

UDC 821.161.2-6.09

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/bsps-2024.4.7>

## PAMPHLET “*WHY DON’T I WANT TO RETURN TO THE USSR?*” BY I. BAHRIANYI: A LETTER TO ETERNITY

### ***Volodymyr Kuzmenko***

*Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor,  
Professor of department of East-Europe languages National Academy  
of the Security Service of Ukraine  
Mykhaila Maksymovycha street, 22, Kyiv, 03022, Ukraine  
orcid.org/0000-0002-2402-1493  
Scopus- Author ID: 58002266900  
e-mail: kuzmenko-vi@ukr.net*

### ***Tetyana Ivasyshyna***

*Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,  
Head of department of East-Europe languages National Academy  
of the Security Service of Ukraine  
Mykhaila Maksymovycha street, 22, Kyiv, 03022, Ukraine  
orcid.org/0000-0003-2859-6961  
e-mail: itavitaastra@gmail.com*

**Abstract.** *The article presents a systemic analytical approach to studying and determining a genre code of a publicistic (non-fiction) work written by Ivan Bahrianyi, a Ukrainian émigré-writer “Why don’t I want to return to the USSR?” which refers to a letter to eternity.*

*It is argued that Bahrianyi’s journalistic work “Why don’t I want to return to the USSR?” is of great relevance due to its meaningful content, free narrative discourse, versatile descriptions of the writer’s image and the recipient’s character as well. Regarding its thematic content Bahrianyi’s work is an essay of strong condemnation and at the same time it is an epistle, a publicist letter addressed to future generations, who should learn from their past.*

*The results of the conducted research clearly indicate that Bahrianyi’s edition of “Why don’t I want to return to the USSR?” represents a letter to eternity from genre perspective but not a pamphlet as it was traditionally believed by literary critics. The matrix criteria of the genre dominants and also the key structural components of Bahrianyi’s epistolary publicistic work have been determined here as follows: an incredible driver of artistry; autobiography, intellectuality, breaking the traditional structure of the epistle, an apparent «author’s image»; epistolary framing in the prescript and clausula, a complex subtext, an individual style, cultural and aesthetic value and others.*

*The presented research introduces a new definition of a letter to eternity as a genre variety of an open letter which is characterized with a distinct psychological introspection and a personal attitude of the author or co-authors current situation, taking into account the specificity of correspondence written in a certain historical era. The scientific insights into I. Bahrianyi’s private epistolary, in particular, his open letters will contribute to future researches on related issues.*

**Key words:** *Epistolary, a publicistic work (non-fiction), an open letter, a letter to eternity, a pamphlet.*

## ПАМФЛЕТ І. БАГРЯНОГО «ЧОМУ Я НЕ ХОЧУ ВЕРТАТИСЯ ДО ССРСР?» ЯК ЛИСТ У ВІЧНІСТЬ

### **Володимир Кузьменко**

доктор філологічних наук, професор,  
професор кафедри східноєвропейських мов Національної академії  
Служби безпеки України  
вул. Михайла Максимовича, 22, Київ, 03022, Україна  
orcid.org/0000-0002-2402-1493  
Scopus- Author ID: 58002266900  
e-mail: kuzmenko-vi@ukr.net

### **Тетяна Івасишина**

кандидатка філологічних наук, доцентка,  
завідувачка кафедри східноєвропейських мов Національної академії  
Служби безпеки України  
вул. Михайла Максимовича, 22, Київ, 03022, Україна  
orcid.org/0000-0003-2859-6961  
e-mail: itavitaastra@gmail.com

**Анотація.** У статті проаналізовано та обґрунтовано жанровий код одного з публіцистичних творів українського письменника-емігранта І. Багряного – памфлет «Чому я не хочу вертатися до ССРСР?» крізь призму жанрової матриці листа у вічність.

Представлено дискурс теоретичних стратегій представників класичної та новітньої генології, а також епістолографів щодо вивчення жанрів памфлету, письменницького епістолярію загалом і відкритого листування зокрема. Лист як первинно мовленнєвий жанр, володіючи внутрішньою діалогічною структурою, створює особливу форму викладу матеріалу, притаманну лише епістолярній комунікації.

Публіцистичний твір українського письменника-емігранта прикметний загостреною актуальністю суспільно значущого змісту, багатогранністю образу автора і повнотою зображення образу адресата, розкутістю викладу. Це твір-обвинувачення і водночас послання, письменницький лист, адресований до тих, хто житиме в майбутньому, хто не повинен забувати життя свого народу в минулому й на цьому минулому вчитися, адже колишні трагічні привиди людства не повинні вирватися назовні в майбутньому.

На підставі проведеного аналізу зроблено висновок про те, що видання І. Багряного «Чому я не хочу вертатися до ССРСР?» в жанровому аспекті є листом у вічність, а не памфлетом, як традиційно вважали літературознавці. Обґрунтовано матричні критерії жанрових доміант і структурних компонентів публікації. Серед найголовніших – надзвичайний заряд художності, автобіографізму та інтелектуальності, руйнування традиційної структури епістоли, наявність образу автора, рамки в прескрипті й клаузулі (звернення й підпису – імені та прізвища «Іван Багрянний» як складової частини всього твору), глибокий підтекст, індивідуальність стилю (наявність епіграфа, емоційність, афористичність висловлювання тощо), культурно-естетична цінність та ін.

Сформульовано дефініцію листа у вічність як жанрового різновиду відкритої кореспонденції.

**Ключові слова:** епістолярій, публіцистика, відкритий лист, лист у вічність, памфлет.

**Defining the Problem and providing argumentation of the topicality of its consideration.** Ivan Bahrianyi, a unique master of Ukrainian prose of the 20th century, (his real name is Lozoviaha Ivan Pavlovych, in Russian – Lozoviahin; 1906–1963) wrote his name in history as “the most outstanding political spokesman of the first emigration from the Soviet Union” [9, p. 612]. His novels such as Tiger Trappers (also translated in English as The Hunters and the Hunted) and Garden

of Gethsemane, a pamphlet “Why don’t I want to return to the USSR?” (or Why don’t I want to go back to the USSR?) and other written works “removed the skin of a prisoner from a Soviet servant and showed underneath it an adamantine proud man who is full of vitality and willing to live and fight” [4, p. 2].

For a writer – prisoner of Stalin’s concentration camps – emigration was the only way left after the war. While thousands and thousands of prisoners, exiles,

various displaced persons wave after wave were still moving through Europe, in 1945 I. Bahrianyi together with his accomplices established a literary and art association of emigration writers named the Artistic Ukrainian Movement (abbreviated MUR) which later turned into “Word” (“Slovo”) with a center located in New York. Moreover, in New Ulm he founded the Ukrainian Revolutionary Democratic Party and its bodies – a journal “Our positions” and a newspaper “Ukrainian news”. Active work of Ivan Bahrianyi as a publicist and a politician started with writing in 1945 a pamphlet *Why don't I want to return to the USSR?* published in 1946 as a single brochure and translated into English, Spanish, Italian and other languages. This novel became, according to O. Tarnavskiy, “a constitution of a free person” [4, p. 7] and carried out a revolution in treatment of the Western world towards the refugees from the Soviet Union. It is notably that Bahrianyi did not speak anonymously and never had other nicknames to conceal his literary name either. Using his full name “Ivan Bahrianyi” was a key element of the pamphlet itself as the publicist's surname had a decent story and a remarkable political passport behind it and a writer's signature was well-known too. In the preface of his non-fiction work the author remarked: “Submitting this work for publishing in the world I have realized that as soon as this *l e t t e r* (Kuzmenko's arrangement) appears in press, the bolsheviks by the hands of NKVS will torture to death the rest of my family, if anyone is still living. However, I ask you to publish it and sign my full name. I had already lost everything that I had before execution” [1, p. 38].

This paper is aimed at systemic and analytical researching the genre code of Bahrianyi's pamphlet “*Why don't I want to return to the USSR?*” (Why don't I want to go back to the USSR?) as a segment of the writer's epistolary. “*Letter to Eternity*” was previously quoted by Yuriy Yanovskiy as the title of the fifth short story from his novel *The riders* (1935). In our research this concept is preferably identified as genre variety of an open letter updated by Bahrianyi in his pamphlet “*Why don't I want to return to the USSR?*” However, this term had been developed in the world literature long before the brochure of Ukrainian émigré-writer was published.

Research analysis. Although, there have been a significant number of studies carried out by Ukrainian and foreign literary scholars (I. Bahrianyi, A. Hornfeld, A. Zinovska, H. Mazoha, W. Todd, etc.), the research into writer's open letters still remains the least explored in the field of literary studies, theory of publicistic writing (journalism) and epistolography.

Since the purpose of an open letter and its subject have not been clearly defined yet, phenomena that do not belong to the publicistic (journalistic) type of activity (for example, front-line writer's correspondence, so-called “triangle letters” [11, p. 89], readers' letters, etc.) are believed to be the specific kind of epistolary publicistic writing.

A. Hornfeld, a famous representative of the aesthetic psychological method in literary studies and also a student of O. Potebnia claims: “Writer's letters are indispensable material revealing glimpses in the recesses of the creative psychics” [3, p. 924].

Modern heuristic defines psychological introspection – self-observation and self-knowledge – as one of the significant sources of the writer's thinking: “Self-knowledge nourishes the writer's creative mind, gives it convincing historical touch” [7, p. 208]. In fact, in most cases the material of fiction literature becomes something that is common, historical and compulsory while representing the fact of the author's personal spiritual experience.

Bahrianyi's literary works with its all-encompassing conflict between the individual and society in the conditions of totalitarianism and forced emigration appeared to a large extent as a consequence of the tragic and philosophical reflections of the publicist about time and himself. The most important argument of it proved to be the writer's private correspondences – epistolary forms of psychological introspection and as a result, the writer's open letters.

Bahrianyi's journalistic (*publicistic*) work “*Why don't I want to return to the USSR?*” represents the genre of *an open letter* and also a “*letter to eternity*” which has not been fully explored yet. Moreover, there is still a great demand for novelty, originality and theoretical insights into genre and nature of a writer's open letter in real life situation, thus all these reasons encouraged us to investigate the aspect stated in the title of the research with vivid interest.

The new theoretical approaches to studying of an open letter genre have been examined and presented more extensively in the main body of the paper.

This article examines the theoretical approaches which have recently revealed in literary studies, in particular, epistolography. However, there are some urgent and relevant problems to be addressed. Our views in this field are focused on the *core questions* determined in this paper as following to explore: 1. identifying the key issues arose in Bahrianyi's journalistic (*publicistic*) work related to the life of Ukrainians in the soviet Ukraine and exile; 2. determining matrix's criteria of the genre dominants of the *letter to eternity* and also the key structural components of Bahrianyi's epistolary publicistic work.

Presenting main material. In Ukrainian literary studies Bahrianyi's publicistic work "*Why don't I want to return to the USSR?*" remains its genre identification as a pamphlet, although any scholar has never justified such a genealogical specificity of this text and moreover has never refuted it. Instead, the author of a revealed brochure, as we restate again, in the author's note to a published work named it "*a letter*" but not a pamphlet.

The term "genealogy" suggested by French literary scholar Paul Van Tieghem (1938) was introduced into scientific circulation thanks to works by Stefania Skwarczynska, a Polish epistolary writer, and an annual journal (almanac) "*Problems of Literary Genres*" ("*Zagadnienia Rodzajów Literackich*", 1958) edited by Skwarczyńska. Taking into consideration literary genre categories as an object of genealogy, Skwarczyńska highlighted genealogical subjects, concepts and names. The typology by Skwarczyńska has both theoretical and practical (primarily methodological) significance as it helps to avoid errors caused by identification of objects, concepts and names and also to provide norms (standards) into a genre definition outlining the three approaches to studying a genre. According to the three established perspectives of genre typology, a pamphlet is "a brief piece of *satirical* (authors' arrangement) publicistic writing on topical subjects in which an author in sharp accusing tone exposes certain phenomena (events) of political and social life" [10, p. 172]. However, the text of the pamphlet (*Why don't I want to return to the USSR?*)

does not correspond to the main dominant of the definition mentioned above including the satirical component.

Bahrianyi's brochure came out in the midst of forced repatriation of former soviet citizens. The most severe war in the history of humanity ended, that war separated families, scattered people all over the world. The French, Britons, Americans, Africans, Germans and Jews were going back to their homelands, places where they were born and where they left their relatives. Life was gradually coming right, cities and villages were restoring. Special commissions were traveling throughout Europe to send repatriates back to their homeland. The Europeans couldn't realize why there were so many people unwilling to return (go back) to the U.S.S.R. The fact that people refused to go back to the Soviet Union suggested that those emigrants seemed to be cruel criminals who were afraid of justice and therefore they hid from prosecution in Europe. A civilized person could not believe that any person living in the U.S.S.R. could be imprisoned for writing an anecdote, a pamphlet, a song, an inappropriate word, for love to mother's language, national clothes, etc.

The journalistic (*publicistic*) work "*Why don't I want to return to the USSR?*" (another English version is "*Why I do not want to return to the USSR?*") was published in response to deceptive appeals of soviet propaganda and shameless actions of western governments, who contributed to the forced repatriation of refugees to the USSR, where they were sent directly to Stalinist concentration camps. The writer expresses a sharp rebuke of the Western public for neglecting the millions of Bolshevism's victims. The text of the brochure describes the terrible truth about the Stalinist "paradise" but the author reflects it in more realistic manner rather than through the prism of satirical (ironic or sarcastic) reproduction of reality. The writer exposes the bitter truth about bolshevism describing its repressive nature stating that it is "violence against people, a slave labour, the tyranny of a political clique, it is the latest human bondage, physical and spiritual terror, the poverty, hunger and it is a war" [1, p. 20].

In his epistle to the contemporaries and descendants the author claims: "I do not want to go back to my homeland because I love my country. But love for motherland, my people,

that is national patriotism, in the U.S.S.R. is the heaviest crime. This has been lasting for long 25 years and it is still now. This crime is called in the bolshevik language, in the language of red Moscow fascism, the local nationalism” [1, p. 24].

Besides, Bahrianyi’s *publicistic* work does not meet the established genre criteria of a pamphlet because of the lack of content campaign orientation in it. As contemporary scholars state, “*this satirical publicist work*” [7, p. 208] can refer not only to social but literary phenomena, “acquiring publicistic satirical or artistic satirical expression and it always performs campaign function” [10, p. 172]. So that genre identification of Bahrianyi’s edition of “*Why don’t I want to return to the USSR?*” as a pamphlet has not been proved yet.

As for the study of a writer’s epistolary, a Polish researcher S. Skwarczynska in her monograph “*Theory of the letter*” (1937) singled out four approximate theories of the epistle: the theory of a letter-*language* (*speech*), the theory of a letter-*semi-dialogue*, the theory of a letter-*talk*, the theory of a letter-*confession*. The suggested concept of epistle by Skwarczynska was based on the principle of the genre paradox – the simultaneous manifestation of private correspondence as a fact of fiction and a text of utilitarian, practical application in everyday life. Thus, S. Skwarczynska pointed out the existence of the alleged theories”, representatives of which determine a letter as a single product of practical needs [16, p. 169–177].

In literary studies genre formation is characterized by the two main trends. On the one hand, there is a crystallization and stabilization of genre features; on the other hand, one cannot omit the active interaction of various genres and generic dominants, a specific genre-generic diffusion. This process is associated with “hybridization of genres” highlighting the particular tendency of time that is genre-blending but not the former genre purity” [6, p. 46]. However, a free structure of a letter allows the writer not only to deviate from the canonical form but also to introduce into its layer the fragments of fiction or dramatic episodes, literature critical reviews and so on. The outcome of the «hybridization of genres» is the emergence of different modifications of writer’s letters, in particular, *open letters*

and *letters to eternity* representing peculiar varieties of epistolary non-fiction (journalistic) writings.

The monograph “*Writers’ epistolary in Ukrainian literary process of the 20-50s years of the 20th century*” by V. Kuzmenko (1998) presented a pivotal approach to the genre concept of a writer’s epistle as a polyphonic genre formation constituting both literary and historiographical phenomenon at the same time. The term of an *open letter* was defined here as “a *publicistic* genre (non-fiction), in which the author through a personal appealing to the public raises important social problems or issues of broad significance and it is expressed in a sharp, candid, highly emotional style (tone)” [6, p. 210].

Later A. Zinovska in her thesis “*Ukrainian writer’s epistolary: open letters typology*” (2008) supplemented and clarified this concept. The researcher argues: “An open letter is a non-fiction genre, the type of epistolary *publicistic* (journalistic) writing. There are usually a lot of similarities between a letter and other non-fiction genres. However, the main peculiarity of an *open letter* is that the author and an addressee are specific persons. “Besides” a personal moment” (the writer’s intention to talk to a specific addressee) there is another addressee in these letters, as Zinovska notes, the readers’ audience. An open letter addressed to one person is read by a great number of people and a lot of them are concerned. Such letter makes a reader get to the heart of disputes, in the essence of the author’s and the addressee’s thoughts, take one’s side. And all this happens without direct appealing to the reader. Secondly, the writer’s letter therefore it is an open letter as well is a piece of writhing of literary and historiographical genre, as V. Kuzmenko convincingly proves. Thus, the above-mentioned definition can also be applied to “the type of epistolary *publicistic* writing (journalism)” [5, p. 63].

We gratefully accept the quoted addition and clarification of the term by Zinovska and define an *open letter* as a type of epistolary *publicistic* writing (non-fiction or journalism). Following this assumption, the pamphlet “*Why don’t I want to return to the USSR?*” should be examined first of all as type of epistolary publicistic writing (journalism) that is an integral part of I. Bahrianyi’s private correspondence,

an amazingly valuable authentic primary source for getting insights into a creative writer's individuality involving a wide range of concepts of literary studies' structure: a personality, worldview, an individual style, etc.

However, among the writer's open letters well-known in Ukrainian literature as types of epistolary journalistic writings ("*An open letter of V. Vynnychenko to M. Gorky*", M. Khvylioviy "*An open letter to Volodymyr Koriak*", etc.), the open letter of Ivan Bahrianyi ("*Why don't I want to return to the USSR?*") is primarily distinguished by the specificity of the addressee – a recipient of the future (the addressee hopes to be heard by descendants at least in the future).

The first author of the *letter for the future* in the world epistolography was F. Petrarch (Petrarca). After his death Padua friends of an Italian poet found a famous unfinished letter entitled with "*Descendants*". Taking into consideration the phrase from the autograph given by an amanuensis, Petrarch was going to complete the whole epistolary by stating: "The 17th book of the old man's letters ends. Amen" In the original version there is one more closing phrase after it: "The 18th book begins. Descendants" [15, p. 869]. This is a single work by an Italian poet written as an introspective description: a *letter for future*.

In later time after Petrarch, Ukrainian writers turned to descendants in their writings too. For instance, T. Shevchenko's "*To my fellow-countrymen in Ukraine and not in Ukraine, living, dead, and as yet unborn my friendly epistle*" or "*Selected fragments from correspondence to my friends*" by M. Gogol. In the listed epistles written by T. Shevchenko and M. Gogol one can truly observe more distinctly the traditions accepted from biblical apostolic epistles, rather than Petrarch's: addressing the wide audience, an elaborate title, a multifaceted apostolic image of a writer, an oratory style, etc.

But never before Petrarch until the Ukrainian "executed Renaissance" of the 20-30s of the XX century had any writer ever addressed the reading descendants in the genre of a private letter. As if it was written to unknown friends, this technique made it possible for the writer to bring the natural informal touch into intonation, to orchestrate the writer's autobiography in the spirit of an intimate conversation. Later in Ukrainian

Literature Y. Yanovskyi gave a title to a novel from his collection "*The Riders*" (1935) as a "*Letter to Eternity*", which described the symbolic character of a postman, a small inconspicuous person who believed in the victory of the truth. At the end of the story the author claims: "The letter to Eternity passed together with life, like a light of a long extinguished star" [14, p. 409].

The analysis of theoretical (methodological) approaches to genre specificity of an open letter provided us with the tools for elaborating the concept of a new genre variety of a *letter to eternity* applied to Bahrianyi's journalistic work "*Why don't I want to return to the USSR?*".

The legacy of Ukrainian literature at the end of nineteenth, the beginning and middle of the twentieth centuries incorporates a great number of open letters having produced a powerful effect on the readers' audience due to direct appealing to the addressee.

Seminal contributions have been made by B. Grinchenko ("*Letters from Naddniprianska Ukraine*"), M. Dragomanov ("*Letters to Naddniprianska Ukraine*"). The literary epistolary discussion about modernism between I. Franko and M. Voronyi is very knowledgeable and also well recognised among literary critics and researchers. In the light of reported studies it is conceivable that the issues pertaining to writer's open letters have always been the focus of polemics and debate. Nevertheless, all these epistolary polemics mentioned above are related to each other due to their journalistic oratory techniques. The main technique – *direct appealing to the addressee* (a specific person or audience) – is also inherent in other non-fiction genres and needs to be highlighted in open letters writing too since this author's tool determines the composition of the letter, the method of presenting events and characters and its style.

With regard to the previous discussion it is necessary to emphasize the role of the writer's "I". A publicist can speak in the first person both in an article, an essay and in a review. But the first person perspective (view) through which the narrator (a writer) tells the story is obligatory in the open correspondence since the personality of a writer, his thoughts and emotions are expressed directly in an open conversation with a recipient. The author of an open letter is the most active character in it and we can clearly observe this factor in the *letter to eternity* by Ivan Bahrianyi.

Bahrianyi's journalistic work "*Why don't I want to return to the USSR?*" is particularly notable for the striking relevance of a meaningful content to a current social situation, free narrative style, the multifaceted image of the writer and a versatile description of the addressee's character as well.

At the beginning of his epistolary work the writer states that he belongs to hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians who, to the bewilderment of the entire world, are reluctant to return to their homeland under bolshevik rule. In fact, it seems also surprising that those people fill the word "Motherland" with sacredness. However, the Motherland in an author's mind is not associated with Stalinist "rodina" but "my Ukraine, "one of the equal" republics in the federation of so called the Soviet Union (U.S.S.R.)" [1, p. 3].

Among the important genre dominants and structural components of the publication there are also some other features highlighting the writer's original style inherent in this epistolary journalistic work: an amazing driver of artistry, autobiography, intellectuality, breaking the traditional structure of the epistle, an "author's image", a complex subtext, emotional aphoristic expressions, cultural and aesthetic value, etc.

The distinctive feature of the writer's individual style is also characterized with availability of epigraph claiming: "I will come back to my homeland together with millions of my brothers and sisters who are staying here in Europe and there in Siberian concentration camps when bloody totalitarian Bolshevistic system has been demolished like Hitler's one, when NKVS goes following the Gestapo, when the red Russian fascism disappears as soon as the Germanic fascism...Author" [1, p. 3]. Epigraphs also introduce other journalistic works by I. Bahrianyi [2, p. 856].

An analysis of genre dominants and structural components of the *letter to eternity* written by I. Bahrianyi is impossible to carry out without determining the peculiarities of an epistolary frame in the opening and closing formulas. To emphasize the role of the latest parameters (epistolary formulas) we carried out the analysis of the structural elements focusing on the ancient epistles. In treatise of *Demetrio* the epistolary framing (opening/closing remarks) are determined as "constructive attributes of this genre" [15, p. 9].

We also support the argument of I. Paperno in her extensive research who remarked that "an epistolary frame containing greetings and signature can be regarded as essential structural element of any letter which lets us distinguish the letter from any other type of text" [13, p. 211].

Bahrianyi begins the *letter to eternity* with an epigraph in the prescript section which serves to generate specific context and tone to the epistle converging of the author's "Self" and a narrative "We": "I am one of those hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians, who, to the bewilderment of all the world, do not want to return home under bolshevik rule" [1, p. 3]. In the conclusion (Latin "*clausula*") of the letter the writer put his real name and surname (*salutation* and *signature*) which became the essential part of the whole work.

The English writer George Orwell in his novel *1984* claims: "Who controls the past, controls the future: who controls the present, controls the past" [12, p. 162]. This quote highlights the technique used in the story by a governing party of altering history to sustain psychological submission of its citizens. We can draw a parallel between Orwell's novel which sounds like a warning against totalitarianism and Bahrianyi's *letter to eternity* which became a declaration of all Ukrainian refugees.

Bahrianyi's *publicistic* work has a double effect on the readers' perceptions. It declares accusation of Stalin's regime and, at the same time, it is an epistle which conveys a message-proclamation for future generation, a kind of letter addressed to those who will live in the future but they should not forget the life of their ancestors, the generations lived in the past, learn from their past experiences and cherish memories of their past.

Ultimately, Ivan Bahrianyi's epistolary work "*Why don't I want to return to the USSR?*" is of surprisingly great relevance to the current situation today as the writer and a publicist restored the national memory to Ukrainian people.

Summing up the results it can be concluded that *a letter to eternity* refers to a type of an open letter noted for its distinct psychological introspection and a personal attitude of the author or co-authors to a current situation and which is written with regard to the specificity of letters belonging to particular historical period. In the *letter to eternity* the writer

by direct appealing to the specific addressee (an individual or large audience) in an expressive (sharp, personal, highly emotional) tone raises social and political issues that are ahead of time and are of amazingly great significance, but solutions to these issues will probably be found only by new generations of compatriots.

On the whole, Ivan Bahrianyi's *letter to eternity* about the bolshevik "paradise" was written in the 1940s and became one of those epistolary documents that altered the approach of Western public to the problem of "displaced persons". In the meanwhile, it was the outset of debunking the myth of Stalin's regime.

Conclusion and perspectives. Every new generation of readers tries to comprehend the literary masterpiece at their discretion. The creative reception process of Ukrainian and world literature is inexhaustible. Thus, a new view on genre specificity of a well-known journalistic (*publicistic*) work "*Why don't I want to return to the USSR?*" by I. Bahrianyi, as if it was taken through the prism of magnifying glass, allows us to identify the relevance of this epistolary work to the current situation, to hear the echoes of epochs, "but the ghosts of history shouldn't break forth from the past, wearing new masks. Under no circumstances should we relax our vigilance" [8, p. 183].

After carrying out research the key factor becomes distinct that from genre perspective the edition of "*Why don't I want to return to the USSR?*" by I. Bahrianyi refers to a *letter to eternity* but not a *pamphlet* as it was traditionally believed by literary critics. The results of the research have shown that Bahrianyi's letter is a unique pattern of "hybridization of epistolary genre", convergence of an epistle and fiction literature that is stipulated by peculiarities of the examined text: an incredible driver of artistry, autobiography, intellectuality,

breaking the traditional structure of the epistle, an apparent "author's image", a complex subtext, individual style, etc.

For a long time, Ukrainians have believed that I. Bahrianyi was a victim and nowadays, perhaps, he will appear before them as a true prophet since he must have been recognized by the majority of his readers. Let's read once again his spiritual testament "*Why don't I want to return to the USSR?*" which is also addressed to all of us who are defending now Ukraine, all Europe and, probably, an entire civilized world from Russian invaders who intend to "denazify" Ukrainian people and return them back to the stable of a Soviet empire.

So, it is clear that the influence of the epistolary work on the movement of literature and the Ukrainian state of mind on the whole, have not been properly evaluated yet. There are, however, still further challenges for epistolary genre studies in order to carry out more insightful scientific approaches to the private epistolary of Ivan Bahrianyi and his open letters, in particular, "*An open letter to the directorate of "Voice of America" regarding auditions in the Ukrainian language*" ("*Vidkrytyi lyst do dyreksii "Holosu Ameryky" z pryvodu audytsii ukrainskoiu movoiu*", 1950), "*The response to big enemies and small enemies (Abramovych, Derzhavin and others)*" ("*Vidpovid voroham velykym i voroham maniunkym (Abramovycham, Derzhavinym ta inshym*", 1950), "*When a smog of the empire blurs honour (A response to the professor F. Bogatyrychuk)*" ("*Koly chad imperii zatumanuie chest (Vidpovid prof. F.P. Bohatyrychukovi)*", 1951) and so on. These issues can provide the field for researches of epistolary genre, literary critics and can be of significant interest for those who are investigating journalistic literary patterns revealing from the past which have not been fully explored yet.

## REFERENCES

1. Bahrianyi, I. P. (1946). Chomu ya ne khochu povertatysia do SRSR? [Why don't I want to return to the USSR?] The Ukrainian Canadian Committee. <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0002250> [in Ukrainian].
2. Bahrianyi, I. P. (2006). Publitsystyka: Dopovidi, statii, pamphlety, refleksii, ese. [Publicistic works: Reports, articles, pamphlets, reflections, essays]. Smoloscyp [in Ukrainian].
3. Dyvnych, Y. (1963). Ivan Bahrianyi // Lysty do Pryiateliv. [Ivan Bahrianyi: Letters to Friends] 9–10: 1–6. New York [in Ukrainian].
4. Hornfeld, A. (1904). Epystoliarnaia literatura. [Epistolary literature]. Entsiklopedycheskyi slovar [Encyclopedic dictionary]. 80. Brokhauz y Efron.
5. Kovaliv, Y. I. (ed.) (2007). "Pamflet" ["Pamphlet"]. In Literary Encyclopedia 2. EC "Academia". 172–173 [in Ukrainian].



6. Kuzmenko, V.I. (1998). Pysmennytskyi epistoliarii v ukrainskomu literaturnomu protsesi 20–50-kh rokiv XX st. [Writers' epistolary in Ukrainian literary process of the 20–50s years of the 20th century]. NASU, Shevchenko Institute of Literature. [in Ukrainian].
7. Kuzmenko, V.I. (2018). U Vsesviti Slova: literaturno-krytychni studiyi. [In the Word Universe: literary critical studios] Druhe dykhannia, [The Second Breath] [in Ukrainian].
8. Kuzmenko, V.I. (2021). “Uzhynok iz vysoty lit”. [“Harvest from the height of years”] Vcheni zapysky TNU im. V.I. Vernadskoho: Filolohiia. Zhurnalistyka [Scientific notes of the Vernadsky Tavri National University] 32 (71), no. 6:181–186 [in Ukrainian].
9. Lavrinenko, Y.A. (1994). Ivan Bahrianyi – politychnyi diiach i pysmennyk [Ivan Bahrianyi – a politician and a writer] Ukrainske slovo: Khrestomatiia ukrainskoi literatury ta literaturnoi krytyky XX st. [Ukrainian word] 2. Ros. 612–617 [in Ukrainian].
10. Mazoha, H.S. (2007). Zhanrovo-styl'ovi modyfikaciyi ukrayins'kogo pys'mennyc'kogo epistolyariyu drugoyi polovyny` XX stolittya [Genre-Style modifications of the Ukrainian Writers' Epistolary in the second half of XX century]. Milenium [in Ukrainian].
11. Orwell, G. (1961). 1984 (Nineteen Eighty Four). Signet Classics.
12. Paperno, I.A. (1974). Perepyska kak vyd teksta. Struktura pysma [Correspondence as a type of text: Letter structure]. Tartu: TSU. 210–219.
13. Petrarca, Francesco. (1977). Secretum / Acura di E. Carrara. Torino.
14. Skwarczynska, S. (1937). Teoria listu [Theory of a letter]. Lviv.
15. Yanovskyi, Y.I. (1983). Tvory: V 5 t. [Novels: In 5 vol.], 2: Dnipro. 424 [in Ukrainian].
16. Zinovska, A.M. 2008. Ukrainskyi pysmennytskyi epistoliarii: typolohiia vidkrytoho lystuvannia: dys. ... kand. filol. nauk [Ukrainian writer's epistolary: typology of open letters], (no. ДС108041), PhD Diss. Kyiv. Slavic University [in Ukrainian].

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Багрянний І. Чому я не хочу вертатися до ССРСР? Канада : Комітет українців Канади. 1946.
2. Багрянний І. Публіцистика: Доп., ст., памфлети, рефлексії, есе. 2-е вид. / упоряд. О. Коновал ; автор передм. І. Дзюба ; авт. післяслова Г. Костюк. Київ : Смолоскип, 2006.
3. Горнфельд А. Эпистолярная литература. Энциклопедический словарь. Изд. Брокгауз и Ефрон. Т. 80. 1904. С. 923–924.
4. Дивнич Ю. Іван Багрянний. *Листи до приятелів*. 1963. № 9–10. С. 1–6.
5. Зіновська А.М. Український письменницький епістолярій: типологія відкритого листування : дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.01.06 – теорія літератури / Київський славістичний університет. Київ, 2008.
6. Кузьменко В.І. Письменницький епістолярій в українському літературному процесі 20–50-х років ХХ ст. 1998. Київ : НАН України, Ін-т л-ри ім. Т.Г. Шевченка.
7. Кузьменко В.І. У всесвіті слова: літературно-критичні студії. Київ : Друге дихання, 2018.
8. Кузьменко В.І. Ужинок із висоти літ. *Вчені записки Таврійського національного університету ім. В.І. Вернадського. Серія «Філологія. Журналістика»*. 2021. Т. 32 (71). № 6. Ч. 2. 181–186.
9. Лаврінченко Ю. Іван Багрянний – політичний діяч і письменник. *Українське слово : хрестоматія української літератури та літературної критики ХХ ст.* : у 3 кн. 1994. Рось, Кн. 2. С. 612–617.
10. Літературознавча енциклопедія / авт.-уклад. Ю. Ковалів : у 2 т. Т. 2. Київ : ВЦ «Академія», 2007.
11. Мазоха Г.С. Український письменницький епістолярій другої половини ХХ століття: жанрово-стильові модифікації. Київ, 2006.
12. Orwell G. (1961). *1984 (Nineteen Eighty Four)*. Signet Classics.
13. Паперно И.А. (1974). Переписка как вид текста. Структура письма. Тарту : Изд-во Тартуского гос. ун-та. 210–219.
14. Яновський Ю. Твори : в 5 т. Т. 2. Дніпро, 1983.
15. Petrarca F. (1977). Secretum / Acura di E. Carrara. Torino.
16. Skwarczynska S. (1937). Teoria listu.