone, Balaev) and the connection between literary expression and human psyche (or, as I call it, the aesthetics of psychic trauma).

A problem with traumatic memory arises when the survivor is unable to narrate the

[14] See the overview of the rise of trauma theory within the academic context in Radstone, Susannah. "Trauma Theory: Contexts, Politics, Ethics."

[15] In the late 1980s post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), or what during WWI was referred to as "shell shock," was recognized as a real illness that can influence both the body and the mind. It is now recognized in cases of rape, child abuse or other forms of violence towards another person or group of people (*The Unspeakable* 7).

event.[16] This is caused by the fact that to memorize, hence, to narrate it later, the person needs to pay attention to what is happening, which is not the case during the traumatic experience. It is my understanding that by writing about trauma and portraying strangers, Ukrainian modernists help to narrate psychic trauma that is otherwise hard to communicate, especially for the survivors and their descendants.

Van der Kolk and Van der Hart point out the need to differentiate between "repression" and "dissociation."[17] For instance, they claim, Sigmund Freud at times uses repression to refer to the "instinctual wishes," as a defense against Id-impulses of a sexual nature. There are also instances when he uses the term "repression" and implies instead dissociated traumatic memories. Similar misuse of the terms generally happens in the psychoanalytical literature. I follow Van der Kolk and Van der Hart's use of the term "dissociation" regarding traumatic memories (168).

Psychic trauma is the mental breakdown that takes place after the mind has been overwhelmed with stimuli presented over a short period of time. It is associated with "the feeling of helplessness in the face of overwhelming danger" (Furst 37). A traumatized person lives their life through the experience of their trauma. They have a hard time fully understanding the present reality without imposing the experience of trauma with which they are already familiar: "As the trauma is fixed at a certain moment in a person's life, people live out their existences in two different stages of the life cycles, the traumatic past, and the

[16] "[T]he traumatic experience/memory is in a sense, timeless. It is not transformed into a story, placed in time, with a beginning, a middle and an end (which is characteristic for narrative memory). If it can be told at all, it is still a (re)experience" (Van der Kolk and Van der Hart 177).

[17] Repression represents a vertically layered model of mind whereas dissociation – a horizontally layered model of mind. This means that the repressed goes down into the unconscious and the person cannot access it anymore. However, dissociation means that the person cannot remember a trauma, but the "memory" of it is stored in an alternate stream of consciousness. A better explanation of the relation between the concepts of repression and dissociation are lacking. Yet, Van der Kolk and Van der Hart assure that traumatic memories cannot be repressed and dissociated at the same time (169).

bleached present" (Van der Kolk and Van der Hart 177).

Bessel Van der Kolk argues that the entire human organism (body, mind, and brain) is affected by trauma. He points out that it is connected to what neurobiology calls "mirror neurons," which relate to our ability to detect other people's movements, emotions and intentions (Van der Kolk 59). We are even susceptible, he claims, to others' negativity and can react to it with anger or another emotional response.[18] Therefore, the first stage on the way to recovery is to sense, name and identify what is happening inside (Van der Kolk 68), which is hard for the trauma survivors. But may be possible for the artist.

The symptoms of traumatized people are "blank stares," "absent minds," which are "the outward manifestation of the biological freeze reaction" (Van der Kolk 72). Dissociation and denial manifest as depersonalization or losing the sense of oneself and become the escape routes from the intolerable suffering, often accompanied by physical and/or emotional numbness (Van der Kolk 101). The question now is how these symptoms can be presented in a literary text and how one should identify and analyze them.

In his analysis of trauma in literature, Michelle Balaev discusses the trauma novel that often represents the protagonist's detachment from others through the violation of moral laws like killing a family member. For instance, Khvyl'ovyi's "Ia" reflects how the character must murder his mother to be able to follow the path of a villain. The main feature of the trauma novel is the metamorphosis of the protagonist's identity, caused by external events. In this transformation, memory is an important instrument of informing the new "perception of the self and the world" (Balaev, "Trends" 150). Balaev, too, claims that traumatic experience is fixed, timeless and "unlocatable in the brain." It has the capacity to penetrate

[18] "Our mirror neurons also make us vulnerable to others' negativity, so that we respond to their anger with fury or are dragged down by their depression" (Van der Kolk 59).

consciousness and affect even non-traumatized people (“Trends” 151).

The literary theory of transhistorical trauma states that because trauma is timeless,[19] repetitious and ‘infectious,’ it impacts people on individual and collective levels. It shapes their responses to the traumatic experience, even if they live centuries after the event: “a massive trauma experienced by a group in the historical past can be experienced by an individual living centuries later who shares a similar attribute of the historical group, such as sharing the same race, religion, nationality, or gender due to the timeless, repetitious, and infectious characteristics of traumatic experience and memory” (Balaev, “Trends” 152).

On the one hand, intergenerational trauma theory emphasizes a connection between individual and collective traumatic experiences, connecting them between generations, thus, erasing the boundaries between individual and collective. It proposes that a person’s identity can be socially labeled as “victim,” based on the shared heritage with the actual victims of the traumatic event. This assumption created strict boundaries between victims and perpetrators. It also suggests that contemporaries, like their forebears, will have similar responses to the event (Balaev, “Trends” 153). On the other hand, such an approach is reductive in the sense that it disregards the complexity of identity formation. The ambiguity of the position “victim-perpetrator” is often depicted in a modernist text (“Ia,” *Smert'*, *Poza mezhamy boliu*). Therefore, although social and geographical peculiarities influence the expression of the self, it is not “a linear re-enactment of a traumatic experience” (Balaev, “Trends” 163).

The crucial aspect of representing trauma in literature is that the protagonist can at the same time depict both personal and collective experiences of trauma (Balaev, “Trends” 155).

[19] Van der Kolk and Van der Hart also talk about the timelessness of trauma as well as feeling of helplessness as fundamental experience that we identify as traumatic (175).

In the trauma novel, the complexity and variety of emotional states are delineated by means of trauma imagery,[20] silence, breaches of timelines, narrative omission. We will see similar narrative strategies in Ukrainian modernist texts. Overall, as Balaev points out, trauma fiction is characterized by a nonlinear plot and the collapse of temporal chronology which amplify the inner chaos and mental confusion of the protagonist. These elements help a writer portray the experience of dissociation ("Trends" 159). Thus, through the act of writing, authors express what we call the "unspeakable" experiences of trauma, those "transcendent" emotional states that also reveal how trauma changes our perception of the event and its aftermath. For instance, the protagonist may undergo a doubling or self-estrangement, led by the inability of the protagonist to distinguish external realities and inner conflicts ("Trends" 162).

1.3. Representation of trauma in the modernist text

In this section, I introduce theoretical concepts that I will apply to textual analyses in later chapters. Namely, I discuss the capacity of a literary text to convey psychic trauma by means of dreams, dreamlike states, effect of *defamiliarization*, and modes for consciousness representation, as suggested by Dorrit Cohn. In the subsection on psychological and literary views on dreams, I distinguish a literary dream from a dream as a psychological phenomenon. A writer can give purpose to the depiction of a character's dream, which is not the case for dreamers in real life, since they cannot control their dreams, and neither can anyone observe them.

[20] Trauma imagery reflects the transformation of protagonist's consciousness. Its diverse nature also proves that there cannot be a unified way to represent trauma (Balaev, "Trends" 163).

1.3.1. Varieties of dreams, dreamlike states, and trauma

Psychological perspective

In "The Relation of Jokes to Dreams and to the Unconscious," Freud defines dream as "a meshwork of sense-impressions, mostly visual […] with which thought-processes and expressions of affect may be mingled" (161). The dream's "manifest content" is what we remember after waking. It emerges from dormant, or as Freud calls them "latent," dream-thoughts. To be manifested in "sensory form," dream-thoughts should go through some "modifications," so-called processes of *condensation* and *displacement* ("The Relation" 162). While condensation is an easily recognized process that connects waking and dream lives, displacement is the process that represents the juxtaposition of the waking mental life and a dream ("The Relation" 164).

To Freud, one of the main goals of dream-formation is to impede censorship that waking states impose on us. The displacement can point to the "operation of the censorship of conscious thinking" ("The Relation" 171). Consequently, what we perceive as nonsense in a dream, is not at all nonsense, but something that has a hidden meaning: "Nonsense, absurdity, which appears so often in dreams never arises by chance" ("The Relation" 173).

Although Freud's argument is that dreams are mainly formed as the fulfilment of a wish, he at times also questions this interpretation. He points to the fact that the meaning of dreams varies and that dreams with the most painful content (not only the wish fulfillment dreams) also happen ("The Interpretation" 113). I think that traumatic experiences caused by war contribute greatly to this "painful content" and should be interpreted differently than a wish-fulfilment: "That the dream actually has a secret meaning, which turns out to be the

fulfilment of a wish, must be proved afresh for every case by means of an analysis" (Freud, "The Interpretation" 123).[21]

Don Kuiken identifies *impactful dreams* as dreams that influence a person's feelings and thoughts even after awakening. They are different from mundane dreams and can be distinguished by emotions, sensory phenomena, movement characteristics, motives and goals, and dream endings. He classifies them into nightmares, existential dreams, and transcendent dreams ("The Contrasting" 178).

Nightmares can be characterized by terms like "scared/terrified," "nervous/anxious," "vulnerable/helpless." Emotions that attribute nightmares can at times signify existential dreams. The difference between the two types of dreams will be in the effect they have on their dreamer. The words "sad/downhearted," "guilty/ashamed," "inadequate/failed" may describe *existential dream emotions*. The latter carry feelings of moral inadequacy, failure, and guilt. As Kuiken puts it, "the distinctively high ratings for guilty/ashamed, despair/discouraged, and disgusted/repulsed in existential dreams suggest that moral inadequacy and failure become salient within that dream type" ("The Contrasting" 180).

Transcendent dream emotions, on the other hand, correspond to ecstatic feelings (a sense of awe and elation); the dreamer feels energetic and alive (Kuiken, "The Contrasting" 181). Both existential and transcendent dreams include dreams with vivid tactile-kinesthetic

---

[21] Freud also argues that the source of a dream depends on the experiences in a waking life, recent or indifferent, that have psychological implications for a dreamer:
"The source of a dream may be:

a) A recent and psychologically significant experience which is directly represented in the dream.
b) Several recent, significant experiences, which are untied by the dream into a whole.
c) One or more recent and significant experiences, which are represented in the dream by the mention of a contemporary but indifferent experience.
d) A subjective significant experience (a recollection, train of thought), which is *regularly* represented in the dream by the mention of a recent but indifferent impression" ("The Interpretation" 153).

imagery. In existential dreams, we can observe more "light/dark contrasts, ineffectual movement (fatigue), separation and loss, spontaneous affective shifts, and intense sadness during the transition to wakefulness" (Kuiken, "The Contrasting" 178). In transcending dreams, the dreamer experiences "spreading warmth, unusual sources of light, felt vitality, flying and floating, magical accomplishment, perspective shifts, and awe and ecstasy during the transition to wakefulness" (Kuiken, "The Contrasting" 178).

The distinctions among these three types of dreams can be described like this: nightmares provoke "postawakaning distress such as lingering vigilance"; existential dreams invoke "postawakening distress and self-perceptual depth, for example, sensitivity to aspects of life usually ignored, reaffirmation of personal convictions"; finally, transcendent dreams evoke "a form of self-perceptual depth that has spiritual import" (Kuiken, "The Contrasting" 183). Kuiken sees self-perceptual depth, pertinent to existential and transcendent dreams, as an aesthetic phenomenon. To him, both existential and transcendent dreams can evoke the sublime, or "an experience that resists articulation" ("The Contrasting" 184).[22]

Dreams and trauma

Ernest Hartmann discusses connections between trauma and dream. He explains that dreams are guided by our emotions and concerns. Therefore, if someone experienced certain traumatic events, we would probably know what is on their mind because dreaming "contextualizes" emotion: "I have found it especially useful to start with dreams after trauma or dreams in stressful situations when we know quite clearly what must be on the dreamer's mind" ("The Nature" 3).

[22] "[T]he carryover effects of these two impactful dream types – but not nightmares – involve a 'touch' of sublimity" (Kuiken, "Contrasting" 184).

Carl Hirsch indicates many cases when people used their dreams to resolve practical problems in their wakeful life: “Asleep or awake, half-asleep or half-awake, the mind continues to function in some fashion. The dream, the nightmare, the daydream – each often produces useful images that have eluded us in full wakefulness” (32). Indeed, dreams have a broader spectrum because most of the times the dreamer does not control them. This gives us access to realizations that might not be available when we are awake. Often in dreams there is a mixture of ambivalent emotions, for example, shame, resentment, guilt and at the same time forgiveness or grief.

Deirdre Barrett states that the waking dissociative disorders, caused by trauma, are “often referred to as ‘dreams’” (“Dreams” 68). Multiple Personality Disorder (MPD), or what is now called – Dissociative Identity Disorder, is connected to dreams because of its “dissociative nature.” Barrett claims that dreams are “invaluable tools” in accessing and even treating trauma (“Dreams” 68). Moreover, people with dissociative identity disorder are prompted not only to experience various types of dreams (e.g., nightmares) while asleep, but also dreamlike states of mind in their awake life: “dreaming is characterized by a degree of hallucination, amnesia, discontinuity with normal experience, and projection of aspects of themselves onto others that they experience at no other time. […] dissociative disordered persons experience much more of this dreamlike state in their waking life” (Barrett, “Dreams in MPD” 80).

Dreamlike states of mind

As already mentioned, dreamlike states of mind, can also contribute to resolving and even treating psychological issues in wakeful life. Thus, they can endorse our understanding of

trauma. This study focuses on the following types of dreamlike states, which I interpret within a literary context: dreams *per se*, daydreaming, hallucinations, and states of hypnagogia, that is, the time between wakefulness and sleep.

In comparison to a dream, *daydream* is more "volitional and less bizarre" because "the daydream contains its own editor and possibility of revising the image sequence" (States, "The Master" 109). For instance, we may daydream of meeting a famous person or achieving something. We can always modify this daydream and revisit it. Bert States compares the process of writing fiction to daydreaming ("The Master" 109). Daydreaming demonstrates the movement of the protagonist's thoughts and creates a vivid sense of unreality which is the desired truth.

The *hypnagogic state* can be characterized by a sense of unreality, a "threshold consciousness": "In the hypnagogic state observation is from a distance; the images appear as if projected upon a screen, and one is oddly detached, observing the phenomenon with interest and curiosity" (Schwenger 424). What differentiates dreams from hypnagogia is the part of us that is awake. Hence, people in this state are fully conscious of the illusory nature of the images they are seeing and can even describe them. In a dream, Schwenger points out, we already appear in a world, only at times we remind ourselves that this is a dream (424).

Hypnagogia is different from *hallucination*. The latter is the experience of an image or images as if they are indeed existent in the external reality, whereas in hypnagogia "the images are viewed as real enough, but not so real that one imagines any kind of concrete reality behind them" (Schwenger 426). Therefore, the dreamer is aware that those images are not real. Moreover, hypnagogic imagery can be described as "repetition before one's closed eyes of a visual stimulus that has been repeatedly enacted during the day," a condition of

"drowsing off" (Schwenger 428). Hypnagogic imagery is constantly changing and perceptions in this state are highly activated. This liminal condition causes "the loosening of the ego boundaries of the subject" which also means a "loosening of control." Thus, the perceiver cannot oversee the hypnagogic images which change "according to a logic of their own" (Schwenger 428).

Literary re-creations of dreamlike states

I have mentioned above that trauma is preverbal – and that art can be a way to express the unspoken. In this section, I draw parallels between writing and dreaming, following Kuiken's view that both waking and dreaming phenomenal fields entail the aspect of expressibility (this is a statement he made in a presentation titled "The Dream Poet" on September 8, 2015, University of Alberta). Thus, I believe, that both writing (which is done during our waking life, although it often reflects the unconscious processes) and dreaming have the capacity to "express" the unspoken by means of poetic devices. Both dreaming and waking, hence, writing, are equally meaningful: "Those objects that 'fail' to cohere [in a dream – DP], 'need to be' compared with coherent waking counterparts." Writing dreams, therefore, is the way to make something implicit (at times, even transcendent) explicit (Kuiken, presentation "The Dream Poet" on September 8, 2015, University of Alberta).

Kuiken charts the analogy between literature and dreaming, which is a "persistent theme" in contemporary dream studies: "literature is the narrative portrayal of how one thought, action, or event leads to another. Dreams similarly possess the structure of reasonably well-formed stories" ("An Enriched" 112). The commonality between writing and dreaming is the use of similar figurative expressions such as metaphor and metonymy. Yet,

this similarity has not been explored enough: "Although studies of dreaming might be considerably enriched by historical scholarship, scholars and researchers interested in the analogy between dreams and literature have not thoroughly explored the implications of 20th century shifts in literary theory" (Kuiken, "An Enriched" 112; 113).

In *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud distinguishes dreams in real life from "artificial dreams" that poets create to convey some hidden meaning. However, he admits that the artificial dreams are only possible because everyone dreams in their "real" life. Therefore, "the artificial dreams may be interpreted as correctly as an actually experienced dream" (81).[23] Supporting Freud's statement that real and artificial dreams are connected, Herschel Farbman argues that science is incapable of revealing the exact images that the dreamer sees in a dream.[24] Therefore, only fiction, by the means of language, can somewhat present what might be happening in a dream (8).

Hence, literature becomes a bridge between trauma and testimony to it, the testimony that is done through storytelling and multiple perspectives (of a victim, a perpetrator, or bystanders). This type of testimony transforms the process of witnessing and the perception of traumatic events by the reader: "The specific task of the literary testimony is, in other words, to open up in that belated witness, which the reader now historically becomes, the imaginative capability of perceiving history – what is happening to others – in one's own body, with the power of sight (of insight) usually afforded only by one's own immediate physical involvement" (Felman and Laub 108).

---

[23] "In a novel, *Gradiva*, of the poet W. Jensen, I accidentally discovered several artificial dreams which were formed with perfect correctness and which could be interpreted as though they had not been invented, but had been dreamt by actual persons. […] Dr. Alfred Robitsek has since shown that the dream of the hero in Goethe's *Egmont* may be interpreted as correctly as an actually experienced dream" (Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams* 81).

[24] "No scientist will ever be able to tell what his or her experimental subject dreamed from the images of the brain activity of that subject in sleep" (Farbman 8).

The relationship between dreaming and writing is reciprocal. Otto Rheinschmiedt claims that dreams, too, can "internalize the social context in which we live" (47) and become a source of fiction writing because of their social and storytelling nature, together with the aspect of multi-temporality: "Dreams walk easily on the timeline of past, present, and future, and by doing so they are the arbiters of historical consciousness, which is the awareness of the individual not only as embedded in the soil of family history but also immersed in the strong currents of history" (69). Thus, dreams and literature bring to the surface the implicit (e.g., estrangement from the Self caused by trauma).[25]

Literary Examples

I will now turn to a few examples of dreams and dreamlike states in Ukrainian fiction to draw the connection between the theoretical concepts and my reading of the modernist texts.

The instance of an existential dream is presented in Kobylians'ka's short story "Lyst zasudzhenoho voiaka do svoiei zhinky" ("The Letter of a Sentenced Soldier to His Wife" [1915]). The soldier has only few hours before his execution, so he writes a letter to his wife, narrating his dream. In it, she decides to commit suicide because of her grief over her executed husband. The man writes: "Не дуже довго тому снилося, що я лежав вмерлий, а довкруги мене свистіли вистріли з крісів. […] Мене нічого не боліло. Мені й не текла кров з жодної рани. Я був мертвий..."[26] (497). After the soldier wakes up, he contemplates his suffering and begs his wife not to kill herself. It is significant that the soldier writes down

[25] "Both dreams and literature bring to the fore that which is hidden but seeks expression, such as the conundrum of fear, the propensity for destructiveness, the search for love, the search for knowledge, the search for beauty, the 'will to power,' and the search for the spiritual" (Rheinschmiedt XIV).

[26] "Recently, I saw a dream that I was dead, and I heard rifle shots around me. [...] I did not feel any pain. There was no blood flowing from any of my wounds. I was dead" (Translation in English is mine – DP).

his own dream, which to me represents a connection between writing and dreaming as inseparable.

This dream is an existential dream because of its impact on the protagonist after awakening. He feels helplessness and despair and questions his life and the unfairness of his sentence. At the same time, the dream *per se* reveals a certain relief from emotional and physical pain. Although the dream is "artificial," to use Freud's term, it testifies to the trauma that the wrongly accused soldiers bear. Because it is a fictitious dream, it allows the writer to deliberately encode this message within it.

An example of a state somewhere between hypnagogia and a transcendent dream is a scene of a dying soldier, Boiani, in Turians'kyi's *Poza mezhamy.* The imagery is complex. It portrays a dreamlike, transcendent state between wakefulness and sleep, providing metaphoric references to death as sleep:

> Він протяг руки до далекої блідо-синьої мраки й почав кликати:
>
> Пальмо, пальмо!..
>
> Вже рік я тебе не бачив…
>
> Як я тішуся тобою!..
>
> Хтось під пальмою на морі…
>
> Човен відбиває від берега… в нім сидить… – боже!.. – моя мати!..
>
> Гляньте!..
>
> Вона пливе прямо до мене…
>
> Мамо, я, твій син, я тут!.. […]

> Незадовго Бояні заснув і – було йому добре. Його мати таки прийшла до нього. І у сні не чув він болю, не видів смерті, лиш усміхався радісно, бо його лице чуло биття серця в теплій матерній груді.[27] (69)

In this dreamlike state, Boiani feels good, warm and is free from any pain. This happy state liberates him from suffering. The example also suggests that psychic trauma caused by war and extreme weather conditions (both are depicted in this novel) might lead to experiences of existential or transcendent dreams or dreamlike states, in which at least one part of the "Self" seeks and attains liberation.

Often literature presents us not with a dream *per se* or even a daydream, but rather a liminal state between reality and dream, mentioned above as *hypnagogia.*[28] Hypnagogic imagery that emerges before falling asleep is depicted in "Ia" in the scene when the protagonist tries to understand whether he is hallucinating. The depiction of hypnagogia contributes to the representation of the trauma of the split Self. On the one hand, the protagonist questions the realness of his mother's image and experiences the inner confusion.

---

[27] He stretched out his arms to the pale-blue distant fog.
"Palm, O palm!.." he called.
"For a year I have not seen you… How glad I am to see you again! Somebody is standing under the palm-tree on the seashore…
A boat leaves the shore...
And in it is... Oh, who is that?... God!...
My mother!..
Look there!...
She is swimming straight toward me!..
O mother, I, your son, am here! (Turians'kyi, *Lost Shadows* 69) […]
Shortly Boiani fell asleep and – was well. His mother came to him, after all… And while sleeping he did not feel any pain nor did he see death. He only smiled joyously, for his face felt the heart throbs in the warm bosom of his mother. (Turians'kyi, *Lost Shadows* 73)

[28] Hypnagogic and hypnopompic state are lingering effects of sleep and after-sleep states, transitional states (into dreaming – hypnagogic, or out of dreaming states – hypnopompic). Hypnopompic imagery takes place upon waking when one continues to see images from a preceding dream (Schwenger 423).

On the other hand, the hypnagogic state interrupts his turmoil; his thinking process ceases. Although he still sees the mother's image, now he only observes how he falls asleep: "І тоді, збентежений, запевняю себе, що це неправда, що ніякої матері нема переді мною […] І тоді в тваринній екстазі *я заплющую очі* […] Тускло горить лампада перед образом Марії. Перед лампадою, як різьблення, стоїть моя зажурна мати. *Але я вже нічого не думаю. Мою голову гладить тихий голубий сон*"[29] [Emphasis mine—DP] (30).

I believe that writing dreams and dreamlike states is a way for modernist writers to address the identity crisis and disturbances in the sense of Self that are often caused by trauma. The texts analyzed in this study suggest that dreams and dreamlike states have a lot to do with matters of identity and the impact of trauma on self-perception. They raise the question, "Who is the real Self?" Is it the person in the dream or is it the one in waking life? Is it both? Is no one real? Hence, the character's self-observation becomes a powerful focal point in the modernist text, together with traumatic memories, a fragmented narrative (often situated between dream and waking life). For a literary critic, I believe, one of the ways to identify the various layers of this process of "Self" observation,[30] is to use the concepts and terminology developed by Dorrit Cohn to determine the various modes of consciousness represented in the text.

So far, I have established that there is a similarity between dreams, dreamlike states of mind and the process of writing. I propose that in the discussed texts, dreams and

---

[29] "Then in a beastly ecstasy *I close my eyes* […]. Feebly the lamp burns before the icon of Maria. And in front of the lamp, like a statue, stands my sorrowful mother. But *I no longer think of anything. A tender, quiet sleep strokes my head"* [Emphasis mine—DP] ("My Self" 40).

[30] I put brackets here, since the mode of narration tells who the dreamer of the dream is, who the narrator is, etc. For instance, third-person narration means that there is a narrator (who often coincides with the author) and a protagonist (observation), whereas in first-person narration the protagonist is the narrator and the dreamer (self-observation).

dreamlike states already have transforming, defamiliarizing force that aid in representation of psychic trauma and its effects on the protagonist's identity.

1.3.2. The effect of defamiliarization

By writing dreams or dreamlike states, writers present something familiar in an unfamiliar way, in other words, they defamiliarize. The term "defamiliarization"[31] was first coined by the Russian Formalist critic Viktor Shklovskii in his article "Art as Technique" (1917), where he makes the connection between the mundane, ordinary, and artistic creation. Shklovskii suggests that poetic images are not unique and do not belong to particular poets but rather are the accumulation of previous epochs:

> Many people still believe that thinking in images […] is the distinguishing feature of poetry [...]. It turns out, however, that images endure and last. From century to century, from country to country, from poet to poet, these images march on without change […] The more you try to explain an epoch, the more you are convinced that the images you thought were created by a given poet were, in reality, passed on to him by others with hardly a change. The work of successive schools of poetry has consisted essentially in accumulating and making known new devices of verbal arrangement and organization. (2)

[31] *Ostranenie* is how Shklovskii calls the term in the original. Robert Stacy comments on the specifics of its translation: "The word *ostranenie* introduced by Shklovskii is also rendered in English as 'estrangement,' 'alienation,' and 'defamiliarization.' The word 'alienation' in English is already closely associated, however with Marx (it translates his *Entfremdung* which is rendered in Russian as *otchuzhdenie*) and, to a lesser extent with Berthold Brecht's concept of *Verfremdung* ("V-effect"). 'Estrangement' is fairly suitable, although it too has rather well-established non-literary connotations. Least used by scholars in the West is 'defamiliarization' which, however, despite its clumsiness and novelty, is most appropriate as a *terminus technicus*" (3). It is crucial to understand that defamiliarization is not a new device. Here Stacy provides references to Voltaire, Montesquieu, etc. (3).

Poetic imagery intensifies the senses and impacts our perception, that otherwise becomes habitual and automatic (5). Shklovskii, in short, talks about awareness of our daily life and our surroundings that poetic imagery can enhance. For, if we are unaware of what is going on around us because we are so used to it, we become bored and unsatisfied.[32] In literary terms, this is where the device of *defamiliarization* comes in and brings new type of alertness into our lives, turning our attention to the perception of the world. In this state of being, we start appreciating and noticing the tiniest things that we might otherwise ignore:

> And so, in order to return sensation to our limbs, in order to make us feel objects, to make a stone feel stony, man has been given the tool of art. The purpose of art, then, is to lead us to a knowledge of a thing through the organ of sight instead of recognition. By "enstranging" objects and complicating form, the device of art makes perception long and "laborious." […] Art is a means of experiencing the process of creativity. The artifact itself is quite unimportant. (Shklovskii 6)

Shklovskii suggests that art has the capacity to intensify the state of being present, of noticing things, of being aware of the "artifact." Consequently, through the device of *defamiliarization*, a thing is described as "if it were perceived for the first time, while an incident is described as if it were happening for the first time" (6). We are forced to see things out of their usual context. Hence, *defamiliarization* can be found almost anywhere (9).[33]

---

[32] "Automatization eats away at things, at clothes, at furniture, at our wives, and at our fear of war. If the complex life of many people takes place entirely on the level of the unconscious, then it's as if this life had never been" (Shklovskii 5).

[33] Shklovskii compares *defamiliarization* to psychological parallelism. In a sense that the task of *defamiliarization* is also to transfer "an object from its customary sphere of perception to a new one" (12).

Svetlana Boym sees *defamiliarization* as both an artistic device and a way of life: "By making things strange, the artist does not simply displace them from an everyday context into an artistic framework; he also helps to 'return sensation' to life itself, to reinvent the world, to experience it anew" (515). According to neo-formalist proposals, as Don Kuiken points out, some dreams have comparable "defamiliarizing and transformative effects" ("An Enriched" 3) because they renew our perception of reality and draw our attention to sensations.

Robert Stacy notices the resemblance between the Shklovskian concept of *defamiliarization* and the concept of satori in Zen Buddhism – an "enlightened" way of perceiving the world (as opposed to a rational or logical understanding of it). This is like our experience of a metaphor or any other aesthetic device: "a good analogy to what happens to our perception when we encounter a striking simile, metaphor, or periphrasis" (36). Consequently, defamiliarization can be viewed as "the process of perception itself," or as "the artistic mode of presentation of that perception" (Stacy 42). Stacy claims that there is an ambiguity in Shklovskii's writings about whether it is the content or the form itself which is defamiliarized: "The fact remains […] that a writer may defamiliarize either his form or his content, or do neither, or do both" (42).[34]

Shklovskii's notion of *defamiliarization* reminds me of what Freud calls "the uncanny," something that is familiar, but is hidden: "on the one hand, that which is familiar and congenial, and on the other, that which is concealed and kept out of sight" ("The 'Uncanny'" 129). From German "unheimlich," it literally means "unhomely" and can be

[34] The transformation of characters in fiction, Stacy argues, is already defamiliarizing (112). The theme of madness, instabilities, ambiguities become common for prose, poetry, art, and drama during the early twentieth century: "For both prose and poetry – and including, of course, drama – the most generally defamiliarizing procedure, especially since the beginning of the twentieth century, has involved those discontinuities and juxtapositional devices" (Stacy 147).

described as something frightening that can still be the part of aesthetic feeling that represents "repulsion," or as I see it – something that portrays horror of the traumatic experiences ("The 'Uncanny'" 123). The effect of the uncanny is often attained by "a recurrence of same things, situations and events" (Freud, "The 'Uncanny'" 144). Freud points out that the uncanny is not something new. It is rather something familiar, but that has been "estranged" in the mind by repression.[35] Hence, it is a familiar thing that is suppressed, but eventually resurfaces ("The 'Uncanny'" 153). As with dreams, Freud differentiates the uncanny in real life and the uncanny in literature. Within a text, the uncanny has something that is missing in real life. Perhaps, it is the aesthetics of a sublime feeling.[36] The uncanny in fiction can be portrayed in many ways and with certain authorial intentions because "the story-teller has a peculiarly directive influence over us" ("The 'Uncanny'" 160).

For the purposes of my study, I will use the term "defamiliarization" in my textual analysis to denote the effect that writers create to represent psychic trauma in fiction. Thus, Ukrainian modernist writers actively use defamiliarization to present trauma, often, as already mentioned, through dreams and dreamlike states. Defamiliarization is used, for instance, to delineate a protagonist's identity crisis, as when Antonenko-Davydovych defamiliarizes for the reader the term "Bolshevik": "'Я – більшовик... *Він хотів це донести до самих глибин свідомості*, але й на цей раз спорснув. Кость зніяковів і стомлено сів. На вустах заграла легка іронічна посмішка. Було неприємно. *Отак само він колись обдурював батьків*"[37] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Smert'* 35).

---

[35] "uncanny is in reality nothing new or foreign, but something familiar and odd-established in the mind that has been estranged only by the process of repression" ("The 'Uncanny'" 148).

[36] "The somewhat paradoxical result is *that in the first place a great deal that is not uncanny in fiction would be so if it happened in real life; and in the second place that there are many more means of creating uncanny effects in fiction than there are in real life*" ("The 'Uncanny'" 158).

[37] "I am a Bolshevik … *He wanted to impress this on the very depths of his consciousness*, but failed this time

Later in the passage, the reader has to figure out why the author brings up lying or why Kost' needs to repeat the phrase "I am a Bolshevik" out loud to himself. This is how Antonenko-Davydovych "makes strange" the identity of his protagonist and points to his inner struggle. Who is Kost'? A Bolshevik? A son? A Ukrainian nationalist? To present this, the writer needs to deconstruct his protagonist's persona first, making the familiar statement "I am a Bolshevik" unfamiliar: "Вся суть, уся непорушна сила її [a pink book that stated his belonging to the Bolshevik Party – DP], що концентрувала Костеву увагу протягом кількох місяців, була в тому, здається зовсім зайвому слові, що притулилося збоку, заховалось навіть у дужки, але яке насправді було і не зайве, і не звичайне – (більшовиків)..."[38] (*Smert'* 34).

On the one hand, Kost' Horobenko is a member of the Bolshevik Party (a familiar situation). On the other hand, he questions this identification and the essence of what it means to be a Bolshevik (unfamiliar). Throughout his thinking process and dreaming, we notice how Kost' eventually convinces himself that he is a Bolshevik and there is no other truth. Therefore, the unfamiliar becomes familiar again: Comrade Horobenko is a Bolshevik.

1.4. Dorrit Cohn's narrative modes for presenting consciousness in fiction

Dorrit Cohn's study *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction* is highly valued by literary critics, including narratologists. Alan Palmer claims that it is "still the only full-length study devoted solely to the topic. All the other full-length studies of which I am aware refer to speech as well as thought or are concerned with

---

too. Kost' became embarrassed and sat down, tired. A light ironical smile played on his lips. He felt uncomfortable. *In the same way he had once deceived his parents*" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Duel* 2).

[38] "The whole essence, its whole inviolable strength which had concentrated his attention over the past few months, was to be found, it seemed, in that quite superfluous word tacked onto the end, hiding inside parentheses, but which in reality was neither superfluous nor ordinary – (Bolshevik)" (*Duel* 2).

narratology generally" (7). Similarly, Brian McHale points out that Cohn corrects the notion that first-person retrospective techniques can better present past states of mind than third-person techniques (186). Although McHale notes a few issues that Cohn has overlooked in her study – such as the representation of perception and the first-person "witness" of an event or another character's story,[39] Cohn's input into the analysis of consciousness representation in fiction is paramount. Among many other details, she pays attention to the distinction and transition between the authorial narrative context and represented consciousness as well as between different types of delineating consciousness, "and especially those points at which the boundaries between types or between consciousness and context are effaced or where ambiguities are exploited" (McHale 189).

I will make use of Dorrit Cohn's taxonomy of narrative techniques to identify the various ways consciousness is depicted in literary texts. Her work will help distinguish moments of dreaming from authorial narration and generally help flesh out the variety of modes of consciousness representation in modernist texts.

Cohn looks at a text from the perspective of grammatical person to show "a profound change in narrative climate" as well as a change in relationship between a narrator and a protagonist. She claims that the change of person affects "the narration of inner events" more strongly than "the narration of outer events" because "past thought must now be presented as *remembered* by the self, as well as expressed by the self" (15). Three *third-person* modes of narration that she identifies will be useful for my work. These are: psycho-narration, quoted

[39] "It seems surprising, for instance, that Cohn has nothing to say about the first-person 'witness,' that narrator who tells not his own but another character's story – heterodiegetic narration, in Genette's terminology. Insofar as the 'witness' reports only his own past states of mind, of course, Cohn's analysis of retrospective techniques is perfectly adequate. But heterodiegetic narration offers considerable scope for representation of consciousness other than the narrator's, often in violation of realistic constraints on knowledge of another's mind" (McHale 187).

monologue, and narrated monologue.

In *psycho-narration,* the narrator provides a "discourse about a character's consciousness" (Cohn 14). The narrator "communicates with the reader about his character – behind his character's back." Hence, the narrator's presence is strongly articulated (Cohn 25). Two types of fictional consciousness can be achieved through psycho-narration – *dissonance* and *consonance*. In the case of dissonance, the narrator distances himself from the protagonist's psyche that s/he delineates (Cohn 26). To disclose the inner world and unclear sides of the psyche, the narrator uses "a highly abstract analytical vocabulary." Cohn compares this type of consciousness representation to "a psychiatrist's diagnostic notes" that are removed from "his patient's free associations" (28). The narrator has the upper hand of knowing the protagonist's inner life and can access the dimensions of a fictional mind "that the latter is unwilling or unable to betray" (Cohn 37). Two of those dimensions – psychic depth and ethical worth – are especially important. The dissonant depiction of psychic depth is useful when the fictional mind cannot clearly access "subliminal zones" of consciousness, whereas the dissonant representation of ethical worth allows the narrator to explicitly "judge" the character (Cohn 29).

In the case of consonance, the narrator blends the narrated consciousness and "avoids prominent analytic or conceptual terms." Cohn points out the "absence of subordination of the 'he thought (felt, knew) that' variety" (31). Thus, the narrator is still there, reporting "inner happenings." However, the "authorial rhetoric" is absent and "the narrator's knowledge of the protagonist's psyche seems to coincide with the protagonist's self-knowledge" (Cohn 31).

Because of its "temporal flexibility," psycho-narration[40] is often used to depict "sub-verbal" states by summarizing "an inner development over a long period of time" and rendering "the flow of successive thoughts and feelings" (Cohn 34). Under the concept "sub-verbal" I also understand dreamlike states of mind and traumatic experiences that psycho-narration seems to have the capacity to represent through the "narrator's knowing words." Or to put it in Cohn's terms: "not only can it [psycho-narration – DP] order and explain a character's conscious thoughts better than the character himself, it can also effectively articulate a psychic life that remains unverbalized, penumbral, or obscure. Accordingly, psycho-narration often renders, in a narrator's knowing words, what a character "knows," without knowing how to put it into words" (46). Moreover, if the narration is about any subliminal levels, the narrator's interference is less needed (Cohn 48).[41]

Another important feature of psycho-narration is the obscure boundary between the external and internal reality, mainly because of the use of similar perception verbs and phrases to depict both imaginary and real experiences: "purely imaginary perceptions by day—or night—dreaming minds are sometimes introduced by the identical phrases that signal a character's perception of the surrounding world" (Cohn 50).

Dorrit Cohn argues that the narration of dreams can take many forms. However, "the dream as a whole" is generally presented through psycho-narration. One of the reasons is that "the mind in vision is paralyzed," and the dreaming mind oversees any experiences within a dream. To connect the experiences of the protagonist's dreamlife and wakeful state, writers

---

[40] On the contrary, Cohn points out the limited possibility of the other two third-person modes: "In quoted and narrated monologues the rendering of consciousness is temporarily restricted to the sequential instants of silent locution, the time of narration roughly coinciding with the narrated time" (34).

[41] "The non-verbal quality of certain inner experiences is on occasion stressed after the fact, that is after lengthy and detailed narration – perhaps for fear that the reader may fail to recognize the circumvention of self-articulation that has just taken place" (Cohn 48).

often "use the same thoughts in dreams and for waking thoughts" (51). I propose that identifying the mode of narration, and particularly, the cases of relations between fictitious wakeful and dream lives, often portrayed through recurrent symbols and metaphors, will aid in revealing the effects of social trauma on the characters' psyche.

The central point for my study is Cohn's statement that dreams in fiction need to be presented via third-person modes, but not monologue techniques because the dreaming subject is incapable of simultaneously dreaming and narrating the dream: "a dreamer does not tell himself his dream while he dreams it, any more than a waking person tells himself his experiences while they are in progress" (Cohn 52). Consequently, because the dreamer does not control his dreams, dreams in fiction require "mediation." The narrator fills this interposition since s/he can access both dreaming and waking minds of the protagonists: "Within the confines of third-person fiction, where a narrator's magic power allows him to see into sleeping minds quite as readily as into waking ones, dreams are a form of mental life peculiarly in need of indirect mediation" (Cohn 52).

Quoted (interior) *monologue*,[42] the second mode of consciousness representation, depicts "character's mental discourse" (Cohn 14). It represents a duality of viewpoints through the mesh of quoted monologues and narrative context. Cohn explains that a monologist in a third-person text is "always more or less subordinated to the narrator," so the

[42] Cohn combines the terms "quoted monologue" and "interior monologue": "since the interiority (silence) of self-address is generally assumed in modern narrative, 'interior' is a near-redundant modifier, and should, on strictly logical grounds, be replaced by 'quoted.' But the term 'interior monologue' is so solidly entrenched […] that more would be lost than gained in discarding it completely. I will therefore use the combined term 'quoted interior monologue,' reserving the option to drop the second adjective at will, and the first whenever the context permits" (13). She also points out that the interior monologue can still develop within the third-person context, it is usually presented in the form of quoted monologue: "In third-person context the direct expression of a character's thought (in first-person form) will always be a quotation, a quoted monologue. But this direct expression of thought can be presented outside a narrative context as well, and can shape an independent first-person form of its own: the type of text also normally referred to as 'interior monologue'" (15).

narrator imposes his perspective on the character: “our evaluation of what he [the monologist – DP] says to himself remains tied to the perspective (neutral or opiniated, friendly or hostile, emphatic or ironic) into which the narrator places him for us” (66). The effect of quoted monologues depends on the situation that the narrator portrays. Sometimes they can increase the distance between the narrator and his character and at times, homogenize the narrating and figural voices (Cohn 76).

Cohn argues that one of the “conventions” of third-person texts is “the *audition* of another voice in another head” (77). Thus, she distinguishes fictional dialogue and fictional monologue. While the former “imitates a readily observable aspect of human behavior,” the latter – a fictional monologue – reveals “a concealed linguistic activity” (Cohn 77). This linguistic activity represents something we can refer to as “inner voice.” It is difficult to verify. Yet, writers and readers know that this inner voice exists, mainly because they can draw parallels with their everyday life. Therefore, this inner voice in literature is not completely fictional, rather it is a “generally accepted psychological reality” (Cohn 77).

Because of this connection with mundane psychological reality, quoted monologue can be also called “interior language,” or “inner speech” (Cohn 78). It is also well-known for its capacity to depict “passive states of mind,” “incongruous imagery,” and “random thoughts that we associate with the stream-of-consciousness novel” (Cohn 84). However, Cohn specifies that the use of the monologue technique depends on the author’s intention. Sometimes it is employed to depict habitual processes of the human mind. At other times, it is used to portray the protagonist’s inner crisis, and situations when those habitual processes break down (81).

Another distinction between monologue and dialogue is the semantic pattern of the monologue to "self-address," or in other words, the situation when the first and second pronouns refer to the same subject. Although grammatically the monologue might resemble the dialogue, its semantics reveals the context where two persons ("you" and "I") coincide, breaking down the "normal dichotomy of speech."[43]

Narrated monologue[44] or "a character's mental discourse in the guise of the narrator's discourse" resembles psycho-narration in person and tense, but also is like quoted monologue because it contains inner monologues of the protagonist presented by the narrator: "Linguistically, it is the most complex of the three techniques: like psycho-narration it maintains the third-person reference and the tense of narration, but like the quoted monologue it reproduces verbatim the character's own mental language" (Cohn 14). Other terms closely related to what Cohn calls "narrated monologue" are "free indirect speech," "indirect interior monologue," and "reported speech" (13).

The free indirect discourse of narrated monologue technique entails the "transposition" of grammatical person and tense that transforms "a narrated into an interior monologue," maintaining the third-person context: "It may be most succinctly defined as the technique for rendering a character's thought in his own idiom while maintaining the third-person reference and the basic tense of narration" (Cohn 100).

---

[43] By "normal dichotomy of speech," Cohn implies the semantic pattern "in which 'you' always refers to the person spoken to, 'I' to the person speaking" (90).

[44] In French structuralism, "narrated monologue" is addressed as *style indirect libre*, or "free indirect style," in Anglo-American criticism it "bears no standard name" (Cohn 108). Cohn considers not only linguistic, but also literary features of consciousness narration. Thus, she emphasizes the difference between spoken thoughts and silent discourse, and chooses the definition of the term from there: "The French and German terms have generally designated not only the rendering of silent thought in narrated form, but also the analogous rendering of spoken discourse, which displays identical linguistic features. I have deliberately chosen a term that excludes this analogues employment of the technique, because in a literary – rather than a strictly linguistic – perspective the narration of silent thoughts present problems that are quite separate, and far more intricate and interesting than those presented by its more vocal twin" (109).

The narrated monologue differs from psycho-narration by the "absence of mental verbs" ("He knew"; "He felt"). Tense and person distinguish it from quoted monologue (Cohn 104).[45] Yet, linguistic criteria are not enough to identify the narrated monologue, or any of the techniques for rendering consciousness. Psychological and contextual implications must be taken into consideration. For instance, the function of narrated monologue varies when it borders with other techniques. It might aid in portraying the protagonists' thoughts explicitly, when it neighbours with psycho-narration: "when it borders on psycho-narration, it takes on a more monologic quality and creates the impression of rendering thoughts explicitly formulated in the figural mind" (Cohn 106). The ambiguity of the narrated monologue lies in its ability to ascribe language to the figural mind, and at the same time, its capacity to fuse narrational and figural language.[46]

The narrated monologue and figural narration are closely related, especially when the language of the text coincides with the language of the figural mind. In this case, as Cohn explains, the narrated monologue is the "quintessence of figural narration" because the character's thought process is integrated into the third-person context (111). The narrator's identification with the character's mentality, that the narrated monologue helps reinforce, indicates the constant presence of the narrator in fiction (Cohn 112).

Cohn applies similar principles of consciousness representation to *first-person* texts and autobiographical novels that are based on the "modified relationship of the narrator to the subject of his narration" (14). Thus, she identifies *self-narration*, *self-quoted* and *self-*

[45] Cohn provides a scheme of how these three modes of consciousness representation might look like in a text: quoted monologue: (He thought:) I am late/ I was late/ I will be late; Am I late?; narrated monologue: He was late/He had been late/ He would be late; Was he late?; psycho-narration: He knew he was late/ He knew he had been late/ He knew he would be late; he wondered if he was late (105).

[46] "Both its dubious attribution of language to the figural mind, and its fusion of narrational and figural language charge it with ambiguity, give it a quality of now-you-see-it, now-you-don't" (Cohn 107).

narrated monologues.[47]

*Self-narratio*n mimics the third-person psycho-narration. Apart from a contrasting grammatical person, the difference is also that a first-person narrator delineates his past self, whereas a third-person narrator unfolds his relationship to his protagonist (Cohn 143). Although self-narration can address "inarticulate states of consciousness, or summarize long-range psychological situations," like psycho-narration in the third-person context, the first-person narrator has limited access to his own psyche.

I have addressed the problem of depicting processes of the psyche, especially dreamlike states, earlier in this section. To reiterate, the dreamer cannot dream and narrate his dream simultaneously. Likewise, the first-person protagonist cannot experience something and narrate this experience at the same time. Therefore, to refer to deep processes of the psyche, a first-person narrator must validate his cognition, "particularly when it involves the most inchoate moments of his past" (Cohn 144). To do that, a first-person narrator might use "verbatim quotation" and "narration of thoughts that passed through his mind" (Cohn 144).

Like psycho-narration, self-narration can be dissonant and consonant. In *dissonant self-narration*, the narrator is articulate and clearly distances himself from his past self: "A lucid narrator turning back on a past self steeped in ignorance, confusion, and delusion" (Cohn 145). In *consonant self-narration*, the text is "self-centered." Although the narrator still depicts his inner life, he does not analyze it. He "simply records" what is, without examining the causes: "though the retrospective narrative stance is maintained, the narrator

[47] Cohn also identifies the *autonomous monologue* as a separate technique for rendering consciousness, different from the autobiographical narration, and characterized by "the absence of a 'manipulating narrator'" (219). See more in Dorrit Cohn's chapter "The Autonomous Monologue" in her book *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*, pp. 217-265.

never draws attention to his hindsight: neither analyzing nor generalizing, he simply records the inner happenings, juxtaposing them in incongruous succession, without searching for causal links" (Cohn 156).

Self-quoted monologue is the quotation of a protagonist's past thoughts, typically presented through the structure "I said to myself…" (Cohn 161). In *self-narrated monologue*, the narrator asks questions that are answered in the text right away, or "makes statements about past events that are immediately belied by what happens next, or asks questions that are clearly answered on the following page of his text" (Cohn 166).

The self-narrated monologue correlates to the narrated monologue in third-person texts. In first-person narration, it is valuable when the narrator describes his unsettled "existential crisis" that he struggles to re-examine: "Unable to cast a retrospective light on past experience, he can only relive his dark confusions, perhaps in the hope of ridding himself of them." Both self-narrated and narrated monologue techniques create "the illusion of a fiction that 'tells itself,' without the ministrations of a narrator" (Cohn 168;169).

Overall, Cohn explains, in comparison to the retrospective techniques, the consonant modes in third-person narration present more opportunities for writers to depict the inner happenings of their protagonists: "For writers seeking to present the most complex inner adventures in the most direct possible manner, the consonant techniques in third-person narration offer obvious advantages over the retrospective techniques" (172).

***

In this chapter, I have outlined the key theoretical concepts and methodologies that I will use to approach my texts in the chapters that follow. I will be combining

interdisciplinary fields to show how traumatic experiences are represented in modernist texts. Specifically, I will make use of trauma theory, literary dream analysis (with emphasis on metaphors, effect of defamiliarization), and techniques for rendering consciousness.

Chapter 2. A Narrative of Human Suffering. Osyp Turians'kyi's Testimony to WWI: *Poza mezhamy boliu*

2.1. Background

The fate of the world was drastically affected in 1914. Within a matter of few days most European countries were at war,[48] pitting the Central Powers (Austria-Hungary, Germany, Bulgaria and the Ottoman Empire) against the Allies (Serbia, Russia, France, the UK, Italy, Belgium, the United States). WWI was the first conflict in human history that impacted the entire world. When the war began, no one expected that it would last until 1918. At first, in 1914-1915, the spark of patriotism led to wide support for the conflict. But by 1916 there were ever more rebellions and protests, especially among soldiers who—exhausted from ongoing battles—could not understand the meaning of the war. In 1918, Germany and Austria-Hungary lost; however, WWI was followed by revolutions and civil wars (Reient, "Peredmova" 11).[49]

During WWI, some parts of Western Ukraine were occupied by the Austro-Hungarian army and some Western Ukrainian lands were seized for extended periods by the Russian Empire, which already was in control of Eastern Ukraine. About 250,000 to 300,000

[48] "On 28 July 1914, Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia. On 30 July, Russia ordered general mobilisation. During the night of 30-31 July, Austria-Hungary decided to mobilise, followed on 1 August by Germany and France at approximately the same time. Also on 1 August, Germany declared war on Russia, and on France on 3 August. On 4 August the United Kingdom declared war on Germany, and on 6 August Austria-Hungary declared war on Russia. Within a few days virtually all the great European powers were at war (with the exception of Italy at this stage, which did not declare war on Austria-Hungary until 23 May 1915)" (Becker and Krumeich 1: 39).

[49] The October Revolution of 1917 in Petrograd, which led to the Ukrainian Revolution and the formation of the Ukrainian People's Republic (UNR) ended the war on Ukrainian territories but led to a civil war in Ukraine from 1918-1921 (Volkovyns'kyi 158). One of the main consequences of WWI was the realization of the Bolshevik plan towards Ukraine (Reient, "Peredmova" 15). Russian tsarism believed that it had a moral right and was even obliged before other Slavic peoples to protect them. This was, however, diplomatic rhetoric. St.-Petersburg was planning to expand its borders up to the Carpathians, masquerading behind the idea of the union of brotherly peoples (Reient, "Persha" 303).

Ukrainians fought on the side of the Austro-Hungarian empire, and 3.5 to 4.5 million ethnic Ukrainians were in the Russian army. Ukrainian lands became a battleground between two empires (Reient, "Peredmova" 11, 12). The army of the Austro-Hungarian empire consisted of various nationalities. Ukrainian divisions of the Austro-Hungarian army basically fought on the Serbian and Italian fronts (Volkovyns'kyi 141).[50]

Oleksandr Reient states that during WWI human losses were equivalent to the losses of the two previous centuries combined. It had a deep impact on civilization (Reient, "Peredmova" 16). Not only battles, but diseases and hunger affected the psyche of millions of people. The tragic effect of this war on children, women and men, on their psyche, mental, emotional and physical wellbeing cannot be overstated. A recent study by Tulane child psychiatry professor Dr. Stacy Drury shows the negative effects of childhood trauma across generations, proving its long-lasting consequences (Brannon).

In his 1917 novel *Poza mezhamy boliu (Lost Shadows* in the English translation),[51] Osyp Turians'kyi addresses the psychological suffering induced by WWI (which the author witnessed himself) and the severe weather conditions that caused physical exhaustion (death for some) and mental breakdown of many soldiers. Andrew Mykytiak, who met Turians'kyi in Vienna and translated the novel into English in 1935, points out the uniqueness of this text, and states that its focus on the psychology of the protagonists complicated the translator's work: "A further difficulty was encountered in translating this work from the

[50]After the war, during the 1917-1920, Myroslav Shkandrij mentions, Ukrainians had struggled "to create an independent Ukrainian People's Republic (UNR)" but instead they "found themselves under foreign rule and divided between four separate states. Central and Eastern Ukraine was under Moscow's control, Galicia and Western Volhynia became part of Poland, Northern Bukovyna was incorporated into Romania, and Transcarpathia was incorporated into Czechoslovakia. By far the largest population outside Soviet borders was in Galicia and other parts of Poland, where there were some five to six million Ukrainians, although unofficial estimates sometimes put the figure at seven million" ("Interwar Nationalism" 17).

[51] I will refer to it as *Poza mezhamy* (Ukrainian version) and *Lost* (English translation by Andrew Mykytiak).

Ukrainian into English, in that the novel deals principally with psychological reaction rather than physical action, for the author describes the mental suffering and agony of his characters instead of the physical brutalities of war" ("Translator's Note" 7).

The English translation differs from the original Ukrainian that appeared in 1921 (Vienna-Chicago) and in 1989 (Kyiv). The translation contains added passages and dialogues that are absent from the Ukrainian text (see pp. 80, 83, 93-99, 245 in *Lost Shadows*), for which I did not find any explanation. It is possible that because Mykytiak knew Turians'kyi personally, he might have translated from a different version of the manuscript. Although this fact did not impact my analysis of the text, it proves the importance of close reading of the original, especially in determining the modes for presenting consciousness. I include the translation for purposes of convenience, but my analysis is solely based on the Ukrainian text.

Turians'kyi's pacifist ideas are presented in the novel through his criticism of war. They resonate with the pacifists' campaign during WWI "to unveil the nature of modern warfare" (Cooper 141). He judges imperialism and the human suffering it caused through forced mobilization. The absurdity of war is at the forefront of *Poza mezhamy*.[52] One striking example is when the narrator explains that Serbs killed weak people so as not to leave them

[52] The theme of absurdity of the Russo-Japanese war is central to the plot of Leonid Andreyev's *Krasnyi smekh* [*Red Laugh*] (1905). For instance, the narrator's brother finds out that his legs were torn off by his own men with one of their shells ("fired out of one of our own guns by one of our men"): "Минут, вероятно, через пятнадцать по начале этого страшного боя мне оторвало обе ноги, и опомнился я уже в лазарете, после ампутации. […] Да, кажется, это были наши, – и нашей гранатой, пущенной из нашей пушки нашим солдатом, оторвало мне ноги. И никто не мог объяснить, как это случилось" (*Krasnyi* 495). ["About fifteen minutes after the beginning of that strange engagement both my legs were torn off, and I recovered consciousness in the hospital after the amputation. […] Yes, I believe they were our own men after all – and it was with one of our shells, fired out of one of our guns by one of our men, that my legs had been torn off. And nobody could explain how it had happened" (Andreyev and Linden, *Red Laugh* 72-73).] The narrator emphasizes the insanity of war, pointing out that there is no meaning in battles anymore; people fight just to shed blood (*Krasnyi* 513).

behind in the fear that they might recover and strengthen the enemy armies of the Germans and Austrians whose riffles they can hear in a distance.[53]

The topic of war was described in works by Marko Cheremshyna (a collection "Selo vyhybaie" ["The Village is Dying Out," 1925]) and Vasyl' Stefanyk (e.g., "Ditocha pryhoda" ["Children's Adventure," 1926]). However, Turians'kyi's primary focus on the soldiers' psyche distinguishes his novel from other literary texts about war. After *Poza mezhamy*, Turians'kyi created, what Taras Prokhas'ko considers, an even stronger antiwar text – *Duma pralisu* [Duma of the Primeval Forest] (1921) – an allegorical novel about animals who gather in the forest for a tribunal (00:16:29-00:18:00).[54]

It is known that writing can have cathartic capacities. The term *katharsis*, meaning "the release of emotion," mainly of pity and fear, was first mentioned by Aristotle (*Politics* 347).[55] From a literary perspective, catharsis can be viewed as a therapeutic way of purgation

---

[53] "Це сербські вартівники вбивають немічних людей, які вже не можуть піднятися. […] Серб здіймає з плечей кріс і підходить до неї. Людина витягає руки й розказує сербові: 'Мої діти ще оттакі маленькі. От тіцькі ще.' – Показує рукою, як маленькі його діти, й роздираючим голосом благає: 'Брате сербе, не осирочуй моїх діточок!' – Але ворог не знає милосердя. Лунає гук вистрілу. (*Poza mezhamy* 47)
["It is the guards killing the helpless who cannot rise to their feet. […] The enemy raises the rifle from his shoulder and draws closer to him. The man extends his hands to the enemy, stammering: 'My children are still so small… merely tots as yet…' He indicates with his hand how little his children are, and with a voice that chills to the marrow of the bone, he pierces this world of darkness: 'Brother Serb, oh! do not make my babies orphans!' But mercy is unknown to enemies. Woe to the vanquished! A shot echoes" (*Lost* 19).]

[54] Other works by Turians'kyi: *Syn zemli* (Son of the Soil, 1933), the story collection *Borot'ba za velykist'* (The Struggle for Greatness, 1926) and the comedy *Raby* (Slaves, 1927).

[55] The limited reference to catharsis in Aristotle's *Poetics* and *Politics* has engendered different interpretations. In ancient Greek, catharsis "is a cleansing or purgation that removes impurities and diseases in the body […]. *Catharsis* in this sense is therapeutic"; "the ritual purification of people"; "clarification or clearing up, where what is clarified is some state, physical or mental, that is an impediment to a thing functioning in its proper state. This was used to refer to physical things, for example the clarification or *catharsis* of a river, as well as to the intellectual clarification of the mind or soul" (Curran 216). Curran talks about two broad approaches to the notion of *catharsis* in Poetics: 1) "The idea is that *catharsis* involves an outlet and evacuation of something that is harmful to the psyche, in the manner that a medical purgation involves a removal of something that is harmful for the body. A spectator goes to the theater to have his excess emotions drained away in the way that one might go to the doctor to have some noxious excess substance removed from one's body" (Curran 217). 2) "The second general approach to *catharsis* relates to the second and third sense, "purification" and "clarification." The nature of *catharsis* is to make clear, purify, or refine some condition of a thing in the way

of painful emotions and/or memories: "*Catharsis* […] has a therapeutic aspect, something that is available to all spectators, because it can lighten the burden of the painfulness of their experience of pity and fear, providing a pleasurable relief" (Curran 232). Thus, because of its cathartic quality, writing can help with remembering and mourning the traumatic event and its aftermath: "We enter an 'as-if' world of metaphor. We grieve 'as if' we really are abused children once more" (Kenny 480). Similarly, reading *Poza mezhamy*, we ourselves relive the events described in the novel "as if" we feel empathy for the pain of the soldiers, and we can release it through reading the text. Not only does Turians'kyi depict pain and suffering of his characters who were drawn from real-life people, but also employs the theme of liberation from pain as a leitmotif of his novel. For example, in situations of mental breakdown and despair, the soldiers transcend their suffering by hallucinating about people they love and miss. It is as if they undergo purgation of their mental and emotional states to reach, even if for a moment, a feeling of catharsis.

Richard Kearney emphasizes the cathartic (purgative) qualities of storytelling and points out the interrelation between catharsis and trauma. Since storytelling can have a cathartic effect, it is beneficial for healing trauma (something explored by Maria-Louise von Franz and Bruno Bettelheim in folkloric tales) (54). In an artistic way, narrative testimonies (e.g., literary, cinematic, theatrical, etc.) help to pass on the unspeakable horrible events to the next generations so that they remember the collective history: "Indeed, even today it is probable that people receive a certain 'cathartic' release from deep trauma in having their histories (personal or communal) recounted and acknowledged" (Kearney 57).

There is some research dedicated to Turians'kyi's oeuvre (Plöhn, Huzar, Pechars'kyi, Nestelieiev), but there is no study that explores the nature of trauma in the novel. I agree with

---

that one might remove mud or weeds from some water in a river to make it suitable for drinking" (Curran 217).

professor Robert Plöhn that *Poza mezhamy* is a useful source for studying psychopathic phenomena caused by physical and psychological exhaustion (XXX).[56] Although the text carries a plethora of meanings, metaphors and symbols, this study aims to analyze the novel in the context of our contemporary understanding of trauma in literature. Therefore, I view *Poza mezhamy* as a trauma narrative because Turians'kyi focuses on the psychic reality of his protagonists and emphasizes their emotional struggle, psychological breakdown and borderline mental situations. The novel—a testimony to human suffering—is rich in various stylistic elements and narrative techniques. At the same time, it is more than a testimony because it does not address only external circumstances and horrors. It is, in fact, an artistic response to mental breakdown, something that cannot be documented by history books.

The novel brings together personal and collective experiences of trauma. Through the story of seven soldiers there is an allusion to mankind overall. Identifying the narrative modes for presenting consciousness will help me to show how the writer depicts conscious and unconscious states of the protagonists. I will also explore some expressionistic features which serve to portray the traumatized psyche. The analysis of the collective and personal experience of trauma will be done by examining the archetype of the mother, that is present throughout the story.

2.1.1. Biographical note

Osyp Turians'kyi was born in 1880 in the village of Ohliadiv, Lviv region. He graduated from the Academic Gymnasium of Lviv. In 1907, he defended his dissertation “Pro zvuk ‘e’ v ukrains'kii movi” (“About the Sound ‘e’ in Ukrainian”) and acquired his doctoral degree in

[56] In Plöhn’s article, pagination with Roman numerals is used.

the department of philosophy at Vienna university (Holubets' 6).[57] His literary career also began in Vienna in 1908 with the publication in the almanac *Sich*[58] of his first short stories "De sontse?" ("Where is the Sun?"), "Ei, kob mene buly vchyly (fotographia z zhyttia)" ("Hey, would that they had taught me (a snapshot from life)," "Kurka (z ukrains'koho zhyttia na Volyni)" ("Chicken (on the basis of Ukrainian life in Volyn'"). His early short stories were about the Western Ukrainian village, its poverty and challenges at the beginning of the twentieth century. Turian'kyi knew peasant life himself since he grew up in the village and often returned there when vacationing. Thematically, his early works are reminiscent of short stories by Vasyl' Stefanyk ("Vyvodyly z sela" [1905]), Marko Cheremshyna (the collection of stories *Karby* [Signs, 1901]), and Les' Martovych ("Muzhyts'ka smert'" ["A Peasant Death," 1898])[59] (Pinchuk, "Osyp Turians'kyi" 19; 22).

In 1910, Turians'kyi worked as a teacher of Ukrainian language and literature in Przemysl gymnasium, now in Poland (Pinchuk, "Syluet" 174). In 1914, the writer was mobilized into the Austrian army to serve at the Austro-Serbian front. In winter of 1915 the Germans attacked, and the Serbs started falling back, taking sixty thousand captives with them, among whom was Turians'kyi. According to him, only fifteen thousand survived. Severe conditions affected everyone, both the captives and the Serbian convoy guards (*Poza*

---

[57] See also an entry on Turiansky, Osyp in the *Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine*.

[58] It was the almanac of the Ukrainian Academic Society in Vienna (1868-1947). The members of the society were students at various higher educational institutions in Vienna. Their goal was to disseminate "informative materials about the suppressed country among international circles of students and the Austrian population at large" (Kukhar, *Viennese 'Sich'* 171).

Roman Oliinyk-Rakhmannyi claims that Osyp Turians'kyi published his works in the monthly literary journal in Lviv *Mytusa* (22). However, I did not find Turians'kyi's name in the contents of this journal (which published only five issues during 1922), neither did any other critic like Holubets', Pinchuk, Fedoriv or Plöhn mention this fact.

[59] Later works by Vasyl' Stefanyk (e.g., "Pistunka," "Ditocha pryhoda") are often associated with expressionism. See, for example, Oleksandra Chernenko, *Ekspresionizm u tvorchosti Vasylia Stefanyka.* The depiction of the protagonist's inner psychological trials in Les' Martovych's prose (e.g., *Zabobon*) is analayzed by Oleh Ilnytzkyj in "Private Worlds: The Psychological Dimension of Les' Martovych's Prose."

mezhamy 44). Turians'kyi witnessed his comrades freeze and starve to death. The fact that he himself returned alive was sheer luck. When Serbian doctors, together with a Ukrainian captive doctor—Vasyl' Romanyshyn—were passing by, they noticed a body that showed signs of life among the frozen corpses. Together they saved Turians'kyi by applying a risky method – they immersed him into the freezing river to restore his body from hypothermia (a drop of body temperature due to exposure to cold[60]) (*Poza mezhamy* 126). From Serbia, Turians'kyi, together with other captives, was sent to an internment camp in Italy, on the island of Elba. There in 1917 he wrote *Poza mezhamy*, which was first published in Vienna in 1921 (Pinchuk, "Syluet" 175). Turians'kyi also worked as a journalist in the Italian publications "Corriere della Sera," "Avanti!" and others, as well as in the English "The Manchester Guardian" (Holubets' 7).

After the war, he moved to Vienna and taught Indo-European law at the University of Vienna (Pinchuk, "Syluet" 175). Turians'kyi tried to return to Galicia but the Polish government that oversaw this region at the time, kept delaying his visa. Only in 1923 did the writer return to Galicia. That same year he participated in establishing the publishing house "Zhuravli" ("Cranes") together with Mykola Uhryn-Bezhrishnyi and Antin Lotots'kyi (Pinchuk, "Osyp Turians'kyi" 20). He also worked in a private school. For some time, he was a principal of the Drohobyts'ka gymnasium in Iavoriv. Here he taught German, Latin and French. Although students loved him, he had difficulties with the board members. Until the end of his life, in 1933, he worked as a teacher in the Polish public school in Lviv (Pinchuk, "Syluet" 176).

[60] See Bennett, Brad, and John B. Holcomb "Battlefield Trauma-Induced Hypothermia: Transitioning the Preferred Method of Casualty Rewarming."

2.1.2. Reception of the novel

Poza mezhamy was received positively, especially abroad. In 1921, it was translated into German by professor Robert Plöhn.[61] It was discussed together with the works of Henri Barbusse (*Under Fire)* and Leonid Andreyev (*Krasnyi Smekh* [Red Laugh]) (Plöhn II; XIV). In particular, Turians'kyi's novel was praised for its uniqueness and evocative power when depicting the psychological depth of the human soul, psychic disturbances and psychological crises, which might have been inspired by Hegel's and E. Hartman's philosophy (Plöhn XX).[62] Plöhn emphasized that the writer does not even depict any scenes of military battles, nor does he display any journalistic bias as in *Krasnyi Smekh* and especially *Under Fire* (XIII; XIV).

Plöhn saw a certain level of optimism and faith in the brotherhood of nations, despite the tragedy portrayed in the novel (XLII). Perhaps, intentionally, Pinchuk claims, Turians'kyi depicts seven soldiers as representatives of different nationalities (the author/narrator and Dobrovs'kyi were Ukrainian; Sabo a Hungarian; Shtrantsinger an Austrian; Pshylus'kyi a Pole; and the Serbs Boiani and Nikolych[63]) ("Syluet" 179). Bohdan Lepkyi stated that when reading the novel, one is torn between marvelling at the author's experience and his manner of writing ("Poza mezhamy" 72-73).[64] Petro Karmans'kyi also praised *Poza mezhamy*, although he thought that the author spoiled the initial harmony of the text and burdened it with too many decorative elements ("Trahediia").

While such modernists like Bohdan Lepkyi, Petro Karmans'kyi and critics like Oleksa

[61] *Jenseits von Leid und Schmerz.*

[62] Turians'kyi had a deep knowledge of West European literary trends and movements because he lived and studied in Vienna (Lebedivna 51).

[63] The spelling of the names of the characters of *Poza mezhamy* is transliterated from the Ukrainian original.

[64] "Отсі рямці, в які оправлений образ Турянського ніякої оздоби не потрібує. Це сама в собі річ замітна і небуденна. Читаючи, не знаєш, чи більше дивуватись тому, що автор пережив, чи тому, що написав. Одно і друге справді 'поза межами болю.' Воно велике" (Lepkyi, "Poza mezhamy" 72).

Kuschak, Mykhailo Selehii praised the novel highly,[65] Turians'kyi's works were ignored by the *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk* (*Literary-Scientific Herald* 1922-32),[66] edited by Dmytro Dontsov. He—an immigrant from Eastern Ukraine and a journalist—created a platform for nationalist writers and was, as Myroslav Shkandrij puts it, "crucial in turning Western Ukrainian youth toward a cultish form of nationalism" ("Interwar Nationalism" 38). The 1920s-30s in Galicia saw the establishment of various political parties and movements, e.g., social-democratic, nationalist, conservative and communist (Reient, "Vplyv" 141). Ukrainians tried to preserve their "historical identity" and opposed "the government's attempts to de-nationalize them" (Shkandrij, "Interwar Nationalism" 24).[67] It is not surprising then that the main characteristic of Western Ukrainian literary traditions after WWI was the belief that literature should serve the nation and be an instrument for national liberation (Oliinyk-Rakhmannyi 26).[68] Consequently, the nationalist-oriented literary critics and writers were repelled, Pinchuk argues, by the anti-imperialistic and anti-war nature of Turians'kyi's oeuvre, as well as his idea of brotherhood among nations ("Osyp Turians'kyi" 17). Turians'kyi was accused of not writing his text according to current ideological inclinations.

---

[65] See the afterword to Turians'kyi's comedy *Raby* (Slaves) published in 1927 (pp. 156-160).

[66] Other periodicals and journals that supported the nationalistic idea of the *Literary-Scientific Herald* also either ignored Turians'kyi's works or spoke negatively of them (Pinchuk, "Osyp Turians'kyi" 17).

[67] "All political currents [in Western Ukraine – DP] desired Ukraine's independence, or at least […] Galicia's autonomy. Ukrainian communists in the Communist Party of Western Ukraine (CPWU) also sought independence, which they envisaged in terms of Western Ukraine's annexation by the Soviet Ukrainian Republic" (Shkandrij, "Interwar Nationalism" 25). However, the support of the Soviet Ukraine's national policy by the CPWU weakened already in the 1927, when Oleksandr Shumsky who oversaw Ukrainization was removed. The CPWU kept challenging Soviet policy. Consequently, it became obvious that "in the 1920s Moscow used the popular Ukrainization policy to interfere in Polish affairs." During the early thirties, Soviet Russia's agenda was obvious: "non-Russian nationalism posed the greatest threat" and Western Ukraine was seen by Moscow as "the territory around which the drive for independence could be consolidated" (Shkandrij, "Interwar Nationalism" 37).

[68] Similar ideas are expressed by O. Rubliov (342) and O. Reient ("Vplyv" 143). Reient argues that such ideologues as M. Mikhnovs'kyi, D. Dontsov, Iu. Vassyian, and V. Matyts' created the theoretical foundation for nationalist organizations such as the Ukrainian Military Organization (Ukrains'ka viis'kova organizatsiia (UVO), etc. (143).

Roman Fedoriv claims that not only was Turians'kyi not affiliated with any of the organizations, but—on the contrary—in his 1927 comedy *Raby* (*Slaves*), he criticized Galician bourgeois society with which he had dealt in Drohobych (13). Only at the end of the 1920s did he start collaborating with the members of the communist movement in Western Ukraine. Turians'kyi helped to establish journals oriented toward Soviet Ukraine, e.g., the journal *Novi Shliakhy* (*New Ways*) (Pinchuk, "Osyp Turians'kyi" 18).[69] However, Turians'kyi's talent as a writer was not appreciated under the Soviets. In the 1940s-50s, his name was completely forgotten (Huzar 13). In 1967, a planned publication of *Poza mezhamy* by the publishing house "Kameniar" was not realized because someone spread the false rumour that during WWI Turians'kyi was a member of a nationalist Ukrainian unit, the Ukrains'ki Sichovi Stril'tsi [The Legion of Ukrainian Sich Riflemen], which was considered a threat by Soviet officials (Fedoriv 7).

2.2. *Poza mezhamy* as a trauma novel

In analyzing the trauma novel, Ronald Granofsky suggests identifying its three interdependent stages: "fragmentation"; "regression" and "reunification":

> In the trauma novel, unassimilable reality throws the individual character back upon his or her elemental nature. With identity under severe stress, the character regresses to seek the security necessary to survive. The traumatic state, however, also places the self and the world in a totally different light, since the normal categories of knowledge assimilation are disrupted. After a painful period of psychic

[69] Like many representatives of the West Ukrainian intelligentsia, Turians'kyi envisioned a better future if Western Ukraine were to join Soviet Ukraine (Pinchuk, "Osyp Turians'kyi" 21). This orientation on communist Ukraine was predicated by the repression of minorities under Polish rule. In 1930, for instance, special military expeditions were organized by the Polish government against the peasants in order to prevent their collaboration with the intelligentsia who wanted independence for Ukraine (Oliinyk-Rakhmannyi 14).

> fragmentation, the individual may begin to see a new pattern in things which adumbrates a transformation into an integrated personhood. The agony of trauma has been absorbed and integrated. The individual is also representative of a group faced with trauma, ultimately, the human race faced with destruction. (19)

Through vivid literal and metaphoric images, with emphasis on horror and suffering, *Poza mezhamy* mimics the psychic trauma of the protagonists who are drawn from real life. Following Granofsky's analysis, I propose to present the development of the novel's plot in a similar way. Although it is not my goal to establish a strict structure, I find that tentatively identifying these stages can help to see the representation of trauma in the text clearer.

Poza mezhamy consists of five chapters that recount the story of seven fellow soldiers (as mentioned, they are Dobrovs'kyi, Shtrantsinger, Pshylus'kyi, Doctor Ohliadivs'kyi,[70] Sabo, Nikolych and Boiani) who fought on the side of the Austrian army. Together with thousands of other captives (taken by the Serbs), they are led through the mountains of Albania in winter. When the opportunity presents itself, they decide to escape from their convoy of captives and hope to survive the harshness of the weather by going their own way.

First, they attempt to start a fire. After failing to do so, they decide to run around bushes to warm up. Each of them is afraid to stop running in the expectation that other fellow soldiers might use the opportunity to kill the weakest among them and use their clothes for fire. Soon, Boaini, weakened by a fall into freezing water, dies. The men kindle his clothes. The warmth from the fire brings them some relief and they reminisce of peaceful days. At the same time, they condemn aristocrats and tsars who earn money from this war. The six

[70] The narrator in the Ukrainian version is Doctor Ohliadivs'kyi, in the English translation the name is changed to Turians'kyi.

soldiers engage in a philosophical discussion, addressing problems of war and existential questions of life and death (chapter 2).

In chapter 3, the *fragmentation* stage is manifested when the protagonists are no longer capable of suppressing their hunger. Almost all of them experience stomach spasms because they did not eat anything in ten days. Their perception of reality becomes fragmented and they suffer from mental delirium. Desperate, Sabo starts eating money he found in his pocket. This incident prompts the men to imitate a tribunal. They imagine themselves as judges of women who are unfaithful, of the Monarch and even of themselves because they participate in this absurd war.

As their hunger gets stronger, Sabo offers to eat the flesh of the deceased Boaini to save themselves: "Найтайніші глибини душі заворушилися проти цієї думки. […] Їм стало ясно, що, хотячи врятувати життя, мусять їсти тіло свого товариша. Виникла жахлива боротьба між духом і тілом. З одного боку, стануло страшенне почуття, що вони мусять стати людоїдами, з другого боку, інстинкт життя, який у боротьбі не перебирає в засобах" (*Poza mezhamy* 93).[71] In short, they *regress* into their instinctual mode of survival. From the conversation between Dobrovs'kyi and Nikolych, we discover that cannibalism was a widespread practice during the war ("Невже ж ти не бачив учора, як наші товариші, прості жовніри, їли тіло свого товариша?" [*Poza mezhamy* 94]).[72] Dobrovs'kyi supports Sabo's idea wondering how killing the enemy is rendered heroic by the authorities, whereas eating a corpse to survive seems like a horrible crime to the rest of the

[71] "From the innermost depths of their souls they startled at Sabo's insistent proposal. However, not the slightest doubt could exist. To save their own lives, they would be compelled to eat the body of their dead comrade. Spirit and body met in close conflict. On the one hand, the conviction that they were about to become cannibals grew ever more hideous. On the other hand, there clamored the instinctive will to live, which in its fight is not particular in choosing means" (*Lost* 173).

[72] "Why, yesterday? Did you not see our comrades, simple privates, eating the body of their own comrade?" (*Lost* 175).

group. He then continues that people themselves are to blame for their ignorance because they listened to rich magnates and forgot their humane nature, having turned into bloody thirsty and corrupt killing machines:

> Наше тіло пожерли найбільші пани світу: царі і грошовладці, а нам оставили тільки шкуряний мішок із душею і кістьми всередині...
>
> Але це наша власна вина.
>
> Навіщо ми, люди, вбивали людей?
>
> Хто смів нас вести на різню брата?
>
> Чому ми слухали волі темних сил?
>
> Ми здерли з себе людське обличчя і стали сліпим, бездушним, жорстоким оруддям убивства.[73] (*Poza mezhamy* 95)

Despite the strong urge to survive, their moral beliefs win out, and they refuse to eat a piece of the corpse. This represents the *reunification* stage, when the torture brought by trauma has been integrated. They now understand that in this unbearable cold they are doomed to die and to some of them it brings a sense of relief. Interestingly, in their agony all of them envision their mothers at different times throughout the novel, or, as in case of Ohliadivs'kyi, a mother with a child (e.g., chapter 4 p.108). This brings them peace. Eventually, one by one, except Ohliadivs'kyi who is miraculously saved (as depicted in the final fifth chapter), they pass away.

Turians'kyi successfully recreates the reality of war through poetic symbols and

[73] "Our bodies have been ruined by the ruling powers and the money magnates, the mightiest masters in the world. These chaffering barkeepers of blood have left us only the skin-bag containing our poor souls and bones. [… – here the translation differs from the sequence of text in the original – DP] "Our will power is to blame as well. For, why did it make us passive, blind tools for killing? […]" (*Lost* 177)

images (Plöhn XLVII): “Із-за гори на крайнебі виповзли із таємних глибин землі дивовижні облаки-страхіття і ще більше місце сонця заступили. Виглядали, мов казочні упирі. Отворили великанські, червоні, наче в крові скупані пащі, щоб кинутись на гори й пожерти їх разом зі сімома живими єствами”[74] (*Poza mezhamy* 51). His text is stylistically diverse. He employs some features of expressionism (e.g., grotesque depiction of horror, movement of eyes, lips) to write about the impact of war on the soldier’s psyche. Modernist and symbolist strategies are also used in the novel,[75] along with moments such as the victory of the spirit over matter, the opposition of beauty and evil.

Although *Poza mezhamy* is a prose text, it has many sections that read like poetry. The language of the novel is very lyrical, which reminds the reader of symbolist poems (e.g., Pavlo Tychyna’s “Enharmoniine” [“Enharmonic”], 1918). As in the passage below, Turians'kyi uses prose poetry to engage in lyrical digression that depicts a collective image of pain and simultaneously projects hope. Metaphorically, the narrator refers to the eyes of the blind that “see” the boundless kindness and beauty of the human heart. They can show the infinite sun and project hope onto the darkness of the world. Turians'kyi implies that while the body deteriorates in pain, the spirit is eternal, which may be the essence of the novel. Not only the emotional effect, but also the form is reminiscent of poetry. Each sentence starts with a new line:

Здається, що віки вже протекли, як це було.

Гарматні кулі розривають землю і людей.

---

[74] “From behind the mountain, on the skyline, gloomy, weird cloudy spectres had crept out, covering the greater part of the sun. They looked like gigantic tigers or fairy vampires. They opened wide red jaws, which seemed steeped in blood, in order to rush upon the mountains and devour them together with seven living creatures” (*Lost* 29).

[75] For a better understanding of the modernist and symbolist movements in Ukrainian literature, see Ilnytzkyj, Oleh. “Ukrainian Symbolism and the Problem of Modernism.”

Кругом нас пекло, божевілля, смерть.

Кожна людина вмирає тисячу разів в одній секунді.

Він один [the blind Shtrantsinger – DP] лежить у ямі супокійно.

А його очі – о, не забуду ніколи його очей!

Вони дивляться так лагідно й любо кругом, **наче хочуть несвідомо зворушити скам'яніле небо безмежною добротою і красою людського серця**.

І **хочуть показати темряві всесвіту й лукавості богів невмируще сонце й надію людського духа.**[76] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Poza mezhamy* 73)

The novel also has a didactic, sermon-like element to it, as when Turians'kyi uses a biblical analogy of the victory of the spirit over body, alluding to the victory over temptation: "У їхнє глибоке мовчання вступила якась дивно святочна хвиля, наче промінь світла прошиб темні нетрі душі; як усе діється, коли дух переміг тіло. […] Але вони чули, що [the victory – DP] була свята, божеська, бо дух людей, що вмирали з голоду, мав силу кинути в жертву й саме життя, щоби поконати, здушити і вбити божевільну пристрасть тіла" (*Poza mezhamy* 98).[77] A passage from "Perednie slovo" ("Foreword") written by the

[76] Centuries seem to have passed since this happened.
Cannon balls rend earth and man.
All around, hell, madness, death, rage.
Every man dies a thousand times within one brief second.
He alone [the blind Shtrantsinger – DP] is lying calmly in the trench.
And his eyes – oh, I shall never forget those eyes!
So gently, with such child-like innocence and love, **they gaze**, **as though they unconsciously wished the stony heavens to be touched by the holy kindness and beauty of the human heart.**
They would reveal to the night of life the immortal sunlight and hope of the human spirit. [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Lost* 81)

[77] "Their stolid silence was changed for a moment into impressive solemnity. A ray of light had penetrated the dark recesses of their souls – a token that the spirit had overcome the flesh. Theirs was a holy – a divine –

author in 1920 in Vienna, seems to also emphasize this aspect of the text. Turians'kyi reminds his reader that even during the darkest times, there is no need to feel despondent because compassion, love and brotherhood can lead to a better world for future generations:

> **Хай наші спільні муки падуть прокльоном на старий світ**, який ще досі тоне в морі крові й нікчемності. Хай ясна ідея, що в цім оповіданні промінням блискає з цвинтарища й хаосу стихій і безмежного болю й божевілля людей, розгориться полум'ям у душі молодого українського покоління й веде його все вище й вище на сонячний шлях волі і **щастя великого українського народу** й до **вселюдського братертсва й любові**. І коли наша боротьба за волю така важка і кривава, то **не падаймо ні на хвилю в темряву розпуки** […].[78] [Emphasis mine—DP] (43; original orthography preserved)

The most relevant aspect of *Poza mezhamy* for this analysis is how Turians'kyi writes about the psychic processes and inner tribulations, almost ignoring realistic details like battles, and the depiction of external reality. Events are merely the background; in the foreground is the human psyche and its transformation under conditions of war and terror. The mind and the unconscious come to the surface. Typically, Turians'kyi uses external elements only to enhance the experience of pain and suffering, something that was done by

---

victory. Through the spirit, they who faced death by starvation found strength to sacrifice their very lives that they might stifle – overwhelm – destroy the raging lust of the flesh" [Emphasis mine; Translation differs from the original—DP] (*Lost* 185).

[78] Here and elsewhere square brackets are my ellipses (DP).

"**May our collective agony condemn the old world**, which is still drowning in blood and pettiness. May the hopeful idea in this story that shines from the cemetery and chaos of elemental forces and measureless pain and madness of people ignite a flame in the soul of the young Ukrainian generation and lead it higher and higher to the sunny path of freedom and **happiness of the great Ukrainian nation** and towards **universal brotherhood** and **love**. And because our struggle for freedom is so hard and bloody, **let us not fall into the darkness of despair even for a moment** […]" [Translation and emphasis are mine – DP].

the expressionists.

In the following sections, I will look at the expressionistic narrative and some thematic elements like hallucinations and the archetype of the mother, which, I believe, enhance the portrayal of mental disorientation in this literary text.

2.2.1. The use of expressionistic strategies to delineate trauma

The term "expressionism," Richard Sheppard explains, "covers a multitude of people working in a variety of fields – poetry, drama, painting, cinema, architecture – and is not amenable to simple definition" (275). It is a complex concept and can be interpreted in many ways. The expressionist movement in art appeared before the war[79] as an opposition to impressionism and naturalism, and simply put, attempted to portray the expression of an emotion: "Rooted in the concept of expression, it accented a highly subjective artistic disposition dependent on the individual artist's emotive response to, and visualization of, the external environment and the experiences of life" (Reinhold, "Expressionism").

Pre-war expressionists were concerned with the problem of absurdity and abandonment, of being human in a world of chaos; with the problem of choice, guilt and punishment; with the overall universal anxiety and horror of existence as well as borderline situations (situations on the edge) and alienation of the human (Huzar 16; 17).[80] Oskar Kokoschka's early portrait work (1909-1910) is an example of pre-war expressionism. In portraits like *Count Verona* (1910), *Ritter von Janikowsky* (1909-10), he depicted the effects of tuberculosis and mental disease (respectively) on the human body. However, the external

[79] Expressionism thives approximately from 1905-1924. In its early years it was primarily non-political: "Social attitudes […] were mostly in terms of pity for stricken mankind as well as visions of abstract evil forces responsible for these conditions" (Myers 42).

[80] In visual art, there were two major pre-war artistic groups – *The Bridge* in Dresden (formed in 1905) and *The Blue Rider* in Munich (established in 1911) (Myers 50).

features only aid to narrate inner processes of the sitters and delineate mental anguish caused by the illnesses: using the "gestural application of paint," Kokoschka focuses on the "movement, transience, distortion, abstracted backgrounds" that move the portrait "from a created illusion of reality toward abstraction […] which functions as a visual metaphor for the illusory world of inner life" (Berland, "The Early Portraits").

After 1916, however, expressionist art began to reflect some political notes of anti-military protest. By the end of WWI, German expressionists were politically engaged and often created caricatures of the bourgeoisie as a protest against a class society and industrial capitalism (e.g., caricatures by George Grosz and war paintings by Otto Dix ["Wounded Soldier" 1924]) (*German Expressionism*).

Another movement that held strong anti-war, anti-military and anti-bourgeois positions was the Dada[81] group of artists, displaced by WWI in neutral Zurich (e.g., Hugo Ball, Jean Arp, Marcel Janco, Tristan Tzara and others). They created provocative demonstrations by jangling keys for hours and banging tin cans together. They were particularly interested in primitive African art (Grossman 49; 58). Tristan Tzara, one of the leaders of the Dada group, declared in his 1963 interview:

> Dada had a human purpose, an extremely strong ethical purpose! The writer made no concessions to the situation, to opinion, to money. […] Dada was not just absurd, not just a joke, Dada was an expression of a very great adolescent pain that came into being during the First World War and the time of suffering. What we wanted was to make a clean sweep of existing values, but also, in fact, to replace them with the highest of human values. (qtd. in Dachy 34)

[81] "'Dada' was a randomly chosen word from a dictionary, provocation on its own, it was aimed to mock the critics who were used to labeling movements, etc." (Dachy 13).

Both expressionism and Dadaism sought to represent the absurdity and brutality of war, which strongly resonates with Turians'kyi's goal. A grotesque, almost hypertrophied depiction of emotion and human suffering, projection of the psyche onto an external landscape, focus on the movement of eyes that reflect horror and death, atrocious visions of soldiers in the trenches, rejection of reason and logic through the theme of hallucinatory states and visions, – these are some of the features of German interwar expressionism we find in *Poza mezhamy*.

The movement of lips that issue sounds of pain, eyes that grow – these are but a few examples of how Turians'kyi intentionally hyperbolizes the movement of body parts to express pain:

> **Смертельне тремтіння проймає їх тіло.** Одна людина шукає в очах другої іскри спасення. Та находить тільки жах і запалий, чорно-сірий, посинілий, труплячий образ смерті, **а замість очей дві чорні ями, що ростуть, ростуть, ростуть... жахливо нахиляються над головами й ось-ось поглинуть усіх і все...** […]
>
> **Уста самі мимоволі відчиняються**, і з горла пливе довгий, протяжний, безперестанний, жахливий звук: **– А-а-а-а-а-а**.[82] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Poza mezhamy* 110)

One of the recurrent images is the movement of the eyes (i.e., "gaze") and the way

[82] "**Death-tremors shake their bodies.** One man seeks in the eyes of another even the tiniest spark of reassurance. But he finds there nothing except a livid, frozen, shrunken, corpse-like spectre of disintegration. **Instead of eyes, black hollows stare at the exiles – they grow, grow – grow… yawning, spectre-like, over their heads as if at any instant they would engulf everything…** […] **The lips open**, and there issues from the throat a long-dawn, ghastly sound: **A-a-a-a-a-a**" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Lost* 212).

they act. For example, eyes are personified as if they "want" to devour the corpse:

> Їх **очі** виступили майже з лоба і стали неприродно великі, а зі всіх облич пробивалася безмежна жадоба не жити, а втихомирити бездонні голодові муки. Тільки уста скривилися з відрази, начеб їх судороги вхопили. **Зате очі, здавалось, хотіли самі полетіти до трупа й пожерти його**.[83] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Poza mezhamy* 94)

Eyesight is often depicted in opposition to blindness. The narrator implies that blind people are happy because they do not have to see the horrors of the world and the faces of "live corpses": "Коли одна людина гляне в лице другій, здригається. Відвертається з жахом, а тремтячі уста шепчуть: – Смерть. Лиш деякі сліпі люди не видять смерті в обличчі других" (*Poza mezhamy* 46).[84]

Turians'kyi vividly describes the expression of death, so typical for expressionism. In one instance he pays attention to the position of Pshylus'kyi's dead body, whose eyes—even after death— "meet" those of his comrades, while an expression of pain remains on his face:

> На шляху до життя **стрічають їх очі** мертвого Пшилуського. **Його труп**, спертий легко на камінь, з головою, що глибоко й важко повисла на груди, сидить задеревілий. **З його уст і з усього його обличчя не уступив вираз болю навіть після його смерті**.[85] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Poza mezhamy* 113)

---

[83] "Their **eyes** protruded and became unnaturally large. From their faces swept forth ravening glances which demanded – not life, but release from the unbearable pangs of hunger. Their mouths alone grew distorted as though in convulsive abhorrence. In turn, their **eyes seemed longing to fly over to the dead body and devour it"** [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Lost* 173).

[84] "When one man looks into the eyes of another, he shudders. He turns away aghast, and his pale lips quiver in a whisper: 'Death…' It is only the blind that do not see death in the faces of the others" (*Lost* 16).

[85] "On their way to life, **the eyes of dead Pshylus'kyi meet them**. **His corpse raised against a stone**, with head hanging heavily on the chest – sits rigid. **Even after death, his face and figure bear the traces of**

The writer employs external landscape as a parallel to the inner tribulations of his protagonists. Oleksandra Chernenko claims that it was common for expressionists to project a person's psychic state onto the external scenery, avoiding typical portrait depictions of characters (*Expressionism* 127). Edvard Munch's "The Scream" (1893) comes to mind. In Turians'kyi's novel, it is as if nature is grieving together with humans. The external flows into the internal and vice versa. Nature symbolizes the soldiers' inner state. The snow, the cold and the abysses in the landscape are associated with human dread, sadness and hopelessness[86]: "З сніжних верхів, з чорних обривів, з пропастей, з кожної скелі і з кожного закутка визирає бездонна глибінь грози, суму й безнадійності"[87] (*Poza mezhamy* 45).

The depiction of grotesque horror reaches its culmination when Sabo brings a body part from the corpse. The mixture of disgust with survival instinct is described in just a few sentences. And again, it is the gaze that renders Sabo's shock from what he has just done: "Крик жаху розвіяв мої думи. Сабо прийшов і приніс кавалок тіла з трупа товариша. Поклав його коло вогню й обтирав полою свого подертого плаща кров на руках. Сів і **впер очі** в огонь та сидів, наче скам'янілий"[88] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Poza mezhamy* 97).

---

suffering" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Lost* 218).

[86] Something similar we find in Barbusse's *Under Fire*, when he compares storm to war: "But when evening is ready to descend within the valley, a **storm** breaks over the mass of Mont Blanc. One may not go forth in such peril, for the last waves of the storm-wind roll even to the great veranda, to that harbor where they have taken refuge; and these victims of a great internal wound encompass with their gaze the elemental convulsion. […] '**Put an end to war**?' say the watchers. – '**Forbid the Storm**!' […] The **streaming** plain, seamed and seared with long parallel canals and scooped into water-holes, is an immensity, and these **castaways** who strive to exhume themselves from it are legion" [Emphasis mine—DP] (4).

[87] "Out from the snowy peaks – the black slopes and gorges – from every rock and wild hiding place, there peers untold dread, sadness and hopelessness" (*Lost* 13).

[88] "A sudden scream of horror scatters my thoughts. Sabo has returned, carrying something with him. He has put it beside the fire… He himself sits down… sits and **stares at the fire**… A lump of ice!" [Translation differs

The expressionistic elements mentioned above are enhanced by means of different narrative modes that help to distinguish conscious states from the unconscious. I discuss these modes in the following section.

2.2.2. Dorrit Cohn's modes for narrating consciousness

Using Dorrit Cohn's classification, which I discussed in the first chapter, it is possible to identify a combination of several first- and third-person narrations in *Poza mezhamy*. Typically, Turians'kyi uses traditional third-person narration (italicized below) to set the scene and provide historical background. For example, he does this in the prelude to his novel: "Під ударом німецько-австрійського війська покин*ули серби* свій край і забра*ли* всіх бранців, 60 000 душ, із собою та погна*ли* їх на албанський 'шлях смерті.' В албанських горах, нетрях, з голоду, холоду й душевного болю загинуло 45 000 бранців"[89] [Emphasis mine—DP] (44).

Third-person dissonant psycho-narration is used to show the internal events of the characters as well as to present their conscious and unconscious states. Although the narrator delineates the psyche and interprets what happens to the protagonists, he remains distant from the consciousness he narrates, which makes the narration dissonant.[90] The soldiers' hallucinations are narrated in the third-person dissonant psycho-narration (in bold) supported by the narrator's explicit remark that the men do not hallucinate about random things. Their visions are about someone or something they are familiar with in their conscious life:

---

from the original; Emphasis mine—DP] (*Lost* 181).

[89] "Under the attack of the German and Austrian army, *Serbs left* their land and *took* all their captives with them, 60 thousand souls. They led them through the Alban "path of death." In the Alban mountains, in the wilds, 45 thousand captives *died* from hunger, cold and psychic pain" (Translation and emphasis mine—DP).

[90] See Cohn's examples of the dissonant psycho-narration in Thomas Mann's *Death in Venice* (p. 28).

> І за чим життя людей тужило, за чим їх душа рвалася, це **ввижається** тіням наче промінь сонця в темряві душі. […] **Їм увижаються люди**, які їм були близькі колись. **Вони вітають**, **обнімають** їх, **говорять** з ними. **Вони чують дивні звуки** з далекої батьківщини, **співають** пісні, які ще дітьми чули. З малими винятками, **вони всі,** здається, **збожеволіли.**[91] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Poza mezhamy* 47)

Another example of third-person dissonant narration demonstrates the contrast between conscious and unconscious states of the protagonists and is an instance of their psychic trauma. Because physical pain is unbearable, the narrator says that "consciousness revolts" and the soldiers become delusional. Hence, the external circumstances (war) that brought the protagonists to these mountains caused alterations to their mental states. The narration is done in what Cohn calls "the gnomic present" which is often used for "timeless generalizations" (28) which I believe aids in portraying the endurance of traumatic experience:

> **Свідомість бунтується проти безтямного болю** й нужденного буття **й западає в сон**. Замучені голодом, морозом і безсонними ночами, **вони** попад**ають** у сумерк **півсвідомості**, яка хвилями зникає, то знов деколи переходить у повну несвідомість. І **їх уяву огортає серпанок сонячних привидів і божевілля**.[92]

---

[91] "That which living men had once longed for, that to which their souls had once aspired **appears** now to these shadows of men as a ray of light in the obscurity of a prison. […] **They have visions of people** who once upon a time were nearest to them. **They welcome**, **embrace**, **speak** with them. They **discern strange echoes** from their distant homeland, **sing** the songs they had heard while yet children. With a few exceptions, **all of them appear to have become mad**" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Lost* 18).

[92] "**Consciousness revolts against the extreme suffering** and the wretchedness of existence, and falls asleep. Tortured by hunger, exhausted by frost and sleepless nights, the captives sink into the dusk of subconsciousness that more and more transforms itself into mental stupor. **About their imaginations, a veil of visions and lurid**

[Emphasis mine—DP] (*Poza mezhamy* 47)

Turians'kyi uses the third-person psycho-narration to portray the experiences of the other six soldiers, whereas he employs retrospective techniques like first-person self-narration to write about the experience of the first-person participant – his alter ego Ohliadivs'kyi. It is hard to differentiate the omnipresent author (the narrating self) from his fictional alter ego (the experiencing self) which signifies consonant self-narration, when the inner life of the protagonist is depicted within the "autobiographical mode" of the author (Cohn 154). However, the understanding of this "quasi-annulment of the narrative distance" (Cohn 156) helps one to see the unanimous relationship between the narrating (the author) and experiencing self (the first-person participant). These two selves, Cohn suggests, are joined by the first-person narration: "even when a narrator becomes 'a different person' from the self he describes in his story, his two selves still remain yoked by the first-person pronoun ["Я" – "I"—DP]" (144).

In addition, we recognize that the event is told but not enacted before our eyes, because—as I discussed in Chapter 1—trauma cannot be witnessed and narrated simultaneously. Hence, Ohliadivs'kyi is an experiencing self that the author uses to recollect what happened to him in the past. The present tense used in the first-person narrative is not a "true" present but a narrative present "that refers to the same past moment as the past tense does" (Cohn 157). The use of extensive psychological vocabulary like talking about thoughts, train of thoughts, mood, shock, nerves, feeling, sensations, etc. is another clue of a unified relationship between the author and his alter ego (Cohn 156).

The following example demonstrates what was just stated. Through the first-person

---

delirium winds itself" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Lost* 17).

consonant narration by the experiencing self (Ohliadivs'kyi) we might discern the presence of the real author because of the added commentary about his past experience in the first sentence (italicized). Then, narration in the present tense follows. The experiencing and the narrating selves merge (in bold):

> *Ні одним словом я не брав участі в цій розмові, бо незвичайна, дивовижна жахливість думки Саба розтрощила до дна моє єство.*
>
> **Ціле моє тіло починає тремтіти**, і **здається мені**, що **мушу** в найближчій хвилі впасти й не устану вже більше.
>
> Ще слабша, ще нужденніша моя душа.
>
> Здається, **моя свідомість починає хвилями притемнюватися**. Якась червоно-темна мряка заступає мені на хвилину очі й думки.
>
> Все моє єство обертається в нічо.
>
> ……..
>
> Щось гострим ножем **уверчується в мою свідомість**.
>
> **Я чую, що думаю... чую біль... на щось тривожно чекаю...**[93] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Poza mezhamy* 96)

Self-narrated monologue also assists in delineating Ohliadivs'kyi's (Turians'kyi's alter ego) testimony to what happens to others. He "sees" how pain and despair turned his

---

[93] "*No further word do* [did – DP] *I speak. The unutterable horror of Szabo's idea has shaken all my being.*
My body trembles. I feel that in another instant I shall break down, without strength to rise again.
But weaker still has grown my wretched soul. **My thought begins to fade.** A dark-red fog arises before my eyes, and bedims my mind.
All my being lapses into oblivion.
…….
Something like a sharp drill bores… it wakens… **I feel myself thinking once again…**
I feel pain… I wait for something to happen…" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Lost* 179)

comrades mad: "**Бачу**, як біль і розпука кладе їм [his comrades – DP] на очі й мозок сонячний серпанок привидів і божевілля і як вони з радісними окликами, з усміхом щастя западаються у безодню небуття"[94] [Emphasis mine—DP] ("Perednie slovo" 42).

The Use of Ellipsis

Repeatedly, Turians'kyi uses the stylistic device of ellipsis, a whole line of dots (……..), to portray trauma and to indicate silence, emotional and psychological tension, the critical state of the protagonists or vague moments between reality and hallucinations. At times, ellipses substitute comas.

Anne Toner suggests that modernist writers used ellipsis differently from the Romantics and the Realists. The modernists sought to show "rupture, fragmentation and formlessness" that reflected the uncertainties of the early twentieth century (151). Ellipsis, Toner claims, helps to express something that is hard to comprehend, as if giving voice to the unspoken: "Ellipsis is a long-proven means of giving our texts a voice by marking its absence. […] It can be used to mimic the skips and uncertainties of the spoken voice. It conveys unplanned and unedited chat, by implicitly marking the elision of more formal adjuncts and connectives" (170). Toner lists some features of ellipses that I believe can be considered as signs of trauma in a literary text by marking omissions and indicating hesitation, silence or paralysis (Toner 153-154). For example, Virginia Woolf used elliptical punctuation for "the literary representation of consciousness, as series of dots suggest the flux and flow of thoughts through the mind" (Toner 158). It can also be deliberately used for "(self)-interruption." (Toner 167). Let us look at the following example in Turians'kyi's text

[94] "**I see** how pain and despair puts a sunny haze of ghosts and madness on their [my fellows' – DP] eyes and brain, and how they, with joyful hails and happy smiles fall into the abyss of nonexistence" (Translation and emphasis mine—DP).

that demonstrates both the fluctuation of the mind and self-interruption experienced by the first-person participant:

> Ні, це корч...
>
> Але ж яким чином може корч бути так похожий на матір із дитиною?
>
> .....
>
> Нараз червона мряка огортає мене і все щезає...
>
> .....
>
> Відчиняю очі і бачу перед собою спокійне, зледеніле чорне небо.[95] (*Poza mezhamy* 96)

Throughout the novel ellipses also signal a change of narration. The following passage contains the ellipsis that signifies Nikolych's waking up in confusion; this is conveyed as third-person psycho-narration (italicized and in bold). The narrator's remark about that moment is presented as self-narration (in bold):

> Зляк***ався*** власного голосу і прокин***увся*** з просоння. Сліпими очима глян***ув*** із зачудуванням на товаришів та тривожно запит***ав***: - Де ми? […]
>
> .....
>
> **Я** глян**ув** на його обличчя.
>
> Воно так виглядало, начеб не було вже з цього світу.[96] [Emphasis mine—DP]

---

[95] "No, it is a bush.
But how is it possible that a bush should look like a mother with her child?..
……
Of a sudden, the red fog again surges over me. Everything vanishes…
…….
I open my eyes.
Black, icy, motionless sky" (*Lost* 180).

[96] "***The blind one became*** afraid of his own voice. ***He started up*** from his semi-slumber. "Where are we?.." ***he***

(*Poza mezhamy* 72)

The mix of first- and third-person modes, as well as traditional dialogues, helps to express both the individual and collective psyche. A deliberate use of ellipsis means that Turians'kyi carefully planned the stylistic aspects of his text. As Natalia Maftyn and Maksym Nestelieiev suggest (27; "Poza mezhamy" 55 respectively), stream-of-consciousness (a continuous flow of a character's thoughts and reactions), which might have been at first glance Turians'kyi's original intention, is not the primary mode of narration in his novel.

2.3. Trauma and hallucinations

The use of hallucinations and dreams in literature is not typical only of the modernists. Oliver Tearle points out that they were widely used by Shakespeare and the Romantics. However, hallucinations and dreams were previously "a fleeting apparition." Only in the mid-nineteenth century, in the works by Dickens, Emily Bronte, and Poe, hallucinations began to be used as "a figure representing conscience, fear, and madness" (7). Tearle implies that the contemporary surroundings, the outbreak of WWI and the global scope of violence and destruction prompted later modernists (e.g., Virginia Woolf, James Joyce, T.S. Eliot and others) to use hallucinations and dreams as literary devices to depict the effect of war trauma on the national psyche: "War and political relations had changed everyday life just as they had changed the way soldiers perceived their own role: the speed at which 'shell shock' passed into wider linguistic use testifies to how rapidly the new experiences of soldiers at the front had seeped into the national psyche" (170).

---

asked, fearfully, turning, in astonishment, his sight-quenched eyes to his comrades. They shrank. […] (*Lost* 79)
……..
I glanc**ed** at his face
It was as if not of this world" (Translation and emphasis mine—DP).

In the following example (a self-narrated monologue), the first-person participant doubts his own experience and tries to make sense of his hallucination about the dancing corpses. At that moment, he feels like a madman:

> Отвираю очі, і крик жаху виривається мені з горла: *я бачу* кругом себе у сніжно-білі кореї завитих мерців...
>
> Всі мерці сидять, та проте рухаються... з місця на місце...
>
> Я божевільний.
>
> Ні... це сон... Такий сон сниться тільки мерцям...
>
> Ні... мерцям не сниться нічо...
>
> Мерці лежать супокійно...
>
> Я живий...
>
> Тисячі ледяних голок устромилися мені в саме серце і в мозок... і колять мене, колять, колять, колять... я бачу мерців... мерці танцюють...
>
> Я божевільний...[97] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Poza mezhamy* 115)

---

[97] "I open my eyes; I send forth, unconsciously, a cry that pierces the cold world.
I see around me dead bodies covered with smocks of snow.
The dead sit… yet they move…
[I am a madman. —DP]
It is a dream.
Dreams like this appear only to the dead…
But no.
The dead have no dreams whatever…
The dead sleep quietly…
I am alive… […]
Oh! My heart is pierced by a thousand icy needles.
They are eating into my [heart and – DP] brain.
And they sting, sting, sting!
I am watching dead men… (*Lost* 221)
Dead men are dancing…
I am a madman." (Translation of last two sentences mine—DP)

Why can hallucinations in literature be a powerful device for depicting the human psyche? Perhaps, because they show "something unconscious and beyond our knowledge" (Tearle 12). While we can control daydreams and choose the topic of our fantasy, Tearle explains, we do not regulate dreams and hallucinations (13). Therefore, hallucinations are linked to memory. The latter, Tearle explains, could help us differentiate reality from hallucination: "seeing a close friend or family member in the same room is simply seeing what is really there, unless, upon reflection, we realize that the friend or relation cannot possibly have been in the room with us" (7).

It seems that in a crisis hallucination becomes a mechanism for coping with unbearable circumstances. At some point, for instance, Ohliadivs'ky envisions a fly, which is clearly a hallucination because in freezing weather flies cannot survive (*Poza mezhamy* 65). Other men are depicted seeing fire. Following the illusory fire, they fall into an abyss: "Ось одна людина з босими, фіолетовими ногами угледіла нараз на хмарах над деброю вогонь. З заіскреними очима показує його товаришам. Три товариші біжать там, де вогонь видять. І падають на хмари над пропастю"[98] (*Poza mezhamy* 49).

Thus, to present the unspeakable, Turians'kyi explores the literary possibilities of hallucinations which often manifests themselves through what Carl Jung calls "archetypes."

2.3.1. The collective unconscious and the mother archetype

To Jung, the unconscious has a superficial layer, or what he calls the "personal unconscious" and a deeper layer, or "the collective unconscious." The latter he identifies as universal

[98] "Behold! A human being, barefoot and with purple-colored legs, has suddenly become aware of a fire on the clouds above the gorge. With eyes that sparkle like flame, he points it out to his companions. And three of them now are running whither they seem to have seen the fire. They fall upon the clouds above the precipice" (*Lost* 22).

because “it has contents and modes of behaviour that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals” (“Archetypes” 15). While the personal unconscious, Jung claims, reflects the private psychic life of an individual (mainly, their feelings and personal experiences), the contents of the collective unconscious are known as “archetypes” (“Archetypes” 15). Simply put, it means that the collective unconscious deals with archaic, “primordial” types and “universal images that have existed since the remotest times” (Jung, “Archetypes” 16). Being an unconscious content first, the archetype eventually is modified and becomes conscious, manifested through individual consciousness (Jung, “Archetypes” 16). Jung uses the water metaphor to explain that in the collective unconscious everything is in unity: “It is the world of water, where all life floats in suspension; where the realm of the sympathetic system, the soul of everything living, begins; where I am indivisibly this and that; where I experience the other in myself and the other-than-myself experiences me” (“Archetypes” 28).

Thus, Jung argues, the collective unconscious “does not develop individually but is inherited” (“The Concept” 44). Consequently, he says, a whole nation might be able to revive an archaic symbol which will impact mass emotions in the catastrophic situation of war:

> Today you can judge better than you could twenty years ago the nature of the forces involved. Can we not see how a whole nation is reviving an archaic symbol, yes, even archaic religious forms, and how this mass emotion is influencing and revolutionizing the life of the individual in a catastrophic manner? The man of the past is alive in us today to a degree undreamt of before the war, and in the last analysis what is the fate of great nations but a summation of the psychic changes in individuals? (“The Concept” 47)

The number of archetypes is endless because every situation in life entails an archetype of some sort: “When a situation occurs, which corresponds to a given archetype, that archetype becomes activated and a compulsiveness appears, which, like an instinctual drive, gains its way against all reason and will, or else produces a conflict of pathological dimensions, that is to say, a neurosis” (“The Concept” 47).

Dreams [and, I assume, hallucinations – DP] are the main proof of the existence of archetypes because dreams cannot be altered by conscious efforts: “The main source, then, is dreams, which have the advantage of being involuntary, spontaneous products of the unconscious psyche and are therefore pure products of nature not falsified by any conscious purpose” (“The Concept” 48). By excluding from the dream, the motifs of which the dreamer is aware, we must look for the motifs that are not known to the dreamer in his awake life but are presented through the dreams. Those unknown motifs in a dream will coincide with an archetype that could be already known from historical sources (Jung, “The Concept” 48).

Turians'kyi uses one such universal image: the archetype of the mother, which like other archetypes, has many aspects: “the personal mother and grandmother, stepmother and mother-in-law; then any woman with whom a relationship exists.” In a figurative sense, the goddess belongs to the mother archetype, “especially the Mother of God, the Virgin, and Sophia,” or the Great Mother as Jung calls it (“Psychological” 69). Some of the qualities with which the mother archetype is associated are “maternal solicitude and sympathy”; “the wisdom and spiritual exaltation that transcend reason”; “all that is benign, all that cherishes and sustains, that fosters growth and fertility. The place of magic transformation and rebirth” (69); “the love that means homecoming, shelter” (Jung, “Psychological” 77).

As already mentioned, Turians'kyi often uses the image of the mother in a dream or hallucination. Both literally and symbolically, the mother signifies love, peace, nourishment, calmness, and conscience. In the moment of intolerable pain, she is envisioned by the dying soldiers as their saviour. Turians'kyi implicitly defines the mother as a combined image. She is a real person kept in the memory of a dying soldier. She symbolizes the source of life, creation, and existence. She is also the manifestation of the Biblical Maria who can dissolve pain, suffering and doubt. To the soldiers she represents safety, comfort, nurturing and memories of a careless childhood. For instance, in the agony of pain, Boiani finds relief in his hallucination about his mother. From a narrative perspective, through the third-person psycho-narration, the ubiquitous narrator takes Boiani's viewpoint: "Незадовго Бояні заснув – було йому добре. Його мати таки прийшла до нього. І у сні не чув він болю, не видів смерті, лиш усміхався радісно, бо його лице чуло биття серця в теплій материній груді"[99] (*Poza mezhamy* 70). In chapter 4, Nikolych, too, hallucinates about his mother. He hears a lullaby and then reports to the others that his mother warned them of the crows cawing[100] (p. 107).

Ohliadivs'kyi himself envisions a woman with a child that he sometimes perceives as his own wife and son. These recurrent hallucinations help him endure physical exhaustion. The female figure evokes in him feelings of comfort, peace and love. In the following example, the first-person participant hallucinates about a mother with a child. The first-person narration is interrupted by a dialogue between Ohliadivs'kyi and Dobrovs'kyi. From it, we learn that Ohliadivs'kyi is hallucinating. In addition, the image he envisions is universal.

[99] "Shortly Boiani fell asleep and – was well. His mother came to him, after all… And while sleeping he did not fell any pain nor did he see death. He only smiled joyously, for his face felt the heart throbs in the warm bosom of his mother" (*Lost* 73).

[100] In Ukrainian folklore, there is a belief that a raven's caw signifies death (Kukharenko 68).

In the last sentence, the third-person narrator states that in the agony of pain, when death was approaching, all the soldiers were seeking the warmth of their mothers:

> Беру Добровського за руку й питаю його:
>
> - Скажи мені: “Чому ця дитина не плаче?”
>
> - Де дитина?.. Чия дитина?.. – шепче він.
>
> - Цієї матері... вона стоїть перед нами...
>
> - Успокійся, товаришу. Це тобі так тільки здається...
>
> Перед нами стоїть мати з дитиною...
>
> Перед нами немає нікого...
>
> Тут до нас ніхто не прийде: ні дитина, ні жінка, ні батько, ні мати...
>
> Я повторюю раз у раз останнє слово: – Мати... мати...
>
> .....
>
> І нараз душу всіх запалює бажання схилити голову на груди матері й почути на своєму волоссі пестощі її ніжної руки. […]
>
> І як маленька дитина тужить за материнською груддю, заки засне, так і вони прагнуть якої-небудь ніжності, заки пустяться в далеку дорогу...[101] (*Poza mezhamy* 108)

---

[101] “I grasp Dobrovsky’s arm.
‘Tell me,’ I ask him eagerly, ‘why does this baby not weep?..’
‘Whose baby?.. Where is the baby?...’ he whispers.
‘With that mother… She is standing over there – in front of us…’
‘Calm yourself, brother. It is only your imagination… No mother and no child stand before us…
No one stands before us… No one will come to us here – No child, or wife, or father, or mother…’
‘Mother… mother…’ Again and again I repeat the last word.
……..
The heart of each one aches with longing to lean his head on the bosom of his mother and to feel on his hair a tender caress of her hand. […]
And as an infant longs for its mother’s breast before slumber, so they now long for a touch of tenderness before entering upon the long journey from which they shall not return…” (*Lost* 207)

A mother with a child is a recurrent image throughout the novel. Sometimes, the omniscient author (in third-person remarks) alludes to the collective tragic fate of mothers who lose their children at war: "Мов смертельно ранена звірюка, вихор кидався на них, в дикім шалі розшарпував хмари, гонив по безоднях і шумів, як розхвильоване море, то знов ридав і стогнав, як тисячі матерів над могилами мужів і дітей" [102] (*Poza mezhamy* 121).

At other times, through the self-narration (in bold), the first-person participant expresses that the mother's fate is the most tragic because she must witness her child's suffering (italicized). This remark is done as an interruption of his hallucination:

> Мої товариші підносять мене й підтримують.
>
> Їхні руки віддаляються від мене, й **я** знову сам **сиджу** та **дивлюся перед себе**.
>
> ……
>
> **Ні... це корч... не корч...** [self-negation, or self-interruption—DP]
>
> **Так, так... це мати з дитиною...**
>
> .....
>
> Небо й земля забули її [a mother with a child – DP] так само, як нас... *І гине вона ще страшнішою смертю від нашої, бо мусить дивитися безпомічно, без ради й поради на конання своєї дитини...*[103] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Poza*

[102] "Like a mortally wounded animal, the wind rushed upon the mountains and gorges. In wild madness, it tore the clouds to shreds, whirled through the clefs and shrieked as though lashing ocean billows into foam. Then its sound was like the moans and sobs of thousands of women (mothers in the original – DP), over the graves of their children and husbands" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Lost* 233).

[103] "My comrades raise and hold me. Then their hands no longer support me.
Again **I sit alone, staring in front of me**.
……
No – there is no bush… no bush…

mezhamy 97)

Jung also considers a negative mother archetype. We encounter it in Pshylus'kyi's story. While he was at war, his wife had an affair with another man in front of his children. He condemns her as a mother who committed a crime against her children: "Я все їй... прощаю перед смертю... Її злочину матері супроти дітей не можу простити"[104] (*Poza mezhamy* 111).

***

To sum up, in Turians'kyi's novel reminiscences are engendered by the need to speak up about painful experience and suffering. I claim that it is both a testimony to the unspeakable horror of traumatic experiences during WWI and a cathartic narrative. By means of third- and first- person narrative modes for presenting consciousness, the writer portrays the fluctuation of mental states affected by the inclement weather and brutal conditions during their forced march.

Turians'kyi often implies that in times of crisis people lose their ability to consciously comprehend reality. At the same time, he also suggests that critical situations can elevate those suffering to a place "beyond pain"[105] – to their own salvation and liberation from pain. This is shown in the text through the protagonists' hallucinations of the people they loved, especially their mothers. Turians'kyi achieves the aesthetic effect of depicting psychic trauma. He reinforces the powerful impact of war by using personal stories of soldiers that are relevant to the collective trauma of a people at war, including the Ukrainians.

Yes, yes – it is a mother with her child…

……

Heaven and earth have forgotten her – like us… *Her death will be far more terrible than ours. She must first look helplessly – desperately – at her dying child…"* [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Lost* 181).

[104] "My wife's sin against me has been forgiven… by me, a man about to die… That crime of a mother against her child I shall never forgive" (*Lost* 214).

[105] Literally, the translation of the title *Poza mezhamy boliu* means "beyond the thresholds of pain."

Chapter 3. *Perpetrator Trauma* in the Context of Early Ukrainian Communism: Mykola Khvyl'ovyi's Short Story "Ia (Romantyka)"

It is less common to view a perpetrator as someone who experiences trauma. Most of the existing scholarship is focused on victims and their traumatic events. Nevertheless, as Sue Vice argues, fiction can also portray perpetrator trauma and even more precisely than historical documents: "The notion of perpetrator trauma is perhaps easier to recognize as a trope in fictional works, suggesting variously a suppressed moral or emotional awareness, visceral horror, or the occasion for self-pity" (17). Two examples of texts in Ukrainian literature that have a main protagonist as a perpetrator are Vasyl' Stefanyk's "Novyna" ("News" [1899]) and Panas Myrnyi and Ivan Bilyk's *Khiba revut' voly, iak iasla povni?* (*Do Oxen Low When Mangers Are Full?* [1880]). The plots reflect on the reality of the times in which they were written and are based on real events.[106]

In the short story "Novyna," Hryts' Letiuchyi drowns his younger daughter in the river because of his extreme poverty, misery and inability to feed his children after his wife's death.[107] In the novel *Khiba…*, Chipka Varenyk commits multiple crimes (robberies, the murder of a watchman and eventually of the entire Khomenko family). Although the social backgrounds that contributed to the establishment of the villain are presented in both texts, the concept of perpetrator trauma can only be applied to "Novyna," which relates to the perpetrator's guilty conscience about his wrongdoing. Hryts' is aware of the awfulness of his

---

[106] See Antonenko-Davydovych, Borys. "Na shliakhu do pravdy," p. 9; Kuz'mina, Iryna. "Ekspresiia ta psykholohism sotsial'nykh novel Vasylia Stefanyka," p. 127.

[107] "Мучився Гриць цілі два роки сам із дрібними дітьми"; "Гриць глянув на них із лави і погадав: 'Мерці,' – і напудився так, що аж його піт обсипав. Чогось йому так стало, як коли би йому хто тяжкий камінь поклав на груди" (47). ["For two whole years now, Hryts has suffered alone with his two little girls; Hryts gazed at them from his seat on the bench and thought: Corpses, and so frightened himself with this thought that he broke out in a cold sweat. He felt as if someone had placed a heavy stone on his chest" ("News" 27).]

crime, whereas Chipka feels no remorse, even after he is sent off to Siberia.[108] While social circumstances, such as poverty, might have impacted Chipka's state of mind as a perpetrator, he nevertheless made a conscious choice to become a villain. This distinguishes him from Stefanyk's character, who undergoes a psychological crisis after the loss of his wife and his subsequent inability to provide for his family. For Chipka, vengeance is one of his main motives. Therefore, his character cannot be considered an illustration of perpetrator trauma. Hence, we understand that not every representation of a perpetrator's mentality implies perpetrator trauma. The crimes of only some fictional villains can contribute to their inner dissociation and become traumatic. In Russian literature, Dostoyevsky's *Crime and Punishment* may also fit the description of perpetrator trauma.

A literary parallel can be drawn with real-life delinquents. For instance, Mohamed Saira claims that for some actual perpetrators of mass atrocities, the process of committing a crime can be traumatizing.[109] Therefore, he believes, it is necessary to consider the concept of *perpetrator trauma* because trauma is an all-encompassing phenomenon, "divorced from morality, and not incompatible with choice and agency":

> In popular, scholarly, and legal discourse, psychological trauma is an experience that belongs to victims. While we expect victims of crimes to suffer trauma, we never ask whether perpetrators likewise experience those same crimes as trauma. Indeed, if we consider trauma in the perpetration of a crime at all, it is usually to inquire whether a terrible experience earlier in life drove a person toward wrongdoing. We are loath to

[108] "As Chipka is about to be led off to Siberia, Hryts'ko approaches to greet him with a kind word. Chipka, however, demonstratively turns away. While other prisoners weep, he casts harsh glances at the crowd around him. His last words, meant for his mother, are sarcastic and threatening […]" (Ilnytzkyj, "The Cossack" 52).

[109] "[P]erpetrators can experience their crimes as trauma – that is, that commission of the crime itself causes a psychological injury to the perpetrator, which can result in particular adverse physical, social, or emotional consequences" (Saira 1162).

> acknowledge that the commission of the crime itself may cause some perpetrators to experience their own psychological injury and scarring. (Saira 1157)

In this and the following chapter, I discuss a type of fictional perpetrator that emerges under totalitarian Bolshevik rule during the years of war communism[110] in Ukraine. I will argue that the oppressive measures of the colonizer shape the character's social, political, ethnical, moral and cultural views. Therefore, he can either become a dissident or join the new ideology. I argue that for the perpetrator who chooses the latter, murder becomes a "way out" to abandon a previous identity and adopt a new one. It becomes not only a physical act, but also a symbolic murder of the protagonist's moral self. The character, thus, undergoes a torturous period of transformation, which I call "perpetrator trauma."

In this chapter, I analyze Mykola Khvyl'ovyi's short story "Ia (Romantyka)" ("My Self [Romantica]")[111] (1924). The time and location of the story are not clear. But they are not central to the plotline, which is constructed around the experiences and feelings of a nameless protagonist, who is narrating the events. Implicitly, these are the early years after the Revolution of 1917. The main character is a dutiful Chekist (a member of the secret police),[112] who unhesitatingly gives orders to execute captives. He seems to enjoy his role, until one day among the prisoners he is about to execute he sees his own mother. While it is

---

[110] War Communism refers to the Bolshevik policy "based on wholesale nationalization of industry, rationing, and compulsory requisition of agricultural produce from the peasantry" (Shkandrij, *The Cultural Renaissance* 35).

[111] From here on, I refer to this short story as "Ia," and "My Self" in translation (by C. H. Andrusyshyn). Already in the title, the word "Romantyka" in parentheses implies the narrator's inner ambiguity and suffering. Bezkhutryi notes that even the dedication to Mykhailo Kotsiubyns'kyi's "Tsvit iabluni" ["The Apple Blossom"; 1902] (in the story, a father undergoes a psychological crisis because he cannot help his dying child), alludes to the internal split and turmoil of the protagonist in "Ia".

[112] Translator's remark: "Cheka – the Extraordinary Commission for Protection against Counter-revolution (secret police)" ("My Self" 33).

not clear whether this was just a hallucination or indeed his actual mother, the Chekist starts doubting his actions. This leads to internal conflict between his ethical Self and his violent duty to the Cheka. The latter requires executing even his own mother for the sake of the Revolution. Following an internal struggle, he eventually commits the crime and marches off in the ranks of the Chekists.

In his article "Between Cultural Memory and Trauma: An Interpretation of Mykola Khvyl'ovyi's 'My Being'," Alexander Kratochvil analyzes the story as a case study to show how literature can represent the unspeakable (361). He considers "Ia" as a trauma narrative "where the plot is a projection of the inner dissociation of the narrator" (366). Hence, the killing of the mother shall be viewed as symbolic. Kratochvil claims that the dissociation of the narrator's personality occurs because of the traumatizing impacts of the cruelties of War Communism on his psyche and on his "self-awareness and world perception" (364). Although there have been some in-depth analyses of the story (e.g., Iurii Bezkhutryi discusses notions of illusion and reality, motifs of murder and fanaticism, etc.), I bring a new perspective to the role dreamlike states play and how narrative modes and stylistic aspects function in presenting traumatic experience in this well-known text. Particularly, I examine aspects of the perpetrator's psychic trauma: his identity crisis (the loss of "self," his sense of dissociation), presented through dreams, flashbacks from the past and metaphysical, irrational moments. These traumatic symptoms are depicted in the short story using impressionistic techniques that translate into ambiguity and distortion caused by the contrast between outer and inner realities.

There is a problem identifying whether the events in the story have already happened, or whether the protagonist narrates them as he is experiencing them. This is crucial for

interpreting the symptoms portrayed in the text as either trauma (an immediate experience of the event) or PTSD (Post-traumatic stress disorder), defined as the "re-experiencing of the trauma memory and consequent avoidance and hypervigilance" (Alford 17). For example, some of the symptoms pertinent to the story are flashbacks from the past, hallucinations, avoidance of thoughts and memories associated with the protagonist's mother. Yet, they are intertwined with the immediate narration of the character's experience. Therefore, the tense of narration (past or present) is relevant here. Consequently, the text requires close analysis of the modes in which consciousness is presented as well as sensitivity to the stylistic peculiarities of the short story to understand the traumatized psyche of the literary perpetrator.

I propose a close reading of "Ia" to reveal how the protagonist's psychology is shaped under the Bolshevik system, arguing that there is a breaking point after which he moves from being a victim of the regime to becoming a perpetrator of its crimes; this happens with the assassination of his own mother. By cutting ties with the person he loves, the protagonist commits a crime that establishes his new identity, that of villain. To understand the historical background that the story alludes to, I first discuss the questions of Ukrainian national communism and Bolshevism, the Literary Discussion and Mykola Khvyl'ovyi's role in Ukraine's cultural and political life during the late 1920s.

3.1. Ukrainian national communism and Bolshevism

For Ukraine's intellectuals, according to Myroslav Shkandrij, Ukrainian nationalism often implied a "separate cultural identity" and was their way of "contradicting mainstream Russian and Polish intellectuals" who included Ukrainians into their respective nations

(*Russia and Ukraine* 23). The time shortly after the 1917 Revolution and during the 1920s (the formative years of the Soviet regime in Ukraine) was both a time of great hope and uncertainty for Ukrainians. The brief period of Ukrainian independence after the fall of the Russian empire also saw a growth in Ukrainian patriotism.

In the 1920s, for example, it seemed possible to be a Ukrainian and a Communist, a concept now known as "national communism." Yet, the Bolshevik policy towards the national question was ambiguous and misleading. Initially, they rejected the idea of nationhood, propagating the Marxist idea of "internationalism."[113] However, this only repelled the Ukrainian elite, for whom the national and cultural components were crucial. To gain support from the Ukrainian intelligentsia, Soviets expressed their "tolerance" for the idea of accepting Ukraine's national aspirations, introducing the policy of "Ukrainization."[114] This, however, turned out to be only Machiavellian rhetoric:

> During the first years of the Soviet ideological mutation, Ukrainian ideologues, historians, and writers remained perplexed. Was a retreat from class analysis a new official line? If so, were they supposed to join the Moscovites [supporters of the Russian Bolshevik Party – DP] in composing paeans to the Russian 'elder brother,' or were they to glorify their own national traditions and national heroes? (Yekelchyk 15)

---

[113] The idea of proletarian internationalism comes from the Marxist concept of international solidarity of all workers, regardless of their nationality. Therefore, Bolsheviks believed that nationalism only divides the workers and prevents the struggle for socialism: "Nationalism thus becomes a species of bourgeois false consciousness serving to divide the workers along national lines, to divert their attention from their class enemies, and thereby to inhibit the struggle for socialism" (Mace 9).

[114] Despite their hostile politics, Shkandrij states, the Bolsheviks saw already in April 1923 that to gain support from Ukrainians, they must "make concessions to national aspirations." This inclination resulted in the policy of Ukrainization, although it took another two years for it to be implemented. The struggle of Ukrainians for their national identity was happening on political, academic and cultural levels: "Oleksander Shumsky led the struggle within the party apparatus; Mykola Skrypnyk defended the new republic's interest at the Union level; Mykhailo Volobuiev offered an economic policy for the movement; Matvii Iavorsky developed a school of history; and Mykola Khvylovy took up the question of Ukrainian culture" (Shkandrij, *The Cultural Renaissance* 3-4).

Although the leaders of the Ukrainian cadre within the Communist Party of Ukrainian Bolsheviks (CP(b)U) – Mykola Skrypnyk,[115] Oleksander Shumsky,[116] Mykola Khvyl'ovyi (a popular Communist writer at the time) and others – were strong proponents of Ukraine's national aspirations as well as the creation of a modern Ukrainian culture, during the first years of Bolshevism, the Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks (RCPB) was unsympathetic towards the idea of Ukrainian nationalism. Consequently, the role of the Ukrainian cadre within the Party was significantly diminished:

> On the economic front they were reduced to requisitioning grain from the villages; on the political front, the Russian administrators and military, desensitized by years of Civil War, took every opportunity to punish defeated peasantry and an outlawed national movement; and on the cultural front, the theory of "the struggle between two cultures" was proclaimed, a move that in effect sanctioned an unabated wave of Russian chauvinism. (Shkandrij, *The Cultural Renaissance* 4)

Volodymyr Panchenko notes that the Bolsheviks never believed in the right of nations to self-determination. It was only a tactical move to ensure the establishment of the "red" – i.e., Bolshevik – "empire" instead of the Romanovs' empire ("Khvyl'ovyi" 59). Ivan Bahrianyi also emphasizes the deceitful national politics of the Communist Kremlin in literature and art, and the Bolsheviks' attempts to subordinate Ukrainian cultural life to communist ideology by means of terror (Bahrianyi 14).

---

[115] Mykola Skrypnyk was "the Old Bolshevik who in 1927 replaced Shumskyi as Commissar of Education;" also "*de facto* minister of the nationality question, ideology, culture and Soviet Ukraine's most effective lobbyist in Union councils" (Mace 3).

[116] Oleksander Shumsky was the Ukrainian Commissar of Education, a former member of the Borot'bists (Shkandrij, *The Cultural Renaissance* 13).

The establishment of the Ukrainian Communist Party[117] (UCP, 1920-1925), as a response to the merger of the *Borot'bists*[118] with the CP(b)U in 1920, is but one example of the Soviet hypocrisy towards the Ukrainian question. The UCP was initially a legal Soviet Party, which was in opposition to the rule of the RCPB over Ukraine as well as to its regional affiliate, the CP(b)U. The UCP stood for the independence of Soviet Ukraine. Although at first the Soviet government in Moscow deceptively acknowledged the legitimacy of the UCP, it soon became afraid of the popularity of the Ukrainian Party. Therefore, the UCP members were soon subject to the terror of the State Political Directorate under the Soviet NKVD (The People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs). In 1924, the Party was officially disbanded. Its members were "offered" membership in the CP(b)U (Lavrinenko 480).

Hence, by manipulating the Ukrainian national question – first being hostile toward it, then pretending that they welcomed it, and then again viewing nationalism as a threat – the Bolsheviks, especially under Stalin, beginning in the late 1920s, aimed to eliminate any sparks of Ukrainian nationalism by violent terror directed towards the Ukrainian peasantry and intellectual elite:

> The Russo-Ukrainian conflict was never resolved. Throughout the twenties and early thirties the Ukrainian countryside and Russian city faced each other in sullen hostility. In 1933-4, Stalin made a sudden change in the national policy of the All-

[117] Serhy Yekelchyk notes that "early Soviet ideology […] rejected the very notion of 'national history.' […] The Bolsheviks identified with a past represented by the revolutionary movements of all peoples and in all times, from Spartacus and the Paris Commune to the Russian Revolutions of 1905 and 1917" (13). The Soviet regime was sending confusing messages to the Ukrainians. First, they were against national history, then in 1920s Ukrainian historical scholarship flourished: "The 'socialist offensive' in history began simultaneously with industrialization, the collectivization of agriculture, and a cultural revolution, resulting in a purge of 'old specialists' during the period 1928-32" (Yekelchyk 13).

[118] "The Borot'bists, or the Ukrainian Party of Socialist Revolutionaries-Borot'bists (Communists), was the left fraction of the Ukrainian Party of Socialists-Revolutionaries (UPSR). In May 1918 this faction gained control of the UPSR and collaborated with the Bolsheviks" (Ilnytzkyj, *Ukrainian Futurism* 34).

> Union Communist Party, proclaiming the chief enemy to be "local nationalism" and giving the order to halt and crush Ukrainization. This attack coincided with the unleashing of the forced collectivization programme, the campaign to "liquidate the kulaks as a class" and the famine in which five to seven million Ukrainians perished. (Shkandrij, *The Cultural Renaissance* 25)

3.2. Mykola Khvyl'ovyi and the Communist Party

Mykola Khvyl'ovyi is perhaps one of the most controversial Ukrainian writers of the early 20th century. A central figure in the Literary Discussion and leader of VAPLITE,[119] he opposed provincialism and populism in Ukrainian culture and literature and strongly believed in a European orientation for Ukrainian culture (Ilnytzkyj, "The Modernist Ideology" 258). Khvyl'ovyi fought against the notion of Ukraine as "Little Russia" (subordinated to Russia) and prostration of some Ukrainian politicians and intellectuals before everything Russian, as if it were a superior intellectual system (Shapoval, "Fatal'na ambivalentnist'" 14).

Although supportive of the socialist system, Khvyl'ovyi had to maneuver between being a "good Ukrainian" and "a good communist": "Unable to reconcile the dilemma of being a good communist and at the same time a good Ukrainian, Khvylovy portrays in many of his stories the conflict between the communist dream and real life" (Luckyj, "Introduction" 4). Mayhill C. Fowler also notes the ambiguity of Khvyl'ovyi's commitment to the Bolshevik Party. One such example is the choice of the term "communard" over "communist":

> In 1924 [Khvyl'ovyi] wrote an autobiography in which he claimed that he was intellectually committed, but questioned his own commitment: 'I am struggling with

[119] VAPLITE – "a free academy of proletarian art" (Ilnytzkyj, "The Modernist Ideology" 258).

> this question – whether I have the right to carry a party card, am I ballast for the Party? … in me there is a romantic, a dreamer – there's always an inner struggle.' He concluded by saying he was, maybe, more of a *communard*[120] than a Communist. (Fowler 70)

Ukrainian artists often faced an uneasy choice between either giving up their pro-Ukrainian views to support Bolshevism or becoming enemies of the Bolshevik Party. In the case of Khvyl'ovyi and Antonenko-Davydovych (whom I will discuss in the next chapter), history showed that it was impossible to achieve a balance between being a Ukrainian patriot and a Bolshevik. I have no intention of identifying the authors' biographies with their fictional protagonists, but it is noteworthy that both writers were hounded by the Party, something they explored in their literary works.

The fact that Mykola Khvyl'ovyi was considered a threat to the Communist Party, even though he was a member, is proven by a case ("sprava-formuliar") that contained documents and materials collected on him by Bolshevik officials prior to 1930. As Iurii Shapoval shows, informants analyzed everything – not only his literary works, the history of his life, but also his political preferences, contacts, conversations, even his moods and behavior ("Fatal'na ambivalentnist'" 28). The case was closed only in 1955, the folder destroyed due to the expiration date for the preservation of this archive and Khvyl'ovyi's suicide in 1933 (Shapoval, *Poliuvannia* 198).

Indeed, Khvyl'ovyi was very quickly disappointed with the politics of the Party, which began "a campaign of terror" in the early 1930s not only against Ukrainian *kurkuli*

[120] As Andrusyshyn points out in his translation, communard literally means "a member or supporter of the Paris commune of 1871. Frequently used by Khvylovy instead of 'communist' in order to remove the story from contemporary life and to emphasize the ideal character of revolution" ("My Self" 35).

("wealthy peasants"), but also against the Ukrainian elite because of its potential to resist the centralizing Stalinist system:

> In the early 1930's the Party resolved to carry out the First Five-Year Plan and collectivization of agriculture at any cost, and thus a campaign of terror was directed in the Ukraine against the hard core of resistance – Ukrainian culture and literature. In order to subjugate that rebellious nation, the Party resorted not only to the decimation of the population by an artificially created famine, but also to the extermination of the Ukrainian intellectual elite. (Luckyj, "Introduction" 11)

In his article "Nove v politytsi i medytsyni"[121] ("New in Politics and Medicine"), Antonenko-Davydovych claims that Khvyl'ovyi's and Skrypnyk's early faith in the Soviet government's ability to resolve the social and national question was proven wrong. The horrifying famine of 1933 is but one example of the government's crimes. Neither Khvyl'ovyi nor Skrypnyk could handle the collapse of their ideals, and this led to their suicides (486).[122]

Luckyj argues that during Stalin's regime, there were hundreds, even thousands, of victims every year. The repressions in Ukraine were also "designed to strengthen the defences of the Soviet Union against possible German expansion" (*Literary Politics* 199). The policy of discrimination revealed the cruel and malicious nature of Stalin's regime, his

---

[121] The article was first published in 1995 in *Rozbudova derzhavy*, no. 12, 1995, and no. 1, 1996. It is unknown when it was originally written. The text had been preserved by B. Antonenko-Davydovych's friend Iurii Piadyk (*Nashschadky pradidiv* 300).

[122] "Концепція Хвильового й Скрипника, за якою радянська система була єдиним ідеальним способом розв'язання соціального й національного питання, – зазнала краху. Страшний голод 1933 року по-своєму розв'язував ці два питання, коли вимирали цілі села на родючих чорноземах, коли доходило до трупоїдства, а подекуди й до людожерства. Пережити загибель своєї ідеї, в яку досі непохитно вірили, не могли ні Хвильовий, ні Скрипник, і перший вистрілив собі в скроню, а другий в серце" (Antonenko-Davydovych, "Nove" 486).

hostility towards everything Ukrainian (culture, literature, language) and the "admission of Russian superiority" (Luckyj, *Literary Politics* 215). It is not surprising then that Khvyl'ovyi was pressured by the political order to write in a certain manner and on certain topics. Freedom, which is required for the writer, was lost (Zhulyns'kyi 11).[123]

Official Soviet literary scholarship presented Khvyl'ovyi's oeuvre as an unfortunate and negative peripheral phenomenon that is not worthy of remembering (Kostiuk 1: 18). Samiilo Shchupak, Khvyl'ovyi's opponent, for example, criticized the leading role of the intelligentsia that Khvyl'ovyi so passionately emphasized. Instead, Shchupak claims that the proletariat is the moving force of the whole revolution, and therefore of the cultural revolution as well ("avanhard tsiloi revolutsii") ("Psevdomarksyzm" 5: 404). The Soviet critic accepted the possibility of perceiving Europe as the symbol of a certain culture, but he condemned Khvyl'ovyi's idea of Europe because he aspired to achieve it through the work of VAPLITE, which strove for "culture for the sake of culture, for renascence for the sake of renascence and art for art's sake." This, Shchupak argued, only demonstrated Khvyl'ovyi's ignorance of the problem of proletarian renaissance in Ukraine which indicates his nationalistic attitudes ("Psevdomarksyzm" 5: 406).

Another Soviet critic, Volodymyr Iurynets', described Khvyl'ovyi's aspirations towards Europe as the artificial fusion of different themes from European literature which were connected only superficially and not at all organically. He claimed that Khvyl'ovyi's works were influenced by Maupassant (and his "refined aristocratism") and Dostoevsky (with his mixture of logic and madness), and that everything the writer created was only for

[123] See also Khvyl'ovyi's letter to Mykola Zerov: "Тепер про внутрішню свободу. Саме її і бракує мені. Поет безперечно є продукт свого часу, але поетом ще не можна назвати того, хто в полоні фейлетонної сучасності" (From the letter to Mykola Zerov, date is appr. middle of 1923, Khvyl'ovyi 2: 841).

the benefit of the enemy [I assume he meant the enemy of the Bolshevik Party, Ukrainian nationalism – DP] (Iurynets', "M. Khvyl'ovyi" 5: 428; 438).

In contrast, Oleksander Doroshkevych, Ievhen Malaniuk and Iurii Lavrinenko recognized Khvyl'ovyi's talent. Doroshkevych called Khvyl'ovyi one of the most profound writers of his time, truly a reformer and revolutionary. He claimed that Khvyl'ovyi's protagonists seem real, even if they lack naturalistic details and are not stable in their psychological aspects ("Mykola Khvyl'ovyi" 5: 393-395). Ievhen Malaniuk mentioned the mellifluousness of Khvyl'ovyi's prose, which he also saw as a flaw because it detracted from its compositional structure and resulted in impressionistic, telegraphic sentences. He pointed to the non-traditional lyric epithets and metaphors like "blue rain" ('synii doshch') ("13 travnia 1933" 5: 467). Lavrinenko noted two stylistic literary European traditions that intersect in Khvyl'ovyi's oeuvre: romanticism and the baroque ("Mykola Khvyl'ovyi" 404). Finally, Vira Aheieva discusses the fusion of various stylistic features in Khvyl'ovyi, his eschewing of realistic or "believable circumstances" as well as his changeability as a writer: "His manner as a writer changed abruptly and often unpredictably. He combined an expressionist, agitational, and debunking emotional intensity in his work with impressionist attention to psychological nuances, beauty, and the multifacetedness and rich tones and colours of the external world" ("Mykola Khvylovy" 47).

3.3. The Literary Discussion

Despite Khvyl'ovyi's early idealistic views of the Revolution, he did not see Ukrainian literature developing side by side with Russian. In April 1925, Khvyl'ovyi initiated the famous Literary Discussion which first addressed Hryhorii Iakovenko's article "On Critics

and Criticism in Literature" (1925), in which he insisted that proletarian literature must be elementary and simple. Khvyl'ovyi, on the contrary, wanted the Ukrainian people to have a distinct culture, separate from the Russian discourse and more concordant with "the most advanced nations of Europe" (Shkandrij, *The Cultural Renaissance* 4). Khvyl'ovyi expressed these views in his article "On 'Satan in a Barrel,' Graphomaniacs, Speculators and Other Prosvita Types,"[124] in which he denied the division between an older and younger generation of writers and instead proposed that there are good and bad writers as well as intellectuals and fools. This pamphlet was followed by two more: "On Copernicus of Fruenburg, or the Alphabet of the Asiatic Renaissance in Art" and "On Demagogic Water, or the Real Address of Ukrainian Voronkyism, Free Competition and so on." These three pamphlets were republished under the title *Kamo hriadeshy [?] Pamflety (Quo Vadis? Pamphlets)* (Shkandrij, *The Cultural Renaissance* 6).

While these polemical pamphlets had more of a literary focus, Khvyl'ovyi's unpublished brochure "Ukraina chy Malorosiia?" ("Ukraine or Little Russia" [1925]) was strongly political. In this pamphlet, Khvyl'ovyi also attacked Russian chauvinism, voiced the need for equal rights among the republics of the USSR, and called for an orientation on Western European art, its style, techniques:[125]

> In […] 'Ukraine or Little Russia' […], which circulated among party leaders, literary figures and students, Khvylovy made the sensational accusation that the reason why the Communist Party in Ukraine was not doing enough to Ukrainize public life was

[124] "'Satan in a Barrel' was the title of a primitive one-act farce popular at the turn of the century" (Shkandrij, *The Cultural Renaissance* 5).

[125] "'Ukraine or Little Russia' was a long pamphlet, consisting of some seventy to eighty pages which sounded the alarm: the national question had not been solved and the old scourge, Russian chauvinism, was gaining the upper hand. Khvylovy had shifted the focus of his polemic to a sensitive political problem and had pointed a finger at the party" (Shkandrij, *The Cultural Renaissance* 12).

> because it was completely dominated by Russians or culturally Russified elements who represented the worst elements of the colonial-settler mentality. (Shkandrij, *The Cultural Renaissance* 12)

At one point in "Ukraina chy Malorosiia?" Khvyl'ovyi rejects the idea that Ukraine is a colony of Russia, stating that it is time to end building Russian culture in Ukraine and to restore an active, young Ukrainian society which represents both the village and the proletariat (4: 415).[126] He declares that the old West European literature is closer to Ukrainians ideologically and advocates the notion of a "psychological Europe," which reveals the psychology of people and the Faustian quality of life.[127] Thus, Khvyl'ovyi views Europe as the "highway of progress," whereas "prosvitas" (popular educational societies) were associated with primitivism and provincialism (Shkandrij, *The Cultural Renaissance* 9).[128]

The idea of a "psychological Europe" is related to the "Asiatic renaissance,"[129] a political and cultural revival of the people of the East, freeing themselves from their colonial mentality. As Khvyl'ovyi puts it, the Asiatic renaissance is dictated not only by classical

---

[126] A passage from "Ukraine or Little Russia?": "Чи є Україна колонією чи ні? […] ми повинні негайно стати на бік активного, молодого українського суспільства, яке репрезентує не тільки селянина, але вже й робітника, і тим назавжди покінчити з контрреволюційною ідеєю будувати на Україні російську культуру" (Khvyl'ovyi, "Ukraina chy Malorosiia?" 4: 415).

[127] In another pamphlet "Dumky proty techii," he explains that the social category can never exist without the psychological one. Thus, not only the economy makes history, but also living people with their ambivalent psychology.

[128] "*Prosvita*" was "the name of a popular enlightenment society which operated mainly in rural Ukraine during the pre-revolutionary years (Shkandrij, *The Cultural Renaissance* 9).

[129] "Ukraine, on the boundary between East and West, long an oppressed nation, had a special role to play in this renaissance: for this South-Eastern republic of communes would bring the new word, the new art to Europe. The great art of the future, the art of the Asiatic Renaissance, would not reject the past, but would build upon its achievements" (Shkandrij, *The Cultural Renaissance* 9).

education, but also by the renaissance of a strong whole person, emergence of a new type of courageous conquistadors which Europe lacks (“Ukraina chy Malorosiia?” 4: 422). Iurii Smolych defined “Asiatic” as a symbol that presented everything that is oppressed, dependent, everything that is in a state of colonial slavery (*Rozpovidi* 7: 92).

Khvyl'ovyi believed that art should reflect contemporary life with its complexities and conflicts, provoking society and revealing the “conflicting forces of the human psyche” (Shkandrij, *The Cultural Renaissance* 4). He even invented the term “romantic vitaism,” which Smolych interprets as meaning an optimistic view on life, an active and happy existence (*Rozpovidi* 7: 92).

The Literary Discussion dominated Ukrainian intellectual life for over two years. James Mace points out that already within a month after the publication of the “Apolohety pysaryzmu” (“Apologists of Scribbling” [1926]) where Khvyl'ovyi states that Ukrainian literature should by no means develop alongside Russian, Stalin himself wrote a letter to Lazar Kaganovich (a Soviet politician and one of Stalin's closest associates) and the CP(b)U Central Committee. Khvyl'ovyi was accused of many things, including propaganda of Ukrainian nationalism and even fascism: “‘Khvylovyism’ was condemned along with ‘Shumskyism’ as a manifestation of ‘bourgeois nationalism,’ that is, as threats to the unity of the Soviet state. The June 1926 plenum of the KP(b)U [CP(b)U—DP] Central Committee convicted Khvylovyi of eight separate deviations ranging from ‘reviving the theory of the struggle of two cultures’ to disseminating the ideas of Ukrainian fascism” (Mace 150). Khvyl'ovyi chose to surrender to the Party in order to be able to continue his work: “Khvylovyi revealed himself to be a master of the art of ostensible surrender, that is, confessing whatever was necessary and then continuing to do what his convictions dictated

in a more subtle manner" (Mace 156). Not too long after Khvyl'ovyi's suicide, at the first All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviet Writers in Kharkiv (1934), the majority of Ukrainian writers declared their loyalty to the Soviet Party and Stalin and established "socialist realism" as the "principle of artistic creation" (Luckyj, *Literary Politics* 230).

This brief overview of Khvyl'ovyi's daring ideas, his political, cultural and literary input reveals the complexity of his time. He was one of the many intellectuals who suffered from the tyranny of the Bolshevik system, and his short story "Ia" portrays the ambiguity of a troubled protagonist who chooses to convert from a sensitive ethical person into a merciless criminal.

3.4. "Ia (Romantyka)": "I am a Chekist, but still I remain a human being"

Many scholars point to Khvyl'ovyi's sense of a divided self (Bezkhutryi, Pavlychko, Zhulyns'kyi). Indeed, one of Khvyl'ovyi's letters to Mykola Zerov from November 12, 1924,[130] reminds me of the inner struggle of his protagonist in "Ia." On the one hand, he describes himself as a romantic, a person who enjoys the beauty of life: chocolate, an evening road covered with snow. On the other hand, he shares his experience of war that traumatized his psyche: "three years of wandering, starvation, horror, which I still cannot

[130] "Уявіть, дорогий Миколо Костевичу, людину, яка до божевілля любить шоколад, яка кожної миті відчуває густий запах життя, яка, нарешті, вічно в колі химерних асоціацій, – уявіть цю людину на прекрасній вечірній сніговій дорозі, коли тільки-но смеркло і на селі перекликаються собаки, коли зимова тиша так, як віфлеємська зоря, стоїть над оселею, уявіть цю людину на такому фоні в колі дикої гайдамаччини, яка везе цю людину на розстріл. Це – я, і так один раз, і так – другий. Картина, як бачите, остільки патетична, що ніяк не можна її читати, не пустивши сльозу. Як же: шоколад, запах, вечірня оселя і т.д. Але коли до цього додати і те, що цій людині бабусин кіт намуркотів якусь 'заозерну' казку – то матимемо 'зреліще' остаточно 'умілітельноє'. Так, бачите, я й на цьому не хочу зупинятися. Треба ж додати ще й те, що 3 роки походів, голодовки, справжнього жаху, які описати я ніяк не ризикну, 3 роки Голгофи в квадраті на далеких полях Галичини, в Карпатах, в Румунії і т.д. і т.д., – все це теж що-небудь значить[…]. І справді: при всій своїй нормальності я все-таки, коли провіряю себе, трошки психічно ненормальний. І з'ясовується це тим, про що я писав на початку свого листа. Саме життєві пертурбації довели мене до такого стану" (From the letter to Mykola Zerov, November 12, 1924, Khvyl'ovyi 2: 852).

dare to describe, three years of Golgotha, multiplied by two, at the remote fields of Galicia, the Carpathians, Romania, etc…" (Khvyl'ovyi 2: 852).

While Bolsheviks tried to portray Chekists as heroes, Khvyl'ovyi's "Ia," showed their so-called 'true heroism.' He revealed that Chekists do not strive for justice and fairness. Rather, they decide to execute their captives while enjoying a glass of wine. It is no wonder then that the Soviet critic Iurynets' called "Ia" a huge psychological mistake ("velyka psykholohichna pomylka") that was damaging for society because of the ambiguity with which it portrays outward and inward realities. He claimed that such disproportions could only be possible in a romantic representation of the psyche, but not in real life ("M. Khvyl'ovyi" 5: 435).

Iurii Boiko, in contrast, views "Ia" as a philosophical and satirical story that is rich in symbolism. He rightfully points out that we will not find any concrete idea about communism in this text. There is only the allusion to "zahirna komuna" ("distant commune"), to communist phraseology, without which the ideas in the text would be counterrevolutionary (Boiko, "Mykola Khvyl'ovyi" 1: 111; 116).

Bezkhutryi argues that "Ia" was an attempt to show the complexity of the revolutionary period as well as the contradiction between feeling and duty (255). The text plays with polysemy and reveals the depth of the protagonist's unconscious processes (Bezhutryi 257). It combines the interplay of illusion and reality. At times, it is hard to detect whether the events and feelings are real or just imagined by the character (Bezhutryi 159). Thus, Bezkhutryi claims, Khvyl'ovyi's prose reveals the perception of the world through feelings and anxieties, suffering, psychological dividedness, symbiosis of illusion and reality that was prevalent in European literature of the twentieth century (259).

Volodymyr Panchenko mentions the mystification and play that Khvyl'ovyi uses when inferring the events of 1919. Apparently, during the time when the story "Ia" was written the slogans of the Parisian commune were very popular and on various occasions were mentioned in newspapers ("Khvyl'ovyi" 67). The translator of the text, Constantine Henry Andrusyshyn, makes a remark that the *Versaillais* were the "supporters of the King during the French Revolution" and in the story this term is used as the "defenders of the old order" ("My Self" 39). Thus, the narrator in "Ia" is culturally aware, which is seen through his rather elitist use of the terms "communard" and *Versaillais*.

In general, as Panchenko puts it, "Ia" is about the sacrifice of humaneness on the altar of Bolshevism, an utopian idea. The violent ways of pursuing this idea led to the loss of its original meaning. The transformation of the Chekist proves this: when he kills his mother, he is psychologically disturbed by his crime. Yet, he does not experience any regret and repentance (at least not overtly). Instead, he walks away joining the rest of the Chekists. Thus, this short story is testimony to the devaluation of human life that goes along with the Bolshevik formula that everything which serves the revolution is moral. This type of ideology allowed crime without punishment and justified bloodshed, while hiding behind the promise of the "zahirna komuna" ("distant commune") (Panchenko, "Khvyl'ovyi" 67-68).

3.4.1. Symptoms of a traumatized psyche

"Ia" is written in an impressionistic style with some elements of romanticism. Impressionism, which originated in France in the 1860s, first in the paintings by artists like Cézanne, Degas, Manet, Monet, Renoir and others, was meant to capture "an impression of what the eye sees at a particular moment" (Chilvers, "Impressionism"). Impressionists, both

in painting and literature, address the way light affects the experience of colours, rather than merely describing them. This function of light and colour aimed to create a certain mood and ambience (Scott 218, 219).

Oksana Filatova points out the following peculiarities of impressionism in early Ukrainian modernist prose: fragmentary depiction, emotionality, rejection of the traditional naturalistic presentation of external reality, focus on psychological analysis. Thus, the subject of the impressionistic portrayal is not reality *per se*, as in the realistic tradition with its focus on logical and detailed depiction, but the impression obtained from it. Hence, the composition and plot are unpredictable. The narration, typically in the first person, is fragmentary because characters express feelings, observations, impressions, without necessarily a rational exposition. The emphasis is on the psychological conflict that often happens in the protagonist's conscious or unconscious states (Filatova 67).

Oleksandra Chernenko explains that the psychologism of impressionists differs from the psychologism of realists. While realists believed that reality is the way we see it, that everything has its cause and effect, impressionists were convinced that everything that surrounds us is not the way we are used to seeing and perceiving it. Rather it is the consequence of learnt concepts and ideas that need to be relinquished if we are to know the true reality (Chernenko, *M. Kots'ubyns'kyi* 28). Thus, the impressionistic technique is a laconic depiction of specific details which represents an impression from reality, the character's inner world, their irrational and psychic concerns by means of sensorial (visual, auditory, tactile, olfactory, gustatory) perception (Chernenko, *M. Kots'ubyns'kyi* 42).

Khvyl'ovyi chooses to show the sharp external contrasts that accompany sharp internal conflicts. Colours and the senses play a significant role in the representation of the

protagonist's consciousness. For instance, whenever the protagonist refers to the Cheka, it is portrayed in dark colours. On the contrary, the image of his mother is always surrounded by (candle)light. Her yard also smells of mint ("My Self" 39).

In the following excerpt, the author describes the nighttime during which the dark tribunal of the Commune holds its meetings. The contrast of darkness and light are presented through the murkiness of the night and the dim burning of the candelabrum that is insufficient for illuminating the whole room. The external reality is analogous to the narrator's inner life. His "unusual" office also symbolizes his mind with its various voices, his dark and evil parts of the self. It is not surprising then that he uses the image of dim light barely illuminating a quarter of the room to depict his despair:

> Темної ночі, коли за вікном проходять міські вечори (маєток злетів на гору й царить над містом), коли сині димки здіймаються над цегельнею й обивателі, як миші, – за підворотні, у канареєчний замок, темної ночі в моєму надзвичайному кабінеті збираються мої товариші. Це новий синедріон, це чорний трибунал комуни.
>
> Тоді з кожного закутка дивиться справжня й воістину жахна смерть.
>
> […] Канделябр на дві свічі тускло горить. Світлу несила досягти навіть чверті кабінету.[131] ("Ia" 26-27)

The impressionistic narration, with its ambiguity and distortion, can be viewed as a symptom of trauma, although it is hard to define who narrates the story: a rational narrator or

[131] "On a murky night, behind the window, when the urban evenings pass (the palace had flown up and lords it over the city), when small columns of blue smoke rise above the brick factory, and the citizens creep like mice, my comrades pass through the gates and into the canary castle, and meet on a murky night in my unusual office. This is a new Sanhedrin, this is the dark tribunal of the Commune. […] The candelabrum burns dimly. It is difficult for the light to illumine even a quarter of the office" ("My Self" 34).

a traumatized one, or is it, perhaps, a voice in-between? It seems like the narrator switches back and forth from being rational to being confused by his reality.

Bezkhutryi points out some theatrical stage directions, like the author's asides (in parentheses) and phrases like “The curtain parts” (253). The latter creates the effect of a stage performance. The following example shows how the narrator interrupts the story to include a comment about one of the characters, using parentheses. It is as if he turns toward the reader to explain some intricacies of the degenerate’s nature. Passages like this also demonstrate the presence of authorial voice in the text:

> Вартовий мовчки, мов автомат, вийшов із кімнати.
>
> (Так, це був незмінний вартовий: не тільки Андрюша – і ми грішили: я й доктор. Ми часто ухилялись доглядати розстріли. Але він, цей дегенерат, завше був солдатом революції і тільки тоді йшов із поля, коли танули димки й закопували розстріляних).
>
> ...*Портьєра роздвинулась*, і в мій кабінет увійшло двоє.”[132] [Emphasis mine—DP] (“Ia” 32)

Besides theatrical remarks, we are presented with the main character's (“I”) dreamy and romantic side. The story begins with an abrupt paragraph which shows the protagonist's inner turmoil. Notwithstanding some of the romanticized ideas about the revolution (25;42), about the mother’s house (30) and about the character’s mother as the Biblical Maria (25),

---

[132] “The sentinel goes out of the room silently, like an automaton. (Yes, he is an irreplaceable sentinel: not Andrusha alone – we too have sinned: the doctor and I. We often neglected to witness the executions. But he, this degenerate, was always a soldier of the revolution, and would leave the field of execution only when the gun-smoke had melted away and the corpses were being buried).
The curtain parts and two persons come into my office […]” [Emphasis mine—DP] (“My Self” 42).

the motifs of silence, grief, memory and loss attest to a traumatized psyche. The metaphor of "a solitary desert cliff" ("самотня пустельна скеля") symbolizes the character's isolation and estrangement from his former self, which he still remembers well. Glimpses of the conscious self briefly break through in the form of flashbacks and the repetitive remark "Це я добре пам'ятаю!" ("This I well remember!"). The motif of remembering permeates this story (e.g., "Я йшов у нікуди" ["I was going into nowhere"]) and is used to reveal the character's psychological crisis and confusion. The following passage shows the romanticized or idealized concept of an ethereal commune beyond the hills (in bold). The Biblical Maria comes from a place of calmness ("тихих озер" – "the calm lakes"). At the same time, the protagonist appears on "boundless fields" ("безгранні поля"), trying to look beyond the horizons, towards that distant commune. His traumatized self emerges when the image of Maria and the distant commune disappear. He then describes the unbearable pain and suffering that warmly glow in the votive lamp of his fanaticism when he recalls his mother, whom he compares to the extraordinary Maria:

> З далекого туману, з **тихих озер загірної комуни** шелестить шелест: то йде Марія. Я виходжу на безгранні поля, проходжу перевали і там, де жевріють кургани, похиляюсь на *самотню пустельну скелю*. Я дивлюся в далі. Тоді дума за думою, як амазонянки, джигітують навколо мене. **Тоді все пропадає**... Таємні вершники летять, ритмічно похитуючись, до одрогів, і гасне день; біжить у могилах дорога, а за нею – мовчазний степ... Я одкидаю вії і *згадую*... воістину моя мати – втілений прообраз тієї надзвичайної Марії, що стоїть на гранях невідомих віків. Моя мати – наївність, *тиха жура* і добрість безмежна. *(Це я добре пам'ятаю!) І мій неможливий біль, і моя незносна мука* тепліють у

лампаді фанатизму перед цим прекрасним печальним образом.[133] [Emphasis mine—DP] (“Ia” 25)

In short, from the very beginning we are introduced to the protagonist’s inner conflict, a conflict between filial duty and the duties of the Chekist: “both my intolerable suffering and my unbearable torture grow warm in the lamp of fanaticism before this wonderful picture of sorrow” (“My Self” 31).

3.4.2. Modes for presenting consciousness

According to Dorrit Cohn’s classification of narrative modes for presenting consciousness, “Ia” is a dissonant self-narration with self-quoted and self-narrated monologues, with occasional quotations of past thoughts. All these elements constitute what Cohn calls the “memory narration” with its “evocative present” that refers to a past experience and “creates an illusory (‘as if’) coincidence of two time-levels, literally ‘evoking’ the narrated moment at the moment of narration” (161; 198).

Cohn states that “in memory monologues the present moment of locution is a moment emptied of all contemporary, simultaneous experience: the monologist exists merely as a disembodied medium, a pure memory without clear location in time and space. The

[133] “From distant misty regions, from the calm lakes of the intangible Commune[133] there rustles a whisper: Maria is coming. I go out into the boundless fields, pass over the hilly crests, walk in the place where the tumuli glow, and lean against a *solitary desert rock*. I look into the distance. Thought after thought, galloping like Amazons, swarms around me. Then everything disappears. The mysterious Amazons, swaying rhythmically, fly towards the horned tips of the mountains, and the day darkens. The road speeds on amid the hillocks, and after it – the silent steppe. I raise my eyelids and try to *recollect*… in truth, my mother – the prototype incarnate of that extraordinary Maria who stands on the boundaries of ages unknown. My mother – simplicity, *silent grief*, and boundless kindness. *(This I well remember). And both my intolerable suffering and my unbearable torture* grow warm in the lamp of fanaticism before this wonderful picture of sorrow.” [Emphasis mine—DP] (“My Self” 31)

monologic presentation itself is reduced to zero here, to a kind of vanishing point of the mnemonic process" (247).

In Khyl'ovyi's story, one example of a memory monologue is when the protagonist returns to his mother's house. Although, he mentions entering the room, this is not a literal reference to a place. Instead, it is a subtle detail that alludes to the protagonist's mnemonic, hallucinatory-like state. Thus, when he enters "the room," I believe it symbolizes his unconscious:

> Я йду в кімнату, знімаю маузера і запалюю свічу.
>
> ... – Ти спиш?
>
> Але мати не спала.
>
> Вона підходить до мене, бере моє стомлене обличчя в свої сухі старечі долоні й схиляє свою голову на мої груди. Вона знову каже, що я, її м'ятежний син, зовсім замучив себе.
>
> І я чую на своїх руках її хрустальні росинки.
>
> Я:
>
> - Ах, як я втомився, мамо!
>
> Вона підводить мене до свічі й дивиться на моє зморене обличчя. Потім становиться біля тусклої лампади й зажурено дивиться на образ Марії.[134] ("Ia" 30)

[134] "I enter the room, take off my gun and light a candle. 'Are you asleep?' But Mother is not asleep. She approaches, takes my weary face in her dry old palms, and rests her head on my breast. Once more she says that I, her rebellious son, have absolutely tortured myself to death. And on my hands I feel the crystal dews, falling from her eyes.
I: 'Ah, mother, how tired I am!'
She draws me towards the candlelight and looks at my weary face. Then she stops to look sorrowfully at the icon of Maria" ("My Self" 39).

The use of past and present tense in the text requires closer analysis. For instance, in the following paragraph the switch from present (italicized) to past tense (in bold) and vice versa helps to distinguish between the experiencing self (present tense: "Мати каже" ["Mother says"]) and the narrating self who recollects the event ("За вікном ішли..." ["Behind the window dewy mornings were passing"]). It also implies that this is a memory narration:

> Мати каж*е*, 'що я (її м'ятежний син) зовсім замуч**ив** себе...'. Тоді я бер*у* її милу голову з нальотом сріблястої сивини і тихо клад*у* на свої груди... За вікном ішл**и** росяні ранки і пада**ли** перламутри. Проходи**ли** неможливі дні. […] Тоді дні перед грозою. Там, за одрогами сизого бору, спалаху*ють* блискавиці і накипають, і піняться гори. Важкий душний грім ніяк не прорве*ться* з Індії, із сходу. І томи*ться* природа в передгроззі. А втім, за хмарним накипом чу*ти* й інший гул – ... глуха канонада. Насува*ються* дві грози.[135] [Emphasis mine—DP] ("Ia" 25)

The short story is written in dissonant self-narration because the unambiguous narrator can detach himself from a past self. Thus, there is a "polar relationship between the narrating and the experiencing self" (Cohn 146). At times, the narrator is lucid and aware of his mental and emotional states and even provides a commentary about his thoughts and

[135] The 1960 English translation of this text by C. H. Andrusyshyn has a different tense of narration – mainly present, whereas Khvyl'ovyi uses both past and present. I analyze the original text, therefore some incongruities of grammar tense reflected in the translation might occur: "Mother *says* that I (her rebellious son) **have** absolutely tortur**ed** myself to death. Then I *take* her lovely head, sprinkled with silvery grey, and *rest* it on my bosom. Behind the window dewy mornings **[were]** pass**[ing]** and pearl-drops **[were]** fall**[ing]**. Intolerable days **[were]** mov**[ing]** on. […] These *are* the days before the thunderstorm… And yet, beyond the cloudy fog *may be heard* yet another roar – a dull cannonade. Onward *move* the two storms" ("My Self" 32) [Emphasis and corrections mine—DP].

actions: "... Так, це були неможливі хвилини. Це була мука. Але я вже знав, як я зроблю. Я знав і тоді, коли покинув маєток. Інакше я не вийшов би так швидко з кабінету"[136] ("Ia" 36).

The sovereignty of the narrator from his past self, "the cognitive privilege of the narrating over the experiencing self" and his role of a "master psychologist" who can move back and forth in time can also be identified by the use of direct quotation (Cohn 149; 151) and a third-person commentary (in bold):

Андрюша суворо дивиться на мене. Його рішуче не можна пізнати.

- Слухай. Навіщо ця мелодрама?

Мій наївний Андрюша хотів бути на цей раз проникливим. Але він помилився.

Я (грубо):

- Провалівай![137] [Emphasis mine—DP] ("Ia" 36)

What complicates the analysis of this story is the presence of the self-narrated monologue (like the narrated monologue in third-person narration), in which the cognitive self merges, as if, with the experiencing self: "The relationship of the narrating to the experiencing self in these self-narrated monologues corresponds exactly to the relationship of a narrator to his character in a figural third-person novel: the narrator momentarily identifies with his past self, giving up his temporarily distanced vantage point and cognitive privilege

[136] "Yes, these are intolerable moments. It is torture. But I already know what I shall do. I knew it even when I left the palace. Otherwise I would not have left the office so quickly" ("My Self" 47).

[137] "**Andrusha looks at me sternly. He is not at all what he used to be.**

- Listen, why this melodrama?

This time my naïve Andrusha wants to be clever. But he is mistaken.

I: (roughly):

- 'Be off!'" [Emphasis mine—DP] ("My Self" 47)

for his past time-bound bewilderments and vacillations" (Cohn 167). Here is one of the protagonist's experiences of a mental and emotional breakdown, in which the cognitive and experiencing selves merge. This also demonstrates an unresolved existential crisis which brings the protagonist back to his experience. From his memory of it, it is he as if relives that moment again. And then he once again provides a commentary on how he felt at that time:

> Я здавив голову й ішов по мертвій дорозі, а позаду мене рипіли тачанки.
>
> Я раптом відкинувсь: що це? Галюцинація? Невже це голос моєї матері?
>
> І знову я пізнаю себе нікчемною людиною й пізнаю: десь під серцем нудить. І не ридати, а плакати дрібненькми сльозами хотілось мені – так, як в дитинстві, на теплих грудях.[138] ("Ia" 39)

3.5. Psychic trauma of a dissociated self

The non-criminal self. The image of the mother. Alter-egos

Throughout the short story, the protagonist vacillates between his rational and irrational self. At times, he "enters" into his role of a Chekist, sees "mist before his eyes," and experiences "a state of extraordinary ecstasy" from giving orders to execute captives ("My Self" 44). At other times, he envisions his mother and her house, something he often refers to as a hallucination. Clearly, the socio-political Bolshevist context triggers this dilemma within him, namely, whether he is a Chekist or a human being: "Я – чекіст, але я і людина" ("Ia" 26) ["I realize that I am a *Chekist*, but still I remain a human being ("My Self" 33)]. He

[138] "I press[ed] my head with my hands and continue[d] down the lifeless road, while behind me creak[ed] the wagon-trains.
Suddenly I am roused: "What is it? A hallucination? Is it really the voice of my mother?"
And again I feel insignificant, and somewhere under my heart I grow faint. I want[ed] to weep, not to wail, but to weep with down-dropping tears, just as I did in my childhood, on a warm breast" ("My Self" 52) [Corrections mine—DP].

understands that it is impossible for him to be both a *Chekist* and a human being, hence, he must choose duty over his humanity. He alternates between feeling indifferent to the suffering of others to feeling unbearable guilt. To stop this duality, he decides to kill his mother who, as he himself admits, symbolizes a part of his conscience. By killing the mother, he believes, he will get rid of the moral principles that restrain him from being a true communard.

Khvyl'ovyi's metaphoric language creates multiple layers of meaning in this short story. To decode the ambivalence within the protagonist's psyche, I propose to apply Mary Lydon's interpretation of the symbolism of the "m(M)/other," which represents the need to separate oneself ("myself") from the mother within. This symbol, according to Lydon, also refers to sexuality and femininity: "it is my desire to distance myself from the 'dark continent' which is femininity. […] Such a forgetting of femininity (or at least of an archaic femininity) would constitute the symbolic castration which would permit its representation, the inscription of the phallic mark, m/others, which constitutes my desires (Lydon, "Myself and M/others" 91).

I view the protagonist's mother in a similar symbolic way as Lydon's m(M)/other. Although linguistically Lydon's breakdown is not possible in the Ukrainian word "мати" ("mother"), we can view Khvyl'ovyi's image as a symbol. When appearing in lower case ("mother"), it stands for the narrator's biological mother who gave him birth and was his primary caregiver. When capitalized ("Mother"), the image alludes to the sacred feminine, the biblical Mary. Finally, "other" without capital "M" or "m" in lower case represents the problem of hurting the other that is also part of the self. Thus, the need to kill the feminine to re-establish the patriarchal (here: communist) order is traumatizing because it is tantamount

to destroying the source of all creation, everything that stands for love, kindness, compassion and sacredness. Thus, the trauma of killing the mother metaphorically refers to removing the vestiges of humanity left in the protagonist, i.e., the killing of his former self ("other").

This explains why the image of the mother in the story is recurrent. It is not just a depiction of a murder, it is what leads to that murder, that is, the degeneration of the character's mind, his transformation into a new identity: the perpetrator. If the whole story is a memory narrative, then perhaps the protagonist recalls what he has already committed, reexperiencing the PTSD symptoms of his dissociated self. The recurrent image of the mother manifested through the flashbacks in the form of remembering and dreams point to the psychic trauma that the character undergoes.

"Ia" consists of three sections. The image of the mother appears in each of them, specifically in the moments when the protagonist reconciles with his sense of conscience, every time he experiences doubt and feels guilt. Thus, the mother represents his morally aware, sacred self that is opposed by his several evil, alter egos: Doctor Tahabat, Andrusha and the degenerate. Perhaps, the mother is his core self, compassionate and humane. She could also symbolize Ukraine, suppressed by the Russian Bolsheviks.

In section I, where the focus is on the dreadful tribunal, his mother's image appears when he is about to give the order to execute "shopkeeper x" ("діло крамаря ікс"): "І в той же момент раптом переді мною підводиться образ моєї матері... – 'Розстрілять'??? І мати тихо-зажурно дивиться на мене"[139] ("Ia" 28).

By the end of this section, the protagonist is on the way to his mother's house. Yet, right before arriving, Khvyl'ovyi employs a contrastive technique to emphasize the duality of

[139] "And at the very moment the image of my mother suddenly rises before me. 'To be executed?' And my mother looks at me calmly, sorrowfully" ("My Self" 36).

the protagonist's fanaticism both vis-à-vis the Party and the mother. In reference to the first (the Party and the dark tribunal), he sarcastically uses the phrases: "I bless ("благословляю") and "the oriental disheveled silhouette" ("східний волохатий силует"):

> Тоді я, знеможений, похиляюсь на паркан, становлюся на коліна й жагуче благословляю той момент, коли я зустрівся з доктором Тагабатом і вартовим із дегенеративною будівлею черепа. Потім повертаюсь і молитовно дивлюся на східний волохатий силует. ...Я гублюсь у переулках. І нарешті виходжу до самотнього домика, де живе моя мати. В дворі пахне м'ятою.[140] ("Ia" 30)

This mode of representing consciousness helps to portray the inner crisis and create a dreamlike reality, in which it is hard to tell whether it is day or night, whether the people with whom he talks are real. We can recognize former victims of the system in the alter egos, the "communards" who have already been persuaded to use any means, including violence, for the sake of the Revolution. It is almost as if Khvyl'ovyi defamiliarizes the image of the commune by presenting it in religious terms: "становлюся на коліна," "молитовно дивлюся на східний волохатий силует." Immediately, this image is contrasted, with the presence of the same piety—but towards the mother this time: "Тускло горить лампада перед образом Марії. Перед лампадою, як різьблення, стоїть моя зажурна мати. Але я вже нічого не думаю. Мою голову гладить тихий голубий сон"[141] ("Ia" 30).

In section II, using allusions to religious events like the Sacred War ("sviashchenna

---

[140] "Exhausted, I lean on a fence, go down on my knees, and passionately bless my first meeting with Doctor Tahabat and the sentinel with the degenerative structure of the skull. Then I turn and gaze pleadingly at the oriental disheveled silhouette. I lose myself in the alleys. Finally, I come to the solitary cottage where my mother lives. The yard smells of mint" [Emphasis mine—DP] ("My Self" 38).

[141] "Feebly the lamp burns before the icon of Maria. And in front of the lamp, like a statue, stands my sorrowful mother. But I no longer think of anything. A tender, quiet sleep strokes my head" ("My Self" 40).

viina"), the protagonist describes his ecstasy from ordering executions. This time his mother stands in front of him, and he is once again not sure if she is real: "Але я повертаюсь і бачу – прямо переді мною стоїть моя мати, моя печальна мати, з очима Марії. Я в тривозі метнувся вбік: що це – галюцинація?"[142] ("Ia" 34). Finally, the image of the mother recurs in section III, when he finally kills her: "Я пориваюся крикнути: – Мати! Кажу тобі: іди до мене! Я мушу вбити тебе. І ріже мій мозок невеселий голос. Я знову чую, як мати говорить, що я (її м'ятежний син) зовсім замучив себе"[143] ("Ia" 41).

However, the sound of a "cannonade" disturbs that peaceful state, reminding him of the inevitable crime he is about to commit. The mode of narration (self-narrated monologue) and choice of quotation marks, as seen above, is crucial here. Although presented as direct speech, it is still the protagonist's self-narration within quotes. The metaphor of "torturing himself to death" represents death of his other, non-criminal self. Joining the remorseless Cheka, ordering the executions for counterrevolutionaries, seems to be a source of suffering for the protagonist. After his moral death everything seems like a dream. Reality merges with hallucination and he can no longer distinguish one from another. He is the merciless machine of the communards, but his unconscious (in the image of the mother, the personification of the Biblical Maria) seems to deny it.

When the protagonist "takes off" his gun and "lights a candle" in his mother's house, he leaves his "criminal self" behind and returns to his "home" (original) Self. In this familiar "room," he pours his soul out to his mother and admits that he is tired of mental and emotional turmoil in his conscious life. The protagonist understands that he overstepped a

[142] "But I turn and see – straight in front of me, my mother, my sorrowing mother with the eyes of Maria. I dart to one side in anxiety: what is it – hallucination?" ("My Self" 45).
[143] "I make an attempt to cry out: 'Mother! Come to me, I tell you; for I must kill you!' And the sorrowful voice again slashes my brain. Again I hear my mother say that I (her rebellious son) have completely tortured myself to death" ("My Self" 54).

sacred boundary. While he confesses his weariness, his mother looks at the candlelight and the icon of Maria, symbolizing his final confession. The protagonist is confused and tries to convince himself that this is not true. He admits that in this "room" his mother is not a phantom but a part of his criminal self to which he gives freedom. The metaphor of the mother being a part of his criminal self is complex. What does the narrator mean by it? Is it the criminal self because deep inside he does not believe in violent methods? If so, then he is a traitor and a criminal to the system. Consequently, he decides to hide that part of his soul he calls a "criminal self." Thus, we can read this as the protagonist's split personality, and the mother is a part of his divided self, it is his criminal self ("criminal" in the sense of disobeying the Party) that he needs to annihilate:

> І тоді, збентежений, запевняю себе, що це неправда, що ніякої матері нема переді мною, що це не більше як фантом.
>
> - Фантом? – знову здригнув я.
>
> Ні, саме це – неправда! Тут, в тихій кімнаті, моя мати *не фантом*, а частина *мого власного злочинного 'я,'* якому я даю волю. Тут, в глухому закутку, на краю города, я ховаю від *гільйотини один кінець своєї душі.*[144] [Emphasis mine—DP] ("Ia" 30)

The trauma of separation from his real self leads to the formation of three alter-egos, as I mentioned above, presented as his comrades: "Моїх товаришів легко пізнати: доктор Тагабат, Андрюша, третій – дегенерат (вірний вартовий на чатах). Чорний трибунал у

[144] "And then, perplexed, I assure myself that it is not true, that there is no mother before me, only a phantom. 'A phantom?' and I shudder again. No, that is not true! Here, in this quiet room, my mother is *not a phantom* but a part of my criminal "self" to which I impart my will. Here, in this dull cranny, on the outskirts of the city, I am hiding *one part of my soul from the guillotine*" [Emphasis mine—DP] ("My Self" 39).

повному складі"[145] ("Ia" 27). Traditionally the tribunals consisted of three people. However, I propose that Doctor Tahabat, Andrusha and the degenerate may also be viewed as three aspects of the same individual, i.e, the narrating "I." The author does not name his protagonist. It might be connected to the mode of narration (first-person narration) or to the possibility that the three alter-egos alternate in their dominating role and become personifications of the character's qualities. Bezkhutryi also notes that the protagonist is split into several alter egos – Doctor Tahabat, Andrusha, the degenerate guard and the mother, which are all parts of his "I" (264).

Doctor Tahabat is cruel and cold-hearted. He has no doubts about his duty and his role within the Party. He dictates to the protagonist, becomes his "master," his "animal instinct." He is the cruel part of the protagonist's "I," his shadow self that rejects the humanity within: "Цей доктор із широким лобом і білою лисиною, з холодним розумом і з каменем замість серця, це ж він і мій безвихідний хазяїн, мій звірячий інстинкт. І я, главковерх чорного трибуналу комуни, нікчема в його руках, яка віддалася на волю хижої стихії" ("Ia" 28).[146] Andrusha, on the contrary, seems to be that part of the "I" that we meet at the beginning – loving, humane and caring. His name, a diminutive from Andriy (in Greek, genitive "andros" means "man"), suggests a little man or a young boy (*Online Etymology*). He is too weak to change anything: "Але Андрюша нервово переходить із місця на місце і все поривається щось сказати. Я знаю, що він думає: він хоче сказати,

[145] "It is easy to recognize my comrades: Doctor Tahabat, Andrusha, the third – a degenerate (a faithful sentinel stationed on guard). The dark tribunal is in full session" ("My Self" 34).

[146] "This doctor, high of forehead and white in his baldness, with his cold reasoning, and a stone instead of a heart – is he not both my irresistible master and my beastly instinct? Head of the black tribunal of the Commune though I am, in his hands I am merely an insignificant thing which has surrendered to a savage will" ("My Self" 37).

що так не чесно, що так комунари не роблять, що це – вакханалія і т.д., і т.д."[147] ("Ія" 28). Andrusha is the most morally aware aspect of the protagonist, who understands the immoral conduct but is afraid to say anything. He was forced into the Cheka: "Андрюшу, мого бідного Андрюшу, призначив цей неможливий ревком сюди, в чека, проти його кволої волі" ("Ія" 27).[148] The degenerate sentinel, who remains nameless in the story, a third alter ego, is a "faithful dog of the revolution." He is immoral and disgraceful: "Він стоятиме на чатах і не під таким огнем! Пам'ятаю, я подумав тоді: 'Це сторож моєї душі'"[149] ("Ія" 37).

The protagonist seems to struggle against his other selves. Through flashbacks, or what he refers to as "remembering," he becomes conscious of the awfulness of his crime and similar crimes in history. The fluctuations of his mind reveal the instability of his identity: "Тоді проноситься переді мною темна історія цивілізації, і бредуть народи, і віки, і сам час... – Але я не бачив виходу! Воістину правда була за доктором Тагабатом. […] І тоді відходила, удалялась од мене моя мати – прообраз загірної Марії, і застигала у тьмі, чекаючи"[150] ("Ія" 29).

The wounded self. "I" – the murderer

[147] "But Andrusha moves restlessly from place to place, continually trying to say something. I know what he is thinking: he wants to say that it is not decent, that the communards are not used to such things, that this is – a bacchanal, etc." ("My Self" 36).

[148] "Andrusha, my poor Andrusha, has been assigned to the *Cheka* by the revolutionary committee against his feeble will" ("My Self" 35).

[149] "He would stand on guard even under the fiercest fire! I remember thinking 'He is the sentinel of my soul'" ("My Self" 49).

[150] "Then, there rushes past me the dark history of civilization, with its peoples, ages, and Time itself. But I see no way out! Indeed, truth stands behind Doctor Tahabat. […] And then my mother – the prototype of the ideal Maria – withdraws from me and waits, rigid, in the darkness" ("My Self" 37).

The dissonant narrator describes the physical symptoms of what might be called PTSD, i.e., his shivering and fever. The protagonist's struggle between loyalty to the party and his moral duty as a human being causes him distress, both physical and psychological: "Але й на цей раз здригаюсь, і мені здається, що я йду в холодну трясовину. Прудкість моєї мислі доходить кульмінацій. І в той же момент раптом переді мною підводиться образ моєї матері... – "Розстрілять"??? І мати тихо-зажурно дивиться на мене"[151] ("Іа" 28).

After painful doubts and contemplations, the protagonist decides to kill his mother. In the meantime, between his decision and the murder, his PTSD symptoms are ongoing and physically manifest: he presses his head with his hands, revisits the past, and experiences flashes of guilt for the violence he and people like him have committed:

> Темним волохатим силуетом стоїть на сході княжий маєток, тепер – чорний трибунал комуни.
>
> Я повертаюсь і дивлюся туди, і тоді раптом згадую що шість на моїй совісті.
>
> ...Шість на моїй совісті?
>
> Ні, це неправда. Шість сотень, шість тисяч, шість мільйонів – тьма на моїй совісті!!!
>
> Тьма?
>
> І я здавлюю голову.
>
> ...Але знову переді мною проноситься темна історія цивілізації, і бредуть народи, і віки, і сам час... [152] ("Іа" 29)

---

[151] "But this time I shudder, and seem to be sinking into a cold marsh. My swift thought approaches its culmination. And at that very moment the picture of my mother suddenly rises before me. 'To be executed?' And my mother looks at me calmly, sorrowfully" ("My Self" 36).

[152] "In *dark*, burly silhouette in the east stands the palace of the princes, now *the dark tribunal* of the Commune. I turn and look at it, and suddenly recall that there are *six lives on my conscience.*
Six on my conscience?

Only the memory of his mother helps him regain his temporary peace. Additionally, sense perceptions and a blurred concept of time and space play a crucial role in representation of the trauma in this text. The protagonist "sees" his mother's face, hears "her sorrowful and persistent voice," meanders "nowhere in particular."

The hostile policy of the Communist Party toward religious belief is revealed when the Chekist must execute two theosophists. In his conversation with them, the protagonist talks about a "psychological crisis" and proposes to see the Cheka as a new Messiah. Thus, he attempts to establish a new truth,[153] which brings comfort to his decision to execute the couple. With the same ease he is ready to kill a new group of the *Versaillais* that agitated against the Commune, until he discovers that his own mother was arrested among them. Prior to seeing his mother, he enjoys his power to end lives. However, when he sees her, he experiences anxiety and doubt. His hysteria is presented as feelings of fainting, which is a repetitive statement and a pointer to his traumatized sense of self: "Я почуваю, що от-от упаду. Мені дурно, я схопився рукою за крісло й похилився"[154] ("Ia" 34). Doctor Tahabat's voice sobers him up and reminds him of his duty as a communard to kill everyone, including one's own mother, in the name of Revolution:

No, it is not true. Six hundred, six thousand, six million – *numberless hosts are on my conscience!...*
And I press my head with my hands.
And again there rushes past me the somber history of civilization, the peoples, the ages, and Time itself" [Emphasis mine—DP] ("My Self" 38).

[153] Ah, you are theosophists! You are seeking Truth! New Truth? Yes! Who is it? Christ? No? Another saviour of the world?..
I: Then according to you, the time has arrived for the coming of a new Messiah?"
The man and woman: "Yes!"
I: "Do you think that this psychological crisis is to be observed in Europe and in Asia, and in every part of the world?"
The man and woman: "Yes!"
I: "Then why in the devil's name don't you make the Cheka into this Messiah?" ("My Self" 43)

[154] "I feel as though I am at the point of collapse. I am dazed, I grasp a chair and lean over it" ("My Self" 45).

То доктор Тагабат:

- ‘Мамо’?! Ах ти, чортова кукло! Сісі захотів? ‘Мамо’?!

Я вмить опам’ятався й схопився рукою за маузер.

- Чорт! – і кинувся на доктора.

Але той холодно подивився на мене й сказав:

- Ну, ну, тихше, зраднику комуни! Зумій розправитись і з ‘мамою’ (він підкреслив ‘з мамою’), як умів розправлятися з іншими.[155] (“Ia” 35)

Having difficulties while facing his mother, he even wonders whether her presence is just a hallucination. He hears her voice, and finds himself at the “point of collapse,” which is also a symptom of mental breakdown and psychic trauma:

В кабінет увалився цілий натовп черниць. Я цього не бачив, але я це відчув. […] *я смакував:* всіх їх через дві години не буде! […]

Я рішуче повертаюсь і хочу сказати безвихідне:

- Роз-стрі-лять!..

Але я повертаюсь і бачу – *прямо переді мною стоїть моя мати, моя печальна мати, з очима Марії.*

Я в тривозі метнувся вбік: що це – *галюцинація*?

Я в тривозі метнувся вбік і скрикнув:

- Ти?

І чую з натовпу женщин зажурне:

[155] **“**It is Doctor Tahabat: ‘’Mother?’ Ah, you, devil’s pup! Suckling! ‘Mother’?’ I become myself in a trice and grasp my gun. ‘Hell!’ and I throw myself upon the doctor. But he looks at me coldly and says: ‘Well, well, not so loud, you, traitor to the Commune! See that you arrange matters with ‘mother’ (he emphasizes ‘mother’), even as you have with others” (“My Self” 45).

- Сину! *Мій м'ятежний сину!*[156] [Emphasis mine—DP] ("Ia" 34)

His mother refers to him as her "miatezhnyi syn" ("rebellious son"). It is an ambivalent statement. Is he rebellious because he is against the *Versaillais*, or is he rebellious because a part of him is against the Cheka? On the one hand, he needs to prove that—in the interests of the Party—he will kill even his own mother and the last part of his humane self. On the other hand, when he nearly collapses, even his body betrays his uncertainty about committing the crime.

The murder of the mother happens as if in a hallucination. The trauma of committing a crime is explicitly presented in the story. The protagonist is "pale" and "lifeless." Silence and the feeling of being frozen amplify his desperation. He admits that his self is split, but he will never admit that to anyone:

> ...Я *остовпів*. *Блідий*, майже *мертвий*, стояв я перед *мовчазним натовпом черниць* із розгубленими очима, як зацькований вовк. (Це я бачив у гігантське трюмо, що висіло навпроти).
>
> Так! – схопили нарешті й другий кінець моєї душі! Вже не піду я на край города злочинно ховати себе. І тепер я маю одно тільки право:
>
> *нікому, ніколи й нічого не говорити, як розкололось моє власне 'я.'*[157] [Emphasis mine—DP] ("Ia" 35)

---

[156] "A whole crowd of nuns packs into my office. I feel rather than see this. […] *I am enjoying the thought* that in two hours they will all be no more! I turn resolutely and want to say the irrevocable: 'To be executed.' But I turn and see – straight in front of me, *my mother, my sorrowing mother with the eyes of Maria.* I dart to one side in anxiety: what is it – *hallucination*? I dart to the other side in alarm and cry out: 'You?' And from the crowd of women I hear the sorrowful: 'Son! *My rebellious son*!'" ("My Self "45) [Emphasis mine—DP]

[157] "I am *silent*. I stand *pale,* almost *lifeless* before the *silent group of nuns*, my eyes wandering, and like a wolf at bay. (I can see this in the gigantic mirror which is hanging opposite me.) Yes! At last they have seized the other end of my soul! No longer will I go to the outskirts of the city to hide myself, as a criminal. Now I have

The culmination of the story is the savage crime itself. In the agony and self-torture before committing the hideous murder, he once again "hears" his mother's "sorrowful voice." For the last time, the protagonist is puzzled whether this is a reality or hallucination. Then, he finally "kills" her, and then after a quick sobering realization about what he has done, he briefly returns to the body, kisses his mother's forehead and walks away in shock. The fact that he goes back to his mother's body might signify his remorse. Another sign of which is the moment when he "blacks out" after looking at his mother's dead face ("Тьма"). The next thing he remembers is that someone tells him to join the battalion:

> *Але я йду і йду, а одинока постать моєї матері все там же.* Вона стоїть, звівши руки, і зажурно дивиться на мене. Я поспішаю на це *зачароване неможливе узлісся*, а одинока постать усе там же, все там же.
>
> Навкруги – пусто. Тільки місяць ллє зелений світ з пронизаного зеніту. Я держу в руці маузера, але моя рука слабіє, і я от-от заплачу дрібненькими сльозами, як у дитинстві на теплих грудях. Я пориваюся крикнути:
>
> - *Мати! Кажу тобі: іди до мене! Я мушу вбити тебе*.
>
> І ріже мій мозок невеселий голос. Я знову чую, як мати говорить, що я (її м'ятежний син) зовсім замучив себе.
>
> ...Що це? Невже знову галюцинація?
>
> Я відкидаю голову.
>
> *Так, це була галюцинація: я давно вже стояв на порожнім узліссі напроти своєї матері й дивився на неї.*

---

but one right: never to mention to anyone that my heart is broken in two" [Emphasis mine—DP] ("My Self" 46).

Вона мовчала. […]

Тоді у млості, охоплений пожаром якоїсь неможливої радості, закинув руку на шию своєї матері й притиснув її голову до своїх грудей. Потім підвів маузера й нажав спуск на скроню. […]

...Я заложив руку в кишеню й тут же згадав, що в княжих покоях я щось забув.

‘От дурень!’ – подумав я.

...Потім скинувся:

- де ж люди?

Ну да, мені треба спішити до свого батальйону! – І я кинувся на дорогу.

Але не зробив я й трьох кроків, як щось мене зупинило. Я здригнув і побіг до трупа матері. Я став перед ним на коліна й пильно вдивлявся в обличчя. Але воно було мертве. По щоці, пам’ятаю, текла темним струменем кров.

Тоді я звів цю безвихідну голову й пожадливо впився устами в білий лоб. *Тьма.*

І раптом чую: - Ну, комунаре, підводься! Пора до батальйону!

[…] *Ага, я зараз. Я зараз. Так, мені давно пора!”* [158] [Emphasis mine—DP] (“Ia” 41)

---

[158] But I move on and on, while the solitary shape of my mother is still in the distance. She stands, her arms outstretched, and looks sorrowfully at me. I hasten towards this enchanted, intolerable edge of the forest, while the solitary shape is still in the distance.

It is empty round about. Only the moon pours her green light down from the pierced zenith. In my hand I hold the pistol, but my hand is weakening, and I am on the point of bursting into thick-falling tears, as in my childhood days, upon a warm breast. I make an attempt to cry out: “Mother! Come to me. I tell you; for I must kill you!”

And the sorrowful voice again slashes my brain. Again I *hear my mother say that I (her rebellious son) have completely tortured myself to death.*

What is it? *Is it really a hallucination? I throw my head back.*

Yes, it was a hallucination: I stood long on the deserted edge of the forest, facing my mother and looking at her. She was silent.

His hallucinatory state is revealed through the motionless figure of his mother that he sees in the distance. It seems like she is just waiting for him in this enchanted and intolerable edge of the forest. The metaphor of the enchanted forest, much like the metaphor of the room, represents his unconscious. The metaphor of his mother waiting for him with her hands outstretched also allude to the biblical crucifixion of Christ. This final scene illustrates the establishment of his new identity as a Chekist, a dutiful soldier of the revolution, merciless perpetrator of hideous crimes, which is justified by the totalitarian ideology.

***

In this chapter, I have explored the notion of perpetrator trauma in Khvyl'ovyi's short story "Ia" as narrated by a fictional protagonist. The impressionist style of narration helps to represent a distorted reality. I have argued that the style *per se* can function as a sign of trauma. The complexity of the text lies in the vacillating behaviour of the narrator: at times he is rational, and at other times the lucid narrator merges with the experiencing self in the story, creating the effect of a voice in-between reason and hallucination.

I also explored the memory narration within the story and showed how the narrator oscillates between his rational, duty-oriented self, presented through his three alter-egos, and

---

[…]
Then, in a daze, enveloped with the flames of an intolerable joy, I put my arm around my mother's neck and pressed her head to my breast. Then I raised my pistol and pressed the barrel to her temple.
[…]
I put my hand in my pocket and immediately remembered that I had forgotten something in the halls of the princes.
"What a fool!" I thought. Then, glancing about: "Where are the people?" But I must hurry to my battalion! And I set off to regain the road.
But I had hardly taken three steps when something stopped me. I shuddered and ran to the body of my mother. I went down on my knees before it and stared at the face. But it was lifeless. Down the cheek, I remember, the blood was trickling in a dark stream.
Then I raised her helpless head and passionately glued my lips to her white forehead. Darkness.
Suddenly I heard: "Well, communard, get up! Time to join the battalion!"
"Oh, yes, I will. I will. I should have done that long ago!" [Emphasis mine—DP] ("My Self" 55).

his moral, conscientious self, symbolized by the image of the mother whom he eventually kills. I drew attention to the repetitive patterns and metaphoric images that represent the protagonist's traumatized psyche as well as his unconsciousness. I showed how the trauma of the dissociated self is revealed within this text through the hallucinatory state and modes for presenting consciousness. The protagonist appears to be fanatically loyal to the Cheka and Revolution; at the same time his fixation on the image of the mother which he chooses to suppress serves to obliterate his own conscience. Through this contradiction, the writer portrays the trauma of the divided self within a fictional text.

Chapter 4. Killing the Other as Killing the Self: The Nature of Psychic Trauma in Borys Antonenko-Davydovych's novel *Smert'*

Borys Antonenko-Davydovych came to literature in June 1923 when his short story "Dva" ("Two") was published in *Nova hromada* (*New Community*).[159] First, he belonged to the organization Aspys (Association of Writers), founded by Mykola Zerov, and then together with Valerian Pidmohyl'nyi he established a literary group called Lanka (1924-1925) and the organization succeeding it – MARS (1926-1928) (Lavrinenko 480).[160]

In the autobiography "Pro samoho sebe" ("About myself" [1967]), Antonenko-Davydovych shared his early life experiences in Russia and Ukraine. He lived in Ukraine only during the first year of his life, then his family moved to Bryansk, Russia. Therefore, his first impressions and language were Russian. He recalled some good moments with his father's friends in Bryansk, the beauty of Russian songs and the surrounding nature. He claimed to have always understood that particular Russia (Antonenko-Davydovych called it "Russia in Russia"); he remembered it with kindness, as a part of his childhood. However, after his family moved to Okhtyrka (Ukraine), when he was a six-year old boy, he also saw another Russia – prerevolutionary Russia – Russia in Ukraine. For example, although he learnt Ukrainian very fast, he was forced not to use it when he was in the gymnasium of Okhtyrka because the Ukrainian language and accent were beaten out of the students by their teachers. The only language allowed in the school was Russian. Since those days, Antonenko-Davydovych detested official Russian policy in Okhtyrka and its further spread to various educational institutions, the church and the police ("Pro samoho sebe" 593).

---

[159] *Nova hromada* was a monthly journal, published in Vienna from July 1923 to 1925 (*Internet Encyclopedia*).
[160] MARS – Maisternia revoliutsiinoho slova (Workshop of the Revolutionary Word).

Antonenko-Davydovych's love for Ukraine and his concern for the Ukrainian question angered Russian officials and caused much trouble for him throughout his life. On many occasions he was falsely accused of antisemitism, fascism, Ukrainian nationalism and even of joining a terrorist organization.[161] Already in 1935 Antonenko-Davydovych became a victim of Stalin's regime. He was arrested and sentenced to ten years in prison. However, he returned from his exile more than two decades later, in 1957. Only then did he begin writing again, although always under the scrutiny of Soviet officials (Boiko, "Lytsar" 21).[162]

What threat did Antonenko-Davydovych pose to the Soviet regime? Iurii Boiko notes that he, like Khvyl'ovyi, criticized "prosvitas," seeing them as retarding the Ukrainian national revolution and development of national consciousness. He also criticized Russian chauvinism in Ukraine (168; 173). His literary works, especially the novel *Smert'* (*Death*), were often attacked by pro-Russian literary critics.

Smert' describes events of the first post revolutionary years. Its characters are inspired by real people from the town of Okhtyrka ("Pro samoho sebe" 596), which is located approximately 100 km northwest of Kharkiv. The affairs of the Bolshevik Party and the life of its members are portrayed through the perspective of a former Ukrainian nationalist, and now a Communist, Kost' Horobenko. He wants to prove his loyalty to the Party, but the authorities still have doubts about him because of his past. Uncertain of his own ideological commitments, he suffers through inner conflict, and undergoes a psychological crisis.

Kost''s crisis is presented at the very beginning of the novel. One example is the allegorical story about the alchemist and the philosopher's stone that Kost' remembers from

[161] In his conversation with Borys Tymoshenko, Antonenko-Davydovych reminisces Hryhorii Epik's (a Ukrainian writer who was also arrested at the same time) false testimony against him. During the interrogation, Epik claimed that he offered Antonenko-Davydovych to join the terrorist organization and the latter agreed ("Iak ia diishov 305).

[162] See also Tarnawska, Marta. "Borys Antonenko-Davydovych. Behind the Curtain."

childhood. To find the stone, the devil asks the alchemist not to think about polar bears for a week. However, the alchemist becomes obsessed with polar bears. Kost' compares himself to an alchemist obsessed with a polar bear, which he associates with Bolshevism. Hence, Kost' admits to himself that he is uncertain about the nature of the philosophical stone he is searching for (*Smert'* 36).[163] This allegory represents his confusion about his new identity as a Bolshevik.

As the plot unfolds, Kost' struggles with his newly acquired Bolshevism and his past as a Ukrainian nationalist. To release himself from mental turmoil, he decides to kill the enemies of the Party, that is, Ukrainian peasants, who are resisting the new Bolshevik order. He convinces himself that this is the only way to become a true Bolshevik and undo his own ambivalence. This struggle leads to the metaphoric death of Kost' and the birth of Comrade Horobenko, which is also marked by a loss of connection with his past (family, a beloved woman, and himself as a human being with a conscience). All this is revealed through the symbolic change to his name; instead of referring to himself by his first name, "Kost'," he

---

[163] "Але враз виринула, чи з гімназії, чи просто з дитячих літ, казочка і стало смішно й сумно.
Якийсь алхімік дошукувався філософського каменя. Він перемолився всім святим, яких тільки знав, благав богородицю, нарешті самого Христа допомогти йому, але всі вони були мовчазні, як звичайнісінький камінь з його дому. Тоді алхімік прокляв їх гамузом усіх і звернувся до сатани. Сатана з охотою згодився допомогти, але правив одного: 'Ти знайдеш те, чого шукаєш. Тільки – одна умова, друже мій: тиждень не думай про білого ведмедя.' Нещасний алхімік, що, здається, ніколи за все своє довге життя серйозно не замислювався над ведмедями взагалі, а білими зокрема, цілий тиждень ні на хвилину не міг позбутися цієї навісної думки про білого ведмедя.
Горобенко, посміхнувшись, подумав: 'Більшовик' – це мій білий ведмідь, але якого ж філософського каменя дошукуюся я?.." (*Smert'* 36)
["But suddenly he remembered a folk tale from school or his childhood years, and he felt sad, wanting to laugh. An alchemist had been seeking his philosopher's stone, he prayed to all the saints he knew, appealed to the Virgin Mary, and finally to Christ Himself to help him, but all were silent, like the ordinary stone of which this house was built. Then the alchemist damned them all and turned to the devil. Satan eagerly agreed to help, but with one proviso: 'You'll find what you're seeking. There's only one condition, my friend: don't think of polar bears for a week.' The poor alchemist, who probably hadn't once in his long life thought seriously about bears, let alone polar bears, could not rid himself of this annoying thought about polar bears for one minute that whole week. Horobenko smiled and thought: 'Bolshevik – this is my polar bear, but what philosopher's stone am I seeking?'" (*Duel* 3)]

addresses himself by his surname "Horobenko." Eventually, he sheds blood. However, along the way toward his crime, he engages in conversations with himself, dreams, and flashbacks that reveal the evolution of his identity as a perpetrator who struggles with a guilty conscience.

Kost' Horobenko suffers from a split personality: Horobenko-the-Bolshevik vs. Kostyk-the-Ukrainian nationalist – or, as in Khvyl'ovyi's "Ia," a Chekist vs. a human being. In short, Antonenko-Davydovych juxtaposes Ukrainian cultural discourse with Bolshevik cultural discourse. The tension in Kost''s biography is conveyed as a series of striking binaries: Russian *versus* Ukrainian; city *versus* village, intelligentsia *versus* peasants and Party *versus* nation.

Early Soviet critics of the 1920s like Andrii Klochchia and Ivan Lakuza reviewed the novel negatively, accusing Antonenko-Davydovych of Ukrainian nationalism (in its negative sense as perceived by the Bolsheviks). The writer himself mentioned the absurdity of Soviet critics. For example, in "Nove v politytsi i medytsyni," he reminisces about the time when a young Soviet critic interpreted one of the negative female protagonists in the novel—Slavina—as a Jew. A scandal erupted and Antonenko-Davydovych was accused of antisemitism until he explained that Slavina was the daughter of the Tambov *arkhiierei* ("eparch"), a word the critic mistakenly read as *ievrei* ("Jew") (485).[164]

[164] "Десь років два тому в газеті 'Комсомолець України' якийсь незугарний молодий критик узявся критикувати мою повість 'Смерть' і зауважив, що негативні герої мого твору – не українці, наприклад, жінорг [in charge of women's organization – DP] єврейка Славіна. Це була чи то груба помилка, чи зухвала брехня, і я написав спростування, навівши цитату з повісти, де сказано, що, за чутками, Славіна – прижитна донька тамбовського архієрея. Звичаї тоді були ще досить лагідні, моє спростування надрукували, й на цьому непорозуміння вичерпалось. Та ось Коряк, може, за браком поважніших аргументів чи передчасна старість стала даватися взнаки, витягнув цю призабуту історію й став орудувати нею як сенсаційною новиною. Антисемітизм у ту пору був один із смертних гріхів, тому я, хоч і не збирався виступати на пленумі, мусив попросити слова. На подив мені, Кулик одразу надав його мені, як тільки Коряк зійшов із трибуни.

Lakuza called *Smert'* "a story of the sickness of a soul," criticizing Antonenko-Davydovych for his idealistic views. He claimed that the writer misrepresented Bolshevism by wrongfully arguing that to be a Bolshevik one needs to hate the village, speak Russian (even though one knows Ukrainian), see a Petliurite (Petliura follower[165]) in every Ukrainian, reject the publication of Ukrainian journals and mercilessly shoot bandits.[166] Lakuza also criticizes the novel for lack of unity and structure because if one were to switch the chapters, he claims, the meaning would not be lost (118). Klochchia, like Lakuza, states that Antonenko-Davydovych suffers from the disease of exaggerated nationalism which prevents him from realising that the foundation for both the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic and the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic is the same (140).

A literary critic writing in the diaspora, Iurii Boiko, explains that the Soviet critics attacked *Smert'* and its author not necessarily for literary reasons but mainly because of the negative depiction of the regime and its cruelty.[167] The bloody methods of the *Cheka* were depicted, for example, in the last scene when Kost' cracks a villager's head with his gun (167). Marta Tarnawska states that the Soviet critics found Antonenko-Davydovych's early works ambiguous because they were written in a romantic and impressionistic manner. As with Volodymyr Vynnychenko's and Khvyl'ovyi's works, they besieged him for the

---

– Якщо комсомольський критик, похапцем читаючи мою повість, помилково прочитав слово 'архієрей' як 'архієврей,' йому можна вибачити: молоде, зелене, – сказав я, – а от як поважний критик міг вчитати 'архієврея' – не розумію. Так усе ж таки, товаришу Коряк, доводжу до вашого відома, що моя героїня Славіна була донька архієрея, а не архієврея!.." (Antonenko-Davydovych, "Nove v polititsi i medytsyni"485).

[165] Symon Petliura was the president of the Ukrainian People's Republic and the commander-in-chief of its army in 1919-1921.

[166] Here Lakuza refers to the Ukrainian peasants as "bandits."

[167] A striking fact is revealed by Dmytro Chub in his footnote to Antonenko-Davydovych's letter (9 December 1972). Chub explains that when *Smert'* was published in Australia by Lastivka Press, the copy of the book was sent to Antonenko-Davydovych many times via air mail, recommended mail, regular mail. However, none of the copies reached the writer. Most likely, they all were confiscated. Only with the help of a Polish translator who received the book in Warsaw, Antonenko-Davydovych managed to get a copy (*Dvisti Lystiv* 102).

representation of characters who were incapable of ridding themselves of individualism and other qualities of the bourgeois intelligentsia (12).

Leonid Boiko has written a major study on Antonenko-Davydovych's life and oeuvre. He points out the ambiguity of Kost''s psychology, which is rooted in his inability to break with the past of the petit bourgeois intelligentsia. As a result, Kost' starts doubting people and himself and attempts to analyze the dissonance within himself ("Z dorih" 7). Boiko defines *Smert*' as a social and psychological novel because the events are presented through Kost' Horobenko's psyche. He claims that Antonenko-Davydovych created a detailed and accurate psychological portrait of Horobenko's "transition" into the new system, depicting Kost''s logic and thoughts. Boiko calls characters like Horobenko and the narrator in "Ia" a typical Party member at the beginning of the 20th century ("Lytsar" 8; 15).

Yet, Boiko thinks that the events during the period of "war communism" were not presented realistically because the judgements about the Party in one Ukrainian town comes down only to the "sick" imagination of Kost' Horobenko, who was a Petliura follower in the past, believed in the Directory (Dyrektoriia) (1918-1920)[168] and now became a member of the Bolshevik Party ("Z dorih" 8). This ideological insecurity, Boiko argues, creates Kost''s divided psyche. Rejecting his past and killing the villagers did not make Kost' "a true Communist," as he believed it would ("Z dorih" 9).[169] In another work, Boiko elaborates that Antonenko-Davydovych objectively presented the tragic situation not only of the protagonist but of the period, a time when many fell victim to circumstances, when severe censorship

[168] "Soon after the Armistice, the Hetmanate began to fall apart and was supplanted by a revived Ukrainian Peoples Republic under a Directory" (Mace 32). The Directory was a "Ukrainian government led by Vynnychenko and Petliura; overthrew the Hetmanate at the end of 1918 and fought the Bolsheviks until 1921" (Mace vii).

[169] "Ясна річ, від цього занадто 'радикального' заходу націонал-ухильник Горобенко не став справжнім комуністом, а лишився дрібнобуржуазним інтелігентом з роздвоєною психікою" (Boiko, "Z dorih" 9).

dictated what to say and how to behave. This creates the ambiguous image of the protagonist; he is a perpetrator of a crime, but he also has some human and humane features (“Maister” 183).

While the immorality of Horobenko’s crimes is undeniable, I disagree with Boiko’s opinion that the choice of a renegade as a main character is a “flaw” (“Lytsar” 17). In my view, Antonenko-Davydovych successfully portrays the genesis of Kost' as a criminal and links it to the traumatizing effects of the Bolshevik totalitarian system which warps the perception of the self in society. Unlike Robert Merle’s merciless protagonist, the commandant of the Auschwitz concentration camp, Rudolf Lang, in *Death is My Trade,*[170] Kost' Horobenko is not portrayed as a savage criminal from the very beginning. On the contrary, he “must” kill to solve the dilemma of being either a Bolshevik or a Ukrainian nationalist, which in his mind are irreconcilable opposites.

Iurii Lavrinenko, a Ukrainian-American literary critic who studied the “Executed Renaissance” of the 1920s, compares *Smert'* with “Ia,” which had appeared two years earlier. He identifies two similarities between both texts: the incompatibility of humane behaviour with Communist morality; the contradiction between being an honest and loyal Ukrainian and simultaneously a Communist loyal to the Russian Communist Party. While Khvyl'ovyi presented these problems impressionistically and almost abstractly, Antonenko-Davydovych did so quite starkly by pitting a Ukrainian versus the Communist Bolshevik Party. This also explains why *Smert'* was viciously attacked by Party critics in the USSR (481).

[170] *Death is My Trade* is a 1952 French novel by Robert Merle. Its protagonist Rudolf Lang was closely based on the real Rudolf Hoss, commandant of the Auschwitz concentration camp. Lang is portrayed as a “distanced and insensitive” person. He is very obedient to the Nazi Party, and never doubts its virtue (Crochet, “Character Study”).

Contemporary scholars like Maksym Nestelieiev, Viktoriia Dmytrenko and Ol'ha Poliukhovych point out the psychologism of the novel and focus on the processes of Kost''s psyche more deeply. Thus, Nestelieiev argues that the conflict of the novel is not resolved because Horobenko remains on the edge between sanity and a mental breakdown. His aggression starts destroying his consciousness. These psychological contradictions are projected outwards – in this case toward the execution of villagers. This also becomes a form of self-punishment for Horobenko ("Avtodestruktyvne" 264-265).

Kost''s complex psychology is shown through his gradual breakdown and transformation into a perpetrator. He attempts to acquire a new identity and to adapt to new post-revolutionary circumstances by killing people who have the same political beliefs he himself once held in the past. What distinguishes Kost' from the perpetrator in "Ia," who enjoys giving orders to execute counterrevolutionaries, is Kost''s lack of hostility toward the villagers. While he often sympathizes with the peasants and even seems to understand their nature and mentality, Kost'' judges and despises some of the Party members like Slavina. For instance, when she tries to prove to a peasant that religion is an illusion, and that God does not exist, the man simply tells her that it is better to go to church anyway. Kost''s initial reaction to the peasant's words is a smile; then he becomes ironic and impatient with Slavina who does not understand how to approach the peasant:

> Дядьків висновок знову засвітив на Горобенковому обличчі усмішку. Але усмішка розбавилась іронією, а за нею гостро взяла нетерплячка – коли нарешті буде край цій розмові! Його дратувала і незрозуміла дядькові мова Славіної, і її

штучність у словах, і невміння звичайно, по-простому підійти до дядька.[171] (*Smert'* 81)

Poliukhovych claims that the change of identity from Ukrainian nationalist to Bolshevik necessitates Horobenko's alienation from his former self as well as his reshaping as a new member of Soviet society (7). Indeed, throughout the novel Horobenko tries to justify why this change needs to happen, which is represented as his inner turmoil and manifests itself as psychological suffering. The following passage illustrates how he forces himself into a new way of thinking. At the beginning, he admires the village (italicized). Yet, he quickly reminds himself that this is his test as a Bolshevik and that he does not care about the village. On the contrary, he wishes to destroy it (in bold). These contrasting ideas are often a sign of Kost''s trauma of being a divided self: he is not a Ukrainian nationalist anymore, but he is also not a Bolshevik:

Горобенко навіть повеселішав. Це дуже правдиво в Шевченка[172]*: "Село – і серце одпочине..."* Тільки не те вже село розглядалось перед очима і не спочинок чекає на Костя Горобенка, а іспит. Один із численних іспитів 'більшовика,' іспит на життя. […]

Горобенко внутрішньо сказав собі: "Я зовсім тебе ще не знаю, село. […] Я зовсім не вклоняюся перед твоїми опоетизованими хатами, садочками, […]

[171] "The old peasant's conclusion again lit up a smile on Horobenko's face. However, the smile was diluted with irony, and then he was seized with acute impatience – when would this nonsensical conversation finally end! He was irritated by Slavina's language too, which the old peasant could not understand, and her falseness with words, her inability to approach the old peasant simply, ordinarily" (*Duel* 46).

[172] Taras Shevchenko was a famous Ukrainian poet, writer, artist, political and public figure of the 19th century.

Мені байдужісінько до них зараз, а іноді... іноді я розтрощив би це все к чорту... **Але я таки загнуздаю тебе, село!**"[173] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Smert'* 84)

Throughout the novel we see depicted his type of borderline situation, which I consider an example of a perpetrator's trauma, namely, internal suffering and conflict, ambiguity within the protagonist and a vacillating identity. In the final scene, right after he murders a peasant, Kost' feels relief but then realizes that he has shed blood. The whole experience happens as if in a dream. He aimlessly walks away from the crime scene and even compares the blood he spilled with the loss of his fiancée's virginity. The blood signifies the loss of his own innocence as well as the loss of his moral self. It also symbolizes the sacrifice of innocent life in the name of Bolshevik ideology. Despite Kost''s temporal confusion, he is now glad that he has finally committed a crime and overcame his conscientious self:

Він випустив цівку з рук і глянув. Перед ним тулуб з розтрощеним черепом, як опудало, лунко гупнув на землю... […]

Горобенко помалу обернувся, перевів дихання й *подався навмання*.

Він не чув уже позаду ні криків, ні стогонів, ні Несторенкової команди. *Стало одразу порожньо всередині і навіть по-особливому легко*. […]

– Кров! […]

І тоді зненацька сильно-сильно в пам'яті промайнуло занадто виразне, мов зараз усе те сталось:

---

[173] "*Horobenko even cheered up. Shevchenko's words were so true – 'A village – and the heart can rest...'* Only it wasn't that village which now spread before him; a test, rather than relaxation, was awaiting Kost Horobenko. One of the countless tests in becoming a 'Bolshevik,' a test of life. […] Horobenko said to himself: 'I still don't know you at all, village. […] I am not bowing before your lyricized houses, neat orchards, […] I'm quite indifferent to all this now, but sometimes… sometimes I damn well feel like smashing it all to pieces… **But I will bridle you all the same, village!**' [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Duel* 48).

> ... Скривавлена сорочка Надина [his fiancée – DP] і на простирадлі іржава краплинка... *Надина кров*! *Непорочна, чиста* дівоча кров... Було тужно за тим, що не стало чогось без вороття, що набезвік розірвано вінок, і *було до сліз радісно*, що народилось щось нове, щось дуже інтимне, щось нерозлучне, рідне...[174] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Smert'* 144)

The problem of Ukrainian nationalism

I have shown how Kost' is gradually transformed into a perpetrator. This is not explicit in the novel; it is implied when he decides to become a murderer because of his need to belong to the Bolshevik Party. The decision is connected to his sense of identity. Prior to that, he associated himself with Ukrainian nationalism, and now he is transitioning into a new ideology that marginalizes people like him. In his mind, he believes that he is being ostracized by the Party members because of his nationalistic past, thus, he blames his bourgeois family, his Ukrainian upbringing, and tacitly considers himself a victim of circumstances. However, there is a striking contrast between what he thinks of himself, his circumstances and what his reality is. His career within the Party is going well, except when upon being evaluated, he is described as "unstable." This is an unpleasant incident and he

---

[174] "He let go of the barrel and looked. Before him a body with a smashed skull thudded hollowly onto the ground, like a scarecrow…
Shots popped on either side.
Horobenko turned around, caught his breath, and *went off aimlessly*.
He no longer heard the shouts behind him, nor the groans, nor Nestorenko's order. *He suddenly felt empty inside, and relieved in a unique way*. […]
'Blood ..!' […]
And all of a sudden he had a much too vivid recollection, as if it had just all happened now:
… Nadia's [his fiancée's – DP] bloodied shirt and a rusty spot on the sheet… *Nadia's blood! Chaste, pure* virgin blood… He longed so much for that which had disappeared for some reason without any return, which had forever torn apart the garland, and *he felt tearfully overjoyed* that something new had been born, something very intimate, something inseparable and dear…" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Duel* 106)

seems anxious about how he is perceived. Psychologically, he needs to choose the Party ideology over his former pro-Ukrainian beliefs and his morality. In a way, he strives for the simplicity that—in his estimation—Bolshevism might bring him with its primitivism and vulgarism.

Having joined the new regime, Kost' demonstrates his need to belong to the Party. He chooses to surrender to the standards of the Bolsheviks in order to be accepted as part of a group. Consequently, he also becomes a *victim* of a system that aims to eradicate individualism, self-reliance and the ability to think critically. The system substitutes an individual's sense of moral worth and values with the required submissive behaviour as proof of loyalty and the guarantee of acceptance.

To understand why I consider Kost' a victim who turns into a perpetrator, it is necessary to keep in mind the concept of Ukrainian nationalism during the 1920s, something I have explored in the preceding chapter. In short, the Bolsheviks perceived Ukrainian nationalism negatively, considering it dangerous to Communist society. Soviet rhetoric excluded the possibility of seeing Ukrainian nationalism as "patriotism." The novel *Smert'* delineates this predicament. Everything we know about Kost''s past points to the fact that he was a Ukrainian patriot before the Russian Revolution. He supported the Directory and cared about Ukrainian culture and people: "Важно те, як я сам думаю про себе, а не хтось інший. І немає мені ніяких докорів від самого себе! Так, я був український націоналіст, я був за голову повітової філії національного союзу; в цьому ж місті я, безусий юнак, що допіру скінчив гімназію, виступав у 1917-му на мітингах, розпинався на всяких зібраннях за 'неньку'"[175] (*Smert'* 35).

[175] "It's important how I see myself, not how someone else sees me. And I have no need for reproaching myself! Yes, I was a Ukrainian nationalist, I supported the head of the district branch of the National Alliance

After the Revolution, however, he was labeled by the communists as a "nationalist," in the negative sense of the word: "'Як комуніст-більшовик (хтось наче умисне і свідомо підкреслив це друге слово) – несталий, зважаючи на перебування раніш в українських організаціях, як культробітник може бути використаний у губерніяльному масштабі'."[176] (*Smert'* 50). The novel is based on the opposition "Kost' Horobenko, the Ukrainian nationalist, versus Comrade Horobenko, the Bolshevik." The conflict lies in the dissonance between what Ukrainian nationalism (or rather, patriotism) means to Kost' and the negative way Bolsheviks interpret it.

At first, because of his Ukrainian background, Kost' is offered a membership in the cultural department within the Bolshevik Party. Shortly after, Party members, who assigned him to this position, evaluate his performance as "unstable," alluding to his Ukrainianness. Hurt by this attitude, Kost' decides to join the Cheka to prove his Bolshevism. As in "Ia," there is the theme of fanaticism and duty to the Party. Horobenko even compares the Party's ideology to various religions and, specifically, the fanaticism of Islam. Kost' thinks that the goal of the Party is to mix all nations and make them "a black mass of trampled slaves":

> Це – їхня істина, це "новий заповіт," з яким вони мають пройти світ, переорати всю землю, стерти кордони, помішати всі нації в одному стремені чорної маси потоптаних рабів, що пустилися берега. "Капітал" Марксів... Що це? Тора, Євангелія, Аль-Коран чи важіль Архімеда?.. Які вони сильні, ці люди в пенсне

[Ukrainian National Alliance (Natsional'nyi Soiuz) – an alliance of socialist parties opposed to the monarchist Hetmanite government in 1918 in Kyiv – translator's note]; while a mustacheless youth straight out of the gymnasium, I spoke out at meetings in this town in 1917, crucifying myself at various gatherings for 'Mother Ukraine'" (*Duel* 3).

[176] In the Party's evaluation of Kost' it said the following: "'As a Communist-Bolshevik (someone seemed to have underlined this second word almost deliberately and consciously) – he is unstable, on account of his previous membership of Ukrainian organizations, but as a cultural worker he can be used on the provincial level'" (*Duel* 16).

> [here he refers to Trotsky – DP] із вдаленим поглядом і фанатизмом ісламу![177] (*Smert'* 51)

The problem of Ukrainian nationalism, which is at the core of Kost''s anxiety, is posed in *Smert'* through the Party's opposition to the Ukrainian village, "the only certain national watershed." It was for the sake of the Ukrainian village that Kost' in the past established *Prosvitas*, acted as an instructor for the Central Rada and served in the Directory's army. Kost' says that together with the Bolsheviks, whom he calls "these incomprehensible people,"[178] he now must execute villagers, which symbolize to him his former self:

> "В тому річ, Костю, що ти йдеш проти села. Українського села. Того єдиного певного національного водозбору, що ради нього засновував колись 'Просвіти,' був за інструктора Цетральної ради, тікав з директоріївським військом. Ти мусиш бити разом цими незрозумілими людьми саме в ту мішень, яку недавно будував своїми власними руками, як певний щит. Ти мусиш розтрощити цю мішень на тріски, спалити ті тріски, щоб не лишилось і сліду. *Ти мусиш, Костю, стріляти в позавчорашнього себе!* Ось у чому річ..."[179] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Smert'* 137)

---

[177] "This was their verity, this was the 'new testament' with which they were to take the world, replowing the whole earth, erasing all borders, mixing all nations into a single torrent, a black mass of trampled slaves which had broken its banks. Marx's Das Kapital … What was this? A Torah, a Bible, an Al-Koran or an Archimedean lever …? How strong they were, these people in pince-nez with distant gazes and the fanaticism of Islam!" (*Duel* 17)

[178] Kost''s thoughts about Bolsheviks like "incomprehensible people," "a black mass of trampled slaves" contain a sarcastic note. Although he seems to say positive things about the Party, these slips demonstrate his inner awareness about the Soviets' destructive ideology.

[179] "… The fact is Kost, that you are marching against the village. The Ukrainian village. That only certain

What makes an ordinary human being turn into a villain? Does this question shed light on Horobenko, a fictional character? I believe it does.

Ervin Staub writes about violent ideologies and claims that when the external circumstances are out of a person's control, they "threaten" the psychological concept of self as well as values and beliefs. Thus, to attain a sense of control over circumstances, one must "regain a comprehension of reality" (Staub 318). The person needs to identify themselves with a certain group (like the Bolsheviks), which will strengthen the sense of self-identification and self-importance: "The inability to protect oneself and one's family, and to control the circumstances of one's life and fulfill basic needs greatly threaten the psychological self – the self concept, values, beliefs, and ways of life – and give rise to an intense need to defend it. Another need is to regain a comprehension of reality […], a conception of the world, of one's place in it" (Staub 318).

By joining a group and following authority, Kost' accepts "the authorities' definition of reality, their views of problems and solutions," which means that people like him (who choose to surrender) are capable of harming others, if that is what the authorities dictate (Staub 319). The need for superiority, caused by challenging life conditions, intensifies feelings of weakness and vulnerability. To hide them, Staub explains, the person needs to "defend and/or elevate the self-concept, both individual and cultural" (320).

By belonging to a certain group, one acquires a new sense of social importance (Staub 321). The feeling of responsibility for problems lessens with "scapegoating,"

---

national watershed for whose sake you once established Prosvitas, acted as an instructor for the Central Rada, retreated with the Directory's armies. Together with these incomprehensible people, you must strike that very target which you recently built with your very own hands as a sure shield. You must shatter this target to pieces, so that no trace of it remains. *You must shoot at your former self, Kost! That is the point* …" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Duel* 98).

"diminishing others." It also renders a perpetrator's superiority and "the possibility of control":

> Diminishing others elevates the self. Scapegoating protects the self-concept by reducing the feeling of responsibility for problems. It provides an explanation for them, and thereby the possibility of control. Adopting nationalistic and/or "better world" ideologies offers a new comprehension of reality, and by promising a better future, hope as well. But usually some group is identified as the enemy that stands in the way of the ideology's fulfillment. By joining an ideological movement people can relinquish a burdensome self to leaders or the group. They gain connection to others and a sense of significance in working for the ideology's fulfillment. Along the way, members of the scapegoated or "enemy" group are excluded from the moral realm. The moral values that protect people from violence become inoperative in relation to them. (Staub 321)

Staub argues that unstable conditions caused by war, or various societal conflicts and disbalances, might elicit violent and aggressive actions in some individuals: "Difficult conditions of life in a society, like severe economic problems or political conflict and violence, give rise to powerful needs for security, protection of the psychological self, comprehension, connection, and hope" (315). The following cultural and societal characteristics can reinforce group violence: "devaluation of a subgroup,[180] strong respect for authority, a monolithic culture, certain societal self-concepts, and a history of aggression"

[180] James Waller expresses a similar idea concerning the perpetrators' need to diminish their victims: "The devaluation of victims, and their suffering, is an important external cog in the internal alterations of perpetrators. The inhibitions against murdering one's fellow human beings are so strong that the victims must be devalued if they are to be subjected to systematic extermination. The devaluation of victims occurs through two primary processes: (a) dehumanizing the victims, and (b) blaming the victims for their own suffering" (17).

(Staub 315). These factors are applicable to *Smert'*. One of the devalued subgroups in the novel are the Ukrainian peasants. The Bolshevik culture is based around certain ideological self-concepts and stereotypes (e.g., Ukrainian villagers are enemies).

The Bolsheviks actively followed the Marxist idea of elevating the proletariat.[181] That meant that the peasantry as a class, along with its private property, must be eliminated: "Drawn mainly from the Russian or Russified proletariat of the Left bank, it [the Bolshevik movement in Ukraine – DP] had traditionally exhibited great hostility to the Ukrainian peasantry" (Shkandrij, *Modernists* 11). In *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Hannah Arendt emphasizes the centralized party bureaucracy of the Bolshevik regime that aimed to liquidate classes, and especially the property-owning classes, that is, the middle class in the cities and peasants in the country. When the Soviets just came to power, *kulaks* (or *kurkuli*, in Ukrainian, i.e., rich peasants) were the most powerful class in society. Therefore, the Bolsheviks applied merciless strategies to abolish the peasantry: "their liquidation, consequently, was more thorough and more cruel than that of any other group and was carried through by artificial famine and deportation under the pretext of expropriation of the kulaks and collectivization" (320). This clearance of the property-owning class is the background in *Smert'* (e.g., see Chapter XI-XII, 83-92).

Because of his own ambiguity and uncertainty, Kost' Horobenko can be seen as a victim of Bolshevik propaganda. The Bolsheviks' hostile policy toward Ukrainians forces him to act (but not think) like them. On the one hand, if he were to remain a Ukrainian nationalist and stand up for Ukrainian culture and the people, he would most likely be

[181] Marx was ambiguous about peasantry as a class, especially in those countries where it was dominant. Thus, it seems that the Soviets speculated with the Marxist idea of overcoming the private property-owing classes to increase production and elevate proletariat (working class). See more on this question here: Duggett, Michael. "Marx on peasants."

persecuted by the Bolsheviks who were threatened by nationalist movements. On the other hand, if he becomes a Bolshevik, he must denounce his nationalistic past. Step by step, Kost' turns from a victim of the Soviet totalitarian system into its loyal executioner. He chooses to become a perpetrator and to rid himself of his conscience (or so he wants to believe), because actually he is still rooted in the memories of his nationalistic past. The dissonance between his feelings and his actions is evidence of his inner crisis. Although he tries to see the "virtues" of the Party to justify his actions and newly formed beliefs, his inner doubts persist, which are presented through his thoughts and dreams: "Партія – це не арсенал святих. Але в тому й ефект, у тому її своєрідне месіянство, що із звичайнісіньких людей, тих людей, яким властиве і добре й лихе, вона творить нове, цілком відмінне плем'я. Більшовицьку расу..."[182] (*Smert'* 73).

The suspicious behavior of Party members toward each other, continuous snitching, and the inability to be one's self – all of this prevented Kost' from calling himself a 'Bolshevik.' Thus, I argue, Kost' experiences a psychic trauma of inner duality and torment caused by the pressures of the Soviet totalitarian system and the need to belong. Antonenko-Davydovych shows what such a system can do to an individual's psyche through the use of fear and guilt to shape a new type of conscience, one that approves of crimes for the sake of ideology. He reveals Kost''s perplexed psychology.

Although the psychologism of the novel has been noted by many scholars (Boiko, Nestelieiev, Lavrinenko, Poliukhovych, Dmytrenko), the role and effects of trauma on the main character have not been discussed. As in "Ia," trauma can be observed through the modes of textual narration and the protagonists' dreamlike states.

[182] "The Party wasn't an arsenal of saints. But therein was its effect, its unique messianism. From the most ordinary people, those with inherent good and evil, it was creating a new, quite distinct tribe. A Bolshevik race…" (*Duel* 38).

I will now examine Kost''s complex relationship with the changing political and social environment around him. I propose to view his denial of the past, and the antagonism he experiences towards the people he loves, as symptoms of trauma. The symbolic nature of his daydreaming and dreamlike states reveals a range of defense mechanisms that he established to shape an image of himself as a Bolshevik. I suggest that *Smert'* is a trauma novel (as defined by M. Balaev) and that it presents the perpetrator's guilty conscience through impactful existential dreams. The psychic trauma of a dissociated self and the loss of a former identity, caused by social and political circumstances, is followed by the trauma of committing a murder. This is a perpetrator trauma. Kost' Horobenko believes that by abandoning his Ukrainian cultural identity, by killing his other self in the form of Ukrainian villagers, he will merge fully into the culture of Bolshevism. As the novel unfolds, he neither becomes a "true" Bolshevik, nor erases his past. Overall, *Smert'* shows how some members of the cultural elite were forced to come to terms with the subordinate status of Ukraine within Russia and to adopt Bolshevik rhetoric – or at least pretend that they did.

4.1. The psychological novel

The concept of the psychological novel had its origins in the the seventeenth- and eighteenth century, in the works of Mme de Lafayette, the Abbé Prévost, Samuel Richardson, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and many others. However, it was reinvented and modified many times as the understanding of the nuances of human psychology progressed (Belknap 134). Although Borys Antonenko-Davydovych wrote *Smert'* during the ascendance of modernism, it is rather a psychological novel in the style of psychological realism *à la* Leo Tolstoy (e.g., *Voina i mir* [War and Peace; 1869]), with some aspects of modernism as well (e.g., symbolism, extensive

use of metaphors, attention to the character's perception of sound, light and nature, delineation of dreamlike states). While social realism tends to describe "a sociological rather than a psychological view of the character," paying attention to the external forces at play, psychological realism "presents the society from the point of view of the individual" (Paris 8).

Bernard Paris claims that psychological novelists do not interpret but represent the experience of their characters. The details of the character's personality depict their inner states: "the main characters exist primarily as mimetic portraits […]. Many aspects of their characterization which are of little formal or thematic interest become very significant when we see them as manifestations of the characters' inner being, as part of the author's unfolding of character for its own sake" (Paris 12). This transpires in *Smert'*, for Antonenko-Davydovych does not interpret Kost''s experience, but rather represents it. In *Chto takoe iskusstvo?* (*What is Art?)* Tolstoy emphasizes that realist portrayal is important but must aid in depicting the protagonists' emotions and feelings. Otherwise, it is just an imitation of art. For, if one were only to follow realist principles, it might be like judging the nutritional value of the dish based only on the way it looks (133; 137).

Comparisons of similar elements between *Voina i mir* and *Smert'* can be drawn. Among extensive numbers of figural dialogues and realistic descriptions of external surroundings and appearances, there are examples of psycho-narration (italicized) and quoted monologues (both as per Cohn). First, there is the excerpt from *Voina i mir*, in which Pierre Bezukhov (one of the central protagonists) contemplates his duel with his wife's lover Dolokhov, whom Bezukhov thought he killed. He tries to sleep but his feelings, thoughts and memories force him to stay awake. He feels uneasy and anxious:

Он прилег на диван и хотел заснуть, для того чтобы забыть все, что было с ним, но он не мог этого сделать. Такая буря чувств, мыслей, воспоминаний вдруг поднялась в его душе, что он не только не мог спать, но не мог сидеть на месте и должен был вскочить с дивана и быстрыми шагами ходить по комнате. То ему представлялась она в первое время после женитьбы, с открытыми плечами и усталым, страстным взглядом, и тотчас же рядом с нею представлялось красивое, наглое и твердонасмешливое лицо Долохова, бледное, дрожащее и страдающее, каким оно было, когда он повернулся и упал на снег.

"Что ж было? – спрашивал он сам себя. – Я убил *любовника*, да, убил любовника своей жены. Да, это было. Отчего? Как я дошел до этого?" – "Оттого, что ты женился на ней," – отвечал внутренний голос.[183] (*Voina i mir* 2:409)

The depth of Pierre Bezukhov's psychological processes, his inner instability and doubt are achieved by the narrator through the presentation of his thoughts and feelings, internal monologues and as the reflection of Bezukhov's surroundings. A similat process transpires in *Smert'*. The author narrates Kost''s psychological states – feelings of sadness,

[183] "*He lay down on the couch and tried to go to sleep, so as to forget all that had happened to him, but he could not do so. Such a tempest of feelings, thoughts, and reminiscences suddenly arose in his soul, that, far from going to sleep, he could not even sit still in one place, and was forced to leap up from the couch and pace with rapid steps about the room. At one moment he had a vision of his wife, as she was in the first days after their marriage, with her bare shoulders, and languid, passionate eyes; and then immediately by her side he saw the handsome, impudent, hard and ironical face of Dolohov, as he had seen it at the banquet, and again the same face of Dolohov, pale, quivering, in agony, as it had been when he turned and sank in the snow.*
'What has happened?' he asked himself; 'I have killed *her lover*; yes, killed the lover of my wife. Yes, that happened. Why was it? How have I come to this?' 'Because you married her,' answered an inner voice" (*War and Peace* 353).

self-pity and confusion. Like Bezukhov, Kost' also cannot sleep because he is obsessed with his role within the Party. While the passage quoted from *Voina i mir* is presented in the past tense, *Smert'* combines variations of past and present. In the following passage, there is also a difference in punctuation between Ukrainian original text and its English translation. In Ukrainian, the psycho-narration transitions into internal monologue, separated only by a semi-colon. It is unknown if that was the author's intention. However, I find that the narration without the quotation marks creates a more fluid transition from Kost''s physical experiences (his heartache, lying in bed) to his thought process. What helps to distinguish the psycho-narration from the quoted (internal) monologue is the change of tenses and person (past to present, third to first and second respectively):

> *І знову глибоко свердлил**о** серце і не можна **було** лежати, не рухаючись, на одному місці. **Горобенко** перевернув**ся** на другий бік і розпучливо подум**ав**:* "Ну, добре, коли вони вважа**ють**, що **я** український націоналіст, то чому ж вони не викин**уть мене** з партії? Це ж так логічно було б..."
>
> ***Горобенко** одкин**ув** з голови піджака, і на тьмяній бруднуватій стіні встал**о** запитання:* а що б **ти** роб**ив** поза партією?..
>
> Дурний! Про що **ти** пита**єш**? Корабля вже давно спалено, і поза партією **тобі немає** чого робити. Розумі**єш** – **немає** чого робити. Для **тебе** там, поза нею, – пустеля.[184] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Smert'* 105)

---

[184] "*Again **his** heart ach**ed** deep inside and stopp**ed him** from lying still in the open spot. **Horobenko** turn**ed** over and **thought** in despair:* 'All right, then, if they consider **me** to be a Ukrainian nationalist, why don't they throw **me** out of the Party? This would be so logical…'
***Horobenko** scrap**ed** away the jacket from his head and the gloomy soiled wall pos**ed** him a question:* 'What **would you do** outside the Party…?'
Fool! What **are you asking** about? Your ships **have** long **been** burnt, and there **is** nothing for you to do outside the Party. Understand – there **is** nothing to do. Beyond it there **is** only a desert for you" (*Duel* 68).

In addition to using similar modes for presenting consciousness, Antonenko-Davydovych—like Tolstoy—incorporates dreams in his texts (e.g., see Pierre's entries in his diary on pp. 573; 574).[185] Overall, novels like *Smert'* are an example of the fluidity of styles, where the realistic depiction of social issues merges with the protagonist's inner life, thus, placing it in the category of the psychological novel. The individual psychology of Kost' Horobenko in the context of social circumstances of the Bolshevik regime also helps the representation of trauma, in both individual and cultural spheres. Therefore, I propose defining *Smert'* as a trauma novel. Before discussing its features, I will show how Antonenko-Davydovych's narration style operates, using Dorrit Cohn's classification of the modes for representing consciousness.

4.2. Modes for presenting consciousness in Smert'

The protagonist's perception of reality and the psychological crisis that emerges from it becomes more important than a detailed description of appearances, surroundings, or rigid chronology of events. We hardly know anything about the lives of other characters in the novel. Anything we can assume about them is based on Kost''s judgements, reported by the omniscient author. Kost''s inner struggle affects his perception of external reality. This is achieved by the use of third-person modes such as consonant psycho-narration (where the voices of the narrator and the character coincide) along with quoted and narrated monologues.

Psycho-narration is identified by the absence of authorial rhetoric and the capacity to depict the protagonist's mental and emotional states. The narrator indicates Kost''s experience without providing his own interpretation. It is hard to determine whether it is the

[185] Tolstoy, Leo. *Voina i mir*.

author's or the protagonist's narration because the narrator simply explains the character's thoughts "better than the character himself" and "articulates a psychic life that remains unverbalized, penumbral, or obscure" (Cohn 46). Here is an example when the narrator, in the third person, describes Kost''s psychic life, pointing out that Kost' has a hard time admitting his feelings and thoughts to himself:

> Тоді думка й тіло зливались в одне гармонійне ціле, і знайомі остогидлі доми повітового міста, і люди, і ввесь неосяжний невідомий світ видавались кращими. І не було в Горобенка на душі ні злості, ні заздрощів, ні підозри, у грудях несвідомо й непомітно виростало і заповнювало всі кутки його одне прекрасне сонячне слово – любов. *Він його ніколи б тепер не вимовив, але він відчував його.*[186] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Smert'* 72)

In the following instance, psycho-narration merges into narrated monologue which helps to present the protagonist's thoughts explicitly. It begins with the phrase, "Кость в'яло подумав" ("Kost' thought limply"). Combined, these modes reveal what the character is thinking to himself: "Кость в'яло *подумав*: це нісенітниця – друкувати українською мовою 'російська'... А втім, не це, власне, впадало в око і настирливо вимагало на самоті витягати з кишені рожеву книжечку і вдивлятися в першу сторінку"[187] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Smert'* 34).

---

[186] "Then his mind and body fused into a single harmonious whole, and the familiar detestable houses of this district town, the people and the whole boundless world seemed better. And Horobenko's soul became devoid of malice, and envy, and suspicion: a single beautiful sunny word – love – subconsciously and imperceptibly welled in his chest and filled every corner of it. *He would never utter it now, but he had felt it"* [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Duel* 37).

[187] "Kost *thought* limply: what nonsense – to print the word 'Russian' in Ukrainian …And yet actually it wasn't this which had caught his eye and indomitably prompted him to pull the pink book from his pocket and to stare at the first page" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Duel* 2).

Narrated monologue, like psycho-narration, presents the protagonist's mental discourse camouflaged as the narrator's discourse without mental verbs like "he thought," "he felt," "he knew," which is intrinsic to psycho-narration (Cohn 104): "'Більшовик!' – це зовсім не те, що 'комуніст.' 'Комуніст' – це термін новий, і Кость призвичаївся до нього одразу, навіть зріднився з ним. А ось із 'більшовиком,' цебто з тим самим більшовиком, що за недавньою термінологією, – на вістрях багнетів 'ніс із півночі, з Росії, на Україну...' – ні"[188] (*Smert'* 34).

To discern that the narrative language belongs to the figural mind, presented by the narrator, and not to the narrator himself, Dorrit Cohn offers to "translate" the narrated monologue into an interior (first-person) one, substituting third-person pronouns with first-person ones (101). Here is how the passage cited above can be transformed: "'Більшовик!' – це зовсім не те, що 'комуніст'. 'Комуніст' – це термін новий, і ***я*** призвичаївся до нього одразу, навіть зріднився з ним. А ось із 'більшовиком,' цебто з тим самим більшовиком, що за недавньою термінологією, – на вістрях багнетів 'ніс із півночі, з Росії, на Україну...' – ні"[189] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Smert'* 34).

As we can see, the meaning of the monologue remains the same. Only the grammatical person has been changed from the third person in the narrated monologue to first person in the interior monologue. In contrast to interior monologues or any other modes for presenting consciousness, the narrated monologue ensures the "fusion of outer and inner

---

[188] "'Bolshevik!' This was by no means the same thing as 'Communist'. 'Communist' was a new term, and he had become accustomed to it at once, even associating with it. But not with the word 'Bolshevik', that selfsame Bolshevik who, according to recent terminology had 'borne Communism from the north of Russia to Ukraine' on the tips of bayonets – no" (*Duel* 2).

[189] "'Bolshevik!' This was by no means the same thing as 'Communist'. 'Communist' was a new term, and ***I*** had become accustomed to it at once, even associating with it. But not with the word 'Bolshevik', that selfsame Bolshevik who, according to recent terminology had 'borne Communism from the north of Russia to Ukraine' on the tips of bayonets – no" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Duel* 2).

reality," it becomes a bridge that links the narrator's and protagonist's voices and creates the effect of a flow within the text. It presents figural consciousness "on the threshold of verbalization in a manner that cannot be achieved by direct quotation" (Cohn 103).

At times, psycho-narration is followed by quoted monologue. Grammatically, the contrast can be shown through a change of tenses: past tense when it is psycho-narration and present tense when it is quoted monologue (although, when Kost' talks about his deceased father in the quoted monologue, the monologue is narrated in the past tense). The change of tense (from past to present) and person (from third to first) as well as the use of quotation marks indicate the quoted monologue. I italicize the psycho-narration in the passage below; the remaining text is the quoted monologue. The grammatical person and changes of tense are in bold:

> ***Кость поклав*** *партбілет на стіл і* ***озирнувся*** *по кімнаті.* ***Було*** *тихо. Крізь одчинене вікно із саду* ***долітало*** *однотонне щебетання якоїсь безглуздої пташки. Десь за листям дерев* ***перевалювало*** *на захід сонце, і його кволе проміння* ***позначилось*** *на стіні сіруватою мармуровою мережею. Розвидані книжки, штани на подушці, наган на столі – все це* ***було*** *німе й глухе. Ніщо* ***не могло*** *підслухати Костевих думок, щоб потім нишком, у закутках, за спиною, шепотіти поміж членами організації.* ***Кость*** *спокійно* ***подивився*** *крізь вікно в сад і тихо* ***сказав*** *самому собі:*
>
> – **Я** – більшовик... […]
>
> ***Кость сперся*** *ліктем на стіл і* ***подумав****:*
>
> "Якого чорта **липне** все це до голови? Що батько був дрібним буржуа – це так. Факт. Ба навіть – він цілував соборному настоятелеві, каштановолосому

панотцеві Гаврилові, руку і його сестра, що колись була мені рідною тіткою, – вдруге замужем за вихрестом-купцем – це також правда. Це все так. Але батько потурбувався вмерти за рік до революції, і, нівроку йому, добре зробив. **Я ненавиджу** його за те, що він був мій батько, і **вдячний** йому, що його тепер **нема**. **В мене немає** тепер нікого. І це так само правильно."[190] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Smert'* 34-35)

Through these two modes the author reassures the reader that whatever is happening in Kost'ʼs psyche is true. The quoted monologue, particularly, helps to determine "a purely subjective expression of internal happenings, and a blending of objective and subjective viewpoints in external happenings" (Cohn 72). The use of third-person modes, however, does not exclude traditional realistic dialogues:

До Горобенка підлетіла Славіна. Її підстрижене волосся не личило до худого обличчя невиразних літ, і зовсім уже дратувала якась каблучка на пальці.

– Таварищ Гарабенко! Таварищ Гарабенко!..

Вона вчепилась худорлявими пальцями в його гудзика на сорочці і почала нещадно крутити:

---

[190] "***Kost lay*** *his Party ticket on the table and* ***looked*** *about the room. It* ***was*** *quiet. Through an open window* ***came*** *the monotone twitter of some small ridiculous bird in the orchard. The sun* ***was setting*** *in the west somewhere behind the leaves of the trees, and its pale rays* ***painted*** *a grayish marble network on the wall. Scattered books, a pair of pants on his pillow, a revolver on the table — all this* ***was*** *mute and deaf ... Nothing here* ***could*** *eavesdrop on Kost's thoughts, to whisper them later to the organization members in corners, behind his back.* ***Kost*** *calmly* ***looked out*** *the window into the orchard and* ***said*** *quietly to himself:*
'**I am** a Bolshevik …' […]
Kost rested *his elbow on the table and* ***thought****:* 'Why the hell **is** all this **plaguing** me? Father was a petty bourgeois — that **is true**. It's a fact. What's more — he even kissed the hand of the synodical appointee, the auburn-haired Father Havrylo, and his sister, who had once been my blood aunt, was married a second time to a neophyte merchant — this **is true** too. All this **is** so. But father took the trouble to die a year before the Revolution and, heaven preserve him, did well to do so. **I detest** him because he was my father, and **am thankful** to him that he **is** no longer around. Now **I have** no one" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Duel* 2).

– Де ж ви загаялись? Мені конче треба з вами поговорити. […]

Горобенко хотів якось одчепитись від неї. Ця завідувачка соцвиху справді надто вже уїдлива. Він одсунув на потилицю кашкета і мляво відповів:

– Це дрібниці, товаришко Славіна; хіба тепер до них...[191] (*Smert'* 37)

Even then, however, these dialogues are typically followed by third-person modes in the form of the narrator's comment on Kost''s experiences. Realistic details seem very important for portraying the protagonist's frustration or anger. What follows the dialogue cited above is a mixture of psycho-narration and quoted monologue (italicized). The interruption of Kost''s thoughts by Slavina is grammatically presented through suspension periods at the end: "Стало знову неприємно за себе – адже не піде Славіна до Горбаня або Дружиніна шушукатись, а цілить у нього: 'Таварищ Гарабенко, таварищ Гарабенко.' Як це бридко! Він глянув на її тоненькі безкровні губи і раптом подумав: *'А мабуть, таки правдиві оті чутки, ніби Славіна – прижитна донька якогось тамбовського архієрея...* "'[192] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Smert'* 38).

Cohn argues that quoted and narrated monologues (depending on the context), correlate with the norms of psychological realism and fictional dialogues: "just as dialogues

---

[191] "Slavina flew up to Horobenko. Her short hair did not suit her face of indistinct age, and he was quite annoyed by the ring on her finger.
'Comrade Harabyenko. Comrade Harabyenko.'
She grabbed his shirt button with her bony fingers and began to twirl it mercilessly.
'Where have you been hiding? I really must talk to you.' […]
Horobenko wanted to get rid of her somehow. This chief of socialist education really was far too tiresome. He moved back his cap and replied languidly: 'These are trifles, Comrade Slavina; now isn't the time for them …' (*Duel* 5).

[192] "He felt uncomfortable again – for Slavina wouldn't have gone to Horban or Druzhynin to whisper in their ears, she directed her 'Comrade Harabyenko, Comrade Harabyenko' at him. How repugnant this was! He looked at her thin bloodless lips and suddenly thought: '*Those rumours are probably true – that Slavina is the illegitimate daughter of some Tambov bishop …* "' [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Duel* 5).

create the illusion that they render what characters ‘really say’ to each other, monologues create the illusion that they render what a character ‘really thinks’ to himself” (76). Yet, unlike the first-person modes and especially stream-of-consciousness technique that “renders primarily ‘preverbal’ thoughts or the ‘prespeech level of consciousness’,” quoted monologues can only partially depict the unconscious slips of the tongue, repetitions, omissions and no more, therefore on their own they are not effective for depicting the unconscious (Cohn 86, 88). However, the combination of two or even all three of these modes is justified when analyzing Kost''s dreamlike states. Because he represses his guilty conscience and sentimentality in his awake life, the author’s commentary on Kost''s dreams and his reaction to them, helps to create the contrast between Kost' Horobenko’s awake and dream life, and thus, represent his psychic trauma.

4.3. The guilty conscience of a dreaming perpetrator

Viktoriia Dmytrenko attempts to analyze the dreams in *Smert'*. She focuses on interpreting symbols and suggests that Kost''s dreams are prophetic (77). Different interpretations are possible. I propose to do something that has not been done in Ukrainian scholarship by following Kuiken’s classification of dreams and paying attention to how dreams and dreamlike states represent Kost''s trauma.

The analysis of dreams is useful for understanding a protagonist’s conflicts in his wakeful state. In *Smert'*, realistic depictions of Kost''s surroundings and interactions are interwoven with his dream life. For instance, he dreams of people and situations which he tries to repress in his awake life. One of the recurrent images in his dreams is that of his

fiancée Nadia. She represents his moral self. He often thinks of her in moments of despair when he is awake.

All dreamlike states are presented in third-person narration modes. While in the first example I offer below, Kost' thinks about his dream and reminiscences about Nadia (modes used: psycho-narration and quoted monologue), in the dream *per se* psycho-narration is used predominantly. Here is the first instance in which Kost' contemplates the dream he had at night:

> *Цієї ночі уві сні прийшла Надя.* Та сама Надя, що була колись, Надя, що не могла б бути тепер... Чому?
>
> Горобенко це добре знав, але він умисно спитав самого себе і щиро відповів: "Тому, що тоді вона була просто Надею, вона була нареченою (хоч цього й не говорилось офіційно), а тепер вона була б 'міщанкою,' 'баластом,' безпартійною 'сволоччю' ..."
>
> Горобенко подумки сказав і це. У цій грубості була якась гостра насолода. Але це так. Нема потреби зараз брехати ні сонцеві, ні жоржині, ні самому собі. Можливо, що це зрозуміла б і Надя, якби вона була не хороший сон, а реальність, а втім... […] *Надя вмерла, вмерла тільки фізично, а коли з'явиться рідко уві сні, вона буде просто Надею, "дореволюційною" Надею.*[193] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Smert'* 47)

---

[193] "*During the night Nadia had visited him in his dreams.* The same Nadia who had once been, the Nadia who could not now be … Why? Horobenko knew very well why, but he asked himself on purpose and answered frankly: 'Because back then she was simply Nadia, she was my fiancée (though this was not mentioned officially), but now she would have been a 'bourgeois,' 'ballast,' non-Party scum …' Horobenko had said that on purpose too. This crudity contained a kind of sheer pleasure. But it was so. There was no need now to lie to the sun, the dahlias, or to himself. Perhaps Nadia would have understood this too had she been a reality, instead of a nice dream, but then … […] *Nadia had died, died only physically, and when she occasionally appeared in his dreams, she would simply be Nadia, 'pre-Revolutionary" Nadia"* [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Duel* 13).

The actual dream, to which chapter XVI is dedicated in its entirety, manifests Kost''s inner conflict. Through unconscious dreamlike states, random thoughts about his past and the feelings that they invoke in him, resurface. He cannot control it this time, and the dream becomes a testimony of his psychic trauma. It is represented through the metonymic images of the crowd (or, as it seems to him at times, Denikin's army) that follows him, the white dress with white roses, the bridge over the river and the little Jewish boy whom Kost' fails to save.

The author reports the dream; it feels as if the reader is immersed in it. There is no commentary about this dream, so we can only propose plausible interpretations. Structurally, the dream can be broken down into the hypnagogic state right before Kost' falls asleep; the dream *per se*; and his waking up. According to Kuiken's classification, this is an impactful existential dream because of its vivid sensory phenomena and movement characteristics, as well as detectable emotions such as guilt, despair and moral choices that become important for the dreamer. Sentences are abrupt. Perceptions are not finished or logical, images and scenes are fast-changing. The prevailing third-person mode of narration also helps to delineate Kost''s guilty conscience and his moral values. He wants to save the boy and is willing to face the crowd. The image of the crowd might represent Kost''s guilty conscience "attacking" him. So, he is willing to "face it," which he cannot do in his awake life.

The state of hypnagogia, which Evan Thompson describes as "a liminal zone where we are neither fully awake nor fully asleep," is a state right before falling asleep, when ego boundaries loosen (112). This state is described before Kost' falls asleep: "Що він бачив перед цим – Кость забув. То все поринуло раптом у непам'ять, як нудна частина

нецікавого беззмістовного фільму. Натомість із темряви виплив коротенький, але напрочуд виразний, разючий фрагмент. Перше, що зафіксувалось, це – ритмічні цоки військових чобіт по бруку"[194] (*Smert'* 108)

In this passage, there is a distinctive feature of hypnagogia – synesthesia – "experiencing sounds giving rise to colors, or associating letters and numbers with colors and personalities […]. Shapes can speak, geometric patterns have personalities, and ideas are colored" (Thompson 112). Similarly, Kost' forgets what happened before this, when he was fully awake; now he transitions into the fragment where he notices "the rhythmic clicking of military boots," which indicates the beginning of the dream *per se:* "Перше, що зафіксувалось, це – ритмічні цоки військових чобіт по бруку. Р-аз! Раз-два, раз-два... То ступала якась військова частина. Може, рота, може, батальйон або й цілий полк. Тільки це не червоноармійці. Ні. Вони так не можуть. В цих кроках видати кожну бездоганно приладнану гаєчку до віками плеканого механізму"[195] (*Smert'* 108).

As I mentioned before, the dream begins with a metonymy: the protagonist does not see people's faces, but rather "boots" and "peakless caps" which lead him to think that this is Denikin's army, but later turns out to be a "celebrating crowd." He is stumped by the image of "the white dress with white roses" that appears from nowhere. It might be Nadia, but this is never revealed in the novel: "Хто там? Ні, не розбереш. Біла сукня з букетом білих

[194] "What he had seen before this – Kost had forgotten. All that had suddenly plunged into oblivion, like the boring part of an uninteresting, insipid film. Instead the darkness divulged a short, surprisingly vivid, stunning fragment. The first thing to register was the rhythmic clicking of military boots against pavement" (*Duel* 72).

[195] "The first thing to register was the rhythmic clicking of military boots against pavement. Hup! Hup! Hup-two, hup-two… It was some military unit marching along. Perhaps a company, a battalion, or even a whole regiment. Only they weren't Red Army soldiers. No. They didn't move like this. These steps reflected every faultlessly connected nut to a well-tended age-old mechanism" (*Duel* 72).

троянд. Навіщо така чудна гармонія – біла сукня й великі білі троянди? І взагалі – навіщо троянди”[196] (*Smert'* 109).

The metonymic description swiftly changes to Kost'’s perception of the distance between him and the approaching crowd. Randomly, he notices various details about the place: low-rise houses, a wooden bridge under the willows. He recognizes the river, in which he threw the physics instructor’s microscope, and realizes that this is his district town. Meanwhile, the distance between him and the crowd decreases. He hears that the crowd is going to beat Jews and commissars. He does not feel afraid and decides to face it. When he is about to make the first step towards the crowd, he sees a little Jewish boy on the bridge. The boy carelessly swings his legs over the river and holds a little red flag. The boy does not notice the crowd and keeps smiling. Kost' wants to warn him of the threat but his jaws are locked, and he cannot say a word. Kost' feels that he cannot leave the boy to the crowd and tries to save him but from the opposite side of the bridge he sees approaching “hooves,” “horses,” “peakless hats” and “swords.”

It is not clear how Kost' actually feels about all these people and images. However, certain physical symptoms (when he feels paralyzed by the crowd’s gaze and cannot move) point to his traumatic experience that causes him to freeze: “Але бігти несила. Навіть обернутись не можна. Натовп вчепірив у нього тисячеський погляд і приковує до себе, паралізує Костя”[197] (*Smert'* 109).

He wants to be lynched by the crowd of villagers (perhaps, as a punishment) which could be a sign of guilt. However, when he sees the Jewish boy and tries to save him, he

[196] “Who was there? No, he could not make anything out. A white dress with a white bouquet of roses. Why such weird harmony – a white dress and large white roses? And anyway – why roses…” (*Duel* 72).
[197] “But he didn’t have the energy to run. He couldn’t even turn around. The crowd had fixed its thousandeyed gaze on him and was riveting him to itself, paralysing Kost'” (*Duel* 73).

cannot. The frozen jaws and the inability to "utter a single word" represent Kost''s feeling of helplessness and despair and are signs of trauma. Similarly, in his awake life, he also conceals his feelings and feels helpless (e.g., when he returns home after hearing his evaluation report and crawls into bed hiding from the world). But let us return to the dream:

> Кость уже заносить наперед ногу, щоб твердо ступити перший крок, але несподівано між собою і натовпом бачить: праворуч на мостових поренчатах спокійнісінько сидить собі єврейський хлопчик і безтурботно теліпає ніжками. В руці йому стирчить маленький червоний прапорець, і хлопчик весело махає ним кудись угору до гав, чи зеленого верховіття дерев, чи сонця.
>
> – Дурне жиденя! – мимоволі зривається з Костевих уст. Цей хлопчик зовсім не помічає натовпу і радісно посміхається. Кость хоче крикнути йому: "Тікай!" *Але Костеві стулило шелепи, і він не може вимовити слова.*[198] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Smert'* 110)

The conclusion of the dream is not clear. It looks like both Kost' and the boy die. Horobenko wakes up confused about his dream, and for a moment he is not sure what happened: "Кость розплющив очі, підвівся і здивовано оглянув свою кімнату. З ліжка звисала зім'ята подушка, і лежала на підлозі ковдра. На стіні легко одбились

[198] "Kost had already moved his feet forward to take the first firm step when on his right he suddenly saw a small Jewish boy sitting peacefully on the bridge railing between himself and the crowd, thoughtlessly swinging his feet through the air. He was holding a small red flag and waving it joyously somewhere at the crows above, or the green treetops, or at the sun.
'Stupid little kid!' Kost exclaimed involuntarily. This boy had not seen the crowd at all and was smiling joyously. Kost wanted to call out to him to run away. But *his jaws were frozen together* and *he could not utter a single word*" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Duel* 73).

передранкові обриси дерев. Кость сів на ліжку і все ще не міг очутитись. ‘Який виразний занадто і дивний сон!’”[199] (*Smert'* 110).

In this dream, Kost''s guilty conscience takes over the rational justifications that he uses in his awake life. Only through his dreamlike states and thoughts, is it obvious that there is something wrong with his sense of identity. His divided self is manifested in his different personalities when he is awake and when he is asleep. These unconscious states and the narration modes that present this inner crisis reveal his psychic trauma. Only when he is dreaming or alone, can he be free from the realities of his awake life.

4.4. The narrative of trauma in *Smert'*

Trauma novel

I have shown how the modes of narration operate within the text. I have also discussed some of the features of the psychological novel disclosed in *Smert'*. The main question, however, is what makes it a trauma novel and is it possible to interpret Horobenko’s psychological crisis as perpetrator trauma?

Traumatic experiences can bring into disarray consciousness, memory, sense of self, and one’s relation to the community (Balaev, *The Nature* 18). All of these elements are present in *Smert'*. As mentioned earlier, the initial traumatic experience for Kost' was presumably the loss of his father and fiancée, perhaps even the capitulation of the Directory, although this is never confirmed within the text explicitly. Not much is known about the period before Kost' joined the Bolshevik Party. However, already the first sentence of the

[199] “Kost opened his eyes, sat up in bed and surveyed the room in amazement. A crumpled pillow hung off the bed and his blanket had fallen to the floor. The wall was lightly painted with dawn silhouettes of trees. Kost dropped his feet to the floor but still could not regain his senses. ‘What a strange and exceptionally vivid dream” (*Duel* 73).

novel indicates that this is not an easy choice for him. Throughout the text, Kost' experiences flashbacks, his altered perception of self and his "desired" new identity of a Bolshevik (so he tries to convince himself). His relationship to the Ukrainian community also changes. The historical background depicted in the novel suggests that its protagonist, Kost' Horobenko, and his transformation from a victim of the system to a perpetrator represent the experience lived by many Ukrainian intellectuals during the 1920s-1930s. They too were forced to join the Bolshevik Party and were persecuted for the slightest evidence of a nationalistic past, especially in the late twenties and early thirties.

Michelle Balaev points out that the delineation of trauma in literature can link the individual and public spheres through a character who is designed to experience it: "The trick of trauma in fiction is that the individual protagonist functions to express a unique personal traumatic experience, yet the protagonist may also function to represent an event that was experienced by a group of people, either historically based or futuristically imagined" (*The Nature* 17).

Balaev identifies the following traits of the trauma novel: various extreme emotional states presented through different "narrative innovations" like landscape imagery (e.g., the symbolism of the bridge under the willows in Kost'ʼs dream); temporal gaps (e.g., Kost'ʼs loss of time and space right after he executed the villagers); "narrative omission including the withholding of graphic, visceral details," which in my opinion are compensated by the use of third-person modes (*The Nature* 22). Thus, Balaev argues: "The novel's expression of painful, incoherent, and transcendent emotional states demonstrates the ways traumatic experience restructures perceptions, as well as the ways that meaning and value are constructed during and after the event" (*The Nature* 22). I also suggest that dreamlike states

are a way of presenting the traumatizing experience which I demonstrated earlier in this chapter.

I will now discuss the way trauma is narrated in *Smert'*.

The first signs of Kost''s mental dissociation are portrayed through the physical symptoms of trauma when he tries to cope with the Party's evaluation of him as "unstable." He wanders the town streets, feels uneasy and tries to numb his feelings by covering himself with a blanket, closing his eyes and pressing his palms between his knees:

> Горобенко не пішов сьогодні до ком'їдальні обідати, а просто подався завулками додому й зашився в ліжку.
>
> І знову краяло всередині, і маленька кімната самотньо притулилась десь аж на споді життя.
>
> Горобенко уткнувся лицем у подушку й накинув на голову піджака. Він заплющив щільно очі, стис між зібганими колінами гарячі долоні, але то дарма: перед очима все ж стоїть скривлений Попинака [Party member who doubted Horobenko's Bolshevism – DP] і в ушах дзвонить – це відомий український націоналіст...[200] (*Smert'* 105)

Kost''s strategies to repress this episode do not work. As he later admits to himself, he cannot get over it because he knows deep inside that he still has not eradicated the remnants of Ukrainian nationalism in himself. Kost''s self-doubt grows, developing into an obsession to break with his insecurity by committing a crime. Yet, his conscience keeps tormenting him

[200] "On this day Horobenko did not go to the Communist dining-hall but went straight home along back streets and climbed into bed. Once more he felt broken inside and the small room nestled alone somewhere in the very pit of life. Horobenko buried his face in a pillow and covered his head with his jacket. He shut his eyes tightly together, pressed his hot hands between the knees of his drawn-up legs, but it was no use: Popynaka's twisted face was still there and his ears rang with the words 'this is a well-known Ukrainian nationalist'…" (*Duel* 68).

with feelings of guilt and shame. His suffering escalates when he remembers that the Ukrainian nationalists like the Kovhaniuks and Pedashenkos whom he "hates" so much now, saved his life in the past, when he was their ally:

> Ну, що ж з того, що він був у 'Просвіті' і ці всякі Ковганюки та Педашенки добирають легального способу животіти? Плювать би він хотів на них!..
>
> Горобенко повернувся горілиць і поклав під потилицю руки. І в цю мить виринув зрадливий спогад. Цей же Ковганюк переховував його, ризикуючи, в своїй хаті, коли Горобенка шукали денікінці. А з Педашенком вони разом утворили філію Національного союзу й заарештували повітового гетьманського старосту. А з Придорожнім...
>
> Ці навісні згадки, як краплі живого срібла, чіплялись одна одної й виростали у велику кулю, що підступала ближче й ближче, одсовувала сьогоднішнє, розмальовувала у якісь занадто фантастичні і, признатись, гарні, приємні, близькі картини, позаторішнє – і знову муляло всередині.
>
> Сумління?.. Га?[201] (*Smert'* 55)

There are a few instances in the novel that depict a contest between Kost''s conscience and his alter egos, that is, his multiple inner voices as he refers to them.

[201] "So what of it that he had been in Prosvita and that all these Kovhaniuks and Pedashenkos were seeking a legal means to vegetate? He'd like to spit on them all …! Horobenko rolled over onto his back and put his hands under his head. And at that moment a treacherous recollection surfaced. This same Kovhaniuk had risked his own life by harboring Horobenko in his home when Denikin's men had been searching for him. And together with Pedashenko they had organized a branch of the National Alliance and arrested the district hetmanite village elder. And with Prydorozhny … These annoying recollections were like drops of mercury, grabbing onto each other and growing into a large ball which drew closer and closer, moving aside the present day, painting the year before last in far too fantastic and admittedly beautiful, pleasant, dear pictures, paining him inside once more. 'Conscience …? Ha?'" (*Duel* 21)

Eventually, this struggle results in a shift in his conscience when he considers murder as the only means to set himself free from his inner suffering:

> Горобенко одкинув ковдру й спустив із ліжка на долівку ноги. Він із хвилину слухав *гомін унутрішніх голосів*, *придивлявся до їхньої боротьби* і... – аж здивувався.
>
> *Тихенько, манівцями, із закамарків підсвідомості, вилізла ця знайома, здається, давним-давно вже думка*. Ну, так, це давно вже він вирішив, тільки чомусь не міг досі голосно сказати:
>
> – *Треба вбити... Мушу, власне, не вбити, а розстріляти.* І тоді, коли перед очима з'явиться їхня кров, коли ця кров розстріляних постанців, куркульні, спекулянтів, заручників і безлічі усяких категорій, що зведені до одного знаменника – контрреволюція, хоч раз, єдиний тільки раз впаде, як то кажуть, на мою голову, заляпає руки, тоді – всьому цьому кінець. Тоді я буду цілком вільний. Тоді сміливо й одверто, без жодних вагань і сумнівів можна буде сказати самому собі: я – більшовик...[202] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Smert'* 56)

This passage demonstrates the transformation of his consciousness through the change of Kost''s views of the villagers. Now he adopts a hostile attitude towards them and

[202] "Horobenko threw off the blanket and lowered his feet to the floor. For a minute or so he listened to *the hubbub of inner voices, watched closely their struggle* and … was even amazed. *Quietly, hedging about, a long familiar thought emerged from the nooks of his subconsciousness.* Well yes: he had decided this a long time ago, only until now he wasn't able to voice it out loud: *'They must be killed … I must execute them, rather than kill them.* And then, when their blood appears before my eyes, when this blood of executed rebels, kulaks, speculators, hostages and countless other categories which all have one common denominator – counter-revolution, when it falls at least once on my head, as they say, soiling my hands, then all this will come to an end. Then the Rubicon will have been crossed. Then I will be *completely free.* Then I can tell myself boldly and openly, without the slightest hesitation and doubt: I am a Bolshevik...'" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Duel* 22).

justifies his decision using ideological reasons, by persuading himself that the villagers are rebels, speculators, counter-revolutionaries. Balaev makes similar observation about certain trauma novels when a traumatic experience "disrupts the previous framework of reality and the protagonist must recognize the self in relation to this new view of reality. The reorientation of the self is often paired with a reevaluation of the protagonist's relation to society and a specific place or landscape, thus expanding the identification between self and world" (*Trauma Novel* 40).

The need to renounce the past in order to become a Bolshevik is traumatizing for Kost'. This is made obvious in one of the passages. Kost''s inner contradictions are portrayed through his inner voice, which reminds him that everything once dear to him is gone and that now he is simply Comrade Horobenko because Kostyk is slowly dying. In a sarcastic manner, this voice, that refers to Horobenko in the diminutive as "Kostyk," points out the absurdity of life and "thanks" the Party and the Revolution for his "beautiful life":

> І раптом у самому центрі їх [думок – DP] устало вихлясте, наївне, майже дитяче запитання: "Це ти, Костику? Невже це ти?.."
>
> І Кость Горобенко весело, як пришелепуватому, давно знайомому дурникові, відповів тому внутрішньому голосу: '"Так, так, не дивуйся, друже мій, – це я. Власне, не я, а те, що було колись мною. Костик умер чи, правду кажучи, вмирав поволі, і те, що не встигло вмерти, в кожнім разі, ось умре. А втім, що таке смерть? Я не філософ, але це й без філософії ясно, навіть не думаючи довго: смерть одного в той же час народження другого. […] Зрозумій же, що Костика вже нема, як нема Наді, немає батька і його двох будинків, як нема того всього, що було тоді, але тепер є зате товариш Горобенко. *Більшовик.*

Збагни ж, яке прекрасне це життя, чорт би його забрав!.. Яке ж воно прекрасне!.. Це життя. І я дякую революції, дякую партії, що вони навчили мене так сильно його любити."[203] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Smert'* 101)

Symbolically, Kost''s psychological crisis is also shown through his relationship with women. When he was pro-Ukrainian, Nadia was his fiancée, whom he describes as gracious and sensitive. Now that he is a Bolshevik, he has an affair with the vulgar Paraska who calls him "My Communist:" "Горобенко пройшовся по кімнаті, але вже не міг не повернутись назад, туди, де сиділа повновида, опасиста жінка з дебелими, м'якими грудьми. Він поволі повернувся і тоді ще виразніше почув, як ця кучурга тряського м'яса, від якого пахтить кухонним жиром і цибулею, нестримано вабить його"[204] (*Smert'* 107).

Paradoxically, Paraska is the only person in his new environment to whom Kost' admits that he is lonely. Shortly after his affair with her, he is disgusted by his actions. Guilt and shame dominate him, and he even has a flashback and sees Nadia's face. This vision reveals his trauma of loss because Nadia died, and now he is different, now he is attracted to

---

[203] "And suddenly in the very centre of it arose a wavering, naive, almost childish question: 'Is this you, Kostyk? Can it be you …?' Kost Horobenko replied joyously to that inner voice, as if it was that of an idiotic, long familiar fool:
'Yes, yes, don't be amazed my friend — it is me. Actually, not me, but that which was once me. Kostyk has died, or, to be truthful, he has been dying gradually and that which has not yet died will in any case soon be dead. But then, what is death? I'm not a philosopher, but even without philosophy it is evident, without much thought, that the death of one is at the same time the birth of another. […] You must realize that Kostyk no longer exists, just like there is no more Nadia, no father and his two buildings, nothing of what existed then. Now there is 'Comrade Horobenko'. *A member of the CP(b)U. Understand what a beautiful life this is, the devil take it! How beautiful it is …! And I thank the revolution, I thank the Party for teaching me to love it so strongly*'" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Duel* 65).

[204] "Horobenko paced across the room, but could no longer help but return to the full-faced, stout woman with soft plump breasts. He turned around slowly and sensed even more distinctly how this mound of jiggling meat reeking of cooking fat and onion attracted him so irresistibly" (*Duel* 70).

people like Paraska Fedotivna, who also symbolizes the Bolshevik Party and its "ugly practices." Again, Kost'ʼs disgust is manifested through physical symptoms of grabbing his jaw and collapsing in the corner:

> І знову якийсь пестливий, ласкавий голос промовив Горобенкові всередині. Не докірливо, а журно: "Це ти, Костику?.." І коло вікна живе погруддя Надине і на щоці дві великі прозорі сльози. Тільки дві. Їх більше ніколи не було. […] Того вечора відходили з міста загони Директорії, того вечора він востаннє в житті бачив живу Надю. Востаннє...
>
> Дві сльози. Дві чисті, прозорі сльози...
>
> І раптом бридким, вульгарним дисонансом увірвався в пам'ять допірішній сороміцький смішок Параски Федотівни і її пристрасне, протхнуте кухнею: "Комуністик мой віхрастий!.."
>
> Горобенко стиснув рукою щелепи, наче там заболів зненацька зуб, і безвладно поточився в куток.
>
> *І останнім докором глибоко лягло на груди і не розтануло одразу: леле! Найкращі теорії так просто і так легко можуть уживатися з найбруднішою практикою... Як це все ж таки гидко в житті!..*[205] [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Smert'* 108)

---

[205] "And once more a caressing, gentle voice spoke inside him. It was not reproachful, only melancholy:
'Is this you, Kostyk …?' And Nadia's live bust appeared near the window, two large transparent tears on her cheeks. Only two. There were never any more. […] That evening the Directory's detachments were leaving the city, that evening he saw Nadia alive for the last time. The last time…
Two tears. Two pure, limpid tears.…
And suddenly his memory was invaded by the repugnant, vulgar dissonance of Paraska Fedotovna's shameless chuckling and her passionate utterance steeped in kitchen smells: 'My impetuous little Communist!'…
Horobenko grabbed hold of his jaw, as if a tooth was suddenly troubling him, and limply collapsed into a corner.
And as a last reproach a voice seeped deep into his chest and did not melt away immediately: '*Woe! The best*

The depiction of physical symptoms of trauma, the struggle between Kost''s conscience and his alter ego, the alteration of his consciousness and his attitude towards the Ukrainian community, psychological crisis, his dissociated sense of self (shown in the section on dreams) and the trauma of loss are all ample proof that *Smert'* is a "trauma novel." Progressively, the psychological breakdown and the pressures of the Bolshevik system propel Kost' to break with his moral beliefs and become a perpetrator.

Perpetrator trauma

Kost''s identity as a perpetrator takes shape gradually. Initially, he just enjoys confiscating people's belongings. He even savours the atmosphere of grief that this causes: "Він намагався уявити собі до деталей атмосферу осиротілого після піаніно дому, малював собі розпуку й горе допіру покинутих міщан – і це давало йому якусь злісну втіху"[206] (*Smert'* 59).

On the other hand, when it comes to something dear to him (like the books that remind him of his childhood and his parents), his attitude changes (like Khvyl'ovyi's character when he sees or thinks of his mother):

> З-під старих, пожовклих, де-не-де заляпаних кавою сторінок, таких знайомих із далекого дитинства – "Родины," "Вокруг света," "Нивы," випливали спогади. Вони асоціювали з безліччю днів, таких затишних і запашних. Ці журнали немов щоденник. Наївні, трохи дурнуваті, але такі прості, такі близькі, такі свої,

---

theories can coexist so simply and easily alongside the filthiest practices… How ugly life was, after all! "" [Emphasis mine—DP] (*Duel* 71).

[206] "He tried to imagine in great detail the atmosphere in the house orphaned of its piano, painted the despair and grief of the people he had just left – and this gave him a kind of wicked satisfaction" (*Duel* 24).

> як те все, що було, що вже ніколи, ніколи не вернеться. На такі ж самі малюнки дивився покійний батько, дивилась мати, що невідомо де тепер, як і чому живе ще й досі, дивився, нарешті, він сам.[207] (*Smert'* 60)

Horobenko grieves over the books and wants to preserve them because they remind him of his past. This becomes his little secret: "Горобенкові несвідомо хотілося якомога довше вдержати книжки в Нардомі. Він не нагадував про них нікому, а тільки старанно привозив до цього капища все нові й нові. Позавчора він повісив на дверях власного замка, а сьогодні, крім того, підпер двері лавою"[208] (*Smert'* 60).

Although in front of the Party members Kost' tries to appear impervious to the suffering of the counterrevolutionaries, he feels uncomfortable with the wrongdoings that he must commit, especially towards people he knew – like his old physics teacher. When he comes to requisition the teacher's microscope, he feels guilty and ashamed: "Горобенко піддався і глянув. Перед ним було повне болю, образи й здивування фізикове обличчя. Дивитись фізикові в вічі не можна було. Горобенко прикусив губу й одвернувся"[209] (*Smert'* 78).

---

207 "Recollections floated from the old, yellowed pages of *Rodina*, *Around the World* and *Niva*, stained here and there with coffee, all so familiar, from his childhood. They were associated with countless days, so snug and fragrant. These magazines were like a diary. Naive, a little foolish, but so simple, so close, so dear, like all that which had been, and which would never, never return. His deceased father had looked at these same pictures, so had his mother, who was still alive somewhere, and he had looked at them too" (*Duel* 25).

208 "Subconsciously Horobenko wanted to hold onto these books in the public hall for as long as possible. He reminded no one of them, diligently bringing more and more new tomes to this pagan temple. The day before yesterday he had hung his own lock on the door, as well as propping the door up with a bench today" (*Duel* 26).

209 "Horobenko yielded and looked. The physics teacher's face before him was filled with pain, insult and amazement. He couldn't look the physics teacher in the eye. Horobenko bit his lip and turned away" (*Duel* 43).

Later, however, one of Kost''s inner voices, just like the remorseless doctor Tahabat in "Ia," reminds him of the plan to commit murder because the confiscation of belongings will not buy him a new conscience:

> Якийсь голос сміявся всередині, знущався над Горобенком – одняв у нещасного дідка його останню втіху і хочеш довести, що ти більшовик! Ха-ха-ха!.. Кому цим доведеш? Може, самому собі? Дурниця! Ти ж знаєш прекрасно, що суть не в цьому. Що важить для революції якийсь мікроскоп! Дрібненька, егоїстична душа! Мізерною шкодою ти хочеш купити собі нове сумління? Дешево! Занадто дешево... Це купується тільки – пам'ятаєш ту безсонну ніч? – купується кров'ю! Смертю![210] (*Smert'* 78)

Horobenko's perpetrator psychology oscillates between feelings of guilt and suffering, and determination to commit the crime. Timothy L. Schroer mentions that there are perpetrators who "complained of pangs of conscience and the sheer physical revulsion that accompanied the shooting of defenseless victims" (35). Because Kost' Horobenko is the type of a perpetrator who is aware and conscious of his crime and undergoes inner turmoil and confusion before he finally kills, I suggest seeing him from the perspective of perpetrator trauma. This is mainly because he experiences moral contradictions, empathizes with his victims, feels guilt, shame and engages in self-denouncement.[211] In short, Kost''s experience of perpetrator trauma is rooted in his self-inflicted suffering through which he wants to numb

[210] "A voice laughed inside Horobenko, mocking him: 'You've taken away an old fellow's last joy and want to prove that you're a Bolshevik? Ha-ha-ha …! Who will you prove this to? Perhaps to yourself? Rubbish! You know full well that this isn't the point. What is some microscope to the revolution! Tiny, egoistic soul! You want to buy yourself a new conscience with miserable harm? That's cheap! Far too cheap… This is bought only with – remember that sleepless night? – only with blood! Death!'" (*Duel* 43).

[211] For a more detailed explanation of these and other characteristics of perpetrator trauma, see Morag, Raya. *Waltzing with Bashir: Perpetrator Trauma and Cinema,* p.15.

feelings of guilt and shame. Unable to bear the contradictions of his inner voices which remind him of the past, he seeks relief by choosing to kill. He understands that by executing the villagers, he will be shooting his former self and that thought brings him temporary relief. Thus, the physical death of others is symbolic of the death of his conscience.

However, when it is time to execute his plan, he agonizes and becomes anxious. He cannot look at the captives and stands motionless as if he is the one to be executed: "Горобенко не дивився на них. Він утопив у землю очі й скулився. Щось важке навалилось на повіки, і страшенно свербить тім'я. Зняти б кашкета й почухати. Ой, як свербить тім'я!.. Але Горобенко не рухався. Стояв застиглий і безвладний, буцімто не заручників мають зараз розстрілювати, а його"[212] (*Smert'* 143).

Once the murder is committed, Kost' experiences shock and loses his sense of reality; he closes his eyes and leaves the scene "aimlessly." Thus, initially Kost' becomes a victim of the Bolshevik system, surrendering to the new regime, and then he transforms himself into a conscious perpetrator of a crime. This explains why his dreaming/thinking self and his awake self are different. What he ceases to admit to himself in his awake life, he expresses in his dreams through symbols and the detailed psychic process narrated by the author.

In this chapter I have argued that the sudden change of regimes is traumatic for Kost' and motivates him to change his moral (and political) views. In general, Antonenko-Davydovych's portrayal of communists is rather clichéd. Although there are certain Bolshevik figures whom Horobenko admires, like Zivert and Druzhynin (*Smert'* 103; 115), the remainder of the communists do not have a psychology; they are shallow, superficial and

[212] "Horobenko did not look at them. He buried his eyes into the ground and cringed. Something heavy had rolled onto his eyelids and his crown felt terribly itchy. He felt like removing his cap and scratching himself. Oh, how itchy his crown was …! But Horobenko did not move. He stood still and limp, as if he himself was about to be executed" (*Duel* 104).

all appear alike. We only see them through dialogues and Kost''s judgements of them. In contrast, Kost' Horobenko is quite different. He is multidimentional and understands the complexity of life. Perhaps, he even wants to escape from this complexity and to search for simplicity. Communism forms the background of the novel; Kost''s thought processes are the center. The emphasis is not on what he does and how he behaves, but rather what he thinks. Therefore, Kost''s behaviour as a Bolshevik is far less ambiguous than his thoughts.

Conclusion

At the outset of this study I mentioned the challenges of speaking about trauma because survivors of a traumatic event are rarely able to comprehend the experience. Subsequently, I indicated that literature often provides testimony to trauma and becomes a powerful tool for expressing the unspeakable through poetic symbols and images, which could have a cathartic effect on both the writer and reader. Then I explored how Ukrainian modernist prose represents trauma that is rooted in social upheavals and claimed that it can connect personal and collective traumatic experiences. I have examined works by Turians'kyi (*Poza mezhamy*), Khvyl'ovyi ("Ia") and Antonenko-Davydovych (*Smert'*), which address the collective disasters of WWI and Bolshevik totalitarianism respectively. They portray the ambivalence and uncertainty of an epoch when social and political forces dictated the culture as well as moral values. Each text delineates subjective traumatic experience as the reflection of the social pressures that serve as the background of the tales.

I talked about trauma in these texts from the perspectives of modernist styles (namely, impressionism and expressionism), through narrative modes for presenting consciousness (Dorrit Cohn), and reflected on the role of literary dreams and dreamlike states to indicate the protagonists' psychological breakdown.

The ambiguity and uncertainty that followed the outbreak of WWI made it necessary for individuals to re-evaluate the relationship between victims and perpetrators, to question their ideological positions. Modernist tendencies to depart from Realism's focus on detailed, journalistic depiction of reality, shifted attention towards the inner life of literary protagonists and allowed for the exploration of borderline situations. Trauma, often implicitly, became an inevitable part of modernist narratives about the Great War and Revolution. It manifested

itself through writings that showed the fluctuations of the conscious and unconscious mind, irrational moments that rupture the rational perception of the world and bring ethical dilemmas to the fore.

I discovered that all three writers employed dreams and dreamlike states to show psychological crisis. Ideological pressure, change of regimes, war, emotional and physical suffering cause mental breakdown of the characters. They often undergo an identity crisis which defamiliarizes their environment and brings them to question their morality, often when they experience altered states of mind like hallucinations or dreams. I found that dreams are often presented in third-person modes and not monologues. This is linked to the fact that the protagonist would not be able to simultaneously experience and narrate the dream.

It is important to point out that, unlike Khvyl'ovyi and Antonenko-Davydovych, Turians'kyi wrote *Poza mezhamy* on the basis of autobiographical experience. The protagonists of his novel are drawn from real life. As mentioned in chapter 2, he was mobilized into the Austrian army in 1914 and witnessed the events he described. His text, in a sense, mimics the psychic trauma of people taken from real life. Khvyl'ovyi and Antonenko-Davydovych experienced the complexity of the period they depicted in their works, but their characters are fictional. Both authors were hounded by the Bolshevik totalitarian regime for their pro-Ukrainian position. For example, one of the reasons for Antonenko-Davydovych's arrest in 1935 and subsequent accusations of nationalism was his service in the Army of the Ukrainian National Republic (UNR) in 1919. In the case of Khvyl'ovyi, he was under surveillance by the State Political Administration (DPU) since 1927. Many informants, who remained anonymous, snitched on him. Someone under the

pseudonym “Literator” (“Litterateur”) speculated that Khvyl'ovyi was a Chekist himself like his protagonist in “Ia” (Panchenko, “Khvyl'ovyi” 74). Other statements, according to Hryhorii Kostiuk, involved accusations that Khvyl'ovyi killed his own mother. This was a total fabrication because she was alive after Khvyl'ovyi’s suicide in 1933 (1:34). Thus, both Antonenko-Davydovych and Khvyl'ovyi understood the atmosphere of their time, and this is reflected in their stories.

In all three narratives, socio-political events serve as background, whereas the human psyche, the mind and the unconscious, are foregrounded. In chapter 2, I discussed how Turians'kyi narrates the collective trauma of WWI by delineating the internal turmoil of seven men, shifting attention from external realities of war and intolerable weather conditions. To portray the traumatized soldiers, Turians'kyi, in expressionist fashion, uses grotesque depictions of horror and death and the psyche’s projection on the external landscape.

In chapters 3 and 4, I wrote about a type of fictional perpetrator that emerged under totalitarian Bolshevik rule during the years of war communism in Ukraine. Both “Ia” and *Smert'* depict a perpetrator as the main protagonist. These characters were first brainwashed by the Soviet regime and later became its dutiful executioners. The main theme of these chapters was the notion of perpetrator trauma.

“Ia” is a dissonant self-narration with self-quoted and self-narrated monologues with quotation of past thoughts. It is a memory narration that refers to a past experience narrated in the present. The experiencing and the narrating selves sometimes merge in the form of self-narrated monologue. Yet, the narrator freely moves back and forth between past and present narration, which is not the case for the experiencing self. The flashbacks from the

protagonist's past—that manifested as "remembering"—allude to his reexperiencing of the PTSD symptoms of his dissociated self, amplified by the extensive use of colors and references to the senses in an impressionistic manner. "Ia" might be viewed as a form of remorse.

In *Smert',* the realistic depiction of social issues merges with the protagonist's inner life, placing it in the category of the psychological novel. It also has some aspects of modernism, like the use of symbolism, extensive use of metaphors, attention to the character's perception of sound, light and nature. The judgements of Kost' are reported by the omniscient author through third-person modes. Consonant psycho-narration often shows where the voices of the narrator and the character coincide. Quoted monologues reveal a purely subjective expression of the protagonist's internal happenings, whereas narrated monologues connect Kost''s outer and inner reality.

Communism forms the background in both "Ia" and *Smert'*. Both protagonists are Chekists, members of the Bolshevik Party who participate in Ukraine's political and cultural transformation at the beginning of the 1910s and 1920s. While Khvyl'ovyi's unnamed character is presented as a Chekist from the very beginning, Antonenko-Davydovych's Kost' sets on a complicated path to serve the Cheka by transforming himself. In "Ia," the first-person protagonist kills his mother. In *Smert'*, Kost' Horobenko kills Ukrainian peasants – the enemies of Bolsheviks. The peculiarity of the protagonists-villains in both Khvyl'ovyi and Antonenko-Davydovych is their ability to be conscious of their crimes and observe their thoughts.

Both writers portray the progression of the protagonist's mental and emotional states, leading to psychic trauma. Through unconscious dreamlike experiences random thoughts

about their past (and the feelings that they invoke) resurface. Only in their dreams and hallucinations do they encounter guilt, despair and moral choices. It is in their dreams that their guilty conscience takes over the rational justifications that they use in their awake life. It is in those states that it becomes obvious that there is something wrong with their sense of identity. Therefore, “Ia” and *Smert'* represent moral identity crises and “perpetrator trauma,” which are manifested as a loss of time and space, enhanced sense perceptions, recurrent images, feelings of guilt and shame, rejection of the moral self, feelings of loss, separation and estrangement, PTSD symptoms like shuddering and collapsing.

In *Poza mezhamy*, Turians'kyi criticizes imperialism and shows the absurdity of a war in which many are doomed to die. For his protagonists, mental delirium and hallucinatory states become the soldiers’ escape from painful reality. The protagonists’ trauma caused by war, hunger and unbearable cold is manifested through the stages of fragmentation, regression and reunification. First, they are in shock because of the despair and unfairness of the situation, then they regress into an instinctual mode of self-preservation. Finally, they reintegrate their traumatic experience through accepting their fate and finding relief in the image of the mother.

The recurrent imagery of the mother is pertinent to both “Ia” and *Poza mezhamy*, although it is used differently. While for Turians'kyi’s protagonists, the image of the mother becomes a symbol of salvation and liberation form pain, for Khvyl'ovyi’s protagonist it symbolizes the split of his personality and his guilty conscience. Although the image of the mother is not presented in *Smert',* Kost' cherishes a female memory, that of his fiancée Nadia, which represents something intimate and sacred for him. Therefore, in all three texts, the feminine symbolizes innocence and purity in its opposition to the patriarchal world of

war and revolution. While Turians'kyi's characters embrace their hallucinations of the mothers, which bring them joy and release from suffering, Antonenko-Davydovych's and Khvyl'ovyi's characters reject that sacred femininity, the memory of which was dear to them in the past.

To conclude, by creating protagonists who are at times self-absorbed into their inner life, these writers showed the ambiguity and complexity of their time. In this dissertation, I examined the relationship between psychological and narrative aspects of trauma prose as well as the literary devices used by the authors to write about trauma. In an artistic way, through the representation of unconscious states of mind, the texts I have analyzed mirror the scope of psychological damage on the human psyche. My study should help us to see the transhistorical impact of trauma, the connection between past events and their effect on the realities of the present. My study may also contribute to wider analyses of the global effect of war, violence and ideological brainwashing not only on the witnesses of a tragic event, but also on their descendants.

Works Cited

Aheieva, Vira. "Mykola Khvylovy and Expressionism." Translated by Myroslav Shkandrij. *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, vol. 25, no. 1/2, pp. 45-59. *CIUS-Archives*. cius-archives.ca/items/show/1119. Accessed 12 Apr. 2019.

Alford, Fred C. "PTSD is a Culturally Bound Concept." *Trauma, Culture, and PTSD*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, pp. 5-30, doi: 10.1057/978-1-137-57600-2.

Andreyev, Leonid. "Krassnyi smeh: otryvki iz naidennoi rukopisi." *Povesti i rasskazy v dvukh tomakh. 1898-1906,* vol. 1. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1971, pp. 475-531.

Andreief, Leonidas. *The Red Laugh: Fragments of a Discovered Manuscript*. Translated by Alexandra Linden, Duffield, 1915.

"Andrew." *Online Etymology Dictionary, www.etymonline.com/word/Andrew.* Accessed 24 Mar. 2019.

Antokoletz, Elliott, and Juana Canabal Antokoletz. *Musical Symbolism in the Opera of Debussy and Bartók: Trauma, Gender, and the Unfolding of the Unconscious.* Oxford UP, 2004, pp. 3-54.

Antonenko-Davydovych, Borys. "Iak ia diishov do zhyttia takoho." *Sybirs'ki novely. Tiuremni virshi.* Interview with Oles' Tymoshenko, edited by O. Tymoshenko. Toronto: Smoloskyp, 1990, pp. 295-308.

---. "Na shliakhu do pravdy." *Panas Myrnyi. Tvory.* Kyiv: Molod', 1965, pp. 3-24.

---. *Nashchadky pradidiv.* Commentary by Leonid Boiko. Kyiv: Akademia, 1998.

---. "Nove v polititysi i medytsyni." *Tvory v dvokh tomakh*, vol. 2, edited by Leonid Boiko. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1999, pp. 481-504.

---. “Pro samoho sebe.” *Tvory v dvokh tomakh*, vol. 2, edited by Leonid Boiko. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1999, pp. 589-98.

---. *Smert'. Sybirs'ki novely. Zavyshcheni otsinky: povisti, novely, opovidannia.* Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1989, pp. 33-144.

---. *Tvory v dvokh tomakh.* Edited by Leonid Boiko. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1999.

---. *Zdaleka i zblyz'ka.* Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1969.

Arendt, Hannah. “A Classless Society.” *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. HBJ, 1973, pp. 305-340.

Aristotle. *The Politics of Aristotle.* Edited and translated by Ernest Barker. Oxford UP, 1958.

Auerbach, Erich. “The Brown Stocking.” *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature.* Translated by Willard R. Trask. Princeton UP, 1974, pp. 525-53.

Bahrianyi, Ivan. “Ukrains'ka literatura i mystetstvo pid komunistychnym moskovs'kym terorom.” *Suchasnist'*, no. 11, 1994, pp. 13-23. chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Suchasnist/1994_N11_403/. Accessed 10 Sept. 2018.

Balaev, Michelle. “Trends in Literary Trauma Theory.” *Mosaic: An Interdisciplinary Critical Journal*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2008, pp. 149-66. www.jstor.org/stable/44029500. Accessed 28 June 2017.

---. *The Nature of Trauma in American Novels.* Northwestern UP, 2012.

Ballinger, Pamela. “The Culture of Survivors: Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Traumatic Memory.” *History and Memory*, vol. 10, no.1, 1998, pp. 99-132. www.jstor.org/stable/25681021. Accessed 26 Jan. 2017.

Barbusse, Henri. *Under Fire: The Story of a Squad.* Translated by Fitzwater Wray. E.P. Dutton, 1937.

Barrett, Deirdre. “Dreams in Multiple Personality Disorder.” *Trauma and Dreams,* edited by D. Barrett, Harvard UP, 1996, pp. 68-81.

Becker, Jean-Jacques, and Gerd Krumeich. “1914: Outbreak.” *The Cambridge History of the First World War*, vol. 1, edited by Jay Winter and Charles J. Stille, Cambridge UP, 2014, pp. 39-64.

Belknap, Robert L. “Dostoevskii and Psychology.” *The Cambridge Companion to Dostoevskii*, edited by William J. Leatherbarrow, Cambridge UP, 2002, pp. 131-147.

Bennett, Brad L., and John B. Holcomb. “Battlefield Trauma-Induced Hypothermia: Transitioning the Preferred Method of Casualty Rewarming.” *Wildreness and Environmental Medicine*, no. 28, 2017, pp. 83-84, doi: 10.1016/j.wem.2017.03.010. Accessed 15 Feb. 2019.

Berland, Rosa. “The Early Portraits of Oskar Kokoschka: A Narrative of Inner Life.” *Image [&] Narrative*: *Online Magazine of the Visual Narrative*, no. 18, 2007. www.imageandnarrative.be/inarchive/thinking_pictures/berland.htm. Accessed 1 Mar. 2019.

Bezkhutryi, Iurii. “’Ia (Romantyka)’: apokalipsys vid Khvyl'ovoho.” *Khvyl'ovyi: problemy interpretatsii.* Kharkiv: Folio, 2003, pp. 254-311.

Boiko, Iurii. “Antonenko-Davydovych.” *Vybrane,* vol. 1. Munich: Iu. Boiko, 1971, pp. 162-73.

---. “Mykola Khvyliovyi.” *Vybrane,* vol. 1. Munich: Iu. Boiko, 1971, pp. 111-32.

Boiko, Leonid. “Lytsar pravdy i dobra.” *Smert'. Sybirs'ki novely. Zavyshcheni otsinky: povisti, novely, opovidannia.* Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1989, pp. 5-32.

---. “Maister psyholohichnoi prozy.” *Z kohorty oderzhymykh: zhyttia i tvorchist' Borysa Antonenka-Davydovycha v literaturnomu protsesi XX stolittia.* Kyiv: Akademia, 2003, pp. 141-208.

---. *Podvyzhnyk dukhu: dokumenty i fakty z zhyttia Borysa Antonenka-Davydovycha.* Kyiv: Pul'sary, 2003.

---. “Z dorih dalekykh i blyz'kykh.” *Na dovhii nyvi: Vybrani tvory. B. Antonenko-Davydovych.* Kyiv: Dnipro, 1967, pp. 5-24.

Boym, Svetlana. “Estrangement as a Lifestyle: Shklovsky and Brodsky.” *Poetics Today*, vol. 17, no. 4, 1996, pp. 511-530. *JSTOR*, doi: 10.2307/1773211.

Bradbury, Malcolm, and James McFarlane. “The Name and Nature of Modernism.” *Modernism: 1890-1930.* Edited by M. Bradbury and J. McFarlane. Penguin Books, 1981, pp. 19-55.

Brannon, Keith. “Tulane Psychiatrist Wins National Award Research that Shows How Trauma Seeps Across Generations.” *Tulane University News*, 17 Aug. 2018, 1:45 p.m., news.tulane.edu/pr/tulane-psychiatrist-wins-national-award-research-shows-how-trauma-seeps-across-generations.

Caruth, Cathy. “Introduction to Part I. Trauma and Experience.” *Trauma: Explorations in Memory.* Edited by C. Caruth. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1995, pp. VII-12.

---, editor. *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*, Johns Hopkins UP, 1995.

Caughie, Pamela L. “Virginia Woolf: To the Lighthouse.” *A Companion to Modernist Literature and Culture.* Edited by David Bradshaw and Kevin J. H. Dettmar. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2006, pp. 486-98.

Cheremshyna, Marko. *Novely. Posviaty Vasylevi Stefanyku. Ranni tvory. Pereklady. Literaturno-krytychni vystupy. Spohady. Avtobiografiia. Lysty.* Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1987.

Chernenko, Oleksandra. *Ekspresionizm u tvorchosti Vasylia Stefanyka.* Suchasnist', 1989.

---. *Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi – impresionist*. Suchasnist', 1977.

Chilvers, Ian. "Impressionism." *The Oxford Dictionary of Art*, 3rd edition, Oxford UP, 2004, doi: 10.1093/acref/9780198604761.001.0001. Accessed 14 Aug. 2018.

Cohn, Dorrit. *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction.* Princeton UP, 1983.

Cooper, Sandi E. "War: The Anatomy of an Anachronism." *Patriotic Pacifism: Waging War on War in Europe 1815-1914,* Oxford UP, 1991, pp. 140-160.

Crochet, Anne, et al. "Character Study." *Death Is My Trade by Robert Merle (Book Analysis): Detailed Summary, Analysis and Reading Guide*, 2016, www.brightsummaries.com/guide/death-is-my-trade-by-robert-merle-book-analysis/.

Curran, Angela. "Catharsis." *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Aristotle and the Poetics*. Routledge, 2016, pp. 214-235.

Dachy, Marc. *Dada: The Revolt of Art.* Thames and Hudson, 2006.

Dmytrenko, Viktoriia. "Onirychnyi prostir povisti 'Smert'' B. Antonenka-Davydovycha." *Naukovyi visnyk MDU imeni V. Sukhomlyns'koho*, vol. 4, no. 13, 2013, pp. 76-82, nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nvmduf_2014_4.13_16. Accessed 25 Sept. 2018.

Doroshkevych, Oleksandr. "Do istorii modernizmu na Ukraini." *Zhyttia i revoliutsiia*, no. 10, 1925, pp. 70-76.

Dostoyevsky, Fyodor. *Crime and Punishment.* Open Road Media, 2017. *ProQuest*, doi: 9781504044479. Accessed 12 Apr. 2019.

---. "Mykola Khvyl'ovyi." *Tvory v p'iatiokh tomakh*, edited by Hryhorii Kostiuk, vol. 5. NY: Smoloskyp, 1986, pp. 390-398.

Duggett, Michael. "Marx on peasants." *The Journal of Peasant Studies,* vol. 2, no. 2, 1975, pp. 159-182, doi: 10.1080/03066157508437924. Accessed 20 Dec. 2018.

Dvisti lystiv B. Antonenka-Davydovycha. Foreword and annotations by Dmytro Chub. Melbourne: Lastivka Press, 1986.

Farbman, Herschel. "Introduction: The Other Night." *The Other Night: Dreaming, Writing, and Restlessness in Twentieth-Century Literature.* Fordham UP, 2008, pp. 1-22, *ProQuest*, doi: 9780823248261. Accessed 13 Apr. 2019.

Fedoriv, Roman. "Povernennia Osypa Turians'koho." *Poza mezhamy boliu. Syn zemli. Opovidannia.* Kyiv: Dnipro, 1989, pp. 5-16.

Felman, Shoshana, and Dori Laub. *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*. Routledge, 1992.

Filatova, Oksana. "Impresionism v ukrains'kii prozi XX st." *Slovo i chas*, no. 6, 1999, pp. 66-69.

Fowler, Mayhill C. *Beau Monde on Empire's Edge: State and Stage in Soviet Ukraine.* U of Toronto P, 1974. pp. 70-71.

Franko, Ivan. "Dlia domashnioho ohnyscha." *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh,* vol. 19. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1979, pp. 7-143.

---. "Lisova idyliia." *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh,* vol. 3. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1976, pp. 107-109.

Freud, Sigmund. *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Translated by A. A. Brill, 3d edition, Macmillan, 1913.

---. "The Relation of Jokes to Dreams and to the Unconscious." *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious.* Norton, 1960, pp. 159-180.

---. "The Relation of the Poet to Day-Dreaming." *On Creativity and the Unconscious: Papers on the Psychology of Art, Literature, Love, Religion.* Introduction by Benjamin Nelson, Harper and Brothers, 1958, pp. 44-54.

---. "The 'Uncanny'." *On Creativity and the Unconscious: Papers on the Psychology of Art, Literature, Love, Religion.* Introduction by Benjamin Nelson, Harper and Brothers, 1958, pp. 122-161.

"Postwar Politics." *German Expressionism*, www.moma.org/s/ge/curated_ge/themes/postwar_politics.html. Accessed 13 Apr. 2019.

Gerwarth, Robert. "The Continuum of Violence." *The Cambridge History of the First World War*, vol. 2, edited by Jay Winter and Charles J. Stille, Cambridge UP, 2014, pp. 638-662.

Gillespie, Michael Patrick. "James Joyce: Ulysses." *A Companion to Modernist Literature and Culture.* Edited by David Bradshaw and Kevin J. H. Dettmar. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2006, pp. 204-11.

Grabowicz, George G. "Commentary: Exorcising Ukrainian Modernism." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, vol. 15, no. 3/4, 1991, pp. 273-283. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/41036432.

Granofsky, Ronald. “Introduction.” *The Trauma Novel: Contemporary Symbolic Depictions of Collective disaster.* Peter Lang, 1995, pp. 1-19.

Grossman, Manuel L. “The Dada Movement in Europe.” *Dada: Paradox, Mystification, and Ambiguity in European Literature.* Pegasus, 1971, pp. 48-115.

Hartmann, Ernest. “The Nature of Dreaming.” *Dreams and Nightmares: The Origin and Meaning of Dreams.* Perseus, 2001, pp. 1-16.

Hartman, Geoffrey. “On Traumatic Knowledge and Literary Studies.” *New Literary History*, vol. 26, no.3, 1995, pp. 537-563. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/20057300. Accessed 16 May 2017.

---. “Trauma within the Limits of Literature.” *European Journal of English Studies*, 2003, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 257-274, doi.org/10.1076/ejes.7.3.257.27984. Accessed 16 May 2017.

Herman, Luc, and Bart Vervaeck. *Handbook of Narrative Analysis.* U of Nebraska P, 2005.

Hirsch, Carl. “Prophets, Poets, and Power Seekers.” *Theater of the Night: What We Do and Do Not Know About Dreams.* Rand McNally, 1976, pp. 22-33.

Holubets', Mykola. “Peredmova.” *Syn zemli by Osyp Turians'kyi.* Lviv: Ivan Tyktor, 1933, pp. 5-10.

Hundorova, Tamara. “Modernists'kyi dyskurs. Semiotyka tekstu.” *Proiavlennia slova: dyskursiia rannioho ukrains'koho modernizmu. Postmoderna interpretatsiia*. Lviv: Litopys, 1997, pp. 126-206.

---. *Tranzytna kul'tura. Symptomy postkolonial'noi travmy: esei.* Kyiv: Hrani-T, 2013, doi: 978-966-465-389-0. Accessed 10 Apr. 2019.

Huzar, Zenon. *Shkiakhamy literaturnoi slavy ridnoho kraiu. Osyp Turians'kyi: Materialy dlia kraieznavchoi roboty.* Drohobych: Ivan Franko Drohobyts'kyi derzh. ped. instytut, 1990.

Ilnytzkyj, Oleh S. "Private Worlds: The Psychological Dimension of Les' Martovych's Prose." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3/4, 1990, pp. 350-363.

---. "The Cossack and Peasant Ethos in Conflict: Reflections on *Khiba revut' voly, iak iasla povni*?" *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, vol. 13, no. 1, 1988, pp.43-54. *CIUS-Archives*, cius-archives.ca/items/show/732. Accessed 10 Jan. 2019.

---. "The Modernist Ideology and Mykola Khvyl'ovyi." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, vol. 15, no. 3/4, 1991, pp. 257-262. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/41036430. Accessed 15 Jul. 2015.

---. "Responses." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies,* vol. 15, no. 3/4, 1991, pp. 284-288. *JSTOR,* www.jstor.org/stable/41036433. Accessed 20 Jul. 2015.

---. *Ukrainian Futurism, 1914-1930: A Historical and Critical Study*. Harvard UP, 1997.

---. "Ukrainian Symbolism and the Problem of Modernism." *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes,* vol. 34, no. 1/2, 1992, pp. 113-130.

Iurynets', Volodymyr. "M. Khvyl'ovyi iak prozaik." *Tvory v p'iatiokh tomakh*, edited by Hryhorii Kostiuk, vol. 5. NY: Smoloskyp, 1986, pp. 415-438.

Jung, Carl. "Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious." *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, 2d edition, translated by R. F. C. Hull, edited by Gerhard Adler, Princeton UP, 1981. *ProQuest,* doi: 9781400850969. Accessed 04 Jan. 2019, pp. 15-42.

---. "The Concept of the Collective Unconscious" *The Archetypes and the Collective*

Unconscious, 2d edition, translated by R. F. C. Hull, edited by Gerhard Adler, Princeton UP, 1981. *ProQuest,* doi: 9781400850969. Accessed 04 Jan. 2019, pp. 43-51.

---. "Psychological Aspects of the Mother Archetype." *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, 2d edition, translated by R. F. C. Hull, edited by Gerhard Adler, Princeton UP, 1981. *ProQuest,* doi: 9781400850969. Accessed 04 Jan. 2019, pp. 64-90.

Kandel, Eric R. *The Age of Insight: The Quest to Understand the Unconscious in Art, Mind, and Brain, from Vienna 1900 to the Present*. Random House, 2012.

Karmans'kyi, Petro. "Trahediia pys'mennyka Turians'koho." *Dilo*, 05 April 1933.

-----. "Chasamy khochet'sia meni." *Vybir z ukrains'koho narodnoho pys'menstva,* edited by Antin Krushel'nytskyi, vol 2, Kyiv: Chaika, 1922, p. 685.

Kearney, Richard. "Narrating Pain: The Power of Catharsis." *Paragraph*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2007, pp. 51-66. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/43152699. Accessed 05 Jan. 2019.

Kenny, Michael G. "Trauma, Memory, and Catharsis: Anthropological Observations on a Folk-Psychological Construct." *Recollections of Trauma,* edited by Don J. Read and D. Stephen Lindsay, Plenum Press, 1997, pp. 475-481. *SpringerLink*, doi: 978-1-4757-2672-5. Accessed 12 Jan. 2019.

Khakhulia, Oleksander. *B. Antonenko-Davydovych u pazuriakh chekistiv.* Introduction and translation by Dmytro Chub. Melbourne: Lastivka Press, 1987.

Khvyl'ovyi, Mykola. "Dumky proty techiii." *Ukraina chy malorosiia? Pamphlets*, edited by Mykola Zhulyns'kyi. Kyiv: Smoloskyp, 1993, pp. 83-154.

---. "Ia (Romantyka)." *Vybrani tvory.* Kyiv: Veselka, 1993, pp. 25-42.

---. “Lysty.” *Tvory u dvokh tomakh*, vol. 2. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1991, pp. 840-889.

---. “My Self (Romantica).” *Stories from Ukraine*. Translated by Constantine Henry Andrusyshyn, Philosophical Library, 1960, pp. 31-55.

---. “Ukraina chy malorosiia?” *Tvory v p'iatiokh tomakh*, edited by Hryhorii Kostiuk, vol. 4. NY: Smoloskyp, 1983, pp. 413-448.

Klochchia, Andrii. “Borys-Antonenko-Davydovych. ‘Zemleiu ukrains'koiu. Literaturnyi reportazh.” *Molodniak,* 1930, no. 3, pp. 139-141, escriptorium.univer.kharkov.ua/handle/1237075002/5666. Accessed 24 Sept. 2018.

Kobylians'ka, Ol'ha. “Lyst zasudzhenoho voiaka do svoiei zhinky.” *Tvory v dvokh tomakh,* vol. 2, Kyiv: Dnipro, 1988, pp. 497-502.

Kostiuk, Hryhorii. “Mykola Khvyliovyi.” *Mykola Khvyl'ovyi. Tvory v p'iatiokh tomakh,* vol 1, Toronto: Smoloskyp, 1978, pp. 15-106.

Kratochvil, Alexander. “Between Cultural Memory and Trauma: An Interpretation of Mykola Khvyl'ovyi’s ‘My Being’.” *Ukraine and Europe: Cultural Encounters and Negotiations*, edited by Giovanna Brogi Bercoff, Marko Pavlyshyn and Serhii Plokhy, University of Toronto Press, 2017, pp. 361-73.

Kuiken, Don. “An Enriched Conception of Dream Metaphor.” *Sleep and Hypnosis*, no.1, 1999, pp.112-121, www.academia.edu/1827608/An_enriched_conception_of_dream_metaphor. Accessed 04 Apr. 2019.

---. “The Dream Poet.” Lecture, 8 Sept. 2015, University of Alberta.

---. “The Contrasting Effects of Nightmares, Existential Dreams, and Transcendent Dreams.” *Dream Research: Contributions to Clinical Practice*, edited by Milton Kramer and

Myron Glucksman, Routledge, 2015. *EBSCOhost*, doi: 9781317645801. Accessed 07 Mar. 2019, pp. 174-187.

Kukharenko, Svitlana. "Traditional Ukrainian Folk Beliefs about Death and the Afterlife." *Folklorica*, vol. 16, 2011, pp. 65-86.

Kukhar, Roman. *Videns'ka "Sich": Istoriia ukrains'koho akademichnoho t-va "Sich" u Vidni (1868-1947).* Kyiv: Kobza, 1994.

Kuz'mina, Iryna. "Ekspresiia ta psykholohism sotsial'nykh novel Vasylia Stefanyka." *Molod' i rynok*, vol. 5, no.160, 2018, pp. 124-128, nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Mir_2018_5_24. Accessed 06 Nov. 2018.

LaCapra, Dominick. *Writing History, Writing Trauma.* Johns Hopkins UP, 2001.

Lakuza, Ivan. "Pro suchasnist' u suchasnii literaturi (z pryvodu 'Smerti' B. Antonenka-Davydovycha)." *Zhyttia i revolutsiia*, no. 11, 1928, pp. 111-118, elib.nlu.org.ua/view.html?id=1172.

Lavrinenko, Iurii. "Borys Antonenko-Davydovych." *Rozstriliane vidrodzhennia: Antolohiia 1917-1933*. Munich: Kultura, 1959, pp. 479-482.

---. "Mykola Khvyl'ovyi." *Rozstriliane vidrodzhennia: Antolohiia 1917-1933*. Munich: Kultura, 1959, pp. 393-405.

Lebedivna, Larysa. "Ukrains'ke oblychchia viiny (povist'-poema O. Turians'koho 'Poza mezhamy boliu. Kartyna z bezodni')." *Slovo i chas*, no. 12, 2004, pp. 50-56.

Lepkyi, Bohdan. "Poza mezhamy boliu." *Nezabutni. Literaturni narysy.* Berlin: Ukrains'ke slovo, 1922, pp. 66-73.

Luckyj, George. *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine,* 1917-1934. Duke UP, 1990.

---. "Introduction." *Stories from Ukraine*. Philosophical Library, 1960, pp. 1-13.

Luts'kyi, Ostap. "Moloda Muza." *Ostap Luts'kyi-molodomuzets'*, edited by Iurii Luts'kyi. Introduction by Bohdan Rubchak, NY: Slovo, 1968, pp. 55-59.

Lydon, Mary. "Myself and M/others: Colette, Wilde and Duchamp." *Literary Theories: A Reader and Guide*, edited by Julian Wolfreys, Edinburgh UP, 1999, pp. 84-92.

Mace, James. *Communism and the Dilemmas of National Liberation: National Communism in Soviet Ukraine, 1918-1933,* Harvard UP, 1983.

Maftyn, Natalia. "Poetyka ekspresionizmu v romani Osypa Turians'koho 'Poza mezhamy boliu' ta povisti Leonida Andrieieva 'Chervonyi smikh." *Slovo i chas*, no. 10, 2011, pp. 24-32.

Malaniuk, Ievhen. "13 travnia 1933." *Tvory v p'iatioh tomakh*, edited by Hryhorii Kostiuk, vol. 5, NY: Smoloskyp, 1986, pp. 464-71.

Martovych, Les'. *Tvory*. Kyiv: Derzhavne vyd-vo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1954.

McFarlane, James. "The Mind of Modernism." *Modernism: 1890-1930.* Edited by Malcolm Bradbury and J. McFarlane. Penguin Books, 1981, pp. 71-94.

McHale, Brian. "Islands in the Stream of Consciousness: Dorrit Cohn's Transparent Minds." *Poetics Today*, vol. 2, no. 2, 1981, pp. 183-191. *JSTOR,* www.jstor.org/stable/1772196. Accessed 20 Dec. 2017.

Merle, Robert. *Smert' – moe remeslo.* Translated by Goratsyi Velle. St. Petersburg: Kristall, 2001.

Mick, Christoph. "1918: Endgame." *The Cambridge History of the First World War*, vol. 1, edited by Jay Winter and Charles J. Stille, Cambridge UP, 2014, pp. 133-171.

Morag, Raya. *Waltzing with Bashir: Perpetrator Trauma and Cinema.* I.B. Taurus, 2013.

Myers, Bernard S. *Expressionism: A Generation in Revolt*. Thames and Hudson, 1963,

pp.38-50.

Mykytiak, Andrew. “Translator’s note.” *Turiansky, Osyp. Lost Shadows*, translated by A. Mykytiak, Empire Books, 1935. pp. 8-9.

Myrnyi, Panas, and Ivan Bilyk. “Khiba revut' voly, iak iasla povni?” *Panas Myrnyi. Tvory.* Kyiv: Molod', 1965, pp. 89-412.

Nadal, Marita, and Mónica Calvo, editors. *Trauma in Contemporary Literature: Narrative and Representation*. Routledge, 2014.

Nestelieiev, Maksym. “Avtodestruktyvne pohranychchia u tvorakh Borysa Antonenka-Davydovycha.” *Visnyk Lvivs'koho universytetu,* vol. 60, no. 2, 2014, pp. 262-266, nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Vlnu_fil_2014_60(2)__32.

---. “Poza mezhamy i u mezhakh: Osyp Turians'kyi i ioho naividomishyi tvir.” *Dyvoslovo*, no. 11, 2012, pp. 50-56.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. “From *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872).” *The Princeton Sourcebook in Comparative Literature: From the European Enlightenment to the Global Present,* edited by David Damrosch, Natalie Melas and Mbongiseni Buthelezi, Princeton UP, 2009, pp. 26-40.

“Nova hromada, journal.” *Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/previous.asp?bottomMenuDisplay=pages%5CN%5CO%5CNovahromadajournalIT.htm&KidNumer=9895. Accessed 03 Dec. 2018.

Oliinyk-Rakhmannyi, Roman. “Narod na porozi Ievropy.” *Literaturno-ideolohichni napriamky v Zakhidnii Ukraini (1919-1939 rr.).* Kyiv: Chetverta khvylia, 1999, pp. 8-26.

Palmer, Alan. "Introduction." *Fictional minds.* U of Nebraska P, 2004, pp. 1-27. *EBSCOhost*, doi: 9780803204102. Accessed 31 Aug. 2017.

Panchenko, Volodymyr. "Khvyl'ovyi: istoriia iliuzii i prozrin'" *Poliuvannia na "Val'dshnepa." Rozsekrechenyi Mykola Khvyl'ovyi,* edited by Iurii Shapoval, introduction by Iu. Shapoval and V. Panchenko, Kyiv: Tempora, 2009, pp. 46-81.

Paris, Bernard J. "The Uses of Psychology: Characters and Implied Authors." *A Psychological Approach to Fiction: Studies in Thackeray, Stendhal, George Eliot, Dostoevsky, and Conrad,* 1st edition, Routledge, 2010, pp. 1-27. *EBSCOhost*, doi: 9781351534581. Accessed 10 Apr. 2019.

Pavlychko, Solomia. *Dyskurs modernizmu v ukrains'kii literaturi*. Kyiv: Lybid', 1999.

Pechars'kyi, Andrii. "'Poza mezhamy boliu' O. Turians'koho: funktsia personazha iak 'figury' nesvidomoho." *Slovo i chas*, no.1, 1999, pp. 25-29.

Pinchuk, Stepan. "Osyp Turians'kyi." *Poza mezhamy boliu. Syn zemli. Opovidannia.* Kyiv: Dnipro, 1989, pp. 17-39.

Pinchuk, Stepan. "Syluet na kameni." *Vitchyzna*, no. 11, 1968, pp. 174-184.

Plöhn, Robert. "Estetychno-krytychni zamitky do tvoru Osypa Turians'koho 'Poza mezhamy boliu.'" *Poza mezhamy boliu. Kartyna z bezodni*, by Osyp Turians'kyi. Vienna: UMNA, 1921, pp. I-LIV.

Pollock, Griselda. "Art/Trauma/Representation." *Parallax*, vol. 15, no.1, 2009, pp. 40-54, doi.org/10.1080/13534640802604372. Accessed 10 May 2017.

Poliukhovych, Ol'ha. "Fenomen alienatsii v ukrains'kii prozi 1920-1940-h rokiv." *National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy*, 2015, pp. 1-21. ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/handle/123456789/4326. Accessed 09 Apr. 2019.

Prokhas'ko, Taras. “Persha svitova viina v ukrains'kii literaturi. Osyp Turians'kyi.” *YouTube*, uploaded by Betv, 1 Mar. 2014, www.youtube.com/watch?v=g6rdEMKEHTc. Accessed 30 Dec. 2018.

Psychic Trauma, edited by Sidney S. Furst, Basic books, 1967, p. 37.

Radstone, Susannah. “Trauma Theory: Contexts, Politics, Ethics.” *Paragraph*, vol.30, no.1, 2007, pp. 9-29. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/i40123216. Accessed 05 Sept. 2018.

Reient, Oleksandr. “Peredmova.” *Velyka viina 1914-1918 rr. i Ukraina. Istorychni narysy,* vol. 1, edited by O. Reient. Kyiv: Klio, 2014, pp. 9-16.

---. “Persha svitova viina i politychni syly ukrainstva.” *Velyka viina 1914-1918 rr. i Ukraina. Istorychni narysy,* vol. 1, edited by O. Reient. Kyiv: Klio, 2014, pp. 302-318.

---. “Vplyv velykoi viiny 1914-1918 na tsyvilizatsiini protsesy v Ukraini (do 90-richchia pershoi svitovoi viiny).” *Spetsial'ni istorychni dystsypliny: pytannia teorii ta metodyky*, no. 11, 2004, pp. 138-146, resource.history.org.ua/publ/sid_2004_11_2_138. Accessed 10 Apr. 2019.

Reinhold, Heller. “Expressionism.” *Oxford Bibliographies*, 2017, dx.doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199920105-0027. Accessed 10 Mar. 2019.

Rheinschmiedt, Otto M. *The Fictions of Dreams: Dreams, Literature and Writing.* Karnac, 2017, doi: 9781782415916. Accessed 14 Mar. 2019.

Rubliov, O. S. “Zahidnoukrains'ka intelihentsia v roky viiny.” *Velyka viina 1914-1918 rr. i Ukraina. Istorychni narysy,* vol. 1, edited by O. Reient. Kyiv: Klio, 2014, pp. 342-363.

Saira Mohamed. “Of Monsters and Men: Perpetrator Trauma and Mass Atrocity.” *Columbia Law Review*, vol. 115, no.6, pp. 1157-1216, scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/facpubs/2500/. Accessed 20 Sept. 2017.

Sass, Louis Arnorsson. *Madness and Modernism: Insanity in the Light of Modern Art, Literature, and Thought.* Harvard UP, 1992.

Schroer, Timothy L. “Civilization, Barbarism, and the Ethos of Self-Control among the Perpetrators.” *German Studies Review*, vol. 35, no. 1, 2012, pp. 33–54. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/23269607.

Schwartz, Sanford. *The Matrix of Modernism: Pound, Eliot, and Early Twentieth-Century Thought.* Princeton UP, 1985.

Schwenger, Peter. “Writing Hypnagogia.” *Critical Inquiry*, 34, no. 3, 2008, pp. 423-439. doi.org/10.1086/589487. Accessed 05 Oct. 2017.

Scott, Clive. “Symbolism, Decadence and Impressionism.” *A Guide to European Literature, 1890-1930,* edited by Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, Penguin Books, 1985, pp. 206-227.

Shapoval, Iurii. *Poliuvannia na “Val'dshnepa.” Rozsekrechenyi Mykola Khvyl'ovyi*, edited by Iu. Shapoval. Introduction by Iu. Shapoval and Volodymyr Panchenko. Kyiv: Tempora, 2009.

---. “Fatal'na ambivalentnist'.” *Rozsekrechenyi Mykola Khvyl'ovyi,* edited by Iu. Shapoval, introduction by Iu. Shapoval and Volodymyr Panchenko. Kyiv: Tempora, pp. 12-45.

Shchupak, Samiilo. “Psevdomarksysm Khvyliovoho.” *Mykola Khvyl'ovyi. Tvory v p'iatiokh tomakh*, vol. 5. NY: Smoloskyp, 1986, pp. 401-414.

Sheppard, Richard. "German Expressionism." *A Guide to European Literature, 1890-1930,* edited by Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, Penguin Books, 1985, pp. 274-291.

Shkandrij, Myroslav. "Interwar Nationalism, 1922-38." *Ukrainian Nationalism: Politics, Ideology, and Literature, 1929-1956,* Yale Scholarship Online, 2015, pp. 17-49, doi:10.12987/yale/9780300206289.001.0001. Accessed 12 Feb. 2019.

---. *Modernists, Marxists and the Nation: The Ukrainian Literary Discussion of the 1920s.* Edmonton: CIUS, 1992.

---. "Mykola Khvylovy and the Literary Discussion." *The Cultural Renaissance in Ukraine. Polemical Pamphlets, 1925-1926*, translated and edited by M. Shkandrij, Edmonton: CIUS, 1986, pp. 1-36.

---. *Russia and Ukraine: Literature and the Discourse of Empire from Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times.* McGill-Queen's UP, 2001, pp. 3-34.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Art as Technique." *Theory of Prose,* translated by Benjamin Sher, Dalkey Archive Press, 1990, pp. 1-14.

Smolych, Iurii. "Vaplite i ia." *Rozpovidi pro nespokii*, vol. 7, Kyiv: Dnipro, 1986, pp. 84-97.

Stacy, Robert H. *Defamiliarization in Language and Literature.* Syracuse UP, 1977.

States, Bert O. "The Master Forms." *Dreaming and Storytelling.* Cornell UP, 1993, pp. 83-110.

Staub, Ervin. "The Psychology of Bystanders, Perpetrators, and Heroic Helpers." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, vol. 17, 1993, pp. 315-341, dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(93)90037-9. Accessed 03 Aug. 2018.

Stefanyk, Vasyl'. *Klenovi lystky*. *Novely.* Kyiv: Dnipro, 1978.

---. *Maple Leaves and Other Stories.* Kyiv: Dnipro, 1988.

Tarnawska, Marta. "Borys Antonenko-Davydovych. *Behind the Curtain*." *Nashe zhyttia*, no. 10, vol. 37, 1980, pp. 12-13.

Tearle, Oliver. *Bewilderments of Vision: Hallucination and Literature, 1880-1994.* Sussex Academic P, 2013.

The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism. "Modernist Theory and Criticism." Edited by Michael Groden, Martin Kreiswirth, and Imre Szeman, 2d ed., The Johns Hopkins UP, 2005, pp. 657-60.

Thompson, Evan. *Waking, Dreaming, Being: Self and Consciousness in Neuroscience, Meditation, and Philosophy.* Columbia UP, 2015.

Tkach, Yuri. *Duel*. Melbourne: Lastivka, 1986.

Tolstoy, Leo. *Chto takoe iskusstvo?* Introduction by Militsa Greene, Bradda Books, 1963.

---. *Voina i mir*, vols. 1, 2, Moscow: Uchpedgiz, 1960.

---. *War and Peace.* Translated by Constance Garnett, introduction by A. N. Wilson, The Modern Library, 2002.

Toner, Anne. "Ellipsis and Modernity." *Ellipsis in English Literature: Signs of Omission*. Cambridge UP, 2015, pp. 151–170, doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139680974. Accessed 10 Jan. 2019.

Turians'kyi, Osyp. *Borot'ba za velykist'. Opovidannia.* Kyiv: Zhuravli, 1926.

---. "De sontse?" *Sich. Al'manakh*, edited by Zenon Kuzelia and Mykola Chaikivs'kyi. Lviv: Naukove tov-vo im. Shevchenka, 1908, pp. 63-66.

---. *Duma pralisu*. Kyiv: Apol'on, 1921.

---. “Ei, kob mene buly vchyly.” *Sich. Al'manakh*, edited by Zenon Kuzelia and Mykola Chaikivs'kyi, Lviv: Naukove tov-vo im. Shevchenka, 1908, pp. 248-54.

---. “Kurka.” *Sich. Al'manakh*, edited by Zenon Kuzelia and Mykola Chaikivs'kyi, Lviv: Naukove tov-vo im. Shevchenka, 1908, pp. 351-55.

---. *Lost Shadows*. Translated by Andrew Mykytiak, Empire Books, 1935.

---. *Poza mezhamy boliu.* Vienna: UMNA, 1921.

---. *Poza mezhamy boliu. Syn zemli. Opovidannia*. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1989, pp. 41-127.

---. “Perednie slovo.” *Poza mezhamy boliu. Syn zemli. Opovidannia*. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1989, pp. 42-43.

---. *Raby. Komediia v chotyriokh diiakh,* 3rd edition, Kyiv: Zhuravli*,* 1927, pp. 156-60.

---. *Syn zemli.* Lviv: Ivan Tyktor, 1933.

Stech, Marko Robert. “Turiansky, Osyp.” *Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CT%5CU%5CTurianskyOsyp.htm. Accessed 20 Feb. 2019.

Tychyna, Pavlo. “Enharmoniine.” *Zolotyi Homin: Poezii (zbirka zbirok).* Lviv: Novi Shliakhy, 1922, pp. 25-26.

Van der Kolk, Bessel. *The Body Keeps the Score: Brain, Mind, and Body in the Healing of Trauma.* Penguin Books, 2015.

Van der Kolk, Bessel A., and Onno Van der Hart. “The Intrusive Past: The Flexibility of Memory and the Engraving of Trauma.” *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*, edited by Cathy Caruth, Johns Hopkins UP, 1995, pp. 159-77.

Vice, Sue. "Exploring the Fictions of Perpetrator Suffering." *Journal of Literature and Trauma Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1/2, 2013, pp. 15-25, doi.org/10.1353/jlt.2014.0006. Accessed 20 Feb 2018.

Volkovyns'kyi, V. "Boiovi dii." *Velyka viina 1914-1918 rr. i Ukraina. Istorychni narysy*, vol. 1, edited by Oleksandr Reient, Kyiv: Klio, 2014, pp. 140-59.

Voronyi, Mykola. "Ivanovi Frankovi (Vidpovid' na ioho *Poslaniie*)." *Tvory*, Kyiv: Dnipro, 1989, pp. 162-64.

Waller, James E. "Perpetrators of the Holocaust: Divided and Unitary Self Conceptions of Evildoing." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1996, pp. 11-33, doi.org/10.1093/hgs/10.1.11. Accessed 05 March 2018.

Winter, Jay. "Introduction to Volume I" *The Cambridge History of the First World War*, vol. 1, edited by J. Winter and Charles J. Stille, Cambridge UP, 2014, pp. 1-15.

---. "Introduction to Volume II." *The Cambridge History of the First World War*, vol. 2, edited by J. Winter and Charles J. Stille, Cambridge UP, 2014, pp. 1-3.

Yekelchyk, Serhy. "Soviet National Patriots." *Stalin's Empire of Memory: Russian-Ukrainian relations in the Soviet historical imagination,* U of Toronto P, 2004, pp. 13-32.

Zhulyns'kyi, Mykola. "Talant, shcho prahnuv do zir." *Tvory u dvokh tomakh*, vol. 1. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1991, pp. 5-43.