FEATURES OF LITERARY MODELING OF THE EAST IN THE WORKS OF MYKHAILO STARYTSKYI

[a]HANNA OSTANINA

[a]Kryvyi Rih State Pedagogical University, 54, University Ave., 50086, Kryvyi Rih, Ukraine
email: [a]anna.ostanina2124@gmail.com

Abstract: The article, based on the historical and literary approach and the systematic research paradigm, examines aspects of the work of Mykhailo Staritskyi, namely, oriental motifs in his work, their literary modeling. The main research method is literary analysis within the framework of a systems approach. The results and conclusions of the research open up new opportunities in the study of issues of the theory and history of literature, in particular the problems of genre, historicism, and inter-literary connections; in the formation of new approaches to understanding the legacy of M. Starytskyi and his place in the Ukrainian literary process of the end of the end of 19th century – beginning of 20th century; in new theoretical and concrete-historical studies on the history of Ukrainian literature, in the field of comparative studies.

Keywords: Mykhailo Staritskyi; fiction; Orient; image; Ukrainian identity.

1 Introduction

The geocultural and political aspirations of Ukrainian "late" romantics and realists of the late 19th and early 20th centuries addressed the complex artistic task of recreating a different eastern world, highlighting its connections with their homeland. These works depict characters of various social statuses, ages, nationalities, and confessional affiliations, as well as individual preferences [1; 2]. Such profound penetrations are characteristic of the best literary works of Mykhailo Starytskyi. In his dramaturgy and prose, orientalism appears more frequently than in his poetry. In his lyric-epic poem "Morituri", a subtle layer of artistically mastered Orient is already present. After the trilogy "Bohdan Khmelnytskyi", the motif of "the glorious Bohdan" leaving the Berestechko field to stop Hirey is minimized (in contrast to Naum Shram's work). The second song shifts the action to the "magnificent tent of Tsargrad", where the king, the sultan's envoy, and knights celebrate victory together. Their cold weapons are decorated with ornate Turkish enamel, which is read as a code and recognition of Eastern craftsmanship by the West.

The artistic work of Mykhailo Starytskyi, as the fruit of his extraordinary talent, at the same time relied on the rich experience of Ukrainian and world literature, was and is an integral part of it. The writer's historical fiction not only contributed to the renewal of the ideological and thematic horizons of Ukrainian literature at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, the search for visual and expressive means in the artistic development of reality, but also brought Ukrainian literature to the European level.

2 Method

The article represent a historical and literary research. A systematic approach has been applied, the choice of which is due to the fact that for the systemic approach the dynamics of the phenomenon is accessible, as well as the mutual transition of quantitative and qualitative changes, the dialectical contradictions of evolving systems, and finally, the systematic approach has "openness" in relation to comparative historical, historical genetic and other methods of research, has repeatedly proven its effectiveness.

The following methods were also used to solve the tasks: descriptive, typological, comparative.

3 Results and Discussion

The Orient is most prominently featured in two plays by Mykhailo Starytskyi: the historical hero-centric dramas "Bohdan Khmelnytskyi" (1895) and especially "Marusia Bohuslavka" (1899). The first play, like most historical works by 19th-century Ukrainian authors, shows a dependence on the negative and widely cultivated image of the treacherous Easterners. They are depicted as capable of selling even their own father into slavery for gold ducats, as exaggeratedly stated in the play. Interestingly, Starytskyi simultaneously debunks this stereotypical heteroimage of the Tatar: in "Marusya Bohuslavka", it is a Ukrainian Cossack who sells his own sister to a Tatar. The fourth act dramatizes the external diplomatic maneuvers of the hetman. In an exchange with the Turkish envoy, Khmelnytskyi expresses his "heavenly delight" in the Eastern grandiloquence at the "clear" Sultan's intention to take Ukraine under his "strong hand". The envoy's complimentary response reveals the author's mastery of the spirit and nature of Eastern oratory: the hetman's mind is clear, like "the moon in the night".

However, the subsequent mass scene reveals the complexities of the alliance with the Porte and Crimea, evidenced by the Cossacks and Tatars camped together at Berestechko. These complexities are rooted in the historical backdrop of armed conflicts between the peoples. This is symbolically represented by the song about the Cossack Sokhron, who went to fight the Horde but ended up in a Tatar prison. Starytskyi, dreaming of harmonizing interethnic relations, innovatively (for the first time in Ukrainian domestic drama and theater) attempted to balance the song component of the work with the life trials of both Ukrainians (Sokhron) and ordinary Tatars. At the beginning of Act V, a Tatar group sings in their native language accompanied by the zurna: "Min el hamde lillyan / Tuyganca osadim; / A shab tuy masan / Ya lab tuy masan![1]" [3, p. 135] Symptomatically, the Tatar song (actually a widespread proverb), sad in tone, does not resonate with the Ukrainian hearts in Starytskyi's work. The Cossacks, accustomed to what they consider more melodic songs, compare such singing to the howling of wolves in winter in a display of "black humor". The author ignored the humorous undertones of the song's words, possibly because he did not aim to depict the worldview of the Easterners but rather to break up the action with musical interludes. Nonetheless, the fact remains that, for the first time, a song in Crimean Tatar was performed on the stage of a Ukrainian professional theater.

The path to alliance and good-neighborly relations between Crimea and the state of Khmelnytskyi appears challenging in the playwright's depiction. Starytskyi subjects it to trials through the Sultan's demands and the mistrust of influential colonels. For instance, Bohun questions the loyalty of Tugay Bey and the Tatars to previous agreements, but Khmelnytskyi confidently replies: "It cannot be that Tugay Bey, my friend, / Whom I saved from death twice, / Has betrayed me!" [3, p. 149]. However, the news of the Tatars' escape portrays them as unreliable allies and the hetman as their accomplice, selling Ukraine's freedom. Ultimately, in the author's view, this historical and political alliance between the East and the West is severely complicated by the Pereiaslav Council and Khmelnytskyi's death.

The author's titles for the prologue and the first acts of "Marusia Bohuslavka" - "The Brother Sold His Sister!", "The Lost Paradise", "Converted to Islam" - quite definitively introduce the world of the Orient and its relations with Cossack Ukraine. The same applies to the list of characters. The Near East is represented by Murza, Pasha, Marusia's husband Hirey, eunuch Ahmet, and overseer Islam Bey. Hirey does not fit the stereotype of a cruel Eastern enemy; rather, he appears in the role of a lover-hero, capable of making Marusia fall in love with him: "Handsome, passionate, poetic".

The events of the work are initially set in the hypothetical steppe of Budjak – somewhere on the east-west border. This defines their outward appearance – some of the maidens of tavern are dressed in Turkish attire. Their speech is marked by oriental

[1] In modern Crimean Tatar, this sounds as follows: „Elhamdilla men / Toyğança asadim / Aşap toymasan / Yalap toymaşsın". A free translation of this would be: "Praise be to God (formula), I have eaten / I am full. / And if you are not full - / You will not lick it clean".

etiquette formulas. For example, a girl addresses the bey as "Most Radiant Ray of the Sun", and the ideal Oriental compliments her in response: "...flower from Ai-Petri! Even the morning eastern breeze would be happy to hug you" [3, p. 178]. The poeticism of the beys and the elevated style of love tirades are oriented towards idealized Ukrainian beauties. "You won't find their equal", confesses the hero, "except perhaps under the tents of Edenic gardens". But one "djaurka" is worth ten Gurias, the daughter of the muezzin of Bohuslav, who struck Hirey right in the heart: "" swear by the beard of the prophet, there is no pearl like her in the blue sea, there is no star like her in the sky!" The dynamics of the leader's internal states are reflected by the Tatar speech of the bey. Among other things, the sacred formula "Lā ilāha illā allāh, Mu ammadun rasūl allāh... Alaykum!" is inaccurately reproduced here, particularly in connection with the girl ("Oh my paradise! Lā-il-lā-ga alaykum"[2]). A joy of winning her being wo is also expressed in the religious formula of a believing Muslim: "Allāh karīm!! [Allah's commandment – *Author*] Mine, mine!!!"

Around the heroine, the playwright has woven intrigue. With the help of the cunning Khaim and gold, the bey proposes to Stepan to sell his sister - not into slavery, but into marriage in a "splendidly lush paradise", making her the mistress of countless treasures. Starytskyi's drama plot is constructed on the basis of adventurous twists: from the borderlands of the Budjak steppe, the Tatar raid secretly penetrates as far as Bohuslav (albeit with Stepan's assistance) and seizes Marusia. The setting for other "unhappy" is the Islamic world. Characters, including Marusia's mother, who dressed in the gypsy dress - in her will but to seek her daughter, converge in this place. Like P. Kulish and D. Mordovets, M. Starytskyi romanticizes the natural and man-made beauty of the Muslim, albeit hypothetical, Orient, with its white minarets and azure sea. An example is the remark "Luxurious pavilion with marble stairs. Around it, a lush garden with flower beds, fountains, and various decorations". The song "The leaf flutters, the flower wilts..." filled with the eastern highlighted beauties of nature and lyrical sentiment, is performed under the supervision of the eunuch by a choir of odalisques, accompanied by zurnas.

Instead of finding solace in song, the melancholic Marusia, in her golden prison, reflects in a feminist spirit of later centuries on the sad fate of Eastern women. She perceives its echo as "heavy, tedious" Tartar songs of harem "companions". Even the graceful dances of the odalisques do not bring her joy; she finds their "sleepy movements" lacking fire (a Western narrow view of Eastern choreography). She somewhat livens up observing the twisting original dance of the black "Arab children" boys. However, the Ukrainian is accustomed to paired dancing. In the Eastern "divertissement" arranged by the Pasha, she prefers the lively lezginka with daggers performed by two pairs of Circassians. In it, she sees resemblance to her native dances, though she considers the Cossack dance "more spirited".

As the author shows, the heroine's soul is dominated by the dramatic consciousness of a woman torn from her homeland, "permanently enslaved". Her psychological relief comes from her love for Hirey, who considers Marusia his sole and absolute "hanym", and her maternal feelings towards their children. Through an "anti-colonial" comparison of Marusia, dialoque with Hirey challenges the status of women: in the East: she is only a "slave" and "concubine", whereas in Ukraine, women have rights almost equal to the Cossacks. The Pasha justifies the established order with a Quranic prohibition, yet he has actually violated Sharia and custom by keeping only one "hanym" and not disbanding the harem due to public opinion. Starytskyi's anti-historical imposition of Western norms on Eastern traditions goes so far that Hirey swears by the name of the Prophet not to destroy Ukraine. However, he is not an autocrat; he answers to the Padishah and there is still the Divan over him.

The mentioned architectural and natural charms of Eastern civilization with its marble-crystal palaces and pointed minarets, fragrant gardens and boundless sea, in the dialogue between Marusia and Lesia, where even the cypress reminds Lesia of a "funeral candle", provide grounds for a nostalgic comparison with Ukraine. It is significant that M. Starytskyi, going against his own beliefs, places philosophical rhetorical questions in Marusia's mouth: is "everything foreign bad?" And can one not love a foreign land when "all love is just habit" (through the dialectics of the work and the evolution of the heroine, it is proven that it is far from being entirely so).

The stories of Marusia and Lesia indirectly reveal the persistence of Eastern men, the Pasha, and Lesia's Tatar lover in winning their beloved women, the fervor of their hearts in seeking reciprocity. The outcome of Act VI is illustrative in emphasizing the Pasha's fidelity to his wife, without whom his domestic paradise would seem like a desert to him, and with her presence, it whispers differently and more gracefully. In a lyric of love, Hirey addresses his Eastern "Song of Songs" to his "radiant hanym", where the white brow of his beloved, in accordance with oriental imagery, outshines "the snows of Mount Lebanon".

Ahmet's assertion that he is actually a compatriot of the "noble hanym" reveals the extent of the Crimeans' trust in Ukrainians - strong in keeping their word, responsible in managing the harem. Ahmet fully mastered the high etiquette style: "Mistress, beauty of all beauties..." The behavior and appearance of Marusia's children (the boy only being connected to the Turkish world through his fez) reveal their Ukrainian identity inherited from their mother. Yet, this does not prevent the idealized "falcon" father from loving his eaglets as he loves his Qur'an, like the scent of lilies.

The third act diversifies the key imagery of "Crimean captivity" typical for romantic literature, as well as the emotional and stylistic palette of the work, with Cossack humor in the remarks of the captive "djaura". For instance, Ohrym ironically characterizes captivity as "marvelous", because they not only put stones under your head and stretch Cossack strength with hard labor, but the "kavadzhi" scratch your body with a shovel. One of the overseers of the beating accompanies it with Eastern curses (dogs, pigs, devilish spawn) and promises to tear belts from the prisoners' skins. The cruelty towards captives in the Islamic world is also evident in the fact that Turkish infantry is ready to immediately crush any their uprising.

The scornful (the land of "asps, clumsy fanatics") and lyrical style of "Eastern flourishing" (addressing the daughter as the grand hanym, "brighter than the lord of the Eastern sun") quickly and organically becomes familiar to Mistress Hanna. Even adventurous "forays" contribute to M. Starytskyi's contrasting depiction of two worlds. For instance, Marusia's mother, dressed as a gypsy, tests her daughter with comparisons of the Port and the "wild land of the ghaur". Marusia herself, personifying the factor of bringing together two worlds and a "medium" between the realities of Western freedom and Eastern captivity, successfully endures this trial with dignity.

The final act substantiates the concepts of freedom and captivity. The former is embodied by a luxurious house with "pillars, a wide porch, marble stairs". The latter is represented by a prison with an iron gate, where captives are punished, surrounded by walls and chains that enclose the city. When all the faithful respond to the muezzins' call ("Aleykum el, Ramzan!" – "Lya illiaga / I lya allahu Magomet rasu"), and go for the night to the mosque of Ali, Marusia, hiding the stolen keys, sets free the Cossack prisoners. The heroine granted them Easter liberation at a high cost. By resolving a dramatic bifurcation between two worlds and civilizations this way, she condemned her children to a life without a mother, herself to destroying, and the city and her husband to bloody revenge. The finale of the oriental drama takes on the characteristics of a liberation myth. In it, the Cossacks bid farewell to their liberator not on the "bakhmetiks of Turkish winddrivers Araps", but on fast galleys with cannon salvos, from which "palaces and prisons crumble in fire".

[2] It should sound like this: „Lā ilāha illā allāhu Muhammadun rasūlu allāh", which means „There is no god but Allah, and Muhammad is His messenger".

Mikhailo Starytskyi, as a novelist, contributed no less to the development of Ukrainian oriental literature at the end of the 19th century than he did in drama or poetry. Evidence of this lies in his trilogy about Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, including his alliance with the Crimean Khanate and his brotherhood with Tugay-bey. The historical epic was composed of the novels "Before the Storm", "The Storm", and "At the Pier", which were published gradually during 1895-1897 in the "Moskovskyi Listok". Preparation for this work, as indicated by the author's notebook from 1891, involved studying sources from the history of Poland, Ukraine, Crimea, and collections of documents, chronicles, and historical works by Ukrainian, Polish, Russian authors, and more. All of this heightened the authenticity of orientalism in the trilogy.

The introductory acquaintance of the readers with the two horsemen ("Before the Storm") allows one to appreciate the classic Tatar type of youth: tanned face, hair curly as "raven wings curly hair", narrow eyes and wide cheekbones. Other external features of the portrait, intriguingly, indicated Ahmetka's half-Ukrainian blood. The lyrical-romantic scene with Oksana clarified the tragic historical retrospective: he is the descendant of a kidnapped Ukrainian woman whom a Tatar killed during a Cossack raid on his ulus, leaving behind their son. This episode largely reproduced the fantastical Western perceptions of the East and its peoples in the 17th century. In particular, Oksana heard such absurdities: "Tatars are born blind like puppies and don't see for nine whole days"; "across the sea live black people who walk with their heads down and their feet up" [3, p. 194].

Khmelnytskyi, like his adopted son, also reveals himself in the "oriental" biographical aspect. The hero recounts his capture at the Battle of Cecora, captivity in Skutari and Karasubazar, and his ransom. The dialogue with Prince Jeremi Bohdan reflects his evaluations of Poland's relations with the Porte and Crimea, shaped by his experiences and reflections. The role of the Cossacks in defending the frontier lands is outlined as follows: only the Zaporozhians from the desert plains of the Dnipro can stand against the hordes of wild steppe warriors led by the Khan. The ranks of the Sich Cossacks could also be replenished, as the openness of the "glorious community" is emphasized by Ganja, by a Tatar or Turkish. It was enough to read "I believe" and cross oneself.

Until the future time of his hetmanship, as in his conversation with Chancellor Ossoliński, he camouflages Ukrainian "interests" by interpreting international politics in favor of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Thus, he rejects the accusation of breaching peace with the East: "...can we call the unbelieving robbers-basurmans and Tatars peaceful neighbors? They do not recognize the rights of our state or its borders; they constantly invade our homeland like ravenous wolves, bringing death and ruin, taking citizens captive" [3, p. 430].

In accordance with historical truth, the novelist embodied the international political paradigm of "Europe against Asia", revealing the aspirations of Władysław IV to "crush the Tatars" and establish his state as a world power [1], and at the same time, Venice's attempts to purchase Slavic swords "to the detriment of Islam" aimed to distract the Turks from Candia. The Venetian envoy entices the king with the possibility of toppling the "raised horns of the crescent moon", scattering the horde, and conquering Crimea with all its "wealth and luxuries", thus forming Poland from sea to sea.

The plot of the novel (15th century) develops the theme of the confrontation between the West and the East by depicting the "holy cause", from the Cossack perspective, of raids on infidels. One of the expedition leaders, Khmelnytskyi, plans to swiftly capture one of the coastal Turkish cities, Trebizond or Caffa, lighting his pipe from the flames (a genetically Shevchenko-like image). He is not concerned with booty or the liberation of captives, but, as M. Starytskyi writes in the same spirit of "romantic horror", with inflicting as much harm as possible on the fanatics and terrifying the shores of Anatolia so that the shock reaches Constantinople itself and awakens the sultan on his carpets" [3, p. 275]. Even without considering fashionable approaches to the orientalization of literature and historical stereotypes of the Russo-Turkish wars, it must be asserted that the quote conveys the real tension between the states and peoples of Eastern Europe and the Near East.

The novel also reflected a lack of tolerance towards the language and neighboring ethnic groups: Morozenko is capable of "barking" in Tatar when needed. Such coarse associations with the sound of another group's language, especially from a nobleman, are rare. For example, they are absent when Marylka addresses "daddy" in Tatar, when Ganja greets the "little Tatar" Morozenko in Tatar (albeit with a mispronunciation), saying "Silyay aylekim yakshi!" or when Chernota, dressed as a Turk, and Khmelnytsky exchange phrases ("Selim-aylekim!" and "Hom-geldi!"). However, neither the ability to speak Tatar nor Morozenko's use of customary sacred Muslim rhetoric – "faithful brothers, Allah is great, and Muhammad is his prophet!" – nor his Tatar "legend" helped the young scout avoid capture by Tatar fishermen.

"Cross-eyed asps", "shaved dogs", "infidels" who must only be beaten – such, with few exceptions, is the prevalent image-stereotype of the Tatar or Turkish Other in Ukrainian historical literature. The reasons for this are obvious and understandable. The novelist, however, does not forget to at least partially harmonize the bloody pages of international relations (see the scene of the galley capture, XXI) with a display of non-solidarity with the "hellish picture" of violence and cruelty.

Marylka's recounting to Bohdan added to the gallery of Eastern negative archetypes with Tatar slave traders - dealers in human goods - and a lustful old man in an expensive silk robe. In the captive's perception, Caffa is associated with the opulent exterior of her prison-palace: pink marble stairs, carpets in which one's foot sinks, stone latticework walls, and a decorated ceiling. The architectural luxury of the Muslim world is matched in M. Starytskyi's description by the works of craftsmen of domestic art, all these shawls, pearls, and damasks, exotic dishes (sherbet and other famous delicacies, coffee, oranges). All this, along with performances by dancers and displays of tricks, turned out to be preparation for selling the beauty to a more expensive harem. The established system of the harem functions: Marylka adapts to "the narcotic atmosphere of Eastern languor and indolence" [3, p. 399], physically developing as if in a greenhouse. Thus, while still half a child, she begins to feel the power of her feminine charms, which captivated the hetman and not only him.

The work has a rather extensive Eastern "geography". Besides the already mentioned places, it includes Khadjibey, "Kimburg", Akkerman, Kayalnik, Sarykol, Budjak, Kadima, and Yahorlyk - rivers that marked the beginning of Ukraine. The anxieties of the Jewish minority in turbulent times (Shmul, Rivka), the parallelism of Tatar images, suggest a certain intertextual significance for M. Starytskyi of N. Gogol's "Taras Bulba", T. Shevchenko's poetry, and possibly the works of H. Sienkiewicz, mentioned in the Ukrainian author's notebook.

Part IX of the next novel in the trilogy, "The Storm", symbolized the scale of the threat to Ukraine from Crimea with the alarming fires of watchful figures, depicted through various arts - from new literature (M. Starytskyi) to contemporary painting (Y. Yushko's painting "Danger", 1995). Behind the panic caused by these fires lies the tragic experience of the Western natives, familiar with the "Tatar trouble", and the influence of folklore tales about the countless "hordes of Tatars and the horrors of the horde's devastations". Ukraine's defenders, from their experience of repelling riders like Khmelnytskyi, are aware that in a clash with the Crimean Tatars, speed and pressure are crucial because "the Tatar is like the wind".

Upon learning from one of them, with eyes like of a "lean wolf", where the battalion had gone, the Cossack "effendi" or "murza" Bohdan, as the captive titles him, reveals to Koniecpolski the

four-pronged strategy of the Tatar raids. This strategy allowed them to swiftly scour the area and, if repelled, to escape to their "ulus and sarai with the loot". Well-acquainted with the subject matter, the novelist accurately depicted the Tatar camp and the beginning of the battle, based on a combination of visual (the strength of the people, wagons, fires) and auditory impressions (the calls of the muezzins, the clamor from the sudden attack, "victory shouts"). In the atmosphere of fierce fighting, the episodes of peaceful communication become even more precious in the epic's concept. An artistic anticipation of the meeting between Khmelnytskyi and Tugay Bey - bonded by a "youthful" friendship through the custom of "blood exchange" and the fact that the Ukrainian saved Tugay Bey from death twice - is depicted in chapter XXVI. This scene features a rare friendly dialogue in Oriental Ukrainian battle literature between the Cossack leader and the young Murzen Kerim, whom Bohdan had once taught to handle weapons.

"Alla illyaha" ("My God!") - the Muslim youth greeted "the delight of his father Tugay's heart," "the glorious dzhigit", and "the falcon of the steppe". Bohdan also tactfully honored the young "swift-winged falcon" in the spirit of Eastern linguistic etiquette: "the beam of the bright moon". The scene of hosting in the tent is rich in Eastern exotic culinary color, with dishes like shashlik, pilaf, horsemeat, halva, sherbet, chihir, and kumis. The conversation during the feast aptly incorporated traditional and everyday realities: beyship, hanym, oath by the prophet's beard, and one of the two bairams[3]. Perhaps the best description in Ukrainian literature of the Arab-Tatar steed is found in this novel [3, p. 206].

Thus, the idea of understanding between the Cossacks and the Crimean Tatars is gradually developed. The horde "should not be provoked" [3, p. 389-390], Sulima insists in response to Teteria. Hetman Bohdan does not support the fluctuating Cossack group's mood to march against the "infidels" or the "unbelievers". As an advocate of reconciliation and friendship with the eastern neighbor, he emphasizes in the mass scene of Chapter XLVII: "The Tatar, though a heathen, keeps his word better than the Catholics and will help us defeat our sworn enemy..." [3, p. 350]. This foreign policy stance is further reinforced by memories of hospitality in Perekop with gifts and feasting, and his time as a hostage in Crimea. Retrospectively, through the recreation of Khmelnytskyi-ambassador's stay in Bakhchisarai while waiting for an audience with Islam Hiray, Starytskyi created a vivid, somewhat hyperbolized, Oriental image of the Crimean Horde leader's residence. It is described as "an extraordinary, magnificent palace; it exudes Eastern luxury; gilded halls decorated with arabesques, illuminated by multicolored windows, shine with fairy-tale splendor... under a lavish canopy, on satin, gold-embroidered cushions, sits the padishah [error, it should be: 'khan' – *Author*]; before him, Lebanese incense smokes, and a hookah smolders in his mouth" [3, p. 389-390].

Khmelnytskyi's speech in Tatar is notable not so much for its diplomatic "servile" expressions but for advocating the ideal of harmonious coexistence and the union of the two peoples. Despite the clashes and confrontations in their shared historical past, the speaker views the Crimean Tatars as "our glorious neighbors", "natural friends", and "brothers in valor". These warriors are worthy of the Cossacks' friendship. To implement this, the embassy offers the "sun of the East" friendship and an eternal alliance, even expressing readiness to fight for Muslim interests. The novelist was sufficiently knowledgeable about history to understand its peculiarities: everyone was both ally and enemy to everyone else. Starytskyi endowed the Crimean khan with an understanding of this historical axiom. The khan listened to the speaker with apparent sympathy but did not fully trust him. Therefore, the oath of loyalty before him and the divan was insufficient - Khmelnytskyi was forced, according to the old customs of the East and West, to leave his son as a hostage (amanat). Even then, the cunning khan only allowed Tugay Bey to assist the Cossacks, and only after the Bairam holiday.

The pivotal event in the Oriental imagoperception of the novel "The Storm" is found in parts LII-LIII, depicting the joyful reunion of Bohdan and Tugay at the head of their armies - Cossacks in zhupans, Tatars in cherkesses, and Circassians in cherkesses and papakhas. The Cossack greeting to the Tatars, this time called upon and thus cherished guests, is met with the response "Tashgeldi! Barabar!" - expressions of blessing and friendship. In the romantic portrayal of the appearance of the mature Crimean Tatar, not as young as Kerym but reminiscent of Burunda-begadir from I. Franko's story "Zakhar Berkut", certain ethno-imagological traits are emphasized: the tan of the son of the sunny East; his physical strength (indicated by the figure of the hero-batyr); a smile, terrifying in its cruelty and threatening to enemies; and finally, the narrow slit of the eyes. Thus, individual and psychological traits are combined with Crimean Tatar lineage. The accuracy of this portraiture is indirectly confirmed by M. Cherniavskyi in his work "Bohdan's Introduction" (1901). Here too, we find Tugay-bey's smile, though not as terrifying - more in the eyes. It is also noteworthy that M. Starytskyi, when introducing some Tatar lexemes as needed, provided their Ukrainian equivalents, thus catering to the reader ("Stop! Saldyr!", "Yok pek! Didn't know!"). The friendly atmosphere of the conversation between the allied leaders is conveyed with characteristic Eastern metaphor ("Oh, my friend, dost - it is stronger than Damascus steel!" [3, p. 395]), and with idiomatic phrase openings ("Kardash! Dost!" – "Yok ter!", "Barabar"). Some of these are connected to ethnic imagemes. For example, Tugay explains the more effective actions of Tatar scouts compared to the Cossacks not by the narrowness of their eyes, but by the fact that they eat horse meat and drink kumys instead of "rakia".

Even friendly relations, when tested by war, reveal in Starytskyi's realistic depiction each leader's concern for their own soldiers in battles and the Tatars' bey, murzas, and chambuls' behavior dependent on the moment's circumstances. This occurs despite Tugay's declarative assurances that Allah's children unite soul to soul in friendship. In reality, there is a direct correlation: when the Polish army's situation worsens, the "eternal barabar" (brotherhood) between the Tatars and Cossacks strengthens, but when it improves, this friendship weakens. The main reason for the conflict between the allies, as shown by the author in a historical spirit, is the Ukrainian captives (jasyr). M. Starytsky, in a romantically hyperbolized light, portrays the extreme agitation of the Tatar and his furious threats to side with the Poles if he does not immediately receive jasyr and the enemy convoy. In response, Khmelnytskyi diplomatically promises the Crimean Tatar army rich spoils, resulting in the bey promising him the friendship of the faithful until the end of time.

The unreliability of the Crimean Eastern ally, according to the Western romantic stereotype, is largely due to his "savagery". The Tatars, according to Charnota, are "an unsubordinate people; they are willful and unyielding... And even our own are not all disciplined yet" [3, p. 523]. The Crimean horde, Khmelnytskyi angrily notes, always seeks to rake in the heat with others' hands, always striving to gain "garach" (plunder). The Tatars, as the author depicts, are not only greedy for jasyr but can also be Asian-style cruel in dealing with enemies who fall into their trap (LXVIII).

After the victory, in accordance with the customs of Eastern warriors, some of them tie up the Poles with lassos, while others loot wagons and carriages. Others strip the dying, who have fallen under the "crossing lightning of scimitars", of their silver armor and gold rings, cutting off fingers to get the jewelry. Among the trophies from the Polish camp, there were many items of Eastern origin: the finest Persian belts, Turkish brocade, and Uriah pearls. When facing a strong enemy in open field, Starytsky emphasizes the extraordinary bravery of the best Tatar knights, like Tugay-bey and his brilliant retinue of murzas, who, despite the danger, approach close to the Polish army's positions to scout their arrangement. The daring warriors (djigits)

[3] Here, too, there is evidently a miscalculation: in M. Starytsky's depiction, the day of Bayram resembles late summer or early autumn. In reality, however, the major Bayram is celebrated by Muslims at the beginning of October, and the minor one in the second half of December.

challenge the enemy to a "valiant duel". Meanwhile, the Polish nobles try to rouse their own courage by falsely belittling the Easterners, saying, "The foolish-headed Tatars, having drunk their booze, are preparing to trouble us..." [3, p. 572]. In reality, during the celebratory feast of triumph at Khmelnytsky's, Tugay's Tatars and he himself consume only those dishes and drinks that the prophet Mohammed has not forbidden to the "faithful". Furthermore, the last parts of the novel "At the Pier" add to the imagological gallery of Eastern characters with the Tatar serdyuks of the hetman, who, during their free time, consume "chihir" while singing a "monotonous, dreary Tatar song", and two giant, monstrous Tatar executioners, faithful servants of Tymko.

Apart from the military and domestic aspects, the Orient is most revealed – mostly in the final novel of the trilogy - in the context of Bohdan Khmelnytsky's diplomatic activities. The Hetman, as portrayed by the novelist in accordance with historical reality, skillfully navigates the contradictions between the Porte and Poland, as well as the ambitions of the Tsar to capture Constantinople. Simultaneously, he sends letters to the Turkish and Muscovite rulers, requesting their protection. These letters, aided by his son Tymko, help gather valuable information about the moods of influential Tatars like Karabich-murza and others. In the author's conception, they contribute to strengthening the oriental vector of Cossack Ukraine's policy. According to the Hetman's persuasion, "we must not lose the Tatars and the Turks". To ensure the "Tatar camps" do not creak too much, lavish gifts, letters with generous promises, best wishes "to His Khanly Majesty", and refined eastern compliments are employed.

Similarly, depicted is the policy towards Constantinople, supplemented by measures to weaken the Vizier's trust in the Poles. The Hetman soberly assesses the situation: whichever side the Porte leans towards will gain the advantage. His inner reflections lead to an understanding of the mutual benefit of protectorate under the Turks: the brilliant Porte beyond the sea "will not overflow to us, but through the Cossacks, it is advantageous for it to keep the neighbors in fear..." [3]. Later, however, Khmelnytsky becomes disillusioned with the alliance with the Sultan in favor of Moscow (his illusions and disappointments in dealing with the Mohammedans were inherited by Hetman Doroshenko in the diptych "Youth of Mazepa" – "Ruins", whom Briukhovetskyi sarcastically dubbed "the illustrious hetman of the Tatars" for this). As a politician, Bohdan understands that the Porte will agree to round out its territory with the "vilayets" of Ukraine, but as a pragmatist, he is convinced that the Sultan will not send troops to defend it and will delegate the matter to the Khan, who will 'sell out' at the first opportunity.

Starytskyi demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the events in Turkish history of the 17th century in his novel. For instance, the phrase from the ambassador's letter to Istanbul regarding the death of the Sultan at the hands of Janissaries and the beginning of the rule of a new vizier reflects actual events from 1648. At that time, Sultan Ibrahim, who was strangled near the helm of power, was succeeded by Muhammad Pasha Dervish (actually Sofu Mehmed Pasha). Other events in the novel depict historical events such as the siege of Zbarazh by allied forces and the death of loyal friend Tugay-bey at the beginning of the Battle of Berestechko. It justified the ominous forebodings of the hetman, who found himself in "honorable captivity" under Islam-Hirey. The end of the Cossack-Tatar alliance during Khmelnytsky's era in the novel comes with the escape of the Horde troops from the plague into their own uluses. It should be added that the trilogy incorporated motifs from the mentioned diptych, including depictions of the splendors of the Bakhchisarai palace, oriental comparisons with the natural world, and tested Turkisms ("yok bek", "barabar"), organically supplemented by "exotic" time calculation ("the moon already changed its appearance three times since then...").

The portrayal of the military-political alliance of the Cossack state under Hetman P. Doroshenko with the Crimean Khanate prompted an oriental discourse in the unpublished Soviet novel diptych of M. Starytskyi's "Youth of Mazepa" (1898) and "Ruins" (1899). The author began to embody these pages of interstate history according to the principle of "from the opposite". Albeit in a humorous context, the Zaporizhzhian elder Sich promises to give time to non invited "squint-eyed Tatar". This line is illustrative of the sentiments expressed by Ivan Bohun (Chapter III) among the people, weary of the raids by the Horde. In the novel, Mazepa, thinking like a statesman, plays the role of a mediator in revealing the international situation. During that time, Moscow, after the Pereiaslav Council, still feared competing with Poland, the "Tatars land", and Turkey, and thus it tore Ukraine apart with the Andrusiv Peace.

With the era of P. Doroshenko, in the novel comes an attempt to rebuild new allied "bridges" between Ukraine and the Muslim East. At the personal sphere level, this is depicted through the appearing of Tatar murzas in the hetman's capital. Doroshenko formed friendly relations with Islam-bey. The verbal portrait of the influential Turk enriched the limited Oriental gallery of positive Ottomans and Tatars in Ukrainian literature of the 19th century. Starytskyi focused on depicting the precious weaponry and rich attire of the Eastern guest - skillfully crafted caftans and robes, a helmet adorned with a large diamond. The features of Islam-bey's appearance harmonize with this description: he has a handsome olive-colored face, not narrow but large almond-shaped eyes radiating bravery combined with cunning. These are both individual psychological characteristics of the character and generic features of an Ottoman in the epic vision. The only negative trait in the realistic "Dickensian" style of the portrait is his broad teeth, giving a predatory tone to his face.

The Tatar-speaking dialogue incorporates friendly yet formal addresses in the bey's remarks. The bey's dialogues vividly revealed, among other things, the relations between the Khanate and the Porte, combined with principles of agreement and friendship rather than the strict domination of the Turkish suzerain over the Tatar vassal. There replicas provided examples of the Porte;s tolerance towards the faith of non-Muslim subjects of the padishah (e.g., "The crescent of Mohammed does not clash with the tops of your Christian crosses") [4, p. 98]. Doroshenko's programmatic language, as focused by M. Starytskyi, aimed not so much at praising the powerful overlord ally but rather at mitigating the widespread imagosemantics of hostility from the Porte towards the Slavic world, highlighting the striking differences between neighboring civilizations of the East and West. In contrast, the novelist emphasized mutually tolerant ideas of unity and joint military endeavors: "...your bravery, your swiftness, your courage - are close to us: the Cossack and the Tatar are akin through the vast steppe and free will" [4, p. 97]

Similar to B. Khmelnytskyi in the trilogy, the hetman from the duology faces a psychologically challenging test with the most crucial situation of choosing an ally. Orienting himself towards a powerful country in the Middle East, Petro Doroshenko weaves secret dreams of deflecting from enemies to establish independent orders in Ukraine. Thus, he hesitates to immediately seek support from the Khan even from Islam-bey, understanding in his heart (Chapter XVIII) that the Tatars are friends but also driven by self-interest. Yet it was with them that "Father Khmel" liberated Ukraine from Polish bondage, and the Tatars did not oppress the faith of Ukrainians, as emphasized by Metropolitan Tukhalskyi. Apparently, eastern "brothers" would demand much in return for their help, and their intervention could lead the homeland into decline. However, Ukraine cannot fend off the Commonwealth and the Muscovite Tsarhrad on its own. Furthermore, eastern pashas would not acquire estates and serfs in Ukraine, nor would they persecute Orthodox priests like the Poles.

Completely unusual in the Oriental paradigm of 19th-century Ukrainian literature is the narrative role of the eastern counselor, depicted in the novel as supporting Islam-bey's statecraft hopes and the hetman's aspirations. Namely he, once rescued by Doroshenko from captivity, asserts the genuine need to

strengthen Cossack Ukraine with the might of the Ottoman Porte and the Crimean Khanate, which Doroshenko secretly dreams of. Perhaps the rhetoric of Islam-bey, the spokesperson of individual brotherhood, adorned with the raspberry flag "with the bright shadow of the sultan", does not entirely appeal to Hetman Petro. However, the constructive idea of a strong union between the Ukrainian and Turkish peoples holds deep significance for him, grounded in his belief that no historical or political storm will break the tree of true friendship.

The staunch opponent of the hetman's pro-Turkish sentiments was the respected Zaporizhzhian colonel Sirko - a consistent critic and hater of "the charm of the Agarian", embodying the traditional Cossack view that raids against Crimean Tatars and Turks are nothing short of a holy feat in the name of Christ. His convictions, expressed during the dialogue among Cossacks in Part XX of the novel, resonate closely with the majority of them. Starytskyi substantiates this with the historical memory of the Sich about the betrayal at Brest and the expulsion of Jasir from Ukraine. They justify their position with the folk proverb "Be friends with the Tatar, but keep a stone ready in your pocket" (Ukrainians adapted its variant regarding a semi-Asian ethnos: "Be friends with the Muscovite, but keep a stone in your pocket").

Despite all the differences in views and political orientations, the duology gradually brings forward Ivan Mazepa in the role of a unique arbitrator. The future hetman, who, having lost, managed estates under the Porte, takes a consistent state position in this decisive debate on saving Ukraine through an alliance with the Crimean Khan (which the Cossacks eventually accept, except for the staunch Sirko). The dialogue of struggle in Parts XXII-XXIII between the visionary political pragmatist Mazepa (who justifies the actions of saviors of their nations Judith, who cut off the head of Holofernes, and Delilah, who weakened Samson) and Sirko shows that the colonel narrowly adheres to the ideas of medieval crusaders and cannot forget the evils of the Horde. Mazepa understands this at heart, having seen villages ravaged by Tatars, but he does not accept Sirko's hardened approach, which promises greater calamity to the homeland, since Sirko rejects the possibility of friendship between the heathens and the Cossacks as long as Zaporizhzhia stands. In contrast, Sirko orients himself towards Moscow - as the supposed "paternal home" for Ukrainians (to which Mazepa reasonably demonstrates the unsuitability of Moscow's order for Ukraine).

Important in terms of Oriental imagery semantics, the scene between Mazepa and Marianna (Chapter XLII) further elaborates on the Eastern vector of Doroshenko's and Mazepa's political doctrines, highlighting both their commonalities and differences. For instance, Mazepa does not support the hetman's idea of extending Turkish protection over the Left Bank Ukraine: "Of course, the Turks are strong and distant neighbors, but under their rule there will never be peace; one only needs to remember that their law commands the eradication of all Christians" [4, p. 249].

The "omniscient" author, using Mazepa's thesis about seeking some distant protector is "building" the bridge into 1709, the events of "the Swedes". M. Starytsky endowed Ivan Stepanovich with far-reaching state plans for distancing from the East in the future (\'throw away the Tatars", "push back the Turks"), which will ultimately only raise respect for Ukraine among Muslims.

The battle scenes in the duology, like in the trilogy, absorbed an Orientalist emphasis on the zeal of Allah's warriors. This is also present in the comparison - generally with a negative connotation - of the Horde soldiers to "disorderly packs of black demons, rushing with howls and roars to engulf a handful of brave men" under Sobieski. At the same time, the novelist noted as a mental trait of Crimean Tatars their dislike for besieging fortified camps or castles. Thus, Doroshenko, eager for victory, decisively calls on Kalga (actually a general term, not a specific name) to a decisive assault, addressing Nur ad-Din in Eastern etiquette. However, the Tatars postpone the battle until morning: it is time to perform the evening prayer, gather, and burn the bodies from the field.

The plans of the hetmans and the sprouts of allied interaction between the Tatar and Cossack armies, dramatically portrayed by Starytsky, collapse together fate, the shortsightedness of some, and the personal experiences of others - though hetmans, but also Ukrainian cordocentric men [2]. This occurred in the depicted events under Berestechko in the trilogy and similarly unfolds in the duology (the Battle of Pidhaitsi). When in the novel "Mazepa's Youth" the allies were separated form the decisive triumph only by night, news reached the Tatars: Sirko had struck at Crimea. This placed Doroshenko at the mercy of Tatar yataghans, from which he was saved by Islam-Bey. Promises wrapped in the guise of Eastern fatalism from "Sultan Kalga" to finish the battle for a double bribe remained promises; the Tatars signed a perpetual peace with Poland.

The final novel "Ruins" continued and completed a series of motifs inherited from the previous work. This includes the plundering of Ukraine by ""slant-eyed dogs" of the Horde, joined by the Turks under the leadership of the Pasha. It also reveals the antagonistic tearing apart of the elite, Cossacks, and commoners among different orientations, and Ukraine - further fragmented by several hetmans fighting amongst themselves. Various characters, in different situations and influenced by external factors, repeatedly discuss which protector to adhere to. However, the chosen political courses of Doroshenko towards the Porte and Khanenko towards the Tatars remained unpopular among the Ukrainian people. Thus, disillusionment with the Eastern ally of Doroshenko and Mazepa began in the ethnoimagological literary reception during the second "intermission" of the historical union between Crimea and Ukraine.

At the end of the novel, Starytsky depicts how Bohun begins a partisan war with the Turks. He had previously expressed dissatisfaction with Ukraine's "eastern course", using the term "unbelief" as a stencil-like signifier for Easterners. The colonel emphasized that the Tatars consider Cossacks to be like dogs, and the Quran supposedly promises a reward for killing and deceiving Christians. Although the idea of a cross "under the protection" of a crescent did not appeal to Bohun and many others, Doroshenko sees no alternative. The hetman idealistically hopes for "easy payment and little obedience" from the powerful Turkish state of another faith [4, p. 396]. Starytsky justified this position with the reasoning that the Porte, located across the sea, cannot absorb or subdue Ukraine, and in general, it is not inclined to pay attention to the internal affairs of its subjects. In the mass scene in Chapter LXXV, Tukalskyi reinforced this argument: by uniting with a Turk, the Cossacks unite with Eastern patriarchs and the source of their piety, thereby supporting the holiest and all "sub-Turkish" Christians.

The characterization of literary orientalism in the novel "Ruins" would be incomplete without noting the Eastern coloration that Chyhyryn acquired. This includes in the description of the castle many guests in "white tents". Mention is made of aghas, murzas in expensive attire, and Turkish Janissaries who were the retinue of the noble leaders of the 30,000-strong Horde, brothers of the "sultan" (meaning khan) Nureddin, Mamat-Hirey, and Salamat-Hirey. In the orientalized depiction of the bazaar square, there are Eastern goods, figures of traders including Tatars and long-bearded Turks, and most notably Armenians. Another Eastern ethnic group mentioned in the novel are the Kalmyks in service to Briukhovetskyi, a detail not covered by P. Kulish.

The romantic twists of the novel, a constant theme in the artist's historical prose, are also characteristic in his oriental discourse. This includes Mazepa's persistent and somewhat hopeless search for Halyna in Crimea and Constantinople (who knows who among the "infidels" and in whose harem ended up?). On the margins of historical storytelling, Starytskyi barely indicated (presumably due to politics overshadowing daily life, or perhaps a desire not to repeat himself) and then only sparingly, as in the novel "Mazepa's Youth", with elements of material Eastern

ambiance. These are already familiar low Turkish divans, carpets, weapons, and so forth.

At the heart of the novel, there is the dilemma of "mutually beneficial alliance" versus "Muslim yoke", which particularly torments Petro Doroshenko. He hopes for the former, having already gained positive experience in his novelistic history of interaction. The Turks helped him twice against the Poles and "Cain" Hanenko with Jurash, who became a prisoner in Istanbul's Yedikule. Also, the hired Bilhorod Horde fought faithfully alongside the Cossack regiments on the left bank. Hetman psychologically explaines unpredictability of the Crimean Tatars by the arrogance of the murzas and "sultans", which Mazepa realistically exploits for advantage in his neighbor's house disturbances.

Historical fiction writer M. Starytsky not only introduced documents into his artistic canvas, like D. Mordovets did, but also visualized Doroshenko's "agreement" with the Turks adopted by the Council of Korsun. Externally, it is a parchment document with a hanging seal, on which was written in Turkish and translated the "irade" of Sultan. The document revealed the foundations of the Cossacks' coexistence with the Porte - not as slaves or tributaries, but as people free from all taxes. The Ottoman insignia "tui", "sandzhak", and the baton signified the alliance and the hetman's readiness to militarily support the Porte in its wars. Mazepa, in turn, keenly inquired about how Turkey would come to the aid of its allies. The agreement guaranteed the inviolability of faith and Orthodox churches, private property, and the freedom of local people under the threat of capital punishment. In Starytskyi's reception and among the representatives of his ideas among the foreground characters (VIII), this forms the very basis on which alliance and coexistence with non-believers and the "unwavering authority" of Turkey can be built.

Around the alliance with it and the reality of implementing these provisions in life, discussions unfold on many pages of the novel (and this typological convergence, let us say, with Panteleimon Kulish;s "Black Council" or Mykola Voronyi's poem "Yevshan-Zillia", authors who reflect on the paths to lead Ukraine on the right road). This leaves its mark on the multifaceted genre-compositional nature of "The Ruin" – simultaneously a historical and biographical novel with projections into the present, an adventurous and romantic canvas, a novel of debate, and partly even a dystopian warning against an alliance with the East.

The final position was summed up during the discussion at Zaporizhzhia by Grandfather Knysh: "...one should not deal with the unclean... one cannot trust the basurmans: they will deceive, they will not give aid, and if they come to us, it will be to our own detriment" [4, p. 680]. The same conclusion is reached by Colonel Hostriy, who in a confidential conversation with Mazepa asserts that one cannot trust Turkish assistance, and thus an alliance with Turkey "will forever be against the people..." [4, p. 706]

In the diplomatic game between the West and the West (Ukraine with Poland) and the West and the East, Constantinople's Patriarch Methodius becomes involved. He alternates between granting and revoking the "unblessed writ" to Sinful. The hetman, falling under the precedent of Doroshenko's policy, leans towards a plan to use the Sultan's protection with subsequent refusal from it. Therefore, he dares to threaten the tsar's envoy with uniting Ukraine under the Turkish "sandzhak" and subsequently launching a joint campaign with the Porte against Muscovy.

The opponent of the eastern orientation - more from tactical than principled convictions, which are not inherent to him - is portrayed by Starytskyi in Samoilovych' image. This "fool" in Taras Shevchenko's assessment actor meticulously substantiates the anti-Christian mode of the Porte (LV), weaving intrigues against Doroshenko and Sinful. The author justified Mazepa's disappointment in the "dreadful alliance" with other state-building reasons: "one could not expect any prosperity or freedom from a country subjected to the rule of Turkey" [4, p. 851]. At the same time, he harbored long-held hopes for the military forces of Turkey's government, distinct from the bloody marauding horde.

The die was cast definitively when, in response to Doroshenko's request, the Sultan raised Turkish-Tatar forces for a campaign against Poland. The novelist easily found the reason for war: the advance of "Lechistan" against the Cossack people was unacceptable ever since they came under the protection of the Porte. Depicting the reactions of Chyhyryn residents to the appearance of the first Turkish patrols, M. Starytskyi emphasized their sobering negative attitude towards these "defenders", with swarthy and savage, as per the narrator's epithet, faces. Indeed, they began to pillage the outskirts (the vizier justifies this by the laws of war and the necessity to obtain forage, which no one simply gives up), seizing women and children, and together with the Tatars, transforming the region into a wasteland.

The ruin is implicated to Doroshenko and Khanenko, shattered by their allies. However, Staritsky, through the means of a nagging internal voice of conscience, "controls" this accusation, reminding of the realities of the recent past: didn;t Khanenko himself summon the Tatars, attempting to wrest the mace from the elected hetman? The culmination in the interpretation of the results of the alliance with the East is Bohun;s curse on Doroshenko for transforming Ukraine into a dumb graveyard-ruin, for unjustified hopes in the "drilled" troops of the Padishah, who in reality, worse than the Tatars, ruthlessly slaughter, burn, and drive into captivity.

The tragedy of Ukraine's ruin, deepening with the twists of the novel, increasingly discredits the idea of an alliance with the Muslim East "from within". This is also facilitated by the description of Doroshenko's union with the Turkish Padishah Mehmed IV and the Crimean Khan Selim-Girey near a village on the Dniester (LXVII). In this depiction, Staritsky emphasized the eloquent ceremonial and auditory impression. For instance, a part of the ceremony underscored the hetman's subordinate status: only on the second day, after visiting the luxurious tent of the Sultan with the Khan, was he allowed to "gaze upon the brilliant countenance of the Padishah" (here, the eastern perspective was skillfully rendered in a floral style) [4, p. 884]. Like a vassal before his sovereign, Doroshenko was compelled to kneel and "kiss the edge of the sacred robes". Only after a "flattering, loyal speech" did the hetman receive a gracious response and gifts from the ruler of the East.

Such attention to "protocol" details allowed, through the traditional ceremony, to highlight the inequality of the alliance. The auditory accompaniment was formed by a cacophony of the hubbub of the crowd, the neighing of horses, the clatter of weapons, the cries and curses of a myriad of people that deafened the fortress. Well-versed in historiographical literature, Starytskyi accurately depicted the arrival of the Sultan's retinue in Kamianets-Podilskyi and the demands for capitulation expressed in an authentic Eastern manner: otherwise, "the mighty ruler... will seethe with rage and annihilate not only all infidels but even their dogs, leaving no stone unturned!" [4, p. 885]. The Turks had significant material resources for this endeavor. These included four batteries: the main battery, that of the vizier, the Khan's, and Doroshenko's, along with experts in underground mining operations and a formidable military force that enveloped the fortress like a "monstrous octopus" (the author found an original image from the Eastern marine bestiary).

M. Starytskyi depicted the decisive two days with the skill of a battle painter-colorist (the hill, the snow-white horse of the Padishah gleaming with "splendor of its garments and the rainbow play of gemstones", the dominance of yellow and green turbans, and the bloody glint of the sun on the crosses of churches) and the mastery of a historical novelist – "the Ukrainian Senkevych" (the explosion of the gate, the boundless

wrath of the Sultan, the satisfaction of Asian pride of the Eastern ruler with the servile capitulation of the infidels).

The emotional and spiritual "thrust" of the castle entry scene is marked by strong episodes of desecration and devastation of sanctuaries. For example, the path before the victors is lined with holy images. The Turks dismantle church bells by order of the Padishah, as they are needed for casting cannons. Doroshenko's semi-mad state was also induced by the order to take 800 boys into captivity. The hetman rushes to strike the Sultan or the Khan, and only Mazepa's melodramatic tirade brings him back to his senses. One of the final plot-compositional intensifications is due to the fact that when nearly half of the "allies" camp disperses across Ukraine for plunder, violence, and looting, Bohun confronts them armed and drives them out of Podillia.

The end of the war, though not from attacks by Poles or Nogais, the deaths of Ukrainian patriots Bohun, Hostryi, and Marianna, and Doroshenko's isolation, who stooped to offering Christians as a gift to the Khan, "clear the field" for Samoilovych, who turns towards Moscow. Similar to "The Black Council", Starytskyi's novel shifts the tragedy of its plotline towards optimistic implications in the epilogue, set ten years after the depicted events. This somewhat softens the drama of the novel about the unreality of equal alliance between East and West in the 17th century with the atmosphere of family happiness and heroes friendship, yet it does not alleviate the painful problems of misfortune and ruin in Ukraine. Therefore, Mikhailo Starytskyi's contribution to the development of the oriental direction in Ukrainian literature at the end of the 19th century is defined by the richness of the ideological content of his artistic historicism, the portrayal of the wealth and beauty of the Orient, the power of the civilization of the Brilliant Porte, the ethos of brotherhood rather than enmity among peoples, as well as a sufficiently high culture of "Eastern" writing.

Literature:

1. Akimova, N. (2022). The study of the genesis of Internet texts understanding in adolescence depending on the level of mental and speech development. *Psycholinguistics*, 31(1), 6-24.
2. Shytyk, L. (2020). Ways of transferring the internal speech of characters: Psycholinguistic projection. *Psycholinguistics*, 27(2), 361-384.
3. Starytskyi, M. (1964). *Works: in 8 volumes*. Kyiv: Dnipro.
4. Starytskyi, M. (1997). *Mazepa's youth. Ruin*. Kyiv: Ukrainian Center of Spiritual Culture.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AL