© Ekaterina V. AVERYANOVA

ekaterina.tioumen@gmail.com

THE DISCURSIVE SCHEME OF THE LIVES OF SAINTS OF THE 15TH — 17TH CENTURIES

SUMMARY. The paper considers the canonical discourse scheme of Russian lives of saints from the point of view of semiotics. The transcendent contract and the anti-contract are the main stages of the scheme. The main element of the competence of the Subject in the hagiography is the modality of **knowledge**, which allows to correctly interpret the manipulation of anti-Sender and Sender. The modality **"to be able"** is necessary, but it is derived from knowledge. Thus, the basis of the competence of the saint is a communicative competence, which is formed in polemical confrontation with the anti-Sender. In contrast with the tales in the lives of saints we observe a more complex relationship of actants and actors: in the fairy tale one actor always stands in the same role. In the lives of saints the same actor can play different roles, even oppositones. If in the tale the hero is always immaculate and static, then in lives of saints the evolution of the hero is possible, the hero can make mistakes. The miracle is a necessary component of lives of saints as an element of glorifying test. If the qualification or the decisive test can be implicit in life, the glorifying test is always present in the story, for the hortatory purpose, since it is presupposed by the genre.

KEY WORDS. Contract, anti-contract, religious discourse, manipulation, discursive scheme, life of a saint.

This article deals with the discursive scheme of Russian hagiography (Russ. 'zhitiye'). The absence of works on this topic indicates the relevance of this research.

We are going to examine the discursive schemes developed by A.J. Greimas, as a result of analyzing V. Ya. Propp's research, and set forth by J. Fontanille [1; 109–125]. Two canonical schemes are distinguished: the test scheme and the search scheme. The complete test scheme has the following structure:

Confrontation → **Domination** → **Appropriation/Deprivation** [2; 110].

We can see that this scheme is not appropriate for hagiographies.

The search scheme puts four types of actants into operation: Sender and Recipient, Subject and Object. A search, as a matter of fact, is a transition of values from one instance to another. As J. Fontanille says, the matter is not the conflict of two actants, but the definition of values which may give meaning to the transition of Subject [2; 112]. The transition of Sender/Recipient is the following:

Contract (or **Manipulation**) → **Action** → **Sanction**

The transition of Subject and Object:

Competence → Performance → Consequence

The second transition is included in the first one, as these three stages are equal to the second stage (Action) of the first scheme:

Action = Competence → Performance → Consequence [2; 112].

It is supposed that the canonical discursive scheme is not appropriate for analyzing hagiographies. We propose a discursive scheme of the narrative transition of hagiographic character (asceticism). It supposes the transitions of Sender/Recipient and anti-Sender/anti-Recipient:

Initiation → Competence [anti-Contract → Interpretation → Consequence] →
Contract → Interpretation → Performance → Sanction

In our analysis of the Kiev-Pechersk patericon, we mentioned that the anti-Sender is dependent on the Sender [2], thus a Subject's sanction can only be performed by the Sender.

We consider the anti-Contract as a necessary narrative element of the scheme, since a Subject's competence without this experience is insufficient, as, for example, in the case of Jesus' temptation in the desert.

The basic element of a Subject's competence in hagiography is the modality of *knowledge,* which allows to interpret the Sender and anti-Sender's manipulation properly. The modality of **ability** is necessary, although it is derivative from knowledge. Thus, the basis for a saint's competence is communicative competence, which is formed in polemical confrontation with the anti-Sender.

Now we are going to examine the hagiography of Nicetas of Novgorod.

The space of the hagiography, like that of a fairy tale, consists of *familiar space/strange space.* The hero, Nicetas, asks the Father Superior of the Kiev-Pechersk Monastery for permission to go into seclusion in a cave. The author compares this seclusion to an epic hero being in the open field. The door of the cave marks spatial discontinuity: the centre of the holy space is in the minster, by the sanctuary, and the cave, the periphery of the monastery, is "the strange space", which is secular, subterranean. The space of hagiography is marked by the following terms:

въ печерскомъ свѧтомъ монастырѣ, въ затворѣ, ко кнѧзю Изѧславу (Зіеv), въ Заволочїи, Новгородъ. Consequently, the "familiar" space of the Kiev-Pechersk Monastery is opposed to the "strange" space.

M. Eliade presents "familiar/strange" as holy/genuine; secular/ingenuine. This proportion negatively estimates "strange", equating it to deception [3; 32-38].

1. Solution

The hero of the hagiography, Nicetas, is viewed as a "searching Subject" before he performs his feats. Being the immanent Sender, the Father Superior does not permit Nicetas to seclude himself, saying: ѡ чадо, нѣсть ти пользы юну суцу сидѣти праздну. Оунѣ ти есть, да пребудеши съ братїею работаѧ тѣмъ, и не погубиши мзды своеѧ. Самъ видѣлъ еси брата нашего Ісакїа пецерника, какѡ въ затворѣ прелценъ бысть ѿ бѣсовъ, аце не бы велїѧ благодать

Бжї́ѧ спасла его молитвъ ради преподобныхъ оцъ̈ нашихъ Антѡнїа и Ѳеодосїа [4].

Here, the Father Superior represents the transcendental Sender, God. He uses provocation and states the Subject's incompetence for his seclusion: lack of experience and "juvenility", i.e. the absence of actualizing modalities: /knowledge/ and /ability/. Then he resorts to temptation and promises a reward for working within the fraternity. The Father Superior predicts forthcoming events, which are connected to spatial characteristics: he sees an immediate connection between sloth and demonic temptation and looks for another way. Out of two ways, the Subject chooses the first one: никакоже очъ̈же прелцꙋ̈сѧ таковою вещїю, но крѣпкѡ стати желаю противꙋ̈ кознеи бѣсовскихъ, и чльвъ̈коⷧюбца Бгъ̈а молити имамъ, да и мнѣ подастъ чꙋ̈дотворенїѧ даръ, коже Ісакїю затворникꙋ̈, иже и до нынѣ чꙋ̈деса многа творитъ.

The Subject misestimates his competence (knowledge) and supposes that he has a right to the gift of working wonders. Thus, the Subject's aim is to work wonders, not serve God. Consequently, the recipient of the Subject's narrative program is not God, but secular world, society. In other words, the Subject initiates a transcendental contract, considering it auxiliary to the social contract. In reply to his persistence, the Father Superior says: выше силы желанїе твое, блюди чадо, да не вознессѧ низпадеши, азъ повелѣваю ти паче слꙋ̈жити на братїю, и за послꙋ̈шанїе твое вѣнчанъ ѿ Бгъ̈а имаши быти.

There is direct evidence of the Subject's *desire* without *ability* and *knowledge*.

Being a "searching Subject', Nicetas should act according to the canonical narrative scheme, i.e. he should pass a test in three forms: qualifying test, final test, and glorifying test [5; 131]. The qualifying test presupposes acquiring competence (or the modalities *knowledge* and *ability*). The final test results in performance. The glorifying test leads to the acceptance of the hero. Apparently, in the Father Superior's mind, "seclusion" correlates with the final test, which requires a sufficient level of competence.

The Father Superior is guided by the modality **knowledge**, obliging the Subject to choose between temptation and provocation.

The persuasion of the Father Superior is presented as a contract of command: the Subject is opposed to the manipulator, whose axiology is inimical to him. Such a contract is based on the contact of genuineness, which determines the modality faith in genuineness from both communicative points of view. The Subject's positive response to the persuasion to act would mean accepting ungenuine values. The Subject's unwillingness to follow the will of the manipulator indicates divergence of their axiologies and modalities.

The episode "Solution" introduces the old narrative scheme suggested by V. Ya. Propp, the antinomy "prohibition — breaking prohibition" in the form of "manipulation/countermanipulation":

1) the Father Superior's proposal of the contract of genuineness — refusal of the contract;

2) the proposal of the contract of command — the refusal of the contract (the Subject withstood the temptation, as well as the provocation). Thus, the Subject breaks the manipulator's prohibition *obligation not to do,* having entered the conjunction with credit. This motif of breaking the prohibition is more typical for warriors, epic heroes, than for monks.

We should mention that the Subject does not have a Sender, referring to the transcendental universe. His refusal to act according to the narrative program of the Father Superior, the delegate of the transcendental Sender, shows us that he is Sender for himself.

2. Qualifying test

In G. Dumézil's "Mythe et Épopée", a priest participates in two contracts of different levels [6]. In the social contract, the priest addresses the immanent Recipient (i.e. the entire society). Here we can define his activity as **education**. In the transcendental contract, the priest addresses God. The communicative initiative can come from the transcendental Sender, as well as from the priest. The priest prays to address God. The discursive program "to pray" makes the priest the speaker, the initial Sender-manipulator: *to pray* — to speak to God in order to ask for help or give thanks [Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English].

The recluse participates in both contracts: he prays, apprehends the Lord's word, and enlightens society. It should be pointed out that it is not divine grace but the social contract that attracts the Subject of this text. We should remind the reader that the social contract is secondary and derived from the transcendental one — a priest cannot educate without transcendental communication.

Ѻбаче не по многихъ днехъ сѣтей дїаволскихъ не избѣже, во времѧ бо пѣнїѧ своегѡ слышаше гласъ молѧщіѧ кѹпнѡ съ нимъ, и ѡбонѧше благоѹханїе неизреченно, и симъ прелстившисѧ глагола въ себѣ: аще не бы сей аггѧлъ былъ, не бы молилсѧ со мною, ниже Дхѧа стѧаго ѡбонѧнїе было бы здѣ.

We can see that the Subject intends to participate in a transcendental model of religious practice, therefore he implements the discursive program "to pray". Having caught the voice and the smell, the first symptoms of an epiphany, the Subject prays to God for His appearance.

Тогда гласъ бысть къ немѹ: не влюсѧ тебѧ, зане юнъ еси, да не вознессѧ низпадеши. Затворникъ же со слезами рече: никакоже Гдси прелцѹсѧ, наѹчи бо мѧ игѹмнъ не внимати прелести бѣсовстѣй, тобою же всѧ повелѣннаѧ ми сотворю.

The Subject mistakes the voice for genuine. He worships a demon as an angel. The demon proposes him a contract: Ѿтолѣ ты оѹже не молисѧ, но читай книги, и тако ѡбрѧщешисѧ съ Бгѧомъ бесѣдѹѧ, и подаси слово полезно приходѧщымъ къ тебѣ, азъ же приснѡ бѹдѹ молити творца всѣхъ ѡ спасенїи твоемъ.

There is direct evidence of manipulation at the level of **temptation**, when the recipient Subject maintains the position of *desire to act*. The narrative programme

Temptation presupposes the Subject's conjunction with a positive value — salvation. The structure of manipulation can be presented as the modalities of *persuasion to act* and *prohibition* (prohibition to pray). Persuasion is presented in the form of contract of command: the Subject does not oppose the manipulator, as the axiology of the latter, while being inimical, is modeled as *not to be* + *to seem* at the same time. A. J. Greimas points out that this is a case of defining a lie as an action ("to lie") [7; 82]. The Recipient (Nicetas) misenterprets manipulation, mistaking *ungenuine* for *genuine*. Thus, we have evidence of creating illusion from the point of view of interpretation. The manipulator makes the Subject learn books, which is secondary, instead of praying, the primary activity of a priest. The manipulated Subject's having chosen the desire to act means accepting ungenuine (false) values.

Thus, the monk fails to resist temptation. He abandons praying to learn from books.

Съ приходащими къ немоу многω бесѣдоваше ѿ писанїа ω пользѣ дꙋши. Нача же и пророчествовати: и бысть ω немъ слава велика, ко всѣмъ дивитиса сбытїю слвесъ егω.

The hagiography specifies the nature of the knowledge acquired by the Subject: [аще бо бѣсъ имоущагω быти и не вѣсть, но еже самъ содѣа, и наоучи злыа члѵкѣки, или оубити, или оукрасти, сїа возвѣщаетъ..]

It is also noted that the Subject (or the anti-Subject, to be more exact) knows the Old Testament better than anybody else: ..еѵаалскихъ же и апслскихъ стꙑхъ книгъ преданыхъ намъ во блжгодати на исправленїе наше и оутвержденїе никогдаже восхотѣ видѣти, или слашати, не точїю читати, ниже иномоу дааше бесѣдовати къ себѣ ѿ новагω завѣта..

Genuine knowledge was unavailable to the Subject. The activity of the Subject as a prophet, conveying transitive knowledge, has become dangerous for him and for society. His prophecies were not a Christian wonder, but "magic", as any communication with God was over. The holy fathers realized that the Subject yielded to the anti-Sender's temptation and relived him: ..сїи вси въ добродѣтелехъ сїаюцїи пришедше, млжтвы творахꙋ къ Бгꙋ ω Нїкитѣ, и ѿгнаша бѣса ѿ негω, кω ктомꙋ не видѣ егω. таже изведше его вонъ, вопрошахꙋ, да повѣсть имъ что ѿ ветхагω завѣта. онъ же коснашеса, кω николиже чташе тыа книги. гаже прежде из оустъ оумѣаше. ксимъ же и ни едино слово знаше, гакω едва наоучиша его грамматѣ.

Thus, the anti-Subject was deprived of book learning — one constituent part of competence.

Nicetas has been preserved from fatal communication with the anti-Sender thanks to a collective delegate Subject of the transcendental Sender. Thus, the Subject was defeated in the first test.

3. The final test and the glorifying test

The subject passes the following tests well:

Тогда млжтвами преподобныхъ оцжъ пришедъ въ себе, исповѣда грѣхъ свой, и плакаса ω томъ горькω, вдавъ себе въ великое воздержанїе

и послѹшанïе, воспрïемъ чистое и смиренное житïе, кѡ превзыти емѹ всѣхъ добродѣтелïю..

..Нѣкогда бо бездождïю бывшѹ, помолисѧ Бгѹ, и дождь съ нбѥсѣ сведе: такоже и пожаръ града млѧтвами своими оугаси и ина мнѡга чѹдеса творѧше.

In the final test, the Subject plays the role of "competent Subject", due to the knowledge that he acquired in the qualifying test.

Thus, the hagiography tells us about the creation of a saint's competence. The "Solution" episode is a cognitive test, in which the Subject resists the influence of the manipulator (the delegate subject of the transcendental Sender). The subject jumps the gun and undergoes his seclusion, the final test, as a qualifying one. It causes a dual result: the Subject gets defeated at the level of the final test by yielding to the temptation of the anti-Sender, but at the level of the qualifying test, he acquires a necessary competence (the actualizing modality — the knowledge of himself and of the demon). As a result, from a "searching Subject" he turns into a "competent Subject", who has realized his identity. In this hagiography of Nicetas of Novgorod, we can find a topical binomial: the topical role of punished ambition during the first test, and the topical role of rewarded "goodness" in the main test, according to K. Bremond's model for fairy tales [8].

Consequently, this narration has the following discursive scheme:

(Initiation) → **Competence** [anti-Contract → Interpretation → Consequence] → **(Contract)** → **Interpretation** → **Performance** → **Sanction**

Therefore, the anti-Contract (explicit or implicit) is a necessary element in the formation of a saint's competence.

REFERENCES

1. Fontanille, J. Sémiotique du discours. Limoges: Presses Universitaires de Limoges, 1998. 291 p.

2. Aver'janova E.V. The function of demon and devil in Kiev-Pechersk's Lives of Holy Fathers and western hagiography. *Evropa: Mezhdunarodnyj al'manah — Europe: International literary miscellany.* 2003. Issue № 3. Pp. 208–210 (in Russian).

3. Eliade, M., Le sacré et le profane. P.: Gallimard, 1965. 185 p.

4. The Life of Nicetas the Eremite. *Svjatootecheskoe nasledie — Heritage of saint fathers.* issue No. 2 (in Russian).

5. Greimas, A.-J., Courtés, J. Sémiotique. Dictionnaire raisonné de la théorie du langage. P.: Hachette Supérieur, (1979)1993. 454 p.

6. Dumézil, G. Mythe et Epopée I. *Mythe et Epopée* I. II. III. P.: Aurto Gallimard, (1968) 1995. P. 35-672.

7. Le Petit Robert: Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française. P.: Dictonnaires LE ROBERT, 1992. 2173 p.

8. Greimas, A.-J. Maupassant. La sémiotique du texte. P.: Seuil, 1976. 287 p.

9. Brémond, C. Les bons récompensés et les méchants punis: morphologie du conte merveilleux français. Sémiotique narrative et textuelle. P.: Larousse, 1973. P. 96-121.