

*Ieliseienko A. P.,**Candidate of Philological Sciences,**Associate Professor at the department of language training
State Biotechnological University*

TO THE QUESTION OF THE ORIGIN OF NEOREALIST PARADIGM IN LITERATURE

Summary. The article is devoted to the study of the neo-realism paradigm in literature. Different views concerning the appearance of the new literary direction are analyzed. Historical events, scientific achievements, the influence of Western politics, philosophy and literature led to the need to find new forms of artistic development of reality. The neorealist paradigm in literature developed under the influence of classical realism and modernism in general expressing the traits of impressionism, expressionism, symbolism, etc. The legacy of the realistic tradition, the aesthetics of the prevailing symbolism at the time, greatly enriched the language, techniques and methods of creativity. The emergence of neorealism was ambiguously perceived in literary circles. Many thinkers sought to “protect” symbolism from the supposedly pernicious influence of realism, while others acknowledged the evolution of symbolism, its enrichment through realism. Some writers tried to prove that neorealism along with neoclassicism is a kind of modernism and is opposed to symbolism. There was a controversy between some magazines concerning the essence of classical realism and its change to neorealism. Being an editor of “Vesy” Valeri Bryosov criticized “Fakely” as on the pages of this magazine different authors who belonged to various literary directions could publish their works. Such artistic eclectics was unacceptable for Moscow editor and his colleagues. G. Chulkov, the editor of “Fakely” tried to prove the emergence of new literary direction which had some features common for symbolism and classical realism. Researchers agree that neorealist writers borrowed the style of writing, brevity of presentation, irony and “laughter through tears” from A. Chekhov. Analyzing the development of literary tradition, scientists had to recognize that realism continued to develop taking into account the experience of modernism as a whole. Neorealist writers have learned to describe events more succinctly (the legacy of A. Chekhov), to depict fragments of events that readers must think of and rethink.

Key words: symbolism, realism, neorealism, “Vesy”, “Fakely”, Bryosov, Chulkov.

In modern literary criticism neorealism is considered as a synthesis of classical realism of the XIX century and modernism (symbolism, impressionism, expressionism) of the early XX century [1; p. 146]. Scientific works by Z. Mints, A. Hansen-Leve, S. Tuzkov, V. Savelov are connected with the study of the neorealist paradigm. Special attention is paid to existential-mythological discourse, neomythologism, grotesque symbolism in the prose by M. Gorky, B. Zaitsev, I. Shmelev, E. Zamyatin.

The aim of the study is to analyze the origin of neorealist paradigm in literature and its perception in literary circles.

The defeat of the first Russian revolution, ideological controversies in society could not but affect the fate and very essence

of Russian symbolism. Historical events, scientific achievements, the influence of Western politics, philosophy and literature, the rapid dynamics of the country's development have led to the fact that writers have faced the need to find new forms of artistic development of reality. V.A. Keldysh pointed to a state of reaction in which “the outcome of revolutionary events united all the literature of those years” [2; p. 259]. As A. Bely rightly wrote in the article “The Present and Future of Russian Literature”: “Literature in its development is based on all the conquered past. The reality of literary conquests is only in form. Ideas in literature have never been ahead of religion, philosophy and science. Literature only reflected the ideas of society, independently forged the form” [3; p. 61].

Contemporaries have repeatedly noted the revival of the realistic tradition in literature. In articles published in the collection “Critical Etudes” (1912) E.A. Koltokhovskaya mentioned a new spiritualized realism, which, in addition to the external “truth of things” was to reveal their “inner essence”, “give their philosophy”, move away from “abstract symbolism” to full specificity” [4; p. 47]. According to the critic, “the new literature <...> is tired of abstract symbolism, of its one-sided “spirituality”, longed for the flesh, for the earth” [4; p. 49], without which its further development was impossible. Noting the specifics of the emergence of neorealism, the researcher pointed to its connection with the symbolist school that prevailed in the early twentieth century. A. Blok in his report “On the current state of Russian symbolism” (Apollon, 1910, №8) noted the futile desire of many realists to become symbolists. The reason for this situation was that “writers, even with great talents can do nothing with art if they are not baptized by the “fire and spirit” of symbolism” [5; p. 427].

S.M. Solovyov and Ivanov-Razumnik believed that neorealism along with neoclassicism is a kind of modernism and is opposed to symbolism [6].

The merging of realistic and symbolic features in neorealism was noted by E. Zamyatin in the article “Modern Russian Literature” (Grani, #32, 1956). The critic presented the development of literature in a peculiar way, comparing the perception of literary currents with the physiological features of human perception. Symbolists, in his opinion, are akin to scientists who look at the world through an X-ray machine. “Their eyes are arranged so that through the material body of life - they see the skeleton of a woman”, “body muscles”, “face colour” [7; p. 94] they are unable to notice. In his opinion, new realists are scientists who, accustomed to the image in the picture, were able to see not only the skeleton of a woman, but also her golden hair and blue eyes. They “grew up, no doubt, under the influence of the Symbolists”, “were fed on the sweet bitterness of Gippius, Blok. But this bitterness did not kill them for the earth, for the body, as it killed the Symbolists: this bitterness was only a precautionary inoculation” [7; p. 94].

E. Zamyatin considered fundamental in the work of neorealists "active denial of life - in the name of the struggle for a better life" [7; p. 94], the laughter of "a man who can laugh at unbearable pain and through unbearable pain" [7; p. 94], deprived of faith in God and man. They "depict a different, true reality, hidden behind the surface of life as the true structure of human skin is hidden from the naked eye" [7; p. 95]. As a result, such works amaze the reader with exaggeration, ugliness and fiction. The feverishness of life led to the fact that neorealists learned to write "in short, jerky" [7; p. 98], "squeezing" the content of the novel into the framework of the story or narrative. There is a so-called syntheticism, in which there is an integral shift of plans. The speed of the epoch, reflected in only a few words, the artist's strokes leads to the fact that the reader must "arrange the picture, finish the words - and they will be imprinted immeasurably brighter, stronger. Thus, syntheticism opens the way to the joint work of the artist - and the reader <...> in this its strength" [7; p. 18].

The "blurring of boundaries" between realism and symbolism has led to sharp controversy in literary circles. Employees of "Vesy" led by V. Bryusov condemned many periodicals ("Fakely", "Shypovnik", "Zolotoe Runo", etc.), in which "coexisted" works of symbolists, realists and neorealists. Such an artistic eclecticism, in which "the lambs had to lie down next to the wolves" [8, p. 55] was inadmissible for V. Bryusov and his colleagues.

In the course of the controversy "Vesy" defended the principles of orthodox symbolism with a bias to the individualism and an orientation toward Western European culture. Ellis, one of the "Vesy" workers saw in the combination of realism and symbolism "the sore spot of modern prose" [9; p. 64]. In the article "Results of Symbolism" (Libra, 1909, №7) he argued that for symbolism as a "free and immortal form of creativity-knowledge" Scylla and Charybdis are a "return to realism (in any form) and death in dogmatism" [9; p. 72].

In 1906 in his debut issue of "Fakely" G. Chulkov (editor of the magazine) pointed to the cultural crisis in literature and the need to find a "new mystical experience". The meaning of life was defined as the search for "humanity's last freedom", the essence of which was "rejection of the world" [10, p. 54]. The writer called to move away from "symbolism grown in the greenhouses of bourgeois culture", from the "miserable decadence" [10; p. 55] putting forward the ideas of "mystical anarchism".

V. Bryusov severely criticized this supposedly new worldview concept. First of all, he pointed on the absence of "new names, new forces, heralds of a new truth" in the magazine. In the article "Vekhi IV. Fakely" he wrote: "The symbolic school in France in the 80's put forward dozens of new, unknown names. And in "Fakely" except for two little-known names (K. Erberg and S. Gorodetsky) you see with bewilderment all the same long-standing signatures. Do you really think that I. Bunin or Ms. Allegro or Mr. Rafalovic reveal to us an "internal concern" unknown to us and lead us further in the search for "the last" freedom? Can we believe that Leonid Andreev or Fedor Sologub with all their undeniable talent will bring us a new revelation? How will Mr. Bunin, who holds the position of a Parnassian poet in the Collection "Znanie", or Osip Dymov, a subtle, witty, skeptical feuilletonist, suddenly cease to be himself? Who uses old sacks perhaps his wine is not new?" [8; p. 55].

The way from realism to neo-realism (its connection with symbolism and modernism in general) was one of the many problems in the controversy between the Moscow "Vesy" and the St.

Petersburg magazines. K. Azadovsky stated the lack of objectivity in "Vesy"'s point. In his opinion, "Chulkov's role in the circles of St. Petersburg Symbolists, his harsh comments about Bryusov, his too frivolous, according to Moscow colleagues attitude towards the ideological precepts of symbolism - all this was inflated by the Vesy workers to gigantic proportions" [11; p. 285].

B. Zaitsev adhered to a different opinion regarding the "Fakely". In the newspaper "Zori" (1906, April 17, No. 9/10) he wrote that this book was "interesting in new realism, which breathes from the beginning to the end" [12; p. 24]. The writer noted the thoughtful, inwardly penetrating realism, deepening experiences "bringing to mysticism" [12; p. 24]. Philosophically, the position of "rebellion" is important, as indignation against the "raw, heavy masses of the real, which must be digested, saturated with light in order to become the atmosphere and content of the life of the future. But this "transformed" life does not seem airless, but enlightened and carnal" [12; p. 25].

It is noteworthy that after two years the worldview concept of G. Chulkov extensively discussed in the periodical press has changed. In "The Veil of Isis" (1909) he noted the evolution of symbolism towards "mystical realism" [10; p. 10], which "does not renounce symbolism, but consistently develops its principles" [10; p. 10].

Contemporaries agreed that the aesthetics of neorealism was prepared by the dramaturgy of A. Chekhov. V. Rozanov, comparing the creativity and perception of the works by A. Chekhov and M. Gorky pointed out Chekhov's "lack of will", which influenced many artists. In 1910 he wrote that A. Chekhov "became the favorite writer of our lack of will, our lack of heroism, our everyday life, our "average". What is the difference between him and Gorky? Yes, but Gorky is rude, short, harsh, unpleasant. All this is truly in him, and because of it he is truly a short-lived writer. Everyone has read it. Together in one gulp they read it. And they forgot. Chekhov will not be forgotten... There is infinity in him" [13; p. 482]. I. Shmelev called the reading of A. Chekhov a rapture. E. Zamyatin in the works about neorealists noted the laughter and humor of Gogol, M. Gorky, A. Chekhov.

N.M. Solntseva noted in the article "Philosophical context of neo-realism" (2006), "anemic plot, absence of deliberate psychologism, significance of an ordinary detail, subtext, dislike for maxims - all this brings together the poetics of Chekhov and neo-realists. But in Chekhov's works there was almost no hero who would express the spiritual world of the writer. Neorealists, on the contrary, began to create lyrical prose, in which they conveyed their own to the characters, the narrators" [14; p. 39]. A new social type arises in the XIX century, called the "little man", and since the time of A. Chekhov and M. Gorky, it has received the name "philistine" [15]. Z. Mintz points out that "during the years of the revolution, this image of human dullness, passivity, evil weakness became peripheral, retreating before the heroism of the "titans" and mass "elements", as well as before the image of the suffering people in A. Blok, A. Bely, F. Sologub and a number of other symbolists "irradiated" by democratic influence" [15]. Since 1907, the image of the "philistine" takes on new features. "He has a special kind of negative activity: he is a destroyer, a hooligan or a crowd of destroyers and hooligans" [15]. There is a presentiment concerning the threat of the "insignificant", concerning its terrible power. The images become bolder and more convex. A. Glinka in an article dedicated to the life and work of A.P. Chekhov, noted

the transition of realism to impressionism. L. V. Reva stated the direct contemplation, impressionable sensations characteristic of neorealism and impressionism P. Kogan in "Essays on the History of Recent Russian Literature" (1911) wrote about the emergence of "recent realism" which combined the features of realism and modernism in general: "from the former it kept the habit of factual accuracy and social instinct, from the latter he learned the cult of liberated isolated individuality, an indefinite longing for a higher life, for that supersensible world into which the soul of man strives in vain to penetrate" [16; p. 92].

Conclusion. The neorealist paradigm in literature was formed under the influence of classical realism and modernism in general. The heritage of the realistic tradition, the aesthetics of the symbolism prevailing at that time significantly enriched the language, techniques and methods of creativity. Researchers agree that neorealist writers borrowed the style of writing, brevity of presentation, irony and "laughter through tears" from A. Chekhov. The emergence of neorealism was ambiguously perceived in literary circles. Many thinkers tried to "save" symbolism from the supposedly harmful influence of realism, while others recognized the evolution of symbolism, its enrichment at the expense of realism. Realism continued to develop, taking into account the experience of modernism.

References:

1. Tuzkov S. Typology and poetics of the Russian story of the early twentieth century. Kirovograd : Imeks-LTD, 2006. 291 p.
2. Keldysh V.A. Realism and "neorealism". Russian literature at the turn of the century (1890s - early 1900s). Book 1. Moscow, IMLI RAN, "Heritage", 2001. 960 p.
3. Bely A. Present and future of Russian literature. Vesny, 1909, No. 2, p. 50–68.
4. Koltokhovskaya E.A. Critical studies. Saint-Petersburg : Self-education, 1912. 292 p.
5. Blok A.A. On the current state of Russian symbolism. Apollon, 1910, No. 8, p. 425–436.
6. Solovyov S. M. Symbolism and decadence. Vesny, 1909, No. 5, p. 53–56.
7. Zamyatin E. Modern Russian literature. Grani, No. 32. 1956. p. 90–101.
8. Aurelius (Bryusov V.). Milestones IV. Fakely. Vesny, 1906, No. 5. p. 54–58.
9. Ellis. The results of symbolism. Vesny, 1909, No. 7, p. 55–86.
10. Chulkov G.I. Cover of Isis. Critical Essays. Moscow: Golden Fleece, 1909. 217 p.
11. Azadovsky K.M., Maksimov D.T. Bryusov and "Vesny" (On the history of publication). Literary heritage. T. 85: Valery Bryusov : USSR Academy of Sciences. Institute of World Literature. A. M. Gorky ; ed. A.N. Dubovikov, N.A. Trifonov. Moscow : Nauka, 1976. 854 p.
12. Zaitsev B. New realism and the collection "Fakely". Moscow, 2000. p. 24–25.
13. Rozanov V.V. About writing and writers. Moscow : Republic, 1995. 734 p.
14. Solntseva N.M. Philosophical context of neorealism / Ivan Sergeevich Shmelev: Aspects of creativity. Moscow : Krug, 2006, p. 24–39.
15. Mints Z.G. Blok and Russian symbolism: Selected works. Saint Petersburg, 2004, p. 207–222.
16. Kogan P. Essays on the history of modern Russian literature. Zarya, 1911, No. 3, p. 90–96.

Єлісєнко А. П. Походження неореалістичної парадигми в літературі

Анотація. Стаття присвячена дослідженню парадигми неореалізму в літературі. Проаналізовано різні погляди на появу нового літературного напрямку та його зв'язок реалізмом та символізмом. Історичні події, наукові досягнення, вплив західної політики, філософії та літератури призвели до необхідності пошуку нових форм художнього освоєння дійсності. Неореалістична парадигма в літературі розвивалася під впливом класичного реалізму та модернізму в цілому, виражаючи риси імпресіонізму, експресіонізму, символізму тощо. Спадщина реалістичної традиції, естетика панівного символізму в той час значно збагатили мову, прийоми і методи творчості. Поява неореалізму була неоднозначно сприйнята в літературних колах. Багато мислителів прагнули «захистити» символізм від нібито згубного впливу реалізму, інші ж визнавали еволюцію символізму, його збагачення за рахунок реалізму. Деякі письменники намагалися довести, що неореалізм поряд з неокласицизмом є різновидом модернізму і протистоїть символізму. Між деякими журналами точилася полеміка щодо сутності класичного реалізму та його переходу в неореалізм. Валерій Брюсов, редактор журналу «Терези» осуджував журнал «Факели», оскільки на сторінках останнього могли публікувати свої твори різні автори, які належали до різних літературних напрямків. Така художня еkleктика була неприйнятною для московського редактора та його колег. Редактор «Факелів» Г. Чулков намагався довести появу нового літературного напрямку, який мав деякі риси, спільні для символізму та класичного реалізму. Дослідники сходяться на думці, що стиль письма, стислість викладу, іронію та «сміх крізь сльози» письменники-неореалісти запозичили у А. Чехова. Виникає новий соціальний тип XIX століття іменований «маленькою людиною», який з часів А. Чехова і М. Горького отримав ім'я «міщанина». З. Мінц вказує на те, що в роки революції цей образ людської сірості, пасивності, злої слабкості став периферійним, відступивши перед героїкою «титанів» та масових «стихій», а також перед образом народу, який відчуває страждання. Аналізуючи розвиток літературної традиції, критики літератури мали визнати, що реалізм продовжував розвиватися з урахуванням досвіду модернізму в цілому. Письменники-неореалісти навчилися описувати події більш стисло (спадок А. Чехова), зображати фрагменти подій, які читай має додумати та переосмислити.

Ключові слова: символізм, реалізм, неореалізм, «Терези», «Факели», Брюсов, Чулков.