

T. YAROVENKO

EXPERIMENTAL AND PROVOCATIVE INTENTIONS OF THE SECOND PERIOD OF V.VYNNYCHENKO'S CREATIVITY

The paper is a comparative analysis of the reaction of Ukrainian and Russian reading public and professional criticism on V. Vynnychenko's provocative and experimental works in the context of the approval of the national imperative against the background of social change era.

During the second period – the one of psychological novel and the drama of ideas – V. Vynnychenko appears in the new role of a searcher-experimenter with inclination to provoke.

The writer deliberately derives his work on marginal position of his time contemporary literary reception by violation of moral issues as fundamental in socio political transformation of the world and its development on socialist principles which can guarantee the achievement of human happiness; and also in order to anatomize various psychological types and especially to approbate the theory of «being honest with oneself» in unexpected, most provocative situations.

M. Hehter, S. Wilkens, I. Nechuy-Levitsky, S. Petljura, M. Sriblianskyi, G. Khotkevych, etc. were among active critics of V. Vynnychenko's creative works. Their attention was foremost focused on such short stories as «The Moment» and controversial drama triangle «Disharmony» – «The Great Moloch» – «Steps of Life» (the main subject of criticism), novels in Russian and furthermore – the principle of «being honest with oneself» as a mainstream point which creates the basis for all problematics of writer's heritage of the second period .

There exists another characteristic detail of Vynnychenko's experimentation: when creating intertextual dilogy: *the play* «Steps of Life» – *the novel* «Being Honest with Oneself» V. Vynnychenko constructs a hero-bearer of his own ideas, who was transformed «in terms of his feelings and thoughts and forced to enter the real practical life with these conclusions.» Here comes a close attention to the dilemma: do Vynnychenko's works belong to publicistics or literature? This is a source of populist

critical discourse and of easily taken on board labels like «pornographism» (S. Efremov, G. Khotkevych) who will bring out criticism misleading from the theory of «being honest with oneself».

All of the above is a part of lasting literary polemics, which a broad range of readers will join to, and this ultimately leads to the actual public trial on the writer, who is accused, as we have briefly mentioned above, of excessive sexual issues, «propaganda» of prostitution and free love, eroticism, and mostly in debunking of the progressive people of that epoch – revolutionaries depicted from inside «in the most detailed and clear way [...] in all sorts of moments and in all sorts of conditions» raising the problems of morality / immorality in the context of party morale , etc. ..

The main postulate of Vynnychenko's artistic doctrine was the task of literature to influence changes in society. This is the source of «tendentiousness», «publicity», «preaching», «philosophizing», «mentoring» which were strongly prejudged and with the help of which *such* (Emphasis added. - T. J.) creativity of the artist was personally rejected by his contemporaries S. Wilkens, M. Yevshan, I. Konchits, I. Licko, P. Khrystyuk etc. ..

Still, in any case, both periods of V. Vynnychenko's creativity imparted Ukrainian literature with «the meaning of revolution», which was both recognized by contemporaries of the artist, and researchers from future generations.