

THE ANNALS OF THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN THE U.S., INC.  
VOLUME XVI 1984-1985 NUMBER 41-42

# STUDIES IN UKRAINIAN LITERATURE

EDITED BY BOHDAN RUBCHAK



**STUDIES IN  
UKRAINIAN LITERATURE**



THE ANNALS OF THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY OF ARTS  
AND SCIENCES IN THE U.S., INC.

---

VOLUME XVI 1984-1985

NUMBER 41-42

---

# STUDIES IN UKRAINIAN LITERATURE

Edited by  
BOHDAN RUBCHAK

Published by  
THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
IN THE U.S., Inc.



*The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S.* are published by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S., Inc.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE: Oleksander Ohloblyn, *Past President of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S.*; John Fizer, *Rutgers University*; Omeljan Pritsak, *Harvard University*; John S. Reshetar, Jr., *University of Washington*; Ihor Ševčenko, *Harvard University*.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS: Yaroslav Bilinsky, *Acting President of the Academy, University of Delaware*; Lubov Drashevskaja; Oleh S. Fedyshyn, *Staten Island College CUNY*; Jacob P. Hursky, *Syracuse University*; I. S. Koropecyk, *Temple University*; William Omelchenko, *Hunter College CUNY*; George Y. Shevelov, *Past President of the Academy*.

VOLUME EDITOR: Bohdan Rubchak, *University of Illinois at Chicago*

COPY EDITORS: Carol R. Uhland and Marian Jean Rubchak

All correspondence, orders, and remittances should be addressed to *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S.*, 206 West 100th Street, New York, New York 10025.

Price of this volume: \$35.00.

---

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 59-33060

All rights reserved.

© 1986 The Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.

ISSN 0503-1001

*Printed in U. S. A. by Computoprint Corporation  
335 Clifton Avenue  
Clifton, New Jersey 07011*

## CONTENTS

|                         |    |
|-------------------------|----|
| Contributors .....      | 11 |
| Editor's Foreword ..... | 17 |

## Part I

|   |    |
|---|----|
| An Enthusiast of the Ukrainian Revival: On Hryhorij Kostiuk's<br>Eightieth Birthday ..... | 23 |
| IWAN KOSZELIWEK   |    |
| Hryhorij Kostiuk: A Bibliography (1972-1985) .....  | 37 |

## Part II

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Die Literatur des Kiever Höhlenklosters in der ostslavischen<br>Kulturgeschichte ..... | 53  |
| HANS ROTHE   |     |
| Gogol's <i>Revizor</i> and the Ukrainian Dramatic Tradition .....                      | 67  |
| IRENE MAKARYK  |     |
| Images of Center and Periphery in the Poetry of Taras Ševčenko ...                     | 81  |
| BOHDAN RUBCHAK   |     |
| Слав'янські піки: Ševčenko contra Puškin? .....  | 119 |
| GEORGE Y. SHEVELOV   |     |
| Sir Walter Scott and Pantelejmon Kuliš .....   | 135 |
| ROMANA BAHRIJ-PIKULYK  |     |
| Byelorussian-Ukrainian Literary Relations before 1917 .....                            | 175 |
| ARNOLD MCMILLIN  |     |
| The Modality of Poetic Forms in Aleksander Potebnja's Theory<br>of Literature .....    | 191 |
| JOHN FIZER   |     |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Futurist Polemics with Xvył'ovyj during the Prolitfront Period ... | 221 |
| OLEH S. ILNYTZKYJ  |     |

### Part III

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Volodymyr Vynnyčenko's Ideas in the Light of His Political Writings .....              | 251 |
| IVAN L. RUDNYTSKY  |     |
| Vynnyčenko's Moral Laboratory .....  | 275 |
| DANYLO HUSAR STRUK   |     |
| Vynnyčenko's Philosophy of Happiness .....   | 289 |
| EUGENE LASHCHYK  |     |
| Predictions and Prognoses in Vynnyčenko's <i>Sonjašna Mašyna</i> ....                  | 327 |
| WALTER SMYRNIW   |     |
| Utopia, Eutopia or Tutopia? .....  | 341 |
| LARISSA M. L. ZALESKA ONYSHKEVYCH  |     |
| How to Save Your Marriage and Other Matters of Love:<br>Vynnyčenko and Maugham .....   | 353 |
| VALERIAN REVUTSKY  |     |
| The Disinherited Dramatist: On the Reception of Vynnyčenko's<br>Plays in Germany ..... | 361 |
| LEONID RUDNYTZKY   |     |
| A Note on Emma Gramatica and Volodymyr Vynnyčenko .....                                | 377 |
| DOMENICO A. DI MARCO   |     |

### Part IV

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <i>The Song of Prince Igor: Russia's Great Medieval Epic.</i><br>Translation, Introduction and Commentary by Robert Mann ... | 385 |
| WILLIAM E. HARKINS   |     |
| Hryhorij Ja. Serhijenko. <i>T. H. Ševčenko i Kyrylo-Mefodijivs'ke<br/>Tovarystvo</i> .....                                   | 386 |
| GEORGE S. N. LUCKYJ  |     |
| <i>Vybrani Lysty Pantelejmona Kuliša.</i> Edited, with an Introduction,<br>by Ju. Luc'kyj .....                              | 390 |
| IVAN KOSZELIWEC  |     |



|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Volodymyr Vynnyčenko. <i>Ščodennyk</i> , Volume I. Edited by<br>Hryhorij Kostjuk .....                                 | 392 |
| LARISSA M. L. ZALESKA ONYSHKEVYCH  |     |
| Hryhorij Kostjuk. <i>Volodymyr Vynnyčenko ta joho doba</i> .....   | 398 |
| BOHDAN RUBCHAK   |     |
| Oksana Dray-Khmara Asher. <i>Letters from the Gulag: The Life,<br/>Letters and Poetry of Michael Dray-Khmara</i> ..... | 404 |
| V. PAVLOVSKY   |     |
| <i>Z hir karpats'kyx: Ukrajins'ki narodni pisni-balady</i> .....   | 405 |
| WILLIAM E. HARKINS   |     |

## Part V

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Chronicle of the Academy .....   | 409 |
| Compiled by WILLIAM OMELCHENKO   |     |
| Alexander Archimovych (Obituary) .....   | 423 |
| HRYPHORIJ HAHARYN  |     |
| Natalia Ossadcha-Janata (Obituary) .....   | 426 |
| LUBOV DRASHEVSKA   |     |
| Stephen George Prociuk (Obituary) .....  | 429 |
| I. S. KOROPECKYJ   |     |
| List of Periodicals in the Library of the Ukrainian Academy<br>of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. (Part I) ..... | 431 |
| Compiled by WILLIAM OMELCHENKO and DIMA KOMILEWSKA   |     |



# Contributors

ROMANA BAHRIJ-PIKULYK is Assistant Professor of Ukrainian literature at York University in Toronto. She is the author of several articles on Pantelejmon Kuliš, including an introduction to G.S.N. and Myra Luckyj's translation of *Čorna rada* (The Black Council, 1973), and on the literature of the 1920s. She has also done translations of imaginative literature from Ukrainian into English. She is currently working on some contemporary dissident writers.

DOMENICO A. DI MARCO is Associate Professor and Division Chairman of Italian at La Salle University in Philadelphia. He has also taught classical philology and history of art. Professor Di Marco is the author of monographs on Father Samuel Mazzuchelli and Alessandro Manzoni, and several articles on literature and the visual arts.

LUBOV DRASHEVSKA, before her retirement, was Curator of geology and mineralogy at Paterson Museum in Paterson, New Jersey. She is the author of *The Geology of Paterson, N.J.* (1976) and of numerous articles, in Ukrainian, on the cultural life of Ukrainians in the United States. She reports on the work of the Academy to the Ukrainian émigré press.

JOHN FIZER is Professor of Russian and literary theory at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, New Jersey. He is the author of *Psychologism and Psychoesthetics: A Historical and Critical View of Their Relations* (1981) and numerous articles dealing with literary theory, aesthetics (especially the work of Roman Ingarden), as well as Ukrainian and Russian literatures. His monograph, *Alexander Potebnja's Psycholinguistic Theory of Literature*, is being reviewed for publication.

HRYHORIJ HAHARYN received his education at the Moscow Academy of Agriculture, and held various positions in the area of agriculture in Ukraine. He is the author of ninety scientific works, written in four languages.

WILLIAM E. HARKINS is Professor of Slavic languages at Columbia University. He is the author of *The Russian Folk Epos in Czech Literature*, *Dictionary of Russian Literature* and *Karel Čapek*, as well as numerous scholarly articles on Russian and Czech literature. Professor Harkins has been a consultant for National Endowment for Humanities and President of the Masaryk Institute.

DANYLO HUSAR STRUK is Professor of Ukrainian language and literature at the University of Toronto. His scholarly interest lies in contemporary Ukrainian literature, with an emphasis on poetry. His publications include *The Pain at the Heart of Existence: A Study of Vasyľ Stefanyk*

(1973) and articles on contemporary Ukrainian poets—Čubaj, Kaly nec', Drač and Adijevs'ka. He is currently writing a monograph on Emma Andijevs'ka. Professor Struk is managing editor of *Encyclopedia of Ukraine* and director of "Encyclopedia Project," Toronto Office.

OLEH S. ILNYTZKYJ is Assistant Professor of Ukrainian literature at the University of Alberta in Edmonton. He has published articles on Mykola Bažan, Bohdan Ihor Antonyč and Myxajlo Semenko. Professor Ilnytzyj is completing a book on Ukrainian Futurism.

DIMA KOMILEWSKA is a widely published Ukrainian poet.

I. S. KOROPECKYJ is Professor of economics at Temple University in Philadelphia.

IWAN KOSZELIWEK is Adjunct Professor of Ukrainian literature at the Ukrainian Free University in Munich. He is better known as an independent scholar and critic. He is the author of *Panorama najnovišoji literatury v URSS* (1963, rev. ed. 1974), *Sučasna literatura v URSS* (1964), *Mykola Skrypnyk* (1972), *Oleksander Dovženko* (1980) and, in Polish, *Ukraina 1955-1968* (Paris: Kultura, 1968), along with numerous articles, essays, and translations. The year 1985 saw the publication of his memoirs. For many years, Professor Koszeliwec was editor of the influential journal *Sučasnist'*. Currently he is working on a history of the literature of the 1920s and translations from Franz Kafka.

EUGENE LASHCHYK is Associate Professor of philosophy at La Salle University in Philadelphia. His scholarly articles include "Some Reflections on the Relationship between Philosophy and Economics" (1977), "Einstein and the Problem of Theory Choice" (1982), and "Heuristics of Literary and Scientific Creativity" (1985). Currently Professor Lashchuk is working on a book on the heuristics of creativity, and editing the next volume of the *Annals*.

GEORGE S. N. LUCKYJ is Professor Emeritus at the University of Toronto. Among his book-length publications, too numerous to list, are: *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917-1934* (1956), *Between Gogol and Shevchenko* (1971), *Panteleimon Kulish* (1983), *Before the Storm: Soviet Ukrainian Short Fiction of the 1920's* (1985). Professor Luckyj edited Pantelejmon Kuliš's correspondence, the correspondence of the writers of the 1920s, a collection of critical articles on Ševčenko, and other documents and critical texts. He has translated numerous literary and critical works from Ukrainian into English. Currently Professor Luckyj is working on a history of the Brotherhood of Cyrill and Methodius and a translation of Pavlo Zajcev's celebrated biography of Ševčenko. Professor Luckyj was co-editor of *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia* and English-language editor of *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*.

IRENE MAKARYK is Assistant Professor of English and Slavic literatures at the University of Ottawa. She is the author of *Comic Justice in Shakespeare's Comedies*, along with articles on Shakespeare and Lesja Ukrajinka. She has recently completed a translation and critical edition of *Slovo o zburenju pekla*, and is now compiling an anthology of contemporary Ukrainian poetry. Professor Makaryk herself is a promising Ukrainian poet.

ARNOLD McMILLIN is Bowes Professor of Russian at the University of Liverpool. He is currently President of the British Universities Association of Slavists, and Slavonic Editor of *The Modern Language Review*. Professor McMillin is the author of *The Vocabulary of the Byelorussian Literary Language in the Nineteenth Century* (1973) and *A History of Byelorussian Literature from Its Origins to the Present Day* (1977). He has written numerous articles on Ukrainian, Byelorussian and Russian literatures. He is currently collaborating with Dr. G. S. Smith on a history of Russian literature outside Soviet Russia since 1971.

WILLIAM OMELCHENKO is Associate Professor and College Archivist at Hunter College, City University of New York. He has written articles on the history of Ukraine.

VADIM PAVLOVSKY is a chemist and chemical engineer. Before the war in Ukraine he published several books in this field. In the United States, upon retirement, he renewed his interest in the visual arts which he had studied professionally in his youth. As a result, he wrote a monograph on the painter Vasyľ Kryčevs'kyj (1974) and compiled an album of photographs of monuments to Ševčenko (1966). He is also the author of numerous articles, both in his field of specialization and in the arts.

VALERIAN REVUTSKY is Professor Emeritus of Slavonic Studies at the University of Victoria, British Columbia. He studied at the Polytechnic Institute in Kiev, earning a degree in construction engineering, and the Moscow Drama Institute, from which he also received a degree. Subsequently, he received a degree in Slavic Studies at the University of Toronto. Professor Revutsky is the author of two books, *Pjat' velykyx aktoriv ukrajins'koji sceny* (1955) and *Neskoreni Berezil'ci* (1985), along with over ninety articles, in English and Ukrainian, on drama and theater. He was co-editor of *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia* (1971), and currently serves on the editorial board of *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*.

HANS ROTHE is Professor of Slavic philology at Bonn University. Although he teaches primarily modern Czech, Polish and Russian literatures, he has done research and published prolifically in the area of other Slavic

literatures. He has prepared editions of Old Russian *Kondakar*, Southern Slavic *Alexandreis*, and examples of Ukrainian literature of the seventeenth century. He has also written studies on the literature of Humanism of the Western Slavs and Ukrainian literature of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries. Professor Rothe is currently preparing more editions of old Ukrainian literature and is working on a history of Eastern Slavic literatures between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries.

BOHDAN RUBCHAK, editor of this volume, is Associate Professor of Ukrainian literature at the University of Illinois at Chicago. He is the author of five collections of poetry in Ukrainian and of articles on Ukrainian literature in English and Ukrainian. He is currently completing a book in which he attempts to define the émigré writer.

IVAN LYSIAK RUDNYTSKY was, at his death in 1983, Professor of Ukrainian and Eastern Slavic history at the University of Alberta in Edmonton. An extended obituary will be published in the next volume of the *Annals*.

LEONID RUDNYTZKY is Professor of Germanic and Slavic literatures at La Salle University in Philadelphia. He is also Professor of comparative literature at the Ukrainian Free University in Munich and Associate Professor of Ukrainian literature at the St. Clement Ukrainian Catholic University in Rome. He is the author of *Ivan Franko i nimecka literatura* (1974) and a number of articles on Ukrainian and German literatures; he has in print an extensive study of twentieth-century Eastern European theater. Professor Rudnytzky is on the Board of Advisors of the latest edition of the *Encyclopedia of Literature in the Twentieth Century*, and serves as Executive Secretary of the Ševčenko Scientific Society.

GEORGE Y. SHEVELOV, till recently President of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, is Professor Emeritus of Slavic philology at Columbia University. His approximately twenty book-length studies are far too numerous to list here. His magisterial work in linguistics is *A Prehistory of Slavic: The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic* (1964, 1965). Three books on the Ukrainian language should also be mentioned: *Narys sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy* (1951), *Die ukrainische Schriftsprache 1798-1965* (1966), and *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language* (1979). Some of Professor Shevelov's articles on Ukrainian literature have been collected in two volumes: *Ne dlja ditej* (1964) and *Druha čerha* (1978). Professor Shevelov received Honorary Doctorates from the University of Alberta and the University of Lund in Sweden. He was co-editor of *Ukraine: A*

*Concise Encyclopedia* and is currently on the editorial board of *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*.

WALTER SMYRNIW is Associate Professor and Chairman of the Department of Slavic Studies at McMaster University. He is the author of *Turgenyev's Early Works: From Character Sketches to a Novel, Ukrainian Prose Manual: A Text for Intermediate Language Studies*, and co-editor of a Festschrift, *Studies in Honour of Louis Shein*. He has also published over twenty articles on Ukrainian and Russian literatures. In 1984 Professor Smyrniw received a German Foreign Exchange Scholarship and was Visiting Professor at the University of Tübingen. He is now working on a history of Ukrainian science fiction.

LARISSA M. L. ZALESKA ONYSHKEVYCH is an independent editing and research consultant. She taught Ukrainian literature at Rutgers University in New Brunswick and subsequently did research at the Institute of Advanced Study in Princeton. Dr. Zaleska Onyshkevych is the author of articles on Ukrainian drama and fiction. Recently she prepared the second edition of a valuable collection of works by Ukrainian women writers, which initially appeared in 1887. She is currently compiling an anthology of twentieth-century Ukrainian drama in English translation.





## Editor's Foreword

This volume of the *Annals* is divided into five parts. In the first part, Iwan Koszeliwec honors the scholar and critic Hryhorij Kostiuk. This is a fitting introduction, because the entire volume is a gift to Hryhorij Kostiuk on his eightieth birthday from the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States. It is the least that the Academy can do to express the gratitude of its members, of all Ukrainians in the emigration—and surely of many Ukrainians in our native country, who are not allowed to honor him themselves—to the man who has done so much to help us perceive and understand our recent literary heritage. We thank him for sharing with us the many years of his significant life, and we wish him many more productive years in the future. A partial bibliography of Hryhorij Kostiuk's works is included in the first part of the volume. Although it embraces only the past thirteen years, its very amplitude exemplifies the generous abundance of Kostiuk's entire yield. It also shows that his creative energy refuses to be eroded by the flow of time.

The second part of our collection contains articles assembled and, in many cases, written in Hryhorij Kostiuk's honor. The selection demonstrates a variety of methodological approaches—from meticulously researched historical studies to bold interpretive readings of texts. It extends from early baroque Ukrainian literature to Kostiuk's particular field of interest—the literary processes of the 1920s and the early 1930s in Soviet Ukraine. It is interesting and perhaps significant that the author of this latter article—one of the youngest among our contributors—takes issue with some important aspects of Kostiuk's own interpretation of that period: if honoring is confined to blind yeasaying—it is meager honoring indeed.

Some other contributions in the second part are no less "revisionist." A scholar, also young, challenges the popular assumption that Gogol was influenced by Ukrainian literature only in his early stories. She convincingly shows parallels between *Revizor* and examples of dramatic

literature of the Ukrainian Baroque, thus implying a direct continuity between Gogol's drama and the dramatic heritage of his nation. One of our most eminent contributors takes up the old saw about Puškins' pervasive and thoroughly beneficial influence on Taras Ševčenko, and investigates the possibility of Ševčenko's having subtly challenged Puškin's political views. Another article attempts to redefine Ševčenko's own position *vis-à-vis* the social and literary centers of his time and of ours. A literary historian meticulously disputes Soviet Ukrainian interpretations of certain aspects of early Ukrainian culture. And a specialist in literary theory questions the "back-burner" place assigned to Aleksandr Potebnja by early structuralists, and suggests that the Ukrainian theorist predates some of the newest developments in our contemporary post-structuralist thought. The two remaining contributions in the second part, although not overtly polemical, throw new light on little-discussed aspects of Ukrainian literature and the West, and on Eastern Slavic literary relations.

The third part of this volume continues the tribute to Hryhorij Kostiuk in a somewhat unusual way: it has been compiled, in the main, by the subject of the tribute himself. It illustrates, incidentally, Kostiuk's tireless activities in the organization of Ukrainian scholarly and literary life in the United States: it consists of expanded versions of some papers presented at two conferences of our Academy on Volodymyr Vynnyčenko—one held in New York in April, 1980 and the other in Philadelphia in September of the same year—both organized by Hryhorij Kostiuk.

The polemical verve does not abate in this part of the volume. The distinguished historian Ivan L. Rudnytsky (who regrettably passed away while this volume was in preparation) offers a thorough analysis of Vynnyčenko's political convictions, rigorously questioning the purity of the writer's socialism. Many of Rudnytsky's assertions, incidentally, again challenge Kostiuk's own views on Vynnyčenko's politics. Although in itself not strictly a literary study, this contribution will prove to be indispensable to our rereading of Vynnyčenko's fiction and plays. Another contributor questions Nietzsche's influence on Vynnyčenko's ethical views, so frequently suggested by critics, in the name of Vynny-

chenko's socialism. This position, in turn, is directly challenged in a lengthy study by a scholar of philosophy; the author offers a careful reading of Vynnychenko's unpublished quasi-philosophical work *Konkordyzm* (Concordism), against the background of Aristotle, Bentham, Rousseau, and other great philosophers, along with works in science, psychology and philosophy published in the last decade or so. Two contributors turn to the neglected question of Vynnychenko's science-fiction and utopian works (which seem to continue, in the fictional mode, the theories developed in *Konkordyzm*). The authors discuss those works in conjunction with Wells, Orwell, Zamjatin, and especially Čapek. We also have in the third part two articles researching Vynnychenko's Western European reputation as a dramatist, and an unexpected (but perhaps intertextually justified) comparative investigation of Vynnychenko's plays and those of Somerset Maugham.

The fourth part of the collection contains reviews, several of which are fully developed review articles. In this part both Kostiuk and Vynnychenko are again given their due. The last part, as is the custom in the *Annals*, deals with matters of the Academy. Here we have a chronology of its activities for the past several years, and obituaries commemorating its recently deceased members. (An extended obituary on Professor Ivan L. Rudnytsky will be published in the next volume of the *Annals*). I would like to draw the reader's attention to a very welcome addition to this part—a list of Ukrainian periodicals, some exceedingly rare, owned by the Library of the Academy. We are publishing here the first half of the list, which stops with the year 1945; the second half will appear in one of the subsequent volumes. Doubtless, this list will become an invaluable research tool, informing us of periodicals in our field that we may have not known about (which, given the vagaries of modern Ukrainian history, and particularly the emigration, is not as "irresponsible" as it may sound) and helping to recognize the Academy as an important research center.

Two systems of transliteration are used in this volume of the *Annals*. The bibliography of Kostiuk's recent works and the list of periodicals at the Library have been prepared according to the Library of Congress

system, for the purpose of facilitating research. The International Slavic system has been followed in all other instances.

The help that Professor George Y. Shevelov, President of the Academy, has given me in my editorial work has been uncommonly generous and valuable. He read all the manuscripts, advised me on finer points of scholarship, as well as of professional editing, and helped me to contact several valuable contributors. His countless notes and telephone calls must go unrewarded, but will not be forgotten. I would also like to express my deep gratitude to Hryhorij Kostiuk for having compiled the part of the volume devoted to Vynnyčenko. Finally, I would like to thank the contributors for their gracious patience with the many delays in the preparation of this volume, and, needless to say, for their excellent articles and reviews. I wish Professor Eugene Lashchuk, editor of the next volume of the *Annals* (which will deal with issues of the history of Ukrainian philosophy and the work of contemporary Ukrainian philosophers) much success in his work: I am certain that he will be extended the same kind of cooperation on the part of the Academy as I have enjoyed in my present endeavor.

*BR*



*Hryhorij Kostiuk*



# Part I





# An Enthusiast of the Ukrainian Revival

## *On Hryhorij Kostiuk's Eightieth Birthday*

IWAN KOSZELIWEK

Eighty years is a considerable span of time. And yet, a life is measured not by years alone, but by accomplishments and projects. Is it possible to live a life signified only by the length of time that has elapsed from the cradle to the grave? At the time of this writing, more than eighty years have passed in the life of Hryhorij Kostiuk—years marked by abrupt changes, adventures on the brink of catastrophe, and, most important, defined at every stage by an alert and purposeful commitment to the work which has made him perhaps the most conscientious chronicler of Ukrainian literary life among the emigrants.

The events of 1917-1920, which for a brief period granted Ukraine her independence, also allowed this child of a Ukrainian peasant family to complete his higher education in Kiev, and to find his way to Kharkiv, the center of the Ukrainian "Renaissance," in the late 1920s. There Kostiuk launched his academic and literary career. These promising beginnings, however, were abruptly interrupted by a five-year prison term in Vorkuta. Only after his release, and several years into the Second World War, was Kostiuk able to continue his multi-faceted work as a literary scholar and critic, a historian, a chronicler of his era, a journalist, and subsequently a public leader and organizer of literary life in the emigration.

Hryhorij Kostiuk was born on October 25, 1902 in the village of Baryšktivci in Podillja. Having begun his secondary education in a gymnasium, Kostiuk finished it at the *Robfak* ("Robitnyčyj Fakul'tet," The Workers' School) in 1925, and then entered the INO ("Instytut Narodnoji Osvity," Institute of People's Education) in Kiev, from which he

graduated in 1929. In 1954 Kostiuk published a reprint of Valerijan Pidmohyl'nyj's novel, *Misto* (The City) written in 1928, with a comprehensive Afterword. Is it a coincidence that Kostiuk undertook this task? The work centers on just such a conqueror as Kostiuk himself—his fictional contemporary, Stepan Radčenko, who also left his village to make a name for himself in the city.

Sometimes it is difficult to find an accurate epithet for the person about whom one writes, and it becomes necessary to postpone that task until after the entire article is completed. In Kostiuk's case, however, I came upon one immediately and without hesitation—"Enthusiast of the Ukrainian Revival." The wave of the "Renaissance" of the 1920s lifted Hryhorij Kostiuk on its crest while he was still a student. It is significant that Kostiuk wrote his first article (published in *Literaturna Hazeta*, in 1929) on Jurij Janovs'kyj, that other enthusiast of the "Revival." In that year of his debut as a critic, Kostiuk moved to the then capital city of Kharkiv, and enrolled as a graduate student at the Taras Ševčenko Institute of Literature. He soon began his pedagogical career as an assistant professor of the history of Ukrainian literature, first at the "Institute of the Cadres" at VUAMLIN ("Vseukrajins'ka Asocijacija Markso-Lenins'kyx Instytutiv," All-Ukrainian Association of the Marxist-Leninist Institutes, 1931-33), and then at Kharkiv University (1932-33). The short tenures within the parentheses are signs of an ominous period inaugurating the start of Stalin's terror and the demolition of the Ukrainian Revival. Among the first victims of that terror was Hryhorij Kostiuk.

"Against the current"—these words are the title of Mykola Xvył'ovyj's collection of polemical articles. The official "current" in literature at that time was represented by the so-called "proletarian writers" and their organizations, "Molodnjak" (Youth) and VUSPP ("Vseukrajins'ka Spilka Proletars'kyx Pys'mennykiv," All-Ukrainian Union of Proletarian Writers), which in truth had nothing in common either with the "social origins" of workers, or with their world outlook. Such writers and their organizations were merely weapons of the Party, in its attack upon the revival of Ukrainian literature. Members of the disbanded VAPLITE ("Vil'na Akademijska Proletars'koji Literatūra," The Free Academy of Proletarian Literature) and its adherents stood against this

“current.” When the time for the liquidation of the *Literaturnyj jar-marok* (Literary Bazaar—a journal of VAPLITE) came about in 1929, Mykola Xvylovij, Jurij Janovs’kyj Ivan Senčenko and Ostap Vyšnja, all former members of VAPLITE, along with a number of people from other organizations (in particular “Molodnjak”) united together in a new organization “Prolitfront” (“Proletars’ke Objednannja Literaturnoho Frontu,” The Proletarian Union of the Literary Front)—and began publication of a journal by that name. We note, incidentally, that in those times everybody and his brother called themselves “proletarian,” so as to be on the safe side.

Immediately upon his arrival in Kharkiv, Hryhorij Kostiuk joined that organization. He was elected to the editorial board of *Literaturnyj cex*, (Literary Guild), a bimonthly journal designed to publish efforts by young writers and materials to aid them in their work. Unfortunately, this publication never left the planning stage. During these first few years in Kharkiv, Kostiuk also worked on the journals *Červonyj šljax* (The Red Path), *Krytyka*, and, of course, *Prolitfront*.

In fact, the journal *Prolitfront* began to appear at a time when it was impossible for it to deviate greatly from other literary periodicals; therefore, it did not lack for articles persecuting “bourgeois nationalists” in Soviet Ukrainian literature. For example, Mykola Xvylovij, paradoxically, waged a verbal battle against his own movement, “Xvylovyzm,” within its covers. However, the fact that *Prolitfront* existed at all, despite the obvious distrust of the Party, had a certain significance; it was still possible, at the end of the 1920s, to think in terms of pluralism on the literary scene. The journal was used as a rostrum in the battle against the Party’s semi-official organization, the infallible VUSPP, and the no less vociferous “Nova generacija” (The New Generation) of Myxajlo Semenko. Let us mention in this context an article written by Kostiuk for *Prolitfront* (no. 3, 1930) “Styl’ i kanonizatory” (Style and Canonizers), a piece obviously directed “against the current.” In his introductory paragraph, for example, the author notes: “In our literary reality, admittedly minute in its significance and influence, a group of ‘theoreticians,’ whom we shall continue to call ‘canonizers,’ was formed.” Kostiuk’s courage can be more fully appreciated when we remember that his ironic term “canonizers” was aimed at the “infallible theoreti-

cians" from the privileged VUSPP: Borys Kovalenko, Myxajlo Dolengo, and other propagators of "proletarian realism"—the precursor of the single, officially enforced style of "socialist realism" in Soviet literature. Kostiuk comes to the defense of stylistic diversity and especially of impressionism. From our contemporary point of view, the author's perception of impressionism may appear to be somewhat naive. But one should also add that this was the opinion of a young writer who, moreover, worked in a country already isolated to the point that some of his colleagues were altogether ignorant of impressionism. Yet this is not the issue; what is important is that the author, under the cover of a defense of stylistic variety, defends the much more crucial matter of creative freedom as such.

The literary career of Hryhorij Kostiuk in Kharkiv practically ends with *Prolitfront*. Soon he was denied the right to teach. "In my personal life," he writes in his memoirs about Vasyl' Mysyk, "the end of the year 1933 was the beginning of the first catastrophic period in my life . . . in Kharkiv, I was denied all work—at the University, at the Institute of the Cadres, and in publishing."<sup>1</sup>

The threat of impending arrest forced Kostiuk to leave Kharkiv; he was fortunate to find a position at the Luhans'k Pedagogical Institute, even if it was for only one year. On November 25, 1934, he was removed from that position as well. From then on, Kostiuk was forced into a day-to-day existence, subsisting on earnings from temporary jobs. He was "relieved" of such mundane worries exactly one year later, on November 25, 1935, when he was arrested on a street in Kiev. And so began the "accursed years" (a book of memoirs thus entitled appeared in 1978), spent in imprisonment at the Luk'janivs'ka jail, and later in forced labor in a coal mine in Vorkuta. Here Kostiuk witnessed a mass execution of Trotskyites, and was himself spared only by a near-miracle, because in the concentration camp he had also been under investigation, falsely accused of sympathizing with the Trotskyites.

After his release, Hryhorij Kostiuk wandered across Ukraine, from Slov'jans'k to Kiev, again without steady work. Once more, he was "relieved" from such worries, this time by the start of the Second World

<sup>1</sup> *Sučasnist'*, 1983, no. 9, p. 16.

War. He left central Ukraine in 1944 and stopped in L'viv, where he took an active part in the literary life of the Ukrainian community, then moved on to the West. In Germany, he became one of the founders of the literary organization MUR ("Mystec'kyj ukrajins'kyj rux," The Ukrainian Artistic Movement). I can still see him speaking from the podium in those distant years, because at every conference and meeting of that organization, Kostiuk appeared as either a lecturer or debater. On January 3, 1951, the important émigré newspaper *Sučasna Ukrajina* began publication in the city of Munich. Hryhorij Kostiuk served as one of its editors during its first year of publication, heading its literary section.

At the beginning of 1952, Kostiuk left Germany for the United States. That transition marks the beginning of a new stage in Kostiuk's literary and scholarly life. From being a participant-enthusiast in the Ukrainian Revival of the 1920s, he became, to the fullest extent of the word, its chronicler. When someday a collection of his articles is published, we will see that his work of the last thirty years constitutes a fully documented literary history of the Ukrainian Revival. Beginning with its forerunner, Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, and ending with Ivan Bahrjanyj, who represented its youngest cadres, hardly anybody who was active during that time span escaped Hryhorij Kostiuk's notice. He devoted substantial studies to some, while others, perhaps less important, were mentioned in a passing phrase. Three central figures, however, received the primary share of literary historian Hryhorij Kostiuk's attention: the aforementioned Vynnyčenko and Bahrjanyj, and, of course, Mykola Xvyl'ovyy.

In the spring of 1953, I met Kostiuk in Paris. He had stopped for a few days in that city on his way down to the Vynnyčenko estate "Zakutok" in southern France. This journey marked the beginning of a new era in the history of Vynnyčenko studies. Kostiuk undertook the transfer of the writer's immense archives from "Zakutok" to New York City. Here, under the auspices of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in America, he found a new resting place for them within the East European Historical and Cultural Archives at Columbia University. He then became curator of the Ukrainian collection in that archival institution. Kostiuk undertook the classification and cataloguing of Vynnyčenko's

papers and library, and simultaneously began researching the writer's personal, political and literary life. He invited several younger scholars to assist him in that enormous task. With the forewarning that I may not be aware of the entire output, let me list the first fruits of that labor, especially the hitherto unpublished or little-known works by Vynnyčenko: *Prorok ta nevydani opovidannja* (The Prophet and Unpublished Stories, 1960), *Slovo za toboju, Staline!* (Take the Floor, Stalin! 1971), *Na toj bik* (On the Other Side, 1972), *Namysto* (A String of Coral Beads, 1976), and *Ščodennyk* (Diaries). The first two volumes of the last title have already appeared, while approximately five more are currently being prepared for publication.

Along with the publication of Vynnyčenko's unknown work, Kostiuk himself has written much about the author. Some of this work has been reprinted in the collection *Volodymyr Vynnyčenko ta joho doba* (Volodymyr Vynnychenko and His Age, 1980): "Dejaki problemy naukovoho vyvčennja V. Vynnyčenka" (Some Questions in the Study of V.V., *Sučasnist*, 1971); "Volodymyr Vynnyčenko ta joho ostannij roman" (V.V. and His Last Novel, introduction to the novel *Slovo za toboju, Staline!*); "Ostannja rezydencija V. Vynnyčenka" (V. V.'s Last Residence, first published in the collection *Volodymyr Vynnyčenko; staty i materialy*, 1953, under the pseudonym B. Podoljak); "Povist' pro ljudej burelomnyx rokiv" (A Novel about People of the Stormbreaking Years, introduction to the novel *Na toj bik*, 1972); "Lesja Ukrajinka i Volodymyr Vynnyčenko" (*Sučasnist*, 1971); "Serhij Jefremov i Volodymyr Vynnyčenko" (*Sučasnist*, 1962); "Volodymyr Vynnyčenko—maljar" (V.V. as Painter, *Sučasnist*, 1962); "Zapysnyky Volodymyra Vynnyčenka" (V.V.'s Notebooks, preface to the first volume of *Ščodennyk*, 1980); "Misija V. Vynnyčenka v Moskvi i Xarkovi 1920 roku" (V.V.'s Mission in Moscow and Kharkiv, *Novi dni*, 1970); etc.

Kostiuk's fresh point of view on Vynnyčenko is already implied in the titles of these articles. To begin with, Kostiuk delivers thoroughly documented work on the little-known periods in the writer's life, and in particular, his life at "Zakutok." On the basis of documents, Kostiuk illuminates the rather mysterious aspects of Vynnyčenko's journey to Moscow and Kharkiv in 1920—a "mission" that has received not so

much objective as unfairly demagogical treatment from Vynnyčenko's émigré critics. Second, Kostiuk brings to light a relatively unknown talent of Volodymyr Vynnyčenko—painting. Third, Kostiuk's articles provide interesting insights into Vynnyčenko's associations with his contemporaries (Lesja Ukrajinka, Serhij Jefremov). And finally, Kostiuk proves to be a fine critic of Vynnyčenko's work. In short, this single volume, *Volodymyr Vynnyčenko ta joho doba*, in itself becomes a new stage in the history of Vynnyčenko studies, after a long interruption from the 1920s. No one researching Vynnyčenko in Ukraine or in the emigration can afford to ignore this work.

Hryhorij Kostiuk began his chronicle of the Ukrainian Revival in the 1920s immediately after World War II, from the platform of MUR; the article on Arkadij Ljubčenko "Poet junosty i syly" (Poet of Youth and Strength) appeared as early as 1946 in the first *MUR* yearbook. He has been tirelessly working in this field ever since. 1951 was a very important year in Kostiuk's work on the 1920s. We recall that he was then editor of the literary section of the newspaper *Sučasna Ukrajina*. Leafing through its pages, one gets the impression that Kostiuk worked hard to put on paper everything that had accumulated in his memory. Using various pen names (B. Podoljak, B.P., Hrok), or else leaving his articles unsigned, Kostiuk wrote several typically brief literary portraits for every issue. Here is an incomplete list of names discussed in these miniature essays throughout that year: Volodymyr Sosjura, Mykola Kuliš, Hryhorij Čuprynka, Hryhorij Epik, Ivan Bahrjanyj, Oleksa Slisarenko, Pavlo Fylypovyč, Myxajlo Jalovyj, Serhij Jefremov, Serhij Pylypenko, Jurij Vuxnal', Oles' Dosvitnij, Mykola Voronyj—I have, no doubt, omitted more than one. They were all men of the Revival, of the author's own era. He knew them not only by their literary work, but personally as well. This helps to imbue his short portraits with life and warmth.

Kostiuk's work on the Revival has grown and matured in the United States, where he has had the opportunity to work peacefully over an extended period of time, with easy access to libraries and archives. At last, he has at his disposal friendly publishers and press, with extremist nationalist and communist publications as the only exceptions. Making

the fullest use of these possibilities, Kostiuk has written an impressive number of articles and observations on various authors of the Revival and the emigration. I will not list them here; I would only like to mention the most recent collection of Kostiuk's work, *U sviti idej i obraziv* (In the World of Ideas and Images, 1983), which was published by *Suč-asnist'* on the occasion of Kostiuk's eightieth birthday. It would not be improper to state that this work may also be used as a definitive history of Ukrainian literary life over the past sixty years. In addition to fifteen essays on single writers and several theoretical pieces—"Problemy literaturnoji krytyky" (The Problems of Literary Criticism); "Tradycija i novatorstvo" (Tradition and Innovation); "Doba i pys'mennyk" (The Epoch and the Writer) — it includes general overviews as well: "Na magistrali istoriji" (On the Highroad of History; on Ukrainian literature in the years 1917-1967); "Z litopysu literaturnoho žyttja v dijaspori" (From the Annals of Literary Life in the Diaspora); etc. The volume, incidentally, contains some of Kostiuk's early work, mentioned in the first part of this article, especially the important "Styl' i kanonizatory."

Kostiuk's most important achievement in the area of the Ukrainian Revival is undoubtedly his work on Mykola Xvyl'ovyj's *Tvory v p'jatox tomax* (Works in Five Volumes). This is a scholarly edition in every sense of the word. As Kostiuk notes in his Editor's Foreword, he was "fortunate enough to collect almost all of Mykola Xvyl'ovyj's works written in the ten short years of his literary career." Furthermore, the edition is enriched by a wealth of scholarly apparatus, and includes a number of articles by literary scholars. Perhaps the most important of them is Kostiuk's own highly detailed biography of Mykola Xvyl'ovyj. Owing to the immeasurable efforts of this editor and organizer, the writings of the most prominent voice of the Ukrainian Revival have been preserved and are being disseminated, enabling younger scholars in Ukraine and in the emigration to read them and work with them for many years to come.

I have called Kostiuk an enthusiast of the Revival. Another characteristic of his enthusiasm is originally of ancient Greek extraction: enthusiasm as a divine obsession. It is the essential element found in all Xvyl'ovists, but especially in their patriarch, Hryhorij Kostiuk. He richly



deserves this title, and not only because he is the oldest of the Xvyl'ovists.<sup>2</sup>

The Xvyl'ovists place great emphasis on the spreading of Mykola Xvyl'ovyj's ideas concerning the liberation of Ukrainian culture from Russian domination. This, however, is a separate topic. I would only like to point out here that, in their criticism, the Xvyl'ovists tend to examine every literary work from an ideological point of view. This is true of Hryhorij Kostiuk as well, although I do not wish to imply that he neglects formal analysis. However, to Kostiuk, ideas are of primary importance, and it is not by chance that his book bears the title *U sviti idej i obraziv*, in which "ideas" take the first place and "images" the second.

Kostiuk's enthusiasm molds his unique, rather breathless style: it is marked by rhetorical questions; lengthy, complex sentences; long series of detailed descriptions of events, phenomena, or names; a certain declamatory pathos, strewn with epithets in the superlative degree and colorful comparisons. These elements of Kostiuk's personal style are evident at every stage of his literary career.

Structuralists and other contemporary critics tend to dissect a literary work, placing the dissected sections under a microscope and subjecting them to close scrutiny, occasionally even with the help of statistical data. Critics employing such methods, of course, may not always be in agreement with Kostiuk's approach to a literary work. By the same token, however, Kostiuk would be justified in not agreeing with their methods as well; aside from the obligation to handle facts honestly, literary criticism is as subjective as any other art form, and different methods of analysis should complement, not diminish, each other. It is important to note here that Kostiuk is open to ideas that are different from his own, and accepts all but blatantly demagogical criticism.

Let me mention still another important accomplishment of Hryhorij Kostiuk—his organization of émigré literary life. After the demise of

<sup>2</sup> The terms *Xvyl'ovyism*, *Xvyl'ovist* were used in Ukraine during the 1920s and early 1930s. They then disappeared from use, only to resurface once again among Ukrainian emigrants, many of whom are followers of Xvyl'ovyj. The most prominent among them are Jurij Lavrinenko, Petro Holubenko, Vasyli' Hryško and, of course, Hryhorij Kostiuk.

MUR in 1950 because of the resettlement of the majority of Ukrainian emigrants in the United States, Canada and Latin America, Kostiuk, then himself a resident of New Jersey, began to take steps toward the formation of a new literary organization. Five years later, in 1954, his dream became a reality—the Association of Ukrainian Writers “Slovo” (The Word), was born. Kostiuk himself headed the organization for twenty years (1955-1975), and has remained its honorary president to this day.

This is a rather unusual organization. Its membership is open to anyone with literary aspirations, regardless of his or her actual bibliography; in his reports, Kostiuk lists approximately one hundred and fifty members which, considering émigré conditions, is a staggering number. Be that as it may, the achievements of “Slovo” cannot be disputed. Kostiuk’s guidance is fatherly; I can describe it in no other way, for he knows how to foresee potential trouble and arrange matters so that his heterogeneous group of ambitious and volatile people is never riddled by disruptions, let alone crippling conflicts. “Slovo,” for example, has an effective program of financial aid for destitute writers. Through its own publications (the yearbook *Slovo* and hundreds of volumes by individual authors), through its close association with PEN Club, and through personal contacts with non-Ukrainian literary figures, it has won a name for itself in outside circles. Kostiuk documented the history of the first fifteen years of “Slovo” in a detailed report: “Z litopysu literaturnoho zhyttja v dijaspori” (From the Chronicle of Literary Life in the Diaspora; *Sučasnist’*, 9, 10, 1971), and of its subsequent activities in similar comprehensive articles.

We should also keep in mind that Kostiuk is a dedicated political journalist and something of a political scientist. To date, his productivity in the field of political journalism—the practice which he has never interrupted, and, in fact, has recently accelerated—consists mostly in viewing contemporary political problems in the context of modern history, particularly the era of the 1920s and the 1930s. From his many published articles in that area, a collection of fifteen was brought out by the publishing concern “Smoloskyp” to honor his eightieth birthday. The volume is entitled *Na mahistraljax doby* (On the Highroads of the

Epoch, 1983). We read in the publisher's Foreword that these are "articles which bring attention to little-documented, unexplained and often ignored questions." The collection includes "Tajemnycja smerty akad. M.S. Hruševs'koho" (The Mysterious Death of M.S. Hruševs'kyj); "Padinnja P.P. Postyševa" (The Fall of P.P. Postyšev); "Ukrajins'ke vidlunnja vbyvstva S. Kirova" (Ukrainian Echoes of the Murder of S. Kirov); "Hroza nad Kyjevom: Vid 'novoji konstytuciji' do samohubstva P. Ljubčenka" (Storm over Kiev: From the 'New Constitution' to the Suicide of P. Ljubčenko); and many others.

Kostiuk's book-length works in the area of contemporary history transcend the functions of journalism altogether and are scholarly studies in the proper meaning of that term. Individual works by Kostiuk may be seen as required reading on contemporary history. These are: *Stalinist Rule in the Ukraine: A Study of the Decade of Mass Terror (1929-1939)*, which was published in English in 1960,<sup>3</sup> and *Teorija i dijs-nist': Do problemy vyvčennja teoriji, praktyky i stratehiji bil'sovyizmu v nacional'nomu pytanni* (Theory and Reality: The Problems of Investigating the Theories, Practices and Strategies of Bolshevism within the Context of the Nationality Question). This was published in *Sučasnist'* as a series of articles, and reprinted as a separate volume in 1971. Vsevolod Holubnychyj, reviewing *Stalinist Rule in the Ukraine* in an article "Istotne doslidžennja z nedavnjoji istoriji Ukrajiny" (A Seminal Work in Recent Ukrainian History, *Svoboda*, 1962, 241-244), justly states that Hryhorij Kostiuk's work is "beyond question the most important study in the Stalinist period of Ukrainian history." The reviewer goes on to say that the Soviet press will be forced, before long, to take a stand on his work. I am not aware that there actually was a response to that particular book, although Kostiuk's other publications have not wanted for Soviet reactions. To quote them here would be pointless, because they hold nothing of interest. What *is* of interest are the numerous non-

<sup>3</sup> An English version of "Padinnja P.P. Postyševa" was published in a separate edition: *The Fall of Postyšev* (New York: Research Program on the USSR, 1954). English translations and versions of Kostiuk's articles published in various journals are too numerous to list here.

Ukrainian scholars who reviewed the work,<sup>4</sup> and who availed themselves of it for their own research.<sup>5</sup>

Those who know Hryhorij Kostiuk well can testify that even in his personal life he is first and foremost a creature of the word—a man of letters, a literary historian, a critic. Everyone personally close to Kostiuk (and I have the honor of including myself in this number) also agrees that he is irreproachably fair, incredibly hard-working and wholeheartedly dedicated to the cultural and political Revival of Ukraine—that of the past, as well as that of the future. It would be fitting to repeat here the closing sentences of George Shevelov's salutation to Hryhorij Kostiuk on his seventieth birthday: "Eternal youth does not exist in the absolute sense. Yet, inasmuch as it lives in human aspirations, of all my acquaintances, I recognize it best in Hryhorij Kostiuk. And it is not his work, honesty, knowledge and skill alone which guarantee him a place in history, but also an extraordinarily praiseworthy combination of faithfulness to the past and receptivity to the future."<sup>6</sup>

These succinct remarks have helped me to appreciate more fully Hryhorij Kostiuk's uncommon capacity for work. Nothing has changed in this commitment to his projects in the years that have passed since G. Shevelov delivered those words. Hence, no article can readily sum up Hryhorij Kostiuk because he is in a perpetual state of creative activity, and his reader cannot catch up with him; while his reader is still familiarizing himself with a new stage in Kostiuk's progress, he himself has already passed it and gone on to something else. To the casual observer, Kostiuk's collection *U sviti idej i obraziv* might have seemed to serve as a formal summing-up of a long and fruitful creative life. Such an impression would have been completely incorrect. At the time the book

<sup>4</sup> There were a number of reviews of Kostiuk's study in the non-Ukrainian press. Here are some examples: Anonymous, *The Times Literary Supplement* (London), February 17, 1961; John A. Armstrong, *Slavic Review*, XX, 3 (October, 1961), p. 532; Tibor Payzs, *The American Political Science Review*, LV, 3 (September, 1961), p. 665; Pandora, "Puszka na Ukrainie," *Wiadomości* (London), August 6, 1961, p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> I shall cite only two notable examples: John A. Armstrong, *The Politics of Totalitarianism: The Communist Party of the Soviet Union from 1934 to the Present* (New York: Random House, 1961); Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror: Stalinist Purge of the Thirties* (London: MacMillan, 1968).

<sup>6</sup> J. Ševel'ov. "Rjadky pro druha." *Novi dni*, 273 (Toronto), 1972, p. 4.

came out, Kostiuk also published in *Sučasnist'* a literary portrait of Vasyl' Mysyk—one of a series of extended essays on Soviet Ukrainian writers, to be included in a book of memoirs, on which Kostiuk is presently working. He is also rushing to make ready for publication the last volume of Mykola Xvyl'ovyj's works, and the approximately five remaining volumes of Volodymyr Vynnyčenko's diaries. And he is surely busy planning a new set of projects for himself. It is in just this "perpetual motion" that we are accustomed to seeing Hryhorij Kostiuk, and it is how we expect to find him for many years yet to come.



# Hryhorij Kostiuk: A Bibliography (1972-1985)

The bibliography of Hryhorij Kostiuk's works from 1927-1972 appeared in the Fifth Collection of the Ukrainian Writers' Association "Slovo" (Edmonton, 1973, pp. 168-183). The present bibliography is arranged chronologically with author's and/or title entries interfiled. The Library of Congress transliteration is used for the researchers' convenience.

## Works by H. Kostiuk

1. "Pervoierarkh, uchenyi, liudyna (Malen'kyi fragment do velykoi biohrafii Blazhennishoho Mytropolyta Ilariona)." *Ukrains'kyi holos*, 17 May 1972, pp. 4-5.
2. "Povist' pro liudei burelomnykh rokiv." Introduction to: Vynnychenko, Volodymyr. *Na toi bik*. New York: UVAN Commission for the Study and Publication of the Heritage of V. Vynnychenko, 1972, pp. 5-21.
3. "Volodymyr Varlamovych Miiakovs'kyi (18 lypnia 1888—22 bereznia 1972). Posmertna zhadka." *Novi dni*, No. 269 (June 1972), pp. 20-22.
4. "Ivan Ivanovych Bakalo (12 liutoho 1898—8 kvitnia 1972). Posmertna zhadka." *Novi dni*, No. 270-271 (July-August 1972), pp. 14-16.
5. "'Gutenberg' Ivana Bahrianoho (Iz spohadiv suchasnyka)." *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 38-39 (17-24 September 1972), pp. 2, 4. Signed: B. Podoliak (H. Kostiuk's pseudonym).
6. "Deshcho pro moiu literaturnu pratsiu (Avtobiohrafichna rozpovid')." *Suchasnist'*, No. 12 (December 1972), pp. 79-88.
7. "Iak my krytykuemo? (Pro deiaki sproby krytychnoho perehliadu posmertnykh publikatsii tvoriv Volodymyra Vynnychenka)." *Novi dni*, Nos. 280, 281 (May, June 1973), pp. 12-17, 8-12.
- . *Ukrains'ki visti*, Nos. 18, 19, 20 (20, 27 May, 3 June 1973), pp. 3-5, 3-5, 3-6.
8. 'Maister penzlia i slova (Pisliaiuvileini rozдумы do 90-richchia Oleksy Hryshchenka)." *Suchasnist'*, No. 7-8 (July-August 1973), pp. 112-128.

9. "Pro ubiiennykh (Z promovy na zhalobnii zustrichi ukraintsiv Kanady i Ameryky 29 lypnia 1973 roku na oseli 'Kyiv', Kanada)." *Svoboda*, No. 152, 153 (18, 21 August 1973), pp. 2, 2.
- . *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 31-36 (9 September 1973), pp. 5-6. Regarding the 40th anniversary of the mass famine in Ukraine.
10. "Doba i pys'mennyk (Promova na vidkrytti 1-ho Z'izdu Ob'iednannia Ukrain's'kykh Pys'mennykiv Kanady 'Slovo' 1 chervnia 1973 roku v Toronto)." *Novi dni*, No. 284 (September 1973), pp. 5-8.
11. "Tak my krytykuiemo! (Dekil'ka zauvah do statii p. V. Davydenka 'I znovu Vynnychenko')." *Novi dni*, No. 285 (October 1973), pp. 9-12.
- . *Svoboda*, Nos. 204-206 (8-10 November 1973), pp. 2, 2, 2 (Abridged).
12. "V kostiumi prapradida Adama (Pro knyzhku spohadiv Anatolia Haka 'Vid Huliai-Polia do N'iu-Iorku')." *Novi dni*, No. 290 (March 1974), pp. 7-10, 29-32.
13. "Dumky z pryvodu (Deshcho pro nas i nashykh susidiv)." *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 19 (12 May 1974), p. 6. About Russian attitudes toward I. Bunin and Ukrainian attitudes toward V. Vynnychenko.
14. "Pam'iaty d-ra P. Kulyniaka." *Svoboda*, No. 14 (21 January 1975), p. 6.
15. "Obrazotvorets' 'vremeni liutoho' (Do 70-richchia zhyttia i 50-richchia literaturnoi diial'nosti Ulasa Samchuka)." *Svoboda*, Nos. 52-58 (18-26 March 1975), pp. 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2.
16. "Na perekhrestyakh zhyttia ta istorii (Do 70-richchia zhyttia i 50-richchia literaturnoi diial'nosti Dokii Humennoi)." *Suchasnist'*, Nos. 3, 4 (March, April 1975), pp. 52-71, 50-75.
17. "Z naukovykh zasidan' Vynnychenkivs'koi komisii UVAN (Dopovid' d-ra Hryhoriia Luzhnyts'koho 'Vynnychenko na stseni')." *Svoboda*, No. 130 (13 July 1976), p. 3.
18. "Serhii Iefremov i Volodymyr Vynnychenko." *Suchasnist'*, No. 11 (November 1976), p. 25-40.
19. "E. Skrib na ukrains'kii stseni (Pro vystavu 'Sklianka vody' u Studii mystets'koho slova Lidii Krushel'nyts'koi)." *Svoboda*, No. 223 (17 November 1976), p. 2.
20. "Pro pervisnu tumannist' i shche deshcho (Deiaki dumky z nahody 30-richchia postannia URDP)." *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 7, 8 (20, 27 February 1977), pp. 2, 2-3.
- . *Nashi pozytsii*, Vol. 31 (1979), pp. 81-94.



21. "Bahatohrannist' i nevhmovnist' (Do 70-richchia zhyttia i 45-richchia tvorchosty Sviatoslava Hordyns'koho)." *Suchasnist'*, No. 4 (April 1977), pp. 7-28.
22. *Okaïanni roky. Vid Luk'ianivs'koi tiurmy do Vorkuts'koi trahedii (1935-1940)*. Toronto: Diialoh, 1978. 164 pp. Excerpts of the book appeared in the following newspapers:  
*Ukrains'kyi holos*, Nos. 11-14 (16, 23, 30 March, 6 April 1977), pp. 9, 9, 9, 9.  
*Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 26 (4 October 1978), pp. 2-3, 6.  
*Vil'na dumka*, No. 16 (7 October 1979), pp. 3-4.
23. 'Mykola Khvyl'ovyi. Zhyttia, doba, tvorchist'." Introduction to: Khvyl'ovyi, Mykola. *Tvory v p'iat'okh tomakh*. Vol. 1. New York: Ukrainian Writers' Association "Slovo" and Smoloskyp, 1978, pp. 15-106.
24. "Trahichnyi final (do 45-richchia vid dnia smerty Mykoly Khvyl'ovoho, 13. 5. 1933—13. 5. 1978)." *Suchasnist'*, No. 5 (May 1978), pp. 19-34.
25. "Iak ne my, to khto... (Lyst do redaktsii)." *Svoboda*, No. 117 (26 May 1978), p. 2. Regarding the Odessa worker L. Siryi and his family.
26. "Pered velykoïu iuvileinoïu datoïu (Deshcho pro pratsiu Vynnychenkivs'koi komisii UVAN)." *Ukrains'kyi holos*, No. 32-34 (9, 16, 23 August 1978).
- . *Novi dni*, No. 345 (November 1978), pp. 14-17. On the 100-year anniversary of the birth of V. Vynnychenko.
27. "Lyst do redaktsii." *Novi dni*, No. 346 (December 1978), p. 34. On Ukrainian-Jewish relations.
28. "Vid redaktora." Introduction to: Drai-Khmara, Mykhailo. *Z literaturno-naukovoi spadshchyny*. New York: Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1979, pp. 7-12.
29. "U zmahanni z chasom (Notatky z pryvodu smerty Petra Pancha)." *Suchasnist'*, No. 5 (May 1979), pp. 63-75.
30. "Pam'ïati Antoniny Illivny Kulish (1891-1978)." *Suchasnist'*, No. 5 (May 1979), pp. 75-79.
31. "U spravi iuvileïu 80-richchia Borysa Antonenka-Davydovycha." *Svoboda*, 31 July 1979, p. 3.
32. "Vymushenyi komentar (Z pryvodu chervovoi polemiky 'cherez tyn')." *Novi dni*, No. 10 (October 1979), pp. 21-24. A polemical discussion with V. Chaplenko.
33. *Volodymyr Vynnychenko ta ioho doba. Doslidzhennia, ktytyka, polemika*.

New York: UVAN Commission for the Study and Publication of the Heritage of Volodymyr Vynnychenko, 1980. 283 pp.

34. "Zapysnyky Volodymyra Vynnychenka." Introduction to: Vynnychenko, Volodymyr. *Shchodennyk*. Vol. 1. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies and the UVAN Commission for the Study and Publication of the Heritage of Volodymyr Vynnychenko, 1980, pp. 11-47.
35. "Nerozv'iaznyi konflikt (Dumky z nahody plianovanoi vystavy dramy V. Vynnychenka 'Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid' ' u Studii mystets'-koho slova Lidii Krushel'nyts'koi v N'iu-Iorku)." *Ukrains'kyi holos*, Nos. 33, 34 (20, 27 August 1980), pp. 7, 6.
- . *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 34, 35 (3, 10 September 1980), pp. 5, 5.
- . *Svoboda*, Nos. 204, 205 (23, 24 September 1980), pp. 2, 2.
36. "... shcho vhoru ide ..." *Suchasnist'*, No. 10 (October 1980), pp. 32-46. On the 80th birthday of B. Antonenko-Davydovych.
37. "Vpershe na amerykans'komu kontynenti (Z nahody prem'ierey dramy V. Vynnychenka 'Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid' ' u Studii mystets'-koho slova Lidii Krushel'nyts'koi)." *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 49 (17 December 1980), p. 4.
- . *Svoboda*, No. 263 (18 December 1980), pp. 2-3.
38. "Svit Vynnychenkovykh obraziv ta idei (Do 100-richchia vid dnia narodzhennia pys'mennyka—1880-1980)." *Slovo*. Vol. 9. Edmonton: Ukrainian Writers' Association "Slovo," 1981, pp. 193-214.
39. "Moia persha zustrich z M. Khvylovym (Uryvok iz spohadiv)." *Novi dni*, No. 5 (May 1981), pp. 10-13.
40. "Tryiednist' tvorchoho vyjavu (Ostap Tarnavs'kyi)." *Novi dni*, No. 9 (September 1981), pp. 6-10.
41. "Nad svizhoiu mohyloiu Pavla Iosypovycha Petrenka." *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 37 (26 September 1982) p.3
- . *Svoboda*, No. 202 (23 October 1982), p.3.
- . *Narodna volia*, No. 43 (November 11 1982), p. 9.
42. "U sytuatsii trahichnoho bezvykhiddia." Introduction to: Khvylovyy, Mykola. *Tvory v piat'okh tomakh*. Vol. 3. New York: Slovo and Smoloskyp, 1982, pp. 7-19.
43. "Poetychnyi svit Marty Tarnavs'koi." *Novi dni*, No. 394 (December 1982), pp. 9-13.
44. "Pidniatysia vyshche i litaty shvydshe: Ivan Svitlychnyi iak literaturnyi krytyk." *Suchasnist'*, No. 1-2 (January-February 1983), pp. 29-44.

45. "Zvelychnyk vidvazhnykh i chesnykh (Ivan Bahrianyi)." *Ukrains'ki visti*, Nos. 33-35 (28 August, 4, 11 September 1983), pp. 2, 2, 2.
46. "Vasyl' Mysyk (Spohad)." *Suchasnist'*, No. 9 (September 1983), pp. 5-20.
47. "Z hory Helikon na Holhofu (Do 50-richchia vid dnia smerty M. Khvylo-voho)." *Narodna volia*, No. 42 (3 November 1983), p. 9.
48. "Vid redaktora" and "Pro druhyi tom 'Shchodennyka.'" Preface and Introduction to: Vynnychenko, Volodymyr. *Shchodennyk*. Vol. 2. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies and the UVAN Commission for the Study and Publication of the Heritage of Volodymyr Vynnychenko, 1983, pp. 11-22
49. *Na magistraliakh doby. Statti na suspil'no-politychni temy*. Toronto-Baltimore: Smoloskyp, 1983. 292 pp. Excerpts appeared in:  
*Ukrains'ke zhyttia*, Nos. 5-10 (1 May, 1 June, 1 July, 1 August, 1 September, 1 October 1984), pp. 5, 5, 3, 8, 3, 4.
50. *U sviti idei i obraziv. Vybrane. Krytychni ta istoryko-literaturni rozdumy*. New York: Suchasnist', 1983, 537 pp.
51. "Pomer Kuz'ma Prokhorovych Kazdoba (Nekroloh)." *Narodna volia*, No. 20 (17 May 1984), p. 8.
52. "Pomer Borys Antonenko-Davydovych." *Novi dni*, No. 413-414 (July-August 1984), pp. 1-2.
53. "Triiumf-iuvilei akademika M. Hrushevs'koho 1926-ho roku (Spohad)." *Novi dni*, Nos. 413-414, 415 (July-August, September 1984), pp. 9-13, 5-6.
54. "Taiemnytsia smerty akademika M. S. Hrushevs'koho." *Novi dni*, Nos. 417, 418 (November, December 1984), pp. 8-11, 5-8.
55. "Pro dvokh, shcho vidiishly (Zamist' nekrolohim)." *Novi dni*, No. 427 (September 1985), pp. 12-14.
56. "Borys Teneta: 1903-1935 (U 50-tu richnytsiu smerty)." *Suchasnist'*, No. 10 (October 1985), pp. 24-41.

### Works about H. Kostiuk in Ukrainian

57. Movchan, Iuliian. "Hryhorii Kostiuk. 'Volodymyr Vynnychenko ta ioho ostannii roman.'" *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 5 (30 January 1972), pp. 6-7.
58. Nahorna, L.P. "Krytyka burzhuaznykh fal'syfikatsii natsional'noi polityky KPRS i Radians'koi Derzhavy." *Komunist Ukrainy*, No. 3 (March 1972), pp. 85-95. About H. Kostiuk's book *Teoriia i diisnist'*.

59. "Hryhorii Kostiuk opublikuvav novu pratsiu pro taktyku i stratehiiu bil'shovyizmu v natsional'nomu pytanni." *Svoboda*, No. 57 (25 March 1972), pp. 1, 3. About *Teoriia i diisnist'*.
60. Podzhio, D.H. "Nespromozhnist' burzhuaznykh kontseptsii derzhavnoho suverenitetu Radians'koi Ukrainy." *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, No. 6 (1972), pp. 135-139. About *Teoriia i diisnist'*.
61. Svaroh, Vadym. "Ostannii roman V. Vynnychenka (Volodymyr Vynnychenko. 'Slovo za toboiu, Staline!')." *Novi dni*, No. 269 (June 1972), pp. 6-8.
- . *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 36-37 (3-10 September 1972), pp. 5-6. References to H. Kostiuk's introduction.
62. Haliv, Mykola. *Teoriia i diisnist'*. *Svoboda*, No. 121 (28 June 1972), pp. 2-3.
63. Nahorna, L.P., "Teoretychni osnovy radians'koi federatsii ta ikh burzhuazni 'krytyky'." *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, No. 7 (1972), pp. 24-34. About *Teoriia i diisnist'*.
64. Panchenko, Oles'. "Nespodivani hosti v Kalifornii (Pro dopovid' Hr. Kostiuka 'Emigratsiia, kul'tura, krai' 9 lypnia 1972 roku v Los Andzhelesi i kontsertovy vystup Hanny Sherei)." *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 31 (30 July 1972), p. 5.
65. A. Iu. (Antolii Iuryniak). "Zustrich-kontsert." *Ukrains'kyi holos*, No. 32 (23 August 1972), p. 10. See no. 64.
66. N.N. "Zustrich u Los Andzhelesi i San Fransisko." *Svoboda*, No. 156 (25 August 1972), p. 4. See no. 64.
67. Didenko, Ivan. "Nezabutnia zustrich u Los Andzhelesi." *Narodna volia*, No. 32 (31 August 1972), p. 6. See no. 64.
68. 'Vidznachennia 70-richchia prof. Hryhorii Kostiuka." *Ekran*, No. 65-66 (September-December 1972), p. 20. A bio-bibliographical note.
69. Davydenko, V. "Ostannii roman Vynnychenka." *Svoboda*, No. 161 (1 September 1972), pp. 2, 5. A separate section on H. Kostiuk's introduction.
70. "Vyishla pratsia H. Kostiuka 'Teoriia i diisnist'." *Ukrains'ke zhyttia*, 10 September 1972, p. 5.
71. Holubnychyi, Vsevolod. "Iak odna knyzhka pobachyla svit?" *Novi dni*, No. 273 (October 1972), pp. 14-16. About H. Kostiuk's book *Stalinist Rule in the Ukraine*.
- . *Ukrains'kyi holos*, No. 41 (25 October 1972), p. 8.

72. Hordyns'kyi, S. "Lyst do redaktora." *Novi dni*, No. 273 (October 1972), p. 5. On the occasion of H. Kostiuk's 70th birthday.
73. Karpenko-Krynytsia, Petro. "Do 70-littia H.O. Kostiuka." *Novi dni*, No. 273 (October 1972), p. 10. A poem.
74. Kyslytsia, D. "Synovi Podillia—slava! (Do 70-littia z dnia narodzhennia i 45-littia literaturno-naukovoi diial'nosti Hryhoriia Ol. Kostiuka-Podoliaka)." *Novi dni*, No. 273 (October 1972), pp. 1-3.
75. Samchuk, Ulas. "Hryhorii Kostiuk (Do ioho 70-richchia)." *Novi dni*, No. 273 (October 1972), pp. 6-8.
- . *Ukrains'kyi holos*, No. 41 (25 October 1972), p. 8.
76. Shevel'ov, Iurii. "Riadky pro druha." *Novi dni*, No. 273 (October 1972), pp. 4-5. On the occasion of H. Kostiuk's 70th birthday.
77. "Vid Tsentral'noho Komitetu URDP i Redaktsii 'Ukrains'kykh visti'. Pryvitannia z nahody 70-richchia zhyttia i diial'nosti Hryhoriia Oleksandrovycha Kostiuka." *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 42-43 (15-22 October 1972), p. 1.
78. "Pryiniattia dostoinnykh hostei iz Skhodu Ameryky." *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 42-43 (15-22 October 1972), p. 9. See no. 64.
79. "Holova OUP 'Slovo' Hryhorii Kostiuk vidznachaie svoje simdesiaty-richchia." *Svoboda*, No. 199 (27 October 1972), p. 1.
80. Tarnavs'kyi, Ostop. "70-richchia Hryhoriia Kostiuka." *Svoboda*, No. 199 (27 October 1972), p. 2.
81. Iker. "Lenta za lentoiu ..." *Svoboda*, No. 200 (28 October 1972), p. 2. On the occasion of H. Kostiuk's 70th birthday.
82. "V N'iu-Iorku vidznacheno 70-richchia prof. Hryhoriia Kostiuka." *Svoboda*, No. 202 (1 November 1972), p. 1.
83. A.N. "Hryhorii Kostiuk. Bio-bibliohrafichna notatka." *Suchasnist'*, No. 12 (December 1972), pp. 89-92.
84. Koshelivets', Ivan. *Mykola Skrypnyk*. Munich: Suchasnist, 1972. References to *Teoriia i diisnist'*.
85. Rakhmannyi, Roman. "Bil'shovyts'ka teoriia i soviets'ka diisnist' (Sproba krytychnoi analyzy)." *Ukrains'kyi holos*, 3 January 1973, pp. 2-3. A review of *Teoriia i diisnist'*.
86. Holub, Vasil' (Dmytro Nytkenko's pseudonym). "Hryhoriu Kostiukovi 70 rokiv." *Tserkva i zhyttia*, No. 3 (4 February 1973), p. 4.
87. "Masovoiu uchastiu v zhalobnykh urochystostiakh u Bavnd Bruku ukrains'ka hromada vshanuvava zhertvy holodu v Ukraini." *Svoboda*, No. 84 (8 May 1973), p. 1. References to H. Kostiuk's speech.

88. Davydenko V. "I znovu Vynnychenko (Vidpovid' p. H. Kostiukovi)." *Svoboda*, Nos. 144-148 (8-14 August 1973), pp. 2, 2, 2, 2, 2-3.
89. H-yi, A. "V Kanadi vidbulasia zhalobna zustrich u 40-vu richnytsiu holodovoho narodovyvstva." *Svoboda*, No. 148 (14 August 1973), pp. 1, 3. References to H. Kostiuk's speech.
90. Lutsiv, Luka. "Hryhorii Kostiuk. Z litopysu literaturnoho zhyttia v diiaspori." *Svoboda*, No. 218 (30 November 1973), pp. 2, 7. A review.
91. "Pys'mennyky, redaktory ta hromada vshanuvaly Ivana Ikera-Kernyts'koho." *Svoboda*, No. 40 (1 March 1974), pp. 1, 4. The text of H. Kostiuk's speech at the evening in honor of I. Kernyts'kyi on February 22, 1974 in New York.
92. Movchan, Iu. "Nezabutyi i nevmyrushchyi Vynnychenko." *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 21 (26 May 1974), p. 6. A report about H. Kostiuk's speech "U dzerel Vynnychenkovoï tvorchosti" on May 5, 1974 in Cleveland.
93. Lutsiv, Luka. "Bohdan Kravtsiv—poet." *Svoboda*, No. 138 (24 July 1974), p. 2. References to H. Kostiuk's review of Kravtsiv's collection of poems, *Zymozelen'*.
94. Mykytas', V.L. *Proty fal'syfikatsii spadshchyny Lesi Ukrainky*. Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1974. A critique of H. Kostiuk's article "Lesia Ukrainka i Volodymyr Vynnychenko" (pp. 128-136, 142-143).
95. Lutsiv, Luka. "Anatol' Hak. 'Vid Huliai-Polia do N'iu Iorku'." *Svoboda*, No. 50 (14 March 1975), pp. 2-3. References to and quotations from H. Kostiuk's article "V kostiumi prapradida Adama."
96. "UVAN i 'Slovo' vshanuvaly pam'iat' red. Bohdana Kravtseva." *Svoboda*, No. 88 (12 May 1976), p. 1. The text of H. Kostiuk's speech at the evening in honor of B. Kravtsiv on May 8, 1976 in New York.
97. Drazhevs'ka, L. "Pam'iaty akademika Serhiia Iefremova." *Svoboda*, No. 93 (19 May 1976), pp. 2-3. About the UVAN conference on May 17-18, 1976 in New York. A section on H. Kostiuk's speech "Serhii Iefremov i Volodymyr Vynnychenko."
- . *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 24 (6 June 1976), p. 6.
98. Drazhevs'ka, L. "Vidznachennia trydtsiatylyttia URDP." *Ukrains'kyi holos*, No. 5 (2 February 1977), pp. 11-12. About H. Kostiuk's recollections "Pro pervisnu tumannist' i shche deshcho."
99. "Okaïanni roky." *Ukrains'kyi holos*, No. 27 (5 July 1978), p. 9. About H. Kostiuk's book.
100. Lutsiv, Luka. "Hryhorii Kostiuk. 'Okaïanni roky'." *Svoboda*, No. 168 (10 August 1978), pp. 2-3.
101. Movchan, Iu. "Strashnyi dokument (Hryhorii Kostiuk. 'Okaïanni roky')." *Svoboda*, Nos. 172-174 (15-17 August 1978), pp. 2, 2, 2.

102. Holub, V. "Knyzhka pro moskovs'ki zlochyny (Hr. Kostiuk. 'Okaianni roky')." *Novi dni*, No. 345 (November 1978), p. 30.
103. Holubenko, Petro. "Mykola Khvyl'ovyi siohodni." *Suchasnist'*, No. 2 (February 1979), pp. 47-64. A review of the first volume of M. Khvyl'ovyi's *Tvory* and of H. Kostiuk's introduction.
104. Chaplenko, V. "Deiaki dopovnennia i popravky do statti Hryhoriia Kostiuka." *Novi dni*, No. 2 (February 1979), pp. 25-26. About H. Kostiuk's article "Pered velykoiu iuvileinoiu datoju."
105. P.O. (Petro Odarchenko). "Literaturnyi vechir u Vashingtoni, prysviachenyi pam'iaty M. Khvyl'ovoho." *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 7 (14 February 1979), pp. 3, 7. Report of H. Kostiuk's speech about Khvyl'ovyi.
106. Pazuniak, N. "Hryhorii Kostiuk. 'Okaianni roky'." *Ukrains'ka knyha*, No. 3 (1979), pp. 85-87.
107. B. B-o. "Ivan Svitlychnyi—liudyna, krytyk, poet." *Svoboda*, No. 173 (2 August 1979), p. 3. About a literary evening in New York in honor of I. Svitlychnyi and H. Kostiuk's speech "Poet i krytyk z zav'iazanyimi ustamy."
108. Haran, Ievhen. "Hryhorii Kostiuk. 'Okaianni roky'." *Vil'na dumka*, No. 42 (7 October 1979), p. 2.
109. Pereima, E. "'Okaianni roky' H. Kostiuka." *Nash holos*, No. 10 (October 1979), p. 188.
110. Drazhevs'ka, L. "Vechir, prysviachenyi M. Drai-Khmari v N'iu-Iorku." *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 43 (14 November 1979), p. 4. Report on H. Kostiuk's speech "M. Drai-Khmara iak slavist i literaturoznavets'."
111. "'Okaianni roky' H. Kostiuka." *Ukrains'kyi holos*, 14 November 1979, p. 7.
112. Prokop, Myroslav. "Pro Vorkutu, holod ta problemy samooborony narodu." *Suchasnist'*, No. 3 (March 1980), pp. 48-56. Review of *Okaianni roky*.
113. Drazhevs'ka. Liubov. "Vidbuvsia litnii seminar UVAN." *Svoboda*, No. 194 (9 September 1980), p. 4. The text of H. Kostiuk's lecture on V. Vynnychenko.
- . *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 40 (15 October 1980), pp. 2, 4.
114. "Z diial'nosti Vynnychenkivs'koi komisii UVAN." *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 44 (12 November 1980), p. 6. About H. Kostiuk's leading role in the commission's activity.
115. Laslo-Kutsiuk, Mahdalyna. *Shukannia formy. Narysy z istorii ukrains'koi literatury XX stolittia*. Bucharest: Kryterion, 1980. About H. Kostiuk's introduction of V. Pidmohyl'nyi's novel *Misto* (pp. 146-156).

116. "‘Okaïanni roky’ Hryhoriia Kostiuka." *Ukrains'ke pravoslavne slovo*, No. 4 (1981), p. 19.
117. Tarnavs'ka, Marta. "‘Chorna Pantera’ i chorna pliama na sovisti." *Svoboda*, No. 74 (18 April 1981), pp. 2-3. About H. Kostiuk's pioneering efforts at "rehabilitating" V. Vynnychenko.
118. "Volodymyr Vynnychenko ta ioho doba." *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 24 (14 June 1981), p. 5. About H. Kostiuk's book.
- . *Narodna volia*, No. 30 (23 July 1981), p. 5.
- . *Ukrains'ke zhyttia*, No. 11 (1 September 1981), p. 8.
- . *Novi dni*, No. 9 (September 1981), p. 24.
- . *Svoboda*, No. 184 (30 September 1981), p. 1.
- . *Ukrains'kyi holos*, No. 47 (25 November 1981), p. 9.
119. Kushnirenko, M. "Volodymyr Vynnychenko iak pys'mennyk u spohadakh suchasnykiv." *Svoboda*, Nos. 117-118 (25-26 June 1981), pp. 2, 2-3. References to H. Kostiuk.
120. Pereimā, E. "Knyzhka pro Vynnychenka (Kostiuk Hryhorii. 'Volodymyr Vynnychenko ta ioho doba')." *Nash holos*, No. 10 (October 1981), pp. 186-187.
121. Mirshuk, Danylo. "Volodymyr Vynnychenko ta ioho doba." *Ukrains'ki visti*, No. 39 (11 October 1981), pp. 4, 6.
122. Harasevych, Mariia. "Volodymyr Vynnychenko ta ioho doba." *Novi dni*, No. 11 (November 1981), pp. 17-20.
123. Iuryniak, A. "Z piietyzmom shanuval'nyka i sumlinnistiu naukovtsia." *Narodna volia*, No. 43 (5 November 1981), pp. 5-6. Review of *Volodymyr Vynnychenko ta ioho doba*.
124. Tarnavs'ka, Marta. "‘Shchodennyk’ Volodymyra Vynnychenka." *Svoboda*, Nos. 224-225 (27-28 November 1981), pp. 2, 2-3. Remarks about H. Kostiuk's introduction and editing.
125. Vikul, O. "Rozdumuvannia nekrytyka (Vrazhennia z vystavy ‘Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid’" V. Vynnychenka v postanovtsi Studii mystets'-koho slova Lidii Krushel'nyts'koi)." *Svoboda*, No. 227 (2 December 1981), pp. 2, 4. References to H. Kostiuk.
126. Prykhod'ko, Viktor. "Nadzvychaina knyha (Hryhorii Kostiuk, 'Volodymyr Vynnychenko ta ioho doba')." *Ukrains'ki visti*, Nos. 2, 3 (10, 17 January 1982), pp. 3, 3.
127. Odarchenko, Petro. "Pam'iati prof. P. Fedenka." *Svoboda*, No. 42 (5 March 1982), p. 3. About H. Kostiuk's speech in Washington on January 17, 1982.



128. Vasyliv, Vasył'. "Shche raz pro Vynnychenka." *Nash holos*, No. 5 (May 1982), pp. 93-94. References to H. Kostiuk.
129. Pazuniak, N. "Avtors'kyi vechir Marty Tarnavs'koi." *Svoboda*, No. 98 (27 May 1982), p. 3. Report of H. Kostiuk's speech on M. Tarnavs'ka's poetry.
130. Vasyliv, Vasył'. "Knyha pro Vynnychenka." *Novyi shliakh*, Nos. 23-25 (5-19 June 1982), pp. 2-3, 2-3, 2-3. Review of H. Kostiuk's *Volodymyr Vynnychenko ta ioho doba*.
131. Shnaider, Borys. "Nad druhym tomom Khvyl'ovoho (Sproba lirychnoi retsenzii)." *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, No. 12 (Spring 1982), 90-95. Kostiuk's editorial work on the volume is mentioned.
132. Horbach, Anna-Halia. "Vazhlyvyi vklad u Vynnychenkiiianu." *Suchasnist'*, No. 4-5 (April-May 1982), pp. 209-213. On No. 33 above.
133. Movchan, Iuliian. "Volodymyr Vynnychenko — Hryhorii Kostiuk (Z nahody ikhnikh znamenytykh iuvileiv)." *Novi dni*, Nos. 389-390 (July-August 1982), pp. 21-23.
134. Vasyliv, Vasył'. "Chy potribnyi nam Vynnychenko?" *Ukrains'ke zhyttia*, Nos. 7, 8 (1 July, 1 August 1982), pp. 6, 7. On No. 33 above.
135. Naumovych, Sofiia. "Moskovs'kyi naklep P. Hryhorenka." *Homin Ukrainy* (15 September 1982). Political polemics, with references to Kostiuk.
136. S., I. [Smolii, Ivan]. "Poiavyvsia tretii tom tvoriv M. Khvyl'ovoho." *Narodna volia*, No. 40 (28 October 1982), p. 1.
137. Onyshkevych, Larysa. "Vartisna zbirka." *Svoboda*, Nos. 223, 224 (16, 17 November 1982), pp. 2, 2. On No. 33 above.
138. "V UVAN vidznachyly 80-richchia Hryhoriia Kostiuka." *Narodna volia*, No. 43 (18 November 1982), pp. 1 and 9.
139. Volians'ka, L. "Vlashtuvaly konferentsiiu v chest' H. Kostiuka." *Svoboda* (1 December 1982), pp. 1 and 7.
140. Chub, Dmytro. "Shliakhem nevsypushchoii pratsi (Hryhoriuu Kostiukovi 80 rokiv)." *Novi dni*, No. 394 (December 1982), pp. 13-14.
141. Holubenko, Petro. "Na poli boiiu (Zhyttievyy i tvorchyy shliakh Hryhoriia Kostiuka)." *Novi dni*, Nos. 394, 395.
142. Veretenchenko, Oleksa. "Hryhoriuu Kostiukovi z nahody 80-littia." *Novi dni*, No. 395 (January 1983), p. 2. A poem.
143. Chub, Dm. "Konferentsiia z nahody 80-littia Hryhoriia Kostiuka." *Vil'na dumka*, No. 3-4 (16-23 January 1983), p. 9.
144. "Khvyl'ovyyi — zbroia." *Svoboda* (9 June 1983). On a literary evening in Khvyl'ovyyi's memory; references to Kostiuk's work on the writer's heritage.

145. "Hryhorii Kostiuk. *U sviti idei i obraziv*." *Narodna volia* (25 August 1983), p. 6. An announcement of the publication. See No. 50 above.
146. "Literaturnyi protses za ostannie piatdesiatrichchia v knyzhtsi H. Kostiuka." *Svoboda* (30 August 1983). On No. 50 above.
147. "Nova knyzhka Hryhoriia Kostiuka." *Ukrains'ki visti* (11 September 1983), p. 3. On No. 50 above.
148. Svaroh, Vadym. "Chytaiuchy, rozdumiuchy (Kil'ka dumok pro novu knyzhku H. Kostiuka)." *Ukrains'ki visti* (16 October 1983), p. 4. On No. 50 above.
149. S., I. [Smolii, Ivan]. "U sviti idei i obraziv H. Kostiuka." *Narodna volia* (17 November 1983), p. 9. On No. 50 above.
150. Onyshkevych, Larysa. "U sviti idei i obraziv." *Svoboda* (28 December 1983), p. 2. On No. 50 above.
151. "Pisliaslovo." *Slovo*. Vol. 10. Edmonton: Ukrainian Writers' Association "Slovo," 1983, p. 478. The editors announce that part of the volume is dedicated to Kostiuk's eightieth birthday. The following articles on Kostiuk were published there:
152. Husar-Struk, Danylo. "Khoto takyi Borys Podoliak?", pp. 428-439. On Kostiuk's work written under that pseudonym.
153. Odarchenko, Petro. "Shostyi z'izd ukrains'kykh pys'mennykiv v emigratsii," pp. 440-452. On Kostiuk as the founder of the organization "Slovo."
155. Mirshuk, D. "Knyha pro tvorchist' vidvazhnykh." *Novi dni*, No. 407 (January 1984), pp. 15-18. On No. 50 above.
156. "Vechir 'Slova o polku Ihorevim' v NTSh." *Svoboda* 11 January 1984), p. 3. Devoted mostly to Kostiuk's paper on the work.
157. Hryshko, V. "Bahrianyi i moie 'bahrianiivstvo' v OUN(b)." *Ukrains'ki visti* (22 January, 5 February 1984). The author describes meetings and conversations with Kostiuk.
158. Hrushets'kyi, Dmytro. "Nevhommonyi Kostiuk." *Ukrains'ki visti* (19 February 1984), p. 3.
159. "Iuvileinyi vechir Hryhoriia Kostiuka." *Suchasnist'*, No. 3 (March 1984), pp. 28-29.
160. "Bezsovisni zakydy prof. H. Kostiukovi." *Ukrains'ke zhyttia* (1 March 1984), p. 5. A defense of Kostiuk on a political issue.
161. Maliar, Pavlo. "Do pytannia syntezy ukrains'koho literaturnoho protsesu." *Ukrains'ki visti* (25 March, 1 April 1984), pp. 5, 5. On No. 50 above.
162. "Knyha Hryhoriia Kostiuka: Na magistraliakh doby." *Svoboda* (27 March 1984), pp. 1 and 4.

163. Smerechyns'ka-Shul', Rozha. "Iuvilei Dokii Humennoi." *Ameryka* (10 April 1984). Discusses Kostiuk's lecture on Humenna.
164. "U v-vi Smoloskyp poiavylasia knyha H. Kostiuka: Na magistraliakh doby." *Narodna volia* (12 April 1984), p. 1.
165. Barahura, Mariia. "Zustrich hromadianstva z pys'mennytseiu D. Humennoi." *Svoboda* (12 April 1984), p. 4. Discusses Kostiuk's lecture on Humenna.
166. "Pro knyhu H. Kostiuka: Na magistraliakh doby." *Ukrains'ki visti* (1 July 1984), p. 5.
167. Mirshuk, Danylo. "Na magistraliakh doby (Pro knyzhku stattei Hryhoriia Kostiuka)." *Novi dni*, No. 415 (September 1984), pp. 23-24.
168. Bohdan Podolianko. "Shcho chytaty? (Pro knyzhku H. Kostiuka: Na magistraliakh doby)." *Vil'na dumka* (5 May 1985), p. 6.

### In Other Languages

169. Simonenko, R.G. "Ideologicheskie proiski ukrainskogo burzhuaznogo natsionalizma." *Burzhuaznoe gosudarstvo i ideologicheskaiia bor'ba*. Tallin: Akademiia nauk Estonskoi SSR, 1975, pp. 456-470. A negative appraisal of H. Kostiuk's *Teoriia i diisnist'*.
170. "Ukrainians Protest Papal 'Ostpolitik'." *Soviet Analyst*, Vol. 5, no. 22 (28 October 1976), p. 5. References to H. Kostiuk's *Stalinist Rule in the Ukraine*.
171. Mace, James E. "Hryhorij Kostiuk. Okajanni roky." *Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies*, Fall 1978, pp. 99-100.
172. Tarnawsky, Marta. "Hryhorij Kostiuk. Okajanni roky." *World Literature Today*, Vol. 53, no. 2 (Spring 1979), pp. 318-319.
173. "Your Activities. The International P.E.N. Club Centre for Writers in Exile." *Newsletter*, Spring 1981, p. 3. About H. Kostiuk's recently published works.
174. "Grigory Kostiuk. Les années maudites." *Quatrième Internationale*, April-May-June 1981, pp. 107-116. Translation of excerpts from *Okajanni roky*.
175. Nakai, Kazuo. "Okajanni roky." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 5, no. 3 (September 1981), pp. 404-405.
176. Tarnawsky, Marta. "Hryhorij Kostiuk. Volodymyr Vynnychenko ta joho doba." *World Literature Today*, Vol. 56, no. 2 (Spring 1982), pp. 369-370.

177. Petlowana-Kordiuk, Melanie. "Hryhory Kostiuk. *Volodymyr Vynnychenko i ioho doba: Doslidzhennia, krytyka, polemika.*" *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*. No. 13 (Fall 1982), pp. 99-100.
178. Zyla, Volodymyr T. "Recent Developments of Ukrainian Letters in the United States." *Ethnic Forum: Journal of Ethnic Bibliography*, Vol. 3, No. 1-2 (Fall 1983), p. 556. Mentions Kostiuk.
179. Buyniak, Victor O. "Hryhory Kostiuk: *U sviti idei i obraziv.*" *World Literature Today*, Vol. 58, No. 2 (Spring 1984), p. 295.
180. Shkandrij, Myroslav. "Hryhorij Kostiuk. *U sviti idei i obraziv.*" *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, No. 17 (Winter 1984), pp. 116-118.

# Part II



# Die Literatur des Kiever Höhlenklosters in der ostslavischen Kulturgeschichte

HANS ROTHE

Unter den wenigen Studien zur ukrainischen Literatur in der westlichen Slavistik sind solche zur älteren Literatur des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts besonders selten. In der Sowjetukraine haben sie in den letzten zwanzig Jahren zugenommen; sie betreffen vor allem Bibliographie und Buchkunde. Der 1978 in Zagreb auf das vergangene Jahr nach Kiev einberufene IX. Internationale Slavistenkongress war Anlass, mehrere Studien und Ausgaben vorzubereiten, die eben dieser Zeit gelten. Es handelt sich um folgende Arbeiten des Verfassers:

1. Zur Kiever Literatur in Moskau I (Kirillova kniga, Moskau 1644), in: Studien zur Literatur und Kultur in Osteuropa. Bonner Beiträge zum IX. Internationalen Slavistenkongress in Kiev 1983 (Bausteine zur Geschichte der Literatur bei den Slaven 18), Köln 1983, S. 233-260.
2. Zur Kiever Literatur in Moskau II (Kniga o věřě, Moskau 1648), in: Slavistische Studien zum IX. Internationalen Slavistenkongress in Kiev 1983 (Slavistische Forschungen 40), Köln 1983, S. 417-434.
3. Zur Kiever Literatur in Moskau III (Herasym Smotryč'kyjs Verse, Ostrog 1580), in: Studia Slavica in honorem viri doctissimi Olexa Horbatsch. Teil I: Beiträge zur ostslavischen Philologie (I), München 1983, S. 163-167.
4. Einführung zu: F. Titov, Materijaly dlja istoriji knyžnoji spravy na Ukrajinі v XVI-XVIII vv. (Nachdruck der Ausgabe Kiev 1924). (Bausteine zur Geschichte der Literatur bei den Slaven 16), Köln, Wien 1982, LS. 1-26.
5. Elemente einer Landesbeschreibung in der "Sinopsis", Kiev 1680, in: Landesbeschreibungen in Osteuropa vom 15.-17. Jahrhundert. Vorträge der 2. internationalen Tagung des Komitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zur Förderung der slavischen Studien. Marburg 10.-13. November 1980. (Schriften des Komitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zur Förderung der slavischen Studien, Bd. 5), Köln, Wien 1983, S. 207-237.
6. Die "Sinopsis", Kiev 1680 in ihrem Zusammenhang mit der Kiever Literatur des 17. Jahrhunderts, in: Die Kiever Sinopsis 1681. Facsimile-Nachdruck (Bausteine zur Geschichte der Literatur bei den Slaven 17), Köln, Wien 1984, S. 1-133.
7. Religion und Kultur in den Regionen des russischen Reiches im 18. Jahrhundert (Vorträge der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Geisteswissenschaften Bd. 267), ca. 130 S., Opladen 1984.

Folgende Arbeiten von Mitarbeitern des Slavistischen Seminars in Bonn kommen hinzu:

Von Dr. Hartmut Trunte:

8. Die zweisprachigen Teile des "Prosfonema". Zu Autorschaft und Entstehung des Lemberger Panegyrikos vom 1. Februar 1591, in: Bonner Beiträge (wie Nr. 1), S. 325-351.
9. "Kai ho kosmos auton ouk egnō": Richtigstellung zu Dzendzelivs'kyjs Fund, ib. S. 353-369.
10. Cyrillus Tranquillus Stavrovec'kyj, Perlo Mnohocěnnoje. Teil I: Text auf Grund der Ausgaben in Černihiv 1646 und in Mohylev 1694 (Köln, Wien 1984).—Teil II: Kommentar (in Vorbereitung; erscheint 1985) (Bausteine Bd. 22).

Von Dr. Franz Schäfer:

11. Zur Formenlehre des ostslavischen geistlichen Liedes, in: Bonner Beiträge (wie Nr. 1), S. 267-276.
12. (Zusammen mit M.A. Joachim Bruss): Gedichte und Lieder bei den Ostslaven 1650-1720. Incipitarius. Teil I: Anonyme Texte (im Druck; erscheint Mitte 1984) (Bausteine Bd. 23).

Schliesslich gehören folgende Arbeiten aus den "Bonner Beiträgen" (wie Nr. 1) hierher:

13. Ivan Dujčev, Sofia: Ein bulgarischer Erzbischof als kaiserlicher Gesandter bei Bohdan Chmel'nyc'kyj (Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts), S. 51-61.
14. Stanisław Urbańczyk, Krakau: Uwagi o Polsczyźnie Melecjusza Smotryckiego, S. 371-379.
15. Tadeusz Witczak, Posen: Wileńskie Echo Muzy Czarnoleskiej, S. 381-388.

Aus den zu Nr. 1-7 genannten Studien wurden dem Kongress in Kiev die folgenden zehn Thesen vorgelegt:

1. Gedruckte Literatur und geistesgeschichtliche Bewegungen sind bei den Ostslaven im 17. Jh. eine Folge von Reformation und Gegenreformation in Polen gewesen.

2. Die orthodoxe Synode von Brest 1596/97—die gegen die Brester Unionssynode von 1596 gerichtet war—entwickelte ein Programm für den Buchdruck. Die Anregung dazu kam von Patriarch Meletios Pegas von Alexandrien. Die Ausführung begann Bischof Gedeon Balaban von Lemberg. Vollständig wurde sie im Kiever Höhlenkloster unter den Äbten Jelysej (1616-1624), Zaxarij (1624-1627), Petro (1627-1647) und Innokentij (1656-1683) realisiert.

3. Die Ukrainer, die dieses Programm in Kiev ausführten und es spä-



ter auch in Moskau fortzusetzen versuchten, waren bis zum Ende des 17. Jh.s sämtlich *Westukrainer* (bzw. westliche Nichtslaven). Sie begannen ihren Bildungsgang deshalb alle unmittelbar unter dem Einfluss der polnischen Kultur des 16. und 17. Jh.s. Es war eine literarische Kultur *in* Kiev, aber *ohne* Kiev. Das hielt auch noch im 18. Jh. an. Eine Ausnahme war nur die Klosterhistoriographie in der Ostukraine (Černihiv, Kiev, Hustynja).

4. Die Ausführung des Programms für den Buchdruck erfolgte fast ausschliesslich im Kiever Höhlenkloster. Deshalb kann man von der "Literatur des Kiever Höhlenklosters" sprechen. Sie begann 1616 und reichte bis etwa 1680. Sie ist praktisch identisch mit der ukrainischen Literatur dieser Zeit.

5. Die Beschlüsse von Brest, die den Briefen des Meletios Pegas folgten, sahen vor, kritisch gereinigte und philologisch gesicherte Texte für den Gottesdienst zu schaffen. Sie wurden zur Grundlage der Literatur des Kiever Höhlenklosters. Äusseres Kennzeichen für das Programm sind die Segensformeln auf dem Titelblatt der Bücher. Diese Bücher wurden in ständig verbesserten Auflagen im ganzen Lande nachgedruckt.

6. Abt Petro erweiterte das Programm um die Historiographie. Realisiert wurde diese Erweiterung aber erst unter Abt Innokentij. Dabei spielten die veränderten politischen Bedingungen eine Rolle: nach 1654 gehörte Kiev nicht mehr zu Polen, zondern zu Moskau.

7. Die Kiever "Sinopsis" brachte die ostukrainische Historiographie zum erstenmal zum Druck (1674, 1678, 1680/81). Sie gilt jetzt als welt-historisches Dokument der Vereinigung von Ukrainern und Russen, als "erstes vaterländisches Geschichtsbuch" der ostslavischen Völker (sovjeteische Enzyklopädien). Eine sorgfältige Analyse des Textes in den verschiedenen Auflagen ergibt jedoch, dass die "Sinopsis" vielmehr das Ergebnis des Scheiterns der Politik von Abt Innokentij ist. Dieser wollte zwei Prinzipien verbinden: Loyalität gegen den Moskauer Staat und Autonomie des Höhlenklosters und der Ukraine gegenüber dem Patriarchen in Moskau. Nach 1672 stellte es sich heraus, dass beide Prinzipien unvereinbar waren. Daraufhin wurden die Grundsätze in Form einer historischen Ableitung in der "Sinopsis" dargelegt.

8. Unter den zahlreichen Texten, die nach 1620 aus der Ukraine nach Moskau kamen, nehmen die Einleitungsverse des Herasym Smotryc'kyj zur Ostroger Bibel von 1580 einen besonderen Platz ein. Sie stehen in der Einleitung zur "Kniga o věřě", Moskau 1648, im Vorwort zur Moskauer Bibel von 1663, und sie wurden 1668 von den Altgläubigen übernommen, z.B. von Avraamij, dem sie neuerdings sogar fälschlich zugeschrieben werden. Bei den Altgläubigen spielen sie eine Rolle im 18. Jh. Der reformatorische Grundgehalt wird im Laufe der Entwicklung allmählich verändert.

9. Im Anschluss an die Brester Synoden haben westukrainische apologetische Theologen (z.B. Stefan Zyzanij) seit 1597 die polnische Gegenreformation eschatologisch gedeutet. Sie griffen dabei auf die ältesten griechischen Kirchenväter zurück (Kyrillos von Jerusalem). Die Gedanken wurden 1619 und 1622 von Zaxarij Kopystens'kyj erweitert. Zyzanij's und Kopystens'kyj's Werke und Gedanken erschienen in Moskau 1644 in der "Kirillova Kniga", 1648 in der "Kniga o věřě" und 1663 im Vorwort zur Moskauer Bibel. Aus der eschatologischen Deutung einer Volksgruppe minderen Rechts im polnischen Staat wurde in Moskau eine neue Staatsidee. Dabei wirkte die Idee von "Moskau dem dritten Rom" mit ("četvertomu ne byvat"). Diese Staatsidee wurde ein Element beim Ausbau des petrinschen Staates. Schon vorher war das eschatologische Denken zusammen mit den ukrainischen und Moskauer Texten zu einem festen Bestandteil der radikalen Opposition der russischen Altgläubigen geworden.

10. Die Moskauer Staatsidee enthielt auch die Vorstellung von der regionalen Ausdehnung seiner Gültigkeit. Es handelt sich um die Anfänge der sog. "Slavenidee" bei den Russen. In eingeschränkter Form war sie bei den Kroaten seit dem 13. Jh. bekannt, bei den Tschechen seit dem 14. und bei den Polen seit dem 16. Jh. Das äussere Kennzeichen für die Slavenidee bei den Ostslaven ist der sog. Völkerkatalog. Pamva Berynda (Vorwort zum "Lexikon", 1627) deutet ihn sakral als Bereich der kirchenslavischen Sprache. Das wird in Moskau 1648 in der "Kniga o věřě" wörtlich übernommen und politisch umgedeutet. Kopystens'kyj hat 1622 zuerst einen Katalog der Taufen Russlands aufgestellt. Diesen Katalog erweitert 1635 Silvester Kossov und bezieht dabei Süd- und

Westslaven mit ein. Die "Sinopsis" kombiniert 1674 den Völkerkatalog mit dem Taufkatalog. Dafür zitiert sie wörtlich den polnischen Historiker Strykowski (1582), dass alle Slaven vom slavo-russischen Volk abstammen. Damit ist die Politisierung einer sakralen Idee vorbereitet. Hierin ist der Grund dafür zu sehen, dass Peter I die "Sinopsis" in Petersburg übernahm.

In dem mündlichen Referat wurden die Thesen erläutert. Die Diskussion war nicht sehr ergiebig. Dem Referenten wurde vor allem vorgehalten, dass er den kulturellen Einfluss aus dem Westen, besonders aus Polen überschätze; die Quellen der ukrainischen Kultur lägen nur in Byzanz. Ausserdem habe er die Bedeutung des Höhlenklosters übertrieben. Hinderlich in der Diskussion war geringe Vertrautheit mit der Kirchengeschichte bei einigen Teilnehmern.

Hier sollen noch einmal die vier Zusammenhänge etwas ausführlicher erläutert werden, auf die der Referent besonderen Wert legt. Es scheint, dass sie die Aufmerksamkeit verdienen, die ein Sonderband der "Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.A." über die Grenzen der Ukrainistik und der Ukrainophilie hinaus wohl wecken wird.

# 1

Missverständlich ist wohl wirklich die erste These gewesen, vor allem für jemanden, der gewöhnt ist, historische Entwicklung als Gesetzmässigkeit zu verstehen. Er wird bei dem Wort "Folge" nur an Kausalität denken. Wenn er zusätzlich Geschichte nur materiell versteht, so wird sich ihm der Begriff des Einflusses beinahe unvermeidlich mit der Vorstellung verbinden, dass eine Substanz dorthin importiert wird, wo vorher keine war. Darin steckt jedoch ein Minderwertigkeitskomplex, ein Misstrauen gegen die Substanz einer empfangenden Sprache, mit dem historiographisch nicht weiter zu kommen ist.

Gemeint ist ein natürlicher Vorgang. Es kann nichts ohne Feuchtigkeit und Licht blühen. Aber Sonne und Regen haben, wenn die Pflanze

wächst, ihren Samen nicht erschaffen. Sie bewirken freilich, dass er Wurzeln treibt und zur Blüte und Reife gelangt.

So ist die ungeheure Bewegung, die—von Italien, England, den Rheinlanden und Böhmen ausgehend—Europa seit dem späten 14. Jahrhundert erschütterte, auch die Kraft gewesen, die, über Polen kommand, seit dem ausgehenden 16. Jahrhundert Ukrainer und Weissrussen und seit dem zweiten Drittel des 17. die Moskauer Russen in Bewegung setzte. Was in den beiden ostslavischen Sprachen dann ans Licht kam, war schon im Beginn eigenständig und wuchs eigenständig weiter. Das Wachstum wurde indessen durch die Kraft ausgelöst, die Humanismus und Reformation frei gemacht hatten.

Der Versuch einer russischen Kirchenreform und die daraus folgende Kirchenspaltung, als das wichtigste Ereignis der russischen Kulturgeschichte im 17. Jahrhundert, ist wohl fast ganz das Werk von Männern gewesen, die aus Nižnij Novgorod im Osten des Reiches stammten (Nikon, Avvakum). Aber die Reform wurde nicht ohne die vorhergehende Wirkung der "litauschen Bücher" unternommen, vor denen der Patriarch Filaret (1619-1633), nach seiner langjährigen Internierung in Polen, gewarnt und ihre Ausbreitung im Moskauer Russland verhindert hatte, wenn er konnte (vgl. die Arbeiten Nr. 1 und 6). Es ist müssig zu fragen, was sonst Nikon hätte bewegen können; tatsächlich waren es die Ukrainer und ihre Bücher. Fragt man, wie diese das vermochten, so stösst man auf die Auswirkung von Reformation und Gegenreformation in der polnischen Ukraine.

## 2

Besonders wichtig erscheint die Beobachtung, dass die ukrainische Literatur im 17. Jahrhundert eine auffällige äussere und innere Geschlossenheit verrät. Im Äusseren sind deutlich zwei Wurzeln auszumachen, beide reformatorisch.

Es sind zuerst die ostslavischen Bibelübersetzungen, von Skoryna (1521) über das Evangelium des Mixail Vasylevyč im Kloster Pere-sopnycja in Wolhynien (1556/61) bis zur Ostroger Bibel von 1580. Ein

reformatorisches Motiv kommt in der Einleitung des Mönchs im Kloster Peresopnycja: "... dlja ľepšoho vyrozumlenja ľjudu xrystyanskoho *pospolytoho*..." und im Eröffnungsvers des Widmungsgedichtes von Herasym Smotryč'kyj zur Bibel 1580 zum Ausdruck: "*Vsjakoho čyna pravoslavnyj čytatelju!*" Es ist ein Anruf an das christlich-orthodoxe Volk, Christen *jeden* Standes. Bis ins 18. Jahrhundert wirkt dieser Aufruf dann unter den Russen nach (Arbeit Nr. 2 und 7), besonders bei den russischen Altgläubigen, auch wenn diese den Vokativ nicht mehr verstanden; darin unterscheiden sich moderne russische Kommentatoren nicht von ihnen, da sie die Verse Herasyms für eine originär russische Stil-Leistung halten (Arbeit Nr. 3).

Die zweite Wurzel wuchs aus der ersten, auf der orthodoxen Gegen-synode in Brest 1596/97, die gegen die Brester Unions-Synode von 1596 abgehalten wurde. Der Patriarch Meletios Pegas von Alexandrien (1549-1601) regte in einem Brief an die Synode an, die ukrainische orthodoxe Kirche möge dafür Sorge tragen, dass die wichtigsten Gottesdienstbücher in einer zuverlässigen Form gedruckt würden. Es war ein Programm zum Bücherdruck, das der humanistisch gebildete Patriarch anregte. Sein Vetter Konstantin Lukares (1572—vor 1664), der in Padua studiert hatte und später als kryptocalvinistischer Patriarch von Konstantinopel berühmt wurde, wirkte zuvor einige Jahre in Ostrog, Lemberg und Wilna in Schulen und Druckereien. Der Lemberger orthodoxe Bischof Gedeon Balaban (†1609), nach 1596 der einzig noch verbliebene orthodoxe Kirchenfürst in Polen, begann als Erster, das Programm des Meletios zu verwirklichen. Aber ausgeführt wurde es danach in Kiev von den vier grossen Archimandriten des 17. Jahrhunderts im Höhlenkloster: Jelysej Pleteneč'kyj (1616-1624), Zaxarij Kopystens'kyj (1624-1627), Petro Mohyla (1627-1647) und Innokentij Gizel' (Giesel) (1656-1683). In beharrlicher Arbeit erreichten sie, woran die russische Kirche wenig später zerbrach: die Versorgung der orthodoxen Kirchengemeinden im ganzen Land mit Kirchenbüchern, die nach slavischen und griechischen Quellen von Auflage zu Auflage gereinigt und verbessert wurden (Arbeit Nr. 4).

Zugespitzt ist die vierte These formuliert, denn die Anfänge dieser Bewegung lagen in den Bruderschaften von Lemberg und Wilna sowie

in den Klöstern Derman' bei Ostroh, Dubno, Suprasl', Jevje u.a. mit ihren Druckereien. Und doch ist die These wahr. Diese Anfänge wären wohl fruchtlos versickert, hätte sich nicht das Kiever Höhlenkloster zum wichtigsten Kulturzentrum aller Ostslaven entwickelt. Der Anteil der westlichen Regionen darf freilich auch dabei nicht übersehen werden. Bis hoch ins 17. Jahrhundert waren alle führenden Männer dort, später in Moskau und überall in Russland Westukrainer (Arbeit Nr. 1). Das ist der Sinn der Formulierung 'in Kiev, aber ohne Kiev' (These 3), die in Kiev Befremden erregte. Mit dieser Präzisierung darf man sagen: die ukrainische Literatur des 17. Jahrhunderts war in ihrer Blütezeit zwischen 1616 und 1683 Literatur der Pečers'ka Lavra.

Diese Literatur ist hierarchisch gegliedert. Die tragende Schicht waren biblische und liturgische Bücher. Sie sind auf dem Titelblatt durch die Segensformel des Archimandriten ausgezeichnet (Arbeit Nr. 6). In diese Gattung wird seit Mohyla und besonders unter Giesel die Historiographie aufgenommen, die sich freilich schon seit Pletenec'kyj vorbereitet hatte. Sie ist ganz deutlich als Lokalgeschichte des Höhlenklosters gefasst, das freilich als Inbegriff der orthodoxen Ukraine überhaupt verstanden wurde. Es war Giesels deutlich erkennbare Absicht, die geistliche Autonomie des Höhlenklosters gegenüber dem Moskauer Patriarchen und die Gleichberechtigung der Ukraine (Rus') neben Moskau historiographisch nachzuweisen (Arbeiten Nr. 5 und 6).

Diesem Druckprogramm ordneten die Kiever Äbte die Literatur in allen ihren Gattungen zu, die ebenfalls fest mit dem Höhlenkloster verbunden sind. Auch die Poesie entwickelte sich nur in enger Verbindung mit der biblischen und liturgischen Literatur. Sie löste diese Verbindung erst spät und gab sie an die russische im 18. Jahrhundert weiter, die das Niveau von Kiev erst spät im 18. Jahrhundert erreichte (Arbeit Nr. 7).

## 3

In dieser gut erkennbaren äusseren Geschlossenheit ist zugleich eine innere Einheit zu beobachten. Sie beginnt ebenfalls mit den Auswirkungen von Reformation und Gegenreformation, gelangt in charakteristischer Veränderung in den petrinischen Staat und erreicht in stets

wechselnder Metamorphose den sovjetischen Staat unsrer Tage. Es ist die eschatologische Geschichtsauffassung, die, vom späten Mittelalter ererbt, zu einer treibenden Kraft der deutschen Reformation geworden war.

Eines der ersten Werke, mit denen die theologische Literatur in neuerer Zeit bei den Ostslaven begann, schrieb schon 1596, unmittelbar nach Brest, Stefan Zyzanij (um 1570-1605) in Wilna. Es war eine Übersetzung der sog. 15. Katechese (geschrieben ca. 348) des ersten Patriarchen von Jerusalem Kyrillos († 386). Stefan, der 1591 von dem damals noch orthodoxen Kiever Metropolit Myxajil Rohoza zum "Prediger des Wortes Gottes" ernannt worden war, veröffentlichte seine Übersetzung in polnischer und ukrainischer Sprache unter dem Titel *Kazanje o Antyxrystě y znakax jeho*. Er kommentierte im fortlaufenden Text den Kyrill Satz für Satz und verstärkte dabei dessen noch urchristlich eschatologischen Enthusiasmus. Darüber informiert seit einiger Zeit die Münsteraner Dissertation von Hans Peter Niess.<sup>1</sup> Die gesamte ostslavische orthodoxe Welt war seit dem ausgehenden 15. Jahrhundert in zunehmendem Masse eschatologisch sensibilisiert. Eine deutliche Verstärkung war aber bei den Westukrainern zu beobachten, seit die Gegenreformation nach 1588 ganz Polen rekatholisierte und dabei auch die orthodoxen Ukrainer nicht schonte.

Ein anderer Traktat, *O obrazex*, war 1602 anonym ebenfalls in Wilna erschienen; seine Verfasserschaft ist nicht geklärt. Er betonte gegenüber der römischen Kirche und dem Calvinismus die mystische Kraft der heiligen Bilder als Hauptstücke der orthodoxen Frömmigkeit. Auch dabei ist eschatologische Deutung zu spüren.

Diese beiden Traktate wurden zur Basis des theologischen Denkens bei Ukrainern und Russen im 17. Jahrhundert. Zaxarij Kopystens'kyj übernahm den Bildertraktat 1619 in der sog. *Azaryeva knyha o věřě* und 1622 in seinem Hauptwerk, der ungedruckt gebliebenen *Palinodia*, die die erste, gegen die Gegenreformation gerichtete, Periode der ukrainischen Theologie abschloss und auf alle Werke der folgenden Zeit den

<sup>1</sup> Kirche in Russland zwischen Tradition und Glaube? Eine Untersuchung der Kirillova Kniga o Věřě (Kirche im Osten. Monographienreihe Bd. 13), Göttingen 1977.

allergrössten Einfluss ausübte. Ivan Nasedka übernahm denselben Traktat 1623 in Moskau in seinem *Izloženie na Ljutory*, ebenfalls ungedruckt. Text und Gedanken übernahm er später in sein Ritual (*čin*) für die Aufnahme Andersgläubiger in die russische orthodoxe Kirche, das 1639 in Moskau gedruckt wurde. Von da gelangten sie in die 1644 gedruckte *Kirillova kniga*, die ihren Namen indessen von der 15. Katechese des Kyrillos hat, deren Übersetzung von Stefan den ersten Teil dieses ersten modernen russischen Konfessionsbuches bildet. In Disputationen mit dänischen Lutheranern scheiterten freilich noch im selben Jahr Nasedka und sein Buch (Arbeit No. 1), und fortan wurden Formulierung und Verteidigung der orthodoxen Glaubenswahrheiten in Moskau ganz den Ukrainern und Griechen übertragen (Arbeit Nr. 6). Es wurde bald ein zweites, weniger schwerfälliges Konfessionsbuch gedruckt, die *Kniga o věřě* (1648). Die Zusammenstellung war schon in Kiev erfolgt. Das Buch enthält eschatologische Teile der *Kirillova Kniga*, zusätzlich wesentliche Kapitel aus Kopystens'kyjs *Palinodia* und Teile aus weiteren Traktaten der Brester Zeit vor 1600 (Arbeit Nr. 2).

Zwei Gedanken waren für die Moskauer Konfessionsbücher in Kiev vorgebildet: die Lehre, dass der Papst der Antichrist sei, und die Verbindung von mystischem und juristischem Denken. Besonders diese letzte Denkform wurde wichtig. Sie besagt ursprünglich nichts Anderes als den "Nachweis" der jurisdiktionellen Abhängigkeit des Kiever Höhlenklosters vom konstantinopolitanischen Patriarchen, also die Stauropegie, die mystisch zur unmittelbaren Verbindung mit dem Urchristentum und mit Christus selbst überhöht wurde. Gegen Rom gewendet, enthält sie zugleich doch Spuren römischen Rechtsdenkens (Arbeit Nr. 6). In Wilna und Lemberg konzipiert, in Kiev immer wieder ausgeführt, brachte diese Denkform die Geschichtsdeutung einer in Polen staatsrechtlich benachteiligten Minderheit zum Ausdruck. Sie schöpfte im Bewusstsein ihrer althergebrachten Rechtgläubigkeit und im reformatorischen Blick auf die nahende Endzeit Kraft und Hoffnung.

Beim Übergang nach Moskau veränderte diese Denkform ihre Eigenart entscheidend. Moskau war keine Minderheit in einem andersgläubigen Staat: es war der Staat selbst. Das apologetische Denken der



orthodoxen Ukrainer im polnisch-litauischen Staat veränderte in Moskau in das Staatsdenken.

Zunächst freilich konnte man dort mit der apologetischen mystisch-juristischen Konstruktion aus Kiev nichts anfangen. Wie die *Kirillova Kniga*, so verschwand die *Kniga o věřě*, obwohl ursprünglich als Glaubensbuch für das ganze Reich gedacht, alsbald aus dem Gebrauch der Staatskirche. Aber sie blieben beide nach der Kirchenspaltung bei den Altgläubigen populär, wurden bei ihnen immer wieder abgeschrieben und am Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts auch noch einmal gedruckt (Arbeiten 1-3 und 7). Die Altgläubigen hatten es mit diesen Büchern auch nicht schwer. Sie wendeten die reformatorische Formel "der Papst ist der Antichrist" einfach auf den Patriarchen Nikon, später auf den Zaren Peter an. So blieb die eschatologische Geschichtsdeutung als staatsfeindliche Unterströmung in Russland in weiter Verbreitung stets virulent. Nichts zeigt ihre verborgene Kraft und Bedrohlichkeit deutlicher als die grosse Popularität der Schrift des westukrainischen Patriarchatsverwesers Stefan Javors'kyjs (1658-1722) *Antichristova prišestvija znamenija i skončanie mira* von 1703, die im Laufe des 18. Jahrhunderts in sechs Auflagen erschien, öfter als jedes andere theologische Buch (Arbeit Nr. 7). Aus dieser ursprünglich ukrainischen, dann russischen staatsfeindlichen Unterströmung führten im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert wieder und wieder Eruptionen an die historische Oberfläche.

Doch auch in das offizielle petrinische Staatsdenken gingen die in Kiev vorgeformten Gedanken ein. Das geschah jedoch nicht vor dem endgültigen Anschluss der linksufrigen Ukraine und Kievs an Moskau 1672. Die Vermittlung übernahm diesmal das apologetische Geschichtsbuch des Höhlenklosters, die *Sinopsis* (1674, 1678, 1680, 1681, 1697). Sein anonymen Autor (oder Kompilator) deutete—gewiss mit Billigung des Archimandriten Innokentij—die gesamtostslavische Kirchen- und Staatsgeschichte als allmähliche Enthüllung eines göttlichen Heilsplanes, an dessen Ende in Moskau ein Patriarch an die Stelle des Papstes in der Reihe der fünf Patriarchen trat. Die Fünzfzahl wurde dabei in mystischer Weise mit dem Haupt der Kirche und den fünf Wunden Christi verbunden.

Die *Sinopsis* wurde vom petrinischen Russland übernommen, und

zwar vom Staat, nicht von der Kirche. Peter selbst liess sie in der Akademie drucken, ins Lateinische und Griechische übersetzen und sorgte für ihre allgemeine Verbreitung, die sie mit regelmässigen Nachdrucken bis in die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts behielt; sie wurde zum Volksbuch (Arbeiten 5 und 6). Ihre Gedanken verbanden sich alsbald fest mit der Lehre von Moskau als drittem (und letztem) Rom, die erst vom ausgehenden 17. Jahrhundert an in Russland verbreitet und wirklich populär wurde. Sie spielte ihre Rolle bei der Gründung Sankt-Petersburgs, wie kürzlich Ju. M. Lotman und B. A. Uspenskij nachgewiesen haben,<sup>2</sup> und bei der Deutung der Schlacht von Poltava 1709 (Arbeit 7).

## 4

Noch ein letzter Gedanke schien dem Referenten in Kiev wichtig. Er weist allerdings über die Ukraine zurück nach Polen, wenn er auch in seiner sakralen Form in Kiev konzipiert wurde. Es ist der Slavengedanke.

In ihrer Gesamtheit wurden die Slaven zum erstenmal wohl von Leibniz als Einheit verstanden. Aber zuvor hatte sich der Slavengedanke bei den Slaven selbst schon schrittweise, von Region zu Region wachsend, vorbereitet. Im 13. Jahrhundert erreichten die dalmatinischen Kroaten die Päpstliche Erlaubnis, die Messe slavisch zu lesen, weil sie "nachweisen" konnten, dass der hl. Hieronymus Slave war und die Heilige Schrift ins "Slavische" übersetzt hatte. Im 14. Jahrhundert knüpfte Kaiser Karl IV. daran an, als er in der Prager Neustadt das sog. Slavenkloster stiftete, in dem die Messe slavisch gelesen und glagolitisch geschrieben wurde, wobei der Kaiser anfangs vielleicht auch an katholische Mission unter den Ostslaven gedacht haben mag. Bis dahin waren immer nur ein oder zwei Völker oder besser Regionen mit dem Wort slavisch bezeichnet, und deutlich ist in dem Mythos das sakrale Element vorherrschend.

<sup>2</sup> Otvzuki koncepcii "Moskva tretij Rim" v ideologii Petra pervogo. (K probleme srednevekovoj tradicii v kul'ture barokko), in: Xudožestvennyj jazyk srednevekov'ja, hrg. von V. A. Karpušin, M. 1982, S. 236-249.

Im 15. Jahrhundert entstand dann, in Dalmatien oder Böhmen, die seltsame "Urkunde", in der Alexander der Grosse allen Slaven zwischen Ostsee und Adria (in späteren Fassungen: zwischen Eis- und Kaspischem Meer) ihre Wohnsitze zu dauerndem Besitz verlieh.<sup>3</sup> Es ist das erste Dokument, in dem mit einem Völkerkatalog der Slavengedanke verbunden wurde, der dabei zugleich entsakralisiert wurde. In dieser Form wurde die Slavenidee bald fester Bestandteil der humanistischen Geschichtsschreibung, vor allem bei Tschechen und Polen.

In der polnischen Historiographie des 16. Jahrhunderts wurde die Slavenidee um ein entscheidendes Element erweitert. Etymologische Namensdeutung liess die Slaven als ein Volk des Ruhms (zu *slava*) und Russland als slavisches Urvolk erscheinen, da nämlich Mosoch, der Sohn des biblischen Japhet, als *Heros Eponymos* Moskau gegründet habe und Russland (*rossijane*) von *ros-sejati* abzuleiten sei, der Name also auf den Ursprung der Zerstreuung und Ausbreitung der Slaven in alle Welt von Russland her hinweise. Bei Matthias Strykowski findet sich dieser Gedanke zuerst in seiner Polnischen Chronik (1582). Damit bahnte sich nicht nur eine gesteigerte Mythisierung, sondern auch eine Resakralisierung der Slavenidee an.

Diese Tendenz verstärkte sich in Kiev. Der Völkerkatalog wurde mit einem Taufkatalog verbunden: viermal sei die Rus' getauft worden, und dabei wurden ausser den Russen selbst auch Bulgarien, Mähren und Pannonien aufgezählt. Kopystens'kyj hat, mit starken Übernahmen aus Strykowski, als Erster diesen Taufkatalog 1922 in seiner *Palinodia*. Nach ihm brachte Pamva Berynda 1627 im Vorwort zu seinem Wörterbuch einen Völkerkatalog. Er umfasst freilich nur die orthodoxen Slaven. Aber ihre Volkssprachen werden hier deutlich neben die kirchenslavische Sakralsprache gestellt: um ihnen das allmählich unverständlich werdende Kirchenslavisch zu erhalten, schrieb er ja sein Wörterbuch. Die Volkssprachen sollen an der Sakralität, der Auserwähltheit teilnehmen. Auch hier ist die Verbindung zu den reformatorischen Anfän-

<sup>3</sup> Vgl. Vf., Nochmals zum 'Privilegium Slavicum' Alexanders des Grossen, in: Festschrift für Wilhelm Lettenbauer zum 75. Geburtstag, hrsg. von A. Měštan und F. Weiher, Freiburg i. LBr. 1982, S. 209-221.

gen deutlich: vor 30 Jahren, also 1597, unmittelbar nach Brest, habe er damit begonnen. Beides: der Taufkatalog Kopystens'kyjs und der Völker-/Sprachenkatalog Beryndas wurden in der Moskauer *Kniga o věřě* 1648 übernommen (Arbeit Nr. 2).

In Kiev selbst erschien diese sakralisierte Verbindung zum erstenmal 1635 im Vorwort zu der polnischen Ausgabe des Kiever Paterikons, das Silvester Kosov geschrieben hat. Es wurde 1661 in der ukrainischen Ausgabe übernommen und gelangte von da in die *Sinopsis* (Arbeit Nr. 6). Hier erreichte die Sakralisierung einen Höhepunkt: nicht mehr vier Taufen Russlands wurden genannt, wie bei Kopystens'kyj, sondern fünf, obwohl de facto sieben aufgezählt wurden. Die neu angenommene Fünffzahl stimmt mit der Zahl der Wunden Christi und der Patriarchen überein. Bis auf die Polen werden inzwischen alle slavischen Stämme und Völker als "russisch getauft" gesehen.

Nachdem der Pole Strykowski 1582 in Königsberg zum erstenmal den Gedanken veröffentlicht hatte, dass die Slaven eigentlich alle Russen seien und ein Jahrhundert später der Königsberger Giesel als Archimandrit Innokentij ihn in Kiev übernommen, noch stärker sakralisiert und in den staatsrechtlichen Verhältnissen noch deutlicher auf Moskau bezogen hatte, nahm er mit der *Sinopsis* auch in Russland seinen Weg. In petrinischer Zeit entstand zum erstenmal die Vorstellung von Russland als Führungsmacht der slavischen Welt und als Schutzmacht der Orthodoxie. Die Auswirkungen auf kleinere, aber nicht kleine slavische Völker (Ukrainer und Polen), später auch auf die nichtslavischen Deutschen, begann ebenfalls noch unter Peter.

Seltsam ist in der Geschichte zuweilen die Metamorphose eines Gedankens mit dem Schicksal der Völker verbunden, in denen er zuerst entstand.

# Gogol's *Revizor* and the Ukrainian Dramatic Tradition

IRENE MAKARYK

One of the commonplaces of Gogol studies is the notion that Gogol was influenced by his native Ukrainian dramatic tradition—that is, by *intermediji* or *interljudiji* (short one-act plays staged as a diversion or rest between the acts of another, usually a serious, play); *vertep* (a puppet theatre whose house-like stage was divided into two playing areas, one for serious, religious action, the other for the comic plot); and *komediji* (comedies in the sense of Dante's *Divine Comedy*, and therefore including mystery, miracle and morality plays). Although this commonplace has been explored in relation to Gogol's short stories, no one has systematically examined the link between his plays and Ukrainian drama. The assumption has been, in fact, that Gogol abruptly stopped using Ukrainian sources after *Mirgorod*, although there is much proof, particularly in Gogol's correspondence, of his subsequent interest in Ukrainian culture. An examination of *Revizor* (The Inspector General) suggests that Gogol continued to be deeply influenced by his native drama.

The evidence for such influence on Gogol's early work is irrefutable and widely known; therefore it merits only a brief reminder. Gogol's parents were amateur actors. His father, Vasyl', was also a writer of comedies, and frequently a stage manager at the Kybynci estate, the so-called Ukrainian Athens. The young Ukrainian was therefore steeped in Ukrainian drama and would have noted its influence on his father's creative work. Also, Gogol would have had many opportunities to see the *vertep* staged in the marketplace and other areas of the Poltava region, where it was particularly popular in the late eighteenth and early

nineteenth century. In fact, almost all the *vertep* performances of central Ukraine known to us were recorded in the Poltava region.<sup>1</sup>

As a student in Nižyn, Gogol excelled in the roles of old men and women—the very type of characters that appeared again and again in the *vertep* and *intermediji*, and which he would have imitated so well since he had seen them acted in Ukraine. We also know from the evidence of Gogol's letters to his mother that he intended to stage his father's plays in Petersburg.

During his student days Gogol became a collector of Ukrainian folklore—songs, sayings, anecdotes, historical documents, descriptions of meals, dress, ceremonies, and rites. In his letters he pleads for information about every aspect of Ukrainian life, including, of course, the drama. Direct evidence of Gogol's knowledge of the *vertep* is found in two of his short stories—"Vij" and "Povest' o tom, kak possorilsja Ivan Ivanovič s Ivanom Nikiforovičem" (The Quarrel of Ivan Ivanovich and Ivan Nikiforovich).

Perhaps because of the persistent belief among scholars of Gogol's work that Puškin was godfather to Gogol's *Revizor*, most scholars have not considered the documented fact that Gogol was still drawing from the same Ukrainian literary sources. In his *Peterburgskie zapiski 1836 goda* (Petersburg Notes of the Year 1836), which was written while he was preparing *Revizor* for the stage, Gogol writes of his unhappiness with the contemporary Russian theater and its old neoclassical repertoire. He deplores in particular the vaudevillian and melodramatic traditions that seemed to be firmly rooted on the Russian stage. The primary offense of these traditions, for Gogol, was that they were alien French and German transplants. Quoting a proverb (V gostjax xorošo, a doma lučše—It is good to go visiting but it is better to stay at home), Gogol also makes a plea for native motifs in opera. "What a beautiful opera could be created on the basis of our national motifs! Show me a nation with more songs than ours. Our Ukraine rings with songs."<sup>2</sup> Gogol also

<sup>1</sup> M.S. Hrycaj, *Ukrájin's'ka dramaturhija XVII-XVIII st.* (Kiev: Vyšča škola, 1974), p. 193.

<sup>2</sup> N.V. Gogol, *Sobranie sočinenij*, 6 vols. (Moscow: Xudožestvennaja literatura, 1959), VI, 116. A working translation has been provided by the editor of the volume.

alludes to his preference for a native over a Western European tradition in the two versions of his *Razvjazka Revizora*, in which he mentions three times the ancient depository of the Ukrainian dramatic tradition—the *skomoroxy*.

Another item of evidence should perhaps be taken into account—the contemporary opinions of people like Venger, Bulgarin, and Senkovskij who found *Revizor* more “Little Russian” than Russian. It is, of course, quite likely that these contemporaries conveniently viewed the play as Ukrainian, because Gogol’s social-satire was obviously directed against Russians.

Let us now return to Ukrainian dramatic traditions and Gogol’s debt to them, and examine the question in greater detail. Perhaps the most obvious and enduring influence on Gogol was the *intermediji*, which take their comic tenor from the carnival-like life of the marketplace, the inns, and also from daily life. Doubtless because of their brevity, the *intermediji* maintain unity of place: the setting of the action is either nameless or generalized, hence a universal quality is suggested. Characters, who are derived from a wide social spectrum, are not individuals but types. The *did* and *baba*, the pompous local official, the priest, the shrew, the drunkard, the braggart *šljaxyč*, the father and son, as well as Cossacks, Poles, Greeks, Jews, Byelorussians, and Muscovites are some character types found in the *intermediji*. The plot, sketchy and unimportant, contains no love interest. Comedy arises more from character than from situation. The “virtues” celebrated in the *intermediji* are cleverness and agility in wriggling out of difficult situations, in other words, the survival skills of the picaresque hero. Scenes of brawls, arguments, and a variety of other types of commotion are a comic constant. A moral precept, formulated in a proverb or a maxim, frequently rounds out the play.

Our quick overview of the *intermediji* should suggest, by itself, numerous links between them and *Revizor*. Gogol’s comedy takes place in a nameless town; it is nowhere and everywhere. The exaggerated character types who represent all aspects of society (justice, education, health care, the post office, etc.) are a hyperbolization of the types in the *intermediji*. It is as if Gogol combined the characters of all the *interme-*

*diji* and constructed a broad social panorama with such representative syntheses. The *Gorodničij*, or mayor, and his wife are examples of the *did* and *baba* or *cyhan* and *cyhanka* types. Xlestakov bears some resemblance to the braggart *šljaxyč*. Dobčinskij and Bobčinskij (like Ivan Ivanovič and Ivan Nikiforovič) may have their source in Xoma and Jarema, the two bald, paunchy, inseparable friends who appear in the *skomoroxy* tradition. While anchoring such characters to their traditional roots, Gogol, at the same time, goes beyond their simple, native prototypes to create universal types.

As in the *intermediji*, so in *Revizor* the plot is really quite unimportant. The source of the action lies in the central problem of mistaken identity. There is no love interest; the feelings that Anna Andreevna and her daughter Maria have for Xlestakov are something quite different—a quest for status. In eliminating the love interest, as well as the *raisonneur* figure, Gogol is not necessarily an innovator, as many scholars claim; rather, he is ignoring the conventions of vaudeville and melodrama to follow the tradition of the *intermediji*. Nor is Gogol interested in the hero—he prefers the group portrait, the interaction of its members, and the psychology of the group.

The identity-trickery motif of the play need not have been suggested by Puškin or even by Kvitka-Osnovjanenko's *Priezžij iz stolicy* (A Guest from the Capital) which critics name as the obvious predecessor of the play. The tale of the disguised magistrate is a wandering anecdote that goes back as far as Haroun al Raschid, and was particularly popular in the early nineteenth century in Ukraine and Russia. Gogol himself posed as an inspector general to avoid long waits for horses at changing stations.<sup>3</sup> In addition, Gogol may have remembered aspects of the identity-trickery motif from his native drama. The *intermedija* of Klymko and Stec'ko (from Jakub Gawatowicz's *Tragaedia, albo wizerunk smierci przeświętego Jana Chrzciciela, przesłańca Bożego*—A Tragedy, or a Spectacle of the Death of John the Baptist, God's Messenger—1619), deals with a clever braggart, Klymko, who tricks the gullible Stec'ko into giving him money by making him believe that he has skills

<sup>3</sup> V.I. Šenrok, *Materialy dlja biografii Gogolja*, 4 vols. (Moscow: n.p., 1893), II, 362-67.



which he really does not possess. Klymko leaves, only to reappear in a flimsy disguise in which he once again fools Stec'ko, this time causing the victim to smash his own clay pots.

This victim-sharper relationship is modified in *Revizor*: initially Xlestakov does not intentionally deceive the other characters. The effect, however, is the same. The townspeople take him to be more than he really is, and are duped of their money in the process. In trying to hide their small sins, they commit even larger ones until, at the conclusion, they, like Stec'ko, have exposed their own stupidity and greed.

The victim-sharper relationship, which begins with Xlestakov, has a domino effect—the further we proceed into the play, the more examples of dishonesty we discover. Every character in the play at some point reveals this same trait—a trait found in all of the *intermediji*—survival through deceit. What is perhaps lacking in Gogol's characters is the witty, picaresque cunning that the sharpeners of the *intermediji* display. The mayor, is, of course, the obvious case; he wants something from everyone; yet he also cannot help his rapacious nature. Xlestakov's servant Osip is perhaps the least complex of the tricksters, and also the one who most resembles Klymko and other clever *intermedija* types. Intent on obtaining good food and lodging, Osip willingly resorts to braggadocio and outright lying to obtain them.

The hungry character who is sometimes able to obtain food through cunning is frequently found in the *intermediji*. In an *intermedija* for three people (also from Gawatowicz), Denys, Maksym, and Hryc'ko have a contest for the prize of a single dumpling; the winner will be the man with the best dream. In his poetic rendering of his dream of the luxuries of heaven, Maksym approaches Xlestakov's inspired exaggerations of life in Petersburg. After describing the golden palace, the walls surrounded by precious stones, the saints and angels, Maksym dwells on the enormous quantity and quality of heavenly food. Likewise Xlestakov, after discoursing on his supposed social contacts, falls into raptures when he talks of the magnificent food of the capital, an example of which is an enormous melon costing 700 rubles.

Food and the inability to obtain it because of lack of money is one of the recurring problems of characters in the *intermediji*. Xlestakov,

too, suffers from hunger in the early part of the play, when, penniless as a result of his high living, he is unable to pay for his meals. When the innkeeper relents and sends a servant with a second-rate meal to him, Xlestakov exclaims: "What kind of soup is this? You simply poured [hot] water into the cup: it has absolutely no taste; it does nothing but stink."<sup>4</sup> Between bites, Xlestakov threatens the servant and calls out deprecations and accusations. This scene is reminiscent of an *intermedija* from Heorhij Konys'kyj's *Voskresenye mertvyx* (The Resurrection of the Dead, 1743), in which a hungry gypsy is angered by his wife's cooking. Her borscht, more like a crab than a beet soup, sets off a barrage of verbal abuse. The wife, however, has the last word: she beats her husband for his laziness, the cause of their meager living.

Comic arguments, ubiquitous in the *intermediji*, also appear in *Revizor*. While many of the characters snipe at each other throughout the play, the most argumentative character is Anna Andreevna, the typical shrewish wife who attempts, usually successfully, to override her husband's opinions. Anna Andreevna also quarrels with her daughter; this can be regarded as a parallel to the usual father-son arguments and rivalry of the *intermediji*.

Besides such situational farcical elements, one of the main sources of humor in the *intermediji* is purely verbal: malapropisms, comic asides, misinterpretations, clichés, non-sequiturs, foreign accents, speech defects, attempts by lower-class characters to imitate upper-class language, etc. Many similar devices are found in *Revizor*. The mayor, for example, attempting to match the court manner he thinks Xlestakov is used to, tries to call the young man by a more glorified title, but begins stammering and cannot get beyond a single syllable. Such affectation is also found in the malapropisms of Osip, who refers to a theater as a "keatr" and a *prospekt* as a "prošpekt" (Act II.i.). Verbal misunderstanding is comically utilized in Act II, scene viii, where Xlestakov, certain that he is being sent to prison for incurring debts at the inn, interprets the

<sup>4</sup> *Revizor*, (*Sobranie sočinenij*, IV, Act II, scene vi.) All subsequent references to acts and scenes will be found in the body of the article. Working translations of quotations, some based on the standard English translations of the play, have been provided by the author and the editor of the volume.

mayor's idea that "he move to another place" as a metaphorical manner of suggesting that he go to prison. The comic asides by the citizens in Act V, particularly by Korobkin's wife, provide a good example of mishearing. Korobkina first fawningly greets the mayor, and then whispers, "May the devil take you!" The mayor, who misses her second remark, replies with the ironically appropriate, "I humbly thank you! And wish you the same!" (V.vii).

In addition to such motifs and sources of humor, certain structural features of *intermediji* and *vertep* have been retained by Gogol. In most interludes involving trickery, such as the Klymko-Stec'ko *intermedija*, only two people appear on the stage—the victim and the trickster. Gogol seems to follow this pattern in Act IV of *Revizor*, which appears to be a departure from his previous more populated scenes. Throughout Act IV, Xlestakov meets one on one with various characters who offer him money. Emboldened, Xlestakov himself begins to demand money from the citizens, and the sum comically rises from 200 to 1,000 rubles within the space of a few short, fast-paced scenes. The dynamics of these scenes are also like those of the *intermediji*, for the victims willingly give up their money, believing that the trickster has done them a favor. But the most important structural aspect is the overall construction of *Revizor*. The essential feature of both the *intermediji* and the *vertep* is the fact that the comic action takes place between acts which in themselves are serious. The overriding structure of *Revizor* is that of a comic-satiric interlude played between two serious actions—the reading in Act I of the letter which announces the imminent appearance of the inspector general, and, in Act V, the sudden, shocking news of the arrival and summons of the real inspector. The action between these two events constitutes the greater part of Gogol's comedy, but not necessarily the most significant. The crucial climax of the play is probably the moment of silence which follows the gendarme's announcement: one can go so far as to say that the real play begins after the curtain falls at the end of the last act.

Gogol's five acts of *Revizor* can give us a clue to the meaning of the play. We know from his articles that he disliked the neoclassical tradition; yet curiously *Revizor* is constructed according to neoclassical

rules—five acts which generally adhere to the three unities. Gogol, however, likes playing with reversal of situation. In his short stories, for example, he will refer to a treacherous person as a “good friend”, meaning, of course, the opposite. It is characteristic of Gogol to use a structure only to make fun of it. Perhaps this is what he intends by the pseudo-classical nature of the play which, in the end, is revealed to be nothing but dross—the real play comes after the curtain falls. The formal structure may, then, be a type of Gogolian joke, a way of disparaging the very canons followed by his contemporary Russian dramaturgy which he disliked so much.

Not only the comic but also the serious aspects of *Revizor* can have their roots in Ukrainian drama. The serious action is implied throughout the play. From the beginning of *Revizor*, sinister overtones act as a counterpoint to comic scenes. For the citizens, and, in particular, the mayor, the source of terror in the first act lies in the *incognito* status of the inspector and his accompanying “secret orders.” Gogol, of course, deliberately chose not to bring the real *revizor* on stage. Had he done so, he would have diminished the inspector’s allegorical and terrifying role. Instead, the appearance of the gendarme, the inspector’s agent, maintains the feeling of awe and uneasiness at the very end of the play, by keeping the *revizor* an unknown quantity beyond the last curtain. Furthermore, the gendarme’s appearance adds to sinister, even supernatural implications connected with the real inspector. Unlisted in the *dramatis personae*, the gendarme comes as a surprise to both audience and characters. And his very occupation should arouse everyone into an awareness of imminent arrest and punishment.

The mysterious, unnamed figure of the real *revizor* bears a distant resemblance to three supernatural figures from native Ukrainian drama—Death, the Devil, and God. First of all, the *revizor* is similar to the allegorical figure of Death which appears in such plays as the interlude *Smert' i vojîn* (Death and the Warrior), from Konys'kyj's drama *Voskresenye mertvyx*. This death-like aspect of the *revizor* is alluded to throughout the play. When Luka Lukič asks about the specific reasons of the *revizor's* visit, the mayor responds with a turn of phrase that could very well refer to the visitation of death: “Why indeed! It is fate, I

suppose! (Sighing.) Until now, thank God, they sneaked up on other towns; now our time has come" (Li). Later, still terrified by the idea of the nameless inspector, the mayor remarks, "I have got that cursed *incognito* on the brain. I expect the door to be opened, and all of a sudden . . ." (I.ii). At this point, the door indeed opens, but only on Bobčinskij and Dobčinskij, who announce that they have found the inspector. This comical turn, however, assumes an undertone of grimness when we regard it as a parody of the arrival of the true inspector as a figure of death. Gogol makes this clear in the much-maligned "resolution" to the play, in which he writes of the inspector as standing at the door to the grave at the time of the final reckoning. The suggestion, then, is that the *incognito* inspector represents the figure of retribution: his arrival is the day of Reckoning, or the Day of Judgment, when all will be called and, it seems from the action of Gogol's play, all will be found comically lacking.

The *revizor* also seems to have some connection with the devil, particularly through Xlestakov, who appears to be his unwitting and playful agent. In traditional Ukrainian drama, the ubiquitous devil tries to raise havoc in human affairs, but often dwindles into a comic figure because of his very human vices. Similarly, Xlestakov is the cause of the town's upheaval, but his youth and his apparent willingness to accept the people's bribes and hospitality diminishes his potentially terrifying effect. The mayor, upon hearing of Xlestakov's approximate age, sighs in relief that he is not an "old devil" (I.iii), otherwise there would be greater problems. Numerous references to the devil occur in the speeches of Osip, especially in connection with the temptations of carefree life in Petersburg. Both Osip and Xlestakov often exclaim to each other, "May the devil be with you." Meeting alone with Xlestakov, the judge fearfully notes that he feels a certain heat beneath him ("Oh, my God! Where am I sitting? It seems that there are hot embers under me" (IV.iii). Toward the end of the play, particularly in the mayor's grand vision of himself as a general in Petersburg, references to the devil abound. It becomes obvious that allusions to the devil are appropriately linked to scenes of greed, pleasure, and self-aggrandizement.

But, as a figure of retribution, the *revizor* is also reminiscent of God.

Here, Gogol may have been thinking of the body of Konys'kyj's play *Voskresenye mertvyx*, the *intermediji* of which—with the warrior and death, the gypsy and his wife—were mentioned above. The central theme of *Voskresenye*—judgment and justice in the next world—is underlined by the Prologue, and by the priest in Act I, who also speaks of the importance of thinking about one's end; those who do not, are blind and stupid. In the course of the play, the two main characters, Hipomen and Dioktyt, are respectively rewarded and punished after death for their deeds on earth.

Gogol seems to be alluding to such themes of judgment, sin, reward and punishment throughout his play. The mayor, in fear of the *revizor*, talks about the citizens' "little sins" and calls the characters "sinners" three times within the first few pages of the play. Once the supposed inspector general has arrived, the mayor makes reference to vague future rewards: "Well, here is an example: you don't sleep nights, you work for your country, not sparing yourself, and as for your reward—who knows when it will come" (II.viii). He makes similar comments in III.v, in which the unseen, distant *načal'stvo* (the authorities) is like a god that needs to be appeased.

In the early part of the play (Act I), the authorities are personified as a godlike, distant, inscrutable force. Their representative, the inspector, will peer into everything and everywhere—nothing will escape him. This image of the all-seeing, all-powerful inspector recalls allegorical figures like *Vsemohučaja syła* (All-powerful Strength) which appears in the morality play *Carstvo natury ludskoj* (The Kingdom of Human Nature, 1701) and claims to be able to understand all, see all, and know all.<sup>5</sup> The mayor himself is a type of minor "inspector" with similar skills: "Now look here. You! You! I know you well: you become chummy with people and put their silver spoons in the leggings of your boots. Watch out, I have a sharp ear. *Better start respecting my rank!* Get out of here!" (I.iv). The shadow of the *revizor* seems to spawn its doubles—mutual

<sup>5</sup> O.I. Bilec'kyj, ed., *Xrestomatija davn'oji ukrajins'koji literatury* (Kiev: Radjans'ka škola, 1967), Act I, scene ii, p. 268. All Ukrainian plays referred to in this article can be found in this anthology.

inspections, and often mutual exposures—as we see particularly in the last part of the play, when the characters betray each other to Xlestakov.

Gogol's play also contains parallels to the anonymous *Slovo o zburanju pekla* (The Word on The Harrowing of Hell), written in the beginning of the seventeenth century, which deals with Lucifer's terror before the approach of Christ. Xlestakov, in representing a power greater than himself, has certain affinities to Christ, while the mayor is like Lucifer, who lords it over his subjects, both saints and sinners. Like Lucifer, the mayor has a very strong drive for power and self-aggrandizement, and spends a lot of time telling Xlestakov about his many talents, but omits mentioning all the petty crimes that he condones and even encourages as the normal way of life. It is curious that in bragging about himself, the mayor expresses himself quite oddly: "But I, I—apart from my duty, I wish every mortal to be treated well" (II.viii). The word "mortal," although it can be read as a simple colloquialism, does acquire sinister overtones in the context that we are discussing here. In *Slovo o zburanju pekla*, Christ appears on stage only in the last few minutes of the play and throughout *Slovo*, Lucifer, who thinks that he is acquainted with all the angels and with all earthly beings, cannot understand who Christ is. He is troubled by what appears to be Christ's *incognito* identity. The mayor, of course, finds himself in a similar situation. The level of tension in both plays is similar (and in both cases is relieved by comedy), and is connected with the anticipated arrival of an all-powerful being.

Other passages that allow us to read *Revizor* as merely an interlude, or (perhaps more accurately) as a prelude to another, more serious play concerned with the theme of ultimate judgment, have to do with faith; such references, at first, seem to have no connection with the comic plot. We discover in Act I, scene i, that the judge is a skeptic, and that the mayor, who attends Mass regularly, is really not a true believer at all; in fact, he seems to have been responsible for misappropriating funds intended for the construction of a new church. In the scene of Xlestakov's betrothal (IV.xv), the mayor, feeling guilty and out of his depth in the new circumstances, remarks: "Oh, God! I am not guilty—my body and my soul are innocent. God bless you, but I am still not

guilty." Perhaps the most obvious example of moral overtones occurs in the last act, when the Postmaster tries to explain how he came to open Xlestakov's letter. "In one ear I hear: 'Oh, don't open it! You'll perish like a chicken.' And a voice like some devil's whispers into my other ear: 'Open it! Open it! Open it!'" (V.viii). In this parody of the *psychomachia*, the grand struggle between good and evil is reduced to a comical conversation with one's conscience, in which curiosity, allied with the devil, easily wins out.

With the aid of such numerous details, at first apparently unrelated, we can form a hypothesis about Gogol's grave intent. His serious concern with the theme of judgment—a theme which encompasses both characters and audience—slowly becomes apparent. It is embodied in the mayor's question, directed at us all: "Why are you laughing? You are laughing at yourselves!" (V.viii).

In *Revizor*, Gogol is content to allude to the serious implications of the action—allusions which hint at (but do not completely undermine) the comic tone of the play. In the *Razvjazka*, written many years later, Gogol implies his growing interest in the moral effect of laughter, and therefore in the didactic role of drama. In referring to drama as a "living lesson" for the masses, and in his moral view of the human comedy, Gogol seems to be pursuing the traditions of his native—especially religious—Ukrainian drama. And it may not be incidental that Gogol, in his stage directions for *Revizor*, calls for the mayor to stand in the center of the frozen last scene, his head and arms thrown back—a position suggesting a parody of the crucifix.

To sum up, we believe that the Ukrainian native dramatic tradition suggested to Gogol motifs, themes, a general structure, and comic devices for his play. We are prepared to assert, moreover, that this tradition may well have influenced the direction of his comic vision—towards comedy which is hyperbolic, sometimes grotesque, moral in effect, based on a combination of character and situation, gay and yet possessed of a certain melancholy. We think that Gogol's celebrated melancholy stems from the essence of this comic vision—a view of the ubiquitousness of vice and vanity. In *Revizor* Gogol maintains the balance between the comical, the satirical, and the morally serious. He



develops in this play his early preoccupation with the intrusion of evil forces into human life, and reveals man's immeasurable vanity and stupidity. He looks at human life more closely and more thoughtfully than he did in his early works, hoping to scourge its folly with the chastisement of laughter.



# Images of Center and Periphery in the Poetry of Taras Ševčenko

BOHDAN RUBCHAK

I shall examine in this article various selected images and implications of *periphery* in Ševčenko's poetical texts. This should lead me to a redefinition and, hopefully, a re-vision, of the notion of centrality *in* that poetry and the centrality *of* that poetry as a literary-historical fact. I shall use as my point of origin the image *popid tynom* (under-the-fence), frequently also expressed by the dialectal *popid tynniu* which (to my ear at least) implies a state of being under-the-fence—a kind of “under-the-fenceness.”<sup>1</sup>

But before I approach the particulars of Ševčenko's poetry, I should like to turn briefly to the state of periphery (“under-the-fenceness”) of literature in general and of Ukrainian literature in particular. I shall attempt to show that the causes of the state of periphery of literature as such are quite different from (one may even say—opposite to) the causes of the peripheral state of Ukrainian literature as a national literature.

## 1

The literary theorist Wolfgang Iser turns to the currently popular Theory of General Systems (upon modifying it in the phenomenological

<sup>1</sup> We should keep in mind that this image, like much else in Ševčenko, does not originate with him. We find it, for instance, in Amvrosij Metlyns'kyj's strange little ballad “Syrityka” (The Orphan), written before 1839. Its heroine moves from the humble situation of *popid tynom* into a state of miraculous metaphysical centrality. Ševčenko, like Shakespeare, borrowed many forgettable topical effects from his predecessors and contemporaries, and proceeded to render them unforgettable.

direction), in order to explain the relationship between the literary text and its reader as a social unit.

Individual social phenomena, as integral parts of temporal social processes, arrange themselves (or are arranged by such processes) into systems. Such systems, in their turn, "represent" or reflect reality as an ordered or structured social process, from a social point of view. In other words, such systems, engendered by the force of social processes (that is, by "life" as we use the term in daily discourse), structure or sort phenomena into hierarchical layerings on the basis of the social value of a given phenomenon for a given historical period, or for a given social class or group. Phenomena that are less significant to a social situation are relegated by such structuration to the peripheral margin, or they are suppressed altogether. The purpose of such rigorous selectivity is to order and control the hopes of an individual as a social unit, and to minimize the element of contingency in his daily life.

A literary text, by its own "system" (in this case, by its thematic as well as formal structure which obviously blend into one another), opposes the central social systems, although it is evidently also engendered by them and depends upon them. Such dialectical state of origin-and-opposition is the result of the fact that the system of a literary text is structured with those components of human experience, including the functions of language, which the central social systems either relegate to their own peripheral margins or reject altogether. It is with such demoted or suppressed components that the literary text restructures social reality according to its own *aesthetic order*.

It follows that the literary text "confounds" our daily hopes and expectations, deviating them from the dependable tracks of social causality and hence denying them the daily security implied for us by social systems: *vis-à-vis* a literary text, our hopes and expectations become "disordered," puzzling, *symbolic*. To put it another way, the system of the literary work provokes in us a *unique* set of hopes—much less calculated, much foggier and yet much more profound and much more urgent than our expectations of rewards or our fears of failure in our daily social relations, structured as these are by central social systems. The literary work, more precisely, re-sorts and encodes single compo-

nents of our social reality in such a manner that it becomes a sort of frame or, better yet, an intricate receptacle for the reader's own deep and confused hopes, marginal as they are to social processes. The reader "places" them into the literary work, raw and "unconditioned," rather than reads them off from the surface of the structure, as he does in the case of central social systems.<sup>2</sup>

By their very uniqueness—by the very fact that they are *our* personal, often semiconscious, hopes and expectations—they bypass the specific social conditioning inherent in the functions of social systems, thus becoming collective and more or less universally human on the widest psychological level. This is obvious in the case of a lyrical poem but is also true for a novel or a play.

It has become a truism that a literary work, from its distanced, peripheral situation with regard to central social systems, can tell us more profound, ultimately more important truths about those very social and historical processes than other discourses which may seem more "immediate" but in fact are generalized toward specific social purposes. (Such generalizations, incidentally, may either be open, as in law, or underhanded, as in political propaganda or commercial advertising.) Here is a rather obvious example: the ordinary, apparently uneventful life of a woman unhappy in her mundane situation, embodied in metaphorical language (a language in itself *apparently* useless for social analysis), has told us much that is crucially important about the society of a given period in Russia, France, England, Norway, or the United States, in the works of Tolstoy, Flaubert, Hardy, Ibsen, or Dreiser. A much more dramatic example of such "truth-telling" or "verisimilitude" would be Joyce's prose or Mallarmé's poetry, but the complexities of such a discussion would take me too far afield.

Even my rudimentary and obvious example implies that the system of a literary work, in the process of selecting and re-sorting social priorities, frequently (especially since the eighteenth century) turns to those social systems which in and by themselves are constructed from "devalued" social components, and therefore become peripheral with regard

<sup>2</sup> Wolfgang Iser, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), pp. 70-85 *et passim*.

to the central systems of a given society. Literature attempts to find a "kindred spirit" on the social periphery. I have in mind the social systems of marginal groups—minorities, the street, the ghetto, the village, the artist, the criminal, the gypsy, etc. One reason is that such peripheral social systems better illuminate (or less efficiently mask) the naked existence of the individual. This frequently obtains even in works which seemingly treat segments of central social systems. In *War and Peace*, for example, Tolstoy employed the glittering center of the Russian Empire *eccentrically*, as a kind of peripheral frame for the purpose of a profound artistic probing into social phenomena which "in life" were situated on the periphery of the central structures of the Russian society of his time, but which the novelist nevertheless regarded as central.

Needless to say, peripheral social structures frequently oppose their own centers, although they are engendered by the latter. Obvious examples are strikes, protests, or more dramatically, political dissent, or even revolution; a particularly relevant example would be the romantic conflict between the artist and the bourgeois. Literature is concerned with such social phenomena because by the very structure of its system it constantly attempts to orient the social periphery centrally, thus in itself becoming, in a certain sense, "revolutionary." The most obvious difference between the procedures of the systems of marginal social groups and the systems of literary works consists in that the marginal social systems, with the implied or overt resistance built into their "otherness," are constructed causally, according to a social, rather than an aesthetic, project. It follows that they attempt to reconstruct *systematically* their corresponding central social systems, according to predetermined social structural laws, generated by, and in their turn generating, patterned and generalized social hopes and expectations of their respective collectives. One may conclude that in this sense literature is much more heedless and anarchical than the social periphery.

Let me now touch upon one more theoretical moment which bears upon my subsequent discussion. Literary works as such become components of a system which embodies a "national literature." Literary works written in a national language express (even through the various codes embedded within the very language) the common past, the common

hopes, and the common destiny of a people. These synthesize, in one sense, the profoundly psychological hopes and expectations with which a single reader invests a single work. National literatures, on a higher level, combine into ever larger systems (international genres, thematic strains, etc.), until the image of a "system of systems" of literature as such emerges.<sup>3</sup>

When the synchronic "system of systems" which is a literature, or a single system within it, begins to move in time, we have a system of literary history. The relationship between central and peripheral social systems—their constant struggle for the center as the fulfillment of the particular hopes and expectations of their respective collectives—may be applied, within the system of literary history, to the so-called law of mutation of genres and forms. Viktor Šklovskij, Mixail Baxtin, Claudio Guillén, together with numerous other Western and Russian formalists and structuralists, have shown how, within a given literary-historical system, peripheral genres and forms conquer the overripe, decaying center and take its place.<sup>4</sup> As we see it particularly convincingly in Baxtin, young peripheral genres which attain centrality frequently originate in marginal social groups and their peripheral social systems: Baxtin shows, for example, how oral traditions of the anonymous and collective "folk" literature of disadvantaged groups forced out the established classical genres and replaced them, crystallizing into the centrally reigning genre of the novel.

Finally, let me mention another interesting aspect of this question. Literature, as a peripheral system with regard to central social systems, in itself can aspire to social centrality either indirectly or by pretending that it is a basic component of a given central social system. Such cooperation of literature into a system ordered according to social hopes and

<sup>3</sup> Among the many theorists who have outlined such a "system of systems" of literature is Northrop Frye. See his *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), pp. 16-18, 352-354 *et passim*.

<sup>4</sup> See Šklovskij, "Sviaz' priemov stixosloženija s obščimi priemami stilja," *Poëtica: Sborniki po teroii poëtičeskogo jazyka* (Petrograd, 1919); Baxtin, "From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse," *The Dialogic Imagination*, Michael Holquist, trans. (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1981), pp. 40-83; Guillén, "Genre and Countergenre," *Literature as System: Essays Toward the Theory of Literary History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971), pp. 135-158.

expectations frequently occurs when that central social system suffers a crisis and must be ideologically resuscitated, as for example in totalitarian systems, revolutions, émigré groups (whose own social systems are hopelessly threatened by the normal, and therefore normative, systems of the host society), or enslaved nations, whose own social systems are either incorporated in the new central systems of the occupier or liquidated by him altogether. In any case, such a suspended state does not allow for the socially mediated hopes and expectations of the collective and thus causes a frightening abyss at its center. That abyss demands immediate impletion by other systems—even if they are most distantly peripheral under normal circumstances—such as the aesthetic systems of literary works. In that case, the specific responses of literary works to individual hopes and expectations, encoded in their intransitive metaphorical language, tend to be falsified by the pretense that they are generated by discourses belonging to other systems.

## 2

Literature as a peripheral system with regard to social systems; literature as a system of the systems of national literatures which in themselves are systems of individual works; the fact that in certain social conditions the peripheral system of a national literature can pretend to substitute for a corresponding central social system; peripheral social systems in which literature is particularly interested; within the system of literary history itself, peripheral genres and forms (frequently cultivated by peripheral social groups) which in time become central—all these questions become immediately relevant to my present reading of Ševčenko's poetry. Although I am unable in the space of this article to methodically examine each of these questions as it applies to Ševčenko, all of them should be obviously implicit in my subsequent remarks. This holds particularly true of the peripheral situation of literature as such.

Tolstoy, in *Anna Karenina*, removes his point of view from the central systems of the Russian Empire, in order to construct the aesthetic system of his novel around the metaphor of the "insignificant" life of a woman. Only from that significant and signifying distance he can afford



to examine, obliquely and symbolically, certain components of those central systems. In Ševčenko's poems, as for example in "Kateryna," such a line of departure may seem more direct, but in fact its course is much more complex and interesting. Even before Ševčenko could approach the task of the re-evaluation and reconstruction of the central social systems of his time in the peripheral systems of his poems, he was forced by circumstance to assume a specific *social* attitude toward those central systems of the Empire.

To begin with, Ševčenko decided to move across several peripheral zones of the social underground within the Empire. I mean not only the periphery of Ukrainian society as such with regard to the "Imperial Otherness," but those systems which were peripheral to Ukrainian society itself—a society rigidly structured *within* its own system, and hence rejecting serfs, unwed mothers, *kobzars*, *hajdamaks*, rebels, bastards, homeless wanderers, convicts, and other "undesirables" who subsequently found a warm welcome in the symbolic spaces of Ševčenko's poems. Aside from the fact that literature as such frequently turns to similar marginal types, Ševčenko had a more specific and political reason for his predilection. According to him (see, for example, "Poslanije" [The Epistle]) the Ukrainian centers, peripheral as they themselves were within the Empire, feverishly desired to be swallowed up by the "Imperial Otherness," submitting to its all-pervasive influence in acts of shameful flunkeyism. Ševčenko, therefore, saw such centers of Ukrainian society as impotent pseudo-centers; he went searching for the authentic centers of his people on the farthest and the least expected social periphery, where they presumably lay buried. It seems that those whom the Russian and even the Ukrainian pseudo-centers did not trust now became the only ones to be trusted.

Within the system of literary history, we again see Ševčenko crossing a double periphery. The poet decided to traverse the various peripheral genres, forms, modes, devices and, most important, the language not only of Ukrainian national literature—peripheral as that was within the larger literary system of the Empire—but those phases of Ukrainian literature which were peripheral to its own either Baroque-bookish or "travestied" centers. I mean, of course, the periphery of the "lowly" oral

or "folk" literature, on which writers (and by no means exclusively Ukrainian writers!) made frequent night raids, but whose existence as a visible, let alone viable, cultural area they would never admit. It was only immediately before Ševčenko's own zenith that some Ukrainians began to ask, in timorous Russian, whether or not the uncouth language of peasants was indeed developed sufficiently enough to express "deep sentiments," or whether it should remain a vehicle of crude and jolly country-gentry humor.<sup>5</sup>

Needless to say, Ševčenko crossed the two *double* peripheries—the social and the literary—in a single, totally unexpected, and socially unmotivated bound, without bothering to ask anybody's permission to do it: he saw no need to explain in long dissertations the right of his literature to be called a literature, and the right of his language to "languagehood." I shall now concentrate on some instances of Ševčenko's specific manner of crossing these peripheral zones, constantly holding in the periphery of my vision the periphery of literary systems as such, with regard to the social (including the intellectual) systems of his age.

Let me begin with some obvious examples. All of us recall Ševčenko's contrast between *xata* (the peasant house, the hut) and *palaty* (the palaces), to which the poet turns time and again, in various contexts in his poems. In the social sense, the "micro-structure" of such images is meant to embody and symbolically illuminate the peripheral situation of the serf with regard to the Ukrainian center, hypnotized as the latter was by the center of the Empire. It is supposed to show, in the literary sense, how Ševčenko restructures peripheral social systems within the aesthetic systems of his works. We recall that a literary work is in itself a socially peripheral system, and Ševčenko's literary work has the specific peripheral elements of "folk" language and "folk" literature.

Although in such clusters of images, as a rule, the palaces of the landlord are physically distanced from the village, with its centrally located village green, as if they were on its periphery (as they were in actuality)—in the social and even the psychological sense they do

<sup>5</sup> For example, Petro Hulak-Artemovs'kyj's doubts are described in George S.N. Luckyj, *Between Gogol' and Shevchenko: Polarity in the Literary Ukraine: 1798-1847* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1971), p. 45.

represent the center. They are, as it were, miniature replicas of the magnificent “center of centers” in distant Petersburg, out of which presumably flow just governance, economic strength, religious authority, and (most important for us) cultural energy over the huge uncultured, unlettered, uncouth, unclean, and finally unknown periphery of countless huts. The local palaces, countless in themselves, function as relay points of that tremendous “central” stream of influence.

Very soon Ševčenko’s reader perceives that the territorial periphery of the palaces is indeed justified in every respect. Witness images such as “A na hori stojat’ palaty” (And up above the palaces stand) or palaces being “nenače dyvo” (like a marvel), etc. The meanings of “up above,” and particularly “like a marvel,” refuse to stand still for long, changing before our eyes under the pressure of their contexts. And so, “up above” undergoes a metamorphosis against the background of the radically Romantic re-evaluation (and devaluation) of the high centrality of Jehovah Himself, an example of which we encounter in the following quotation:

Daješ ty, Hospody jedynyj  
 Sady panam v tvojim raju,  
 Daješ vysokiji palaty,—  
 Pany ž nesytiji, puzati  
 Na raj tvij, Hospody, plujut’,  
 I nam dyvytys’ ne dajut’  
 Z ubohoji, maloji xaty.

(You grant, O, Lord,/ gardens to lords in your paradise,/ You give them high palaces./ The lords—greedy and pot-bellied—/ Spit on your paradise, O, Lord,/ And do not let us look out/ From our poor, small hut.)

This quotation re-thinks for us the image of “the marvel”—perhaps even the miracle—of distant palaces. Here *dyvo* exploits its other, almost opposite Ukrainian meaning: “marvel” becomes “awe” (as in the contemporary meaning of “awful”)—a monstrosity, worth one disdainful look from the narrowed eyes of a dignified peasant who knows his own humanity. But, perhaps because of the fear of such silent judgment, his look is banned, he is literally blinded. While he is forbidden to look on the lords’ monstrosities, he is also forbidden (in an ambiguous syntactic construction) to look out on the beautiful paradise of God’s earth.

But those who forbid him to look are themselves blind: their injunction is not so much against "us" as against themselves. The paradise of the earth, as well as the heart of the hut, must become transparent, and therefore illusory, under the gaze of the pot-bellied lord.

The central social systems of the Empire stipulate that the strength of the hut should be sucked out and its sooty shell discarded. This, incidentally, was already done with the language of that hut in sundry vaudevilles, travesties, fables, and rollicking "translations," so that the language could be used as an amusing toy, could be called *kabačnaja reč* ("tavern talk" in Russian), and thus painlessly pushed out onto the most remote periphery of oblivion.

Ševčenko makes plain that the energy of the hut and the energy of the palace—the generative and the degenerative forces—oppose each other on a profoundly atavistic level. The power that lurks in the illusory center of the palace is only violence which is born of weakness. The nature of such power is implied by the ironical use of the word *raj* (paradise), a word that in itself contains centrality or, more specifically, Logocentricity: paradise as the central symbol of the beautiful earth (the only paradise possible for Ševčenko) now has been betrayed and forced out onto the periphery by the monstrosity of those in power.

It is interesting that even when the owner of the palace plays the fashionable role of a "de-centralized" liberal, his pose does not save him from exile onto the periphery as against the really important, authentically moral centers. For example, the monster-father in the poem "Knjažna" (The Duke's Daughter) is regarded by his cronies as "*ubohyx brat*" (the brother of the poor), which subtly implies the Russian liberal, frequently himself a serf-owner, of the 1840s. He who in Dostoevsky is merely a distanced progenitor of evil-doers (for example, Stepan Verxovenskiĭ), becomes in Ševčenko an evil-doer, a microcenter of evil. We should, of course, take into account not only the fact that Ševčenko's character was created earlier than that of Dostoevsky (which in itself is significant here), but also the more important fact that the peripheries of the two writers are situated quite differently.

We see that the authentic, viable peripheries, which Ševčenko's reader quickly learns to identify as centers of lasting human values, are not the

various liberal circles of exploitative landlords' sons whom the poet castigates in a number of works. As we have already seen, they are the clusters of huts abandoned on the social periphery of the Empire. They are centers because each of these huts houses the heart, and it is only around the center of the heart that, according to Ševčenko, every authentic society can be built. Indeed, the poet frequently connects the image of the hut with the image of the heart—the spiritual center of the person, the center of love which survives all the temporal, transitory, illusory centers of power. The hut, as the house of the heart, becomes elevated to highly symbolic, almost mystical regions of significance. It is only now, in a state of kinship with the heart, that the hut as the center becomes fully comprehensible.

Needless to say, at this level of analysis the shift between center and periphery is not a purely literary matter; I have not attempted to prevent the almost inevitable intrusion of the social, psychological, and even philosophical implications of the periphery-center opposition. It is, nevertheless, the system of the literary work that provides such an exchange with immediate validity. I mean that such an exchange is *metaphorical* by its very form: it obeys the law of metaphorical transfigurations of superficial and causal actuality, in the name of a more profound syntonic, that is poetical, reality.

All this does not mean that the metaphorical centrality of the peasant hut swallows, in the insatiable hunger of the Ideal, the actuality of the tiny windows, the sooty walls, and the misery of the inhabitants. In frequent moments of pitiless cold sobriety, Ševčenko sees that the actual social periphery of the hut does challenge its symbolic centrality. The landlords' exploitation leads the peasants to desperate impoverishment which is not only economic but also spiritual, the latter caused by the former: the essential heart-center of the hut is frequently completely hidden under the ragged veil of the peasants' own meanness and small-mindedness. Here causal actuality shows through metamorphical reality, threatening its legitimacy. Hence it is not on the hard ground of the everyday that the hut stands as the inviolable heart-center of existence, but on the temporal peripheries of either the re-imagined past of a poeticized nucleus of the family or in a similarly imagined future,

enriched by uncompromising desire. Is it not in those possible-impossible extensions of time that the metaphor and its metamorphoses are born?<sup>6</sup> It follows that the *temporal peripheries* become the metaphorically legitimate center, replacing the illusory center of the peasant *actuality* which rules by the illegitimacy of naked power. Reality reigns simultaneously in the past and in the future, while the present is ruled by nightmarish illusion.

Let me now define more accurately the terms "reality," "actuality," "illusion" (or "illusoriness") and "imagination," as I have been using these terms so far. Because Ševčenko is an uncompromising Romantic (in fact, one of the few consummate Romantics in world literature), reality for him is not the depressing actuality of his environment—an actuality oppressed by chains of cause and effect—but poetic imagination, saturated (in his own case, perhaps over-saturated) by desire.

The opposition of center and periphery with regard to the hut and the palace is based precisely on the struggle for supremacy between the vital poetic imagination and the soul-destroying illusoriness. Imagination is constantly threatened by illusoriness for the very reason that the one may seem to be so similar to the other. The crucial difference between them consists, of course, in the fact that illusoriness, governing itself as it does by bad faith, manipulates the causal series of actuality in order to counterfeit the procedures of metaphor and hence of poetical reality: it reconstructs the "paradise of the earth" in the interests of the centers of power, in order to allow them to pretend to ontic legitimization. Hence such systems of illusoriness act, within the very centers of power, to the end not of illuminating but of masking. The most obvious examples of the verbal structures of illusoriness would be the pseudo-causal "proofs" of political ideology, which is reduced, in our case, to the "defense" of the illusory social centers of the Empire. With the immediate, acausal simultaneity of desire, embodied in the metaphor, the

<sup>6</sup> On the functions of temporal zones in the creation of metaphors, see Gaston Bachelard, *The Poetics of Reverie: Childhood, Language and the Cosmos*, Daniel Russell, trans. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), pp. 108-109, 117-124, *et passim*. On the circular structure of the past and the future in Ševčenko's *oeuvre*, see my "Shevchenko's Profiles and Masks: Ironic Roles of the Self in *Kobzar*," in George S.N. Luckyj, ed., *Shevchenko and the Critics 1861-1980* (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1980), pp. 405-407.

poetic imagination defeats illusoriness which pretends to the status of reality, in order to become reality within the system of the literary work, or, in other words, in order to become itself. The relationship between imagination and illusoriness as one between the center and the periphery is now evident.

## 3

Having established the ways in which the peasant hut occupies the center of Ševčenko's poeticized society, I should like now to return to the image *popid tynom*, *popid tynniu* (under-the-fence, under-the-fenceness) which embodies the periphery of that center and becomes the rich, multivalent symbol of banishment, exile, the state of being an outsider, and ultimately Otherness.

The peasant huts are surrounded by fences and cherry orchards. The fences and orchards, meant to contain and protect the huts from the evil outside wind and the evil eye of the lord, are products of authentic culture: the peasant defends the centers of his humanity from the arrogance of power, just as primitive man defended his sacred space from the blind forces of nature, in his growth from the zoological to the historical level. To be cast out from that enclosure is to be *popid tynom*, to be "under the fence," forsaken and forgotten by both friend and foe.

In primitive societies, in which the notion of the individuality and uniqueness of the person has not yet emerged from the rigorously bounded collective, the native village or settlement is sacred space, symbolizing the whole world—a world that is known, beloved, and secure. In such societies, the cruellest punishment is not death but banishment. Mircea Eliade writes: "[The religious man's] terror of the chaos that surrounds his inhabited world corresponds to his terror of nothingness. The unknown space that extends beyond his world—an uncoscimized because unconsecrated space, a mere amorphous extent into which no orientation has yet been projected, and hence in which no structure has yet arisen—for religious man this profound space represents absolute non-being. If, by some evil chance, he strays into it, he feels emptied of his ontic substance, as if he were dissolving in Chaos, and he finally

dies."<sup>7</sup> Having lost access to the sacred space of the village green and the secure warmth of the community collective, primitive man becomes *dis-oriented* in the fullest meaning of that word, because of his inability to think of his body-proper as the center of his personal space.<sup>8</sup>

Ševčenko seems to have intuited the very essence of those ancient systems of center and periphery: in his poetry we find numerous individuals, particularly women and children, thus banished and consequently thus destroyed. They are banished from the authentic center of the village because of manipulations by the illusory centers of power:

To pokrytka popid tynnju  
Z bajstrjam škandybaje.  
Bat'ko j maty odcuralys',  
J čuži ne pryjmajut'!  
Starci navit' curajut'sja,  
A panyč ne znaje . . .

(An unwed mother, with her bastard,/ Hobbles under the fence./ Her own mother and father have turned away from her,/ And strangers do not accept her!/ Even beggars shun her!/ And the young lordling does not know . . .).

The children of such "marriages" between center and periphery are visited by the sins of their mothers: they, too, will be rejected by all. One such mother cynically-crazily sings:

Ja vže syna oženyla,  
A dočka tak bude!  
Lazytyme popid tynnju,  
Poky stopčut' ljudy.

(I have already seen my son married,/ But my daughter will have to do without!/ She will crawl under fences,/ Until people trample her.)

Such thematic motifs are magnificently developed in Ševčenko's early poem "Kateryna." Here, as in a number of other works, we see the

<sup>7</sup> Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1959), p. 24.

<sup>8</sup> See Eliade's *Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1959), pp. 12-21; *Images and Symbols: Studies in Religious Symbolism* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969), pp. 41-47, 51-55; *The Sacred and the Profane*, op. cit., pp. 20-29.



interesting question of Ševčenko's divided loyalty: on the one hand, he is faithful to the sanctified centers of hut and village, and the elaborately structured peasant society that they represent, but on the other, he is fascinated by the centrality of the individual and his free will, so assiduously preached by Sentimentalism and subsequently by Romanticism. Primitive culture and the "modern" Romantic cult of the free will of the individual (frequently united by Romantics and even, on occasion, by Ševčenko himself) are here put in a situation of fierce mutual antagonism. The symbol of the heart becomes thus bifurcated in an antagonistic opposition against itself: the wise heart within the heart-center of the hut—the love of the intimate but demanding collective—and the impetuous heart within the breast of a young individual which does as it pleases, against the laws of all collectives, frequently leading the individual astray, onto the dangerous periphery of ultimate estrangement. Hence, three spheres act against each other in "Kateryna": the primitive collective, the individual freedom of choice, and the "Imperial Otherness."

Having carelessly left the center of her native vital collective, the heroine Kateryna wanted to construct her own center beyond its fence (*popid tynniu*), in the illusory center of the palaces. She naively hoped to create a new family with her Russian lover, a lordling officer, outside of the village center. She wanted to build a family outside of the social system which (as her mother explains to her) always sanctifies all the phases of human existence—birth, initiation, marriage, and death—by celebrating them in structured rituals or "rites of passage." Grounding her hopes, her desire for the future, on the Romantic notion of the freedom of her heart beyond the ancient structures of the community, she was forced into the bondage of illusion—into the inauthentic "marriage" of the hut and the palace.

Consequently, Kateryna had to be condemned to a different type of exile in her lover's wasteland and kingdom of sands and snow, a "disorienting"—because morally disoriented—space "under-the-fence" of the human. In that kingdom, marvellously embodied in the "Gothic" landscape imagery of the Sentimentalist tradition, the ultimate horizon of desire is powerless to transfigure the heart-destroying everyday reality

into the life-giving reality of the imagination: there desire can be only suicidal, promising merely a puny, insignificant death ("Šubovst' v vodu" [Plop into the water]). The Romantic in Ševčenko commiserates with the disastrous result of Kateryna's free choice. But the poet also realizes that the very rigor of the social system of the village protects the heart of the hut from the rot of adultery, rape, incest, child-murder, which threaten from the illusory centers of the palaces. The poet regrets that things must be as they are, but he refuses to forgive Kateryna (as her own father and mother refused to forgive her) for her faith in the illusory glitter of her alien male—a representative of the illusory centers of power. And so, Kateryna is destined to remain in exile *with the sign of minus*.

There may remain for Kateryna a glimmer of posthumous grace for the sincerity of her feelings, although her feelings were sincere toward falsehood. As usual in Ševčenko, her son Ivas', as the fruit of her illicit union with illusion, will be punished for his mother's sin: a bastard, he will spend his life "under-the-fence" of the sacred space of the village and its beneficial laws. The poet indicates, nevertheless, that Ivas' will live with the *kobzars*, and probably one day will become a *kobzar* himself, as usually happened with the *kobzars'* young guides. If my surmise is correct—if Ivas' is destined by Ševčenko to become a *kobzar*—then he will be an exile *with the sign of plus*. He will occupy Perebendja's creative periphery ("popid tynniu siromaxa i dnjuje i nočuje" [sleeps and wakes, the poor soul, under the fence])—that is, the periphery of an artist working in the medium of his lowly "folk" language, in which Ševčenko's own *Kobzar* also grew and matured. Hence it is in Ševčenko himself that Ivas' will find a viable symbolic, or poetic, substitute for the vile bastard who was his natural or *actual* father. And so, the illegitimate child will be legitimized on a profound poetic level.

On the page, before the reader's eyes, a new and intricately linked family group comes into being. Needless to say, it is unlike the family in which Kateryna grew up, let alone the family that she planned for herself. Ševčenko himself, as the author, becomes the symbolic father both of Kateryna and of Ivas'. But, as Ivas' ' symbolic father, he also becomes Kateryna's true, poetically legitimized, lover. As a *kobzar* in

his own right, Ševčenko becomes Ivas' ' twin brother or double. Indeed, he frequently calls himself an orphan and identifies his own fate with that of the numerous illegitimate children in his poems. Thus Kateryna becomes Ševčenko's own unfortunate mother, as the Virgin Mary will become his symbolic mother in the later poem "Marija." If we admit that Kateryna symbolizes Ukraine (a supposition that is permitted by the text, when, for example, she is contrasted with the mighty oaks from the times of the Hetmanate)—then, in view of Ševčenko's frequent identification of his motherland with his mother, her role as his symbolic mother becomes certain. And so, a new center is created for Ivas' not so much in the sands of an alien periphery but on the borderline of the social periphery of the "folk" and the aesthetic periphery of the poetic text. Ivas' finds his center within the system of the book *Kobzar*, soon itself to become so dramatically central. We find in Ševčenko's poems sudden perversions of familial relations within the palaces by the act of incest. This is the dark obverse of the transformations of familial relations by the act of the poetic imagination, implied in the poem "Kateryna". Ivas' ' new "family", with its metaphorical shifts of familial ties, is the answer that the imagination gives to the brutal perversions of such relationships by incest within the palaces, which Ševčenko depicts in his other works.

To conclude my remarks on "Kateryna," let me mention the interchange between the central and the peripheral positions of the poem itself within the system of the history of literature. This will anticipate my comments on Ševčenko's poems as literary-historical facts, which I intend to propose later in this article. As Leonid Bilec'kyj, among others, has shown, much in "Kateryna" derives from the widespread Sentimentalist model. But while in that model social elements are subdued in favor of the intrinsic love intrigue, in which not only the injured woman but also her tormentor-lover are prominently featured, Ševčenko drastically reduces these elements, in order to concentrate on the psychological development of the heroine and on her position in society.<sup>9</sup>

An interesting paradox develops here. Shifting the components of the

<sup>9</sup> Leonid Bilec'kyj, "Kateryna," in Pavlo Zajcev, ed. *Povne vydannja tvoriv Tarasa Ševčenka*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: Mykola Denysiuk, 1962), 1:290-292.

popular literary model to the periphery, Ševčenko distances his poem from the literary convention, so as to approximate it not only to the problems characteristic of social systems as such, but specifically to the problems of the social periphery. Drawing that specific social periphery into the center of his literary work, he thereby centralizes it in the reader's consciousness, thus *saving* it almost in the religious sense. Such a crossing of the double (the literary and the social) periphery at the expense of the popular, somewhat generalized, model of the hurt heroine and the ogre-hero, is an excellent example of how drab social actuality becomes poetic reality by the agency of the imagination, within the peripheral systems of literature as such. It also suggests, from a somewhat different angle, the contrast of approach between "Kateryna" and *Anna Karenina* which I mentioned in the beginning of this article.

## 4

Ševčenko's implied identification with Kateryna's son Ivas' is one of countless examples of the role of Ševčenko's lyrical subject as an exile with the sign of plus. Here one is vaguely reminded of the Romantic outsider—vaguely, because the specificity of the social periphery (the Ukrainian situation) all but overshadows the generalized model of a literary work as in itself a peripheral system. Time and again Ševčenko places his lyrical subject in various quasi-biographical and quasi-psychological, but always specifically social, peripheral situations of "under-the-fenceness." Such a state of "under-the-fenceness" in itself opposes the generalized model of the Romantic hero: instead of the proud, early-Byronic outsider, openly flaunting his peripheral situation, we frequently meet an ironically self-deprecating "underdog." As I will attempt to show later, the proud outsider appears among Ševčenko's third-person (usually historical) heroes. When we deal with his first-person lyrical subject, however, we have to do with a sort of modern anti-hero, perhaps a precursor of Dostoevsky's underground man (although more dignified than he), a hater of anything and everything even remotely connected with Byronic pomposity and self-centered posing.

The peripheral situations in which Ševčenko's lyrical subject finds

himself—or, more accurately, willfully places himself—belong to two diametrically opposite kinds: I mean the peripheral situations with regard to the palace and those with regard to the hut. Although, as I pointed out, the lyrical subject is almost invariably an exile with the sign of plus, his peripheral situation *vis-à-vis* the hut on occasion *seems* to turn him into an exile with the sign of minus. It is in such instances that Ševčenko hints at a dark relationship between his lyrical subject and Kateryna, or exiles of her type in other works.

The lyrical subject as an exile with the sign of plus puts himself onto the periphery not because of inauthentic illusions (as Kateryna has done) but because of, *and for the sake of*, the life-giving poetic imagination. In such instances the state of “under-the-fenceness” only appears to be suicidal; in fact, it is the single moral choice that both the poet and his nation can afford. Needless to say, such a state of “under-the-fenceness” is not easy, because it is the opposite of a bohemian abnegation of social responsibility. It is made that much more difficult by the fact that it is not the freely chosen pose of a romantic rebel, but the poet’s sole existential possibility.<sup>10</sup>

Ševčenko frequently complains that the unfair fate of a poet—more precisely, a Ukrainian poet—has pushed him out of the center of the village, with its imagined anonymous happiness of dwelling in the paradise of the earth, onto the world’s crossroads. Hence the image of the crossroads (*rozputtja*) begins to form a pair with the image of “under-the-fenceness.” In the following quotation, it is his Muse, the allegorized figure of his poetry—his symbolic but by no means illusory Mother—who carries him, like a baby, far beyond the protective border of the village, exactly as Kateryna carried her little son Ivas’. What saves the lyrical subject from becoming an exile with the sign of minus (and this also may be true of Ivas’) is his identification with freedom:

Mene ty v pelenu vzjala  
I het’ u pole odnesla.

<sup>10</sup> On the inauthenticity of romantic dandyism and even its “metaphysical rebellion,” see Albert Camus, *The Rebel: An Essay on Man in Revolt*, Anthony Bower, trans. (New York: Vintage Books, 1956), pp. 23-54 *et passim*.

I na mohyli sered polja,  
 Jak tuju volju na rozdolli,  
 Tumanom syvym povyla.

(You wrapped me in your skirt/ And carried me far into a field./ And on a mound, in the midst of that field,/ You swaddled me in grey fog,/ Just as freedom was swaddled out on the plain.)

Where is that desolate field, in terms of Ševčenko's own life? It lies in the "center of centers" of the vast Empire, in glittering Petersburg itself. We know that in Petersburg Ševčenko spent many happy hours among more or less cultivated people. But it is equally obvious that the poet had no other authentic choice than to put his lyrical subject into the situation of a lonely provincial immigrant in that city.<sup>11</sup> Petersburg becomes in the peripheral system of *Kobzar* the consummate embodiment of illusoriness—a nightmare city, where there are countless *palaces* but not even a single *hut* ("palaty, i ni odnisińkoji xaty"). The capital of the Empire, aping pell-mell the latest intellectual fashions of Western Europe, becomes for Ševčenko a "smitnyčok Mykoly" (Nicholas' garbage dump), it becomes a remote, God-forsaken periphery of the authentic center of the hut. It becomes a carnival of illusionism where all human values have been distorted beyond recognition, where not only the profound dignity of the heart has been vulgarized (the degeneration of immigrant Ukrainian "zemliačky" [countrymen]), but where the intellectual centers of the West have been caricatured, in stupid arrogance, beyond all recognition:<sup>12</sup>

Vse pys'menni drjukovani,  
 Sonce navit' hujat':  
 "Ne vidtilja," kaže, "sxodyt',  
 Ta ne tak i svityt' . . ."

(All of them are literate, published,/ They even manage to find fault with

<sup>11</sup> The central situation of the famous Russian critic Kornej Čukovskij has blinded him to such obvious reasons in his otherwise excellent and sympathetic essay "Ševčenko's 'Abandonment,'" in *Shevchenko and the Critics*, pp. 135-144.

<sup>12</sup> Ševčenko writes about the vulgarization of Western European thought in the Empire in his "Poslanije," where he attacks with particular vehemence unintentional caricatures of the theories of personality in German Idealism, especially Fichte's celebrated "das Ich und das nicht-Ich."

the sun:/ "It does not rise," they say, "where it should."/ "And it does not shine right . . .")

The poet is morally compelled not only to walk "under the fence" of such a society, but even to act as a drunken derelict, so as to be able to deliver his prophetic condemnations with the radical irony that the object of his scorn deserves.

Otak idučy popidtynnju  
Z benketu pjanyj unoči,  
Ja mirkuvav sobi jdučy,  
Poky doplentavs' do xatyny.

(So walking under the fence/ From a banquet, drunk, one night/ I was thinking to myself, while walking,/ Until I dragged myself to my little hut.)

Was *this* the only "little hut" in Petersburg—the only space where thoughts of the heart were being thought?

Occasionally Ševčenko depicts his underground state of "under-the-fenceness" not as alert awakening (as he usually depicts it), but as depressive slumbering which causes spiritual decay. In such cases, the state of "under-the-fenceness" seems to be a state of exile with the sign of minus. Such moments of weakness can be explained psychologically. Behind the ironic, worldly-wise mask of his lyrical subject, Ševčenko at times can see that in his peripheral state of "under-the-fenceness" he has not so much lost the way of a "decent citizen" (which would be quite proper under the circumstances) but that he has alienated himself from the systems of the authentic center with its authentic spiritual order. It is at such moments of doubt that Ševčenko turns to the protective circle of the *anima*, embodied for him in the structure of maiden-reader-lover-sister-mother-Muse-Ukraine-Virgin Mary.

In any event, even if such (incidentally, quite justifiable) fear motivates Ševčenko, it seems to be temporary. In general, the periphery of "under-the-fenceness" becomes for him the territory of revolutionary explosiveness, the volcanic zone of the central poetic imagination which must take the place of the calm, dignified, anonymous, and rigorously

structured center of the hut, even as the hut appears in temporal projections. It must substitute for the hut and it must transcend it, as the only possible battleground. Ševčenko received his state of "under-the-fenceness" from history, as his personal fate. But, despite his numerous ironical protests to the contrary, he accepted that verdict as if it were the consequence of his personal choice. After all, he could have rejected it, staying on in Petersburg, continuing to paint, to drink good wine, and to visit interesting people, "ploughing his field" in that elegant and pleasant manner.

Such a choice, as we have seen, was closed to Ševčenko on moral grounds. The symbolic, and only occasionally psychological, state of alienation on Nevskij Prospekt (surely Ševčenko in daily life was less alienated in Petersburg than, for instance, his neurotic compatriot Gogol) soon turns into an immediate actuality in the distant, desolate landscapes of his punitive banishment. There he is given a taste of actual "under-the-fenceness," when he is forced to write stealthily, against the specific ban of the Tsar Himself ("nenače zlodij toj, poza valamy" [like some thief under the embankments]). The illusory center of power—as if reacting to the poet's constant provocations from the periphery, and as if *literally* interpreting (in the literal linearity of all illusory centers of power) the motifs of exile and banishment in the first *Kobzar*—finally provided Ševčenko with an actual fence, the prison embankment, to live under:

[Dolja]

Kynula maloho  
Na rozputti, ta j bajduže . . .  
A vono, ubohe  
Molodeje, syvouse  
(Zvyčajne, dytyna!)  
I podybalo tyxen'ko  
Popid samym tynom  
Až za Ural. Opynylos'  
V pustyni, v nevoli . . .

([Fate]/ Left the small boy/ At the crossroads, and did not care,/ And he—poor,/ Young, greybearded,/ (A child, to be sure!)/ Proceeded to hobble softly,/ Right under the fence/ All the way beyond the Ural Mountains. He ended up/ In the desert, in captivity.)



The pose of a passive victim of fate—half-greybeard and half-baby, or an immature, childish adult—is an example of Ševčenko's ironical protests against the state of "under-the-fenceness" as the only existential situation possible for him. But in fact there is no trace of passivity even in the poet's actual imprisonment. Now that the periphery of banishment has become an actuality, the need to turn it, metaphorically, into a spiritual center, which implies a center of the explosion of poetry, has become even more crucial for the poet's self-preservation as a human being.

We can readily understand the urgent reasons that prevented Ševčenko from regarding Petersburg as the center of his existence and of his aspirations. But what about the center of the hut? To conclude this section, let me return to that important question.

Members of some primitive societies give directions to a stranger not from the actual center that is formed by both parties at the moment of their meeting (I have mentioned the hypothesis that primitive man cannot visualize his body-proper as the center) but from the center of their village, no matter how far from it they may find themselves at that moment. This is a very important point for our understanding of the relationship between the heart-center of the hut and the periphery of exile in Ševčenko's poetry.

The hut as the center of the heart, which also means sacred space, must stand only on the ground of symbolic transcendence. The hut—even the one in the past of a poeticized childhood or in the futurity of desire—must remain, paradoxically, as a distanced point of orientation, as an "unrealistic" (and quite deliberately "unrealistic" at that) possibility of a symbolic return. And what does it represent in actuality? As we have seen, the poet's childhood as thematic material is active only when it is poetically saturated with desire: the past can be alive only when it is imbued with the future. Ukraine disappointed the poet terribly when he visited it as a mature man, hence it too had to remain for a very long time (until Ševčenko's plans to settle there, immediately before his death) as a symbolic center, distanced for proper poetic illumination. The poet, furthermore and for seemingly opposite reasons, must shun the comforts of anonymity in "the paradise of the earth," protected by

the secure cycles of the agricultural calendar, for the sake of struggle. He must not be lulled by such a vision, even if he finds it only in the space of his imagination. We recall that it was his own Muse, the eternally-feminine embodiment of his genius, who banished him onto the periphery of cold, transient rooms which have to serve as unsatisfactory surrogates of the hut—onto the zone of constant farewells, constant roads and crossroads, constant losses and constant regrets—into the region of ultimate solitude and purification, like that of a knight before his decisive battle.

The existential freedom that the periphery promises, already mentioned in connection with the poet's Muse, is by far more "central" than political or economic freedom which, finally, depends on it and becomes only one of its numerous results. This is the most important reason that the poet cannot afford the longed-for anonymity of the hut, although he is condemned to a constant striving for it in the unrealizable futurity of the ultimate horizon of desire, while at the same time knowing that its actual attainment would mean his death:

Brydnja! A j dosi, jak zhadaju,  
To serce plače ta bolyt':  
Čomu Hospod' ne dav dožyt'  
Maloho viku u tim raju?!  
Umer by, orjučy na nyvi,  
Ničoho b na sviti ne znay,  
Ne buv by v sviti jurodyvym,  
L'udej i Boha ne prokljav.

(Nonsense! And yet, when I remember it even now,/ My heart hurts and weeps:/ Why didn't the Lord let me end/ My short life in this paradise?!/ I would have died, ploughing my field,/ I would not have known anything of the world,/ I would not have gone through the world as a holy fool,/ I would not have cursed God and men.)

## 5

Ševčenko frequently puts the heroes of his dramatic poems, together with his lyrical subject, into peripheral situations. Kateryna, as we have seen, is a peripheral heroine with the sign of minus; but the heroes as *heroes* in *Kobzar* are peripheral with the sign of plus. It is no wonder that those heroes are on the periphery *together* with Ševčenko's lyrical

subject: they are, after all, masks of that subject, as he is obviously a mask of Ševčenko himself.<sup>13</sup> Their grand heroic gestures, however, draw them much closer to the model of the Romantic hero than the deliberately self-belittling gestures of the lyrical subject. Space permits me to discuss only a few examples from among a considerable number of such characters.

Jarema Halajda, the hero of the poem *Hajdamaky*, enters the historical arena from an area quite alien to the centers of "decent citizens:" his social periphery is so marginal that in the beginning of the poem he is oppressed by the oppressed. Nevertheless he too dares to dream of his own "central" hut and of a structured family with his betrothed Oksana. He too, moreover, dares to relinquish that dream in favor of the volcanic periphery of the *hajdamaks'* uprising. It is only thus that his dream of the anonymity of a happy agricultural life will become a reality, *although not for him*, because only in the peripheral guerilla warfare can he find the center of his own existence.

We should keep in mind that the *hajdamaks* as such suddenly appear out of distant, dim social peripheries, and that their battle is not only peripheral but, historically, of problematical value. For some historians, as for Ševčenko's friend Pantelejmon Kuliš, the *hajdamak* uprising was definitely a peripheral enterprise with the sign of minus, and Kuliš (that advocate of Ukrainian centers) strongly disapproved of Ševčenko's glorifying it in his admittedly great poem.<sup>14</sup> Although in the poem itself Ševčenko imagines for the *hajdamaks* genealogical roots in the *kozaks* and even in the Hetmanate—thus attempting to historically legitimize or "centralize" their struggle—when we consider the context of all of *Kobzar*, they seem to be placed in a situation of opposition (or periphery) to those centers of Ukrainian history.

Jarema Halajda is but one example from among many heroes in

<sup>13</sup> See my "Shevchenko's Profiles and Masks," *passim*.

<sup>14</sup> See George Luckyj's comments on Kuliš's article "Maljovana Hajdamaččyna" in his *Panteleimon Kulish: A Sketch of His Life and Times* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1983), pp. 159-160. Kuliš also expresses his dislike of the poem in a letter to Oleksandr Barvins'kyj, written in 1869: Jurij Luc'kyj, ed., *Vybrani lysty Pantelejmona Kuliša ukrajins'koju movoju pysani* (New York: UVAN, 1984), p. 195.

*Kobzar* (both in the literary and the historical sense) who suddenly explode from the periphery in order to create new centers, and with whom Ševčenko openly identifies in his own situation of “under-the-fenceness.” Another interesting example, chosen almost at random, is a more recent revolutionary, the hero of the poem “Jurodyvyj” (The Madman or The Holy Fool), who also stems from the social periphery:

A miž vamy  
Najšovs' taky jakyjs' projava,  
Jakyjs' durnyj orygnal  
.....  
Iz miliona svynopasiv.

(And among you/ Appeared some strange fellow,/ Some foolish original/  
... From among a million swineherds).

It takes a peripheral *jurodyvyj* to perform a heroic revolutionary act: the hero's peripheral state is stressed by the fact that the poet has bestowed it upon him in an ironical sense.

Doubtless, the most interesting peripheral heroes in Ševčenko's *Kobzar* are Jesus and his mother Mary. We read in the poem “Marija” that Mary, in contrast to Kateryna and much like Jarema, spent Her youth as a servant to a citizen of the periphery (Joseph), without a hut of Her own and without the benefit of the protective structure of a family. And when Her Son begins to preach, She follows Him onto an even more distanced periphery:

Pišla tynjatys' popid tynnju,  
Až poky-poky ne dijšla  
Až do Holhofy . . .

(She went wandering under-the-fence,/ Until she finally ended up/ On Golgotha).

She follows Him onto the periphery not only of His, but of Her own ultimate disgrace, through which solely authentic Grace can be reached. (The parallel, incidentally, between this and an earlier quotation, in which the poet himself winds his way under the fences, until he ends up in captivity beyond the Ural Mountains—in the only morally possible situation—cannot be missed.) And so, from Her seemingly hopeless

peripheral situation of "under-the-fenceness," not unlike the poet himself, Mary finds the strength to rally Her Son's cowardly and speechless Apostles to hopeful revolutionary activity, although She Herself must die in that very situation:

Ty ž pid tynom,  
Sumujučy u burjani  
Umerla z holodu. Amin'.

(And you, grieving/ Under a fence, among weeds,/ Died of hunger.  
Amen.)

In the poem "Marija," Christ Himself is born without a father, but also without a miracle. He is born far from the circle of "decent citizens," not even in the traditional stable but directly under the sky, near a road (perhaps at a crossroads), without any mysterious signs of Heavenly centrality. As is implied in "Marija" and overtly stated in other poems, it is from such a distant social periphery that Christ explodes against the illusory centers, embodied in the systems not so much of His own as of Ševčenko's hated society. He explodes against the Tsar's cruelty, against the church which has become the flunkey of the exploitative Empire, against both the foreign and the native lords and lordlings. Moreover, Christ frequently opposes—not like the Son of God but like the son of Mary—the center of centers that has no periphery, namely the reign of Jehovah Himself, Who is then identified with the central system of absolute power:

...I za ščo  
Joho, svjatocho, mordovaly,  
Vo uzy kuvaly;  
I hlavu joho čestnuju  
Ternom uvinčaly?  
I vyvely z zlodijamy  
Na Holhofu horu;  
I povisyly miž nymy—  
Za ščo? Ne hovoryt'  
Ni sam syvyj Verxotvorec',  
Ni joho svjatiji—  
Pomoščnyky, pobornyky,  
Kastraty nimiji!

(And for what/ Did they torture and enchain Him in fetters,/ Him, Who is Holy,/ And crown his noble head with thorns?/ Why did they lead Him together with some thieves/ Onto the hill of Golgotha,/ To hang Him among them?/ For what purpose? The grey-haired Supreme Creator does not answer,/ Nor do His saints—/ His helpers, the defenders of His faith—/ The mute *castrati*!)

(Let me point out in this quotation the irony of the parodic application of the “central” pseudo-Church-Slavonic dicton.)

From his own situation of “under-the-fenceness,” the poet profoundly sympathizes with Christ who hangs between two thieves—on the most distant social periphery. His sympathy becomes that much more brotherly when he reflects upon the fact that Christ’s Logocentric message gave birth not to authentic centers of the heart but to false, illusory centers of exploitative power. The poet comes to the conclusion that instead of love—but *still* in the name of love—other modes of action are now needed. Ševčenko hopes, in a strange little poem of his late period, that Christ will again come back to the people from His periphery (out of which, in a gesture of ultimate but unconscious irony, we have created the center of Western culture)—that He will return to us not as a meek poet of love, but as a sudden explosion of rebellion. Ševčenko, quite simply, identifies Christ with a *hajdamak*: together with brother Christ, Ševčenko’s lyrical subject will tear strips of the ecclesiastical purple cloth for leggings,

I kropylom budem, brate,  
Novu xatu vymytaty.

(And we will use the holy-water sprinkler/ To sweep out our new peasant hut.)

Christ as an “illegitimate” (not centrally legitimized) Son, Christ as our brother, Christ as a *hajdamak*—such a Christ *is the new poet* who has matured, without us knowing it, on a periphery, the existence of which the centers of power do not even suspect. Ševčenko identifies this word of Christ with his own directly and courageously, when, speaking in Christ’s name but in the first person, he says:

. . . Vozvelyčū  
Malyx otyx rabiv nimyx!  
Ja na storoži kolo jix  
Postavlju slovo.

(I shall raise/ And ennoble these mute, petty slaves!/ And I shall place the Word/ To guard them.)

That word explodes on the periphery, and finally returns to it—to beggars, to lepers, to Marys-Magdalenes, to the poor, bitter serfs of Ukraine. That peripheral and therefore anti-Logocentric Logos must serve them as the explosive answer to the lying words that drift to them from the illusory centers of power:

. . . I ponyče  
Nenače stoptana trava  
I vaša dumka i slova.

(And your words and thoughts/ Will lie prostrate/ Like trampled grass.)

Be it in the mask of a lyrical subject (either a weak and passive orphan or an all-powerful poet-magus), be it in the masks of the heroes of his longer poems (Jarema, Prometheus, Christ)—in all these *personae* Ševčenko's Logos explodes on the periphery, vanquishes the center, and forces the periphery to take its place.

## 6

The periphery as the zone of transformations, which means the zone of renewal, is particularly noticeable in the space of poetry as such. Throughout this article I have alluded to the peripheral centrality of poetry as the source of transformative, or metaphorical, energy which radiates into other spaces of human existence. We should always keep in mind the obvious fact that Ševčenko's radical upheavals in the history of his people were exclusively *poetical*, and only by the grace of poetry have they become *political*.

As I have also implied, time and again, from the very beginning of his poetic career, Ševčenko shared the insistence of the Romantics that the situation of a vital separation, a viable apartness, is absolutely crucial for the health of poetry. Let us recall that Perebendja—Ševčenko's prototypical model of the poet—spends his life in a situation of under-the-fenceness:

Popid tynnju siromaxa  
I dnuje j nočuje.

(The poor soul/ Sleeps and wakes/ Under the fence.)

We recall, however, that Perebendja has another life—the life of the authentically central imagination—carefully hidden from society. That life is Perebendja's symbolic periphery which would be impossible without his actual voluntary "under-the-fenceness."

A jakby počuly, ščo vin ody nokyj  
Spiva na mohyli, z morem rozmovlja,—  
Na Božeje slovo vony b nasmijalys',  
Durnym by nazvaly, od sebe b prohnyly:  
"Nexaj ponad morem", skazaly b, "hulja."

(And if they [his village audience] heard that he, the lonely one,/ Sings on the mound and speaks with the sea,—/ They would ridicule God's word,/ They would call him crazy, they would chase him away:/ "Let him," they would say, "stroll along the seashore.")

As in his personal life fate helped Ševčenko to find his own periphery, so in the system of literature history itself marked the periphery on which his poems were to be born. I have mentioned this periphery of Ukrainian literature as a national literature in the beginning of this article. Ševčenko utilized this periphery, as he had used his personal periphery, for his explosive transformations. The most obvious moment here is his attitude to Russian literature as the literature of the center, which was seen as such not only by Russians but by most Ukrainian intellectuals. Let us keep in mind that no Russian writer, because of his role in the social and literary centers of the Empire, could achieve Ševčenko's tremendous shift. I mean even those Russian writers who took up arms against their centers—even they could not avail themselves of Ševčenko's specific and uniquely fruitful periphery of the serfs' huts. Only Ševčenko's radically distanced periphery at the crossroads of several peripheral systems gave the poet both the proper symbolic space and the proper distance for such leveraging.

Although, as is well known, Ševčenko was fascinated by fame and desired it for himself, at the same time he was afraid of that fascination precisely because of its "centralizing" powers: one has to pay for being famous, as one has to pay a prostitute. Ševčenko addresses the following words to one of his several personifications of fame:



. . . Kesarja-kata  
 I hreka dobroho ty poljubyla  
 Odnakovisin'ko, bo . . . zaplatyly.  
 A ja, ubohyj, ščo prynesu ja?  
 Za ščo siromu ty pociluješ?  
 Za pisnju-dumu "Oj haju, haju" ?

(You, [fame], loved/ The henchman-caesar and the good Greek/ Equally,  
 because they paid you./ And I, impoverished, what will I bring you?/ For  
 what will you kiss me, a beggar?/ For a song-duma about a tree grove?)

In the long run, the periphery, which the whore fame visits but rarely, is the only viable creative region.

As late as in the very last poem of his canon, Ševčenko expressed his views on "central literature":

Tvoryly b, leža, epopeju,  
 Paryly b skirz' ponad zemleju—  
 Ta vse b heksametry plely,  
 Ta na horyšče b odnesly  
 Myšam na snidannja . . . A potim  
 Spivaly b prozu—ta po notax,  
 A ne jaknebud' . . .

(Stretched out, we would write an epic poem—/ We would fly everywhere  
 above the earth,/ And we would constantly plait hexameters,/ Taking  
 them up to the attic/ And serving them to mice for breakfast . . . And  
 later/ We would sing prose—according to a musical score,/ And not any  
 old way . . .)

The fact that Puškin admitted to the habit of writing while lying on his couch, the fact that his prose is still admired for its careful structure (written according to a musical score, and not any old way), and then all the parodie "parquet floors," "spurs" and so forth in Ševčenko's earlier work, seemingly straight out of *Evgenij Onegin*,—all of this begs for a thorough investigation of the possibility of Ševčenko's parodie attitude to Puškin's work, that "center of centers" of Russian literature.

We have often heard the argument that "folk" literature must always remain peripheral to "mainstream" literature: various folk or dialectal writers remain peripheral in any national literary process. This is precisely the fate that Vissarion Belinskij predicted for Ševčenko. What Belinskij and countless others did not take into account is, first of all,

the radical difference between the literature of a nation and that of an Empire and, second, the uncanny power of Ševčenko's re-imagination, and subsequent transfiguration, of the folk literature of his own nation. Searching for alternatives to their own sclerotic cultural centers, Herder, Goethe, later Wordsworth, Coleridge, and many other Western European pre-Romantics and Romantics paid polite visits to the periphery of the "folk." For Ševčenko, however, the periphery of folk literature was not the place of a *temporary* abode but an existential necessity. Only one other Romantic, Robert Burns, comes to mind here, but the talents and scopes of vision of the two poets are so incommensurate that any comparison between them cannot exceed one or two sentences. It is historically irresponsible to even mention the various Kol'cova and Nikitins in Ševčenko's presence, as some American scholars of Russian literature still insist on doing. Such practice, incidentally, has an interesting bearing on my theme: Ševčenko's creative, existential periphery is identified (either willfully or, what is much worse, unconsciously) with the completely different "periphery" of the second-rate. Such is frequently the vengeance of the centers.

The caricature of Ševčenko as a quaint "folk poet" is negated outright by his immediate participation in the processes of Western European literature of his time. We recall Leonid Bilec'kyj's comments on the position of "Kateryna" in the constellation of Sentimentalist works. As Franko, and later Fylypovyč, have demonstrated so eloquently, Ševčenko did not shun Western Sentimentalist and Romantic models.<sup>15</sup> But the poet reconstructed such models *almost* beyond recognition. We should keep in mind that between 1838-1861 such models were already central, if not overripe, in Western Europe and even in Petersburg. It is interesting to observe how Ševčenko transfigured such central models with the energy of his own periphery. By literally rejuvenating them in his work, he returned those central phenomena of Romanticism to the

<sup>15</sup> From among the several articles by the two critics devoted to this problem, let me cite only those that are conveniently reprinted in Luckyj's *Shevchenko and the Critics*. Franko, "Foreword to Shevchenko's 'Perebendja'" (pp. 96-114) and Fylypovyč, "Shevchenko and Romanticism," (pp. 168-181). See further Lisa Efimov-Schneider, "An Examination of Shevchenko's Romanticism," pp. 430-453.

sphere of periphery whence they had come, restoring to these models—already made almost trite by fashion—their pristine romanticity.

I should like now to make a few remarks about the nature of periphery *within* the form of Ševčenko's poems. The existential freedom which the state of "under-the-fenceness" affords has allowed Ševčenko to create a poetry of phenomenal formal freedom, a poetry not only "modern" but, for its time and perhaps for ours, daringly experimental. The formal "periphery" of Ševčenko's poetry is particularly evident in his short works written in banishment. They are singularly "informal" fragments of calm narration, with very few images or even completely imageless, and their tone and diction approaches speech, rather than "writing," not to mention the so-called "poetic style." This is the kind of poetry that Wordsworth would have liked to write, had he been *peripheral* enough to write it.

Roman Jakobson found a poem by Puškin "Ja vas ljubil" (I Loved You), in which there are no images at all, and as was his habit, built upon that discovery an elaborate theory of a poetics of oppositions, repetitions and syntactic variations, but particularly of intonation.<sup>16</sup> Some contemporary American poets, in their "poetry of statement," also count on intonation as the structural element of cohesion: their "statements" are supposed to be poeticized by the voice, by a mimesis of speech.<sup>17</sup> It would take some time to list all of Ševčenko's lyrical poems in which "statement" takes the place of imagery, and in which the energy of poetry flows from the poet's amazingly fresh, vital and often subtly ironical voice with its absolutely unique coloration. As our contemporary American poets try to do, Ševčenko challenges the very conception of "lyrical poetry," as it has been defined by the "central" institution of literature.

<sup>16</sup> Jakobson's analysis has gone through many revisions and reprintings. See, for example, "The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles," *Fundamentals of Language* (The Hague: Mouton, 1956), pp. 76-82. See also, "Two Poems by Pushkin," *Verbal Art, Verbal Sign, Verbal Time* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1985), pp. 48-51.

<sup>17</sup> The term "poetry of statement" was originally used by twentieth-century critics to describe some imageless English poetry of the eighteenth century, but its meaning has obviously been changed by contemporary American poets and their commentators to suit their own particular needs, much different from those of the Augustans.

Ševčenko's decentralization of structure becomes dominant in most of his narrative poems, in which matters of structure as such are obviously crucial. Ševčenko's contemporaries, steeped in "centralized" literary conventions, regarded this as a drawback. Later, Myxajlo Drahomanov believed that Ševčenko's narrative poems are "examples of disarray and dishevelment" and expressed regret that the poet did not use Russian literary models.<sup>18</sup> Even Franko complained that the poem "Son" (The Dream) is weak because "there are no *logical* connections of images in it."<sup>19</sup>

The decentralization of structure in Ševčenko's narrative poems consists in the fragmentation of the whole into more or less independent sections. It is as if the poem had no center at all. One can still perceive a trace of plot on the thematic level, fragmented as it is in itself, but on the formal level even metrical patterns change from section to section, and in one instance some sections appear in prose, while others are cast in formally presented dramatic dialogues. Set pieces of authentic folk songs, or stylizations of folk songs, also contribute to the fragmentation of the unity of the given poem.

The center of Ševčenko's narrative poem, however, is not a void. It is a source of intuitive energy—a definitely *musical* energy, together with the energy of the poet's unique voice—which ties the work together for the reader on some profound pre-conscious level. The first critic who realized that Ševčenko's decentralized structure was not a drawback but a virtue (readers, obviously, had intuited that long before!) was Pavlo Fylypovyč. But even Fylypovyč was not equipped to take this problem to the end. Relying on the Formalist Viktor Žirmunskij, he did not go further than some unconvincing comparisons between Ševčenko and Byron, saying that in both poets the spark of the plot jumps from one peak to the next, thus uniting the seemingly formally varied sections.<sup>20</sup> The trouble here is that in Ševčenko the spark of plot does not

<sup>18</sup> M. Drahomanov, "Ševčenko, ukrajinoфілы і соціалізм," *Literaturno-publicystyčni praci u dvox tomach* (Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1970), 2:93-94.

<sup>19</sup> Ivan Franko, "Temne carstvo," *Zibrannja tvoriv u pjatdesjaty tomach* (Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1980), 26:138.

<sup>20</sup> "Shevchenko and Romanticism," pp. 183-184.

jump thus, because the plot is also fragmented, and there are whole chunks of quasi-autobiographical interludes (advancing suddenly, sometimes in the middle of a line) where the plot vanishes altogether. Furthermore, the sections in Byron's narrative poems are not all that varied, or (to be more precise) are varied in an orderly, systematic manner. We understand the mechanics of Ševčenko's "organic" unity (in this case, the term "organic" seems to regain its validity) only when we arm ourselves with our contemporary theories of the fragmentariness of literary works, such as Joseph Frank's celebrated essay on spatial form in modern literature or Albert Cook's excellent study *Prisms*, on the structure of modern poems.<sup>21</sup>

Another well-known element of Ševčenko's style, evident in both his lyrical and narrative poems, is the frequent parodic mixing of "stylistic levels" in his diction and of logically or historically incompatible fragments in his imagery. Although our contemporary commentators of Ševčenko's work have become used to this practice, it not only startled the early critics but seemed to disturb them on a profound psychological level. The reason for such reactions becomes obvious when we consider that Ševčenko's "irresponsible" hodge-podge of drastically varying lexical and cultural elements very effectively questions the legitimacy of the language and the culture of the centers. This is especially true of his miniature parodies of the pompous "poeticity" of the central literature of his time on the one hand and of the Church Slavonic diction of religious centers on the other. By the discontinuous simultaneity of incompatible cultural fragments, moreover, Ševčenko immediately unmasks the diachronic continuity of the abuse of power by centers throughout history—be it by the Old Testament kings, the Roman caesars, or the Russian tsars.

What is most interesting, and seemingly paradoxical, here is that two representatives of the *social* periphery—one Russian and the other Ukrainian—were particularly chagrined by this practice of Ševčenko.

<sup>21</sup> Joseph Frank, "Spatial Form in Modern Literature," *The Widening Gyre: Crisis and Mastery in Modern Literature* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968), pp. 3-62, especially pp. 9-14; Albert Cook, *Prisms: Studies in Modern Literature* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967), pp. 3-24 *et passim*.

Belinskij strongly objected to the great quantity of vulgar and street language (*vul'garnye i ploščadnye slova i vyraženija*) in Ševčenko, appearing as it does next to "pompous, artificial diction" which a peasant could never understand. In view of Belinskij's pronounced sympathies with Russia's imperialistic policies which seriously threaten the authenticity of his liberal sentiments, his defense of centrality here and in his other attacks on Ukrainian literature is hardly surprising.<sup>22</sup> What is surprising is that the Ukrainian thinker Drahomanov, whose Ukrainian patriotism is surely beyond question, enthusiastically quotes Belinskij's condemnation of Ševčenko's style, and proceeds to add numerous criticisms of his own. He points an angry finger at the cultural and historical impurity of Ševčenko's imagery, mixing as it does ancient and modern elements (for instance, the Bible and St. Petersburg), the poet's pose as an illiterate country bumpkin alongside his erudite references to Apollo, the general "inconsistency" of his "jokes," and many another "inconsistency."<sup>23</sup>

Drahomanov, aside from his own pronounced Positivist orientation, speaks from the position of the structured social periphery. Or, perhaps more precisely, he speaks from a social periphery structured according to Positivist tenets. As I mentioned early in this article, the structure of a politically cohesive social periphery, no matter how radical, is forced to operate according to certain rigid laws of cause and effect (let us say, a "program"). An unstructured social periphery, even if it chooses to express quasi-political ambitions, obviously falls outside of the framework of organized political dissent: it is only history that may, *a posteriori*, structure its activities, thus "legitimizing" them. Paradoxically, the structured social periphery usually clings to causal laws more tenaciously than institutions of the center do: its very revolutionary state of emergency does not permit "deviation." Hence, given the condition of victory, it can so "naturally" become a center of unprecedented ferocity. This is its curse.

The poet, on the contrary, is not bound by such laws. A peripheral

<sup>22</sup> See Victor Swoboda, "Shevchenko and Belinsky," in *Shevchenko and the Critics*, pp. 302-323.

<sup>23</sup> Drahomanov, 2:93-96.

poet's various "irresponsibilities" can, in fact, directly threaten the structure of organized dissent, and the latter reacts accordingly. We recall that this is Draho-manov's second attack on Ševčenko's "disorder" mentioned here: there are many others in his several articles on the poet. They illustrate and summarize Draho-manov's belief that Ševčenko has no place in the ranks of organized political opposition—that his very literary periphery prohibits his presence on the social periphery, as Draho-manov saw it. To this may be added the violent reactions to Ševčenko by some early Soviet critics, when they were still, to a greater or lesser extent, revolutionaries.

The profound distrust that the organized social periphery harbors for the literary periphery becomes quite plain when a peripheral poet himself desperately wants to join the ranks of the organized social periphery or believes that he is already marching in them. Let us recall attacks, surprisingly similar to Draho-manov's, on the literary periphery of Surrealism from the organized social periphery of orthodox Western Marxism (I obviously do not mean here its own periphery, such as the Frankfurt School). Such attacks continued as late as the 1960s. It is well known that the Surrealists, at least for quite some time, openly flirted with Marxism and considered themselves to stand on the same social periphery with the Marxists. The vehemence with which orthodox Marxists in the West rejected such *camaraderie* is quite revealing: it was the danger of proximity that made them react so violently. To orthodox Marxists, Surrealism was not a viable periphery but a "lunatic fringe" which would confound and compromise their political program, so clearly proceeding from cause to effect.

Let me, parenthetically, mention the reverse of this. Many literary revolutionaries (T. S. Eliot being, perhaps, the most significant example) professed an incorrigible, even dangerous, "centrality" in their views on social issues, including the institution of literature as a social instrument. And yet such poets—often in the name of a poetic vision of some peripherally distant "centrality"—have threatened the very form of central social discourses (Mallarmé, Valéry, Stevens), as well as the very soul of central social institutions (Eliot in *The Wasteland*), incomparably more effectively than all the committed Marxist poets put together.

The reasons for such one-sided or mutual antagonisms are too obvious to discuss further. Suffice it to say that they all point to the dialectical bifurcation—that of opposition-within-unity—of the literary and the social peripheries, as I have attempted to outline it in the opening section of this article.

I have attempted to show that the spirit of the periphery, of “under-the-fenceness,” permeates and governs Ševčenko’s work on all levels—from broad philosophical concerns to specific questions of structure and diction. It is on the God-forsaken periphery that Ševčenko constructed new centers of his word, of his ultimately central imagination.

Skaży jim os' ščo:—Brešut' bohy,  
 Ti idoly v čužyx čertohax,  
 Skaży, ščo pravda ožyve,  
 Nadxne, naklyče, nažene  
 Ne vetxeje, ne drevlje slovo,  
 Roztlinneje, a slovo nove  
 Miž ljud'my krykom ponese.

(Tell them this: gods lie/ —Those idols in foreign palaces./ Tell them that truth will come alive,/ Truth will inspire, will call out and will bring forth/ Not the ancient, worn out,/ Rotting words, but the new word/ And truth will carry its shout among the people.)

From the periphery of his decentralized folk language, Ševčenko attacked the Imperialistic Logocentrism, a Logocentrism that uses language—frequently in a pseudo-mystical, pseudo-theological way—to enslave and to oppress. Out of this decentralized folk language Ševčenko created the center of the freedom of language and, in the same gesture, a language of freedom.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>24</sup> The nucleus of this article was presented in the form of an address at the Ševčenko Memorial Concert in Toronto, on March 22, 1980. A somewhat expanded paper was given at the Ševčenko Scholarly Conference, sponsored by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. and by the Ševčenko Scientific Society, in New York on May 2, 1981. Subsequent versions were read at a number of centers of Ukrainian studies. This is the second of a trilogy of articles on Ševčenko with a common theme. The first has been cited above, and the third is ready for the printer.



# Слав'янський Ріки Ševčenko contra Puškin?

GEORGE Y. SHEVELOV

The well-known facts are the following. On August 16, 1831, Puškin wrote a poem called “Klevetnikam Rossii” (To the Slanderers of Russia). It contained two lines which have become what is called in Russian *krylatye slova*, a generally known and often cited quotation, a catchphrase:

Славянские ль ручьи сольются в русском море?  
Оно ль иссякнет? вот вопрос.

(Will the Slavic rivulets converge in the Russian sea? / Will it dry up?  
Here is the question.)

After having completed (October 10, 1845) his poem “Jeretyk” (The Heretic), on November 22 of the same year, Ševčenko added an introduction—an epistle in verse, addressed to the renowned Czech Slavist of Slovak descent Pavel Josef Šafarik and entitled “Šafarykovi.” It contains two lines apparently on the same subject as those of Puškin (partially quoted in the title of this article in the spelling of its first publication *Osnova* 1861, 1, p. 3):

І потекли в одно море  
Слов'янські ріки!

(Into the single Slavic sea / Have flowed all the Slavic rivers.)

*Ševčenkivs'kyj slovnyk*, in the article “Puškin” by Z. Kyryljuk (2:151) does not mention the striking similarity of imagery in the two quotations. Yet it did not escape the attention of scholars and was pointed out by several of them. Without attempting to exhaust the subject and limiting myself to a few recent examples, I shall refer to the following. V. Simovyč (in Simovyč, 1921), specifically commenting on the two lines, discusses the differences between Ukrainian and Russian Slavo-

philism and mentions in passing the name of Puškin; but he does not go into details:

... the idea was born that if all Slavs joined hands and lived together, nobody could conquer them (Slavophilism, or, so to speak, an inter-Slavic sympathy). This idea also migrated to Russia and to Ukraine. But the Ukrainians upheld the view that each Slavic people, while living in harmony with the others, should have its freedom (federation), whereas the Russian Slavophiles said that all "the Slavs are to merge in one (Russian) sea (Puškin)" (p. 134).

Simovyč's assertion that Ševčenko in "Šafarykovi" promulgated the idea of an all-Slavic federation was not original. I am not certain who was the first to suggest this. Perhaps it was Kostomarov; in his autobiography (1875, published 1890, p. 61f, p. 195 in the 1922 edition), he speaks of a Slavic federation as the ideal of the Cyrillo-Methodians, but without any specific reference to "Šafarykovi." Be that as it may, we find an unequivocal statement of that conviction as early as Franko (1910, p. 110); it was repeated by Bryk (1917), in his detailed study of "Jeretyk" (for which study he was not even granted an entry in *Ševčenkivs'kyj slovnyk!*). Bryk wrote that, according to "Šafarykovi," "truth, freedom and love will abide in the Slavic federation, based as it is upon Christian republican principles" (p. 160). This, of course, implies discord with Puškin. Ivakin, in 1964, came much closer to a careful juxtaposition of the pertinent passages in Puškin and Ševčenko (which earlier had been pointed out by Bryk) and discussed them at some length, on three pages to be exact. But Ševčenko's views are summarized uncritically: "Here the poet expresses the idea of a free union [*spilkuvannja*; the word more often means 'communication'] of independent Slavic peoples, enjoying equal rights, in other words, he expresses the idea of a Slavic federation" (p. 210).

Although Ivakin admits a deep discrepancy between the views of Ševčenko and Puškin, he conspicuously abstains from revealing the essence of that discrepancy: "Ševčenko's variation of the image by Puškin has substantial ideological differences from its primary source" (p. 211). Leaving the question of the nature of these differences unanswered, Ivakin proceeds to the hypothesis that the image of rivers/rivulets and the sea—as it is applied to the Slavic relationships in the past and to the

"Slavic" future—may have its roots in the phraseology of the Decembrists; Ivakin then takes up the issue of the polemical aspects of Ševčenko's image. It contains, he writes, "a hidden polemical addressee, the reactionary Slavophiles," not bothering to explain that these "reactionary Slavophiles" were Russians and that Ševčenko's polemic was aimed against them indirectly. In the meantime, he evokes Puškin directly, as if the Russian poet belonged to them.

In *Ševčenkivs'kyj slovnyk*, the problem could have been discussed in the articles: "Slavjanofily, slovjans'ke pytannja" (by L. Xinkulov) and "Jeretyk" (by F. Volyns'kyj). In the former piece, the problem which Ivakin at least noticed is not even mentioned; in the latter, any differences that might exist on this question between Ševčenko and Puškin, are flatly denied. We read: "Following in the footsteps of the Decembrists, A. Puškin, and the progressive [*peredovymy*] figures of the Polish and Czech national liberation movements, Ševčenko saw the future of the Slavs as a free family of Slavic peoples" (1:216).

The attempt to smooth over the ideological differences between the two poets in regard to interrelations among the Slavs is so flagrant a violation of the two given texts that there is no need to dwell on it. Moreover, the contention that in "Šafarykovi" Ševčenko promulgated the political program of a Slavic federation is also quite unconvincing. The truth is that the notion of a Slavic federation does not appear in Ševčenko's poem at all; his *sui generis* quotation from Puškin is not a borrowing or a rehash, but rather a polemic with Puškin. What is more, it is a polemic, the sense of which is quite different from what has been suggested by Simovyč and Bryk and hinted at by Ivakin.

My purpose here is to measure the degree of the discrepancy between Ševčenko's and Puškin's views as reflected in the apparent borrowing by the former of the image created by the latter and, by the same token, to close the gap deliberately left open by Ivakin. Let me begin by putting the two passages in somewhat broader contexts.

Puškin's poem was written on a specific occasion—the Polish uprising of 1831. Puškin saw (or pretended to see) the strife between the Russians and the Poles as the crucial question of "to be or not to be," of existence either for Poland or for Russia. The idea of the two nations

freely coexisting does not seem to have occurred to him at all; rather, the Poles had to be crushed in order to ensure the very survival of Russia. In a letter of that same summer of 1831, he wrote in a similar vein: "It is necessary to strangle them [the Poles], and our procrastination is painful" (10:351). This helps us to analyze the distribution of expressive means in the poem. The Pole (derogatorily called *ljax*) is vainglorious/boastful (*kičlivyj*), as opposed to the Russian (called *ross* in the high poetical tradition, not to speak of the tradition of patriotic clichés) who is reliable/honest (*vernij*). The entire second part of the poem is devoted to the glorification of Russian power and the vastness of the Russian people: it will crush not only the Poles but also their Western sympathizers and, in fact, all of Europe; Puškin specifically alludes to the fairly recent defeat of Napoleon:

Есть место им в полях России  
Среди нечуждых им гробов.

(There's room for them in Russia's fields / 'Mid graves that are not strange to them.)

The question of to what extent the danger of destruction of Russia by Poland was real in 1831 does not interest us here. Puškin clearly transferred the situation of the early seventeenth century (which disturbed him, for instance, during his work on *Boris Godunov* in 1825) to his own time.

It follows that the question of Slavic unity was not the topic of Puškin's poem at all. Attempts to search in it for traces of Slavophilism are not only chronologically improper but also opposed to the very ideological fabric of the poem as a literary work. It was the political situation of 1831, viewed through the ideological prism of the imminent absorption of Poland by Russia (in order to nip in the bud the alleged Polish attempt to absorb Russia) that dictated the opposition of the Russian *sea* engulfing the Polish rivulet, otherwise surely strange for that time, to the merely speculative alternative of that sea running dry. Why should it run dry? Were there any actual indications of such a danger? One is forced to conclude that *slavjanskije ruč'i* in this context do not mean "all Slavic rivulets," but rather Polish (or, less likely, Polish and Russian) rivulets, and that the word *slavjanskije* is used metonymically,

meaning actually "Polish." The Czechs, the Slovaks, the Serbs, the Bulgarians and the other Slavs did not actively occupy Puškin's imagination in that poem. Let us keep in mind, moreover, that in 1831 the main works by Šafarik were not yet published, nor was J. Kollár's essay *On the Literary Interdependence of the Slavic Tribes and Dialects*, nor the enlarged version (third edition) of his *Slávy dcera* (literally, Daughter of Glory). Whether or not, in 1831, Puškin envisaged the eventual absorption of all the Slavs by Russia cannot be deduced from his "Klevetnikam Rossii."

The situation had changed by 1845. Slavophilism was in the air; differences between its Moscow and Prague varieties were increasingly apparent. The particular occasion on which "Klevetnikam Rossii" had been written faded from memory. The metonymic use of *slavjanskije ruč'i*, consequently, became obscure. The reader extended Puškin's original conception of the mutual exclusion of an independent Poland as against an independent Russia to, and grasped Puškin's antithesis of "Poland vs. Russia" as, the alternative of the survival of all Slavs on the one hand and, on the other, the hegemony of Russia and the obliteration of other Slavic cultures and political aspirations. One wonders why, in this new context, the survival of all the Slavs should imply the Russian sea running dry (*issjaknet*). Did the Czechs, the Serbs or even the Poles, by the very virtue of their self-preservation, threaten the existence of the Russians?

It was this conception—not necessarily shared by Puškin himself but, to a great extent, approved by the official Russia of Nicholas I—which called out for a reaction. Ševčenko accepted the challenge in his introduction to "Jeretyk." Ševčenko's position, however, should not be interpreted as a negation of Puškin's political conception in favor of his own. Neither was it simply a rejection of the official views on Slavdom for the sake of Ševčenko's own political program. If it was a kind of polemic with both, it took place on a completely different level.

The change of emphasis becomes immediately apparent when one considers certain subtle shifts in the leading image: although it was still reminiscent of Puškin, it was not entirely his anymore. To begin with, rivulets (*ruč'i*) became rivers (*riky*), which in itself endowed the streams

in question with a certain magnitude and grandeur (absent in Puškin) and rendered the possibility of their absorption somewhat implausible. Characteristically, Ševčenko did not use the diminutive variant of *rika*, which is *rička*. In contemporary Ukrainian the opposition *rika:rička* is largely neutralized, and *rička* may apply even to very large rivers. In Ševčenko's language, however, that opposition still obtained. All sixteen usages of *rika* in the body of his Ukrainian work refer to large rivers (emphasized in such word sequences as *šyrokiji riky* — 1:387 or *riky-more* — 2:251), and some are used hyperbolically (*riky krovy* — 1:262). Of the eight usages of *rička*, all but one are either neutral as to size, or clearly refer to small rivers (*ričok Sokorivky i Nosačivky* — 1:148; cf. also 1:66 and 1:305, 2:298). The only exception is the use of *rička* in reference to the Neva (1:406), which in another instance appears as *rika:ponad tyxoju rikoju* (1:248). The usage of *rička* for the Neva probably is meant to reinforce the overall ironical, derogatory tone of the particular passage in which it appears.

Second, and more important, we do not find any "Russian sea" (*russkom more*) in Ševčenko. The image of the sea does indeed appear, but with an entirely different meaning: it is now the result of a harmonious confluence of all the Slavic rivers. In nature, when rivers flow into a sea, they do not disappear; their disappearance (Puškin's image as grasped by posterity) actually would be in total disagreement with the laws of nature, except in the improbable case of the sea engulfing the lands which such rivers traverse. So in Ševčenko, the presence (or rather the rise) of the Slavic sea by no means implies the demise of the rivers of individual Slavic nations. On the contrary, the rivers—precisely because of their independent and permanent existence—feed the sea and secure its very presence, without being endangered themselves.

The idea that Ševčenko's image of the sea symbolizes a federation of the Slavs—an idea expressed, as we have seen, by so many scholars of Ševčenko's poetry—cannot be supported by any formulation, image or allusion in the text of the poem itself. Ševčenko, moreover, would view the notion of any such federation as a matter of the future, whereas in the poem the sea is already there. We see this in the use of the past tense:

І потекли в одно море  
Слов'янські ріки

(Into a single sea / *Flowed* the Slavic rivers)

and again:

Слава тобі, Шафаріку,  
Вовіки і віки,  
Що звів *еси* в одно море  
Слов'янські ріки.

(Great Šafařík, may fame be yours, / Now and forevermore / For *having*  
*joined* all Slavic streams / Within one ocean's shore.)

What then is that sea created by Šafarik and his fellows and followers?

Here we arrive at the main point of Ševčenko's "polemics" with Puškin. Puškin's poem was entirely political; Ševčenko moves the whole problem onto a spiritual plane. His "sea" is the outcome of free creativity by all the Slavic peoples, now awake and therefore spiritually free. It is because of this common effort that, after having become

Добрими братами  
І синами сонця правди,

(Good brothers / And sons of the sun of truth)

the Slavs will fulfill their new mission in relation to the whole world—

Мир мирові подарують  
І славу вовіки!

(Will bring the world through endless time / Undying peace and glory!)

—as the poem significantly ends.\*

Ševčenko's poem does not address questions of the Slavs' actualizing their spiritual unity, of their fulfilling their mission in the world (not even that!), of their being politically independent or federated, or even

\* Franko, in 1897, certainly followed his own and not Ševčenko's views when he said that Ševčenko "did not love the Slavs because they were the Slavs, . . . did not indulge in nebulous ponderings on the bright future of the Slavic race . . . did not believe in any specific principles of a future 'Slavic' culture." (31:25). This is exactly what is found in "Šafarykovi" and even more—a belief in a special world mission of the Slavs. It is another matter that Ševčenko did not hold such views throughout his career.

merging in some political—or for that matter non-political, unstructured, non-statist—unity; Ševčenko's poem does not address such questions because it has nothing whatever to do with politics as such. Ševčenko's "polemic" with Puškin was not a polemic between political ideologists. It was a "polemic" between the bearer of a spiritual conception and the promulgator of a political design.

Another well-known statement by Ševčenko on the future of the Slavs can be found in the prose post-scriptum (called *Peredmova*) to his poem *Hajdamaky* (1841): "Let the Slavic land, covered with golden rye and wheat, remain free of boundaries [*nerozmežovanoju*] from sea to sea." Although this passage lends itself more easily to a political interpretation, it does not have to be interpreted in this way. It too can be grasped—at least if it is isolated from the theme of the poem as a whole—as a metaphor of spiritual unity. But the image of *nerozmežovanyj* steppe, even though it occasionally has been interpreted as identical with the image of the sea in "Šafarykovi," can by no means be read as such. The former image is open to geographical and political interpretation, while the latter is not. It is because the latter image—the image of the sea—is spiritual that the subsequent image of a boat crossing that sea becomes possible:

І попливе човен  
З широкими вітрилами  
І з добрим кормилом,  
Попливе по вольнім морі,  
На широких хвилях.

(And a boat will float— / A boat with *broad sails* / And a sturdy rudder— / It will float on the free sea, / On the wide waves.)

The image of that boat probably embodies the message launched by Šafarik, the message which Ševčenko calls *naša pravda*. (our truth).

The Ševčenko of 1841 was in many respects quite different from the Ševčenko of 1845, contrary to attempts to show Ševčenko as immobile, petrified, not susceptible to development. Having stated that, let us now discuss a few more similarities and differences in Ševčenko's treatment of the Slavic question in 1841 and in 1845.



First, let us examine some similarities in the two works. The Slavs, in both texts, are children of the same mother, hence members of the same family: "We are children of one mother" in "Peredmovi"; *slovjans'kij dity* (Slavic children), *slovjan simju velyku* (the great family of the Slavs) in "Jeretyk." Both texts deplore the hostility among the Slavs: "Let the sons and the grandsons see that their fathers erred, let them fraternize with their [Slavic] enemies" ("Peredmovi"); "rivers of blood," "fierce serpent of feuds"—this is the past of the Slavs in "Jeretyk."

The inter-Slavic conflicts in Ševčenko's view of 1841, however, were limited to two nations—the Ukrainians and the Poles. In 1845, the scope of his meditations came to embrace all Slavs. Consequently, the general reasons for the internecine Slavic feuds were ignored in 1841; in 1845, at least one general reason had to be found, and Ševčenko believed that he had found it. It was the plot of (*nimci*)—*nimota*—*nimčyky*: the word always appears with such derogatory suffixes, and not a single time in its neutral form:

Отак німота запалила  
Велику хату. І сім'ю,  
Сім'ю слов'ян роз'єднила  
І тихо, тихо упустила  
Усобиць лютюю змію.

(Thus did *nimota* set ablaze / Our own great dwelling, and our family, / The Slavic stock, confused us to a daze, / And quietly gave to our divided ways / The fiery serpent of discordancy.)

The problem here is, however, that while accusing the *nimci* of sowing discord and provoking feuds among Slavs, Ševčenko does not mention any particular examples of the real Germans causing such feuds—be it in the introduction to his poem "Jeretyk" or in the body of that poem. On the contrary, the only Slavs specifically treated in the poem are the Czechs, and they do not participate in conflicts with other Slavs or, for that matter, among themselves. They always act, in supporting Jan Hus, as a harmonious unity, monolithically opposed to the Germans and to Rome in its various incarnations (the Pope, the Antipopes, the cardinals, etc.). It follows that the accusation of inciting inter-Slavic conflicts must refer to something that is not explicitly treated or even

mentioned in the poem—something that loomed in the poet's mind but was not formulated in words.

What were those inter-Slavic conflicts, sown by the *nimci*, that disturbed Ševčenko and that were implied, but not named, in the poem of 1845? The reader has surely noticed by now that the word *nimci*, in its various morphological manifestations, has been left untranslated in this text. Nothing would have been simpler than to render it by the English word "Germans." But such a rendition would hardly be adequate, even though *Slovnyk movy Ševčenska* (in its entirety deaf to Ševčenko's semantics) explains this word, without any comments, by the single word "German" (s. v. *nimec'*). We believe that Ševčenko's meaning of the word *nimci* will provide the key to the meaning (the message) of the poem "Šafarykovi" and of the poem "Jeretyk" as a whole.

The semantic spectrum of that word (used in Ševčenko's Ukrainian *oeuvre* twenty-three times) requires a separate study; if such an analysis were undertaken here, it would disrupt the framework of this article, which deals with a single poem. Anticipating (and simplifying) the possible conclusions of such a semantic study, suffice it to say that the meaning of the word *nimec'* vacillates in Ševčenko's poetry between "German" and "foreigner, stranger." Within the latter meaning, moreover, it vacillates between including and excluding "Russians" (in Ševčenko's vocabulary mostly *moskali*). There are texts in which *nimec'kyj* is clearly opposed to *moskovs'kyj*, e. g., in "Son" (Dream), 1844:

То город безкрайї,  
Чи то турецький,  
Чи то німецький,  
А може те, що й московський—

(This city has no limits. / Is it Turkish? / Is it German? / Or can it be that it is Russian?)

I shall put aside here the possibility of identifying all three adjectives in the above quotation through apparent contrasting. There are examples, however, in which *nimec'kyj* quite plainly encompasses the meaning of "Russian" as well, e. g., in "Poslanyje" (Epistle), separated in time from "Šafarykovi" by only twenty-two days. In his apostrophe to members of the upper classes, Ševčenko reproaches them as follows:

І сонця правди дозрівать  
В німецькі землі, не чужії,  
Претесея знову!...

(And to search for the Sun of Truth / Into *nimec'ki* lands, by no means foreign, / You throng again . . .)

If *nimec'ki* here meant "German," it could hardly sustain the qualification *ne čužiji*. That characterization, however, becomes plain and logical if *nimec'ki* means "Russian." It is well known that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries men and women of the upper classes "jostled through" or "thronged" (*perlysja*) to Russia in search of a successful career and/or of the ultimate truth; and that land was *ne čuža* because it belonged to the same Empire and because the phrase, used ironically (as an unmarked quotation), as it is obviously used here, can allude to the way of thinking of those people.

L. Bilec'kyj, in discussing the variant *u chužiji*, wrote (p. 422): "Whereas the first variant [*ne chužiji*] shows that for the Muscovite Germanized rulers the *nimec'ki zemli* were not foreign, but theirs, as if their own, the further . . . variants present the *nimec'ki zemli* as foreign to the Moscow rulers. This is a complete negation of Ševčenko's original idea by its later revision." Bilec'kyj correctly refers to Ševčenko's idea of the Germanization of the rulers of Russia; but he, too, takes *nimec'ki* as "German," in disregard of Ševčenko's semantic transitions. Actually, Ševčenko switches the meaning of the word to "stranger" and, consequently, implies "Russian" and not really "German." Similarly, in "Son" (The Dream; 1844), we find a full equation of the adjectives *moskovs'kyj* ("Russian") and *nimec'kyj*. Ševčenko describes his countrymen in St. Petersburg:

І землячки...  
По-московській так і ріжуть,  
Сміються та лають  
Батьків своїх, що змалечку  
Цвенкать не навчили  
По-німецькій—а то тепер  
І кисни в чорниках!  
П'явки! п'явки! Може, батько  
Остатню корову  
Жидам продав, поки вивчив  
Московської мови.

(And countrymen . . . chatter away in Russian, / Laughing and cursing / Their parents, for not having taught them, / When they were children, / To chatter in German— now they have / To soak in ink. / Leeches! Leeches! Perhaps your father / Sold his last cow / To the Jews, so you could learn / The Russian language.)

In the 1840s, large numbers of German settlers resided in St. Petersburg. In his "Xudožnik" (The Artist), Ševčenko writes: "You notice that all my acquaintances were Germans. But what nice Germans! I am simply in love with such Germans (4:190)." But there is no allusion to those settlers in the quoted fragment from "Son." The language of the Russian bureaucracy was of course not German but Russian; the mastery of German would not help the *zemljačky* to obtain better jobs.

To sum up, Ševčenko's *nimota*, which sows conflicts among the Slavs, does not mean only—and perhaps not even primarily—Germans in the strict sense of the word. However, in passing, Germans as such are also attacked in "Šafarykovi": they are accused of wanting to drown the Slavs in the German *pučyna* (the deep of the sea), in other words to Germanize them. But the *nimota* of the poem does not exclude the Russians either. This by no means implies that Ševčenko excluded the Russians from the Slavic community or wanted them to stay outside the borders of the Slavic unity of the future, as he envisaged it. Logically, this may seem to be a blatant contradiction. To explain it, we should remind ourselves of Ševčenko's fondness for fluctuating semantics, for the chameleonic nature of word meanings in his poetry, which effortlessly vacillate between different, and occasionally even mutually exclusive, notions. In the particular case of the status of the Russians in Ševčenko's world of the Slavs, however, we may suspect the poet of attempting to rationalize the contradictions inherent in *his* word *nimci*. A similar rationalization was most clearly formulated, probably a few months after Ševčenko had written "Šafarykovi," in M. Kostomarov's *Knyhy bytija*, e. g. in §94 (p. 23):

And the Slavs [*Slavjansščyna*] have suffered and continue to suffer bondage, but it was not they who inflicted it on each other. Because both the Tsar and the ruling class [*pany*] were not created by the Slavic spirit, but by the German or the Tatar one. And now in Russia there is a despotic tsar, yet he is not a Slav but a German; for this reason his ministers [*urjadnyky*] are Germans. Therefore, although there is a ruling class

[*pany*] in Russia, they soon turn [!] into either Germans or Frenchmen, while a genuine Slav does not love either the tsar or the ruler, but loves and keeps in mind only our God Jesus Christ, the tsar over heaven and earth.

The inter-Slavic conflicts incited by the "Germans" and deplored by Ševčenko in "Jeretyk" prove to be, first and foremost, conflicts between Russians and Ukrainians. While the basic text of "Jeretyk" depicts the struggles between Czechs and proper Germans and/or between Czechs and Rome, "Šafarykovi" transfers the reader—at least in its deep subtext—to the relationships between Ukrainians and Russians: their conflicts are allegedly also being caused by the "Germans" who had built the ferocious and all-devouring Russian empire.

Here, then, we re-enter the realm of politics, the pertinence of which in "Šafarykovi" we disputed and rejected earlier in this article. We see no real contradiction, however, between our earlier and our present statements. Ševčenko's political views are projected into the past, into history—only thus can they serve as an explanation of the present situation. The future, however, is presented purely on the spiritual level. This is still another message of the poem: spirituality overcomes and neutralizes politics, making it null and void. We have a poetical vision, and not a political program—a poetical vision which is called forth to render harmless the evil caused by political reality. The political program of Puškin's "Klevetnikam Rossii" is once more opposed and rejected on that specific level.

This article, limited as it is to semantic aspects of "Šafarykovi," does not pursue any biographical or psychological investigations. Marginally, we would like to point out a parallel to our theme in Varvara Repnina's "program" of Ševčenko's re-education. Describing her attempts to divert the poet from the monotony and the excesses of his daily life, Repnina wrote in her "Povest' " (Tale): "He was endowed with more than talent, he was given genius, and his sensitive and kind soul tuned his reed [*cevnica*] to everything lofty and holy"; accordingly, she "wanted him to reach the lofty goal . . . always and in everything to be great" (Geršenzon, p. 225). Ševčenko himself reacted to this in his "Trizna" (The Wake), written two years after *Hajdamaky* and two years before "Šafarykovi":

Для вас я радостно сложил  
 Свои житейские оковы,  
 Священнодействовал я снова  
 И слезы в звуки перелил.  
 Ваш добрый ангел осенил  
 Меня бессмертными крылами  
 И тихостройными речами  
 Мечты о рае пробудил.

(For you I happily abandoned / The chains of my daily existence, / I acted priest-like again, / Pouring my tears into song. / Your good angel took me under the shade / Of his immortal wings, / And awakened dreams of paradise / With his quietly harmonious words.)

It is the rejection of politics for "dreams of paradise" that Ševčenko espoused in "Šafarykovi." But, as we have seen in the subtext of the poem, the evil demon of "the chains of daily existence" pushed him toward the realities of everyday politics. Bryk (1917, p. 130) noticed that before 1843 Ševčenko's ideology was predominantly political, but in "Trizna" (1843) "the evangelical attitude came to the fore." Bryk did not refer to Ševčenko's relations with Varvara Repnina; yet 1843 was the year of the greatest scope and impact of these contacts and of her influence, and it was not by chance that "Trizna" was dedicated to her.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bilec'kyj—Taras Ševčenko. *Kobzar*, vol. 2. Ed. and commented by Leonid Bilec'kyj. Winnipeg 1952.
- Bryk—Ivan Bryk. "Ševčenkova poema «Ivan Hus.»" *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeny Ševčenka*, vol. 119-120, 1917; vol. 126-127, 1918.
- Franko—Ivan Franko. "Čy spravdi T. Ševčenko napysav virš «Slovjanam»?" *Zibrannja tvoriv u pjatdesjaty tomax*, vol. 31. Kiev 1981.
- Franko—Ivan Franko. *Narys ukrajins'ko-rus'koji literatury do 1890 r.* Lviv 1910.
- Geršenzon—M. Geršenzon. "T.G. Ševčenko i kn. V.N. Repnina." *Russkie proplei*, 2. Moscow 1916.
- Ivakin—Ju. O. Ivakin. *Komentar do "Kobzarja" Ševčenka. Poeziji do zaslan-nja*. Kiev 1964.

*Knyhy bytija*—Mykola Kostomarov. *Knyhy bytija ukrajins'koho narodu*. (B. Janivs'kyj, ed.). Augsburg 1947.

Kostomarov—N.I. Kostomarov. "Avtobiografija." *Literaturnoe nasledie*. St. Petersburg 1890. (Also second edition with omissions by censorship restored: *Avtobiografija N.I. Kostomarova*. V. Kotel'nikov ed. Moscow 1922.)

Simovyč—T. Ševčenko. *Kobzar*. Narodnje vydannja z pojasnennjamy i prymitkamy d-ra Vasylja Simovyča. Katerynoslav—Kamjanec'—Leipzig 1921.

*Slovnyk movy Ševčenka*, vols. 1–2. (V. Vaščenko, ed.). Kiev 1964.

*Ševčenkivs'kyj slovnyk*, vols. 1–2. (Je. Kyrjlyuk, ed.). Kiev 1976–1977.

Ševčenko's poetry is quoted from the edition: Taras Ševčenko. *Povne zibrannja tvoriv v desjaty tomax*. Akademija nauk URSR. Instytut ukrajins'koho literatury im. T.H. Ševčenka, vols. 1–2. Kiev 1939, with minor adjustments in spelling. Ševčenko's prose is quoted from Taras Ševčenko. *Povne zibrannja tvoriv u šesty tomax*. Akademija nauk Ukrajin's'koho RSR, Instytut literatury im. T.H. Ševčenka, vol. 4. *Povisti*. Kiev 1963.

Puškin's works are quoted from A.S. Puškin. *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij v desjati tomax*. Moscow-Leningrad, 1949 (volumes 3 and 10).

Translations of some of Ševčenko's excerpts are taken (with minor modifications) from: C.H. Andrusyshen and Watson Kirkconnel, trans., *The Poetical Works of Taras Shevchenko* (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1964). Others have been provided by the author and editor.

Translations of Puškin's excerpts are taken from: Walter Arndt, trans., *Pushkin Threefold: Narrative, Lyric, Polemic, and Ribald Verse* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1972).





# Sir Walter Scott and Pantelejmon Kuliš

ROMANA BAHRIJ-PIKULYK

The first novel of modern Ukrainian literature, *Čorna rada: Xronika 1663 roku* (The Black Council: A Chronicle of the Year 1663) by Pantelejmon Kuliš, is a historical novel; moreover, it closely adheres to the historical-novel pattern as developed by Sir Walter Scott. This is no coincidence: Scott was perhaps the most important figure in European literature in the first half of the nineteenth century. He influenced not only all the major English Victorian novelists—Dickens, Thackeray, George Eliot, Hardy—but also such Continental novelists as Alessandro Manzoni in Italy or the French writers Alexandre Dumas (père), Victor Hugo, Alfred de Vigny, Prosper Mérimée, Théophile Gautier. His trace is perceptible in the work of the Americans James Fenimore Cooper and William Gilmore Simms.<sup>1</sup> With reason, Walter Allen writes: “He was *the* European novelist, as Byron was *the* poet, and a later generation of novelists, Balzac, Dumas, and the Russians among them, were to look back to him as to a father.”<sup>2</sup>

Scott's influence in the Russian Empire and in the rest of Eastern Europe was enormous. Jakubovič describes this phenomenon:

In the 1930s, Walter Scott's works are recognized, assimilated and conquered. Russia is no exception to this. For the literary historian who studies the problem of literary influence this epoch provides an absolutely exceptional opportunity for the observation of the influence of a genre in its pure form. The historical novel masterfully conquers the minds of all the leading prose writers of Europe. . . . All the threads of that genre are interlaced with, criss-crossed by, and bound firmly to the name of Scott.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> John Lauber, *Sir Walter Scott* (New York, 1966), pp. 148-9.

<sup>2</sup> Walter Allen, *The English Novel: A Short Critical History* (New York, 1958), p. 113.

<sup>3</sup> D. Jakubovič, “Reminiscencii iz Val'ter Skotta v *Povestjax Belkina*” in *Puškin i ego sovremenniki: Materialy i issledovanija*, XXXVII (Leningrad, 1928), p. 100.

Scott's influence is evident in the novels of the Polish writer Henryk Sienkiewicz and in the historical novels of the Russian writers Zagoskin, Lazečnikov, in Puškin's *Kapitanskaja dočka* (The Captain's Daughter) and in Gogol's *Taras Bul'ba*.<sup>4</sup> Besides these well-known authors, there were dozens of lesser known Slavic "Walter-Scottists."<sup>5</sup> Borys Nejman comments that all the major and minor writers of Russian literature (and here one must include the Ukrainian school of Russian literature<sup>6</sup>) of the 1820s and 1830s "experienced the influence of 'the Scottish magician'."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Besides Peter Struve who wrote about this subject in "Walter Scott and Russia", *The Slavonic Review*, II (1932-33), 397-410, Ivan Zamotin analyzed the influence of Scott's *Legend of Montrose* on Zagoskin's *Jurij Miloslavskij* in *Romantizm dvadcatykh godov XIX stoletija v russkoj literature*, II (2nd ed.; St. Petersburg-Moscow, 1913), pp. 347-351. Borys Nejman also wrote a short article on the influence of Scott on Puškin, "Kapitanskaja dočka Puškina i romany Val'tera Skotta" in *Sbornik statej v čest' Akademika Alekseja Ivanoviča Sobolevskogo* (Leningrad, 1928, 1965 reprint), pp. 440-443. D. Jakubovič has studied the influence of Scott on Puškin in the article listed above and also in "Kapitanskaja dočka: Romany Val'tera Skotta" in *Puškin, Vremennik Puškinskoj komissii IV-V* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1939), pp. 165-197 and in "Iz zametok o Puškine i Val'tera Skotte" in *Puškin i ego sovremenniki: Materialy i issledovanija*, XXXVII-XXXIX (Leningrad, 1930), pp. 122-140. Serhij Rodzevyč analyzed the influence of Scott's *Ivanhoe* on *Taras Bul'ba* in "Taras Bul'ba, istorična povist" in Hohol', *Tvory*, I. Lakyza and P. Fylypovyč, ed., II (Kiev, 1930). There are also comments on this subject in studies of the Russian historical novel by S. Petrov, *Russkij istoričeskij roman XIX veka* (Moscow, 1964), by Walter Schamschula in *Der russische historische Roman vom Klassizismus bis zur Romantik* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1961).

<sup>5</sup> These have been listed by Zamotin, *Romantizm dvadcatykh godov XIX stoletija v russkoj literature*, pp. 336-338.

<sup>6</sup> The Ukrainian school of Russian literature refers to Russian romantic literature on Ukrainian themes, according to Dmytro Čyževs'kyj, *A History of Ukrainian Literature*, trans. by D. Ferguson, D. Gorsline and V. Petyk and ed. by G. S. N. Luckyj (Littleton, 1975), pp. 449-454. N. Piksanoj in *O klassikax* (Moscow, 1933), p. 70, writes that although Russians did write on Ukrainian themes, it was the Ukrainians who created "a whole separate movement in Russian culture and even spoke openly about the Ukrainian school in Russian literature." According to V. Sipovs'kyj in *Ukraina v rosijs'komu pys'menstvi (1801-50")*, I, U. A. N., *Zbirnyk istorično filolohičnogo viddilu*, LVIII (Kiev, 1928) there were over thirty works in Russian literature in the early nineteenth century on Ukrainian historical events of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Studies of this topic include: G. S. N. Luckyj, *Between Gogol and Ševčenko: Polarity in the Literary Ukraine, 1798-1849*, Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies, VIII, (Munich, 1971), G. G. Grabowicz, "The History and Myth of the Cossack Ukraine in Polish and Russian Romantic Literature" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1975).

<sup>7</sup> Borys Nejman, "Kuliš i Val'tera Skott" in S. Jefremov and O. Doroškevyč, ed., *Pantelejmon Kuliš: Zbirnyk prac' komisiji dlja vydavannja pamjatok novitnjoho pys'menstva* (Kiev, 1928), p. 128.

Scott's historical novels were immensely popular among readers in the Russian Empire, including Ukrainians. In the 1820s, the whole series of Scott's historical novels was translated from French into Russian.<sup>8</sup> Ivan Zamotin describes Scott's great popularity as a "cult." "Scott was known in all circles of Russian society. His name, his characters, his plots became increasingly popular and the custom in everyday conversations, arguments, comparisons, references."<sup>9</sup>

Pantelejmon Kuliš, like most of his contemporaries, read Walter Scott's novels with great enthusiasm. Yet Scott's influence on Kuliš was not researched until the present, except for the short studies by Borys Nejman and Viktor Petrov.<sup>10</sup> We know that Kuliš was reading Scott in 1840, when he first met Maksymovyč; Šenrok writes that "Maksymovyč, having developed a liking for the talented youth [i.e. Kuliš], began inviting him to his place, and they often sang Ukrainian songs together and read Walter Scott."<sup>11</sup> Kuliš expressed his enthusiasm for Scott in his essay "Perednje slovo do hromady: Pohljad na ukrajins'ku slovesnost'" (An Introductory Word to the Community: A Look at Ukrainian Literature), which appeared in the publication *Xata* (House) in 1860. He placed Scott alongside Europe's greatest literary geniuses.<sup>12</sup>

Kuliš's enthusiasm for Scott was reinforced by other historical novelists whom he admired,<sup>13</sup> primarily by the Polish "Walter-Scottist" Michał Grabowski who lived in Ukraine (in a Gothic-style palace in Oleksandrivka), and with whom Kuliš enjoyed a stable friendship,

<sup>8</sup> I. Zamotin, *Romantizm dvadcatykh godov XIX stoletija v russskoj literature*, pp. 340-341.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 341.

<sup>10</sup> i) B. Nejman, "Kuliš i Val'ter Skott", pp. 127-156; ii) V. Petrov, "Skotivs'ka povist' z ukrajins'koji mynuvšyny" in P. Kuliš, *Myxajlo Čarnyšenko* (Kiev, 1928), pp. 1-35; iii) R. Bahrij-Pikulyk, "*Taras Bul'ba* and *The Black Council*: Adherence to and Divergence from Sir Walter Scott's Historical Novel Pattern" (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1978). The present article is based on material from my dissertation.

<sup>11</sup> Šenrok, "P. A. Kuliš: Biografičeskij očerk," *Kievskaja starina*, LXXII (February, 1901), 173.

<sup>12</sup> P. Kuliš, "Perednje slovo do hromady: Pohljad na ukrajins'ku slovesnost'" in P. Kuliš, *Vybrani Tvory* (Kiev, 1969), p. 512.

<sup>13</sup> Puškin's *Kapitanskaja dočka* exerted some influence on Kuliš. Echoes of plot motifs and characters from that work are found in Kuliš's *Aleksej Odnorog*.

apparently founded on a similarity of outlook and interests.<sup>14</sup> Kuliš met Grabowski in 1843, while traveling through Ukraine, and they remained good friends until the death of the latter in 1863. Grabowski, a critic and historical novelist—a writer of the Ukrainian school in Polish literature—was the most significant figure in the right-bank Ukraine who wrote in Polish on Ukrainian themes. He wrote the following historical novels, all imitations of Scott: *Koliszczyzna i stepy* (The Anti-Polish Uprising and the Steppe), *Stanica hulaj-polska* (The Hulaj-polska Station), *Tajkury*, *Pan Starosta Kaniowski* (The Village Head Kaniowski), *Pan Starosta Zakrzewski* (The Village Head Zakrzewski). In fact, it was Scott who indirectly brought the two men together in 1843: the twenty-four-year-old Kuliš sent the Polish “Walter-Scottist” a copy of his *Mixajło Čarnyšenko*, which had just come out that year, and requested a personal meeting. Kuliš wrote later in his memoir “Okolo polustoletija nazad” (About a Half a Century Ago):

For the visit with Grabowski I prefaced a copy of my so-called historical novel, as a sign of respect for the Polish Scottist . . . I was particularly interested, in that respect, in Michał Grabowski's novel *Stanica hulaj-polska*. To me, at that time, the novel appeared to have been written by Walter Scott. I found out that Grabowski lived near Čyhyryn in the ancestral town of Oleksandrivka, and I began to think about how I could meet him. My dream was realized; but, first of all, à la Walter Scott, I walked about and drove about all the places described in the Polish-Ukrainian novel. It was here that the book, which today is making its appearance in the world, was first started.<sup>15</sup>

Not only was Kuliš enthusiastic about *Stanica hulaj-polska*, but he translated into Russian and published Grabowski's *Pan Starosta Zakrzewski*. Kuliš's enthusiasm for Grabowski's work was reciprocated by the Polish writer. Grabowski had someone translate *Mixajło Čarnyšenko* into Polish<sup>16</sup> and Kuliš, in a letter to Juzefovyč of July 31, 1843,

<sup>14</sup> V. Hnatjuk, “Pol's'kyj literator M. A. Grabovs'kyj i joho pryjateljuvannja z P. O. Kulišem,” *Zapysky istoryčno-filolohičnoho viddilu VUAN* (1929), Bk. 21-22, pp. 227-47; Bk. 23, pp. 97-124.

<sup>15</sup> Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 105.

<sup>16</sup> Vasyľ Ščurat, in *Filosofična osnova tvorčosty Kuliša* (L'viv, 1922), p. 124, states that the translator of *Mixajło Čarnyšenko* into Polish was Zenon Fiš. *Mixajło Čarnyšenko* was

quoted Grabowski as saying that he, Kuliš, had grasped the elements of the Zaporozhian soul and that soon he would write something equal to Scott's *Waverley* or *Old Mortality*.<sup>17</sup>

Not only was Kuliš familiar with Scott's works, but he used them in their various translations as a means of studying languages during his exile in Tula. Earlier, in Luc'k, he had the opportunity to read Scott's works in the French translation,<sup>18</sup> but it was in Tula that he read them in the original English.<sup>19</sup> Kuliš's wife Oleksandra Bilozers'ka wrote in a letter to Nadija Bilozers'ka: "Išimova often provides him with the novels of Walter Scott in the original,"<sup>20</sup> and in another letter she wrote that her husband "is reading, writing, [and] studying the novels of Walter Scott in the original."<sup>21</sup>

It is possible to trace by direct references the specific works of Scott that Kuliš read. Kuliš seems to have read *The Antiquary*, because he wrote: "I rush to own a rare book like Walter Scott's Oldbuck or like the famous bookbinder before whom even Oldbuck, that unforgettable antiquary, bowed."<sup>22</sup> He also must have read *Rob Roy*, because in the

also translated into Czech in 1847. *Michal Čarnyšenko aneb Malá Rus pred osmdesáti lety od Petra Čuleše, z rustiny preložil Cristián Stefan.*

<sup>17</sup> "Pis'ma P. A. Kuliša k M. V. Juzefoviču (1843-1861)," *Kievskaja starina*, LXIV (February, 1899), p. 191.

<sup>18</sup> M. Čalyj, "Junye gody P. A. Kuliša," *Kievskaja starina*, LVII (1897), pp. 296-297.

<sup>19</sup> O. Doroškevyč in "Kuliš na zaslanni," in *Pantelejmon Kuliš*, ed. by S. Jefremov and O. Doroškevyč (Kiev, 1927), p. 38, writes: "One may say that it was here [Tula] that Kuliš mastered the main European languages, and became a true European." Kuliš wrote to Bodjans'kyj while in exile, "I don't know Greek and I know Latin poorly but, on the other hand, I read in Polish, in French, in German, in Italian, in English, and dabble somewhat too." (*Kievskaja Starina*, LIX [November, 1897], p. 260).

V. Hnatjuk confirms Kuliš's extraordinary linguistic talents and points out that Kuliš learned Polish while living with a Polish family before going to Luc'k in 1841. V. Hnatjuk, "Pol's'kyj literator M. A. Grabovs'kyj i joho pryjateljuvannja z P. O. Kulišem," p. 105. In addition to Ukrainian, Russian and Polish, Kuliš learned French, German, English, Spanish, Italian and Arabic and later, in order to translate the Bible into Ukrainian, he learned Hebrew and Latin.

<sup>20</sup> Letter of May 1st, 1850 (Archives of U. A. N.). Cited by O. Doroškevyč, "Kuliš na zaslanni," p. 40.

<sup>21</sup> Letter of January 18, 1849. Cited by Doroškevyč, "Kuliš na zaslanni," p. 38. Presumably this letter is from the same source as above, although Doroškevyč does not specify the source.

<sup>22</sup> P. Kuliš, "Progulki po Peterburgu," *Sovremennik*, XXXVII (January, 1853), Sect. 6, p. 43.

letter to Xyl'čevs'kyj he compared Sonja Klyčevs'ka to Diana Vernon.<sup>23</sup> In a letter to Bodjans'kyj, written on December 18, 1848 in Tula, he mentions that he has four Scott novels, *Quentin Durward*, *The Antiquary*, *Waverley* and *Ivanhoe*, and asks Bodjans'kyj to send him more.

There is a Leipzig Tauchnitz edition of English writers (collection of British Authors), of which each volume is sold separately at 60 kopeks. Please buy me four volumes of Walter Scott's novels of that edition. Of these I already have the following: 1) *Quentin Durward*, 2) *The Antiquary*, 3) *Waverley*, 4) *Ivanhoe*—so don't buy these, but buy four others, according to your own selection. With time I shall acquire all of them, but now buy those which you yourself prize most highly. . . . The English language has convinced me that this is the best way to study languages. While travelling abroad, I understood barely one word in a hundred in a book, but now I read books freely, rarely turning to the dictionary.<sup>24</sup>

Two important facts are conveyed in this letter. The first is that Kuliš owned copies of the four Scott novels, mentioned above. Second, it confirms that Kuliš's method of studying languages included reading Scott's novels in various translations. In another letter to Bodjans'kyj, of June 26, 1849 from Tula, he requested the following:

With the enclosed three rubles, please buy me two of the following novels of Walter Scott in a good German translation (from the original): 1) *Ivanhoe*, 2) *Quentin Durward*, 3) *The Antiquary*, 4) *Guy Mannerling*, 5) *Waverley*; and also, one of these novels in Italian translation (translated from the original, and not from the French). If you do not find an Italian translation, then *Don Quixote* in Italian translation will do (but not translated from the French).<sup>25</sup>

Kuliš appears to have been familiar with *Old Mortality*, as is implied in the above-mentioned letter to Juzefovyč of July 31, 1843.

The extent of Kuliš's familiarity with Scott's texts becomes even more evident when we examine the plot motifs and character types in Kuliš's following historical novels: *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko ili Malorossija vosem'-desjat let nazad* (Mixajlo Čarnyšenko or Little Russia Eighty Years

<sup>23</sup> "Pis'ma P. A. Kuliša k I. F. Xil'čevskomu 1858-1857," *Kievskaja starina*, LX (January, 1898), p. 107.

<sup>24</sup> "Pis'ma P. A. Kuliša k O. M. Bodjanskomu," *Kievskaja starina*, LIX (November, 1897), p. 248.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 251.

Ago), published in 1843; *Aleksej Odnorog* (Aleksej Unicorn), published in 1853; and *Čorna rada*, begun in 1843 but not published in its final version until 1857.<sup>26</sup> These similarities have been observed by Borys Nejman,<sup>27</sup> in a study based on Dibelius' analysis of recurring plot motifs and character types in Scott's novels.

According to Walter Dibelius, a representative of the German school of compositional analysis, the two main narrative traditions that serve as sources for Scott's motifs are the adventure novel (*Abenteuerroman*), and the Gothic novel (*Sensationsroman*). The adventure novel and the Gothic novel provide what Dibelius calls the *Konstruktionsmotiv*—the main-plot motif—such as the journey motif, the love motif, the education (*Bildung*) motif, the intrigue motif, and the mystery motif. "Single-plot motifs," (*Einzel motive*) are also present in Scott's novels. "Single-plot motifs" in the tradition of the adventure novel are: the hero's saving of his beloved, an unjust trial of the hero, a duel resulting from rivalry in love, the imprisonment of the hero or some other important character, a lost letter which causes confusion, a secret about the hero's birth and legitimacy. "Single-plot motifs" in the tradition of the Gothic novel are: a prison full of secrets, long court sessions, an escape from captivity despite great dangers, the appearance of ghosts in a castle, the return of those presumed to be dead, the last-minute prevention of the death of someone, the death of someone just as he or she is about to reveal a secret, the revelation of a relationship by means of a small picture.

Another tradition which provides some "single-plot motifs" in Scott's novels, although it is not as important a source for Scott as the adventure and Gothic traditions, is the medieval-romance tradition (*heroisch-galanter Roman*), and the ballad tradition. These sources provide the

<sup>26</sup> All three novels were written in Russian. Only *Čorna rada* was written also in a Ukrainian version. Kuliš began *Čorna rada* in 1843 and completed both the Russian and the Ukrainian versions in 1846. Due to censorship, some parts of only the Russian version were published in the 1840s. In the 1850s Kuliš rewrote both the Ukrainian and Russian versions, and both of these new versions were published in 1857. There are some differences of a stylistic nature between the Russian and Ukrainian editions. For a detailed history of the publication of this novel, see Je. Kyryljuk, "Peršyj ukrajins'kyj roman *Čorna rada*" in P. Kuliš, *Tvory*, ed. by O. Doroškevyč, III (Xarkiv-Kiev, 1931), pp. 186-244.

<sup>27</sup> B. Nejman, "Kuliš i Val'ter Skott".

following "single-plot motifs": a heroic friendship between opponents in an enemy camp, the capture of a beautiful woman, and a duel over a beautiful woman (we have seen that the last is also a plot motif in the adventure tradition).

Nejman's list of recurring plot motifs is actually half as long as Dibelius' original: a civil war or a conflict in the background; one or more knights are on a journey; the protagonist arrives at a castle where a banquet is held—he meets a beautiful lady; the obstacle to love is another suitor who sometimes captures the beauty either by force or cunning; the conflict over the woman leads to a duel; the woman heals the wounded protagonist; the protagonist finds himself in an enemy camp—sometimes the leader of the rebels reveals his plans to the protagonist; the protagonist or some other important character goes to prison; a disguise is used as a means of escape from prison; there is frequently mystery—a dark forest and a den of thieves; marriage and domestic happiness crown the end; the monarch regains his throne at the end.

The number of plot motifs and character types which Kuliš borrowed from Scott, both directly and indirectly,<sup>29</sup> is much greater than that listed by Nejman. The most important motif from the point of view of the novel as genre is the education or initiation motif; yet Nejman roundly ignores it. Even Dibelius, who does mention it, fails to appreciate its full significance.<sup>30</sup> Yet this motif is central to the genre of the novel, and sets it apart from the genre of the romance. Closely related to the education motif is the motif of the conflict between father and son, the strict-father motif and the journey motif: the son leaves his father in order to prove himself.

<sup>28</sup> Wilhelm Dibelius, *Englische Romankunst: Die Technik des englischen Romans im achtzehnten und zu Anfang des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, II (Berlin, 1922).

<sup>29</sup> Many motifs are direct borrowings from Scott, while others are indirect, via such works as Puškin's *Kapitanskaja dočka* and M. Grabowski's *Stanica hulaj-polska*.

<sup>30</sup> The main drawback of Dibelius' study is that he sees Scott's novels as belonging to one type — the adventure type (p. 118); that is, novels in which the action is a sequence of causally unrelated events. Such a grouping does not account for the Scott novels that belong to the *Bildungsroman* type, where the action consists of causally interrelated events in which the protagonists learn from their experiences, and by their decisions change the course of their lives.



Although both in the romance and the novel the protagonist sets out on a quest, the nature of such a quest is determined by the given genre.

[He] goes forth to discover his own nature and the nature of the world; he is often in search of his name, his father, in search of a mysterious treasure. The completion of the quest proves the young man, if he is the protagonist of a romance, to be what he, and the author, and we the readers knew from the start that he was—a hero. In the novel, the “going forth” may be metaphorical rather than actual; but the voyage often provides the novelistic framework, and the protagonist’s movement is always from a narrow environment to a broader one. . . . The goal of the quest—the name and the treasure, may or may not be achieved; but the protagonist of the novel is likely to discover, with Falstaff, that there is no future for heroism, that he himself is a perfectly ordinary man, with the experience and the knowledge that suit his station.<sup>31</sup>

The progression of events in the novel, because of the “education” of its protagonist, leads to disillusionment and disenchantment: and the “hero” realizes that he is not a hero but an ordinary man with certain limitations and responsibilities; he learns that the world is not a heroic or enchanted place but dismal, mundane and ordinary. As the protagonist realizes his limitations and those of the world around him, he adjusts accordingly and thus undergoes a change of character. This is essentially the movement of the *Bildungsroman*—the “apprentice novel”—but it is, at the same time, the cornerstone of the novelistic genre in general.<sup>32</sup> Marian Cusac points out that the initiation theme is present in *Waverley*, *Rob Roy*, *Quentin Durward*, *Old Mortality*, *Woodstock* and *Anne of Geierstein*, and places *Waverley* and *Rob Roy* squarely in the tradition of the *Bildungsroman*.<sup>33</sup>

Kuliš’s *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko* and *Aleksej Odnorog* contain the education motif, the father-son conflict, the strict-father motif and the motif of the journey. The treatment of these motifs in *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko*

<sup>31</sup> V. Z. Shroder, “The Novel as a Genre,” in Philip Stevick, ed., *The Theory of the Novel* (New York, 1967), p. 15.

<sup>32</sup> The romance, which shares many common features with the adventure novel, presents an illusionary world where the protagonist undergoes no character changes and the focus of interest is not on character but on action, which is not a direct result of characters, as it is in the novel, but consists of a fantastic succession of events.

<sup>33</sup> Marian H. Cusac, *Narrative Structure in the Novels of Sir Walter Scott* (The Hague, 1969), pp. 78-81.

bears traces of Gogol's Gothic-like romance *Taras Bul'ba*: the father, for example, is inflexible, and the son is totally damned. Although old Čarnyš does not kill Mixajlo (as Taras Bul'ba kills his son Andrij), he damns him with a curse that is all-powerful. The presence of a curse supports the theory of indirect reinforcement from Gogol, because Gogol used this motif in his *Strašnaja mest'* (Terrible Vengeance) and Kuliš used it, as well, in his short story "Ognennyj zmej" (The Fiery Serpent). The source of this motif can be found in the Gothic tradition; it was used by Scott in his most Gothic novel, *The Bride of Lammermoor*. Here a prophecy has the same damning power as the curse does in *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko*.

*Aleksej Odnorog* begins at the point where the hero, after having left his father and having received a foreign education, is returning home. Aleksej's father is also severe, but not to the degree of old Čarnyš; here the father-son motif resembles the treatment of such a motif by Puškin in *Kapitanskaja dočka* and by Scott in *Waverley* and *Rob Roy*.

*Čorna rada* opens with the journey motif: the morose and serious Šram, accompanied by his obedient son Petro, has embarked on a political mission to Somko in Perejaslav. But we do not find in this novel an obvious education motif, nor is there an apparent *open* conflict between the father and the son. There is, however, a deep and *hidden* conflict between the two; an analysis of the function of each of these characters in the narrative structure of the novel brings it to light. This indirect conflict is implied by the two different approaches to the questions of history and of the individual. Whereas Šram is committed to politics and is constantly involving himself in state affairs which set the course of history, Petro, on the contrary, always chooses the road of non-involvement in political affairs.<sup>34</sup>

Kuliš utilizes many of Scott's motifs and character types in his historical novels. Here is an example. In Scott's novels, we occasionally see the capture or kidnapping of a beautiful woman; in *Ivanhoe*, for

<sup>34</sup> Romana Bahrij-Pikulyk, "The Individual and History in the Historical Novel: P. Kulish's *The Black Council*," *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, XXIV (June, 1982), No. 2, pp. 152-160.

instance, Rebecca and Rowena are captured by Front-de-Boeuf and De Bracy. The second part of this motif consists in that the protagonist rescues the beauty; in *Ivanhoe*, Ivanhoe rescues Rebecca. In *Čorna rada*, Lesja is captured by Kyrlo Tur and rescued by Petro. This motif, in its variant of the capture of a bride, is found in Scott's Introduction to *Rob Roy*—James Roy's brother, Robin Oig, who is a widower, kidnaps a twenty-year-old widow Jean Key and forcibly marries her.

Having, at length, dragged the object of their lawless purpose from her place of concealment, they tore her from her mother's arms, mounted her on a horse before one of the gang, and carried her off in spite of her screams and cries, which were long heard after the terrified spectators of the outrage could no longer see the party retreat through the darkness.<sup>35</sup>

It is more likely that Kuliš borrowed the motif of capture, rescue, and duel directly from *Quentin Durward*, because *Čorna rada* contains a great number of plot motifs, characters, scenes and even minor details that are strongly reminiscent of this one particular novel. In *Quentin Durward*, the Duke of Orleans attempts to capture the two ladies of Croye, but Quentin, in whose care they have been placed, valiantly defends them. Not only is this scene similar to Lesja's rescue in the sense of the general motif of a duel in defense of a lady, but a number of details in the two scenes strongly resemble each other. There is the waving of a handkerchief, the interruption of the duel at its height by a rescue party, the encounter between two warriors, one of whom is a well-known champion, and the similarity of reasons for the capture. Like Kyrlo's, the Duke of Orleans' motive was "harebrained passion, suddenly and rashly undertaken" (ch. 15, p. 140). In *Quentin Durward* (ch. 17), we find yet another variant of the motif of capture. Here Quentin overhears the plan of Hayraddin, the gypsy, and the mercenaries to capture Isabelle de Croye, and frustrates their plans. This variant of the motif of capture (the prevention of capture) is echoed in *Čorna rada* when Petro sees the captured Lesja being carried away by Tur and stops

<sup>35</sup> Sir Walter Scott, Introduction to *Waverley Novels*, III, Abbotsford ed. (Edinburgh-London, 1842), pp. 26-28. Henceforth, all quotations from the *Waverley Novels* will be from this edition; page numbers will be indicated in the text parenthetically.

Tur's plans. Taking into consideration the fact that there is a close resemblance between Kyrylo Tur and Hayraddin, which will be outlined later, we see that what Kuliš has done is to combine the two motifs of capture in *Quentin Durward* into one.

There are some similarities of plot motifs limited solely to *Quentin Durward* and *Čorna rada*. For example, the journey motif in both novels is presented as a pretended pilgrimage. In the former, the two ladies of Croye are escaping, but they pretend that they are on a pilgrimage to the holy city of Cologne. So, too, Šram embarks on a journey to Somko in Perejaslav, but pretends to be going on a pilgrimage to Kiev. When the Čerevan' family joins Šram and his son, the journey indeed becomes a pilgrimage to Kiev for blessings for the betrothed couple.

This reason for the pilgrimage implies the theme of auguring a happy marriage, evident in both novels. In *Quentin Durward*, Le Balafré, Quentin's uncle, mentions to Lord Crawford that his countryman Saunders Souplejaw had prophesied an advancement for him through marriage. Because Le Balafré is not inclined towards marriage, he deduces that the prophecy must refer to his nephew Quentin. In *Čorna rada* Lesja's mother reveals to Petro her prophetic dream about her daughter's marriage to the het'man. The lovesick Petro in *Čorna rada*, (first edition) goes to a convent to pray, just as the lovesick Quentin prays in one of the chapels of the convent church (see Appendix, II).

In *Quentin Durward*, the reason for the conflict between the Bishop of Liege and William de la Marck is a personal insult.

This William de la Marck was bred in his [the Bishop's] household, and bound to him by many benefits. But he gave vent, even in the court of the Bishop, to his fierce and blood-thirsty temper, and was expelled thence for a homicide committed as one of the Bishop's chief domestics. From thenceforward, being banished from the good Prelate's presence, he hath been his constant and unrelenting foe; and now, I grieve to say, he hath girded his loins, and strengthened his horn against him (*Quentin Durward*, ch. 16, p. 152).

So too in *Čorna rada* the immediate cause for Brjuxovec'kyj's intense animosity toward Somko is Somko's personal insult against him: Somko called Brjuxovec'kyj an old dog before the council. For this Brjuxovec'kyj tried to kill Somko, but was caught and humiliated by being

forced to ride on a pig through Hadjač. As a result of this double insult, Brjuxovec'kyj became the head of the Zaporožian opposition against Somko.

In both novels, the men who attempt to capture women are severely punished.<sup>36</sup> The Duke of Orleans is taken to Loches, a dreaded prison, for his attempt at capturing Isabelle. In *Čorna rada*, this theme is embodied in Kyrylo Tur's punishment for the capture of Lesja. The actual mode of punishment that Kyrylo receives is similar to the punishment the gypsy Hayraddin receives for having intoxicated the monks of a monastery. The monks are ordered to beat Hayraddin with broom-staves and cart whips. Tur is beaten with sticks, according to an old Zaporožian custom. Because this Zaporožian custom is historical, as are the facts concerning Somko's insult against Brjuxovec'kyj, they should be regarded as examples of how fact and literary convention reinforce each other.

A plot motif in the romance tradition is the healing of a wounded knight by a beautiful woman. In *Ivanhoe*, Rebecca cares for the wounded Ivanhoe, while in *The Legend of Montrose*, Annot Lyle looks after the wounded Lord of Monteith. In Grabowski's *Stanica hulaj-polska*, Mokryna, like Rebecca in *Ivanhoe*, becomes a physician. In Kuliš's *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko*, Roksanda tends to the wounds of Mixajlo. Lesja in *Čorna rada* cares for Petro, wounded after the duel, just as Isabelle de Croye tends to the wounds of Quentin after his duel.

The motif of the friendship between opponents in the enemy camp—as it is embodied in Scott's *Waverley* between Edward and Colonel Talbot, and in *Old Mortality* between Morton and Evandale—is paralleled in *Čorna rada* by the friendship between Petro Šramenko and Kyrylo Tur.

The plot motifs of disguise and mistaken identity are also found in both Scott and *Čorna rada*. The use of a disguise as a means of rescue from prison often appears in Scott, as for example in *Ivanhoe*. This

<sup>36</sup> This motif, slightly altered, also appears in Scott's *Ivanhoe* and in Gogol's *Taras Bul'ba*, except that here the Templar Brian and Andrij are punished not for capturing but simply for loving a woman.

motif also appears in Gogol's *Taras Bul'ba*. In *Čorna rada*, Kyrylo Tur uses the disguise of an old hunchback in a cape and hood, in order to enter the prison. Related to the motif of disguise is the motif of mistaken identity. Quentin is mistakenly indentified as a Scotch Guard because he is wearing a steel-lined bonnet which Lord Crawford ordered to be placed upon his head after his own morion had been broken in the duel with Orleans and Dunois. So, too, Petro is mistakenly identified as a Brjuxovec'kyj supporter at the black council, because he and Čerevan' are wearing blue ribbons which their host Gvyntovka gave them.

We have seen that the motif of disguise is frequently used as a means of liberation from prison. Imprisonment of the protagonist or of some other important person is, therefore, a frequent motif in both novelists. It appears in *Waverley*, *Ivanhoe*, *The Antiquary*, *Rob Roy*, *The Heart of Midlothian*, *The Legend of Montrose*, and in *Quentin Durward*, to cite only a few examples. Needless to say, it is an important plot element in *Čorna rada*. For example, King Louis in *Quentin Durward* is imprisoned by his opponent Charles the Bold, just as Somko in *Čorna rada* is imprisoned by his opponent Brjuxovec'kyj.

Close to the motif of imprisonment is the theme of the offer of one's life in exchange for the life of someone else. In *Waverley*, Evan Dhu offers his life so that Fergus MacIvor may be spared, but his offer is refused. In a similar gesture, Kyrylo Tur offers to exchange places with the imprisoned and condemned het'man Somko, but the latter refuses.

Now let me briefly point to some similar scenes in Scott's novels and in *Čorna rada*. One of these is the scene of the blacksmith's wife in *Waverley* (ch. 30), and the scene of the blacksmith's wife in *Čorna rada* (ch. 10). Similar, too, is the accidental and coincidental finding of a cottage by the protagonist. In *Old Mortality*, Morton, upon returning after several years abroad and while deep in thought, stumbles upon the cottage of Elizabeth MacLure. In a similar fashion, Petro in *Čorna rada* (ch. 11), while visiting Gvyntovka in Nižyn, walks deep in thought and stumbles upon the cottage of Kyrylo's mother and sister who at that very time are looking for him. Particularly striking in their similarity are the town scenes in *Quentin Darward* and *Čorna rada*. Quentin is harassed by the townsmen of Liege, just as Šram and his company are

harassed by the townsmen of Kiev. The Count of Crèvecoeur's contempt for the burghers is similar to Šram's contempt for the Kievan townsmen (see Appendix, I).

An interesting variation on the application of motifs is the use of a striking object as a symbolic motif. Let me point to the example of a drinking vessel which, incidentally, performs important functions in medieval romances. We encounter the stirrup cup in *Waverley* and also in *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko* and *Čorna rada*. In each of these novels the drinking vessel is very large, beautifully decorated, and serves as a symbol of hospitality. Drinking from it is like performing a ritual. Here is an appropriate passage from *Waverley*:

As the guests had left their horses at the small inn, or *change-house*, as it was called, of the village, the Baron could not, in politeness, avoid walking with them up the avenue, and Waverley, from the same motive, and to enjoy, after this feverish revel, the cool summer evening, attended the party. But when they arrived at Luckie Maclearey's, the Lairds of Balmawhapple and Killancureit declared their determination to acknowledge their sense of the hospitality of Tully-Veolan, by partaking with their entertainer and his guest Captain Waverley, what they technically called *deoch an doruis*, a stirrup-cup, to the honour of the Baron's roof-tree (*Waverley*, *W. N.*, I, ch. 11, p. 87).

Scott adds a long footnote:

I may here mention that the fashion of comotation described in the text, was still occasionally practised in Scotland, in the author's youth. A company, after having taken leave of their host, often went to finish the evening at the clachan or village, in "womb of tavern." Their entertainer always accompanied them to take the stirrup-cup, which often occasioned a long and late revel.

The *Poculum Potatorium* of the valiant Baron, his Blessed Bear, has a prototype in the fine old Castle of Glamis, so rich in memorials of ancient times; it is a massive beaker of silver, double gilt, moulded into the shape of a lion, and holding about an English pint of wine. The form alludes to the family name of Strathmore, which is Lyon, and, when exhibited, the cup must necessarily be emptied to the Earl's health. The author ought perhaps to be ashamed of recording that he has had the honour of swallowing the contents of the Lion; and the recollection of the feat served to suggest the story of the Bear of Bradwardine. In the family of Scott of Thirlstane (not Thirlstane in the Forest, but the place of the same name in Roxburghshire) was long preserved a cup of the same kin, in the form of a jack-boot. Each guest was obliged to empty this at his departure. If the guest's name was Scott, the necessity was doubly imperative.

When the landlord of an inn presented his guests with *deoch an doruis*, that is, the drink at the door, or the stirrup-cup, the draught was not charged in the reckoning. On this point a learned Bailie of the town of Forfar pronounced a very sound judgment (ch. 11, p. 87).

The scene that follows in the text of the novel is one of great merry-making, drinking and singing. This scene has a parallel in *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko*, in a description of Pan Bardak's uncommon hospitality:

"Good," said Pan Bardak, "Good, Cossack. Get busy, boys! Open the gates! Hand over *Dorošenko's cup* [*Dorošenkova čarka*] and some aged plum brandy."

All of these orders were carried out within a minute. But Mixajlo and Cossack Sereda became horrified when they saw *Dorošenko's cup*. It was a huge silver vessel measuring two quarts, plated with gold on the inside and decorated with various mythological scenes of exquisite workmanship on the outside.<sup>37</sup>

Kuliš liked this object so much that he concluded *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko* with a detailed description of it. The passage is immediately reminiscent of Scott's footnote, quoted above.

If it should happen that somehow, unexpectedly, one of my readers finds the famous *Dorošenko cup* that I have described, I hope that he will be so kind as to send an accurate sketch of it to the author of this book. In addition to what I have already said in chapter XVI, I consider it necessary to describe the following features. According to the account of an old centenarian, who himself drank from it many times, there was inscribed on one side of the long handle: *Het'man of the Zaporozhian Army Petro Dorošenko*. On the other side, the inscription read: *To my faithful captain Fedir Bardak, from myself, the year 1675*. But the most interesting was the inscription on the rim of the cup: *Whoever drinks at one time the contents of this vessel, is worthy to stand beneath the banner of Dorošenko*.<sup>38</sup>

This object-motif is repeated in *Čorna rada*. Here also Kuliš describes an elaborate ritual of drinking from a beautiful drinking vessel; instead of singing, the guests attempt to answer a riddle.

"Enough, enough of politics," said Čerevan'. "I'll give you a better topic for conversation."

<sup>37</sup> P. Kuliš, *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko ili Malorossija vosem'desjat let nazad* (Kiev, 1843), ch. 16, p. 102.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. 30, p. 203.



He took down from a shelf a pitcher made of silver and beautifully decorated. The Polish lords spared no money for such luxuries. On the sides of the pitcher figures of barefoot girls were entwined; one of them was playing a tambourine. On the top, the figure of Bacchus looked life-like. That was the reason why Čerevan' called this jug a deity.

"I am sorry, old man, that you are blind," he said to the Man of God. "Perhaps you can feel with your hand the relief on this jug. A wonderful vessel which I brought back from Poland."

"Vanity of vanities," said the old man with a smile (ch. 3, pp. 19-20).<sup>39</sup>

Along with numerous similar plot motifs, we find some striking similarities between Scott's and Kuliš's characters and character types. This, of course, is as expected, because the motifs must be embodied in the actions of the characters. The strict father is one such character type. Besides appearing in *Rob Roy* in the person of Mr. Osbaldistone, it also appears in *Ivanhoe* in the person of Cedric. In Kuliš's works, the type appears in *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko* as old Čarnyš, in *Aleksej Odnorog* as Aleksej's father, and in *Čorna rada* as Šram. Not only does Šram resemble the morose and strict fathers of some of Scott's novels, but his very name seems to be borrowed from Quentin's uncle in *Quentin Durward*. Ludovic Lesly is called *Le Balafré*, which means "scar." "The man you speak of, we, I think, called *Le Balafré* from that scar on his face—a proper man, and a good soldier" (ch. 3, p. 41). Šram's name, which means "scar" in Ukrainian, was given to him because of his war scars. "No one was braver than he in battle and no one inflicted such discord in the enemy Polish ranks. . . . It was in these circumstances that he received so many scars on his body that the cossacks started calling him Šram, and thereby forgot his real name under which he had been registered" (ch. 1, p. 9).

Another common character in Scott is the faithful servant figure, the most famous being that of Caleb in *The Bride of Lammermoor*. Caleb appears as Savelič in Puškin's *Kapitanskaja dočka*, as Semen in *Mixajlo*

<sup>39</sup> All quotations from *Čorna rada* are from Kuliš, *Tvory*, ed. by O. Doroškevyč, III (Kharkiv-Kiev, 1931). Chapter and page numbers are indicated in the text parenthetically. All quotations are from the second Ukrainian edition, unless otherwise stated. The translations of the quotations are my own and are as close to the original as possible.

*Čarnyšenko*, as Dobrynja in *Aleksej Odnorog*, and finally as Vasyľ Nevol'nyk in *Čorna rada*. Witness the similarities between Caleb and Vasyľ Nevol'nyk in the scenes of the opening of the gates (in chapter seven of *The Bride of Lammermoor* and in chapter one of *Čorna rada*). Scott's antiquary Oldbuck is echoed in Kuliš's figure of old Čarnyš, especially as he appears in chapter three of *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko*. Baron Bradwardine of *Waverley* is echoed in Čerevan' of *Čorna rada*, and in Čerevan's prototype, Pan Bardak of *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko*.

The literary ancestry of the Zaporozhian Kyrylo Tur is also largely, though not entirely, derived from Scott.<sup>40</sup> His prototype is not one but several of Scott's characters and character types. There are traces in Kyrylo Tur of the mercenary Dugald Dalgetty of *The Legend of Montrose*, as well as in the Highlanders, such as Fergus MacIvor, Allan M'Aulay and especially Rob Roy. Kyrylo's name, "Tur," which means "bison," "bull," or "auroch" may even have been suggested by Scott's description of Rob Roy as the "red-coloured Highland Bull" (*Rob Roy*, ch. 32, p. 247).

It is, however, the similarity between Kyrylo Tur and Hayraddin Maugrabin in *Quentin Durward* that is particularly noteworthy. Both Hayraddin and Kyrylo are similar in appearance. In chapter fifteen of *Quentin Durward* and in chapter five of *Čorna rada*, each character is described as sunburnt, with black hair and dark eyes, wild and uncivilized, and an excellent horseman. Each, in addition, manages to terrify traveling noble ladies. Here is the appropriate passage from *Quentin Durward*:

The rider was even more singular in his appearance than the horse which he rode, though that was extremely unlike the horses of France. Although he managed his palfrey with great dexterity, he sat with his feet in broad stirrups, something resembling shovels, so short in the leathers, that his knees were well-nigh as high as the pommel of his saddle. His

<sup>40</sup> Kyrylo Tur is also a continuation of the portrayal of the Zaporozhian Ščerbyna in *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko*, based on information in the *Rasskazy Zaporozhca Korža*. See R. Bahrij-Pikulyk, "Superheroes, Gentlemen or Pariahs? The Cossacks in Nikolai Gogol's *Taras Bulba* and Panteleimon Kulish's *Black Council*," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, V (Fall, 1980), No. 2, pp. 30-47.

dress was a red turban of small size, in which he wore a sullied plume, secured by a clasp of silver; his tunic, which was shaped like those of the Estradiots (a sort of troops whom the Venetians at that time levied in the provinces, on the eastern side of their gulf), was green in colour, and tawdrily laced with gold; he wore very wide drawers or trousers of white, though none of the cleanest, which gathered beneath the knee, and his swarthy legs were quite bare, unless for the complicated laces which bound a pair of sandals on his feet; he had no spurs, the edge of his large stirrups being so sharp as to serve to goad the horse in a very severe manner. In a crimson sash this singular horseman wore a dagger on the right side, and on the left a short crooked Moorish sword; and by a tarnished baldric over the shoulder hung the horn which announced his approach. He had a swarthy and sunburnt visage, with a thin beard, and piercing dark eyes, a well-formed mouth and nose, and other features which might have been pronounced handsome, but for the black elf-locks which hung around his face, and the air of wildness and emaciation, which rather seemed to indicate a savage than a civilized man.

"He also is a Bohemian!" said the ladies to each other; "Holy Mary, will the King again place confidence in these outcasts?" (ch. 15).

In *Čorna rada*, we read:

The first Zaporožian was a veritable giant. He had a wide, sunburnt face and was rather heavysset. His long thick hair fell back behind his ears like a horse's mane. A long mustache curled at the ends and hung upon his jacket. His eyes gleamed from beneath black, bushy eyebrows and only the devil knows what was on his mind. You'd look at him and it would seem that he was scowling; but then if you'd look again, he'd wink and make you laugh. . . .

Suddenly the sound of horses' hooves and the crackling of dry twigs was heard on both sides of the road and the red jackets of two Zaporožians appeared in the green thicket. It was the same two Zaporožians who had separated from their group and had pestered our pilgrims by the monastery.

Mrs. Čerevan' and Lesja were frightened. These rogues did not ride like other people. They did not follow the road but rode through the woods, circling around the coach and disappearing now and then. Their horses did their bidding, jumping like goats between the bushes. It was frightening to see how these wild steppe creatures climbed up steep cliffs and then leaped into chasms, leaving behind them only the muffled sound of galloping and snorting in the ravine. Lesja and her mother often thought that the horse and his rider had perished, when suddenly the rider would reappear like a whirlwind, his crimson coat reflecting the sun (ch. 5, pp. 38-39).

The two heroes' comments on the vanity of life are also similar. Kyrylo

says to Somko when he offers to die in his place: "Isn't our whole life a joke? It spreads honey on your lips and you think that this is happiness! But you look closely and everything is deceit. So you fling it all aside as worthless . . ." (ch. 17, p. 158). Hayraddin's attitude to life is very similar, as revealed in the dialogue in chapter sixteen, which he ends with the following words: "I can always die, and death is the most perfect freedom of all" (ch. 16, pp. 216-218). Indeed when the time of Hayraddin's death comes, he is defiant and stoical, and even manages to joke. The heroes' defiance of death may have a common source in the epic tradition.

Another feature that these two characters share is that they are both outcasts of society. It was Scott who first introduced such pariahs of society into the novel.<sup>41</sup> His outcasts and fools are some of his most interesting characters: Edie Ochiltree, the old beggar of *The Antiquary*; Meg Merrilies, the gypsy prophetess of *Guy Mannering*; the fool Davie Gellatley of *Waverley*; Madge Wildfire of *The Heart of Midlothian*; blind Alice of *The Bride of Lammermoor*; the discussed Hayraddin Maugrabin of *Quentin Durward* are just some such characters. Kuliš's pariahs include, besides Kyrylo Tur, the "Božyj čolovik" (the Man of God) who is a beggar like Edie Ochiltree of *The Antiquary* and even resembles him physically. Like some of Scott's pariahs, such as Alice and Meg Merrilies, the Man of God possesses the gift of prophecy. When he first sees Petro, he prophesies: "He is a good Cossack; he takes after his father. He has great courage and he will live a long life and will be lucky in battle. He won't die by sword or bullet but will die a natural death" (ch. 3, p. 19). There are also similarities between the Man of God and Old Mortality, particularly in their comments on transience and immortality.

Such outcasts and outlaws have an important function in Scott's novels. Dibelius calls them *Regiefiguren* (directing figures) in novels that have mystery plot motifs.<sup>42</sup> Alan McKillop similarly comments: "Sometimes, particularly in the earlier novels from *Waverley* to *Rob Roy*,

<sup>41</sup> Dibelius, *Englische Romankunst*, II, p. 148.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 182-185.

Scott tries to unify his plot by giving over control of its secret to a picturesque outlaw or outcast; to Donald Bean Lean, Meg Merrilies, Edie Ochiltree, or Rob Roy."<sup>43</sup> It is this relationship to the Scottish *Regiefigur* that accounts for the air of mystery around Kyrlo Tur. Throughout the novel, Kyrlo is always mysteriously appearing and disappearing; he mysteriously appears in the prison where Somko is being held prisoner; he saves Lesja from Vujaxevyč, and returns her and the whole Čerevan' family to Xmaryšče. Kyrlo is not the only pariah figure whose function it is to be a *Regiefigur* in *Čorna rada* — The Man of God also performs this function.

Kyrlo Tur may also be regarded as a variant of the pre-Byronic "noble outlaw hero," represented in Scott's novels by the romantic and barbaric Highlanders Fergus MacIvor, Rob Roy, or Allan M'Aulay. They are fiery and passionate characters and tend to dominate the works in which they appear. Kyrlo — like his literary cousins, Scott's Highlanders, and other pre-Byronic outlaws — "always pre-empts the stage in the productions in which he appears, even when . . . there are others . . . who have more lines, more action and ostensibly more sympathetic characteristics."<sup>44</sup>

Let us briefly turn to similarities in the settings of Scott's novels and those of Kuliš. The cliffs and ravines of Scott's novels — a normal part of the scenery of the Scottish Highlands — reappear, less accountably, in *Čorna rada*, as for example, in the scene of the leap over the chasm. Such cliffs are even more numerous in *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko*. Even in *Aleksej Odnorog* — a novel that describes the marshy and flat terrain of Northern Ukraine — there is a river ravine.

There are also some minor stylistic similarities, such as the use of epigraphs, found in Scott and in the second Russian edition of *Čorna rada* and in *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko*. The second part of the title of *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko* or *Little Russia Eighty Years Ago*, bears a close resemblance to the second part of the title of *Waverley, or 'Tis Sixty Years*

<sup>43</sup> Alan McKillop, "Sir Walter Scott in the Seventeenth Century," in *The Rice Institute Pamphlets*, XX (January, 1933), p. 204.

<sup>44</sup> Peter L. Thorslev, Jr., *The Byronic Hero: Types and Prototypes* (Minneapolis, 1962), p. 68.

*Since.* Another possible stylistic influence is the use of scriptural quotations in *Old Mortality* and in *Čorna rada*.

In addition to these similarities of plot motifs, character types, settings and other topical features, we notice and even more fundamental and profound influence of Scott on Kuliš — namely, in the domain of the actual structure and ideology of the novels. In fact, Kuliš's historical novels, particularly *Čorna rada*, adhere very closely to the historical-novel pattern, as it had been established by Scott. Kuliš acknowledged this in his Epilogue to the Russian version of *Čorna rada*, where he stated that his purpose was “. . . to write in my native language a historical novel, *conforming to all strictness of form, peculiar to that type of work.*”<sup>45</sup>

One of the features of this pattern is a responsible and meticulous use of historical sources. The historical framework of a historical novel, as formulated by Scott, consists of actual historical events and characters, a detailed description of manners and a cross-section of characters from all spheres of society. In *Waverley*, for example, the actual historical events are the Jacobite uprising of 1745 and the Battle of Preston. The actual historical figure is Prince Charles Stuart who landed in Scotland to reclaim the throne for the Stuarts.

Like Scott, Kuliš always used all the available historical sources<sup>46</sup> and accurately portrayed historical events and characters. In *Čorna rada* we have the description of a historical event, the black council of 1663, and the struggle for the hetmancy between two historical figures, Somko and Brjuxovec'kyj. Besides these two main historical characters, others like Vujaxevyč, Gvyntovka and Prince Gagin appear in the novel as well. In addition, there are references to approximately twenty other historical figures. When a section of the first Russian edition of *Čorna*

<sup>45</sup> Kuliš, “Ob otnošenii malorossijskoj slovesnosti k obščerusskoj,” in *Tvory*, O. Doroškevyč, ed. (Xarkiv-Kiev, 1931), 3:420.

<sup>46</sup> Kuliš's extensive use of historical sources has been documented in my article, “The Use of Historical Sources in *Taras Bul'ba* and *The Black Council*,” *Studia Ucrainica*, 2, University of Ottawa Ukrainian Studies, No. 5 (Ottawa, 1984), pp. 49-64. See also Lev Okynševyč, “Ukrajina 1663 roku ta *Čorna rada* P. Kuliša,” in P. Kuliš, *Tvory*, 3:168-177.

*rada* was published in 1846, in *Sovremennik* (The Contemporary), the editors offered the following comment:

The author takes the task of novelist seriously, and for his narratives he studies historical sources and monuments as diligently as if he were writing a history of Ukraine. For this reason the picture that is portrayed here, although it is depicted in dramatic form, is based on a solid study of the Ukrainian past.<sup>47</sup>

Also in *Aleksej Odnorog*, there is an actual historical character of great importance, Dimitrij Samozvanec himself. Kuliš's concern with historical accuracy is revealed in a letter to Bodjans'kyj from June 16, 1848, the time of the writing of *Aleksej Odnorog*. He stated that, instead of writing a historical novel, he had decided to split a single project into two — to write a work of history, *Istorija Borisa Godunova*, and a novel, *Severjaki* (The Northerners). These works were later renamed *Istorija Borisa Godunova i Dimitrija Samozvanca* and *Aleksej Odnorog*, respectively.

As I began to think about my novel and as, thread by thread, I reached the weft and woof of that time, I thought to myself: why should I lie when I am just about to touch the truth? So I will first outline the whole scene of that time, as it really was, then I will become a real master and will be able to select something for a novel.<sup>48</sup>

This letter reveals Kuliš's method of writing historical fiction. First he would prepare all of his historical background material, and only then compose the fictional narrative.

In addition to the *Waverley Novels* which accurately portray Scottish history and which belong to the novelistic tradition,<sup>49</sup> Scott also wrote medieval period romances like *Ivanhoe*, *The Betrothed*, *Talisman*, *The*

<sup>47</sup> Kuliš, "Kievskie bogomol'cy v XVII stoletii," *Sovremennik*, XLI (1846), bk. 1, p. 62.

<sup>48</sup> "Pis'ma P. A. Kuliša k O. M. Bodjanskomu (1846—1877 gg)," *Kievskaja starina*, LX (February, 1898), 286.

<sup>49</sup> The novel, as opposed to the romance, consists of such features as the movement from heroic and romantic illusion to common everyday middle-class reality, a non-heroic hero, a plot that issues from character, a de-romanticizing and realistic style, individualized characterization and a detailed and factual portrayal of exterior reality. See Northrop Frye, "The Four Forms of Fiction" and Maurice Shroder, "The Novel as a Genre" in Philip Stevick, ed., *The Theory of the Novel* (New York, 1967); also Edwin Muir, *The Structure of the Novel* (London, 1928).

*Fair Maid of Perth*, *Pevelil of the Peak* and *Kenilworth*. While they make "a serious effort to recapture the spirit of a past age, frequently by employing one or two historic personages," they also free themselves "from the bondage of exact history."<sup>50</sup> Kuliš's novels, particularly *Čorna rada*, resemble the *Waverley Novels* rather than Scott's "medieval" romances. *Mixajlo Čarnyšenko*, on the contrary, contains strong romance features. Despite the narrator's claims that the story is truthful, there is a preponderance of fantasy and Gothic elements. There are no historical characters and no historical events, except for the allusion to the recruitment of volunteers for the battle for the Holstein succession. This allusion does nothing but provide Mixajlo with an excuse to leave home.

Scott did not limit himself to the incorporation of historical events and historical characters in the spirit of accuracy and truth: he portrayed the whole cultural atmosphere or spirit of a specific period. He did so by means of an extensive use of details of local color, reproduction of speech, dress, manners, behavioral patterns of the people of a particular region, and detailed and accurate descriptions of the geographical areas in which they lived. Borys Nejman, who justifiably refers to Scott's novels as "antiquarian museums," considers this extensive use of local color to be the most characteristic feature of Scott's work and the one that had the greatest impact on his contemporaries.<sup>51</sup> Besides ethnographic details, another way in which Scott evoked the whole cultural atmosphere of a period was by the inclusion of characters (historical and fictional) from all social strata, who lived or could have lived at

<sup>50</sup> C. Hugh Holman, "William Gilmore Simms's Theory and Practice of Historical Fiction" (PhD dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1949), p. 88. It is interesting to note that in a later definition of the historical novel, in which Holman participated, he included period romances, works that depict the spirit of the period only, and include no historical events or characters under the general heading of historical novel. In Thrall, Hibbard and Holman, *A Handbook to Literature*, revised ed. (New York, 1960), we read: "The extent to which actual historical events of some magnitude must be present, the extent to which actual historical personages must be actors in the story . . . are among the questions to which both historical novelists and critics of the form have given varying answers. There has been little dispute, however, over the responsibility of the historical novelist to give a truthful picture of the age he describes" (p. 223).

<sup>51</sup> B. Nejman, "Kuliš i Va'iter Skott," pp. 141 and 137.



a particular time and in a particular region. In *Waverley*, the hero Edward Waverley, a rather romantic gentleman from England, comes into contact with the Scottish landowner Baron Cosmo Comyne Bradwardine and his daughter Rose. He also meets the Pretender to the throne, Prince Charles Stuart, a real historical figure, the English soldier Colonel Talbot and the colorful Highlanders with their chieftain Fergus MacIvor and his sister Flora. Numerous common people appear in the novel as well — the robber Donald Bean Lean, the *bhairdh* (minstrel) MacMurrough, the idiot Davie Gellatley, the *bailie* (municipal official) Macwheeble, the devoted follower of Fergus, Evan Dhu, clergymen and various minor "ordinary" people, such as the smith's wife of the village of Cairnvreckan. Hence a historical epoch is presented to us in its all-encompassing totality — rulers, peasants, gentlemen, outlaws, clergymen, townspeople, fools, businessmen.

In *Čorna rada*, Kuliš also provides a picture of a whole epoch. Besides actual historical individuals, there are fictional characters based on historical types — Zaporožians, the town Cossacks, and the homesteading Cossacks — Čerevan', Šram and Petro. The wife and daughter of Čerevan' appear as well. There are townsmen — Taras Surmač and the blacksmith and his wife. There is also a servant, Vasył' Nevol'nyk, a former Turkish prisoner; there is even a part-pariah and part-minstrel figure, the Man of God. There are references to clergymen — Šram is a priest, as well as a colonel. The nobility is represented, and even a Polish princess and a Serb appear, not to mention the countless unnamed townsmen, Zaporožians and peasants, who represent the masses and whose voices are heard throughout the novel. Indeed, a comprehensive overview of Ukrainian society in 1663 rises before the reader. Čyževs'kyj characterizes Kuliš's method of describing the breadth of society as follows:

In his depiction of mass scenes, Kuliš, in the Walter Scott tradition, presents a picture of the multifarious social interests that are at play, and of the conflicts underlying these interests — conflicts involving people of different class, character and disposition. Rather than any idealized representation, we are given an image of a people with a broad and multifaceted life. The historical forces in question — the cossacks, both the lower strata and the town-dwellers, the *bourgeoisie*, the cossack *staršyna*,

the peasants — are described by Kuliš on the basis of his study of Walter Scott's method. Out of isolated remarks and the observations of separate individuals is built up a whole picture of the swelling of the crowd and of its changes of mood. The artistic force of the novel resides in the fact that Kuliš paints; he does not explain or elucidate.<sup>52</sup>

Kuliš, like Scott, excelled in ethnographic descriptions — ethnographic research was one of his foremost interests. Sometimes he, like Scott, collected his information firsthand, as he did in the case of his *Zapiski o južnoj Rusi* (Notes on Southern Rus') and in the following example from the first edition of *Čorna rada*:

In describing these scenes in accordance with folk legends, I regret that my readers did not share with me that satisfaction with which I heard the tales about the Zaporožians from the old men who personally had come into contact with them. I will share with those who know the Ukrainian language at least an excerpt of my notes: "These people were always so resplendent. Their necks were such that they could bend hoops. They wouldn't accept just anybody into their group. Their whiskers were so long that they tucked them behind their ears. On Sunday when they would prepare to have a good time, rich and poor would prepare themselves and would hold entertainment. They played cards and mostly checkers. Someone would play a *kobza* and they would dance. When it came to dancing sit-downs, only the devil knows where they would go. What a disciplined people they were. When they would dance cartwheels, then I'll be damned, they would turn just like wheels!" (first edition, p. 404).

In the second edition (Russian version), Kuliš even cites from the first volume of his own *Zapiski o južnoj Rusi*.<sup>53</sup>

Kuliš also consulted many secondary sources<sup>54</sup> for information on the customs, the clothes, the buildings, the furniture and the food of the past. The first edition of *Čorna rada* lists numerous ethnographic sources; it also contains lengthy descriptions of manners. The second edition (Russian version) lists several ethnographic sources — much fewer than the first — and also contains fewer ethnographic descriptions. The

<sup>52</sup> D. Čyževs'kyj, *A History of Ukrainian Literature*, p. 530.

<sup>53</sup> P. Kuliš, *Černaja rada: Xronika 1663 goda* (Moscow, 1857), p. 165.

<sup>54</sup> Kuliš's extensive use of ethnographic sources has been documented in my "The Use of Historical Sources in *Taras Bul'ba* and *The Black Council*". See Note 46 above.

second edition (Ukrainian version) contains the least number of ethnographic descriptions, and lists no sources.

Although the descriptions of manners in the second edition (Ukrainian version) have been reduced, as compared to the first edition, a considerable number still remains. Examples are the description of the Pečers'k Monastery (Cave Monastery) in chapter six, the description of Kiev in chapter four (based on the "Plan of Kiev of 1638" in Atanasij Kal'nofojs'kyj's *Tereturgema*) and the description of the interior of a *xutir* (homestead) in chapter three. This last example (in itself reminiscent of Gogol's description of Taras Bul'ba's homestead) is worth quoting:

The main room of the house of Čerevan' was the kind that may still be seen today in wealthy Cossack houses, which were built by ancestors in better times. Above were oak beams, carved with sayings from the Scriptures. The name of the builder and the date were there too. Benches made of lindenwood, comfortable, with back supports, were covered with carpets. In the middle stood a table, and icons, surrounded by embroidered towels, were in the corner, as you may still find them today. Only one unusual item, which cannot be seen nowadays, adorned the main room of the house of Čerevan'. There were shelves running along the walls, full of silver, golden and crystal cups, flasks, bottles, trays and all kinds of china seized in the wars. Whenever the Cossacks burned Polish manor houses and princely castles, they first carried out the contents by the sackful. The Lord was good to the Cossacks who avenged themselves on the proud Polish nobles, whose cups now adorned Cossack homes, while their former owners were either in Turkish captivity or had fallen on the field of battle. On the walls, too, were Polish sabres, ancient Tartar quivers, gold-embroidered horse-plates, German muskets and armored vests and helmets to protect against enemy blows. Yet none of these much helped the Poles who were hated by the common people. So now all these bows and sabres and arms shone in this room and elsewhere, and gladdened Cossack eyes (ch. 3, pp. 17-18).

Scott's interest in history extended far beyond the historical novel. In addition to creating this new sub-genre and exemplifying it in thirty works, as well as collecting extensive ethnographic material, Scott was active in contemporary historiography — he wrote, for example, a *Life of Napoleon* and contributed articles on contemporary history to the *Edinburgh Annual Register*; in 1829, he even planned to write a "philos-

ophical history of Scotland.”<sup>55</sup> Kuliš too, as Romanovs’kyj pointed out, can be considered a historian. “In the field of Ukrainian historiography, Kuliš played a role both as a collector and publisher of historical sources and as a useful populizer and researcher with a broad view of the world and with the erudition of a true historian.”<sup>56</sup> Not only did Kuliš discover a manuscript copy of *Litopys Samovydcja* (The Eyewitness Chronicle) which provided him with the social interpretation of the Cossack conflict for *Čorna rada*, but he also translated Macaulay’s *History* into Russian and published numerous popular and scholarly historical works. His major and surely controversial scholarly historical work *Istorija Vozsoedinenija Rusi* (The History of the Reunification of Rus’), published in the years 1874-77, was the first historical study to describe Cossackdom against the social and economic background of the Polish state and the first to adopt a critical approach in the study of Ukrainian history.

Another distinguishing feature of the structure of the historical novel, as developed by Walter Scott, is the introduction of a non-heroic protagonist (an “ordinary” person) into the center of the fictional narrative. Nejman correctly pointed out the recurrence of this type of fictional protagonist, but failed to notice that this “ordinary” protagonist is more than merely a recurring character type; he is the center of the narrative structure of the historical novel, and demonstrates by his central position the impact of history on the ordinary individual. One scholar of the historical novel remarks that the historical novel is, after all, *a novel*, and that, as such, it is concerned with the “probabilities of character types and the necessities of the human condition.”<sup>57</sup> And an earlier commentator writes:

It is the aim of the novelist to stand by the individual and feel life with him. The waves of some political or historic movement may touch the man and so come within the range of the novel, but they will not affect

<sup>55</sup> Duncan Forbes, “The Rationalism of Sir Walter Scott,” *Cambridge Journal*, VII (October, 1953), p. 27.

<sup>56</sup> V. Romanovs’kyj, “Kuliš i joho praci po istoriji Ukrajiny,” *Knyhar* (November, 1919), No. 27, p. 1801.

<sup>57</sup> Avrom Fleishman, *The English Historical Novel: Walter Scott to Virginia Woolf* (Baltimore, 1971), p. 8.

the man any more than his own special, homely concerns — probably they will only affect him through those little concerns. It is his own hopes and ambitions and fears as he finds himself set up against the world of men and things, his conflict with circumstances, his moods and his glad moments, his risks, his falling in love, his bewilderments, his relations with men, that make up a novel.<sup>58</sup>

This is effectively shown in *Waverley*, in chapter forty-seven, which treats the Battle of Preston. As soon as the actual historical battle begins, Scott refuses to describe it. “‘Forward, sons of Ivor,’ cried their Chief, ‘or the Camerons will draw the first blood!’ They rushed on with a tremendous yell. *The rest is well known*” (p. 253; italics mine). Instead, the author concentrates on Waverley’s personal impressions of the battle. The Battle of Preston is thus presented through the prism of the mind of a single individual who is much less concerned with its historical implications than with his own crisis during its course.

Although the individual, according to Scott, can never free himself from the shaping forces of his social environment, he can at least get out of the direct path of great historical events and personages, especially those who are attempting to change the course of history. In fact, the actions of Scott’s protagonists seem to imply that this is very desirable indeed. In *Waverley*, all of the characters who attempt to change the course of history, such as the Pretender or Fergus MacIvor, are doomed. Waverley regains personal safety by disengaging himself from these characters and their activities. At the end of *Waverley*, as well as most of Scott’s other novels, there is a marriage and a scene of domestic idyllic happiness which is far removed from historical events and personages. Such domestic idylls represent an escape from the chaos and terror of historical conflict. Precisely because the protagonist is fictional, he can escape the tragic determinism of history, which binds the historical character.

In *Čorna rada*, instead of one fictional protagonist, there are two — Šram and Petro. They demonstrate two alternative approaches to the relationship of history and the individual. Šram attempts to change the

<sup>58</sup> Herbert Butterfield, *The Historical Novel: An Essay* (Cambridge, 1924), p. 68.

course of history and fails; Petro accepts the inevitability of the historical process and at the same time consistently attempts to extricate himself from its direct course. By means of the narrative structure and the imagery, the resolution of the novel rests with the "prosaic" Petro. Petro is associated with the *xutir* (the homestead) which represents individual happiness, as opposed to the tragic course of history.<sup>59</sup>

Another theme of Scott's novels is the conflict between tradition and change, the old and the new. This conflict is also one of the features of the historical framework of the historical novel. Daiches writes: "Underlying most of these novels is a tragic sense of the inevitability of a drab but necessary progress, a sense of the impotence of the traditional kind of heroism, a passionately regretful awareness of the fact that the Good Old Cause was lost forever and the glory of Scotland must give way to her interest."<sup>60</sup> Yet change, as it is presented in Scott's novels, is not always progress, nor is it necessarily good, as Lukács would have us believe.<sup>61</sup> Scott's vision of history is a conflicting one: he accepts the inevitability of change and progress, but regrets the death of the values of the past. Fleishman sums this up in the following statement:

Society in Scott's fiction is constantly changing, often for the better in a longer-range estimate of stability and convenience. But this Enlightened sense of progress goes together with a nostalgic sense (resembling Ferguson's) of the lost values of simpler social forms, the tribal virtues of loyalty, honor, and military skill, and the heroic heritage of aristocratic family-lines.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>59</sup> The narrative structure of *Čorna rada* and the role of the two protagonists has been analyzed in detail in my "The Individual and History in the Historical Novel: P. Kuliš's *The Black Council*." See Note 34 above.

<sup>60</sup> David Daiches, "Scott's Achievement as a Novelist," in D. D. Devlin, ed., *Walter Scott: Modern Judgements* (London, 1962), p. 36.

<sup>61</sup> Georg Lukács, *The Historical Novel* trans. by H. and S. Mitchell (Harmondsworth, 1962), p. 50.

<sup>62</sup> See Fleishman, *The English Historical Novel* p. 49. On p. 42 Fleishman writes: "The speculative school to which I have referred includes both constancy and change in its very definition of history. There is progress, or at least novelty, as between past and present, but it proceeds along rationally predictable lines and is similar where conditions are similar." And on p. 46, "For these 'scientific Whigs' history was a complex process of mystical forces which nevertheless obeyed scientifically ascertainable laws; it was neither the design of a deity nor the direct unfolding of an absolute rational system, but a steady stream of tendency, good on the whole."

And so, *Waverley*, at the end of the novel, sides with the rational English culture as represented by Colonel Talbot, and yet still retains sympathy for the old heroic Highland culture; he demonstrates this by settling on the estate of Tully Veolan in the Lowlands — a compromise between England and the Highlands — and by helping Fergus' clan.

There is one definite truth about the conflict between tradition and change: change always wins. The process of historical change is inevitable and ruthless, sweeping everything from its path. This is most vividly shown in *The Bride of Lammermoor*, in the slow but inevitable destruction of Edgar Ravenswood and of Wolf's Crag. Anyone who tries to reverse the historical process, like Fergus MacIvor in *Waverley*, is doomed to die. Kuliš's view of history is very similar. In *Čorna rada*, the destructiveness of the historical process is symbolized by the black council; those, like Šram, who actively participate in it and thus try to interfere with the predetermined historical process, are mercilessly destroyed.

It is no accident that in Scott's novels the representatives of the old romantic culture, like Fergus MacIvor, Rob Roy and the other Highlanders, although they are colorful and magnetic personalities, and even seem to dominate the novels in which they appear, are not the protagonists — in the long run, they are the pariahs and misfits in the new culture. Scott's protagonists, on the contrary, always move away from romanticism as a basis of action toward an acceptance of change which means realism.<sup>63</sup> In novels like *Ivanhoe* and *Old Mortality*, where both sides lack reason and common sense, the protagonist still accepts the side of change — even though it is neither rational, nor good — simply because it is the reasonable thing to do. Because the process of change in history cannot be stopped, according to Scott, one might as well side with it; eventually, good is bound to result from the change.

The support of the political *status quo* by Scott's protagonists may now be interpreted not as simple reactionary conservatism, but as a frequently painful acceptance of the inevitable process of history, with

<sup>63</sup> Marian H. Cusac, *Narrative Structure in the Novels of Sir Walter Scott*, pp. 23, 26, 118-19 (Appendix G).

its inevitable changes and its ultimate progress. The majority of Scott's protagonists either already possess common sense, or undergo a process of education to acquire it. They seem to realize that they cannot reverse the process of history and that, in order to survive, they must accept the inevitable historical changes. Waverley reveals this attitude in his meditation.

Whatever were the original rights of the Stuarts, calm reflection told him, that, omitting the question how far James the Second could forfeit those of his posterity, he had, according to the united voice of the whole nation, justly forfeited his own. Since that period, four monarchs had reigned in peace and glory over Britain, sustaining and exalting the character of the nation abroad, and its liberties at home. Reason asked, was it worthwhile to disturb a government so long settled and established, and to plunge a kingdom into all the miseries of civil war, for the purpose of replacing upon the throne the descendants of a monarch by whom it had been willfully forfeited? (*Waverley*, ch. 28, p. 172).

In the end, Edward Waverley is loyal to the Establishment, but in a quiet way, removed somewhere far away on an estate with his wife. The fictional protagonist of the *Waverley Novels*, according to Welsh, "represents the modern and conservative model of a member of civil society. The hero is not precisely Everyman, but every gentleman — not in some supercilious social sense, but in the profound conviction that society is a compact of independent owners of property."<sup>64</sup>

In *Čorna rada*, the flamboyant Zaporozhian Kyrlo Tur, a representative of the romantic past, is not the protagonist, and in fact disappears at the end of the novel; there is no place for him in the new agricultural society, consisting of settled family units — of *xutorjany* (homesteaders), or "independent owners of property." It is the gentleman Cossack, the "prosaic" Petro, settled on a *xutir* with his wife and his in-laws, who perseveres in the end. Although Petro briefly contemplates joining the Zaporozhians, he decides not to do so. Petro has no illusions about reality; like Scott's protagonists, he is a middle-class hero. Bernštejn believes that Kuliš created a new positive hero in Ukrainian literature, the *zažytočnyj prostoljudin* (the prosperous settler) which corresponds to *xutor-*

<sup>64</sup> Alexander Welsh, *The Hero of the Waverley Novels* (New Haven, 1963), p. 57.



*janyn* (the homesteader) in Ukrainian. Bernštejn, in describing this positive hero as someone possessing moral virtues, as an ideal type devoid of individual traits — a landed settler and a median between the upper and the lower classes — provides at the same time a fairly accurate description of Petro.<sup>65</sup> And although the *xutir* in *Čorna rada* represents, on the symbolic level, individual survival and happiness as opposed to history, on the purely social level, the *xutir* represents a very prosaic phenomenon, the rise of the middle class and of middle-class values.

The ideology of Scott's historical novels, although somewhat modified by the Scottish school of speculative history,<sup>66</sup> remains essentially in the eighteenth-century tradition of the rationalism of the Enlightenment, with its belief in universal and unchanging rational laws of history and of human nature. Scott's historical novels, however, were not perceived in this spirit by his followers who interpreted them as romantic works. Scott, as Fleishman writes, was "a special kind of Romantic in whom elements of neoclassicism and the Enlightenment are at least equally strong, but his followers took him to represent a spirit closer to their own."<sup>67</sup> Peter Struve has also commented on this literary irony:

Walter Scott, who in his time was the originator and the mouthpiece of the Romanticist movement, has always been and is still felt to be a most unromantic personality. But as a writer too, Walter Scott is inwardly alien to the most striking representatives of the genuinely Romantic spirit among his contemporaries; what is there, indeed, in common between him and, say, Novalis or E. T. A. Hoffmann?<sup>68</sup>

We see, therefore, that the impulse behind the *Waverley Novels* and even *The Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* was not romantic, although

<sup>65</sup> Myxajlo Bernštejn, *Ukrajins'ka literaturna krytyka 50-70x rokiv XIX st.* (Kiev, 1959), p. 95.

<sup>66</sup> A. Fleishman, *The English Historical Novel*, p. 40. The reason that Scott, a follower of the Scottish speculative school of historians, stressed the uniqueness of the past was due to the fact that these speculative historians allowed "some values to be added for the uniqueness of nations at various stages of the past." And so, one may speak of the influence of romantic historicism in the basically Enlightenment-outlook of the Scottish speculative historians.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 28.

<sup>68</sup> Peter Struve, "Walter Scott and Russia," p. 397.

it was interpreted as such by Scott's countless followers in Europe. Duncan Forbes, writing about Scott's theory of the ballad, points out:

For Scott the ballads were not what they were for Herder: the revelation of unique, organic "folk-souls." He was interested in such "Border Ballads as may tend to illustrate the ancient state of the Southern counties of Scotland", but this "state" was not a unique phenomenon, it was the "partly pastoral, partly warlike" state of society, in which "the history, the laws and even the religion . . . are usually expressed in verse," which is common to all mankind at a certain stage of social evolution.<sup>69</sup>

Scott's followers in Europe did not make this distinction, with the result that in the Russian Empire, for example, the generation of Decembrists regarded him as a spokesman of romanticism and, above all, an advocate of the "value of the native, indigenous cultural expression, and a re-creator of the old and national."<sup>70</sup>

The fact that Russians considered Scott "the mouthpiece of the Romanticist movement" is partially due to the circumstance that his works appeared simultaneously with the romantic movement in that country. Another reason for his being treated as a romantic throughout Europe is that certain structural features, such as the introduction of extensive descriptions of local color, of exotic peoples and cultures — combined with an interest in history in general (particularly the history of long-forgotten cultures) — lent themselves so well to romantic historicism. The fact that Scott showed the historical necessity of the ultimate passing away of these old cultures, and that he often made ironic remarks about them, seems not to have been noticed by the majority of his readers.

Scott's ironic, and even satiric, outlook and style have affinities with some eighteenth-century writers. This allowed some critics to perceive a continuity between Scott and the eighteenth-century realists and "novelists of manners" like Defoe, Fielding and Smollet. John Raleigh,

<sup>69</sup> Duncan Forbes, "The Rationalism of Sir Walter Scott," p. 29.

<sup>70</sup> Peter Christoff, *The Third Heart: Some Intellectual-Ideological Currents and Cross Currents in Russia, 1800-1830* (The Hague, 1970), p. 60.

in his study of *Waverley*, concludes that the major impulse behind this novel is "realistic and satirical rather than romantic."<sup>71</sup>

The realistic features of *Čorna rada* — the non-heroic and middle-class hero, the critical view of the Cossack past, the negative portrayal of both the settled Cossacks and the Zaporožians, and the detailed descriptions of manners — are all derived from Scott. Kuliš, in contrast to many of his romantic contemporaries, grasped the underlying irony, realism and rationalism of Scott's historical novels. This could partly be due to the fact that by 1857 — the date when the second edition of *Čorna rada* was finally published — romanticism was on the wane and realism was beginning to take its place. Realism, like classicism, was based on a rational ideology: many realist writers turned to the eighteenth-century traditions of classicism, such as satire and moralism. It is also undeniable that Kuliš was attracted to such eighteenth-century writers as Jean Jacques Rousseau,<sup>72</sup> the Ukrainian philosopher Hryhorij Skovoroda, and the Ukrainian sentimentalist Hryhorij Kvitka-Osnovjanyenko, whose works are distinguished by a strong dose of moralism. Bernštejn, in fact, states that Kuliš's moral homesteader is derived from Kvitka-Osnovjanyenko.<sup>73</sup> Temperamentally, too, Kuliš was a highly disciplined conservative, as Luckyj has demonstrated in his recent biography of the writer.<sup>74</sup> Kuliš's personality was closer to that of the "business-like" Scott than to that of his romantic countryman Ševčenko.

As this article has shown, the influence of Sir Walter Scott on Pantelejmon Kuliš was enormous. Kuliš began reading Scott's works in his early student years and studied them thoroughly in later life. As a result, he introduced into Ukrainian literature a variety of motifs from the English: the adventure story, the Gothic tale, the romance, the ballad, and the apprentice novel, together with a rich assortment of character types. He also grasped, and applied to *Čorna rada*, Scott's historical-

<sup>71</sup> John Henry Raleigh, "Waverley as History; or 'Tis One Hundred and Fifty Years Since," *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, IV (1970), No. 1, pp. 16-21.

<sup>72</sup> My article "J. J. Rousseau's *Émile* and Kulish's Philosophy of Education" is scheduled to appear in the *Festschrift* for G. S. N. Luckyj.

<sup>73</sup> Bernštejn, *Ukrajins'ka literaturna krytyka 50-70 kh rokiv XIX st.*, p. 95.

<sup>74</sup> G. S. N. Luckyj, *Panteleimon Kulish: A Sketch of His Life and Times*, East European Monographs (New York, 1983).

novel structure, with its serious approach to history and ethnography and its use of a fictional protagonist to show the relationship of the individual to history. Kuliš, unlike many of his contemporaries (Gogol, for example) understood the underlying themes of Scott's historical novels, which are based on eighteenth-century Enlightenment ideas. Like Scott, Kuliš exhibited admiration and regret for old heroic cultures and, like Scott, he was an untiring antiquarian, with a passion for collecting all sorts of information about the past; at the same time, however, he was critical of these past societies. And Kuliš's *xutorjanyn* is, at least in part, derived from the ordinary and reasonable gentleman-protagonists of the *Waverley Novels*. Although Scott was by no means the sole influence on Kuliš, he certainly was a major influence, and he cannot be ignored if we are going to understand the enigmatic and misunderstood Kuliš, whose role in Ukrainian literature and culture is perhaps as important as Ševčenko's. Finally, Pantelejmon Kuliš demonstrated by his thorough knowledge of Scott's works in the original English, and by his adaptation of them to his own works and primarily to *Čorna rada*, that in the nineteenth-century Western European literary masterpieces were directly accessible to Ukrainian writers.

## APPENDIX

### EXAMPLES OF PARALLEL TEXTS

#### I

#### *Quentin Durward*

"But those blind, unsteady, faithless, fickle beasts, the Liegeois," said the Count, "that they should have combined themselves with this inexorable robber and murderer, to put to death their lawful Prince!"

Durward here informed the enraged Burgundian that the Liegeois or at least the better class of them, however rashly they had run into the rebellion against their Bishop, had no design, so far as appeared to him, to aid in the execrable deed of De la Marck; but, on the contrary, would have prevented it if they had had the means, and were struck with horror when they beheld it.

"Speak not of the faithless, inconstant, plebeian rabble!" said Crèvecoeur: "When they took arms against a Prince, who had no fault, save that he was too kind and too good a master for such a set of ungrateful slaves — when they armed against him, and broke into his peaceful house, what could there be in their intention but murder? — when they banded themselves with the Wild Boar of Ardennes, the greatest homicide in the marches of Flanders, what else could there be in their purpose *but* murder, which is the very trade he lives by? And again, was it not one of their own vile rabble who did the very deed, by thine own account? — I hope to see their canals running blood by the light of their burning houses. Oh, the kind, noble, generous lord, whom they have slaughtered! — Other vassals have rebelled under the pressure of imposts and penury, but the men of Liege, in the fulness of insolence and plenty." — He again abandoned the reins of his war-horse, and wrung bitterly the hands, which his mail-gloves rendered untractable. Quentin easily saw that the grief which he manifested was augmented by the bitter recollection of past intercourse and friendship with the sufferer, and was silent accordingly; respecting feelings which he was unwilling to aggravate, and at the same time felt it impossible to sooth (*Quentin Durward*, ch. 24, p. 111).

### *Čorna rada*

"To hell with the red coats," the crowd yelled, incensed like bulls. "All they can do is rattle their sabres. Where were they when the godless Radziwill fired his cannons at the city walls?"

Šram became furious upon hearing such words.

"And where were you, damn you, you fat traders, when the Poles surrounded us at Berestečko, like fire around a pot? Where were you when the fire burned us on all sides and almost half of our Cossack army perished like steam? You didn't rattle your sabres then, but only the money in your pockets which you got from the Cossacks for your rotten shoes and cheap cloth! Eh! When Radziwill came here you didn't once defend yourselves with cannons! Filthy cowards! You surrendered the city to him and called 'peace' to him like a bunch of women. And when the Lithuanians set the city on fire and began cutting your throats like lambs, who, if not the Cossacks, came to your assistance? It was Cossack Džendželyj who raced into the city with his men, as a hawk races into its nest after a dove. But he got no support from you, you wretched rabbits! He was a fool. Instead of fighting the Lithuanians, he should have cut you to pieces, you children of Satan! I would have taught you how to defend what the Cossacks won for you."

"What did the Cossacks win for us?" the townsmen protested. "We ourselves did it, not the Cossacks. We were those Cossacks. It is only because of you that we now don't carry sabres or wear crimson tunics. You keep Cossack privileges for yourselves, you behave like lords almighty and drive around in carriages while we have to work building walls, palisades, towers. We have to provide the building materials, pay rent, taxes and God only knows what. Why shouldn't we carry sabres like you and do nothing?"

"So you think the Cossacks are doing nothing?" replied Šram. "What a pack of lies! If it weren't for the Cossacks the devil would have licked you all; you would have been conquered by the Poles or taken prisoner to the Crimea by the Tartars! Brainless heads! It is only through Cossack bravery that ancient *Rus'* and the Orthodox faith are still preserved in Ukraine. So you would all like to enjoy Cossack privileges! If you had talked like this to Bohdan Xmel'Inyc'kyj, he would have smashed your silly heads with his mace! Who in the world ever heard of everyone having the same rights? Each one has his station in life: the Cossacks have their sabres; you have your scales and the peasants have a plough and harrow" (*Čorna rada*, ch. 4, pp. 30-31).

## II

*Quentin Durward*

He requested the friar to show him into one of the various chapels which opened from the main body of the church of the convent, where, upon his knees, and with sincere devotion, he ratified the vow which he had made internally. The distant sound of the choir, the solemnity of the deep and dead hour which he had chosen for this act of devotion, the effect of the glimmering lamp with which the little Gothic building was illuminated — all contributed to throw Quentin's mind into the state when it most readily acknowledges its human frailty, and seeks that supernatural aid and protection, which, in every worship, must be connected with repentance for past sins, and resolutions of future amendment. That the object of his devotion was misplaced, was not the fault of Quentin; and, its purpose being sincere, we can scarce suppose it unacceptable to the only true Deity, who regards the motives, and not the forms of prayer, and in whose eyes the sincere devotion of a heathen is more estimable than the specious hypocrisy of a Pharisee.

Having commended himself and his helpless companions to the Saints, and to the keeping of Providence, Quentin at length retired to rest, leaving the friar much edified by the depth and sincerity of his devotion (*Quentin Durward*, ch. 17, p. 159).

*Čorna rada*

Wandering through the forest, Šramčenko heard the sound of the bell, summoning the worshippers to evening prayer. He did not return to the Pečers'k Monastery however, but went to the convent which was located in the same place where there is an arsenal today, opposite the Pečers'k Monastery. In this convent, according to Kal'nofojs'kyj, there were many nuns of noble origin.

Entrusting his weapons to a grey-bearded bell-ringer, he entered a simple wooden church which served the hermits who, it seemed, had chosen as their motto the words of the saintly Nestor: "Many monasteries are built by the wealth of tsars and boyars, but they are not equal to those which are built by the prayers of saints, by tears, by fasting and vigil." As soon as he entered the

holy dimness of the temple and heard the prayers and songs being offered to the invisible creator of human hearts who was present here, his soul immediately experienced a lightening as if some sort of cool breeze had blown over his fiery feelings. Seeing these virgins, who had forsaken their noble ancestry, their wealth and worldly pleasures, he reconciled himself to his unfavorable fate. He understood now the truth of the words of the unmarried apostle: *Everything in the world is carnal lust, lust of our eyes and of worldly pride*. He addressed himself to the heavens with pure thoughts and tears flowed from his eyes.

In those times of emotional simplicity such occurrences in God's temple were not rare. Whoever witnessed this silently praised God for having made the unhappy person feel better, and the person who cried was not ashamed of his tears. Only in our age — it is with grief that I mention it — has this purifying disturbance of the soul been so profaned that even the stern admonition of the Savior cannot make us disdain false shame and set ourselves apart from people who stand unfeeling before the face of God.

And so Šramčenko left the monastery at peace with himself (*Čorna rada*, first edition, p. 372).





# Byelorussian-Ukrainian Literary Relations before 1917

ARNOLD McMILLIN

As is well known, Byelorussia and Ukraine for many centuries shared a common historical development within the East Slav group of nations. In linguistic terms, this means that the differentiation of literary texts according to the nationality of authors is for a substantial period entirely arbitrary, except perhaps on the grounds of geographical dispersion. This is particularly true of the texts essentially written in Church Slavonic, arising in the East Slav territory during the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries, but also applies in large measure to the sixteenth century, when ethnic Byelorussians and the majority of Ukrainians lived together in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, not only sharing a religion and an official language, but enjoying almost complete freedom in terms of the circulation of ideas, books, and people. Characterizing for convenience the standard secular language of the period up to the late sixteenth century as Ruthenian, Professor Shevelov pertinently observes that the literary process of the time may be most adequately presented as a history of interconnected local cultural centers such as Vil'na, Zabludaw, Ostrih-Derman', L'viv, later Orša-Kucein, etc.<sup>1</sup> The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries likewise are of only limited relevance to consideration of Byelorussian-Ukrainian literary relations in view of the weak or non-existent state of national awareness and the comparative backwardness of literature in Byelorussia. The nineteenth century, however, with its growth in national consciousness throughout Europe (not least in the Slav lands) and, to an even greater extent, the early

<sup>1</sup> George Y. Shevelov, "Belorussian versus Ukrainian: Delimitation of Texts before A.D. 1569," *Journal of Byelorussian Studies*, III, 1 (1973), p. 147.

twentieth century was dominated by the Byelorussian national revival. Associated with the newspaper *Naša niva* (1906-1915),<sup>2</sup> that period marks the real beginning of readily definable relations between the two recently established national literatures, insofar as that before this period it is hardly possible to speak of Ukrainian and Byelorussian literature separately. Naturally, the story is mainly one of the influence of Ukrainian literature on the less developed Byelorussian, although by the second decade of this century such classical Byelorussian writers as Janka Kupała (1882-1942), Jakub Kołas (1882-1956), and Maksim Bahdanovič (1891-1917) were already not only showing, but also arousing interest in Ukrainian writers with, in several cases, mutually beneficial effects.

Ukraine by no means always led Byelorussia in the area of art and literature, and in the period from the thirteenth to the eighteenth centuries the cultural balance shifted more than once with the various tides of history sweeping the whole East Slav region. If, for example, during the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries Byelorussian culture predominated, exerting an undoubtedly beneficial effect on Ukrainian literature, this led in turn to the latter's rise in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, whilst throughout the baroque period of the late seventeenth century and, particularly, in the eighteenth century Ukrainian literature played an important role in not only Byelorussian but also Russian cultural development.<sup>3</sup> As will be seen, moreover, "the talented founder of modern Ukrainian literature,"<sup>4</sup> Ivan Kotljarev's'kyj (1769-1838) greatly influenced the beginnings of modern Byelorussian literature.

Even in the earliest period geographical criteria are not entirely uncontroversial, and the twelfth-century homiletic writings of Cyril of Turaw/Turiv/Turov are deemed variously as belonging to Byelorussian,

<sup>2</sup> In this article the secondary (Latin) Byelorussian alphabet is employed. For a description of this orthography, systematized during the early *Naša niva* period, see A. Losik, *Bielaruskij pravapis*, Minsk, 1943 (photomechanically reprinted, New York, s.a.). For technical reasons ŭ is replaced by w.

<sup>3</sup> See D.S. Lixačev, "Social'no-istoričeskie korni otičij russkogo barokko ot barokko drugix stran," in *Sravnitel'noe izučenie slavjanskix literatur*, Moscow, 1973, p. 388.

<sup>4</sup> Clarence A. Manning, *Ukrainian Literature: Studies of the Leading Authors*, Jersey City, 1944, reprinted New York, 1971, p. 24.

Ukrainian, and (the largest concept of all) Russian literature,<sup>5</sup> whilst the first serious history of Byelorussian literature devotes a whole section to the "Byelorussianness" of the *Slovo o polku Igoreve*.<sup>6</sup> There is, perhaps, more rationality in speaking, as does P. Achrymienka, of the "noticeable influence on Ukrainian literature in the sixteenth and, partly, seventeenth centuries" of Frańcišak Skaryna (c.1485-c.1540), whose works circulated widely both in book form and in copies.<sup>7</sup> Skaryna, however, though frequently referring to his place of birth, Połack, was a true son of the Renaissance and citizen of Europe, for whom the concepts of Byelorussia and Ukraine as separate entities simply did not exist. In the sixteenth century many prominent figures in the cultural history of Byelorussia originated in ethnic Ukraine, typical being the religious polemicist Meletij Smotryč'kyj/Mialecij Smatrycki (1572-1630) who began his literary career in Ostrih but whose main activity was based in Vil'na; Stefan and Lavrentij Zyzanyj/Lawrencij Zizaniy moved to the same city from L'viv; Fiłon Kmita-Čarnabyłski (1530-87), who in literary terms represented the flourishing tradition of Byelorussian memoir literature in the late sixteenth century, was born in the ethnically Ukrainian Vinnycja region, then in the south-east corner of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Linguistically also, Smatrycki was typical of the age, as indeed of the succeeding baroque period, in that he wrote in Middle Byelorussian (which can also often reasonably be described as Ruthenian),<sup>8</sup> Polish, Latin, and Church Slavonic. Perhaps only Simeon Poloc'kyj/Simiaon Połacki (1629-80), another polyglot Byelorussian writer, may properly be described in terms of influence; himself a representative of the Kievan school, as Čyževs'kyj has noted, he "revived the dying Russian sermon—and his successors were, for the most part, Ukrainians."<sup>9</sup>

<sup>5</sup> See, for example, Maksim Harecki, *Historyja biełaruskaje literatury*, 3rd edition, Vilna, 1924, p. 11; Dmytro Čyževs'kyj, *A History of Ukrainian Literature*, Littleton, 1975, p. 140; N.K. Gudzij, *Xrestomatija po drevnej ruskoj literature XI-XVII vekov*, 3rd edition, Moscow, 1938, p. 60.

<sup>6</sup> Harecki, op. cit. (n. 5), p. 13.

<sup>7</sup> Pavel Achrymienka, *Letapis braterstva: Ab biełarуска-wkraïnskich falktornyh literaturnykh i teatralnykh suviaziach*, Minsk, 1973, p. 31.

<sup>8</sup> See n. 1.

<sup>9</sup> Čyževs'kyj, op. cit. (n. 5), p. 357.

The baroque period of Byelorussian literature, as, indeed, that of the Enlightenment which followed it,<sup>10</sup> consisted mainly of manuscripts in a variety of languages, with Byelorussian and Ukrainian elements at times developing in parallel, frequently merging.<sup>11</sup> Classification is particularly difficult in this period of comprehensive polonization,<sup>12</sup> but this does not excuse the persistent and perverse tendency for works originating in places like Niašviž and Połack and with predominantly Byelorussian linguistic features to be classified as Ukrainian.<sup>13</sup> To sum up the pre-nineteenth-century situation, it might be said that in no periods or genres were the links between Byelorussian and Ukrainian developments weaker than the points of divergence or difference.

If the eighteenth century can be reasonably described as the eve of modern Byelorussian literature,<sup>14</sup> then the dawn itself broke in unspectacular manner. In the middle of the nineteenth century Vikienci Dunin-Marcinkievič (1807-84) was to establish a significant corpus of original plays and poems, but the first decades after the partition of the Rzeczpospolita which had brought Byelorussia (and, indeed, Ukraine) into the Russian Empire produced only scattered individual works, mostly the amateurish products of ethnographers. One anonymous poem, however, the comic mock-epic *Enieida navyvarat* (written after 1812 but probably before 1825), achieved great popularity,<sup>15</sup> and almost certainly influ-

<sup>10</sup> Unfamiliar and perhaps improbable as the linking of eighteenth-century Byelorussia with the Enlightenment may seem, a convincing case for such usage is made in the outstanding study of this transitional period: Adam Maldzis, *Na skryžavaŋni slavijskich tradycej: Litaratura Bielarusi pierachodnaha pieryjadu (druhaja palavina (XVII-XVIII st.))*, Minsk, 1980.

<sup>11</sup> Maldzis, op. cit. (n. 10), *passim*. For an example of a typically mixed collection of eighteenth-century secular songs see A.B. McMillin and C.L. Drage, "Kuranty: An Unpublished Russian Song-book of 1733," *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, III (1970), pp. 1-31.

<sup>12</sup> To give but one instance, in her authoritative study of early East Slav popular drama Paulina Lewina acknowledges these problems by the chapter heading "O intermediach tak zwanych białoruskich," *Intermedia wschodnio-słowiańskie XVI-XVIII wieku*, Wrocław, Warsaw, Cracow, 1967, especially p. 7-26.

<sup>13</sup> Some examples are given in Maldzis, op. cit. (n. 10) pp. 12, 163.

<sup>14</sup> See A.I. Maldzis, "Na zary novaj białaruskaj literatury," *Bielaruskaja literatura i litaraturaznavstva*, 2 (1974), pp. 45-58.

<sup>15</sup> In Byelorussia there appears to have been no equivalent of Pantelejmon Kuliš in Ukraine who felt that in its comic treatment of simple people this poem desecrated the nation's sacred image. See George S.N. Luckyj, *Shevchenko and the Critics 1861-1980*, Toronto, Buffalo, London, 1980, p. 64 n.

enced another work in similar genre, *Taras na Parnasie* (c.1840?). Although the authorship of *Enieida* is uncertain,<sup>16</sup> its origins as a very free imitation of Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj's Ukrainian *Aeneid* travesty are plainly discernible, for although the Byelorussian poem is at times far from being a translation of Kotljarevs'kyj it is much closer to it than to the earlier Russian version of Nikolaj Osipov or, of course, Vergil's original. Both Byelorussian and Ukrainian poems represent watersheds not only in their national literatures, but in national consciousness too. In each of them elements of ethnographic detail and popular tradition are to the fore (like the heavily travestied action which they derive in some measure from the shared eighteenth-century tradition of puppet theater and its adaptations), and much successful use is made of richly vernacular language (particularly by Kotljarevs'kyj); moreover, as Karski observed, many individual episodes coincide in the Byelorussian and Ukrainian versions.<sup>17</sup>

Far less important, but nonetheless an illustration of the cross-cultural interaction which had been such a feature of Byelorussian and Ukrainian literature in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, is a ballad of the 1840s (published in *Naša niva* in 1915), *Pani Tvardowskaja*, a reworking of *Tvardovs'kyj* (1827) by Petro Hulak-Artemovs'kyj, itself a free adaption of Mickiewicz's ballad *Pani Twardowska* (1822).<sup>18</sup> One Ukrainian critic categorizes Hulak-Artemovs'kyj's ballads as "kotljarevščyna." Further indirect influence of Kotljarevs'kyj can be found in *Taras na Parnasie*, the sister burlesque to *Enieida*, which possibly belongs to the same author.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>16</sup> On the question of authorship see H. Kisialow, *Zahadka bielaruskaj 'Enieidy'*, Minsk, 1971. Also of interest are P. Šawcow, "Siamiejnaje padaŋnie," *Połyмя*, 1971, no. 10, pp. 203-20, and A. Kulašow, "Što chavajecca za siamiejnym padaŋniem," *ibid.*, p. 201-03.

<sup>17</sup> E.F. Karskij, *Belorusy*, vol. 3, pt 3, Petrograd, 1922, p. 18. For some instances of these parallels see Achrymienka, *op. cit.* (n. 7), pp. 51-54. M.M. Hrynčyk speaks of "a translation of the first two cantos": *Falktornyja tradyцыi w bielaruskaj dakastryčnickaj paezii*, Minsk, 1969, p. 17.

<sup>18</sup> Mickiewicz is supposed to have preferred Hulak-Artemovs'kyj's version to his original ballad. See A.P. Roslavskij-Petrovskij, *Petr Petrovich Artemovskij-Gulak (nekrolog)*, Karkiv, 1866, p. 9.

<sup>19</sup> Mykola Zerov, *Lekciji z istoriji ukrajins'koji literatury*, (Oakville Ont., 1977), pp. 32-38.

<sup>20</sup> See n. 16.

It has been suggested that *Taras na Parnasie* echoes the establishment of Taras Ševčenko (1814-61) as a writer.<sup>21</sup> Be that as it may, the giant figure of the Kobzar undoubtedly dominates Byelorussian-Ukrainian literary relations throughout and, indeed, beyond the nineteenth century. During his stay in St. Petersburg in the 1830s Ševčenko met with many Byelorussians, including some of those who were taking their first tentative steps in literature, such as the young critic Ramuald Drucki-Padbiarski (1813-63),<sup>22</sup> and the writer and ethnographer Jan Barščewski (1794-1851). According to a later critic, Ramuald Ziamkiewicz (1881-?1943), the Ukrainian poet took a lively interest in Byelorussian folk songs at this time, and in 1839 gave some valuable advice and encouragement to Barščewski, thus indirectly contributing to the establishment of modern Byelorussian literature.<sup>23</sup> Barščewski, incidentally, provides an early Byelorussian example of *kolomyjka* verse, a prosodic form which plays an immense role in the works of Ševčenko, as also in those Byelorussian writers like Hurynovič, Łučyna, Bahuševič, Kołas, and above all, Kupała, who were amongst those spiritually closest to him.<sup>24</sup> Ševčenko's interest in Byelorussian folk songs found indirect expression in two of his poems, "Podrażanije. Eduardu Sovi" (1859) and "Oj dibrovo—temnyj haju" (1860) which have been shown to derive from original folk-type verses in Polish by the Byelorussian poet and ethnographer Jan Čačot (1796-1847).<sup>25</sup> Čačot's mixture of folk verses

<sup>21</sup> See A. Adamovič [Anthony Adamovich], "Da pabudovy navukovaje historyi bielarskaje litaratury," *Zapisy*, 2 (1963), p. 90 n.

<sup>22</sup> Drucki-Padbiarski was one of the first critics to write positively (in *Tygodnik petersburgski*) of Ševčenko's work as both artist and poet: V.E. Šubravs'kyj, *Ševčenko i litaratura narodiv SRSR*, Kiev, 1964, p. 30. It may also be mentioned that the first illustrator of Ševčenko's poems was a Byelorussian, Michaił Bašyław (1820-70): Hienadz Kisialow, *Hiero i muzy: Historyka-litaraturnyja narysy*, Minsk, 1982, pp. 49-54.

<sup>23</sup> R. Ziemkiewicz [Ziamkiewicz], "Taras Ševčenko i bielarusy," *Naša niva*, 1911, no. 8, pp. 117-19.

<sup>24</sup> See the present writer's "Stanza, Rhyme and Metre in Nineteenth-century Byelorussian Verse: Some Statistical Observations," *Journal of Byelorussian Studies*, III, 2 (1974), pp. 161-62; I.D. Ralko, *Bielaruski vierš: Staronki historyi i teoryja*, Minsk, 1969, especially pp. 146-57; and M.M. Hrynčyk, *Šlachi bielarskaha vieršaskładaŋnia*, Minsk, 1973, pp. 78, 208-09.

<sup>25</sup> V. Ščurat, "Ševčenko—Želigov'sky—Čečot," in *Literaturni načerky*, Lviv, 1913, pp. 94-99. Ščurat's earliest writings include an extended review of Kołas's *Pieśni žalby*, and translations of two of his lyrics. See Achrymienka, op. cit. (n. 7), p. 205.

and original poems in folk style underlines both the emphasis on popular elements characteristic of Ševčenko's own poems at that time and also the elements that he sought to encourage in his Byelorussian friends in St. Petersburg.

Three poets of the second half of the century, Frańcišak Bahuševič (1840-1900), Janka Lučyna (1851-97), and Adam Hurynovič (1869-94) have all too often been subjected to oversimplified generalizations about the thematic and ideological influence of Ševčenko (and, for that matter, Nekrasov) on their work.<sup>26</sup> However, in the case of Bahuševič and Lučyna the Ukrainian link was genuine and not without significance. Bahuševič lived nearly twenty years of his life in Ukraine, having fled there to escape reprisals after the anti-Russian Uprising of 1863. Ševčenko is known to have been one of his favorite writers, and he comes close to the *Kobzar* not only in the linking of social and national themes, but also in some poems genetically related to Ševčenko's *dumy* such as 'Prawda' and 'Dumka', and, as already indicated, in many instances of *kolomyjka* verse. Bahuševič's first literary works, now lost, had in fact been in Ukrainian, and, predictably, Ukraine was one of the countries he held up to Byelorussia as an example of developed national consciousness in the exhortatory prose introduction to his first major collection of verses, *Dudka biełaruskaja* (1891). Moreover, as Žmitrok Biadula suggested, the title of this and his other principal collection, *Smyk biełaruski* (1894) — like the titles of Kupala's early collections *Žalejka* (1908), *Huślar* (1910) and *Skrypka biełaruskaja*, published near L'viv by Ciotka (Ałaiza Paškievič, 1876-1916) — echo through their references to musicians and instruments the title of Ševčenko's first collection.<sup>27</sup> Bahuševič's younger contemporary Janka Lučyna was, like him, attracted by Ševčenko's patriotic and social ideals. A keen Panslavist with much affection for Ukraine, he wrote two verses warmly dedicated to Ukrainian actors, 'Usioj trupie dabradzieja Staryckaha biełaruskaje slova' and 'Dabradzieju artystu Mańko' (both dated 1885),

<sup>26</sup> Typical, but far from the worst example, is M. Larčanka, *Ślavianskaja supolnaść*, Minsk, 1963.

<sup>27</sup> See "Vodhuki kabzarskich strun," in *U vianok T.H. Šavčenka*, Minsk, 1939, pp. 120-21.

which point to an important aspect of Byelorussian-Ukrainian cultural contacts falling largely outside the scope of the present review, namely the great importance of the Ukrainian acting and dramatic tradition in nineteenth-century Byelorussia.<sup>28</sup> It is worth noting, however, that even in this dark period for Byelorussian drama the flow of inspiration and material was not entirely one-way, for there exists a late nineteenth-century translation into Ukrainian of Dunin-Marcinkievič's satirical comedy *Pinskaja šlachta* (1866).<sup>29</sup>

Karuš Kahaniec (1868-1918), painter, poet, and playwright of the next generation, may well have been influenced or at least stimulated by such plays of Marko Kropyvnyč'kyj (1840-1910) as *Pošyls' u durni* and *Po reviziji* (both of 1885) in the writing of his own classic comedy *Modny šlachciuk* (1910).<sup>30</sup> Quite beyond doubt is the influence of Ševčenko on his poem of the previous year, "Kabzar."<sup>31</sup> Kahaniec, in fact, is one of the many Byelorussian writers who, although active in the period before *Naša niva*, produced their best work under the stimulus of this publication and during the years in which it appeared (1906-1915). There were few writers of the time who did not publish in the pages of *Naša niva*, and the paper represented both an expression of and an influence on Byelorussian national aspirations and ideas of all kinds. This is clearly reflected in attitudes to Ukraine, interest in Ukrainian literature, and a strong feeling of common cause as well as shared historical experience. One major feature of this period was the shift in balance from the one-sided influence of Ukrainian culture on Byelorussian to a more equal relationship, with Ukrainian readers, critics, schol-

<sup>28</sup> Lučyna himself had ambitions to set up a Byelorussian acting troupe modeled on Staryč'kyj's company: Larčanka, op. cit. (n. 26), p. 77. In fact, the first professional Byelorussian theater was founded by Ihnat Bujnicki (1861-1917) in 1910; the first productions were of plays translated from Ukrainian.

<sup>29</sup> See Ol'ha Oxrimenko, "Nevidomyj pereklad z 'Metamorfoz' Ovidija," *Vsesvit*, 1966, no. 11, pp. 118-19.

<sup>30</sup> In 1910 and 1911 Byelorussian translations of these works were produced in St. Petersburg by the "Zahlane sonca i w naša akonca" publishing house. The greatest significance of these plays in the context of the present article was that they inspired Kupała to attempt dramatic forms.

<sup>31</sup> See, for example, V.A. Kavalenka, *Vytoki, upłyvy, paskoranašć*, Minsk, 1975, pp. 258-59.



ars, and translators taking virtually as much interest in Byelorussian literature as Byelorussians were taking in theirs. That the latter interest was reflected rather than created by *Naša niva* is demonstrated by the tremendous variety of forms taken by Byelorussian-Ukrainian literary relations in the early twentieth century.

Despite living much of his mature life in Siberia, Aleś Harun (1887-1920) was inspired by *Naša niva* and, typically for his age, devoted one of his poems to Ševčenko, "Za tysiaču viorst ad radzimaha kraju," in which he clearly associates with the "piaśniar hienialny pryhonu." It was Harun's misfortune to be banished from Byelorussia during much of one of the most exciting periods of its history. Far more commonly, however, geographical factors played a positive role, with, for instance, Byelorussians who lived in Ukraine stimulating interest in their own country and disseminating information about it. Amongst major examples was Ciotka who, though a native of the Vil'na region, lived for a time in L'viv, publicizing Byelorussian literature, particularly the works of Kupała, and declaring the influence on her own verse of Ševčenko and Ivan Franko (1856-1916), as well as Lesja Ukrajinka (1871-1913) whom she knew at that period; Lesja Ukrajinka herself was avidly interested in Byelorussia in the person of her close friend, the political activist Siarhieĭ Miaržynski (1870-1901), who had lived in Kiev from 1895 to 1899.<sup>32</sup> Of more general significance was the activity of two gifted Byelorussian writers who went to Ukraine for higher education, Janka Žurba (1881-1964) and Siarhieĭ Paľujan (1890-1910); together they published in *Naša niva* a series of highly informative reports, *Listy z Ukrainy*, the first of which was, characteristically, entitled "Pra jednaść miż biełarusami i ukraincami" (*Nn*, 1909, nos 13-14). This theme was also prominent in the articles of Ramuald Ziamkievič (see n. 23) and Alhierd Bulba, published to mark the 50th anniversary of Ševčenko's death in 1911, where Bulba, for example, wrote: "To us Byelorussians Ševčenko is dear in that already half a century ago he was expressing

<sup>32</sup> See L.I. Miščanka, "Vobraz S.K. Miaržynskaha w tvorčaści Lesi Ukrainki," *Vesnik BDU imia U.I. Lenina. Fitahija. Žurnalistyka. Seryja IV*, 1970, no. 1, pp. 23-28.

the ideas by which we now live . . . Ševčenko shows us the way to go."<sup>33</sup> Apart from Ševčenko, a large number of other Ukrainian writers were discussed in the pages of *Naša niva*, including Kotljarevs'kyj, Kropyvnyč'kyj, Franko, Volodymyr Šaškevyč (1839-85), Hanna Barvinok (1828-1911), Myxajlo Drahomanov (1845-95), Lesja Ukrajinka, and Borys Hrinčenko (1863-1910). At the same time two Ukrainians played a particularly important role in introducing Byelorussian literature to their fellow-countrymen. Marginally the first was Ilarion Svjencic'kyj (1876-1956), a friend of Branisław Epimach-Sypiła (1859-1934) and Janka Kupała, whose *Vidrodžennja bilorus'koho pys'menstva* (Lviv, 1908) displayed extensive knowledge of and sympathy for all aspects of Byelorussian culture, and was subsequently translated into both Russian and Byelorussian. It was followed, two years later, by *Narys istoriji ukrajins'ko-rus'koji literatury do 1890 r.* (Lviv, 1910) by Ivan Franko who had worked on the Polish paper *Kraj* in St. Petersburg with, amongst others, Bahuševič, Lučyna, and Alaksandr Jelski (1834-1916). In it much incidental information was given on, *inter alia*, early and middle Byelorussian literature. The same may be said of his article on "Južnorusskaja literatura" in the Brokgauz and Efron *Enciklopedičeski slovar'* (vol. 81, pp. 300-26).

Ivan Franko's place in Byelorussian-Ukrainian literary relations goes beyond his critical writing. In 1887, the version of his 'Himn—Vičnyj revoljucioner' by Adam Hurynovič appears to be the only nineteenth-century Byelorussian literary translation from Franko;<sup>34</sup> several of Franko's books were in the library of *Naša niva*; and, most important, he was singled out by Maksim Bahdanovič, as, along with Ševčenko, one of the greatest Ukrainian poets of his age. Bahdanovič's only translation from Franko, however, was an abbreviated version of "Na rici vavylons'kij . . ." in Russian. Franko's influence on Bahdanovič (as also on Kanstancyja Bujło [b. 1899], Ciotka, and Kołas) has been posited by Achrymienka, but the evidence is slender, pointing rather to typological

<sup>33</sup> A. Bulba, "Pamiaci Tarasa Ševčenko (u 50-letniuiu hadawščynu jaho šmierci)," *Naša niva*, 1911, no. 8, p. 115.

<sup>34</sup> A translation of the socio-political tract *Pra bahactvo ta biednaść* was published in Geneva in 1881.

analogy.<sup>35</sup> The same may be said of Bahdanovič's relationship to other writers whom he held in high regard like Lesja Ukrajinka, Volodymyr Samijlenko (1864-1925), and Ševčenko, though occasionally literary reminiscences of the latter's works can be observed, particularly in those poems which were closest to (Byelorussian and Ukrainian) folk verse.

In literary criticism, as in so much else, Bahdanovič was a pioneer, achieving hitherto unknown standards of sophistication. His interest in and knowledge of Ukrainian culture was exceptionally profound, and is reflected in a variety of major articles on Ukrainian life and literature, written in Byelorussian, Ukrainian, and Russian, which added to the enthusiasm displayed by writers like Ziamkievič and Bulba a new critical refinement and discrimination, particularly in the assessment of Ševčenko.<sup>36</sup> Ukrainian translations of Bahdanovič's poems began to appear as early as 1909, largely thanks to the recommendation of his friend Siarhiej Paľujan, though they remained comparatively few in number compared with, for instance, those from Kupała, but his excellent articles on Ukrainian life, in particular Western Ukraine (Galicia), ensure him a central position in the overall picture of Byelorussian-Ukrainian relations at that time.<sup>37</sup>

Bahdanovič's translations from Ševčenko were all into Russian, but he also made some highly successful translations from the work of Myxajlo Kocjubyns'kyj (1864-1913), and number of lesser figures: Stepan Čarnec'kyj (1881-1944), and Samijlenko, into Russian; Oles' (1878-1944), and Mykola Černjavs'kyj (1828-89), into Byelorussian; and, perhaps most important, in view of a certain affinity, particularly in his sonnets, Ahatanhel Kryms'kyj (1871-1942), into Byelorussian and Rus-

<sup>35</sup> Achrymienka, op. cit. (n. 7), pp. 129-30.

<sup>36</sup> See in particular "Krasa i sila" and "Pamyati T.G. Ševčenko" in Maksim Bahdanovič, *Zbor tvorav u dvuch tamach*, Minsk, 1968, II, pp. 139-50 and 151-57 respectively, the first attempts in any language to analyze the form of Ševčenko's poetry.

<sup>37</sup> Many of Bahdanovič's articles were published in Russian-language journals like *Golos*, *Žizn' dlja vsej*, and *Ukrainskaja žizn'*. In the earlier period also Russian and Polish journals had preceded and then supplemented the work of Byelorussian and Ukrainian journals in disseminating information about cultural developments in these smaller but at the time highly active areas. For further detail see the best study of that period: T.V. Kabržyckaja and V.P. Rahojša, *Karani družby: Bielaruska-wkrainskija literaturnija suviasi pačatku xx st.*, Minsk, 1976, especially pp. 38-42.

sian. Though the selection may seem random, each of the translated poets represents some formal interest, and as such fits into the overall pattern of Bahdanovič's plans for the development of Byelorussian literature, an area in which his role was decidedly analogous to that of Lesja Ukrajinka and Kocjubyn's'kyj in Ukrainian, particularly in the turning to the past and to mythology in order to speed the development of a still somewhat backward and unsophisticated literature.<sup>38</sup>

Among the many translations from Ukrainian appearing at that time,<sup>39</sup> most significant were the various versions of Ševčenko's poetry by Ales' Hurlo (1892-1938), Fiodar Čarnyševič, and especially Kupała,<sup>40</sup> and the rather freely Byelorussianized but very readable versions of ten novellas of Vasyľ Stefanyk (1871-1936) published by Ziamkievič in *Naša niva* in the years 1909-1911.<sup>41</sup> Even if one does not share the view held by the late M.P. Alekseev and others that translations represent the only true form of literary influence,<sup>42</sup> it is nonetheless necessary to exercise great caution when imputing the influence of other writers, particularly Ševčenko, to such major Byelorussian figures as Bahdanovič, Kołas, and Kupała, all of whom were well known in Ukraine and very familiar with Ukrainian literature. However, a very convincing case has in fact been made for the influence of Stefanyk on Žmitrok Biadula

<sup>38</sup> See Kabrzyckaja and Rahojsa, op. cit. (n. 37), pp. 115-24.

<sup>39</sup> A summary list of those appearing in *Naša niva* may be found in Achrymienka, op. cit. (n. 7), p. 143. See also T. Kobrzyč'ka, "Ukrajinityka v 'Našaj nive'." *Ukrajins'ke literaturoznavstvo*, 1969, no. 6, pp. 98-100.

<sup>40</sup> The outstanding faithfulness of Kupała's versions has been noted more than once. See, for example, Luka Luciv, 'Ševčenko v bilorus'kij movi', in Taras Ševčenko, *Povne vydannja tvoriv* (Warsaw and Lviv, 1934-39, XV), pp. 196-97. See also Šciapan Aleksandrovič, *Staronki bratnij družby*, Minsk, 1960, pp. 73-108; Arnold McMillin, "Kupała's Translations from Ševčenko," *Journal of Byelorussian Studies*, V, 1 (1981), pp. 14-18; and D. Palityka, *Janka Kupała — pierakładčyk*, Minsk, 1959, pp. 38-64. For a wider view of the role of translations in Byelorussian-Ukrainian literary relations see E. Martynava, "Mastacki pierakład jak forma bielaruska-wkrainskich litaraturnych uzajemasuviaziej," in N.S. Pierkin (ed.), *Sadružnašč litaratur*, Minsk, 1968, pp. 72-102, and Id., *Bielaruska-wkrainski paetyčny wziama pierakład*, Minsk, 1973.

<sup>41</sup> Ziamkievič was far from alone in "naturalizing" the works he translated. This practice, widespread since at least the eighteenth century, was almost universal in the versions of Ukrainian plays performed in Byelorussia. Typical were the versions of Kropyvnyč'kyj's plays which appeared in 1910-11. See n. 30.

<sup>42</sup> See *Mastera russkogo literaturnogo perevoda*, Leningrad, 1968, p. 7.

(1886-1941), a factor which adds considerably to the importance of Ziamkievič's translations. In addition to a multitude of similar themes and episodes there are many very close formal analogies between the work of Stefanyk and Biadula, so that, although not all commentators can accept it, the indications are that the Ukrainian master of the novella form played a direct role in the development of one of Byelorussia's most important prose writers.<sup>43</sup>

The special place of Ševčenko in the hearts of Byelorussians has already been indicated. His sociopolitical and literary significance is reflected not only in the enthusiastic outpourings of Ziamkievič and Bulba (see nn. 23 and 33) or, indeed, in early Ukrainian articles on Ukrainian-Byelorussian relations, such as appeared in *Dniprovi xvyli* in 1911,<sup>44</sup> but also in a number of special studies ranging from Bahdanovič's pioneering articles to present-day monographs.<sup>45</sup> Critics have detected echoes of his writing in a wide range of Byelorussian verse and prose, and Jakub Kolas, for example, was very early on in his career described as a 'Byelorussian Ševčenko'.<sup>46</sup> But although Kolas himself traced a general link between the form of his and Kupala's verse on the one hand and Ševčenko's on the other,<sup>47</sup> he developed away from the Kobzar, and attempts to link his two masterpieces, *Novaja ziamla* (1911-23) and *Symon-muzyka* (1911-25) with Ševčenko are unconvincing.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>43</sup> See the evidence adduced by V.M. Lesin, in "Pra wpływ Vasilja Stefanika na Žmit-raka Biadulu," *Materyjały pieršaj navukovaj kanfierencyi pa vyvučenni ju biełaruskawkrainskich litaraturnych i falktornych suviaziej*, Homiel, 1969, pp. 59-63. For a dissenting view see E.M. Martynava, "Niekatoryja rysy blizkaści i svojeasabliwaści ražvićcia biełaruskaj i wkrainskaj litaratur pačatku XX st.," in N.S. Pierkin (ed.), *Staronki litaraturnych suviaziej*, Minsk, 1970, pp. 205-13.

<sup>44</sup> s.n., "T.H. Ševčenko i bilorusy," *Dniprovi xvyli*, 1911, no. 11, and M. Ž(učenko), "Ševčenko na bilorus'kij movi," *ibid.*, 23-24.

<sup>45</sup> See for example, Bohdan Čajkovs'kyj, *Nezabutnja storinka družby (T.H. Ševčenko i bilorus'ka literatura)*, 2nd ed., Kiev, 1971. Other special studies include *U vianok T.H. Šavčěnka* (n. 27), and V.V. Barysienka (ed.), *Taras Šavčěnka i biełaruskaja litaratura*, Minsk, 1964.

<sup>46</sup> See N. Černockij, "K voprosu o belorusskoj nacional'noj škole," *Minskij kur'er*, 1908, no. 64, quoted in Kabržyckaja and Rahojša, *op. cit.* (n. 37), pp. 159-60.

<sup>47</sup> "The very poetic form of his works speaks of Ševčenko's influence on Byelorussian poetry, and, in particular, on the poetry of Janka Kupala and Jakub Kolas," Ja. Kołas, "Šavčěnka i biełaruskaja paezija," in *U vianok T.H. Šavčěnka* (n. 27), pp. 105-06.

<sup>48</sup> See for example, Achrymienka, *op. cit.* (n. 7), pp. 202-03.

Janka Kupała, too, has frequently, and with perhaps more justification, been associated with the Kobzar, beginning with the review by Uładzimir Samojła (1878-c.1940) of his first cycle of poems *Žalejka*, in which the critic expressed the hope that Kupała “would become for Byelorussians what Ševčenko had been for Ukrainians.”<sup>49</sup> Various later commentators have described Kupała as “the Byelorussian Ševčenko,”<sup>50</sup> and throughout his life he retained great affection for the Kobzar, from his rhetorical call to Ševčenko to be the spiritual “father” not only of Ukraine but of Byelorussia too in the early occasional verse *Pamiaci Šawčenki* (1909) to his flawed but undoubtedly heartfelt narrative poem of 1939, *Tarasova dola*.

The Ukrainian poet Teren' Masenko has quoted Kupała as saying, “I began to write after I had read *Kobzar*. The Ukrainian national poet and his language evoked in me love for my own native, Byelorussian language.”<sup>51</sup> Three translations from Ševčenko are, in fact, among Kupała's earliest verses in Byelorussian: an excerpt from “Hoholju” (“Za dumaju duma rojem vyljataje,” 1905-7), “Pažowknuw list . . . Pryhašli vočy” (1906) from “Mynajut' dni, mynajut' noči,” and *Dumka* (“Našto čornyja mnie brovi,” 1908). In addition should be mentioned the extensive help he gave to Fiodar Čarnyševič whose Byelorussian version of *Kateryna* was published in 1911. At a celebration of the 125th anniversary of Ševčenko's birth Kupała declared, “Not through books but through the people, when we were still children, we came to know the works of Taras Ševčenko,”<sup>52</sup> apropos of which it is interesting to note that both Kupała's and Kołas's works were popular in the original Byelorussian even amongst Ukrainian village people.<sup>53</sup> Hence translations, although very important, were far from the only channel of literary communication between Byelorussia and Ukraine: in this respect the

<sup>49</sup> B.S. “Bol'šoj prazdnik,” *Minskij kur'er*, 23 August 1908, quoted in Kabržyckaja and Rahojsa, op. cit. (n. 37), pp. 158-59.

<sup>50</sup> See, for example, V.A. Kavalenka, op. cit., (n. 31), p. 259; Čajkovs'kyi, op. cit. (n. 45), p. 136; and E.M. Martynava, “Niekatoryja rysy” (n. 43), p. 171.

<sup>51</sup> Taren' Masenka [Teren' Masenko], “Słowa pra Kupału,” *Połymlia*, 1952, no. 6, p. 133.

<sup>52</sup> Janka Kupała, *Zbor tvoraw u siami tamach*, Minsk, 1972-76, VII, p. 302.

<sup>53</sup> For a particular instance see Achrymienka, op. cit. (n. 7), p. 205.

first decades of the twentieth century were little different from the sixteenth or, indeed, the ensuing centuries.

The critic V.V. Ivašyn has described Kupała as being "of all the Byelorussian poets, inwardly the most prepared to receive the creative heritage of Ševčenko in all its variety"<sup>54</sup> and that heritage as being for him "something special, as if it were a part of his own poetic world."<sup>55</sup> Such consistent empathy and deep affinity makes it particularly difficult to distinguish between influence and analogy when considering individual works. This even applies to a poem like *Bandarowna* (1913) whose Ukrainian subject matter has perhaps been a factor in prompting very many critics to posit the influence of Ševčenko. It is clearly close to the Ukrainian's poetry not only in theme but also in treatment and formal features such as meter (*kolomyjka*) and imagery, both of the latter being linked with Ševčenko by Jakub Kolas, for instance.<sup>56</sup> However, when in 1929 Lev Kleinbort asked Kupała whether Ševčenko had influenced his work, he replied: "It is difficult to say. It is possible that in some of my verses there may be echoes of his poetry, but in which ones I do not know."<sup>57</sup> Even in the case of *Bandarowna* we appear to be dealing with close typological analogy rather than influence, analogy whose roots, whether in meter, imagery, or characterization, lie in a common folk source. Indeed, this closely intertwined, largely shared, Byelorussian-Ukrainian folk heritage lies behind much of the similarity observable between Ševčenko and Byelorussian writers in both the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries.

If over the years Byelorussian-Ukrainian literary relations have been somewhat sporadic, this simply reflects the uneven development of the

<sup>54</sup> V.V. Ivašyn, "Ševčenko ta šljaxy rozvytku bilorus'koji poezii," in *Zbirnyk prac' juvilejnoj 13-ji naukovoji konferenciji*, ed. Ie. P. Kyryljuk, Kiev, 1965, p. 290.

<sup>55</sup> V.V. Ivašyn, op. cit. (n. 54), p. 291.

<sup>56</sup> See Jakub Kolas, *Zbor tvoraw u dvanaccaci tamach*, ed. V. Barysienka and others, Minsk, 1961-64, XI, p. 205. One of the most assiduous seekers for literary reminiscences has been Luka Luciv, op. cit. (n. 40), pp. 200-01. For a broader consideration of the question see the present writer's "Kupała's *Bandarowna* and Ševčenko: Towards the History of the Development of Byelorussian Literature in the Early Twentieth Century," *Slavonic and East European Review*, LX, 2, (1982), pp. 211-20.

<sup>57</sup> Letter of 11 January 1929: *Zbor tvoraw*, VII, p. 435.

literatures themselves. But even in periods of slow and hesitant growth (such as that of Byelorussian literature in the nineteenth century) contacts between writers, critics, and readers of the two countries were made and maintained, whilst in the more relaxed atmosphere of the early twentieth century the exchange of literary information and ideas, the cross-fertilization of inspiration, proceeded at a pace that can only be called amazing.<sup>58</sup> Perhaps the great affinity between Kupała at the height of his powers in 1913 and Ševčenko may serve to symbolize the closeness of Byelorussian and Ukrainian literature in many important respects, a closeness which can only stem from a largely shared cultural and historical heritage, and a true community of national aspirations and ideals such as linked Byelorussia with Ukraine throughout the period leading up to 1917.

<sup>58</sup> To give but one small example of this speed, Lesja Ukrajinka's last fairytale poem *Pro veleta* (1913) was known to the author ('V') of the extensive article published in *Naša niva* (1913, no. 30) on her death. See Kabržyckaja and Rahojsa, op. cit. (n. 37), p. 201.



# The Modality of Poetic Forms in Alexander Potebnja's Theory of Literature

JOHN FIZER

Alexander Potebnja (1835-1891), a foremost Ukrainian linguist, literary theorist and folklorist, has left an indelible mark on the linguistic and literary scholarship in Ukraine and Russia. At the end of the last century, Russian symbolists readily appropriated his theoretical postulates; Russian Formalists initially hailed and later vehemently challenged them; and in 1907, his students in Kharkiv University founded a journal, *Voprosy teorii i psixologii tvorčestva* (Problems of Theory and Psychology of Creativity), in which they elaborated those theoretical postulates into a school of thought known as *potebnjanstvo* (Potebnianism). The intellectual enthusiasm for Potebnja's linguistics and aesthetics continued unabated until the early 1930s when Socialist Realism was declared the official theory of the arts.

Potebnja's actual contribution to literary theory, if judged by the number of published works and the extent of his research into theoretical issues, is insignificant. His most acclaimed work, *Mysl' i jazyk* (Thought and Language), written and published when he was in his twenties, is mostly a compendium of citation, with extensive commentary, from his German mentors, Wilhelm Humboldt, H. Steinthal, Johann F. Herbart, Herman Lotze, and others; his *Iz zapisok po teorii slovesnosti* (Notes on the Theory of Literature), published by his students after his death in 1905, were lecture notes at Kharkiv University; finally, his *Iz lekcij po teorii slovesnosti* (Lectures on Theory of Literature) were likewise transcribed lectures, given privately to a group of women and published in 1894.

Obviously, the reason for Potebnja's reputation as a literary theorist lies in the pioneering nature of his ideas, rather than in the quantity of his publications. He was the first in the Russian Empire to undertake the study of the diachrony of cognition; the first to search for the semantic principles of man's relationship to his reality, and the first to posit the structural affinity between language and literature.

In this article I will attempt to discuss Potebnja's ideas on literary forms, and to show how they approximate some current theories of literature.

### IMMANENT FORMS

Potebnja discerned two kinds of forms: those which constitute the very essence of poetic language and are independent of man's varying creative intentionality, called immanent forms, and those which result from such intentionality, called intentional forms. Verbal constructs, be they myth, folklore, poetry, or prose, may be looked upon as configurations of both immanent and intentional forms, and their classification may be attempted on the basis of both.

Seen from the point of view of immanent forms, the distinction of verbal constructs is determined by the semantic function of their internal form. For example, so long as the proverb—one of the most concise poetic constructs—explains varied actual events, it remains a poetic allegory. When, however, its internal form begins to refer to a single specific event, it automatically converts into a prosaic statement. Hence the proverb, in terms of its immanence or immanent form, has only two semantic manifestations. As protean and complex a verbal construct as the novel, however, in addition to its capacity for polysemy, can also perform distinctly referential or prosaic functions. It follows that pure poetry and pure prose are but terminal thresholds on a hypothetical axis, between which language distributes fluxional ratios of imaginative and conceptual syntactics. Mathematics, for example, represents a language situated on the extreme right of such an axis, beyond the point of prose.

Historically, the progression from poetry to prose was preceded by

grammatically unstructured words. Pre-poetic perception, Potebnja believed, did not distinguish among the object, its qualities, and its instrumentality. Such discernment must have been a matter of continuous linguistic evolution. Hence such grammatical categories as verb, noun, and adjective are not petrified entities—they have developed and continue to do so in the sentence.<sup>1</sup> The etymology of adjectives and nouns demonstrates this by revealing their common source; for example, Russian голубой (blue) from голуб (dove); соловей (yellow) from соловей (nightingale); Polish *niebieski* (light blue) from *niebo* (sky); and so forth. Such lexemes have drifted apart by the pressure of syntactical development, because of their functions as grammatical units. Original sentences, Potebnja asserts, must have consisted of the comparison of two substantives or two independently formed emotional images. In all probability they were the initial cognitive attempts to divide images of corresponding objects into their constituent attributes, then to compare them, and eventually to form a rudimentary analytical judgment. This must have been the beginning of man's attempt to conceive reality linguistically.

The progression from the inchoate pre-poetic construct to conceptual prose, however, must not be considered as irreversibly unilinear. Such a progression would necessarily lead to the eventual disappearance of imaginative thought and a total triumph of conceptual thinking. "Differentiation of poetry and prose," Potebnja wrote, "does not lead to the death of poetry,"<sup>2</sup> inasmuch as the imaginative character might disappear in individual words but not in the language as a whole. The congruent character of language, simultaneously poetic and prosaic, evolves out of the creation of new words, as well as out of an ever-new combination of the existing ones, thus protracting its multi-functionality.

What then are folklore, poetry, and prose from the perspective of their immanent forms? All three are narrative sequences, articulated in

<sup>1</sup> *Mysl' i jazyk* in A.A. Potebnja, *Estetika i poëtika*, compiled by I.V. Ivanjo and A.I. Xolodnaja, "Iskusstvo," Moscow, 1976, p. 151.

<sup>2</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Iz zapisok po teorii slovesnosti*, izd. M.V. Potebni, Kharkiv, 1905, p. 103.

accordance with pre-existent grammatical rules; all have either a dynamic or an inert internal form; and all are directed toward some implicit or explicit goal. The internal form of folklore and poetry, "in relation to its variable content, remains immobile,"<sup>3</sup> while that of prose is inert. Its intended reference is contained by its external form. The difference between folklore and poetry, however, depends on the fact that the former has existed in oral and the latter in written versions, which means textual variability as opposed to relative permanence. An authentic folk song, for example, "during its life span is not just one work but a series of variants whose ends may be greatly dissimilar but whose intermediary levels imperceptibly fuse with one another."<sup>4</sup> Writing, by contrast, has generally fostered both deliberate and unintentional conservation; through assimilation, contraction, abbreviation, and omission, it has frequently led to the formation of its own language. Oral or colloquial language, however, has always favored communally shared forms of reference, devices, and representation.

Folk poets rarely consider their works as exclusively their own. Oral poetry resorts to fixed measure, melody, and mannered expression. The creation and reception of such poetry are practically identical acts; deviation from the existing patterns occurring in a collectively shared inventory of devices is dilatory and insignificant, even though each repetition is always somewhat varied in rendition and content. As in the case of poetry in general, folk poetry is not "work (*ergon*) but activity (*energeia*), not song but *nomen actionis*, singing."<sup>5</sup>

The specific modality of oral poetry is defined by the relationship of its symbols to the intended reality or reference. There are three such relationships: first, either explicit correspondence or explicit difference between symbol and reference; second, contraposition of symbol and reference; and third, causal relationship between symbol and reference.

The first relationship, usually rendered in a distich (positive or negative correspondence between two objects), is symmetrical, as for example, in this Ukrainian song:

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 139.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 143.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

"Грушиця моя! чом ти не зелена?"  
 "My pear tree! Why aren't you green?"

"Милая моя! чом ти не весела?"  
 "My darling! Why aren't you happy?"

Grammatically, such correspondences can be juxtaposed as an apposition (pear tree/darling); as an adverbial modifier in the instrumental case (in Russian, солнцем блестеть, to shine like a sun), or as a developed sentence in which the intended reference is implied contextually; in Czech:

Ach ty růže, krásná růže!  
 Čemu si rano rozkvětla,  
 rozkvětavši pomrzla,  
 pomrzavši usvědla,  
 usvědevši opadla?

(Rose, beautiful rose! / Why did you blossom so early, / After blossoming — freeze, / After freezing — fade, / After fading — fall off?).

A negative comparison can be constructed as a "not/but" opposition or as a question and answer; in Serbian:

Šta se sjaji kroz goru zelenu?  
 Da l'je sunce da l'je jasan mesec?  
 Nit'je sunce, ni ti jasan mesec,  
 Vec zet šuri na vojvodstvo dođe.

(What's glittering through the green forest? / Is it the sun or the bright moon? / Neither the sun nor the bright moon, / But the son-in-law coming to the brother-in-law to pay homage.)

In the second relationship—that of contraposition—the form is similar to that of the extended sentence, as for example, in a Ukrainian song, where carefree birds are contraposed to the figure of a worried, aging woman.

Над горою високою голуби літають.  
 Я розкоші не зазнала, а літа минають.

(Over the high mountain doves are flying: / I haven't yet experienced pleasure, and years are passing)

In the case of causal relationship, two objects are linked symbolically on the basis of their alleged similarities. Such a linkage is used in various medicinal charms, symbolic cures, and superstitions. For example, "If your ears ring, somebody is speaking about you." As a portent (*primeta*), these expressions must have been coined because of a prelingual association between a bell and the sound of speech; however, the portent, as a verbal construct, inferring a causal relationship between disparate objects, is rarely empirically true. As abundantly attested to by colloquial language, these linkages must have been made on the basis of external similarities rather than according to a uniform coexistence and sequence. "It is impossible to explain," Potebnja wrote, "how man began curing diseases [*erysipelas* and others] by fire, if we ignore the fact that before this there must have existed an association between fire and disease, a representation of the latter by fire."<sup>6</sup> "More than likely," he continued, "man originally became aware of the cause, through creating it by sorcery or similar phenomena"<sup>7</sup> based on language.

Forms of folklore, exploiting the three relationships discussed above, are more than mere devices by which nameless bards composed songs, fairy tales, spells, mythical stories, proverbs, *dumy*, *byliny*, and so on. Indeed, they were the very mode of man's understanding of the unity and disparity of his world. Here is an example of a Ukrainian folk song:

І по той бік гора  
І по сей бік гора.  
А між тими та гіриськами  
Ясна зоря;  
О, тож не зоря,  
О, тож не ясна,  
О, то ж, то ж моя та дівчинька  
По воду пішла.

(On that side there is a mountain. / And on this side there is a mountain. / And between these two mountains / there is a bright star; / Oh, it isn't a star / Oh, it isn't bright, / Oh, it is my girl / Who went to fetch water.)

<sup>6</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Mysl' i jazyk*, p. 204.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

The structure here might appear to be based merely on the relationship of a simple negative simile; yet, from a historical and conceptual perspective, its juxtaposition of positive and negative propositions must have been a model of explicatory reasoning. Potebnja observed: "The first scientific explanation of the fact corresponds to a positive comparison; the theory that annihilates that explanation corresponds to a simple negation. To man, in whose eyes comparisons, contained in language, were science (*nauka*) and wisdom, poetic negation was already a type of destructive criticism."<sup>8</sup>

In individually created poetic art, by which Potebnja means belles-lettres in general, the three types of relationship between symbol and reference evolved into a complex system of tropes, notably metaphor and metonymy.<sup>9</sup> In such poetry—as opposed to folklore in which they were determined by genetic affinities—comparison, contraposition, and causal sequences have frequently been affected by various intellectual considerations.

Poetic tropes, Potebnja observed, are not synonymous with poetic images or internal forms. They are the "mode of transition" or the "leap" from image to signification.<sup>10</sup> Such modes could be of two kinds—"images believed to be objective and thereby transferable into signification at their face value, or images as a subjective means toward signification."<sup>11</sup> The first mode of transition figures prominently in mythical, and the second in poetic perception.

Metaphor, or more generally "metaphoricity," is that quality of language whereby "any subsequent signification (*respective* word) can be created only by means of the preceding one that is distinct from it. As a result, it is possible to create an infinite number of derivatives from a

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 208.

<sup>9</sup> Hyperbole and irony, generally considered as separate tropes, are not distinct in Potebnja's view because they do not represent a specific relation between the image and its signification.

<sup>10</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Iz zapisok po teorii slovesnosti*, p. 407. Potebnja was well acquainted with the vast literature on poetic tropes. His definitions are frequently definitions *per contra*. His lecture notes are replete with quotations from Aristotle, Quintilian, Wackernagel, Paul, Benfey, Taine, Spencer, etc.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 406.

finite number of relatively elementary words."<sup>12</sup> In this sense, "metaphoricity is a perennial quality of language,"<sup>13</sup> and the significations it generates are simply transitions from metaphor to metaphor. And yet, Potebnja observed, to treat language as nothing but metaphor, or, as Derrida says, as pure figuration, would prevent us from knowing anything for certain. Although we might never be able to reach apodictic truth (because concepts that allegedly represent it can never become final), the distinction between metaphor and signification secures the possibility of science and of effective communication.

In a limited sense, metaphor "is a transfer of a word that is unrelated . . . to the signification that is being sought, either from type to appearance, or from appearance to type, or from appearance to appearance, or by correspondence (similarity)."<sup>14</sup> Metaphor by correspondence is not merely a substitution of two known quantities for each other (as, for example, Aristotelian poetics claimed), but is an authentic attempt to define the unknown in terms of the known. Aristotle's equation  $a:b = c:d$ , Potebnja said, implies a "senseless game of replacement of the existing quantities, rather than a serious search for truth."<sup>15</sup> In order for the trope to be a true metaphor, the correspondence within it must include a signification which is being sought; it must be  $a:b = c:x$ . Otherwise, a metaphor would be but a stale catachresis. Potebnja added: "Aristotle's speculation about the mutual substitution of two members in the proportion which underlies a metaphor would be valid if language and poetry did not contain a definite direction of cognition from the previously cognized to the unknown, or if the conclusion of analogy in metaphor were merely an aimless game of transferring already given quantities, instead of a serious search for truth."<sup>16</sup>

In metonymic constructions, including synecdoche, the image represents its reference by one of its attributes or, conversely, the attributes point to the image by their reference (*pars pro toto* or *totum pro parte*).

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 589.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 261.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.



Hence the attributes either amplify or reduce the intended reference. Unlike metaphor, which relates phenomena of different order (as, for example, nature and human life), metonymy relates phenomena that stand in an objective relationship to one another. In a strictly linguistic sense, most communicative signs are metonymic.

In some instances, metaphor and metonymy cannot be readily discerned. For example, the expression "the burning heart" may be regarded as either metaphor or metonymy, depending upon whether we consider "burning" as a substantive (an independent phenomenon), or as an attribute implicit in the notion of "heart."

As "leaps from image to signification," tropes may appropriate two different values—the mythic and the poetic—depending on the attitude our consciousness takes toward them. In other words, they are mythic or poetic only in regard to the point of view of those by whom and for whom they have been created. In poetic works, they function as the means of creating signification or of making us aware of signification. As such, they decompose into their elements, or are destroyed, each time they reach their object. In this sense, they serve only an allegorical purpose. In myth they function differently. By not being actualized by the subject, they do not decompose but are completely transferred into signification. Myth "is, therefore, a verbal expression of an explanation (apperception) in which the explaining image, which has only subjective meaning, is imbued with objectivity and true being in the explained."<sup>17</sup> In other words, the explaining image of myth is a statement whose signifier and signified, in spite of their explicit semantic variance, are perceived as complementary.

Although myth is prevalent in folklore or collective art, it is by no means absent in works created by individuals. In Potebnja's view, myth is a fundamental human disposition, affecting all possible significations—religious, philosophical, and scientific. Generally speaking, myth "(a) belongs to the sphere of poetry and, like any poetic work, is an answer to a certain question of [our] thought and thus a quantitative augmentation of previous cognition; (b) consists of image and signification whose

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 587.

unity need not be verified, as is the case in science—it can be directly convincing, that is, accepted on faith; (c) is seen, consequently, as a product that terminates the act of cognition and which differs [from this act] by being unconscious. Myth, initially, is a verbal work that always precedes the pictorial or plastic depiction of a mythical image.”<sup>18</sup>

Potebnja's definition of myth and poetic tropes implies the essential unity of human minds throughout history.<sup>19</sup> Accordingly, myth perseveres without essential change. Even “the most positive contemporary mind which occupies itself with chemical analyses, comparative anatomy, statistical conclusions, and the like would consider a cloud to be a cow and name it thus if it had only so little knowledge about a cloud and a cow as the ancient Aryan had.” Hence, if “images that are identical in language and myth seem to us to be very much different, then it is only because of the peculiarity of our point of view.”<sup>20</sup> The identity and comparison of objects, in myth and poetry respectively, is a matter of the noetic faculty rather than a functional decay of language. “Given the [primitive man's] insufficiency of observation, and his extremely dim awareness of that very insufficiency, together with his intentional attempt to compensate for it, the similarity among [his] images must have appeared to him so great that it could have been only the product of an intelligent mind, rather than that of stupidity.”<sup>21</sup>

Finally, the difference between myth and poetic art lies in that the

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 586.

<sup>19</sup> This definition sets Potebnja apart from a group of scholars of his time: Max Müller (1823-1900), Aleksander N. Afanasev (1826-1871), and even Aleksander N. Veselovskij (1838-1906), who treated myth diachronically. Müller's theory of myth (cf. *Essay on Comparative Mythology*, 1856, and *Lectures on the Science of Language*, 1861-64), based on the assumption that myth was the “disease of language,” was particularly objectionable to Potebnja. In his view this assumption implied that prior to myth language must have been superior in its generalizing and communicative functions. “Such an exalted condition of thought, and its subsequent degradation, are unjustifiable and contradict the theory of the gradual revolution of thought. They contradict M. Müller's assertion itself about the original concreteness of language.” (*Iz zapisok po teorii slovesnosti*, p. 423). Müller's assumption also implied a stage in the evolution of language when it was not metaphorical. This, Potebnja insisted, was wrong, since “metaphoricity was the only original way accessible to language. [Generalizing power] presupposes the absence of representation in the word and its prosaic character.” (Ibid., p. 591.)

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 593.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

image in the former relates only to one referent, while that in the latter predicates an unrestricted number of referents. Therefore, "the cloud which was called a mountain, or the sun which was presented as a light wheel were completely different from the cloud represented by a cow or the sun represented as 'fire-bird' (*žar-ptica*)."<sup>22</sup> Even when man became capable of abstracting seemingly different objects as one and the same, instead of naming each of their multiple representations by a special designation, he conceived of them as transformational sequences; instead of saying, "It only seems to be that the sun is a bird, but actually it is a wheel of a chariot," he said, "The being that governs the solar chariot occasionally becomes a bird." Such mythical transformations, Potebnja contended, abound in fairy tales and are reflected in superstitions.

The one-to-one correspondence between sign and referent in myth, from the point of view of its function, renders it equipollent to science. "Myth," Potebnja stated, "is similar to science in that it aims at objective knowledge of the world,"<sup>23</sup> or that, like science, "it is an act of conscious thought, an act of cognition, an explanation of  $x$  by the aggregate of the previously given attributes, united and brought to consciousness by the word or by the image of  $A$ ."<sup>24</sup> Myth, however, is closer to poetry. In myth, as in poetry, the image is manifestly present, while in science it is absent. Algorithmically, the three can be shown this way:

|          |                  |
|----------|------------------|
| myth:    | $X \equiv a (A)$ |
| poetry:  | $X \equiv a < A$ |
| science: | $X = A$          |

in which  $X$  stands for signification, reference, or the cognized object;  $a$  for image, attribute, or metonymic representation of  $X$ ; and  $A$  for the aggregate of the previously acquired knowledge pertinent to  $X$ .

### INTENTIONAL FORMS

Unlike immanent forms that originate in linguistic and ethnopsychological structures, intentional forms of a work of poetic art are a matter

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Mysl' i jazyk*, p. 171.

<sup>24</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Iz zapisok po teorii slovesnosti*, p. 401.

of the poet's creative choice—his aesthetic judgment and preference determine the *generic* appearance of his work. The poet has no such conscious choice with internal forms, for although he might enhance or blur their expressiveness, he cannot avoid them. In poetic art, external and internal forms are, to use Kant's terminology, *a priori* and necessary.<sup>25</sup>

This means that artistic genres, because they are products of intentional forms, are subject to the continuous vicissitudes of aesthetic predilection. Therefore the aesthetic necessity of immanent forms and the temporal relativity of intentional forms render the former primary and the latter secondary in the classification of poetic texts. "We can see poetry," Potebnja wrote, "in any verbal work in which the definition of the image, by a few of its features, generates fluctuation of signification—a *mood*—and which *sees* in them a great deal more than they contain, and in which, without, or even contrary to, the author's intention, allegory appears."<sup>26</sup> No matter whether it is a simple poetic statement or a "universally recognized novel or novella, poetry is everywhere where it is most concentrated, potent and pure."<sup>27</sup> Combined with prose, it might also episodically appear in scientific or journalistic literature.

Traditionally, poetic texts, seen from the perspective of intentional forms, have been classified as epic, lyric, or dramatic. Potebnja held that, depending upon the authority of the existing convention in a given period, these modes may or may not facilitate the imaginative rendition of the intended reality. If they do, they enhance the heuristic power of the poetic text; otherwise, they are merely decoration. If they do, then they relate to the intended referent in the same way that the "form of

<sup>25</sup> Although Potebnja shared a number of Kant's aesthetic assumptions, in regard to intentional forms, he seemed to profess a somewhat different position than Kant. Kant believed that aesthetic intention was also preexistent and necessary. The very fact that the artist imbues this or that experience with specific forms is proof that they are necessary. To make sense of his experience the poet has no alternative but to determine its formal purposiveness. His aesthetic judgment, therefore, contains a principle of *a priori*. (Cf. Kant's *The Critique of Judgment*, especially the first part, "Critique of Aesthetic Judgment.")

<sup>26</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Iz zapisok po teorii slovesnosti*, p. 108.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 107.

the crystal, plant, and animal relates to the processes that have generated it";<sup>28</sup> and if they do not, then they are "completely separable from such a content."<sup>29</sup>

Potebnja's definition of the three generic modes was very close to that of the German romantics, particularly the pre-romantics Goethe and Schiller.<sup>30</sup> Hence, "epic poetry" (the epic mode), both simple (historical or autobiographical) and complex (novella, novel, short story) as *perfectus* is a "calm reflection, objectivity (an absence of any other personal interest in things depicted, except the one that is needed for the depiction itself)."<sup>31</sup> Its manner of narration is free from "haphazard leaps, interruption, and gaps."<sup>32</sup> Unlike the lyrical mode, which prefers metaphors, "epic poetry" (the epic mode) relies upon metonymy. It "widens the time limits in the form of digression (retrospective narration)."<sup>33</sup> In its simple form, the epic mode removes the narrator from the center of action and keeps him hidden—he is "not seen." Events or series of events are related causally. Cause "may appear either as external powers or as internal properties of phenomena. As the former, it may appear as miraculous in the mythological sense; as the latter, as miraculous in the scientific sense. But no matter what we call this chain of causes and effects—god, fate, or world—it nonetheless remains irrational and inaccessible to our comprehension."<sup>34</sup>

"Lyric poetry" (the lyric mode), in all of its variety—erotic, contemplative, elegiac—is *praesens*. As such, it "speaks about the future and the past only to the extent that the 'objective object' disturbs, worries, attracts, or repulses us. Hence the properties of lyrical representation

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p. 108.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> In a famous document, "Über epische und dramatische Dichtung," Goethe and Schiller defined the difference between the epic and drama this way: "An epic poet narrates an event as completely past, while the dramatic poet presents it as completely present....The rhapsodist as a higher being ought not to appear in the poem himself; he should stay behind a curtain, so that we may separate everything personal from his work and may believe we are hearing only the voice of the Muses in general" (Goethe, *Sämtliche Werke*, Stuttgart, 1902-07, Vol. 36, p. 149).

<sup>31</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Iz zapisok po teorii slovesnosti*, p. 532.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., p. 533.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

are brevity, reticence . . . and the so-called lyrical disorder."<sup>35</sup> As cognition, "it objectivizes emotion, subordinates it to thought, calms it down, moves it into the past, and thus enables us to master it."<sup>36</sup> This direct tie to involvements with actuality renders the lyric poem more "pragmatic" than the epic. As a variant of  $X = a < A$ , lyric poetry is directed primarily toward cognition of personal life, and this becomes apperception or self-cognition. But inasmuch as *praesens* "is but a constantly generated and disappearing moment,"<sup>37</sup> the apperception of apperception, in order to become lyric poetry, must be rendered as a "sign of the past thought," as creative introspection, whereby a hereto unknown part of our mind becomes evident to us. It differs from the epic mode in that it is less receded in the past. It is subjective presence.

"Dramatic poetry" (the dramatic mode)—comedy, tragedy, and tragicomedy—in contrast to epic and lyric modes, has no narrator or mediator between the viewer and the event. Action in it, synchronically fused with its language, functions constitutively. Both action and language form syntactic series, and both generate complementary significations. Action lacks a determined external form; however, this does not mean that it is therefore fortuitous. In order to function semiotically, it must form a "series or a chain whose links recede into the past and are retained in memory to the extent that the other [action] appears."<sup>38</sup> In other words, action, as an integral part of the dramatic mode, is to be arranged in a semantically meaningful text. Mime and dance, as pure dramatic action, represent such texts explicitly.

The paucity of Potebnja's remarks about epic, lyric, and dramatic modes can be explained by his belief that the psychological verisimilitude of the text is determined by the nature and function of its internal forms rather than by norms extraneous to it. Consequently the epic, lyric, and dramatic modes are to be treated as secondary taxonomic markers of the poetic text. And yet this does not make them superfluous. A particular sonnet, for example, may have become an *ergon*, that

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., p. 531.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., p. 5.

is, may have lost its poetic potency; as a poetic construct, nonetheless, it must still be defined by the rules of its sub-genre. However, slavish adherence to those rules or patterns, in Potebnja's view, might lead to sterile mannerism or pseudo-classical devices.<sup>39</sup>

From among various generic or intentional forms, Potebnja focused on the fable and the proverb, believing that they could serve as models for such complex poetic works as the novel and novella, and such simple ones as a single poetic statement or even a word.<sup>40</sup>

### THE FABLE

Potebnja's analysis of the fable contended with that of G.E. Lessing (1729-81), a classicist in literature, and a rationalist in thought. One may even say that Potebnja's view of the fable is a *definitio per contra* with regard to that of Lessing. To Lessing, the fable was an application of universally valid maxims to particular events of human life: "If we were to reduce a general moral statement to a particular case and present it as actual, not as an example or comparison but as an event that actually happened, and yet if we, at the same time, were to present it in such a manner that our narrative would explicitly facilitate the original general assertion, then such a work would be a fable."<sup>41</sup> This definition, no doubt, conformed to Lessing's belief in aprioristic knowledge obtained independently of sensory experience.

Potebnja, being essentially an empiricist, to whom experience was one of the presuppositions of knowledge, reacted to Lessing's definition:

Before us is a readymade prescription, from which one should conclude that, first, there exists the general moral confirmation in the mind, for example, "flattery is harmful" or "the mighty devours the weak"; we then proceed to invent for these general statements: for the first, a fable about the Crow and Fox and for the second, a fable about some wild animal devouring either a bird or some other animal and, in turn, itself being devoured, and so on. Such statements presuppose that at first there is a

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., p. 60.

<sup>40</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Iz lekcij po teoriji slovesnosti: Basnja, Poslovica, Pogovorka*. Khar'kov, 1894, p. 1.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. his *Abhandlungen über die Fabel*. Quoted by Potebnja in *ibid.*, p. 48.

général position which subsequently is reduced to a particular case or, as French theoreticians [De la Motte, Richer] say, disguises itself in allegory.<sup>42</sup>

"The fable," Potebnja continued, "cannot be [merely] proof of a single abstract statement, because it serves as a focus of many abstract statements . . . with regard to abstraction, the fable is an allegory."<sup>43</sup>

Potebnja chose to describe the fable rather than other generic forms, because for him it was highly representative of the structure of a poetical work in general. Moreover, by the fable, he "wanted to show the difference between the two fundamental forms of human thought—poetry and prose—and thereby to demonstrate that these are not merely some provisional forms of cognition which, with progress, can be discarded, but rather that they are constant and definitely interacting."<sup>44</sup> These forms—poetry and prose—he observed, "are like eyes; we use them wholly unconsciously; we notice the difference between them only when a notable personality becomes aware of his talent for the one or the other."<sup>45</sup> In other words, Potebnja—very much like his German mentors—searched in the fable for those nonvariables of human cognition which generate knowledge.

The fable, perhaps more explicitly than other, more complex literary forms, is a bipartite construct. It "consists of two parts; the first part is subject to explanation, it is not expressed by words, it does not enter the fable directly, and hence in abstraction it is easily omitted. It can be called the *subject* or that which is explained (*objasnjaemoe*). The second part, which we usually call the fable, is that which explains (*objasnjajuščee*) [and], to some extent, the *predicate*."<sup>46</sup>

What are the functional properties of these two constituents? Let us first consider the second part. The fable, as the predicate, must have four characteristics, in order to function as the continuous explanation of ever new experiential situations. It must consist of a series of actions; the actions must form a definite unity; the actants must be recognized

<sup>42</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Iz lekcij po teorii slovesnosti*, p. 48-49.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 72-73.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.



without description or explanation; and the images must refer to concrete and individual events. Potebnja supplies examples.

"A widow had a hen that laid an egg every day. 'I'll try to give the bird some more barley; perhaps it will lay twice a day,' the housewife thought. She did this. The hen, however, got fat and stopped laying eggs altogether." There are four functions in this story. In contrast to it, Turgenev's prose poem, "Necessitas-Vis-Libertas"—depicting an old, blind, and raw-boned woman pushing a large blind woman who, in turn, pushes a tiny, slender little girl—has only one action, and is therefore an emblem or, as Turgenev himself called it, a *bas-relief*, rather than a fable. Such emblematic, or single-action stories, Potebnja held, can be better depicted by the spatial arts—painting or sculpture.<sup>47</sup>

In Phaedrus's fable, "Calvus et musca" (The Bald Man and the Fly), a fly bit a bald man on the head. Instead of hitting it, the man hit and harmed himself. The fly commented: "For a light pinch you wanted to punish a tiny insect by death; but what happened was that you added abuse to offense." The man responded: "I can easily forgive myself because I had no abuse in mind, but I surely would like to kill you—the most contemptible animal that enjoys drinking human blood—even if it would mean great pain to myself." "How can this fable," Potebnja asks, "serve as an answer to a specific question if it contains two disparate answers?"<sup>48</sup> Consisting of two thematically disjointed fables, it lacks the second property, namely that of a definite unity between actions.

The poet frequently uses animals instead of people. Hence, instead of a cunning man, the fable uses the fox; instead of a greedy man, the ass.

<sup>47</sup> The emblematic fable grew out of the *pictura poesis* literature. It reached its apex in the works of the Renaissance fabulist Gilles Corrozet (1516-1568). Initially, such a fable was a combination of picture and text, but in time the latter subsumed the former; however, the idea that the text is but a corresponding component of the visual image was retained. (Cf. Barbara Tiemann, *Fabel und Emblem*, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, München, 1974.) Corrozet's emblematic fable was but an actualization of the Horatian dictum, *ut pictura poesis*, which Lessing, in his celebrated *Laokoon oder über die Grenzen der Malerei und Poesie* (1766), had subjected to a thorough analysis and rejection. Potebnja embraced Lessing's position entirely. Poetry and painting, he contended, perceive the object in two different modes, the former in action and the latter in stasis. It is for this reason that he classified texts like Turgenev's poetry in prose as emblems rather than as fables.

<sup>48</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Iz lekcij po teorii slovesnosti*, p. 17.

Such substitutions are automatically comprehended by the interpreting community. As in a chess game, in which players know the moves of the pieces by their names alone, so fables with animal actants require no supplementary information to arouse our sympathy or animosity; on the contrary, more information would most likely prevent them from achieving their goal.<sup>49</sup> Hence we can say that the poet uses animals in order to fuse actant and action, and that he thus has a more direct access to actants.

Potebnja illustrates this property with Nathan's parable from the Second Book of Kings (2 Sam. 12:1):

And the Lord sent Nathan to David: and when he was come to him, he said to him: There were two men in one city, the one rich, and the other poor. The rich man had exceeding many sheep and oxen. But the poor man had nothing at all but one little ewe lamb, which he had bought and nourished up and which had grown up in his house together with his children, eating of his bread, and drinking of his cup, and sleeping in his bosom: and it was unto him as a daughter. And when a certain stranger was come to the rich man, he spared to take of his own sheep and oxen, to make a feast for that stranger, who was come to him, but took the poor man's ewe, and dressed it for the man that was come to him.

All the references in this parable are direct rather than impersonal pronominal or generalized subjects, actuating neither doubt, nor disagreement. Instead of questioning the veracity of Nathan's story, "David's anger [was] exceedingly kindled against that man."

The poetic effectiveness of the fable, as well as its historical durability, depend upon the four characteristics of the second part of the fable—namely, of the predicate or "that which explains." Without them its capacity to function as a general explicatory schema for a host of actual situations would be seriously impaired. In comparison to the first part of the fable—the subject or "that which is to be explained"—this schema is and ought to be considerably simpler and clearer.<sup>50</sup> If, however, some of the components of the fable become incomprehensible because the corresponding predicament in life is no longer a factor for

<sup>49</sup> Potebnja (critical of La Fontaine and Krylov who preferred informational detail), advocated with Lessing conciseness and simplicity such as is found in Aesop's fables.

<sup>50</sup> A. A. Potebnja, *Iz lekcij po teorii slovesnosti*, p. 38.

subsequent generalizations, then and only then, is this part of the fable altered by substitution, or it becomes poetically sterile.

Let us now return to the first constituent of the fable—the subject or “that which is to be explained.” In situations in which the image (“that which explains,” or the predicate) can be explicitly correlated with the appropriate event or exigency, the subject “does not have to enter the fable directly, and in abstraction can be easily omitted.”<sup>51</sup> For example:

A husband and his wife daydreamed about what they would do if they won two thousand dollars in a lottery. But as it always happens when everyone has a different idea, they began quarreling and said caustic things to each other. At that moment, however, they recalled the reverie of a gypsy who said, “I will forge some musical instruments, go to the bazaar, buy a heifer that will grow into a cow that will have a calf and we’ll drink milk.” Thereupon a gypsy child said, “And I will ride the calf.” The gypsy hit the child. “Don’t you dare ride it, you may break its back.” Husband and wife . . . burst into laughter and ended their quarrel.<sup>52</sup>

In this fable “the action is palpable and important.” When, on the other hand, there is no explicit correlation between the event and the fable, then the fable is in need of some general conclusion. Such a conclusion may be rendered in three ways: “One particular story explains another particular story; the story explains a well-known general proposition; or the fabulist resorts to both possibilities at the same time.”<sup>53</sup>

In the first case, we usually have a double fable (or as Lessing called it, *zusammengesetzte Fabel*) in which *A* is explained by event *B*. Such are, for example Krylov’s “Wolf and the Little Mouse” or La Fontaine’s “Coq et la perle.” Often “such a comparison is a complete parallelism, in the sense that not only does the case of the second story correspond to the first, but each verse in the first half corresponds to a verse of the second half.”<sup>54</sup>

The second way validates a general proposition by a particular case. If it were the reverse, as Lessing proposed, the fabulist would always have to make a valid generalization—a task that is neither possible nor

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., p. 40.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., p. 41.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., p. 45.

necessary. After all, images of the fable, in order to retain their poetic capacity, should remain potentially polysemous, which means that they should be able to generate varied generalizations.

The third way (as for example in Krylov's adaptation of Aesop's fable "The Peacock and the Crow") is a combination of the general proposition and a double fable. In it the relevance of fable *A* is enhanced both by fable *B* and by the general proposition. But even such a concerted effort to ascribe the fable in question to one specific proposition seldom contains its overall generative capacity. As in the first two ways, here too the "proposed proposition" must remain posterior to its central image.

Regardless of how the general conclusion or proposition of a fable is rendered, in authentic fables it is always only a prosaic *addendum* to the poetic text. Fables with such *addenda* resemble complex works of art that combine the text with an explicit metatext.<sup>55</sup> Such fables contain three distinct meanings: the denotative or extensional meaning of the story; the connotative or allegorical meaning of the story; and finally the generic meaning, mostly axiological, offered either at the outset or at the conclusion of the story. Of the three, the first and third are immediately given, while the second is usually supplied in the process of reading.

What, then, is the possible relationship among these three meanings? If, as Potebnja believed, the fable with such a signficatory function reflects the structural arrangement of the concurrent poetry and prose, then (as in scientific inquiry), the third or generic meaning should function as a verification of the first two. This, in Potebnja's view, is not and should not be the case. In the sciences, verification is the expansion (*razloženie*) of the general conclusion into the elements of which it is composed.<sup>56</sup> Hence, it is the reverse of induction. The ideal verification is the one that expands the given conclusion without any remainder. Such verification is possible when the expansible components are bare

<sup>55</sup> We find such *addenda*, for example, in Phaedrus: "Ne gloriari libeat alienis bonis, Suoque potius habitu vitam degere, Aesopus nobis hoc exemplum prodidit; Nunquam est fidelis cum potente societas. Testatur haec fabella propositum meum; Sibi non cauere et aliis consilium dare, Stultum esse paucis ostendemus uersibus."

A.A. Potebnja, *Iz lekcij po teorii slovesnosti*, p. 60.

signals of transmission, devoid of any auxiliary meaning and thus can be computed quantitatively. Consequently, "perfect proof or verification is possible only in mathematics, within the limits of finite quantities, and in logic, to the extent that it serves as a generalization of the mathematical way of thinking."<sup>57</sup> When, however, the given general conclusion consists of components that transcend it semantically, thus becoming polysemous, then either they relate to it arbitrarily or they yield additional conclusions.

Fables, functioning as verifications of general conclusions, usually have an approximate character. They are not and cannot be proofs of one abstract proposition because they always "prove" more than is necessary. Verification of a strictly scientific character would destroy their allegorical nature. The signs that transmit the stories of the fables are but a "point around which facts are grouped [and] from which a generalization results."<sup>58</sup> Fables, therefore, are closer to a comparison than to a scientific verification. Their role is more synthetic than analytic. They "help us to acquire generalizations rather than to verify them."<sup>59</sup> They are "the means of cognitive generalization and are moral, and as such must precede rather than follow what they tend to attain."<sup>60</sup>

## THE PROVERB

The proverb may be formed out of a condensed fable. Such a condensation might occur in one of two ways. First, the two givens of the fable—the story and the generalization—are inverted: the latter is retained *in toto*, while the former is either considerably condensed or abandoned altogether. Potebnja gives the example of a Serbian condensed fable: " 'It looks like they are short of water and wood,' said the donkey who was invited to a wedding." Second, the story of the fable itself becomes the proverb. For example, "The dog lies on the hay; it does not eat it, but it prevents others from doing so."

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., p. 62.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., p. 74.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., p. 75.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., p. 80.

Fables can be further condensed to what is generally known as sayings (поговорки)—allegorical images which consist of one person, one quality, or one action, but never of all three together. As unidimensional constructs, they stand to proverbs as emblems do to fables. All languages have various sayings that poetically explicate the issues of the condition, quality, and action of life. Here are a few examples in Russian. How poor is an individual? "У него медной посуды—крест да пуговица, а рогатой скотины—таракан да жуковица" (In copper dishes, he has a cross and a button; and in horned cattle, a cockroach and unicorn beetle). How stupid is he? "Из за угла прибит, мешком пришеблен" (Smashed from around the corner; knocked silly by a sack). How drunk is he? "Пьян, как ночь" (Drunk like the night). And so on. Expressions like "на руку" (playing into one's hand); "по нутру" (to one's liking); "в тупик" (cul-de-sac); "сдуру" (out of foolishness); "везет" (to be in luck), and many others are poetic by virtue of having retained their imaginative quality.

In all such proverbs, sayings and idiomatic expressions, considerably more than in the case of fables, the mind must provide appropriate associations, memories, or knowledge to make them meaningful. An instantaneous response to proverbs implies that they must lie just "beyond the threshold of consciousness."<sup>61</sup>

The fable is not the only genre that can be transformed into the proverb. Other, more complex forms, such as comedy, the epic, the novella, and the novel can also be condensed to merely one sentence, one statement, or even one "syntactical unit,"<sup>62</sup> and thus become proverbs. "The process of condensation of the larger story into a proverb is a phenomenon of enormous importance for human thought. To the extent that

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., p. 91. Potebnja's metaphor of consciousness as a "narrow stage that accommodates only a limited number of sensory data that therefore must enter, pass, and exit," was borrowed from J.F. Herbart's intellectualistic psychology. Accordingly, various presentations (*Anschauungen*) are struggling to rise onto this stage via inhibition of and interaction with one another. Potebnja, to be sure, considered this definition as only a poetic figure: "While saying *stage, threshold*, etc. we resort to a poetic form of cognition. We are content with this figurative expression only because we cannot find another one for the resolution of this important question" (*Iz lekcij po teorii slovesnosti*, p. 91).

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., p. 102.

it is accessible to our observation, condensation is unique to it.”<sup>63</sup> This process reduces large intellectual data to relatively small units and thus facilitates and accelerates their movement.<sup>64</sup> If, however, the process should result in the disappearance, rather than the substitution or summation, of the larger cognitive masses by the lesser ones in the reader's consciousness, the value of such works would be a negative one. Their cognitive efficacy is therefore proportional to their power “to reduce disparate phenomena to a relatively small number of signs or images, and thereby to increase the importance of intellectual complexes entering our consciousness.”<sup>65</sup>

### FABLE AND PROVERB AS EXAMPLES OF THE WORK OF POETIC ART IN GENERAL

By the time Potebnja chose to discuss it, the fable as an intentional aesthetic form was already largely extinct. Its historical span (beginning perhaps with cuneiform texts and lasting several millennia) had finally, by the end of the eighteenth century, reached its end. Johann G. Herder, the ideologue and theoretician of *Sturm und Drang*, and an avowed apologist of the fable, wrote in 1801: “Arrogant times debase everything; hence the great teacher of nature and educator of mankind, the fable, gradually became a gallant chatterer or a childish fairy tale.”<sup>66</sup>

In addition to reasons already discussed earlier in this article, it was perhaps also the waning of the historical tradition of the fable that prompted Potebnja to focus on it. Unlike the novel—a genre long in arriving and in a state of continuous development—the fable, being arrested in time as a concluded process, had become most suitable for description and analysis. As Potebnja himself said, it was primarily the formal homogeneity and perspicuity of its essential components that were heuristically valuable and worthy of analysis.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., p. 96.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., p. 97.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., p. 98.

<sup>66</sup> J.G. Herder, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Bernhard Suphan, Berlin, 1877/1913, Vol. XXIII, p. 255.

Defining the fable and the proverb as constant answers or predicates to a continuously changing subject of human experience, Potebnja came to believe that the two genres were indeed the paradigms of all possible works of poetic art. Complex literary works, such as the epic, the novella, the novel, and drama, "in order to become such an answer, would have to recede from us, as if into a distance, their dimensions would have to become reduced in our eyes, their details would have to disappear, and only easily perceptible general outlines would be retained."<sup>67</sup> In short, to be an effective "medium of cognition, generalization, and moral,"<sup>68</sup> these works would also have to become fables.

Such a view of the fable was by no means new. During the seventeenth and the early eighteenth centuries, when the fable reached its zenith, neo-classical and romantic theorists treated it in a similar way. Charles Batteux, for example, in his *Beaux Arts réduits à un même principe* (1746), observed that the fable is constructed and functions in the same way as the epic and tragedy. At its center is an action with a beginning, an end, and a conflict which, in order to yield a proper moral, should be narrated appropriately. Fables, therefore, should be regarded as either miniature epics or as miniature tragedies. Batteux, however, by insisting on the didactic aim of the fable and on the pre-existent abstract or general truth, of which the fable is merely an illustration, substantially differed from Potebnja.

Potebnja's view on the fable was closer to that of Herder. A century earlier, Herder had regarded the fable as a "source, a miniature, of the great poetic genres, in which most of the poetic rules are found in their original simplicity and, to a certain extent, in their original form."<sup>69</sup> His definition of poetry, outlined in the essay "On Image, Poetry, and Fable" (1787), was destined to influence the aesthetics of German pre-romanticism and romanticism, particularly that of Goethe and Humboldt. By contending that the human mind perennially creates, rather than passively receives, images of reality, he placed it at the center of artistic as well as scientific creativity. Reality, he proposed, is not simply

<sup>67</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Iz lekcij po teorii slovesnosti*, p. 23.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 80.

<sup>69</sup> J.G. Herder, Vol. II, p. 98.



imitated or reproduced but always created anew. The continual flow of images through the mind that expresses itself in a variety of verbal and visual images is poetry. In this sense, "our entire life is, so to speak, poetry. . . . Hence it follows that our soul, as well as our speech, continuously allegorizes."<sup>70</sup> The fable, like all poetry, emanates from man's natural need to have a sense of, and control over, external and internal reality. It is, therefore, merely one of the creative modes employed "to explain the changes of the universe, its becoming, existence, and extinction."<sup>71</sup>

Our conjecture on the apparent similarities between Herder's and Potebnja's views on poetry and the fable ought not be taken as peremptory. While for Herder rationalism and didacticism were an abomination of the human spirit, for Potebnja, the centrality of cognition—both in poetic and scientific works—was a matter of epistemological exigency. Poetry and science, he concluded, might be different in the devices they employ, but they both "aim at introducing unity and completeness into the diversity of [our] sensory data; the difference between their means and results demands that these two trends of thought . . . support and complement each other."<sup>72</sup> For Herder and his fellow-romantics a century earlier, such a view of poetry and science would have been anathema; for Potebnja, it served as both an epistemological concept and a method.

This should not lead us to the conclusion that Potebnja was a rationalist of one sort or another. Essentially a Kantian, he believed that our knowledge of the phenomena of sensory perception contains generalities that function by means of elements that are given *a priori*. This was quite distant from Herder's *Glaubensphilosophie*, which in matters of knowledge ascribed priority to feeling and belief. It is in this philosophical context that the similarities, and differences, between the two scholars are to be viewed.

As mentioned above, the fable—a literary genre that had endured over millennia and finally, at the end of the eighteenth century, had

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., Vol. XV, p. 526.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., p. 535.

<sup>72</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Myśl i język*, p. 193.

outworn its poetic vitality—represents most markedly, in Potebnja's opinion, the structural arrangement of the work of poetic art in general. Its external form objectivizes the artistic image; its internal form (or the sign of the image) intimates that the content, or the idea and its content, although not given textually, is provided by the apperceiving consciousness. All three—the internal form, the external form, and the idea—are structural components *sui generis*. The discernment of these components is therefore a simultaneous discernment of poetic art as such.

So that the image, or the concatenation of images, may function optimally in the fable, they should have four properties: they should represent a series of actions; they should be thematically unified; they should be free of excessive attribution, and they should address events or cases evident in human life.

In addition to the above properties, the fable might also contain a general proposition or truth. Such a prosaic *addendum*, in Potebnja's view, does not and ought not to exist as the epistemological or axiological antecedent of the fable. "The role of the fable," Potebnja stated, "is synthetic. It helps us to acquire generalizations rather than to verify them."<sup>73</sup> In other words, the fable, within the limit of our experience, enlarges rather than simply confirms existing knowledge. In this respect, the fable, and in fact "all poetic works without exception,"<sup>74</sup> function as a focus for the diverse occurrences, out of which emerges a general proposition or truth. Its structure can be represented by three concentric circles, of which *A* is the fable or the poetic text, *B* the occurrences or the experiential context, and *C* the generalization or the prosaic *addendum*.

## CONCLUSION

Jan Mukařovský, an eminent representative of Prague Structuralism, wrote in "A Note on the Czech Translation of Šklovskij's *Theory of Prose*" (1934) that Potebnja's school had "reduced the artistic aspect to something secondary, had rendered the work of art a passive reflection

<sup>73</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Iz lekcij po teorii slovesnosti*, p. 75.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., p. 80.

of something which was outside of art, had not differentiated sufficiently the specific function of poetic language from the function of the communicative utterance."<sup>75</sup> These accusations, plainly borrowed from Šklovskij,<sup>76</sup> were most certainly the result of a misinterpretation of Potebnja's view on poetic language.

By "artistic aspect," Mukařovský meant the aesthetic orientation of the text toward expression as such or toward the liberation of expression from its referential, emotive, and connotative functions. If we should assume that in poetic art, to utilize the linguistic sign means to free it from a unilateral bond with any of these functions, then Potebnja stands accused. If, on the contrary, we assume, as Potebnja did, that because of the undifferentiable nature of the human mind, it is virtually impossible to break the bond of the unity of functions of a linguistic sign and that any attempt to isolate some of those functions is merely heuristic, then Šklovskij's and Mukařovský's criticism become irrelevant.

It simply is not true that Potebnja "reduced the artistic aspect to something secondary." We have attempted to show that, according to him, the dominant constituent of the poetic utterance is its internal form, that is, such linguistically rendered attributes or their combination as are capable of invoking in the reader's perception completed objects or realities. In order to be able to do this, these attributes or signs must be polysemous. The polysemy of the internal form, Potebnja observed, "is the property of poetic works."<sup>77</sup> The reduction of this capacity of polysemy automatically deprives such signs of their poeticalness and converts them into purely referential signs.

Even less plausible is Mukařovský's allegation that Potebnja's aesthetics "rendered the work of poetic art a passive reflection of something that was outside of art." This allegation bluntly contradicts Potebnja's fundamental claim that the work of art is *energeia* rather than *ergon*. As *energeia* it either continually creates new realities or explicates new

<sup>75</sup> Jan Mukařovský, *The Word and Verbal Art, Selected Essays*, New Haven, 1977, p. 135.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Viktor Šklovskij, *O teorii prozy*, and particularly his essay "Iskusstvo, kak priem," Moscow, 1929, pp. 7-23.

<sup>77</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Iz lekcij po teorii slovesnosti*, p. 139.

questions of human existence. Passive reflection plainly purports either a structural analogy or a homology between the work of art and the intended reality. This does not agree with Potebnja's view. Poetic images or signs are metonymically organized systems, whereas intended realities, as they occur in consciousness, are often loosely organized aggregates. It is from these aggregates, by means of apperception, that poetical signs form cognitive objects. There is an explicit disproportion between the two: in Potebnja's notation their relation is  $a < A$ . Metaphorically, they stand to each other "as alcohol and sugar stand to grain, potatoes, and sugar beets."<sup>78</sup>

Looking at Mukařovský's allegation from the point of view of classical logic, passive reflection would also imply that the "reflected something" performs a validity function, and the aesthetic signs a validity value. But for Potebnja, poetry, in relation to everything "that is outside of it" is untrue, while immanently it is true to itself.<sup>79</sup> Wilhelm Humboldt put it even more bluntly: "The realm of imagination is directly opposed to the realm of reality, and equally opposed is the character of whatever belongs to one of these realms to anything within the other." Poetic art is "wholly opposed to reality."<sup>80</sup>

As for the last allegation—that Potebnja did not discern a specific function of poetic language—it can be said, and has been shown above, that his major effort, both in linguistics and in literary aesthetics, was to demonstrate how language, with *manifest* internal form, has always functioned either mythically or poetically; conversely, with *neutralized* internal form, it has served as an instrument of scientific reference.

To recapitulate briefly. The work of poetic art is a "form of forms," a configuration of immanent and intentional forms. Immanent forms are inherently linked with human progressing or regressing consciousness; they specify either the "poeticalness" or the "prosaicalness" of an utterance (in the broad sense). Intentional forms, linked with historical conventions, specify the generic modification of a work of art. This inter-

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., p. 65.

<sup>79</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Iz lekcij po russkoj grammatike*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1941, Vol. IV, p. 116.

<sup>80</sup> M. Humboldt, "Über Goethes Hermann und Dorothea," *Gesammelte Werke*, Berlin, 1903-1936, Vol. II, p. 128.

connection of mind and history, as it manifests itself in language, is a reservoir of a constant creative quest, both "poetic" and "prosaic." Out of it developed preflexional words and, subsequently, syntactically structured language, giving us collective or folk creations, imaginative and realistic poetry, and mythic and scientific explications of spiritual and physical realities. All these forms of expression represent a creative reciprocity between man and his self, man and men, and men and nature.

In spite of their historical and synchronic peculiarities, the forms of expression mentioned above are similar in that all are narrative sequences, all function in accordance with specific rules and all are directed toward some goal. Although these forms are sequential to each other and therefore could be distributed on a hypothetical axis from *X* to *Y*, they do not invalidate one another by the process of supercedure or otherwise. Their progression from imaginative to strictly referential functions, on the one hand, and, on the other, their continuous intention to function both poetically and prosaically, are not mutually exclusive, inasmuch as language, of which these forms are the constituents, does not remain the same. Language, in its perennial variation, becomes polysemous and thereby multifunctional. Although poetry and prose may *seem* to be mutually exclusive, they are, on the contrary, complementary. Poetry, myth, and science, therefore, coexist in a state of symbiosis.

The difference between poetry, myth and science lies in the manner in which their structural components—external form, internal form, and signification—relate to one another, or more precisely, how such a relationship is perceived, both collectively and individually. In poetical works images, upon invoking signification, dissipate without becoming a part of it; in myth, they are transferred into it; and in science, they remain neutral. Algorithmically, poetry, myth and science represent three variant relations of *X*, *a*, and *A*: of a signification that is being sought, of an image by means of which signification is being sought, and of *A* as the aggregate of the previously acquired knowledge pertinent to *X*.

Intentional forms (traditionally labeled as epic, lyric, and dramatic

modes) depend entirely upon the authority of the existing convention. Here they obviously differ from immanent forms. It is this authority that either affects or minimizes the heuristic power of intentional forms. Of the many variants of the lyric, epic and dramatic modes, Potebnja described in detail only the fable and the proverb, believing that these two examples best illustrate the nature and function of poetic works in general.

If we were to offer a criticism of Potebnja's theory of literary forms, it (unlike that of Šklovskij and Mukařovský) would concern his inadequate attention to the external form. His only qualification of it was that it should be "significant in its constitutive parts,"<sup>81</sup> and that it ought not impede the cognitive function of the internal form. Such a restrictive qualification considerably limits the aesthetic search for original arrangements and experimentation, for bold challenges to the existing forms of expression, and for what Umberto Eco called aesthetically overcoded constructs. The fable might indeed represent a group of generic variants, but it does not and cannot represent the entire spectrum of aesthetic possibilities: no literary genre can subsume all possible poetic variations. Behind all of Potebnja's formulations is the conviction that ultimately poetic art, like all other intellectual endeavors, should help us to comprehend the predicaments of our existence, should expand our knowledge of ourselves and others, and should lessen inter-subjective conflicts. These are, of course, noble goals, and poetry should not circumvent them, but they are not its exclusive tasks. In "Draft Remarks on the Art of L. Tolstoy and F.M. Dostoevsky" Potebnja wrote: "If we were to suppose that reason, theory and conscious striving toward some goal play no role in life, then we would destroy the possibility of discerning man's conscious life from his unconscious life."<sup>82</sup> Paraphrasing this remark, we can say that if we were to regard reason, theory, and conscious striving as the only source and regulator of poetic creativity, we would contain it considerably and perhaps even destroy it.

<sup>81</sup> A.A. Potebnja, *Iz zapisok po teorii slovesnosti*, p. 30.

<sup>82</sup> A.A. Potebnja, "Černovyje zametki o tvorčestve L.N. Tolstogo i F.M. Dostoevskogo," *Estetika i poetika*, p. 561.

# Futurist Polemics with Xvyl'ovyj during the Prolitfront Period

OLEH S. ILNYTZKYJ

In October 1927 Ukrainian Futurists finally realized the long-cherished dream of publishing their own, independent monthly journal. *Nova generacija* (The New Generation), as this publication came to be known, appeared thereafter without interruption until December 1930. Because of their uncertain and controversial position in the literary community, and in order to forestall any possible criticism from the proletarian groups and the Party, the Futurists found it necessary to define their position on the most delicate question of the day, namely Mykola Xvyl'ovyj and VAPLITE (Free Academy of Proletarian Literature). Not sharing the artistic and philosophical world view of VAPLITE or the Neoclassicists (Xvyl'ovyj had found supporters among the latter), and recognizing that their own position was tenuous, the Futurists readily took the side of the Party, declaring themselves allies of the proletarian organizations VUSPP (All-Ukrainian Union of Proletarian Writers) and Molodnjak (The Young Forest—an organization of young Kom-somol writers).<sup>1</sup> At the same time, although less clearly and less emphatically, the Futurists let it be known that they were not about to emulate the artistic and cultural practices of those and other proletarian organizations. The Futurists from the beginning insisted on a “differentiation” of the artistic process, a right to their own mode of artistic *expression*.<sup>2</sup> The “ideological” alliance with VUSPP did not prevent the Futurists from engaging in a prolonged and often savage debate with the ‘proletarians’ on issues of art. It was not by chance that one critic observed that “polemics against representatives of VUSPP hold first place” in

Copyright by the Author.

<sup>1</sup> “Platforma i otocennja livyx,” *Nova generacija*, No. 1, 1927, pp. 40-41.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41.

*Nova generacija*.<sup>3</sup> At the end of 1929, however, during VUSPP's second congress (when it became increasingly obvious that VUSPP had the backing of the Party), the Futurists made a decision to desist from further harsh confrontations with VUSPP and entered into a formal "coalition" with that organization.

The coalition with VUSPP had been formed under the pretext of combatting the literary "right." It cannot be said, however, that the Futurists exhibited unusual fervor in this regard. Their crusade against the "right" amounted mostly to publishing brief sarcastic remarks in the "notebook" section of *Nova generacija* about such writers as Arkadij Ljubčenko, Kost' Burevij, Pavlo Tyčyna, Xvyl'ovyj and, especially, Borys Antonenko-Davydovyč whom Geo Škurupij characterized as "famous (only) for his hyphenated name."<sup>4</sup> Objections were also raised by the Futurists against "discredited" leftists like Valerijan Poliščuk and the director Les' Kurbas. By far the sharpest attacks were reserved for a group of painters in the organization ARMU (Association of Revolutionary Artists of Ukraine), the so-called Bojčukists (Myxajlo Bojčuk and his adherents) for drawing much of their inspiration from ancient icons.<sup>5</sup>

Provincialism and artistic backwardness emerged as the major vices in Futurist attacks. As was the case with most issues during that time, such polemics were not purely cultural but had a political dimension as well. Relatively speaking, however, politics did not have a prominent place in these polemics, with a few important exceptions. An article against T. Os'mačka, for example, ominously characterized him as a "carrier of a hostile ideology."<sup>6</sup>

The major representative of the so-called "right" in 1929 was the journal *Literaturnyj jarmarok* (Literary Fair) of which twelve issues were published between December 1928 and February 1930. Although it served as a platform for a variety of writers, it was identified primarily as a successor to the controversial *Vaplite* and viewed as a haven for

<sup>3</sup> H. Ovčarov, "Pro žurnal'nu krytyku 1929 roku," *Krytyka*, No. 3, 1930, p. 113.

<sup>4</sup> Geo Škurupij, "Veresk vse-ukrajins'koho liliputa," *Nova generacija*, No. 7, 1928, p. 40.

<sup>5</sup> Geo Škurupij, "Dyktatura bohomaziv," *Nova generacija*, No. 10, 1929, pp. 26-34.

<sup>6</sup> B. Kovalenko, "Pokryvdžena zemlja," *Nova generacija*, No. 11, 1929, pp. 53-58.



Xvyl'ovyj and his associates. VUSPP took a very dim view of *Literaturnyj jarmarok* and critics connected with that organization were not at all timid about attacking it.<sup>7</sup> In contrast, the Futurists paid relatively little attention to the journal and its associates. Although the hostilities between *Literaturnyj jarmarok* and *Nova generacija* were quite obvious, they were not featured in either of the two journals. The polemics that did appear were initially of a sarcastic character; only gradually (toward the end of 1929) did they turn into more insidious confrontations.

The first item of substance to appear in *Literaturnyj jarmarok* touching on the Futurists was an open letter signed by "a group of ARMU members." Published in the June issue (which actually appeared in late July), the letter was dedicated to *Nova generacija* and its "chief" Myxajl' Semenko. Full of sarcasm, the letter set out to list the "dialectics" (i.e. inconsistencies) of Semenko's movement, implying that the war of words waged by the Futurists against Kurbas and the Bojčukists in ARMU was a reflection of their mercenary mentality and political opportunism, their need to find a new scapegoat, now that VUSPP had been adopted by the political powers and thus had become untouchable. Concluding that Semenko's journal and his movement were superfluous in their day and age, the anonymous authors declared: "You must die [Semenko]. We say this in all seriousness. You and your boys must die not as a physiological entity, but as a social factor. . . . Yes, Comrade Mike [Myxas'], you must disappear."<sup>8</sup>

A month later *Literaturnyj jarmarok* attacked the Futurists again by reviving an embarrassing incident which had involved the fictitious writer Edvard Strixa. An invention of Kost' Burevij, who by 1929 was an associate of *Literaturnyj jarmarok*, Strixa had been accepted in early 1928 as a legitimate contributor to *Nova generacija*. So well did Strixa imitate the exuberant and egotistical tone of Futurist poems that for a time his works were not recognized as parodies. *Literaturnyj jarmarok*

<sup>7</sup> Cf. I. Mykytenko, "Za hehemoniju proletars'koji literatury," *Hart*, No. 6, 1930; reprinted in I. Mykytenko, *Na fronti literatury, 1927-1937* (Kiev: Radjans'kyj pys'mennyk, 1962), p. 84. See the section entitled "Šljaxy 'Literaturnoho jarmarku,'" M. Novyc'kyj, *Na jarmarku* (Kharkiv: Hart, 1930).

<sup>8</sup> "Lyst do jarmarkomu; 'Dialektyka,'" *Literaturnyj jarmarok*, No. 7, 1929, p. 279.

gleefully reminded its readers that Semenko had been so thoroughly deceived by Strixa that he had even attributed genius to his works.<sup>9</sup> When, finally, Semenko realized he had been duped, Strixa was gradually weeded out of the journal. At first, Semenko and Poltorac'kyj appropriated the pseudonym for themselves, publishing several works under that name; finally they orchestrated Strixa's demise. *Nova generacija* revealed to its readers that Strixa had become the victim of a tragic accident. In a sad letter to the editor, Strixa's "wife" (invented by the Futurists) even gave public testimony to that fact. In 1929 Burevij decided to resurrect Strixa, publishing works under that name in Valerijan Poliščuk's *Bjuleten' Avangardu*. It was to the newly resuscitated Strixa that the editorship of the eighth issue of *Literaturnyj jarmarok* was entrusted, thus giving him the opportunity to further jab at the Futurists. "You [Semenko] have thrown your journal into mud," Strixa declared at one point.<sup>10</sup>

Although the Futurists completely ignored the Strixa incident, they took advantage of the ARMU letter. In September 1929, *Nova generacija* carried a series of the documents that appeared under the collective title "Sprava pro trup" (The Case of the Corpse).<sup>11</sup> The editorial commentary that accompanied all works published in *Nova generacija* noted that the VUSPP coalition had "stirred the circles of the right," and brought *Nova generacija* under attack from the "all-Ukrainian Philistine [miščanyn], who was seeking Semenko's death. In order to fulfill this wish of their adversaries, the editors had requested that Semenko die. In an example of Futurist joking, he complied. In memory of their deceased leader, the editors offered readers a number of documents: a letter addressed to the local prosecutor asking him to investigate Semenko's untimely demise; two letters found on Semenko's body; an obituary; and, lastly, a memoir about the late Semenko written by Anatolij Petryc'kyj. One of the two letters, presumably found on Semenko's

<sup>9</sup> *Literaturnyj jarmarok* No. 8, 1929, p. 2.

<sup>10</sup> *Literaturnyj jarmarok*, No. 8, 1929, p. 323. For a history of the Strixa affair see Jurij Šerex, "Istoriija odnijeji literaturnoji mistyfikaciji," in Edvard Štrixa, *Parodezy, Zozendropija, Avtoekzekucija*, ed. by Jurij Šerex (New York: Slovo, 1955), pp. 249-264.

<sup>11</sup> *Nova generacija*, No. 9, 1929, pp. 27-33.

person, was from Poltorac'kyj; it discussed the subject of ARMU's own "opportunistic" alliances; the second was Semenکو's incomplete reply to Poltorac'kyj volunteering the following characterization of *Literaturnyj jarmarok*: "This 'Fair' is an organ of uncle Taras from the Poltava region [and it has] the commensurate circle of Little Russian readers."<sup>12</sup>

Such sarcastic but harmless jousting took a nasty turn toward the end of the year. In early January 1930 the long overdue October issue of *Literaturnyj jarmarok* appeared, carrying a letter to the editor signed by Arkadij Ljubčenko, Hryhorij Epik, Oleksander Kopylenko, and Jurij Vuxnal'. An editorial note explained that the publication of this letter was necessitated by the fact that three of the four authors were co-workers of *Literaturnyj jarmarok* and because the issues it broached were of concern to the journal.

The letter in question was a reaction to one that appeared in both *Visti VUCVK* (The News of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee—one of the two official dailies) and *Komsomolec' Ukrajinjy* (The Komsomolian of Ukraine) signed by a coalition of five organizations: VUSPP, Pluh (The Plough—The Union of Peasant Writers), Molodnjak, VUARKK (All-Ukrainian Association of Workers of Communist Culture—the official organizational name of *Nova generacija*), and Zaxidna Ukrajinna (Western Ukraine). The coalition had rebuked Hryhorij Epik for advocating at a public forum that *Nova generacija* be closed down, and condemned *Literaturnyj jarmarok* for "associating" (spilkuvannja) with Valerijan Poliščuk's organization, Avangard ("the constructivists").

The letter in *Literaturnyj jarmarok* flatly denied both allegations as groundless inventions. But it went even further by suggesting that the letter of the coalition was a conspiracy to obscure the central question which had been raised by Epik, namely the "pornography" and "political cynicism" of *Nova generacija*. The four authors interpreted the letter of the coalition as an attempt on the part of *Nova generacija* (which had been caught "red-handed") to evade "proletarian judgment" by hiding

<sup>12</sup> "Sprava pro trup," p. 28.

"behind the back of the other four organizations" which supposedly signed the protest without being aware of the facts.

*Nova generacija* was again accused of pornography in February 1930 when the twelfth issue of *Literaturnyj jarmarok* appeared.<sup>13</sup> The Futurists replied to this rather lamely, with a brief commentary that pointed to the "pornography" in Oleksander Kopylenko's work which appeared in the previous issue of *Literaturnyj jarmarok*.<sup>14</sup> The unremarkable nature of their reply may have had something to do with the fact that by then they had significantly more serious accusations to worry about. On January 27, 1930 Xvyl'ovyj had published an attack against them in the Party newspaper *Komunist*. In it the Futurists were branded as nationalists, Mazepites, Jefremovites (followers of the liberal intellectual Serhij Jefremov), and fascists.<sup>15</sup>

The immediate stimulus to Xvyl'ovyj's article was the publication, in early January of 1930; of the Futurist *Avangard: Al'manax* (no connection with Valerijan Poliščuk's Constructivist journal *Avangard*).<sup>16</sup> Published in Kiev and edited by Geo Škurupij, it included among its contributors Oleksa Vlyz'ko, Oleksander Dovženko (represented by an excerpt from his filmscript "The Earth" which was about to be released), P. Mel'nyk, Iu. Palijčuk, I. Malovičko, M. Bulatovyč, Viktor Petrov, S. Vlasenko, and M. Xolostenko. Although subtitled "an almanac of proletarian artists" (an obvious obeisance to the spirit of the day and a reflection of the fact that *Nova generacija* too had changed in January 1930 from a journal of "left" art to one of "revolutionary" art), on the first page it still managed to assert in bold letters the belief that art was dying as an "irrational category." Even though slightly more conservatively designed than *Nova generacija* (it recalled Semenko's *Mystectvo*

<sup>13</sup> M. Xvyl'ovyj, "Proloh do knyhy sto sorok druhoji," *Literaturnyj jarmarok*, No. 12, 1929, p. 2. This issue may have appeared later than February. An advertisement seems to indicate that No. 12 was published and ready for sale only in mid-April, 1930. Cf. *Komunist*, No. 102, April 13, 1930, p. 4.

<sup>14</sup> *Nova generacija*, No. 3, 1930, pp. 36-37.

<sup>15</sup> "Kryčušče božestvo," *Komunist*, No. 26, January 27, 1930, p. 4. This article was reprinted in *Proletfront*, No. 1, 1930, pp. 247-253. My references will be from the latter source.

<sup>16</sup> *Avangard: Al'manax proletars'kyx mytciv Novoji generaciji*, No. a, January, 1930.

of 1919-1920), in other respects the almanac was a perfect child of the parent journal. Like *Nova generacija*, *Avangard: Al'manax* contained in the table of contents editorial comments about all contributions; like the journal, the almanac was consciously international and covered all the arts. The title appeared both in Ukrainian and German; it featured an article by the "De Stijl" leader Theo van Doesburg; it ran a report on *Der Sturm* and on the avant-garde in Czechoslovakia. There were also articles on architecture, city planning and film. None of these items, however, attracted Xvyl'ovyj's attention. He saw nothing in *Avangard: Al'manax* except evidence of the most heinous nationalism.

Xvyl'ovyj chose Vlyz'ko as his primary target, zeroing in on a chapter from his book, *Pojizdy idut' na Berlin* (The Trains are Leaving for Berlin) which was a humorous "history of the travel passport."<sup>17</sup> In this ironic reportage (Xvyl'ovyj insisted on calling it an editorial), written from the point of view of a naive, rambling and forever digressing traveler, Xvyl'ovyj found "an undisguised apology for [that] Mazepism [mazepyn'stvo], of which Ukrainian fascists are so proud."<sup>18</sup> He began mounting his evidence against Vlyz'ko with a quotation (taken out of context) that had the narrator remarking, ironically and in passing, that he cannot forgive Czar Peter I for destroying Ivan Mazepa "because this was our best Het'man." On the basis of this and other passages, Xvyl'ovyj argued that Vlyz'ko's work "reeks with malice toward Peter I" while it "sings panegyrics to Mazepa." Xvyl'ovyj stated that Vlyz'ko grieved for a "militant Ukrainian nationalism" especially the "imperialistic" variety. Generalizing from this case, Xvyl'ovyj went on to declare that "these apologists of Mazepism are none other than the well-known, relentless opponents of Xvyl'ovism, the Panfuturists-Komunkul'tists from *Nova generacija*".

Xvyl'ovyj's second target was Geo Škurupij's article "Nove mystectvo v procesi rozvytku ukrajins'koji kul'tury" (The New Art in the Process of Development of Ukrainian Culture).<sup>19</sup> Although Škurupij attacked *Lite-*

<sup>17</sup> "Istorija zakordonnoho pašportu," *Avangard: Al'manax proletars'kyy mytsiv Novoji generaciji*, No. a, pp. 3-15.

<sup>18</sup> "Kryčušče božestvo," *Prolitfront*, No. 1, 1930, p. 247.

<sup>19</sup> "Nove mystectvo v procesi rozvytku ukrajins'koji kul'tury," *Avangard: Al'manax proletars'kyy mytciv Novoji generaciji*, No. a, pp. 37-42.

*raturnyj jarmarok*, Xvyl'ovyj ignored this, in order to stress what he called Škurupij's "Xvyl'ovist concepts" which proved that Škurupij was a "consistent Xvyl'ovist" and a representative of "one hundred percent [pure] national-bolshevism."<sup>20</sup>

The last person to be singled out by Xvyl'ovyj was Viktor Petrov, a renowned scholar who also wrote fiction under the pseudonym V. Domontovyč.<sup>21</sup> Petrov's contribution was a chapter from a biographical novel about Pantelejmon Kuliš. It was Petrov's chapter heading ("Movčušče božestvo") that Xvyl'ovyj parodied when he named his attack on the Futurists "Kryčušče božestvo." Petrov's chapter was described by Xvyl'ovyj as a "programmatic article" which in the age of reconstruction offered readers only "bourgeois nonsense." The Futurists' sin lay in the fact that they had dared to shelter in the person of Petrov a "neoclassicist." The article ended by recalling that the Futurists continued to suffer from the illness of pornography and were responsible for publishing "toilet works."

Xvyl'ovyj's article received several replies from the Futurists. The first appeared at very short notice and, therefore, was no more than a paragraph long. Dashed off by Semenko for the January issue of *Nova generacija*, it was an ironic observation about Xvyl'ovyj's recent conversion to the age of reconstruction. More important, however, it was also a diplomatic but quite obvious rebuke to the editors of *Komunist* (where the article had originally appeared; see Note 15) for publishing an article like Xvyl'ovyj's without any editorial rejoinder.<sup>22</sup>

A much longer reply appeared in the February issue of *Nova generacija*. Written by S. Antonjuk, it was virtually a reprint of Xvyl'ovyj's article, with Antonjuk's running commentary on its distortions.<sup>23</sup>

The final reply was Geo Škurupij's; it appeared in April, i.e. in the

<sup>20</sup> "Kryčušče božestvo," *Prolitfront*, No. 1, 1930, p. 250.

<sup>21</sup> See his novel *Doktor Serafikus* (Munich: Ukrajins'ka trybuna, 1947) which contains references and allusions to Futurism.

<sup>22</sup> M. Semenko, "Kryčušča nikčėmnist' (Z pryvodu odniji nebezpeky)," *Nova generacija*, No. 1, 1930, p. 57.

<sup>23</sup> S. Antonjuk, "Božestvo serdyt'sja abo novi podvyhy konkvistadora Xvyl'ovoho," *Nova generacija*, No. 2, 1930, pp. 23-28. Antonjuk was also the author of two other articles which appeared in the Kharkiv daily press (*Visti VUCVK*, *Večirnja robitnyča hazeta*), but these were not available to me.

second and, as it turned out, the last issue of *Avangard: Al'manax*.<sup>24</sup> Ironically, Škurupij's answer was published the same month that Xvy-l'ovyj's article was reprinted in *Prolitfront*, the journal that succeeded *Literaturnyj jarmarok*. Aside from demonstrating once again how Xvy-l'ovyj misrepresented the texts he cited, Škurupij argued that Xvy-l'ovyj's "lies," "falsehoods," and "slander" were motivated by inter-group rivalries. On a more serious note, Škurupij accused Xvy-l'ovyj of becoming the inadvertent spokesman for Russian great-power chauvinism, a role that automatically discredited him as a true communist.<sup>25</sup>

Before the dust had time to settle around Xvy-l'ovyj's "Kryčušče božestvo," he published a new article which contained still more ominous and far-fetched accusations against the Futurists. On March 16, 1930, the newspaper *Xarkivs'kyj proletar* carried an article entitled "A xto šče sydyt' na lavi pidsudnyx" (And Who Else Sits Among the Indicted?), which was nothing less than an attempt to link the Futurists to the counterrevolutionary SVU (Spilka vyzvolennja Ukrajiny) trial that had begun in Kharkiv only a few days earlier.<sup>26</sup> Xvy-l'ovyj did this by citing Škurupij's poem of 1921 and misreading into it evidence of "Xvy-l'ovism." This old poem ostensibly proved that Škurupij "had been appearing in the role of a broadcaster of Jefremovite lies [pidbrexač jefremovščyny] for a long time."<sup>27</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Geo Škurupij, "Čerhovyj blef M. Xvy-l'ovoho," *Avangard: Al'manax proletars'kyx mytciv Novoji generaciji*, No. b, pp. 63-66.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid. pp. 64-64.

<sup>26</sup> M. Xvy-l'ovyj, "A xto šče sydyt' na lavi pidsudnyx," *Xarkivs'kyj proletar*, No. 62, March 16, 1930. (This article was not available for my examination. Information and quotations from it were culled from sources cited below). SVU was alleged to have been an anti-Soviet organization created by intellectuals of the older generation, former supporters of the UNR and Symon Petljura. Forty-five individuals were tried between March 9 and April 19, 1930, among them the noted critic and literary historian S. O. Jefremov. The accused were found guilty and sent to Soviet concentration camps where most died. It was alleged by Soviet security organs that SVU had links to SUM (Union of Ukrainian Youth) and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. For an example of the orchestrated condemnation of SVU and the role literary organizations played in this see "Zuxvalyj zamax ukrajins'koji kontrrevoljuciji," *Hart*, No. 12, 1929, pp. 177-182.

<sup>27</sup> This quotation is taken from Geo Škurupij's rebuttal to Xvy-l'ovyj, a letter he addressed to the Federation of Organizations of Revolutionary Writers of Ukraine (FORPU). For the entire text see Geo Škurupij, "Do federaciji radjans'kyx pys'men-nykiv," *Nova generacija*, No. 4, 1930, pp. 62-63.

No less astonishing accusations were leveled against Semenko. He was described by Xvyl'ovyj as a disseminator "of global bourgeois lies" as well as of those invented by the bourgeois "intelligence service." Asking rhetorically "Do you want proof?" Xvyl'ovyj pointed to Semenko's poem of 1913 "Osin' " (Autumn). Describing it as an "editorial," he stated that the poem was imbued with "kulak ideology" and amounted to a "Doncovian proclamation," a "call [to the masses] to organize sabotage and mischief in the field of culture." Xvyl'ovyj "proved" this by citing a line from the poem ("Osin' u serce vede smutok neždanyj" — Autumn brings unexpected sadness into heart) and interpreting the harmless combination "u serce" (into the heart) as an abbreviation standing for the "counterrevolutionary" Ukrainian SR (Socialist Revolutionary) Party. The word "sum" (sadness) became SUM (Union of Ukrainian Youth) in Xvyl'ovyj's exegesis. From this he concluded that Semenko was passing secret messages to the enemy on the "other side of the barricades."<sup>28</sup> The whole article was so ridiculous that Semenko could only respond with incredulity: "Is this or is this not a hoax?"<sup>29</sup>

Xvyl'ovyj's articles of January and March marked the beginning of a vicious and ignoble struggle between the Futurists and the Xvyl'ovite camp (by 1930 the latter had reorganized itself into Prolitfront). Both *Nova generacija* and *Prolitfront* published articles that accused the respective opposition of the worst conceivable political transgressions. Traditionally, it has been argued that the Futurists were the aggressors in this war and that Xvyl'ovyj and Prolitfront merely responded in kind only after losing patience with the Futurists, who, supposedly, subjected them to perennial torments. Most recently this view has been succinctly enunciated by H. Kostiuk:

During the period of Prolitfront Xvyl'ovyj did not publish a single new story [...]. All his creative energy, all his polemical passion was concentrated on literary polemics [which] were directed mainly against *Nova generacija*. He dedicated three long, sharp, exposé articles to the organization of Ukrainian Futurists and, especially, to its member, the critic O.

<sup>28</sup> D. Holubenko [M. Semenko], "Mistyfikacija (?)," *Nova generacija*, No. 4, 1930, pp. 57-58.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*



Poltorac'kyj.<sup>30</sup> Moreover, *Prolitfront* published articles by I. Momot under the pseudonym O. Mak,<sup>31</sup> I. Senčenko,<sup>32</sup> and Varvara Žukova (Kost' Burevij)<sup>33</sup> [all of which were] directed against *Nova generacija*. How can we account for *Prolitfront*'s [showering of] such "attention" on *Nova generacija*? This was not some kind of whim on the part of *Prolitfront*; [it was] especially not [a whim on the part of] Xvyl'ovyj. This sharp attitude was triggered by two factors: 1. the sharply negative attitude of *Nova generacija* towards *Prolitfront* as an organization, as well as by the constant defamation of it [*Prolitfront*]; 2. the provocative article by O. Poltorac'kyj against the works of Ostap Vyšnja which played a fatal role in the subsequent fate of Ostap Vyšnja. These are the basic reasons for the all-out war Xvyl'ovyj [waged] against *Nova generacija*.

Kostiuk goes on to elaborate that from 1927 to 1930 *Nova generacija*:

stubbornly, from issue to issue, published various derisive, malicious inventions, pamphlets, annoying provocations and even common political denunciations against M. Xvyl'ovyj and his followers. The most active author of such "literature" was the young critic O. Poltorac'kyj. His long (it spanned several issues) political denunciation [donos] of Ostap Vyšnja incensed not only numerous readers of Ostap Vyšnja but the entire literary community that was close to *Prolitfront* [...]. Such spiritually filthy, amoral types [as Poltorac'kyj] set the tone in *Nova generacija* for the attacks against *Prolitfront*. Finally [these individuals] destroyed Xvyl'ovyj's equilibrium and became one of the fundamental causes for Xvyl'ovyj's and *Prolitfront*'s total counterattack against *Nova generacija*. These conflict-laden situations should not be forgotten by any investigator.<sup>34</sup>

The two opposing groups could hardly have been described in more contrasting terms. The above quotation leaves little doubt as to who are the heroes and who are the villains: the implicit argument in this interpretation is that the Futurists were national renegades throughout the 1920s, whereas the Xvyl'ovites were true patriots. This theme, which is only hinted at here, has been pursued much more bluntly by other critics.

<sup>30</sup> "Kryčušče božestvo," *Prolitfront*, No. 1, 1930, pp. 247-252; "Čym pryčaruvala 'Nova generacija' tov. Suxyno-Xomenka"? *Prolitfront*, No. 3, 1930, pp. 229-270; "Ostap Vyšnja v svitli 'livoji' balalajky," *Prolitfront*, No. 4, 1930, pp. 254-310 [Kostiuk's notes]. Kostiuk makes no mention of "A xto šče sydyt' na lavi pidsudnyx."

<sup>31</sup> "Z bl'oknotu čytača," *Ibid.*, Nos. 1, 3, 4 [Kostiuk's note].

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 2, pp. 177-210 [Kostiuk's note].

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 3, pp. 205-228 [Kostiuk's note].

<sup>34</sup> H. Kostjuk, "Mykola Xvyl'ovyj: Žyttja, doba, tvorčict'," in M. Xvyl'ovyj, *Tvory u pjat'ox tomax*, vol. I (Baltimore: Smoloskyp, 1978), pp. 82-83.

"For years Soviet Ukrainian Futurism exposed VAPLITE's and Neoclassicism's nationalism." Futurists, (e.g. Geo Škurupij), it has been said, were "assailants" of the aforementioned groups. They were servile followers of the "party line," capable of no more than "conformity" and "flattery" in the face of the "new Moscow religion of Leninism."<sup>35</sup>

Views such as these are deeply ingrained among Ukrainian literary historians working in the West. The facts, however, paint quite a different picture. But before I demonstrate this and address myself to the specific events of 1930, it will be useful to review briefly the relationship between the Futurists and the Xvyl'ovyj camp from the perspective of the entire decade.

It should be kept in mind that Xvyl'ovyj and the various organizations to which he belonged in the course of the 1920s maintained very negative views on Futurism. This is evident from a number of early documents,<sup>36</sup> but it became much more obvious later, when Xvyl'ovyj was a member of Hart (Tempering — an organization of proletarian writers) — an organization that rejected the Futurists on principle. During the early period, Xvyl'ovyj was always part of officially sanctioned organizations and had no conflicts with the Party, something which cannot be said for the Futurists. His difficulties began with the creation of VAPLITE in November 1925. It was then that the question of nationalism emerged as an issue that further divided the Xvyl'ovites and the Futurists: until that time the two sides basically argued about art and culture, and the characteristics that were eventually to make it "proletarian."

The issue of "nationalism" in these polemics deserves a separate comment. It is true that the Futurists were against all manifestations of Ukrainian "nationalism," but this observation should be placed in con-

<sup>35</sup> Ju. Lavrinenko, *Rozstriljane vidrodžennja* (Munich: Instytut literacki, 1959), pp. 111, 234-235, 383. In the case of Škurupij, criticism was tempered by this observation: "He was at the same time a patriot of Soviet Ukraine, in whom dwelled pride and pain for his fatherland."

<sup>36</sup> See, for example, "Deklaracija vseukrajins'koji federaciji proletars'kych pys'mennykiv i mystciv," and "Naš universal do robitnykiv i proletars'kych mystciv ukrajins'kych." *Desjat' rokiy ukrajins'koji literatury (1917-1927)*, edited by A. Lejtes and M. Jašek (Kharkiv: DUV, 1928), vol. 1, p. 70 and p. 67.

text if it is to be properly understood. Nationalism, as a political concept, was alien to the Futurists because they accepted the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Ukrainian culture as established facts that obviated it. Whether this was naive or not is another question; the fact remains that the political aspect of this issue was irrelevant to them. Although in their polemics and in their literary works there were attacks against Ukrainian nationalists, and even an occasional instance of lumping Xvyl'ovyj and his associates into the so-called "counterrevolutionary" camp, in the majority of cases they addressed themselves to an entirely different aspect of this question. When persecuting their opponents, they were not concerned about exposing their *political nationalism* (i. e. suggesting that they were traitors), but rather about combating, what for lack of a better term can be here called their *cultural nationalism*. The latter can be defined as any manner of artistic practice that consciously and conspicuously endeavored to emphasize or incorporate Ukrainian national elements, themes or styles into contemporary culture. In this instance the Futurists understood "nationalism" as equivalent to "provincialism" and "Little Russianism."<sup>37</sup> Borys Antonenko-Davydovyč, for example, was attacked for his "Little Russian nationalism,"<sup>38</sup> meaning his artistic and intellectual backwardness. It is apparent from this that the Futurists rigorously adhered to what Semenko had proclaimed in 1914, namely that the "national" period in Ukrainian culture was over. The present orientation of *Ukrainian* culture had to be international. A national orientation was reactionary by definition. For the Futurists, VAPLITE and, especially, *Literaturnyj jarmarok* with its *intermediji* and Gogolian-like banter, was proof that Xvyl'ovites were "nurturing" only a "museumlike," "provincial" culture. From their point of view, the Xvyl'ovites were typically regressive even when they invoked European culture as a model for Ukrainians because their view of Europe was "antiquated by at least 50 years."<sup>39</sup> Just how important it

<sup>37</sup> Cf. "Platforma i otočennja livyx," pp. 40-41 and M. Semenko, "Mirkuvannja pro te, čym škidlyvyj ukrajins'kyj nacionalizm dlja ukrajins'koji kul'tury, abo čym korysnyj internacionalizm dlja neji ž," Lejtes and Jašek, vol. II, pp. 375-380.

<sup>38</sup> Geo Škurupij, "Veresk vse-ukrajins'koho liliputa," p. 41.

<sup>39</sup> Geo Škurupij, "Nove mystectvo v procesi rozvytku ukrajins'koji kul'tury," p. 37.

was for the Futurists to identify Ukrainian culture with modern, particularly experimental movements is evident from their disappointment with the director Les' Kurbas. When the latter "betrayed" them by turning away from constructivism, Semenko argued that the government should withdraw support from his theater because "it is not in the interest of the Soviet state and its leadership to make of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic an eternal province."<sup>40</sup>

Because of such attitudes, it has been erroneously concluded that the Futurists were national renegades. Such is obviously not the case. Although their views on Ukrainianization and Russian chauvinism were not expressed as conspicuously as VAPLITE's, the Futurists cannot be accused of being indifferent to these issues. They were not reluctant to attack Russian journals (e.g. *Novyj lef*, *Novyj mir*) when these betrayed arrogance towards Ukrainian and other non-Russian cultures in the U.S.S.R., calling such attitudes remnants of an unsavory pre-revolutionary tradition.<sup>41</sup> They were known even to invite the CP(b)U to investigate what they considered to be Russian chauvinistic practices in the publishing house "Proletarij."<sup>42</sup> When the Futurists appeared in towns and villages of the Russified Donbas region to give public readings and lectures on Futurism, they also became promoters of Ukrainianization. In one of their reports, they noted that "not everything was in order" with Ukrainianization in the Donbas and that "our appearances [...] turned into an agitation for a Ukrainian newspaper [...]": the Futurists were compelled "to conduct very long discussions to prove to the workers the need for learning the Ukrainian language...,"<sup>43</sup> a cause which they were to promote on other occasions as well.<sup>44</sup> At one such public appearance, a worker (speaking Russian) suggested that Ukrainianization was a base for the development of Ukrainian nationalism and

<sup>40</sup> "Pro teatr," *Nova generacija*, No. 10, 1929, p. 76.

<sup>41</sup> Čf. S. Červonyj, "Nevdali turysty," *Nova generacija*, No. 2, 1928, pp. 137-140; Geo Škurupij, "Na šturm linošživ i neznajstva," *Nova generacija*, No. 3, 1928, pp. 211-213; D. Holubenko, "Antonenko-Davydovyč a la rjuss," *Nova generacija*, No. 2, 1930, p. 60.

<sup>42</sup> "Blok-not 'Novoji generaciji'," *Nova generacija*, No. 12, 1928, p. 424.

<sup>43</sup> O. P. [Poltorac'kyj], "Donbas sluxaje," *Nova generacija*, No. 4, 1929, p. 71.

<sup>44</sup> "Šefstvo VUARKK (N.G.) nad zavods'koju hazetoju 'Metalist' u Stalini," *Nova generacija*, No. 6, 1929.

expressed the view that the proletariat could be better served if everyone spoke a single international language. Semenko responded to the speaker by saying that the international language about which the worker was dreaming was nothing less than an excuse for "Russification."<sup>45</sup>

Poltorac'kyj's article against O. Vyšnja holds a central place in any discussion of the question of why Proletfront and Xvyl'ovyj attacked the Futurists so viciously in 1930. Not only has this article been seen as the instrument of Vyšnja's tragic ten-year experience in the GULAG, but it has been offered as a typical example of just how base the Futurists' polemics were. The impression has been created that Xvyl'ovyj and his associates were merely *reacting to* this "moral filth" and hence the meanness of their attack assumes a certain noble or, at least, justifiable character. A closer examination of the content of Poltorac'kyj's article, as well as an awareness of when it appeared in print, should suggest a different conclusion.

Poltorac'kyj's article can be eliminated as the *casus belli* of the 1930 polemics between the Futurists and the Xvyl'ovites on chronological grounds alone. The article began appearing only in February,<sup>46</sup> that is, after the Futurists were charged with pornography and political cynicism in *Literaturnyj jarmarok* and after Xvyl'ovyj's article "Kryčušče božestvo" appeared in *Komunist*. If anything, Poltorac'kyj's article seems to have been a reaction to attacks initiated by the Xvyl'ovite camp rather than their cause. The tone and content of his article are also at odds with the monstrous role usually assigned to it.

Poltorac'kyj's article, which was entitled "Ščo take Ostap Vyšnja"? (Just What is Ostap Vyšnja?), ran in three installments in *Nova generacija*. The professed stimulus to its writing was a recently published two-volume edition of Vyšnja's works, although other motivations certainly cannot be ruled out.<sup>47</sup> Poltorac'kyj set out to investigate why Vyšnja had become "king of the Ukrainian *tyraž*" (the number of copies of a

<sup>45</sup> "Stalins'kyj protokol," *Nova generacija*, No. 7, 1929, p. 59.

<sup>46</sup> It may actually have appeared even later than that because the February (No. 2) issue of *Nova generacija* was advertised in the press only in April. Cf. *Komunist*, No. 97, April 6, 1930, p. 4.

<sup>47</sup> Ostap Vyšnja, *Usmišky*, 2 Vols. (Kharkiv: DVU, 1929-1930).

published book), why he was apparently so strongly promoted by publishing houses, and why he was considered useful in the task of "Ukrainianization." Poltorac'kyj's goal was to contradict the generally accepted opinion that Vyšnja played a positive role in Soviet Ukrainian society. In the first installment of his article he made the following major points: Vyšnja was a representative of the uncultured peasant masses; his linguistic practice was characteristic of this "idiotic" stratum of society (quoting Marx), and hence it was reactionary, conservative and reminiscent of the populists' ideals in the preceding century. In his view, Vyšnja was bad for "Ukrainianization" and demoralizing in the struggle to raise the masses to a higher cultural level. In the face of Vyšnja's primitive example, Poltorac'kyj took it upon himself to act as an apologist for a cultured non-ethnographic language.

Whereas several years ago Vyšnja's "popular language" [prosta mova] could have been greeted as the best language for the masses, now, when the masses have matured unbelievably in the cultural sense, such a language as Vyšnja's can only be detrimental to the process of cultivating the language of the Ukrainian masses [...]. Ostap Vyšnja's linguistic practice can only have a negative influence on workers [...] who are being Ukrainianized [...]. In our opinion the proletarian circles of Ukrainian society should condemn the reactionary linguistic practice of Ostap Vyšnja.<sup>48</sup>

Related to the above argument was Poltorac'kyj's characterization of Vyšnja's "comic technique." He concluded that Vyšnja employed one basic device in his writings, namely vulgarization. This not only led him down the path of anal, genital and bathroom humor, but also resulted in the depiction of human beings as virtual animals.

Whereas the first installment managed, for the most part, to retain a descriptive and analytical thrust, the second and third began to betray a strong sense of political indignation at what was interpreted to be Vyšnja's negative and cynical view of Soviet socialist reality. Pointing to Vyšnja's attitudes about the village, city and machine, Poltorac'kyj argued that Vyšnja had eyes only for the primitive and retrograde aspects of Soviet life and was blind to the achievements and successes of the revolution. Poltorac'kyj concluded that the "literary mask" that was

<sup>48</sup> "Ščo take Ostap Vyšnja?," *Nova generacija*, No. 2, 1930.

Ostap Vyšnja (the author's real name was Pavlo Hubenko) was not really an intrepid propagandizer of Party tenets as his readers believed; the mask was really that of an unprincipled, uneducated bourgeois who had a dubious political past. In short, Vyšnja "as a literary figure,"<sup>49</sup> insisted Poltorac'kyj, was an ideal example of the conservatism that the Ukrainian village had stood for in the recent past. Therefore, "independently of the personal sympathies of the author," Vyšnja had emerged as "a reactionary figure, a brake on the train of the cultural revolution in Ukraine."<sup>50</sup> In view of Vyšnja's "militantly anti-cultural character," his "cheap and primitive" artistic devices, Poltorac'kyj was forced to declare:

We must openly state that the work of Ostap Vyšnja is not [our] wealth; it is not an achievement of Ukrainian culture. *Ostap Vyšnja is our poverty* because in his works we have the fullest expression of the smugness [xutorjanstvo], lack of culture and provincialism from the clutches of which Ukrainian Soviet literature is liberating itself with such effort.<sup>51</sup>

It must be stressed that above and beyond these manifestly literary and cultural issues, Poltorac'kyj's article also contained a number of political innuendoes. The names of Petljura and Vranghel, the White Army and the Cadet Party were suggestively dropped in the course of his analysis and comparisons. This clearly demonstrates that his was not just a literary or philosophical exercise. In short, there can be no doubt that the article meant to do Vyšnja harm. Its author had an obvious political ax to grind; he deliberately chose to be humorless, puritanical and literal with a writer who obviously could not be judged by such criteria. But it must also be said that, on balance, Poltorac'kyj's article was far less obnoxious than those of Xvyl'ovyj and *Prolitfront*. The latter were nothing less than out-and-out political assassinations, accusations of treason. Poltorac'kyj at least made an effort to distinguish between the writer (Hubenko) and his literary persona (Vyšnja). Ultimately he condemned the mask, not the creator.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>51</sup> "Ščo take Ostap Vyšnja?," *Nova generacija*, No. 4, 1930, p. 28. Emphasis in the original.

The difference between Xvyl'ovyj's approach and Poltorac'kyj's is evident even in the former's reply to the latter.<sup>52</sup> Despite the length (56 pages), Xvyl'ovyj's argument against Poltorac'kyj was simple and crude. Regardless of what the elitist and formalist Poltorac'kyj might think, Vyšnja was a good writer, according to Xvyl'ovyj, because he was loved by the peasant and working masses, and had been recognized by leading orthodox proletarian critics. The only detractors of Vyšnja were nationalists, fascists and untrustworthy Soviet writers. As an example, Xvyl'ovyj pointed, respectively, to Doncov, to an anonymous Ukrainian author writing in a nationalist publication in Prague, and to Borys Antonenko-Davydovyč. Poltorac'kyj's characterization of Vyšnja, was, in short, in complete agreement with that of other "counterrevolutionaries."<sup>53</sup>

As we see, the views on Ostap Vyšnja divide along class lines: fascists, and those who sing to their tune on this issue, look at Vyšnja [...] as if [he were a] member of the Cheka [čezvyčajka]. Communists declare that Vyšnja is "necessary," they place him next to academician Tyčyna and call him "one of the most noted, most influential contemporary Soviet writers." It cannot be otherwise: there is no apolitical literature; there is only class literature. And inasmuch as classes struggle with one another, a Soviet writer will never find a place in the heart of a bourgeois critic.<sup>54</sup>

In light of the content and tone of Poltorac'kyj's article, can it still be reasonably maintained that it had any bearing on the tragic fate of Vyšnja? Could an article written in 1930 really have been instrumental in the arrest of a man in December 1933? This question can be answered by another. Are Xvyl'ovyj's articles (or those of his associates) responsible for the execution of Vlyz'ko in 1934, the death of Škurupij in the GULAG and the execution of Semenko in 1937? Obviously not. The same answer must hold true for Poltorac'kyj. The causes of these tragedies must be sought in the immediate historical context in which they occurred (e. g. the fall of Skrypnyk, the rise of Postyšev, the growing terror in general). They can hardly be attributed to a specific article.

<sup>52</sup> M. Xvyl'ovyj, "Ostap Vyšnja v 'svitli' 'livoji' balabajky," *Prolitfront*, No. 4, 1930, pp. 254-310.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 307.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 306-309.



The supposedly evil nature of the Futurists obviously does not explain why Xvyl'ovyj waged such a virulent war against them. We have seen that chronology as well as the tone and content of Poltorac'kyj's article argue against the proposition that the Futurists instigated the harsh polemics of 1930. The facts indicate that responsibility for the qualitative deterioration in the Futurist-Xvyl'ovite debate rests with the Xvyl'ovite camp. It started in *Literaturnyj jarmarok*, gained momentum through Xvyl'ovyj's January and March articles and by April, when the journal *Prolitfront* began appearing, was canonized, more or less, as the style of the period. It is difficult indeed to accept the argument that *Prolitfront* was merely *responding* to the attacks of *Nova generacija* when it is clear that Xvyl'ovyj initiated the attacks before *Prolitfront* was founded. *Nova generacija* could not have originated the attacks against *Prolitfront* because the very first issue of *Prolitfront* already contained virulent anti-Futurist statements in the form of Xvyl'ovyj's reprinted article and an editorial.<sup>55</sup> What we see, then, is not an innocent group of writers defending themselves against the vicious Futurists. If anything, the opposite is true. When the articles in *Nova generacija* about *Prolitfront* and Xvyl'ovyj are examined against the time of their appearance, it becomes clear that they were primarily written in response to attacks that first appeared in *Prolitfront*.<sup>56</sup> These counterattacks by the Futurists were strong, but it is important to emphasize that they were never as politically vicious as those that originated in Xvyl'ovyj's camp. The Futurists preferred to address themselves to issues rather than to accuse their opponents of treason.

To understand why Xvyl'ovyj's group initiated a crusade against the Futurists we should examine the literary and political situation during that immediate period. Such examination will show that the Xvyl'ovites began their campaign against the Futurists in order to gain access to the proletarian sanctum from which they were excluded; it will show that

<sup>55</sup> See "Do čytača," *Prolitfront*, No. 1, 1930, pp. 8-10.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Ju. Muzyčenko, "Zapysky z 'prolitfrontu,'" *Nova generacija*, No. 10, 1930, p. 36; I. Malovičko, "Jak zasypavsja M. Xvyl'ovyj na zaxysti Ostapa Vyšni," *Ibid.*, No. 11-12, 1930, pp. 26-36; Ju. Muzyčenko, "Pidručnyk peresmykuvannja (polemičnyj reportaž)," *Ibid.*, No. 11-12, 1930, pp. 36-46.

the attacks on the Futurists were a way to repudiate their past and reinstate themselves into the good graces of the Party. In short, I shall argue that this was no moral campaign against the evils of Futurism; it was a self-serving act, designed to reap political capital.

We have seen that *Literaturnyj jarmarok* had been severely censured by VUSPP. The writers identified with this journal were being gradually isolated, while exactly the opposite was happening to the Futurists. Although far from being universally recognized by the "proletarian" community, their coalition with VUSPP made the Futurists nominal members of this powerful organization and sheltered them from active persecution. Indicative of the legitimacy that *Nova generacija* enjoyed during this period was its presence on October 21, 1929 at a meeting in Kiev which examined the question of forming a "revolutionary coalition."<sup>57</sup> VUSPP, Molodnjak, Pluh, and Zaxidna Ukrajina were also party to these proceedings. Incidentally, this was the same group of five organizations that shortly afterwards took Epik and *Literaturnyj jarmarok* to task for advocating the liquidation of *Nova generacija* and for associating with Valerijan Poliščuk.

The meeting in Kiev focused largely on *Literaturnyj jarmarok*. The journal was discussed not only as the most important opponent of the "revolutionary" orientation but also as the organization around which other members of the "right" tended to coalesce. It is interesting to observe that whereas the critic Borys Kovalenko from Molodnjak spoke about the "recidivism" of nationalism in *Literaturnyj jarmarok* at the meeting, Geo Škurupij, who represented *Nova Generacija*, linked "the national tastes in literature and film" of the "right" to their provincialism. In addition, he pointedly reiterated that differences on formal (artistic) issues continued to exist between VUSPP and *Nova generacija*, but insisted that these should not cause animosity between them.<sup>58</sup>

In November 1929 *Nova generacija* again improved its position, when the coalition it was part of was expanded to include the All-Ukrainian Association of Revolutionary Cinematographers, known otherwise as

<sup>57</sup> "Do utvorennja revoljucijnoho bl'oku v literaturi," *Literaturna hazeta*, No. 21, November 1, 1929, p.8.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid.

VUARK.<sup>59</sup> (It was probably in connection with this development that *Nova generacija* altered its formal name VUARKK to VUSKK, becoming a "union" rather than an "association" of workers of communist culture. This was done, no doubt, to avoid confusion with the cinematographers' organization.)

This mania for coalitions as well as the meetings dealing with the possibilities of federation were part of a mushrooming tendency at that time to form a single unifying body for all "revolutionary" organizations. VUSPP had received a mandate to do exactly that at its May 1929 congress; by the end of the year it was on the verge of launching what eventually came to be known as FORPU (Federation of Organizations of Revolutionary Writers of Ukraine). As the moment of federation approached, *Literaturnyj jarmarok* came under tremendous pressure to justify its continued estrangement from the "proletarian" camp. Although the journal resisted these pressures, the breaking point came in November 1929 when Valerijan Poliščuk, leader of the Constructivists, was violently condemned from every forum in the nation for his third issue of *Avangard*. Accused of pornography and other offenses, Poliščuk was forced to confess his errors and liquidate his organization.<sup>60</sup> When this occurred, *Literaturnyj jarmarok* was also forced to throw in the towel: the resounding condemnation that Poliščuk received at the hands of the "proletarians" threatened to spill over to *Literaturnyj jarmarok*. In order to short-circuit the inevitable, the journal decided to join the chorus of condemnations. When the tenth issue appeared, it contained a strongly worded attack on Poliščuk.<sup>61</sup> The events that followed are by now familiar. Before the attack of *Literaturnyj jarmarok*

<sup>59</sup> Cited from G. S. N. Luckyj, *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1927-1934* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956), p. 148.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. I. Kulyk, "Naxabstvo, ščo ne viz'me horoda," *Hart*, No. 12, 1929, pp. 126-131; "Poliščukijada," *Ibid.*, pp. 174-177. See also H. F. Ovčarov, "Proty miščans'kyx vyxvatok u literaturi (z pryvodu 'Avangardu')," in his *Narysy sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literatury*. Vypusk peršyj (Kharkiv: Literatura i mystectvo, 1932), pp. 136-153.

<sup>61</sup> "Odvertyj lyst do redakciji 'Literaturnoho jarmarku'" *Literaturnyj jarmarok*, No. 10, 1929, pp. 303-304. The letter accused Poliščuk of "counterrevolutionary stunts" and "gross pornography." Its signers were: M. Kuliš, Ju. Janovs'kyj, V. Vražlyvyj, M. Jalovyj, M. Xvyl'ovyj, A. Ljubčenko, O. Dosvitnij and H. Epik. It was dated 10. XI. 1929.

against Poliščuk had a chance to be noticed (the issue in which it appeared was published very late), the aforementioned coalition of five organizations, among them *Nova generacija*, published a letter chastising the journal for its "association" with Poliščuk. *Literaturnyj jar-marok* angrily rejected this accusation, calling it the "invention of a sick mind." It then proceeded to build a case against the Futurists.

When *Literaturnyj jar-marok* claimed that it had not been associated with Poliščuk it was blatantly lying. Poliščuk as well as other members of his entourage (e.g. Leonid Černov) had appeared in the pages of *Literaturnyj jar-marok*, while writers like Burevij (Strixa) and Ivan Senčenko appeared in Poliščuk's publications. Contemporaries went so far as to speak about a coalition between the two groups. The "contributors to *Literaturnyj jar-marok* had a coalition [bl'okuvalys'] with [Poliščuk's] 'Avangard'," said Mykola Skrypnyk in May 1930.<sup>62</sup> There was confirmation of this even in one of Poliščuk's publications which carried the following notice: "A new literary organization has been formed [by the name of] 'Proliten' "<sup>63</sup> (Xvyl'ovyj, Senčenko, Kuliš, Epik and many others). 'Proliten' will live with 'Avangard' in a relationship of good neighborliness."<sup>64</sup>

The abandonment of Poliščuk and the creation of "Prolitfront" in late November or early December were symptomatic of the serious change taking place in *Literaturnyj jar-marok*. With Number Ten (formally designated as the September issue but actually published in mid-November), the journal unofficially entered the Prolitfront era. The tone of the last two issues of *Literaturnyj jar-marok* already prefigured the journal *Prolitfront*. Observers at the time were quite aware of this. In January 1930, a critic wrote:

Two months ago there was reason to fear that this group of writers [*Literaturnyj jar-marok*] had an organic, 'pessimistic' illness; today we can say with assurance that this illness is not organic and that the majority of

<sup>62</sup> M. Skrypnyk, "Dvi promovy. Na vyščyj ščabel'," *Krytyka*, No. 6, 1930, p. 25. See also V. Suxyno-Xomenko, "Literaturna sytuacija na radjans'kij Ukrajinі," *Zaxidna Ukrajin-a*, No. 1, 1930, p. 34.

<sup>63</sup> A preliminary name for "Prolitfront."

<sup>64</sup> Cited in Ipolit Tovarec', "Znaxabnila pošljatyna," *Avangard: Al'manax*, 1930, p. 95.

[these] 'pessimists' will become our own singers. They have begun to speak a different language [...]. If you take Number Ten of *Literaturnyj jarmarok* you will see that it already signals the end of the age of *Literaturnyj jarmarok*... [and signals] a transition to [...] an organization [that is part] of the *proletarian literary front*. It was exactly in November and December that the long process of drawing nearer to the creative obligations of proletarian and revolutionary literature came to an end for members of *Literaturnyj jarmarok*.<sup>65</sup>

All this points to the fact that in the face of the complete rout of one of its allies (Poliščuk) and the imminent creation of FORPU, *Literaturnyj jarmarok* made a resolute decision to gain entry into the proletarian camp regardless of cost. The implications of not belonging to a nationwide federation were too grievous to contemplate. But since it was obvious that *Literaturnyj jarmarok* was not going to be accepted into FORPU, Xvyl'ovyj's group quickly formed a new organization, Prolitfront,<sup>66</sup> which was nothing but a device to gain entry into FORPU. On December 31, 1929, Prolitfront, until then a completely unknown organization, became one of seven signatories of the document that created FORPU.<sup>67</sup> Not until April 1930, when the first issue of *Prolitfront* appeared, would the public know what Prolitfront was. But in the intervening period, readers were being alerted to its formation both in the last two issues of *Literaturnyj jarmarok* and especially in Xvyl'ovyj's articles.

Attacking the Futurists proved to be an excellent way for Prolitfront to demonstrate its new-found proletarian fervor. The issues were ready-made. Poliščuk's downfall showed that the argument of pornography was a lethal weapon against a foe; the trial of SVU suggested nationalism as the second potent theme (collectivization, naturally, inspired such pejorative terms as "kulak"). By initiating a crusade against the Futurists, the Xvyl'ovites were deflecting attention from their own past,

<sup>65</sup> V. Suxyno-Xomenko, "Literaturna sytuacija na Ukrajinii," *Zaxidna Ukrajinna*, No. 1, 1930, p. 31, 34. Emphasis mine.

<sup>66</sup> This organization, incidentally, embraced and advocated the concept of "work among the masses," the very same concept *against* which VAPLITE had been formed five years earlier.

<sup>67</sup> "Deklaracija vseukrajins'koji federaciji revoljucijnyx radjans'kyx pys'mennykiv," *Molodnjak*, No. 1, 1930, pp. 124-127.

while settling old scores. The reason the Futurists made such a tempting target is that of all the members of FORPU, they were the group with the least support. It was no secret to anyone that except for VUSPP, the organization with which Prolitfront now set out to compete, no other group really desired closer contacts with the Futurists. An organization like Pluh openly voiced opposition to the alliance of VUSPP with *Nova generacija*. It is significant that even though Pluh called VUSPP and Molodnjak its "closest associates," it nevertheless considered the coalition with the Futurists an "incorrect tactic" and wanted no part of it. In contrast, the attitude of Pluh toward Prolitfront was much more positive. Pluh went out of its way to "greet the psychological breach that occurred among members of Prolitfront in favor of [...] proletarian literature."<sup>68</sup>

It is quite conceivable that there was a direct link between the creation of Prolitfront and its militantly anti-Futurist orientation. Permission to form this organization, together with the funding for the journal, obviously had to come from the CP(b)U. It would not have been surprising if Xvyl'ovyj and his associates had been denied this permission. Considering, however, that they were not, some kind of *quid pro quo* could possibly have existed.<sup>69</sup> It seems that the Party, having destroyed one avant-garde group in the person of Poliščuk, was now ready to orchestrate the demise of the second. This was not, after all, 1927 when Skrypnyk personally had given the avant-gardists a new lease on life. Artistic and organizational plurality had come to an end with the introduction of the first Five-Year Plan. Now the catchwords were "federation" and "consolidation." With the capitulation of *Literaturnyj jar-marok*, the Futurists remained the last significant, unorthodox organization with a clearly autonomous program. To correct that "anomaly,"

<sup>67</sup> The other cosigners included: VUSPP, *Nova generacija* (VUSKK), Pluh, Molodnjak, Zaxidna Ukrajina, Hrupa A. This declaration was widely published in other journals and newspapers.

<sup>68</sup> A. Šymans'kyj, "Plenum CK 'Pluha'," *Pluh*, No. 1, 1930, p. 78-79.

<sup>69</sup> It is interesting to note what Kostiuk says about the formation of Prolitfront: "Khvy-l'ovyj informed [us] that he had [support] from 'higher spheres' for the creation of a new organization and a promise to insure the financing of a monthly." H. Kostiuk, "Mykola Xvyl'ovyj: žyttja, doba, tvorčist'," p. 80.

the Party apparently decided to unleash Xvyl'ovyj and his associates against them. The facts, as we shall see below, point to an agreement between the Xvyl'ovites and the CP(b)U on this issue.

The Futurists seemed to have been unaware that they were being singled out for attack by the party. Xvyl'ovyj's articles were interpreted as purely private initiative, just another case of inter-organizational polemics. We recall that Semenko had registered surprise at the fact that Xvyl'ovyj's article appeared in *Komunist* without any editorial comment; he seemed to have believed that the absence of a disclaimer was merely an oversight. V. Antonjuk too assumed that he was responding merely to a personal vendetta. So certain was he of this that he ended his article with the following smug apostrophe to Xvyl'ovyj: "Your public statement [vystup] has not been supported by public and Party [partijno-hromads'ka] opinion."<sup>70</sup> Soon after this and other defensive articles had appeared, it became obvious that the Futurists had miscalculated. A number of official commentaries in the press condemned the Futurists for their self-justification and in no uncertain terms declared that Xvyl'ovyj had been correct in exposing the Futurist threat.

The first to shatter the illusions of *Nova generacija* was Andrij Xvylja, member of the CP(b)U and a leading spokesman on literary matters in the 1920s. Xvylja had been one of Xvyl'ovyj's foremost critics during the VAPLITE period, but when Antonjuk and Škurupij responded to the *Komunist* article, Xvylja came to the defense of his former ideological foe. Not only did Xvylja see fit to reiterate the basic accusations against the Futurists (pornography, nationalism) but he went out of his way to acknowledge that Xvyl'ovyj's article was proper and had to be admitted as such by the Futurists:

Articles have already appeared in our press critical of Škurupij's work. There was the article by M. Xvyl'ovyj which *quite justly* noted that Škurupij's book, *Dlja druživ poetiv sučasnykiv vičnomy* (To My Poet-Friends, the Contemporaries of Eternity), contained a passage that can be called nationalistic. Comrade Xvyl'ovyj *justly exposed* this sick phenomenon in

<sup>70</sup> "“Božestvo” serdyt'sja, abo novi podvyhy konkvistadora Xvyl'ovoho,” *Nova generacija*, No. 2, 1930, p. 28.

Geo Škurupij's work. Let us assume that Geo Škurupij wrote these things in 1921-1922 [...]. But why, then, when comrade Xvyl'ovyj reacted against [these] elements of Geo Škurupij's work and exhorted our proletarian community to take note of this phenomenon [...], why [then] did comrade Škurupij in his letter to the press and comrade Antonjuk in his articles [...] react with such indignation, such outcries against "the new capers," "the new tricks" of Xvyl'ovyj? Is there any evidence of Xvyl'ovism in Xvyl'ovyj's article? Nothing of the kind. The attempt to call this Xvyl'ovism has nothing in common with [literary] criticism. This is an unwarranted attempt to persecute [c'kuvannja] a proletarian writer, a member of the Party, comrade Xvyl'ovyj. This is an attempt to cover up one's own ideological waverings, one's own mistakes, an attempt to distort the general line of proletarian literature [...]. We note again that all three of comrade Antonjuk's articles contained attacks [c'kuvannja] against comrade Xvyl'ovyj.<sup>71</sup>

A month later Skrypnyk himself made the following observation: "M. Xvyl'ovyj's *great service* lies in the fact that he raised his voice as early as January of this year [in order] to expose the erroneous traits which manifested themselves in *Nova generacija's Al'manax*."<sup>72</sup>

Two months after "Kryčušče božestvo" appeared in *Komunist*, it received a negative review in *Hart*, the VUSPP journal. The author, Volodymyr Suxyno-Xomenko, accused Xvyl'ovyj of seeking "revenge" and of discovering "Xvyl'ovism in places where it is completely superfluous."<sup>73</sup> This prompted Xvyl'ovyj to write a forty-page rebuttal entitled "Čym pryčaruvala *Nova generacija* tov. Suxyno-Xomenka?" (With What Has *Nova Generacija* Enticed Comrade Suxyno-Xomenko?).<sup>74</sup> Between instances of self-flagellation, Xvyl'ovyj not only subjected the VUSPP critic to sharply sarcastic attacks, but set out to prove once again that the Futurists (especially Škurupij) were indeed permeated with "nationalism," "counterrevolutionary theories," and "Xvyl'ovism"; that they were, in effect, no better than Petljurites, Jefremovites and Donco-vites. Bristling at the suggestion made by Suxyno-Xomenko that he, Xvyl'ovyj, was out of step with the Party's views, Xvyl'ovyj addressed this blunt remark to him:

<sup>71</sup> A. Xvylja, "Notatky pro literaturu," *Krytyka*, No. 4, 1930, pp. 35-36. Emphasis mine.

<sup>72</sup> "Dvi promovy. Na vyščyj ščabel'," *Krytyka*, No. 6, 1930, p. 26. Emphasis mine.

<sup>73</sup> "Na prolitfronti bez zmin," *Hart*, No. 3, 1930,

<sup>74</sup> "Čym pryčaruvala *Nova generacija* tovaryša Suxyno-Xomenka"? *Prolitfront*, No. 3, 1930, pp. 229-269.



If [my article] was anti-Party [...] Comrade Suxyno-Xomenko, then, first of all, it would not have been printed in *Komunist* and, at that, without any commentary; in the second place, I bring to your attention that you were not being addressed from the pages of the central organ of the Party by a Xvyl'ovite who [mistakenly] got mixed up with members of Prolifront while [continuing to] dream about counterrevolutionary "revenge." [No, you were addressed] by a member of the Communist Bolshevik Party of Ukraine.<sup>75</sup>

As if to emphasize that his articles were not quixotic outbursts or anomalies, Xvyl'ovyj had begun his attack on Suxyno-Xomenko with these words:

*Avangard* [No. a] [...] has been condemned. It has been condemned by responsible workers of the Party. It has been condemned by Comrade A.A. Xvylja [...]; it has been condemned by the People's Commissar for Education, Comrade M.O. Skrypnyk [...]. Moreover, Party opinion has condemned not only the almanac in question, but the entire orientation of the *Nova generacija* poets.<sup>76</sup>

This issue would not go away. As late as September 1930, in giving an overview of contemporary literary criticism, the critic H. Ovčarov, known as "Skrypnyk's right hand and his closest aid in the NKO [People's Commissariat for Education]," once again returned to the errors committed by the Futurists and the positive role that Xvyl'ovyj played in exposing them. Ovčarov did concede that Xvyl'ovyj's article in *Komunist* contained "significant mistakes in several instances,"<sup>77</sup> among which he enumerated Xvyl'ovyj's description of *Avangard: Al'manax's* faults, an incorrect assessment of the dangers on the literary front,<sup>78</sup> and "falsified quotations" and "distortions."<sup>79</sup> But Ovčarov concluded that despite these "significant mistakes," Xvyl'ovyj's article was "necessary and beneficial" and that it had an "objectively positive meaning."<sup>80</sup> Suxyno-Xomenko, Škurupij and Antonjuk were criticized for not rec-

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., p.233.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid., p. 229.

<sup>77</sup> H. Ovčarov, "Ohljad Žurnal'noji krytyky," *Krytyka*, No. 9, 1930, p. 85.

<sup>78</sup> Xvyl'ovyj had stated that his former opponents were trying to monopolize proletarian ideology for themselves, a remark that upset certain members of VUSPP. Cf. "Za hehemoniju proletars'koi literatury (Rezoljucija komunistyčnoji frakciji VUSPP)," *Krytyka*, No. 6, 1930, p. 26.

<sup>79</sup> "Ohljad žurnal'noji krytyky," p. 106.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., p. 106, 85.

ognizing this fact. In addition, the latter two were singled out for not exhibiting any self-criticism. Instead of confessing their errors, these Futurists engaged in “outbursts” (vyxvatky) whose only purpose was to “compromise” Xvyl’ovyj.<sup>81</sup>

The events recounted here set the stage for the last act in the history of Ukrainian Futurism. With the onset of Xvyl’ovyj’s attacks, the Futurists entered a period of irreversible decline. The conditional acceptance they had enjoyed in the “proletarian” community was about to disappear thanks mainly to the “revelations” made by Xvyl’ovyj. Within months of the first attack, the Futurists were once again isolated on the literary front. Out of favor with the Party, out of favor with VUSPP, *Nova generacija* was about to go through the final desperate months of its existence.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., pp. 97, 100.

# Part III



# Volodymyr Vynnyčenko's Ideas in the Light of His Political Writings

IVAN L. RUDNYTSKY

There can be little doubt that Volodymyr Vynnyčenko was one of the most talented and colorful figures in Ukrainian history of the first half of the twentieth century. He achieved prominence both as a writer of fiction and as a politician. It is enough to mention that Vynnyčenko was the first Ukrainian writer to support himself exclusively by his literary work, and the first to achieve a measure of international recognition in his own lifetime. It is also well known that as a political figure, Vynnyčenko played one of the leading roles in the Ukrainian Revolution. In 1917, he headed the embryonic Ukrainian government, the General Secretariat of the Central Rada. A year later, as Chairman of the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic, he served as head of state for a few months.

Nevertheless, along with such successes, Vynnyčenko also experienced monumental defeats. His international literary triumphs did not last and his plays did not remain in the repertory of European theaters. Even in Eastern Europe his literary fame declined to such a point that he has been recently designated—though with a question mark—as “the forgotten writer.”<sup>1</sup> Moreover, Vynnyčenko's political record has been severely criticized, or even unconditionally condemned, from different quarters. In Soviet Ukraine he is officially declared a “counterrevolutionary” and “bourgeois nationalist.” During the years between the wars Vynnyčenko became an odious figure among Ukrainians outside the USSR, and found himself in almost complete isolation. Only after the Second World War, during the last years of his life, did he again meet with

<sup>1</sup> The title of Myxajlo Mol'nar's introductory essay, “Zabutyj pys'mennyk?” in Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, *Opovidannja* (Bratislava, 1968), p. 5.

some understanding and friendly response among the liberal circles of the new Ukrainian emigration.

Vynnyčenko's activities were not restricted to fiction and politics. In his later years, he developed an interest in painting. In Svjatoslav Hordyns'kyj's judgment, "Vynnyčenko was a painter far above amateur stature, although he did not create anything truly original."<sup>2</sup>

The flamboyant personality and many talents of Vynnyčenko—one could describe him as a "Renaissance man"—manifested themselves in yet another area, namely in his political-philosophical and journalistic writings. He left behind numerous articles, a string of pamphlets, and two large works, *Vidrodžennja naciji* (Rebirth of a Nation) and *Konkordyzm* (Concordism). To date, this legacy has not attracted the attention of researchers. Vynnyčenko's journalistic writings are difficult to obtain, except for the lengthy, three-volume historical-political treatise, or rather polemical tract, *Vidrodžennja naciji*, which was published in 1920 in an edition of 15,000 copies.<sup>3</sup>

Let me state at the start that I do not consider Vynnyčenko's writings to possess any intrinsic scholarly and theoretical value. In this respect, he cannot be compared with such original Ukrainian thinkers as Myxa-jlo Drahomanov and Vjačeslav Lypyns'kyj. Vynnyčenko's political works, nevertheless, are interesting and deserve attention. They provide insight into his world view and are an important source for the study of his intellectual biography. And, insofar as his writings display not merely his own ideas, but also reflect the outlook of an influential political trend of the revolutionary era, they contribute to the understanding of that crucial period in modern Ukrainian history. Furthermore, they are rich in factual information, acute observations, and interesting, controversial comments on various personalities and events. Because of the incontestable documentary value of these articles and pamphlets, one wishes that at least a selection of them were available in book form. It would also be worthwhile to publish the philosophical and political treatise, *Konkordyzm*, which still remains in manuscript. Vynnyčenko

<sup>2</sup> S. Hordyns'kyj, "Maljars'ki tvory V. Vynnyčenka," *Volodymyr Vynnyčenko: Statti i materijaly*, Borys Podoljak et al., eds. (New York, 1957), p. 60.

<sup>3</sup> V. Vynnyčenko, *Vidrodžennja naciji*, 3 vols. (Kiev and Vienna, 1920). Prof. Rudnytsky was not aware of Prof. Lashchuk's study on *Konkordyzm*, included in this volume (Ed.).

invested much time and effort in it, and it may be considered the testament of his ideas.

The scope of this paper does not allow for a complete study of Vynnyčenko's legacy as a journalist and political essayist. I will concentrate, therefore, on a single topic—Vynnyčenko's interpretation of the Ukrainian Revolution and his own role in it. This is the subject of *Vidrodžennja naciji*. The book was written in the span of six months, between July 1919 and January 1920, when Vynnyčenko, having withdrawn from the Directory, lived as an exile in Austria. One can only wonder at the energy of a man who hurried to preserve for himself and others the experiences of the immediate past and to draw from them certain programmatic conclusions. While Vynnyčenko was working on *Vidrodžennja naciji*, the Ukrainian Revolution was still in progress, and he assumed that his own active political role in it was not at an end. He not only wished to present an apologia for his activities as a revolutionary and statesman in the past two and one-half years, but also to prepare the ground for his next political action—his return to Ukraine under Soviet rule and subsequent collaboration with that regime. Such expectations surely influenced many of the formulations found in *Vidrodžennja naciji*. It would be a mistake, however, to reduce Vynnyčenko's interpretation of the history of the Ukrainian Revolution to such opportunistic motives. Although his view of the world was to change, his interpretation of the Ukrainian Revolution remained constant. The basic tenets of *Vidrodžennja naciji* are repeated in Vynnyčenko's political writings of his final years.

Vynnyčenko saw the historical tendency of the Ukrainian Revolution in the striving of the peasant and worker masses toward total or "omni-lateral" liberation (vsebične vyzvolennja). In his opinion, the tragedy of the Ukrainian Revolution was that "the Central Rada lacked a sufficiently clear conception of the moment, unanimity, and determination to stand in the forefront of the masses and to become the mouthpiece of not only their national, but also of their social and economic interests."<sup>4</sup> Because of this one-sidedness of the Central Rada in its neglect

<sup>4</sup> V. Vynnyčenko, *Rozhjad i pohodžennja. Vidpovid' mojim pryxyl'nykam i nepryxyl'nykam* (no pl. and y.), p. 6. From the introductory note by the publishing firm, "Naša

of the social issues, the Ukrainian masses did not give it their support at the critical moment. According to Vynnyčenko, the same mistake was later made by the Directory.

Vynnyčenko characterized his own political position as follows: "Therefore, the current, to which I have belonged since the earliest stage of my social consciousness . . . is the current of omnilateral (social, national, political, moral, cultural, etc.) liberation; such a total and radical liberation is usually known under the name of revolution."<sup>5</sup> The "omnilateral current" of the Ukrainian Revolution, which represented a correct synthesis of social and national aspirations, included, according to Vynnyčenko, the Ukapiists (members of the dissident Ukrainian Communist Party), the Borot'bists (Left Socialist Revolutionaries), and the oppositional elements within the official Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Ukraine—in other words, the partisans of Ukrainian national communism.

Let us take a closer look at the concept of "omnilateral liberation," which occupies a central place in Vynnyčenko's political philosophy. What was the actual content of this attractive slogan? As far as national liberation is concerned, the answer is simple. Vynnyčenko did not belong to the old, pre-revolutionary *samostijnyky* (supporters of state independence), of whom there were only a handful in central Ukraine, under Russian rule, before 1917. At the onset of the revolution, he expected to build a free Ukraine in fraternal union with a regenerated Russia. However, having become disillusioned with the Provisional Government and Russian democratic and socialist parties because of their unfavorable stance toward Ukrainian national demands (the process of his disillusionment is described in the first volume of *Vidrodžen-nja naciji*), he soon became a partisan of independence. Vynnyčenko was one of the architects of the Third Universal (November 20, 1917) and the Fourth Universal (January 22, 1918), which proclaimed, respectively, the establishment of the Ukrainian People's Republic and the latter's complete sovereignty. He never withdrew from this position,

borot'ba," one can deduce that the brochure appeared in Germany, in 1948 ("three years after the end of the war").

<sup>5</sup> Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, *Pered novym etapom. (Naši pozyciji)* (Toronto, 1938), p. 9.



even when he later accepted the social platform of the Soviet regime in an attempt to come to terms with the Bolsheviks. There is no reason to question the sincerity and steadfastness of Vynnyčenko's pro-independence convictions.

It is more difficult to ascertain the precise meaning that Vynnyčenko assigned to the concept of "social and economic liberation." He had always, even in his youth, evidenced the temperament of a social revolutionary, rebelling against all forms of social injustice, oppression, and exploitation. During the early stages of the revolution, however, he did not take a pro-communist position. He probably did not have, at that time, a clear conception of the future social and economic order in the Ukrainian People's Republic, which was then in the process of formation. The most urgent social issue in Ukraine was the agrarian question. As head of the General Secretariat, Vynnyčenko accepted the program of socialization of the land, which was advocated by UPSR (the Ukrainian Party of Socialist Revolutionaries), even though the Social Democrats, to whom he belonged, "approached the agrarian program of the Socialist Revolutionaries extremely critically, because, according to the Social Democrats, the Ukrainian SRs had simply copied that program from the Russian SRs, not taking into account the differences in conditions between Ukraine and Russia."<sup>6</sup> Vynnyčenko realized that the Ukrainian peasantry, in contrast to the Russian peasantry, with their traditional *obščina* (repartitional commune), had "a thoroughly individualistic land tenure system,"<sup>7</sup> but he failed to draw any practical conclusions from that accurate observation.

It follows that the essence of Vynnyčenko's social and economic views can be best defined by their negative rather than positive objectives. He passionately rejected the social system of his age, "capitalism," in which he saw the embodiment of sheer social injustice. In his rejection, he did not make any distinction between the underdeveloped, semi-colonial capitalism of Russia, including Ukraine, and the capitalism of the advanced countries of the West. He passionately hated the landlords and the bourgeoisie, whom he considered parasitical classes, and desired

<sup>6</sup> Vynnyčenko, *Vidrodžennja naciji*, 1:182.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

their destruction. He believed that only the people of physical labor, the industrial workers and peasants, were economically productive and socially useful. In contrast, the bourgeoisie was "a class of non-workers, permanently idle, eternally debauched people."<sup>8</sup> The workers starve, while the *buržuji* gorge themselves with caviar and truffles and wash them down with champagne and expensive liqueurs. Such images of bourgeois gluttony obsessively reappear in Vynnyčenko's writings. He felt sincere indignation against all those who wished Ukraine to become a state "like other people's" (*jak u ljudej*), i.e. with class differentiation and the usual social inequalities.

As mentioned above, Vynnyčenko did not yet adhere to a communist position during the initial stages of the revolution. However, under the impact of the setbacks suffered by the Central Rada and the Directory, he moved to the left in the course of the next two years (1917-1919). We should note the Declaration of the Directory, dated December 26, 1918, which Vynnyčenko drafted, as a milestone in the leftward drift. The Declaration stated that "governmental power in the Ukrainian People's Republic ought to belong to the laboring classes, the workers and peasants. The exploiting, non-working classes, which live off and enjoy luxury from the labor of the toiling classes, have no voice in the affairs of the state." As a practical consequence, the Declaration resolved that only the workers, peasants, and "the laboring intelligentsia, who directly serve the working people" (elementary school teachers, paramedics, agronomists, employees of co-operatives, etc.) would participate in the elections to the Congress of Toilers (legislature); the "non-working classes" of the population were deprived of the franchise.<sup>9</sup> It apparently did not occur to Vynnyčenko that such reverse discrimination was incompatible with the democratic principles which he professed. He took a further step in this direction a short time later, after he had gone abroad. His *Vidrodžennja naciji* was written from a national-communist perspective.

Vynnyčenko's political opponents attacked him most frequently from

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., I:150.

<sup>9</sup> The text of Directory's Declaration in Vynnyčenko, *Vidrodžennja naciji*, 3:167-176.

a nationalist position, even so far as to accuse him of treason. He gave the following dignified reply to these charges:

Never and nowhere did we under any circumstances betray the national side of the struggle for liberation. In no negotiations or treaties did we ever consent to giving away into bondage even one part of the united Ukrainian nation. . . . Never, nowhere, nor for any personal or group (class) subsidies, privileges, or other advantages did we ever agree to reduce the sovereignty of the Ukrainian nation even by an iota.<sup>10</sup>

In my opinion, the primary target of criticism ought to be not Vynnyčenko's loyalty to the Ukrainian nation, but rather his social ideas, which often have not been given due attention. It was his erroneous social philosophy that led him into taking wrong steps also in the area of national politics, notwithstanding his patriotism and his good intentions, which cannot be doubted.

Let us once again examine Vynnyčenko's favorite slogan of "omnilateral liberation." What objections can one raise to this apparently noble ideal? The crux of the matter is that in life there exists the inescapable necessity of choosing, time after time, among alternatives, of establishing an order of priorities, of concentrating efforts on that which at the given moment is most pressing. Whoever wants "everything, and everything at once," usually ends up empty-handed.

The disintegration of tsarist Russia in 1917 offered the Ukrainian people a unique historical chance to break away from the imperial clutches and create their own independent state. If they failed to take advantage of that opportunity, the responsibility—discounting external and internal difficulties of an objective nature—lies primarily with the "omnilateralists," the social utopians, whose most typical representative was Volodymyr Vynnyčenko. Chasing after mirages of "total liberation," they contributed to a situation in which the Ukrainian people, whom they loved and whom they wished well, fell into total national and social servitude.

I do not intend to imply that the Ukrainian governments of the revolutionary era should have abstained from an active policy in the field of social and economic relations. This is not the place to go into details,

<sup>10</sup> Vynnyčenko, *Pered novym etapom*, pp. 45-46.

but it is clear that the agrarian question, more than any other, called for immediate radical measures. The Central Rada can be justifiably blamed for not having promptly undertaken an independent initiative toward resolving that urgent issue, because of a misplaced regard for Petrograd and the future All-Russian Constituent Assembly. The same could also be said, incidentally, about the delay in concluding a separate peace with the Central Powers. The "omnilateralists" failed to recognize the primacy of the *raison d'état*, but instead were motivated by utopian fancies.

The utopian character of Vynnyčenko's social and economic conceptions manifested itself, among other ways, in simplistic egalitarianism. He refused to accept the plain truth that the landlords and the bourgeoisie not only "lived luxuriously," but also, despite all their faults, performed certain useful social functions. To remove them suddenly, without providing a suitable replacement (for instance, in the form of a well-trained managerial elite, which simply was not available at the time), meant plunging the country into chaos. In any event, if Ukraine was not to remain an amorphous ethnic mass, but to become a modern nation, it was imperative that it develop a differentiated social structure, capable of performing all the complex functions indispensable in the building of a state. The trouble did not lie in Vynnyčenko's humanitarian concern for the well-being of the workers and the uprooted, pauperized stratum of the peasantry. But by orienting himself solely toward those classes, by identifying uncritically with their grievances and resentments, he alienated from the process of building the Ukrainian state the prosperous and educated segments of the population, including the so-called village bourgeoisie, "the counterrevolutionary *kulak* forces"—precisely those elements that might have served as the most reliable foundation for a state. It should be acknowledged that such aberrations were more or less shared by most of the central Ukrainian socialist "revolutionary democrats."

Vynnyčenko's attitude toward Bolshevism was ambivalent. On the one hand, he clearly recognized the chauvinist and colonial character of Bolshevik policies toward Ukraine, and the ensuing continuity that

existed between tsarist and Bolshevik Russia. He strikingly and truthfully depicted the misdeeds that accompanied the first and the second periods of the Soviet occupational regime in Ukraine (respectively, the beginning of 1918, and the spring and early summer of 1919). On the other hand, he believed in the historically progressive, socialist character of the October Revolution and that it served the interests of the working masses. He addressed the following panegyric to the Bolsheviks in the last chapter of *Vidrodžennja naciji*:

The Russian workers' and peasants' revolution has provided a visible lesson of a realistic implementation of the social tasks of the proletariat. Soviet Russia—by carrying out the gigantic work of the destruction of the old, oppressive social order and by creating a new one . . . and by accomplishing this task with such success and such consequences—has given Europe an example of a social miracle. This uplifts the revolutionary, live elements with enthusiasm, while it chills with deadly fear the parasitic and criminal elements.<sup>11</sup>

Wishing to be consistent at any price, Vynnyčenko excused the system of terror introduced by the Bolsheviks. "The class which seizes power must fight for it and its class objectives by whatever means necessary. . . . It was for the sake of such goals that the Bolsheviks used force against idle people, against a small minority, on behalf of the interests of the huge working masses and all mankind." Vynnyčenko regarded it as altogether normal that "the press of the idle classes was suppressed, as well as of those groups of 'democrats' who defended the inviolability of the bourgeois order." Vynnyčenko rejected, as a matter of course, the parliamentary system of government which, he asserted, the bourgeoisie used as a "well-tried means of convenient speculation."<sup>12</sup> It is disconcerting to read such apologies for tyranny from the pen of a man who not long before had stood at the helm of a would-be democratic Ukrainian government.

Vynnyčenko basically disagreed with the Soviet regime on only one point—the question of nationality policy. However, he did not admit the thought that this policy flowed from the very nature of the regime.

<sup>11</sup> Vynnyčenko, *Vidrodžennja naciji*, 3:501.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:178, 185, 188.

On the contrary, he comforted himself with the argument that such expressions of traditional Russian imperialism contradicted the principles of self-determination of peoples and proletarian internationalism which were solemnly proclaimed by the October Revolution. He tended to explain Bolshevik practices in Ukraine as a painful misunderstanding that sooner or later must be overcome, because this was what the logic of history and the interests of the world-wide socialist revolution demanded. The task of the Ukrainian communists—"omnilateralists" was to persuade Moscow of the basic error of its policy toward Ukraine. (Similarly, their task was also to persuade the Ukrainian patriots—"unilateralists" to drop their objections to the social goals of communism.) Vynnyčenko called Soviet rule in Ukraine "Pjatakism" (*pjatakoviščyna*), after Jurij Pjatak, the leader of the Kiev Bolsheviks. In this one can perceive his attempt to shield the Moscow elite of the Russian Communist Party from responsibility for the "mistakes" allegedly perpetrated by the shortsighted local Bolshevik leaders.

We see that Vynnyčenko sought a synthesis of the Ukrainian national revolution and the communist revolution. In this lay the essence of his political conception. While writing *Vidrodžennja naciji*, he strove to convince others and, it seems, primarily himself that such a synthesis was not only desirable, but also historically necessary. We may surmise, however, that in the depths of his heart he doubted the feasibility of such a synthesis. The artist's intuition in him suggested other conclusions than such pseudo-rational cerebrations. Vynnyčenko's brilliant play, *Miž dvox syl* (Between Two Powers), written in 1918, under the impression of the first Soviet occupation of Ukraine, reflects such doubts.<sup>13</sup> The heroine portrays the tragedy of the idealist Ukrainian communists who found themselves in a hopeless situation, at the crossroads between the irreconcilable elemental forces of the national-liberation movement and Bolshevism. In the end, she is forced to commit suicide. In her demise Vynnyčenko foretold not only the fate of the whole nationalist-communist camp, but also his own personal political bankruptcy.

<sup>13</sup> Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, *Miž dvox syl* (Kiev and Vienna, 1919).

A study of Vynnyčenko's practical political activities does not fall within the scope of this paper. But in our discussion of his social and political ideas, we cannot but emphasize that he possessed certain authentic qualities of leadership. For instance, the authors of memoirs of the Ukrainian Revolution frequently mention his exceptional oratorical skills. The Western-Ukrainian journalist, Osyp Nazaruk, who had the opportunity to observe Vynnyčenko at close range when the latter was Chairman of the Directory, characterized his public personality in the following laudatory terms:

He is a man in the full meaning of the word who keeps his promises, knows how to confide fully in others, understands situations and people, has the necessary energy, and—what I consider particularly important—has a sense of humor. . . . As a statesman, he was fully equal to his difficult responsibilities and had bold plans. It was not his fault that he was unable to realize them.<sup>14</sup>

In another context, Nazaruk reports that Vynnyčenko often discussed with him “a glorious dream”—the founding of several cultural centers, to be located in the most beautiful regions of Ukraine (the Carpathian Mountains, the high bank of the Dnieper near Kaniv, etc.). The centers would consist of complexes of residential buildings, workshops, and other facilities, providing a favorable environment for writers, painters, sculptors, and musicians. Vynnyčenko expected that such centers would stimulate a flowering of Ukrainian culture.<sup>15</sup>

We find another example of Vynnyčenko's “bold plans” in the memoirs of Lonhyn Cehel's'kyj, a member of the government of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic (Eastern Galicia), who in December 1918 and January 1919 negotiated with the Directory concerning the unification of the two Ukrainian states. According to Cehel's'kyj, Vynnyčenko complained to him about the difficulties caused by the pro-Russian outlook of the Orthodox Church hierarchy in Ukraine, and then proposed that Andrij Šeptyc'kyj, the metropolitan of the Greek Catholic (Uniate) Church in Western Ukraine, be made the head of the

<sup>14</sup> Osyp Nazaruk, *Rik na Velykij Ukrajin: Konspekt spomyniv z ukrajins'koji revoluciji* (Vienna, 1920), p. 66.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 67.

entire Ukrainian Church. When Cehel's'kyj observed that such a step would imply a break with Orthodoxy, Vynnyčenko reportedly replied:

We shall abolish Orthodoxy! It has led us under the Eastern Orthodox tsar and has been instrumental in the Russification of Ukraine. Orthodoxy will always gravitate toward Moscow. Your [Western Ukrainian] Uniatism is good for separating from both Poland and Moscow. A Uniate naturally becomes a [nationally-conscious] Ukrainian. We shall convoke a synod of bishops, archimandrites, and representatives of laymen from all Ukraine, and we shall advise them to accept the union [of churches] and to put Šeptyc'kyj at the head. We will reach an understanding with Rome, in order to make him [Šeptyc'kyj] patriarch of Ukraine. This is a serious plan.<sup>16</sup>

The examples, provided by Nazaruk and Cehel's'kyj, support the notion that Vynnyčenko was indeed endowed with great vision. As a political figure, however, he also had great shortcomings, which were partially rooted in his character and partially in his intellect. Among the flaws of his character one must count Vynnyčenko's unrestrained, "man-of-the-steppe" temperament, which threw him into extremes and made him prone to alternating moods of elation and depression. His excitable temper manifested itself in the tone and style of his polemics. And so, in *Vidrodžennja naciji* he characterized Hetman Pavlo Skoropads'kyj as a "slobbering manikin," "a wretched, politically illiterate figure," "a degenerate," and the Chief Otaman Symon Petljura as "a ridiculous man, detrimental to our whole movement," "a little philistine with a morbid, maniacal vanity," and so forth. It is worth noting that in his polemics against the Bolsheviks Vynnyčenko maintained a completely different tone—while criticizing their policies toward Ukraine, he used factual arguments and did not indulge in personal abuse of the Kremlin leaders. He reserved his gross insults for his Ukrainian political rivals.

Nazaruk believed that Vynnyčenko "understood situations and people," or, in other words, that he was a political realist. To a certain extent, this is corroborated by many keen observations in the political writings of Vynnyčenko himself. Along with them, however, we find

<sup>16</sup> Lonhyn Cehel's'kyj, *Vid legend do pravdy: Spomyny pro podiji v Ukrajinі zvjazani z Peršym Lystopadom 1918 r.* (New York and Philadelphia, 1960), p. 193.



numerous judgments, the naiveté of which startles us. Although Vynnyčenko often saw the facts correctly, he arrived at erroneous conclusions because of his ideological preconceptions. It appears that in Vynnyčenko's mind realistic and doctrinaire tendencies opposed each other in a perennial, unconscious conflict, and it was the latter that usually prevailed in the end. In this consisted his primary intellectual defect.

The literary critic Myxajlo Rudnyc'kyj made a similar observation concerning Vynnyčenko's fiction and drama. According to him, the strength of Vynnyčenko's literary talent lay in his ability to grasp scenes and situations from life. However, he also liked to introduce into his novels and plays "ideas," which were replete with didacticism and naiveté. "From that moment on, an ever growing fissure opens in his works, through which an ever larger stream of water flows in."<sup>17</sup>

As an example of Vynnyčenko's political realism, it is worthwhile to quote a long passage from *Vidrodžennja naciji*, which shows that he had a clear perception of the immense difficulties of Ukrainian state-building.

For what does it mean, our own national Ukrainian state? This means, first of all, that all the organs of state administration and management should be created in Ukraine, where they had not existed to this day. This does not mean a reconstruction of old, organized, apparatuses, nor the substitution of one set of persons by another. No, it is to create everything from the very beginning, from the smallest details, to create in one or two months all that which in other lands has been formed through the ages. To create these organs, while not having at your disposal any military power, and, at the same time, while having against you the military, police, and administrative power of an old state, and while facing the hostility of the entire non-Ukrainian population.

But let us assume that the enemy's might has somehow been defeated. Where, then, are those human forces with which apparatuses could be built, that huge, complex machine, which is called the state? There is a need for thousands of experienced, educated, and nationally conscious people in order to fill all the governmental positions, all the institutions, starting with the ministries and ending with the petty clerks in the offices. Where are they, these people, where could they be found, when we did not have our own schools and have had no opportunity to develop a mass of our own intelligentsia, from whose ranks one could select an experienced, educated, and nationally conscious personnel? But even if there were

<sup>17</sup> Myxajlo Rudnyc'kyj, *Vid Myrnoho do Xvyl'ovoho* (L'viv, 1936), p. 309.

enough of them for the ministries—what next? And all the directors, heads of bureaus, commissars, and the tens of thousands of civil servants—where could they be found? And how were they to be maintained? How could one conduct the whole business of state without any financial resources?<sup>18</sup>

A question arises at this point. If the quoted statements correspond with the actual situation at that time, how can one justify that Vynnyčenko, as a matter of principle, excluded from participation in Ukrainian state-building the members of the well-to-do and educated strata, who might have given the young state the badly needed cadres? It must be said in his defense that Vynnyčenko the practical politician was often wiser in this matter than Vynnyčenko the ideologue. And so, in the fall of 1917, while he was chairman of the General Secretariat, he invited Fedir Lyzohub to take the position of associate general secretary (that is, vice-minister) of internal affairs. Lyzohub was an experienced public administrator, but—one hardly dares say it—a great landowner, a conservative, and subsequently the premier in Hetman Skoropads'kyj's cabinet. Following the takeover by the hetmanite government, Vynnyčenko advised the leaders of the moderate Ukrainian Party of Socialist Federalists to take advantage of the proposals of Skoropads'kyj and the German army command to enter the government, in order to assure the Ukrainian national character of the new regime. We know from the memoirs of Pavlo Zajcev (who at that time was director of the presidential department of the Ministry of Education) that Vynnyčenko praised Zajcev warmly when, upon Zajcev's urging, the collective of the ministry's functionaries decided not to resign (as the Ukrainian employees of the other ministries had done in protest against the hetmanite coup), but rather to remain at their posts and to continue under the changed conditions with the work demanded by national and state interests.<sup>19</sup> From the point of view of revolutionary purity, these had been Vynnyčenko's "sins," which he later even publicly repented, but, in my judgment, such so-called lapses save his honor as a statesman.

<sup>18</sup> Vynnyčenko, *Vidrodžennja naciji*, 1:255-256.

<sup>19</sup> Pavlo Zajcev, "Žmut spohadiv pro V. Vynnyčenka. 3. Het'manat," *Ukrajins'ka literaturna hazeta* (Munich), no. 9 (51), September 1959, p. 2.

To balance the picture, here are some examples of Vynnyčenko's doctrinaire naiveté. In *Vidrodžennja naciji* he explained the outbreak of the First World War as "the commercial gentry coming to blows among themselves as to who was to clothe the African Blacks in aprons," which amounts to a caricature of the familiar Marxist theory of imperialism. Vynnyčenko's friend Oleksander Šul'hyn recorded in his reminiscences that "he [Vynnyčenko] would say outrageous things, such as that under socialism a person would only need to work two hours per day."<sup>20</sup>

The source of these "outrageous" pronouncements by Vynnyčenko was, despite his exceptional and multiple inborn talents, his lack of a solid political education. I say this not to denigrate his memory, but to state a fact. Vynnyčenko's writings as a political theorist fail to indicate that he seriously studied even Marxist political, sociological, and economic literature. It seems that the only thing that Vynnyčenko got out of the Jelysavethrad gymnasium which he had attended was a rebellious spirit and a hatred for all established authority. Even in his old age, he still bitterly recalled the humiliations inflicted on him by his teachers and the "young gentlemen" among his fellow students, who treated him as a "little *mužik*" and "little *xoxol*."<sup>21</sup> In 1902, when he was only twenty-two, Vynnyčenko was arrested for the first time, and consequently expelled from Kiev University. That same year, he made his debut in literature with his first published short story. In the following fifteen years, until the revolution, the course of his life ran along a double track, that of a professional writer and that of a professional revolutionary. As a writer, Vynnyčenko worked very productively and intensely. New works appeared every year—collections of short stories, novels, and plays. At the same time, Vynnyčenko was a leading member of the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party (Ukrajins'ka revoljucijna partija, RUP) and its successor, the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party (Ukrajins'ka socijal-demokratyčna robitnyča partija, USDRP). Several times he was thrown in prison, had to flee the country, illegally

<sup>20</sup> "Uryvky zi spohadiv Oleksandra Jakovyča Šul'hyna," in *Zbirnyk na pošanu Oleksandra Šul'hyna (1889-1960)* (Paris and Munich, 1960), p. 292.

<sup>21</sup> Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, "Malen'ke pojasnennja. Odvertij lyst do redakciji *Ukrajins'kyx vistej*," *Ukrajins'ki visti* (Neu Ulm), August 10, 1950.

returned to Ukraine, wandered around various European countries, participated in party conferences, edited party organs, etc. Between literary work and revolutionary bustle, there was no time left for extending his political education. Activity in underground groups gave him a certain practical organizational experience, but not of the kind which would provide training in statesmanship.

Throughout the greater part of his life, from his student days until the mid-1930s, Vynnyčenko presented himself as a convinced and militant Marxist. But what was the specific character of his Marxism? It was not without reason that Jaroslaw Pelenski once called Vynnyčenko "the illegitimate offspring of Karl Marx and a good-looking and sexy Ukrainian village wench. He was centrally representative of our way of thinking, or, to put it more accurately, of our unsystematic and illogical way of thinking."<sup>22</sup> In a nutshell, Vynnyčenko assimilated from the teachings of Marx and Engels only the eschatological and utopian, but not the cognitive and scientific aspects. What captivated him in Marxism were topics such as the denunciation of the iniquities of capitalism, the myth of the proletarian revolution, and the vision of a perfect socialist society. Furthermore, he appropriated the typical Marxist phraseology. Karl Marx, however, was not only the prophet of the proletarian revolution, but also an erudite and eminent scholar and thinker. Marx and Engels adapted and reinterpreted—some will say perverted—the achievements of certain schools of thought, which belong to the mainstream of the European intellectual tradition—the French Enlightenment, German classical philosophy, English liberal economics. All this did not leave any noticeable mark on Vynnyčenko's intellectual outlook. In Ukrainian scholarly and political literature, too, there are several authors who more or less successfully applied Marxist methodology to historical and social analysis: Julijan Bačyns'kyj, Mykola Porš, Valentyn Sadovs'kyj, Lev Jurkevych, Volodymyr Starosol's'kyj, Volodymyr Levyns'kyj, Roman Rozdol's'kyj. We cannot add Vynnyčenko to this list: his understanding of Marxist theory did not rise above the level of popular brochures. We may regard Vynnyčenko as an ideologist of

<sup>22</sup> Jaroslav Pelens'kyj, "Čomu tak malo dumajemo?" *Ukrajins'ka literaturna hazeta*, no. 4 (58), April 1960, p. 1.

Ukrainian national communism in the sense that in *Vidrodžennja naciji* and his pamphlets and articles of subsequent years the mood, the emotional climate, peculiar to this milieu is clearly expressed. If, however, we are searching for a more logical and intellectually more solidly based formulation of the conception of the Ukrainian path to communism, or of Ukrainian Soviet statehood, we should have to turn to the well-known treatise of Vasyľ Šaxraj and Serhij Mazlax, *Do xvyli* (translated as *On the Current Situation in Ukraine*), or to the writings of Mykola Skrypnyk.

Soon after Vynnyčenko's much-publicized journey to Moscow and Ukraine and his unsuccessful attempt to reach an understanding with the Bolshevik regime (May-September 1920),<sup>23</sup> he published under the imprint of the Emigré Group of the Ukrainian Communist Party the pamphlet, *Revolucija v nebezpeci!* (Revolution in Danger!), in which he voiced a protest against the Soviet "system of absolute centralization," and asserted that "the nationality policy of the Russian Communist Party in Ukraine is a policy of 'one and indivisible' Russia."<sup>24</sup> This, however, by no means signified that Vynnyčenko had broken with communism. The pamphlet was addressed to "the communists and revolutionary socialists of Europe and America," and it was written "from the perspective of the revolution, in the interests of the revolution, and from the standpoint of an ideological, social, and political affinity with that very same Russian Communist Party."<sup>25</sup> When the era of "Ukrainianization" was initiated in the Ukrainian SSR, Vynnyčenko accepted it in the belief that the Bolsheviks had now met his demands and had started to implement his program. In 1926 he published another pam-

<sup>23</sup> A firsthand account of Vynnyčenko's journey is now available in his recently published diaries: Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, *Ščodennyk. Tom peršyj, 1911-1920* (Edmonton and New York, 1980), pp. 427-487. See also Hryhorij Kostjuk "Misija V. Vynnyčenka v Moskvu i Xarkov 1920 roku," in his *Volodymyr Vynnyčenko ta joho doba. Doslidžennja, krytyka, polemika* (New York, 1980), pp. 210-255; Melanie Czajkowskyj, "Volodymyr Vynnyčenko and His Mission to Moscow and Kharkiv," *Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies*, vol. III, no. 2 (Fall 1978), pp. 3-24.

<sup>24</sup> *Revolucija v nebezpeci!* (*Lyst Zak. grupy U.K.P. do komunistiv i revolucijnyx socialistiv Evropy ta Ameryky*) (Vienna and Kiev, 1920), pp. 11, 50.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

phlet, in which he called on the Ukrainian émigrés “to return to Ukraine and take part in the work and struggle for a socialist order.”<sup>26</sup> In the 1920s, his fiction was occasionally published and his plays staged in Soviet Ukraine.

One can regard Vynnyčenko's pamphlet, *Za jaku Ukrajinu?* (For What Kind of Ukraine?), published in 1934, as the swan song of his national communism.<sup>27</sup> Having taken notice of such alarming facts as the recent suicides of two leading Ukrainian communists, Mykola Skrypnyk and Mykola Xvyl'ovyj, Vynnyčenko nevertheless once again declared his devotion to communist ideology and loyalty to the Soviet regime. In the pamphlet, he addressed the Kremlin grandees as “comrades,” and reminisced about the friendly discussions he had held with Comrade Stalin while travelling by train from Kharkiv to Moscow in 1920. Next, Vynnyčenko asked what was more beneficial for the Ukrainian working people: a (hypothetical) independent bourgeois Ukraine or the present Soviet socialist Ukraine, “in close alliance with other Soviet republics”? As was to be expected, he resolved his dilemma, without reservation, in favor of the second alternative. “One can bet upon one's own head that an ‘independent’ Ukrainian bourgeois government would not have cared as much for the education, the advancement, and the cultural improvement of the toiling masses as is now being done by the Soviet government.”<sup>28</sup> This was written shortly after the Soviet government had starved to death several million of the so-called toilers in Ukraine, and during the very time when the Ukrainian cultural cadres were being destroyed *en masse*, including the entire early leadership of the CP(b)U. One can only wonder at the appalling influence of doctrinaire thinking upon the politics of a man who was lacking in neither intelligence nor patriotism.

Stalinism inflicted the death blow to Ukrainian national communism. Vynnyčenko moved away from this conception sometime in the mid-

<sup>26</sup> Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, *Povorot na Ukrajinu* (L'viv and Příbram, 1926), p. 13; cited in Myxajlo Mol'nar's introductory essay in Vynnyčenko, *Opovidannja* (Bratislava, 1968), p. 14.

<sup>27</sup> V. Vynnyčenko, *Za jaku Ukrajinu* (Paris, 1934).

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41.

1930s. At the same time, he also abandoned Marxism, but not the final goal that Marxism sets for itself—the striving toward a “paradise on earth,” a classless and non-antagonistic social order. Characteristically, in the writings of his last fifteen years, he never overtly repudiated the errors of his former Marxist and pro-communist positions.

Vynnyčenko, it seems, belonged to that species of human being that cannot live without a utopia. Perhaps it is because he rejected the idea of a transcendent Absolute so vehemently that he could not do without the belief in an earthly divinity, embodied in the image of an ideal future society. When Marxism failed to satisfy him, he immediately began fashioning his own personal utopia, for which he coined the terms “collectocracy,” or “concordism.” He expounded this self-made ideology in the large treatise, *Konkordyzm*, which unfortunately remains unpublished. However, a fairly accurate idea of the contents of this doctrine can be derived from Vynnyčenko’s two last novels, *Nova zapovid’* (The New Commandment)<sup>29</sup> and *Slovo za toboju, Staline!* (Take the Floor, Stalin!)<sup>30</sup> which are dedicated to propagandizing the ideas of concordism by using fiction as a vehicle; the latter novel even has the subtitle, *A Political Conception in Images*.

Hryhorij Kostiuk, who read *Konkordyzm* in manuscript, describes it as follows:

And so Volodymyr Vynnyčenko began to think and write about a new code of human life, “a new commandment.” During many years of difficult labor and deep thought, he completed his great philosophical-political work, “his best child”—*Konkordyzm*. In the author’s intention, this was to be the primer of a renewed social life. This was his utopian theory of building a new, reconciliatory and harmonious social order and new people. . . . *Konkordyzm* is not a dogma. It is merely a number of signposts, pointing to a path away from the world’s leper colony onto a path of renewal, to a healing, and to the flowering of a new concordist,

<sup>29</sup> Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, *Nova zapovid’* (Neu Ulm, 1950); first published in French translation, *Nouveau commandement* (Paris, 1949).

<sup>30</sup> Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, *Slovo za toboju, Staline!* (*Polityčna koncepcija v obrazax*) (New York, 1971); posthumous publication.

reconciliatory, happy coexistence of people, to a "sunnism," a "sunny way of life [*soncejizm*]." <sup>31</sup>

The practical way to achieve collectocracy, or concordism, is through the establishment of a universal system of production co-operatives, in which all the workers of a given enterprise would be its co-owners and would receive shares of the profits according to a certain scale. Simultaneously, Vynnyčenko calls for a moral renewal of mankind through a "return to nature." The first step toward this is abstinence from tobacco, alcoholic beverages, and meat dishes which entail the killing of animals. Vynnyčenko himself became a strict abstainer and vegetarian (a "carrot-eater," as he was jokingly called in Ukrainian émigré circles), and he placed a great deal of importance on this issue, considering it a matter of principle.

The time will come for a detailed criticism of the theory of concordism, once Vynnyčenko's work has been published. I shall limit myself here to a few preliminary observations. I do not believe that antagonisms, conflicts, or, using Vynnyčenko's terminology, "discords" can be eliminated from social life, because life itself unceasingly and with unfailing necessity gives birth to ever new conflicts of interests and ideas. Social peace is a desirable ideal, but it should not be identified with the absence of antagonisms. Rather, it means the channeling of antagonisms into a framework of a rule of law, which curtails them and subjects them to norms. An example of this may be a situation which prevails in a country where, instead of civil war, a legal electoral campaign is the rule. The struggle of antagonistic social forces, although often entailing dangers, is the motive power of progress. Therefore, on principle, one should be suspicious of preachers of ideally harmonious, "reconciliatory" social systems, of inventors of panaceas "for the salvation of mankind." The experience of history teaches that when such cure-all doctrines are attempted in real life, they usually lead to the violent suppression of the autonomy of individuals and groups, to tyranny and totalitarianism.

<sup>31</sup> Hryhorij Kostjuk, "Volodymyr Vynnyčenko ta joho ostannij roman," introductory essay in Vynnyčenko, *Slovo za toboju, Staline!* pp. 47-48; reprinted in Kostjuk, *Volodymyr Vynnyčenko ta joho doba*, p. 64. The phrase "the world's leper colony" is a reference to Vynnyčenko's unpublished novel *Leprozorij* (Leprosarium). (Ed.)



One additional comment concerning Vynnyčenko's programmatic vegetarianism is in order. At the very time he was working at his *Konkordyzm*, there appeared, in 1937, a brochure by a prominent ideologue of the Ukrainian "integral-nationalist" movement, Volodymyr Martynec', entitled *Za zuby i pazuri naciji* (For the Nation's Teeth and Claws).<sup>32</sup> Martynec' advised the Ukrainian public to adopt a carnivorous diet, to eat steaks as often as possible, in order to foster among Ukrainians bloodthirsty instincts, which he considered most praiseworthy from the point of view of nationalist ideology. Vynnyčenko's and Martynec's dietary ideas stand intellectually on the same level of a naive stomachic determinism, in accordance with the old German saying: *Der Mensch ist, was er isst* (You are what you eat).

The final phase of Vynnyčenko's philosophical evolution is interesting in that it coincides with tendencies which emerged later, during the sixties and seventies, among some left-wing circles of the West, especially the young. I have in mind those individuals who became disillusioned with official, Soviet-type communism, but did not reconcile themselves to the tenets of "bourgeois" parliamentary democracy. There are many things in common between their outlook and Vynnyčenko's ideology of concordism: the ideal of a "return to nature," pacifism, concern for special dietary rules and sexual liberation, the call for the formation of small communities (communes) in which people would live and work collectively, and finally the concept of participatory democracy, in opposition to traditional representative democracy. Here Vynnyčenko may be considered a forerunner of the New Left, or at least of some of its offshoots.

While examining the socio-political world view of Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, I unexpectedly discovered similarities between his ideas and those of the theorist of Ukrainian "integral" nationalism, Dmytro Doncov. The similarities are not in the contents, but in the style of their thinking. To conclude my reflections, I will attempt to demonstrate this instructive parallel.

<sup>32</sup> Volodymyr Martynec', *Za zuby i pazuri naciji* (Paris, 1937).

Vynnyčenko and Doncov belonged to the same generation—Doncov was born in 1883, and therefore was three years younger than Vynnyčenko. Both were sons of Southern Ukraine, of the steppes. Both in their youth were active in the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party, although afterwards their paths diverged.

The main similarity between Vynnyčenko and Doncov was that both were typical Russian intellectuals—"Russian," obviously, not in the ethnic-national sense, but in the style of their political culture. For instance, both combined politics and literature (Doncov combined political writing with literary criticism). Such a mixing of the political and literary spheres was characteristic of Russian social and cultural life in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In the Western world, these spheres are usually separate and fairly distant from each other.

Both Vynnyčenko and Doncov manifested a doctrinaire turn of mind and an inclination toward ideological extremism, simplified and reductionist formulas, and radical solutions typical of the Russian intelligentsia. This made their thinking revolutionary and totalitarian. Both were more interested in changing the world than in understanding its underlying structure. Such an outlook brought both to paradoxical conclusions, notwithstanding their great innate talents. It is said that old age makes a person wise—but this did not happen in the case of Vynnyčenko and Doncov. In their later years, both turned into philosophical eccentrics—the former elevated vegetarianism to the rank of an article of faith, and the latter became a devotee of theosophy.

Both Vynnyčenko and Doncov shared a disdain for Western, "bourgeois" democracy, its pluralism, evolutionary methods, and the parliamentary system of government. They had little use for "formal" democratic liberties and civic rights. Vynnyčenko fell under the spell of the communist dictatorship of Lenin and Doncov of the fascist dictatorships of Mussolini and Hitler, and they recommended these tyrannical systems as models to their own people. But fate played a joke on both writers: in their declining years, they were obliged to find a sanctuary under the protective wings of the democratic countries, whose regimes they scorned.

Both Vynnyčenko and Doncov illustrate the paths and dead ends of

Ukrainian political thought of the first half of the twentieth century: the crisis of Ukrainian democracy and the appearance in Ukrainian society of the left-and-right-wing anti-democratic, totalitarian movements. Therefore, these figures have a symptomatic significance and, because of this, deserve attention from historians and political scientists.

Finally, I see an analogy between Vynnyčenko and Doncov in that both were representative of that type of political ethos which Max Weber calls *Gesinnungsethik*. In his classic essay, "Politics as Vocation" (1918), Weber defined two models of socio-political ethics, *Verantwortungsethik* and *Gesinnungsethik*. The first term translates simply as "the ethics of responsibility." But the German word *Gesinnung* is difficult to translate. It means something like "spiritual orientation"; Weber's translators have rendered *Gesinnungsethik* in English as "ethics of ultimate ends."<sup>33</sup> Politicians of the first type strive to foresee and take into account the probable consequences of their actions. Being guided by the maxim that "politics is the art of the possible," they attempt to attain the optimum of that which might be achieved within a given situation. Politicians of the second type are guided by absolute demands, in the name of which they radically oppose existing reality. In their struggle to attain the ideal, no price is too high. They condemn pragmatic accommodation to reality as rotten opportunism, moral capitulation. What is important to them is the purity of intentions and uncompromising dedication to ideals, not practical results. Their maxim is "let the world perish, if by this justice will come to pass" (*pereat mundus, fiat justitia*). Returning to our ideologues, Doncov in his *Nacionalizm* (Nationalism, 1926) and in numerous other works insistently propagated "romanticism, dogmatism, and illusionism"; he opposed "principled" politics to *Realpolitik*, identifying the latter with opportunism. As for Vynnyčenko, he advocated the slogan of "honesty with oneself" (*česnist' z soboj*), which corresponds exactly with Weber's concept of *Gesinnungsethik*.

Let us give Vynnyčenko his due. Throughout his life, he was, indeed,

<sup>33</sup> H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, trans. and eds., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York, 1958), p. 120 ff.

truly "honest with himself." His actions always conformed with his convictions: when he was thrown into a tsarist prison for his revolutionary activities; when he was building the Ukrainian People's Republic and stood at the helm of its government; when, for the sake of the phantom of "total liberation" and utopian social schemes, he was destroying the chances of an imperfect but real Ukrainian state; when, perhaps risking his own neck, he traveled to Moscow to negotiate with the Bolshevik leaders; and when, already an old man, he took up hard physical labor on his small farmstead in southern France, while adhering to strict dietary rules. For this—for his brave character and personal integrity—Volodymyr Vynnychenko deserves sympathy and respect as a human being, no matter how one evaluates the theoretical validity of the ideas by which he was guided, and the practical results which followed from the application of these ideas in Ukrainian politics of the revolutionary era. As for his gifts as a writer of fiction, let literary critics and scholars describe and evaluate them.

*Translated by Bohdan Klid*

# Vynnyčenko's Moral Laboratory

DANYLO HUSAR STRUK

In the well-known scene from the first act of *Hamlet*, old Polonius exhorts his son Laertes:

This above all, to thine own self be true,  
And it must follow, as the night the day,  
Thou canst not then be false to any man.<sup>1</sup>

In time, Shakespeare's words "to thine own self be true" have turned into an aphorism, a condensation of a great moral truth. The essence of this "truth" is nothing more than Vynnyčenko's *bud' česnyj iz soboju* (be honest with yourself). Yet strange as it may seem, although the essence of both pronouncements is the same, no one has reproached Shakespeare that his words hide a formula for the legitimization or the approval of total amorality. Yet Vynnyčenko was condemned and still is condemned for propagating such a "new morality." The characterization of Vynnyčenko as apologist for and propagator of extreme individualism and total amorality grew and spread so freely that it has now become universally accepted as fact. It will suffice here to cite the *Encyklopedija Ukrajinoznavstva* (Ukrainian Encyclopaedia), a work, after all, meant to be informatively objective. One who has not read Vynnyčenko's works and would like to learn something about them will, upon turning to the *Encyklopedija*, read the following:

V[yunnyčenko] time and again returns to the portrayal of the egotist-cynic, who dismisses the moral code generally accepted by all in favor of "honesty with one's self," thus permitting any deed provided that "the will, the mind and the heart" uniformly approve of it. In sharp collisions there appears a rogues' gallery of hysterical, sickeningly irresolute personages who are wayward in their beliefs and behavior.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> W. Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, act I, scene 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Encyklopedija ukrajinoznavstva*, Slovnykova častyna, T. I (Paris-New York: Molode žyttja, 1955), p. 249.

It is not the aim of encyclopaedias to furnish exhaustive analyses of literature. Rather, they are expected to provide objective information. In the case of Vynnyčenko, however, it seems that the *Encyklopedija* did not so much present objective information as give an accepted opinion, an evaluation. This evaluation arose from the fact that Vynnyčenko's readers paid more attention to the application of the ethical concept of "honesty with one's self" than to the concept itself. Thus they were prone to accept the illustrative material as instructive. Vynnyčenko was chastised because his readers refused to understand, despite his frequent explanations, his own approach to morality and even less so his literary method of exploring ethical dilemmas.

It is naive to compare Vynnyčenko to Arcybašev or Dostoyevsky, and his views to Nietzsche's philosophy, even though one can find a more or less justifiable similarity in some themes, personages, or dialogues. Vynnyčenko, like Tolstoy (who suffered a moral crisis because of this), believed in the notion of the absolute consistency of human behavior. Above all, he was troubled by ever present hypocrisy, and especially the hypocrisy in personal matters which he noticed among his socialist companions. That this was by no means a pose or a temporary whim can be seen from the fact that Vynnyčenko continually insisted on publicizing this hypocrisy despite pressure from friends (here it is interesting to read the diaries of Čykalenko), or from publishers, who refused to publish his works, thus forcing him to publish them in Russian translations. Serhij Jefremov was undoubtedly correct when he wrote that Vynnyčenko himself "was tormented . . . by unresolved riddles placed before him by life; he passionately (a favorite word of Vynnyčenko) searched for truth, and curiously (also an expression from his vocabulary) unraveled the 'disharmonies' between what is and what should be."<sup>3</sup> Vynnyčenko himself, when he finally had enough of the various attacks from people who did not understand the essence of the matter, was forced to explain himself publicly. In his article "Pro moral' panu-jučyx i moral' pryhnohlenyx" (About the Morality of the Ruling and the Morality of the Ruled) he puts forth his objections to hypocrisy:

<sup>3</sup> Serhij Jefremov, *Istoriya ukrajins'koho pys'menstva*. vol. II (Kiev-Leipzig: Ukrajin'ska Nakladnja, 1919), pp. 296-297.

I, for example, despite my belief in the bright clean teachings of socialism, felt myself a moral *criminal*—I frequented prostitutes, sometimes liked to have a drink, for the sake of conspiracy had to lie to my own friends, be dishonest with the closest people, perform often unjust and brutal acts. All of this did not correspond to the model of a socialist, a person of a higher morality, a hero and a saint. . . . Of course, this bothered me, forced me to struggle with myself, to pay even closer attention to my surroundings. But that which I began to notice here not only did not calm me, but rather created even a greater bewilderment and anguish. I realized that the majority of my companions also were not saints, that their daily and even party life did not correspond to the high models of former revolutionaries. To a greater or lesser degree they did, in fact, the same things I did.<sup>4</sup>

We see in this quotation two postulates that governed Vynnyčenko's thought. Neither was born of individualism and the superman of Nietzsche. It is not there that one should search for the roots of Vynnyčenko's works concerned with ethics, but rather in the foundations of socialism. The first postulate has to do primarily with the socialist attitude toward the cornerstone of society—the family. In 1891 in Erfurt the German Social-Democratic Party issued its program which was to become the foundation of the new social order proposed by the socialists. There is no reason to doubt that Vynnyčenko and his colleagues subscribed to it. That program, annotated by Karl Kautsky in 1892, assumed that the present form of the family was not the final form—the new social order would create a new family structure.<sup>5</sup> That same socialist program maintained that in a socialist system the basis for a marriage would be ideal love,<sup>6</sup> while under the capitalist mode of production prostitution becomes one of the pillars of society.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, under capitalism the family disintegrates, the husband, wife and children are torn asunder; only when the woman stands beside the man in large collective enterprises, will she become the man's equal and attain an equal position in society. She will become a free friend, liberated not only

<sup>4</sup> Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, "Pro moral' panujučyx i moral' pryhnohlenyx," *Naš holos*, 1911, no. 9-10, p. 458. Hereafter cited as "Pro moral' . . ."

<sup>5</sup> Karl Kautsky. *Das Erfurter Programm in seinem grundsätzlichen Teil*. (Stuttgart: J.B. Dietz, 1892), p. 41.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 42.

from domestic servitude but also from the slavery of capitalism. She will become a mistress unto herself, and she will quickly put an end to all forms of prostitution, both legal and illegal; for the first time in history monogamy will become a real and not a fictitious institution."<sup>8</sup>

Out of that program came one of the two main postulates that occupied Vynnyčenko, that is, the equality of man and woman. The other postulate, having to do with the moral danger of the belief that the end justifies the means, also arose from Vynnyčenko's loyalty to socialism. It did not derive from the program itself but from the revolutionary activity of all those opposed to the existing order. The overthrow of this order and the attainment of the bright goal of a social utopia often served as an excuse for various misdeeds.

Being a man of principle and one who first and foremost intended to be honest with himself, Vynnyčenko could not overlook the contradictions and the hypocrisy that were brought about by the introduction of the above two postulates. Nevertheless, neither in the works themselves nor in their various explanations by the author can one find any grounds for the contention that Vynnyčenko was propagating a "new moral code." One cannot agree with the opinion of Sribljans'kyj that "the basis for Vynnyčenko's work is the struggle against the old world,"<sup>9</sup> nor can one accept Xrystjuk's proposition that "there is in Vynnyčenko's quests a *strong desire born of life itself* . . . to create a new sphere of moral relations."<sup>10</sup> Nor, finally, can one agree with the contention in Romanenčuk's *Azbukovnyk* (again a reference work meant to provide objective information) that because "socialism proclaimed revolutionary changes in society and in the social order, and old-fashioned morality, and sexual life, did not satisfy him [Vynnyčenko] and needed revolutionary changes, [Vynnyčenko] . . . proposed a new system of ethics based on extreme individualism and variable for every individual being."<sup>11</sup> In fact, however, Vynnyčenko does not proclaim anything at all (although some of his heroes do), nor does he establish any new set of

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 146.

<sup>9</sup> M. Sribljans'kyj, "Borot'ba za indyvidual'nist," *Ukrajins'ka xata*, 1912, no. 2, p. 108.

<sup>10</sup> P. Xrystjuk, "V. Vynnyčenko i F. Ničše," *Ukrajins'ka xata*, 1913, no. 4-5, p. 276.

<sup>11</sup> *Azbukovnyk*, vol. II (Philadelphia: Kyjiv, 1973), p. 114.



moral values. All he tries to do, in his own words, is "to have an exchange of views in an artistic form between other people and myself on the subject of my observations of life and of the consequences which arise from life."<sup>12</sup>

The juxtaposition of word and deed, of that which is desired with that which is possible—here lies the key to Vynnyčenko's works. The works serve as an artistic laboratory in which Vynnyčenko tried out his two postulates mentioned above—the equality between man and woman and the end as a justification of the means. Unfortunately, the populist conception of literature as an educational and moralizing instrument had so established itself by the beginning of our century that it made it impossible to read a literary work without identifying the words of the personages with those of the author, without perceiving that which is written either as a sermon for the people or as the personal experiences of the author. The author's protestations did not help. Once a work is about "the sexual question," it means that "the author's own sexual life is unsatisfactory." Once the hero of a work defends prostitutes, it means that the author is praising prostitution. Yet in the case of Vynnyčenko such attitudes are particularly unfair. One can accuse Vynnyčenko of the fact that some of his works are too tendentious, that in some of his works he pushes certain ideas toward absurdity (although always in keeping with a strong sense of logic), one can insist that some of his works are weaker than others or that some are completely unsuccessful and uninteresting. Yet "honesty with one's self" is not a new morality. It is but an ethical law which arose as the sole answer to Vynnyčenko's artistic experiments in the realm of those ethical problems which, in turn, arose from the proposed socialist program as well as from the methods employed by revolutionaries to attain their goals.

Even though in his pamphlet "Pro moral' . . ." Vynnyčenko set out his ideas clearly and logically, the work of seeking answers in his artistic laboratory progressed slowly and chaotically, being complicated by the fact that the experimentation had to take place in a double dimension—the juxtaposition of the socialist social program to the existing capitalist social order and the juxtaposition of the ideal revolutionary to real fel-

<sup>12</sup> Vynnyčenko, "Pro moral' . . .", p. 455.

low revolutionaries whom he knew and with whom he worked. Complications arose at every step. When Vynnyčenko attempted to portray his hero in a way that would, in his opinion, reflect the behavior of the ideal revolutionary socialist, he was accused of portraying his hero as a "cynical egotist"; when, on the other hand, he portrayed his heroes from life, he was accused of insulting and blackening his friends.

Vynnyčenko himself approached the matter logically and in sequence. Taking as his base the socialist program, Vynnyčenko could not but notice that, in the words of Myxajlo Rudnyc'kyj "the slogans of liberty, equality, justice and fraternity had to touch one of the foundations of the social order — the family and individual morality."<sup>13</sup> Having the inclination to seek harmony between word and deed and being a superb observer of life, Vynnyčenko saw very quickly that not everything proposed in the socialist program was possible without serious consequences, which must be taken into account. This was not all, however. What was more serious and disturbing was the fact that the majority of socialists themselves could not accept that which was being propagated in their program. It was fairly easy to say things, but to do them, to put them into practice—especially when it came to the postulate of equality between man and woman—complicated matters enormously.

Consequently, it was easy to proclaim the equality of the sexes but what exactly did this equality mean: equality at work, in sexual relations, in the family, in the party? To answer this question Vynnyčenko takes each one of these spheres and attempts to prove its workability by trying it out in his artistic laboratory. That this is the actual way in which Vynnyčenko worked, can be seen in the author's own statements about his play *Ščabli žyttja* (The Rungs of Life):

. . . I built a fictional character with such features as I had encountered among living people. I brought it into the sphere of my thoughts and feelings and then forced it to enter with them into real life. I wrote a play *Ščabli žyttia* where I described the *results of the introduction of these conclusions* to the surrounding life, *conclusions which I myself had experienced* in part and which *in a logical consequence flow out of the state of things*.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> M. Rudnyc'kyj, *Vid Myrnoho do Xvyl'ovoho* (L'viv: Dilo, 1936), p. 310.

<sup>14</sup> Vynnyčenko, *Pro moral'*. . . , p. 472. Emphasis mine.

Although the above quotation refers to *Ščabli žyttja*, the "laboratory" method described in it is applicable to all of Vynnyčenko's works in which he deals with ethical problems.

Perhaps the least problematic part of Vynnyčenko's work was the theme of the equality of the sexes. The exploitation of woman in Vynnyčenko's lifetime was attributed to the sins of capitalism, but the same type of exploitation would have been possible under socialism as well. Vynnyčenko's perceptive eye was quick to notice this instance of hypocrisy among his socialist friends. Furthermore, it was most noticeable not in employment practices (after all, the socialists did not run factories) but in revolutionary and agitational activities.

Vynnyčenko submits this problem to a laboratory analysis in the play *Bazar* (Bazaar) where, despite all contentions to the contrary, neither the revolutionary Leonid nor the revolutionary Troxym can accept the revolutionary Marusja as a truly equal member of the group. Her *feminine* beauty stands in the way. "I have yet to see a fellow," she says, "who would not make a pass at me. Including the revolutionaries. At first I thought the revolutionaries were not like that, but . . . I see . . ." <sup>15</sup> And in fact Leonid leaves his wife because of her, Troxym is ready to jeopardize the mission of freeing comrades from prison because of his jealousy for her, while the leader Markovyč, in order to attain his conspiratorial ends, is ready to convince her to lie (to Troxym, to cool his jealousy), to exploit her beauty for the purpose of worker agitation (workers are ready to listen to her because she is beautiful), and to distract the police. Markovyč attempts to banish her qualms by bits of cynical sophistry, claiming that life is but a bazaar to which all come with those goods of value which they possess. Marusja is forced by all this to dissipate her beauty and then discovers that even Leonid who claimed to love her soul was interested only in her body—the goods which she could bring to the bazaar. Finally she forces her companions to treat her as an equal only by means of deception.

The result of this experiment is quite clear. In theory man and woman are equals, but in reality one cannot avoid the question of sex. On a

<sup>15</sup> V. Vynnyčenko, *Bazar* (Winnipeg: Ukr. robotnyči visti, 1921), p. 13.

more particular level (and more bothersome to Vynnyčenko), however, was the fact that his socialist colleagues were incapable of realizing their own inability to abide by one of the basic postulates of the socialist program. "A great achievement of Vynnyčenko," writes Rudnyc'kyj, "lies in the fact that he was the first in our literature to reveal behind the mechanically repeated sentimental word 'love' the sexual question which in society has more strength than all the so-called 'ideals.'" <sup>16</sup>

As in *Bazar*, so in *Dysharmonija* (Disharmony) and in *Česnist' z soboju* (Honesty with One's Self), Vynnyčenko analyzes another question related to that of equality between the sexes and the sex drive which hinders the realization of this equality. I mean the question of the possibility of "spiritual love" outside of the physical. The analysis gives uniform results—whether it is from the woman's point of view (Ol'ha in *Dysharmonija* in her attitude toward her sickly husband Hryc'ko, or Natalja's attitude toward Myron in *Česnist'*) or from the man's (Leonid's attitude toward Marusja in *Bazar*, Serhij's attitude toward his wife in *Česnist'*). In all instances it is apparent that a successful separation of spiritual and physical love is not possible. People fool themselves hiding their lust under the mantle of the spirit (Natalja or Leonid) or they find excuses for their lack of physical desire by claiming spiritual union (Ol'ha or Serhij).

Perhaps the loudest controversy arose around Vynnyčenko's analysis of equality between the sexes in the sphere of sexual relations. The suppositions for the "experiment" consisted of the following: if man and woman are equal, if because of their belief in socialism they disregard the tenets of the Church which proclaims marriage as the only sanction for sexual relations, if they believe that to have sex is a normal biological function which both man and woman must satisfy, and if in advance they can make certain that there will be no serious consequences—neither children nor disease—if such is the case, then can a woman go ahead and find sexual gratification, just as a man does? Vynnyčenko tests this question in the novel *Česnist' z soboju*, whose heroine Dara goes into a hotel and orders a young man to be brought to her. She

<sup>16</sup> Rudnyc'kyj, p. 310.

wants to pay him for his services, just as a man would pay a prostitute. He fulfils his function, and Dara goes home. At first glance, the experiment seems to have been successful. But a closer analysis will reveal that Dara is not herself wholly convinced of the propriety of her act. She is incapable of dismissing her own betrayal of her husband Serhij. She narrates her escapade as if it were experienced by a friend who, supposedly, later shot herself. On the other hand, Serhij, expressing the man's view of the whole affair, cannot accept what has taken place. He knows that Dara does not love him, he suspects that she is in love with another man (Myron) and yet he never protests against this spiritual betrayal. As soon as it dawns on him that Dara is talking about herself, that it is, in fact, she who has been with another man, without bothering to observe spiritual restraints, he is appalled. Dara, who herself is not proud of her behavior, nevertheless accuses Serhij of hypocrisy and of having a double standard:

Spiritual love is important. And this love remained, let us assume. . . . Or, perhaps, this is but a theory and in reality everything is centered on this body which everyone degrades so? Eh? As long as she was betraying him with her soul he knew of it and did not push her away. . . . That is, one can live with this, but as soon as she just touched the body, then everything was finished? A crime and a degradation. . . . Vile hypocrites . . . Owners. You can go crazy, or die but don't you dare touch the belongings of the man.<sup>17</sup>

Again the results are the same: the differences between words and deeds are immense. The same may be said of prostitution. Vynnyčenko, together with other socialists, claimed that prostitution is an expression of the capitalist exploitation of woman. If this is the case, it would seem logical to look at prostitutes as equals of the other exploited workers, and therefore help them to gain their human rights and self-respect. But this is merely cant. The experiment conducted with Myron and his sister, the prostitute, proves that even though men are ready to frequent public houses, they are ashamed of this and find prostitution degrading. Only Myron, who is trying to be honest with himself, and wants to unite word and deed, finds the task of comprehending prostitution very diffi-

<sup>17</sup> V. Vynnyčenko, *Česnist' z soboju. Tvory*, vol. X (Kiev-Vienna: Dzvin, 1919), pp. 184-6.

cult. Even though he seems to be indifferent to his sister's profession, he does everything in his power to stop her from going into prostitution, tries to talk her into quitting the profession and finally breathes a sigh of relief when she returns home.

Indirectly related to the question of the equality of the sexes is the matter of children. It is a law of nature that the woman gives birth, but must the woman be married, or can she, as in the story "Tajemna pryhoda" (A Secret Adventure), pick up a stranger, invite him to a hotel, question him to see if he has any inheritable diseases and if he is fertile, and then, without giving him any explanation, meet him in that hotel regularly until she is impregnated? In this story Vynnyčenko comes to the conclusion that, if one were to dismiss the laws of society, such parentage, as far as nature is concerned, would be quite normal. Single mothers after all, have existed through the ages. What interests Vynnyčenko, however, is not the state of the unwed mother as such but the woman's premeditated and seemingly cold decision: it is in this that the woman's revolutionary act consists.

The analysis of the "child problem" seems to be brought to its logical resolution in *Česnist' z soboju*. Olja is full of admiration for Myron and wants to have a child by him, but without any family ties. He refuses and explains his refusal:

This is, my dearest Olja, a most profound, a most important act. . . . Even to knit a stocking one needs expertise, preparation. And you say: 'Why can't she when she wants one?' And what about me? It would also be my child, wouldn't it? And how am I giving birth to it? Am I conscious of the fact that I am starting a new life? Did I examine myself? Can I in full conscience say that I have done everything so that my child turns out strong and healthy? Do I really want to have children with this woman? Did I approach this act with love and deliberation? Our moralists talk of animals, and themselves really give birth to children like animals. So what if I gave birth to a cripple, that is all right, that's the way it turned out.<sup>18</sup>

That these words belong not only to Myron but to Vynnyčenko as well can be readily seen when we compare them with a statement in Vynnyčenko's letter to Čykalenko of October 30, 1911:

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 74.

I married, that is, I got together with the woman with whom I want to have children, half a year ago, but until now I could not talk about it because this was a trial-period marriage. As yet we did not know each other and could not say whether we could establish a family. Now, it is, more or less, clear. My wife is Jewish, but we agreed that the family would be Ukrainian and that we would have children only when the mother is sufficiently prepared to raise them as Ukrainian. . . . I want to build a family that will answer its *natural* function and not one which is prescribed by some moral codes and laws. I want it to be useful and good for me and the community in which I live.<sup>19</sup>

For Vynnyčenko, childbearing was a serious and responsible affair. If the birth of a child was to serve frivolous or inauthentic aims, the result could be tragic. This is the proposition that Vynnyčenko examines in the drama *Zakon* (The Law). Inna, the heroine, cannot have children, but she is convinced that only a child can save her marriage to Panas. To attain that noble end—the saving of her marriage—she persuades Panas to find a young and healthy girl and to have a child with her, whom they will then adopt. Panas' protests against this wild, animal-like experiment are of no avail; Inna insists that they are justified in what they have set out to do, because their cause is "noble and great." "You have agreed that we have a moral right to reach it in such a manner."<sup>20</sup> The experiment, of course, fails. Ljuda, the child's mother, in accordance with the laws of nature, refuses to give up her child. Moreover, during this experiment, all existing, even if tenuous, bonds between Inna and Panas are severed.

In the play, Vynnyčenko touches upon his other postulate, discussed in the beginning of the paper: does the end justify the means? The noblest end, the purest goal, if it is not for the good of the community but only for the good of an individual, is never justified. But Vynnyčenko takes that question further: what if the end is indeed for the benefit of the group—does it then still justify the means? If this is really true then it logically follows that the means cannot be governed by any moral laws, or that the moral laws are not absolute and change in accordance with the means. How can one then decide if a given act is

<sup>19</sup> Jevhen Čykalenko. *Ščodennyk 1907-1917* (L'viv: Červona kalyna, n.y.), date of entry is 10, XI, 1911, pp. 240-241.

<sup>20</sup> V. Vynnyčenko, *Zakon* (Prague-Berlin: Nova Ukrajina, 1923), p. 39.

righteous or if it is perhaps a crime? Besides, the experience of life has shown that such basic laws as "do not steal," "do not kill," "do not commit adultery"—all were proclaimed by a society which itself, in the words of Vynnyčenko, sanctioned "the robbery of one group of people by another," created "social institutions for killing," and considered adultery as lawful marriage.<sup>21</sup>

But the matter does not lie in the laws of society. Such laws, in Vynnyčenko opinion, have had but one goal throughout history: "the protection of the rule of the 'haves' against the 'have-nots'."<sup>22</sup> The matter lies in the behavior of future society, in the behavior of the socialist-revolutionaries. Already in *Dysharmoniiia* Hryc'ko formulates the approach to such ethics: "I find that they [the 'black-hundreds'] do not differ in anything from us! We lie, and they lie. In what way are we now better than that *bosjak* [bum]? We sit here and lie for such and such a reason and he lies for his own reasons. . . . The essence is the same."<sup>23</sup>

Vynnyčenko, in his pursuit of ethical absolutes, forces his hero to bring his thoughts to a logical conclusion: "I maintain that every minute, every moment I want to be righteous. And if I lie but once, that means I can lie always."<sup>24</sup> But Hryc'ko realizes that he must, in fact, lie; if he does not, he and his friends will die. Because he lies without being truly convinced of the righteousness of his act, a "disharmony" occurs between the will and the deed. In searching for a resolution of such ethical "disharmony," Vynnyčenko finds a single basic answer: the unity of thought and deed must be brought about on the basis of honesty with one's self:

It is all right to lie to a policeman for it is suggested to me both by my brain and by my feelings that by being truthful with him I will destroy myself and my friends. It is all right to lie even to a friend when by this lie I save him. But when I lie to my friend and by this lie save myself, then I lie not only to him but also to my social consciousness.<sup>25</sup>

In order to test this hypothesis, Vynnyčenko analyzes it in the play *Hrix*

<sup>21</sup> Vynnyčenko, "Pro moral' . . .", p. 462.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 465.

<sup>23</sup> V. Vynnyčenko, *Dysharmonija* (Kiev, 1907), pp. 94-5.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 99.

<sup>25</sup> Vynnyčenko, "Pro moral' . . .", p. 471.



(The Sin). Here the heroine Marija agrees to cooperate with the policeman Stalyns'kyj in order to save her revolutionary comrades. At first glance it seems that her goal is most noble and therefore her means to achieve it are morally unavoidable. But Stalyns'kyj knows that she is acting also out of her love for Ivan. And playing upon this, he forces her to betray more and more members of the group. Marija finally realizes that she was fooling herself, that she was not honest with herself, that she was guilty of a crime which she had excused in the name of the common good. It is after this self-revelation that Marija manages to escape the clutches of Stalyns'kyj by poisoning herself.

When Myron in *Chesnist' z soboj* steals Kysylevs'kyj's money in order to save Olja from prostitution, the end indeed justifies the means, for he does this for the good of his fellow human being without any personal motives or gains. Yet, in order that this act not bring about "disharmony," he must be honest with himself as to what he is doing and why he is doing it.

One and the same act can be either moral or immoral, depending on the circumstances, on the "situation." But for this type of honesty one needs virtually ideal human beings. Vynnyčenko looked for such human beings among his friends, the social revolutionaries. But there he found only unconscious or, even worse, deliberate hypocrites. They were incapable of living in accordance with the law of honesty with one's self, nor could they understand what it was exactly that Vynnyčenko tried to portray.

A careful reading of Vynnyčenko's works reveals that he did not propagate extreme individualism, total amorality, prostitution, falsehood, free love, or an animalistic abandon to lust. Instead, he attempted to test certain ideas that in theory sound so beautiful, to see if they were realizable and what their consequences would be. If he were alive today, he would most likely analyze in his artistic laboratory such current phenomena as test-tube babies, or artificial insemination. We see that his subjects are but examples of that illustrative material for which he was so often chastised, but which was indispensable to test the essential: to what extent do people believe in that which they proclaim, to what extent every present-day Laertes wants to and is able to live in

accordance with the teachings of old Polonius (which, incidentally, he himself was unable to put into practice) "to thine own self be true." Perhaps today Vynnyčenko would not be attacked for the subject matter of his works (after all, ethics and mores, as well as attitudes toward sex have changed) but he would probably still disturb his readers. As Rudnyc'kyj so aptly captured it: "We always prefer a writer who believes in some ideal and defends it fervently over a skeptic who leaves us in his cold laboratory."<sup>26</sup> I would add: over one who shows us ourselves in a non-distorting mirror.

<sup>26</sup> Rudnyc'kyj, p. 312.

# Vynnyčenko's Philosophy of Happiness

EUGENE LASHCHYK

Vynnyčenko is considered to be one of the most distinguished Ukrainian writers and statesmen of the twentieth century.<sup>1</sup> He was a prolific novelist, short story writer and playwright whose works were known in Western Europe and Russia. Vynnyčenko was also a leading figure in the revolutionary movement of Ukraine in the years 1917-1920, and on two occasions headed the government of the Ukrainian Republic. In spite of his fame, particularly during the first twenty years of the twentieth century, Vynnyčenko is now rather neglected in the West, and reduced to the status of a non-person in the Soviet Union.

A few words on Vynnyčenko's life and career might have bearing on the development of my thesis. Vynnyčenko was born in the village of Velykij Kut, in the Jelysavethrad region of Ukraine into the family of a destitute peasant on July 27, 1880. He died near Cannes, France on March 6, 1951.<sup>2</sup> Because he was a gifted pupil, his grammar school teachers recommended him for the gymnasium. While attending the gymnasium, he came in conflict with the czarist establishment for writing a revolutionary poem, and becoming involved in other political activities. He was expelled from school, but succeeded in completing

<sup>1</sup> The research and the writing of this paper was in part supported by a summer grant from La Salle University. I would like to thank the following persons who commented on various versions of this paper: T. Patrick Burke, Michael Kerlin, Albert Kipa, Hryhorij Kostiuk, and Martha Tarnawsky.

<sup>2</sup> For an account of this earliest period in Vynnyčenko's life, see the short biographical sketch provided by his wife, Rozalja Vynnyčenko, "Volodymyr Kyrylovyč Vynnyčenko (Biografična Kanva)" in *Volodymyr Vynnyčenko*, edited by B. Podoljak (H. Kostiuk), V. Pors'kyj (V. Mijakovs'kyj), V. Čaplenko (New York: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., 1953), pp. 9-15. A more detailed account of Vynnyčenko's life can be found in Hryhorij Kostiuk's "Volodymyr Vynnyčenko ta joho ostannij roman," originally published as an introduction to the novel *Slovo za toboju, Staline* (New York, 1971) and reprinted in Hryhorij Kostiuk's *Volodymyr Vynnyčenko ta joho doba* (New York, 1980), pp. 23-84.

another gymnasium as a correspondence student. In 1901 he entered the law school at Kiev University, but did not attend it for long. He was imprisoned by the czarist authorities for being a member of a revolutionary student organization, and was excluded from the university. Inducted into the army, he deserted and escaped to Western Ukraine (then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire) to avoid further arrests. There he became a member of the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party and contributed numerous articles to various socialist papers. Between 1903 and 1917, the year of the Soviet Revolution, he traveled widely in Europe, periodically returning to Ukraine and Russia, only to be arrested again and again.<sup>3</sup> In spite of such frequent disruptions, this was probably the most productive period of Vynnyčenko's life. He published numerous short stories, novels and plays, as well as countless articles and pamphlets, covering a wide range of moral, social and political issues.

Even a cursory view of Vynnyčenko's life reveals striking similarities between him and Lenin.<sup>4</sup> Both stood for the liberation of man, both for a time were the dominant spokesmen of the revolutionary socialist movement in their countries, both headed their respective post-revolutionary governments, and both wrote on philosophical topics. Lenin's philosophical interests were mostly in epistemology and political theory, whereas Vynnyčenko's focused on the nature of man, happiness, a new morality, universal disarmament, the self-management of workers.

Vynnyčenko's philosophical legacy is mostly unpublished, except for two of his novels which deal with world peace<sup>5</sup> and the self-management of workers.<sup>6</sup> The Vynnyčenko archives, on deposit with the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States at the Bahmeteff

<sup>3</sup> The best primary source of Vynnyčenko's life and thought is the diary that he kept from 1911 to 1951. Two volumes have been published to date by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies in Edmonton, Canada in collaboration with the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., 1980 and 1983.

<sup>4</sup> I say this in spite of the fact that Vynnyčenko was one of the first heads of state to attack Lenin's policies and the general conduct of the revolution. See his *Revoljucija v nebezpeči* (Vienna, 1920). Lenin, in turn, attacked Vynnyčenko both as a political leader and as a novelist.

<sup>5</sup> V. Vynnyčenko, *Le Nouveau Commandement* (Paris: Editions des Presses du Temps Présent, 1949). In 1951 the novel appeared in Ukrainian under the title *Nova zapovid*.

<sup>6</sup> *Slovo za toboju, Staline* (New York, 1971).

Archive of Columbia University, contain two unpublished philosophical treatises. The first manuscript, entitled *Ščastja: Lysty do Junaka* (Happiness: Letters to a Young Man) consists of 393 typed pages. It was completed in 1930 in Paris. Eight years later, on his small estate "Zakutok" in southern France,<sup>7</sup> Vynnyčenko embarked on the writing of his second philosophical treatise on a similar theme: *Konkordyzm—Systema Buduvannja Ščastja* (Concordism: A System for the Creation of Happiness; hereafter referred to as *Concordism*). It was completed in 1945. A comparison of the two philosophical treatises merits separate study. In this paper, I will mainly concentrate on the latter work, with emphasis on a discussion of happiness, health and morals.

In *Concordism* Vynnyčenko covers a broad range of subjects established in the table of contents: 1. Happiness, 2. Impediments to Happiness—Social Inequality, 3. Impediments to Happiness—Religion, 4. Concordism, 5. The Morality of Discordism and of Concordism, 6. Agreement with Nature—the Morality of Concordism, 7. Agreement with Nature—Nutrition, 8. Agreement with Oneself, 9. Agreement with One's Neighbor, 10. Agreement with One's Neighbor—Sexual Morality of Discordism and Concordism, 11. Agreement with One's Neighbor—Sexual Morality of Concordism, 12. Agreement with the Collective, 13. Collective Morality—Socio-Economic Program, 14. Collective Morality—Political Program, 15. International Discordism and Concordism, 16. Ways of Actualizing Concordism.

The theoretical foundation of Vynnyčenko's philosophy is related to the philosophy of naturalism, promulgated in the United States by thinkers like Ralph Barton Perry and John Dewey. Vynnyčenko himself, however, usually quotes French philosophers—Poincaré, Rousseau and others. I have not found evidence of any direct connection of Vynnyčenko's ideas with the American thinkers. And yet, there are striking similarities between Vynnyčenko's *Concordism* and R. B. Perry's *Realms of Value*.<sup>8</sup> Both argue that values are relative, while pointing to concepts

<sup>7</sup> For an explanation of why he moved from Paris to southern France, see Kostiuk's *Volodymyr Vynnyčenko*, pp. 61-63.

<sup>8</sup> Perry wrote two books on the subject of value: *General Theory of Value* (New York, 1926); the second, closer in structure and content to *Concordism*, is *Realms of Value: A Critique of Human Civilization* (Cambridge, Mass., 1954).

like harmony and balance as ideals to strive for.

Vynnyčenko was concerned with philosophical and psychological issues from almost the very beginning of his literary career, developing them in his plays and novels rather than in philosophical tracts. Concordist themes already can be found in the plays *Ščabli žyttja* (Rungs of Life), *Brexnja* (The Lie), *Bazar*, or in the novels *Česnist' z soboju* (Honesty with One's Self, 1911), *Rivnovaha* (Balance, 1913), *Božky* (Gods, 1914). This may be the reason that Vynnyčenko's treatise is not written in the style that professional philosophers employ. We also recall that he wrote many pamphlets and articles in revolutionary periodicals in the loose, rhetorical style of the socialist and Marxist writers of the time. By the time Vynnyčenko sat down to write his treatise, in the last twenty years of his life, it was probably somewhat too late to develop the precision and compression usually associated with the philosophical style of an English analytical philosopher or the complexities and convolutions of the style of a German philosopher. We should also keep in mind that Vynnyčenko spent almost half of his life in France, and that his philosophical "diet" consisted mostly of French thinkers and philosophers. His style, therefore, comes closer to some French humanist thinkers than to English or German philosophers in the strict sense. This also may explain the fact that Vynnyčenko's style is occasionally somewhat loose. Vynnyčenko correctly rejects the dogmatism usually associated with religious moral tracts, but unfortunately he occasionally replaces it with the fervor and dogmatism of his own "religion". His style, therefore, sometimes resembles the style of religious apologia, more than of a scientific treatise.

Vynnyčenko's *Concordism* predated many of our contemporary movements, including universal disarmament and the self-management of workers (the latter subsequently adopted in Yugoslavia and recently demanded and received by workers in Poland, to be taken away again shortly thereafter), as well as the almost world-wide interest in nutrition.

Although Vynnyčenko's work is broad in range and scope, it can be narrowed down to two proposals, addressed to mankind, regarding the conditions of happiness. The first results from a diagnosis of the inadequacies of the two dominant systems of the world—American cap-

italism and Soviet state capitalism. The main reason for the failure of the two systems is the presence in both of a deadly disease that is destroying man from the inside. Vynnyčenko calls this disease *discordism* and states that social and political reforms are doomed to failure, so long as they do not have a program for its proper treatment. The second proposal deals with an external threat. Vynnyčenko foresees the total destruction of Western civilization by an atomic war between the United States and the Soviet Union; he, therefore, proposes total disarmament of all nations of the world under the auspices of the United Nations. Vynnyčenko, furthermore, urges people of the world to adopt a new form of social relations which he calls *kolektokratija* ("collectocracy," or "collective rule"). Only the elimination of all forms of hired help will ultimately lead to the elimination of war. The model of the new system, according to Vynnyčenko, should be "a planet without hired help" (*Planeta bez najmyta*). It is within the general system of *collectocracy* that Vynnyčenko places his idea of the self-management of workers. Mankind must resolve both the problem of *discordism* and that of war, if it is to survive and be happy. If mankind should accept only one of the two proposals, happiness or a lengthy survival would not be guaranteed. In the present course, with the two dangers facing it, mankind will soon be destroyed by the disease of *discordism* which is responsible for the aggressive and destructive behavior of man in society and which, in the long run, causes the second danger—that of nuclear warfare.

In this paper I will examine the former of Vynnyčenko's proposals, dealing with *discordism*. First, I will scrutinize Vynnyčenko's definition of happiness and contrast it with some central positions on happiness in Western philosophy. Second, I will examine Vynnyčenko's diagnosis of the major sources of unhappiness—primarily the claim that mankind is suffering from the disease of *discordism*. Finally, I will present Vynnyčenko's moral system and argue that it dramatically departs from both the Christian and the socialist-communist systems of morality.

### THREE CLASSICAL THEORIES OF HAPPINESS

To facilitate my examination of Vynnyčenko's contribution to the theory of happiness, let me place it in historical perspective. There are

at least three dominant theories of happiness in the history of Western thought—the Aristotelian, the Thomistic and the utilitarian. I will argue that Vynnychenko's theory suggests a fourth possibility.

According to Aristotle, happiness consists in the pursuit of theoretical or philosophical wisdom (*Sophia*), guided by moral virtue. Aristotle states:

If happiness is activity in accordance with virtue, it is reasonable that it should be in accordance with the highest virtue; and this will be that of the best thing in us. Whether it be reason or something else that is this element which is thought to be our natural ruler and guide and to take thought of things noble and divine, whether it be itself also divine or only the most divine element in us; the activity of this in accordance with its proper virtue will be perfect happiness. That this activity is contemplative we have already said.<sup>9</sup>

Man's soul, Aristotle believes, is composed of three parts—the rational, the desiring or appetitive, and the vegetative. The rational part of the soul aims at truth. To achieve truth, man must possess intellectual or philosophical<sup>10</sup> wisdom which Aristotle claims is composed of intuition and science. If a man possesses intuition, he can be relied upon to arrive at the first principles or axioms of any field. However, he must also possess the ability to think scientifically, in order to be able to relate the axioms to concrete situations or things. We should be careful not to confuse our contemporary notion of science with that of Aristotle. Aristotle defines science as deductive reasoning; it is therefore apodictic. (Our contemporary notion of science implies a field of study which concerns nature but whose predictions and explanations are merely probable.) Deductive reasoning—science in Aristotle's sense—is used to derive explanations and predictions from axioms or theories.

One cannot properly pursue truths or be a lover of wisdom (intuition and science) if one is deprived of moral virtue—if one's passions and desires are not under complete control. And so, for example, a drunk-

<sup>9</sup> Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, translated by Terence Irwin (Indianapolis, 1985), 1177a, 11-17.

<sup>10</sup> Aristotle states: "It follows that the wise man must not only know what follows from first principles, but must also possess truth about first principles. Therefore wisdom must be intuitive reason combined with scientific knowledge . . . of the highest objects which has received as it were its proper completion." *Ibid.*, 1141a, 15 ff.



ard will be incapable of reliably carrying out the activities connected with either intuition or science. Only a person who can control his or her desires is capable of virtue, and therefore of wisdom. But the degree of control of desires, or the mean, can be known only by the person who possesses practical wisdom. We have now come full circle: to achieve wisdom (Sophia), we must possess moral virtue, but to achieve moral virtue we must possess practical wisdom. For Aristotle, both happiness and moral virtue are dependent on wisdom, whether it be theoretical or practical.

St. Thomas Aquinas' concept of happiness does not radically depart from that of Aristotle. Happiness still consists in the satisfaction of the desires of the three parts of the soul, and truth is still the desire of the intellectual part of the soul. For St. Thomas, however, truth or its attainment, which is theoretical wisdom, cannot be achieved in this world. It is interesting to note parenthetically that, at least on this point, Vynnyčenko agrees with St. Thomas. Vynnyčenko writes:

We as people have been tremendously restricted in our knowledge-seeking apparatus, or more precisely, we have not yet developed our methods of knowledge to the point that we can comprehend certain phenomena. There are many phenomena which we cannot completely understand. We can only conjecture about phenomena just as a dog who is behind closed doors guesses by the scent that his master is eating something good.<sup>11</sup>

In spite of the fact that St. Thomas and Vynnyčenko agree on the limitation of man's knowledge, they disagree on the nature of happiness. St. Thomas goes on to locate man's happiness in God;<sup>12</sup> i.e., in the possession of the beatific vision. Hence it comes as no surprise that man

<sup>11</sup> *Concordism*, p. 7. All translations of quotations from Vynnyčenko's works are mine.

<sup>12</sup> Man attains his last end, and hence happiness, "by knowing and loving God." *Summa Theologica*, Part 1 of Part 2, Q1, A8. Complete happiness comes only from the participation in the Godhead. "The other is a happiness surpassing man's nature, and which man can attain by the power of God alone, by a kind of participation of the Godhead." *Ibid.*, Q62, A1. In another place St. Thomas says: "Now the end of our desires is God; hence the act whereby we are primarily joined to Him is basically and substantially our happiness. But we are primarily united with God by an act of the understanding, and therefore, the very seeing of God, which is an act of the intellect, is . . . our happiness." "On the Sentences, 11, 40, 1, 1, Response," *The Pocket Aquinas*, ed. V.J. Bourke (New York, 1960), p. 192.

is not happy in this world, and that he can achieve complete happiness only in the next.

Aristotle's conception of happiness is excessively intellectual and therefore has been considered as "elitist": it has been unfairly reserved only for people who have the leisure to pursue science, philosophy or the other intellectual disciplines. St. Thomas retains Aristotle's bias toward the intellectual, but his bias seems to allow, indirectly, for the justification of whatever lot man happens to be in. One danger of Thomistic philosophy is that it can remain always at the *status quo*, or become conservative: because ultimate happiness is a gift of God, it is not within man's power to achieve happiness.<sup>13</sup> One wonders what justification can be found for exploring an alternative organization of society within such a framework. Furthermore, neither Aristotle's nor St. Thomas' theories of happiness provide us with the means of verifying at what point we achieve that state. Actually, the problem of verification will dissipate if we interpret Aristotle's account of happiness as consisting in the activities<sup>14</sup> of *seeking* wisdom rather than of its *attainment*.

In Jeremy Bentham's utilitarianism, we have a clearly alternative conception of happiness. The good, as in St. Thomas, is still defined as the satisfaction of desire, but because the satisfaction of desire yields pleasure—and Bentham identifies the good with whatever is conducive to pleasure—the good is defined as whatever is conducive to pleasure.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Theological virtues direct man to supernatural happiness. "Theological virtues: first, because their object is God, because they direct us rightly to God; secondly, because they are infused in us by God alone; thirdly, because these virtues are not known to us except by Divine revelation, contained in the Holy Writ." Ibid., Q 62, A1.

<sup>14</sup> See *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1100 a, 12, where Aristotle writes that his position is meant "especially for us who say that happiness is an activity."

<sup>15</sup> When Bentham proposed the calculus, he simply gave the following directions: "Sum up all the values of all the pleasures on the one side and those of all the pains on the other. The balance, if it be on the side of pleasure, will give the good tendency of the act upon the whole, with respect to the interests of the individual person; if on the side of pain, the bad tendency of it upon the whole." *The Utilitarians: Jeremy Bentham, Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (Garden City, 1961), p. 39. For a discussion of the hedonic calculus and the problems associated with the measurement of subjective states in general, see Eugene Lashchyk, "Some Reflections on the Relationship between Philosophy and Economics" in *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* Volume XIII, 1973-1977, No. 35-36, pp. 217-237.

Happiness is defined as achieving, on balance, more pleasure than pain in one's lifetime. It can be said that one has to get out the calculator, add all the pleasure that one has experienced in one column, then add all the pain in another, and simply subtract the smaller from the larger number. In spite of the fact that Bentham's approach resulted in important penal reforms in many countries and removed some blatant injustices from the system, it nevertheless created new problems. Hedonism, even if unintended by Bentham<sup>16</sup> (as I believe it was), is one side effect of his philosophy. The pursuit of pleasure as a goal of life, whether it be sex-oriented or goods-oriented, very often leads to frustration. As soon as one has acquired one object, industry creates others that are better. Love, based on pleasure alone, demands ever new objects of affection. This introduces a vicious circle, in which the satisfaction of one desire leads to the striving for the next. Such a continuous cycle cannot result in long-lasting satisfaction. Another serious problem with utilitarianism is implied by the principle of utility. A popular version of this principle is "the greatest happiness for the greatest number." This principle is compatible with the denial of the rights of a minority if they threaten the increase of pleasure, and thus happiness, of the majority.

The above discussion is obviously not intended to be exhaustive.<sup>17</sup> My goal was to show that Vynnyčenko's proposal provides a clear alternative. Moreover, because none of the three conceptions are satisfactory, as my brief discussion has tried to suggest, there is a viable need to search for an alternative. I should also point out that none of Vynnyčenko's political allies were of help to him in that matter: neither the socialists, nor the Marxists have adequately addressed the question of the nature of happiness.

<sup>16</sup> For further discussion of this point, see Eugene Lashchuk, "The Hedonic Calculus as a Decision Method", MA thesis, CCNY, 1964. Gordon R. Taylor, in his book *Conditions of Happiness* (London, 1949), also criticizes the philosophy of hedonism which dominates our time. He states: "The real paradox of our time is not poverty in plenty but unhappiness in pleasure," p. 5.

<sup>17</sup> For a rather comprehensive discussion of these and other theories of happiness, see V.J. McGill, *The Idea of Happiness* (New York, 1967). Of the most recent proposals, John Rawls' definition deserves mention. He claims that "a person is happy then during those periods when he is successfully carrying through a rational plan and he is with reason confident that his efforts will come to fruition." *Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), p. 550.

## VYNNYČENKO'S DEFINITION OF HAPPINESS

Vynnyčenko takes it as axiomatic that mankind strives toward happiness. "That every man—*volens-volens*—seeks happiness is the only law that we have a right to claim with absolute certainty. The validity of that law is not negated by various theoretical differences about the nature of happiness."<sup>18</sup> Here he agrees with the whole tradition of Western thought, beginning with Aristotle and including the utilitarians. Where he radically differs from them is in his definition of happiness. Vynnyčenko wants to locate happiness in something stable and permanent. For that reason, he does not want to locate it in the pursuit of moral or aesthetic values because they, according to him, are relative. He writes:

There are no moral human eternal values. Good and evil, like waves on the ocean, are constantly transformed into one another. What was good a moment ago, now becomes evil. That which is valuable for one person, can be harmful for another. The same action is labeled courageous by some and criminal by others. All human moral values, in other words, are conditional and relative. Therefore it is senseless to search for such absolutes as happiness in such relative matters. One has to search for happiness in something more permanent and reliable, such as the law of the coordinated relationship among the elements of existence. That is: whatever changes take place in things or in values, whether such changes be physical or spiritual, the relationship between these things or values remains as unchanging and eternal as the laws of nature. No matter what kind of changes take place in objects, all of them remain subject to the laws of gravity . . . I repeat: wealth, fame, health, love, intellect, and so on, in themselves, . . . even all together—when they are not in agreement with themselves and among each other—do not lead to happiness. *Only an active balance of these values and their agreement among themselves and in the forces outside of us produces that state which we have an absolute right to call happiness.*<sup>19</sup>

It should be pointed out that here Vynnyčenko discusses a balance of forces which are all values, or—if we admit Ralph Barton Perry's definition of value as "any object of any interest"—of interests as well. But later in *Concordism*, in the discussion of his system of morality, he

<sup>18</sup> *Concordism*, p. 9.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 45.

includes in his catalogue of forces to be balanced human faculties or, as he calls them, "main forces"—instincts, sub-instincts, reason, drives, will.<sup>20</sup> This interpretation is particularly well-supported in the section specifically dealing with moral principles. Vynnyčenko states: "Fourth Principle '*Form a unified whole!*'" or, in other words, behave in such a way that your actions would be a manifestation of the agreement of the great majority of your "main forces" (instincts, sub-instincts, reason, drives, will).<sup>21</sup> Here we would be faced by an inconsistency only if we took "forces" to mean "interests." In this section of his work, however, Vynnyčenko operates at a deeper level—a level at which we can speak both of values and of human faculties as forces of one kind or another. Hence there is no inconsistency. There is, however, another problem, having to do with the precise meaning of "balance."

Whatever happiness is, it cannot consist in the pursuit of values, because these are relative. Just as a physicist like Einstein found invariant laws, even though space, time and mass are relative, so Vynnyčenko was searching for invariant laws in the face of constant change in the human realm. He wanted to locate happiness in what is unchanging and permanent within the stream of change. Vynnyčenko correctly perceived the search for invariant laws to be the goal of physics. Many artists and writers of the 1930s and 1940s misunderstood Einstein's theory of relativity as meaning that all is relative.<sup>22</sup> Actually, the goal of Einstein's theory of relativity was to find invariant laws of nature *in spite* of the fact that space, time and even mass were relative and changing. Similarly, Vynnyčenko wanted to develop a theory of man and society which would codify the invariant laws of happiness, even when values are relative. This brings us to the question of "balance."

<sup>20</sup> It should be pointed out that Vynnyčenko in *Concordism* still uses the now discredited notion of human instincts. It was accepted practice among the social scientists at the beginning of the twentieth century to speak of human drives as instincts. His work reflects the spirit of the times.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 119.

<sup>22</sup> The movement in literature and art called Dadaism is the most obvious application of this erroneous interpretation of Einstein's theory of relativity. To see that there is nothing "relative" about Einstein's theory, see Henry Morganau's article "Einstein's Conception of Reality," reprinted in Paul Arthur Schilpp (ed.) *Albert Einstein: Philosopher Scientist* (La Salle, Ill., 1949), particularly p. 253.

## AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONCEPT OF BALANCE

The concept of balance is the most crucial in Vynnychenko's definition of happiness. What does it mean in this context? The primary meaning of balance probably comes from the weighing of things on the balance scale, like the one held by the allegorical figure of Justice. When the pointer on a balance scale points to the center line, then the unknown weight, let us say in the left shale, is equal to the known weight in the right shale. When the forces of gravity on both sides are equal, we have a balance. A concept of balance more useful for my purposes stems from chemistry, with application to plants and animals. Here a balance is achieved when the osmotic pressure of, let us say, the ions of salt or sugar on the one side of a membrane are equal to that on the other side of the membrane. When the number of ions of X are equal on both sides, there is a balance of forces. There are many such regulatory mechanisms in every biological organism, designed to keep certain levels of nutrients necessary for life.<sup>23</sup> The sense of balance that Vynnychenko needs to make his discussion of happiness plausible occurs on a higher level of abstraction. And yet, it seems to me quite probable that Vynnychenko's concept of happiness is based on the concept of balance in the biological sciences and in the medical definition of health.

In accordance with his definition, Vynnychenko claims that whenever there is a balance of forces in plants and animals, we have a right to say that this means that they are happy.<sup>24</sup> In the case of humans, however,

<sup>23</sup> In Claude A. Villee, *Biology* (Philadelphia, 1972), there is the following dramatic description of the importance of chemical balances essential for life: "The concentrations of the various salts is kept extremely constant under normal conditions, and any great deviation from the normal values causes marked effects on cell function, even death. A decreased concentration of calcium ions in the blood of mammals results in convulsions and death. Heart muscle can contract normally only in the presence of the proper balance of sodium potassium and calcium ions. If a frog heart is removed from the body and placed in a part sodium chloride solution, it soon stops beating in the relaxed condition. . . . It will continue to beat, however, if placed in a solution containing the *proper balance* of these three salts," p. 34. My italics.

<sup>24</sup> Richard Warner in a lecture called "Enjoyment and Happiness," given at the University of Pennsylvania on October 2, 1981, has argued that animals cannot be said to be happy in the primary sense because they do not realize motivational self-conceptions. He defines a necessary condition of a happy person: "A person is happy at a time *t* only if he has enjoyed realizing a sufficient number of his motivational self-conceptions up to (and including) *t*" (p. 31 of ms.)

we are not only concerned with the chemical and biological balances, but also with such psychological and social forces or interests as the desire for fame, love, intellect, and wealth. How are we to understand balance in this context?

Two interpretations of balance come to mind. In the first, balance could mean equal amounts of time or energy devoted to the pursuit of each desire or interest. This interpretation excludes extremes, as the case of a man who devotes almost all of his time to the pursuit of wealth. We obviously would find it difficult to believe his assurances that he values art, literature, or his own health as highly as he values money. Because such a man devotes practically all of his time to the pursuit of a single interest, we would have to say that he is in a state of imbalance. Therefore, according to our first interpretation, developed here, that man would be deemed to be unhappy. To sum up: in our first interpretation, balance and its subsequent feeling of happiness comes when equal amounts of time or energy are devoted to the pursuit of such interests as intellect, culture, fun, health, power, etc.

In our second interpretation, balance means a certain mixture of time and energy devoted to one's interests, but not in equal amounts. Here balance is understood by analogy to harmony in music: some instruments play the dominant theme, while others provide the accompaniment; they are in the background, but are nevertheless needed for a certain total effect. According to this second interpretation, persons who devote unequal amounts of time to the pursuit of physics and tennis will not be in a state of imbalance, although it is unlikely that they will achieve excellence in both fields.

A number of questions arise from the above discussion. Which of the two conceptions of balance did Vynnyčenko espouse? How does one achieve either balance? Is it possible to have a balance of forces in either sense, and yet not feel happy?<sup>25</sup> Can people who make significant contributions to the arts, humanities or the sciences achieve a balance in

<sup>25</sup> Vynnyčenko responds to this question in his definition of disease: "The agreement of functions, when they are balanced, is felt by the organism as satisfaction, joy or even rapture. If such a state persists for a long duration . . . then . . . happiness." *Concordism*, p. 5. This passage indicates that Vynnyčenko believes that "balance" translates into felt joy and ultimately felt happiness.

either the first or the second sense? The last question can be restated in the following terms: can one be a physicist of the magnitude of an Einstein without almost complete commitment of time and energy to physics, an Isaac Stern without a complete devotion to music? And, most important, are such people happy?

Vynnyčenko remarks in *Concordism*<sup>26</sup> that his conception of happiness excludes any kind of "dictatorship," or dominant status, of any one force, desire, or interest. Such a position would tend to support my first, rather than my second, interpretation of balance. However, I have certain difficulties accepting the plausibility of the first interpretation. As I have implied above, few would deny that a person making a significant contribution to a demanding field like science, must let one of his or her interests predominate over others. Empirical data might conceivably support Vynnyčenko's position after all (I will consider his own success in several full-blown professional careers below), but it seems counter-intuitive to claim that a person will be unhappy merely because he or she is almost completely devoted to one vocation or one interest.

One tends to think that people who have a single vocation and who devote most of their time and energy to it may be considered as happy. Hryhorij Skovoroda,<sup>27</sup> the eighteenth-century Ukrainian philosopher, argued that the pursuit of one's vocation—a vocation for which one was destined by nature—is indeed true happiness. To work daily on what is not one's vocation is close to living death. On this question I tend to side with Skovoroda.

<sup>26</sup> Vynnyčenko proposes a communal model of the individual, without the dictatorship of reason or will or any other faculty: "... and we are sometimes very surprised when in the morning we wake up with a clear resolution of the question which only last night seemed so convoluted and impenetrable. Obviously the commune without the presence of a 'dictator' — consciousness during the night — pondered the question, explained it, reduced all of the forces to a unity [sucił'nosti] and came up with the general decision which intelligence must merely register and put up for realization by that same commune." *Concordism*, p. 122.

<sup>27</sup> The only translation into English of Skovoroda's philosophical writings can be found in *Russian Philosophy*, edited by James M. Edie, James P. Scanlan, Mary-Barbara Zeldin and George L. Kline (Chicago, 1965). The translated dialogue is called "A Conversation among Five Travelers Concerning Life's True Happiness," 1:26-58. For other dialogues see the complete edition of Skovoroda's works: *Povne Zibrannja Tvoriv u Dvoh Tomax* (Kiev, 1973).



Our contemporary theory of personality, developed by the psychologist Abraham H. Maslow, seems to be akin to the one of Skovoroda. For Maslow, the goal of life is the realization of one's potential, or self-realization.<sup>28</sup> We are not certain that Maslow would agree with the second interpretation of balance given here, but in any case this second interpretation has much more going for it than the first. To be in tune with one's environment and to strike a balance in the sense of a harmony of one's particular interests, *ceteris paribus*, is without doubt a desirable goal of individuals. The *ceteris paribus* clause is necessary, because there is a need to specify which environmental conditions it is worthwhile to be in balance with, and which ought to be modified. Vynnyčenko's moral system recommends moral rules for a happy life. Among them are rules for proper nutrition, sexual conduct, relationships with other individuals, etc. Since his thesis is that most of mankind is suffering from the disease which he calls *discordism*, naturally it is not with such an environment that one should be in balance, but with a pre-discordist or post-discordist environment.

That happiness is a balance of internal and external forces in the individual is not a philosophical abstraction that has no relation to Vynnyčenko's life. On the contrary, as is evident not only from his fiction but from his diaries, his philosophy was a lived philosophy. Let us briefly leave Vynnyčenko's theories and consider his life. His exciting biography, sketched in my introductory paragraphs, is well known. Vynnyčenko, moreover, kept from the age of thirty-one an almost daily record of how he felt and what he did.<sup>29</sup> On the surface, we have a man who did indeed successfully pursue many interests, even careers. He was a short-story writer, novelist, dramatist, journalist, political theorist, practical politician, and head of state; in the last twenty years of his life he developed into a professional gardener, a natural-foods expert, as well as a painter. As this article testifies, he was a thinker. In spite of the variety of interests, it is not easy to decide which of the two interpretations of balance is exemplified by his life.

<sup>28</sup> See Abraham Maslow, *Toward a Psychology of Being* (New York, 1968).

<sup>29</sup> See Note 3 for a reference to his *Diary*.

We recall that when Vynnyčenko was head of state, he expressed regret at not having enough time for writing. This was probably an important reason contributing to his early resignation from political life. In the 1930s, partially because of the rise of fascism, Vynnyčenko's royalties from such sources as the Western European theater began to diminish. His royalties from the Soviet Union were completely cut off, primarily because of his criticism of Stalinism.<sup>30</sup> In order to guarantee an economic base for himself and his wife, he purchased a garden farm near Cannes, which he called "Zakutok." Unfortunately, Vynnyčenko underestimated the amount of time required to make the garden productive and overestimated the income that it would bring. Important for our purposes is the fact that Vynnyčenko laments that his creative work suffers, particularly during the planting and summer seasons, because there is so little time and energy left for writing. Vynnyčenko's experience has been borne out again and again by people who desired to live off the land, so to speak. After all the daily chores were done, little time or energy remained to do much else. The conclusion to be drawn is that for sedentary professions it is important to have avocations such as sports or gardening for a balanced, healthy life. But when it becomes necessary to pursue such activities for one's livelihood, and when such pursuits begin to occupy most of our productive life, then they lead to frustrations and ultimately unhappiness. In his diaries, Vynnyčenko says again and again that he was happiest when he could devote most of his energies to writing. In spite of the complexities of the case, I think that Vynnyčenko's life, as against his theory, tends to support the second, rather than the first, interpretation of balance. Such evidence, however, has to be taken with a grain of salt lest we fall into the *ad hominem* fallacy. Also, such biographical asides, in the end, help us little in our pursuit of the question as to which of the two interpretations of balance was intended by Vynnyčenko in *Concordism*. With this in mind, let us return to the work itself.

<sup>30</sup> The decision to confiscate his royalties in the Soviet Union was made at the highest levels of government. See *Pravda*, Dec. 6, 1933.

## DISEASE, UNHAPPINESS AND PRIMORDIAL MAN

An imbalance of forces serves to define not only unhappiness but also disease. Vynnyčenko defines disease as follows:

Disease is the disarray or disorganization of forces in the organism, whether it be the weakening of organs or cells or the dispersal of their functions; i.e., disagreement or imbalance of forces. The agreement of functions, when they are balanced, is felt by the organism as satisfaction, joy or even rapture. If such a state persists for a long duration, so does joy, and only then do we have a right to call such a state the joy of life or happiness.<sup>31</sup>

The only difference between disease and unhappiness presumably is that there are different forces at work in each case. In the case of unhappiness, the imbalance might be not only chemical or physical, but might also involve interests or values. Even diseases can be psychosomatically induced, as the result of frustrations due to an imbalance of interests or to excessive stress, produced by conflicts with the environment. On the other hand, some, if not most, psychological disorders or diseases are caused by chemical imbalances. There is a school of psychiatric medicine that treats mental disorders by nutrition and megavitamin therapy.<sup>32</sup> Vynnyčenko claims that mankind is almost universally suffering from the disease of *discordism*: in an unpublished novel, *Leprozorij* (Leprosarium),<sup>33</sup> he regards mankind as a colony of lepers. The reason that such a widespread disease is so rarely noticed is that almost everyone suffers from it. It is the norm in modern societies, hence it is not treated as an anomaly—usually only deviations from the norm are taken as constituting some disorder. Because mankind is suffering from the disease of *discordism*, the causes of unhappiness of most people become plain: we recall that, according to Vynnyčenko, an imbalance of forces is a sign not only of disease but also of unhappiness.

<sup>31</sup> *Concordism*, p. 5.

<sup>32</sup> For a nutritional and megavitamin approach to resolving serious psychological disorders and research reports from orthomolecular medicine see Michael Lesser, M.D., *Nutritional and Vitamin Therapy* (New York, 1980), especially pp. 25-34.

<sup>33</sup> V. Vynnyčenko, *Leprozorij*, MS, 1938, 477 pages, Bahmeteff Archive, Columbia University.

To explain how mankind has fallen victim to such a widespread disease, Vynnyčenko proposes a hypothesis which borders on a myth of primordial man. Primordial man did not suffer from diseases, nor did he know unhappiness, until the great catastrophe—the Biblical flood. Vynnyčenko describes the antediluvian state of nature:

We have to find the cradle of civilization . . . somewhere at the shores of the Pacific or Indian Ocean . . . where even today there are islands with an ideal climate and with a rich flora. If we believe the opinions of scientists who claim that mankind, even without a system of written signs, is capable of preserving in its memory events that occurred long ago, then we have to agree that the myth of the existence of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden has a real basis. What else are we to call the life of our ancestors if not heavenly (heaven on earth) or happy? They enjoyed that balance and agreement of forces that we call happiness. They were not troubled by hunger or cold or antagonisms or jealousies or the exploitation of man by man . . . even sickness was unheard of . . . <sup>34</sup>

Vynnyčenko further speculates that primitive people ate fruits, vegetables, nuts, and therefore there was an ample supply of everything. But, as is described in the Bible and other myths, the Great Flood caused the deaths of countless people and scattered the survivors over more inhospitable lands. There fruits and vegetables were much scarcer; in order to survive, people were forced to slaughter animals and devour their carcasses. In order to facilitate the consumption of such indigestible food, people began to cook and to season meats and other foodstuffs, so as to guarantee their own and their relatives' existence. A clan would endeavor to expropriate as big a piece of land and as many plants and animals as it could. But the eating of meat and of cooked foods in time led to various diseases, especially those of the stomach. Such a diet gradually weakened a person's organs and cells. People began to fall ill, and therefore became unhappy. Other causes of psychological change, moreover, were becoming evident. The continued aggressive and violent behavior, implied by the accumulation of wealth to guarantee survival, led to the hypertrophy of the ego. The increase of wealth at any price—by taking advantage of the weaker—ultimately resulted in a state of economic,

<sup>34</sup> *Concordism*, p. 22.

and hence social, inequality. Social and economic inequality became another reason for the state of unhappiness. In time, new human characteristics were formed:

Not only did the ego-hypertrophy become evident, but all other psychological functions began to be deformed as well . . . A new morality began to appear, based on the new abnormal conditions of life and on new psychological states. That is why psychological states which could not have existed in primordial times, such as rivalry, jealousy, hostility, pugnacity, cruelty, insidiousness, coercion began to appear . . . and to become, as it were, a part of the laws of nature.<sup>35</sup>

### THREE THEORIES OF HUMAN NATURE

I now want to place Vynnyčenko's myth-hypothesis about primordial man in historical perspective. In the history of Western thought, especially during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, there were many similar hypotheses or myths about man in the state of nature. The goal of such myths is plain—to explain which characteristics of mankind are inherited, and which are acquired. Such myths attempted to resolve the issue of whether man is by nature aggressive and destructive, or peaceful and creative. Needless to say, they imply a human nature, or "essence," as developed by ancient Greeks, particularly Aristotle.

As the reader may have already surmised, Vynnyčenko's myth is compatible not only with the Judeo-Christian Biblical account, but also with the social theories of Jean Jacques Rousseau<sup>36</sup> and Karl Marx. Those theorists attributed to man in the state of nature exclusively peaceful, creative, or generally good characteristics. Only changes in the environment—or in the case of the Judeo-Christian tradition, original sin—resulted in the formation of such characteristics in man as excessive egoism, aggressiveness, viciousness and destructiveness.

The second myth-hypothesis was proposed by Thomas Hobbes.<sup>37</sup> Although it is completely opposite to the myth-hypothesis outlined

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., p. 30.

<sup>36</sup> J.J. Rousseau, *The Social Contract and Discourses*, translated by G.D.H. Cole (New York, 1950).

<sup>37</sup> Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (1651). Several editions in print.

above, it too implies the basis of human nature or "essence." According to Hobbes, life in the state of nature was "nasty, brutish and short." (Vynnychenko would have reserved such words for the human condition only after the Great Flood and even then only after some time had elapsed.) The Hobbesian picture of life in the state of nature describes humans as egoistical, aggressive and brutal. In their attempts to satisfy their desires and needs, they took advantage of their fellow men, exploiting them, subjugating as many of them as their strength would allow, and frequently killing them. Because of constant wars, anarchy, and absence of security, it is hard to imagine primitive man as attaining happiness. Hobbes argues that only when people gave up most of their rights to the sovereign and joined the commonwealth, was it possible to have security, peace and stability. Only a strong sovereign, however, deserves the respect of his constituents. Citizens have the right to overthrow sovereigns who do not have enough power to enforce the laws and to keep peace.

More than thirty years of scholarly work since the writing of *Concordism* has contributed little to the resolution of the question as to which of the two competing myth-hypotheses is the more probable one. Because of the problem of verification, scientists and philosophers alike are more reluctant than ever to develop further hypotheses about the primordial state of man. As a result, the battleground has shifted to those theories of human nature which bypass the issue of the primordial state.

At the present time, the nature-nurture controversy is waged in the textbooks of a new science (or pseudo-science) called sociobiology. The founder of sociobiology, Edward O. Wilson of Harvard,<sup>38</sup> claims that his science can establish which of the exhibited human characteristics are transmitted by the genes, and which are acquired. He argues, for example, that males and females exhibit different characteristics not because of nurture but because of genetic differences. Such human characteristics as male dominance, homosexuality and xenophobia seem to resemble similar behavior in animals. Sociobiologists conclude that

<sup>38</sup> See, for example, Edward O. Wilson, *Sociobiology* (Cambridge, Mass., 1975).

because such behavior is genetically based in animals, it is likely to be thus based in humans. At the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1978, Eleanor Leacock, an anthropologist from City College of New York, opposed the sociobiologists by demonstrating that, although male dominance is evident in Western societies, it is not the rule in *all* human societies: recent anthropological findings have shown that there were societies in which women played at least as important a role as did men in food gathering, and often enjoyed as much social and sexual freedom as did the men.<sup>39</sup> Women's liberation groups have vehemently objected to Wilson's theories on the grounds that sociobiology is merely a subtle version of sexism, as well as racism.

There is yet another theory which provides a sort of compromise between the extremes of the Rousseau-Vynnyčenko and the Hobbesian theories. Man is capable of both good and evil—of creative, cooperative behavior, as well as of destructive, aggressive, individualistic behavior. It is environmental factors which decide whether an individual develops in the one or the other direction. That position is perhaps the most compatible with the Aristotelian view of man as composed of potentiality and actuality. According to Aristotle, each being has a nature, an "essence," which disposes it for action. Man's life is the unfolding of his potentialities. Environmental conditions determine which dispositions to action are exhibited in man, just as appropriate conditions dictate whether or not an acorn becomes an oak tree. Contemporary versions of such a compromise position on human nature are found in Bertrand Russell and even more recently, in the Yugoslav philosopher Mihailo Marković.<sup>40</sup>

At the present time I find this dispositional account of human nature the most plausible one. We recall that in Vynnyčenko's account, a harsh environment causes the formation of undesirable characteristics, such as excessive egoism, etc. This implies that if one changes the environment, one can gradually improve the behavior of individuals living in it. Because the Aristotelian view takes it as axiomatic that actual behavior

<sup>39</sup> See a report from the conference in the *New York Times*, Feb. 15, 1978.

<sup>40</sup> Mihailo Marković, *Democratic Socialism* (New York, 1982).

is a sign of a disposition to such behavior in an individual's nature, Hobbes' and Rousseau's extreme accounts of human nature, as contradictory as they are, must both be part of the essence of man. In actuality, the great variety of behavior patterns exhibited throughout history implies that human nature must be a very malleable and amorphous thing. Let me show, finally, how Hobbes' and Rousseau's theories give rise to completely opposite practical social policies; the Hobbesians will tend to support a strong police and army to keep the lid on the dangerous qualities of man; the followers of Rousseau will not fear removing restrictions on human behavior, at least for the very young. They will encourage laws which restrict pollution and keep the environment as close as possible to its natural state.

It is worth noting parenthetically that Vynnyčenko entertained, at least in his last novel, *Slovo za toboju, Staline* (Take the Floor, Stalin), a form of the Aristotelian position. One of the characters says:

It is true, Mary, that when Stalin was healthy and strong, he had a healthy instinct for justice. But when he began to grow old, when his strength weakened, his instinct for justice began to be deadened by such forces as egoism, ambition, greed for power . . . Oh uncle, shouted Mary, it appears then that all old people should be extremely egoistical and self-centered . . . ? No, girl, not all, but only those who live in environments conducive to such development. In you and me at the present time there is no greed for power! <sup>41</sup>

### VYNNYČENKO'S NUTRITIONAL THESIS

Vynnyčenko's nutritional thesis is based, at least in part, on firsthand experience with what he called "the Concordist diet." For the average reader, personal testimony concerning dramatic improvements in one's health can be very persuasive. Vynnyčenko, for example, writes in his diary entry of January 7, 1933: ". . . After five months of this regime [diet] we feel almost fifty years younger . . ." (Vynnyčenko was then fifty-three). In the entry of January 10th of the same year, he writes: "By itself, without any medication, my hair grew back . . . just because we returned to a diet of our cave ancestors."

<sup>41</sup> *Slovo za toboju, Staline* (New York, 1971), p. 231.



To give the reader a flavor of the daily menu of the Concordist nutritional program, let me quote from the entry made after the New Year celebration of January 1, 1945:

Najradrada greeted the New Year with the following dinner menu: salad, wheat with milk and grape juice, and hot water with milk. And we thought of all the unfortunate people who dined on all the poisons that *discordism* provides. Today Najradrada feels a freshness, a lightness, a capability, a capacity for all kinds of work, and the radiance of spirit which is maximally possible in this polluted atmosphere, aggravated by all of the sores of *discordism*.

On January 6, 1933, Vynnyčenko listed in his diary the following very general reasons for the correctness of the Concordist diet:

Modern science, clear logic and our own experience lead us to the absolute conviction that our diet is the most nutritious, healthful, cleanest, most aesthetic and most economical possible. We have adopted the diet and see no serious reason for changing it . . . just as there can be no doubt as to what to feed a horse — oats, hay or whatever — so also in our case. . . . Enjoyment comes not from variety and inventiveness in the menu but health and appetite. Inventiveness and variety were introduced by people of poor health and with a depressed, dull appetite. . . . One need not arouse appetite in a healthy person, it comes by itself, when it is needed.

Because Vynnyčenko himself felt better after such a dramatic change of diet, it is understandable why he speaks with so much conviction. Doubtless, Vynnyčenko felt better after he stopped smoking, drinking, and eating French dishes with all their rich sauces. Life on a small estate in southern France, and frequent work out-of-doors, on the house and in the garden, also helped. Actually, improvement in one's health and well-being can come from any one or more of such salutary changes. People report a general improvement in health, for example, just because they stopped smoking, or just because of regular physical exercise, or just because of a change of diet.

It is difficult to deny Vynnyčenko's claim that eating more natural foods—foods which are less processed, or which have fewer chemical additives—is healthier for the human organism. Years of scientific experimentation confirmed the dangers to one's health from smoking, excessive drinking, or eating foods rich in animal fats. Nevertheless, it is

important to note that these "abuses" tend to affect different people differently. Much depends on their generic tendencies to cancer, diseases of the heart, stomach or other organs. The problem with Vynnyčenko's *Concordism* lies in part with the loose way that he formulates some of his theses. An example of such looseness is his attempt to explain most negative social behavior—burglaries, robberies, murders—by improper nutrition and an inhospitable environment.

Aside from Vynnyčenko's fervent and even bombastic style, in which they are expounded, his nutritional claims have been paralleled by recent developments in nutritional science. It is, for example, incontestable that many cooked foods lack some of the nutritional value of raw food.<sup>42</sup> It is equally true that a heavy diet, consisting of pork and beef, can be detrimental to one's health, particularly to the cardiovascular system. One could go on to cite further examples. In the end, let me say that nutritional science has, in my opinion, merely touched the tip of the iceberg. Approximately forty years after *Concordism* was written, the study of the connection between nutrition and human diseases is still in the infantile stages of development. Part of the problem lies in the very nature of the science of nutrition, which does not encourage precise experiments. Experiments must be conducted over long periods of time and by the method of double-blind studies. Even with such special care, it is difficult to control the various external, environmental effects on the given experiment. In the final analysis, the results are usually couched in statistical terms which are only more or less accurate.

## SOME REFLECTIONS ON VYNNYČENKO'S MORAL THEORY

A controversy has arisen over the issue of whether Vynnyčenko developed a new moral system or not. In a recent paper "Vynnyčenko's Moral Laboratory,"<sup>43</sup> Danylo Struk claims that neither in Vynnyčenko's formal writings, nor in his personal explanations and commentaries, are

<sup>42</sup> See the table on nutritional values of cooked and raw vegetables in *Nutritional Almanac* prepared by Nutritional Search, Inc., John D. Kirschmann, Director; McGraw Hill, 1975.

<sup>43</sup> The text of Professor Struk's paper is included in this volume. (Ed.)

there any grounds for claiming that Vynnyčenko himself propagated a new morality. My own reading of Vynnyčenko's philosophical and literary work leads me to conclude that Struk's above claim is erroneous. I want to argue that both in Vynnyčenko's philosophical work *Concordism*, and in such novels as *Nova zapovid'* (The New Commandment), he was consistently and deliberately developing a new moral system.

What are the criteria for my claim? It is almost universally acknowledged that a moral system is defined by a set of rules. John Rawls, a leading contemporary moral philosopher, has drawn in his article "Two Concepts of Rules"<sup>44</sup> an analogy between moral systems and games. He argues that just as the rules of a game define the game, so the rules of morality define the given system of morality. Change even a single rule in a game and you have created a new game. To tighten his definition, Rawls draws a distinction between two kinds of rules—regulative and constitutive. Constitutive rules are those that are definitive of a game; for example, the moves of chess pieces constitute the game of chess. Regulative rules are merely rules of thumb; they, therefore, are weaker. They pertain to game strategies rather than to the definition of the basic rules of the game, for instance, the decision when to castle in a chess game. According to Rawls, moral rules are constitutive or definitive of the given system of morality. This is a rather formal definition of a system of morality.

The Ten Commandments constitute the core of the Judeo-Christian system of morality. This system—because of its longstanding tradition and widespread acceptance, at least in the Western world—deserves to be called the standard system of morality. Any recently proposed system of morality which deviates from it can be said to constitute a new system. For example, if the socialists would codify their system, they would offer a new system of morality, at least in the sense that it would be in conflict with some of the Ten Commandments. One way to interpret Struk's claim that Vynnyčenko did not propagate a new morality is to say that even when we observe the obvious fact that socialist morality is anterior to Vynnyčenko's writings, and therefore technically older than

<sup>44</sup> John Rawls, "Two Concepts of Rules," Part I, *Philosophical Review*, LXIV (1955), pp. 3-13.

they are, Vynnyčenko still can be considered as proposing a new morality, even with respect to the socialist one. The issue is complicated further by the fact that Vynnyčenko, both in novels like *Nova zapovid*, and in philosophical treatises, claims time and again that neither the socialists, nor the communists have ever developed a system of morality. He states in *Concordism*:

Neither the socialists nor the communists . . . have ever had in the past or at present, their own [system of] morality. Both the socialists and the communists have produced certain theoretical works on ethical themes, but they have failed to create any specified and formulated system of moral rules.

.....

Nowhere can one find rules on how a socialist or communist individual is to behave toward nature, toward himself, toward the members of his collective. As far as the practice of socialists—and even more so of communists—is concerned, their morality has not departed from the morality practiced by members of traditional religions: absolutism, dogmatism, coercion [compulsion], penalties, hatred, etc.<sup>45</sup>

Having argued that the Judeo-Christian religious morality has drawbacks and, furthermore, that the socialist and communist morality has never been properly developed,<sup>46</sup> Vynnyčenko proceeds to establish a system of rules for his own Concordist morality. My above explanation of how moral rules ought to be understood will serve as a basis for the following brief summary of Vynnyčenko's system of morality. It should then be an easy matter to prove that Vynnyčenko did in fact develop a new morality.

Vynnyčenko's moral principles are not imperative—they do not have the force of obligations. His system allows “for the complete freedom

<sup>45</sup> *Concordism*, p. 52.

<sup>46</sup> This is true in spite of the fact that the socialists and communists do not lack works on ethics. The following books ought to be mentioned as at least dealing in some form or other with ethical issues: Leon Trotsky, *Their Morals and Ours* (New York, 1942). Karl Kautsky, *Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History* (Chicago, 1907). Richard Kramer, *Practical Morality Taught to Soviet Children as Illustrated in Four Official Soviet Periodicals, 1937-1951* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1954).

and independence of the individual.”<sup>47</sup> Concordist morality rejects “commandments-orders” and instead provides “rules of advice”; for example, “if you want to be healthy, strong and happy, you are advised to proceed thus and thus.” Vynnyčenko’s attitude to moral principles as rules of advice is by itself in sharp contrast to the imperatives of the Ten Commandments (i.e., Thou shalt not steal, etc.). Two questions should be answered before such an “advisory” system of morality is recommended. Can society be run on a system of principles which have the character of counsel, rather than the force of imperatives? Does Vynnyčenko’s proposal embody our intuitions about the essence of morality? These are difficult questions indeed. Although it is important to be aware of them, restrictions of space do not allow me to discuss them adequately in this article. Instead, I will proceed to list Vynnyčenko’s *Rules of Concordist Morality*.

First Rule: *“In all aspects of your life, constantly liberate yourself from the hypnosis of religion and be a simple part of nature.”*<sup>48</sup>

Second Rule: *“Be at peace [in agreement] with other beings on this earth that do not cause you harm. Try as hard as you can to engage in outdoor activities, striving to be in the closest contact possible with the sun, water and plant life.”*<sup>49</sup>

Third Rule: *“Do not eat anything that is not compatible with human nature. That is, do not eat anything that was not prepared in the kitchen of mother nature.”*<sup>50</sup>

Fourth Rule: *“Be integrated [form a unified whole]. Or, in other words, behave in such a manner that your action will be a manifestation of the agreement of the great majority of your main forces (instincts, sub-instincts, reason, feelings, unconscious drives, will).”*<sup>51</sup>

Fifth Rule: *“Be honest with yourself That is, bring to the surface of consciousness every unconscious thought, every hidden feeling; do not be lackadaisical or excessively egoistical or fearful to lose those habits and to take pleasure in acting in a sly manner with yourself Most*

<sup>47</sup> Concordism, p. 66.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., p. 74.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., p. 78.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., p. 86.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., p. 119.

*important, do not be afraid to be truthful and courageous toward yourself*"<sup>52</sup>

Sixth Rule: "*Bring your thought and action into agreement; namely, whatever you espouse on the level of words, carry out in practice. Whatever you preach to others, practice yourself.*"<sup>53</sup>

Seventh Rule: "*Be steadfast to the end.*"<sup>54</sup> Vynnychenko explains the Seventh Rule in another passage:

Inconstancy, vacillation, indecisiveness or opportunism are the most distinctive characteristics of *discordist* morality. Just as that morality does not demand agreement between thought and action, so also it does not require one to be steadfast to the end. When an honest *discordist* says "a," he does not feel it necessary to say "b," and thus follow his activity to the end. On the contrary, this wavering, evasive opportunism is put forth as a positive value in diplomacy and in *Realpolitik*.

For a person who wants to be honest with himself, being steadfast to the end is the best way to control himself and to justly test the practicability of the realization of a certain idea. By the application of this rule of action, one can expose all the secret and hidden absurdities and contradictions of the rules of *discordist* morality.

Eighth Rule: "*Do not force yourself to love your neighbor without a personal evaluation, and do not expect his love in return without being valuable to him.*"<sup>55</sup> Explaining the Eighth Rule, Vynnychenko writes: "Love is a valuation. To love that which one does not know and which one does not value is an absurdity. But more important, one cannot love that which is detrimental to one, which is ugly. This law pertains to all living beings."

Ninth Rule: "*Remember at all times that everyone, including you, is inflicted with the horrible disease of discordism. Fight it, not with dogmatism or hatred or punishment, but with understanding, pity and aid.*"<sup>56</sup>

Tenth Rule: "*Live only from the fruits of your own labor.*"<sup>57</sup> Vynnychenko goes on:

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., pp. 125-6.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., p. 127.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., p. 126.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., p. 144.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., p. 146.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., pp. 146-7.

That is, if you want to have as much advantage as you can from the agreement of forces within and outside of you on the one hand, and on the other, from the sources that we derive from our neighbors, then in no way take away from your neighbors the basis of their livelihood. Sustain yourself in this world only by the fruits of your own efforts, by your own labor. First and foremost, this is a law of nature. Every living creature, in one way or another, does its best to create for itself the means of its own existence, or in other words, it exerts itself in labor. Whenever it does not do this, then sooner or later it will become abnormal, unhealthy and crippled!

Eleventh Rule: "*Make love with whomever it is pleasant to do so, but create a family only with that person whom you want with all your soul and body to have as the mother or father of your children.*"<sup>58</sup>

Twelfth Rule: "*Do not dominate and do not succumb to dominance.*"<sup>59</sup>

Thirteenth Rule: "*Do not be above the collective or beneath it, or outside of it—be an active, committed part of it. Then even suffering for it will bring a higher joy.*"<sup>60</sup>

Let me now attempt a comparison between the Concordist and the Judeo-Christian moralities. Even such a detail as the title of Vynnyčenko's novel *Nova zapovid'*—The New *Commandment*—suggests a justification for it. There is no doubt that the two systems dramatically differ from each other. The differences can be divided into: (a) those rules that are opposite or contradictory—in Vynnyčenko's case, Rules One, Four, Eight, Eleven and Twelve; (b) those rules of Vynnyčenko that are missing in the Judeo-Christian system—Rules Two, Three, Ten and Thirteen; (c) those rules that are the same in both systems—the Sixth Rule; (d) rules that are ambiguous as to the Judeo-Christian system—Rules Five and Seven.

The First Rule of Vynnyčenko's system which recommends to "liberate yourself from the hypnosis of religion" is derivable from his philosophy of naturalism. According to this view, man is a part of nature and not, as the Judeo-Christian religion puts him, above nature (see also Rule Three). The believer, however, puts himself above nature in the

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., p. 181.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., p. 203.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., p. 203.

conviction that he has a supernatural or immaterial soul. This difference is profound, flowing as it does from opposite views on the nature of man and the world. It is worthwhile to point out that Vynnyčenko is not unambiguous concerning religion. He echoes not only Marx but also Freud in the reason he gives for our freeing ourselves from the hypnosis of religion: religions are dogmatic and oppressive. In another instance, however, he argues that Concordism must create a new religion, or at least utilize the techniques of a religion for the blatantly anti-religious purpose of "dehypnotization," which would ensue in liberation and ultimately happiness. "Concordism," says Vynnyčenko, "has to establish its own rites, rituals, ceremonies, symbols—in a word, all the techniques of influencing the imagination, emotions and will of its followers. The following holidays should be incorporated into the arsenal in the battle with the all-human discordism: 'holiday' of dehypnotization, 'holiday' of agreement with nature, 'holiday' of agreement with oneself and with one's neighbors, 'holiday' for one or another form of liberation from discordism."<sup>61</sup> Vynnyčenko, by utilizing the technique of the old religions, ends up with a new religion. One cannot help concluding that he in principle is not against mind control, except that he would probably call it consciousness-raising, or more mundanely, a change of belief. Looking at it objectively, one cannot imagine it as being otherwise: if Concordism is to catch on as a new morality, a new system of world government—in a word, a new *Weltanschauung*—the public needs to be converted to it.

I have listed the Fourth Rule as a principle opposed to Christian doctrine with reluctance. There are, after all, conflicting traditions on that issue within Catholicism itself. We see a strong tradition which treats the subjugation of man's sexual drives, of his will and of his feelings to God's moral law as the Christian ideal. Vynnyčenko's Fourth Rule has as an ideal, on the contrary, the agreement and balance of all the components of personality listed above. That principle allows them free rein, but at the same time it aims at striking a balance, or agreement, between them. Vynnyčenko's view in that Rule is actually close to the other tradition within Catholicism, founded by St. Thomas Aquinas.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., p. 264.



nas, who was for a long time the "official" philosopher of Catholicism. According to St. Thomas, whatever is in agreement with the laws of nature is good, and whatever interferes with the laws of nature is evil.<sup>62</sup> Modern popes have on occasion abused the concept of natural law. Some have claimed that contraceptive devices are against natural law because they interfere with the natural function of intercourse which is the begetting of children. The only drawback in this argument is that according to St. Thomas reason decides what is natural law: who is to say that popes are the official interpreters of what is and what is not in accordance with reason? Would not a council of advisers from all walks of life, including philosophers, scientists, and of course theologians, be better judges of what is reasonable? Be that as it may, Vynnyčenko's philosophy echoes Thomistic philosophy when he states that the goal of man ought to be to strike a balance between himself and the forces of nature, between the forces within man and outside of man.

There is little doubt that the Christian rule, "Love your neighbor as you love yourself," applies equally to all mankind. A true Christian must love everybody. Vynnyčenko, as we have seen, does not believe that one can love a person who for one reason or another stands in opposition to one's convictions, be they moral or otherwise. He, therefore, restricts the applicability of the rule of love to those people who would be valuable to the person concerned. Few would deny that the Christian rule of "loving thy neighbor" is probably the most abused rule of Christian morality. Still, this need not provide grounds for its rejection as an ideal. After all, when we speak of morals, we are in the realm of the *ought*, rather than that of the *is*.

Probably the most controversial rule of Vynnyčenko's moral system among Christians would be Rule Eleven, which permits pre-marital sex. The rule is consistent with the general goal of agreement and balance between one's drives, intellect, and will, rather than with the suppression of one's drives in the name of a supernatural law as revealed in the Bible. If the various statistical studies of the sexual practices of men and

<sup>62</sup> For example, St. Thomas says: "The light of natural reason, whereby we discern what is good and what is evil which is the function of natural law, is nothing else than an imprint on us of the divine light." *The Summa Theologica*, Q91, A8.

women are reliable, then the majority of Western society has been for a long time practicing the Eleventh Rule of the Concordist morality without knowing it. That rule, together with Rule Eight—both paralleling as they do actual practices among the majority of mankind—will encounter the least opposition from the general public outside the groups strongly committed to Christian morality.

I have listed the Twelfth Rule as being opposed to Catholic-Christian morality because of such Christian practices as the bride pledging obedience to her husband at the altar, the Catholic pledging obedience to the rulings of the popes in matters of faith and morals, the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope and many others. The Twelfth Rule puts Vynnyčenko in opposition to any system of hierarchy, of dominance, and in favor of a system of *communitas*,<sup>63</sup> where all are equal—without lords and serfs, rich and poor, etc. There is tension, if not outright inconsistency, between that Rule and Vynnyčenko's program of a world economic federation, or a world government, using the United Nations as a framework for such a government. Vynnyčenko states:

It is understandable that with the world Economic Federation there would appear an imperative necessity to change the *political* regime of the Soviet Union. Nations of the world could not realize the ideas of disarmament without having an absolute guarantee that some nation would not take advantage of the situation of total disarmament to attack the other nations with the goal of subjugating them to its social and political system. There would have to be a serious and intensive international control over every nation. The government of every country would have to be responsible not only to the nations of the world, but also to their own constituency (nation). Such a responsibility can be carried out only under the greatest freedom of criticism of government, freedom of speech, elections, organizations, or in a word, under the greatest democracy of the federated nations.<sup>64</sup>

I have raised these aspects of Vynnyčenko's concept of a system of world government only to point out that he too envisions some form of

<sup>63</sup> For a definition of *communitas*, as the term is used here, see Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process* (Chicago, 1969), p. 96 and *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors* (Ithaca, 1974), pp. 237-238, as cited in George G. Grabowicz, *The Poet as Mythmaker: A Study of Symbolic Meaning in Taras Ševčenko* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), pp. 78-79.

<sup>64</sup> *Concordism*, pp. 239-240.

dominance, even if it is intended to make certain that finally no one dominates.

Obviously, much more needs to be said about the differences and similarities between Concordist and Christian moralities, but space does not permit me to continue this discussion. There remains the question of comparison between the Concordist and the socialist system of morality. Here, however, we encounter serious methodological problems.

Neither Marx nor Engels wrote a treatise on communist or socialist morality. Only recently Soviet scholars have attempted to discuss the subject.<sup>65</sup> As late as the 1940s, however, Vynnyčenko was still justified in having one of his characters in the novel *Leprozorij* challenge anybody to produce a treatise on morality in communism or socialism. He repeated that challenge somewhat later in *Concordism*. That lack is paradoxical because, as Nikolai Berdyaev pointed out in the 1920s, Marx's critique of capitalism arose from a deep sense of moral indignation at the exploitation of man by man.<sup>66</sup> There are many other philosophers who claim with Berdyaev that the ultimate source of the communist critique of society is not economic but moral. Unfortunately—and here, I think, Vynnyčenko is right—the emphasis has been put on the thesis that economic forces are the determinants of the superstructure; because morality is part of the superstructure, morality is ultimately a function of economic forces. It is plain that in classical Marxism morality has been replaced by the theory of economic materialism. If there is any morality in Marx, it is only the morality of one class or another, usually expressed in the rationalizations of the class doing the exploiting. As Marx and Engels write in the *Communist Manifesto*, "Law, morality, religion, are to him [the proletarian] so many bourgeois prej-

<sup>65</sup> Philip J. Kain in a recent article provides an explanation of why Marx never developed a system of moral values: "There is no rule for moral values established independently of material conditions and we cannot derive moral values from facts. Morality will be replaced by empirical science [and] technical control. Marx does not try to create a scientific morality . . . Morality for Marx means what it traditionally means, and Marx rejects it as impossible." "Marx and the Abolition of Morality," *Journal of Value Inquiry*, 18:283-297. See also Note 46.

<sup>66</sup> Nicholai Berdyaev, *The Origins of Russian Communism*, translated by R.M. French (London, 1948).

udices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests.”<sup>67</sup> Engels generalizes this position to all classes when he says, “In reality every class, even every profession, has its own morality and even this it violates whenever it can do so with impunity.”<sup>68</sup>

The second problem that complicates our attempts to compare the moral system in *Concordism* to socialist or communist morality has to do with the communists’ contradiction between theory and practice (praxis). The revolutionary and post-revolutionary behavior of communists in the Soviet Union has been anything but moral. Because of the atrocities committed against mankind by the Soviet regime in the name of Marxism, many intellectuals who initially supported the revolution, later became its severest critics. The open avowal of the communists’ maxim that the end justifies the means, ultimately leads to a total suspension of human rights and of moral principles, of even the most basic types such as the right to life.

It is obvious that Vynnyčenko’s Concordist morality differs from the communist position that in the struggle for a classless society the end justifies the means. As early as 1917 and 1918, when Vynnyčenko became head of the Ukrainian government, he voiced his sharp criticism of Lenin’s ruthless tactics, which he considered to be perversions of true Marxism. After a period of attempts to come to terms with the Soviet system in the 1920s, Vynnyčenko again became one of its severest critics in the 1930s. Hence, in *Concordism*, and even more poignantly and forcefully in such novels as *Leprozorij*, *Nova Zapovid’* and *Slovo za toboju*, *Staline*, Vynnyčenko condemned the system of morality which permitted the extermination of millions of people in the Soviet Union, and the subjugation of hundreds of millions. He was particularly critical of the system of dual morality practiced by the Soviets—one system for “pre-revolutionary” societies and quite another for “revolutionary” ones.

Vynnyčenko’s system of morality differs from the classical Marxist system, and more fundamentally from the corrupted Marxist-Leninist

<sup>67</sup> “Manifesto of the Communist Party, 1848” in Thomas P. Whitney, comp. *The Communist Blueprint for the Future: Complete Texts of All Four Communist Manifestoes 1848-1961* (New York, 1962), p. 21.

<sup>68</sup> Friedrich Engels, *Selected Works* (London, 1942), Vol. I, p. 450.

system, as practiced in the Soviet Union, first and foremost in the sphere of praxis. The Twelfth Rule which states "Do not dominate and do not succumb to dominance" is plainly at odds with the Soviet system which is highly repressive, domineering and hierarchical. The Thirteenth Rule which states "Be neither above the collective, nor beneath it, nor outside of it" is also violated, primarily by the Soviets, because the members of the Communist Party which is, according to Lenin, the avant-garde of the proletariat, form a new privileged class.<sup>69</sup> This model was recently challenged by the Polish *Solidarność* which demanded a national referendum on self-management by workers of factories,<sup>70</sup> free elections, freedom of the press and free access to the communications media. All of these continue to be controlled by the leaders of the Communist Party of Poland.

An even more dramatic departure from both the classical Marxist morality and the Soviet practice can be found in the Third Rule of Concordist morality. Marx, Engels, Lenin or Stalin did not envision so drastic a change in diet as was proposed by Vynnyčenko. It did not occur to them that diet was so significant a factor in shaping character and ultimately societies.<sup>71</sup> Vynnyčenko goes so far as to blame diet for the failure of previous attempts at setting up a communal way of life in England, France and the Soviet Union. He writes:

Their attempts failed. They failed because they did not know the real and certain cause of evil. In the first place, they did not know that social injustice was not only a manifestation of ill will, bad morality of the people, but also of disease with which they, irrespective of their honest and beautiful desire and good will, were nevertheless thoroughly penetrated. Since they did not know this, they did not know the fundamental basis of evil with which they wanted to wage combat . . . they had a sick . . . method

<sup>69</sup> Milovan Djilas, *The New Class: An Analysis of the Communist System* (New York, 1957).

<sup>70</sup> See *New York Times*, Sept. 26, 1981.

<sup>71</sup> There have been other socialists and Marxists who considered diet as important in shaping character. Moleshott wrote a book on nutrition in the nineteenth century; also Daniel DeLeon in his *Socialist Reconstruction of Society* discusses the way workers eat food which lacks adequate nutrition and as a result die prematurely of various diseases. Vynnyčenko had in his library a Ukrainian translation of that book which he heavily annotated: *Socijalistyčna perebudova suspil'stva*. 1927, published by the Ukrainian Organizational Committee of the Socialist Labor Party in America.

of thinking, feeling and acting. In the first place, they all had all of the habits and inclinations of daily life which they received from their parents, the old nutritional methods which supported and developed the inherited disease. Therefore, when they joined the collective and destroyed private ownership, they destroyed just a fraction of the evil. The rest remained unnoticed within them and continued its work. They remained physically and psychologically the same discordists as the ones they tried to teach and cure.<sup>72</sup>

The Fourth Rule of Concordist morality that advises us to “be integrated” opposes communist morality, at least in its transitional stage of struggle for a classless society. In that struggle, every communist is to subjugate his drives, feelings, will and reason to a single goal—the total victory of communism in all countries of the world. The Sixth and Seventh Rules of Concordist morality conflict with the pragmatic, *Realpolitik* attitude of the communists, not only in the Soviet Union itself but also in France and Italy, certain countries in Latin America, and other areas of the world.

In order to show that the Concordist morality differs also from the recently formulated principles of Soviet morality, I list below the principles of the moral code of the builder of communism promulgated by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1961. It reads:

The Party holds that the moral code of the builder of communism should comprise the following principles:

Devotion to the Communist cause; love of the Socialist motherland and of the other Socialist countries;

Conscientious labor for the good of society—he who does not work, neither shall he eat;

Concern on the part of everyone for the preservation and growth of public wealth;

A high sense of public duty; intolerance of actions harmful to the public interest;

Collectivism and comradely mutual assistance; one for all and all for one;

Humane relations and mutual respect between individuals; man is to man a friend, comrade, and brother;

Honesty and truthfulness, moral purity, modesty, and guilelessness in social and private life;

<sup>72</sup> *Concordism*, p. 261.

Mutual respect in the family, and concern for the upbringing of children;

An uncompromising attitude to injustice, parasitism, dishonesty, and careerism;

Friendship and brotherhood among all peoples of the USSR; intolerance of national and racial hatred;

An uncompromising attitude to the enemies of Communism, peace, and the freedom of nations;

Fraternal solidarity with the working people of all countries, and with all peoples.<sup>73</sup>

In all fairness, a case could probably be made that Concordist morality is at least one possible development of the basic assumptions of the socialist and Marxist systems.

## CONCLUSION

*Concordism* is a philosophical treatise in which Vynnyčenko provides a theoretical, all-encompassing definition of happiness. He examines the various aspects of the problem and proposes a system of personal, social and global structures which are essential for the realization of his conception of happiness.

Vynnyčenko's *Concordism* is comparable in scope and intent to Plato's *Republic*, in which Plato tried to provide a theoretical definition of justice by describing the kinds of social and political structures that were necessary for the realization of justice in this world. To call both systems utopian is not, in my opinion, a criticism but a descriptive term, meant to imply that both authors explore systems that are ideals, providing viable alternatives. Whereas Plato's *Republic* has become a paradigm of a structured society divided into three classes, Vynnyčenko's *Concordism*, when it is published, will become a paradigm of an egalitarian, democratic, classless world society. The best minds, whether among professional intellectuals, or among practicing politicians (as, for example, representatives to the United Nations), have indeed been advancing many of the causes that Vynnyčenko proposed in *Concor-*

<sup>73</sup> "The 1961 Draft Program," in *The Communist Blueprint for the Future*, p. 209. See also: Richard T. De George, *Soviet Ethics and Morality* (Ann Arbor, 1969), p. 83.

*dism.* Among such causes are: freedom of religion, speech, elections and organizations, the elimination of empires, total bilateral disarmament, and the creation of a world economic federation. The United Nations is already on record as supporting all of the above goals. The problem that remains is one of implementation.

The egalitarian positions found in *Concordism* are not new in Vynnyčenko. He held such social, economic, and perhaps even political positions almost from the beginning of his creative career. For example, he describes his position in 1938: "That position to which I belong from the very first steps of my social consciousness . . . is the position of total liberation. (social, national, political, moral, cultural, and so on)"<sup>74</sup>

Vynnyčenko's intellectual biography has yet to be written. The recent publication of the first two volumes of his diaries will provide the basis for such a project. His place in the history of Western thought (particularly regarding his ideas on the self-management of workers, his ideas on moral and political philosophy, his role in the history of socialist thought) has yet to be established. I hope that this article will be the first step in the proper evaluation of Vynnyčenko's philosophical legacy.

<sup>74</sup> Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, *Pered novym etapom: Naši pozyciji* (Toronto, 1938), p. 9.



# Predictions and Prognoses in Vynnyčenko's *Sonjašna Mašyna*

WALTER SMYRNIW

In imaginative literature special honors are bestowed on writers who attempt to foretell the future development and achievements of mankind. Works built around such predictions are very popular: they are published in numerous editions and translated into many languages. Francis Godwin's *The Man in the Moone*, for example—a narrative of an imagined journey to moon—was translated into four languages and printed in twenty-five editions during the first thirty years after its appearance.<sup>1</sup> Those who are not impressed by such information should bear in mind that this work was written by a bishop and first published in 1638. In the beginning of the seventeenth century, Francis Godwin envisioned not only the construction of a vehicle for a journey to the moon, but also had this to say about subsequent technological developments:

You shall then see men flie from place to place in the ayre; you shall be able, (without moving or travailing of any creature), to send messages in an instant many Miles off, and receive answer againe immediately; you shall bee able to declare your minde presently unto your friend, being in some private and remote place of a populous Citie, with a number of such like things: but that which far surpasseth all the rest, you shall have notice of a new World, of many most rare and incredible secrets of Nature, that all the Philosophers of former ages could never so much as dream off.<sup>2</sup>

Only in recent times has it become possible to ascertain how accurately Godwin predicted the development of air transport, the invention of the

<sup>1</sup> Julij Kagarlickij, "Kak popast' na Lunu"? *Fantastika 1968* (Moscow, 1969), p. 253.

<sup>2</sup> Francis Godwin, *The Man in the Moon: or a Discourse of a Voyage thither by Domingo Gonsales* (London, 1638; republished in facsimile by Da Capo Press Inc., Amsterdam, 1972), pp. 10-11; the archaic and inconsistent English spelling is cited as in the original.

telephone, radio and television, as well as other vast advances in science and technology.

The prevalence and the universal appeal of such writings has not diminished in our times. This is amply confirmed by Arthur Clarke's novel *Childhood's End*. Initially published in 1953, the work went through its thirty-fifth printing by 1976, and now "almost twenty million copies of his books have been printed in over thirty languages."<sup>3</sup> Such data show that modern readers are still very fond of "prophetic" writings. Not every such work, however, enjoys global popularity. In spite of their ability to predict the future, some works from our century have been confined to obscurity. A case in point is a novel by Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, *Sonjašna mašyna* (Solar Machine).

Written between 1922 and 1924, when its author, Volodymyr Vynnyčenko was already an émigré in the West, *Sonjašna mašyna* was published in Soviet Ukraine in 1928. The work proved to be very popular and by 1930 had gone through three editions. But since then, the novel has been almost unavailable not only in Ukraine, but also in the West. In 1962 an attempt was made to reprint it in the United States, but regrettably only the first part managed to appear. Were all three parts of *Sonjašna mašyna* more accessible, contemporary readers would be able to enjoy the heterogeneous nature of the work. It can be appreciated as an adventure tale, a detective novel, a psychological and a philosophical novel, a social and political satire, and certainly as a prophecy.

Contemporary readers would realize that in *Sonjašna mašyna* Vynnyčenko quite accurately foretold some recent economic, political, social, scientific and technical developments. For example, in the description of the industrial empire of Friedrich (Fridrix) Mertens (one of the main characters), the reader can easily recognize an outline of the structure and functions of present-day multinational corporations. Vynnyčenko's prediction of the rise of various economic "kingdoms" and "empires" has certainly come true in many respects. In the same vein, the writer foretold how the heads of companies and corporations exert a

<sup>3</sup> Arthur C. Clarke, *Childhood's End* (New York, 1976), pp. 4, 219.

substantial influence on, or are in complete control over, national and international political and economic developments. Vynnyčenko illustrates this by noting that because Friedrich Mertens was the President of the United Bank, it was taken for granted that "at a moment's notice, by way of their Parliament, the German people would be prepared to follow Mr. President even to the very brink."<sup>4</sup> A similar tendency prevails in international affairs. The novelist conveys this by describing how, during a "World Congress" attended by delegates from many countries, also gathered:

a number of friends and mutual acquaintances from various Western countries and [were] taking a holiday at the green shores of the Breton sea. A private gathering . . . a party of about thirty people in all. . . . They have absolutely nothing to do with the Congress. They are neither delegates from parliaments, neither ministers, chairmen of committees, nor presidents of states. . . . And perhaps only once in a while they'll talk of this and that and among other things about the Congress. . . . But lo and behold, what a strange thing: everything that is being said by these private friends, by these nobodies, all of it is strangely enough repeated word for word in all of the speeches at the Congress.<sup>5</sup>

One inevitably recognizes in such passages analogies to present-day political life in the West, Parliaments, political parties, and free elections seem to prevail and function unencumbered in Europe and in North America. As Vynnyčenko predicted, however, the major political decisions and the economic policies are determined more frequently by the corporate giants than by the electors or their representatives.

No less striking is Vynnyčenko's depiction of a radical political group called INARAC — an acronym for "International Avant-garde of Revolutionary Actions."<sup>6</sup> Denounced by all official socialist parties, INARAC is an illegal political organization dedicated to relentless struggle against the political and economic establishment. Branches of INARAC are coordinated by intellectuals, but the organization draws its members from all walks of life. The members of INARAC exemplify

<sup>4</sup> V. Vynnyčenko, *Sonjašna mašina* (Kharkiv, 1928), vol. I, p. 175. Translations of quotations are mine.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 180.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 55.

a fanatical devotion to their cause. The main weapon of INARAC is unlimited terrorism; consequently, its members "assassinate successful capitalist leaders and members of the government, they rob banks and call such acts expropriations, and they blow up buildings. INARAC is an inevitable phenomenon, a logical consequence of the socio-political regime which has been established by the present heads of state; this is a natural reaction against the social terror of the kings of the stock exchange. Branches of INARAC exist throughout the world,"<sup>7</sup> In his invention of INARAC, Vynnychenko predicted the emergence of the ideology and urban guerilla warfare tactics, exemplified by such recent terrorist organizations as Brigade Rosse, the Bader-Mainhof gang, the Middle Eastern terrorists and a host of other groups.

The most recent developments in science, moreover, have provided some credibility to the solar machine, which is the center of Vynnychenko's novel. Until recently, the very concept of a solar machine seemed quite impossible. What is more, Vynnychenko's description of the machine did not at all enhance its credibility. The solar machine resembles an old-fashioned camera attached to a hand-operated coffee grinder. A unique part of the machine is a special lens made from heliolite (sun-stone). This red lens can harness and modify the rays of the sun so that they can be used for the production of synthetic food, which is called "sunbread". Until recently, it did not seem possible to modify and to redirect the rays of light. But in 1960 Theodore H. Maiman gave the first practical demonstration of light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation: he made a working model of a laser by using a red lens, a ruby lens to be exact. The full potential of lasers is, of course, not known at present, but it is not out of the question that in the future they may yet be used for the synthetic production of food. Be that as it may, the recent development of laser technology has certainly enhanced Vynnychenko's solar machine with unprecedented verisimilitude.

Vynnychenko also mentions other uses of solar energy. He points out that the heliolite collector of solar energy "could be utilized not only for the solar machine, but for other machines as well. In general, instead of

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 56.

relying on various gases and so forth, solar energy could be put to work. Just imagine . . . that you would be able to install a heliolite lens into your automobile, or into your air-car and the energy in the sun would take you wherever you wanted to go.”<sup>8</sup> Although Vynnyčenko alludes to such uses of solar energy, he does not elaborate on the necessary technology for such operations. He provides instead detailed accounts of the economic, political and social consequences of the extensive use of solar energy. These speculations are perhaps of greatest interest to contemporary readers, inasmuch as they imply the grave problems confronting mankind in the near future, namely, extensive energy and food shortages.

In his *Sonjašna mašina*, Vynnyčenko quite perceptively conjectures on the possible responses of the heads of industry to an invention which would be inexpensive and yet useful to everyone. As soon as Dr. Rudolf Stor (Štor), a brilliant German chemist, had constructed his solar machine, the establishment made every effort to denounce the machine and to discredit the inventor: it proclaimed that the solar machine was a hoax and interred the inventor in an asylum. Rudolf Stor had no other recourse but to pass the plans for his solar machine to INARAC.

This episode may remind contemporary readers of the various inventions that were never produced for consumers, although they had been announced in the press. Lately, several case histories pertaining to the suppression of inventions have come to light. In a recent article, Eliot Janeway outlines a case reminiscent of the episode in Vynnyčenko's novel. Janeway describes how an American chemist, William Jay Hale, in the 1930s discovered an efficient means of producing cheaper gasoline by mixing it with methane alcohol. But “the gasohol initiative was suppressed by a corporate alliance between Du Pont and Standard Oil of New Jersey (now Exxon). Du Pont not only dominated the chemical industry; it controlled General Motors. The three of them together . . . committed the country to lead and against alcohol.”<sup>9</sup> As Janeway points out, moreover, much of the ethyl alcohol can be derived from the distillation of gasoline from crude oil. But instead of producing gasohol dur-

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., vol. III, pp. 159-60.

<sup>9</sup> Eliot Janeway, “Gasohol: Solution to the Gas Shortage,” *The Atlantic*, November 1979, pp. 62, 64.

ing the recent energy shortage, the oil industry is still burning off 'ten billion pounds of ethylene a year into the smog above its fractioning towers.'"<sup>10</sup>

In view of recent revelations of such corporate suppressions, it is obvious that Vynnyčenko foresaw that inventions would not be promoted, unless they could yield corporate profits and ensure corporate dominance. He vividly illustrates how corporate heads compelled the government to spare no efforts in suppressing Stor's invention which, as we mentioned above, entailed the use of freely available solar energy for the production of "solar bread" from any organic substance, mostly grass. This "bread" presented an enormous economic threat to the corporate establishment, because it contained all the necessary nutrients to sustain life, and hence made all other foods a matter of luxurious self-indulgence.

Rudolf Stor was correct in foreseeing that his solar machine, which was inexpensive to build and simple to operate, would bring obvious benefits to all people, rather than benefit only the privileged few. Indeed, the solar machine freed all men from the drudgery of daily labor, for it was no longer necessary to earn one's daily bread. Vynnyčenko shows, however, that the inventor did not anticipate any of the side effects of the new technology. The solar machine soon gave rise to universal and total unemployment. Everyone began to enjoy unlimited leisure; this led to a collapse of the workforce, and consequently, to the deterioration of all social institutions. For the first time in history, men and women became free, neither controlled nor restrained in any way by social or economic forces. Yet on attaining such absolute freedom, mankind used it to no other end than to wallow in abject laziness. A world emerged in which "Oblomov's dream" became an actuality.

Vynnyčenko goes to great lengths to convey the atmosphere of sloth, lethargy and repulsive torpidity that prevail in this "new world." Here he seems to have foreseen the way of thinking and the mode of life among the chronically unemployed and among the long-term recipients of welfare. The author also emphasizes that scientists and inventors are unable to foresee many of the consequences of their discoveries. Rudolf

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

Stor certainly could not anticipate, let alone resolve, the social disasters resulting from his invention.

As we see, in *Sonjašna mašina* Vynnyčenko outlined most accurately a number of problems that we are beginning to realize only sixty years later. One of them is our extensive reliance on science and technology in many of our activities. Neither we nor the specialists in various branches of science, however, have the means of predicting the long-range effects of our dependence on scientific know-how and devices. What is worse, nobody seems able to foresee the possible disasters from a single human error or mechanical malfunction. There are many shocking examples of this. Among them is the potential poisoning of almost the whole population of the state of Michigan. It resulted from a simple mistake in the shipment of forty bags of chemicals in 1973. Because of this error, a highly toxic and carcinogenic chemical PBB (polybrominated biphenyl) entered the food chain and now "up to 90 percent of Michigan's nine million people have PBB in their body fat."<sup>11</sup> The chemical gives rise to cancer in rats and retards the growth of monkeys—what it will eventually do to humans is anyone's guess. Readers will find in Vynnyčenko's novel a parallel to the Michigan disaster: the author describes how several million people were poisoned by the substitution of a single chemical for another in the production of lenses for the solar machine.

Vynnyčenko's insight into the relationship between scientific progress and religious belief is equally astute. The first part of the novel contains examples of skeptical and even cynical attitudes toward God and the doctrines of the Christian church. A character, Truda, tells her pastor that, although "she believes in God, and loves Him and wants to please Him with all her heart,"<sup>12</sup> she has doubts about religious matters. She cannot understand why in the Bible "the Almighty God is always so terribly angry at everybody. . . . And why it is that for mere trifles He imposes awfully harsh punishments. . . . And besides one gets a very

<sup>11</sup> Ted J. Rakstis, "The Poisoning of Michigan," *Reader's Digest*, October 1979, p. 200. This article was written before the Chernobyl disaster which would have provided the author with a dramatic illustration of his argument. (Ed.)

<sup>12</sup> V. Vynnyčenko, *Sonjašna mašina*, vol. I, p. 51.

unpleasant impression from the fact that God is terribly fond of various worldly signs of authority, as though He were some kind of general.”<sup>13</sup> Truda is also of the opinion that the Bible contains “on the whole, many incomprehensible notions.” But she is distraught and puzzled most of all by the questions pertaining to the existence of evil. Truda questions “why God has to put up with various forms of evil in this world? After all, He is Omnipotent, and, therefore, He can do anything. What does He need evil for? . . . He cannot eliminate it? Then it follows that He is not Omnipotent. He does not want to? Then He is not All-Merciful.”<sup>14</sup>

Vynnyčenko shows that although Truda’s questions are imbued with skepticism and even echo Schopenhauer’s pessimistic philosophy, they are nevertheless the doubts of a believer. Max Stor (Maks Štor)—Rudolf’s brother, a zealous member of INARAC—expresses radically different views on religion. He is so well acquainted with the substance of Christian morality and beliefs that he freely quotes from the New Testament: “Love your enemies, bless those who hate you, obey those who are plundering you, turn to them your left cheek when they hit you on the right one, love your neighbors as you love yourself, avoid anger, malice, hatred, for they are indeed great sins.”<sup>15</sup> He recites such quotations only to call them “foolish and false nonsense.” Max’s sarcastic and even cynical attitude toward the Christian faith stems from the murderous ideology of INARAC: the basic moving force of life is a “ruthless, malicious and blunt egoism.”<sup>16</sup>

Vynnyčenko goes on to speculate that, in addition to the skepticism among believers and the cynicism of the terrorists, there exists also a somewhat peculiar “religion of people who have lost the ability to adhere to all religions.” Such people have not turned into cynics on losing their belief in God; instead, they have created for themselves a secular cult, a so-called cult of beauty. They frequent a “Temple of Beauty,” where Max’s sweetheart, Suzanna, presides as the main priestess. Both Suzanna and the members of this cult believe that “the wor-

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 48.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 115.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 116.



ship of beauty, the love of beauty . . . is, after all, the noblest purpose of life."<sup>17</sup>

The invention and the mass production of solar machines led to several changes in the sphere of religious beliefs. Max Stor, for example, was fully convinced that solar machines would bring about the "death of all gods and demons." As the novel progresses, however, it becomes obvious that his was hardly an accurate foresight. Because of the consequences of the solar machines, to be sure, the former religious doctrines did lose their authority and influence. But they were soon replaced by other forms of worship. Shortly after "solar bread" became available, various discussions began among the people as to the nature and the new purpose of human existence. For instance, a man named Spindler (Špindler) proudly declared: "My hypothesis is short and simple: our present state is the state . . . *of gods*. Yes, we have become gods, my dear fellow beings." Although Spindler attempts to substantiate this notion with various examples, not all of his colleagues are prepared to share his beliefs; a character named Han states that from an indulgence in "solar food" the people have become 'pigs' rather than "gods."<sup>18</sup>

The reader soon realizes that Han's assertion amounts to an accurate prognosis of subsequent life. In a state of total idleness, the people, who only a short time ago proudly declared themselves gods, begin to resemble not only wallowing swine, but also filthy rats who would spend the winter in hiding and emerge from their burrows only in order to get some "solar bread." Obviously, all former conjectures about the godhood of human beings as a result of "solar bread" now became ridiculous.

On realizing that man "cannot live by bread alone," not even by "solar bread," the people in Europe and North America gradually abandoned their vegetative existence and returned to work. But with the re-establishment of normal ways, the former notions about the new beings, the so-called "mangods," began to be heard again. At this point the narrator of the novel becomes openly ironic on the subject of these

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., pp. 114, 117.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., vol. III, pp. 31, 34 (Vynnyčenko's italics).

"mangods."<sup>19</sup> The irony is most effective and conspicuous in Vynnyčenko's descriptions of the "Freedom Day" festivities. The "mangods" spared no efforts in preparing for this celebration. They even created "a real hill which did not exist previously at this place. . . . And on top of the hill . . . What's on that hill? A gigantic golden coffer? An ark? An altar? Its edges glitter, beaming with blinding flashes of yellow and golden rays. There's chimney on top, just like on a solar machine. My God! This really is a gigantic solar machine."<sup>20</sup>

It is not difficult to discern Vynnyčenko's irony in the fact that the very characters who so recently had proclaimed the hour of "death of all gods and demons" and had boasted of having become godlike beings themselves, finally achieved nothing more than the creation of a mechanical idol which they began to worship devoutly. The mocking irony increases in Vynnyčenko's descriptions of the ceremonies during the "Day of Freedom":

At the very base of the golden idol gathered all the priests and pontiffs. As it had been thousands of years ago—in all epochs of human existence, during periods of brutal slavery and ignorance—so it was now: the priests refrained from mingling with the crowd and relied on the same old sorcery, the same old smoke screen to conceal the marvelous objects from the meek souls in the crowd. By using these same silly comedies, the freedom-loving, independent priests still procured for themselves the foremost places and maintained control over the dumb flock of sheep.<sup>21</sup>

From this description it is obvious that the seemingly new celebration consists mainly of adaptations of the former religious rites and beliefs which had been altered very little, just enough to make them compatible with the new cult based on technological developments.

No less ironical is the metaphor of the "metallic shouts of the trumpets" which proclaim the "Day of Freedom," or the "thunderous voice" which roars: "Brethren! Unfettered, free and resurrected brethren! We are entering the promised land about which our forefathers had dreamt for thousands of years. . . ." Irony can be further discerned in the

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., vol. II, p. 172. Vynnyčenko uses the term *boholyjdy*. Here the oblique and ironical allusion to Dostoevsky cannot be missed.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., vol. III, pp. 176-77.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 178.

description of the "Crucifixion of Inequality" and the offerings made during the "Festival of the Solar Machine."<sup>22</sup> The participants of the festivities, who continually cheer "Hail! Hail to the Solar Machine!", regard all events as "most grandiose," and hence perceive with utter seriousness both "the ecstatic chants, and the devotional clamor and awe. . . ." <sup>23</sup> The ultimate irony consists in that the readers of the novel are hardly ready to share the devotional mood of the festival, or even to treat it seriously, inasmuch as the architect and chief priest of the Solar Machine Temple is none other than Max Stor, who only recently proclaimed the "death of all gods and demons" and maintained that the solar machine had liberated mankind from all religious superstitions. What is more, the temple of technology that Max had built was indeed similar to the temple of beauty formerly established by his sweetheart Suzanna. Hence it is quite obvious that in essence Max created merely a variant of the peculiar "religion of people who have lost the ability to adhere to all religions."<sup>24</sup>

The pervasive concern with religious matters in *Sonjašna mašyna* interestingly foreshadows the theme of Vynnyčenko's much later work—his play *Prorok* (The Prophet). But even more impressive is the fact that in his considerations of the relationship between religion and progress in science and technology, the author managed to predict the emergence of religious cults which worship existing, or even fictional, scientific and technical achievements. In recent times, particularly during the past twenty years, a considerable number of these so-called "scientific cults" have appeared. According to one survey, over three thousand "scientific cults" came into being since the 1960s on the North American continent alone.<sup>25</sup> Most of these cults essentially represent what Vynnyčenko called "the religion of people who have lost the ability to adhere to all religions." Members of some such cults believe, for instance, that in the very near future advanced creatures from the far reaches of space will land on earth in order to save a limited number of humans who will

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., pp. 178-80.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 187.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., vol. I, p. 114.

<sup>25</sup> "An Encyclopedia of Cults," *Weekend Magazine*, April 14, 1979, p. 6.

then be taken to a "paradise" in "flying saucers."<sup>26</sup> The cult with the largest membership is the so-called "Church of Scientology" which was founded by a former American writer L. Ron Hubbard. He began his career as a science-fiction writer and was quite successful in this genre. In 1954 Hubbard published a book entitled *Dianetics*. He defined dianetics as "a new science of the mind" which would allegedly free mankind from all psychological traumas and eventually establish a paradise on earth. Subsequently Hubbard utilized the notion of dianetics for his cult of Scientology. Scientology became the largest cult in the world; it has at present an estimated four million members and its "annual revenues are in the hundreds of millions."<sup>27</sup>

The recent proliferation of the various "mystical-scientific" cults seems to confirm Vynnychenko's prognoses in the realm of faith. He not only predicted the rise of such cults, but also pointed out their complete ineffectiveness in coping with unexpected social crises. We see this in the passages of the novel which deal with the complete impotence of the solar machine cult: Max Stor and his priests, for instance, were unable to advise, let alone protect, their faithful during the unexpected invasion by the armed forces from Africa and Asia.

Let me point to still another significant prediction in *Sonjašna mašina*, the fulfillment of which we are witnessing in our times. In the novel women played a subordinate role in all social relations until the wide availability of "solar food." Thanks to the solar machine, women gained complete independence in economics, politics and morality. By emulating the actions of men, women at first also misused their new freedom: they, like the males, soon experienced the degenerative effects of social and economic decline. In subsequent passages of the novel, however, it becomes evident that only because of the women's initiative was it possible to bring to a halt the widespread physical and mental deterioration and to begin a renaissance. Such healing of society was initiated by Truda, who was prepared to use all means available to her—feminine charm and kindness, as well as bitter sarcasm and persistent nagging—

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., p. 11. Webster's Dictionary defines "dianoetic" as "proceeding from logical reasoning rather than intuition."

in order to combat the prevailing apathy and sloth. Although hers was not an easy task, Truda managed at long last to arouse Max Stor from his lethargic slumber. Instead of yawning and constantly mumbling that "nothing will come of that," he began to inquire cautiously "Can that be true, Truda?" And finally, full of enthusiasm, he shouted: "Truda! Get a large campaign going, right away! Mobilize the whole commune. Find all the members of INARAC. Grab them by their hair, grab them by the neck. Beat their heads in. Get going, Truda!"<sup>28</sup>

Max Stor realized, in time, that the former members of INARAC had nothing to do with the regeneration of humanity. He understood that during its many crises in history, as well as during its recent decline, mankind survived mainly because of the persistent endeavors and boundless compassion of women. In view of this awareness, Max Stor made an effort to honor women by way of symbols and rites in the cult of the solar machine which he was introducing. He chose an extraordinary image to convey the notion of equal rights for women in the realm of faith: in front of the Solar Machine Temple, "at the very center of the pedestal, there was a black cross bearing the crucified body of a woman."<sup>29</sup> The image of a crucified woman (provided that it is not used ironically) implies that in his interpretation of equal rights for women, Vynnyčenko was much more radical—envisioning a broader scope of women's rights—than the most ardent advocates of feminine emancipation in the 1920s.

While Vynnyčenko's anticipation of women's influence in economic and professional spheres is being confirmed by some contemporary developments, nevertheless his prediction of an absolute equality of women in religious matters is not likely to be realized. Equally improbable is the fulfillment of Vynnyčenko's prophecy about the complete elimination of war, which in the novel the women achieve through their willingness to "love their enemies" completely and unconditionally. It is obviously much easier to manifest such unreserved altruism in a work of fiction than in real life. The number of such improbable predictions,

<sup>28</sup> V. Vynnyčenko, *Sonjašna mašina*, vol. III, pp. 132, 135-36.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 180.

however, is not large and, what is more, such dubious predictions do not in the least contradict or invalidate the substantial number of accurate prognoses in Vynnyčenko's novel.

To sum up, the unexpected crises that stem from extensive reliance on science and technology, the depiction of the power of multinational corporations, as well as the rise of extremist terrorist groups which would attack the economic and the political establishment—these and other phenomena have become a part of our reality. Vynnyčenko's prophetic work is no less perceptive, no less accurate and certainly no less entertaining than similar novels by H.G. Wells, Evgenij Zamjatin, Aldous Huxley and George Orwell. But, regrettably, Vynnyčenko's novel is not so well known. *Sonjašna mašyna* certainly deserves greater recognition than it has received thus far, for it also contains a vivid illustration of the limits of scientific and technical solutions to man's problems.

# Utopia, Eutopia or Tutopia?

LARISSA M. L. ZALESKA ONYSHKEVYCH

Two rather unusual Slavic writers, Volodymyr Vynnyčenko and Karel Čapek, were not only contemporaries but, what is more, they shared certain ideas and posed similar questions. Part of the reason for such affinities may be that both of them reflected the *Zeitgeist* of the early 1920s. The similarities between them are particularly evident in several of their science-fiction works. Some of their shared themes deal with freedom of the individual, the opportunity to work creatively, and the possibility of creating a society in which mature and deserving people could live without the destructiveness of war. One may say that both of them were concerned with the possibility of an eutopia not in some distant future but here and now. While many writers of the period bewailed the effects of industrialization on man and his creative abilities—neither Čapek nor Vynnyčenko considered technology to be a major threat to man. They were concerned rather with the political and social changes that were precipitated or proliferated by machines. Man's attitudes to labor and the effects of such attitudes on his spirit and behavior were of primary interest to both writers. Nevertheless, while such questions were treated similarly in their works, these writers' literary destinies ran their separate courses.

Karel Čapek in Czech, and Volodymyr Vynnyčenko in Ukrainian literature, are known as authors of numerous short stories, novels and plays. They also wrote journalistic articles and philosophical treatises, and edited several periodicals. The works of these two writers became widely known in their own countries, and were translated into numerous languages. Vynnyčenko's works, however, have never been translated into English, and this is perhaps one of the primary reasons why his international reputation does not come close to that of Čapek; there are at least one hundred publications in English bearing Čapek's name.

Karel Čapek (1890-1938) became known in Ukraine during the early 1920s, at the threshold of his popularity. Because of Čapek's anti-

Communist stand, his works were ignored in the Soviet Union from the end of the 1930s (a play of his was staged in Kiev in 1939) until the 1950s; in 1958 two studies on Čapek appeared in Ukrainian.<sup>1</sup> Translations followed, at first in several Ukrainian periodicals, and then in Russian and other languages of the Soviet Union.

Volodymyr Vynnyčenko (1880-1951) was Čapek's senior by ten years. He had a very active political life,<sup>2</sup> until he left Ukraine in 1919 and eventually settled in France. By the beginning of the 1930s, Vynnyčenko's name became anathema in the Soviet Union, and since World War II his works have been banned in Čapek's country.<sup>3</sup> The ban on Vynnyčenko has not been lifted.

Because both writers lived during the same time in the same, Slavic, part of Europe, it is little wonder that their works reflect the same or similar problems, and reveal the writers' respective positions on them. We have already mentioned some — let us now review them: (a) opposition to any totalitarian tendencies of any nation, but especially of their countries' two most populous neighbors — Russia and Germany; (b) opposition to wars; (c) strong concern about widespread technological escalation and its possible damaging effect on people. Both writers turned to the genre of science fiction to suggest such problems and propose evaluations or solutions. In their works of science fiction, both writers frequently constructed situations in which the intellect of several individuals produced, for the sake of science, that which was then desired by others for the sake of power. They then proceeded to expose

<sup>1</sup> V.I. Ševčuk, *Karel Čapek: Antyfašysts'ki tvory: Literaturno-krytyčnyj narys* (Kiev, 1958); K.S. Zabyralo, "K. Čapek," *Naukovi zapysky* (L'viv: Pedahohičnyj Instytut, 1958), 3:79-94; subsequently, A. P. Volkov, *Dramaturhiia Karela Čapeka* (L'viv, 1972).

<sup>2</sup> Vynnyčenko held several important positions in the Ukrainian government during the years of Ukraine's independence (1917-1919). He was initially Vice-President and then Secretary General of the *Centralna Rada* (The Central Council) of the Ukrainian National Republic, and later served as Chairman of the Directory.

<sup>3</sup> The only publication so far appeared in 1968, in Ukrainian: Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, *Opovidannja*, Myxajlo Mol'nar, ed. (Bratislava: Slovac'ke pedahohične vydavnytvo, 1968). That edition contains a short bibliography of earlier Czech translations of Vynnyčenko's works. See p. 16. As for Soviet Ukraine, a number of Vynnyčenko's works was reprinted or even originally published there in 1920s. *Sonjašna Mašyna* was an original Soviet-Ukrainian publication, and was twice reprinted in Soviet Ukraine. See Note 5 below.



the imminent threat to mankind hidden in such situations. Alongside such collective social problems, both writers were intensely interested in the individual—his attitude to life, his personal goals, the strength of his spirit and the paths of his behavior. The two writers' views on the collective and the individual are worth examining in some detail.

I would like to concentrate on Vynnyčenko's two-volume novel *Sonjašna mašyna* (The Solar Machine), written in 1921-1924, and *Prorok* (The Prophet), written in 1929, and on Čapek's *R.U.R.* (1920), *Továrna na absolutno* (The Factory of the Absolute—a more popular translation of the title is *Absolute at Large*), written in 1922 and *Krakatit*, written in 1924. Just before Vynnyčenko began to plan his *Sonjašna mašyna* in 1920, he visited Czechoslovakia. Although Vynnyčenko may well have heard of Čapek during his visit, there is no proof that he read any of his works.<sup>4</sup>

After *R.U.R.* and *Sonjašna mašyna* were published, an unusual reaction occurred in both cases: public discussions by critics and readers were held in many countries, thus testifying to the popularity of the works, as well as to a certain strangeness of their ideas. It is also interesting that the writers' compatriots by and large ignored the universal message contained in the two works and criticized their authors for not including specifically national problems and backdrops. Such a reaction suggests that the domination of the two countries by foreign powers had left its obvious psychological effect on many Ukrainians and Czechs, who considered that literature should concentrate on national themes, otherwise the country had nothing to gain by it.

The reaction outside the writers' countries was not the same in each case. *Sonjašna mašyna* did not popularize Vynnyčenko's "sun-bread" or his concept word "sunism" in the way that Čapek's *R.U.R.* popularized the Slavic root-word "róbot" (first used by his brother Josef in 1917).

<sup>4</sup> Very early in his adult life, Vynnyčenko began to keep a diary. He included lists of books that he read. I had the opportunity to examine in detail his diaries for the years 1919-1926, and found no mention of any of Čapek's works. The diaries, as part of the Vynnyčenko archives, are at the Russian and East European Archives, Columbia University, New York, N.Y. The first two volumes of the diaries have been published by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies in 1980 and 1983.

This word became almost instantaneously and universally known through many translations of the play, as well as because of its two-year run on Broadway in the early 1920s. The popularity of *Sonjašna mašyna*, on the other hand, was restricted to Ukraine, although there its impact was indeed impressive. When the novel was published in Kharkiv, even blue-collar workers stood in long lines in front of bookstores to acquire the book, while waiting lists at local libraries had no precedent.<sup>5</sup> Although the novel was translated into several minor languages, it did not receive the kind of attention in the West for which the author had hoped.<sup>6</sup>

*Sonjašna mašyna* was begun by Vynnyčenko in May 1921, and was completed in July 1924, while the author lived first in Germany, and then in France, where he finally settled. As a politician and diplomat with government experience at the highest level, and as an observant writer, he was especially concerned with political developments in Germany, and quite correctly prophesied the rise of Hitler. (In fact, the character Mertens is so close to Hitler that in his own translation of the work into Russian, finished in 1938, Vynnyčenko considered renaming him Kitler). The novel depicts a Europe of the future, ruled by a German businessman. A scientist makes a unique scientific discovery: he builds a "solar machine" capable of producing food in almost infinite quantities and without much effort. The solar machine produces "sun-bread," a most savory food which can be made from any plant, even from grass, by means of the sun's rays passing through a special lens. This food, nevertheless, is edible, or palatable, only to those related by blood to the maker of the particular piece of bread, thus neutralizing

<sup>5</sup> M. Zerov, "Sonjašna mašyna jak literaturnyj tvir," *Vid Kuliša do Vynnyčenka* (Kiev: Kul'tura, 1929), p. 173. The novel was published in Ukraine after long delays and debates. The first edition in three volumes came out in the Kharkiv publishing house *Deržavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy* in 1928. A year later that concern published its second edition. In 1930, the Kharkiv publishers *Rux* published the novel in a single volume as Volume XXIII of Vynnyčenko's *Tvory* (Works). The first volume only was reprinted in New York by *Prometej* in 1962.

<sup>6</sup> Just before Vynnyčenko completed this novel, he wrote in his diary on January 14, 1924, that *Sonjašna mašyna* is "Ukrainian literature's calling card in Europe. One wishes that the Ukrainian name were known, but I am afraid that specifically because it is Ukrainian, the work itself may lose in the eyes of Europe any good qualities that it may contain." Vynnyčenko Archives, Diary for 1924. Now published in Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, *Ščodennyk* (Edmonton-New York: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1983).

the danger of a new "surplus value." The invention should free workers from their servile position toward employers. Very soon, however, it becomes threatening to the efficient management of society, and is even suspected of being able to cause anarchy. Such gloomy predictions come true when a terrorist organization learns of the invention and speedily distributes a special lens, thus making the production of the "sun-bread" accessible to all, and not only to blood relatives of the given operator of the machine. As a result, most people stop working, and all services are paralyzed first in Germany, and then in the rest of Western Europe.

In *Sonjašna mašina* Vynnyčenko strongly opposed the entrapment of people in their jobs; he considered work an "organic" part of life, freely chosen, performed for the sake of preserving the dignity of man. In the novel, those who worked willingly saved Berlin and the whole of Europe from complete destruction. It is interesting that while in his political writings Vynnyčenko stressed the strengths and the needs of blue-collar workers, in the novel it is students, intellectuals and women, mostly mothers, who are the labor activists, and the ones who choose to work, although labor is not necessary anymore. By wishing that people would make use of their prerogatives of free choice of values and then act upon their choices, Vynnyčenko took what would appear to be a proto-existentialist position. In the same spirit, he insisted that when one chooses to work as an individual, for the sake of one's self, one should at the same time understand the needs of the collective; it is only thus that the individual, while working for himself, will at the same time work for society.

Čapek, in his play *R.U.R.* also warned that man can become a machine if he is forced to work, instead of, in his freedom, understanding the value of dignified labor. The author criticized the dullness of work as demeaning to man, and stressed the creative aspect as the necessary positive component of labor. Vynnyčenko seems to have been attached to the idea of primitive physical labor as being particularly ennobling. This is symbolized in the novel by the solar machine itself; it is a deliberately simple apparatus, requiring rather strenuous physical exertion on the part of the operator. Čapek, on the other hand, believed

that physical labor as such adds to the depersonalization of man. Čapek concentrated on showing how blind obedience for the sake of food and of work made man a robot, isolating him from creativity and nature. It is the negative that stands at the center of his play. Vynnyčenko, in contrast, stressed the positive, anti-robot, human qualities; so long as man thinks and chooses freely, he should not succumb to de-individualization, regression, and a strictly animal-like, biological existence.

I should like to extend my comparison of the ideas of the two writers on the individual and the collective beyond the texts discussed above.<sup>7</sup> I see some striking similarities in their other works, even when it comes to external aspects of situational elements and plot details. *Sonjašna mašyna* was completed in 1924, the same year that Čapek finished his *Krakatiit*. The protagonists of both works are young scientists from the lower social classes. Each of them discovers either a process, or a device, by means of which the way of life, or even the fate, of humanity can be changed. Their discoveries can provide themselves and other scientists with an opportunity to acquire tremendous power over people and governments. Neither of the protagonists is interested in such an opportunity.

Each scientist pursues his experiments on a princely estate where a princess of ravishing beauty resides. Although both princesses are cold, calculating, and selfish, they nevertheless manage to fall in love with the respective scientists. The similarities are even more detailed. In both cases, the scientist utilizes a piece of the princess' jewelry to develop his invention. Each lady undergoes certain personality changes, as, for example, when she experiences for the first time the pleasure of physical labor. In both works the princess also sacrifices herself to save the scientist. Note also that the two titles—*Sonjašna mašyna* and *Krakatiit*—consist of the names of the respective inventions. It is true that the two authors approach the use of these inventions from opposite

<sup>7</sup> For a detailed analysis and comparison of *R.U.R.* and *Sonjašna mašyna* see: Larysa M.L. Zales'ka-Onyškevych, "Róboty i antyroboty," *Sučasnist*, No. 4, vol. 136 (April, 1972), pp. 60-73. In 1980 Hryhorij Kostyuk brought to my attention an article which was probably the first attempt to compare the two writers: S. Sakydon, "Karel Čapek i V. Vynnyčenko," *Literaturna hazeta* (Kiev), No. 17, vol. 35 (September 1, 1928).

poles: Vynnyčenko's device is a bread-producing machine, while Čapek's explosive device obviously possesses destructive powers. But even here we perceive a similarity: both inventions ultimately threaten mankind. It appears as if someone gave Vynnyčenko and Čapek a basic plot outline, and then commissioned them to write their versions of the story, in order to compare the final products.

Vynnyčenko's solar machine causes situations similar to those precipitated by a device called "karburator" in Čapek's *Továrna na absolutno* (1922). The "karburator" is capable of generating atomic energy, or, more specifically, releasing it from matter. This energy comes in the form of the Absolute which, as the Idealists assure us, is immanent in all concrete phenomena. In *Továrna na absolutno* and *Sonjašna mašina* we also find similar threats posed by the inventions: the struggle among various groups for power, and the possible complete destruction of large areas of the earth. While in *Sonjašna mašina* people refuse to work as a result of the "sun-bread," in *Továrna na absolutno* the "karburator" takes over the work in the factories and thus makes people almost superfluous. In both works, the drastic changes in people's lives cause slovenliness and irresponsibility. In *Továrna na absolutno* the farmers continue to toil, proudly fulfilling their peasant destiny, while everybody else, under the influence of the Absolute floating in the air, turns into a saint, praying, rejoicing and giving away his possessions. Because even angels can fall, all the people-lovers, blessed by the Absolute, soon become quite intolerant of the religious beliefs of their fellows. As a result, the short-lived paradise becomes hell, and extensive wars (predicted to take place between 1940 and 1952) threaten to exterminate humanity. Nevertheless, at least some people prove that their human qualities, grounded in healthy relativism, can survive and eventually predominate. In the satirical ending, reminiscent of that of *R.U.R.*, a cyclical rebirth is promised, while a small group of middle-class Czechs, eating sausages and drinking beer, begins to grasp the danger of absolute values and the importance of small, relative, individual truths.

Čapek admitted that he always wrote the same thing in his numerous and diverse works: "Only the coat is a bit different. I simply keep repeating myself. In all my work, I keep rehashing two, partly moral,

partly poetic themes; the first is negative, Pilate's 'What is truth?' the second is positive: 'Everyone has his own truth.'"<sup>8</sup> Čapek's insistence on the relativity of truth is quite obvious in *Továrna na absolutno*: during the wars each side demands support from God only for its own "Absolute" which it deems to be the only possible truth. Čapek unequivocally explained this in 1922: "Each man who believes in some sort of Truth thinks that therefore he must hate and kill a man who believes in a Truth which carries a different brand name . . . man is something more valuable than his 'truth.'"<sup>9</sup> Čapek went on to elaborate his view of relativism: "For me it is the only path by which it is possible to come to love for man when we have lost our faith in humanity; the only way to come to a love for the search for truth when we cannot find truth. . . ."<sup>10</sup>

In Vynnyčenko's *Prorok*, the protagonist and prophet Amar, when pressed to make a desperate choice, sacrifices truth for the sake of humanity; he wants to preserve the people's faith in love, which to him is the only truth worth saving. Vynnyčenko, however, never regarded such sacrifices as demonstrations of the human soul, as Čapek might have done. Vynnyčenko was almost afraid to take a further step and analyze man's willingness to sacrifice himself for the sake of others as a decision motivated by profounder causes than mere intellectual choice.

In Čapek's *Krakatit* the scientist, symbolizing contemporary intellectual pursuits, is punished for not considering the good of mankind at the very beginning of his project, and for being lost in his selfish interest in intellectual tasks alone. The old man—a God figure—prophesies: "You sought to tear yourself apart, but you remain whole, and you will neither save the world nor break it asunder. Much of you will remain hidden, like fire in a stove; but that is well; it is sacrificed. You sought to do things too great, and now you will do little things. It is well so."<sup>11</sup> Similarly, in Vynnyčenko's *Prorok*, when Amar wants to save the whole world by love, he is incapable of seeing the evil effects that his religion

<sup>8</sup> Alexander Matuška, *Karel Čapek: An Essay*, Cathryn Alan, translator (Prague: Artia, 1964), p. 161.

<sup>9</sup> Quoted by William E. Harkins, *Karel Čapek* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962), p. 102, from "Nemohu mlčet," *Lidové noviny*, 30 (June 10, 1922), pp. 1-2.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Quoted by Harkins, p. 106.

has brought to his followers and believers. After considering the people's future and his own faith in love—he sacrifices the truth, and agrees to participate in a fake miracle. Amar is not able to achieve perfect harmony between his preaching and his practice, between his personal life and that of humanity. Hence he is forced to sacrifice either his truth and his life, or the faith of the people. In Čapek's *Krakatit*, the scientist-protagonist searches for a similar harmony, and finally finds it in the rejection of his own invention, “krakatit,” the child of his intellect, which he meekly sacrifices. In both cases, individual pride is thus compromised for the greater good.

Both Vynnyčenko and Čapek devoted much attention to the imperfections of man. Čapek did this predominantly by irony and satire, while Vynnyčenko criticized man more seriously and openly. This brings us back to the important difference between Vynnyčenko and Čapek, mentioned above. Vynnyčenko believed that man can be improved, re-educated, and changed by means of a belief or a philosophy, such as his “sunism,” which he later elaborated and called the philosophy of Concordism.<sup>12</sup> Čapek's skepticism, conversely, did not allow him to give credence to the possible effectiveness of dogmas, *eutopias*, (“good places”) or anything redolent of the Absolute. He believed that everything is relative and that man will be saved by his toleration of the ideas of others, and by his capacity to sacrifice for the good of others. He therefore, championed modest, rather than grand-scale, plans. To him, world-shattering ideas and inventions were the results of man's intellect, and therefore represented man's pride. Čapek claimed that it is not technology and science by themselves which mechanize man but man's weakness—his desire to use various devices as an escape from his small, but all-important, daily obligations. Vynnyčenko implied that man can be persuaded to be changed when he is taught to rule his life by his mind, and not by his “nature,” which he should control, if not change. Čapek suggested that man should not attempt to change “human nature” but should modestly allow himself to

<sup>12</sup> Eugene Lashchyk is probably the first scholar who has attempted to analyze and classify Vynnyčenko's ideas of Concordism. See his article in this volume.

be led by moral principles, which are often relative, and especially by his devotion to others. Vynnyčenko was in agreement with Čapek on this latter precept of man's devotion to others when he stressed that a good society evolves from the harmony between the values of a group and those of an individual.

Vynnyčenko's and Čapek's *eutopian* works, in their cyclical aspect of returning to the same starting point, display the same *homo* whom technology does not change. The eternal human spirit qualifies man, and always comes to the rescue at the very last moment. The catalytic factor involved is mostly of the spirit, influencing man to make a personal sacrifice and choose the welfare of all, rather than merely the fulfillment of his own ambition. Hence self-sacrifice and love for others save mankind. Čapek seems to point out that a touch of *eutopia* is actually possible here and now, that it is rooted here and should not be sought elsewhere, because it is intrinsically possible to resurrect the spirit of man. Hence the neologism *tutopia* in my title, built on the Ukrainian word *tut* (here).

It can be said that Vynnyčenko's vision of the future is based on a certain compromise. We have seen that he does not count on some technological revolution to save mankind. Like Čapek, he depends on man to make the correct social choices. When technology provides new circumstances, leading to important changes, man is expected to assimilate the new situation and react to it with the aid of his moral and spiritual resources. In a way, man is almost expected to be ready for it—and then to choose quickly and correctly either to support anarchy and destruction, or to rise to a higher level which leads toward a better future for mankind. It is precisely because of this that Vynnyčenko believes in man's survival. He does not follow the theory of cyclical regeneration from the zero-point, with mankind periodically beginning all over again; he only indicates the possibilities contained in the idea of the nuclear community—namely the family—which, by subsisting on the same bread (made by a single "breadmaker" in each family), can afford to consider larger issues in life, and thus achieve permanent freedom without any great personal sacrifices. Both writers show that their protagonists have finally reached almost the same state of dignity and



peace with themselves which is necessary for creating a better world, or at least for taking steps in that direction. This development and promise was achieved in both cases due to the individual growth of the protagonists, who were shown to accept and demonstrate the writers' respective philosophies.

Let me review the differences between the approaches that the two writers take to such resolutions. While Vynnyčenko believes in the "larger issues" of existence, Čapek celebrates the importance of the seemingly insignificant matters of daily life. While Vynnyčenko seems to reject the cyclical theory of history, Čapek demonstrates the eternal qualities of man, awakened at the right moment at the price of personal sacrifice; he has thus accepted the cyclical approach. The resulting pastoral complacency in his work is slightly similar to that in Vynnyčenko's. However, Vynnyčenko's view does not possess the touches of Ludite antitechnological protest found in Čapek; on the contrary, whether Vynnyčenko's heroes utilize a solar machine, or a motor (as in *Prorok*, to create an illusion of a miracle), we see in the writer's view on the world an almost idyllic cooperation of the intellect (and its products), nature and science. Science should free man and give him the opportunity to create his *eutopia*.

The two writers—leading figures in their respective Slavic literatures—did not always choose to write on strictly Czech or Ukrainian questions. They preferred themes dealing with European society, human nature, political situations and technology in the twentieth century. By approaching such themes in surprisingly similar ways, they provided us with parallel reflections of the problems of their day, or perhaps of the future day.<sup>13</sup> In the writers' respective individual attitudes against the enforcement of the ideas and social orders of some people upon other people (which covers all aspects of dictatorship and totalitarianism) Čapek and Vynnyčenko agreed that it is imperative for man to remain

<sup>13</sup> In 1938 Vynnyčenko proudly stressed that he quite correctly prophesied the coming of the two dictators, Stalin and Hitler, and that he could still claim "with absolute certainty" that work, science and freedom, with the help of nature, shall bring all nations to very close cooperation in the future. Archives: Diary entry for April 12, 1938, Book 14-1, p. 111.

Man—by acting on his own free will, on his own free choices, to rebuild this planet as a possible *eutopia* (good place)—to create it not in *utopia* (no place), but in *tutopia*—this place.

# How to Save Your Marriage and Other Matters of Love

(ON THE PLAYS OF VOLODYMYR VYNNYČENKO  
AND W.S. MAUGHAM)

VALERIAN REVUTSKY

The creative legacy of Vynnyčenko and Maugham is very extensive. I will concentrate here on only one aspect of their work, their dramaturgy, which nevertheless has a very important place in their respective canons. But why set up a comparison between Vynnyčenko's plays and those of W.S. Maugham? Although they were contemporaries, they never met. Maugham wrote mostly comedies, and Vynnyčenko wrote only a few. The overwhelming majority of Maugham's plays deals with the lives of the members of upper-class English society, while Vynnyčenko's are centered mostly on the middle class. What, then, can be the grounds of comparison between them?

Let us begin by stating that both writers focus their attention on questions of morality. Maugham, particularly, delved into them very profoundly, much more so than his contemporaries, such as James Barrie, who stressed the stability of customs in English society, or G.B. Shaw, who vociferously recommended specific changes in it.

André Maurois wrote that "the dishonesty of human relationships denounced by Ibsen was precisely the malady which afflicted this society."<sup>1</sup> In other words, Ibsen exposed the antimorality which arrogantly paraded under the mask of morality. Here the similarity between Ibsen and Vynnyčenko is obvious. Naturally, the influence of this famous dramatist, with his *Brand*, *A Doll's House* or *Ghosts*, is plainly seen in Vynnyčenko's dramas, particularly in his *Pryhvoždeni* (The Downtrod-

<sup>1</sup> André Maurois, *King Edward and His Time*, tr. Hamish Moles (New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1933), p. 233.

den), *Nad* or *Prorok* (The Prophet). Such isolated instances of "Ibsenism" in Vynnyčenko, however, should not mislead us into regarding Vynnyčenko as Ibsen's follower, since that would limit his scope. Ibsen also influenced some of Maugham's plays. Maugham's drama *The Bread-Winner*, for example, was called by one critic "a light-hearted but acid version of *A Doll's House*."<sup>2</sup> We see that both Vynnyčenko and Maugham drew on Ibsen's work, without being overwhelmed by him.

When Vynnyčenko emigrated to Western Europe, the reign of Edward VII in England was coming to an end. Edward's assertion that "nothing was more repellent than an intellectual female"<sup>3</sup> is known to have accelerated the drive for the emancipation of women. In France, where Vynnyčenko then lived, the movement of emancipation became very strong. This, plus the current of women's emancipation within the revolutionary ideologies of Eastern Europe, which Vynnyčenko had supported in his youth, found its place in his dramas. Themes of women's emancipation are also evident in Maugham's plays. On the most obvious level, they are reflected in Maugham's treatment of the marriage contract as a symbol of moral obligations and legal responsibilities. In his middle period, he raised this issue in almost every play. His most important plays in this context are *Penelope* (1908), *Land of Promise* (1913), and *Unattainable* (1915). At that time, Vynnyčenko created such plays as *Brexnja* (The Lie, 1910), *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'* (The Black Panther and the White Bear, 1911) and *Natus'* (1912), in which the questions of the institution of marriage and of women's rights became central.

To be more specific, both authors treat in these plays desperate attempts to save the marriage contract. Both the hero and the heroine of *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'* as well as the heroine in *Brexnja*, die in their respective struggles to preserve their marriage contracts. Both authors' heroines, however, defend their rights to greater freedom within the marriage contract. Mrs. O'Farrell (*Penelope*), upon discover-

<sup>2</sup> Richard A. Cordell, *Somerset Maugham* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969), p. 207.

<sup>3</sup> Ronald E. Barnes, *The Dramatic Comedy of William Somerset Maugham* (The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 1968), p. 143.

ing that her husband has a liaison with another woman, drastically changes her way of life and her attitude toward her husband. She becomes less expansive and more reserved with him, and begins to find her own life outside the home, with her friends. The heroine of *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'*, Rita Kanevyč behaves in a similar way, but with a "Slavic temperament." Discovering her husband's affair with another woman, Rita begins her own affair with another man, defending her emancipated behavior by repeating the phrase "We are a modern couple."<sup>4</sup>

The finales of *Penelope* and *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'*, however, are quite different from each other. In *Penelope*, the heroine gains a victory over her husband by mocking him, but she does not break with him, thus saving their marriage contract. In *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'* the hero and heroine die tragically, saving the dignity of their marriage contract by a suicide pact. Caroline Ashley, the heroine of *Unattainable*, discovers at the end of the play that her husband, from whom she had separated ten years earlier and whom *The Times* proclaimed as deceased, is really alive. On the verge of marrying another man, she decides to stay with her husband, in this way saving their marriage contract.

The two writers' approach to the question of the marriage contract changed drastically after the First World War. The war shook the moral foundations of societies, and the question of the marriage contract was no exception. Vynnyčenko and Maugham began to reflect not on the preservation but on the dissolution of the marriage contract. In Vynnyčenko's *Nad* (1927), and in Maugham's *The Bread-Winner* (1930) husbands leave wives. Although the hero of *Nad* does not appear to be in conflict with society, and the hero of *The Bread-Winner* certainly is, both feel compelled to search for a more productive life in society; that quest forces them to dissolve their marriage contracts.

Vynnyčenko's *Nad* touches another moral problem in marriage, which is also found in Maugham—the problem of marriage between an older woman and a younger man. The theme, incidentally, seems to fascinate

<sup>4</sup> V. Vynnyčenko, *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'*, *Tvory* (Kharkiv: Rux, 1927), vol. XII, p. 41.

many playwrights. It received wide currency in the 1920s, and continues on in our contemporary dramatic literature (see, for example, the one-act play *Ask at the Nearest Gas Station* by Jo Ledingham). Neither of our two dramatists liked the idea very much.

Il'ko in *Nad* leaves his wife, Nadia, who is older than he. She dwells on the approach of old age, and begins to be attracted by the small comforts of daily existence. Il'ko's life, on the contrary, is "in full bloom," and it seems to him that he sees a corpse when he looks at his aging wife. Foreseeing a similar situation, Lady Frederick, the heroine of Maugham's play of the same name, refuses to accept a proposal by a younger man, Lord Mereston. She says:

If I married you, my whole life would be a moral struggle to preserve some semblance of youth. Haven't you seen those old hags who've never surrendered to Anno Domini, with their poor, thin, wrinkled cheeks covered with paint, and the dreadful wigs that hide a hairless pate?... You've laughed at their ridiculous graces, and you've been disgusted too. Oh, I am sorry for them, poor things. And I should become just like that, for I should never have the courage to let my hair be white so long as yours was brown. But if I don't marry you, I can look forward to the white hairs fairly happily.<sup>5</sup>

Like the earlier *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'*, Vynnyčenko's play *Velykyj sekret* (The Great Secret, 1928) is set in Paris. In contrast to *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'*, however, it has French rather than Ukrainian characters. Again, the problem of marriage plays a large part in this work. The view on marriage as an economical union "of convenience" has been an "eternal" human problem. However, Vynnyčenko, in the character of a millionaire's daughter Jaqueline, gives a new interpretation of it. She believes her moral code to be "even higher than our century" because her view on marriage is completely "realistic, purged of the slobbery of romanticism."<sup>6</sup> Jaqueline's theory consists in rejecting the need for love. Her idea of marriage is one of an economic union without any hypocrisy. She is even willing to accept an immoral husband, a thorough swindler, rather than some bore, suffering from high

<sup>5</sup> *The Collected Plays of W.S. Maugham*, (London: W. Heinemann, 1961), vol. I, p. 77.

<sup>6</sup> V. Vynnyčenko, *Velykyj sekret*, *Tvory*, vol I, p. 9.

morality. A declaration of love acts on her as if she were sitting in a dentist's chair.

Similar expressions by female characters with a morality "even higher than our century" abound in Maugham's plays of the postwar period. His play *Our Betters*, published in 1923, will serve as an example. Its heroine, Pearl Grayston openly states that "marriage is rather a swindle of benefit than a feeling." "Believe me," she says to a female friend, "the flourishing state of father's hardware store is a much sounder basis for matrimonial happiness than any amount of passion."<sup>7</sup>

Let us now turn to some interesting similarities between Vynnyčenko's and Maugham's last plays, *Prorok* (1930) and *Sheppey* (1933). Here the similarities are not limited to the themes, but also consist in the expressionistic styles in which the two works are written. The prophet Amar, hero of Vynnyčenko's play, proposes an immortal, eternal order of love among people. His opponent, an American pragmatist, General Ričard Rajt (Richard Right) sees in the prophet's scheme the danger of anarchism and the disintegration of all social structures, because Amar and his followers disregard institutions and laws. This greatly disturbs Richard Right. He decides that Amar must depart, but in such a way that institutions and the social order do not suffer at the hands of his followers. And so, one machine raises Amar into the sky, while another one destroys him in the air during a thunderstorm.

Sheppey, the hero of Maugham's last play by the same name (his real name is Joseph Miller), wins a great deal of money in the Irish sweepstakes and decides, like a true Christian, to give all of it away to the poor. His philanthropy is regarded as an absolutely extraordinary phenomenon in the country, and he is finally proclaimed a madman. A character in the play, Dr. James Jervis observes: "A sane man will not give all his money away to the poor. A sane man will take money from the poor."<sup>8</sup>

However, neither Amar's dream of immortal love among the people, nor Sheppey's profound Christianity are compatible with society, and

<sup>7</sup> *The Collected Plays of W. S. Maugham*, vol. II, p. 45.

<sup>8</sup> *The Collected Plays of W. S. Maugham*, vol. III, p. 285.

society rejects them. Both dramatists attempted to create in these plays strong personalities who search for recognition in society, for a platform from which to share their ideals and feelings, who pursue their aim to be accepted into the social organism, but who receive in return only burdensome obligations, and finally utter rejection. We note that here the focus changes from morality to social experience: the only way that differences between society and an individual can be resolved without rejecting the individual is the conviction that the individual's activities are confined within the limits of the laws and mores of a given society.

It is possible to find many more parallels between Maugham and Vynnyčenko. One can focus, for example, on the way they both build characters with the help of long dialogues, constructed with exceptional precision. Both playwrights show an extraordinary skill in closely observing their characters, and this is why they need (with a few exceptions) so few characters to create action. The initiating action in the plays of both dramatists usually occurs very far from the beginning of the text itself. Both are masters of ambiguity and irony: it is always possible to feel the difference between a meaning which is actually enunciated and that which might be expected to be said.

J.B. Priestley, in his book *The Wonderful World of the Theatre*, wrote that the theater where a man meets his image is an alive theater.<sup>9</sup> The contemporary theater continues to exist so long as it makes it possible for man to meet his image. In the same way, the theater of the past will continue to exist so long as it provides opportunities for such encounters. Using Priestley's criterion, we may ask: does the theater of Vynnyčenko and Maugham continue as contemporary theater?

Of course, not everything in the legacy of both dramatists will continue to live in the contemporary theater. Such, after all, is the case with numerous other dramatists. But much continues to live in their plays, because in them our contemporary frequently meets his image. For example, contemporary women increasingly attempt to preserve marriage contracts. The problem of the union between an older woman and a younger man has also remained a matter of great concern. The ad-

<sup>9</sup> J.B. Priestley, *The Wonderful World of the Theatre* (New York: Rathbone Books, 1959), p. 69.



herents of an economic union in marriage show no intention of disappearing. The ideas of contemporary prophets sound among all the peoples of the world, including Ukrainians and particularly Ukrainian emigrants.



# The Disinherited Dramatist

(ON THE RECEPTION OF VYNNYČENKO'S PLAYS IN  
GERMANY)

LEONID RUDNYTZKY

The repertory of the German and Austrian theater of the 1920s was rich in the diversity of plays performed. Although repudiated by most dramatists, naturalism lived on in the plays of Gerhart Hauptmann (1862-1946), whose then contemporary dramatic works were crafted in the neoromantic manner, and in the powerful and highly original dramas of Frank Wedekind (1864-1919). Neoclassicism continued to survive principally in Paul Ernst's stylistically austere tragedies; symbolism made its inroads onto the German stage through the lyrical dramas of Hugo von Hofmannsthal (1847-1929), while *fin-de-siècle* impressionism was perceptible in the psychological plays of Arthur Schnitzler (1862-1931). The most vigorous style of the time, however, was expressionism. It was the *Sturm-und-Drang* movement of the twentieth century which, with its dynamic search for the "new man," dominated the German stage in the plays of Georg Kaiser (1878-1945), Ernst Barlach (1870-1938), Ernst Toller (1893-1939), Franz Werfel (1890-1945), and many others. Also of great importance was Carl Sternheim (1878-1942), "the modern-day German Molière" (as he liked to think of himself), whose plays mark a transition from impressionism to expressionism.

Among the non-German playwrights staged in Germany were the Norwegian Henrik Ibsen (1828-1906), whose naturalistic, analytical drama had a tremendous impact on the German theater; the Swede August Strindberg (1849-1912), whose plays were a constant source of inspira-

tion (and imitation) for German expressionists, and the Belgian Maurice Maeterlinck (1862-1949), who profoundly influenced the symbolist theater in Germany. To be sure, the classical theater of France, England, and other Western European countries continued to occupy an important position on the German stage.

The growth and development of the German theater in the 1920s bore the stamp of the genius of Max Reinhardt (1873-1943), whose lavish productions were characterized by original, exciting techniques, including new stage-lighting effects that bore the influence of film. At that time, too, the repertory was diversified enough to include plays representing different esthetic, social, and political views. It should be mentioned here that the "Epic Theater" of Bertolt Brecht (1898-1956) who at that time moved to Berlin to become the dramatic consultant at Max Reinhardt's Deutsches Theater, has its origins in that decade.

A vibrant, sparkling intellectual atmosphere prevailed in the German theater of that time: it inspired experimentation, a search for stylistic innovation, and for new spiritual horizons. That exciting period, which also witnessed the rise of a renewed social, political, and religious commitment, ceased to be a force in German cultural life when the Nazi subjugation of the German *Geist* reduced the German theater to a bombastic but also lackluster "blood-and-soil" spectacle.

The *Zeitgeist* of the theater in the 1920s enables us to appreciate more fully the success of Volodymyr Vynnychenko's plays on the German stage. On the one hand, it was, as we have said, an age of experimentation; hence the conditions were favorable to the introduction of a new playwright. On the other hand, it should also be quite plain that, despite some important personal contacts, it must have been very difficult for Vynnychenko to break into the German repertory. As far as the Western European theater was concerned, he was a nonentity, he came from a country whose drama was completely unknown in Germany, and the competition at that time was fierce. The inclusion of his plays in the German repertory can therefore be viewed as irrefutable testimony to the dramatic merit of his work. In the present article we attempt to assess his success on the German stage by focusing on the reception of his plays in Germany, particularly on the reception of his two most

famous dramas — *Brexnja* (The Lie) and *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'* (The Black Panther and the White Bear).

Volodymyr Vynnyčenko was the only Ukrainian playwright whose plays were successfully staged in the theaters of Western Europe for a considerable period of time. In the 1920s, Vynnyčenko became famous as a dramatist all over Europe, and especially in Germany. His *Brexnja* enjoyed great popularity in such cities as Leipzig (where it made its debut in the spring of 1921 at the Schauspielhaus), Berlin, Nuremberg, and Munich, as well as in Vienna, Zürich, and Amsterdam, where it was performed in German translation. In addition to *Brexnja*, other plays by Vynnyčenko, such as *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'*, *Hrix* (The Sin), and *Zakon* (The Law), were also staged; the last, however, was performed mainly in Russian translation in the émigré Russian theater in Berlin.

Much of the success of *Brexnja* can be attributed to the German actor-director Friedrich Kayssler (1874-1945), who was at that time the director of the Volksbühne in Berlin. His adaptation of *Brexnja* to the German stage made the play more accessible to the German public.<sup>1</sup> As a result of his efforts, it was staged with considerable success in 1922, and went through sixty performances in Berlin alone. Kayssler not only directed the play, but also played the leading character. In addition, he published a brief and favorable interpretation of the play in the theater periodical *Die Rampe*, where he focused on its quintessential moral and ethical aspects. "The special charm of the play," Kayssler wrote, "consists in the manner in which, during a quiet mundane struggle which a group of simple people wages in a half-unconscious and half-conscious manner, one single will [that of Natalia, the heroine of the play] transcends itself; a will which has determined to give of itself and which perishes for the good of others because of this determination."<sup>2</sup> According to his interpretation, Natalia was destined to perform good deeds and therefore to die. At the same time, Kayssler indicated that the play was not marred by pathos or overblown sentimentality which could eas-

<sup>1</sup> In Berlin, *Brexnja* (*Die Lüge* in German translation) made its debut at the Volksbühne on November 1, 1922.

<sup>2</sup> See "*Die Lüge*. Von Wolodymyr Wynnyschenko. Übertragen von Gustav Specht" (Potsdam, 1923), p. 27.

ily develop from the situation of Natalia's self-sacrifice, and in this he saw another strong point of the drama.

Kayssler also wrote that the heart of the play is in the words: "The lie can become the truth under certain circumstances," pointing out that this is neither quibbling nor wordplay, much less an attempt on Vynnyčenko's part to justify lies. Kayssler maintained that the main theme of the play is human goodness and self-sacrifice, and that the lie is but a means of achieving these virtues. According to Kayssler, this play could have just as well been titled "Goodness" (*Die Güte*).<sup>3</sup>

In the conclusion of his interpretation, Kayssler went almost too far in idealizing the play and especially Natalia's noble character traits. He saw hidden under the surface of the text the most tender of human feelings which, although rooted in everyday life, transcends the level of everyday existence. Vynnyčenko's characters, according to Kayssler, are transformed by the strong will and goodness of Natalia from a chance group of people into a close-knit community which becomes a symbol of humanity (*Menschheit*). The dramatist shows how the inadequacy of human communication—of language—leads to lies in the conventional sense. But that which convention would call a lie is here nothing but pure humanity (*reines Menschentum*). The only crucial matter in the play is the "consciousness of inner truth," that inner drive to do good which informs the character of Natalia: all else is of secondary importance.

Let us parenthetically remark that this interpretation stands in sharp contrast to those advanced by most Ukrainian critics. The émigré Bohdan Romanenčuk, for example, asserts that "Natalia does everything without love, she acts calculatingly, from narrow materialistic, egoistical reasons. Everything that she does and says is a lie, and lies fill her life, because she pretends to be better than she is."<sup>4</sup> Similarly, the Soviet critic Jevhen Šabliovs'kyj interprets the play, and Natalia's actions, as "a call to cast aside all obligations" and a "rationalization for lying and deceit." He adds that "the author openly propagates a 'new morality,' which, to be sure, obliterates the differences between truth and false-

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>4</sup> *Azbukovnyk* (Philadelphia: "Kyiv," 1973), 2:116.

hood."<sup>5</sup> We have already seen Kayssler's completely opposite view on the play as endowed with a profoundly moral ethos. What needs adding here is that *Brexnja* was staged in Germany in accordance with Kayssler's interpretation.

Kayssler's interpretation cannot be arbitrarily dismissed as an attempt to make the play more palatable to the German audiences, because it emerges directly from the text itself. As early as the first act, Natalia's feelings evolve in a certain definite direction; she displays a sense of responsibility, of compassion, and of love. Here is her *confession de foi*: "To tell the truth, I married Andrij out of pride, out of an abstract love for humanity . . . I knew that Andrij had great mathematical abilities, and through him I wanted to give to mankind these new values. . . . But when I first saw his father, I wanted to kneel before him, to wash his feet, and to dry them with my hair."<sup>6</sup> In addition to the obvious allusion to Mary Magdalene, we find here a definitely oriented evolution of Natalia's love—from the abstract love of mankind to the concrete love for a single human being, the father of her husband. She is now on the road to an authentic love of mankind, which is possible only through the love of individual human beings. And this, it appears, is that *reines Menschentum* postulated by Kayssler. Love for fellow human beings is her main character trait; the happiness of a human being is her *sumum bonum*, everything else is secondary and derivative. Later in the same dialogue, she states: "People . . . really do not need either truth or lies, they need happiness, do you understand me? Happiness. . . . And if a lie can provide happiness then — long live the Lie."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup> For his comments on Vynnyčenko, see *Radjans'ke literaturoznavstvo* (September, 1970), p. 44; excerpted by this writer in English in: Vasa D. Mihailovich, et al., eds., *Modern Slavic Literatures* (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1976), 2:528-529.

<sup>6</sup> Wolodymyr Wynnyschenko, *Die Lüge. Drama in drei Akten*. Einzig autorisierte Übersetzung aus dem Ukrainischen von Gustav Specht (Potsdam: Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag, 1922), p. 10.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11. Regarding Vynnyčenko's thoughts on happiness during his work on the German version of *Brexnja*, see entries in his diary: Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, *Ščodennyk* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1983), vol. II, p. 70; also cf. Eugene Lashchuk's article in this volume. The diary provides much information on the issues discussed in this article, together with Vynnyčenko's own terse, laconic and incisive comments and reactions. See appropriate entries throughout vol. II, especially pp. 25-300.

In addition to Kayssler's work on the play both on and off stage, the success of *Brexnja* in Germany was enhanced by a good translation by the German writer Gustav Specht (1885-1956). This translation, titled *Die Lüge*, was authorized by Vynnyčenko himself; the author and the translator closely collaborated on it.

The success of a play on the stage depends, by and large, on the skill of the actors; in Vynnyčenko's *Brexnja*, the rendition of the part of Natalia is particularly important. The role was made famous in Italy by the grand lady of the Italian stage, Emma Gramatica;<sup>8</sup> in Germany, no actress of such stature acted in Vynnyčenko's plays. According to the theater reviews, the best Natalia was the Berlin actress Helene Fehdmer (1872-1939) who, significantly enough, also excelled as the lead in Ibsen's *Hedda Gabler*.

Finally, Vynnyčenko as a dramatist enjoyed favorable advance publicity in German theatrical publications. In addition to Kayssler and other Germans who wrote on Vynnyčenko's dramaturgy, the Ukrainian scholar Vasyl' Simovyč published an article on the Ukrainian theater in the *Mitteilungen der Leipziger Schauspielgemeinde* extolling Vynnyčenko's plays. Some germane passages are offered here in translation:

Volodymyr Vynnyčenko is the most successful contemporary Ukrainian dramatist. Imprisoned several times by the Czarist regime for his revolutionary activities, he likes to treat various problems of the revolution in his work. . . . For example, his drama *Miž dvox syl* (Between Two Powers) is set during the first Bolshevik invasion of Ukraine, and the plays *Dysharmonija* (Disharmony), *Velykyj Molox* (The Great Moloch), and *Bazar* (Bazaar) deal with the lives of revolutionaries. Here . . . Vynnyčenko reveals his *Weltanschauung* and touches on the various conflicts inherent in life. This is particularly true of his two most frequently performed dramas, *Brexnja* and *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'*. Of importance also are Vynnyčenko's comedies, which exploit the small absurdities in the lives and the psyche of the Ukrainian people. These plays are especially captivating and amusing, and they enjoy great popularity in Ukraine. Vynnyčenko's fame, however, is not confined to his native Ukraine. His plays have been performed in the capitals of Russia, St. Petersburg and Moscow, and *Brexnja* has enjoyed great success on the Czech stage. Recently, a Belgian theater acquired the right to translate that play, and

\* See Domenico A. DiMarco's article in this volume.



both *Brexnja* and *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'* have been translated into German by Gustav Specht. . . . Vynnyčenko's *oeuvre* is an important phase in the development of the Ukrainian theater after the Revolution.<sup>9</sup>

It is interesting that although *Brexnja* enjoyed a long run on the German stage, critical reception of it was not, on the whole, enthusiastic. *Brexnja* was criticized for its imitation of Ibsen, Strindberg, Wedekind, Sudermann, and a number of other Western European playwrights, for its outdated treatment of psychological problems, for its lack of action, etc. Yet the irrefutable fact remains that the play did well, the theater-going public liked it, and Vynnyčenko's fame spread all over Europe. Perhaps the most objective and thorough analysis of *Brexnja* next to Kayssler's, but quite different from it, was offered by the German critic Fritz Mack in the *Leipziger Neueste Nachrichten*,<sup>10</sup> after the play had its debut in Leipzig. Mack called Vynnyčenko "a writer who knows Russian literature as well as the literature of Western peoples", and used to his advantage Sardou, Henri Bernstein, Sudermann, Ibsen, and Strindberg. Mack provided a concise critical synopsis of the play:

Natalia Pavlovna deceives her sick and weak husband with a young student. When she assures the student that she loves him, he demands that she follow him. Natalia declines out of consideration for her husband, whom she does not want to abandon. She counters the ethical objections of her lover with sophistic arguments: man needs neither truth nor deception, just happiness. If lies can produce this, then lies are fine! In fact, Natalia acts according to this questionable principle. She deceives her husband, to whom she feigns faithfulness, and she deceives the student, to whom she feigns love. In truth, her only interest in the student is his youth and his strength. Finally, she even deceives Ivan, her husband's assistant, who proclaims his love for her when she tells him that she has always loved him. Ivan, to be sure, has justified suspicions about this surprising admission. Shortly before, he had spied on Natalia and her lover from behind a door and had even stolen letters written to her by the student. In order to be able to believe in her love, he demands (Rosmer in reverse) that Natalia either throw herself from the fourth floor or take cyanide. He

<sup>9</sup> See Wasyl Simowytsch, "Über das ukrainische Theater," *Mitteilungen der Leipziger Schauspielgemeinde*, 13, June 3, 1921.

<sup>10</sup> Issue of June 4, 1921. Another, even more favorable, review was written by Hans Ratonek in the *Leipziger Zeitung*, June 4-5, 1921.

supports this delightful demand by threatening to read the stolen letters to her family. At this point, the image of Ivan is momentarily inflated in the mind's eye of the audience: he returns the stolen letters to Natalia. Just like Melitta Wrangel, the woman from the sea [Mack probably refers to Ellida Wangen, the heroine of Ibsen's play *The Lady from the Sea*], she is supposed to decide freely. However, one can hardly hold it against her that no real confidence is inspired in her by such a noble turn of events. One can understand her decision in the final act to poison herself when one takes her naive husband into account, to whom she cautiously pays some attention, who simply tells her that he would rather see her dead than deceiving him.

Mack also sees Natalia as the key figure of the play, a woman whose character is irresistibly attractive to the audience:

All the creative talent of this writer has been expended on the figure of Natalia. This red-blooded human being with unflagging primitive instincts is anchored in an environment in which she can develop only in this way. One is really drawn to this woman, hungry for life and happiness, who knows how to generate the joy she needs to live by lying, by producing the appearance of truth from the strength of a naive egoism, which has not been destroyed by civilizing processes. Natalia lies not only to find happiness, but to keep misery and discomfort out of the lives of her lovers. This is the deep tragedy of a human being, who rises to such greatness as a victim that precisely this sacrifice becomes the crowning lie of her life: it is supposed to maintain the image of her purity in her husband's mind and at the same time provide Ivan with proof of her love for him. Ivan appears to me to be the least successfully drawn character in the play. The beginnings of the development of a devious character remain petrified. Her husband, the student, the father, the minor figures, however, display poetic vision.

In the conclusion of his article, Mack reiterates and summarizes his qualified admiration for the play:

In general, it is a strange mixture of poetry and theater; the most refined materials clash with the crassly theatrical. . . . Very superficial effects alternate with moments of poetic inspiration. All in all, the poetic predominates; Vynnyčenko has obviously learned something about atmosphere from the Russians. It is a work well worth getting to know.

On the basis of the various reviews and articles, we can conclude that *Brexnja* was Vynnyčenko's most successful play in Germany. His other plays did not fare so well. The reviews of *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'* from 1922, for example, convey the impression that it should not have

been staged. The majority of the reviews were negative. In addition, some critics did not limit their criticism to the play, but also attacked the author's person and the sound of his name, and even his native country. The very title of the play brought forth either merriment or outright scorn. It was labeled "kitschy," "corny," and "symbimbolic" (a sarcastic play on the word symbolic). One critic began his disquisition as follows: "This title sounds like an Indian story. We think of James Fenimore Cooper, of Indian chiefs, of tomahawks, of scalps, etc."<sup>11</sup> Speaking of the author, a more charitable critic stated that Volodymyr Vynnyčenko was a Ukrainian writer and statesman with "innumerable y's in his name,"<sup>12</sup> and another reported that he was the prime minister (*Ministerpräsident*) of his country who, in addition to politics, also had "an unfortunate penchant for the theater."<sup>13</sup> A less charitable critic began his review with an account of an anecdote: during the performance, some members of the audience, in order to divert themselves somewhat, told each other stories about Vynnyčenko, one of them being that he was exiled from his country for having written this play. The author of the review concluded that every anecdote contains some truth, and this particular one was no exception.<sup>14</sup> Still another critic began his review by stating that the management of the Berlin theater, where the play was staged, wanted to prove that "even a Ukrainian is able to imitate the dramatic literature of recent decades." He continued: "Apparently we [the Germans] are doomed to see nothing but foreign plays on our stages; hence, why not a Ukrainian one once in a while?" He concluded his review by reporting that the words of one of the minor characters of the play, "Why have we come here?" brought a hearty applause from the audience who asked themselves the same ques-

<sup>11</sup> J. Kn., "*Der weisse Bär und die schwarze Pantherkatze*. Uraufführung in der Tribüne," *Boersen Zeitung* (Berlin), July 14, 1922. The animals in the German title were, as a rule, reversed.

<sup>12</sup> E.M., "*Der weisse Bär und die schwarze Pantherkatze*," *Berliner Morgenpost*, July 16, 1922.

<sup>13</sup> A.M., "Wynnytschenkos *Pantherkatze*," *Vossische Zeitung* (Berlin), July 14, 1922.

<sup>14</sup> K.H.B., "Psychologeles in der Tribüne. *Der weisse Bär und die schwarze Pantherkatze*," *Das deutsche Abendblatt*, July 14, 1922.

tion.<sup>15</sup> In addition to the comment about the dramatist's nationality, quoted above, there were many more slurs directed against Ukraine. One reviewer wrote that Ukraine was "a rather dark section of Europe," and another concluded his review by expressing the pious wish: "Hopefully, Ukraine will soon start delivering grain once again."

Not all criticism of the play stemmed from the German *Übermensch* syndrome. Some reviewers were quite objective, and their comments contribute to a better understanding of Vynnyčenko's dramaturgy. To provide an example of this more balanced and constructive criticism, we offer excerpts from a review published under the initials A.Wi., in the *Deutsche Zeitung* of July 14, 1922. While pointing out the shortcomings of Vynnyčenko's dramaturgy, especially what he considers to be borrowings from Western dramatists, the reviewer does provide some positive and encouraging comments:

The Ukrainian author of *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'* should not believe that this demonstration of talent makes him an accomplished dramatist. . . . In general, his work lacks the brimstone, the searing breath, the theatrical élan requisite to any play which seeks to endow its characters and themes with significance. There are successful moments in Volodymyr Vynnyčenko's work, but they pale in the trappings of the total production and in embarrassing pauses and repetitions. The better aspects of the play have, in fact, been borrowed from famous predecessors; one is continually reminded of Strindberg and Ibsen, but mostly of Wedekind.

The critic also chastises Vynnyčenko for presenting characters who lack "internal drive or self-motivation, who simply accept fate as unalterable," and therefore are puppets governed by external forces. At the same time, he sees several "redeeming qualities" in Vynnyčenko's work and intimations of potential significant dramatic achievement:

He [Vynnyčenko] attempts to capture all conceivable theatrical themes in a single format, hoping that something will eventuate from the collage. He

<sup>15</sup> Otto Gysae, "Ukrainisches Theater. Wynnyschenko: *Der weisse Bär und die schwarze Pantherkatze*," *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* (Berlin), July 14, 1922. Almost identical sentiments were expressed by Leo Rein in the *12 Uhr Mittags-Zeitung* of the same date; however, Rein also stated that the play could not be denied a certain "colorfulness" (*Farbigkeit*).

<sup>16</sup> A.P., "Wynnyschenko: *Der weisse Bär und die schwarze Pantherkatze*," *Tägliche Rundschau* (Berlin), July 14, 1922.

has taken the ivory-tower motif from Ibsen, together with that of the tragedy of the artist ruined by his own creativity. [This motif, frequent in Ibsen, culminates in his last important play *When We Dead Awaken*.] Such an artist sins mortally by making his woman the victim of his work, destroying her love life and, thereby, causing her death. Also attributable to this Northern sorcerer is the tarantella dance of Nora's doubt [reference to the conclusion of *A Doll's House*] and the positioning of a man between two women which, as in Gerhart Hauptmann's *Gabriel Schilling's Flight*, both entices and devastates him. These women also have traits characteristic of Strindberg and Wedekind: the black panther is a Lulu-figure from *Castle Wetterstein*, but made playfully bourgeois. Because she is modeled after Gabriel Schilling's wife, Eveline, she too is rendered very unfeline; the "snow flake" is a Hanna, a Strindbergian vampire-type. These women, nevertheless, are depicted with some care. One can see that their author loves them; their womanhood, therefore, has a certain degree of warmth. The men are another story. They dangle from these women like big zeros. The hero, the white bear, whose struggle for artistic freedom is unbelievable . . . is a used-up dishrag, who in the second act knows what he wanted in the first and in the fourth is blocked by what he himself produced in the third. We may accept the hero's victimization of his dying child with his art—which, incidentally, is totally unnecessary—but when he becomes a pimp for his faithful wife, as in the *Castle Wetterstein* model, simply to be able to complete his painting, which actually idealizes her as a Madonna, pfui!—that is too much. This "madness" is not even attributable to demonic greatness but simply to weakness, to an inability to come to terms either with art or with life.<sup>17</sup>

From the evidence presented above, it should be plain that *Brexnja* enjoyed greater popularity on the German stage than *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'*. The reasons for this are diverse. It would appear that the German translation of the former play was far superior to that of the latter, although both were translated by the same man—Gustav Specht.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Additional German reviews of Vynnyčenko's plays are listed and provided with succinct Ukrainian summaries in the unpublished Vynnyčenko bibliography. See *Volodymyr Vynnyčenko: Anotovana bibliohrafija* compiled by Vadym Stelmashenko, New York, 1985. The author gratefully acknowledges the use of this excellent, meticulously compiled work.

<sup>18</sup> See *Der weisse Bär und die schwarze Pantherkatze*. Schauspiel in 4 Akten von Wolodymyr Wynytschenko. Einzig autorisierte Übersetzung aus dem Ukrainischen von Gustav Specht (Potsdam, Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag, [1922]), 69 pp. It would be interesting and productive to compare the German translations with the Ukrainian originals. Such a study might yield additional insight into Vynnyčenko's dramaturgy. In this connection it should be added that the influence of German thinkers and dramatists on Vynnyčenko's dramaturgy needs to be explored and analyzed.

In addition, the very title of the play, "Black Panther and White Bear," as we have seen, seems to have had a prejudicial effect on the critics. Also *Brexnja* has a much better constructed plot, a more attractively developed heroine, less emotionalism and pathos, and more realism than *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'*. Finally, as in the case of *Brexnja*, the Germans apparently expected a Ukrainian playwright to dwell on rustic themes and motifs from his native land, and not to examine, in the manner of Ibsen, the depth of the human soul. This reasoning becomes repeatedly apparent in the reviews; and it is quite obviously expressed in the 1921 adaptation of the play to the screen.

In order to satisfy the backers, actors, and directors involved in the production of the motion picture, Vynnyčenko not so much rewrote the play as wrote a completely new script for the film in line with the taste of the German critics. According to the available sources,<sup>19</sup> the film was indeed quite different from the play. Vynnyčenko transferred the action from a French to a Ukrainian setting, added a number of characters to allow for folk scenes in a Ukrainian village, thus ensuring local color, and he radically changed the ending. In the original dramatic version, the main characters die; in the film, they return to their native village where, in the rustic surrounding of the Ukrainian landscape, they seek a new life. Vynnyčenko apparently based the script on the dramatic version that was performed in the Russian theater of Berlin, responding to the requests of his business associates and friends, among them the Russian actress Elena Polevickaja (1881-1973), who played the heroine in both the stage version and the film. The directors of the film, Hans Janowitz and Johannes Guter, even hired a special consultant (Viktor Aden) for Ukrainian themes and motifs, to make certain that the process of "Ukrainianization" had been fully achieved.

To be sure, Vynnyčenko was not happy with this "revisionism" but he

<sup>19</sup> The journal *Illustrierter Film-Kurier* (Berlin), Nr. 73 1921, offers the following information about the film: "*Die schwarze Pantherin*. Nach dem Drama *Das Pantherweib* [note change in title] von Wolodymyr Wynnyschenko. Für den Film bearbeitet von Hans Janowitz und Dr. Johannes Guter." It also lists all the *dramatis personae* and the actors who played their parts, provides all other credits, includes 19 stills from the film, and contains a summary of the script in the form of scene synopses.

was too astute a businessman to pass up the opportunity.<sup>20</sup> In any case, the making of the film further validates our notion that the German critics simply were not ready to accept a work by a Ukrainian dramatist that did not deal with Slavic themes and motifs. Vynnyčenko's spiritual kinship with Ibsen, Sudermann, Wedekind, and other Western European dramatists and thinkers disturbed them. They probably wanted someone who would reveal something about the "Slavic soul" and generate a Ukrainian (Russian, for most Germans) "atmosphere," or tell them something about the Russian Revolution. That is the reason why some of the critics attempted to define the Ukrainian dramatist in the context of the Russian theatrical tradition. Most important, however, they expected from Vynnyčenko a typical *Heimatkunst* product, dealing with the life of Ukrainian peasants; instead, they were confronted with the psychological problems of an artist living in Paris. All this evidently did not bother the audiences who continued to enjoy Vynnyčenko's plays. The prejudiced opinion of the German critics notwithstanding, Vynnyčenko presented his plots and characters with considerable force and ingenuity; his plays were, and still are, eminently suited for the stage.

In the context of the development of the Ukrainian theater, as well as in the context of Vynnyčenko's own development as a dramatist, the German critiques of *Čorna pantera i bilyj vedmid'* were paradoxically ironic. Not only were the Germans totally ignorant of the author's cultural tradition, which is obviously quite distinct from that of their Russian models, but they also failed to appreciate the revolutionary moral undertones and the subtle psychological nuances of Vynnyčenko's plays.

<sup>20</sup> In his diary we find repeated indications of his dissatisfaction with the work on the film. The entry of February 28, 1921, for example, records: "A heated conversation with Specht regarding the film 'Black Panther'"; another conversation with the makers of the film took place on March 6, 1921. (See *Ščodennyk*, 2:28, 29). The fact that Vynnyčenko had a flair for business is attested to by his various planned ventures mentioned in his diary and in his letters. He thought to establish a film company as well as his own theatrical company, and he knew how to assert his rights with publishers and translators and, when needed, knew how to use the law as a last resort. (See *Ščodennyk*, 2:25-64 and 2:151). His business acumen is also revealed in his attempt to sell the "Black Panther" to an American film company. (See *Ščodennyk*, 2:218-219).

Vynnyčenko's drama, as the Ukrainian scholar Oleksandr Doroškevyč pointed out, "led the Ukrainian theater from its primitive ethnographic base to the world of the neo-realistic theater of Hauptmann, Ibsen, and Chekhov and endowed it with its own important ideological content."<sup>21</sup> The German critics were unable to see that unique "ideological content" of Vynnyčenko's plays, expecting him to provide ethnographic depiction of life in Ukraine or, as some of them put it, in Russia, and thus to return Ukrainian dramaturgy to its "ethnographic base."

In this light it is appropriate to ask whether Vynnyčenko's plays were in their own way not too *avant-garde* for the provincial German theater critics of the early 1920s. Recently, a Ukrainian émigré scholar placed Vynnyčenko's dramaturgy quite convincingly within the framework of existentialism, linking it specifically with Sartre's thought.<sup>22</sup> Thus Vynnyčenko can be viewed as one of the first dramatists to introduce existentialism to the German stage. It should also be pointed out that Vynnyčenko's anti-bourgeois concept of morality, his principle of "honesty with oneself," as well as his notion of happiness, harmonize with some of the credenda current in the 1960s and are, to a degree at least, quite relevant even in the 1980s.

An examination of the reception of Vynnyčenko's plays in Germany offers, first of all, additional insight into Vynnyčenko as a man and a dramatist, and invites some interesting speculations about the tastes and attitudes of the German theater critics of the 1920s.<sup>23</sup> It demonstrates,

<sup>21</sup> *Pidručnyk istoriji ukrajins'koji literatury*, 5th ed. (Kharkiv: "Knyhospilka," 1930), pp. 226-227.

<sup>22</sup> See Larissa M. L. Onyshkevych. "Existentialism in Modern Ukrainian Drama." PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1973, pp. 52-62, and 140-141. Also see "Róboty i antyróboty: *Sonjašna mašina* V. Vynnyčenka i *R.U.R.* K. Čapeka," *Sučasnist'*, 4 (136), 1972, pp. 60-73 and her article in this volume.

<sup>23</sup> Other plays of Vynnyčenko performed on the German stage were *Zakon* (*Das Gesetz* in German translation) and *Hrix* (*Die Sünde*). The former was scheduled to be staged in Max Reinhardt's Deutsches Theater, but apparently no satisfactory agreement could be concluded between the management and the author (see *Ščodennyk*, 2:145). It was, however, successfully staged in Riga, both in the Russian and the German theaters of that city (see *Rigauer Rundschau*, December 11, 1922, and *Ščodennyk*, 2:177-178), despite some unpleasantness with the German translator (see *Ščodennyk*, 2:44). *Hrix* was advertised in German newspapers following the success of *Brexnja* in Leipzig as a coming attraction. However, information on its performance on the German stage was not available to me.



among other things, that the self-proclaimed cosmopolitanism of the German theater critics was, in fact, a petty provincialism, and that their attitudes toward Slavic artists were unbearably patronizing. It also provides us with an appreciation of the difficulties involved in transplanting a Ukrainian play to the German stage—difficulties which (we have reason to suspect) are still very much extant today. Finally, this study should shed some light on the complex relationships and conflicts that invariably arise when two cultures interact, be it on or off stage.

More than any other dramatist of his time, Vynnyčenko was constrained and limited by the prevailing political circumstances. Driven from his native Ukraine by Russian imperialism only to find himself ultimately in a Europe convulsed by economic depression and fascism, scorned by the Ukrainian nationalists who shunned him for his leftist views, and anathemized by the communists for his decadence and "bourgeois nationalism," Vynnyčenko was a disinherited artist—a man with plays for which there was no stage.



# A Note on Emma Gramatica and Volodymyr Vynnyčenko

DOMENICO A. DI MARCO

Three years ago, I was looking for a particular Greek dictionary which, I vaguely remembered, had to be inside a decrepit suitcase in the attic.

We all know that, by rummaging through old books, magazines, and papers, many unexpected things turn up. In this case, the surprise consisted of a brownish, half-moldy copy of a newspaper. Its third page contained a review of a drama by Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, presented for the first time in Italy, on the stage of the Carignano Theater, in Turin, on September 1, 1924, by the Philodramatic Company of Emma Gramatica.

I have always had a special affection for the famous, peppery actress from Borgo San Donnino, ever since my high-school days, when my literature teacher gave me the assignment of writing a brief critique of her acting abilities with special reference to her performance as the protagonist in a drama by Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, called *Brexnja* (The Lie).

Suddenly, as if I were looking into an enchanted kaleidoscope, some precious moments of my boyhood flashed again before my mind's eye. I caught a glimpse of myself doing research in our school library; I relived the excitement of finding articles and clippings about Emma and Vynnyčenko, and, above all, I precisely recalled Miss Gramatica's performance as Vynnyčenko's heroine, Natalia Pavlovna.

Emma met Vynnyčenko in Paris and the two immediately admired and respected each other. She undertook to familiarize herself with Vynnyčenko's works, and particularly with *Brexnja*. Emma thought that Vynnyčenko's play had a good chance of success in Italy, or at least in Northern Italy, first of all because it was a drama of real life which

could hold the interest of the public by its unusual plot, and second, because the events depicted in it did not apply to one nation rather than another, to one race rather than another, to one political system rather than another, but to all mankind. It took great courage and firm determination on the part of Emma Gramatica to stage a work by an author then completely unknown in Italy. She risked her reputation as a famous actress, with the additional risk of a substantial financial loss. We should keep in mind that Emma, like any successful person, had many personal enemies, including those who, at the time when Italy was about to become a dictatorship, considered xenophobia a noble virtue.

The Italian premiere of *Brexnja* began in a low key, and the audience seemed at first rather unreceptive and cold. But then, little by little, as the dialogue became more and more pliant and rhythmical, and the artistic ability of Emma started to impress the audience, its contact with the actors became stronger. At the end of the evening, the success of *Brexnja* and of Vynnyčenko was assured. Favorable reviews appeared in many daily newspapers, among them *La Stampa*, *Il Momento*, *Il Corriere Padano*, and *La Gazzetta del Popolo*. And so, a new dramatist was introduced to the Italian theater-going public and the drama *Brexnja* became familiar to audiences and to critics.

For three years *Brexnja* was an integral part of Emma Gramatica's repertoire. It was performed in Turin, Milan, and finally in Ravenna, at the Teatro Mariani. In the role of Natalia, Emma fascinated Italian audiences by an unassuming, and yet masterly, presentation of a difficult human situation—a situation that required frequent lies, both large and small, to the point that, at a certain moment, nobody knew where the lies ended and the truth began. Natalia's overall philosophical outlook is synthesized in the following statement: "Men need neither truth nor lies. They only need happiness. Happiness and peace. Do you understand me? If a lie can give them happiness and peace, then blessed be the lie."

The character of Natalia Pavlovna developed in Vynnyčenko's mind when he wanted to repudiate traditional morality, and to replace it with a sort of personal "honesty with oneself" which could justify even seemingly bad deeds, provided they were accomplished "with the will, the reason, and the heart." Let me note parenthetically, however, that, in

later works, and especially in the novel *Zapysky kyrpatoho Mefistofelja* (Memoirs of the Pug-nosed Mephistopheles), Vynnyčenko somewhat mitigated this philosophical position.

Let us very briefly review some specifics of the play. The plot revolves around the character of an unfaithful wife, who, although she is having an affair with another man, loves her husband, and, in order to spare the latter the grief of discovering her infidelity, ends by taking her life. The play is clearly psychological, and only if it is examined from this point of view, can the protagonist's character and actions be understood. This is also true of the other characters who at times seem to be muddled and enigmatic. When their psychology, perhaps deliberately complicated, is understood, they show moments of a profound, shining humanity.

I am convinced that, as in the case of Luigi Pirandello's dramas, the average spectator cannot absorb all the details and diverse subtleties of *Brexnja* after seeing the play only once. There are in it too many half-truths and half-lies, too much psychological introspection, which require careful analysis of every scene, every situation, almost every word. Such an analysis would expose the basic pessimism of the play which recalls some of the best playwrights of the modern European theater. Pessimism, incidentally, is characteristic of Northern Italians. Also, matrimonial morality is far more liberal in the North than in the South of the peninsula. This is the reason that, from the very beginning, Emma Gramatica believed that *Brexnja* had an excellent chance of success in cities like Turin, Milan, and Ravenna, but perhaps less secure prospects in cities like Rome, Naples, and Palermo.

Because it was through Emma Gramatica's initiative and hard work that Vynnyčenko became famous, admired, and loved in Italy, let me now say a few words about her. Emma Gramatica was born in Borgo San Donnino, a little village near Fidenza, in 1874, and died at the Lido in Rome, in 1965. She began her career in the shadow of her famous sister Irma, and of the internationally celebrated Eleanora Duse. From 1896, however, she freed herself from such domination and went her own way, with various theatrical companies headed by L. Biagi (1896), F. Ando', C. Leigheb, V. Reiter, E. Novelli, Ermete Zacconi, Alfredo De Sanctis (1901), L. Orlandini (1903), R. Ruggeri (1906-1909), L. Cari-

ni, and U. Piperno (1916). In 1916 she formed her own company, achieving great success in Italy and in many other European countries, especially in France, Germany, Hungary and Spain. She was supported by great actors like Memo Benassi, Armando Falconi, and Camillo Pilotto.

Alfredo De Sanctis, in his *Caleidoscopio Glorioso* (Glorious Kaleidoscope), published in Florence in 1943, writes that Emma usually appeared taciturn and solitary. During the actors' long train journeys, she would curl up on a seat near the window, covered with a plaid traveling blanket, with three or four books within reach, reading for hours. Her companions were amazed to discover that she read works by Ibsen, Shaw, Tolstoy, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and other giants. Some of her colleagues, grinning maliciously, would remark: "That girl reads and studies too much!" But others would defend her, saying that she was serious in her desire to learn. People were surprised that in each new city, she would visit, at least once, the most important museums and galleries, and lodge in German and English hotels, in order to practice conversation in foreign languages. Her motto was *lavorare, lavorare, lavorare* (work, work, work). She would go back alone to her hotel, after three or more hours of rehearsal, stopping a while only in front of flower shops. But if someone offered her a rose, she would refuse. Emma seemed detached from material things, as if between her heart and the world there were a pane of glass that allowed her to see everything, but to touch nothing. "That girl knows what she wants, and she will reach her goal," *la Distinta Signora* (the distinguished lady)—Eleanora Duse—used to say, and she was certainly right.

Emma Gramatica reached the top of her profession in spite of many shortcomings. She did not have the style and the expressiveness of her sister Irma, or of the great Dina Galli. Her voice was not pleasant or harmonious. Physically she was not attractive; she was rather small, and her face, although expressive, could not be considered very feminine. Often she had to compete with rivals whom nature had supplied with all the gifts of beauty and charm. In that professional "war," she learned to use the weapons of intelligence, boldness, and faith, in order to come out victorious.

Hers was not a sudden victory; it came gradually, after many difficult

moments of debilitating anxiety. As in the case of swordsmen and pugilists where agility and accuracy can overcome sheer physical strength, so in Emma Gramatica's case—she countered the physical attractiveness of actresses like Tina Di Lorenzo or Lyda Borelli with artistic virtues of psychologically powerful characterization, of the ability to portray very different personalities, of the ability to pass from one mode to another (tragic melodramatic, comical), of simplicity and natural spontaneity, which are still remembered, in spite of the time gone by, for their rare, refreshing, genuine purity. Emma never resorted to vulgarity, even when the roles that she interpreted allowed some deviation from propriety. Reciting on the stage was to her *Arte Pura* (pure art).

A gentlewoman (in the real sense of the word) in her private life, it is not an exaggeration to say that on the stage she possessed the composed reserve of a nun. In fact, it is with a genuinely religious spirit that she portrayed the characters into whom she had to instill life, even when they did not exactly respond to her own artistic profile. But when a role happened to suit her, she would become a magnificent interpreter, a true priestess of her art. For this reason she was so successful in the role of Vynnyčenko's Natalia Pavlovna.

Emma Gramatica, like Eleanora Duse before her, made a lasting contribution to the history of the international repertoire on the Italian stage. If we listed the non-Italian plays which she revealed to the Italian public, we would be astonished at the wide range of theatrical culture that this exceptional actress had at her command. She was the ideal ambassador of international dramaturgy: always sensitive to fresh voices, she would make new plays from various countries immediately known to the Italian public. This is probably the reason for her initial interest in Vynnyčenko. A messenger of poets, and not a mediator of merchants, she was a necessary voice of our time; she served Italian intellectual life, she enriched it, she illuminated it with lights that perhaps without her would have remained unknown to Italians. It was only the future that to her was the sum of her dreams of art, perfection, and conquest. And she did accomplish what she had set out to do.

I wish to conclude my note by mentioning that in her meteoric rise from humble beginnings, in her overcoming of numerous obstacles, in

her dedication to hard work, and in her adoration of art, Emma Gramatica resembled her Ukrainian friend, Volodymyr Vynnyčenko.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. "Commedie Italiane e Straniere," from the magazine *Noi e il Mondo*, I: 683-712. (*Le Menzogne*, dramma ucraino in tre atti.)
2. Silvio D'Amico, *Storia del Teatro Italiano*.
3. Cesare Giulio Viola, "Arte di Emma Gramatica," *Scenario*, I, no. 4 (III dello Spettacolo Italiano, Maggio 1932, X), pp. 28-31.
4. Alfredo De Sanctis, "Emma Gramatica," *Caleidoscopio Glorioso* (Florence: Giovannini, 1946). pp. 143-147,
5. Italian Encyclopedia *Treccani*, p. 311.
6. Critical reviews of the drama *Menzogne* (Lies), from the following Italian newspapers:
  - a) *Il Momento*, Rome, October 24, 1924.
  - b) *La Stampa*, Turin, October 25, 1924.
  - c) *La Gazzetta del Popolo*, Milan, October 24, 1924.
  - d) *Corriere Padano*, Ravenna, February 17, 1926.



# Part IV



## Book Reviews

*The Song of Prince Igor: Russia's Great Medieval Epic.* Translation, Introduction and Commentary by Robert Mann. Eugene, Oregon: Vernyhora Press, 1979, 70 pp.

The present translation of the *Ihor Tale*, by a young American Slavist, has strong claims to consideration as an outstanding scholarly edition of *Ihor*. Not only does the translator and editor display a very considerable erudition, but he brings fresh insights to our understanding and appreciation of the *Tale*.

Unfortunately, Mr. Mann's discoveries are only stated here; the details are to be contained in a forthcoming scholarly study: *Lances Sing: the Old Russian Igor Tale*. Until that work appears, it is not possible to make any precise judgment on the author's claims to accuracy.

Most important of these findings—one that in the present reviewer's opinion is justified (though no doubt exaggerated in places)—is Mr. Mann's discovery of the close, well-nigh systematic parallel between the imagery of *Ihor* and that of East-Slavic wedding songs. Thus, Mr. Mann likens the dream of Svjatoslav of Kiev, usually interpreted as a dream of death, to the bride's foreboding dream of the coming wedding, a dream that may employ death imagery. No doubt there are difficulties in this approach: first, more general folkloric references may be mistakenly interpreted as references to bridal and wedding folklore (as possibly in the instance just cited). Second, the new approach requires that the bride be cast in the role of *male* figures, e. g., Ihor, Vsevolod, or Svjatoslav in the instance just cited. Finally, Mr. Mann never states a principle on the basis of which the use of bridal imagery would be relevant to *Ihor* (though such a principle may conceivably figure in the forthcoming study). Be that as it may, such a principle is by no means obvious. In Jaroslava's celebrated lament for Ihor, the use of the language and imagery of death laments is of course evident, but the same can hardly be said for bridal imagery.

Mr. Mann follows the line set forth by Sreznevskij, Peretts and Ržiha when he argues that the text of *Ihor* is essentially a recording of an elaborate oral song, an approach to which the present reviewer is sympathetic and one that would help to explain the extremely faulty condition of the text as we have it. (All copies of the *Zadonščina*, also an oral song in this view, are also extremely faulty.) He therefore opposes the view, most recently stated by such scholars as Jakobson and Lixačev, that the work is essentially a literary text.

Mr. Mann's second potentially important contribution is a stress on mythic elements in the text. Here he seems to have less evidence, though the approach is again tempting. But it seems very doubtful that *Ihor* contains vestiges of "a major Russian myth about the thunder god Perun." (*Ihor*, of course, never mentions Perun.) Nor does Mr. Mann tell us the source of his view that the

East-Slavic Trojan was a dragon. (Trojan is mentioned in the East-Slavic versions of the Slavonic *Xoždenie bohorodicy po mukam* as a deity worshipped by the Eastern Slavs.) Perhaps we can judge this hypothesis better when Mr. Mann's study finally appears.

If in 11. 104-105 of Mr. Mann's translation, the Polovtsians are *fleeing* from Ihor (who defeats them in an initial action), the same can hardly be said with confidence about 11. 142-143, which immediately precede the main military action: Gzak and Končak are hardly *fleeing* (*běžit*), but rather hastening to attack.

In 1. 246 the image "the bloody wine ran dry" (*krovavago vina ne dosta*) scarcely means that Ihor's men "ran out of weapons," as Mr. Mann's commentary would have it, but that they had no more blood to shed. Incidentally, the imagistic association of wine and blood is well known in oral literature, and particularly in Old Norse battle poetry (with which *Ihor* will perhaps be compared someday).

A major innovation of Mr. Mann's version is his notion that the apostrophes to the princes are pronounced by Svjatoslav, rather than by the author. This point has always bothered the present writer: the absence of punctuation or marked change of style, of course, makes it quite impossible to tell to whom these speeches should be credited. A closer study of the question is certainly necessary.

Many other small matters could be discussed, either in support of or attack on Mr. Mann's version. Still it cannot be denied that he has taken a fresh, and in many respects an independent, approach. We await his major study with interest.

WILLIAM E. HARKINS

Hryhorij Ja. Serhijenko. *T. H. Ševčenko i Kyrylo-Mefodijevs'ke Tovarystvo*. Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1983. 205 pp.

Since 1928, when Zynovij Hurevyč published his study of the Brotherhood of Sts. Cyril and Methodius under the revealing title *Moloda Ukraïna* (Young Ukraine), this most important topic in Ukrainian intellectual history has been virtually taboo. This is especially so in Ukraine, where only cursory attempts to deal with it have been made by V. Horbatjuk (1939), Ju. Kovmir (1950) and I. Nazarenko (1964, 1966). A significant Russian study of the Brotherhood appeared in 1959 in Moscow (P. A. Zajončkovskij, *Kirillo-Mefodievs'koje obščestvo*), but this product of the Khrushchev "thaw" was not widely welcomed in Ukraine. Writing in 1983, Serhijenko dismisses it because Zajončkovskij's work "calls into doubt the existence of the revolutionary-democratic group headed by

T. H. Ševčenko," and "the society is defined [by Zajončkovskij] as exclusively liberal-bourgeois in character."

After such a prolonged silence, Serhijenko's study is welcome indeed. In the 1960s, announcements were made in Soviet Ukrainian scholarly journals that the Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood would soon be honored by scholarly analyses and by the publication of a three-volume collection of primary documents. The latter promise has remained unfulfilled, but Hryhorij Serhijenko's work may be regarded as making some kind of mark. One would wish it were a landmark, which it is not. Serhijenko follows the old Soviet line, claiming that the Brotherhood (he avoids the word *bratstvo*, substituting *tovarystvo*), which was full of liberals like Kostomarov and Kuliš, managed to play a positive role in historical development because it was, as it were, hijacked by the radical Ševčenko.

One should, of course, acknowledge the great influence Ševčenko and his poetry had on the "brethren," but one should not exaggerate, as Serhijenko does, the importance of the "left wing" of the Brotherhood. Undeniably, Ševčenko was more radical than Kuliš, Bilozers'kyj or Kostomarov, but he did not write the *Knyhy bytija* (Books of Genesis) or the statute of the Brotherhood which are its two most trenchant documents. Serhijenko, incidentally, rejects what most other scholars agree on—that Kostomarov was the author of the *Knyhy bytija*. "In general," he writes, "*The Books of the Genesis of Ukrainian People* must be regarded as an anonymous work" (p. 86). To impose a division of "right" and "left" on the Brotherhood is to violate historical truth which may best be revealed by assuming that men of different outlook and temperament were drawn together by a common cause. It is through the study of their personalities, backgrounds and views, rather than through pseudo-Marxist stereotypes, that we can come to see and appreciate the nucleus of modern Ukrainian political thought.

The curious thing about Serhijenko's work is that it furnishes all the facts known to us about the Brotherhood but arranges them so as to prove a preconceived thesis. The reader may be grateful for the former but less willing to accept the latter. Serhijenko's facts, indeed, have been known for a long time. They were discovered between 1907 and 1928, and have not been substantially supplemented since then. One is left to wonder if the promised but unforthcoming three volumes of documents would contain new material. The nagging suspicion remains that there may be more hidden in the archives.

In the first chapter on the "social and class differentiation of forces in the socio-political movement in Russia" Serhijenko's bias is plainly visible. While admitting the overwhelming Slavophile influence in the first half of the century, as well as specifically Ukrainian interests in the Polish and Czech movements, he nevertheless blithely asserts that "the main thrust of social and political movement in Russia and in Ukraine was determined not by liberal or conservative activists, but by the revolutionary democrats who stood on the side of the peasantry and reflected its interests and desires" (p. 26). There follows the usual panegyric to Belinskij and Herzen. According to Serhijenko "even then [early

1840s] T. H. Ševčenko declared himself as a comrade-in-arms [*soratnyk*] and follower of the revolutionary democrats in Ukraine" (p. 29). Predictably, much is made of the program of the Petraševskij Circle, although at the same time Serhijenko admits that Kostomarov, during his stay in Kharkiv (1838-43) was interested not so much in the abolition of serfhood as in a Pan-Slavic federation.

Soviet critics are often at a loss in dealing with Kostomarov. The reviewer of Serhijenko's book, Ju. Pinčuk chides the author in *Ukrajins'kyj istoryčnyj žurnal* (No. 10, 1983) for relegating Kostomarov to the reactionary camp, and reminds him that the historian was not a conservative in the late 1840s. And yet, the idea of a group which would study the Slavs occurred to Kostomarov first in Kiev, when he already knew Kuliš and Ševčenko and was very much under the influence of Juzefovyč.

All these conservative leanings of the Ukrainian intelligentsia (which, reportedly, formed a group called "Kievan Youth") were, according to Serhijenko, decisively counteracted by the young radical Ševčenko. While no one can question that Ševčenko's poetry in the "Three Years" cycle contained some revolutionary ideas—much more radical than those of his Kievan friends—Serhijenko forgets that very few people knew those poems and that Ševčenko's popularity among his countrymen rested on a different perception—that of a master of the art of poetry and a bard of past Ukrainian glory. It is, therefore, hardly possible to claim, as Serhijenko does, that Ševčenko's poetry produced the "conditions which were favorable to the establishment in Ukraine of a secret society with a wide political program" (p. 42). Further in the book, in the chapter devoted to the creation of the Brotherhood, this claim is downplayed, and a fairly accurate account of the establishment of the Brotherhood is provided.

It is certain that Ševčenko took no part in the inception of the Brotherhood: its organization was the work of Kostomarov and Hulak (the experience of the latter in the Burschenschaft at Dorpat is downplayed in the book). As one of the Kievan circle of friends, Ševčenko knew about the Brotherhood; Serhijenko reports Kostomarov's account of the "many disagreements between me and Ševčenko." Serhijenko's interpretation of the nature of these disagreements is that Ševčenko criticized the moderate platform of the Brotherhood. This, of course, is pure conjecture. The fact that throughout his life Ševčenko preserved good relations with the "bourgeois liberals" Kostomarov and Kuliš testifies to his tolerance of different views and to his understanding that men of different opinions could and should be united in a common cause. It is the unity and not (as Serhijenko would have us believe) the disunity of the Brotherhood, which is so remarkable.

Although there is no doubt that Ševčenko's poetry had a profound impact on the "brethren" (see, especially, Kuliš's testimony), his actual participation in the Brotherhood has been widely debated. It was, after all, for his poetry, rather than for his participation in that organization, that he received such a severe sentence. It seems somewhat futile to this reviewer, in fact, to try and ascertain the degree of Ševčenko's participation in it. Any such attempt ignores the possibility that Ševčenko deliberately kept at some distance from the Brotherhood,

recognizing his own special mission as a poet. Be that as it may, Serhijenko's claim that "under T. H. Ševčenko's influence there was formed within the society a revolutionary-democratic group" (p. 59) is completely unfounded. Similar difficulties in analyzing the Brotherhood's history, resulting from the constrictions of the Marxist-Leninist straight-jacket, flaw the author's discussion of the program of the Brotherhood. Serhijenko pays little attention to the Christian aspect of that program, although the evidence in *Knyhy bytija* and other accounts is overwhelming. It is a pity that Serhijenko is not familiar with some contemporary Christian—in this case, Catholic—church groups in Central America which advocate revolution, although he does mention early Christian socialism. In all fairness, he does not conceal many "unpalatable" points in the Brotherhood's platform (e.g. their admiration of the U.S. constitution), although he upsets the balance by spending too much time (an entire chapter) on showing the affinity of *Knyhy bytija* with some of Ševčenko's ideas.

In the end, Serhijenko's long chapter on the Brotherhood's ideology comes to a surprisingly honest conclusion: the brethren "do not protest against the exploitation of the masses and do not call on them to conduct a revolutionary struggle against the exploiters" (p. 100). Hence their limitations. However, on the next page, there is the inevitable reminder: "At the same time the revolutionary democrat T. H. Ševčenko decidedly rejected the sermons of reformism and wrote a devastating critique of Christian dogma, which called on the masses of the people to suffer and be humble." This rather conciliatory conclusion—reminiscent of the Ukrainian proverb "The wolf is sated and the goat is safe"—does not end the argument. There follows a short chapter "The Political Propaganda and the Contacts of the Cyrillo-Methodians: The Spread of the Revolutionary Works of T. H. Ševčenko" (pp. 102-23). Attempts in this chapter to portray Ševčenko as a rabblouser are again not very successful.

The reader gleans more information about the Brotherhood in the next chapter which deals with their activities in the field of education (pp. 123-43). Also, Serhijenko's account of the trial of the "brethren" is exhaustive and accurate: it is here that the author often dips into archival material. From earlier accounts of the trial, which are corroborated here, one could not but appreciate the incisive evaluation of the Brotherhood by Orlov and Dubel't of the Third Section. One wonders, incidentally, if today's KGB interrogators of Ukrainian dissidents are equally sharp and intelligent—in any case, the thoroughness and ruthlessness of the Third Section has certainly been passed on to today's *gendarmes*. Despite the secrecy of the trial, the news and repercussions were wide and important. Serhijenko tries to assess such public opinion in the last chapter of his work. In order to hew to the official line, he scandalously misinterprets Belinskij's letter to Annenkov (p. 168) in which that Russian critic unequivocally branded Ševčenko and Kuliš as "the enemies of all progress." Alas, this is something that the Soviet reader can learn neither from Serhijenko, nor from anyone else.

In that short concluding chapter Serhijenko also feels obliged to follow the official line by paying his respects to Lenin and to the official theses of the Central Committee on the occasion of the 300th Anniversary of the "reunion" of

Ukraine with Russia (1954), which declare that Ševčenko "saw the path of the liberation of the Ukrainian people first of all in the revolutionary union of all the Slavic peoples with the Russian people" (p. 176).

A careful reader will be grateful for Serhijenko's thorough account and discussion of the Brotherhood. However, the reader will have to wait for a definitive study of that fascinating subject, free from constant ideological shadow-boxing.

GEORGE S. N. LUCKYJ

*Vybrani lysty Pantelejmona Kuliša, ukrajins'koju movoju pysani.* Ed. Jurij Luc'kyj. Introduction Jurij Ševelov. New York-Toronto: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., 1984. 326 pp.

After reading this book twice, I recalled Xvyl'ovyj's reverential references to Kuliš in his polemical articles, in which he regarded himself as the direct heir of the writer ("We and the proletariat are descended from Kuliš"). To be sure, Kuliš also impressed Xvyl'ovyj by his constant worry about Ukrainian culture, which he wanted to see raised to the level of the important countries of the world. Testimony to these views can be found in the letters. "Let them criticize it [Ukrainian poetry] as much as they want," he wrote in a letter to Oleksandra Myloradovyč on March 6, 1857, "yet it will forever remain the temple of my soul. It will rescue any pure heart from despondency, it will raise it aloft and adorn it with the flowers of paradise." Writing in the same month to Hryhorij Galagan, Kuliš informed him that he was translating *Childe Harold* and was getting ready to translate *Hamlet*, *Wilhelm Tell*, *Goetz von Berlichingen* and *The Bride of Lammermoor*. One can imagine how much satisfaction it would have given Xvyl'ovyj if he had been able to read that letter, in which Kuliš pointed out that he was translating "in order to refine the forms of our language which has become peasant-like, in the service of universal human thought."

Xvyl'ovyj, however, was probably not very well acquainted with Kuliš's literary heritage, which was accessible only to scholars. Hence, it is all the more curious that Xvyl'ovyj intuitively understood Kuliš's role in the cultural development of the nineteenth century. He formulated this succinctly in one sentence: "These people [Kuliš for Xvyl'ovyj was the first among them] proceeded on the right path, but, having encountered native parochialism, they remained tragic figures, full of contradictions and errors" (M. Xvyl'ovyj, *Tvory v pjat'ox tomax*, vol. IV, p. 179).

This sentence of Xvyl'ovyj could stand as an epigraph to the book under review. Kuliš's letters are indeed full of contradictions, with which he struggled, and are permeated by the tragedy of his personal fate. This is how Kuliš regarded the cultural leaders in Kiev: "Kiev is an intelligent city—no doubt



about it. I very much regret that I did not have a chance to live there long enough" (to Vasyľ Tarnovs'kyj, May 8, 1856). Ten years later (on July 12, 1867), however, he wrote to Ivan Xyl'čevs'kyj: "As for Kiev, forgive me, but there is hardly a more idiotic city in the world." This is how Kuliš viewed everything—the Russians, the Poles, his friends, the Cossack era. Everyone, even those closest to him, and more distant people whom Kuliš met during his turbulent life and whom he admired, occasionally became victims of his harsh opinions.

His judgment of others, frequently so severe, was of no help to him in his own affairs. In a letter to Oleksander Barvins'kyj (May 18-30, 1869), while giving advice on how to compile a reader in Ukrainian literature, he criticized most of his contemporaries. Maksymovych "is not one to reveal a drop of creativity." Kostomarov "has contributed much to history, but nothing to the development of literature," Konys'kyj "has failed to introduce a single new form into our language." Petrenko makes no sense (*pryšyj kobyli xvist*). Kuliš goes on in this vein, lashing out at everybody, including his closest friend Ševčenko (his poem "Pryčynna" is very weak, his "Nevol'nyk," "Černec," "Moskaleva krynycja" and *Nazar Stodolja* rank much lower than he does as a person).

To be sure, some of Kuliš's judgments were just, but they did not remain secret and harmed his relations with others. Other traits of his difficult character also helped to put his friendships in jeopardy. He regarded his life as a mission bestowed on him by God Himself. "What, my dear friend, if indeed God has stretched out His hand over me?" he wrote to Oleksandra Myloradovych on February 18, 1857. "What if the Almighty's will gives extraordinary power to my words? What if my heartfelt sufferings, my designs—not revealed to anyone—are turned by the Divine Spirit into a great achievement for posterity?" From such a fantasy about his own destiny, it was only one step to the conviction that everything revolved around him and that everybody must do what he, Kuliš, told him to do. On July 15, 1860 he wrote to Stepan Nis: "So tell them that without hearing my opinion, whatever my opinion might be, they should not print any of your [works]. As long as I have the strength, I will protect you and some others from falsehood in literature and will sort out the pure grain from the chaff." Kuliš also wanted Ševčenko's poems to go through his hands. He wrote to him on December 22, 1857, "First, send them to me for review, so that I have the final check . . . I dearly love your muse and will not begrudge the time to rewrite what she inspired you with. Let her not appear among people like an untidy and disheveled gypsy girl; let her appear before the world as a beautiful girl, the good daughter of her father, so that one may recognize her father by her."

It is small wonder that practically nobody could stay friends or work with a man of such a domineering nature. It was this quality, as well as what Xvyl'ovyy called the "native parochialism" of Ukrainian society around him, which drove Kuliš toward the end of his life to tragic solitude on his estate "Motronivka," which he significantly renamed "Hannyna Pustyn'" (Hanna's Desert). But this is only one side of the coin.

I began this review by admitting to a second reading of the book, not only for the purpose of writing a review. The book can be read twice for pleasure, like a very good novel with a single character, in our case—the writer of the letters. The letters reveal not only a tormented, contradictory and difficult man, but also a man of highly developed intellect, who saw wider and further than his contemporaries did. A good example of this is his desire to see a true “Europeanization” of Ukrainian culture. In a letter to Nis of November 2, 1890, he wrote: “Do not be offended by foreign words. I do not share the view that we should not borrow from anyone either tobacco or a light for our pipe. The pipe will remain ours. Nations which divided Greece and Rome have built their own languages, as well as their own edifices, out of Greek and Roman ruins. And nobody can say that Dante’s language was stolen; yet it was at one time such a lowly dialect, a jargon, that Cicero’s heirs would have stopped their ears (so as not to hear it) only because in that dialect no Dante or Shakespeare had yet spoken to them. We must take care above all to raise the creative spirit of our people. Then the edifice, even if partly built with foreign bricks or marble, will be noble and independent.” This desire, so well expressed, never had a chance to be realized in the feeble cultural environment of the nineteenth century; it had to be reformulated in our own century by the spokesmen of the new revival of the 1920s — Mykola Zerov and Mykola Xvyl’ovyj.

This edition of Kuliš’s letters is made doubly valuable by George Shevelov’s Introduction. In it the figure of Kuliš stands out as a living human being in his rise and fall, in his oscillation and in his true worth. I believe that Shevelov’s Introduction is the best article on Kuliš yet written. George Luckyj long ago gained a reputation as the editor of similarly valuable publications. This time the reader will be as grateful to him for this gift as he was some years ago for his *Vaplitjans'kyj zbirnyk* (VAPLITE Collection).

IWAN KOSZELIWEK

Volodymyr Vynnyčenko. *Ščodennyk* (Diary). Vol. 1; 1911-1920. Ed., introd. and annot. by Hryhorij Kostiuk. Edmonton-New York: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies and the Vynnyčenko Commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., 1980. 490 pp.

Depending on the candor of the individual, a politician’s diary can illuminate many a puzzling moment of his public life. Volodymyr Vynnyčenko’s position is rather unique in Ukrainian literature and politics, as well as in the area of Soviet policies toward Ukraine and other Soviet nationalities. This diary, therefore, should be of interest to scholars in several disciplines.

Vynnyčenko was a Ukrainian socialist activist and writer who was persecuted and imprisoned by the tsarist government. He was forced to flee Ukraine, and he lived in Western Europe for many years. In 1902 he began to publish his literary works—short stories, novels and plays. These immediately became quite controversial because their author did not hesitate to expose the superficiality and hypocrisy of the behavior and morals of individuals, families and social groups. The years of the Ukrainian national liberation, 1917-1919, brought Vynnyčenko to the forefront of political action; he occupied two of the most responsible positions in the Ukrainian government: first, General Secretary of the Central Rada (Council), and later, President of the Directorate of the Ukrainian National Republic. In 1919 the Entente Powers demanded his dismissal in exchange for their cooperation; he voluntarily resigned and emigrated to Western Europe. After the Soviets took power in Ukraine and began their program of oppression of Ukrainians, Vynnyčenko attempted to negotiate with them for the preservation of at least a minimum of rights and privileges. This political step made him even more controversial among Ukrainian émigrés, while his earlier participation in the nationalist government (and his relentless defense of Ukrainian autonomy) made his name an anathema in the Soviet Union.

This first volume of Vynnyčenko's diaries, consisting of nine manuscript notebooks (out of a total of forty-one, to be published in approximately six additional volumes), covers the years 1911-1920.\* It provides many hitherto unknown facts about Vynnyčenko and some reasons for his frequently controversial ideas and actions. Reading this volume, one quickly realizes that Vynnyčenko's diaries are not literary works, nor were they intended for publication. This, perhaps, is one reason that the author faces his own self with exceptional courage; one may even find his candor about himself and his intimate life almost embarrassing. But his personal notes and comments clearly demonstrate his abilities as a writer; his gifts of observation of people and events is particularly striking. His comments on and assessments of leading Ukrainian political and cultural figures, as well as other Slavic cultural and political leaders (Stanislavskij, Nemirovič-Dančenko, Trubetzkoy, Trotsky, Kamenev and Beneš) are indeed valuable.

For the literary scholar the diary is valuable in several other respects. The reader is privileged to witness the author's devotion to the details of life, to interesting human behavior, dialogue, dialect, idiomatic expressions; he is privileged to follow the birth and development of certain ideas and motifs which later found their place in plays or novels. In many cases, the author even marked the entries which he later used in a certain literary work. Quite punctiliously, Vynnyčenko recorded the dates when he wrote a given work (or even

\* Since the writing of this review, the second volume of the diaries has been published.

thought about it), and how many hours he spent on it—thus allowing a researcher to calculate the exact time devoted to a play or a novel. Of interest to a biographer are the financial records of the family for 1916, showing the salary of Vynnyčenko's wife, Rosalia Lifschitz, who worked as a physician at a hospital, and earned three to ten times less than he did for his fiction and the stage productions of his plays in several languages and in various countries. His wife was completely dedicated to his plans and actions, and often served as his assistant or aide in handling bureaucratic arrangements for him—as if to spare him the embarrassment of having to deal with such matters without numerous aides whose services other politicians enjoyed (although he did have a secretary and an aide even during the first years of emigration). He shared his secrets with his wife and was completely frank with her in all matters.

The reader of the diaries can follow the development of Vynnyčenko's basic personal philosophy, to which he tried to adhere, and especially of his credo "honesty with oneself." In his self-analyses he was indeed determined to be almost pitilessly honest with himself. At times, he assumed the role of an impartial observer of himself, and in other instances, that of a strict guardian, judge or examiner of his own principles. Several times he asked himself if his role in politics, with its fame and the attentions showered on him from all sides, brought him any pleasure. His answers were always in the negative. When it came to his literary ambitions, however, Vynnyčenko admitted a craving for fame. "I want fame . . . earned on the basis of my strength, my knowledge, my work, my talent . . ." (p. 393).

Both in his works and in his daily existence, Vynnyčenko constantly searched for "harmony in life"—that is, the ability to lead one's life according to one's proclaimed principles, which should always include not only one's own welfare, but also that of others. And yet, Vynnyčenko sometimes demonstrated a surprising lack of harmony in his life, resulting in sharp and painful personal conflicts. This, paradoxically, often stemmed from his loyal adherence to the principle of "honesty with oneself." Although he was happiest as a writer, when he was called to serve in his nation's government, he felt that he could not refuse his country, which was then undergoing a national rebirth. And so, for almost two years, he put aside his writing, and often complained about this sacrifice. Although he disagreed with many of his colleagues in the Ukrainian government, his diary for that period does not reflect an open rift with them. He displayed, however, little respect for the two men with whom he shared top government responsibilities—Symon Petljura and Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj. Vynnyčenko considered them to have landed on the political scene by accident; they themselves were incapable of realizing "the grandeur and the immense importance of their own steps" (p. 310). Nevertheless, in the two years of intense and frenetic political activity, he claimed to have submitted to the will of the majority, for the sake of the country. Then, with time, his comments about the two men began to grow more and more reproachful and caustic. He presented Petljura as a self-centered person, who was primarily concerned about his own popularity, while being careless and irresponsible in his duties (the organization of

the army, training of recruits, conscription reforms, etc.). Vynnyčenko also blamed Petljura for playing up too much to "the bourgeoisie" and church leaders, and for disregarding the need to organize the workers and to cooperate with them and their unions. By losing their support, Petljura is said to have opened the door to the Bolsheviks. Vynnyčenko called Hruševs'kyj "an envious, dishonest old man" (p. 316); he could not forgive the professor for proofreading a galley of his own work, while an important law was being voted upon.

The unrealistic plans and self-important poses of many government figures, and later many émigrés, greatly pained him. Slowly he began to feel alienated from many of his former co-workers in the government, as well as from the émigrés in the nationalist camp. At the same time, he held on to his belief in the saving mission of socialism. Because of this, he encouraged Soviet Russia to save the Revolution. But, on the other hand, he scorned the eternal tendency of Russia to view events in other countries as support of Russia, as well as Russian innate chauvinism and its imperialistic and messianic behavior. While living in Russia, he blamed its intelligentsia for civic apathy during World War I, particularly for displaying little support for conscripts, and for having no sympathy for the wounded. The typically Russian submissiveness to power and unhygienic living conditions repulsed him.

The loss of Ukraine's independence greatly grieved Vynnyčenko. His near-physical torment finally led him to the decision to support *any* Ukrainian government (from a reactionary to a Bolshevik one), if it would only be truly Ukrainian: "Then it would possess harmony, a higher form of civic and individual existence" (p. 338). In the spring of 1920, Moscow had to cope with a particularly strong wave of Ukrainian resistance. It needed Vynnyčenko's tremendous authority to pacify the unrest. Feelers were put out to Vynnyčenko, who was then in Western Europe, through Lenin's "favorite student," the Hungarian Béla Kun and his associates. They brought an invitation for him to come to Soviet Russia and take an important position in the central Soviet government. Upon his insistence, he was promised a position in the Soviet Ukrainian government. On the one hand, Vynnyčenko knew that local Russians and Jews would oppose his attempts to turn the government in a pro-Ukrainian direction—but, on the other, he wanted to help both Ukraine and the cause of socialism. He knew that if Moscow lost Ukraine, it would also lose the Revolution. This, in turn, would considerably weaken the cause of socialism in Western Europe. It was Vynnyčenko's belief that only socialism could free Europe from capitalism—once Europe was "truly free," Ukraine would gain its own independence.

Probably because of psychological pressures, caused by the state of emigration and by his attempts to come to an agreement with Soviet Russia, Vynnyčenko's comments about Petljura grew more and more vituperative: he criticized the way the latter was directing the affairs of the Ukrainian government, his cooperation with the Poles (e.g. losing Western Ukraine to them) and with General Denikin, who "hangs all the important Ukrainians, shoots the less prominent ones, and arrests the average ones" (p. 365) as soon as he enters a

Ukrainian city. Petljura's cooperation with the Germans and the Entente Powers particularly annoyed Vynnyčenko. And while he criticized Petljura's collaboration with foreigners and submission to their demands, Vynnyčenko, in turn, continued to bargain with Moscow. He called his impending mission "my road to Golgotha," where he would "drink again my cup of debasement" (p. 409). He kept putting his demands to Moscow, primarily stressing a relatively independent Ukrainian government, the statewide use of the Ukrainian language, and the return of Western Ukraine to Ukraine—all in exchange for his support of a Soviet Ukraine and of the legitimization of the Soviet state by the Western powers. Finally Vynnyčenko decided to visit Moscow.

After arriving in Moscow, Vynnyčenko noted that the typical Russian chauvinism was even stronger than the spirit of the Revolution or communism itself. In his diary, he called himself quite naive for going to Moscow. He, nevertheless, proceeded to confer with Lenin's representatives in Moscow, suggesting to Lenin that wars should be fought, not on a national, but only on a class basis. He was ready to fight Petljura and his Polish "coalition of the bourgeoisie," even if this would mean splitting Ukraine in two (p. 432). It would have to be done in the name of international socialism. Vynnyčenko's meeting with Trotsky, however, quickly made him realize that the Russians did not intend to recognize the basic rights of Ukraine, let alone grant it independence. Vynnyčenko refused the invitation to join the Communist Party of Russia, but expressed the wish to join the Ukrainian one. His Russian hosts skillfully employed psychological chicanery by forcing him to wait three months for their answer to his demands, and would not even let him visit Ukraine. He fully realized his embarrassing position, but still kept on vacillating. While biding his time in Russia, Vynnyčenko attended the Second Congress of the Third International. It was then that he witnessed the dishonesty, the declamatory empty phrases, the artificiality of the speeches and declarations. It hurt him that the Communist Party of Ukraine was not allowed to be represented as a separate body, but was treated as part of the Russian Party. Vynnyčenko noted that while the Congress discussed self-determination for African nations, Soviet Ukraine was actually being turned into a colony. He also observed the birth of "the cult of personality," with Lenin and Trotsky being glorified as superhuman beings, and pointed out that this was contrary to communist ideology.

After Vynnyčenko was finally allowed to go to Ukraine, he was shocked to see that the leading Ukrainian Communist Party officials were under constant threat of persecution as counterrevolutionaries—not only for demanding rights for Ukraine, but even for using the Ukrainian language in their own country. Vynnyčenko spoke with many members of the intelligentsia who had refused to enter the Party: they were hoping that he would be able to bargain with Moscow for a tolerable position for Ukraine and for some kind of real Ukrainian government, so that they would be able to join in and work for their country. Here again he was torn between reality and hope. When he was finally offered the position of People's Commissar for External Affairs, he also demanded a seat in the Politburo, realizing that without it his hands would be tied. When

this was refused, he in turn refused his post. He saw that this final answer from Moscow was the acid test for the whole Ukrainian-Russian relationship. It finally dissipated the last traces of his own political naiveté. Only then did he realize that his earlier suspicions were true: non-Russians, and Ukrainians especially, would have no equal rights in the Soviet Union. His despair over this brought him to the brink of suicide (other prominent Ukrainian communists, caught in similar situations, actually committed suicide). That final gesture was to be "a protest before European communism," an act of exposing the Soviet policy "against Ukraine and its people" (p. 471). He then realized the futility of such a gesture, and when he was later allowed to return to the West, Vynnyčenko decided to stay away from politics and serve Ukraine as a writer.

Vynnyčenko's "journey to Golgotha" in 1920 proved to be rather one to the Garden of Gethsemane, as he faced the grim reality of Russian communism in *praxis*. The question of why it was that only non-Russians, and Ukrainians especially, had to make sacrifices of their nation for the sake of socialism—while Russia did not—continued to torment him. The long period of vacillation and of the final awakening in the case of such a brilliant and observant mind as Vynnyčenko's may well reflect on the dilemma that his contemporaries, with less analytical and logical minds, had to face and resolve in those uncertain and puzzling times. Vynnyčenko's confessions and difficult debates with his own conscience may well serve as a basis for a psychological study of the effects that an idealistic approach to communist ideology has on thoughtful individuals.

*Ščodennyk* is provided with ample annotations explaining Vynnyčenko's private codes, as well as names and references; they were carefully prepared by Hryhorij Kostiuk. Kostiuk has also written an introduction providing a background not only for this volume, but for the diaries as a whole. Kostiuk traces Vynnyčenko's development from a Social Democrat to that of a "citizen of the world," who placed the welfare of Ukraine at the center of all his thoughts and actions (p. 27). Included in the edition are about three dozen photographs of the author himself and a number of leading figures with whom he dealt. A detailed index has also been provided. One misses a chronology of Vynnyčenko's life within the time span of the volume, so necessary in a publication of this type. Although one should be aware of the subjective aspect of the work, it nevertheless contains many revelations, and is an important document of the era, not only for the modern history of Ukraine but for that of Eastern Europe as a whole. It is indeed a valuable and unique publication.

Hryhorij Kostiuk. *Volodymyr Vynnyčenko ta joho doba: Doslidžennja, krytyka, polemika*. New York: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., 1980. 283 pp.

Hryhorij Kostiuk is a witness—an active and enthusiastic witness. Among the companions of his youth were such legendary figures as Mykola Xvyl'ovyj, Vale-rijan Pidmohyl'nyj, Jurij Janovs'kyj, Mykola Kuliš. He participated in the revival (or the renaissance, as it is now called) of Ukrainian culture in the 1920s, and was severely punished by the Soviet government for that activity. He continues his role as an enthusiastic witness in the emigration: he scrupulously follows the careers of the younger and youngest Ukrainian writers working in the West, heartily welcoming even some experimental work which is obviously at some distance from his own intellectual estate. But he has also become a witness of the past in the sense of archeological witnessing. He has "excavated" a number of important works—hopelessly buried so soon after their authors' own violent and mostly unrecorded deaths—in carefully edited volumes, with thorough commentaries and ample annotations, which have now become indispensable. Pidmohyl'nyj's novel *Misto* (The City), the most outstanding plays of Mykola Kuliš and an excellent reference work on Ukrainian literature by Mykola Plevako are only three examples. More recently, he has been busy resur-recting for us Mykola Xvyl'ovyj's full stature in an excellent five-volume edition.

I believe that the most important "discovery" among Kostiuk's recent "excavations" is that of Volodymyr Vynnyčenko's *oeuvre*, if only because it has been even less accessible, and is ultimately more valuable, than that of Xvyl'ovyj. Kostiuk himself seems to share this opinion, because he has devoted more time and energy to that task than to any other of his numerous and far-flung projects. That interest is, of course, contiguous with his work on the writers of the 1920s: it is becoming increasingly evident (mainly because of Kostiuk's efforts) that Vynnyčenko's influence on the Soviet Ukrainian prose of that time was momentous. There are sufficient opportunities for research and speculation in this newly opened area for at least a dozen scholarly lifetimes.

The volume at hand is one of Kostiuk's several important publications in the new area of Vynnyčenko studies: he edited a slim collection of articles written by himself and others, *Volodymyr Vynnyčenko: Statti i materijaly* (New York: UVAN, 1953), published a play, a handful of stories and two novels which had remained in manuscript at the author's death—*Prorok ta nevydani opovidannja* (The Prophet and Unpublished Stories; New York: UVAN, 1971), *Slovo za toboju, Staline!* (Take the Floor, Stalin!; New York: UVAN, 1971), *Na toj bik* (At the Other Side; New York: UVAN, 1972), *Namysto* (String of Corals; New York: UVAN, 1976)—and is now hard at work on the monumental task of editing Vynnyčenko's *Ščodennyk* (Diaries), the first two volumes of which we are fortunate to have in print (Edmonton-New York: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies and the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., 1980 and 1983). In the past thirty years, Kostiuk has written a great deal on



Vynnyčenko, examining the writer from various aspects: some, but by far not all, of that work has been reprinted in the present collection.

The collection, as its subtitle states, is a *mélange* of meticulous research, critical commentary, and impassioned polemics. In spite of such a "carnivalistic" variety of approaches and modes, together with the fact that some pieces are separated from each other by two decades, the book has a monographic and even a monostylous continuity. It is held together by that special and almost ineffable quality of enthusiastic energy which nourishes Kostiuk's style and underlies his unmistakable "grain of the voice." Vynnyčenko is brought to life for us in the book because Kostiuk is so alive.

Kostiuk's research articles contain a great deal of valuable information—hitherto hidden details of Vynnyčenko's life, reports on translations of his works into French, German, English, Italian, Norwegian, Dutch, Czech, Polish, Hebrew, Romanian, and Russian, lists of theatrical productions of his plays in Ukraine, Western countries, and Russia, and much else. There are instances when Kostiuk's research threatens to become too meticulous: reporting the measurements of the floor space of each room at Vynnyčenko's French estate "Zakutok," or the maiden name of the woman from whom Vynnyčenko bought it, seems to belong to hagiography rather than to biography. In most cases, however, the details are there to serve, rather than to dominate and intimidate, the discourse.

Kostiuk's punctilious research serves him particularly well in reports on Vynnyčenko's relations with other Ukrainian writers—not only the younger Soviet Ukrainian writers of the 1920s but also his seniors, particularly Lesja Ukrajinka and Serhij Jefremov, Ivan Franko and Ol'ha Kobylyjans'ka, and a number of others. (The designations "younger" and "seniors" do not refer so much to differences in age, which in some cases were slight, as to the given writer's importance in the first two decades of the century.) Kostiuk's article on Vynnyčenko's complex relationship with the noted critic and literary scholar Jefremov—a friendship fraught with controversy (perhaps even animosity), and yet illuminated by mutual respect (perhaps even love)—makes for particularly interesting reading. The reader can reconstruct the opposite ideological tendencies in the two writers' contemporary Ukraine, which they so commandingly represented: Jefremov's liberal-populist point of view implied an ultimate trust in the *status quo*, legalism, insistence on slow changes "from within," as opposed to the radical-revolutionary spirit, represented by Vynnyčenko, which implied a faith in extremes, a romantic (frequently heedless) utopianism, and an insistence on drastic changes "from without."

In the excellent article on Lesja Ukrajinka and Vynnyčenko, we learn about Lesja Ukrajinka's sympathies not only for Vynnyčenko's early work but, what to some readers may come as a greater surprise, for his political platform. Kostiuk "excavates" facts that have been either buried by time, or deliberately suppressed both by Ukrainian nationalists and by Soviet communists. Aside from informing us about such interesting political matters, the article helps to reinforce Lesja Ukrajinka's image (one that has been emerging in recent years) as a

witty, ironical, sometimes sarcastic, and politically highly sophisticated and complex intellectual—an image which successfully opposes the icon of a naive child-woman, not to speak of a heroic man-woman, which Ukrainians have been taught to worship.

Some errors, such as the play *Ščabli žyttja* (The Rungs of Life) being called a novel (p. 36), do not detract from the importance of this section of the collection. Kostiuk's critical essays, by and large, are as valuable as his research articles, although they give the reader more scope for a dialogue with the text. And that is how it should be, although Kostiuk himself might not agree. What I mean is that in this section of the collection we frequently come across the notion of "objectivity." Kostiuk demands such "objectivity" not only of himself but of other critics and even of the writer whom he discusses. As early as the opening essay, we read a rather typical accusation: "Critics were incapable of immersing themselves in the world of Vynnyčenko's ideas, images and stylistic devices as objective manifestations of his age, and as reflections of psychological, social and national relationships among the people of his time" (p. 12). If we add to such an insistence on "objectivity" Kostiuk's pervasive historicism (obvious even in the above quotation) and his concentration on the writer's life, we arrive at a critical method that has its roots in Taine's positivism and develops into an almost "classical" instance of the sociological method, as it was practiced in Ukraine in the 1920s, during Kostiuk's apprenticeship, and as it was tempered in the famous debates between the "sociologists" and the "formalists." A sociologically oriented reader might insist that such a method is obviously suited to the "specificity" of Vynnyčenko's own discourse, although younger Ukrainian critics are ready to read him with other critical instruments, perhaps deliberately chosen for their dialectical opposition to that supposed "specificity," existing as it does not so much in his texts as in certain readers' minds.

Even when it comes to the sociological method as such, our contemporary sociological criticism, nourished as it is by existentialism, psychoanalysis, semiotics, and deconstruction, has abandoned all false hopes of any "objectivity" in the reading of texts—for what "objectivity," after all, can there be in the dialogue between the text and the reader? It follows that it is equally dangerous to speak of the reader's "subjectivity" which implies willful violence inflicted on a text that remains in inert, object-like passivity. A term borrowed from existential phenomenology might perhaps be most fitting in this discussion—I have in mind *intersubjectivity*. To borrow another term from that philosophy, the critic, in my opinion, should strive not for "objectivity" but for *authenticity* in his intersubjective relationship with the text. Vynnyčenko's own notion of "honesty with oneself" might do just as well.

Although Kostiuk's literary upbringing will probably continue to impede his release from the bondage of a conscious idolatry of "objectivity"—his critical practice, fortunately, shows precious little of it; instead, it frequently demonstrates a passionate "honesty with oneself." His criticism evidences an uncompromisingly individual point of view and the fervent polemical voice of an actively thinking man. Once in a great while, however, Kostiuk's specific socio-

logical method does take him outside the ultimate borders of literature, widespread as they are. This is demonstrated particularly graphically in a passage on *Slovo za toboju, Staline!*. The critic begins with a very interesting observation, reminiscent not of sociology but, surprisingly enough, of its opposite number, OPOJAZ: "Putting aside the question of the reality or the utopianism of the idea of 'collectocracy,' the reader of the novel soon sees how in it the logic of art cancels out the logic of sociology. Or, more precisely, he perceives how a sociological concept, during the process of metaphorical thinking, becomes nothing but a supplemental compositional device in the striving for artistic truth." Well now. The reader braces himself for the impending explosion. But the explosion never comes. Instead, the idea fizzles out in the following sputter: "[Collectocracy] becomes for Vynnyčenko nothing but a metaphor, with whose help he attempts to organize public opinion around the as yet unresolved and tragic question of war and peace" (p. 78). The poetic metaphor, even after all the interesting things that have just been said about it, is condemned to remain a tool of social, if not political, action, which takes place far from the territory of the page. We have here an example of the reversal of the hermeneutic arc, only too familiar to Eastern European readers: from society—through the literary text—to society. It is now slightly more difficult to believe Kostiuk when he so assiduously separates Vynnyčenko, the writer from Vynnyčenko, the political activist, in order to silence the writer's enemies.

Such protestations notwithstanding, Kostiuk's kind of critical method almost forces him to hold unwaveringly in view Vynnyčenko's profile as a *homo politicus*. He seems to perceive a seamless merging of art and concrete political activity in Vynnyčenko's texts. This Vynnyčenko, however, is not my Vynnyčenko. In my increasingly frequent and devoted readings of Vynnyčenko's texts, I am constantly surprised at exactly the opposite: how little of the concrete political reality—of the charged atmosphere, which Vynnyčenko almost daily inhaled while writing his most important works—is really re-embodied in them. I see actual political events reflected most plainly in the play *Miž dvoch syl* (Between Two Powers) and, more diffusely, in the novel *Na toj bik*. As for Vynnyčenko's other literary texts, I enthusiastically agree with the first part of the passage from Kostiuk, quoted above: politics, distanced and strangely *abstracted*, indeed serves Vynnyčenko as a pure poetic metaphor or, I am willing to grant, as a complex sign of deeper "politics"—of psychological and philosophical conflicts within the discourse of power. At the risk of trivializing the question, let me admit my surprise during the reading of *Ščodennyk*, at how deeply Vynnyčenko despised his daily political duties and how he missed writing—the very physicality of the hand moving the pen across a sheet of paper. In the vortex of the fateful year 1918, he notes: "I am amazed at myself that I am writing, that I am holding my pen in my hand, and inscribing my thoughts with it. . . . I feel such love for that hand of mine, and for my simple, sad thoughts, so distant from all politics, from everything that has filled my life from the first days of the Revolution. . . . I want to run away, to go somewhere into the country, and to take up my pen again, to take up my dear, beloved work" (1:269-270). One is tempted to

add marginally that while Vynnyčenko's thoughts were often sad, they were rarely simple.

My refusal to admit "objectivity" as a criterion of literary criticism does not permit me to label Kostiuk's "political" Vynnyčenko as an "incorrect" view on the writer. That very refusal of mine, however, compels me to state that Kostiuk's Vynnyčenko is "incomplete." But then, that again is as it should be: to think otherwise would indeed mean to fall into a positivist, "objectivist" error. After all, if it were possible for a critic to produce a "complete" writer, the first able critic of Shakespeare (to paraphrase Sartre's image) would "digest" the *oeuvre* for us, leaving us with the empty, useless shells of the texts. We are looking forward to younger critics and scholars constructing many Vynnyčenkos for us, as they are already doing with other "classical" writers. One such Vynnyčenko might not be a new "construct" but a restoration—a darker, slightly "satanical," slightly (why not?) "decadent" Vynnyčenko—the one, in fact, whom Ukrainian priests were cursing and Ukrainian mothers were forbidding their young daughters to read back "in the old country." It goes without saying, however, that such a restoration would have to be an authentically literary one. And that, of course, would be new.

Kostiuk's less disputable weaknesses as a critic paradoxically stem from a kind of personal strength—the critic's steadfast loyalty to Vynnyčenko. This, incidentally, is also true of his writings on the men of the 1920s: once the hero is apprehended, adopted and anointed, he can do no wrong. The trouble with Vynnyčenko (as with Dostoevsky, whom he greatly resembles) is that his prose is flawed in many ways, mostly because of hurried composition. Kostiuk stubbornly refuses to discuss such flaws. I say "*refuses* to discuss" advisedly: he sees them, and even occasionally mutters something indistinct about them, but evidently does not want to "corrupt" the reader by bringing them up to the reader's consciousness.

A more serious instance of Kostiuk being blinded by adoration is his refusal to admit that Vynnyčenko might have had predecessors in Ukrainian literature. Vynnyčenko's very first story "Krasa i syla" (Beauty and Power), Kostiuk believes, was an unprecedented event. The critic quotes Ivan Franko's famous rhetorical question, expressed in a review of Vynnyčenko's early work: "And from where did you come to us, such as you are?" (p. 264). I can see Franko secretly smiling to himself and mumbling into his ruddy mustache: "You come from me, sonny, from me." The early Vynnyčenko's heavy debt to Franko's prose is obvious at first glance. Now that the images of Ivan Nečuj-Levyč'kyj and Panas Myrnyj are beginning to be sandblasted of layers upon layers of historical prejudices, and the writers are finally beginning to be treated as serious, and even pioneering, stylists — further research on Vynnyčenko's Ukrainian ancestry might bring really surprising results.

Kostiuk's great enthusiasm, ennobled by his personal courage and dignity, and by his profoundly democratic view on the world, is most evident in the polemical pieces in this collection. The critic inveighs against Vynnyčenko's numerous enemies—those diverse and often warring groups which for various

reasons have attempted to bury Vynnyčenko's legacy, and have almost succeeded in doing so. That their reasons are indeed diverse, and frequently even contradictory, testifies to the restlessness, the energy, and the horizons of Vynnyčenko's talent. He has been attacked by Ukrainian churchmen, by the Communist Party, by civic groups and by influential individuals for the "ambivalent morality," or (on an even more primitive level) for the erotic scenes and situations in his works. He has been chastised for pessimism, and even suspected of "neurasthenia." But his most ferocious enemies have always been political. Vynnyčenko managed, not only by the inherent complexity of his mind but also by his restlessly shifting positions on many practical political issues, to alienate several opposing camps in the Ukrainian political arena. His works are unconditionally banned in Soviet Ukraine. As Kostiuk informs us, some young critics' efforts to rehabilitate him during the Khrushchev years were quickly and severely suppressed. The followers of Petljura still cannot forgive him for his conflicts with that leader. And the rightist nationalist groups chastise him, even circa 1980, for his "socialism." All émigrés still remember his ephemeral attempts to find a *modus vivendi* with Soviet Ukraine in the late 1920s, when Vynnyčenko himself was in the emigration. It is, of course, painfully unfair that Vynnyčenko's lifelong attempts to search for a political standpoint that he could adopt as authentically his own, with the resulting abandonment of positions that proved to be existentially inadequate, should be equated with treason. It is perhaps even more unfair that Vynnyčenko's literary output is being "punished" for his political opinions. Kostiuk becomes eloquent, and doubtless just, in unmasking such detractors' basic dishonesty with the reader, and ultimately with the Ukrainian nation. Aside from the "Vynnyčenko dossier," much can be learned from these polemics about the underside of Ukrainian political thought and action.

Let me add, at the conclusion of this review, still another epithet to characterize Kostiuk's function in Ukrainian literature. I have in mind the epithet "useful"—a virtue that in certain literary-critical circles has recently fallen into disrepute. For better or for worse, Ukrainian literature cannot yet afford to speculate on the usefulness of useful criticism—a useful Ukrainian critic is still "useful" *a priori* and in every sense of that word. It has become a truism that the unenviable fate of every critic is to be stepped over: if he is deserving, he will be remembered as a talented prose stylist or, more rarely, as a historical factor in the process of his own undoing—sometimes as a link, but more frequently as a dialectical Negative. This has not yet come to pass in Kostiuk's case. He shares, with Jurij Šerex and Jurij Lawrynenko, the distinction of being most often quoted by younger men and women engaged in Ukrainian literary studies in the West, especially when it comes to twentieth-century literature. These three critics have established a framework of fact and opinion, the boundaries of which are only now beginning to be hesitantly and cautiously crossed. It is good to know, however, that these boundaries are there to be transgressed. Kostiuk's articles on Vynnyčenko certainly represent an important stretch of that framework.

Oksana Dray-Khmara Asher. *Letters from the Gulag: The Life, Letters and Poetry of Michael Dray-Khmara*. New York: Robert Speiler and Sons, 1983. 164 pp.

After the appearance of *Gulag Archipelago* by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, the term "Gulag" became a household word in the United States. Although not all readers were able to finish the book itself, the press quoted from it and commented on it so frequently that Americans now have a rather definite idea of the character and purposes of the organization named "Gulag." Yet even now there are a number of people who "for the sake of objectivity" are afraid to give credence to narratives of eyewitnesses, let alone seriously take unsigned notes, often scrawled on a scrap of paper and smuggled out of faraway labor camps, describing the horror of the life of Soviet political prisoners. They consider such evidence to be "hearsay"—unchecked and therefore doubtful rumors. For example, over fifty years ago a collection of heart-rending notes, smuggled out of the Soviet death camps, was published (*Out of the Deep: Letters from Soviet Timber Camps*, introd. by Hugh Walpole. London: G. Bles, 1933). But because these notes were unsigned, certain Western "Sovietologists" of that time regarded them as suspicious, possibly fabricated in the West. It is a well-known fact that many Western intellectuals doubted the very existence of Soviet labor camps as late as the 1950s. Solzhenitsyn's book helped to lay such doubts to rest.

In *Letters From the Gulag* we have similar authentic documents of human suffering—letters written from Soviet labor camps during the purges of the 1930s. They were written by Michael Dray-Khmara (Myxajlo Draj-Xmara), an outstanding scholar, poet, literary critic, and translator. He was arrested in 1935. The letters published in this volume were passed by the censor and reached his family by regular mail during the period between the summer of 1936 and the end of 1938, when he died in a prison camp.

The book under review consists of four parts. In the first part, Dray-Khmara's daughter, Oksana Dray-Khmara Asher, has provided biographical information about her father. In the second part, "My Mother's Story," she has translated and commented on her mother's description of Michael Dray-Khmara's arrest and of the subsequent fate of his family. The third, and main, part—"My Father's Letters (1936-1938)"—contains translations of forty-nine letters from various Gulag camps. The short fourth part, "Dray-Khmara as a Poet," is a descriptive essay on Dray-Khmara's poetry.

The first part shows us Michael Dray-Khmara as a healthy, physically robust person with a lively mind. When we read his letters from the Gulag camps (especially if we read between the lines), we perceive the gradual breakdown of a human being: at the beginning he attempted to preserve his health by sports and an optimistic outlook, but further letters show the inevitable progress of deterioration. The unbearable working conditions in the gold mines, the hunger, disease, winter frost of  $-57^{\circ}\text{C}$  (about  $-70^{\circ}\text{F}$ ) and other circumstances, which Dray-Khmara could only hint at (considering the Gulag censors) — all this gradually broke him down physically, as well as spiritually and mentally.

According to statistical data, ten to twelve million prisoners annually were confined in the Gulag death camps during the 1930s. According to very conservative estimates, Gulag prisoners, together with their families, comprised a minimum of fifty million, or one-fifth of present population of the Soviet Union. We should also realize that this equals approximately the total population of Great Britain, the total population of France, or Italy, or Mexico. These are the bare figures that do not speak to our imagination. But in the volume before us we meet a single flesh-and-blood "unit" of such statistics. We are also vividly reminded that behind most such "units" are their families, with their own suffering. We cannot help thinking: how many other people experienced similar or even worse horror? How many individuals? How many families? They and their suffering have vanished without a trace.

We should be grateful to the family of one of the Ukrainian martyrs of those evil years — the poet and scholar Dray-Khmara — for saving and bringing to the United States these forty-nine documents of human suffering. They are valuable documents indeed—possibly the only ones of their kind published in English. They are also very moving: one cannot read the book without anger, indignation, and deep sympathy.

The book is well designed. We note, however, a certain unevenness in the quality of the reproductions of valuable photographs. Also, numerous typographical errors mar the effect of the book. Nevertheless, we should be grateful to Oksana Dray-Khmara for this intrinsically valuable publication.

V. PAVLOVSKY

*Z hir karpats'kyx: Ukrajins'ki narodni pisni-balady.* Užhorod: Ordena družby narodiv vydavnytstvo "Karpaty," 1981. 462 pp.

While Carpatho-Ukraine is justly famous for its folk ballads, no attempt has been made, to this writer's knowledge, to bring various examples of the genre together in one volume. The present work attempts this with remarkable thoroughness, offering variants as well as the melodies of many of the songs. The volume represents the collective work of a number of scholars, with a useful introduction supplied by Stepan Myšanyč.

Ballads are one of the most attractive folklore genres for the modern reader. They specialize in strong, often melodramatic action, and often concern crimes, especially those of passion. Their laconic quality is noteworthy, and at times melodrama even passes into tragedy.

The genre is subdivided here in a somewhat untraditional but probably pragmatically useful way: historical ballads; ballads of family life; ballads of lovers; social ballads; and ballad-"chronicles." The first category is now well accepted in the Soviet Union for a variety of songs combining a fictional element with a historical setting or situation; it also corresponds, of course, to international ballads of this type such as many found in Child's celebrated collection of

Anglo-Scottish ballads. But it should be noted that *dumy* and *byliny* are often "historical" in a very similar sense. The last type, the ballad-"chronicle," is somewhat unconventional, since this is often a song about particular people and taken from real life, but the form, rough as it no doubt is, does offer an opportunity to observe the evolutionary process according to which casual songs develop into ballads.

The introduction discusses the use of the term "ballad," somewhat new for Ukrainian folklore scholarship. The older common term, "inferior epic song" (*nyžča epična pisenja*) is rejected. (By *nyžča* older scholars presumably meant "unheroic.") Unfortunately Myšanyč persists in the view that ballads are mixed "lyrico-epic," though this view has been contradicted in Soviet folklore scholarship by Vladimir Propp, and now seems outdated. Ballads, like historical songs, are purely epic in their classical form, but become increasingly lyricized as we approach modern times.

WILLIAM E. HARKINS



# Part V



# Chronicle

The following conferences and lectures took place at the sessions of the Academy between November, 1980 and December, 1984.

- |                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| November 2, 1980  | ● Oleh Fedyshyn: "The Polish Revolution—Cause, Problems, and Prognoses"  |
| December 7, 1980  | ● Alexander Dombrovsky: "What is the History of Ukraine?"  |
| December 21, 1980 | ● Anna Procyk: "Prague—a Ukrainian and Russian Emigré Mecca"<br>● Natala Liwycka-Cholodna: "Reminiscences of the Literary Scene in Prague"<br>● Petro Cholodny: "Reminiscences of Prague as a Center of Ukrainian Art" |
| February 1, 1981  | Conference conducted jointly with the Ševčenko Scientific Society.<br>● Jury Lozovsky: "Introduction to the General Theory of Labor Activity"  |
| February 22, 1981 | ● Myroslav Labunka: "The Role of Ideology in the Development of Religious and Political Centers in the Middle Ages"  |
| March 15, 1981    | ● Vasyl Hryshko: "The Ukrainian National Idea in the Works of Volodymyr Vynnyčenko"  |
| March 29, 1981    | Conference on Taras Ševčenko.<br>● Jurij Lawrynenko: "A Visit to the Land of Ševčenko (Reminiscences and Reflections)"   |
| April 12, 1981    | ● Mykola Kushnirenko: "Volodymyr Vynnyčenko, the Politician and Writer as Represented in the Memoirs of His Contemporaries"  |

- May 2, 1981      Conference commemorating the 120th anniversary of the death of Taras Ševčenko, organized by the Commission for Ševčenko Studies, which was founded by the Ševčenko Scientific Society, the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., and the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.
- George Y. Shevelov: Opening Remarks
  - George Grabowicz: "The Future of Ševčenko Studies"
  - John Fizer: "The Encoded Presence of General Romantic Categories in the Works of Ševčenko"
  - Bohdan Rubchak: "Images of Center and Periphery in Ševčenko's Poetry"
  - Maksym Tarnawsky: "Ševčenko's Ironic Paradise"
  - Roman Koropec'kyj: "The Narrative Structure of The Psalms of David"
  - Volodymyr Hitin: "On the Common Qualities of Ševčenko's Prose and 'Diary' "
- May 31, 1981      ● Roman Szporluk: "Kiev, the Capital of Contemporary Ukraine"
- October 18, 1981      ● Stepan Prociuk: "The Golden Age of Ukrainian Demography"
- October 30, 1981      Joint conference of the Ševčenko Scientific Society, the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., and the Ukrainian Literary and Art Club in New York.
- Borys Lewyts'kyj: " 'The Soviet Nation': Moscow's Contemporary Nationality Policy"
- November 22, 1981      Conference commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth and 40th anniversary of the death of Dmytro Revuc'kyj.
- Hryhorij Kostiuk: Opening Address
  - Wasyl Wytwycky: "Dmytro Revuc'kyj: His Life and Works"

- Reminiscences by Vasyl Zavitnewych, Vadym Pavlovsky, and Valerian Revutsky
  - Julian Kytasty: Musical performance
- December 6, 1981      Joint conference of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. and the Ševčenko Scientific Society.
- Paweł Korzec: "The Nationality Policy of the State and Relations Among Polish Minorities"
- December 13, 1981      ● Alexander Dombrovsky: "The Early Historical Stages of the Emergence of Kievan Rus' "
- December 20, 1981      ● Roman Serbyn: "University Youth During the Ukrainian National Renaissance of the 1860s"
- January 24, 1982      ● Marc Raeff: "Ukrainian-Russian Contacts in the 17th-19th Centuries in the Sphere of Political Culture"
- February 14, 1982      ● Mykola Kushnirenko: "Hryhorij Čuprynka's Poetical Works and Their National Significance"
- In the 1981-82 academic year, the Academy began a series of lectures on Ukrainian cities, in particular, Kiev, Kharkiv, L'viv, and Odessa, with the objective of presenting a regional history of Ukraine. The series includes scholarly reports, conferences, and reminiscences.
- February 28, 1982      The opening lecture of the series on Kiev.
- George Y. Shevelov: Opening Address.
  - Omelan Pritsak: "The Rise of the Princely City, Kiev"
- March 7, 1982      Joint conference of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. and the Ševčenko Scientific Society.
- Ivan Koropecyk: "Economic Studies in Ukrainian Universities before the Revolution"

- March 14, 1982      ● Rev. George Szumowskij: "Prehistoric Art of Ukraine"
- March 27, 1982      An evening of discussion on "The Future of Ukrainian Studies in the U.S."
- Yaroslav Bilinsky: "Introductory Remarks: The Publications of the Academy"
- William Omelchenko: "The Archives and Library of the Academy"
- Oleh Fedyshyn: "The Scholarly Activities of the Academy"
- George Y. Shevelov: "American Scholarship, Ukrainian Scholarship, and the Tasks of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S."
- Round-Table Discussion on "Ethnicity in the Professional and Academic World: Advantages and Disadvantages." Participants: Bohdan Wytwycky, Roman Koropecy, Andrew Fedynsky
- April 3, 1982      Conference on Ševčenko Studies, organized by the Commission on Ševčenko Studies of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., the Ševčenko Scientific Society, and the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.
- George Y. Shevelov: Opening Address
- George Grabowicz: Introduction
- Asya Humesky: "The Symbolism of Sound in the Poetry of Ševčenko"
- Leonid Rudnytsky: "The Meaning of Ševčenko's Statement, 'I Don't Know God' "
- Bohdan Struminsky: "The Role of Church Slavonic in Ševčenko's Works"
- George Grabowicz: "Ševčenko as a Millenarian"
- Jaroslav Padoch: Closing Comments
- April 4, 1982      Opening of the lecture series on Kharkiv, "Kharkiv University through the Eyes of Its Former Students."

- George Y. Shevelov: Introduction
  - Reminiscences: Lubov Drazhevskaja (1928-1929 and 1933-1935); Oksana Burevij (1939-1941); Oksana Solovej (1936-1941); Nadia Svitlychna (1953-1958).
- May 1, 1982      ● Paul Magocsi: "The Vienna Events of 1848 as Seen through the Eyes of Ukrainians"
- May 2, 1982      ● Jurij Lawrynenko: "The Enchantment and Disenchantment of My University Studies (Reminiscences in Lieu of Flowers on the Grave of Academician Aleksander Bilec'kyj)"  
Lecture in the Kharkiv series.
- May 23, 1982      ● Yaroslav Turkalo: "The Byzantine Heritage of the Kievan State"  
Lecture in the Kiev series.
- June 6, 1982      ● Albert Kipa: "The Life and Work of Vadym Kipa"  
● A selection of Vadym Kipa's songs performed by Phyllis Falletta-Olvin (soprano) and Irene Kipa-Deigl (piano)
- June 13, 1982      Joint conference with the Ukrainian Museum in New York.  
● Tyt Hewryk: "The Church Architecture of Kiev"  
Lecture in the Kiev series.
- September 26, 1982      ● George Y. Shevelov: "Transcarpathia at the Linguistic Crossroads (1941-45)"
- October 2, 1982      Joint conference with the Ševčenko Scientific Society and the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences of America on Ukrainian-Polish relations.  
● Speakers: Bohdan Ciuciura, Andrzej Kamiński, Frank Sysyn, Piotr Wandycz, Taras Hunczak, Stanisław Szypek.

- October 24, 1982      Conference commemorating the 80th anniversary of the birth of Natala Liwycka-Cholodna and Petro Cholodny.
- George Y. Shevelov: Opening Address
  - Ivan Korowytsky: "The Poetry of N. Liwycka-Cholodna"
  - Poetry reading by the author
  - Petro Cholodny: "A Word About Myself"
  - Yevhen Blakytyn: "The Creative Work of Petro Cholodny"
- October 31, 1982      ● Israel Kleiner: "V.Z. Žabotinskij—Architect of Zionism and Supporter of the Ukrainian Cause"
- November 6, 1982      Conference commemorating the 80th anniversary of the birth of Hryhorij Kostiuk (held jointly with *Slovo*, the Ukrainian Writers' Association).
- George Y. Shevelov: Opening Address
  - Petro Holubenko: "On the Battle Field: Kostiuk's Life and Works"
  - Danylo Struk: "Who is Borys Podoljak?"
  - John Fizer: "Some Reflections on H. Kostiuk's Literary Criticism"
  - Bohdan Rubchak: "Witness and Enthusiast"
  - Michael Voskobijnyk: "The Historical and Political Works of H. Kostiuk"
  - Hryhorij Kostiuk: Closing Address
- November 21, 1982      ● Arkadij Tratschuk: "The Press in Ukraine, Galicia, the Crimea, and the Kuban' in 1941-1944"
- December 5, 1982      Opening of lecture series on L'viv.
- Oleh Fedyshyn: Introduction
  - Ivan Kedryn-Rudnyc'kyj: "L'viv—A Cultural and Political Center in the Inter-War Period"



- Roman Osinchuk: "The Sixtieth Anniversary of the Ukrainian Underground University in L'viv"
- December 12, 1982      Conference commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of Dmytro Dorošenko (held jointly with the Ukrainian Historical Association).
- William Omelchenko: Introduction
  - Lubomyr Wynar: "The Historiographic Heritage of Dmytro Dorošenko"
  - Marko Antonovych: "Dmytro Dorošenko and Vjačeslav Lypyns'kyj—Relations between Two Prominent Historians"
  - Lubomyr Wynar: Closing Remarks
- January 30, 1983      Joint conference with the Ukrainian Historical Association.
- Alexander Dombrovsky: "The Problems of the Antes in the Light of a New Scheme for the Early History of Rus'-Ukraine"
- February 6, 1983      ● Roman Szporluk: "The Struggle for 'Kiev': The Publication of a New Journal in the Capital of Ukraine"
- Lecture in the Kiev series.
- February 27, 1983      ● Martha Bohachevska-Chomiak: "L'viv in Time and Space"
- Tyt Hewryk: "The Architecture of the L'viv Marketplace"
- Lectures in the L'viv series.
- March 6, 1983      ● Ivan Myhul: "The Historical Reinterpretation under Shelest of the Period of Revolution and Ukrainization (1917-1933)"
- March 20, 1983      Conference commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of David Burliuk.

- Vadym Pavlovsky: "David Burliuk, a Futurist from Ukraine"
  - Oksana Mizakovs'ka-Radysh: "David Burliuk in America"
- March 27, 1983      ● Frank Sysyn: "Kiev in the Time of Xmel'nyč'kyj"  
Lecture in the Kiev series.
- April 17, 1983      ● George Starosolsky: "An Endless Line: A Profile of  
a Defense Attorney at the Political Trials in L'viv"  
● Wasył Kachmar: "Reminiscences of a Political Prisoner"  
Lectures in the L'viv series.
- April 24, 1983      ● Vasyl Sokil: "The Literary and Cultural Life of  
Kharkiv after the Second World War"  
Lecture in the Kharkiv series.
- April 30, 1983      Conference on Ševčenko Studies, organized by the  
Commission for Ševčenko Studies, which was created  
by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the  
U.S., the Ševčenko Scientific Society, and the Harvard  
Ukrainian Research Institute.
- Vasyl Lew: Opening Address
  - George Grabowicz: Introduction
  - Petro Odarchenko: "An Overview of Ševčenko Studies in Ukraine in the Last Twenty-Two Years (1961-1982)"
  - George Gajecky: "Ševčenko and the Descendants of Cossack Officers"
  - Yaroslav Rozumny: "Ševčenko and the Poets of the 1960s in Ukraine"
  - Oleh Fedyshyn: Closing Remarks
- May 22, 1983      ● Yaroslav Bilinsky: "Skrypnyk, Xvyl'ovyj and Šelest:  
Three Examples of Ukrainian National Communism"

- September 18, 1983      Opening of the academic year.
- John Fizer: "The Psycholinguistic Literary Model of O. O. Potebnja"
- October 16, 1983      ● George Y. Shevelov: "The Letters of Pantelejmon Kuliš: Their Place in the History of Ukrainian Epistolary Style"
- October 30, 1983      ● Eugene Lashchyk: "Science and Religion: Conflict or Harmony?"
- November 20, 1983      ● Arkadij Tratschuk: "Working Conditions in Ukraine during the German Occupation"
- December 4, 1983      Joint conference with the Ukrainian Historical Association.
- Olexander Dombrovsky: "The Folklore of Populations Living on Prehistoric Ukrainian Territory"
- January 29, 1984      Kiev during the German Occupation, 1941-1943.
- Yaroslav Turkalo: "Reminiscences of a Kievite"
  - Myroslav Prokop: "Observations of a Member of the Anti-German Underground"
- Lectures in the Kiev series.
- February 12, 1984      ● Alexander S. Kharkowsky: "Vasyl' Jerošenko, a Japanese Poet"
- February 26, 1984      ● George Liber: "The Ukrainianization and Urbanization of the UkrSSR, 1920-1933"
- March 10, 1984      Conference on Ukrainian-Polish relations, organized by the Ševčenko Scientific Society, the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., and the Polish Institute of America. Morning session, Tadeusz Hromada, Chair.
- Feliks Gross: "Improvements in Polish-Ukrainian Relations"

- Stanisław Barańczak: "Ukrainian Motifs in Contemporary Polish Poetry"

- Włodzimerz Bączkowski: "The Source and Substance of the Polish-Ukrainian Rapprochement in 1931-1939"

Afternoon session, Ivan Kedryn-Rudnyc'kyj, Chair.

- George Grabowicz: "Polish Romantic Cossackophilism"

- Martha Bohachevska-Chomiak: "Nationalism, Feminism, and Socialism in Eastern Galicia at the Turn of the Century"

- Orest Subtelny: "The Russian Threat as Seen by Ukrainian and Polish Emigrés in the Eighteenth Century"

- Oleh Fedyshyn: Closing Remarks

March 11, 1984

- Martha Bohachevska-Chomiak: "Bridges over the Zbruč River: Collaboration between Women, 1887-1914"

March 25, 1984

- Nadia Svitlychna: "Impressions of the Generation of the Poets of the 1960s in Kiev"

Lecture in the Kiev series.

April 7, 1984

Conference commemorating the 170th anniversary of the birth of Taras Ševčenko, organized by the Commission for Ševčenko Studies of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., the Ševčenko Scientific Society, and the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.

- Jaroslav Padoch: Opening Remarks

- George Y. Shevelov: "Slavic Rivers: Ševčenko against Puškin?"

- Bohdan Rubchak: "The Question of the Father in Ševčenko's Poetry"

- Petro Odarchenko: "Ševčenko and the Ukrainian Folk Song"

- Leonid Rudnytsky: Closing Remarks
- April 20, 1984      ● Daria Karanovych, Ulana Liubovych: "The Music of L'viv"  
Lecture in the L'viv series.
- June 3, 1984      ● Eugene Lashchuk: "Morality and Happiness in Volodymyr Vynnychenko's View of the World"
- June 9, 1984      Conference conducted jointly with the Ševčenko Scientific Society in memory of Alexander Archimovych and Roman Kobrynsky.
- June 10, 1984      Opening of the Odessa lecture series.  
● Nina Strokata: "And Odessa Too..."
- October 21, 1984      ● Paul Wexler: "Jewish-Ukrainian Linguistic Connections (A Historical Survey)"
- November 17, 1984      Joint conference of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. and the Ševčenko Scientific Society: "Selected Topics in Today's Economy of Ukraine".  
● Iwan Koropecyk: Opening Remarks  
● Donna Bahry: "Ukraine and Soviet Economic Policies: Political Privileges and Economic Rewards"  
● Fedir Kushnirsky: "The Structure of Ukraine's Economy and the Decision-making Process"  
● Leslie H. Kool: "Ukraine and Western Research Studies of the Soviet Union's Regional Economy"
- November 18, 1984      Joint conference of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. and the Publication Fund of Archbishop Mstyslav, Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the U.S.A. "Ukrainian Proverbs. On the One Hundred Twentieth Anniversary of the Publication of M. Nomys' Collection of Proverbs (1864-1984)."

- George Y. Shevelov: Opening Remarks
- Petro Odarchenko: "Collection of Proverbs by M. Nomys-Symonov"
- Bohdan Struminsky: "Collections of Ukrainian Proverbs Omitted by Nomys"
- Natalie Kononenko-Moyle: "Food, Board and Hospitality in Nomys' Collection"
- George Y. Shevelov: "Nomys—Dal'—Adalberg"

December 2, 1984

Conference commemorating the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the death of Professor Michael Vetukhiv.

- George Y. Shevelov: Opening Remarks
- Lubov Drazhevska: "Michael Vetukhiv, First President of UVAN"
- Olga Pavlovsky: "Michael Vetukhiv, Geneticist"

December 16, 1984

Conference commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of the "Kirov Executions" in 1934.

- George Y. Shevelov: Opening Remarks
- Hryhorij Kostiuk: "Cause of the December Tragedy"
- Larysa and Volodymyr Lysniak: "Excerpts from the Works of the Executed Writers"

### *Summer Seminars*

The summer seminars of the Ukrainian Academy began in 1974 and have been held every August since then in Hunter, N.Y. They last one week, and their format comprises lectures and discussion sessions. The lecture series are given by visiting scholars, usually two at each seminar. The average number of registered participants is about 35 (with a low of 29 and a high of 47). The following seminars were organized by the Philadelphia Branch of the Ukrainian Academy (Renata Holod, Oleh Tretiak, Tyt and Sofia Hewryk, Eugene and Vira Lashchuk, and Olexa Bilaniuk).

August 17-22, 1981

- George Grabowicz: "Ševčenko the Mythologist"
- Virko Baley: "Profiles from the History of Ukrainian Music"

- August 22-27, 1982
- George Y. Shevelov: "The Condition and Status of the Ukrainian Language in the First Half of the 20th Century"
  - Israel Kleiner: "Jews in the USSR and Israel, and Their Views on Nationality Issues in the Russian Empire"
- August 15-19, 1983
- John Fizer: "Aleksander Potebnja (1835-1891)—Linguist, Folklorist, and Literary Scholar"
  - Bohdan Nahaylo: "Human Rights in Ukraine"
- August 19-24, 1984
- Martha Bohachevska-Chomiak: "Women's Participation in the Ukrainian Movement"
  - John Paul Himka: "The Galician Village: From Serfdom to the Prosvita Society"

### *Conferences in Other Cities*

The following conferences and lectures took place between August 17, 1981 and December 1984 under the auspices of individual branches of the Academy:

#### Philadelphia, Pa. Branch

- October 17, 1982
- Joint conference with the Ševčenko Scientific Society in honor of Vadym Kipa.
- Albert Kipa: "The Life and Work of Vadym Kipa"
  - Slides and selections of V. Kipa's musical compositions

#### Washington, D.C. Branch

- November 13, 1982
- Literary evening dedicated to Vasyl Grendža-Dons'kyj.
- Petro Odarchenko: "The Literary Output of V. Grendža-Dons'kyj"
  - Zirka Grendzia-Donsky: "Reminiscences of My Father"
  - Readings of the author's works

- January 16, 1983
- Joint conference with the Ševčenko Scientific Society

on the Tenth Anniversary of the death of Oleksa Povstenko.

- Petro Odarchenko: "O.I. Povstenko, a Prominent Architect and Art Critic"
- George Starosolsky: "Reminiscences of O.I. Povstenko"

January 22, 1983

Conference commemorating the Hundredth Anniversary of the birth of Kyrylo Stecenko.

- Petro Odarchenko: Opening Remarks
- Father Petro Budny: "The Life and Work of Father Stecenko"
- Recorded selections of Stecenko's compositions

March 12, 1983

The Philadelphia Branch of the Union of Ukrainian Artists of America and the Washington Branch of the Academy organized an exhibit of the works of Oleksa Povstenko.

- Petro Odarchenko: "The Life and Work of Oleksa I. Povstenko"

*Compiled by William Omelchenko*



# Obituaries

## ALEXANDER ARCHIMOVYCH (1892-1984)

Dr. Alexander Archimovych, well-known scientist and botanist, active member of the Ukrainian community and president of the Academy from 1961 to 1970, died on January 19, 1984 at the age of 92.

Alexander Archimovych was born on April 23, 1892 in the town of Novozybkiv in Ukraine into a family with a high level of culture. By completing studies in biology at Kiev University of St. Volodymyr in 1917, in agronomy at the Kiev Polytechnic Institute in 1922, as well as advanced courses in natural selection, Archimovych received a general education in these disciplines. Thereupon, he secured a position as an instructor of biology in secondary schools in Kiev and as an assistant in the Botanical Department of Higher Women's Courses in Kiev.

As a young scientist, Archimovych displayed an interest in and talent for research while studying at the University, particularly in the laboratories and experimental plots of the Agronomy Faculty of the Polytechnic Institute. He devoted particular attention to the study of some specific problems of horticulture. As a result of such efforts, he was frequently invited to give papers at seminars and academic meetings in these disciplines. His interest in this kind of research led to his work with the Committee for the Study of the Flora of Ukraine in the Second Division of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and the Ukrainian Agricultural Committee. Aspiring to further scientific research, Alexander Archimovych entered the Sugar Trust system, where he at first worked for a short time at the Ivanivka Selection Station and, from 1924 to 1930, as the administrator and director of the Research Division of the Selection Station in Bila Cerkva.

The Division's research encompassed work in several disciplines—biology, genetics, natural selection, seed cultivation and so on. Particular attention was devoted to the study of the heredity and variability of the sugar beet, especially its pollination, fertilization, embryonic development and seed production. Studies in these areas created a theoretical foundation for broader work in the field of natural selection. The research conducted by Prof. Archimovych in those years led in several directions: first of all, to the study of the flowering patterns of the sugar beet, including pollination and the development of means of controlling it (e.g. self-pollination and crossbreeding). Secondly, it led to the appli-

cation of methods of inbreeding and refractometry in the breeding of the sugar beet, the results of which were published in a two-volume monograph *The Biology of the Sugar Beet* (Biologija saxarnoj svekly) by the Scientific Research Institute of the sugar beet industry in 1932. Specific results of the scientist's original research had previously been published as separate articles as well: "The Regulation of the Pollination of the Sugar Beet" (Reguljuvannja zapylennja cukrovoho burjaka, 1928), "To the Question of the Application of Inbreeding in the Cultivation of the Sugar Beet" (Do pytannja sastosuivannja incuxtu cukrovoho burjaka, 1931), "The Adaptation of Refractometry in the Selection of the Sugar Beet" (Zastosuivannja refraktometriji pry selekciji cukrovoho burjaka, 1927) and others.

In 1931, Archimovych was transferred to the All-Union Institute for Research of Sugar Beets (Kiev, Batyjeva Hora), where he directed the Research Division. During that time he published a number of valuable works, one being "The Dependence of the Harvest on the Peculiar Structural Characteristics of the Sugar Beet and the Quality of its Seeds" (Zavisimost' urožaja ot osobennostej stroenija sveklovičnogo probora i kačestva posevnogo materiala, 1939).

His valuable scientific research in the biology of the flowering patterns and seed development of the sugar beet led to the development and cultivation of the first genetically monospermous form of the sugar beet plant in the world.

Professor Archimovych was one of the most outstanding figures among Ukrainian horticulturists of the sugar beet. In 1933, he was elected a full member of the All-Union Institute for Research for the Sugar Industry. In conjunction with his research he received a *Kandidat Nauk* degree on the basis of his published works and a doctoral degree from Kiev University (1940).

Professor Archimovych did not limit himself to his work in natural selection; he was also entrusted with the Chairs of Flora and Special Agriculture at the Kiev, Bila Cerkva and Žytomyr Agricultural Institutes.

The onset of World War II initiated a new stage in the scientist's life and work. During the German occupation, he participated in the attempts to restore the institutes of higher education in Kiev and Žytomyr. In 1943, Archimovych left Ukraine and until 1945 directed the selection of spring crops at the breeding station in Halbtorn near Vienna. Later, while in Bavaria, Archimovych, together with other Ukrainian scientists, worked in Ukrainian émigré scientific institutions—the Ukrainian Husbandry Institute, the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences and the Ševčenko Scientific Society. From 1945 to 1948, he directed the Department of Special Agriculture at the faculty of agronomy and held the Chair of Botany of the veterinary and pharmaceutical faculties at the Ukrainian Free University in Munich. From 1948 to 1952, Professor Archimovych worked for a large Spanish firm specializing in seed cultivation, where he had been invited on the recommendation of the United States Department of Agriculture. His responsibilities there included the development of the process for selecting

and producing sugar beets. His recommendations, which were based on the results of his original research, led Spain out of its perennial shortage of sugar beet seeds. The scientist reported on his work in Spain in the Bulletin of the National Institute of Agriculture and in a special brochure of the Spanish Agricultural Ministry in 1951. While in Spain, he also resolved a number of other agricultural problems.

In 1952, Professor Archimovych emigrated to the United States, settled in New York City and became a member of Ukrainian scholarly organizations. He directed the Bio-Medical Division of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. (1959); he also was a member of the Board of Directors of the Chemical-Biological-Medical Division of the Ševčenko Scientific Society. Professor Archimovych was the head of the Agricultural Division of the Ukrainian Husbandry Institute and, from 1955-1962, was the director of the Institute. In 1956, he gave several lectures at Columbia University, including "The State of Genetics and Selection in the U.S.S.R." and "The State of Agriculture in the U.S.S.R." In 1961, Professor Archimovych was elected President of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, in which capacity he served until 1970.

Prof. Archimovych is the author of approximately two hundred scientific papers in the area of botany dealing with genetics, natural selection, seed cultivation and other subjects. Having concentrated his work on problems of sugar beet cultivation while in Ukraine, in the emigration, he turned to some general problems of plant cultivation and often incorporated geographical, economic and even historical interests in his writings. Much of his work concentrated on the year-to-year state of agriculture in Ukraine and the U.S.S.R., particularly on its seed cultivation as compared to both the levels of the prerevolutionary period and to the yields of other countries. Some of his writings include: 1. "The Agricultural Harvest of Ukraine in 1965" (Naslidky sil's'koho hospodarstva Ukrajinij v 1965 roci, 1966), 2. "Changes in the Geographical Distribution of Grain Cultivation in Ukraine during Soviet Rule" (Zminy v heohrafičnomu roztašuvanni zernovyx kul'tur v Ukrajinij pid čas isnuvannja radjanskoji vlady, 1967), 3. "Geography of the World Distribution of Grain Cultures" (Heohrafija svitovoho rozmiščennja zernovyx kul'tur, 1976), 4. "The Role of Individual Grain Cultivation Industries in the Balance of World Grain Production" (Rolja okremyxx zernovyx kul'tur v balansij svitovoji produkciji zerna, 1977), 5. "Changes in World Production of Grain Cultivation and the Role of the U.S.S.R. in World Grain Production" (Zminy v svitovij produkciji zernovyx kul'tur i pakja S.S.S.R. u svitovij produkciji zerna).

The scientist also published such works as *Selection and Seed Cultivation of the Sugar Beet* (Selekcija i semenovodstvo saxarnoj svely, Munich 1954, 172 pp.) and *Plant Cultivation in the U.S.S.R.* (Roslynnictvo S.S.S.R., Munich 1960, 232 pp.). The works of Alexander Archimovych have been published in Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, Spanish, and French, in the *Annals* of

the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., in *Visti* (Proceedings) of the Ševčenko Scientific Society; in *Naukovi Zapysky* (Scientific Proceedings) of the Ukrainian Husbandry Institute; in the *Bulletin* of the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., in publications of the Spanish Agricultural Ministry; and in a number of Ukrainian journals and newspapers. The scientist was a member of a number of non-Ukrainian scientific organizations, including German, Spanish and American (namely the American Academy for the Advancement of Science and the New York Academy of Sciences).

Alexander Archimovych was a world-renowned scholar. He was a prominent botanist, an outstanding researcher in biology, a talented horticulturist in natural selection and an expert in agricultural sciences.

Both as a researcher and as an administrator, Archimovych was a person of expertise and stature. He was an energetic organizer and leader of scientific conferences, and a critical editor of publications, who was always fair and always more than ready to assist a scientist in the pursuit of answers to scholarly questions.

On the personal level, Alexander Archimovych was distinguished by an innate nobility, faithfulness to his work and convictions and good will toward colleagues.

*Hryhorij Haharyn*

### NATALIA OSSADCHA-JANATA (1891-1982)

Natalia Ossadcha-Janata, a full member of the Academy—botanist, long-time student of the use of plants in Ukrainian folk medicine and contributor to the establishment of Ukrainian botanical nomenclature—died in New York City on April 9, 1982. The lives of Ossadcha-Janata and her family reflected the fate of Ukrainian intellectuals in modern times. At the turn of the century, her parents—each in his own way—struggled for the liberation of their native country; her husband, active in the renaissance of Ukrainian culture in the 1920s, perished in the Kolyma camp. As the wife of “an enemy of the people,” Ossadcha-Janata was not granted the opportunity to develop her talents and knowledge fully.

She was born on May 19, 1891 in Xerson where her father, Tyxon Ossadchy, worked at the Zemstvo (Agrarian Council). An economist and writer, he was an active promoter of the cooperative movement in Ukraine, and in 1917-1918 became a member of the Ukrainian Central Rada (Council). When Natalia was nine years old, her mother Maria was arrested for participating in underground

revolutionary work and spent five years in exile. After serving her term, she entered medical school and became a physician at the age of forty-five.

In 1908 Natalia Ossadcha graduated from a gymnasium, and enrolled in the Biology Department of the Higher Courses for Women in Kiev. In 1910 she married Oleksander Janata, then a student at the Agricultural Department of the Kiev Polytechnic Institute, and later a prominent botanist, an organizer of agricultural research in Ukraine, and a promoter of the Ukrainianization of scientific institutions and schools of higher learning. In 1918 Natalia graduated from the Higher Courses for Women with a major in botany. In 1922 the couple was invited by the Institute of Ukrainian Scientific Language of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences to work on the dictionary of Ukrainian botanical nomenclature. Ossadcha-Janata was put in charge of the ordering and editing of 66,000 cards with plant names collected since 1910 by volunteers throughout Ukraine; sometimes different names had been applied to the same plant in various regions of Ukraine, and in other cases several plants had been given the same name. The final decision in selecting the proper plant name for the dictionary, and hence for standard Ukrainian usage, was taken by the Botanical Section of the Natural Science Department of the Institute. Ossadcha-Janata presented materials at twenty-six conferences devoted to this problem. In 1926, she resigned from the job because of illness caused by overwork. *Slovnyk botaničnoji nomenklatury: projekt* (Dictionary of Botanical Nomenclature: A Project, 313 pp.), was published by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in 1928.

In 1926 Ossadcha-Janata moved to Kharkiv to study the distribution of medicinal plants in Ukraine and their application in folk medicine. In 1927-1933, she worked as a research associate at the Ukrainian Institute for Applied Botany, and led expeditions throughout Ukraine, seeking out village practitioners of folk medicine and recording their legends. She would also record the local plant names from the Ukrainian vernacular. In total, she investigated the folk practices of medicine in 144 villages.

In 1933 Oleksander Janata was arrested and sentenced to imprisonment in forced labor camps. He died in 1938 in the Kolyma camp. Ossadcha-Janata was discharged from the Institute as the wife of a political dissident. Her expertise, however, was of crucial importance to pharmacy: in 1934, the All-Union Institute of the Essential-Oil Industry commissioned Ossadcha-Janata to carry out a botanical study of the azalea (*Azalea pontica* L.) in the Ukrainian Polissja. Later she worked as botanist for the Ukrainian Institute of Experimental Medicine and subsequently for the Ukrainian Institute of Experimental Pharmacy. As a result of her field work, pharmacological experiments and clinical studies, the plant *Peganum harmala* L. was introduced into Soviet pharmacopoeia for the treatment of some nervous disorders (see *Gosudarstvennaja farmakopeja* [Government Pharmacopoeia], Komissariat Zdravooxranenija RSFSR, Mos-

cow, 1946, 8th ed.). Ossadcha-Janata submitted a dissertation on wild medicinal plants in Ukraine, but as the "wife of an enemy of the people" she was forbidden to defend it.

In 1943 Ossadcha-Janata emigrated to the West. In 1944-45 she worked at the *Kaiser-Wilhelm Institut für Kulturpflanzenforschung* in Vienna. After the war, she lived in the DP Camp Ettlingen in West Germany, and continued to work on materials collected during her expeditions, which she managed to take out of the Soviet Union. She was closely associated with the Free Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, and in 1947 was elected Chair of its Botanical Group.

Ossadcha-Janata came to the U.S. in 1950, and settled in New York City. In 1951 the Research Program on the U.S.S.R. granted her a research fellowship which enabled her to work at the New York Botanical Garden for nine months. She devoted much time to the expansion of her dissertation. She also prepared an abbreviated version of it, in order to put her research on public record. In 1952 it was published by the Research Program on the U.S.S.R. under the title *Herbs Used in Ukrainian Folk Medicine* (114 pp.). David D. Heck, Head Curator of the New York Botanical Garden, wrote in the Foreword: "This draft is much shorter than the original, but it is hoped that the more significant findings of the author's Ukrainian expeditions have been included. It is certain that this original data could not now be gathered again in Ukraine, for the practices that are covered here were already on the wane fifteen to twenty years ago when the information was collected, and since that time the full impact of the collectivization of the country has been felt." Excerpts from this work were published in *The Garden Journal of the New York Botanical Garden*, vol. 2, No. 6, 1952, pp. 171-172, 188; vol. 3, No. 1, 1953, pp. 19-21.

Ossadcha-Janata participated in the work of the Academy from the time of its founding. In March 1952, she was elected a full member. She presented eleven papers at scholarly conferences of the Academy. In 1961-1974 Ossadcha-Janata was Chair of the Academy Audit Committee. In the years 1965-1975 she headed the Doroshenko Relief Committee at the Academy which collected donations and distributed funds among needy émigré scholars and their families. Her book *Ukrajins'ki narodni nazvy roslyn* (Plant Names in Ukrainian Folk Language) (176 pp.) was published by the Academy in 1973. It gives the Ukrainian names of 810 plant species, supplementing *Slovník botaničhoji nomenklatury*. The research for it is based mainly on material recorded by Ossadcha-Janata in 158 Ukrainian localities. Ossadcha-Janata was a full member of the Ševčenko Scientific Society and of the Ukrainian Medical Association of North America.

In July 1974, at the age of 83, Ossadcha-Janata broke her hip, and after that time rarely left her apartment. She died of heart failure, at her home in her ninety-first year.

STEPHEN GEORGE PROCIUK  
(1916-1984)

Stephen George Prociuk, a prominent Ukrainian engineer and economist, died on October 12, 1984 in New York. He was born on January 3, 1916 in Chocen, Czechoslovakia, into the family of a government official Pylyp and a school teacher Ol'ha neē Ivanciv. He obtained his primary and secondary education in L'viv, where he also graduated (in 1939) from the Department of Mechanics of the local Polytechnical Institute. Until emigration with his wife Olena (neē Škil'na) to Slovakia and then Austria, Prociuk worked as a research assistant at his Alma Mater. After the war, he settled first in Australia, where he worked as an engineer. Subsequently he emigrated to the United States. Here he conducted research on Soviet machine building, especially airplane technology, at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. From 1964 until his death, Prociuk resided in New York where he was associated with the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics. He was a member of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences and a member of its managing board for many years. In addition, he belonged to the Ševčenko Scientific Society, New York Academy of Sciences, Association for Comparative Economic Systems, Society of Ukrainian Engineers, and other organizations. Information about him is included in *Encyklopedija ukrajinoznavstva* (vol. 6, 1970), *Who is Who in Aviation* (1973), *Ukrainians in North America* (1975), *Men of Achievement* (1980) and *Who is Who in Aviation and Aerospace* (1983).

Prociuk was a prolific writer; he is the author of about 350 works in the Ukrainian, English, German, French, and Spanish languages. These works include journal and newspaper articles, book chapters, entries in encyclopedias, and book reviews. His polemical articles were published in journals and newspapers in various countries of the world. Many articles in the major field of his scholarly interest, economics, were published, among others, in such journals as *Review or Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of the USSR*, *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.*, *Soviet Studies*, *Sučasnist'*, and *Ukrainian Quarterly*. Another important field of Prociuk's lifelong interest was mechanical engineering, primarily aeronautics and astronautics. Several of his studies in this area were published in *Visti ukrajins'kyx inženeriv*, of which he was editor from 1964 up to the time of his death.

With respect to economics, Prociuk was interested in those areas which he considered vital to the survival of the Ukrainian nation. For this reason, he continuously studied the historical development and present conditions of manufacturing and mining in Ukraine, believing that the welfare and the international standing of the Ukrainian nation depend on them. In his works on various branches of Ukrainian industry he paid particular attention to the rela-

tionship between its basic mineral resources and technology and economics. These studies are characterized by their rich statistical content and the author's ability to distinguish the important issues from the minor ones. An interest in the industrial development of Ukraine led Prociuk to study the relevant policies of the Moscow government, such as the regional and location-determining policies and economic planning and management in the USSR as a whole. Another major area of Prociuk's interest was the demographic development of Ukraine. His study of Ukraine's demographic losses during the first and second World Wars is a considerable contribution to this field. His conclusion about the future of Ukrainians in their own country was rather pessimistic. Because of a relatively low natural growth of ethnic Ukrainians and the climatic attractiveness of Ukraine for migration from Russia proper, Prociuk feared that this republic will gradually be transformed into a region with an ethnically mixed population in which the Ukrainians will be in the minority. Under such conditions, the preservation of the Ukrainian language will be exceedingly difficult.

A considerable part of Prociuk's writings is occupied by works devoted to the contributions of scholars, ethnically Ukrainians but considered in the literature as members of other nationalities. The objective of his studies was to retrieve these people for Ukrainian culture and science. Articles on physicist Petro Kapitsa, ophthalmologist Myxajlo Borysykevych, the remarkable school of demographers under the leadership of Myxajlo Ptuxa in the 1920s, and the recent pioneers of space research in the USSR belong to this category. In the last years of his life, Prociuk was concerned with the treatment of the Ukrainian language in Soviet publishing policy. Moscow's virtual ban on the use of the Ukrainian language for scholarly purposes has no doubt been an attempt to relegate it to everyday, conventional use only and thus make it incomplete and inferior.

The large number of publications, written in hours free from professional duties, proves Prociuk's exceptional diligence and efficiency. They are characterized by an enormous quantity of new and sometimes fascinating material which he was consistently collecting from sources all over the world but mostly from Soviet Ukrainian publications. Prociuk belonged to the increasingly rare breed of Ukrainian scholars in the West who closely follow social, political, and cultural developments in their native country. It is necessary to say that additional polishing would have made Prociuk's works more readable. Also greater attention to the theoretical framework in a given field would have made them more valuable.

In his private life, Prociuk was a European gentleman of the past era. He was invariably courteous, considerate, modest, and willing to cooperate with others. He was widely read and had an eye for a good work of art. His contributions to Ukrainian culture and scholarship are considerable and will not be forgotten soon. Those who were privileged to know and work with this good man will miss him.

*I. S. Koropecyky*



# List of Periodicals in the Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.

WILLIAM OMELCHENKO  
DIMA KOMILEWSKA

The Library of the Academy maintains a large collection of periodicals dating from the nineteenth century to the present.

This catalogue of Ukrainian serial holdings at the Library of the Academy represents the first major attempt at listing and describing Ukrainian newspapers and other periodicals in the Library. It encompasses the titles published up to 1945.

Titles are arranged in alphabetical order. Entries are numbered in a consecutive numerical order. A complete entry provides information in the following sequence:

- 1.—Transliterated title of the publication.
- 2.—Name of sponsoring organization.
- 3.—Place of publication.
- 4.—Library holdings.

To facilitate research, the Library of Congress system of transliteration is used in this list.

In a few instances entries do not contain the above information in full. This happens when the entry is based on the library shelflist which serves as an inventory record of serials in the library.

The second part of this list, which includes the periodicals from 1946 to date, will be published in subsequent volumes of the *Annals*.

We hope that this bibliography will fill an important gap in Slavic reference literature.

1. *AMERYKA*—*AMERICA*; chasopys dlia ukrains'koho narodu i uriadovyi orhan t-va Provydinnia. Philadelphia, Pa. 1921-26, 1930, 1937, 1941-45 (incomplete).

2. *AMERYKA*; pershyi i ody nokyi ukrains'kyi dnevyk v Amerytsi. The only Ruthenian daily in America. Organ "Provydinnia". Editor: A. Tsurkovs'kyi. Philadelphia.  
IV—no. 78, 272, 1915
3. *AMERYKANS'KYI UKRAINET'S'*—UKRAINIAN AMERICAN; Vydaie Soiuz Ukrains'ko-Amerykans'kykh Kliubiv steitu Niu York. Misiachnyk. New York.  
II—No. 1, 1931
4. *BAT'KIVSHCHYNA*; tyzhnevyyk. Lviv.  
I—No. 1 (10), 1935  
III—No. 7 (66), 1936
5. *BAT'KIVSHCHYNA*—THE FATHERLAND; tyzhnevyyk, prysviachenyi ukrains'kym natsional'no-hromads'kym spravam v Amerytsi i na ridnykh zemliakh. Detroit, Mich.  
I—No. 1, 1940
6. *BAZAR*; misiachnyk dlia sprav promyslu, torhovli i prosvity. Vydaie Sichovy Bazar. New York.  
No. 1-12, 1920  
No. 4-12, 1921  
No. 1, 1922  
No. 2/3, 1923
7. *BIBLIOLOHICHNI VISTI*; Ukrains'kyi Naukovo-Doslidchyi Instytut Knyhoznavstva. Kiev.  
No. 1, 1928
8. *BIULETEN'*; neperiodychnyi orhan Ukrains'koi Hromady Iednist' na Slovachchyni. Bratislava.  
No. 1, 1929  
No. 2-4, 1930
9. *BIULETEN GENERAL'NOI STARSHYNY*—K! Chornomore, na pravakh rukopysu. Lviv.  
No. 3, 1938
10. *BIULETEN' HET'MANS'KOI UPRAVY*; Het'mans'ka Uprava Obiednanykh Khliborobs'kykh ta ynshykh klasovykh orhanizatsii. Na pravakh rukopysu. Berlin.  
1-14, 16, 18, 1929-1933
11. *BIULETEN' HOLOVNOI UPRAVY* Ukrains'koho Natsional'noho Obiednannia v Nimechchyni. Kil'-Berlin.  
No. 9, 1942

12. *BIULETEN' TABORU* im. M. Lysenka u Hannoveri. Hannover.  
No. 11-108, 1945
13. *BIULETEN' TSENTRALI NATSIONALISTYCHNOI ORHANIZATSII*  
Ukrains'kykh Studentiv Velykonimechchyny (NOUS). Berlin.  
No. 6-8 (11-13), 14-15, 1944.
14. *BIULETEN' UKRAINS'KOHO* Presovoho Biura v Ch.S.R. Prague.  
No. 38, 1924
15. *BIULETEN' UPRAVY* Tovarystva Prykhyl'nykiv Ukains'koi Hospodar-  
s'koi Akademii. Prague.  
No. 7, 1938
16. *BIULIETEN* Vydavnychoho Komitetu Ukrains'koi Iednosty u Frantsii.  
Red. Iu. Kossatch. Paris.  
No. 1, 1938
17. *BIULETYN*; Soiuz Ukrains'kykh torhovtsiv i pidpriiemtsiv. New York.  
I (Kviten'), 1928
18. *BIULETYN NEPRAVNO VYKYNENYKH HEMTREMS'KYKH* i Di-  
troits'kykh Viddiliv i Tovarystv Soiuza Ukrains'kykh Robitnychykh Orha-  
nizatsii Tsentral'nym Vykonavchym Komitetom. Detroit, Hamtramck, Mich.  
No. 1-6, 1930
19. *BIULETYN TSENTRAL'NOHO SOIUZU* Ukrains'koho Studentstva;  
Vykhodyt' neperiodychno. Prague.  
No. 1 (2), 1934
20. *BLAHOVISTNYK*—L'Annonciateur—The Annunciator; Orhan Predstav-  
nytstva Ukrains'koi Avtokefal'noi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy za kordonom.  
Geneva.  
No. 1, 1925  
No. 2/3, 1926
21. *BODIAK*; satyrychno-politychnyi chasopys dlia Ukrains'koho narodu.  
Vydaie Komitet Oborony Ukrains'koi Emigratsii v Amerytsi. New York.  
I—No. 1-3, 1939-1940  
II—No. 5, 1941
22. *BOIAN*; Misiachnyk dlia orhanizatsii ukrains'kykh khoriv. Lviv-Droho-  
bych.  
II—No. 10/11, 1930
23. *BOROT'BA*; Chasopys robuchoho liudu Ukrainy. Tyzhnevyyk. Vydaie

redaktsiinyi komitet. Za red. vidpovidaie Lev Hugel'. Administrator Vasyl' Pyrih. Vienna.

No. 1-14, 1920

24. *BOROT'BA*; Orhan ukrains'koi partii nezalezhnykh sotsialistiv. Vykhydyt' dva razy v misiats'. Vydaie Vyd. "Chornohora." Za red. vidp. A. Iaremchuk. Kolomyia.

I—No. 1-5, 1938

25. *BOROT'BA*; orhan Zakordonnoi Orhanizatsii USDRP. Geneva.

No. 1-5, 1915

No. 6, 1916

26. *BUDIVNYTSTVO*; iliustrovanyi zhurnal dlia ukrains'kykh robitnykiv OT. Berlin.

No. 2, 1944

27. *BUDUCHNIST' NATSII*—The Future of the Nation; Biuletyn' Bratstva Ukrainstiv Katolykiv Kanady. Pershyi Ukrains'kyi katolyts'kyi dvotyzhnevyy u Kanadi. Yorkton, Sask. (Redaktsiia B.N.—Winnipeg, Man.)

XII—No. 6, 8, 1944

28. *CHAS*; Nezalezhnyi, bezpartiinyi chasopys. Shchodennyk. Chernivtsi.

IV—No. 745-749, 751, 753, 1931

29. *CHAS*—THE TIME; visti z presy i radio. Vykhydyt' raz na tyzhden'. Vydaie Roman Il'nyts'kyi. Nach. Red. Roman Oliynyk. Furt (Bavaria).

I—No. 1-8, 10, 11-14, 1945

30. *CHERVONA KALYNA*; povazhnyi ta humorystychno-satyrychnyi sichovyi orhan. Vykhydyt' v Koshi ukrains'koho Sichovoho Viis'ka. Vydaie hurtok USS. Red. Mykola Uhryn Bezhrishnyi.

No. 3-6, 1917

31. *CHERVONA ZORIA*; robitnycha hazeta. Ukrainian Weekly. Redahuie Komitet. New York.

I—No. 1, 1921

32. *CHERVONYI SHLIAKH*; hromads'ko-politychnyi i literaturno-naukovyi misiachnyk. Redaktor H.F. Hryn'ko. Kharkiv.

No. 1-7, 1923

33. *CHORNOHORA*; neperiodychno pys'mo dlia robitnychoho naroda pid red. Dr K. Tryl'ovs'koho. Vienna.

I—No. 4, 1922

34. *CHORNOMORE*; zhurnal ukrains'kykh students'kykh bratnikh korporatsii. Warsaw.  
No. 1 (4), 1928  
No. 2 (5), 1929
35. *CHORNOMORS'KA KOMUNA*; orhan Obkomu KP/b/U.  
No. 869, 876, 935, 937, 958, 960, 962, 963, 994, 1932
36. *CHORNOMORTSI*; Uriadovyi Orhan Holovnoi Upravy Chornomors'kykh Sichei v Amerytsi. Red. kolegiia. New York.  
I—No. 4, 1931
37. *DAZHBOH*; dvotyzhnevnyk. Lviv.  
No. 4, 7, 1935
38. *DIL0*; tyzhnevnyk. Vydaie Vydavnycha Spilka "Dilo". Lviv-Vienna.  
1913-1916, 1922-1928, 1931-1939 (incomplete)
39. *DIL0 I NOVE SLOVO*; za red. vidpovidaie Dr. Rudnyts'kyi. Lviv.  
No. 6, 20, 21, 23, 1914
40. *DLIA SIL'S'KOHO ZHINOTSTVA*; bezplatnyi dodatok do chasopysu ZHINOCHA DOLIA. Kolomyia.  
II—No. 5, 9-11, 20, 23-24, 1933  
III—No. 5-9, 15-19, 21-24, 1934
41. *DNIPRO*; orhan Ukrains'koi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Amerytsi. Tyzhnevnyk. Trenton, N.J.  
1921-1925 (incomplete)
42. *DNIPRO*; Ukrains'kyi misiachnyk. Orhan Ukrains'koi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v ZDA. Pittsburgh, Pa.  
XXIV—No. 7-12, 1944  
XXV—No. 1-11, 1945
43. *DNIPRO*; ukrains'kyi dvotyzhnevnyk. Ukrainian semi-monthly. Orhan Ukrains'koi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Zluchenykh Derzhavakh Ameryky. Philadelphia.  
VI—No. 29, 1926  
XI—No. 19, 1932  
XIII—No. 2, 1934  
XIV—No. 22, 1935  
XIX—No. 4, 1940
44. *DNIPRO*; ukrains'kyi tyzhnevnyk. Orhan Ukrains'koi Avtokefal'noi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Zluchenykh Derzhavakh. Chicago, Ill.  
VI—No. 2, 3, 5-10, 13-21, 23-38, 1926

45. *DNIPROPETROVS'KA HAZETA*; ofitsiinyi orhan mista Dnipropetrovs'ka.  
III—No. 40, 1943
46. *DO BOIU!*; Orhan Soiuzu Borot'by za Samostiinu Ukrainu.  
No. 1, 1927 (photocopy)
47. *DO PEREMOHY*; hromads'ko-literaturnyi zbirnyk, prysviachenyi 8-i richnytsi Ukrain's'koi Sektsii i 10-i richnytsi Mizhnarodn'oho Robitnychoho Ordenu. New York.  
1940 ed. (bez No.)
48. *DO PEREMOHY*; Suspil'no-hospodars'kyi ta literaturno-krytychnyj misiachnyk. Uzhhorod.  
I—No. 1, 1935  
II—No. 3, 1936
49. *DO PEREMOHY*; tyzhnevyy Viis'kovoi Upravy Halychyna dlia dobrovol'tsiv Strilets'koi Dyvizii Halychyna i ikh rodyn. Vidp. Red. Mykhailo Ostroverkha. Lviv.  
II—No. 1, 24, 39, 42, 45, 47, 1944
50. *DOROHA*; iliustrovanyi zhurnal. Za redaktsiiu vidpovidaie Severyn Levyts'kyi. Kraków-Lviv.  
II—No. 2-4, 1941  
VI—No. 1-12, 1943  
VII—1, 3-5, 1944
51. *DOSVITNI VOHNI*; Chasopys natsional'noi osvity i vykhovannia dlia ukrains'kykh osvitnikh tovarystv. Kraków.  
I—No. 1, 1941
52. *DOSVITNIA ZORIA*; Ukrains'kyi kul'turno-ekonomichnyi chasopys. Vidpovidal'nyi red. M. Spolitač. Volodymyr-Vol.  
I—No. 10, 1923
53. *DOZVILLIA*—Nach der Arbeit; ukrains'kyi iliustrovanyi zhurnal. Berlin.  
No. 18, 29-31, 35, 37-40, 1944
54. *DUMKY HET'MANTSIA*; Misiachnyk. Vyd. N. Kochubei. Dalhem, Belgium.  
Lypen', 1930
55. *DUSHPASTYR*; Chasopys' dlia hr.-kat. Rusynov v Amerytsie. New York.  
I-V, 1909-1913 (incomplete)

56. *DZVIN*; orhan Ukrains'koi Narodn'oi Partii. Rivne.  
 II—No. 45, 52, 54, 1924  
 IV—No. 188-189, 193-195, 197, 202, 1926
57. *DZVINOCHOK*; Chasopys dlia ukrains'kykh dityi. Vykhodyt' shchomisia-tsia. Lviv.  
 No. 1, 2, 1931  
 No. 3-14, 1932  
 No. 15-25, 1933  
 No. 27-38, 1934
58. *DZVINOK*; Iliustrovane pys'mo dlia nauky i zabavy molodezhy. Red. K. Hrynevychyeva. Lviv. (also incl. DODATOK DLIA MALYKH CHYTACHIV)  
 1910, 1912, 1913 (incomplete)
59. *DZVONY*; misiachnyk. Literaturno-Naukovyi zhurnal. Lviv.  
 No. 1-3, 8, 9, 1931 No. 2-3, 6-7, 1935  
 No. 1, 4-5, 1932 No. 10-11, 1938  
 No. 1-7, 1933 No. 1-6, 1939  
 No. 12, 1934
60. *EMIGRANT*; Chasopys' Tovarystva Sviatoho Rafaila dlia okhorony ruskykh emigrantiv z Halychyny i Bykovyny. Lviv.  
 II—No. 1/2, 1912  
 III—No. 6, 1913
61. *EMIHRANT*; Orhan Khshanivs'koi Filii Ukrains'koho Tsentral'noho Komiteta. Khshaniv-Chrzanów.  
 II—No. 1, 1931
62. *EPARKHIAL'NI VISTY*; vydaie Dukhovna Konsystoriia Ukrains'koi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Pivnichnii Amerytsi. [n.p.]  
 No. 2, 1934
63. *FRONTOM!*; Chasopys borot'by z komunizmom, marksyzmom i materializmom. Vydaie i za redaktsiiu vidpovidaie Ivan Mets. Vykhodyt' kozhnoho tyzhnia v chetver. Lviv.  
 II—No. 4, 7-10, 12, 1937
64. *GOLOS NARODA*. Carpatho-Russian weekly paper. New York.  
 I—No. 1, 1917  
 No. 2-52, 1918  
 II—No. 1-41, 1919
65. *GOLOS RUSI*. Carpatho-Russian weekly paper. New York.  
 V—No. 18, 20, 1922

66. *HALYTS'KYI KOMUNIST*; Chasopys komunistychnoi partii Skhidnoi Halychyny.  
I—No. 1 (pislia 1920) n.p., n.d.
67. *HASLO*; Vydaie i za red. vidpovidaie Lev Kohut. Misiachnyk. Chernivtsi.  
I—No. 2, 1902  
(fotokopiia)
68. *HAZETA HADIATS'KOHO ZEMSTVA*. Hadiach, Poltavshchyna.  
No. 75, 1917
69. *HOLOS*—Die Stimme; Ukrains'kyi chasopys. Vyd. i holovnyi red. Bohdan Kravtsiv. Zastupnyk red. Iurii Muzychenko. Chasopys dlia ukrainsiv u Nimechchyni. Berlin.  
1941-1945 (incomplete)
70. *HOLOS DNIPRA*; Khersons'kyi chasopys. Vydaie T-vo PRESA UKRAINY. Vidp. Red. K.A. Kurinnyi. Vykhodyt' trychi na tyzhden'. Kherson.  
III—No. 62, 1943
71. *HOLOS HOVERLI*; informatsiinyi tyzhnevnyk dlia meshkantsiv ukrains'koi oseli "Nowa Howerla" v Neumarkti. Neumarkt. 19 hrudnia 1945  
(mimeograph)
72. *HOLOS IZBAVYTELIA*; misiachnyk vydavanyj misioneramy Sv. Izbavytelia. Yorkton.  
I—No. 8, 1923  
II—No. 12, 1924  
IV—No. 9, 1926
73. *HOLOS KHOLMSHCHYNY*. Poshtove chyslo 40034.  
No. 20 chervnia, 18 lypnia, 1944 (n.p.)
74. *HOLOS MAZEPYNTSIV*—The Mazeppian's Voice; Ukrainian Monthly. Misiachnyk. Chicago, Ill.  
No. 1, 1931
75. *HOLOS OKHTYRSHCHYNY*—Stimme von Achtyrka; Okruhovyi chasopys, vykhodyt' trychi na tyzhden'. Vidp. Red. Strakhov.  
II—no. 42, 1943
76. *HOLOS POLTAVSHCHYNY*; ukrains'kyi chasopys mista i sela. Za Red. Petro Sahaidachnyi. Poltava.  
I—No. 13, 1941  
III—No. 53-54, 1943
77. *HOLOS PRATSI*; orhan Ukrains'kykh Anarkhistiv-komunistiv. New York.  
No. 1, 1919



78. *HOLOS PRAVDY*—The Voice of Truth. Winnipeg, Canada.  
No. 2, 1939  
No. 3, 1940  
No. 4, 1941
79. *HOLOS SOTSIALISTA*; Neperiodychne vydannia Zakordonnoi Hrupy USDRP. Kiev-Prague-Lviv.  
No. 1, 1924  
No. 2, 1926
80. *HOLOS SPASYTELIA*. Yorkton, Sask.  
X—No. 6, 1938  
XV—No. 7/8-12, 1943  
XVI—No. 1-12, 1944
81. *HOLOS SUCHASNOSTY*; Opovidannia, naukovo-populiarni statti, spohady, rozvaha. V-vo R. Herrose. Grefenheinichen.  
No. 1-2, 1944
82. *HOLOS TABORA*; Vykhodyt' neperiodychno. Vydaie prosvitnyi kruzhok. (n.p.)  
No. 9, 1919  
No. 6, 1920
83. *HOLOS TABORU*; chasopys ukrains'koho taboru v Turkovychakh. Turkovychi, Kholms'koho Povitu.  
17 serpnia, 1941
84. *HOLOS TSERKVVY*—VOICE OF THE CHURCH; orhan Ukrains'koi Pravoslavnoi Hreko-Kat. Arkhiieparkhii v Amerytsi. Philadelphia.  
I—No. 4, 1929
85. *HOLOS VOLYNI*—Wolhyniens Stimme; Nach. i vidp. Red. I.E. Ohurevych. Zhytomyr.  
No. 26/27, 1942
86. *HOLOS—UKRAINSKI VISTI (Die Stimme)*. Berlin.  
VI—No. 18/19, 22, 1945
87. *HOSPODARS'KO-KOOPERATYVNYI CHASOPYS*; iliustrovanyi tyzhnevnyk. Orhan Reviziinoho Soiuzu Ukrains'kykh Kooperatyv. Lviv.  
III—No. 17, 1923  
IV—No. 6-9, 11-13, 15, 1924  
IX—No. 27, 1929  
—No. 51-52, 1936

88. *HOTOVS'*; orhanizatsiinyi lystok Tovarystva Orly, KAUM. Dodatok do Ukrains'koho Iunatstva. Lviv.  
No. 9, 1935  
No. 11, 1937
89. *HOVERLIA*; misiachnyk kul'tury. Obkladynka R. Lisovs'koho. Khust.  
I—No. 1, 1939
90. *HROMADA*; Orhan Ukrains'koi Natsional'noi Dumky. Tyzhnevyk. Vidpovidal'nyi red. S. Vyshnivs'kyi. Luts'k.  
Rik II, 1926 (incomplete)
91. *HROMADA*; tyzhnevyk suspyl'no-politychnoho i ekonomychno-hospodars'koho zhyttia. Redaktor-vydavets' I. Pylypchak. Luts'k.  
I—No. 1,2, 1920
92. *HROMADA*—Ukrains'ka chasopys', vporiadkovana M. Drahomanovym, M. Pavlykom i S. Podolins'kym. Geneva.  
No. 1, 1878  
No. 4, 1879  
No. 1, 1880  
No. 1, 1881  
No. 5, 1882
93. *HROMADIANKA*; dvotyzhnevyk. Vyd. Kooperatyva "Soiuz Ukrainok" u L'vovi. Nachal'na Red. Milena Rudnyts'ka. Lviv.  
No. 2, 3, 4, 1938
94. *HROMADS'KA DUMKA*. Lviv.  
I—No. 58, 133, 1920
95. *HROMADS'KE ZHYTTIA*—Community Life. New York-Detroit-Toronto-Winnipeg.  
No. 1-4, 1944
96. *HROMADS'KYI BIULETEN'* dlia ukrains'koi kolonii b Augsburshchyni. Aufkirch.  
No. 1 (4.5), 1945 (mimeograph)
97. *HROMADS'KYI HOLOS*—Voice of the Commonwealth; Orhan Demokratychnoi Dumky Ukrains'koi emihratsii v Amerytsi. New York.  
1941-1945 (incomplete)
98. *HROMADS'KYI HOLOS*; radykal'nyi politychnyi i ekonomichnyi chasopys. Tyzhnevyk. Lviv.  
1924-1929, 1934-1939 (incomplete)

99. *HROMADS'KYI VISTNYK*; Vydaie i za redaktsiiu vidpovidaie Oleksa Kuz'ma. Vydaie vydavnycha spilka Dilo. Lviv.  
I—No. 1-154, 1922  
II—No. 13, 15, 1923
100. *HURTUIMOSIA*; neperiodychnyi zhurnal viis'kovo-hromads'koi dumky. Red. V. Fylonovych ta M. Bytyns'kyi. Horní Černošice.  
1929, 1931-1934, 1938 (incomplete)
101. *IAHIDKA*; misiachnyi zhurnal dlia molodi. M.I. Borysyk—redaktor. Winnipeg.  
I—No. 2, 1931
102. *IDEIA I CHYN*; vydaie Provid Orhanizatsii Ukrains'kykh Natsionalistiv (OUN).  
IV—No. 9, 1945 (b.m.)
103. *IEDNIST'*; Orhan Ukrains'koi samostiinoi sobornyts'ko-derzhavnoi dumky. Brno.  
II—No. 6 (8), 1938
104. *IEDYNYM FRONTOM—FRONT UNIQUE*; misiachnyk. Vydaie Liga Ukraintsiv u Frantsii. Paris.  
No. 1, 1939
105. *ILIUSTROVANI VISTI*—Illustrierte Nachrichten; vykhodyt' raz u mi-siats'. Vidpovidal'nyi Red. L. Khomiak, literaturno-mystets'kyi Red. L. Lepkyi. Kraków.  
No. 1-3, 5, 7/8, 1940  
No. 1-4, 6-12, 1941
106. *ILIUSTROVANYI TYZHNEVYK*—Illustrated Weekly by Stephen Buchewsky; Prosvitno-Ekonomichna, postupova chasopys' dlia ukrains'koho naroda v Zluchenykh Derzhavakh. New York.  
I—No. 1-7, 1919  
II—No. 1-9, 1920
107. *INDUSTRIALIST*; Ofitsiial'nyi orhan v ukrains'kii movi revoliutsiinoho iuniizmu industriial'nykh robitnykiv svita. Misiachnyk. New York.  
I—No. 1, 1919
108. *INFORMATSII TSENTRAL'NOHO VYKONAVCHOHO KOMITETU* Ukrains'kykh Emihrants'kykh Orhanizatsii v Ch.S.R. Prague.  
No. 1, 3, 1930 (mimeograph)
109. *INFORMATSIINYI BIULETEN' VUKOOSPILKY*; vydannia Vukoos-pilky. (Vseukrains'ka spilka kooperatyvnykh orhanizatsii). Kiev.  
I—No. 5/6, 1942

110. *ISKRA*; literaturno-naukova, narodna chasopys'. Cherepkivtsi, Bukovyna.  
I—No. 2, 1907
111. *KADYLO*; humorystychno-satyrychnyi misiachnyk. Red. P. Krat. Winnipeg.  
I—No. 2, 1916
112. *KAMENIARI*—Holos molodi; vykhodyt' raz u misiats'. Vidpovidal'nyi  
Red. d-r K. Kobers'kyi. Vydavets' Osyp Navrots'kyi. Lviv.  
V—No. 2-5, 1936
113. *KAMENIARI*; *SUPM* (Soiuz Ukrains'koi Plastovoi Molodi). Vydavets'  
Osyp Navrots'kyi, vidpovidal'nyi redaktor Dr. K. Kobers'kyi. Lviv.  
No. 2-5, 1936  
No. 4, 10, 1937  
No. 7, 1938
114. *KANADIIS'KA SICH*—The Canadian Sitch; ofitsiial'nyi orhan kanadiis'-  
koi Sichovoi Orhanizatsii. Winnipeg.  
III—No. 5/6, 1930
115. *KANADIIS'KYI FARMER*—The Canadian Farmer; Prosvitno-ekono-  
michna i politychna chasopys'. Tyzhnevyyk. Winnipeg.  
1921, 1925, 1927-1931, 1943-1944
116. *KANADIIS'KYI RANOK*—Canadian Ranok; Chasopys dlia ukrains'koi  
rodyny. Winnipeg.  
1921, 1922, 1925-1926, 1938, 1944
117. *KANADIIS'KYI UKRAINET'S'*—Canadian Ukrainian;передовий Україн-  
с'ький Католітський Тижневик в Канаді, присвячений інтересам пратиіуі-  
чух лиудей. Winnipeg.  
1921-1922, 1925, 1927-1929
118. *KANCHUK*—The Ukrainian Whip; organ boiovoi druzhyny mista Niu  
Iorku. Vydaie Ukrainian Information Bureau. New York.  
No. 1-3, 1930
119. *KARPATO-UKRAJINSKÁ SVOBODA*; tydenik pro kulturni i národ-  
hospodářské sblížení Čechu, Slováků a Ukrajinců. Prague.  
I—No. 1, 1939
120. *KATOLYTS'KA AKTSIIA*; Vistnyk Heneral'noho Instytutu Katolyts'koi  
Aksii Hr.-Kat. Hal. Tserk. Provintsii. Lviv.  
I—No. 1, 1934  
II—No. 1, 2, 3, 1935  
III—No. 1, 3/4, 1936

121. *KHLIBOROB'S'KA UKRAINA*; vydannia Initsiiatyvnoi hrupy Ukrains'koho Soiuzu Khliborobiv Derzhavnykiv. Vienna.  
1920-1925
122. *KHLIBOROB'S'KYI SHLIAKH*; vydaie, redague i za redaktsiiu vidpovidaie: D-r Ivan Hladylovych. Lviv.  
No. 1-12, 1923 (zhurnal)  
No. 6, 14, 1935 (hazeta)
123. *KHOLMS'KA ZEMLIA*—Cholmer Land; tyzhnevnyk. Za red. vidpovidaie M. Khomiak. Kraków.  
I—No. 19, 46, 1943  
II—No. 27-30, 1944
124. *KNYHOLIUB*; Vydannia Ukrains'koho Tovarystva Prykhylynykiv Knyhy. Prague.  
I—No. 1-4, 1927  
II—No. 1/2, 3/4, 1928  
III—No. 1/2, 3/4, 1929  
IV—No. 1-4, 1930  
V—No. 1-4, 1931
125. *KNYZHKA*; Neperiodychnyi vistnyk ukrains'koho knyzhkovoho rukhu. Vydaie V-vo "Bystrytsia". Stanyslaviv.  
I—No. 2-3, 1921  
III—No. 6-10, 1923
126. *KOL'KA*; Zavdanniam tseho chasopysu ie zrobyty kozhnoho ukraintsia chesnym. Vykhodyt' koly treba. New York.  
I—No. 2, 1936  
II—No. 1, 1937  
III—No. 1-7, 1938
127. *KOMUNIKAT* Presovoho Viddilu Het'mans'koi Upravy. Berlin.  
No. 5, 1939
128. *KOMUNIKAT* Prezydii Holovnoi Emihratsiinoi Rady. Paris.  
No. 5, 1936
129. *KOMUNIST*; Orhan Tsentral'noho Komitetu KP(b)U i Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrains'koi RSR. (n.p.)  
No. 250-251, 262, 264, 265, 267, 269, 274-275, 278-284, 286-289, 1942
130. *KOMUNISTYCHNYI SVIT*; orhan Ukrains'koi Federatsii Komunistychnoi partii Ameryky. (n.p.)  
I—No. 4, 5, 1920  
III—No. 1/2, 3, 1922

131. *KOOPERATYVNA RESPUBLIKA*; suspil'no-ekonomichnyi misiachnyk. Lviv.  
IV—hruden', 1931  
X—sichen', 1937
132. *KOOPERATYVNE MOLOCHARSTVO*; iliustrovanyi misiachnyk. Lviv.  
XIV—No. 3, 1939 (photocopy)
133. *KOROTKI VISTI*. Vyd. Informatsiina Sluzhba Orhanizovanoho Ukrains'-koho Hromadianstva v Nimechchyni. Weimar-Hersfeld.  
No. 1-13/5, 1945
134. *KOSTIANTYNOHRADS'KI NOVI VISTI* — Konstantinograder Neue Nachrichten; Vykhydyt' dvichi na tyzhden'. Za red. vidp. Vasyl' Chaikiv-s'kyi Kostiantynohrad.  
II—No. 24-28, 1943
135. *KOZA DEREZA—UKRAINS'KYI PRODAVETS'*; Chasopys dlia humoru—chasopys dlia prodavtsiv. Dvi chasopysy v odnii i za odnu tsinu. Vyd. Sichovy Bazar. New York. (n.d.)
136. *KOZATS'KA DUMKA*. (Pokhidna drukarnia Shtadarmii. n.p.)  
I—No. 9, 1920
137. *KRAKIVS'KI VISTI*; tyzhnevnyk. Za redaktsiiu vidpovidaie M. Khomiak. Kraków.  
1940-1945 (incomplete)
138. *KRAMATORS'KA HAZETA*. Kramatorskajer Zeitung. Red. V. Shopen. Kramatorsk.  
II—No. 36, 1943
139. *KUBANS'KYI KRAI*; Orhan neperiodychnyi. Prague.  
v. I, 1929  
v. IV, 1930  
v. XI, 1932 (mimeograph)
140. *KUL'TURA*; zhurnal kul'turnoho, suspil'noho i politychnoho zhyttia. Lviv.  
I—No. 1-2, 1924  
II—No. 1-7, 10-12, 1925  
IV—No. 11, 1926  
VI—No. 7/10, 1928

141. *KVARTAL'NYK VISTNYKA*; Misiachnyk literatury, mystetstva, nauky i hromads'koho zhyttia. Knyhozbiirnia Vistnyka. Lviv.  
No. 1-3, 1934  
No. 1-4, 1935-1938  
No. 2-3, 1939
142. *LEMKIVS'KYI DZVIN*—Lemko Bell; Organ organizatsii oborony Lemkivshchyny Zakh. Ukrainy. Misiachnyk. New York, NY, Passaic, NJ  
I—No. 4, 5, 1936  
V—No. 1, 1940
143. *LEMKO*. Iezhenedel'naia, Karpatorusskaia, Narodnaia hazeta. Organ' Lemkovskoho Soiuzu v S.Sh. i Kanadie. Cleveland, Ohio.  
IV—No. 9, 51, 1931  
V—No. 16, 1932
144. *LEMKOVSHCHINA*. New York.  
IV—No. 4, 7, 8, 10, 15, 1925  
V—No. 11, 15, 1926
145. *LIESHANS'KA AKADEMIIA*; Odnodnivka Dobrovol'choi Strilets'koi dyvyzii "Halychyna". Lieshan.  
1/IX—1/XI, 1943
146. *LIKARS'KYI VISTNYK*; Orhan likars'koi komisii NTSh i ukrains'koho likars'koho t-va u L'vovi. Lviv.  
VII—No. 1/2, 1929  
VIII—No. 1, 1930  
XIV—No. 1, 1936
147. *LITERATURA, MYSTETSTVO I NAUKA*; bezplatnyi dodatok do METY. Lviv.  
I—No. 37, 1931
148. *LITERATURA I MYSTETSTVO*. Orhan Spilky Radians'kykh pys'menykiv Ukrainy ta Upravlinnia v spravakh mystetstv pry RNK URSR. (n.p.)  
No. 4-7, 10, 1942  
No. 6, 10, 11, 1943
149. *LITERATURNO-MYSTETS'KYI AL'MANAKH*, prysviachenyi literaturi, krytytsi, teatrovi, muzytsi. New York, NY  
I—No. 1, 1935

150. *LITERATURNO-NAUKOVYI VISTNYK*; misiachnyk literatury, nauky i suspil'noho zhyttia. Lviv.  
VII- XXV, 1904  
XXI— 1-8, 1922  
XXII-XXX— 1-12, 1923-1931  
XXXI— 1-7, 1932
151. *LITOPYS BOIKIVSHCHYNY*; Zapysky, prysviacheni doslidam istorii, kul'tury i pobutu boikivs'koho plemeny. Sambir.  
I—No. 1, 1931  
VIII—No. 10, 1938  
IX—No. 11, 1939
152. *LITOPYS CHERVONOI KALYNY*; iliustrovanyi zhurnal istorii ta pobutu. Lviv.  
1930-1939 (incomplete)
153. *LITOPYS NATSIONAL'NOHO MUZEIU*; Neperiodychne vydannia Soiuзу Prykhylnykyv Natsional'noho Museiu. Lviv.  
1934, 1935
154. *LITOPYS POLITYKY, PYS'MENSTVA I MYSTETSTVA*; tyzhnevnyi ohliad pid red. S. Tomashivs'koho. Nakladom V-va Ukrains'ke Slovo. Berlin.  
No. 1-20, 1924
155. *LITOPYS REVOLIUTSII*. Kharkiv.  
No. 1-6, 1928  
No. 1-2, 1932 (microfilm)
156. *L'VIVS'KI VISTI*; Shchodennyk dla dystryktu Halychyny. Lviv.  
1941-1944 (incomplete)
157. *LYS MYKYTA*—Reynard The Fox; humorystychno-satyrychnyi iliustrovanyi chasopys. New York.  
I—No. 1-2, 1921
158. *LYTERATURNI NEDIELIA* Podkarpatskoho Obshchestva Nauk. Unhvar.  
III—No. 4, 6, 7, 15-17, 1943  
IV—No. 6-7, 1944
159. *MALI DRUZI*; iliustrovanyi zhurnal dla ukrains'koi ditvory. Kraków.  
No. 1-12, 1937  
No. 1-5, 1938  
No. 1-12, 1940-1943  
No. 6, 1944



160. *MALI DRUZI*; iliustrovanyi zhurnal dlia ukrains'koi ditvory. Za redaktsiiu vidpovidaie Iaroslav Tkachuk. Lviv.  
No. 9/11, 1937  
No. 3, 6, 1943  
No. 1, 3, 7/8, 1944
161. *MAMAI*; literaturno-krytychnyi misiachnyk pid nachal'noi redaktsiieiu Klyma Polishchuka. Lviv-Kiev.  
I—No. 1, 1921
162. *MAN'DZHURS'KYI VISTNYK*; Orhan ukrains'koi natsional'no-derzhavnyts'koi dumky. Vidpovidal'nyi redaktor I. Svit. Kharbin.  
1932-1937 (incomplete)
163. *MEDYCHNYI VISNYK*; vydaie tymchasovyi tsentral'nyi provid ukrains'kykh studentiv medykiv v Minkheni. Munich.  
I—No. 1, hruden' 1945
164. *META*; tyzhnevyyk; vydaie Meta, vydavnycha Kooperatyva. Vidp. Red. Petro Kozyts'kyi. Lviv.  
I—No. 37, 1931
165. *METEL'YK*; Odnodnivka polonenykh ukraintsiv. Vydaie hurtok prykhyl'nykiv SVU. Tabir polonenykh, Freistadt.  
10 kvitnia, 1916  
19 travnia, 1916
166. *MISIONAR*—The Missionary; uriadovyi orhan Apostol'stva Molytvy i Bratstva naisviatishykh Tain. Philadelphia.  
1922, 1925, 1927, 1930-1934, 1937, 1940, 1944 (incomplete)
167. *MISIONAR BRAZYLII*; Misiachnyk relihiinyi dlia rusyniv-katolykiv. Vyd. ottsi Vasyliiany v Prudentopolisi.  
IV—No. 9, 11, 1914  
V—No. 2-5, 12, 1915  
VI—No. 2, 3, 1916
168. *MISIONAR* Presviatoho Isusovoho Sertsia; v-vo oo. Vasyliian. Red. o. Pakhomii Borys. Relihiinyi misiachnyk. Zhovkva.  
No. 3-10, 1938  
No. 11, 1943
169. *MOLODA HROMADA*; chasopys, prysviachenyi spravam ukrains'koi molodi. Vykhydyt' shcho druhyi tyzhden'. Vydaie i za redaktsiiu vidpovidaie Stepan Tkachuk. Kolomyia.  
I—No. 4, 11, 1922

170. *MOLODA UKRAINA*; Chasopys' ukrains'koi molodizhy. Lviv.  
I—No. 2-4, 6-11, 1900  
II—No. 7, 1901
171. *MOLODA UKRAINA*—La Jeune Ukraine; misiachnyk nezaleznoi dumky. Paris.  
1935, 1937, 1938 (incomplete)
172. *MOLODE ZHYTTIA*; Misiachnyk ukrains'koi akademichnoi molodizhy. Vydaie Naukovo-Literaturna sektsiia Akademichnoho Tovarystva "Sich". Redahuie Komitet. Vienna.  
I—No. 1, 2, 3, 1921
173. *MOLODI KAMENIARI*; dodatok do Hromads'koho Holosu. Lviv.  
1928-1929 (incomplete)
174. *MOLODYI AGRONOM*; Neperiodychnyi agnomichnyi zbirnyk. Agnomichne Tovarysvo pry Ukrains'kii Hospodarchii Akademii v Ch. S.R. Poděbrady.  
No. 2, 3, 1928
175. *MOLODYI UKRAINETSY*; Neperiodychnyi orhan Spilky Ukrains'koi Molodi v Manchzhu-Di-Ho. Vyd. K.P. Iakovets'; Red. Fedorenko. Kharbin.  
Berezen', 1936
176. *MOLOT*; Satyrychno-humorystychna chasopys'. New York.  
II—No. 6, 21, 1920  
III—No. 3, 6-10, 12, 1921  
IV—No. 4, 6, 1922  
V—No. 9, 1923
177. *MY*; literaturnyi chvert'richnyi zhurnal. Vydavnytstvo Variah. Warsaw.  
Kn. I-VII, 1933-1937
178. *MYRHORODS'KI VISTI*; ukrains'kyi chasopys Myrhorods'koi okruhy. Vykhydyt' dvychi na tyzhden'. Red. Mykhailo Voskobiinyk. Myrhorod.  
II—No. 9, 1942
179. *NA PERELOMI*; Zhurnal polityky, literatury ta mystetstva pid red. O. Olesia. Vienna.  
I—No. 1-5, 1920
180. *NA PROVESNI*; Misiachnyk dlia ukrains'ko-ievanel's'koi molodi. Vykhydyt' iak dodatok do "Viry i Nauky". Kolomyia.  
I—No. 2-10, 1934

181. *NA SLIDI*; zhurnal molodi. Vyd-vo Kooperatyva "Vohni". Red. Uliana Starosol's'ka. Lviv.  
VI—no. 1, 5, 1939
182. *NA VARTI*; zhurnal ukrains'koho students'koho obiednannia v Avstrii. (U.S.O.A.) Innsbruck.  
No. 3-4, 1945
183. *NA VIDSICH!*; Orhan mistsevoi orhanizatsii Soiuzu Het'mantsiv Derzhavnykiv u Berlini. Prague.  
No. 8/9, 10/11, 12/13, 1940
184. *NADDUNAIS'KA VARTA*; orhan oblasnoi upravy Ukrains'koho Natsional'noho Obiednannia. Vienna.  
No. 1, 2, 1944  
No. 3, 1945
185. *NAPEREDODNI*; literaturno-mystets'kyi i naukovyi chasopys. Vydaie i redaguie Bohdan Kravtsiv. Vykhodyt' 15-ho i 30-ho kozhnoho misiatsia. Lviv.  
I—No. 3, 1937  
II—No. 3 (7), 1938
186. *NAROD*—The People; Tyzhneva hazeta dlia Ukrains'koho Naroda v Amerytsi. Vydaie Federatsiia Ukraintsiv v Zluchenykh Derzhavakh. Red. Myroslav Sichyns'kyi. New York.  
I—No. 2-6, 1917
187. *NAROD*—The People; Ukrains'ka hazeta, shchodennyk. Ukrainian Daily publ. by Ukrainian Federation. Red. Omelian Reviuk. New York.  
I—No. 1-32, 34-134, 136-188, 1919
188. *NARODNA HAZETA*—People's Gazette; odydnoka ukrains'ka shchodenna hazeta v Kanadi. Vydaie robitnycho-farmers'ke vydavnyche T-vo. Winnipeg.  
XIX—No. 1, 38, 1937  
XX—No. 21, 1938  
XXII—No. 30, 1940
189. *NARODNA VOLIA*—The People's Will; Chasopys' dlia ukrains'koho naroda v Amerytsi. Orhan Ukrains'koho Robitnychoho Soiuzu. Scranton, Pa.  
1917-1929, 1932-1945 (incomplete)
190. *NARODNE SLOVO*—The National Word; Orhan zapomohovoho tovarystva "Narodna Pomich". Pittsburgh, Pa.  
1919-1920, 1923-1926 (incomplete)

191. *NARODNI VISTY*—Les Nouvelles Populaires; orhan ukrains'koi emih-ratsii u Frantsii. Misiachnyk. Paris.  
No. 5, 1938
192. *NARODNIA PROSVITA*; prosvitnyi misiachnyk tovarystva Prosvita. Lviv.  
II—No. 1-3, 5-8, 1924
193. *NARODNIA SPRAVA*; ukrains'kyi tyzhnevnyi chasopys. Vyd. Ukrains'ka Presa. Vidp. Red. Lev Chubatyi. Lviv.  
1936-1937, 1939 (incomplete)
194. *NASH HOLOS*; Informatsiinyi dvotyzhnevnyk. Vydavets' i vidpovidal'nyi redaktor Osyp Pechunka. Drohobych.  
II—No. 13-24, 1935
195. *NASH HOLOS*; Sotsiialdemokratychnyi misiachnyk. Lviv.  
No. 9/10, 1911
196. *NASH PRAPOR*; iliustrovanyi dvodennyk. Vydaie vydavnytstvo "Ukrain-s'ka presa" (Ivan Tyktor). Lviv.  
V—No. 64, 80, 82, 1937
197. *NASH PRAPOR*; nach. red. Arkadii Malets'kyi. Shchodennyk. Lviv.  
No. 34, 1924
198. *NASH PRYIATEL'*; chasopys dlia molodi i dityi. Lviv-Zhovkva.  
1923-1925, 1928-1934 (incomplete)
199. *NASH SHLIAKH*—OUR WAY; komunistychna robitnycha hazeta, mi-siachnyk. Red. E. Kruk. New York.  
I—No. 1, 1919  
II—No. 1, 1920
200. *NASH SHLIAKH*; Orhan Ukrains'koi Samostiinyts'koi Dumky. (n.p.)  
No. 4-6, 7-8, 1945
201. *NASH SHLIAKH*; orhan ukrains'koi vyzvol'noi dumky.  
[Aschafenburg].  
IV—No. 9, 11, 12, 1945 (mimeograph)
202. *NASH STIAH*; Orhan halyts'koi komunistychnoi molodi za kordonom. Za red. vidpovidal'nyi T. Prokopovych. Vienna.  
II—No. 4, 1922
203. *NASH STIAH*—Our Banner; odynokyi ukrains'kyi tyzhnevnyk v piv-nichno-zakhidnykh steitakh ZDA. Chicago, Ill.  
1937-1942 (incomplete)

204. *NASH SVIT*; iliustrovanyi literaturnyi i populiarno-naukovyi tyzhnevnyk. Warsaw.  
No. 1-3, 1924
205. *NASH SVIT*; Iliustrovanyi zhurnal literatury, mystetstva, nauky. V-vo Volodymyra Ostrovs'koho. Luts'k.  
V—No. 4, 1935
206. *NASHA HROMADA*; Orhan akademichnoi hromady pry Ukrains'kii Hospodarchii Akademii v ChSR. Poděbrady.  
No. 1, 9, 11-14, 1924  
No. 1, 4, 1925  
NO. 5/6, 1926
207. *NASHA KUL'TURA*; naukovo-literaturnyi misiachnyk. Vydaie I. Ohienko. Warsaw.  
I—No. 1-8, 1935  
II—No. 1-12, 1936  
III—No. 1-12, 1937
208. *NASHA PRAVDA*; Vydaie Kompartiiia Zakhidn'oi Ukrainy. Redahuie kolegiia. Lviv.  
III—No. 1, 1923  
IV—No. 2/3, 1924  
VIII—No. 4/5, 1928
209. *NASHA SHKOLA*; Naukovo-pedahohichniy zhurnal. Orhan Tovarystva ukrains'kykh uchyteliv serednikh i vyshchyykh shkil. "Uchytel's'ka Hromada" u L'vovi i "Tov. im Skovorody" u Chernivtsiakh.  
III—v. IV, 1911  
IV—v. IV/V, 1912  
VI—v. 2/3, 1914
210. *NASHA SPILKA*; Chasopys dlia ukrains'koho selianstva. Vydaie Ukrain's'ka Selians'ka Spilka na emigratsii v ChSR. Redahuie kolehiia. Vidpovidaie za red. M. Tymchenko. Prague.  
I—No. 1, 2/3, 1923  
II—No. 4/5, 1924  
III—No. 6, 1925
211. *NASHA SPILKA*; narodna hazeta. Romny, Poltava.  
No. 34, 1917

212. *NASHA UKRAINA*; Ukrains'kyi dytiachyi prytulok v Podebradakh. Red. S. Nahirna.  
No. 1, 1933  
No. 3, 1934
213. *NASHE SLOVO*—OUR WORD; Ukrains'kyi misiachnyk, prysviachenyi shyrenniu osvity. Vydaie Prosvitnie Tovarystvo im. T. Shevchenka pry Ukrains'kii Presvyters'kii Tserkvi v Oshavi. Ont., Canada.  
II—No. 1, 1934
214. *NASHE ZHYTTIA*; Kraievi tyzhnevyyk po spravam politychnym, kul'turnym i suspil'no-ekonomichnym. Kholm.  
III—No. 43, 1923
215. *NASHE ZHYTTIA*—OUR LIFE; Misiachnyk kul'tury i hromads'koho zhyttia. Winnipeg.  
V. 1, 1941
216. *NASHE ZHYTTIA*—OUR LIFE; Orhan Soiuzu Ukrainok Ameryky. Philadelphia.  
I—No. 2, 1944
217. *NASHE ZHYTTIA*; ukrains'kyi chasopys. (Ukrainian newspaper "Our Life"). Redaktor V. Chaplenko. Vyd. Kul'turno-Osvitnii Viddil Ukrains'koho taboru v Avgzburzi. Augsburg.  
No. 1-32, 1945
218. *NASHI DNI*; misiachnyk. Vydaie Ukrains'ke Vydavnytstvo, vidpovidal'nyi red. I. Nimchuk. Kraków-Lviv.  
I—No. 4-10, 1942  
II—No. 1-12, 1943  
III—No. 1-5, 1944
219. *NASHI DNI*. Orhan Ukrains'koi Holovnoi Upravy Propahandy. Vykhydyt' dvichi na misiats'. Berlin.  
No. 1, 1945
220. *NASTUP*; ukrains'kyi tyzhnevyyk. Redaguie kolegiia pid provodom Dra. Stepana Rosokhy. Prague.  
III—No. 1, 4, 9, 12, 23, 1940  
IV—No. 33, 1941  
V—No. 24, 1942  
VI—No. 48, 1943

221. *NATSIIA V POKHODI*. Nation im Aufbruch; Orhan ukrains'koi derzhavnyts'koi dumky. Berlin-Prague.  
I—No. 1-17, 1939  
II—No. 1-20, 1940  
III—No. 1-10, 21-24, 1941
222. *NATSIONALIST*; Chasopys ukrainoznavstva, vykhodyt' shchodva tyzhni, bezplatnyi dodatok do "Nastupu". Vyd. i vidpovidal'nyi redaktor S. Rosokha. Prague.  
II—No. 7, 1941
223. *NATSIONALIST*; orhan ukrains'koho orhanizovanoho natsionalizmu v Amerytsi. Philadelphia-New York.  
1935-1939 (incomplete)
224. *NATSIONAL'NA DUMKA*; vydaie hrupa ukrains'koi natsional'noi molodi v Prazi. Prague.  
IV—No. 4-6, 10, 1926
225. *NAUKOVYI ZBIRNYK* Ukrains'koho Vil'noho Universytetu v Prazi. Prague.  
v. I, 1923  
v. II, 1930  
v. III, 1942
226. *NAZUSTRICH*; literatura—mystetstvo—nauka—hromads'ke zhyttia. Lviv.  
I—No. 23, 1934  
II—No. 5, 1935  
III—No. 3-5, 10-12, 14-22, 1936
227. *NEDIILIA*; Pouchitel'no-hospodarska hazeta dlia uhro-russkoho naroda. Budapest.  
XVIII—No. 10, 1915
228. *NEDIILIA*; iliustrovanyi tyzhnevyyk. Vydaiut' i redahuiut': Roman Holiiian i Mykola Holubets'. Lviv.  
II—No. 25, 1929  
VIII—No. 39, 1935
229. *NEDIILIA*; Vydaie vydavnycha spilka "Dilo". Red. Iaroslav Vesolovs'kyi. Odvichal'nyi redaktor Dr. Volodymyr Bachyns'kyi. Lviv.  
II—No. 7-19, 1912
230. *NEDIILIA*. Tyzhnevyyk ukrains'koho taboru v Shveinfurti. Schweinfurt.  
I—No. 1, 1945
231. *NEMEZIDA*; Kvartal'nyk prysviachenyi spravam Vyzvolennia ukrains'-

koho narodu, istorii viis'ka ta utvorennia ukrains'koi kozats'koi derzhavy dvokh chastyn svitu—Evropy i Azii. Orhan frontovykiv-partyzaniv Novoi Ukrainy. Red. i vydavets' Serhii Sydorenko-Saporai. Jablonna, Poland.  
No. 1, 1936

232. *NEZALEZHNIIST'*—L'Independance; Ukrain's'kyi dvokhtyzhnevyyk v Paryzhi. Redahuie koliehiia. Paris.  
I—No. 3, 4, 1931
233. *NOVA DOBA*; iliustrovanyi tyzhnevyyk. Berlin.  
No. 22-23, 41, 46, 48, 1944
234. *NOVA DOBA*—NEUE ZEIT; Red. Volodymyr Semeniuk. Berdychev.  
II—No. 85, 86, 95, 1942
235. *NOVA ERA*; Naukovyi zhurnal dlia dumaiuchykh liudei. Iliustrovanyi misiachnyk. Canora, Sask.  
II—No. 3, 1932  
VI—No. 4/6, 1936
236. *NOVA HROMADA*; suspil'no-politychnyi zhurnal pid red. Semena Vityka. Vienna.  
No. 1-4, 1923  
No. 1-6, 1924
237. *NOVA KHATA*; zhurnal dlia plekannia domashn'oi kul'tury. Vydaie kooperatyva "Ukrains'ke Narodne Mystetstvo". Za redaktsiiu vidpovidaie Mariia Hromnyts'ka. Lviv.  
1925-1926, 1931-1932, 1936-1939 (incomplete)
238. *NOVA KNYHA*; knyzhkovyi biuleten'-tsinnyk "Ukrains'koho Vydavnytstva" v Krakovi. Kraków.  
I—No. 1, 1940
239. *NOVA KUL'TURA*; zhurnal kul'turnoho, suspil'noho i politychnoho zhyttia. Lviv.  
I—No. 5-12, 1923  
II—No. 1/2, 1924  
(Prodovzhennia dyv. "Kul'tura")
240. *NOVA RADA*; hazeta politychna, ekonomychna i literaturna. Kiev.  
No. 74 (12.5), 1918
241. *NOVA RADA*. Vidpovidal'nyi Red. A. Lotots'kyi. Lviv.  
No. 52, 53, 1919
242. *NOVA SHEPETIVKA*; Chasopys Shepetivs'koi Okruhy. Shepetivka.  
I—No. 81, 1942



243. *NOVA SVOBODA*; ukrains'kyi nezalezhnyi shchodennyk. Vid 1939—Orhan Ukrains'koho Natsional'noho Obiednannia. Red. Fedir Revai—1938, V. Grendzha-Dons'kyi — 1939. Uzhhorod-Khust.  
XXXIX—No. 96-1-1, 136-142, 145, 1938  
XL—No. 21-26, 28-32, 50, 53-55, 1939
244. *NOVA UKRAINA*; chasopys dlia evakuiovanykh. Holovnyi red. Vsevolod Tsarynnik. Vykhodyt' dvichi na tyzhden'. Vynnytsia-Berlin.  
IV—No. 2-4, 6, 8, 1944
245. *NOVA UKRAINA*—lystok dlia naroda; Misiachnyk. New York.  
I—No. 5, 1920  
II—No. 2-12, 1921
246. *NOVA UKRAINA*; misiachnyk pys'menstva, mystetstva, nauky i hromads'koho zhyttia, pid red. V. Vynnychenka i M. Shapovala. Prague-Berlin.  
I—No. 1-12, 1922  
II—No. 1-12, 1923  
III—No. 1-3, 1924  
IV—No. 1-8, 1925  
V—No. 1-6, 8, 9, 1926  
VI—No. 1-12, 1927  
VII—No. 1-6, 1928
247. *NOVA UKRAINA*—Neue Ukraine; Vykhodyt' dvichi na tyzhden'. Poltava.  
III—No. 106, 110, 1943
248. *NOVA ZORIA*; Vydaie i redahuie Komitet UKO. Vidpovidal'nyi redaktor Panteleimon Khytra. Vykhodyt' dva razy na tyzhden'. Lviv.  
IV—No. 70, 73, 1929  
VI—No. 91, 1931  
IX—No. 37-48, 1934
249. *NOVE MYSTETSTVO*; tyzhnevnyk. Kharkiv.  
No. 26, 1927
250. *NOVE SELO*; ukrains'kyi selians'kyi tyzhnevnyi chasopys. Redaktor M-r Borys Levyts'kyi. Lviv.  
X—No. 35 (486), 1939
251. *NOVE UKRAINS'KE SLOVO*; Vydaie Kyivs'ke Narodnie V-vo. Vidpovidal'nyi red. K.F. Shtepa. Kiev.  
I—No. 2, 5, 7, 9-11, 13, 60-65, 70-71, 76-78, 1942
252. *NOVE ZHYTTIA*; hromads'ko-politychnyi, ekonomichnyi ta literaturnyi dvokhtyzhnevnyk. Vidpovidal'nyi red. d-r Ivan Sekanina. Prague.  
No. 1/2, 1926

253. *NOVE ZHYTTIA*; neperiodychnyi chasopys VI Strilets'koi dyvizii. Aleksandrovo.  
No. 32, 97, 1921
254. *NOVE ZHYTTIA*; Ukrains'ka Iliustratsiia. Herausgeber Ukr. Presse G.m.b.H. Hauptschriftleiter Joseph Antonenko. Dresden.  
No. 4, 1944  
No. 6, 1945
255. *NOVE ZHYTTIA*—New Life; Chasopys' dlia ukrains'koho narodu v Amerytsi i orhan T-va Zhoda Bratstv. Pivmisiachnyk. Olyphant, Pa.  
IV—No. 41, 1916  
XIV—No. 1-6, 9, 10, 12-20, 23-32, 1926
256. *NOVI DNI*; vykhodyt' u nedili i sviata. Salzburg.  
I—No. 2-12, 1945
257. *NOVI SHLIAKHY*; literaturno-naukovyi, mystets'kyi i hromads'kyi misiachnyk. Lviv.  
NO. 1, 1929
258. *NOVITNII REMISNYK*; fakhovyi orhan ukrains'kykh remisnykiv. Misiachnyk. Vydaie Hospodars'ko-tekhnichne Tov-vo "Pratsia". Red. Iryna Halibei. Lviv.  
I—No. 3, 1938  
II—No. 2-8, 1939
259. *NOVOJE VREMJA*. Nezavisima politicheska gazeta Podkarpatskoj Rusi. Uzhhorod.  
II—No. 61, 1926
260. *NOVYI CHAS*; iliustrovanyi politychno-hospodars'kyi chasopys. Vykhydyt' dva razy v tyzhden'. Lviv-Luts'k.  
1923-1931 (incomplete)
261. *NOVYI CHAS*; iliustrovanyi populiarnyi chasopys, vykhodyt' shcho druhyi den'. Lviv.  
IX—No. 40, 1931
262. *NOVYI CHAS*; iliustrovanyi shchodennyk. Vydaie V-vo "Ukrains'ka Presa". Vidpovidal'nyi red. Lev Chubaty. Lviv.  
1935-1939 (incomplete)
263. *NOVYI CHAS*; Orhan Voznesens'koho Gebitkomisara. Voznesens'ke.  
No. 47, 1943

264. *NOVYI SHLIAKH*—New Pathway; ody nokyi ukrains'kyi pivtyzhnevyyk u Kanadi. Winnipeg, Manitoba.  
XV—No. 70, 73, 1944
265. *NOVYI VIKHOT*; Satyrychno-humorystychnyi chasopys ukrains'koho studentstva v Prazi. Prague.  
No. 5, 1922
266. *NYVA*; tserkovno-suspil'nyi chasopys. Prysviachenyi tserkovnym i suspil'nym spravam. Vidpovidal'nyi Red. o. Petro Kozits'kyi. Lviv.  
No. 6/7, 1921  
No. 6, 1931  
No. 1-3, 1938
265. *OBIEDNANNIA*; Neperiodychni zbirnyky stattei na temy politychni, ekonomichni i kul'turni. Redahuie komitet. Vienna.  
I—Lystopad, 1924
266. *OBNOVA*; Narodnyi tyzhnevyyk. Vydavets' i vidpovidal'nyi redaktor Sydir Tverdokhlib. Lviv.  
I—No. 1-6, 1920
267. *OBORONA UKRAINY*; Chasopys Ukrains'koi Narodn'oi Revoliutsiinoi Armii. Vydaie viddil Propahandy pry Holovonii Komandi UNRA. Redahuie koliegiia. (n.p.).  
No. 1, 1943 (photocopy)
268. *OBRII*; literaturno-mystets'kyi i naukovyi tyzhnevyyk. Vydaie i redahuie Bohdan Kravtsiv. Lviv.  
No. 2, 1936
269. *OKO*—The Eye; Iliustrovanyi zhurnal humoru i satyry. New York.  
I—No. 1, 1939
270. *ORDEN*; orhan relihiino-filosofs'koi dumky. Augsburg-London.  
No. 1-3, 1945
271. *ORHANIZATSIIINI VISTY OBORONY UKRAINY*; Scranton, Pa.  
1936-1941 (incomplete)
272. *OSA*; humor i satyra. Ody nokyi ukrains'kyi zhurnal humoru i satyry v Amerytsi. Chicago.  
I—No. 2, 1931
273. *OSA*; Ukrainian humoristic and scientific semi-monthly paper. Chicago.  
IV—No. 3, 1921

274. *OSA*—The Wasp; dvotyzhnevyyk humorystychno-satyrychnyi, vykhodyt' 1 i 15 kozhdoho misiatsia. Olyphant, Pa.  
I—No. 1-5, 1902  
II—No. 1-10, 1903
275. *PARAFIAL'NYI VISTNYK*—The Parochial Herald; Vydaie Ukrains'ka Pravoslavna Tserkva Presviatoi Troitsi. Misiachnyk. Chicago, Ill.  
I—No. 2, 3, 4, 1935  
II—No. 1, 2, 1936
276. *PEREDZ'IZDOVYI BIULETEN'* Marksivs'koi Hrupy pry Sots.-Hromadi im. Drahomanova v Prazi, Sots. Hromady im. Drahomanova u Vidni i Sots. Students'koho Soiuzu Halychyny. Prague.  
No. 1, 1922
277. *PERELOM*; ukrains'kyi kul'turno-informatyvnyi tyzhnevyyk. Editor A. Bielopolsky. Buenos Aires.  
I-III—No. 1-124, 1943-1945
278. *PEREMOHA*; ideolohichnyi zhurnal F.N.Ie. Lviv.  
v. I, II, III, 1936
279. *PEREMOHA*; Suspil'no-politychnyi dvotyzhnevyyk, nakladom V-va. "Bat'-kivshchyna". Nachal'nyi Red. Dr. Paliiv. Lviv.  
I—No. 16, 1934
280. *PERETS'*; Zhurnal satyry i humoru. Vydavnytstvo TSK KP/b/U "Komunist". Vidpovidal'nyi red. L. Palamarchuk (n.p.).  
II—No. 2-6, 8, 1943
281. *PID PRAPOROM PROSVITY*; Biuletyn' Dilovoho Komitetu 70-littia Prosvity. Lviv.  
No. 1, 1938
282. *PLASTOVYI SHLIAKH*; chasopys provodu ukrains'koho plastovoho uladu prysviachenyi spravam pozashkil'noho vykhovannia molodi. Lviv.  
No. 1-3, 1930
283. *PLASTUN*; instruktyvno-rozvahovyi chasopys ukrains'koho Plastu v Avgshburzi. Augsburg.  
15 hrudnia, 1945
284. *PLUH*; literaturno-khudozhnii misiachnyk. Spilka selians'kykh pys'menykiv "Pluh". Kharkiv.  
V—No. 1, 1929
285. *PLUH I HART*; dodatok do "Hromads'koho Holosu". Misiachnyk

ukrains'koho selians'koho i robitnychoho pys'mennyka. Kharkiv.

Dodatok do No. 1/2, 6, 14, 1929

286. *PLUH TA MECH*—El Arado y La Espada; Neperiodychne vydannia Ukrains'koho Soiuzu Monarkhistiv-Derzhavnykiv "Pluh ta Mech" v Argentyns'kii Respublitsi. Buenos Aires.

No. 4, 1937

No. 5, 1938

No. 8, 1939

287. *PODIEBRADKA*.

No. 2, 1923

No. 3, 4, 1924

No. 6, 1925

288. *PODIL'S'KA KOOPERATSIIA*; zhurnal. Vydaie Podil's'kyi Kredytovyj Soiuz Kooperatyvnykh ustanov "Soiuzbank" i Kamianets'ka Kooperativna Rada.

v. 1, 1920

289. *PODIL'S'KA VOLIA*; Chasopys sotsial'no-politychna ta kooperativno-ekonomichna. Vinnytsia.

No. 15, 1917

290. *PODKARPATS'KA RUS'*; Chasopys' prysviachena dlia poznania rodnoho kraiu. Redahuie Ivan Pan'kevych. Bratislava.

I—No. 3, 1924

291. *PODKARPATSKE PCHOLIARSTVO*; iliustrovana novynka pcholiarov Podkarpatskoi Rusy. Uzhhorod.

I—No. 2-7, 1923

II—No. 1-5, 1924

292. *PODOLIANYN*—Der Podolier; vykhodyt' dvichi na tyzhden'. Red. D.M. Korbutiak. Kamianets' na Podilli.

No. 35, 1942

No. 45, 48, 49/50, 1943

293. *POLITYCHNYI INFORMATSIYNYI BIULETEN'*. Lviv.

II—No. 3, 1935

III—No. 1, 1936

294. *POLITYKA*; dvotyzhnevnyi ohliad natsional'noho zhyttia. Vydaie V. Panko. Za redaktsiiu vidpovidal'nyi Iu. Mudrak. Lviv.

I—No. 1-6, 1925

II—No. 1-4, 1926

295. *PORA*—The Times; Odynoka ukrains'ka chasopys v Michigan. The only Independent Ukrainian Weekly Newspaper for the Cultural, Moral and Social Development of the 50,000 Ukrainians residing in Greater Detroit.  
 III—No. 26-27, 1932  
 IV—No. 1-10, 24-25, 1933
296. *POSTUP*; vistnyk literatury i zhyttia. Lviv.  
 No. 5-8, 1927  
 No. 3-6, 1928  
 No. 1-4, 1929
297. *PRAVDA*; orhan vil'noi ukrains'koi dumky.  
 13.IV.1921 (copy of a typewritten periodical published in Lviv, prepared by SSV T.Sh. Prague.)
298. *PRAVDA*; orhan vil'noi ukrains'koi dumky. Lviv.  
 (Dodatok) 10.IV.1921
299. *PRAVDA*—The Truth; Hazeta dla russkoho naroda v Spoluchenykh Derzhavakh i Kanadi i orhan obshchestva russkikh bratstv. Olyphant, Pa.  
 XII—No. 51-52, 1914  
 XIV—No. 23, 1915  
 XIV—No. 102, 1916  
 XVI—No. 43, 1917  
 XVII—No. 54, 101, 1918  
 XXIV—No. 22, 1924
300. *PRAVDA*—The Truth; hazeta dla ukrains'kykh robitnykiv i farmeriv u Kanadi i Spoluchenykh Derzhavakh. Tyzhnevyyk. Winnipeg.  
 I—No. 4, 10-12, 14-17, 19-31, 33-38, 1936  
 II—No. 1, 2, 5-38, 1937
301. *PRAVDYVYI PROVYDINETS'*; Orhan Komitetu Provydintsiv Dobroi Voli. Philadelphia.  
 I—No. 1, 1941
302. *PRAVOSLAVNYI VISTNYK*—The Orthodox Herald; Orhan Ukrains'-koi Hreko-Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Kanadi. Winnipeg.  
 II—No. 10, 1925
303. *PRIKARPATSKAIA RUS'*; Orhan Russkaho Ispolnitel'naho Komiteta vo L'vove. Lviv.  
 No. 15, 1919
304. *PROBOIEM*; Chasopys ukrains'koi natsionalistychnoi dumky. Prague.  
 1933, 1934, 1939-1941 (incomplete)
305. *PROMIN'*; Chasopys himnaziial'noi molodi pry LUH. Luts'k.  
 IV—No. 9, 1928

306. *PROMIN'*; ofitsiyni orhan mista Nikopolia. Red. P.I. Lapin. Nikopol'.  
II—No. 45, 1943
307. *PROMIN'*—The Ray; Zhurnal, pryznachenyi ukrains'kii fil'movii i baletnii spravi ta narodn'omu zhyttiu. Vydaie kolehiia pid red. Ievhena Skotska. New York.  
I—No. 1, 1936
308. *PROSVITNI LYSTKY*. Lviv.  
No. 31, 1910 (Dr. Zenon Kudelia: lak zakladaty i provadyty narodni biblioteky po selakh.)
309. *PROSVITNYI LYSTOK*. Vydaiut' poloneni ukraintsi taboru Vetsliar (Vezlar).  
II—1916 (incomplete)
310. *PROTY KHVYL'*; Misiachnyk. Lviv.  
I—No. 1, 2, 3, 1928
311. *PROVYDINETS'*; organ krytychnoi dumky dlia popravu "Provydinnia". Vydaie advokat Ivan Dudun. Philadelphia, Pa.  
No. 2, 1941
312. *PRYIATEL' DITEI*; misiachnyk dlia ukrains'koi ievanhel's'koi ditvory. Kolomyia.  
II—No. 6, 11-12, 1934
313. *PYS'MO Z PROSVITY*; literaturno-prosvitnyi tyzhnevuk pid red. Volodymyra Doroshenka. Lviv.  
IX—No. 7/8, 1922
314. *RADA*; Hazeta politychna, ekonomychna i literaturna. Shchodennyk. Redaktor V. Ianovs'kyi. Vydavets' Ie. Chykalenko. Kiev.  
VIII—No. 269, 1913
315. *RADA*; politychnyi orhan nezalezhnoi dumky. Za redaktsiiu vidpovidaie Kost' Lychkivs'kyi. Tyzhnevuk. Lviv.  
I—No. 12-21, 1925  
II—No. 3-31, 45-49, 1926  
III—No. 44-45, 1927
316. *RADIANS'KA UKRAINA* v deviatnadtsiati rokovyny isnuvannia; 1917-1936. Spetsial'ne vydannia UKRAINS'KYKH SHCHODENNYKH VIS-TEI. New York.  
Hruden' 1936.

317. *RADIANS'KE LITERATUROZNAVSTVO*; (Akademiia Nauk URSR). Kiev.  
No. 5-6, 1940
318. *RADIANS'KYI KYIV*; dvokhtyzhnevyy zhurnal Kyivs'koi Mis'koi Rady deputativ trudiashchyykh. Kiev.  
No. 10, 22-24, 1940
319. *RANNIA ZORIA*; Literaturno-Hromads'kyi ukrains'kyi misiachnyk. Vydvo "Soiuz Ukrains'kykh Zhinok". Chicago.  
I—No. 1/2, 1918
320. *RELIHIINO-NAUKOVYI VISTNYK*; Neperiodychnyi zhurnal Bratstv Sv. Pokrovy 4 i 6 Str. divizii. Oleksandrivs'kyi tabir.  
No. 1-5, 7-15, 1921-23
321. *REPIAKH*; zhurnal satyry ta humoru. Vidpovidal'nyi redaktor Dr. Stepan Nyzhankovs'kyi. Prague.  
I—No. 3, 1930
322. *RIDNA MOVA*; Naukovo-populiarnyi misiachnyk, prysviachenyi vyvchenniu ukrains'koi movy. Holovnyi redaktor i vydavets' Prof. D-r Ivan Ohiienko. Warsaw.  
1933-1939 (lacking No. 10-12, 1939)
323. *RIDNA SHKOLA*; iliustrovanyi chasopys dlia vsikh. Red. kolieghiiia. Nach. i vidp. red. Mykhailo Strutyns'kyi. Lviv.  
1932-1939 (incomplete)
324. *RIDNA SHKOLA*; Misiachnyk dlia shyrennia nauky i osvity mizh ukrains'kym narodom v Amerytsi. Vydaie T-vo ukrains'kykh hreko-katolyts'kykh diakovchyteliv v Amerytsi. Red. Dm. Andreiko. Jersey City.  
I—No. 4, 6-8, 11, 1918  
II—No. 1, 1919
325. *RIDNA ZEMLIA*; ukrains'kyi populiarnyi tyzhnevyyk. Vidp. red. O. Bodnarovych. Lviv.  
V—No. 4, 26-27, 1944
326. *RIDNE SLOVO*; ukrains'ka narodna chasopys'. Vykhodyt' odyń raz na tyzhden'. Redaktor M. Soloveichuk. Biała.  
I—No. 1-5, 7-28, 1917
327. *RIDNE SLOVO*; visnyk literatury, mystetstva i nauky. Redahuie Teodor Kurpita. Munich-Karlsfeld.  
No. 1, hruden' 1945



328. *RIDNYI KRAI*; narodnyi dnevnyk. Lviv.  
III—No. 227-288, 1922
329. *RIDNYI KRAI*; Nezalezhna hazeta. Vydavets' i red. Dr. Lev Kohut. Chernivtsi.  
1928, 1929 (incomplete)
330. *ROBITNYCHA HROMADA*. Newark, N.J.  
I—No. 1-5, 1937  
II—No. 6-9, 1938  
III—No. 10, 1939
331. *ROBITNYCHA PRAVDA*; organ ukrains'koi sektsii robitnychoi partii Ameryky. New York.  
I—No. 1-16, 18, 19-26, 28, 1922
332. *ROBITNYCHE SLOVO*; Postupova chasopys' dlia pratsiuiuchoho liudu. Tyzhnevnyk. Redaktor I. Stefanits'kyi. Toronto.  
II—No. 22, 1916
333. *ROBITNYCHYI HOLOS* — Labor Voice; Ofitsiial'nyi Orhan Ukrains'-koho Orhanizatsiinoho Komitetu sotsiialistychnoi robitnychoi partii Ameryky. Akron, Ohio.  
1922-1926 (incomplete)
334. *ROBITNYCHYI HOLOS*; Organ Ukrains'koi Sotsiial-demokratychnoi Partii. Vydaie TSK USDP, vidpovidaie za redaktsiiu M. Matviiv. Misiachnyk. Lviv.  
I—No. 1-8, 1938  
II—No. 1, 1939
335. *ROBITNYCHYI PRAPOR*; Orhan Ukr. Sotsiial'demokratii. Sofia (Bulgariia).  
No. 1-2, 1915
336. *ROBITNYCHYI VISTNYK*; populiarno-naukovyi misiachnyk. Vydaie ekzekutyvnyi komitet Ukr. Federatsii Komunistychnoi partii v Amerytsi. New York.  
I—No. 1, 2, 1919
337. *ROBITNYK*—The Worker; Neperiodychnyi organ Opozytsii Soiuzu URO v Zluchenykh Derzhavakh Ameryky. Detroit.  
I—No. 1-4, 1930  
II—No. 5-13, 1931

338. *ROBITNYK*—The Worker; tyzhneva ukrains'ka robitnycha chasopys', posviachena interesam pratsiuiuchoi kliasy. Orhan Ukrains'koi Fed. Sots. Partii v Amerytsi. Cleveland - New York.  
1916, 1917, 1919 (incomplete)
339. *ROBITNYTSIA*—The Working Woman; Iliustrovanyi zhurnal dla zhinok-robitnyts'. Dvotyzhnevyyk. Winnipeg.  
IV—No. 15, 16, 23, 24, 1927
340. *ROBOCHYI NAROD*—Working People; organ Ukrains'koi Sotsiial-Demokratii v Kanadi. Winnipeg.  
IX—No. 24-26, 31, 33, 38, 42, 43, 1917  
X—No. 3-6, 25, 40, 1918
341. *ROHATYNETS'*; iliustrovanyi zhurnal kul'turnoho zhyttia povitu. Red. Antin Lotots'kyi. Rohatyn.  
I—No. 1, 1923  
II—No. 3-4, 1924
342. *ROHATYNS'KE SLOVO*; Vidp. Red. Mykola Uhryn-Bezhrishnyi. Rohatyn.  
I—No. 18, 1941
343. *ROZBUDOVA NATSII*; Organ Provodu Ukrains'kykh Natsionalistiv. Prague.  
1928-1934 (incomplete)
344. *ROZS'VIT*; Chasopys' polonenykh ukrainsiv. Vydaie hurtok prykhyl'nykiv SVU. Tyzhnevyyk. Rastatt.  
I—1916, II—1917 (incomplete)
345. *ROZVAHA*; Chasopys' dla polonenykh ukrainsiv. Vydaie hurtok prykhyl'nykiv SVU. Freistadt. Austria.  
1915-1918 (incomplete)
346. *RUSYN*; Chtodenna hazeta v Uzhhorodie. Vydaie drukarske tov-vo. Otviechal'nyi red. V. Grendzha-Donskii.  
No. 1, Ukazove chyslo. Bezplatno. 1923
347. *SAMOKHOTNYK*; satyrychno-humorstychnyi chasopys Ukrains'koho Sichovoho Viis'ka 1917. Nakladom V-va "Samokhotnyk", koshtom i zachodom Spilky "Samokhotnyk" v Sich. Koshi. Druhe vydannia. (n.p.)  
I—No. 1-7, 1915  
II—No. 8-18, 1916

348. *SAMOOSVITNYK*; iliustrovanyi chasopys masovoi osvity, dvotyzhnevnyk. Vydaie Oseredok Vydavnychoi Dopomohy Masovii Osviti. Redahuie vid OVDMO Roman Paladiichuk. Vydavets' V. Kunavets ("Desheva knyzhka"). (n.p.)  
II—No. 11, 1938
349. *SAMOOSVITNYK-AUTODIDAKTA*; samoosvitnii hurtok u Prudentopolis. Red. Waldomir Ostapiw.  
I—No. 1, 1936  
II—No. 10, 1938  
III—No. 2, 4, 8, 1939
350. *SAMOSTIINA DUMKA*; zhurnal literatury, nauky ta hromads'koho zhyttia. Ed. Sylvester I. Nykorowycz. Chernivtsi.  
1931, 1933-1937 (incomplete)
351. *SAMOSTIINA DUMKA UKRAINS'KOI MATERY*; zhurnal osvity, tvorchosti i borot'by. Chernivtsi.  
I—No. 1-5, 1931
352. *SAMOSTIINYK*; politychno-informatyvnyi dvotyzhnevnyk (n.p.).  
I—No. 1 (19), 2 (20), 3-4 (21-22), 1945
353. *SELIANYN*; chasopys' Revoliutsiinoi Ukrain's'koi Partii. Chernivtsi.  
I—No. 6, 1903 (photocopy)
354. *SHASHKEVYCHIVS'KI VISTY*; Kvartal'nyi orhan T-va im. Markiiiana Shashkevycha v Zolochivi. Vidp. red. d-r. Teodor Van'ko. Zolochiv.  
I—No. 1, 1931
355. *SHCHODENNI TABOROV VISTI*; orhan upravy taboru pereselentsiv u Liandeku. Landek.  
No. 60 A (nadzvychaine vydannia), 1945 (mimeograph)
356. *SHERSHEN'*; satyrychno-humorystychnyi dvotyzhnevnyk. Holovnyi red. Oleksii Verba. Fel'dpost N. 38716  
I—No. 1, 2/3, 6/7, 1944
357. *SHERSHEN'*—Szerzsen; iliustrovana, prosvitno-naukova, literaturna i zabavna chasopys, tyzhnevnyk. Scranton.  
II—No. 22, 23, 1910
358. *SHKOLIARYK*; dvotyzhnevnyi chasopys dlia ukrains'kykh shkoliariv. Vydaie "Lad", vydavnycha spilka. Dubno.  
II—No. 5-7, 1942

359. *SHLIAKH*—The Way; ukrains'kyi katolyts'kyi tyzhnevyyk. Philadelphia. 1940-1945
360. *SHLIAKH MOLODI*; dvotyzhnevyyk pozashkil'noho vykhovannia molodi. Lviv.  
I—No. 8/9, 1936  
II—No. 6, 7, 8, 1937
361. *SHLIAKH NATSII*; Misiachnyk ukrains'koi natsional'noi polityky i hromads'koho zhyttia. Lviv.  
No. 1-8, 1935  
No. 1-4, 1936
362. *SHLIAKH VYKHOVANNIA I NAVCHANNIA*; Misiachnyi pedagogichno-metodychnyi dodatok do "Uchytel's'koho Slova". Lviv.  
III—No. 11, 1929
363. *SHLIAKHOM NEZALEZHNOSTY*; orhan Holovnoi Upravy Ukrains'koho Tsentral'noho Komitetu v Pol'shchi. Warsaw.  
No. 2, 1930
364. *SHLIAKHY*; Misiachnyk. Redaktor-vydavets' 'Fed' Fedortsiv. Lviv.  
IV—zsh. 3-4, 1917
365. *SHLIAKHY MYSTETSTVA*; misiachnyk khudozhn'oho sektora Holovpolitovsity. Vydaie Vseukrains'kyi Literaturnyi Komitet. Kharkiv.  
No. 2 (4), 1922
366. *SICH*—Siege; odynokyi ukrains'kyi tyzhnevyyk v Pivnichno-Zakhidnykh Steitakh Zluchenykh Derzhav Ameryky. Orhan Sichovoi Orhanizatsii. Chicago.  
XIV—No. 13, 14, 1931  
XV—No. 28, 30, 1932  
XVI—No. 7, 12, 1933
367. *SICH—SITCH*; official organ of "Sitch", Ukrainian-American Association. Red. Dr. O. Nazaruk. Chicago.  
1924-1926, 1928-1930 (incomplete)
368. *SICHOVI VISTY*—Sitch Herald; organ Sichovoi Orhanizatsii Ukraintsiv u ZDA. Ed. Dr. Osyp Nazaruk. Semi-monthly. Chicago.  
VI—No. 15-17, 19, 1923  
VII—No. 1, 13, 14, 1924

369. *SICHOVI VISTY*; pys'mo prysviachene sichovym spravam, pros'viti i nautsi. Orhan Sichovoi Orhanizatsii Ukraintsiv v Zluchenykh Derzhavakh. New York.  
I—No. 2-5, 1918  
II—No. 1-10, 1919  
III—No. 1-6, 1920
370. *SICHOVYI KLYCH*—The Sitch Call; organ Organizatsii Chornomors'koi Sichy v Amerytsi. Misiachnyk. New York-Newark, N.J.  
I—No. 1-8, 1936  
II—No. 2-12, 1937  
III—No. 1-10, 1938  
IV—No. December, 1939 /b.n./  
V—No. 2/3, 1940
371. *SIACH*; ievanhelizatsiinyi lystok. Vykhodyt' iak dodatok do "Viry i Nauky". Kolomyia.  
I—No. 5, 7, 8, 1934
372. *SIL'S'KYI HOSPODAR*. Za red. vidpovidal'nyi inzh. Ievhen Khraplyvyi. Red. d-r B. Hnatevych. Lviv.  
1928-1930, 1940 (incomplete)
373. *SKHIDNII SVIT*; orhan Vseukrains'koi Naukovoi Asotsiiatsii Skhodoznavstva. Kharkiv.  
No. 6, 1928  
No. 1/2, 1929
374. *SKOB*; zhurnal plastovoho kosha v Karl'sfeldi. Karlsfeld.  
I—No. 1, lystopad 1945
375. *SKOB*; zhurnal ukrains'koho Plastu u Frantsii. Paris.  
No. 2, 1937
376. *SLOVO*; orhan ukrains'koho mishchanstva. Za red. vidpovidaie Petro Seniuta. Tyzhnevyyk. Lviv.  
1922-1923 (incomplete)
377. *SLOVO*—The Word; Ukrainian Weekly. Ukrains'kyi tyzhnevyyk. Regensburg.  
I—No. 1-7, 1945
378. *SLOVO*; (Vydavnytstvo im. Antona Bonchevskoho.) Skranton, Pa.  
I—No. 5-7, 1904  
II—No. 10, 1905

379. *SLOVO PRAVDY*—Word of Truth; Ofitsiial'nyi organ Karpato-russkoi pravoslavnoi missii v Amerikie. Philadelphia, Pa.  
I—No. 1, 4, 1930
380. *SMIKH*; humorystychnyi dvokhtyzhnevyyk pid red. Valientina (O. Oles'). Vienna.  
I—No. 1, 1920
381. *SMIKH I HORE SICHOVOHO STRIL'TSIA*; Vydaie Kish Korpusu SS. Redahuie presova kvatyra kosha. Kremianets'.  
No. 1, 1919
382. *SOBORNA UKRAINA*; Orhan vil'noho kozatstva. Tyzhnevyyk. Vydaie Heneral'na Uprava Vil'nokozats'koho T-va pid provodom Viktora Andriievycha Andriievs'koho. Vienna. (V druhomu rotsi: vydaie T-vo "Soborna Ukraina").  
I—No. 12, 1921  
II—No. 16, 1922
383. *S'OHOCASNE I MYNULE*; visnyk ukrainoznavstva. Vydaie N.T.Sh. Lviv.  
v. II, 1939
384. *SONTSETSVIT*; Literaturno-Mystets'kyi Al'manakh. Vyd. T-va Sontsetsvit. Kiev-Lviv.  
v. I, 1922
385. *SOTSIAL-DEMOKRAT* — Le Social-Democrate; Vyd. Podiebrads'koi orhanizatsii USDRP. Poděbrady.  
No. 5, 6, 1930
386. *SOTSIALISTYCHNA DUMKA*; tsentral'nyi organ Ukrain's'koi Sotsiial-demokratychnoi Robitnychoi partii. Vykhodyt' dvichi na misiats'. Vydaie TSK USDRP. Vidp. red. Mykola Hankevych. Lviv.  
I—No. 1, 1921
387. *SOTSIALISTYCHNA DUMKA*; tsentral'nyi organ Ukrain's'koi Sotsiial-demokratychnoi Robitnychoi Partii. Vykhodyt' raz na misiats'. Prague.  
No. 10-12, 1923
388. *SPUDEI*; neperiodychnyi orhan Akademichnoi Hromady Studentiv Ukrain's'koho Pedagogichnoho Instytutu im. M. Drahomanova u Prazi. Prague.  
No. 2/3, 1925  
No. 4, 1926
389. *STANYSLAVIVS'KE SLOVO*. Stanyslaviv.  
II—No. 75, 1942

390. *STARA UKRAINA*; chasopys istorii i kul'tury. Lviv.  
v. VII-X, XI-XII, 1925
391. *STOROZH PRAVDY*—Watchman of the Turth; Vykhodyt' shcho-druhyi misiat's'. Vydaie Stovaryshennia uchenykyv Biblii ABS. Winnipeg.  
II—No. 5, 1934
392. *STRILETS'KI VISTY*—Veterans News; orhan Ukrains'koi Strilets'koi Hromady v Kanadi. Winnipeg.  
II—No. 3, 5, 6, 1931
393. *STUDENT*; zhurnal ukrains'koi students'koi hromady v Miunkheni. Munich.  
No. 1, hruden', 1945
394. *STUDENTS'KYI INFORMATOR*; (Ukrains'ka students'ka hromada.) Munich.  
No. 2, 1945
395. *STUDENTS'KYI PRAPOR*; zhurnal Ukrains'koi Akademichnoi Molodi. Vydaie Obiednannia Pratsi Ukrains'kykh Studentiv u L'vovi. Lviv.  
II—No. 1, 3-6, 1944
396. *STUDENTS'KYI SHLIAKH*; Vydaie Bohdan Dorots'kyi. Vidpovidal'nyi red. Omelian Matla. Lviv.  
No. 4/5, 1933
397. *STUDENTS'KYI VISTNYK*; tsentral'nyi Soiuz Ukrains'koho Studentstva. Prague.  
1923-1927, 1930-1931 (incomplete)
398. *SUMKIVS'KYI ZHURNAL*; Orhan 134 viddilu SUMK v Toronto im. Iuriiia Hassana. Nach. red. Vasyl' Gaba. Toronto, Ont., Canada.  
1/9 (Sept.) 1942
399. *SURMA*; orhan Ukrains'koi Viis'kovoi Orhanizatsii. Vydaie Propahan-dyvnyi Viddil UVO. Pershyi rik—neperiodychno, potim—misiachnyk (n.p.).  
1927-1934 (incomplete)
400. *SUSPIL'STVO*—La Société; Vydannia Ukrains'koho Instytutu Hroma-doznavstva u Prazi. Red. M. Shapoval. Prague.  
I/II, III/IV, 1925  
V/VI, 1927
401. *SVIT*; iliustrovanyi zhurnal. Za red. vidpovidal'nyi Stepan Mykyta. Lviv.  
II—No. 1, 2, 5, 1926  
IV—No. 15/18, 1928  
V—No. 6/7, 1929

402. *SVIT DYTNYN*; iliustrovanyi zhurnal dlia dityi. Vykhydyv dva razy v misiats', potim misiachnyk. Vyd. i za red. vidpovidaie Mykhailo Taran'ko. Lviv.  
1920-1923, 1930-1938 (incomplete)
403. *SVIT MOLODI*; bezplatnyi dodatok do chasopysu "Zhinocha Dolia" dlia ukrains'kykh divchat. Red. Slava Herashchak. Kolomyia.  
1933-1938 (incomplete)
404. *SVITANNIA*; literaturno-mystets'kyi al'manakh "Novoi Epokhy". (V-vo Brama Sofii) (Na pravakh rukopysu.) (n.p.)  
No. 1-3, 1945
405. *SVITLO*; misiachnyk, prysviachenyi spravam natsional'noho i suspil'noho vykhovannia. Lviv.  
II—No. 4/6, 1922
406. *SVITLO*; ukrains'kyi relihiinyi dvotyzhnevnyk. Mundare, Alta., Canada  
VII—No. 8, 15-18, 1944
407. *SVITLO I HOLOS PRAVDY*; (The Light and the Voice of Truth.) Winnipeg, Canada.  
No. 5, 1943  
No. 7, 1945
408. *SVITLO I TIN*'; shchomisiachnyk. Zhurnal ukrains'koho fotohrafichnoho tov-va u L'vovi ta ioho filii. Lviv.  
V—No. 2, 4, 1937
409. *SVITLO MOLODI*; odynokyi dvomisiachnyk ukrains'koi molodi na skhodi Kanady. Vydannia SUMK, red. Pavlo Kit. Toronto, Ont., Canada  
Zhovten'-Lystopad, 1943  
Zhovten'-Lystopad, 1944  
Z'izdove chyslo, 1945
410. *SVITOVA SLUZHBA*; mizhnarodnia korespondentsiia dlia vyiasnennia zhydivs'koho pytannia. Vykhydyt' dvichi v misiats' u 18 movakh. Frankfurt.  
No. 1, 1943  
No. 11/16, 1944
411. *SVOBODA*; iliustrovana politychna, pros'vitna i hospodars'ka chasopys'. Vykhydyt' shcho tyzhnia v subotu. Redague: D-r Stepan Baran. Lviv.  
XX—No. 1, 1916
412. *SVOBODA*; nezavysyma, bezpartiina, kul'turno-polytychna y torhovel'na hazeta Podkarpatskoie Rusy. Uzhhorod.  
XXIV—No. 41-42, 1923



413. *SVOBODA*; organ Khrystiians'koi Narodnoi Partii Pidkarpats'koi Rusy. Uzhhorod.  
XXXV—No. 19, 1934
414. *SVOBODA*; organ ukrains'koho natsional'no-demokr. obiednannia. Nachal'nyi redaktor: Volodymyr Tselevych. Lviv.  
No. 4-6, 1933
415. *SVOBODA*; politychnyi, prosvitnyi i hospodars'kyi chasopys. Vydaie Spilka "Dilo". Za red. vidp. V. Tselevych. Tyzhnevyyk. Lviv.  
XXVIII—No. 1-18, 46, 1926
416. *SVOBODA*; vydaie: vydavnycha Spilka Dilo. Lviv.  
XXIV—1922 (incomplete)
417. *SVOBODA*—Liberty; chasopys' dlia ruskoho naroda v Amerytsi i organ Ruskoho Narodnoho Soiuzu. The Ruthenian Weekly. Published every Thursday. Anth. Curkowskyj, editor; est. 1893. New York.  
No. 34, 42, 1908
418. *SVOBODA*—Liberty; Karpato-Ruskaia gazeta. Weekly. New York.  
I—No. 1-4, 1944
419. *SVOBODA* (Liberty); The Ruthenian (Little Russian) Weekly published every Thursday. JNO. ARDAN, Publisher and Editor. Established 1893. Chasopys' dlia ruskoho naroda v Amerytsie. Scranton, Pa.  
XII—No. 24, 26-27, 1904
420. *SVOBODA*—Liberty; Uriadovyi organ Ukrains'koho Narodnoho Soiuzu.—Official organ of Ukrainian National Association. Joseph Stetkewicz, Chief Editor. Andrew Sawka, Business manager. Vykhydyt' try razy na tyzhden': vivotrok, chetver i subotu. Jersey City.  
XXVI—No. 146, 1918
421. *SVOBODA*; ukrains'kyi shchodennyk. Orhan Ukrains'koho Narodnoho Soiuzu. Jersey City, N.J.  
1914-1928, 1940-1945
422. *TABOR*; voienno-naukovyj zhurnal. Kalisz-Paris.  
1923, 1924, 1927-1930, 1933-1938 (incomplete)
423. *TEKHNICHNI VISTY*—Technical News; orhan Ukrains'koho Tekhnichnoho Tovarystva. Lviv.  
VII—No. 2, 1931
424. *TEKHNIK*; Ohliady podii iz svita tekhniky. Chasopys tekhnichnoho znannia. Tyzhnevyyk. Prague.  
II—No. 16, 1941  
III—No. 14, 1942

425. *TOCHYLO*; Ukrains'kyi iliustrovanyi misiachnyk humoru ta satyry. Winnipeg.  
1934, 1940-1941, 1944 (incomplete)
426. *TRUDOVA UKRAINA*; tsentral'nyi orhan Ukrains'koi Partii Sots.-Revoliutsioneriv. Vykhodyt' neperiodychno. Vydaie Pavlo Bohats'kyi. Redahuiut' P. Bohats'kyi i M. Shapoval. Prague.  
1932-1938 (incomplete)
427. *TRYBUNA UKRAINY*; neperiodychnyi orhan ukrains'koi emigratsii. Red. A. Salykovs'kyi. Warsaw.  
I—No. 2/4, 1923
428. *TRYZUB*; Nadzvychaine shchodenne vydannia. Paris.  
No. 3-6, 1927
429. *TRYZUB*; Orhan Ukrains'koho Okruzhnogo Komitetu. Red. Bohdan Budnyk. Chortkiv.  
II—No. 1, 1942
430. *TRYZUB*—Trident. Revue Hebdomadaire Ukrainienne; Tyzhnevyyk polityky, kul'tury, hromads'koho zhyttia ta mystetstva. Red. Viacheslav Prokopovych. Administrator II. Kosenko. Paris.  
1925-1940
431. *TSENTROREKLIAMA*; zhurnal ukrains'koi reklamy. Lviv.  
No. 1, 1937
432. *TSERKOVNI VISTI*; orhan Ukrains'koi Avtokefal'noi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy. Vydannia Vseukrains'koi Pravoslavnoi Tserkovnoi Rady. Kharkiv.  
No. 2/3, 4, 1927
433. *TSERKVA I NARID*; dvotyzhnevyyk, prysviachenyi tserkovnym i tserkovno-hromads'kym spravam. Kremianets'.  
IV—No. 5, 1938
434. *TSERKVA I ZHYTTIA*; orhan Ukrains'koi Avtokefal'noi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy. Vidpovidal'nyi Redaktor Arkhyiepyskop Ivan Pavlovs'kyi. Vyd. Vseukrains'koi Pravoslavnoi Tserkovnoi Rady. Kharkiv.  
No. 5, 1927  
No. 1, 2, 1928
435. *TS'VITKA* (Floweret); iliustrovana chasopys' dlia rus'koi molodizhy v Amerytsi. Misiachnyk. Jersey City, N.J.  
I—No. 1-5, 7-12, 1914  
II—No. 1, 3, 5-6, 9, 1915  
III—No. 1, 3-6, 1916  
IV—No. 1-6, 1917.

436. *UCHYTEL'*; organ Rus'koho Tov-va Pedagogichnoho. Red. Ivan Iushchyshyn. Za red. vidpovidaie Roman Dashynych Kul'chyts'kyi. Lviv. XXIV—No. 2, 1911
437. *UCHYTEL'S'KE SLOVO*; orhan vzaimnoi pomochi ukrains'koho vchytel'stva. Nach. red. Ivan Iushchyshyn. Za red. vidpovidaie Ivan Litsyns'kyi. Lviv. XI—No. 5, 1919
438. *UKRAINA*—L'Ukraine; Naukovyi dvokhmisiachnyk ukrainoznavstva pid red. akademika Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho. Vseukrains'ka Akademiia Nauk, Istorychna Sektsiia, Derzhavne vyd-vo Ukrainy. Kiev.  
No. 1/2, 5, 6, 1925  
No. 4, 1926  
No. 4, 1927  
No. 1, 1928
439. *UKRAINA*—organ ukrains'koi sobornyt's'koi dumky v Amerytsi. New York.  
V—No. 126, 127, 139, 1939  
VI—No. 1982, 1940
440. *UKRAINA*; orhan Ukrains'koi Narodnoi Rady v Brazyl'ii. Redaktor Nykola Fediuk. Curitiba.  
I—v. 5, 1919
441. *UKRAINA*—The Ukraina. Ne maie nichoho spil'noho z niiakymy relihiinymy sektamy ani politychnymy partiiamy. Red. Dr. Ol. Shushko. Winnipeg.  
I—No. 2/3, 1918
442. *UKRAINA*—Ukraina; tyzhnevyyk. Chicago.  
No. 13, 1931
443. *UKRAINA*—Ukraine; published monthly by the Organization for the Rebirth of Ukraine. New York.  
VII—No. 196-206, 1941  
VIII—No. 207-215, 1942  
IX—No. 217, 219, 1943  
X—No. 221, 1944
444. *UKRAINA*; ukrains'kyi tabirnyi zhurnal; misiachnyk. Red. V.I. Zhyla. Ukrains'ka Hrupa Zondertabir. (Wustrau?)  
No. 7, 1943
445. *UKRAINA*; Vydaie Inform. Biuro. Stanyslaviv.  
II—No. 139, 1920

446. *UKRAINA HOVORYT'*—visti z kraiu. Berlin-Vienna.  
Serpén'-veresen', 1945
447. *UKRAINET'S'*—Der Ukrainer; tyzhnevyyk dlia ukrains'kykh robitnykiv.  
Berlin.  
III—No. 22, 27, 35, 41, 45, 1944
448. *UKRAINET'S' U FRANTSII*—L'Ukrainien en France; Redaktor Ivan Popovych. Paris.  
I—No. 2-4, 6-11, 1945
449. *UKRAINKA*; vydaie zhinocha orhanizatsiia taboru im. Lysenka. Hannover.  
No. 1, 1945
450. *UKRAINKA*; zhinochyi populiarnyi chasopys. Misiachnyk. Redaktorka: Mariia Strutyns'ka. Lviv.  
II—No. 7-8, 1939
451. *UKRAINKA V AMERYTSI*; Journal of Ukrainian Women in America—  
Chasopys ukrains'koi zhinky. New York.  
I—No. 7/8, 1941
452. *UKRAINO-BIELHARSKI VESTI*. Ukrains'ko-Bolhars'ki Visty; Vyd. Ukra-  
ino-Bolhars'koho tovarystva v Sofii. Sofia.  
I—No. 1, 1935
453. *UKRAINS'KA DIISNIST'*; Orhan politychnyi, hospodars'kyi i hromads'-  
ko-kul'turnyi. Prague.  
No. 1, 1939  
No. 2, 3, 5, 1940  
No. 19, 1941
454. *UKRAINS'KA DIISNIST'*—Ukrainische Wirklichkeit; orhan ukrains'koi  
hromady v Nimechchyni. Berlin.  
1940-1941, 1944-1945 (incomplete)
455. *UKRAINS'KA DUMKA*. Vidpovidal'nyi redaktor Stepan Charnets'kyi.  
Lviv.  
I—No. 11, 1920
456. *UKRAINS'KA DUMKA*. Vydaie Mis'ka Uprava mista Nikolaieva. Vidp.  
Red. Petro Hrebins'kyi. Vykhodyt' dvichi na tyzhden'. Mykolaiv.  
II—No. 27, 33, 1942
457. *UKRAINS'KA GAZETA*—Ukrainian Gazette. Edmonton, Alb.  
II—No. 3, 1934
458. *UKRAINS'KA HAZETA*. Berlin.  
II—No. 28, 1930

459. *UKRAINS'KA HAZETA*—Ukrainian Daily; Redaktor Omelian Reviuk. New York.  
I—No. 30-188, 1919
460. *UKRAINS'KA HROMADA*—The Ukrainian Commonwealth; Orhan oborony Ukrainy. Dvotyzhnevnyk. New York-Detroit.  
I-V,—No. 1-67, 1923-1927  
I (new ed.)—No. 1-4, 1930  
II—No. 5-11, 1931
461. *UKRAINS'KA KHATA*; literaturno-krytychnyi hromads'kyi ukrains'kyi misiachnyk. Kiev.  
1911, 1913, 1914 (incomplete)
462. *UKRAINS'KA KNYHA*; Misiachnyk, prysviachenyi bibliolohii ta bibliofil'stvu. Orhan biblioloh. komisii NTSh ta Ukrains'koho T-va bibliofiliv u L'vovi. Red. Ie. Iu. Pelens'kyi. Lviv.  
I—VII, 1937  
IV—V, 1943
463. *UKRAINS'KA LITERATURA*; Misiachnyk literatury, publitsystyky, mystetstva. Orhan Spilky radians'kykh pys'mennykiv Ukrainy. (n.p.)  
No. 3-4, 1942  
No. 1-2, 1943
464. *UKRAINS'KA MUZA*. Buenos Aires.  
I, II, 1944
465. *UKRAINS'KA MUZYKA*; Misiachnyk. Vydaie Soiuz Ukrains'kykh Profesiiynykh Muzyk u L'vovi. Lviv.  
I—No. 1, 1937
466. *UKRAINS'KA NOVA PORA*—Ukrainian New Times; Vykhodyt' kozhnoho chetverha. Vydaie Ukrains'ka Vydavnycha Spilka. Red. T. Pochyniuk. Detroit.  
1940-1945 (incomplete)
467. *UKRAINS'KA NYVA*; Vychodyt' 10 raziv na misiats'. Red.-Vyd. T. Dominiecki. Warsaw.  
II—No. 68, 73, 1927
468. *UKRAINS'KA PRAVDA*—Ukrainian Truth. New York.  
No. 2, 3, 1934
469. *UKRAINS'KA SHKOLA*; chasopys T-va Uchytel's'ka Hromada u L'vovi. Lviv.  
XIII—No. 2-3, 1928

470. *UKRAINS'KA SHKOLA*; Chasopys ukrains'koho vchytel'stva v Hen.-Hubernatorstvi. Kraków.  
No. 1/2, 1942
471. *UKRAINS'KA SPRAVA*; shchodenna nepartiina demokratychna hazeta. Warsaw.  
No. 1-7, 1922
472. *UKRAINS'KA TRYBUNA*; shchodenna nepartiina demokratychna gazeta pid providnym kerivnytstvom Oleksandra Salikovs'koho. Warsaw.  
1921-1922 (incomplete)
473. *UKRAINS'KA VOLIA*.—La Liberté Ukrainienne; orhan Ukrains'koi emihratsii u Frantsii. Misiachnyk. Paris.  
No. 1-6, 8, 1938  
No. 9-13, 1939  
No. 15, 1940
474. *UKRAINS'KE DOSHKILLIA*. Lviv.  
v. 1, 1939
475. *UKRAINS'KE IUNATSTVO*. Iliustrovanyi zhurnal Ukrains'koi molodi. Lviv.  
1933-1939 (incomplete)
476. *UKRAINS'KE SLOVO*; Mishchans'kyi politychno-ekonomichnyi chasopys. Vykhodyt' shchonedili. Za red. vidpovidaie Mykola Oгородnyk. Lviv.  
I—No. 10, 1923
477. *UKRAINS'KE SLOVO*; politychna, ekonomichno-suspil'na i literaturna hazeta. Vydaie i vidvichaie za red. D-r. Sydir Holubovych. Vykhodyt' shchodnia krim ponedilka. Lviv.  
No. 133, 1916
478. *UKRAINS'KE SLOVO*—Ukrainian Word; Vykhodyt' kozhnoi seredy. Winnipeg.  
I—No. 32, 1943
479. *UKRAINS'KE SLOVO*. Vydaie A. Korshnivs'kyi, redahuie Osyp Kvas. Rivno.  
I—No. 1-5, 7-9, 13, 1920
480. *UKRAINS'KE SLOVO*; vykhodyt' shcho vivtirka i piatnytsi pid red. D-ra Z. Kuzeli. Berlin.  
1921-1922 (incomplete)

481. *UKRAINS'KE SLOVO*, vykhodyt' trychi v tyzhden'. Vidpovidal'nyi red. Dmytro Gregolyns'kyi. Stanyslaviv.  
II—No. 16, 1942
482. *UKRAINS'KE ZHYTTIA*—La vie Ukrainienne; Vydavtsi: M. Lytvyts'kyi ta O. Kostiuchenko. Vidp. Red. J. Jitičkova. Red. kolehiia. Vykhodyt' shcho-tyzhnia. Poděbrady Lázně.  
I—No. 4, 1926  
II—No. 1-10, 1927
483. *UKRAINS'KE ZHYTTIA*; Orhan politychnyi, ekonomichnyi i literaturnyi. Luts'k.  
I—No. 10, 13, 1922
484. *UKRAINS'KE ZHYTTIA*; Poděbrady.  
I—No. 6, 1926  
II—No. 1, 1927
485. *UKRAINS'KE ZHYTTIA*—The Ukrainian Life; Vykhodyt' dva razy v misiats'. Drukuie i vydaie Ivan Hnyda v Montreali. Montreal.  
I—No. 1, 1932
486. *UKRAINS'KI LYSTY Z DALEKOHO SKHODU*. Kharbin.  
I—No. 1, 1932
487. *UKRAINS'KI PARAFIAL'NYI VISTY*—Ukrainian Parochial News; vydavani Ukrains'koiu Katolyts'koiu Tserkvoiu Sv. Iuriiia v Niu-Iorku. New York.  
I—No. 1, 1941
488. *UKRAINS'KI ROBITNYCHI VISTY*—Ukrainian Labor News; Vykhodyt' dva razy na tyzhden'. Winnipeg.  
III—No. 97, 1921  
IV—No. 13, 22, 38, 67, 71, 75, 80-82, 85-86, 90, 94-96, 100-104, 108, 1922  
VII—No. 8, 1925
489. *UKRAINS'KI SHCHODENNI VISTY*—Ukrainian Daily News. Chasopys dlia ukrains'koho pratsiuuchoho liudu. Shchodennyk. New York.  
1920-1921, 1923-1928, 1932-1933, 1939-1945 (incomplete)
490. *UKRAINS'KI SHKIL'NI VISTY*; pidruchnyk dlia diakouchyteliv i shkil'noi molodi pry navchanniu ukrains'koi movy. Vykhodyt' raz na misiats'. Vydaie t-vo Hreko-Katolyts'kykh diakovchyteliv v Amerytsi. Newark, N.J.  
II—No. 2/3, 8/10, 1929
491. *UKRAINS'KI VISTY*—Les Nouvelles Ukrainiennes; Dvotyzhneva hazeta. Paris.  
III—No. 75, 1928

492. *UKRAINS'KI VISTY*; shchodennyk. Vydaie V-vo Bat'kivshchyna. Lviv.  
I—No. 2, 1935  
II—No. 198, 1936  
III—No. 35, 47, 81, 88, 1937
493. *UKRAINS'KI VISTY*—Ukrainian News; ukrains'kyi katolyts'kyi tyzhnevnyk. Vykhodyt' kozhnoho vivotirka. Edmonton, Alberta.  
XV—No. 5, 1942  
XVI—No. 23-24, 26, 1943
494. *UKRAINS'KYI AGRONOMICHNYI VISTNYK*; chvert'richnyk. Pid red. inzh. Dr. Ievhena Khraplyvoho. Lviv.  
No. 1-4, 1934  
No. 5-6, 1938
495. *UKRAINS'KYI BAZAR*; literaturno-prosvitnyi zhurnal. Vykhodyt' misiachno. Vydaie i redahuie Mykhailo Petrivs'kyi. Toronto.  
I—No. 1, 4/5, 6/7, 1934
496. *UKRAINS'KYI DOBROVOLETS*; Fel'dpost No. 38716  
(A) No. 3, 4, 9, 1944 (Hol. Red. V. Man'kivs'kyi)  
(B) No. 9, 13, 14, 1944 (Hol. Red. M. Vasylenko)  
(H) No. 36, 1944 (Hol. Red. R. Svitlychnyi)  
(V) No. 48, 1944 (Hol. Red. Hennadii Kotorovych. Fel'dpost No. 01404)
497. *UKRAINS'KYI EKONOMIST*; Poděbrady (UTHI).  
I, 1928  
III, 1930
498. *UKRAINS'KYI EMIGRANT*; Orhan T-va Opiky nad Ukrains'kymy Emigrantamy u L'vovi, vykhodyt' dvichi na misiats'. Lviv.  
I—No. 1, 1923  
III—No. 10, 1929  
IV—No. 1, 1930
499. *UKRAINS'KYI HOLOS*; Orhan Okruzhnoi Upravy ta upravy mista Proskurova. Vidpovidal'nyi red. M. Lishchyns'kyi, red. Iu. Koshel'niak. Proskuriv.  
II—No. 32, 1942
500. *UKRAINS'KYI HOLOS*; politychno-ekonomichnyi orhan. Vydaie i za redaktsiiu vidpovidaie Zenon Pelens'kyi. Peremysyl'.  
1919-1932 (incomplete)



501. *UKRAINS'KYI HOLOS*—Ukrainian Voice; iliustrovana, prosvitno-ekonomichna, politychna postupova chasopys' dlia ukrains'koho naroda. Winnipeg.  
1921-1927, 1930, 1941-1943, 1945 (incomplete)
502. *UKRAINS KYI HOLOS*—Ukrainische Stimme; vykhodyt' raz na tyzhden'. Vidpovidal'nyi redaktor Anatol' Dublians'kyi. Luts'k.  
II—No. 5, 1942
503. *UKRAINS'KYI HOLOS NA DALEKOMU SKHODI*; dvotyzhnevnyk. Shanghai.  
1942, 1943, 1944 (incomplete)
504. *UKRAINS'KYI INFORMATOR*; politychno-informatyvnyi tyzhnevnyk. (Vidbyto v drukarni U.I., Neustadt)  
No. 6, 10, 13-18, 1945
505. *UKRAINS'KYI INVALID*; Chvert'richnyk Ukrains'koho T-va Dopomohy Invalidam. Lviv.  
III—No. 2, 1939
506. *UKRAINS'KYI INVALID*—L'invalide Ukrainien; orhan ukrains'kykh voiennykh invalidiv na emihratsii. Kalisz.  
1929-1931 (incomplete)
507. *UKRAINS'KYI INZHENER*; Orhan Soiuzu Orhanizatsii inzheneriv ukrainsiv na emigratsii. L'Ingenieur Ukrainien. Poděbrady.  
No. 2, 1931  
No. 3, 1932
508. *UKRAINS'KYI KOZAK*; Ukrains'kyi natsional'nyi orhan. Vydaie Ukrains'ke Kozats'ke T-vo. Munich.  
I—No. 1-15, 1923  
II—No. 16-20, 1924
509. *UKRAINS'KYI LITOPYS*; Redaktor Bohdan Kentrzhyns'kyi. Helsinki.  
I—No. 1/2, 1943
510. *UKRAINS'KYI MOLOT*. Peremyshl'.  
31/X, 1920
511. *UKRAINS'KYI NAROD*; Misiachnyk. Vyd. Sydoniia Kyporovykh. Chernivtsi.  
I—No. 5, 1933

512. *UKRAINS'KYI NATSIONALIST*. Vydaie OUN. (n.p.)  
I—No. 2/3, 4, 1933  
II—No. 5, 6/7, 1934  
III—No. 1/2, 12, 1935
513. *UKRAINS'KYI NIUIORS'KYI VISTNYK* Ukrainian New York Herald;  
Vyd. The Bazar Press. New York.  
I—No. 1, 1922
514. *UKRAINS'KYI PRAPOR*; Berlin.  
No. 8, 1930
515. *UKRAINS'KYI REMISNYK*; Orhan Holovnoi Hrupy Promyslovoi Hospodarky. Chasopys oblasnykh hrup: Lviv, Krakiv, Liublyn. Kerivnyi red. Emil Ian. Kraków.  
I—No. 1-3, 1943  
II—No. 1-7, 1944
516. *UKRAINS'KYI REVOLIUTIONER*; Orhan zakhidno-ukrains'koi natsional'no-revoliutsiinoi orhanizatsii. Vykhodyt' neperiodychno(n.p.).  
I—No. 5, 1926  
II—No. 1-3, 7, 1927  
III—No. 3, 1928
517. *UKRAINS'KYI ROBITNYK*—L'ouvrier Ukrainien; Orhan Ukrains'koi Robitnychoi Spilky u Frantsii. Paris.  
No. 1-3, 1926
518. *UKRAINS'KYI ROBITNYK*—Ukrainian Toiler; Odynokyi ukrains'kyi chasopys v Skhidnii Kanadi. Toronto, Ont.  
IV—No. 47, 1937  
X—No. 22-25, 37, 1943
519. *UKRAINS'KYI SAMOSTIINYK*; Chasopys Tsentr. Soiuzu Ukrains'kykh Orhanizatsii v ChSR. Prague.  
III—No. 2, 1937
520. *UKRAINS'KYI SHLIAKH*, davnishe KRAKIVS'KI VISTI—Der Ukrainische Weg. vorm. KRAKAUER NACHRICHTEN. Vienna.  
VI—No. 1, 2, 1945
521. *UKRAINS'KYI SKYTALETS'*; Kul'turno-Prosvitnyi Kruzhok v ukrains'komu tabori v Libertsii.  
1920-1923 (incomplete)
522. *UKRAINS'KYI SKYTALETS'*; Orhan Viis'kovoi Emigratsii z Zemel'

UNR. Iliustrovanyi dvotyzhnevnyk. THE HOMELESS UKRAINIAN. Vienna.

III—No. 19-22, 1922

IV—No. 1-24, 1923

523. *UKRAINS'KYI STUDENT*; Orhan vil'noi dumky studentstva. Prague. 1923, 1927-1931 (incomplete)

524. *UKRAINS'KYI SURMACH*; chasopys ukrains'kykh kul'turno-osvitnikh orhanizatsii v taborakh. Szczypiorno-Kalisz. 1922, 1923 (incomplete)

525. *UKRAINS'KYI TYZHDEN'*; Prague. VI—No. 1, 2, 14, 1938

526. *UKRAINS'KYI VETERAN*; Zbirnyk stattei na aktual'ni temy. Warsaw. No. 1, 1935

527. *UKRAINS'KYI VISNYK*; Orhan Ukrains'koho Natsional'noho Obiednannia. Poiavliaiet'sia try razy na misiats' na pravakh rukopysu. Redahuie kolehiia pid kerivnytstvom V. Maruniaka. Vidp. Red. T. Omel'chenko. Berlin. 1941-1945 (incomplete)

528. *UKRAINS'KYI VISTNYK*; Orhan nezalezhnoi respublikans'ko-demokratychnoi dumky. Prague-Poděbrady. Traven', 1925

529. *UKRAINS'KYI VISTNYK*—Ukrainian Herald; Natsional'nyi tyzhnevnyk. Vydaie Amerykans'ko-Ukrains'ka Vydavnycha Spilka. Detroit, Mich. 29 kvitnia, 1932

530. *UKRAINS'KYI VISTNYK*—Ukrainian Herald; Tserkovno-narodnii chasopys, misiachnyi. Ieparkhiial'nyi Orhan Ukrains'koi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy. Prot. Ivan Hundiak Vydavets' i Redaktor. Carteret, N.J.-New York. No. 11-12, 1934

531. *UKRAINS'KYI VISTNYK*—Ukrainian Herald; Tserkovno-narodnyi chasopys. New York. XVII—No. 4, 1945

532. *UKRAINS'KYI VISTNYK*—Ukrainian Herald; Vydaie Ukrains'ka Vydavnycha Kooperativna Spilka. Redaktor Dr. L'ongyn Tselhel's'kyi. New York. 1927-1928 (incomplete)

533. *UKRAINS'KYI ZASIV*; literaturnyi chasopys. Kharkiv.  
No. 1-2, 1942  
No. 4, 1943
534. *UMANS KYI HOLOS*; Vykhodyt' dvichi na tyzhden'. Vidpovidal'nyi Red. O. Maievs'kyi. Uman'.  
III—No. 43, 1943
535. *VECHIRNIA HODYNA*; shchomisiachnyk. Red. M. Chomiak; lit. red. V. Chaplenko. Kraków.  
No. 1, 1942  
No. 1-3, 6-9, 11-12, 1943  
No. 1-3, 1944
536. *VESELKA*; literaturnyi misiachnyk. Kalish [Kalisz]. Pol'shcha.  
v. 2-4, 1922  
v. 4-12, 1923
537. *VIDRODZHENNIA*; iliustrovanyi orhan ukrains'koho protyal'khol'noho i protynikotynnoho rukhu. Holovnyi redaktor: Dr. Sofiia Parfanovych. Lviv.  
VII—No. 1-23/24, 1934  
VIII—No. 1-4, 1935
538. *VIDRODZHENNIA*; orhan Gebitskomisara v Tarashchi. Tarashcha.  
II—No. 35, 37, 50, 51, 1942
539. *VIDVOIONVYK*—El Libertador; odnodnivka ukrains'koi strilets'koi hromady v Arhentyini. Buenos Aires.  
22/1, 1934
540. *VIENOCHOK* Dlia Podkarpatskikh dietochok. Uzhhorod.  
I—No. 14, 15, 1920
541. *VIENOCHOK* russkikh dietochok. Otviechatel'nyi redaktor i izdatel' Hryhorii Kupchanko. Vienna.  
No. 4/5, 1897
542. *VIL'NA DUMKA*; bezpartiinyi tyzhnevnyk. Luts'k.  
II—No. 3 (30), 1926
543. *VIL'NA HROMADA*; orhan ukrains'kykh anarkhistiv-komunistiv.  
v. 11, 1921
544. *VIL'NA SPILKA*; neperiodychnyi orhan Ukrains'koi Partii Sotsial-Revoliutsioneriv. Prague-Lviv.  
Zb. 3, 1927-29

545. *VIL'NA UKRAINA*; neperiodychnyi zhurnal Tsentral'noho Komitetu Ukrain's'koi Sotsial-Demokratychnoi Robitnychoi Partii. Lviv-Kiev.  
No. 1-2, 1921
546. *VIL'NA UKRAINA*; politychno-literaturno-naukovyi misiachnyk. S. Petersburg.  
v. 3, 1906
547. *VIL'NE KOZATSTVO*—Vol'noe Kozachestvo—Les Cosaques Libres. Paris.  
No. 51/52, 61/62, 63/64, 1930
548. *VIL'NE KOZATSTVO*. Vol'noe Kozachestvo. Volne Kozactvo. Red. I.A. Bilyi. Prague.  
1931-1939 (incomplete)
549. *VIL'NE SLOVO*; dvotyzhneva chasopys' polonenykh taboru Zalzwedel. Vykhodyt' zakhodom prosvitnoho viddilu SVU i polonenykh. Salzwedel.  
1916-1918 (incomplete)
550. *VIL'NE SLOVO*; Orhan Ukrain's'koho Komitetu v Drohobychi. Drohobych.  
I—No. 35/36, 1941
551. *VIRA I NAUKA*; ievanhel's'kyi relihiino-prosvitnyi chasopys. Stanyslaviv.  
II—No. 3, 1926
552. *VIRA I NAUKA*; orhan Ukrain's'koi Ievanhel's'ko reformovanoi tserkvy. Kolomyia.  
1934, 1936-1938 (incomplete)
553. *VIRA TA ZNANNIA*; chasopys ievanhel's'koho khrystiianstva. Toronto, Ont.  
I—No. 2-8, 1923  
II—No. 7-10, 1924
554. *VISNYK*; orhan Prezydii Ukrain's'koi Holovnoi Vyzvol'noi Rady (UHVR). Kiev-Lviv.  
II—No. 4 (7), 1945
555. *VISNYK* Ukrain's'koho Chervonoho Khresta v Bavarii. Munich.  
I—No. 1, 1945
556. *VISTI* Vseukrain's'koho Tsentral'noho Vykonavchoho Komitetu Rad robitnych, selians'kykh ta chervonoarmiis'kykh deputativ. Kharkiv.  
XIV—No. 184, 1933
557. *VISTKY Z RADIIA I PRESY*. Redahuie L. Lavriv. Munich.  
18 serpnia-30 hrudnia, 1945

558. *VISTNYK*; misiachnyk literatury, mystetstva, nauky i hromads'koho zhyttia. Lviv.  
I-VII, 1933-1939 (incomplete)
559. *VISTNYK* (Parokhiia Sviatoho Volodymyra), New York.  
No. 2, 1932
560. *VISTNYK*—The Herald; Ukrains'kyi relihiynyi dvo-tyzhnevnyk v Kanadi. Winnipeg, Man.  
V—No. 14/15 (59/60), 1928
561. *VISTNYK DERZHAVNYKH ZAKONIV* i rozporiadkiv Zakhidnoi Oblasty Ukrains'koi Narodnoi Respublyky. (n.p.) Drukovano v Stanyslavovi.  
No. 1, 9, 1919
562. *VISTNYK KHOLMS'KOHO* Guberniial'noho Starostva. Berest'.  
No. 1-17, 1918
563. *VISTNYK KRAIEVOHO KOMISARIATU* Ukrains'koi Narodn'oi Respubliky na Kholmshchynu, Pidliashe i Polissie. Berestie.  
No. 1, 1918
564. *VISTNYK O.D.V.U.*; Misiachnyi Biuletyn Orhanizatsii Derzhavnoho Vidrodzhennia Ukrainy v Amerytsi. New York.  
I—No. 1, 2, 3, 1932  
II—No. 1-10, 14/15, 1933  
III—No. 16-21, 23-25, 1934
565. *VISTNYK POLITYKY, LITERATURY I ZHYTTIA*. Vienna.  
No. 43, 1918
566. *VISTNYK SOIUZA VYZVOLENNIA UKRAINY*; Nachrichtenblatt des Bundes zur Befreiung der Ukraina. Vienna.  
I—V, No. 1 (23/24)-42 (226), 1914-1918
567. *VISTNYK* Tsarstva Bozhoho na zemli. The Herald of God's Kingdom. Winnipeg.  
No. 2 (n.d.)
568. *VISTNYK U.P.S.R.* (neperiodychne vyd.); Vydaie Hol. Komitet UPS-R. Prague.  
v. 1-14, 1931
569. *VISTNYK UKRAINS'KOHO NATSIONAL'NOHO KONGRESU*; (Vydannia neperiodychne). Prague.  
I—No. 1, 1936

570. *VISTNYK UKRAINS'KOHO ORHANIZATSIINOHO* Komitetu Sotsiialistychnoi Robitnychoi Partii Ameryky. Akron, Ohio.  
No. 1, 1928
571. *VISTNYK UKRAINS'KOHO ROBITNYCHOHO* Universytetu; Neperiod. vydannia URU pry Ukrains'komu In-ti Hromadoznastva. Prague.  
No. 1, 1927  
(bez N.) sichen'-liutyi, kviten'-traven', cherven'-serpen', 1928
572. *VISTNYK UKRAINS'KOHO TOVARYSTVA PROSVITY* u Zahrebi. Zagreb.  
Berezen'-kviten', 1939
573. *VISTNYK* Ukrains'koi Hromady u Frantsii. Paris.  
No. 2-6, 13-58, 60-68, 1929-1938
574. *VISTNYK UKRAINS'KOI NATSIONAL'NOI KOL'ONII*. Shanghai.  
I—No. 1, 2, 1942
575. *VISTNYK UKRAINS'KOI* Robitnychoi Spilky v Kniutanzhi. Frantsiia.  
No. 1, 1929
576. *VISTY MUZEIU VYZVOL'NOI BOROT'BY UKRAINY*. Prague.  
1925, 1930, 1934-1938 (incomplete)
577. *VISTY PERSHOHO KONGRESU UKRAINS'KYKH INZHENERIV*. Lviv.  
No. 4, 1932
578. *VISTY UKRAINS'KOHO NAUKOVOHO INSTYTUTU* v Berlini; mi-siachnyk. Red. Zenon Kuzelia. Berlin.  
1933-1938 (incomplete)
579. *VISTY UKRAINS'KOHO TSENTRAL'NOHO KOMITETU* u Pol'shchi. Warsaw.  
III—No. 18/19, 1928
580. *VISTY "UNO"*; Ukrains'ke Natsional'ne Obiednannia. Vidp. Red. Theodor Koroliff. Berlin-Hallensee.  
No. 1, 1933
581. *VISTY Z LUHU*; pys'mo, prysviachene luhovym i sichovym spravam, prosviti i nautsi. Lviv.  
IV—No. 1, 1929  
V—No. 11, 12, 1930  
VI—No. 8/9, 1931

582. *VISTY Z UKRAINS'KOI TSENTRAL'NOI* Rady u Kyivi. Kiev.  
I—No. 1-8, 10, 1917 (photocopy)
583. *VISTY Z UKRAINY*—News from Ukraine; *odnodnivka*. New York.  
No. 1, 1941
584. *VOHNI*; ideolohichniy zhurnal novoho pokolinnia. Vidp. Red. D-r I. Rakovs'kyi. Lviv.  
V—No. 7/8 (46-7), 1935
585. *VOIATS'KA SLAVA*; Zhurnal ukrains'kykh dobrovil'tsiv v taborakh poranenykh. Red. V.I. Zhyla. Misiachnyk. Sondertabir Vustrau [Wustrow].  
I—No. 1/2, 3/4, 1944
586. *VOLIA*; Orhan Ukrains'koi Sotsial-Demokratychnoi Partii. Vydaie Uprava USDP. Stanyslaviv.  
I—No. 8, 1919
587. *VOLIA*; Ukrains'kyi tyzhnevyyk pid redaktsiieiu Andriia Horlenka (A. Voinarovs'kyi). Vienna.  
Vol. I-VI, 1919  
Vol. I-IV, 1920  
Vol. I-III, 1921
588. *VOLIA POKUTTIA*; Ukrains'kyi populiarnyi tyzhnevyyk dlia Kolomyishchyny. Lviv.  
IV—No. 6, 1944
589. *VOLIA UKRAINY*—prodovzhennia VOLI. Vienna.  
vol. III (No. 9-14), 1921
590. *VOLYN'*—“Wolhynien”; Chasopys dlia Volyni. Osnovopolozhnyk i holovnyi kermanych Stepan Skrypnyk. Redahuie kolehiia pid provodom Ulasa Samchuka. Rivne.  
II—No. 11, 1942
591. *VOSKRESENNIA*; tserkovno-relihiinyi chasopys. Kraków.  
I—v. 1-6, 1941
592. *VPERED!*; Organ ukrains'koi sotsiial-demokratychnoi partii. Lviv.  
VI—No. 201 (485), 1921  
VII—No. 17 (788), 1924
593. *VPERED*; orhan Ch.S.L. sotsial-demokratychnoi robitnychoi partii Pidkarpats'koi Rusy. Uzhhorod.  
XVI—No. 5, 1935



594. *VPERED*— Forward; hazeta dlia ukrains'kykh robitnykiv i farmeriv v Kanadi i Spoluchenykh Derzhavakh. Toronto.  
IV—No. 8-11, 1939
595. *VPERED*—Forward; Sotsiialistychno-naukova chasopys' dlia pratsiuiuchoho liudu. Ukrainian monthly. New York.  
v. I—No. 1, 2, 1919
596. *VSESVIT*. (Fundator V. Blakytnyi) Kharkiv.  
No. 44, 45, 51, 1927
597. *VUIKO SHTIF*; dodatok do Kanadiis'koho Farmera. Winnipeg.  
XXVII—no. 1, 1929
598. *VYZVOLENNIA*; misiachnyk vil'noi ukrains'koi dumky za kordonom. Vienna-Prague.  
I—No. 1-3, 1923
599. *VYZVOLENNIA UKRAINY*—Deliverance of Ukraina; Red. i vyd. S. Sydorenko. Warsaw.  
v. 1, 1932
600. *WISTI*; tyzhnevyyk dlia ukrains'kykh robitnykiv z Heneral-Hubernatorstva (vkluchno z Halychynoiu). Vydavets' Bohdan Kravtsiv. Berlin.  
II—No. 36 (78), 1944
601. *Z DNIV RADOSTY I SMUTKU*; odnodnivka, prysviachena ukrains'kym invalidam. Lviv.  
1929
602. *ZA KONGRES!*; Neperiod. organ initsiiatyv. komis. V.N. Kongresu. Vidpovid. Red. Anna Shumova. Vydavets' Viktor Prykhod'ko. Prague.  
No. 1, 1934
603. *ZA MAIBUTNIE*—Ukrainian weekly "For the Futurity"; Vydaie i redahuie Kolehiia pry Kul't. Osvitn. Viddili Ukr. Taboru v Füssen. Nach. Red. I.A. Domazar.  
I—No. 1-3, 1945 (mimeograph).
604. *ZA UKRAINU*; literaturnyi neperiodychnyi zhurnal 3-ho kinnoho polku 3-oi zaliznoi strilets'koi dyvizii, m. Kalish (Kalisz, Poland).  
No. 4/5, 1921
605. *ZA UKRAINU*; Orhan Ukrains'koho Vyzvol'noho Viis'ka. Hol. Red. Kotorovych. Feldpost 01404.  
I—No. 1, 5, 9, 1945
606. *ZA VOLIU I PRAVA*; holovnyi red. Iv. Saksahanets'. Feldpost N. 38716  
No. 19, 1944

607. *ZAHRAVA*; organ nezalezhnoi politychnoi dumky. Nach. Red. Dmytro Dontsov. Dvotyzhnevyyk. Lviv.  
I—No. 1-18, 1923  
II—No. 1-8, 1924
608. *ZAHRAVA*; organ Ukrains'koi Partii Natsional'noi Roboty. Vidvichal'nyi Red. T. Martynets'. Lviv.  
II—No. 9-15, 1924
609. *ZAKHIDNIA UKRAINA*; Vydannia Spilky Revoliutsiinykh pys'mennykiv "Zakhidnia Ukraina". Kharkiv.  
No. 1, 1939
610. *ZALIZNYI STRILETS'*. Kalisz.  
II—No. 58, 60, 61, 64, 66, 1921  
III—No. 1, 2, 4-12, 1922
611. *ZAMORS'KYI VISTNYK*—The Trans-Oceanic Herald. Toronto.  
I—No. XI, XII/XIV, XV, 1920
612. *ZAPOROZHETS'*—Zaporojetc; misiachnyk. Paris.  
II—No. 7/8, 13/14, 1937  
III—No. 15/16, 19/20, 1938
613. *ZAPOROZHETS' ZA DUNAIEM*; Vistnyk Ukrains'koi Fil'movoi Studii Vasylia Avramenka. Herald of the V. Avramenko's Ukrainian Film Studio.  
No. 2, 1938
614. *ZAPYSKY ISTORYCHNO-FILOLOHICHNOHO VIDDILU*; Vseukrain-s'ka Akademiia Nauk. Kiev.  
v. I, 1919  
v. II (1920-1922), 1923  
v. IV (1925), 1925  
v. VII-VIII, IX, 1926  
v. X-XV, 1927  
v. XVI-XX, 1928  
v. XXI-XXII, XXIV, XXV, 1929
615. *ZAPYSKY NAUKOVOHO TOVARYSTVA im. SHEVCHENKA*. Lviv.  
v. II, 1893  
v. III, 1894  
v. XXXIII, KN. I, 1900  
v. XXXIX, KN. I, 1901  
v. CX, KN. IV, 1912

616. *ZAPYSKY* Ukrains'koi Akademychnoi Hromady pry Ukrains'kii Hospodars'kiii Akademii v Ch.S.R. Orhan periodychnyi. Poděbrady.  
v. I, 1923
617. *ZAPYSKY UKRAINS'KOI HOSPODARS'KOI AKADEMII* v. Ch.S.R. Poděbrady.  
No. 1, 1927
618. *ZASIV*; Ukrains'ka tyzhneva literaturno-politychna i ekonomychna chasopys'. Kharbyn.  
I—No. 1-5, 1917  
II—No. 19-26, 1918
619. *ZBIRNYK FILOLOHICHNOI SEKTSII* Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Shevchenka. Lviv.  
v. 2-12, 15-22, 1899-1909, 1912-1929
620. *ZBIRNYK MATEMATYCHNO-PYRODOPYSNO-LIKARS'KOI SEKTSII NTSh*. Lviv.  
v. V—No. 1, 2, 1899
621. *ZEMLIA*—Boden; Tyzhnevyy ukrains'kykh sil's'ko-hospodars'kykh robitnykiv u Nimechchyni. Plauen.  
I—No. 1-16, 1944  
II—No. 1-12, 1945
622. *ZEMLIA I VOLIA*; Vydaie Uprava USDP. Za redaktsiiu vidpovidaie Illia Kaliatyns'kyi. Lviv.  
XII—No. 41, 1923
623. *ZHINKA*—The Woman; dvotyzhnevyyk. Vydaie Zhinocha Kooperatyva Soiuz Ukrainok. Vidp. Red. Olena Fedak-Sheparovych. Lviv.  
I—No. 2-4, 15-17, 1935  
II—No. 19, 20, 23, 24, 1936  
III—No. 1-10, 13, 19-24, 1937  
IV—No. 1-4, 1938  
V—No. 1/2, 5-14, 1939
624. *ZHINKA*—The Woman—La Femme; Misiachnyi zhurnal dlia ukrains'koho zhinotstva v Amerytsi. Detroit, Mich.  
I—No. 2, 4-6, 10-12, 1939  
II—(bez No.) VII-X, 1940
625. *ZHINOCHA DOLIA*; dvotyzhnevyyk dlia ukrains'koho zhinotstva. Vydaie i redahuie Koliegiia. Nach. Red. O. Kysilevs'ka. Kolomyia.  
v. III, X-XIV, 1927, 1929-1938

626. *ZHINOCHA VOLIA*; chasopys dlia sil's'koho zhinotstva. Dodatok do chasopysu *ZHINOCHA DOLIA*. Nachal'na redaktorka i vydavets' Olena Kysilevs'ka. Dvotyzhnevnyk. Kolomyia.  
1932-1938 (incomplete)
627. *ZHINOCHYI HOLOS*; chasopys ukrains'kykh pratsiuiuchykh zhinok. Lviv.  
VI—No. 1, 3, 1936  
VII—No. 1, 3-12, 1937  
VIII—No. 1-8, 12, 14-16, 21-24, 1938  
IX—No. 1, 3-15, 1939
628. *ZHINOCHYI SVIT*; Misiachnyi zhurnal dlia natsional'noi osvity ukrains'koho zhinotstva v Amerytsi. Orhan "Soiuz Ukrainok Ameryky." Red. M. Bek. Pittsburgh, Pa.  
I—No. 1-5, 1933  
II—No. 1-4, 1934
629. *ZHURNAL MEDYCHNOHO TSYKLU*; Vseukrains'ka Akademiia Nauk USSR. Kiev.  
Tom II, vyp. 1, 2, 3, 1932  
Tom V, vyp. 3, 1935
630. *ZHYTTIA*; Orhan Ukrains'koi Sotsialistychnoi molodi. Vykhodyt' na pravakh rukopysu. Prague.  
I—No. 1, 1924  
II—No. 1 (4), 1925
631. *ZHYTTIA I SLOVO*. Misiachnyk. Vydaie i za red. vidpovidaie Ivan Iurkiv. Drohobych.  
II—No. 2-8, 1938
632. *ZHYTTIA I ZNANNIA*; iliustrovanyi populiarno-naukovyi zhurnal. Lviv. 1928-1930, 1933, 1935-1939 (incomplete)
633. *ZHYTTIA V TABORI*; neperiodychne vydannia Ukrains'koi Students'koi Hromady. Velliaria-Rimini.  
No. 1, 8, 10, 11, 13, 1945
634. *ZHYVE SLOVO* — Żywe Słowo; Misiachnyi zhurnal literatury, polityky, ekonomiky i suspil'noho zhyttia. Lviv.  
I—No. 1-6, 1939
635. *ZIRKA*; iliustrovana chasopys' dlia dityi starshoho i mensshoho viku. New Britain, Conn.  
No. 1, 2, 1913

636. *ZOLOTYI PERSTEN'*; literaturno-khudozhnii iliustrovanyi misiachnyk. Lviv.  
No. 1, 1944
637. *ZORIA*—Estrella; Pershyi u Pivdenii Amerytsi ukrains'kyi iliustrovanyi tyzhnevnyk. Red. A. Korshnivs'kyi. São Paulo, Brazil.  
I—No. 1-3, 5-9, 1937  
II—No. 2-12, 1938
638. *ZORIA*—Hajnal; Chasopys' Podkarpatskoho Obshchestva Nauk. Red. Ivan Haraida. Ungvar'.  
II—No. 1/2, 3/4, 1942  
III—No. 1/4, 1943
639. *ZORIA*; Pys'mo, literaturno-naukove dlia ruskykh rodyn, vydavane Tovarystvom im. Shevchenka. Lviv.  
VII—No. 1-24, 1866  
VIII—No. 1, 2, 4-12, 17-20, 23, 24, 1877  
IX—No. 1-24, 1888  
X—No. 1-24, 1889  
XII—No. 1-24, 1891
640. *ZVIAHEL'S'KE SLOVO*; vykhodyt' dvichi na tyzhden'. Vidp. Red. T. Tots'ka. Zviahel'.  
I, No. 8, 9, 1942
641. *ZYZ*; zhurnal satyry ta humoru. Vidpovidal'nyi Redaktor i vydavets' Edvard. Kozak. Lviv.  
VII—No. 14, 1930  
X—No. 6, 1933



# *THE ANNALS OF THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN THE UNITED STATES*

Vol. I, No. 1, 1951. *Five dollars.*

Vol. I, No. 2, 1951. *Five dollars.*

Vol. II, No. 1 (3), 1952. Mykhaylo Drahomanov: A Symposium and  
Selected Writings. *Ten dollars.*

Vol. II, No. 2 (4), 1952. *Five dollars.*

Vol. II, No. 4 (6), 1952. *Five dollars.*

Vol. III, No. 1 (7), 1953. *Five dollars.*

Vol. III, No. 2 (8), 1953. *Five dollars.*

Vol. III, No. 3 (9), 1954. *Five dollars.*

Vol. III, No. 4 (10)/Vol. IV, No. 1-2 (11-12), 1954. Olexa Powstenko.  
The Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev. *Thirty dollars.*

Vol. IV, No. 3 (13), 1955. *Ten dollars.*

Vol. IV, No. 4 (14)/Vol. V, No. 1 (15), 1955. N. Polons'ka-Vasylenko,  
The Settlement of the Southern Ukraine (1750-1775). *Twenty dollars.*

Vol. V, No. 2-3 (16-17), 1956. *Ten dollars.*

Vol. V, No. 4 (18)/Vol. VI, No. 1-2 (19-20), 1957. Dmytro Doroshenko  
and Olexander Ohloblyn, A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography.  
*Twenty dollars.*

Vol. VI, No. 3-4 (21-22), 1958. *Ten dollars.*

Vol. VII, No. 1-2 (23-24), 1959. Special Issue Devoted to the Memory of  
Arnold Margolin. *Ten dollars.*

Vol. VIII, No. 1-2 (25-26), 1960. Studies in Linguistics. *Fifteen dollars.*

Vol. IX, No. 1-2 (27-28), 1961. Studies in History of the Post-  
Revolutionary Ukraine and the Soviet Union. *Fifteen dollars.*

Vol. X, No. 1-2 (29-30), 1962-1963. Studies in Political Science and  
History, and Index to Volumes I-X. *Fifteen dollars.*

Vol. XI, No. 1-2 (31-32), 1964-1968. Memorial Vladimir Vernadsky. *Fifteen dollars.*

Vol. XII, No. 1-2 (33-34), 1969-1972. *Fifteen dollars.*

Vol. XIII, No. (35-36), 1973-1977. Economic Issue. *Fifteen dollars.*

Vol. XIV, (No. 37-38), 1978-1980. Studies in Political Science. *Twenty dollars.*

Vol. XV, (No. 39-40), 1981-1983. Studies in Ukrainian Linguistics in honor of George Y. Shevelov. *Thirty five dollars.*

*Orders may be placed with the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, Inc., 206 West 100 Street, New York, New York 10025*





