

DOI: 10.31861/pytlit2018.98.191

УДК 821.111(73)-312.9Сай.09

THE FANTASTIC SHAKESPEARE: CHARACTER'S PASSIONARY CONFOCALITY IN THE ASPECT OF RECEPTION

Alyona Tychinina

orcid.org/0000-0001-6316-2005

a.tychinina@chnu.edu.ua

*Department of World Literature, Theory of Literature and Slavic Philology
Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University
2 Kotsiubynsky str., 58012, Chernivtsi, Ukraine*

Dan Paranyuk

orcid.org/0000-0002-7274-5576

paranyukdan@gmail.com

*Department of World Literature, Theory of Literature and Slavic Philology
Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University
2 Kotsiubynsky str., 58012, Chernivtsi, Ukraine*

Abstract. Based on J. Baudrillard's methodology on the beginning of the era of hyperreality as the "world of simulation", the article under discussion substantiates the expansion of science fiction horizons by means of "reversing the imaginary". The latter notion is mostly marked with the inter-penetration of fictional worlds, which are genealogically revealed only in their connection with new genre forms. Particular emphasis in the "hyperreal indifference" of science fiction narratives has been laid on intertextual ties. The article updates the issue of intertextual potential of the personosphere of science fiction and fantasy, which, according to Tz. Todorov, presupposes "reader's active integration into the world of characters". In this way, the specifics of including the "fantasy" characters of Shakespeare's plays into the intertextual space of science fiction has been analyzed.

Much attention has been paid to the figure of William Shakespeare as a character in literary texts by American science fiction writer Clifford Simak (1904–1988) "The Goblin Reservation" (1968) and "Shakespeare's Planet" (1976). Another emphasis has been laid on

the peculiarities of synthesizing science fiction and fantasy that form the so-called “simulative hyperreality” by means of combining several models of personosphere – fairy, fantastic, fantasy, mystical, and other – in the creative activities of C. Simak. They function in accordance with the principle of combining the image fields, whose imagological vectors are constantly intersecting with each other. What is more, the personosphere has been attracted not by the protagonist, but by some confocal figure (a sage or a sentinel, according to C. Jung), who is absolutely neutral, however has a reliable “point of view”, thus winning reader’s receptive trust.

In this case, W. Shakespeare is regarded as a confocal and, at the same time, passionary character, for he is presented as an imaginative nucleus of a personosphere, and not only as an intertextual phantasm (according to R. Barthes) or an atropomic allusion. Therefore, this “penetration” of Shakespeare into science fiction may be considered as an essential intertextual ideogeme (according to J. Kristeva). Entering the world of other characters, his passionary status pushes away the center of the personosphere, thus generating the development of plot events. This is why the chronotope version, suggested by the American writer (whereby realistic, fantastic, fantasy and even mystical characters coexist quite peacefully), stands out as rather logical for Shakespeare’s timeless image, whose idiorhythmic nature is able to fit any context, ironically refuting the so-called “Shakespeare’s Question”. The article under studies also points out Shakespeare’s interrelations with a mystical anthropomorphic character Spirit, whose “traces” (in J. Derrida’s interpretation) frequently “run into” the figure of Shakespeare. Hence, it might be concluded that Shakespeare’s immanent presence strengthens the integrity of a literary text, as well as denounces the inferiority of its function in the personosphere, whereas in the aspect of reception, it intercepts the readers’ attention, shifting away the rest of the imaginative centers of the novel.

Key words: science fiction, fantasy, passionary character, confocal image, simulacrum, William Shakespeare, Clifford Simak.

Despite J. Baudrillard’s ambiguous statement that “the «good old» SF imagination is dead” [12, p. 126] – which has outlined the borders of “expanding universes” of classic science fiction [12, p. 128] in his work “Simulacra and Simulation” (1981) – the scholar still dwells on the so-called “reversion of the imaginary”: “when there is no more virgin ground left to the imagination, when the map covers all the territory, something like the reality principle disappears” [12, p. 129]. The French philosopher means, above all, the expansion of borders and the

reconstruction of the science fiction discourse episteme. The latter has long been associated with keeping to certain criteria, which immanently contradicts the very essence of fiction. It is the time formation of space that J. Derrida referred to as *Differance*. At the same time, it is worth mentioning that at its basis lies the notion of “science fiction method”, which only in genealogical respect may be divided into science fiction, post-apocalypses, (anti) utopia, the so-called “horror”, as well as fantasy with its numerous modifications.

Since the notion of fantastic is usually defined in the correlation with the notions of real and imaginary [15], and science fiction “has always played upon the *double*, on artificial replication or imaginary duplication” [12, p. 131], J. Baudrillard speaks of the beginning of the era of hyperreality as the “world of simulation” [12, p. 129–130]. He is sure that “it is the hyperrealist indifference that constitutes the true «science-fictional» quality” [12, p. 132]. In literature, this idea might be implemented as an interaction, or even integration, of different worlds, numerous realities, as well as stratification of several chronological dimensions and genealogical dynamics from science fiction to fantasy. Undoubtedly, in such cases, the authors of fictional narrations most often appeal to the classic literary heritage.

Updating the paradigm of genre in the field of Literary Studies, O. Chervinska emphasizes on the sources of fantasy, which reach as far back as the Ancient times, “mostly denoting one of classic and ancient techniques of literary fantasizing” [10, p. 45]. The researcher is convinced that the very History of Literature “proves rather the metamorphic nature of a quite limited number of genre forms than the systematic enrichment with any genre-making experience” [10, p. 45]. At the same time, the phenomenon of intertextuality is an immanent quality of literature on the whole, and the metamorphic nature of the meta-genre of fantasy in particular [10, p. 46]. Together with the active application of reminiscences and literary allusions, the issue of the intertextual potential of personosphere is getting more and more important. L. Heckman, N. Nikoriak, S. Namestiuk, G. Khazagerov have investigated the issue in the context of various literary problems. Nevertheless, it lacks sufficient consideration at the level of literary science fiction and fantasy.

Taking into account Tz. Todorov’s theory regarding “readers’ predictable integration into the world of characters” [15, p. 30] in science

fiction and fantasy (for instance, the texts by P. Anderson, T. Pratchett, J. Crowley, N. Hayman, J. Tolkien, T. Williams), it is worth noting that this intertextual circle contains the characters of Shakespeare's plays. The way the latter have been introduced there, is best described by the phrase "Shakespeare's genius" [13, p. 60]. Shakespeare's images, introduced into a science fiction context, are the objects of reconsideration. In addition, they are able to reflect "the secondary world" [7, p. 176]. Naturally, in such cases, science fiction authors most frequently use "fantasy" pretexts ("A Midsummer Night's Dream", "Macbeth" and "The Tempest") due to the fact that "Shakespeare's play always touches upon the most crucial issue of fantasy – the issue of interaction between the bordering worlds and their inhabitants, particularly between the immortal creatures <...> and mortal humans" [7, p. 176]. Therefore, the personosphere of classic fantasy, more seldom – that of science fiction, is usually formed relying on the images of various magic creatures that perform the above-mentioned functions (according to the terminology of V. Propp).

For example, E. Kanchura, while analyzing T. Pratchett's alternative worlds, refers to Shakespeare's comedy "A Midsummer Night's Dream" and comes to a conclusion about the metatextual effect of "a double parody" [2, p. 275]. In other words, Apuleius – Shakespeare – Pratchett:

A charming smile of Shakespeare's elves turns into masters' grin at the mortal. Pratchett deprives the images of fairy-tale heroes, who administer happy destinies, of a romantic flare and reminds of the primary folklore reception of elves as an alien and incomprehensible folk [2, p. 278].

Thus, the transitive images of extraordinary creatures (whose presence determines the respective science fiction genre), removed by Shakespeare from mythological or folklore contexts and introduced into a literary space, constitute the basis of the personosphere of classic and modern fantasy.

As a rule, the popularity of intertextual potential of the Great Bard's literary texts is closely associated with the fact that W. Shakespeare (1564–1616) is presented (according to H. Bloom) not only as the center of the Canon, substantiated by "cognitive acuity, linguistic energy, and power of invention" [13, p. 46], but also as a creator of "an enormous number of metaphors that have entered the Western civilization and get permanently updated in various field of its

activities” [9, p. 178]. N. Torkut points out that Shakespeare is becoming the founder of “new discourse” (term by M. Foucault) [9, p. 179]. “The name of Shakespeare or, to be more specific, the concept of Shakespeare, as a cultural metaphor that functions in a sociocultural field” [9, p. 179], determines the extratextual level of interpretative metaphorization. This may be regarded as a significant culturological indicator of the personosphere of a literary text.

However, W. Shakespeare, as an intertextual character of a science fiction metagenre, is an exceptional phenomenon. In the 60s–70-s of the XX century, his image was actively involved in the texts by an American science fiction writer Clifford Simak (1904–1988): the novel “The Goblin Reservation” (1968), later “Shakespeare’s Planet” (1976). The creative activities of this author mostly revealed the peculiarities of “contacts between the representatives of different galactic civilizations” [6, p. 471]. It is important that the above-mentioned period of literature is considered to be “the golden age” of science and social-philosophical fiction [3, p. 13]. It was mostly presented by the works of A. Azimov, C. Simak, H. Kuttner, T. Sturgeon, O. Stapledon, R. Heinlein, K. Chapek, as well as was marked with growing popularity of fantasy (H. Evers, M. Eliade, H. Lovecraft, G. Meyrink). In particular, American literature of this genre has faced an anthropological “turn to a human being”, the activation of social-critical motives [3, p. 75], as well as the synthesis of basic elements of science fiction and fantasy, especially in the works by C. Simak.

O. Kovtun deals with the efficiency of combining science fiction and fantasy, as two reality models, related, above all, to the respective types of world perception, emphasizing on a slight difference between them. She substantiates this point of view by the fact that there exists a considerable number of works, where these two genre models are joined together, interpenetrate, and even “germinate” [3, p. 118–119], creating the so-called “simulative hyperreality” (according to J. Baudrillard). Not only C. Simak was engaged in synthesizing these two literary genres, but also V. Berestov, I. Varshavsky, H. Kuttner, A. and B. Strugatsky, R. Sheckley, J. Rowling, and others.

Keeping in mind J. Baudrillard’s concept of simulative hyperreality, this genre situation might be explained by the fact that science fiction appeals to

the resurrection of the “historical” worlds of the past, trying to reconstruct *in vitro* and down to its tiniest details the various episodes of bygone days: events, persons, defunct ideologies – all now empty of meaning and of their original essence, but hypnotic with retrospective truth [12, p. 137].

Here, we might even speak of the so-called “simulation field”:

Models no longer constitute an imaginary domain with reference to the real; they are, themselves, an apprehension of the real, and thus leave no room for any fictional extrapolation – they are immanent, and therefore leave no room for any kind of transcendentalism [12, p. 137].

It would be expedient to note that the personosphere of C. Simak’s novels has been built in a very peculiar way. Despite the generally accepted genre canons, it includes both humans (fiction characters, real historic figures, artists, literary heroes), animals, anthropo- and zoomorphic simulacra, characters of science fiction type (inventors, biomechs, aliens) and fairy-tale-fantasy images (ghosts, goblins, fairies, trolls, magicians, dinosaurs, dragons). In fact, in “The Goblin Reservation”, all these characters study on the Earth, so that the planet has turned into “a great galactic university”: “*Earth was the galactic melting pot, a place where beings from the thousand stars met and mingled to share their thoughts and cultures*” [14]. Since the fantastic is viewed as “the border experience” [15, p. 80], C. Simak builds his personosphere in accordance with the principle of combining the image fields, whose imagological lines are constantly intersecting. What is more, the personosphere has been attracted not by the protagonist, but by some secondary figure (a sage or a sentinel, according to C. Jung), who is absolutely neutral, although has a reliable “point of view”, thus winning the so-called “reader’s receptive trust”.

It is interesting that in this context, William Shakespeare looks, at first sight, as a secondary, though passionary character. His image functions as an imaginative nucleus of the personosphere and not only as an intertextual phantasm (according to R. Barthes) or an atropomic allusion. Since passionarity of the secondary is “logically regarded as an internal constituent of crisis situations” [11, p. 228], it may be also extrapolated into the field of genres: here, we mean the crisis of science

fiction. We refer to the peculiarity of a passionary character as to “the energetic surplus that exceeds, at a given moment, the needs of a certain individual or entirety” [11, p. 227]. Consequently, any character, as “a visible and identified individuality” (according to M. Bakhtin) with a passionary status, entering the world of other protagonists, shifts away the center of the personosphere and thus generates plot events.

Readers’ receptive attention gets attached to the figure of W. Shakespeare for the first time, when the main character of “The Goblin Reservation” Peter Maxwell comes across an announcement, printed in an Old-English script. At this point, C. Simak starts his intertextual game with the recipients:

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, ESQ.
Of Stratford-on-Avon, England
“How It Happened I Did Not Write The Plays”
Under the Sponsorship of Time College
Oct. 22, 8 P.M: Time Museum Auditorium
Tickets available at all agencies [14].

The very fact of Shakespeare’s presence goes beyond the frames of his biography, being supplemented with exact coordinates of his future quasi-lecture. In this way, the recipient becomes involved in the plot events and determines his further horizon of expectations, later specified by Shakespeare’s name on the commercial cloth of the museum. Shakespeare’s name is also closely related to the activities of the English Department at the Institute of Time, whose staff have proved that “*the Earl of Oxford, not Shakespeare, had been the author of the plays*” [14]. The so-called “Shakespeare’s Question”, articulated by C. Simak, generates numerous interpretants of the image.

Due to the fact that science fiction discourse presupposes not only the existence of “some strange event causing a wide range of emotions of both a reader and a hero, but also a peculiar manner of reading <...>: it should be neither «poetic» nor «allegoric»” [15, p. 31], we interpret Shakespeare’s presence in C. Simak’s works in an intertextual manner. When the English Classic suddenly turns up in the future, everyone starts expressing respect for him, especially «an awful lot of creeps from English Lit [14], united by the common object of their scientific research – Shakespeare himself. In Simak’s text, Shakespeare’s indisputable

authority is often considered as “a measure of all things”, as a constant object of comparison of different historical epochs.

The American science fiction writer interprets the speculations about the difference between real and recorded history from the point of view of biased judgments and tendentiousness. He treats them as the collapse of “cozy little worlds” [14]. A vivid example of this is Shakespeare’s authorship. He has violated the peace and harmony at the Institute of Time and “*is forced to make a sideshow out of history to earn a little money*” [14]. That is the reason why Shakespeare’s promoted lecture on how he did not write his plays becomes a huge problem for the University Administration:

William Shakespeare is not any easy man to handle. He wanted at once to go out and have a look at this new age of which he’d been told so much. Time had a rough time persuading him to change his Elizabethan dress for what we wear today, but they positively refused to let him go until he agreed to it. And now Time is sweating out what might happen to him. They have to keep him in tow, but they can’t do anything, that will get his back up. They have sold the hall down to the last inch of standing room and they can’t take the chance that anything will happen [14].

Shakespeare’s figure covers an integral storyline canvas. The passionarity of this “confocal” character is revealed through the tendency to its symbolic disappearing and returning, which is of rather systematic nature. In this way, his escape turns into “Shakespeare circus we are putting on”: “*Can you envision the ruckus there would be if a man like Shakespeare should not be returned to his proper age*” [14]. What is more, Simak’s Shakespeare does not even plan to attend his own lecture: “*Forsooth, and if I did attend it, they would forthwith, once that I had finished, whisk me home again*” [14], thus ascertaining the cunningness of his plan to stay in the timeless context. Particularly indicative is the scene when Shakespeare’s “confocal” image comes across “the world of principal characters”. The relaxation of a man with “a white-toothed smile flashed above the beard”, enthusiastic about the taste of ale (“stuff soft to the palate and pleasing to the stomach”) [14], is narrowed down to his pondering over the attempt to stay in the present time for good. In addition, the plausibility of Shakespeare’s image is strengthened by the personal details from his biography, which

produces an impression of realism of his mystified image upon the readers: “I left at home, said Shakespeare, a wife with a nagging tongue and I would be rather loath to return to her” [14].

It is interesting that Shakespeare expresses his thoughts in the spirit of language stylistics of the XVI century: “*I deem me fortunate <...> to have fallen in with such rough and rowdy fellows*” [14]. Hereby, he prohibits his companions to call him a bard, because “*I be no more than an honest butcher and a dealer in the wool*” [14]. In H. Bloom’s work we find an explanation for such a principled position of Simak’s Shakespeare: “Actors in Elizabethan England were, by statute, akin to beggars and similar lowlife, which doubtless pained Shakespeare, who worked hard to be able to go back to Stratford as a gentleman” [13, p. 45].

Thus, Shakespeare’s image is presented as a passionary intertextual ideologeme (according to J. Kristeva), which “materializing” at various levels of the text structure, expands over its whole trajectory and assigns it certain historical and social coordinates” [4, p. 136–137]. The image of Shakespeare, introduced by Simak into the hyperreal time and space, is marked with its own historical epoch. Nevertheless, due to the desire to stay in the future, it ironically proves the continuity of its being: “*My teeth are bad <...> they hang loosely in the jaw and at times pain exceedingly. I have intelligence that hereabout are marvelous mechanics who can extract them with no pain and fabricate a set to replace the ones I have*” [14]. The chronotope version, suggested by the American writer, whereby realistic, fantastic, fantasy and even mystical characters coexist quite peacefully, stands out as rather logical for Shakespeare’s timeless image, whereas its idiorhythmic nature is able to fit any context: “*I hear tell that you have arrived at understanding with goblins and with fairies, which is a marvelous thing. And to sit at meat with a ghost is past all understanding, although one has the feeling here he must dig close at the root of truth*” [14]. Shakespeare’s immanent presence “solidifies” the integrity of a literary text, as well as denies the inferiority of its functions in the personosphere.

Relying on the concepts of L. Ginsburg, N. Tamarchenko, R. Wellek, and A. Warren, R. Dzyk concludes that “it is rather problematic to classify any character as secondary (inferior) in the

aspect of reception”, because the primary and the secondary are “relative notions and often interchange each other”, thus “eliminating the status border” [1, p. 130–131]. The meeting of Shakespeare and mystic Ghost is particularly important for realizing the border between these two relative notions, as well as in determining the character’s status. The “traces” of anthropomorphic Ghost (in J. Derrida’s interpretation) frequently “run into” Shakespeare’s figure, indicating a hidden connection that exists between the two. It was not accidentally that H. Bloom also compared Shakespeare to “a spirit that permeates everywhere, that cannot be confined” [13, p. 52]. At first sight, the image of the creature with extraordinary abilities, introduced by C. Simak, seems to be a certain simulacrum: “*The guy gets drunk on moonbeams. He can dance on rainbows. He has a lot of advantages <...> For one thing, he’s immortal*” [14]. However, when Ghost adds “From England” [14], reader’s receptive attention is directed to the figure of W. Shakespeare. The proof of this is the café visitors’ chanting an ironic song:

Hurrah for Old Bill Shakespeare;
He never wrote them plays;
He stayed at home, and chasing girls,
Sang dirty rondelays [14].

Similar quasi-folklore intermedial inclusions that “by all possible means reproduce the wide-dimensionality of the world of variable realities” [8, p. 44], demonstrate, in this case, the “fermentability” of Shakespeare’s image in the holistic context of the novel. They point at the temperamental splash of the character’s passionary energy. The French philosopher is certain that simulative systems are related, above all, to the experience of science fiction, the latter “only being, most often, an extravagant *projection* of, but qualitatively not different from, the real world of production” [12, p. 156], with constant accumulation of mechanic or energetic abilities. In this way, the encounter of an active, mystified natural force – a simulacrum (Ghost) and a passionary “preliminary” (Shakespeare) is a display of enormous energetic power that alters the course of the narration.

Shakespeare is not embarrassed by the conversation with Ghost (his immaterial beginning): “*He accepted Ghost much more readily than would have been the case, say, with a twentieth-century man. In the sixteenth century they believed in ghosts and ghosts were something that could be accepted*” [14]. This conversation may symbolize Ancient England as the inversion of Noah’s Ark: “*A goodly country to the eye <...> but filled with human riffraff. There be poachers, thieves, murderers, footpads, and all sort of loathsome folk...*” [14]. Substance-Ghost, visualized through “the sleeves of his robe, if robe it was”, solemnly announces: “*I am William Shakespeare’s ghost!*” [14], which frightens Shakespeare-Character: “*If Shakespeare sees him following he’ll set new records running*” [14], though till that moment the talk and relaxation with Ghost did not bother the writer: “*He never got the wind up until he found that Ghost was his ghost and then...*” [14]. Eventually, Shakespeare’s figure, which has previously disappeared from the storyline, is found at a climax moment beside the most crucial problems: “*The Artifact is gone and the museum is wrecked and Shakespeare has disappeared*” [14].

The final scene of the novel, offered by C. Simak, distinctly proves the genre metamorphicality of this text – from science fiction to fantasy: on a lawn, “*facing one another, dancing to the music of the fairy orchestra, were Ghost and William Shakespeare*” [14]. The latter’s merger emphasizes the reincarnation idea of Shakespeare’s image in the novel, which makes up the so-called “architectonic ring”. In fact, C. Simak applies a technique of metempsychosis in the text of “Shakespeare’s Planet”. It is a remake of the previous novel that, on the contrary, starts with poet’s death and ends up in his transformation into a spiritualized skull, thus implying the cult tragedy “Hamlet”. This enables us to state that W. Shakespeare, as C. Simak’s character, is a transitive image, an efficient paradigm of author’s creative method.

In addition, the intertextual specifics of the personosphere of C. Simak’s novel “The Goblin Reservation” is one of the most significant examples of genre metamorphicality, which describes the dynamics of transition from science fiction to the format of fantasy. Hence, the passionary energy of a confocal character (implicated into the personosphere and endowed with his personal point of view) does not only guide the plot development, but also shifts the previously

assigned receptive vectors into the space of simulative hyperreality. The figure of W. Shakespeare, activated by C. Simak in the form of a character, is not a mere antroponymic allusion or intertextual phantasm. It is the center of the personosphere; it intercepts readers' attention and puts away all other imaginative centers of the novel.

1. *Дзик Р.* Не-другорядні персонажі в романі Юлії Крістевої „Убивство у Візантії” / Р. Дзик // Пасіонарність другорядного : матеріали XIV Міжнародної літературознавчої конференції, 11–12 травня 2017 р. – Чернівці : Чернівецький нац. ун-т, 2017. – С. 129–131.
2. *Канчура Є.* Роль шекспірівського інтертексту в поетиці романів про Дискосвіт Террі Претчетта / Є. Канчура // Ренесансні студії. – Запоріжжя, 2012. – Вип. 18–19. – С. 264–278.
3. *Ковтун Е. Н.* Поэтика необычайного: Художественные миры фантастики, волшебной сказки, утопии, притчи и мифа: (на материале европейской литературы первой половины XX века) / Е. Н. Ковтун. – Москва : Изд-во Моск. ун-та, 1999. – 308 с.
4. *Кристева Ю.* Избранные труды: Разрушение поэтики / Ю. Кристева. – Москва : Российская политическая энциклопедия, 2004. – 656 с.
5. *Москвітін Д. А.* В. Шекспір і література фентезі: до постановки проблеми / Д. А. Москвітін, Ю. Ю. Малафай // Витоки літератури фентезі. Поезія у контексті метажанру фентезі : збірник матеріалів наукового семінару Центру з Дослідження Літератури Фентезі при Інституті літератури ім. Т. Г. Шевченка НАН України (17 листопада 2016, 21 квітня 2017). – Київ, 2018. – С. 22–28.
6. *Назарець М.* Саймак, Кліффорд Доналд / М. Назарець // Літературознавча енциклопедія: у двох томах. – Київ : ВЦ „Академія”, 2007. – Т. 2. – С. 470–471.
7. *Тихомирова О.* Полеміка з Шекспіром у літературі фентезі / О. Тихомирова // Вісник Львівського університету. Серія : Іноземні мови. – 2012. – Вип. 20. – Ч. 2. – С. 176–182.
8. *Тичініна А. Р.* Поетика інтермедіальності в малій прозі Анджея Сапковського / А. Тичініна // Інтермедіальні виміри літератури фентезі : збірка матеріалів наукового семінару Центру з Дослідження Літератури Фентезі при Інституті літератури ім. Т. Г. Шевченка НАН України (20 квітня 2016р.). – Київ, 2016. – С. 43–50.
9. *Торкут Н.* Шекспір як культурна метафора в контексті пошуків європейської ідентичності / Н. Торкут // Шекспірівський дискурс. – Запоріжжя : КПУ, 2010. – Вип. 1. – С.178–191.

10. Червинская О. У истоков фэнтези: превращение апулеевского сюжета о Золотом осле в ремейке К. С. Льюиса „Пока мы лиц не обрели” / О. Червинская // Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія „Філологія”, 2017. – Вип. 76. – С. 45–49.
11. Червінська О. Пасіонарність другорядного vs вторинного / О. Червінська // Пасіонарність другорядного : матеріали XIV Міжнародної літературознавчої конференції, 11–12 травня 2017 р. – Чернівці : Чернівецький нац. ун-т, 2017. – С. 226–228.
12. Baudrillard J. Simulacra and Simulation / Jean Baudrillard ; [translated by Sheila Faria Glaser]. – Michigan : University of Michigan Press, 1994. – 170 p.
13. Bloom H. The western canon. The Books and School of the Ages / Harold Bloom. – New York : Harcourt Brace & Company, 1994. – 578 p.
14. Simak Clifford D. The Goblin Reservation [Electronic resource] / Clifford D. Simak. – Available at : <https://www.e-reading.club/book.php?book=84057>.
15. Todorov Tz. The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre / Tzvetan Todorov ; [translated by Richard Howard]. – Ithaca, New York : Cornell University Press, 1975. – 180 p.

ФАНТАСТИЧЕСКИЙ ШЕКСПИР: ПАССИОНАРНАЯ КОНФОКАЛЬНОСТЬ ПЕРСОНАЖА В АСПЕКТЕ РЕЦЕПЦИИ

Алёна Романовна Тычинина

orcid.org/0000-0001-6316-2005

a.tychinina@chnu.edu.ua

Кандидат филологических наук, ассистент

Кафедра зарубежной литературы, теории литературы и славянской филологии

Черновицкий национальный университет имени Юрия Федьковича

Ул. Коцюбинского, 2, 58012, г. Черновцы, Украина

Дан Викторович Паранюк

orcid.org/0000-0002-7274-5576

paranyukdan@gmail.com

Соискатель

Кафедра зарубежной литературы, теории литературы и славянской филологии

Черновицкий национальный университет имени Юрия Федьковича

Ул. Коцюбинского, 2, 58012, г. Черновцы, Украина

Аннотация. Опираясь на методологию Ж. Бодрийяра о начале эры гиперреальности как „мира симуляции”, аргументируется расширение горизонтов фантастики с помощью „реверсии воображаемого”, обозначенных взаимопроникновением фиктивных миров. Отдельное место в „гиперреалистичный индифферентности” фантастических нарративов занимают интертекстуальные связи. В данном случае актуализируется вопрос об интертекстуальном потенциале персониферы фантастики и фэнтези, что, по Цв. Тодорову, предусматривает активную „интеграцию читателя в мир персонажей”.

Внимание фокусируется на личности Уильяма Шекспира как персонаже литературных текстов американского фантаста Клиффорда Саймака (1904–1988) „Резервация гоблинов” (1968) и „Планета Шекспира” (1976). Акцентируется специфика синтеза фантастики и фэнтези в творчестве Саймака, формирующих так называемую симулятивную гиперреальность путем объединения нескольких моделей персониферы – сказочной, мистической, фантастической, фэнтезийной и др. Они действуют по принципу совмещения образных полей, имагологические векторы которых постоянно пересекаются. При этом аттрактором персониферы, как правило, выступает не протагонист, а конфокальная фигура (страж или мудрец по К. Юнгу), что занимает нейтральную позицию, однако оперирует надежной „точкой зрения”, чем вызывает рецептивное доверие у читателя.

В данном случае конфокальным, но пассионарным персонажем выступает Уильям Шекспир, поскольку функционирует в качестве имагинативной основы персониферы, а не только интертекстуальным фантазмом (по Р. Барту) или антропонимической аллюзией. Подобное „проникновение” Шекспира в фантастику можно считать, опираясь на идею Ю. Кристевой, актуальной интертекстуальной идеологемой. Его фигура в статусе пассионария, входя в мир других персонажей, смещает центр персониферы и соответствующим образом генерирует развитие сюжетных событий. Поэтому предложенная американским писателем версия хронотопа, где уживаются персонажи реалистического, фантастического, фэнтезийного и даже мистического планов, выступает совершенно логичной для вневременного образа Шекспира, чья идиоритмия вписывается в любой контекст, опровергая так называемый шекспировский вопрос. Отмечается взаимосвязь Шекспира с мистическим антропоморфным персонажем – Духом, следы (в понимании Ж. Деррида) которого постоянно „наступают” на фигуру Шекспира. Его имманентное присутствие „цементирует” целостность литературного текста, отрицает второстепенность в персонифере, а в аспекте рецепции перехватывает читательское внимание, смещая остальные имагинативные центры романа.

Ключевые слова: фантастика, фэнтези, пассионарный персонаж, конфокальный образ, симулякр, Уильям Шекспир, Клиффорд Саймак.

ФАНТАСТИЧНИЙ ШЕКСПІР: ПАСІОНАРНА КОНФОКАЛЬНІСТЬ ПЕРСОНАЖА В АСПЕКТІ РЕЦЕПЦІЇ

Альона Романівна Тичініна

orcid.org/0000-0001-6316-2005

a.tychinina@chnu.edu.ua

Кандидат філологічних наук, асистент

Кафедра зарубіжної літератури, теорії літератури та слов'янської філології

Чернівецький національний університет імені Юрія Федьковича

Вул. Коцюбинського, 2, 58012, м. Чернівці, Україна

Дан Вікторович Паранюк

orcid.org/0000-0002-7274-5576

paranyukdan@gmail.com

Здобувач

Кафедра зарубіжної літератури, теорії літератури та слов'янської філології

Чернівецький національний університет імені Юрія Федьковича

Вул. Коцюбинського, 2, 58012, м. Чернівці, Україна

Анотація. З опертям на методологію Ж. Бодріяра про початок ери гіперреальності як „світу симуляції” обґрунтовується розширення горизонтів фантастики за допомогою „реверсії уявного”, позначених головно взаємопроникненням фікційних світів, генологічно оприявлених у зв'язках із новітніми жанровими формами. Окреме місце в „гіперреалістичній індіферентності” фантастичних наративів посідають інтертекстуальні вкраплення. У даному разі актуалізується питання про інтертекстуальний потенціал персоносфери фантастики та фентезі, що, за Ц. Тодоровим, передбачають активну „інтеграцію читача у світ персонажів”.

Увага фокусується на постаті Вільяма Шекспіра як персонажа літературних текстів американського фантаста Кліффорда Саймака (1904–1988) „Резервація гоблінів” (1968) та „Планета Шекспіра” (1976). Акцентується специфіка синтезу фантастики та фентезі у творчості Саймака, що формують так звану симулятивну гіперреальність шляхом поєднання кількох моделей персоносфери – казкової, містичної, фантастичної, фентезійної тощо. Вони функціонують за принципом суміщення образних полів, імагологічні вектори яких повсякчас перетинаються. При цьому атрактором персоносфери зазвичай виступає не протагоніст, а конфокальна постать (страж або мудрець за К. Юнгом), що займає нейтральну позицію, однак оперує надійною „точкою зору”, чим викликає рецептивну довіру в читача.

У даному разі конфокальним, але пасіонарним персонажем виступає Вільям Шекспір, позаяк постає імагінативним ядром персоносфери, а не лише

інтертекстуальним фантазмом (за Р. Бартом) чи антропонімічною алюзією. Поряд із цим подібне „проникнення” Шекспіра у фантастику можна вважати, спираючись на ідею Ю. Крістевої, актуальною інтертекстуальною ідеологемою. Його постать у статусі пасіонарія, входячи у світ інших персонажів, відцентровує осереддя персоносфери й відповідно генерує розвиток сюжетних подій. Тому запропонована американським письменником версія хронотопу, де співіснують персонажі реалістичного, фантастичного, фентезійного і навіть містичного кшталту, доволі логічна для позачасового образу Шекспіра, чия ідіоритмія вписується у будь-який контекст, спростовуючи так зване шекспірівське питання. Висновується, що іманентна присутність фігури Шекспіра „цементує” цілісність літературного тексту, заперечує другорядність її функції в персоносфері, а в аспекті рецепції перехоплює читацьку увагу, зміщуючи інші імагінативні центри роману.

Ключові слова: фантастика, фентезі, пасіонарний персонаж, конфокальний образ, симулякр, Вільям Шекспір, Кліффорд Саймак.

References

1. Dzyk R. Ne-druhoriadni personazhi v romani Iulii Kristevoi “Ubyvstvo u Vizantii” [Non-Secondary Characters in the Novel by Julia Kristeva “Murder in Byzantine”]. In: *Pasionarnist druhoriadnoho* [Passionarity of the Secondary]. Abstracts of Papers of the 14 rd International Conference. Chernivtsi, 2017, pp. 129–131. (in Ukrainian).
2. Kanchura Ie. Rol shekspirivskoho intertekstu v poetyesi romaniv pro Dyskosvit Terri Pretchetta [The Role of Shakespeare’s Intertext in the Poetics of the Novels about the Disco World of Terri Pratchett]. *Renesansni studii*, 2012, no. 18–19, pp. 264–278. (in Ukrainian).
3. Kovtun E. N. *Poetika neobychainogo: Khudozhestvennye miry fantastiki, volshebnoi skazki, utopii, pritchi i mifa* [Poetics of the Extraordinary: the Literary Worlds of Science Fiction, Magic Fairy-Tale, Utopia, Parable and Myth]. Moscow, 1999, 308 p. (in Russian).
4. Kristeva Iu. *Izbrannye trudy: Razrushenie poetiki* [Selected Works: Denunciation of Poetics]. Moscow, 2004, 656 p. (in Russian).
5. Moskvitina D. A., Malafai Iu. V. V. Shekspir i literatura fentezi: do postanovky problemy [Shakespeare and Fantasy: On Setting a Problem]. In: *Vytoky literatury fentezi* [The origins of literature fantasy]. Abstracts of Papers of the Seminar. Kyiv, 2018, pp. 22–28. (in Ukrainian).
6. Nazarets M. Saimak Klifford Donald [Simak Klifford Donald]. *Literaturoznavcha entsyklopediia*. Kyiv, 2007, vol. 1, pp. 470–471, (in Ukrainian).
7. Tykhomyrova O. Polemika z Shekspirom u literaturi fentezi [Polemic with Shakespeare in Fantasy Genre]. *Visnyk L’vivs’koho universytetu*, 2012, no. 20, pp. 176–182. (in Ukrainian).

8. Tychinina A. R. Poetyka intermedial'nosti v malii prozi Andzheia Sapkovs'koho [The Poetics of Intermediality in a Short Prose by A. Sapkowsky]. In: *Intermedial'ni vymiry literatury fentezi* [Interdimensional measurements of literature fantasy]. Abstracts of Papers of the Seminar. Kyiv, 2016, pp. 43–50. (in Ukrainian).
9. Torkut N. Shekspir iak kul'turna metafora v konteksti poshukiv ievropeis'koi identychnosti [Shakespeare as a Cultural Metaphor in the Context of Searching for European Identity]. *Shekspirivs'kyi dyskurs*, Zaporizhzhia, 2010, no. 1, pp. 178–191. (in Ukrainian).
10. Chervinska O. U istokov fentezi: prevrashchenie apuleevskogo siuzheta o Zolotom osle v remeike K. S. L'iuisa "Poka my lits ne obreli" [At the Sources of Fantasy: the Transformation of Apuleius' Plot about the Golden Donkey in C. S. Lewis' Remake "Till We Have Faces: A Myth Retold"]. *Visnik Kharkivs'kogo natsional'nogo universitetu imeni V. N. Karazina*, 2017, no. 76, pp. 45–49. (in Russian).
11. Chervinska O. Pasionarnist' drugoriadnogo vs vtorinnogo [Passionarity of the Secondary vs Inferior]. In: *Pasionarnist druhoriadnoho* [Passionarity of the Secondary]. Abstracts of Papers of the 14 rd International Conference. Chernivtsi, 2017, pp. 226–228. (in Ukrainian).
12. Baudrillard J. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Michigan, 1994. 170 p.
13. Bloom H. *The Western Canon. The Books and School of the Ages*. New York, 1994, 578 p.
14. Simak Clifford D. *The Goblin Reservation*. Available at: <https://www.e-reading.club/book.php?book=84057> (accessed 6 December 2018).
15. Todorov Tz. *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre*. Ithaca, New York, 1975, 180 p.

Suggested citation

Tychinina A., Paranyuk D. The Fantastic Shakespeare: Character's Passionary Confocality in the Aspect of Reception. *Pytannia literaturoznavstva*, 2018, no. 98, pp. 191–207. doi: 10.31861/pytlit2018.98.191.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 6.12.2018 р.
Стаття прийнята до друку 20.12.2018 р.