The Ideas of Dangerous Education: Modification of the Pedagogical Novel in *Oliver Twist* by Charles Dickens and “The Gemini” by Taras Shevchenko

Denys Chyk, Tetiana Semehyn

Taras Shevchenko Regional Humanitarian Pedagogical Academy of Kremenets, Department of Foreign Languages and Methods of their Teaching, 1 Litseynyi Lane, office 55, Kremenets, Ternopil Oblast, 47003, Ukraine

orcid.org/0000-0002-4304-114X, orcid.org/0000-0002-1211-3729
denyschyk@ukr.net, semehynt@gmail.com

The article deals with usage of the pedagogical genre in the novels *Oliver Twist* by Victorian writer Charles Dickens and the story “The Gemini” by Ukrainian writer Taras Shevchenko. It demonstrates that in the novel *Oliver Twist* by Dickens and the story “The Gemini” by Shevchenko there are some distinct genre features of the pedagogical novel: in both works, one can observe the development of authors’ experiments—the main heroes are placed in specific pedagogical circumstances. Unlike Shevchenko, Dickens promotes the idea of “noble” heredity, which is important for further formation of personality with high moral and ethical principles of the character that is able to resist the negative impact. Despite the external similarities with biblical motifs and themes, the plot of the novels is based on archaic components: the motif of the amazing rescue of the infant and dual organization of the myth about brothers (twins), where the first represents consistency of Good and the other Evil. In both works, antagonists are infantile individuals who revolt against their loving mothers. The writers construct images of wise mentors without whom ideal characters would not form successfully.
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In comparison with Taras Shevchenko’s other prose works, his story “The Gemini” (“Bliznetsy”), which was written approximately in 1855 but remained unpublished until 1886, is poorly researched. Perhaps this can be explained by the fact that the text reached its readers in an unfinished draft version and, therefore, is characterized by certain compositional incompleteness.

As to the definition of this literary work’s genre, there is a full agreement in Shevchenko’s studies: modern scholars (e.g. Sydorenko, Hrytsiuta, Zarva, Kharina) largely interpret “The Gemini” as an education novel (in Ukrainian—роман виховання) with a distinct Enlightenment spirit. Sydorenko, a researcher of Shevchenko’s prose, defined the genre of “The Gemini” as a version of Enlightenment education novel (Sydorenko, “Povist” 68) but later clarified it as a syncretic combination of features of education, picaresque, ethological novels as well as documentary genres of autobiography, diary, confessions and memories (Sydorenko, “Bliznetsy” 452). Hrytsiuta identified such features of education novel in “The Gemini” that prove its typological correlation with models of the given genre varieties of the eighteenth and nineteenth century (J.-J. Rousseau, J. W. Goethe, J. Paul, L. Sterne): the linear biographical composition principle, the concept of constant personal spiritual and aesthetic growth; the spiritual mentoring motive; architectonics of the main character image as spiritual and aesthetic centre; constructive role of the author; traditional autobiography (Hrytsiuta 6). Importantly, the researcher observes a typological kinship of the novel poetics not only with classic examples of Bildungsroman (novels by J.-J. Rousseau or J. W. Goethe) but also with the novel Der grüne Heinrich (1854–1855) by a Swiss writer G. Keller that corresponds to the Ukrainian author chronologically. However, this relationship is too general and applies to common reference to the genre of education novel because Der grüne Heinrich is a classic example of another genre variety—a novel about an artist.

Zarva singles out the following features of Shevchenko’s story approaching it to the Enlightenment prose and, accordingly, to the genre of an education novel: anthropocentrism, “appeal to childish and youth years as the period of formation of the heroes’ spiritual world,” the idea of the necessity of honest labor and training, education, the good of science, emphasis on the role of literature as an important means of people’s education and upbringing (Zarva 46–48). Kharina also notes features of education novel in the story “The Gemini”: the image of the ideal hero, clear opposition of positive and negative characters, educational promotion of knowledge, love and respect for the
work, focus on issues of upbringing, the introduction of the mentor image (Kharina 28). Slipushko and Shapovalova, following the ideas of Hrytsiuta, term the story educational and define its main idea – “the formation and degradation of a person depending on educational factors” (Slipushko and Shapovalova 29).

The story “The Gemini” shares several distinct features of other sub-genres of education novel as well, in particular pedagogical novel. To confirm this, we decided to compare Shevchenko’s story with the novel of a British writer Charles Dickens _Oliver Twist, or The Parish Boy’s Progress_ (1837–1839). _Oliver Twist_, being the first experience of the author in the genre of Bildungsroman and his second major work, presents a genre modification of the pedagogical novel.

Bildungsromans in the works of Dickens are diverse and original and primarily include _Oliver Twist_ (1838), _David Copperfield_ (1849–1850), _Great Expectations_ (1860–1861), _Bleak House_ (1852–1853), _Hard Times_ (1854) and _Our Mutual Friend_ (1864–1865) (cf. Zwierlein 341). Taking into consideration the definition of Bildungsroman suggested by a well-known researcher of this genre J. G. Buckley, Ghosh singles out the following characteristic features in _Oliver Twist_: the idea of progress and development of an individual as the quintessential of liberal narrative, characteristic of Victorian literature; topos of protagonist’s journey from the village to the big city, from innocence to experience, from social repressions and restrictions to maturity (Ghosh 84). However, scholars also note that, compared with the classic model of Bildungsroman in the heritage of Dickens (_David Copperfield_), the second novel of the writer is a certain deviation from the traditional model of the Bildungsroman genre, because we observe secularized allegory _psychomachia_—the struggle of light and darkness for the fate of the soul (Buzard 1226). The same psychomachia can be noticed in the story by Shevchenko, and that is why we consider such deviation from Bildungsroman as one of the modification features of the pedagogical novel.

The fact of Shevchenko’s possible familiarity with Dickens’ novel cannot be excluded while conducting the typological comparison of English and Ukrainian writers’ prose works. The Ukrainian writer could have known the Russian translations of Dickens’ education novels _The Life and Adventures of Nicholas Nickleby, The Personal History, Adventures, Experience and Observation of David Copperfield_ etc., which were quoted by him in some of his stories, as well as other short and long literary works of the British author. In the Russian Empire, readers had the opportunity to acquaint themselves with Russian
translations of *Oliver Twist*, or *The Parish Boy’s Progress* for the first time in 1841 (then Shevchenko studied at the Imperial Academy of Arts and took an active interest in all artistic innovations). An excerpt from Dickens’ novel “O tom, kakoe vliyanie imeyut chaynyie lozhki na lyubov i nravstvennost” was first published in the *Literatururnaya gazeta* number 123. Later, the translation of the whole novel appeared in the journal *Otechestvennie zapiski* (vol. 18–19), and at the end of the year, a separate book with the novel was published in St. Petersburg. In fact, the appearance of the novel in the book form and in a reliable translation caused a positive resonance and the book received favorable reviews from critics (Katarskiy 59).

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who is considered to be the founder of the pedagogical novel, offers a program of upbringing an ideal citizen and his wife in the work *Émile ou De l’éducation* (*Emil or On education*). Although it is obvious that the proposed program is totally utopian, the novel gained enormous popularity as a guide for teachers. This text is also often called a novel-treatise because the author not only depicts the plot events but mostly justifies his own vision of a purposeful and constant correction of the human nature in order to receive a true citizen-humanist in the end. The emphasis on the pedagogical centre of the text gave reason to the American literary critic Moore to note wittily that this first *Erziehungsroman* has actually more *Erziehung* (from German—education) than *Roman* (from German—novel) (Moore 382).

Besides the key idea of education, scholars point out other distinctions between the pedagogical novel and Bildungsroman. Gaizhiunas admits that in the pedagogical novel, the way of forming of the average character (which is the key idea of educational novel) is only outlined at the beginning and then develops to the patterns of established ethical or ideological author program. As a result, instead of the average character, a positive or perfect character is portrayed (Gaizhiunas 26–27). Thus, the pedagogical novel is a variation of Bildungsroman, in which the development of a certain pedagogical experiment takes place in the foreground: the main character (characters) is placed in specific conditions that have a definite impact on his formation and growth, socialization, and individualization. In his definition of the European Bildungsroman, Moretti named this genre the cultural mechanism that represents the conflict in modern society between two mentioned values—self-determination and socialization—and is trying to reach some consensus on this issue (Moretti 15–16). The educational component in solving this dilemma is crucial for the pedagogical novel. The text represents the experiment description, which must
Mikhail Bakhtin considered historical treatises *Cyropaedia* by Xenophon, *Les Aventures de Télémaque* (*The Adventures of Telemachus*) by Fénélon, and *Émile ou De l’éducation* by Rousseau to represent classic examples of the didactic and pedagogical novel (Bakhtin 330–331). The texts selected by the scholar also demonstrate main milestones in the development of the pedagogical novel and are predetermined by the chosen type of the learner: a perfect autocrat, an ideal politician and, as it was mentioned above, an ideal citizen. To some extent, the change of pedagogical novel protagonists is a “literary” response to the demands of society at a given stage of civilization. Therefore, “the result of education” is outlined by the goals set before the teachers who must “guide” their students. The initiation motif is very crucial for the pedagogical novel: a hero, formed according to a definite pedagogical idea, begins his “maturity”, which usually presupposes separation from home and faraway journeys. The initiation involves the return to the native community which, depending on circumstances, may be in the form of a triumph or defeat.

Researchers primarily pay attention to the Christian origin of the sphere of images in the novel *Oliver Twist*. The most common is the reception analysis of Puritan in the novel *The Pilgrim’s Progress from This World to That Which Is to Come*, which belongs to the famous English preacher, Bunyan. After all, the subtitle of the novel “The Parish Boy’s Progress” hints the reader at this famous Christian allegory. Marcus was one of the first to notice that the novel of the young writer is a traditional sequel of parable tradition of the British literature written in Bunyan’s manner and is, moreover, a form of a *moralité* or preaching story (Marcus 66–67). Larson tried to specify this observation, carefully analyzing *Oliver Twist* not as a religious and didactic novel, but through the prism of possible biblical sources. It is difficult not to agree with this approach because in comparison with Christianity, Oliver’s way is not the way of God searching and overcoming vices and temptations. From the first chapter to the last one, Oliver did not find out what the sin was. Thus, his spiritual development in the novel is much
materialized: the boy regains his fortune, but his spiritual growth is not considered at all. Besides, Larson singles out Jesus’ parable about the Good Samaritan as a pretext for most novels of the writer and as a motive of providential rescue that was also used in Bunyan’s work. Thus, the parable about the Good Samaritan is a subtext for *Oliver Twist* but not necessarily through the mediation of Bunyan, whose story is only used for spotting the archetype motive of struggle between the good and evil (Larson 48–49). Although Larson does not use a more accurate term to describe the struggle between the good and evil for the human soul, obviously we can talk only about the implementation of the aforementioned allegory *psychomachia*.

The parable of the Good Samaritan is used by Dickens dialectically: as a didactic motive and for the ironic mimicry. Criminals under the direction of Fagin, as well as dishonest public institutions and the church, cover their dishonest deeds with the help of church morality, inversing or completely denying the ideological content of the parable. And, on the contrary to different criminals, gentlemen in the novel show genuine acts of kindness towards poor Oliver similar to the Good Samaritan (Lewis 27). Taking into consideration the sense of the parable, we can consider Nancy in Dickens’ novel as a real Samaritan because she comes to help the boy at the time when even the reader hardly ever expects it from a criminal and prostitute.

*Researchers* in the field of Shevchenko study often notice the Christian origin of the story “The Gemini”. Highlighting the binary opposition “good—evil” as the semantic core, Hrytsiuta points to its biblical origin, particularly the Old Testament story about Cain and Abel, which is interpreted anew by Shevchenko—without an emphasis on the fratricide motif (Hrytsiuta 7–8). Sydorenko treats the plot of the story as a complex projection of other biblical scenes—about the sons of the Old Testament patriarch Isaac (Esau and Jacob) and the prodigal son (Sydorenko, “Bliznetsy” 456).

The fratricide motif in the stories about Cain and Abel is interconnected with the motif of rebellion—the first murder on the earth is the result of jealousy because Yahweh gave preference to the sacrifice of one of the brothers. However, in Shevchenko’s story, there is neither sibling rivalry nor violent struggle for parental affection or inheritance despite the binary opposition “good—evil”.

The Old Testament story from Genesis about the brothers Jacob and Esau is based on the idea of unacceptable disregard of God’s grace: the hungry Esau sells his birthright to his twin brother in exchange for a bowl of stew and, thus, despises God’s will. At the instigation of a
loving mother Rebecca, Jacob tricked his old father and obtained his blessing, which could not be taken back. Here we see a bold rebellion of a woman against a man and at the same time a desperate deed of a mother who, for the sake of her son, is able to intervene in the will of patriarchal society law and the will of God that defines the headship of a younger son and his descendants over the older one. The lost birthright is the loss not only of wealth, but also of spiritual things—the blessing of his father. Selling of God’s blessing for a bowl of stew represents the neglect of higher will as well as the manifestation of the lack of faith in one’s own strength. An important issue concerning this Old Testament story is not Esau’s anger and his persecution of the deceiver but the reconciliation of the two brothers who did not follow the ill-considered and terrible act of Cain and are able to come to mutual understanding despite offenses. Mother’s affection to one of the sons in Shevchenko’s story does not lead to fatal consequences because she completely obeys her husband and openly gives preference to none of her sons. Her affection to one of the twins is a consequence of her understanding of a happy person in the Russian Empire, so she links success exclusively with military service.

We do not agree that “the biblical scheme in the story is realized to the fullest” (Shahinian 73). The parable about the prodigal son implies sincere penitence of the sinner and open forgiveness of his sins. We do not observe this in the story: “the prodigal son” is an outcast, his foster father actually refuses him, and he does not change internally under the influence of difficult circumstances. The abovementioned list of events is not related to the plot of the story in any way: Zosym returns to his native hamlet after his father’s death and invades it, turning this place into a nest for gamblers and drunkards. So, his return as the prodigal son and his forgiveness are absent at all. Paraskeva does not “die with his name on her lips” because she has to endure the cruelty of a drunken son patiently for three years and then go through severe maternal grief—his burial after the brutal murder.

Thus, the ideological basis of the story is not derived from the Old Testament motif about Cain, the story about the stolen birthright, or the New Testament parable about the prodigal son, and that is why its background must be found in other plots, including archaic ones.

Firstly, attention should be paid to the myth about the amazing rescue of the infant. The latter is known to be extremely common in both polytheistic and monotheistic religions. In the works of Dickens and Shevchenko, the main components of the myth outlined by Rank can be traced (Rank 68). The first component concerns the origin: an
infant has a divine origin or is a descendant of a heavenly father and a maiden. Oliver, who was destined to a difficult childhood, is an illegitimate child. His birth story is worthy of thorough analysis.

Thus, Oliver’s future father Mr. Edwin Leeford is deeply unhappy in his marriage since he has to marry by family compulsion. His son Monks demonstrates criminal inclinations from the very early years, whereas his wife cultivates hatred to her son’s own father. It was one of the reasons for Leeford to leave his family eventually, but he is unable to divorce with his wife for some mysterious reasons that are not revealed to the reader.

Meeting with the young nineteen-year-old Agnes Fleming becomes fatal for Leeford: he falls in love with Agnes and seduces her. Up to now, he was a victim of circumstances and suffered from coldness of his wife and son, but at this very moment he himself destroys someone’s happy family. As a result, Agnes’ father is forced to leave his own home with two daughters in order to avoid people’s disapproval, but, being convinced of his daughter’s suicide, dies of despair. Agnes dies during the birth of her son in the workhouse. It seems that the author should disapprove Leeford’s deed leading to the death of two innocent people. Instead, he fully justifies him, shifting the blame for the life failures to his imperious parents, treacherous wife, ungrateful and cruel son, and already mentioned strange circumstances that did not allow divorcing. Besides, Agnes Fleming is not a victim as well, since the author notes unambiguously in the last paragraph of the book:

Within the altar of the old village church there stands a white marble tablet, which bears as yet but one word: ‘AGNES.’ There is no coffin in that tomb; and may it be many, many years, before another name is placed above it! But, if the spirits of the Dead ever come back to earth, to visit spots hallowed by the love—the love beyond the grave—of those whom they knew in life, I believe that the shade of Agnes sometimes hovers round that solemn nook. I believe it none the less because that nook is in a Church, and she was weak and erring. (Dickens 641)

Describing Agnes Fleming depreciatingly as weak and erring, the writer completely shifts the blame to the poor disgraced woman who sincerely trusted a gentleman and his promises.

We can find the same author’s condemnation of the disgraced woman in the story by Shevchenko. Eventually, in the story “The Gemini”, Zosym also repeats the offence of an unknown father when deceives the only daughter of an old townsman and widower, Yakilina. He shamelessly lies that due to certain circumstances, he will receive
parental blessings later. Afterwards, despite the marriage made out of military authority compulsion, the young officer does not want to care about his family. Although the fate of Zosym’s wife and her infant is truly frightening, Shevchenko, following Dickens, shifts the blame for Zosym’s unworthy deeds to the poor woman:

Oh, my poor Yakilino! If (only) you could foresee your mediocrity, your bitter future fate, you would run away into the forest or drown yourself in the rotten Ostr, instead of marrying a noble officer. But you, a simple-minded bourgeois woman, in the depths of your immaculate soul, believed the empty phrase that tender love can tame the fierce beast. But this is just a catchphrase, nothing else. And you, a fool, thought that it was really so. Poor woman, how dreadfully you paid for your innocence! You died, and neither your tender love for a drunken monster, nor even your single golden hope—your firstborn son, your beautiful child—saved you from bitter fate. You both lay on the dirty Astrakhan street until you were cleaned up and buried by the generous police. (Shevchenko 68)

Obviously, only the noble and decent background of Edwin Leeford rescues him from being stigmatized in the end of the novel; he is called neither weak nor lost by Dickens. Besides, Oliver inherits all his noble and positive features from his father. The same probable “noble” origin of twins is also implied by Shevchenko when he writes about their appearance after the cavalry regiment leaves the town of Pereiaslav.

The rejected baby(ies) in most myths and legends is saved either by animals or common people (Rank 61). Immediately after his birth, Oliver gets to the social bottom and is sent to the workhouse where he fully experiences the features of the imperial care about the orphans: his life is worthless, while his death is highly desirable for the Christian society that is eager to get rid of the “extra mouth”, “waste”, and burden for the parish. The twins get to a much better place—a hamlet of the old captain Sokyra, which is a pastoral island of grace and happiness.

Twin myths are extremely popular in the world legends and beliefs, but at the same time, they differ completely—twins can be creators of the new world (gods), misfortune bearers (demons) or, on the contrary, harbingers of not evil but desired events, and are capable of embodying magical actions. It is hardly possible to name ancient religions where this myth does not occupy a prominent place. They are typical of Old Egyptian, Old Iranian, Old Persian, Old Indian, Babylonian, Assyrian, and, of course, ancient Greek and Roman cultures. Probably, the most famous one is the legend about Rome founders—Romulus and Remus, in which the first twin brother kills an opponent in the struggle for power.
Moreover, this legend also includes the myth about an amazing rescue of babies—both twins were nurtured by a she-wolf and raised by shepherds. Ivanov considered the binary organization of twin myths as a result of the dual organization of ancient communities typical not only for Rome but other societies as well, including Indo-European and Slavonic (Ivanov 234). The dual organization of such myths is based on the principle of reflection, when a cultural hero confronts his opposite in the form of a twin brother (Meletinskiy 192). The principle of reflection is not necessarily associated with twin myths; there is the similar principle in Christianity, where God is contrasted with the devil, who tries to do the opposite. The same principle of reflection in mythology, religion, and literature also concerns the antagonistic confrontation between Good and Evil (Abramian 135–136). In the works of Dickens and Shevchenko, the conflict is founded on the archaic principle of building a dualistic pair of brothers based on the “reflection” scheme: if one sibling possesses all possible virtues, the other has no such features at all.

An attempt to examine the main theme of Dickens’ novel as an exclusively Christian version of the struggle between good and evil through the scheme “Son—Savior—Devil—Antichrist” focused on ancient beliefs seems unconvincing. The correspondence between images of Oliver and Jesus Christ, Nancy and Mary Magdalene, and Fagin and devil is somewhat pondered (Krupenina 153). With certain restrictions, we can roughly interpret the novel as “a novel allegory”, taking into consideration the represented archaic dichotomous pair of Good and Evil. Evil is represented by one of half-brothers Monks and other criminals who serve only as executors of Monks’ sinister intentions. A colorful thief Fagin is in charge of all criminals and is depicted in the anti-Semitic tone presenting Jewish archetype of a villain.

Both texts, which are examples of the pedagogical novels, present some pedagogical experiments. Edwin Leeford from Dickens’ novel includes a demand of high moral qualities for his future junior son on his deathbed will, and in case of an act unworthy of a gentleman his son can immediately lose the right to inheritance. Therefore, his elder son Monks begins the antipedagogical implementation of the experiment in order to direct young Oliver to a criminal path and gain the right to inherit the property. The essence of the experiment is to develop criminal inclinations in a small child who knows nothing about his background, provoke his arrest, and ultimately prove that he cannot claim his father’s legacy.

Bildungsromans also include characters who, using their age advantage, act as false mentors for young helpless creatures, and because of
this, the plot acquires tragic turns (Krasnoshchekova 451). The sly, greedy, and cruel criminal Fagin represents one of such deceivers in *Oliver Twist*. Fagin is a “false teacher” because he commands a gang of minors with the tyrant’s ardor and teaches them the craft of dirty pickpocketing. Fortunately, despite all Fagin’s and his assistants’ efforts, Oliver does not become a criminal, unlike his elder brother. Due to his inner purity and unchildish persistent judgments about good and justice, the young hero proves the author’s opinion that external purposeful devastating impacts cannot destroy the noble innate inclinations quickly. Also, the boy meets good-natured mentors on his way, who take custody of him and free him from the clutches of the criminal world. Thus, as to his moral traits, he represents the complete opposite to his brother Monks.

Shevchenko’s twins Zosym and Savatii in the story “The Gemini” are also involved in a pedagogical experiment: the first one is sent for training to the cadet corps, and the other—to Poltava gymnasium. The author himself describes it as follows:

> The saying fairly goes: ‘What is bred in the bone will not come out of the flesh’. But we will see to what extent this proverb is true. They also say vivid childhood impressions are so lasting that they die only with us, and no upbringing can do anything out of a young man if his childhood was surrounded by rough decorations and the actors alike; on the other hand, childhood spent in the vastness of nature with a loving beautiful mother and a Christian father will form an impenetrable wall around a person and protect him on the road of life from all the abominations of the rotational life. We shall see to what extent one can believe this immutable truth. (Shevchenko 16)

Apparently, the writer wants to demonstrate reasonably that even congenital good inclinations, as well as family Christian education, cannot protect the person of harmful environment effects in the future. This feature distinguishes the work of the Ukrainian writer from the novel about *Oliver Twist*; the latter is based on the heredity theory, predetermined by genetic determinism and popular in the nineteenth century. It presupposes inherited nature of intelligence, moral and ethical inclinations, and even demeanor. As Levontin noted, Oliver was raised in the workhouse with 20 or 30 other small pupils placed in the appalling conditions on the same floor and who could not be expected to become useful members of society in the future. But Oliver does not become similar to one of Fagin’s favorites “Artful Dodger” Jack Dawkins, who feels at ease in the criminal world, although they are peers who received the same “upbringing”. Even the lack of education does not
spoil Oliver’s selected vocabulary and perfect pronunciation; according

to the writer’s plan, his “blue blood” is noticed anyway (Levontin 115).

Significantly, even the character of Shevchenko’s story Ivan Kotliarevskyi reveals an interest in the final results of the experiment and writes to his parents in the letter: “Every cloud has a silver lining, a psychic experiment can be conducted on the basis of their different upbringing, and it will show what difference can occur between two people with different upbringing but completely equal organization” (Shevchenko 57). However, Ivan Kotliarevskyi could not be a participant of the described events because Petrovskyi Poltava Cadet Corps was opened in December 1840 (Pavlovskiy 16), after the writer’s death. The author could not be a gymnasium teacher as well since he only held the position of a warden at the boarding house for poor nobles, although the training program here corresponded to Poltava gymnasium curriculum (Kyryliuk 46). However, his figure is necessary for the story since Ivan Kotliarevskyi represents a model teacher, a counselor, and a mentor for the youth.

Researchers have already noticed that some of Dickens’ Bildungsromans, like Oliver Twist and Our Mutual Friend, consider the question of education inseparably from the environment impact (Zwierlein 345). However, Dickens, as well as Shevchenko, completely keeps secret the process of moral degeneration of Oliver’s antagonist—Monks. Both works show how family education fails under the influence of social environment that can fatally ruin the inner world of people. At the same time, Dickens, as we have already noted, promotes the idea of “noble” heredity which cannot be spoiled by a social environment. However, in case of Monks, who, like Oliver, has “blue blood”, an important role is given not to heredity but to inappropriate family education and further influence of criminal surrounding.

Monks’, as well as Zosym’s, image is partly fragmentary. Dickens endows him with true demonic traits: Monks conceals his identity, real name, and motives for criminal acts; his kinship with Oliver remains unknown till the epilogue. The elder brother has disgusting appearance, so he prefers to meet his associates at dusk in places that correspond to gothic topic. As Mr. Brownlow remarks, from his very cradle, he was sorrow and punishment for his own father, one can add to this destructive characteristic “real creation of hell” and a curse.

There is no mentioning in the novel about the previous Monks’ crimes: the main attention is paid to the intrigues he arranges to his half-brother. Ivashëva emphasizes the connection between this story line (the struggle of the embodied evil in Monks with perfect good in
Oliver) and the gothic tradition (Ivasheva 155). Indeed, the opposition of ominous Monks and spotless Oliver is the reflection of the fundamental gothic dichotomy concept of good and evil. However, taking into consideration the immaturity of the protagonist, Dickens endows him with equally charitable companions and allies, who save him in a wonderful way from certain pitfalls prepared by his elder brother and his assistants.

Monks’ fear of thunder is quite demonstrative and rather strange for such an avid criminal. Thunder, which rattles during dark Monks’ intrigues, has deep symbolism: in ancient times, thunder and lightning manifested gods’ anger at the moment of crime commitment. Monks suffers from epilepsy, and he also has a kind of “Cain’s seal” — a broad red spot on his neck. Oliver was punished for his brother’s sneaky deeds. As Brownlow remarks, Monks’ acquired epilepsy is a result of his bacchanal life:

Unworthy son, coward, liar,—you, who hold your councils with thieves and murderers in dark rooms at night,—you, whose plots and wiles have brought a violent death upon the head of one worth millions such as you,—you, who from your cradle were gall and bitterness to your own father’s heart, and in whom all evil passions, vice, and profligacy, festered, till they found a vent in a hideous disease which had made your face an index even to your mind—you, Edward Leeford, do you still brave me! (Dickens 585)

So, Monks is punished and soon after he condemns himself to exile. Interestingly, Monks is not punished in a legal way; Brownlow, by agreement with Oliver, gives Edward an equal share of property, and the latter immigrates to the United States where he is destined to die in prison from his terminal illness. And once again, offenses committed by Monks in exile remain unknown for the reader. The same symbolic punishment is given to Zosym: he dies a violent death from the hands of thieves who remain unknown.

Zosym’s asocialization in Shevchenko’s story develops gradually. Step by step, the writer provides indications that the future officer acquires negative traits. Firstly, in his letter to cadet’s parents, Kotliarevskyi mentions their son’s request for money, then, the same requests start to appear regularly in Zosym’s brief letters home. Unlike his brother, Zosym leads a very limited spiritual life; if Savatii takes an active interest in art and new literature, his brother openly despises them: instead of the print from K. Briullov’s painting “Last Day of Pompeii”, he buys his brother a primitive lithography, and instead of a booked novelty “Dead souls” by M. Gogol, also sends a cheap pseudohistore novel by R. Zotov “Nyklas-Medvezhia
lapa, ataman kontrabandistov, ili Nekotoryie cherty iz zhyzni Fridrikha II”, which could interest only a very undemanding reader.

Zosym constantly and cynically begs his parents for money, but soon the authority of parents is replaced by the authority of “regimental brotherhood”. Being ashamed of his mother’s frank and tearful letter, informing him about her tries to beg a large sum of money, Zosym quickly invents a story that the letter is sent by his mistress from Poltava. Edward-Monks, like Zosym, meanly exploits immense mother’s love. She is ready to commit a crime for her only son. However, Edward robs and leaves his seriously ill mother alone, gambles away all his money, and goes to the capital, where he plunges in the familiar and comfortable world of crime. Dying, Edward’s mother apparently forgives her ungrateful son; besides, she tries to intervene in her husband’s will again and, guided by intuition, points that his younger brother is alive. Paraskeva Tarasivna also forgives her murdered son; she often recalls him looking at Savatii’s happy wife, and, probably, mentally modeling the same imaginary quiet family happiness for her late Zosym.

Why do both antagonists reject mothers’ love and begin to hate them, although they are ready for everything for their sons? Judging by the texts, Edward and Zosym were favorite sons, but because of excessive care, infantile inclinations with the maternal image in the centre were formed in them. As Carl Jung explains, an infantile individual becomes such infantile because he did not sufficiently free himself from his mother’s dependence and therefore inadequately responds to the environment. Due to this close attachment, he loses his own originality and type and is identified with his parents since he is trying to behave in life as they do (Jung 285). Edward tries to change his father’s will owing to his mother’s desire, although he has been trying to get rid of her guardianship since the age of majority. Besides, his hatred towards father was cultivated by his own mother since the very young age and because of this, his asociality is equally heritable and acquired as a result of such “special” “family” education. But in the end, his attempts to change his father’s will represent the repetition of his hateful father’s way, who unsuccessfully tried to get rid of disgusting marriage bonds imposed by his family.

So, Edward and Zosym consciously reject their mothers, which represents the denial of relationships and restrictions that their souls brought from childhood to adulthood. Such a riot is obvious from the very beginning: excessive maternal care is hanging over the two boys, so after leaving parents’ home they do everything not to come back there once again.
The acquisition of antisocial features by antagonists in Dickens’ and Shevchenko’s works is not easy to explain. Edward’s character is formed under the influence of a loving mother who cultivates hatred towards his own father and lays the foundations of future struggle for inheritance; on the other hand, young Oliver, who is also brought up in the atmosphere of hatred and brutal struggle for survival, remains perfect and noble. So, if Leeford “is educated”, Oliver is already born with an arsenal of noble virtues that often do not help him but even hinder to recognize deceit and intrigues on the part of certain villains. It is interesting to note that nine years spent in a workhouse do not make a thief out of him; Oliver steals in desperation to avoid starvation rather than enrich himself.

The same dilemma is seen in the story of the Ukrainian writer. Zosym’s moral decline is explained by the influence of the Cadet Corps atmosphere where he studies. So, Shevchenko sharply condemns the imperial system of military education in the story that kills all human features and cultivates sinister instincts and dark traits.

The twins are brought up in the same conditions till their separation with a foster family, and only during the last year before studying, their mother begins to give preference to a future officer Zosym. Finally, the role of the mother in the family tragedy is extremely significant: the initial opinion about identical civic education for both children was changed on her demand. This is because of Paraskovia’s misconception about brilliant military life, similar to previously seen opera “Kozak-stikhotvorets” by the Russian playwright Alexander Shakhovskoy that is considered the first Russian vaudeville. It is known that during the first performance of the opera on Ukrainian territory in 1817, Kharkiv public reacted extremely negatively, treating it as a personal insult and seeing in libretto a parody on the Ukrainian national life rather than reproduction of unknown to the author realities (Radionova 127). The captain also critically characterizes vaudeville; he is annoyed by his wife’s exciting memories about “чепуха на двух языках” (“nonsense in two languages”), and the author himself subjectively sees the continuation of Skovoroda’s tradition in the artificial language of the characters’ libretto.

Zosym and Savatii’s upbringing is based not only on receiving primary education, but also on compliance with Christian and avital customs. Why did then four-year studying in different schools change twins identical in character, who received common family education?

As Shevchenko mentions, the character of young students began to be defined with the help of their letters that were initially identical in content and then started to differ:
Thus, for example, Zosia always wrote rather laconically: that he was almost a beggar among the other pupils but practically the first at the front. However, Vaty expressed himself more extensively: he described his successes modestly without mentioning his poverty. But he filled the whole pages about his kind and noble patron. It was possible to recognize the costume, habits, occupation, in a word, the daily life of the author of ‘Natalka Poltavka’, ‘Moskal-Charivnyk’ and ‘Revised ‘Aeneid’ from his letters. (Shevchenko 59)

Thus, Zosym demonstrates thirst for wealth (perhaps as a consequence of envy of friends) and self-praise. However, at first, his parents do not respond to his complaints about poverty.

Unlike Zosym, Savvatii has a good and wise mentor, Ivan Kotliarevskyi, during his training. The image of a wise and reasonable leader is one of the genre features of classic Bildungsroman. Thus, we cannot imagine the formation of the abovementioned heroes of educational novels-treatises Les Aventures de Télémaque by Fénelon and Émile ou De l’éducation by Rousseau without teachers—Mentor (whose name became a synonym of “preceptor”) and the omniscient teacher of young Émile. As we have already noticed, a very important role in the story is given to Ivan Kotliarevskyi since he represents the image of an ideal teacher taking care of his students. Kotliarevskyi is a true genius for Savatii, as well as for his father, and his book Aeneid is their favourite book. Shevchenko does not overestimate the role of Kotliarevskyi in the educational sphere. Upon receiving the position of a warden at Poltava boarding house for poor nobles in 1810, the author completely devoted his life to this job and stopped writing new works. Contemporaries note the extraordinary honesty of Kotliarevskyi, whose tasks included not only preparing students for military service but also choosing of the best learners for the continuation of studying at the local university (see Borzenko 106–110). Without such a mentor and without any corrections from parents, Zosym easily falls under a negative influence and begins to commit one offense after another until he becomes an avid drunkard and criminal.

The role of a reasonable mentor-protector in Dickens’ novel is given to Mr. Brownlow, an old bachelor and booklover. Brownlow rescues Oliver from the intrigues of his elder brother, untangles the mysteries related to boy’s origin, and later becomes his guardian. There is no doubt that without the intervention of this wise man, Oliver would have never been able to return his legacy, get rid of his new “friends”—criminals and cope with the intrigues of his brother on his own. A cognominal real figure of London benefactor, John Brownlow, stands behind this image (Colby 124–126) and his activity is similar to long-
term dedicated public service of Ivan Kotliarevskyi. However, only
the name and city of residence are common in the “real” and fake
Brownlow. John Brownlow, like Oliver Twist, was a foundling who
grew up and was educated in The Foundling Hospital of London, a
philanthropic shelter for foundlings and orphans with a focus on treat-
ment that was established in the first half of the eighteenth century.
After some time, Brownlow begins to work at the shelter that provides
a dwelling for him, and soon he becomes a holder of a responsible
position of a secretary there, devoting nearly 60 years of selfless service
to the job. Dickens knew the headmaster of The Foundling Hospital
personally, was in correspondence with him, and, except perpetuating
his name in Oliver Twist, repeatedly mentioned his institution in indi-
vidual and co-authored works of different genres – articles “Received, a
Blank Child”, “A Walk in a Workhouse”, “A Curious Dance Round a
Curious Tree”, the Christmas story “No Thoroughfare”, and the novel
Little Dorrit (Taylor 302–360).
So, we have traced the main genre features of educational novel
on the basis of the novel Oliver Twist by Dickens and the story “The
Gemini” by Shevchenko. The deployment of authors’ pedagogical
experiments can be observed in both works where main characters are
placed in specific circumstances. The impact of environment, rather
than family education, is the most influential factor for the characters
that shapes them as individuals.
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Predstave o nevarnostih izobraževanja: modifikacije pedagoškega romana v Oliverju Twistu Charlesa Dickensa in »Dvojčkih« Tarasa Ševčenka

Ključne besede: angleška književnost / ukrajinska književnost / Dickens, Charles / Ševčenko, Taras / razvojni roman / pedagoški eksperiment / izobrazba / okolje / dvojčka / psychomachia

Prispevek v analizi Oliverja Twista viktorijanskega romanopisca Charlesa Dickensa in »Dvojčkov« ukrajinskega pesnika in pisatelja Tarasa Ševčenka naslavlja žanr pedagoškega romana. Analiza pokaže, da besedili vsebujejo izrazite žanrske značilnosti pedagoškega romana: v obeh lahko opazujemo razvoj avtorjevih eksperimentov, ki osrednje junake umesčajo v specifične pedagoške okoliščine. Drugače od Ševčenka Dickens promovira idejo podedovane »plemenitosti«, ki pomembno prispeva k nadaljnemu oblikovanju osebnosti lika z visokimi moralnimi in etičnimi načeli, ki se zmore upreti vsemu negativnemu. Kljub zunanjim podobnostim med romanesko zgodbo ter biblijskimi motivi in temami temeljita deli na arhaičnih motivih – skoraj čudežna rešitev otroka in dvojnost mita o bratih (dvojčkih), od katerih prvi upodablja konstancytnost Dobrega in drugi Zlega. Pisatelja tako izgradita podobo modrih učiteljev, brez katerih se idealna lika ne bi mogla razviti v vsej svoji polnosti.
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