

**ANTHROPOLOGY OF LOVE
IN VOLODYMYR VYNNYCHENKO'S LIFE
AND WRITINGS: PSYCHOANALITICAL ASPECT**

Pecharskyi A. Y.

INTRODUCTION

Love as the individual's personal experience manifests itself in V. Vynnychenko's life and writings at the level of interpersonal phenomena in two basic dimensions: *Oedipal* and *egocentric*. The first one derives from the concept of the Oedipus complex that is differently interpreted in psychoanalysis: as an unconscious and sexual attraction and an ambivalent relation of a child to his/her parents (S. Freud); as a human desire to return to a renewed source of life – mother's womb (K-G. Jung); as a dominant form of a child's promiscuity (A. Adler); as secondary identification (J. Lacan); as lack of love which depends on the role of parents (K. Horney), etc. The egocentric dimension of love in life and literary works by V. Vynnychenko is characterized by the complex of inferiority and "compensation" (A. Adler) that goes into neurotic form of "intellectual narcissism" (S. Freud). Some artists, however, do not turn their whole personality into a compulsory subject of narcissism, but usually some of its mental representations. Mainly, it is mind, intellectuality, the subtle sense of artistic word – all which is associated with creativity which is not internal ennoblement for them, but a ghost, an illusion of egocentric desires, a mirror of persona grata, and a place of arms for admiring themselves. This "optical deception" of the soul unfolds in the neurotic form of a person's creative process where the phenomenon of intellectual egocentrism is not traced in itself, but the relation to own creativity has crystallized.

Actually, the paradigmatic structure of the study of V. Vynnychenko's life and activities was constructed by using this psychoanalytic gradation of the *oedipal* and *egocentric* dimensions of love. An important argument is F. B. Simon's opinion that "psychoanalysis is not anywhere else but in the space of intimate communications"¹.

¹Кьонінг К. Між кушеткою і однобічним дзеркалом. *Системна терапія для психоаналітиків – психоаналіз для системних терапевтів. Діалог*. Івано-Франківськ: "Місто НВ", 2006. С. 8.

Obviously, the psychoanalytic anthropology of love is also a goal – physical, i.e. it tries to explain the “ontological Self” of the human. After all, in ancient Greek mythology four types of love were distinguished: Eros (uncontrollable passions); Philia (sociability); Storge (family love); Agape (perfect divine love). It is not surprising that Virgil’s words “Amor omnia vincit” (love will overcome everything) became a well-known expression. So, we deduce the very concept of “amoristics” (the theme of love) which lies first of all in the context of V. Vynnychenko’s life and creativity.

1. The Oedipal Dimension of Love in V. Vynnychenko’s Life and Creative Works

The phenomenon of the Oedipus complex makes it possible to grasp the seriousness and complexity of V. Vynnychenko’s anthropology of love which encompassed all his essence and often defined his destiny.

Discussing the objectification and universality of the psychodynamic system of “cognition” of human love, Lviv’s psychoanalyst, chairman of the International Association of Psychotherapists O. Filts remarked: “Freud, obviously, could not help but understand that the Oedipus complex is just a mythological theme that can have many interpretations along with other ones. The peculiarity and value of the tragedy of Oedipus is its “plot” which reflects not only a single-person drama, but a much wider “group” (familial and social) situation”².

Consequently, following the paradigm of the Oedipal complexes, situations, and conflicts in the theory and praxis of psychoanalysis, we can unconditionally claim that most analysts have come to a common conclusion: the Oedipus complex, as a universal phenomenon, speaks a little of true parents in general, since it is based on the assertion that the child, using real objects at the same time, is internalized into the world of infantile fantasies and manipulates them for psychological self-defence in order to facilitate his or her existence.

This also applies to V. Vynnychenko, an extremely talented, complicated writer, artist, sculptor, who elaborated the philosophy of “new morality”. His creativity shocked, disdained, and at the same time fascinated the audience, forcing people to think about the secret depths of human existence. There were no forbidden topics for him. Poets from

² Фільц О. Груповий аналіз як метод. *Груповий психоаналіз: Навч. посібник*. Ред. колег.: О. Фільц та ін. Львів: ВНТЛ-Класика, 2004. С. 42–43.

the “Ukrayinska Khata” magazine perceived V. Vynnychenko as a “Nietzschean”, Mykola Yevshan enlisted the writer to the “new generation” of the best European modernists, and I. Franko could not understand from his literary pedestal saying with enthusiasm: “And where have you appeared from?”³

V. Vynnychenko’s plays “Black Panther and White Bear”, “Memento”, “Lies”, “Market”, “Sin”, “Law” won the scenes of the best theaters in Berlin, Leipzig, Dresden, Rome and Madrid. The Popular Italian actress E. Grammatika performed one of her most successful tours with V. Vynnychenko’s drama “Lies”. The play “Black Panther and White Bear” passed from the stage of Berlin’s theatres to the screen. In 1921, the film was produced by filmmakers Hans Janowitz and Johannes Guter. The sensational three-volume novel of the writer “Solar Machine” became the most readable book among all Ukrainian editions. His works were translated into German, Italian, Hebrew, Polish, Tatar, and Russian.

The phenomenon of this popularity, apparently, was caused by the freedom of the writer’s artistic word, the non-standard self-expression that was constantly pulsating in his creative process. However, the coherent picture of V. Vynnychenko’s life and work represents the distorting mirror of the biblical image of the “prodigal son”, as one of his characters from the story “The Secret” (1912), who believed that human freedom “is a person’s state when he or she can do whatever he or she wants”⁴. After all, the internal freedom of the individual which in its essence is experiencing, not subject to verbal definition, lies not only in being free (*-from-*), but also free (*-for-*). This is the reason for the personal tragedy of V. Vynnychenko as a writer and a politician which was mentioned by D. Dontsov, comparing the Ukrainian writer with the German philosopher: “In the distorting mirror...! Nietzsche preaches love to the distant ones; Vynnychenko, love for the close ones, to oneself, to one’s body and to one’s outstretched instincts above all”⁵.

The veiled, ironic characterization of the two varieties of atheistic anthropocentrism relates to the myth of Oedipus whose symbolic images include the tendency of “pulling away” the human consciousness to his or her corporeality. This evokes the exacerbation of the problem of instincts in the amoristics of V. Vynnychenko. This is a type of “gastric

³ Франко І. Новини нашої літератури: В. Винниченко. “Краса і сила” (зб. оповідань). *Літературно-науковий вістник*. Кн. 4. Т. 38. Київ, 1907. С. 139.

⁴ Винниченко В. Краса і сила. Зб. оповідань. Повість. Упоряд., авт. приміт. П. Федченко. Київ: Дніпро, 1989. С. 560.

⁵ Донцов Д. Дві літератури нашої доби. Львів: Просвіта, 1991. С. 265.

man” (“Parents’ will”), the symbol of “consuming subject” (“Solar Machine”), the image of “degenerative parental instinct” (“Notes of Flat-Nosed Mephistopheles”), ideal of “seductive female-conspirator” (“Gold deposits”) and others.

Relevant artistic projections should be regarded as narcissistic identifications of the author himself, which, in real life, led, on the one hand, to self-acquirement, and on the other hand, to the marginalization and depreciation of his own Ego. “I was painfully vulnerable to insults”, said the Nietzschean poet-socialist Andriy Khalepa in Vynnychenko’s novel “I Want!”. Often, literary critics also indicated this feature in the writer’s nature and revealed the psychological problems of his characters that were hidden under the mask of the author’s double.

Studying the human psyche, A. Adler concluded that few people managed to change their behaviour model acquired in childhood. “Even the change of social setting in adulthood, – assures the analyst, – will not necessarily lead to a change in the behaviour model. Soul does not change its basis; both in childhood and maturity, the person retains the same inclining, due to which we can argue that a person’s vital purpose is also unchangeable”⁶.

Consequently, the cause of Vynnychenko’s excessive mental vulnerability is partially rooted in his childhood where in a family circle he was raised as a favourite son. V. Panchenko commented on this fact of the writer’s life: “In the story “The winds are raging...”, Vynnychenko describes how sweet it is to be “the smallest”, a kind of “king and god” who everyone likes. There is an interesting moment of the almost instinctive race of two children – six-year-old Hryn and nine-year-old orphan Sanka-Riabukha – to rule and struggle for the right to keep another person in their power”⁷.

Those psychological factors which in the childhood made Vynnychenko have high self-esteem, already in his student days appeared to be protective mechanisms in the function of the reflective object which later will be called “rebellion” and “revolutionary activity”. Therefore, further transformation of the writer’s individuality, due to his success in the political and artistic activity, was determined by the activation of the oedipal complex and the grand Self.

⁶ Адлер А. Понять природу человека Санкт-Петербург: Гуманитарное агентство “Академический проект”, 1997. С. 56.

⁷ Панченко В. Винниченко Володимир: парадокси долі і творчості: Книга розвідок та мандрівок. Київ: Твім інтер, 2004. С. 11.

All-fascinated by himself, V. Vynnychenko writes in the “Diary”: “I want fame... I want great appreciation...”⁸ Paradoxically, here’s the idea of the future of his sacrificial heroism: “My death must be a victim of the history of the nation’s liberation. It must become a flag under which the great struggle for liberation must continue”⁹. Looking through his diary, one can be sure that these thoughts are not a fantasy or romantic wave of the writer’s emotions, but his system of values. Here, in fact, the conscious approval of one of the most negative defects of a human’s distorted spiritual world – a special way of comprehending reality – as a virtue is striking: “Fame is the root of the instinct of life. To live in generations, to pass over great glory – it caresses and fascinates the sense of life, it gives faith in one’s forces, and it is an evaluation of vitality and endurance of the forces of the instinct”¹⁰.

Here are V. Vynnychenko’s conclusions that feeling worthy is possibly only when one can identify oneself with a great huge act! He is not just looking for fame, he is a “fighter for the great idea”, and to whom even death must serve and make his name immortal. Hence comes the godless Nietzschean, malicious and at the same time highly poetic magic of influence on the writer’s creativity, in which the complex of the “superhuman” and the cult of force are accidentally established.

However, the oedipal-narcissistic dimension of love by V. Vynnychenko endured any influences. In the novel “Po-svii!”, revolutionary Vadym Stelmashenko brushes off the authority of his spiritual teacher in his arguments and thoughts: “Yes, I am an immoralist. If you want to call me so, but Nietzsche is not an immoralist. <...> Nietzsche was the same philister, but with a sense of majesty and anger at those who did not recognize his genius. That was his essence! “On the other side of good and evil!” Nonsense! Phrase! He was never there”¹¹.

Of course, how could the protagonist, who affirmed the author’s concept of “new morality” recognize as his mentor the closed, sick philosopher Nietzsche who ended his life so badly – madness, signing his letters as “Antichrist”. After all, confidently building up his own apology of a perfect person, he feverishly cried out with a grudge: “God is dead!” And what happened...?

⁸ Винниченко В. Щоденник (1911–1920). Упоряд. Г. Костюк. Едмонтон-Нью-Йорк: Вид-во КІУС і Комісії УВАН (США) для вивчення і публікації спадщини В. Винниченка, 1980. Т. 1. С. 392.

⁹ Ibidem. С. 461.

¹⁰ Винниченко В. Щоденник (1911–1920). Упоряд. Г. Костюк. Едмонтон-Нью-Йорк: Вид-во КІУС і Комісії УВАН (США) для вивчення і публікації спадщини В. Винниченка, 1980. Т. 1. С. 392.

¹¹ Винниченко В. По-свій! *Твори*. Київ: “Рух”, 1927. Т.18. С. 31–32.

It is difficult to enumerate how many Vynnychenko's characters masking with the "name of the triumph of ideas" led to ridiculous and horrible deeds in order not to offend their pride. Thus, a student from the same story commits suicide in order to prove his rightness to the peasants. Under the brand of heroism, we see a similar diversity of suicidal layers in the play "Market". In the novel "I Want!", poet Andriy Khalepa is confused and does not know what he needs: "I cannot imagine anything in life what I'd like to have. Wealth? Power? Glory? Beauty? Love? It's so boring, not new, does not raise, does not attract. None of the most fantastic and impossible possibilities and impossibilities can force my heart to beat harder"¹².

Impressions! Impressions! Impressions! And where is the sense of being? In this maze, most of the writer's characters move being symbols of his mental institutions and unconscious complexes. All of them, in search of "Path, Truth and Life" made the same mistake as Pontius Pilate, who asked Jesus Christ: "What is the Truth?" and did not receive any answer. Why? Saint Saint Nikolai Velimirovich of Serbia reveals the mystery of divine revelation to us in his book "Biblical topics": "The Lord did not answer anything. He was silent... because the question was put incorrectly. What was Pilate's mistake? That he asked: what is the truth? – And not Who is the truth? If Pilate asked Christ: Who is the truth? – He would, of course, receive the answer, the same as he received for the question: Are you the King of the Jews? Truth is the Who, not what. Truth is a person, not an object. God is the truth"¹³.

The artistic causative model of the writer's state of mind lies in the literary phenomena – like a plot, an idea, motives, images – processed and experienced by the author. The motives of a devaluated impoverished, depersonalised, confused human are increasing in the works of V. Vynnychenko. A brilliant analytical assessment of this oppressive pessimism was given by the Holy Fathers. They unanimously and assertively confirmed: when we are subject to a feeling that we cannot at all deal with sins, this is the first sign of arrogance, because only via the gate of humility, God enters the human soul and destroys all its internal misfortunes. After all, evil is not the primary fundament, therefore, it has no essence. It exists only temporarily as a parasite on a healthy body.

¹² Винниченко В. Хочу! *Дзеркало: Драматична поема Лесі Українки "Орґія" і роман В. Винниченка „Хочу!“* Упоряд. В. Панченко. Київ: Факт, 2002. С. 106.

¹³ Николай Сербский. Библиейские темы. Москва: Изд-во Свято-Троицкой Сергиевой Лавры, 2006. С. 220.

What a remarkable revelation of the thoughts of the saints! Finally, the problem of the narcissist manifestation of the Oedipus complex is the problem of the 20th century, the consuming generation of the scientific and technical progress focusing on the image of the new godless Self. Consequently, it is not surprising that V. Vynnychenko was in this magical, vicious circle. In this dimension, right is the thought of H. Kostelnyk who, analyzing the novel “Honesty with oneself”, noted that his author emphasizes on “a primary wish that the reader lose the concept of “sin”¹⁴. Of course, only under this condition in a literary context, the writer with relief can play like a child with shooting, but the writer plays with exhibitionist passions, satisfying his egocentrism. Consequently, Vynnychenko’s ideal of “new morality”, enriched with a halo of “honesty with oneself”, can be regarded as an incomplete gestalt of the author’s “mania grandiosity” that weakened their heroes with dark colours of instinct in search of “Path, Truth and Life”. These are: Natalia (“Lies”), Marusia (“Market”), Shurka (“Equilibrium”), Danko (“Parents’ will”), Yurko (“Idols”), Kolia (“Honesty with oneself”), Olha (“Disharmony”) and others.

Investigating the paradigm of moral and philosophical problems in the works by V. Vynnychenko, it is possible to clearly formulate the psychological amplitude of his narrative ideological setting. This is a “war with himself” that was reformatting a lot of philosophical and moral-ethical ideologemes of the writer. For these reasons, not only the outside world, but also the inner Self of the character becomes the object of aggression, hatred, revenge. At first glance, it seems that the psychological phenomenon of the Oedipus complex can be considered as a libido supplement to egoism as an instinct of self-preservation in the Freudian interpretation. Nevertheless, unlike “primary normal narcissism” (S. Freud), we trace the inner conflict between the object-libido and Self-libido in Vynnychenko’s characters as the author’s masked doubles. From the viewpoint of classical psychoanalysis, this characterizes a person as “not wanting to yield to the narcissistic perfection of his childhood, and when, as time goes by, he sees himself as an ideal, it is only a compensation for the lost narcissism of a child when he or she was his or her own ideal”¹⁵.

¹⁴ Костельник Г. “Чесність з собою” В. Винниченка. *Ломання душ*. Львів: Вид-во “Добра книжка”, 1923. С. 7.

¹⁵ Лейбин В. М. Словарь-справочник по психоанализу. Санкт-Петербург: Питер, 2001. С. 304.

But it is difficult to get through to the hearts of Vynnychenko's charismatic characters. Their rebellion continues, and the determination to be oneself comes to the absurd. For example, in order to overcome the inner need for parental "old morals", venereologist Petro Zabolotko, the protagonist of the novel "Parents' will", does incredible acts: he deliberately provides the evidence that lead him to three years of exile. He is accompanied by his beloved Tonia – a former prostitute (already in the status of his wife) who led to his deeper understanding of the "new morality".

The character needed to know the "miserable" life of the lower classes of society, to get acquainted with the visitors of public houses divided into the corresponding categories. It is clear that V. Vynnychenko was well-informed about the lifestyle of these institutions. He acknowledged this in a letter to L. Goldmerstein: "I am not attracted to women, and when I once wanted to, I went to a prostitute, I had to refuse because it was disgusting"¹⁶. Love correspondence of the writer echoed the words of his character schoolboy Danka ("Parents' will") who visited public houses because of his "sin of masturbation": "I was disgusted and ashamed... Oh, how ugly and ashamed! But, however, I went there once again, and then again... And I'm sure to go more"¹⁷. In the psychoanalytic aspect, this way of self-satisfaction is a physiological consequence of the Oedipus complex, which causes an unconscious sense of guilt.

Modern literary critics paid their attention to Vynnychenko's peculiar bestiality (the sameness of human and animal properties), which functioned in the works of the writer as a kind of "Ukrainian decameron", containing a lot of references to human corporal passions. These oedipal features of the anthropology of love are inherent to the literary psychoportrait of V. Vynnychenko who torments himself with purposeful instructions, questions, faults rooted in his moral hypochondria.

2. Egocentric Dimension of Love in V. Vynnychenko's Life and Writings

The egocentric dimension of love in V. Vynnychenko's life and works is a kind of metamorphosis or continuation of the oedipal one. After all, the cornerstone of the so-called writer's "honesty with oneself" and "new morality" that was his spiritual impoverishment which arose as

¹⁶ Миронець Н. Таємниці кохання В. Винниченка (документальна розповідь). *Кур'єр Кривбасу*. 2001. № 141. С. 103.

¹⁷ Винниченко В. Заповіт батьків. Харків: "Рух", 1928. Т. 22. С. 54.

a consequence of pride and “intellectual egocentrism”. In the “Diary” V. Vynnychenko ironically mentions Ten Commandments; in his painful imagination, he visualizes a peculiar “exam” to the Almighty as a plan of his future comedy. His atheistic fundamentals of world perception reached the complete absurdity: “The teaching of Christ, which seems at first glance altruistic, is deeply egotistic and harmful to the happiness of people. First of all, it ignores forces in a human which are of great importance in the life of each”¹⁸, he remarked in the diary.

What “ignored forces” did Vynnychenko mean? Of course, this is “the passion of the body” and “everyday pride”. But the Holy Fathers assured that they were all distorted human virtues. For example, “anger” by its nature is good, but in our everyday manifestation, it acts as evil, which, according to John Chrysostom, exists not by nature, but by will. “As if the devil were sitting in the boy! <...> Calmness was his enemy...” – this is the author’s characteristic of Fedko-hooligan (the character of the eponymous story by V. Vynnychenko) which fully applies to the author himself”¹⁹, – this is how V. Panchenko defined the writer’s “spirit of resistance”.

Of course, one can look for reasons of Vynnychenko’s anti-Christian reasoning in Nietzsche’s philosophy, Marxist doctrine or a narrow party circle of people, etc. But the main core of the writer’s philosophical thinking is not only in social or external factors, but in his egocentric nature, for which narcissistic tendencies are too acceptable to himself. The reason may be hinted in the psychoanalytic sense by an interesting observation of N. Schwartz-Salant who claimed: “Phenomenology of narcissist personality disorders... hides from our attention the fact that there, in depth, outside of clinical world of idealization, envy, exhibitionism and transitions, the process of creating the world proceeds”²⁰.

In this context, it becomes clear what kind of world V. Vynnychenko was building – this is the egocentric reflection of the “original sin”, in other words, the unconscious identification with God. According to Jung’s dominant “collective unconscious”, the corresponding

¹⁸ Винниченко В. Щоденник (1911–1920). Упоряд., вступ. ст., прим. Г. Костюка. Едмонтон–Нью-Йорк: Вид-во КІУС і Комісії УВАН (США) для вивчення і публікації спадщини В. Винниченка, 1980. Т. 1. С. 399.

¹⁹ Панченко В. Винниченко Володимир: парадокси долі і творчості: Книга розвідок та мандрівок. Київ: Твім інтер, 2004. С. 107.

²⁰ Шварц-Салант Н. Нарциссизм и трансформация личности: Психология нарциссических расстройств личности. Москва: Класс, 2007. С. 163.

psychological process can be formulated as a departure from the archetypal power of the Self which is unique in its kind and can give an individual the awareness of “personal identity” (A. Adler) and a sense of love. A person’s inability to accept this divine gift (in terms of psychoanalytic terminology, it is a true pattern) because of its irrational sense of grandeur, guilt and fear leads to a pathological phenomenon which is called an egocentric personality disorder.

Hence, Vynnychenko’s literary projections are atheistic religious surrogates: “parents’ will”, “honesty with oneself”, “new morality”, his own “theory of love”, utopian idea of the “solar machine”. All these arose as a result of displacement of the feeling of God which entails the cult of personality in society, the thirst for material wealth and the illusory earthly happiness. Therefore, the human nature of love, the unconscious sexual drive was not enriched by the soul, but vulgarized in the works by V. Vynnychenko that dissatisfied his contemporaries, especially I. Nechui-Levytskyi, Ye. Malaniuk, S. Yefremov, H. Khotkevych, S. Petliura, D. Dontsov, subscribers of the newspaper “Rada”, the journal “Literaturno-Naukovyi vistnyk” and many others.

At the background of literary discourse, in the “Parents’ will” by V. Vynnychenko, the dialogue of a morally stunned high school student Danko, who got infected with a sexually transmitted illness and later joined the circle of “religious seekers”, is remarkable: “Is there only father’s “stomach”? And mother’s “soul”? You always told me that you will treat the disease. And what about the soul? Though I will recover – only I do not believe in it! – then still I'm bad till the end of my life. <...> If I believed in God as my mother, it would be easier for me. I would repent, confess, and God would forgive me all my sins... <...> But I do not believe, and therefore I can never be pure. Who will forgive me? When I have committed sin, I am already unclean to people forever”²¹. This is where the moment of truth is, a kind of revelation of the writer’s own ego about controversial vectors of his anthropology of love says, “not God, but society, not a collective consciousness but individualism, not anyone, but ME!” The writer elevated a human as “the measure of all things”, infallible authority of any ethic norm, to the rank of deity. A striking example of Vynnychenko’s “Babel Tower” is the utopian novel “The Solar Machine” where thanks to the scientific and technical progress and coincidence of events, namely the discovery

²¹ Винниченко В. Заповіт батьків. *Твори*. Харків: “Рух”, 1928. Т. 22. С. 67–68.

of the heliot stone by Rudolf Shtor and the creation of an extraordinary mechanism capable of providing a wealthy life on the planet, humanity reaches its purpose – carefree existence. Thus, the existential discourse of the writer’s love never went beyond the materialist conception of “daily bread” and the coercive absolutization of the power of instincts. This caused the assimilation of Nietzschean and Freudian ideas in the writings by V. Vynnychenko.

As it is known, happiness and love were of the greatest value for the writer. So the above argumentation raises the question concerning the relationship between the atheistic and anti-Christian attitude of the writer, his personal life and creativity in the coordinates of amoristics. Actually, the metaphorical image of Vynnychenko’s love to women (K. Holitsynska, L. Goldmerstein, S. Zadvynoya, R. Livshyts known as Kaleriya, Marusia, Yelena, etc) reverberates J. Milton’s “Paradise Lost” (1665), that is, we can hypothetically assume that Adam and Eve would change their roles. In the writing, the biblical revelation of “the original sin” is revealed through the prism of the ancient Greek myth of Narcissus. There Eve, seduced by the unknown echo-like voice, faces freedom of choice: either she loses the sense of the presence of the True God or becomes the mother of all humankind which will be like her. Having fallen in love with her beautiful image-reflection, which she recognized in the blue waters of the lake, the woman made the choice. Since then, all humanity is in search of true love, the one felt in Paradise by Adam and Eve. As it is written in the Book of Solomon Parables, “the one who seeks love is hiding guilt”²².

Consequently, the elements of the embedded mechanism of transfer – the human universal phenomenon which became one of the main categories in theory, and especially in the practice of psychoanalysis, – were described in the Holy Bible as a sin. Adam transferred the blame to Eve, and then to God. And Eve blamed the devil – instead of repenting: “The serpent tempted me – and I ate”²³. So pride, as foremother of all sins, in its transfer basis includes the comparative characteristics that ultimately lead to a dualistic egocentrism: self-exaltation and “inferiority complex” (A. Adler).

In the context of anthropological issues, Vynnychenko’s love paradigm is under the burden of the author’s egocentric-erotic

²² Біблія або Книги Святого Письма Старого й Нового Заповіту. Пер. з давньоєвр. й грец. І. Огієнка. Київ: Українське Біблійне Товариство, 2009. [Пр.: 17; 9].

²³ Ibidem. [1 М.: 3; 13].

transference which is followed by a comparative interpretation of his texts, correspondence and diaries. One of these transfer mechanisms is described in detail by N. Myronets in the documentary story “Secrets of Vynnychenko’s love” where literary critic through comparative characterization of the writer’s letters to Goldmerstein (maiden name Maksymovych) – the mother of his illegitimate, unwanted son who died at the age of three months – and fragments of the play “Memento” where this tragedy is shown – clearly shows the biographical basis of the work. The writer’s “new morality” and the situation in which he appeared, make a creepy impression.

Already after the funeral, all allegations, reproaches of conscience, creative catharsis of a personal parental tragedy, V. Vynnychenko wrote to the grieving mother, L. Goldmerstein: “Can’t you do as a heroine of one of my (last) stories did: choose a healthy, fresh male, take from him what is needed and leave... There will not be a father, and the child will be completely yours. You have to earn in order to do this, but isn’t it a good goal of life? Won’t you give people a new man, a new force that will fight with the same Goldmersteins and their morals?”²⁴

The writer’s cynical advice opens to us additional semantic associations regarding the transfer of his conceptual and creative ideology of a “new morality” to a real life situation that is perceived as a means of realizing the desires. The function to “give birth to a child”, “new man” is identified with the support of self-identity that leads to the dilemma of egocentric formation of the “Self” and instinctual object relations. This is confirmed by the diary entries of V. Vynnychenko: “Once Caleriya suggested having a child with her”. If you do not find a wife for yourself, I agree to bring you a baby”. <...> If she still has the same thoughts I may accept her proposal”²⁵.

This projective identification can be traced in the novel “Notes of Flat-Nose Mephistopheles” by V. Vynnychenko – an episode when Yakiv Mykhailiuk wants to take his newborn son from Claudia who desperately chides him: “You don’t want to have children with me for I am not worthy of this; you cannot leave my child in my hands because I

²⁴ Миронець Н. Таємниці кохання В. Винниченка (документальна розповідь). *Кур’єр Кривбасу*. 2001. № 140. С. 68–69.

²⁵ Винниченко В. Щоденник (1911–1920). Упоряд., вступ. ст., прим. Г. Костюка. Едмонтон–Нью-Йорк: Вид-во КІУС і Комісії УВАН (США) для вивчення і публікації спадщини В. Винниченка, 1980. Т. 1. С. 104.

am not worthy of this. Oh, I have understood it for a long time! But do you still want to take a child? Right?”²⁶

So, Flat-Nose Mephistopheles does not perceive the child as an individual, but, on the contrary, as a surrogate of his own Ego. This author's character-double with the thirst for a higher ideal constantly shades into the inner mirror of the Nietzschean “superhuman”. By the way, it is the first time in the writer's work when the parental instinct prevails over an abstract idea, purposefulness, and philosophical invective. Vasyl Kryvenko (“Memento”), Korniy Kanevych (“Black Panther and White Bear”), Myron Kupchenko (“Honesty with oneself”), Vadym Stelmashenko (“Po-svii!”) – all these characters are ready in their name of their own believes to step over their loved ones: son, mother, and loving woman. Only in the image of Flat-Nose Mephistopheles, the writer embodies the idea of celebration of the instinctive feeling of fatherhood above the devil's “will to power” (A. Adler) as if he tries to atone for all past flaws of his characters. Thus, humiliating “flat-nose” is the Achilles heel of the arrogant “mephistophelism”. However, this confusion is caused by the egocentric problem of the author's oedipal complex about which V. Panchenko rightly noted: “The writer builds the stories of his works in such a way to test the power of the mother-father's instinct, opposing to it the power of other feelings, desires, and volitional installations”²⁷.

Consequently, there is a cancelation of the positive “admissible transfer” (S. Freud) which, according to the interpretation of modern psychoanalysts of the University of Ulm, Helmut Thomä and Horst Kächele, is “a characteristic and abstract hybrid from the pre-Oedipal, preambivalent period of the infantile development in which the basis of trust was formed”²⁸. Is there any reason to speak of Vynnychenko's ideological “basic mistrust” which, according to E. Erickson (“Childhood and Society”), is associated with the loss of the child's primary biological unity with his mother? It is difficult to give an unambiguous answer. But how would you consider the mother's insults and complaints which, like a dark shadow, lay in the letters of Evdokiya Vynnychenko to her son?! “You, my son, for some reason, have not

²⁶ Винниченко В. Записки Кирпатого Мефістофеля. Роман, повість, оповідання, п'єса. Харків: Фоліо, 2006. С. 183.

²⁷ Панченко В. Будинок з химерами (Творчість В. Винниченка 1900–1920 рр. у європейському літературному контексті). Кіровоград: КДПУ ім. В. Винниченка, 1998. С. 190.

²⁸ Томэ Х., Кэхеле Х. Современный психоанализ: В 2 т. Общ. ред. А. В. Казанской. Москва: Прогресс-Литера-Яхтсмен, 1996. Т. 1. С. 100.

loved me for a long time...” Or: “If you, Volodinka, do not love and you do not feel sorry for me as your mother, I will not write anymore...”²⁹

And what is interesting is that we can follow the similar oedipal-egocentric transference in the diaries of V. Vynnychenko: “What to think about? About Marusia? Tell her I feel sorry? And immediately I recall how I was praying to Roza while she was getting around the house, breathing heavily... If I had K., I would have told her how badly I felt. I would curl up to her warm loving chest. But there is no K. anymore, there is R-ia. Yes, R-ia who is afraid of me and lies so as not to be alone”³⁰. The projective identification of compassionate impotence of a man does not dwell in many of Vynnychenko’s works, especially in the play “Lies”. When Tos asked Natalia why she felt sorry for Andriy and not for him, he heard almost the answer of Solomon: “Because you will be humiliated by my pity, and he will rise with it”³¹.

This is a vivid example for understanding not only the infantile, egocentric desires of the writer, but also the fundamental difference between love in transfer and love in the real life of a person what was first discovered in his clinical practice of psychoanalysis by J. Breuer (“The case of Anna O.”). Thinking of the relevant issue, S. Freud in his work “Three *Essays* on the Theory of Sexuality” (1905) concludes that the essence of the phenomenon of love in transfer is faceless. That is, the very person is not the stimulus to love, but the specific life situation which evokes the primary objects of his/her childhood in the psychic reality of the individual. Thus, we face the literary-psychoanalytic phenomenon: the synthesis of the real and artistic and aesthetic effects of the phenomenon of love in transfer (A. Adler).

As we can see, V. Vynnychenko, having “nature as in the urus” (Ye. Chykalenko), needed the strong guardian-maternal type of a woman. Can we talk about the writer’s love as such when his selected changing objects become for him only a crutch of his own mental infirmity?! And how cannot we mention the two main commandments of love of Jesus, over which V. Vynnychenko ironised and later confessed to the woman he left and the grief-stricken mother L. Goldmerstein in depressive state: “Oh, Liusia, how I’d like to find a healthy person who

²⁹ Див.: Винниченко Є. до В. Винниченка (без дати). ЦДАВО України. Фонд 1823. Опис 1. Справа 40.

³⁰ Винниченко В. Щоденник (1911–1920). Упоряд., вступ. ст., прим. Г. Костюка. Едмонтон–Нью-Йорк: Вид-во КІУС і Комісії УВАН (США) для вивчення і публікації спадщини В. Винниченка, 1980. Т. 1. С. 105.

³¹ Винниченко В. Вибрані п’єси. Упоряд. М. Жулинський. Київ: Мистецтво, 1991. С. 163.

would understand my sickly mood and behave with me in some cases as with the sick one!”³²

In his egocentric coordinates of love, the writer found himself in the situation of Baron Munchausen who must pull himself and his horse out of the swamp by using his own hair. That is the source of the Nietzschean cult of power in Vynnychenko's characters who, in reality, appeared as Echo-projections of his narcissistic complexes and ideas. “And we do not need crippled and weak ones! Enough. Not strong, so don't come here”³³, emotionally speaks Tania in the novel “Equilibrium”. In the name of social justice and change in the moral code, Natalia in the play “Market” brings her maiden beauty and thus life to the altar. Rita did the same but for the sake of her family (“Black Panther and White Bear”). And Rina (“Idols”), summing up the author's ideologemes, throws a reproach to her beloved Yura: “I do not respect you because you are not strong”³⁴.

In the social consciousness, the concept of “power” and “control” (A. Adler) over anyone or anything primarily correlates with the idea of “strength”. Therefore, the idea of “beauty” is identified as the aesthetic perception of a person oriented at creative sublimation. These two vectors of the author's attitude were the basis of the first printed artistic work “Power and beauty” (in the following reprints “Beauty and Power”).

So, what is the problem of monogamous marriage in the traditional Vynnychenko's love triangles? The author himself gives an answer in the story “Moment” where after the intimate pleasures, the heroine, leaving forever his partner, says: “Never...! Neither you nor I will give this to each other. Our... our love must die now, so that, as someone said, never to die... Happiness is a moment. Then there is everyday life, vulgarity”³⁵.

The instant possession of an object which evokes perfect love means for the narrator much more than a long-term relationship. As far as the intensity of narcissistic ambitions is transmitted to other people, the need for idealization of the object develops, which becomes a real

³² Миронець Н. Таємниці кохання В. Винниченка (документальна розповідь). *Кур'єр Кривбасу*. 2001. № 141. С. 100.

³³ Винниченко В. Рівновага. Роман з життя емігрантів. *Твори*. 2-ге вид. Київ-Відень: Вид-во А. Гольцгавзена, 1919. Т. 6. С. 68.

³⁴ Винниченко В. Божки. *Твори*. Т. 8. Київ: т-во “Дзвін”, 1919. С. 87.

³⁵ Винниченко В. Краса і сила. Зб. оповідань. Повість. Упоряд., авт. приміт. П. Федченко. Київ: Дніпро, 1989. С. 502.

barrier to the ability to love at all. The introverted dynamics of this psychological problem is observed in changing Vynnychenko's feelings to his young wife Rozaliya Livshyts, a student at the Medical Faculty of the Sorbonne. "And what does it mean? Living with Roza only because I do not have anything better. <...> And clearly now I see that I have never thought about Roza as a woman... Not only do I not want, but I feel something unpleasant, imagining her arms. <...> I have a heart freezing at this moment, and Roza is already becoming so small and miserable! Becomes the one as L., A., E., S. and all the others had become for me"³⁶, V. Vynnychenko wrote in his "Diary".

Similar considerations are essentially the key to understanding the egotistic love of V. Vynnychenko, in the maze of which the narcissistic echo-like souls of his characters rotate. How can we understand the concepts of "new morality", "honesty with oneself", "harmony", "equilibrium" as well as the most ordinary projections of mental institutions (id, ego, super-ego) of the author in the external world? However, the writings of the Holy Fathers testify this reality: when a person lives in favour of spirit, he or she likens to God, and when a person lives in favour of flesh, he or she likens the devil. All our being is encompassed into this invisible system.

CONCLUSIONS

Analyzing the anthropology of love in V. Vynnychenko's life and works, we focused on the dynamics of its two main dimensions: Oedipal and egocentric. The "internal biography" of the author became a kind of physiology of the genre which, as an artistic text, was transferred into the psychoanalytic sphere of perception. This is why used is the psychobiographical method of investigating the life and work of the writer which made it possible in the relationship between artistic fiction and reality to trace the problems of the oedipal complex and the presence of narcissist features in a character's nature, narrator and author. This interdisciplinary approach allowed us to make the conclusion that the main psychoanalytic code of Vynnychenko's oedipal and egocentric anthropology of love in prosaic and dramatic texts ("Parents' will", "Posvii", "Equilibrium", "I want!", "Notes of Flat-Nosed Mephistopheles", "Black Panther and White Bear", "Lies", "Memento", "Honesty with

³⁶ Винниченко В. Щоденник (1911–1920). Упоряд., вступ. ст., прим. Г. Костюка. Едмонтон–Нью-Йорк: Вид-во КІУС і Комісії УВАН (США) для вивчення і публікації спадщини В. Винниченка, 1980. Т. 1. С. 101–104.

oneself”, “Moment”, “Beauty and Power”, etc.) embodies the understanding that a person who has not managed to overcome their internal complexes is resorted to “illusory compensation” (A. Adler). In the case of Volodymyr Vynnychenko, it is active social and political activity as well as artistic creativity which, in terms of psychoanalysis, are regarded as a substitute for true love (parental, brotherly, erotic, to oneself, to God, country, and so on).

Thus, violated is the process of personality’s identity via the Self (J. Meade) that led the author to anti-Christian atheist views in which he reached the pure absurd by criticizing sacrificial love as “the morality of enslaved human passions” in his diaries. This is what shapes the biological understanding of love, the cult of physical strength and strong irresistible power: for example, Yakiv Mykhailiuk (“Notes of Flat-Nose Mephistopheles”), Danko (“Parents’ will”), a mysterious stranger (“Moment”), Tonia (“Equilibrium”), etc.

The transformation of a personality in V. Vynnychenko’s life and works makes it possible to comprehend how a person, having departed from the divine substance, tries to solve the mystery of his own love by the egocentric path of attempts and mistakes.

SUMMARY

The paper is dedicated to the anthropology of love in the life and writings by V. Vynnychenko in terms of psychoanalysis. The oedipal and egocentric dimensions of the love of the writer’s characters are considered through the prism of the psychobiographical method. Consequently, the use of the Freudian theory of the mental apparatus, the concept of attraction and the oedipal complex explain the complexities of the functioning of the human soul. In the system of the Ukrainian classic’s artistic mind there clearly appeared Adler’s concept of the person’s creative “ego”, inferiority complex and excess compensation the functioning of which affirms the view that any mental manifestations and experiences are related to all aspects of the life of an individual person. The analysis of Vynnychenko’s prose and drama offers grounds to assert that most of the characters are figures of the author’s unconscious. In the study, the researcher has come to the conclusion that the paradigm of love topics in the writings by Vynnychenko is burdened by the author’s narcissist transfer and “desire for power” (A. Adler) which are traced in his artistic texts, epistolary and diaries.

REFERENCES

1. Адлер А. Понять природу человека Санкт-Петербург: Гуманитарное агентство “Академический проект”, 1997. 256 с.
2. Біблія або Книги Святого Письма Старого й Нового Заповіту. Пер. з давньоєвр. й грец. І. Огієнка. Київ: Українське Біблійне Товариство, 2009. 1151 с.
3. Винниченко В. Божки. *Твори*. Т. 8. Київ: т-во “Дзвін”, 1919. 356 с.
4. Винниченко В. Вибрані п’єси. Упоряд. М. Жулинський. Київ: Мистецтво, 1991. 605 с.
5. Винниченко В. Записки Кирпатого Мефістофеля. Роман, повість, оповідання, п’єса. Харків: Фолю, 2006. С. 3–203.
6. Винниченко В. Заповіт батьків. Харків: “Рух”, 1928. Т. 22. 202 с.
7. Винниченко В. Краса і сила. Зб. оповідань. Повість. Упоряд., авт. приміт. П. Федченко. Київ: Дніпро, 1989. 752 с.
8. Винниченко В. По-свій! *Твори*. Київ: “Рух”, 1927. Т.18. 210 с.
9. Винниченко В. Рівновага. Роман з життя емігрантів. *Твори*. 2-ге вид. Київ–Відень: Вид-во А. Гольцгавзена, 1919. Т. 6. 274 с.
10. Винниченко В. Хочу! *Дзеркало: Драматична поема Лесі Українки “Орґія” і роман В. Винниченка “Хочу!”* Упоряд. В. Панченко. Київ: Факт, 2002. С. 91–307.
11. Винниченко В. Щоденник (1911–1920). Упоряд. Г. Костюк. Едмонтон-Нью-Йорк: Вид-во КІУС і Комісії УВАН (США) для вивчення і публікації спадщини В. Винниченка, 1980. Т. 1. 500 с.
12. Винниченко Є. до В. Винниченка (без дати). *ЦДАВО України*. Фонд 1823. Опис 1. Справа 40.
13. Донцов Д. Дві літератури нашої доби. Львів: Просвіта, 1991. 296 с.
14. Костельник Г. “Чесність з собою” В. Винниченка. *Ломання душ*. Львів: Вид-во “Добра книжка”, 1923. С. 5–22.
15. Кьонінг К. Між кушеткою і однобічним дзеркалом. *Системна терапія для психоаналітиків – психоаналіз для системних терапевтів. Діалог*. Івано-Франківськ: “Місто НВ”, 2006. 144 с.
16. Лейбін В. М. Словарь-справочник по психоанализу. Санкт-Петербург: Питер, 2001. 688 с.

17. Миронець Н. Таємниці кохання В. Винниченка (документальна розповідь). *Кур'єр Кривбасу*. 2001. № 140. С. 54–93.
18. Миронець Н. Таємниці кохання В. Винниченка (документальна розповідь). *Кур'єр Кривбасу*. 2001. № 141. С. 78–116.
19. Панченко В. Будинок з химерами (Творчість Володимира Винниченка 1900–1920 рр. у європейському літературному контексті). Кіровоград: КДПУ ім. В. Винниченка, 1998. 272 с.
20. Панченко В. Винниченко Володимир: парадокси долі і творчості: Книга розвідок та мандрівок. Київ: Твім інтер, 2004. 288 с.
21. Сербский Н. Библейские темы. Москва: Изд-во Свято-Троицкой Сергиевой Лавры, 2006. 302 с.
22. Томэ Х., Кэхеле Х. Современный психоанализ: В 2 т. Общ. ред. А. В. Казанской. Москва: Прогресс-Литера-Яхтсмен, 1996. Т. 1. 576 с.
23. Фільц О. Груповий аналіз як метод. *Груповий психоаналіз: Навч. посібник*. Ред. колег.: О. Фільц та ін. Львів: ВНТЛ-Класика, 2004. С. 41–60.
24. Франко І. Новини нашої літератури: В. Винниченко. “Краса і сила” (збірка оповідань). *Літературно-науковий вістник*. Т. 38. Кн. 4. Київ, 1907. С. 139–141.
25. Шварц-Салант Н. Нарциссизм и трансформация личности: Психология нарциссических расстройств личности. Москва: Класс, 2007. 296 с.

Information about the author:

Pecharskyi A. Y.

Doctor of Philology (Habil.), Professor,
Ivan Franko National University in Lviv,
Faculty of Philology,
Mykhailo Vozniak Ukrainian Literature Department
1, Universytetska str., Lviv, 79000, Ukraine