



**2<sup>nd</sup> Shaikh Ayaz  
International Conference  
on  
Language and Literature  
(SAICLL)**

November 7-10, 2008

**PROCEEDINGS**

*Editors*

**Muhammad Qasim Bughio** (Tamgha-e-Imtiaz)

**Muhammad Shaban Rafi**



**Faculty of Arts**  
University of Sindh  
Jamshoro

## Tendencies in the Contemporary Ukrainian Literary Process: Diachronic Aspect

Oksana Prykhodko\*

### *Abstract*

*The paper deals with a problem of representation of the Ukrainian literature of the XX-XXI centuries as a confrontation of methods, techniques and ideologies, which had a direct impact on literature process in the XX century. The aim of the article is to evaluate the Ukrainian literature in its diachronic aspects, paying a special attention to the cognitive points, realized in styles and methods of writing. The paper proves that in the Ukrainian literature without the ideological pressure tendencies and styles unfold according to the rule of generic oppositions, when one tendency is created on the ruins of the precursory one. However when the ideology is dominant in the society, literature cannot unfold only in the aesthetical realm; it should analyze the social and political contexts and be the source of struggling for the national independence. The phenomenon of Shystdesiatnytstvo was a very good example, and the Bu-Ba-Bu generation proves that when the ideological regime is ruined, literature manages to ruin the ideological aspects of the precursory literary tendencies using humor, satire and parody, and only then we could say about the ontological return of the literature to the aesthetic values.*

The process of the contemporary Ukrainian literature and its stylistic dominants in period of the end of the XX—XXI centuries is based on the precursory tendencies in literature of the XX century, which was the period of struggling for the development of the Ukrainian literature as a aesthetic phenomenon as a part of the Ukrainian identity. Modernism in Ukrainian literature was a way of creating a powerful literature system, explicated in the rebellion of the Ukrainian spirit and intellect (in the poems of *Tychyna*, *Svidzynskyi*, *Pluzhnyk*). What is more, after 1932, when the method of 'social realism' was proclaimed as the official ideological doctrine, modernism was in opposition to it. Ukrainian literature of the XX century had a powerful ideological pressing of Stalinism and communism, the imperial tendencies wanted to eliminate the Ukrainian culture and colonize the mind.

Modernism is the international movement in literature and art that emphasized the sense of a radical break with the past and the possibility of a transformed world.

---

\* Ph.D. Scholar in the pedagogical sciences, Rivne University of Slavic Sciences of the Kyiv Slavic University, Ukraine.



Central and East European modernism in the years 1880–1913 is often viewed as encompassing the “isms”: impressionism, symbolism, cubism, abstractionism, futurism, and expressionism. A second wave of modernism appeared in the years 1914–30, which was strongly influenced by radical political movements in Europe and sometimes identified itself as the cultural avant-garde of these movements. It was closely associated with the futurists, constructivists, expressionists, and surrealists of the post-First World War years.

On the eve of the First World War a growing tension and unease with the social order also manifested itself in artistic works in every medium which radically simplified or rejected previous practice. In 1913, the year of Einstein's first paper on the General Theory of Relativity, Niels Bohr's quantized atom, Edmund Husserl's *Ideas*, Ezra Pound's founding of Imagism, and the New York Armory Show, and young painters such as Pablo Picasso and Henri Matisse were causing a shock with their rejection of traditional perspective as the means of structuring paintings—a step that none of the Impressionists, not even Cézanne, had taken.

These developments began to give a new meaning to what was termed 'Modernism': It embraced disruption, rejecting or moving beyond simple Realism in literature and art, and rejecting or dramatically altering tonality in music. This set modernists apart from 19th century artists, who had tended to believe in 'progress'. Writers like Dickens and Tolstoy, painters like Turner, and musicians like Brahms were not 'radicals' or 'Bohemians', but were instead valued members of society who produced art that added to society, even if it were, at times, critiquing less desirable aspects of it. Modernism, while it was still "progressive" increasingly saw traditional forms and traditional social arrangements as hindering progress, and therefore the artist was recast as a revolutionary, overthrowing rather than enlightening.

Generally, Ukrainian modernism gravitates towards the romantic type of art. This accounts for the distinctiveness and originality of Ukrainian modern poetry, where the forms for Romantic imagery are revived and developed. In a desperate search of modernity, Ukrainian modernists did not adhere to terms as to a literary school; instead, they took it as a more or less definite poetic system having a lasting existence. Due to that, a new name, a new fact in the poetry played the part of a 'mouthpiece', the poetry transformed into slogans, appeals and declarations.

A characteristic feature of Ukrainian modernists is manifestation of new ideas, methods and principles. Almost all Ukrainian "modernists" started their creation with "declarations", 'yells as to their intention to write about the beauty and not about people'. Modernism was born up from the crises of representation in literature

and the end of the positivistic views. Thus modernism, which had not managed to ruin the deep canons of the quest for national identity, was at the time on a level of formal aesthetic experiments and was only able to upgrade certain topics. It was as late as in the 1910s, when modernism was formed and grounded in Ukrainian literature. Unlike modernism, neoclassicism established its own criteria, hence the natural Ukrainian neoclassicists' admiration for the poets of the Silver Age, French "Parnassism" and reminiscences of the ancient lyrics, which had been newly adapted to European modernism. Anti-narodnik movement also determined the content of the first manifest of Ukrainian futurism entitled "Sam" (On our own), written by the "father" of Ukrainian futurism *Mikhailo Semenko*. One of the most prominent Ukrainian poets of the 20th century was *Pavlo Tychyna*, whose literary heritage was a break-through towards the "world polyphony" of poetry.

Ukrainian literary modernism made its appearance at the turn of the century with the Lviv-based *Moloda Muza* group, who championed the idea of 'pure art,' and the Kyiv-based journal *Ukraïens'ka khata*. *Mykola Vorony*, an early theoretician of the movement, believed that modernism consisted of a change in thematic focus from the social to the psychological, of the enrichment of forms of versification, and of greater sophistication of metaphor. The movement dominated Ukrainian poetry after the publication of *Pavlo Tychyna's* *Soniashni klarnety* (Sunny Clarinets, 1918) and *Zamist' sonetiv i oktav* (Instead of Sonnets and Octaves, 1920). In the 1920s it was manifested in the radical poetic experiments of *Mykhailo Semenko* and *Valerian Polishchuk* and in the poetry of *Mykola Bazhan* and other poets. Examples in prose include the psychological prose of *Volodymyr Vynnychenko* and, in the 1920s, *Valerian Pidmohylny*, and the experimental prose of *Mykola Khvylovy's* (*Syni etiudy* [Blue Etudes], 1923) and *Leonid Skrypnyk's* (*Intelihent* [The Intellectual], 1929). Ukrainian literary modernism also produced strong women writers who expressed feminist concerns (eg, *Lesia Ukrainka* and *Olha Kobylianska*). In Ukrainian émigré literature, modernism was most apparent in the work of the interwar 'Prague school' of Ukrainian poets and the postwar New York Group of poets.

In his essay "At the Crossroads of the Century," Ukrainian literary scholar *M. Ilnytsky* (1995) concludes that "the development of Ukrainian poetry in the 20<sup>th</sup> century has testified to the European orientation of Ukrainian culture, which has made it possible for it to preserve its identity despite political pressure from various countries... (Ilnytsky, 72). "Before its independence in 1991 and the more recent Orange Revolution, Ukraine had been for most of its modern history under the rule of politically more powerful neighbors--the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Poland,



Tsarist Russia, and the Soviet Union. Under the rule of the relatively benign Austro-Hungarian Empire, Western Ukrainian writers had immediate interlocutors in their German-speaking neighbors and a natural window to literary and cultural developments in Europe. Soviet rule later was to slam that window shut. The highly repressive Tsarist and Soviet colonizations of Ukraine led to the establishment of what Ukrainian literary scholar John Fizer aptly has coined "coercive intertextuality," a process that induced indigenous Ukrainian literati to take a subservient role and to extol the language and culture of the colonizers.<sup>1</sup> Mykola Khvylovy's call under Soviet rule to look toward the West for literary models during the Ukrainian Literary Discussion of 1925-1928 ended with his suicide in 1933, shortly before the Stalinist terror inevitably would have engulfed him. Émigré literary critic Jurij Lavrinenko was later to term this wave of persecutions of Ukrainian literati and other intellectuals as the "executed renaissance,"<sup>2</sup> which eradicated several hundred of Ukraine's cultural elite.

Khvylovy's aesthetic call for openness to Western literary influence, as an alternative to a coercive Russian one, was ultimately perceived by Stalin's regime as an inexcusable political transgression. It was, in fact, a totally principled position in unprincipled times, one that expressed the logic of the enlightened slave who thirsted for personal and intellectual freedom in opposition to the brutal might of the unenlightened master. Many of Khvylovy's contemporaries like the Neoclassicist poets Mykola Zerov, Maksym Rylsky and Mykhailo Drai-Khmara took that call to introduce European literature and the literature of antiquity to Ukrainian culture through their extensive translation activities. Thus the early 1920s comprised the zenith of Ukrainian literary culture's European orientation—until Stalin chose to crush it with arrests and executions. Khvylovy's impassioned democratic plea, quashed by Soviet authoritarianism for nearly six decades, was reborn during the days of Gorbachev's *glasnost*. In that later state of relatively unfettered freedom, Ukraine experienced a reinvigorated gravitation toward the West that continues to gather momentum to the present day.

In the early 1930s the Soviet authorities repressed and then eradicated modernism and its exponents in both literature and the arts, demanding in its place a

<sup>1</sup> Fizer used the term in an unpublished article entitled "Against Coercive Intertextuality." For the best analysis of Russo-Ukrainian literary relations in an historical context, see Myroslav Shkandrij, *Russian and Ukraine: Literature and the Discourse of Empire from Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times* (2001).

<sup>2</sup> For a detailed analysis of the Literary Discussion see Myroslav Shkandrij, *Modernists, Marxists and the Nation: The Ukrainian Literary Discussion of the 1920s* (1992). The title of Lavrinenko's pathbreaking anthology was *Rostriliane vidrodzhennia* (1959). See also George S.N. Luckyj's *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917-1934* (1956; revised ed., 1990).

state-sanctioned form of populism that stressed the heroic gesture and loyalty to the Communist party. Most forms of modernist experimentation were denounced as 'formalism,' 'psychologism,' 'bourgeois nationalism,' or 'decadence'. Not until the 1960s did a literary movement — *the Shistdesiatnyky* — re-emerge in Ukraine that built on the gains made by modernists in the century's first three decades.

Stalin's death, the seizure of power by *Chruščëv* and the Thaw inaugurated a new period in the national relationship within the USSR: Ukraine was given the role of *secunda inter pares* and from 1955 was granted an independent Ministry of Higher Education. Also in 1955, a new national movement came to light through the protest of Ukrainian jurists against legal exploitation of Ukraine. The reform of Soviet education, begun by *Malenkov* and clinched by *Chruščëv*, formally endeavored to complete de-Russification of schools and universities, but was actually frustrated by another new law: according to it, the parents of the students were given complete freedom to choose the language their children were to be taught in. Since the official language of the Army (military service was compulsory) and of the administrative and economic apparatuses was Russian, most parents would have leant towards education in Russian, realizing an actual *Russification*. The law was approved by the Central Committee of CPSU in 1958 and by Ukrainian authorities on 17<sup>th</sup> April 1959.

As a consequence, the Ukrainian intelligence rose in revolt against the Soviet power and in defense of national idiom. The protest was very strong among exponents of the humanistic sciences and among university students; however, it was not only all the well-known Ukrainian literates and historians took part in it, but also famous scholars in the fields of nuclear physics and cybernetics, which were particularly well-developed subjects of study in the Ukrainian SSR. The main aim of the revolt was the adoption of the Ukrainian language as a means of diffusion of culture and scientific knowledge. That was the first episode of compact dissent in the USSR after WWII, a revolt that, as *Oxana Pachlovska* has noticed through the words of the Ukrainian poet *Lina Kostenko*, used literature and culture as "an alternative to barricades"<sup>3</sup>.

This social movement characterized the entire *Sixties* (hence the name of *Shistdesiatnyky*, "generation of the Sixties," for its protagonists) and was given a proper answer at national level by the first Secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, *Petro Šelest*; he was in charge only from July 1963 but, after a short hesitation, decided in favor of supporting national requests. In his speeches, which were given vast publicity (the most famous is the one at the

<sup>3</sup> O. PACHLOVSKA, *Civiltà letteraria ucraina* [Ukrainian Literary Civilization], Rome 1998, p. 887.

Congress of Ukrainian Writers in November 1966). Šelest set himself up as the champion of Ukrainian national question.

In those years the cultural and civil life of Ukraine was characterized by great excitement, expressed in many different projects, all having in common the use of the Ukrainian language; the national idiom thus became the symbol of the Ukrainian "rebirth" (*vidrodžennja* was the term then often used to define this period). But the imprisonment of a few intellectuals in 1965 marked the beginning of a state repression that would include confinement in labor camps and mental hospitals; the victims were above all members of the *intelligencija*, authors of writings denouncing Soviet oppression both in the legal and the illegal press, the *samvydav* (the Ukrainian equivalent of *samizdat*). The most famous denunciations of Soviet repression became books, usually published illegally or abroad: *Internacionalizm chy russyfikacija* (1965) by the literary critic Ivan Džuba (later Minister of Culture from 1992 to 1994), *The Čornovil's Papers* (1967) by *V'jachcheslav Chornovil*, and *Valentyn Moroz's Report From the Beria Reservation* (also 1967), an outstanding recount of a prison camp<sup>4</sup>.

The trials against the Ukrainian *intelligencija* found a mighty opponent in Petro Šelest, whose actions had been seen as a recommencement of Ukrainian "national-communism" during the '20s and the '30s<sup>5</sup>. Unfortunately he too was about to publish his own condemnation: his book *Oh Our Soviet Ukraine* re-interpreted the whole Ukrainian history, and especially the Perejaslav treaty of 1654, as a history of Russian imperialism in Ukraine, and led to his almost instantaneous removal from the leadership of the Ukrainian Communist Party (1972) and from the Politburo (1973). A mauling of the book in the «Komunist Ukraïny» (the magazine of political orthodoxy) in April 1973 marked Šelest's irrevocable ban from public life.

Although the Ukrainian dissent in the *Sixties* was an output of the tradition of the Ukrainian "national-communism" between the two World Wars and the basis for future developments of Ukrainian dissent till Ukrainian independence in 1991 (the Ukrainian Helsinki Group in the 70s, the Society "T. Shevchenko" and finally the Rukh), this extraordinary period of civil uprising and cultural turmoil has yet to be thoroughly and duly studied, by both Ukrainian and foreign scholars.

<sup>4</sup> I. DŽUBA, *Internacionalizm chy russyfikacija?*, München 1968; V. MOROZ, *Report From the Beria Reservation*, Toronto 1974.

<sup>5</sup> Y. BILINSKY, *Mykala Skrypyk and Petro Shelest: An Essay on the Persistence and Limits of Ukrainian National Communism*, in J. R. AZRAEL (ed.), *Soviet Nationality Policies and Practices*, Praeger Publishers, New York 1978, pp. 105-143.

A thorough study of this period ought to begin with the reading of current affairs journalism of the day (*publicystyka*) and literary books: all the more skillful Ukrainian writers tried to put into words the atmosphere and the occurrences of those days, not only in political and journalistic writings but also in novels, poems and memoirs. In addition to the writings already cited above, the poets *Lina Kostenko, Vasyl Stus, Ivan Drač, Mykola Vinhranov'skyj, Vasyl Simonenko*, and the novelists *Dmytro Pavlyčko, Hryhir Tjutjunnyk, Valerij Ševčuk, Jevhen Bucalo, Volodymyr Drozd, Pavlo Zahrebel'nyj, Vasyl Zemljak* and *Oles Hončar* have described the aspirations and the feelings of their generation in both contemporary and later writings. A fascinating portrayal of the social and intellectual turmoil can be found in dissident's memoirs, such as those of *Levko Luk'janenko*, the leader of the jurists' uprising, *Leonid Pjušč*, a mathematician who flew to France after conviction in a mad-house, and obviously *Oles' Hončar*, the head of the Ukrainian Writers' Union and the author of the short novel *Sobor'* (The cathedral), which became a symbol of the intellectual revolt<sup>6</sup>. A very useful repository of information can be found in the coeval collections of documents that recount the underground activity of the *samvydav* and the trials against intellectuals and jurists<sup>7</sup>.

The Ukrainian Poets of the Sixties, while a significant cultural and political phenomenon, were largely unable to promote an overt Western orientation in their poetry since that would have been a sign of antipathy to the state and politically suspect. They did, however, attract significant attention and galvanize support from the reading public to pave the way for future developments. Additionally, Ukrainian poets in the 1960s to the early 1980s had little personal contact with Western writers. Few foreign authors visited the USSR,<sup>8</sup> especially Ukraine on the periphery of the Soviet Empire, and Ukrainian poets were rarely if ever permitted to travel to the "capitalist" countries of the *decadent*.

The emergence of the Ukrainian underground into aboveground life in the mid-to-late 1980s marked the opening of Pandora's box in the process of the restoration and return of Ukrainian literary culture. Prior to that time, poets, artists and other intellectuals met in the back rooms of cafes and at carefully guarded

<sup>6</sup> L.H. LUK'JANENKO, *Spovid' u kameri smertnykh*, Kyiv 1991; L. PJUŠČ, *History's Carnival: A Dissident's Autobiography*, New York 1977.

<sup>7</sup> M. BROWNE (ed.), *Ferment in the Ukraine: Documents by V. Chornovil, I. Kandyba, L. Lukianenko, V. Moroz, and Others*, London 1971; G. LUCKYJ (ed.), *The Ukrainian Herald: Ethnocide of Ukrainians in the USSR*, Cambridge 1976.

<sup>8</sup> A program of "cultural infiltration" run by the US State Department was in effect during the Cold War, which brought authors such as Edward Albee, John Steinbeck, John Updike, and others to the USSR. However, contacts with these visiting writers were greatly restricted and controlled.



gatherings in private apartments. It culminated in large-scale events like the two-day *Bu-Ba-Bu*<sup>9</sup> multimedia Chrysler Imperial "happening" in 1992. This process of the reestablishment of Ukrainian linguistic and cultural identity and the popularization of new literature marked the beginning of the process of reintegration with Europe and Ukrainization. The process has been twofold. The first aspect of it comprised the ritual obliteration of traditional Ukrainian cultural identity through parody and satire, and the second—the reestablishment of a new Ukrainian identity in the modern world through the exploration of literary and mass European and Third World cultures. With the advent of *glasnost* and later Ukrainian independence in 1991, Ukrainian poets for the first time had the opportunity to travel abroad to Europe and North America in a steady stream, many at first just to earn honoraria to support themselves under the difficult post-independence economic conditions. A mutual interpenetration and influence began, as well as an active publication process to introduce émigré authors and to restore previously banned writers, many from the "executed renaissance," to the Ukrainian reading public.

*The Bu-Ba-Bu Generation* of writers particularly focused on creating a new sense of literary identity by breaking with the traditional icons of the Ukrainian past, by, in fact, playfully mocking them, and by focusing on aesthetic freedom as their primary concern. They rejected the rigidly nationalistic canonical approach to their Ukrainian literary antecedents, the aesthetically bereft socialist realist content of much of Soviet Ukrainian literature, and even their immediate predecessors in the literary establishment—the Poets of the Sixties, who, although treated as heroes within traditionalist Ukrainian culture, were perceived as old-fashioned and too programmatically nationalistic for the modern aesthetic of the younger generation. These new writers focused, too, on a new, freer Ukrainian language that broke both Soviet and nationalistic taboos. They provided forces of energy for a society in a state of at least partial entropy in the mid-1980s, and which, in the latter part of the decade, suffered from post-Chornobyl shock and a total loss of confidence in those who governed them. They ignited a spark to build a larger fire of cultural change.

The predisposition to change in language comprises one of the vital forces in cultural development, and language innovation has been one of the primary legacies of the *Bu-Ba-Bu* Generation. A prime example would be a poem like *Victor Neborak*'s:

---

<sup>9</sup> The name of the group is formed from the first syllable of the Ukrainian words for buffoonery (*bufonada*), puppet show farce (*balahan*), and burlesque (*burlesk*).

"*Bubon*," which functioned as a kind of anthem for the *Bu-Ba-Bu Generation*. It is brief enough to quote in its entirety:

### **A drum-tympanum**

(a sonnet uttered by the Flying Head)

--Paint a BABE naked BLUE  
with lips the day looks BA  
BU in dithyramBs BU taBOO  
put your teeth in BUBABU  
poetry grows from hunchback work  
a battle with money in the hump  
and BUBABU will BE reBELLion  
from the alphaBETs your head is weak  
the BARD explodes in your lips  
what the world hisses with the theater screams  
you'll play a poem that makes it worth it  
you'll end up in Paradise (or Paris)  
BU to death immortal BU  
and BU and BA and BUBABU

The poem's title "*Bubon*," according to *C.H. Andrusyshen's Ukrainian-English Dictionary* (44) can be translated as "drum," "ear-drum," "tympanum," and "naughty boy." While the language of the poem playfully imitates the sound of a snare drum in Neborak's reading of it, he obviously has virtually all of the above meanings in mind. He is a "naughty boy" for the double-entendric readings of lines. "Maliute BABU holu BU," for example, can be read as the innocuous "Paint a light blue snowman" as well as "Paint a BABE naked BU." This kind of paronomastically-oriented double-meaningedness of words, phrases, and images is prevalent throughout much of the writing of Neborak and the other *Bu-Ba-Bu Generation* writers. This kind of writing has created a disconnect with the older generation of Ukrainians, who, for the most part, have rejected such linguistic transgressions and overt sexuality in literature, but, at the same time, has created a sense of connectedness for younger Ukrainians seeking self-definition and a less rigid notion of their identity.

Other writers outside of *Bu-Ba-Bu* have also taken similar stances against petrified icons of the Ukrainian past. We can mention, for instance, the phenomenon

of the Lviv poet *Nazar Honchar* of the *Lu-Ho-Sad* group, whose shtick as a poet is to be a walking parody of a Cossack.

In another poem he combines a parody of the Lemko-born Ukrainian poet *Bohdan Ihor Antonych's* predilection for plant imagery with his own Cossack hair style and one of the archetypal plant-world emblems of Ukraine — the sunflower:

**A dream (with antonych at the head of the bed)**

they jeered at me  
they tormented me  
oh-oh-oh

as bald as a mirror  
I grew angry:  
there's no sun  
in your eyes why?

problems itched the crown of my head  
a scalplock  
grew  
on me  
from the tiny white flowers  
and from the tiny white flowers  
a sunflower grew

*(A Hundred Years of Youth, 670-1)*

Many of the writings of the *Bu-Ba-Bu Generation* have also crossed generic boundaries and have entered into popular culture, particularly rock music. The Lviv band *Jeremiah's Cry* (*Plach Ieremii*) has performed and recorded, among others, *Victor Neborak's* "Flying Head" (*Litaiucha holova*); *Petro Midianka's* "Hi, there, Mr. Warhol" (*Servus, pane Vorhol*) with its existentially nationalistically focused question "Andy Warhol are you a Rusyn or a Khokhol?," and *Nazar Honchar's* "Ode to a Bed or Lullabye to Myself" with its catchy refrain of "do you sleep English?"/"schlafen sie deutsch?" *Neborak* himself has recorded his own poetry-rock cassette "NEBORok" that also appealed to a large audience across the border in Poland.

Translations of foreign poets have steadily been appearing in Ukrainian journals and publishing houses since the mid-1980s. Even before then, a number of foreign

authors unavailable in the Soviet Union in Russian were available in Polish translations, which many Western Ukrainian poets were able to read. The Ukrainian poets of today now regularly travel to give readings in Ukraine's neighboring Slavic countries. Many, too, have traveled to the other parts of Europe and the United States on grants and as writers-in-residence, and their works are being published in translation in virtually every language of the continent. The multi-lingual writers, who can communicate in the native tongues of their European neighbors, such as *Yuri Andrukhovych* (German, English, Polish, and Russian) and *Oksana Zabuzhko* (English, Polish and Russian) have, understandably, had the most frequent invitations as ambassadors of Ukrainian culture abroad. And the younger generation of writers is largely growing up with second language skills (usually English, German, Russian, or French), which naturally opens up possibilities for future interaction. New Ukrainian poetry, in all its manifestations, from the avant-garde to the traditional, is finding a new audience in translation and new interlocutors. This, of course, is a natural process and one that bodes well for future developments, precisely because it is a non-coercive one.

But it is necessary to admit that literature of carnival represented in *Bu-Ba-Bu generation* unfolds in the system of different stylistic preferences. Today in Ukrainian literature neo-modernism deems to be very powerful, it is very close to the psychological literature tendencies. What is more, it grows up on neo-barocco, existentialism, intuitivism etc. *M. Matios, V. Medvid, L. Holota, Ye. Pashkovskyi* and others represent this part of the literature panorama.

Finally, we need to understand that today the specters of the Ukrainian literature are very bright and different. The prose genres are dominant, and even the poetry becomes more narrative, more 'prosaic'. The intuitive writing is very popular. In prose we do have the contamination of essayistic tendencies also. What is more, we have in our literature also represented such a genre as *travel expressions* (*Yu. Andrukhovych, S. Zhadan*). Most works have autobiographic elements integrated in their structure, so the narrator and the character is one person.

Hence, we can systematize our views and build a scheme of the stiles and tendencies in the contemporary Ukrainian literature:

1. Neo-avant-garde literature.
2. Neo-romantic tendencies.
3. Neo-realism (as the continuation of the modernistic techniques).
4. Post-modernistic-tendencies.

What is more, we should take into account that in the contemporary Ukrainian



literature we have the differentiation between high literature oriented to the intelligence, e.g. *L. Holota, O. Zabuzhko, Yu. Andrukhovych, V. Shevchuk* and others and mass-literature, oriented based on hedonistic strategies, e.g. *Yu. Vynnytskyi, Kapranov brothers, I. Karpa, S. Zhadan* etc. However such works as 'Nation' 'Practically Always not as vice versa' of *M. Matios* could pretend to have a niche between high literature and mass-literature. WE also have in our literature such great poets as *Lina Kostenko*, however her personal position is that she does not want to take part in this literature process that has not been crystallized yet, that looks as a chaos. For the at least last 10 years her new works haven't been published, although readers have a great passion to her writing and find *Lina Kostenko* the symbol of the Ukrainian Literary Prudence that is worth a Nobel Prize.

### References

- Aheieva, V. (2003). *Zhinochyi prostir: Feministychnyi dyskurs ukrains'koho modernizmu*. Kyiv: Fact.
- Antonych, B.-I. (1998). *Tvory*. Kyiv: Dnipro.
- Drozdovskyi, D. (2006). *Code of the Future*. Kyiv: Publishing house Vsesvit.
- Hundorova, T. (1997). *Proyavleniia slova: Dyskursiia rann'oho ukrains'koho modernizmu. Postmoderna interpretatsiia*. Lviv: Svichado.
- Ilnytskyi, M. (1995). *Vid 'Molodoji muzy' do 'Praz'koï shkoly'*. Lviv: University Press.
- Lavrinenko, Iu. (1959). *Rostriliane vidrodzhennia antolohiia 1917-1933: poeziia, proza, drama, esei*. Paris: Instytut Literacki.
- Luchuk, O & M. Naydan. (2000). *A Hundred Years of Youth: A Bilingual Anthology of 20<sup>th</sup> Century Ukrainian Poetry*. Lviv: Litopys Publishers.
- Luckyj, G. (1990). *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917-1934*. Durham: Duke UP.
- Pavlychko, S. (1999). *Dyskurs modernizmu v ukrains'kii literature*. Kyiv: Osnovy.
- Shkandrij, M. (1992). *Modernists, Marxists, and the Nation: The Ukrainian Literary Discussion of the 1920s*. Edmonton.
- Shkandrij, M. (1992). 'Ukrainian Avant-Garde Prose of the Twenties,' in *Literature and Politics in Eastern Europe*, ed Celia Hawkesworth. New York.
- Zabuzhko, O. (1996). "Reinventing the Poet," *A Kingdom of Fallen Statues: Poems and Essays by Oksana Zabuzhko*. Toronto: Wellspring.