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Abstract. The article has the comparative study of the phenomenon of paradox in the plays of the Ukrainian playwright V. Vynnychenko and English dramatist B. Shaw. It pays attention to the possibilities of paradox to express the author’s idea most exactly. This work has the analysis of two types of paradox – phraseological one and paradox on the level of the plot and their specific features.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The beginning of the XXth century is marked by the ideological search of the contents of life, the examination of such questions as freedom, guilt, fear, the analysis of the problems of individuals, taken in their internal parameters. As a response to the request, the category of “literature-as-philosophy” appeared and the main writers of this literature represented the philosophical thinking and the prevailing of intellectual principles in the creating of individual characters. In such kind of literature as drama a new aesthetic phenomenon appeared: drama of character was replaced by drama of ideas, the essence of which was to focus the author’s attention on the ideological contradictions and conflicts. This had an impact on the choice of “technology” that would help the author to achieve the goal. So, paradox became such techniques of the philosophical and intellectual drama at the beginning of the XXth century.

Philosophical Dictionary defines paradox as “a phenomenon in logic that goes in a circle through the simultaneous truth and falsity of the evidence of certain statements, and the proof of the truth of this statement leads to the recognition of its falsity and vice versa” [5, p. 369]. In this context, we try to analyze the paradox as the means of the expression of the ideological positions of two playwrights - V. Vynnychenko and B. Shaw. The starting point of our theoretical arguments about the paradox as the means of the expression of the ideological position of the author were literary works of such scientists as L. Moroz, H. Kostiuk, L. Onyshkevych, N. Dyakonova, A. Anikst and others .

For V. Vynnychenko, the spokesman of one of the trends in the Ukrainian literature of the XXth century – striving for intellectualism and searching for truth, paradox became the tool that “changed the play into philosophical treatise” [1, p. 117]. Many works of this playwright are characterized by the
conflict that is built on the phenomenon of paradox. This structure of plays arouses particular interest of readers, depriving them of direct answers to questions and forcing them to think. The paradoxical form also helps the author to express new views on the familiar things, identify the conflicts which you haven’t noticed before.

2. Analysis and Discussion

Let us try to compare the phenomenon of paradox in the works of V. Vynnychenko and in the plays of the creator of a new British drama B. Shaw called the master of paradox. In his work “The Quintessence of Ibsenism”, B. Shaw argued that the paradox is both the oldest and the newest element of drama, is a kind of “a game with human conscience” [1, p. 81]. According to B. Shaw, moralizing and preaching about the noble ideals remain inconclusive, so it would be better to choose another way to communicate with the readers using the unexpected, paradoxical statement. In this case humor should not be the aim. The main hero of “John Bull’s Other Island” expressed an artistic credo of B. Shaw – “My way of joking is to tell the truth” [7, p. 67].

In the works of V. Vynnychenko and B. Shaw we observe two types of paradox: the paradox at the level of phraseology and the paradox within the plot. The phraseological paradox has the important point hidden in the seemingly illogical statement, which diverges from the conventional social representations. The paradox at the level of plot appears in the logic of the characters through their actions, thoughts and relationships.

It should be noted that we can meet the first type of paradox more often in the plays of B. Shaw. His speech is full of expressions that do not coincide with the generally accepted views. At first glance, these expressions may seem strange, but when you think a little you feel that they are true. For example, you can read a very interesting collection of paradoxes at the beginning of the play “Man and Superman”. This is one of the most popular expressions of B. Shaw: “Reasonable people adapt themselves to the world; fools try to adapt the world to themselves. Therefore, progress depends on unreasonable people” [7, p. 53]. Thus the author expresses the idea of human activity and the principle of responsibility for everything that happens in the world. The paradoxical phrase does not only reflect the unusual views of the author, but it is also used as the means of the individualization of characters. You can meet paradoxes at the level of phraseology much less frequently in dramas of V. Vynnychenko. Creating them as the mosaic, the author embodies the main idea of the work. Conflicting views about the nature of truth are expressed by the characters of the play “Lie”, the logical conclusion of them is the paradoxical phrase of the main protagonist: “The lie is the aged truth” [8, p. 67].

Even the titles of works have forms of paradoxes, crystallizing in a few words the main idea, urging the audience to deeper meditation. Unfortunately, the paradoxical contents of B. Shaw’s drama “Too True to Be Good” in Ukrainian translation is transferred only partially. The title is inverted sentence “Too Good to Be True” and means literally “too true to be pleasant”.

The title of V. Vynnychenko’s play “Song of Israel” has the nature of subtle paradox that illustrates the state of mind of the protagonist. “By its title and the plot, it resembles the definition of P. Tushar (tragedy is a song of despair)” [3, p. 159]. “Song of Despair” denies itself, because you can’t sing with despair. If the protagonist sings, so he has overcome despair.

V. Vynnychenko and B. Shaw used the phenomenon of paradox within the plot very successfully. As the examples of the new European drama, the works of these authors are distinguished by certain features, including the prevalence of the discussion under intrigue and thrilling story. “Serious playwright sees in discussions not only the touchstone for his talent, but the main advantage of the play,” – says B. Shaw [6, p. 240]. In the drama-discussion there is a new kind of action – “the thought of the individual as an act”. At this level V. Vynnychenko and B. Shaw use the phenomenon of paradox, making the thoughts of characters paradoxical. This means is the convincing clarification of the truth of certain ideas in the real life and the psychological analysis. The irony is not only removed by the further
reflection of characters, but even becomes sharper. In the plays of V. Vynnychenko and B. Shaw the heroes are not always those about whom we can say that they are the exponents of the views of the author. Often the playwrights provide the characters, which we would call negative, with better arguments. For example, even if you have studied in detail the whole system of images of B. Shaw’s drama “The Doctor’s Dilemma”, you can hardly answer the question: “Should I save the lives of criminals and give them the opportunity to commit dozens of new crimes?” The reader who is in the constant search for the ethical harmony together with the main character of V. Vynnychenko’s play “Disharmony” cannot make a final conclusion, what happiness is.

The new drama with the such feature as the absence of the strict division of the conflict into “good” and “evil”, promotes to the use of such technology as paradox. The characters don’t have one dominant feature and a villain can have as much good as a positive hero. “In new plays, – B. Shaw explained – the dramatic conflict is not built around the primitive inclinations of a man, his greed or generosity, offences and ambitions, but around the clash of different ideals ... The problem that makes the play interesting (if it is really interesting), is to clarify who is the positive character and who is the perpetrator ” [6, p. 56]. Criminals do good, dishonest people perform noble deeds and good citizens commit crimes. The authors analyze the inner life of the characters, focuses primarily on the ideological contradictions even to the antagonism between the characters, often related to each other [7].

On the one hand, it deepens the psychological and social interpretation of the images, and on the other it puts the viewer in front of paradoxical problem: who is a real hero. This is a character of Mrs. Warren (B. Shaw’s play “Mrs. Warren’s Profession”), which also combines love for the daughter and cynical way of obtaining funds for her. The reader understands that the heroine is both a victim and a criminal and evil is widely interpreted. The characters of the play “John Bull’s Other Island” are very indicative; B. Shaw depicts a typical Englishman as a very romantic person and Irish, which should be romantic as a skeptical practitioner.

In the works of V. Vynnychenko paradox is not only the means of individual features characteristic of a personage. The phenomenon of paradox is a bold psychological experiment that shows a person from another point of view, highlighting other, still unknown side. Heroes of V. Vynnychenko are very colourful. The main character of his drama “Sin” Maria combines cynicism, cruelty with willpower and the ability to sacrifice. This allows the author to show the struggle between good and evil in the soul of the heroine and express views on events in Ukraine, “if in the struggle for a better future the person with the best traits of character should disappear ... whether does it make sense” [8, p. 34]. In his drama “Lie” the character of Natalia Pavlivna has the paradoxical qualities. The combination of her traits such as caring for neighbour, falsehood, kindness helps V. Vynnychenko to implement the paradoxical idea: ”Lie is aged truth”.

The paradox in the works of B. Shaw is the result of a collision of two ideas, two ideologies, which are demonstrated by main characters with a wide variety of traits. Such structure you can notice in the plays “John Bull’s Other Island”, “Major Barbara”, “The Doctor’s Dilemma” and others.

For example, in the play “Major Barbara” the ideological enemy of the main heroine, who joined the ranks of the Salvation Army, is her father, “the king of guns”, Andrew Andershaft. Barbara has a lot of clashes with her father, and author, being true to his creative manner, completes with their full reconciliation.

B. Shaw preferred contrast depicting of ideas. V. Vynnychenko applied another approach to the creating of original paradox. Rejecting the linear logic with its opposite poles “good” and “evil”, the author supposed “simultaneous truth of many thoughts” [3, p. 148]. The plays of this playwright is primarily an analysis of man’s inner world, matching of high and low, spiritual and carnal. Since laws that control human spiritual life are unknown to the end, there are many options for treatment of the certain spiritual phenomena. The clash of the following options inevitably leads to the paradox, mission of which to reveal the truth among many truths. Mary from V. Vynnychenko’s play “Bazaar” chooses the unexpected method of conflict resolution (but it is motivated by the character of the heroine). She decides to destroy the beauty of her face that attracts attention to her propaganda speeches.
In a paradoxical way the playwrights propose the readers to solve the moral dilemmas and the moral conflicts. In dramas they can see the process of dynamics or the regression of moral consciousness of the heroes – from pre-conventional morality and to the post-conventional (L. Kolberg). At the same time the realistic scenes create the conditions for the objective evaluation of moral positions, comparing the moral consciousness of the hero and his behavior.

Sometimes paradox in the works of the playwrights becomes the means of proof from opposite. The authors intentionally exaggerate their ideas, accumulate the negative effects and provoke the reader to an ideological debate. In this way such characters as Martin from V. Vynnychenko’s “Disharmony” and Kryvenko from “Memento” by the same author behave. The main characters of these works are embodiment of Evil, which stimulates activation of Good. As a result, critics call “Memento” “complete shame of new morality”. B. Shaw uses the similar methods, creating a cycle of “unpleasant” plays (“Widower’s Houses”, “Mrs. Warren’s Profession”) in which this idea is presented in the ultraparadoxical form.

The paradoxical situations, woven into the fabric of the drama, are perceived ambiguously by the audience and the readers. The first left the theater with mental anxiety, noticing contradictions which were not expected recently. In other words, they caused a shower of criticism. The irony irritated even those who shared the views of V. Vynnychenko and B. Shaw. The examples are the words from the letter of M. Gor’ky to V. Vynnychenko: “You are a very talented man, but you like paradoxes. I think it is very sad, especially when you tell about such paradox as in your “Bazaar” [3, p. 148]. The same attitude to the paradoxes the reader can find in Tolstoy’s letter addressed to B. Shaw: “You are not serious enough. It is impossible to say by the way of a joke about such things as the aim of human life, and reasons of its perversion” [1, p. 5].

3. CONCLUSIONS

This way of creating drama was a successful invention under conditions when the playwrights became “political and social agitators” [2, p. 64], and demonstrated the awakening of nationally and socially oppressed nation (remember the situation in Ukraine at the beginning of the XXth century). Paradoxes, which absorbed the important questions of life, attracted attention of the friends and the enemies. And what was more important, they made the readers think. So, according to the French philosopher Blaise Pascal, “A man is only a rush, the weakest creation of nature, but it is a thinking rush ... The greatness of a man is in his ability to think ... Let us try to think with dignity... This is the basis of morality” [4, p. 19].

The mechanism of paradox is psychologically justified because the reader is presented as a subject of his own inherent activity and freedom of choice. The authors appeal through the paradox in the plot to the human subjectivity and thus activate the intentional present spiritual source of the human that breaks through the antagonistic social experience. At the same time the reader is able to compare and analyze his own actions, see the prospect of the further growth, even after the previous crash.

Although B. Shaw’s works with his bright paradoxes found their audience earlier, V. Vynnychenko’s paradoxes arising on Ukrainian soil, are distinctive phenomena, proving that Ukrainian literature is an organic part of the European process. The problems, the solution of which appeared due to the paradox, have the universal importance, and expressed in the form of paradox the idea of “honesty with yourself” is the key problem of existentialism of the XXth century.
REFERENCES


Address: O.I. Semak, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 57, Shevchenko Str., Ivano-Frankivsk, 76000, Ukraine.
E-mail: oksem@meta.ua.
Received: 12.03.2015; revised: 20.05.2015.


У статті на порівняльно-типологічному рівні досліджується явище парадоксу як засобу вияву ідейної позиції автора, проведено аналіз драматургії В.Винниченка та Б.Шоу з точки зору функціонування парадоксу у сюжеті твору.
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