

UDC 82.0:808.1:821.161.2 Л. Українка
doi: 10.15330/jpnu.8.2.56-64

Section: WORD AND TIME

UKRAINIAN LITERARY NATURALISM IN THE IDEOLOGICAL AND AESTHETIC RECEPTION OF LESIA UKRAINKA

ROMAN GOLOD

Abstract. The article deals with the study of the problem of Lesia Ukrainka's reception of the literary phenomenon of naturalism and the philosophy of positivism as its ideological basis. It also studies the way the poetess evaluated and looked at the achievements of European and Ukrainian writers representing this literary movement in the context of world and Ukrainian literary and cultural processes. The research also singles out the significance, national and individual-author features of the naturalism professed by I. Franko, A. Krymsky, E. Zola, Goncourt brothers, and F. Norris. The article focuses on the ideological and aesthetic importance of the postulates of naturalistic art for the development of the Ukrainian literary process. It also analyses different stages of the ideological and aesthetic reception of the naturalism doctrine in the perception of different generations of Ukrainian literary critics; it deals with Lesya Ukrainka's attitude to the naturalistic concept of a man and her reasoning about the compatibility of naturalism with certain genres and movements of literature. The article drives to the conclusion that Lesia Ukrainka recognizes the very fact of the existence of Ukrainian naturalism. It provides Lesia's vision on the usage of naturalistic elements in generally unnaturalist works and their combination with other elements, sometimes representative of opposite to naturalism in their ideological and aesthetic postulates, such as romanticism, decadence, neo-romanticism, realism, etc. The article also provides an insight of Lesia Ukrainka's attitude to the problems of zoomorphic imagery, social involvement, physiological scientism in the literature of naturalism. It draws attention to the problem of the evolution of aesthetic consciousness of E. Zola, I. Franko, A. Krymsky, and Lesia Ukrainka herself. There is also place for the comparative analysis of the perception of naturalism in the literary-critical reception of different generations of Ukrainian and foreign writers.

Keywords: positivism, naturalism, romanticism, neo-romanticism, realism, literary movement, worldview-philosophical basis, zoomorphism, decadence, epic, drama.

1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of naturalism is among the least studied branches in our science. For a long time, literary criticism did not pay attention to the existence of naturalistic tendencies in the Ukrainian literature, and the few works that dealt with this topic were ideologically biased and far from objective. In the late XIX - early XX centuries, literary critics perceived naturalism as ultra-realistic, overly radical movement compared to the traditional Ukrainian literature. Even if understood differently, such terms as "naturalism", "socialism", "revolution" were often used side by side in the literary-critical works of V. Barvinsky, G. Tseglynsky, O. Ogonovsky. For example, in the "History of the Ruthenian Literature" in 1893 the latter one is not overly enthusiastic about the "drastic scenes" in

the story "At the bottom", or "naturalistic pictures" in the story "Mission" by Ivan Franko [7, 1042]. Moreover, preachers of socialist realism declare naturalism to be the antithesis of realism, "the literature of the imperialist reaction," while naturalistic objectivism is seen as the reverse side of the decadence model, "a peculiar form of revolting bourgeois subjectivism" [9, 123]. In the article with the eloquent title "Marxist-Leninist aesthetics against naturalism in art" (1950) A. Burov defines naturalism as a set of "bad features" and techniques that harm art [1, 69-81].

Therefore, such turn of events led to the situation in which, on the one hand, the conceptual focus on the extraordinariness and scandal provoked a symmetrically aggressive reaction on the part of literary critics, while, on the other hand, the contamination of research optics by vulgar sociology stood in the way of the objective study of genetic and typological features of naturalism in the Soviet period.

However, naturalism is not a deviation in the historical development of realism; it is rather a natural, integral, independent and self-sufficient phenomenon of the literary process. The objectiveness of its existence is rooted in the fact that it was simultaneously developing in various national literatures in the second half of the XIX century.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Numerous literary studies by V. Matviishyn, M. Tkachuk, R. Golod, D. Nalyvayko, N. Vengrynovych, N. Kosylo and other researchers, which were published in the post-Soviet period, are devoted to the essence of this literary phenomenon, its role and significance in the history of the Ukrainian and world literary process. They reveal certain peculiarities and significance of the poetics of naturalism in its comparison with the poetics of other literary movements. This kind of comparative analysis can be found in the works "La naturalisme français" by P. Martino (focused on the relationship between realism and naturalism); "Modern French Literature" by M. Rykova (naturalism - decadence); "To the controversy about the realism of the XX century" by T. Motylova (naturalism - realism); "It is about methodology" by B. Suchkova (naturalism - realism); "Max Kretzer and the German naturalistic novel of the 80-90s of the XIX century" by L. Shpak (naturalism - realism - expressionism); "The Art of the Novel and the XX Century" by D. Zatonsky (naturalism - realism); "Art: movements, currents, styles" D. Nalyvayko (naturalism - realism - impressionism - modernism).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The direct participants of the literary process of the end of the XIX - the beginning of the XX century paid enough attention to the naturalistic tendencies in the literature of that time; in particular, it was Ivan Franko who tried to popularize ideological and aesthetic bases of the movement and focused on the integral study of it on both at the level of theoretical comprehension and the level of its own creative embodiment. Another writer contributing to the matter was Lesia Ukrainka; she did not belong to the adherents of naturalistic art, nevertheless, she objectively acknowledged the fact of the existence of this phenomenon in the Ukrainian and world literature. In particular, having a literary debate with S. Yefremov, Lesya Ukrainka wrote in a letter to her mother (January 27, 1903): "How can one say there was no naturalism - what about Nechuy and Franko?" [4, vol. 12, 33].

The importance of Lesya Ukrainka's literary-critical reception of the naturalistic movement is that she considered its achievements and shortcomings impartially, from the side, being emotionally and ideological-aesthetically distanced from its art system, and therefore quite objective and unbiased. She could not but see naturalism as a phenomenon in the Ukrainian and world literature because of her own personal connections with writers who actively introduced elements of naturalism in their artistic work (I. Franko, O. Kobylyanska, A. Krymsky), and because of the family connections with his uncle - Mikhaïlo Drahomanov. At the time he had a huge influence on Lesya's worldview development, and, perhaps, he made the greatest effort to promote Western European literary naturalism and its philosophical basis - positivism - in Ukraine.

After all, it was under the influence of M. Drahomanov that I. Franko turned to the philosophy of positivism as well as to the works of European naturalist writers. He also drew young Franko's attention to the literary works of Flaubert, Zola, Spielhagen, and Dickens. Franko supported the ideas of European positivists, scientific requirements, usefulness of literature, its usefulness, its social commitment, and its focus on the analytical study of reality, and these were the ideas of European idealists promoted by Drahomanov.

Among the main sources of Franko's concept of "scientific realism", which scientists tend to consider as branch of naturalism as an international movement, one can find M. Drahomanov's teachings, philosophy of positivism, foreign literary influences, certain traditions of Ukrainian literature and psychological features of I. Franko's creative personality [6, 125]. In the article "Literature, its tasks and the most important issues" Franko clarifies the essence of this concept: "Literature, as well as modern science, must be a worker in the field of the human progress. Its tendencies and methods should be of scientific nature. It gathers and describes the facts of everyday life, relying on truth only, but not on the aesthetic rules; yet, at the same time, literature analyzes them and draws conclusions from them – and this is its scientific realism" [10, v. 26, 13].

The most prominent representative of the naturalistic trend E. Zola tried to find scientific basis for the literary work, to rely on the achievements of natural science in explaining human nature, all being done under the influence of positivism. He stated that: "If we disregard the form and style, the author of an experimental novel is a scientist ... Similar to physiologists we conduct experiments on humans ..." [3, 277]. The Goncourt brothers shared the above-expressed opinion, in their one could read: "No one has described our talent as novelists yet. This talent relies on a strange and unique combination: we are simultaneously physiologists and poets" [2, 614].

Just like Zola, in his works Franko did not avoid descriptions of horrible, revolting, drastic pictures of reality, he could have agreed with the French writer that "we can never come to clear-cut and truly resultative assumptions about life phenomena unless we ourselves make experiments and work in the hospital, in the prosector's office and in the laboratory, rummaging in the trembling tissues of decomposing living organisms" [3, 259]. Yet, Zola often limited himself to the role of "anatomist" of human souls or society (more than on one occasion did Franko use this comparison, characterizing the creative method of the French write; he also wrote that some stories of the latter "resembled an anatomic theatre rather than a living slice of life warmed by the author's heart" [10, v. 31, 305]). The Ukrainian writer always prioritized the "doctor's work": he used the "dissection" only when the pragmatic consciousness sanctioned it, when he was convinced that the "prosector's work" was not an end in itself, but rather a means of achieving a positive result in medical practice.

Literary critics have always picked at naturalists for their interest of in dark, uncomfortable, "dirty" aspects of human life. The Goncourt brothers justify a writer's right to *aestheticize the "unaesthetic"* with the help of literature as an art form: "Literature can and should depict the life of the lower classes, as well as unattractive things or even ugly ones. It is painting that tends to be more drawn to the beautiful, refined, and pleasant. One turns to sight which cannot be offended; the other one turns to the heart which must be stirred" [2, 457]. In fact, if a writer is an "official working for the truth," then reality is his immediate supervisor. It provides the write with the material to process, and he has no right to refuse from this material. The surrounding of the naturalist writer, his places to live and work, the facts of his biography, all are reflected on the pages of his works. The fact that naturalists focus their attention on pathological phenomena in their surrounding is an antithesis to the depiction of idyllic pictures by representatives of idealistic-romantic trends.

In fact, as a scientific component of the true revelation of the human nature essence physiology was to become a safeguard against the excessive creativity flight and imagination flights of the writer to the realm of the ideal spirit, as it was typical for classicism or romanticism. Apparently, Lesia Ukrainka was aware of this as in one of her letters to Agatangel Krymsky she wrote: "And physiology - what can you do about it? It is a common woman and has little understanding of ideals" [4, v. 12, 144]. However, the poetess also understood that the excess of physiology and science can make a scientific study out of a literary work, and it will not enhance its aesthetic and receptive significance. In addition, "literature can

not do anything against pure physiology, because it is beyond its field of expertise, it, probably, needs Mechnikov or Krafft-Ebing, or whomever, but not a fiction writer" [4, v. 12, 143].

It is equally important to emphasize that Lesya Ukrainka did not equalize the rejection of reality idealization in the naturalistic works as a certain artistic method with the rejection of ideals in the social sphere, she was convinced that attention to descriptiveness and physiology in the naturalistic literature of did not interfere with the need of a positive programme of a certain didactic content. In particular, in a letter to her mother on January 27, 1903, referring to some theses of S. Yefremov's article "In Search of Beauty", Lesya wrote: "Who told Efremov that naturalism was indifferent "to the issues of socio-political life"? What about "Germinal", "Assommoir", "Debauché", "Paris", "Rome" etc.? The morality of the naturalists was the morality of positivism. Zola regrets "the denial of an ideal", but not indifference and lack of principles (one can have principles, so-called "rules", and not have an ideal) – and the principle was: to seek the actual truth and build everything on it" [4, vols. 12, 32].

At the same time, it is difficult to refute the fact that naturalist writers of Western Europe tried to spike dull tastes of their readers by means of "ugly aesthetics", thus bringing them out of indifference, impressing them, making them think about things they read. Commenting on the demand for the "unaesthetic", the Goncourt brothers expressed the following opinion: "Passion for something is not the result of its good quality or pure beauty. People adore only perversions. A woman can be madly loved for her dissoluteness, for being mean, for shrewdness of her mind, heart or feelings. Some people are fond of words with uftertaste. In fact, spoiled people love kind of whimsiness in creatures and things" [2, 539]. In French literature of the second half of the XIX century, going overboard is characteristic not only of readers, but also of the writers. "If you want," Zola wrote, "I have a corrupt taste: I like spicy literary dishes, works that appear in the times of decline when the full health of the heyday is replaced by sickly sensitivity. Well, I am the son of my time" [3, 46]. Such sentiments, combined with the study of heredity and physiology of human passions, spiked French naturalists' interest in psychopathological phenomena, and later, decadents started to perceive psychopathology as a guarantee of spirituality.

To tell the truth, the use of naturalistic techniques was not always harmoniously intertwined in the general context of a literary work. Ukrainian writers also were guilty of an excessive use of the "aesthetics of the ugly" (while this use is not always justified and to the point).

For example, one of the tasks of Franko's work "Mission" (1887) is to show how bloody scenes from childhood got "stuck" in the mind and soul of Reverend Gaudentius, and how "under the influence of gloomy asceticism and dark dogmas and bloody martyrdom stories" they were reborn in "ardent desire" martyr's death" [10, vols. 16, 267]. Yet, in our opinion, the stated goal does not justify the means – the images of the massacre in 1846, when "bloody and half-broken heads hung in the cracks of steps and were dragged along the snow, leaving traces of blood and cerebral palsy" [10, v. 16, 266], when the children "brought home a human eye that fell out of some unfortunate head" [10, v. 16, 267]. Such impressive pictures were quite leveled, because there was no deep psychological analysis in the subsequent parts of the work. The scenes of children-slaughter and cannibalism during the famine of 1846, when "children gnawed at their unfortunate brother's bones, not knowing that it might be their turn in a few days. And indeed, their turn came: meat did not last for long, and, after long painful arguments and mother's crying, father slaughtered a second son, a totally healthy one" [10, v. 16, 269], did not quite resonate with the general outline. The fact that the elements of naturalism can be found only at the beginning of the work suggests that originally the author intended to write something akin to Zola's novel "Teresa Raken" (M. Laslo-Kutsiuk studied the similarity of naturalistic descriptions in these literary works), but having written the first chapters he realized that the theme needed a calmer, more balanced, realistic manner of narration. Therefore, one can agree with H. Tseglynsky's critical remarks about the "lack of naturalism" of Franko's naturalism in this work and that it would be better if Franko "omitted" some naturalistic descriptions [12, 194-195]. Being in the discussion with the critic, Franko used arguments such as "[I] did not omit [these details and descriptions] because [I] saw no reason to do it" [10, v. 16, 494]; and while the arguments were emotional, they were hardly convincing.

Unlike Ivan Franko, who was sometimes overconfident in his writing skills and creative righteousness, Ahatanhel Krymsky, the author of the novel "Andriy Lagovsky" (1895-1905), reacted to

the critical remarks of his colleagues in the literary department more tolerantly, he also asked for their advice.. Even though, Ahatanhel Krymsky's novel was published later than Ivan Franko's work and naturalism was no longer perceived as extremely repulsive as it was at the time of the publication of "Mission" (1887), Lesia Ukrainka's first reaction to the naturalistic scenes in the former was very similar to Hryhory Tseglynsky's reaction to the work of Ivan Franko. In particular, in one of her letters to Ahatanhel Krymsky Lesya Ukrainka wrote: "Regarding the practical advice you asked me for, I can tell you this: it would not hurt to get rid of a few pages in your novel. You know which ones. Not all the "readers" are as "experienced" in the different schools literature as I am; therefore, maybe, some of them will drop the book, and it will rather unfortunate in my opinion. Moreover, the idea of your work does not require such naturalism à outrance [naturalism, taken to the extreme], it is rather obscured by the latter. Next time don't torture yourself so much, dear comrade, I ask you sincerely, because I clearly feel this naturalism is not coming easy for you (well, at least take the scene with finger biting! ..). Meanwhile, your lyrical poems (don't they torment you less?) contain far more living truth than these naturalistic "protocols of vivisection" [4, vols. 12, 149-150].

However, it is impossible to fully equalize H. Tseglynsky's evaluation of "Mission" and Lesya Ukrainka's criticism of "Andriy Lahovsky". The first one criticizes the very access to naturalism and "aesthetics of the ugly" to literary fiction, while the second one is rather against the tendency to aestheticize physiology, which is embedded in the discourse of decadent art in particular. Taking into account the above-mentioned features of the literary process of that time and the analyzed work of Ahatanhel Krymsky, B. Pastukh comes to conclusion: "Unlike naturalism, decadence relies on factology not for the sake of sounding "scientific": physiology becomes the subject of aestheticization in here. Though, decadence still uses the stylistic parameters of naturalism. The novel appears to be the artistic account of the history of Andriy Lahovsky's illness, that's where the name comes from, in fact, it is a history of illness with exacerbations, relapses and recovery" [8, 67]. At the same time, having analyzed Lesia Ukrainka's reaction to the novel above, Niukovets points out: "In fact, this can be seen as a critique of naturalism, which is quite expressive in the novel and its stylistic arsenal becomes the means of creation of the general decadent tone of the work" [8, 68].

The Darwin's theory of the evolution of species in nature, positivist postulates about "race" and "environment" determinants underlying the patterns of human behavior, interest in physiology, problems of heredity, degenerative human development, these all made naturalists to often address the topic of animal, even "bestial" nature of a human being. Ivan Franko wrote the following, concerning this issue: "Even in our age civilization is still stepping on corpses and staining their feet with blood. Humans have not become a big family with the dominance of one heart and one spirit; too often the beast is still trying to come out and it needs taming" [10, pp. 27, 345].

Literary studies have focused repeatedly on the problem of zoomorphism in the works of European naturalist writers, making it their research object and subject. For example, V. Milovidov believes that E. Zola's novel "Trap" "uses zoomorphic imagery in the most active way" [5, 223-224]. The scientist is convinced: "Differentiation between naturalistic and unnaturalistic perception of the image of an animal should be based on the relation of this image to a man, to be more precise, what is the position of a man concerning the image of an animal from the point of view of the author and the reader" [5, 211].

As for zoomorphic images in F. Norris's works, Z. Hannanova points out: "To a large extent, the motif of the beast in a man is a continuation of the traditional idea of Christian Dualism, where a man is half-God and half-animal. Obviously, one cannot insist that Norris advocated this approach in his worldview, but there is no doubt that some forms of dualism are evidently present in his stories and novels. More than often the writer relies on his interpretation of dualism: he contrasts good and evil in a man, selfishness and anti-egoism, rational and irrational actions of the character, some of them being dictated by free will and others being induced by external, out-of-this-world forces "[11, 84-85]. According to the researcher, F. Norris's novel "Vandover and the Beast" (1914) can be seen as the most striking and successful example of a naturalistic work of the author with a very characteristic title in this aspect [11, 85].

The topic of animal existence of a human in the conditions of social inequality and the necessity for biological survival in a hostile environment has repeatedly become the subject of interest for Ukrainian writers. Say, due to his bitter experience of imprisonment, Franko discovered the whole unattractive truth of the dark side of human nature at the bottom of human society, where "...всюку видно наголо особу,/ Мов фрак роздівши й мундур урядовий,/ Вони і людську скинули подобу" ["... everyone can see a person's essence naked,/ As if, having taken of a tailcoat and a government uniform,/ They also lost the human likeness"] [10, vol. 1, 152-153].

In one of his poems Franko writes: "Досвітній нурок із мене: що в власному «я» там тайться/ На болотистому дні – знаю, голубчики, й се!/ Черепи стовчених мрій, кістяки неоправданих планів,/ Зломки дрібних пожадань, трупи обманних надій./ Ах, а крім того, гидкі слимаки самолюбства, медузи/ Зависті, хроби гризот, кефалоподи підлот" // [The dawn bird am I: what is there hidden in my own "I"/ At the swampy bottom, I know, sweethearts, all of it!/ Skulls of crushed dreams, skeletons of unjustified plans,/ Fractures of small wishes, corpses of deceptive hopes./ Alas, and besides them, there are ugly snails of selfishness, jellyfish of/ Envy, gnawing worms of illnesses, cephalopods of foulness"] [10, vol. 3, 343].

Other poems of the poet are also representative of a typically naturalistic vision of the "foundations" of the human "I". Although, unlike "monomaniac" Zola, Franko was able to see also the bright sides of human nature, he still warned subjectivist poets that in the "quiet bay of one's heart" a person could find not only "pearls and diamonds", "warmth and luxury" or "paradise, and fragrances without end": "А як знайде гидкі черви/ І гіркість сліз, розбиті нерви,/ Докори хорого сумління,/ Прокляття свого покоління,/ Зневіру чорну, скрип розстрою,/ То що почать з такою грою?!" [And if you find ugly worms/And the bitterness of tears, broken nerves,/ Remorse of sickly consciousness,/ The curse of your generation,/ Black despair, squeaks of frustration,/ So what will start with such a game?] [10, Vol. 3, 108]

While Franko's interpretation of the animal side of the human essence includes obvious features characteristic of the ideological and aesthetic postulates of the world invariant of naturalistic art, the physiologism of Ahatanhel Krymsky's novel "Andriy Lagovsky" fits the modernist-decadence system of ideological and aesthetic dominants rather than the scientific framework of a positivist-naturalistic context.

What is interesting: the extensive commentary Lesia Ukrainka offered to Ahatanhel Krymsky in response to his request to evaluate the novel, i.e. the commentary concerning the relevance of use of the physiological scientism, poetics of ugliness, outrageous drasticity, zoomorphic imagery, etc., can equally apply to both modernist-decadent and naturalistic-positivist interpretation of the human nature. Moreover, one should not think it is all about Lesia Ukrainka's readiness to perceive or reject poetic or stylistic subtleties of different literary directions. It is rather about the ideological and aesthetic principles of Lesia Ukrainka's concept of a man, which is based on the classical principle of kalokagatia and humanistic anthropocentrism. The harmonious perception of man in the integrity of his spiritual and bodily development contradicts both the idealization and absolutization of the light spiritual essence of human nature, and the identification of the latter exclusively with the dark animalistic beginning. Therefore, it is not surprising that in her letter to Ahatanhel Krymsky (November 16, 1905) Lesia Ukrainka addresses the issue of "pages" from the novel "Andriy Lagovsky" that "hurt" her in the following way: "Lord Almighty, why is he torturing himself so much?!" - that was what I thought about you, because it seemed to me that you must have been in terrible pain when you were writing those pages. It could not have been otherwise, because it physically hurts even to read them. You probably wanted to uncover some truth with it- didn't you? – even at the price of your own and the reader's suffering, but you did not uncover the truth, because you surpassed it. Do tell me, does vivisection in anima vili [vivisection of a miserable soul] or even nobili [noble] provide us with a picture of that soul or at least give us an idea how to put that picture together? I think not. I think that if you take the best, the noblest person and describe them in detail, how they eat, chew, digest etc., they can become repulsive beyond measure, and, maybe, there is a very sensitive and delicate reader who will say: "My fellow people, let's not eat anymore, we'd better starve to death, because it's more aesthetically pleasing than this disgusting reality of chewing", etc. And the second one, less sensitive or easily impressive, will say: "No, it's nothing like that! All life processes are unaesthetic, especially if you take a closer look, they are all "bestly", but there is no way out of them even in death, because it is also "bestly" and unaesthetic and leads to many further, perhaps even more unaesthetic, bestial and plant

processes, - we have no power over that, we can only build "over-buildings" (or, in other terminology, superstructures) on those foundations, and the foundations will remain the way they are, all we have to do is cover them a bit with soil so that they don't sport their nudity before our eyes. We will have enough work and tragedies working on those annex-superbuildings and we will have no time to think about the foundations." That's what the "less sensitive" will say, and I stand on his side... " [4, v. 12, 140-141].

Another reason contributing to the impression that Lesia Ukrainka was cautious of the artistic achievements of naturalism was that similarly to some representatives of the movement for a certain period she was convinced of its incompatibility with drama as a genre of literature. For example, pointing out the genre specificity of Zola's works, Ivan Franko wrote: "By his nature he is a representative of an epic genre, he is, probably, one of the last great epic writers, and he tried to project his naturalistic theories on drama, but his theories were very naïve and superficial, not deep enough to even touch the essence of drama works" [10, v. 31, 304]. Lesia Ukrainka once advocated a similar point of view as she was convinced that almost all naturalist drama was not original but compiled of adaptations of the novels that were not very successful, apart from the "success of the scandal" of some of them. The poetess argued: "It turned out to be as impossible to create a drama from all the "human documents" of the naturalistic school, as it would be impossible to create a picture out of photographs by means of clippings and glue. A real playwright can use these documents the way a real artist uses photographs – they can backup and refresh his memory but they should not make him obey" [4, v. 8, 235]. It is obvious that for the writer who laid the foundations of Ukrainian drama with her work this anti-dramatic character of naturalism appeared to be a serious drawback.

However, to be fair one should say there are other points of view regarding the relevance of the drama and poetics of naturalism. For instance, literary critic L. Shpak believes: "It is the naturalistic drama of Germany that has reached the most flawless forms of expression. Relying on the "style of the second" playwrights surpassed novelists in accuracy and capacity of details" [13,16]. Many dramatic works by Hauptmann, Vynnychenko, and representatives of "Young Poland" school were written in a naturalistic manner. Moreover, the art of collage proves that a real artist can make a picture out of photos with the help of cutouts and glue. Later on, even Lesia Ukrainka changed her opinion (the evidence being presented in a recently discovered article about Hauptmann's drama). It is not all about the documents. For example, the detailed psychological analysis in the Franko's "Stolen Happiness" comes from the "small print" of the naturalistic style.

It was not characteristic of Lesia Ukrainka to be categorical in her assessment of certain literary and artistic phenomena. She tried to objectively assess a phenomenon in its entirety, in the dialectical unity of its opposing manifestations. Moreover, while her concept of a man included both spiritual and bodily components, she also tried to balance out different categories in art: high and low, beautiful and ugly, ethical and aesthetic, and so on. Undoubtedly, Lesia's approach went hand-in-hand with the ideas expressed in the lines of another poem by Ivan Franko: "Нема чоловіка, в котрого/ Не було б добра, окрім злого./ В котрого, крім гнилі й зосупття,/ Не було б в душі щось цілого" // [There is no man who has/ nothing good in him, but evil,/ Who would not have, besides rot and corruption,/ Something whole in the soul] [10, vol. 3, 193].

Consciousness and deep understanding prompted Franko to fight both subconscious desires for "pure" beauty and idealization, and the materialism of instinctive bodily "vocations"; as both of them are equally distracting when it comes to socially useful work, or the focus on the objective, that is the construction of a new, bright "temple of human strivings, efforts and work". Lesia Ukrainka also contributed to the work on this temple. Therefore, she could not have afforded to be overly fascinated by the extremes of poetics of ugliness, or the cult of pure beauty and art for art's sake. Even more, if one focuses only on the thesis or antithesis they consciously limit their arsenal of means and tools of artistic representation. Instead, literary critics drew attention to the fact that both E. Zola and I. Franko used contrasting elements of the opposing in their ideological and aesthetic guidelines literary trends, such as naturalism and romanticism. These extremes are even more frequent in the works of neo-naturalists, and in the Ukrainian literature its most prominent representative is V. Vynnychenko. Literary critics find several reasons to explain such tendencies in the development of

naturalism; they include the exhaustion of the rationalist principles of positivism in the early XX century, and the consequent search of writers for a different, more irrational philosophical basis. "Vynnychenko's vitatism is also a result of distrust of irrationalism and lack of trust to reason". As D. Nalyvayko puts it: "Similarly to certain branches of the "philosophy of life", in particular Nietzscheanism, for Vynnychenko physical and emotional basic sources are as significant and active as consciousness and rationality" [6, 128].

Lesia Ukrainka was able to find features of naturalism even in the work of such a refined esthete as O. Kobylyanska. She believed that Kobylyanska's true literary talent was a combination of two styles: a "very romantic" one and a "purely naturalistic" one [4, vol. 9, 58-59]. У листі до М. Павлика від 16 березня 1891 р. з приводу повісті Ольги Кобилянської «Льорелей» (першої редакції «Царівни») Леся зауважує, що «тут уже видно правдивий натуралізм»: In her letter to M. Pavlyk from March 16, 1891, talking about Olha Kobylianska's story "Lorelei" (the first edition of "The Princess"), Lesia stated that "one can see true naturalism here": "In general, it seems that this story was written in two different styles but together: the very romantic and purely naturalistic ones". In her opinion, it was quite a drawback that Kobylyanska's neo-romantic style "has not yet reached such a harmony of the ideal and the truth of life, as it can be seen in the works of some of the modern French writers" [4, vol. 10, 81]. In her letter to O. Kobylyanska from January 30/February 3, 1900, Lesya Ukrainka wrote: "I recognize such realism, because it does not exclude the *urge ins Blau*" [4, vol. 11, 160].

4. CONCLUSION

Lesia Ukrainka's definition of realism that "does not exclude the *urge ins Blau*," is essentially similar to Franko's definition of his ideological and aesthetic concept as "ideal realism." In fact, both explanations and understandings came out as fruit of a long-term evolution of their systems of aesthetic and philosophical beliefs and views. Thus, as strange as it may seem, both definitions are demonstratively opposite to naturalism, yet they exist in the realm of dialectic unity with the poetics of this seemingly down-to-earth movement, which is focused directly on the everyday issues of human soul and human society. Although Lesia Ukrainka did not apply the ideological and aesthetic achievements of naturalism in her own literary works, she acknowledged the very existence of naturalism in the Ukrainian literature, and she was willing to give advice on the relevance of using of its elements in the works of certain authors directly, or in peculiar genres of literature.

REFERENCES

- [1] Буров А. Марксистско-ленинская эстетика против натурализма в искусстве// Вопросы философии. 1950. № 1. 69-81.
[Burov A. Marksystsko-lenynskaia estetyka protyv naturalyzma v iskusstve// Voprosy filosofii. 1950. № 1. 69-81.] (in Russian)
- [2] Гонкуры Э. и Ж. Дневник. М., 1964. Т. 1. – 710 с.
[Honkury E. y Zh. Dnevnyk. M., 1964. T. 1. – 710 s.] (in Russian)
- [3] Золя Э. Собр. соч.: В 26 т. – Т. 24. – М., 1966. 321 с./
[Zolia E. Sobr. soch.: V 26 t. – T. 24. – M., 1966. 321 s.] (in Russian)
- [4] Леся Українка. Зібр. творів: У 12 т. К., 1977.
[Lesia Ukrainka. Zibr. tvoriv: U 12 t. K., 1977.] (in Ukrainian)
- [5] Миловидов В. А. Поэтика натурализма. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени доктора филологических наук. Рукопись. Тверь, 1996. 334 с.
[Mylovydov V. A. Poetyka naturalyzma. Dyssertatsyia na soyskanye uchenoi stepeny doktora fylolohycheskykh nauk. Rukopys. Tver, 1996. 334 s.] (in Russian)
- [6] Наливайко Д. Проблема натуралізму в українській літературі. Літературознавство: Матеріали III конгресу Міжнародної асоціації українців. К., 1996. С. 118-130.
[Nalyvaiko D. Problema naturalizmu v ukrainskii literature. Literaturoznavstvo: Materialy III kongresu Mizhnarodnoi asotsiatsii ukrainistiv. K., 1996. S. 118-130.] (in Ukrainian)

- [7] Огоновський О. Історія літератури рускої. Львів, 1893. Ч. 3. 1115 с.
[Ohonovskiy O. Istorii lyteratury ruskoj. Lviv, 1893. Ch. 3. 1115 s.] (in Russian)
- [8] Пастух Б. Роман «Андрій Лаговський» Агатангела Кримського як «історія хвороби» / Б.Пастух // Слово і час. Київ, №5. 2013. С.64-69.
[Pastukh B. Roman «Andrii Lahovskyi» Ahatanhela Krymskoho yak «istoriia khvoroby» / B. Pastukh // Slovo i chas. Kyiv, 2013. №5. S.64-69.] (in Ukrainian)
- [9] Стебун І. Питання реалізму в естетиці Івана Франка / І. Стебун. К., 1958. 315 с.
[Stebun I. Pytannia realizmu v estetytsi Ivana Franka / I. Stebun. K., 1958. 315 s.] (in Ukrainian)
- [10] Франко І. Збір. творів: У 50т. / Іван Франко К.: Наук. думка, 1978 – 1986.
[Franko I. Zibr. tvoriv: U 50t. / Ivan Franko K.: Nauk. dumka, 1978 – 1986.] (in Ukrainian)
- [11] Ханнанова З. Р. Фрэнк Норрис. Проблема стиля и метода (к вопросу о развитии американского натурализма). Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. Рукопись / З. Р. Ханнанова Казань, 2000. 199 с.
[Khannanova Z. R. Frenk Norrys. Problema stylya y metoda (k voprosu o razvytyu amerykanskooho naturalyzma). Dyssertatsiya na soyskanye uchenoi stepeny kandydata fylohohycheskykh nauk. Rukopys / Z. R. Khannanova Kazan, 2000. 199 s.]. (in Russian)
- [12] Цеглинський Г. «Ватра» : Літературний збірник// Зоря. 1887. Ч. 9. С. 192-196.
[Tsehlynskyi H. «Vatra» : Literaturnyi zbirnyk// Zoria. 1887. Ch. 9. S. 192-196.] (in Ukrainian)
- [13] Шпак Л. Макс Кретцер и немецкий натуралистический роман 80-90-х годов XIX ст. К., 1982. 132 с.
[Shpak L. Maks Krettser y nemetskyi naturalystycheskyi roman 80-90-kh hodov KhIKh st. K., 1982. 132 s.] (in Russian)

Address: Roman Golod, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 57 Shevchenko St., Ivano-Frankivsk, 76025 Ukraine.

E-mail: roman.golod@pnu.edu.ua

Received: April 15, 2021; **revised:** April 16, 2021.

Голод Роман. Український літературний натуралізм в ідейно-естетичній рецепції Лесі Українки. *Журнал Прикарпатського університету імені Василя Стефаника*, 8 (2) (2021), 56–64.

Статтю присвячено дослідженню проблеми рецепції Лесею Українкою літературного феномену натуралізму та філософії позитивізму як його світоглядної основи. Вивчається проблема оцінки та ставлення поетеси до здобутків європейських і українських письменників зазначеного напрямку в контексті світового й українського літературних і культурних процесів. З'ясовуються значущість, національні й індивідуально-авторські особливості натуралізму, сповідуваного І. Франком, А. Кримським, Е. Золя, братами Гонкурами, Ф. Норрісом. Вивчається ідейно-естетична важливість постулатів натуралістичного мистецтва для розвитку українського літературного процесу. Проаналізовано різні етапи рецепції ідейно-естетичної доктрини натуралізму в осмисленні різних поколінь українських літературознавців, а також ставлення Лесі Українки до натуралістичної концепції людини та міркування поетеси щодо сумісності натуралізму з окремими родами та жанрами літератури. Зроблено висновок про визнання Лесею Українкою самого факту існування українського натуралізму. Описано Лесине бачення можливості застосування елементів натуралізму у загалом ненатуралістичних творах і в поєднанні з іншими, часом протилежними за своїми ідейно-естетичними постулатами до натуралізму напрямками, як-от романтизмом, декадансом, неоромантизмом, реалізмом тощо. З'ясовується ставлення Лесі Українки до проблем зооморфічної образності, соціальної заангажованості, фізіологічного сцієнтизму в літературі натуралізму. Звернено увагу на проблему еволюції естетичної свідомості Е. Золя, І. Франка, А. Кримського, і самої Лесі Українки. Здійснено порівняльний аналіз сприйняття натуралізму в літературно-критичній рецепції різних поколінь українських і зарубіжних письменників до натуралізму.

Ключові слова: позитивізм, натуралізм, романтизм, неоромантизм, реалізм, літературний напрям, світоглядно-філософська основа, зооморфізм, декаданс, епос, драма.