

УДК 82–2:82–14

*Ihor Yudkin-Ripun*  
(Kyiv)

### SCENIC SCRIPT AS A TRANSFORMATION OF A LYRICAL VERSE

Розвиток поетичного театру сприяє зростанню уваги до загальних передумов перетворення літературного тексту в сценарій для виконання на кону. Таке перетворення добре відоме в театральній практиці з режисерських коментарів до драматичного тексту. Елементарні передумови такої процедури закладено вже в можливостях оповіді бути поданою як спілкування (діалог), які містяться в самій природі предикації, в протиставленні ознак предметам, де відношення підмет-присудок подається структурою катехісису як питання-відповідь. Приклад катехісису, побудованого з оповіді, становлять так звані сценічні прислів'я. Лірична абстрактність з переважанням ознак над предметністю як результат тотальної предикації відкриває дальші можливості виявлення внутрішньої конфліктності образу, відтвореної як солілоквія.

**Ключові слова:** предикація, комунікація, катехісис, солілоквія, конфлікт, антагоніст, протагоніст, авторизація, ситуація, референція.

Развитие поэтического театра способствует росту внимания к общим предпосылкам преобразования литературного текста в сценарий для исполнения. Такое преобразование хорошо известно в театральной практике в режиссерских комментариях к драматическому тексту. Элементарные предпосылки такого преобразования заложены уже в возможностях представления повествования как общения (диалога), которые содержатся в самой природе предикации, в противопоставлении признаков предметам, где отношения подлежащее-сказуемое передается как вопрос-ответ. Образцы катехисиса, производного от повествования, дают так

называемые сценические пословицы. Лирическая абстракция с преобладанием признаков над предметностью как результат тотальной предикации открывает дальнейшие возможности раскрытия внутренней конфликтности образа, воссозданной через солилоквию.

**Ключевые слова:** предикация, коммуникация, катехизис, солилоквиа, конфликт, антагонист, протагонист, авторизация, ситуация, референция.

The development of poetical theatre promotes the growth of attention towards general prerequisites for converting a literary text into a script for scenic performance. Such conversion is well known in common theatrical practice as the producer's comments to a dramatic text. The elementary premises for such procedure are to be found in the property of narration to be converted into communication ensuing from the general nature of the objects vs. attributes' opposition where the relation subject – predicate is converted into a catechetic structure of question – answer. The examples of catechism arising from narration are to be found in the so called scenic proverbs. Lyrical abstractedness with its prevalence of attributes instead of objects as the result of total predication discloses the inner conflict of an image (reproduced as a soliloquy) presupposing its representation on stage.

**Keywords:** predication, communication, catechism soliloquy, conflict, antagonist, protagonist, authorization, situation, deixis.

The thought that drama and lyrics are internally interconnected comes back still to W. von Humboldt who has suggested that tragedy can be conceived within the attachments of lyrics to what has been discussed as the inner action of drama whereas a poem in its turn concerns the inner world of personality [2, p. 240]. Nowadays this old idea has gained actuality in regard to the tasks of staging poetry in the manner of a dramatic poem because «poetry happens to be called the foreboding of a thought <...> it can also become the foreboding of action and the inner substantiation of a human deed... all elements of a theatrical performance are at hand within the poetical stuff» [8, p. 271]. This artistic practice can be traced still to L. Kurbas and his essays with making T. Shevchenko's lyrical digressions personified in the manner of baroque mysteries as «The Ten Words of the Poet» which in its turn «are the further development of what has been found by Les' Kurbas with staging Lyrical Verses» [3, p. 17].

Obviously the development of such poetical theatre discloses new problems concerning the very nature of the staged text and its transformations. Within the scope of such general topics the nature of lyrical and dramatic interpretations of a textual entity turns to concern the particular procedural aspects of script-making technique. In this regard the ancient practice of unfolding proverbial utterance in a little play in the so called scenic proverbs appears to become the paragon for experiments with the scripts based on lyrics. It was already Hegel who substantiated the statement that proverbs belong to lyrics and can be confronted with lyrical digressions because «the contents being epic; nevertheless its elaboration is lyric» (*so ist der Inhalt zwar episch, die Behandlung aber lyrisch*) [10, p. 1003]. Meanwhile there exist also some obvious common points between proverbial and lyrical modes of the interpretation of utterances that enable deepening this Hegelian thought.

It has been demonstrated that the peculiarity of lyrical interpretation of speech consists in the phenomenon of **total predication** where actual predicates include the whole textual stuff: lyrical utterances designate the attributes and not the objects themselves: «A sentence within such ultimately condensed unity as a poetical text does loose one of the principal communicative properties of an utterance, that of the opportunity to be divided into theme and rheme <...> A lyrical verse does represent and develop the only theme. Therefore it is a thorough rheme» [6, p. 151]. In this respect lyrical verses behave like riddles where a circumscription substitutes the meant object and the task arises to guess the object's name. Lyrical enunciation can be said to belong to the enigmatic kind of poetry. This peculiar lyrical abstractedness of attributive features replacing immediate designations of objects results also in multiplying semantic transitions that can intersect

with the rhetorical devices of the so called *metalepsis* peculiar for proverbs as well as those of allegory.

These properties of lyrical and proverbial texts entail some peculiar consequences concerning the technical procedures of their conversion into plays for scenic performance. The transformation of any narrative text into a dialogue is provided with the circumstance that the pair *subject & predicate* can be converted into a pair of *question & answer* as seen from communicative viewpoint. In this respect one has to take into consideration that to build up such possible dialogues the actual predicate (the so called rheme) and not the potential one must be chosen. For instance the simplest sentence *<a table stands>* can be treated either as *<a table does stand (and not swing)>* or as *<it is the table (and not the seat) that stands>*. Respectively the conversion into dialogues will give two opportunities – either *<– What’s about the table? – It stands (firmly)>* or *<– What it is that stands (there)? – It’s the table>*. As a conclusion one can say that any narrative text can be converted into a communicative structure of **catechism**. Respectively the relations of subjects and predicates (whether potential or actual) are to be replaced with the pairs of questions and answers. In other words the collocations that correspond to subject and predicate are to be authorized as the utterances of different persons. Therefore while transforming narration into a catechetical communication the problem of the intensified heterogeneity arises. In particular it goes about the authorization of utterances that is attached to the personified voices designating subject and predicate that would become the vehicles of different *intentions* as well.

In difference to a narrative script the lyrical replicas must be converted in a vision of the depicted situation as seen by the involved observers (that can also coincide with the author’s image or with that of a lyrical hero). Lyrical abstractedness promotes disclosing the opposition of the observers’ viewpoints and the antithetic situations comprehended through the personified protagonists and antagonists. In particular the authorization of lyrical lines can’t be ascribed to a single person in spite of the monologue-like form, so latent *dramatis personae* must appear. This step must be done before immediate authorization of voices; therefore this approach wouldn’t put the stress upon the category of person while disclosing more essential dramatic properties of the lyrical source, such as conflict and intentional load. It is lyrical total predication that enables disclosing such dramatic qualities present within the lines, namely the negations and antithetic confrontations inherent to predication. Therefore lyrical enunciation always deals with a set of predicates or the so called «polypredicative» structure [7, p. 199]. Noteworthy it is just proverbial enunciations that serve as a paragon for such structures. Due to the interaction of different actual predicates (rhemes) the utterance of the kind, be it even a simple sentence, discloses the opportunity for being converted into a clausal structure of hypotaxis. Such is the case, for instance, with the Ukrainian proverb *<і на меду знайдеш біду>* (even at the honey one can find harm) that can easily be explicated and expanded into a compound enunciation with the clause of concession *<→ навіть якщо сидиш серед меду, біда може спиткати>* (→ even if one is situated in the honey one can meet harm).

The attributive prevalence of lyrical enunciation comes to the result that there are always opposite statements latently or manifestly confronted within the predicative sphere, and not only the confrontation of subject with predicate. The code of negations is deeper than that of a mere catechism with its alternative questions and answers. The inner conflict of predicative units is to be represented with soliloquy whereas the contraposition of subject and predicate presupposes the conversion in a catechism. The participants of the conflict designated with predicative parts of speech are comparable to the inner voices of what V. I. Nemirovich-Danchenko has wittily called «*the stream of unpronounced words*» [5, p. 101] that are recommended to an artist to invent in addition to the written words of a role. In particular it has been recommended by him for the actors: «*Invent inner monologues for you!*» [5, p. 98]. Then a script of a lyrical enunciation could be said to disclose its latent dramatic structure as a soliloquy with complementing it with the implications

obtained due to a performer's inventiveness. The same concerns proverbs that always represent antithetic relations and therefore include a set of predicates. It is already **soliloquy** with its alternation of mutual objections and not a simple catechism of questions and answers that approaches scenic proverb and lyrical verse performed as a play for stage. Such soliloquy represents the mental process of the searches for the solution of a problem and therefore attests also the deeper attachments towards the enigmatic utterances of riddles.

The common problematic mode of enunciation of lyrical and proverbial genera let come to the question as to the mutuality between the proverbs in proper sense and riddles that belong to the species of allegory represented with periphrastic description. In this respect one should bear in mind the cases of the reversibility of proverbs in riddles and vice versa. For instance, a very widely known riddle that presents «*scattered grains*» (the solution being «*nocturnal sky with stars*») can easily be compared to the proverb about «*sown seeds*» that means the preparations for the future; another image from the riddle designating «*nut*» has the outlook of a condition «*To break a pot before eating the porridge*» that is almost identical with the proverb «*Before frying the scrambled eggs one has to break them*»; such a riddle as «*Never the twins will meet*» (with «*eyes*» as the solution) has become proverbial expression used as a famous poetic line by R. Kipling (with the preceding line «*Oh, West is the West and East is the East...*»). In its turn, the proverb «*The more the merrier*» implies also its treatment as a riddle with the solution *dullness, stupid speeches* or something of the kind (bearing in mind the unmotivated laugh as the symptom of mental degradation). Besides, proverbs can be used as nicknames (as in V. Hugo's *l'homme – qui – rit* «*person – that – laughs*» designating actually cripples mutilated with the aim of entertaining mob), and in this case they presuppose the existence of the experience of such communicative validity to be understood correctly.

Thus there are grounds for ascribing **problematic mode** to proverbs as the initial point of their possible comparison to riddles as the specialized form of enigmatic utterances. Proverbs suggest multitude of interpretative possibilities comparable to the searches for the solution of a riddle. In this respect it seems worth mentioning the statement by E. Koengaes-Maranda: «*Proverb is the image or the signifying that arises in the context presupposing certain signified, and riddle is the signifying where the signified is still to be found and named*» [4, p. 280]. The existence of the so called solution of a riddle does presuppose a latent name to be guessed as a standard answer to a question of a catechism that is put in the form of circumlocutions. The same concerns lyrical poem that gives **periphrastic description** with designating attributes instead of objects and posing the respective problems to cope with. Meanwhile the solution here can be not a single one. For instance the riddle «*глибоке провалля, а в проваллі чорненьке*» (a deep precipice, in the precipice something black) with the solution «*a water-well*» can't be exhausted with such an answer. The very image of black bottom of the precipice generates thoughts and dreams of enigmatic matters. The mentioned solution becomes only a pretext for the process of interpretation of such image. To demonstrate such plurality of solutions it would be apt with a poetic riddle by W. Cowper chosen as the epigraph to the 15-th chapter of F. Cooper's «*The Pathfinder*»: «*What pearl is it that rich men cannot buy, / That learning is too proud to gather up; / But which the poor and the despised of all / Seek and obtain and often find unsought? / Tell me – and I will tell you what is truth*». One can add that «*truth*» is not the only possible answer to the question put by the poet: there are also such notions as «*justice*» that would meet the represented circumlocution.

In its turn the analytical tendency of periphrastic utterance entails its transformative opportunities. Each proverbial utterance presupposes an alternative judgment of **antithesis** and not only a series of questions. Together with the discussed changeability of actual predicates (rhemes) it proves the unimportance of propositional form for proverbial and lyrical circumlocutions. One assumes both a proverb and a lyrical conventional collocation as a trope to be comprehensible for the addressee so that subsequently it belongs to the category of commonplaces (*loci communes*). This stability and comprehensibility

of a seemingly absurd utterance as an indication towards the latent problem of semantic transition reveals itself in the circumstance that appears as a sort of reproducible quotation of an anonymous source. It sounds so that proverbs and conventions are pronounced by an oracle or an incognito. Due to stability and constancy of semantic transitions proverbs and conventions presuppose latent contents, and the syntax of respective periphrastic descriptions remains the invariant of multiplied approaches in searches of its semantic core. For instance, the Latin proverb «*Mater virtutum ratio; nocet esse locutum, / Esse nocet mutum; reddunt mediocria tutum*» [Werner 1966: p. 69] (common sense is the mother of virtues: it would hurt to be both loquacious and mute; it is mediocrity that restitutes security) represents a kind of periphrastic description of the dangers ensuing from exaggerations, and the syntactical structure remains here invariant indicating the connection between reasonability and mediocrity. The antithetic type of such structure is represented with binary dissection (especially those of adversative or restrictive type) where the prevailing type of proverbial constructions is the twice paired combination [9, p. 123], so that one can call such construction «quadrangle» with the view of their four-partite division (parallel confrontations, comparisons, chiasmus etc.).

It ensues from here that the transformation of a proverb to be staged looks like the production of inferential statements disclosing the implicit contents. In particular alternative statements can be produced and put to examination in a scenic discussion. The said can be exemplified with the following patterns of transformations where preliminarily the conversion into passive voice or infinitives is carried out and the derivative meanings of words are displayed as the latencies & lacunas implying further explication and expansion. Then the ambivalent actualities are displayed with the ensuing implications of alternative interpretation of proverbs. In particular it is with converting into negative that the alternative interpretations of actualities are examined. It is connected with the disclosure of catechetic structure and conversion into interrogative (the four types of questions – total / partial, modal / dictal).

As an example the proverb <Чия б гарчала, а твоя б мовчала> (even if one grumbles you'd better keep silence) can be taken. It gives the following transformations giving a draft of a script.

[the substitution with infinitives]. → <кому гарчати, тобі мовчати> (for somebody to grumble, for you to keep silence)

[antithetic statements] → *our / their grumbling is worse / better than our / their silence*

[implications] 1) [rheme] grumbling for anybody → one can both grumble and keep silence → it is indifferent whether one grumbles or keeps silence → it is not to keep silence for all, somebody can grumble; 2) [rheme] silence for ours → silence is preferable as there are no grounds for grumbling → silence is better than grumbling [the last derivation corresponds to the proverb *хто мовчить, той лиха збудеться* (while keeping silence one gets rid of misfortune)]

[interrogative conversion] *is it that all grumble and ours is to be silent?*

[catechetic structure with partial questions] – *Does everybody grumble at this occasion? – Not at all, and you'd better shut up!*

The derivative sentences of the kind supply stuff for scenic evolvement of conversational episodes as the scripts for staging the initial proverb.

Another type of script-making procedure is to meet with producer's comments to a dramatic play where the task of removing the incompleteness and indefiniteness is put. Here the necessity arises to add performer's interpretative implications that would disclose the *meant but not mentioned* intentions of the dramatis personae, their genuine purposes. Dramatic dialogue is to be conceived as an «*adversative echo*» discerning voices of the partners. In particular they build up in dialogue what's to be called conversational axis that restricts the opportunities of a dialogical composition scrutinized by S. D. Balukhaty [1, p. 24]. In this way a «communicative axis» arises that can be regarded as the necessary prerequisite for the very existence of dialogue. A dialogue is used as a rule as an alternation of conjectures and objections: even if the succeeding cue only supplements the

preceding one it implies partial negation. Respectively a pair of cues in dialogue can be converted into an adversative sentence of a monologue. It can be exemplified with the case of catechism with its alternation of questions and answers. Such case is to be found before the scene of the murder of Macduff's son («Macbeth», 4.2) where a concatenation of cues arises in his conversation with the mother. To comprehend adequately this conversation one should remind the meaningful utterance of Lady Macduff «*All is the fear, and nothing is the love*» (12th line) introducing the infernal visionary of the world. Then after the farewell with Ross the conversation begins: «L. Macduff: *How will you live?* Son: *As birds do, mother...*». Then at last follows the infantile refutation of this infernality brought forth with calumny: «Son: *...there are liars and swearers enow to beat the honest men*» – bearing in mind that here the liar and the honest man would represent absolutely opposite meanings under the conditions of perverted world. Another sample gives the discussion of the murderers («Macbeth», 3.3): «3d Murderer: *Who did strike out the light?* 1st M.: *Was't not the way?* 3d M.: *There's bit one down: the son is fled.* 2nd M.: *We've lost / Best half of our affair*». The cues supplement one another so that the thorough axis is built up. In regard to this axis one could say of its «bifilar» structure (and even of the triple structure, be an author's image and voice taken into account).

One can imagine the situation where all signs indicating the attribution of cues to a character disappear (in particular it concerns pronouns and proper names). Then the task would arise as to their identification. Such experimental distortion of dramatic text would be similar to that of converting verses into prose. Then «a conversation with the self» is made up so that the partner's voice appears as one's own echoed imaginary remark. As an example one can take the famous scene from O. Wilde's «Lady Windermere's Fan» (3) where the chief heroine has come to the flat of Mrs Erlynn who was claimed to be notorious for her frivol behavior and reveals in reality generosity in persuading her to return home. The cited passage contains the most important excerpts. After the removal of all the particulars of personal location of direct speech a bare concatenation of thoughts appears that can be regarded as inner hesitation of heroine (who is here designated as Lady and her partner as She). It gives the following draft for a script.

[the situation of disbelief in the sincerity]

*Mrs Erlynn: (...) You must go back to your husband's house immediately. W.: Must? E.: Yes, you must! (...) W (...) My husband sent you to lure me back that I might serve as a blind to whatever relations exist between you and him. (...)*

→ «I avow the sentiment of jealousy ensuing from the demand of E. to return home immediately and express the suspicion of being treated as a puppet in the play of my rival and my husband»

[the situation of shaken convictions]

*E.: Lady Windermere, you wrong me horribly – you wrong your husband horribly (...) He never read the mad letter you wrote to him! (...) I – saw it, I opened it, I – read it. (...) W.: (...) You wouldn't dare!*

→ «the surprising confession of my letter (addressed to husband) being stolen and read by E. makes me believe that she really had the compassion to me»

[the situation of arising confidence]

*E.: (...) Oh, to save you from the abyss into which you are falling, there is nothing in the world I would not dare (...)*

→ «she assures me of her intentions to save me, and it arouses my agreement to discuss my affairs»

[the situation of an attempted objection being refuted]

*W. I do not love him! E.: You do, and you know that he loves you.*

→ «I avow my opinion that my love to my husband has declined, and she dissuades me»

[the situation of external outlook taken for reality].

*W.: (...) Living at the mercy of a woman who has neither mercy nor pity (...) E.: The money that he gave me, he gave not through love but through hatred, not in worship, but*

*in contempt. The hold I have over him (...) It is love for you, Lady Windermere. (...) His desire to spare you – shame, yes, shame and disgrace (...) I tell you that your husband loves you*

→ «I tried to resist with the last argument of being humiliated with the aid rendered by the supposed sweetheart of my husband, and it again was denied because the grants given by him to her attest actually his contempt to her and therefore love to me».

The viewpoint of the Lady is here chosen because it is her decision that is to be taken, the confrontation and struggle of adverse opinions contributing to the revaluation of her deeds. One sees the profitability of such transformation in the detection of communicative axis. Here one can divide the following steps: 1) the jealous suspicions are cast to doubt; 2) the confession of reading the letter strikes the heroine and becomes the first turning point; 3) the false opinion about the absence of love is argued that becomes the second turning point; 4) the decisive step (and the third turning point) is the refutation of the false opinion of «mercy» with the paradoxical statement of «hatred & contempt» as the sources of the husband's genuine attitude towards the pretended sweetheart. In the situation Mrs. Erlynn can be regarded as a «magic helper» who supplies the missing arguments to the heroine's inner discussion. Such are first of all her confession in regard to letter and the paradox of donations motivated with contempt. Her cues can be identified as those of objections vs. the heroine's previous opinions. If the initial state of mind can be represented as «living at the mercy» → [ABUSED PRIDE] → [refusal to return home] so the transition gets the outlook of a paradox: love (of the husband) (→ hatred) → contempt → hold → love (of Mrs. Erlynn).

Another example of comments elucidating situation can be found in the episode of I. Kocherha's «Nature and Culture» where not only the malice of a scoundrel (the former husband of heroine who has turned out to be a thief and who has nevertheless profited in his official career) remains unpunished. The situation is still more complicated due to the disclosure of the heroine's friend reserved behavior that results in the heroine's disappointment. The draft is as follows.

[situation of the ambitions of the past]

Кучерявий: *Не пізнала? <...> А може, це ти заміж зібралась? Весілля при живому чоловікові справляєш <...>* Мокрина: *Тут немає твоєї хати, Борис, ти сам відштовхнув мою руку, коли я благала тебе не кидати мене <...>* (К.: Thou hast not recognized? Or it may be, thou hast the plans of marriage? Thou make wedding while the husband being alive. M.: There are no your home here. Boris, thou hast thrown away my hand thyself when I implored thou not to leave me)

→ «the rebukes with reminding the marriage are unsubstantiated because it was not me who showed ruthlessness»

[situation of justifying one's rights]

К.: *Втішилась, заміж зібралась <...>* М.: *Ми не женемо нікого, хто хоче працювати <...> Але від мене ... від мене тобі нема чого сподіватись <...>* (К. Thou hast rejoiced, thou plan to get married. M.: We don't expel those who want to work. As to me, thou hast nothing to wait)

→ «the rebukes about the banishment are wrong because I defend only my own self»

[situation of threat] + [situation of divulging a secret as a calumny]

К.: *Да ти знаєш, що під моєю владою по сто чоловіка було й буде, да й не такого падла, як твій Прищепка <...> Він і дивитись на тебе не схоче, не до тебе, а до твоєї дочки залицяється <...> бачив, як вони там цілувалися в світлиці* (К.: And dost thou know that it was and it will be hundred men at my disposal, and not such scoundrels as thy Pryshchepa. He will not even look at thou; he makes courts to thy daughter. I have seen them kissing in the room).

→ «power compensates the dirty conscience»

→ «with the aim of humiliation he talks about the love affair of his friend with the daughter»

[situation of resisting the ambitions] + [situation of a cynic scoundrel's victory]

Прищеп: як-небудь і вас прогодуємо <...> може, ви хочете повернути нам ті карбованці, що вкрали <...>? К.: Плювати я на вас всіх хотів. Сволота. Мене, може, вже на директора заводу призначають <...> (P.: We'll be able to nourish you anyhow. Perhaps you want to return what you have stolen. K.: Ye all are to be spat by me, ye rubbish. I myself seem to be appointed the top manager)

→ «rebuke with reminding the committed crime»

→ «the proposal of reconciliation is refuted with the new message on the successes despite moral degradation»

[situation of disappointment with the broken hopes]

М.: Як ... як він смів сказати, що <...> ви з Галею цілувались <...> П.: Та й що казати, бачиш сама – любимо ми з Галею один одного ... благослови <...> М.: Ти... ти з Галею... а я <...>кого я так кохала, мов <...> (M.: How did he dare to say that you and Halya kissed, P.: And what to say, thou see – we love one another. Get the bless. M.: Thou and Halya ... and me ... and I loved him so as ...)

→ «the confession of the friend on the daughter's love story proves to be true»

Here one traces obviously a bitterer picture than in the previous example. The heroine endures not only the successes of the scoundrel. Still the worse is that his information about the genuine state of affairs turns out to be true. The heroine's expectations are shipwrecked, and despite the succeeding happy end this bitterness of the disillusionment (proclaimed here in addition by the overt thief) puts its seal upon the whole. The MALICE exists and flourishes – such is the latent meaning of the drama. That the scoundrel discloses the truth looking like a calumny gives especially painful blow. The situation of a «contest of advantages» displays honesty vs. power. Therefore the dramatic conflict isn't solved with the neat reconciliation; its solution becomes only postponed to be achieved beyond the play's borders. Moreover one can say here of a double conflict – those of JUSTICE VS. VIOLENCE and TRUTH VS. CALUMNY. The last becomes especially bitter because one loses the certitude of decision.

Such producer's comments to a drama disclose just those *meant and not mentioned* words that performer reproduces in his or her imagination as a silent monologue of the inner voice without pronouncing them loudly. The task is here to detect intentions in the same manner as the cues *a parte* do it. While supplying dramatic dialogue with such inner monologues the script of a dramatic performance discloses latent intentions of the *dramatis personae*.

A soliloquy that arises from a lyrical verse resembles producer's comments but it is attached neither to a *dramatis persona* nor to its intentions only. The matter is that lyrical character is an abstract entity and behaves in the manner of a personified allegory. Therefore the interplay of objections added by a performer to the performed lyrical enunciation is by no means attached to some personality as the embodiment of intentions remaining authorized only in a conventional way to an abstract entity. To turn the verse into a soliloquy means to disclose the antithetic statements that are *meant and not mentioned* as the presupposition to be disclosed in the contest of abstract protagonist and antagonist. The task consists in making antithesis explicit while disclosing the possible antonyms to the uttered words. This procedure acquires the outlook of a **counterpoint** invented to supplement the written statements. In particular the above mentioned polypredicative structure of lyrical enunciation presupposes the existence of at least manifested and latent conflicts that are to be disclosed in scenic soliloquy. Then the draft of a soliloquy would presuppose inventing the counterpoint of antithetic inferential statements. Such counterpoint would represent the inner monologue that dramatic text generates in a performer's imagination.

A very bright example of a conflict incarnated in a lyrical verse is to be found in M. Rylski's «Yes, we are a Prologue» (М. Рильський. «Так, ми Пролог ...» 19.12.1927).

< Ми без'язикі, безіменні, ми – / Німа вода холодного свічада, / Слизький туман. Ми привидів громада, / Що непомітно ходить між людьми. >



(We're void of tongue and name, we're deep water of a cold mirror, we're slippery fog, and we're a flock of ghosts wandering imperceptibly among the living people)

[counterpoint of antithetic inferences] → «there must be existence with tongue and visible actions» → «if we are imperceptible there exist those manifesting themselves overtly» → «apparitions are the shadows of something real»

*<I раптомо – кров у жилах закипіла, / Проїшло по тілу радісне тепло, / I творча мисль осяяла чоло / I морок бідний дивно оживила >*

(And suddenly the blood boils in the veins, the joyous heat has rushed through the body, the creating thought enlightens the forehead and enlivens wondrously the poor dimness)

[counterpoint of antithetic inferences] → «blood was earlier cold as water» → «wondrous revival is resurrection» → «the heat is radiated from some source»

[antithetic actual predicates (rhemes)] <the absence of language> vs. <the thought at the forehead>; <deep water's coldness> vs. <blood's heat>; <water & fog> vs. <blood & vein & body>; <the existence «through the looking-glass»> = <the imperceptible apparition> vs. <vitality & joy>

Such draft of soliloquy would add the counterpoint to the verse in proper sense as a performer's inner monologue added to the pronounced cues. This draft delineates situation with the manifested and latent conflicts. The first consists in the contradiction of the somber past and the «joyous» future. The very fact of «sudden» & «wondrous» transition entails the conclusion as to TRANSGURATION'S contradiction. Besides, the motif of RESURRECTION is visible as it goes about the transition from «cold water» to «hot blood». The latent conflict presupposes in its turn the antonymous conjectures to the mentioned predicates. In particular the «watery» attributes of the past before the wonder refer to the presence of some other qualities still to be sought for. It implies the necessity of the overt transition that has been rooted within the former existence.

The transformation of a verse to soliloquy is similar to the so called declamations – the manner of performance of the baroque epoch when the lines were distributed among the readers. In difference to this manner the inner monologues are added to the poet's own words disclosing thus the latent contradictions represented with the inferred counterpoint. Lyrical work always refers to some alien and different, to the otherness that is not manifested within the poetical lines. It is not only within the personal dimension of alien voices of soliloquy that such otherness reveals itself. In particular it refers to latent collisions as the invisible textual integrative power (as the action for drama) representing the problem that the lyrical verse deals with. Lyrical lines are written as the objections in a discussion. The latent refutation of antitheses is the foundation of lyrical integration. Lyrical text can be said to be integrated with its own implications so that the formation of inferences and textual integration go here side by side. When an image is mentioned in a lyrical line then another antonymous antithetic image is implied to be denied and rejected belonging to the latent background. Thus a kind of counterpoint appears that constantly accompanies the mentioned words. Therefore latent alternative has for lyrics the same meaning as action for drama so that lyrics can be said to become polemics. Each lyrical work implies polemics. Lyrics conceived as polemics can therefore be represented as a chamber theatre. In particular it invites a reader for contest, and in this participation its performable nature becomes revealed. To comprehend a lyrical work adequately a reader must behave as the performer suggesting his or her own responses. Lyrical work behaves as a drama without action. It imposes upon a reader its particular vision instead of compelling to action. Therefore lyrical poem presupposes the comprehensible attitude towards its contents and the resistance to what has been suggested. A reader is invited to take part in polemical contest. It is things and images that become dramatis personae without being specially personified.

Thus a paradoxical contemplative participation arises presupposing the disputable topics to be displayed in imaginative space. It is this paradox that builds up the foundation of lyrical imaginative theatre. A special case of such paradox is another contradictory combination of solitary play that takes place in lyrical imaginative space. Although play

presupposes the involvement of the participants' community it is the sole addressee's imagination where such theatrical treatment of lyrics is carried out. It can be exemplified with the following lines by the Ukrainian poet V. Svidzynski «The red, yellow and green glitter» (В. Свідзинський, «Червоний, жовтий і зелений блиск ...» 12. 1937).

*<Там, в високих вікнах / Тонкі завіси мглиють прозористо, / Електрика повніє*  
(There, in the high windows / the thin curtains are shimmering transparently / and electricity fills up)

→ «the curtains conceal the depth» [→ the image of a cave with shadows]

– *і рослини / Широкий лист підносять загадково* (and the plants / Heave their broad leaves enigmatically)

→ «the plants pose the puzzles» [→ conjectures about the dramatic events taking place behind the curtains]

[antithetic predicates] <leaves> vs. <curtains>

The cited fragment already introduces the hints to some mystery that can compose an inner monologue of a possible performer. The contradiction between the visible scenery and the latent risks becomes apparent. The poet has managed to recognize in the contemporary urban architecture the features substantiating the same images that had been once produced in the known simile of the shadows on the wall of a cave. It is interesting that just the plants' leaves are «entrusted» by the poet to betray the mystery and point to the puzzle in opposite to curtains concealing it. The motif of JEOPARDY and the sentiment of ANXIETY are obviously implied with these details. Lyrical details refer to the eventual deeds concealed behind the blinds in the windows.

Thus one can come to the conclusion that lyrical verses can be conceived as the scripts for a particular kind of scenic performance. The polemical nature of lyrics presupposes the necessity of inferential counterpoint that would be confronted to the manifested lines of a verse as a background. Such counterpoint would play the role of an inner monologue for the performer of a dramatic role. In lyrics the circumscriptions of details promote artistic abstractions with designating typical poetic motifs. Periphrastic descriptions become the vehicles of delineating conflicts as the core of lyrical situation. The disclosure of such conflicts gives the prerequisites for performing lyrical verses at stage.

1. *Балухатый С. Д.* Вопросы поэтики / С. Д. Балухатый. – Ленинград, 1990. – 320 с.
2. *Гумбольдт В.* Эстетические опыты. Ч. 1 : О «Германе и Доротею» Гете // *Гумбольдт В.* Язык и философия культуры / В. Гумбольдт. – Москва : Прогресс, 1985. – С. 160–278.
3. *Довбищенко Г. В., Лабінський М. Г.* Поема народного гніву. До 50-річчя сценічного втілення «Гайдамаків» Т. Шевченка / Г. В. Довбищенко, М. Г. Лабінський. – Київ : Мистецтво, 1972. – 228 с.
4. *Кенгэс-Маранда Э.* Логика загадок / Э. Кенгэс-Маранда // *Паремиологический сборник.* – Москва : Наука, 1978. – С. 249–282.
5. *Кнебель М. О.* Школа режиссуры Вл. И. Немировича-Данченко / М. О. Кнебель. – Москва : Искусство, 1966. – 168 с.
6. *Ковтунова И. И.* Поэтический синтаксис / И. И. Ковтунова. – Москва : Наука, 1986. – 210 с.
7. *Онипенко Н. К.* Внеситуативность речевых высказываний и грамматика генеритивного регистра речи / Н. К. Онипенко // *Научное наследие В. Г. Адмони и современная лингвистика.* – Санкт-Петербург : Нестор-История, 2009. – С. 198–199.
8. *Осмоловский А. В.* Этот новый древний вид искусства / А. В. Осмоловский // *Наш современник.* – 2014. – № 10. – С. 269–287.
9. *Тарланов З. К.* Очерки по синтаксису пословиц / З. К. Тарланов. – Ленинград : Издание Ленинградского университета, 1982. – 136 с.
10. *Hegel G. W. F.* Ästhetik / G. W. F. Hegel. – Berlin : Aufbau, 1955. – 1176 s.
11. *Werner J.* Lateinische Sprichwoerter und Sinnsprueche des Mittelalters aus Handschriften gesammelt. 2-te ueberarbeitete Auflage von Peter Fleury. Mit einem Vorwort von Heinz Haffter / J. Werner. – Heidelberg : Carl Winter Universitaetsverlag, 1966. – 140 s.