

Tetiana Sharova

*Doctor of philological sciences, Professor
Professor of the Department of Social Sciences and Humanities
Dmytro Motorny Tavria State Agrotechnological University,
(Melitopol)*

LITERARY PARADIGM OF POSTTOTALITARIAN NARRATIVE

The literary paradigm of the post-totalitarian narrative, which took part in the first decades of the XXI century, actively focuses research attention to the problem of Ukrainian social realism. A key trend is the rejection of the Soviet culture pre-articulated annihilation (such as the «Should We Give Up Socialist Realism» which was discussed in the Literaturnaya Gazeta in 1988), which has been marginalized in scientific studies of the late 1980s and 1990s; or a radical denial of any artistic and aesthetic value of such a phenomenon as socialist realism.

Abstracting to some extent from the clearly biased interpretation of «Socialist realism as a pseudo-artistic unitary method (direction) in Soviet literature» [5, p. 650]; «bitter historical failure» [11]; «ersatz art as something in between ideology and production» [1, p. 20]; «pure ideology, which served the purpose of the artist work legitimization, his recognition as a Soviet» [7]; «artificial, decreed by the Communist Party direction, which reminisced artistic and political centaur» [4, p. 41]), domestic scholars propose a new approach to the objective study of the Soviet literature «basic artistic method».

Moreover, in conditions «when socialist realism ceased to be a depressing reality and retreated into the realm of historical memories» [6, p. 96], modern Ukrainian literary criticism is noticeably intensified in various aspects of this phenomenon study, its sources and structure. Domestic researchers, using the concepts of foreign colleagues (A. Boden, M. Golubkov, B. Groys, H. Gunther, M. Zalambani, K. Clark, R-D.Kluge, I. Smirnov, etc.) resort to a systematic analysis of the Soviet discursive practices, develop scientific strategies for the reception of the past cultural product, thus expanding the discussion field for further theoretical and historical-literary studies.

Currently, the paradigm of Soviet literature research of totalitarian times in its Ukrainian projection is represented by scientific studies (N. Bernadskaya's «Canon of the Socialist Realist Novel», T. Gundorova's «Socialist Realism as a Mass Culture» and «Socialist Realism: Between Modernism and the Avant-Garde», N. Ksyondzych «Theory of Socialist Realism», L. Medvedyuk «Theory of Socialist Realism as a Canon of Realism-Centrism», D. Nalyvayko (Notes on the Genesis and Typology of Socialist Realism», M. Pavlyshyn's «Canon and Iconostasis», etc.), which cover a fairly wide range of problems and demonstrate analytical-pragmatic approach to the study of social realism theoretical foundations: genesis and typology, its structure and modifications, predicates of the genre and the communicative field, etc.

In addition, the Ukrainian humanities comprehends the question of the Ukrainian literature national identity under totalitarianism (L. Senyk, T. Sverbilov, L. Skoryna), the

phenomenon of the socialist-realist canon in the literature of the Stalinist period is depicted (V. Kharkhun, U. Fedorov); in the system of Soviet cultural markers the military paradigm of literature (I. Zakharchuk) is studied, within the imperative canon of socialist realism – author's intentionality (O. Filatova), strategies of Ukrainian short stories of 1940-1960 development (S. Lenska), etc.

Modern scholars, bypassing existing stereotypes and demonstrating the interdisciplinary nature of the analysis, are more interested in critical observation of individual artistic creativity of totalitarian period writers at the level of ideological, philosophical and ideological and stylistic dominants. From this point of view, in the field of socialist realism literary-theoretical discourse, works where a qualitatively new approach to the understanding of «camp prose» by Borys Antonenko-Davidovych (S. Zhigun, O. Khmel) is especially fruitful.) or the camp of Ukrainian Sixties epistolary (N. Zagoruyko), anti-colonial novels by Roman Ivanychuk (T. Yemchuk), creative evolution in the context of Oleksandr Kopylenko (I. Kolomiets) socialist-realist paradigm, Leonid Pervomaisky (O. Siniook), Anatolii Shyian (O. Konovalov) and others.

It is obvious that the study of totalitarian experience by understanding literary and artistic practices is an actual problem, as it allows not only to expand the boundaries of man and society knowledge, but also allows identifying a kind of intellectual and mental phenomenon manifested in anti-colonial projection of the world. As Iryna Zakharchuk rightly points out, it is «literary sources, due to the stability and inscribing in the historical cultural modality, that over time accumulate increasing information potential, which allows to read ideological and metaphorical narrative, ways of aesthetic norms political regulation, and cultural consciousness, finally, it reconstructs that image of the world, with helped the descendants to learn the identifying existential coordinates of the past» [3, p. 1].

Despite these diverse and multifaceted works, questions of totalitarianism cultural strategy, ways of political regulation of aesthetic norms of totalitarian culture require a comprehensive and systematic analysis. Therefore, in this section of the dissertation we first of all choose systematical reading of the problem formation, development and transformation of socialist-realist discourse in the Ukrainian socio-cultural space of the XX century as a purpose. The focus of research attention is concentrated on the system of state influence on literary and artistic life, the reasons for the moral, ethical and aesthetic compromise of the artist, acceptable in a totalitarian society to preserve the illusion of creative freedom.

The Ukrainian literary and artistic process of the early twentieth century is a bright and heterogeneous phenomenon, according to the D. Chyzhevsky fair definition, «largely by non-literary reasons» [8, p. 64]: national liberation struggles (Central Council formation, proclamation of the UPR) and social and political cataclysms caused by the Bolshevik coup (civil war, the establishment of Soviet power, the forcible communist ideology introduction). The Bolsheviks were forced to turn to the sphere of national policy, in particular, the policy of «indigenization» developed by the party leadership and actively picked up by non-state institutions in 1923 [9, p. 91], determined a powerful wave of national and cultural upsurge in Ukraine (instead of the pragmatic intentions of the

Communists to win over the nationalist Ukrainian politicians and intelligentsia, to curb the popular opposition, in general, to control the process of national revival. – T. Sh.) [10, p. 143] and stimulated the development of many trends and the socio-cultural plan phenomena.

The logics of scientific research proves that in the conditions of a generally destructive post-revolutionary atmosphere on the territory of Ukraine there was a real «national-cultural explosion» in which, according to I. Dziuba, «the energy accumulated during the years of Ukrainian life and Ukrainian thought of the pre-revolutionary period» [2, p. 37]. In other words, it was not paradoxically, that the process of «Ukrainization» was a feigned tactical move of the Bolshevik government, introduced by its usual methods – not only expanded the socio-cultural space of creative activity, but also determined powerful literary and artistic initiatives.

Список використаних джерел

1. Гундорова Т. Соцреалізм: між модернізмом і авангардом. *Слово і Час*. 2008. №4. С. 14–21.
2. Дзюба І. М. Пастка. Тридцять років зі Сталінім. П'ятдесят років без Сталіна. Київ: Криниця, 2003. 144 с.
3. Захарчук І. В. *Мілітарна парадигма літератури соціалістичного реалізму* (еволюція, функції, аберації): автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня д-ра філол. наук. Київ, 2010. 32 с.
4. Ковалів Ю. «Соцреалізм» – глухий кут історії літератури. *Слово і Час*. 2009. № 4. С. 27–42.
5. Літературознавчий словник-довідник. Київ: Академія, 1997. 752 с.
6. Страда В. Советская литература и русский литературный процесс XX в. *Вестник МГУ. Сер. 9*. 1995. № 3. С. 93 – 101.
7. Таганов Л. Н. Стихотворные тетради Я. П. Надеждина: к проблеме массовой контркультуры 1920–1930-х годов [Електронний ресурс]. *Режим доступу*: <http://vestnik.rsuh.ru/article.html?id=55164>.
8. Чижевський Д. Реалізм в українській літературі. Київ: ВЦ «Просвіта», 1999. 118 с.
9. Шарова Т. Літературна практика у форматі соціалістичного реалізму. *Літератури світу: поетика, ментальність і духовність: зб. наук. пр.* Кривий Ріг: ФОП Мариниченко С.В., 2018. Вип. 11. С. 90–100.
10. Шарова Т. Літературно-художня творчість у радянській парадигмі: практики адаптації, логіка та аргументи конформізму. *Зб. наук. пр. Філологічні науки. Миколаїв: МНУ імені В.О. Сухомлинського*, 2018. № 1 (21). С. 143–149.
11. Vaudin A., Heller L. *Le Réalisme socialiste soviétique de la période jdanovienne (1947–1953)*. Bern; Berlin; Frankfurt/M.; New York; Paris; Wien: Peter Lang, 1998. XVII. 394 p.

Євгенія Шипиленко

студентка II курсу

спеціальності «Садівництво та виноградарство»

Науковий керівник: Шлєіна Л.І.

доктор філософії з педагогічних наук, старший викладач

Таврійський державний агротехнологічний університет

імені Дмитра Моторного

(м. Мелітополь)

РОЛЬ РИТОРИКИ В СУЧАСНОМУ СУСПІЛЬСТВІ

Сучасні глобальні процеси посилюють інтерес до риторичної підготовки особистості. Світова інтеграція значно розширює межі комунікацій, вона спонукає