

But there is one thing more dear than a sweetheart—
honor.”)

His description of the horrors of war is a stirring evocation:

*Hude v Latiji dzvin viščovyj
i haslo vsim k vijni daje,
ščob vsjak latynec' buv hotovyj
k vijni, v jaku jix zlist' vede.
Tam kryk, tut ha'las, tam klepalo,
tisnyt'sja ljud i vse triščalo . . .
Vijna v kryvavyx ryzax tut;
za neju rany smert', uviččja,
bezbožnist' i bezčoloviččja,
xvist mantiji jiji nesut'.*

(“The assembly bell rings out in Latium and gives everyone the call to arms, so that every Latin might prepare himself for the war, the outcome of their wrath. Yonder a shriek, here an uproar, there a sound of pounding; the men press together and everything is crashing. . . . Here war is gowned in bloody raiment. In her steps come wounds, death, mutilation, ungodliness and inhumanity, carrying the train of her mantle.”)

The entire lengthy description of the underworld is, on the whole, somewhat of a departure from the overall character of the rest of the *Enejida*. In it, Kotljarevs'kyj drew on completely different sources from those used for the mock-heroic poem proper—namely, Baroque religious poetry. Admittedly, the style of the underworld tableaux is in general that of sustained parody on folk beliefs (although heaven is parodied still more). However here, motivated by the moralism native to his spirit, Kotljarevs'kyj remains fairly aloof from vulgarisms. He presents a catalog of sins that is altogether traditional, and places these lines, not without reason it seems, near the beginning of the section:

*Paniv za te tam mordovaly
i žaryly zo vsix bokiv,
ščo ljudjam l'hoty ne davalj
i stavyly jix za skotiv . . .*

("It is for this reason that the masters were tortured and were being roasted on all sides—they denied their people any rights, and treated them like cattle. . . .")

Nor is Kotljarevs'kyj lax in designating the appropriate punishments awaiting "all officials . . . without exception," "judges, jurymen, clerks" "who did not carry out justice according to the law." Kotljarevs'kyj concludes the caricature with this edifying discourse by Sybil who characterizes the inhabitants of paradise:

Ne dumaj, ščob buly čynovni

*abo ščo hrošej skryni povni,
abo v jakyx tovstyx žyvit,
ne ci te, ščo v cvitnyx županax,
v karmazynax abo sapjanax;
ne ti z, ščo z knyhamy v rukax,
ne lycari, ne rozbyšaky;
ne ti ce, ščo kryčat' "i paky,"
ne ti, ščo v zolotyx šapkax . . .*

("Do not imagine that they were high officials nor that they had coffers full of gold, nor that any were ample of girth. They were not those who dress in bright mantles, or gowns of crimson or shoes of Moroccan leather. They were not those who wander about book in hand, nor were they knights or highwaymen; they were not those who chant in church, nor who wear golden caps. . . .")

Clearly, this passage does not denote any special love for the common people. It simply expresses the typical Christian viewpoint found in writings and paintings dealing with Judgment Day and "the other world." Kotljarevs'kyj continues this Christian account of the righteous: "*Ce bidni nyščy*" ("Nay, these were miserable wretches"), "*ce vdovy bidni, bezpomoščny*" ("these were poor, helpless widows"), "*ce divy česni neporočny*" ("these were chaste, unblemished virgins"); these were orphans, these were people "*ščo ljudjam pomahat' ljubyly*" ("who loved helping others"). "*Tut tak že staršyna pravdyva*" ("Here there was also an honest official"), "*no til'ky troxy c'oho dyva*" ("but such a miracle was

rare indeed”), adds Kotljarevs’kyj in another traditional motif. Finally, there were people “*vsjakoho zavitu . . . kotori pravedne žyly*” (“of every faith who led a pious life”). This last motif identifies Kotljarevs’kyj, in his depiction of the other world, as a “man of righteousness” for whom a person’s salvation is not connected with fealty to any particular faith or belief.

Thus, gradually, certain indications emerge from the *Enejida* about the character of Kotljarevs’kyj. He appears as a sensitive, sentimental person, religious, but in the somewhat more modern, not old-fashioned sense. Small wonder then that this “enlightened” religious man was librarian of his local biblical society. However, he could not discover the appropriate serious forms for his thoughts and ideals. The works he produced (for more of his works, see below) belonged to such restrictive genres that they might have been appendages to some other literature such as Russian or French. Such was the difference between his era and the Baroque when a poet of similar temperament and equal interest in antiquity and national life and customs would have produced not a travesty, not a work whose genre lay on the periphery of literature, but a work of truly important significance. Admittedly, throughout the entire period of the Baroque there was nothing which could be compared with the *language* of Kotljarevs’kyj. It is not surprising then that Ševčenko could write “the *Enejida* is good, but still only a farce in the Muscovite manner.” For Kuliš, whose view was totally in accord with Romantic ideology, the *Enejida* was nothing but a parody on the way of life and even the language of the peasant, a parody showing “a lack of respect” for the Ukrainian people. Later, Kuliš wrote that Kotljarevs’kyj “himself did not exactly know what he was doing” but, in his handling of the common language and in his subsequent establishing of a new Ukrainian literature, he was following “some unknown command of the popular spirit.”

8. Kotljarevs’kyj’s travesty has only a few stylistic similarities to works of the Baroque. Besides the already mentioned word games, perhaps the sole features related to Baroque stylistics are the numerous repetitions, the play on synonyms and words of similar meaning, and the accumulation of these techniques. The greatest concentration of these features occurs, in fact, in the depictions of hell and heaven, the passages whose themes and Baroque-like language most recall the poetry of the Baroque (see above, pt. A, no. 7). The travesty genre itself was a legacy Classicism inherited from the Baroque, although Boileau, a thorough-going Classicist, had wanted to remove this category from literature practically altogether. Kotljarevs’kyj, however, like other Classicists who wrote travesties, did avail himself of the Baroque tradition to a certain limited degree. But he had far greater recourse to the stylistic theories of Classicism. Indeed, in some parts of his poem it would not be difficult to

transform the piece into a serious work. One need only remove the linguistic elements of the travesty—the vulgarisms, the overly colloquial expressions, the ethnographic details, etc. It would not be necessary to change the style—it is completely classical.

9. Apart from the echoes it produced in other genres (to be discussed later), Kotljarevs'kyj's travesty spawned innumerable epic imitations which altered the mock-heroic poem in various ways (to be sure, the times themselves were unfavorable to the classical genre). Mention need be made only of P. P. Bilec'kyj-Nosenko (1774-1856) who wrote, among other Ukrainian and Russian works, the poetic travesty *Horpynyda, abo vxoplennja Prozerpyna* (*Horpynyda, or Kidnapped Proserpine*, unpublished until 1871). This work, too, is based on a traditional travesty theme elaborated in 1653 by the French poet Charles Coypeau d'Assoucy (1605-1675) and rendered into Russian in 1795 by J. Ljucenko (1776-1854) and Kotel'nickij. Bilec'kyj-Nosenko's work, which follows the latter version fairly closely, is of interest for the history of literature primarily in pointing up, by contrast, the refinement of Kotljarevs'kyj's literary taste. Bilec'kyj-Nosenko, in imitating the *Eneida*, was unable to refrain from using numerous coarse and indecent witticisms and turns of phrase. Despite the fact that the author was concerned with ethnographic matters, the work offers very little in this area. Moreover, his attitude to the language and life of the common people seems ironic and disdainful.

In the tradition of travesty, there is another, later reworking of the old mock-heroic poem by K. Dumytraško (1814-1886), entitled *Žabomyšodrakovka, z hrečes'koho lycja na kozac'kyj vyvorot na švydku nytku pereštopana* (*The Battle of the Frogs and the Mice, Greek Material on One Side, Cossack on the Other, Darned Anew with a Nimble Thread*, 1859). In language and verse it is weak. In content it is a Polonophobic and Russophilic adaptation of political events of the seventeenth century in the form of a tale about a war between the mice (the Poles) and the frogs (the Cossacks) who are aided by the crabs (the Russians).

A mock-heroic poem was also begun by Jakiv Kuxarenko, a Kuban otaman (d. 1862). Entitled *Xar'ko Zaporožs'kyj Košovyj* (*Xarko, a Zaporozhian Chief*), this unfinished poem imitates the plot of the *Eneida*, while reducing the elements of burlesque and emphasizing the patriotic motifs.*

*The name of O. Lobysevyč, a priest who translated Vergil's *Bucolics*, should perhaps be mentioned as one of Kotljarevs'kyj's forerunners from the late eighteenth century. However, his travesty has been lost and it is therefore impossible to speculate about its relationship to Classicist travesties.

D. VERSE POETRY

1. One type of lyric among those most favored by Classicist poetics was the ode. Several examples of the genre may be found in Ukrainian in the post-Kotljarevs'kyj period. For the most part, however, they were the work of literary dilettantes who turned to this form in the spirit of Russian patriotism to extol the events of 1812 and 1855. Even in the ode, it is travesty which, surprisingly, plays the greater role.

This type of composition may be traced to an ode of Kotljarevs'kyj's dedicated to "the Little Russian Governor-General" Prince Kurakin. The actual aim of the work is the consolation of the addressee; accordingly, the expressions of the author's respect for the high personage in his performance of office are sincere: "*Ne žaliye žyvota dlja nas svoho*" ("In serving us, he does not hesitate to sacrifice his own life"), "*Jarmo ty tjahneš, ne hnučys, jak dobryj vil*" ("You bear the yoke unflinchingly, like a faithful ox"). Yet, despite its intention, the tone of the ode is entirely that of travesty. For example, classical antiquity is Ukrainianized: Orpheus is depicted as a "poor old thing" ("*neborak*") and as a *kozak* strumming his *kobzura*. Also, folk expressions and vulgarisms abound: in the office the clerks "*tovčut'sja*" ("thrash about as if possessed"); "*treba vsjakuju papiru pidvesty jak raz do šnyru*" ("every piece of paper must be scrutinized right down to the last period"); "*nikoly boršču s'orbnuty*" ("never slurp your boršč"); "*skil'ky vzjav ljudej ty z hrjazi i . . . až u knjazi jix uper*" ("the number of people you pulled out of the mire and set up like princes"). Most importantly, Kotljarevs'kyj himself assumes the pose of a simple person who does not understand what goes on in "the higher world" or even in the provincial office, and who speaks of everything as if it were some sort of marvel. In point of fact, the poem is poorly executed, containing several errors in rhyme, etc.

2. Next in importance to Ukrainian literature's master of epic travesty is its master of ode travesty, Petro Hulak-Artemovs'kyj (1790-1865). His unlikely background—an unsuccessful professor of dubious scholastic merit or achievement, but with the psychology and ambition of a Russian civil servant and the political ideology of a Russian monarchist—does not alter the fact that he was an extraordinarily talented poet who surpassed Kotljarevs'kyj in technical proficiency.

Hulak-Artemovs'kyj began as a student, paraphrasing Boileau's comic poem *The Lectern* into a language that was almost Church Slavonic. Later, he translated works of Baroque and classical poets (Rousseau, Milton, Racine) into classical "high style" Russian. He started to write poetry in Ukrainian in 1817,

the beginning of a lifelong creativity. While few in number, his verses are, from the point of form, exceptionally masterful.

Hulak-Artemovs'kyj's travesties of the odes of Horace, *Pisni Haras'ka* (*Songs of Haras'ko*) are the most successful examples of their type. These paraphrases invariably transform the basic thought of the ode to a plane whose style and language are thoroughly vulgar. The level of vulgarization may vary however. Hulak-Artemovs'kyj seems to favor the speech of drunkards and buffoons; however, serious, lyrical language may also be found in his work.

The following is Hulak-Artemovs'kyj's version of that ode in which Horace counsels Dellius to preserve tranquility of soul, for life devoted to the pursuit of pleasure ends inexorably, as do all other forms of worldly activity, in death:

*Parxome, v ščasti ne brykaj!
V nud'zi pryt'mom ne liz' do neba,
ljudej pytaj, svij rozum maj;
jak ne mudruj, a vmerty treba . . .*

("Parxom, when in luck, do not buck! When in misery, ask not for mercy. Learn others' thoughts; keep yours to yourself. No matter how clever you are, you must die someday. . . .")

The travesty also ventures this portrayal of the various human types:

*Čy korotaješ vik v žurbi,
čy to za postavcem horilky
v šynku narizujut' tobi
cymbaly, kobzy i sopilky,

čy pjanyj pid tynom xropěš,
čy do hospody lizeš račky
i žinku makohonom bješ,
čy sam tovčěšja na kulačky . . .*

("Whether you spend your life in sorrow, or whether behind your glass of brandy you are serenaded in the tavern by the *cymbaly, kobzy* and *sopilky*, whether you lie beneath a hedge drunk and snoring, or whether you homewards crawl on all fours and beat your wife about the head, or thrash yourself in fisticuffs . . .")

Then, on a more somber note, this truth:

*Ory i zasivaj lany,
kosy šyroki perelohy,
i hrošky za baštany
lupy—ta vse odkyneš nohy . . .*

("You may plow and sow your fields, mow your fine broad meadows, and for your melon gardens, exact good money, yet in the end, to death you'll have to go. . .")

In this lexicon, even dying is expressed by "*odkynuty nohy*" ("to stretch out one's legs"), or "*zjisty dulju*" ("to swallow a fig"), and death by the epithet *skažena* (rabid). Music does not play, but rather *narizuje* (cuts), and the *lasošči* (sweets) which the hero of the poem may think of are *paslin*, *cybulja* (nightshade, onion). Accordingly, while the highest level of worldly existence may be represented by the "*soc'kyj*" ("county policeman"), human endeavor, truth, and the job of "*oraty, zasivaty ta kosyty lany y perelohy*" ("to plow, sow and mow the fields and fallow lands"), normal earthly pursuits are passing one's time "*na peči*" ("on top of a stove"), sitting "*za postavcem horilky*" ("behind a glass of brandy"), and all those others cited in the excerpts above. That Hulak-Artemovs'kyj could also write in a different style is indicated by his paraphrase of another ode of Horace. Addressed not to Chloe, but "*Do Ljubky*" ("To My Sweetheart"), replaces Horace's sustained classical laconicism with a language that is broadly sentimental and completely Ukrainized:

*Na ščo ty, Ljubočko, kozac'ke serce sušyš!
Čoho, jak kizon'ka manen'ka ta v boru,
Ščo—čy to nižkoju suxen'kyj lyst zvorušyt',
čy viterec' šepne, čy žovna de koru
na lypi dodovba, čy jaščirka zelena
zašelestyt' v kušči, vona mov toroplena
dryžyt', žaxajet'sja, za matir'ju vtika . . .*

*Oj čas vže divčyni divoc'ku dumku mat':
ne vik že jahodi pry hilci červonity,
ne vik pry materi i divci divuvat';
Oj čas teljatočko vid matky vidlučyty.*

("For what reason, sweetheart, do you desiccate a Cossack's heart! Why are you like a tender little kid in the forest which— if its little foot makes a withered leaf rustle, or if a zephyr is whispering or a woodpecker is pecking away at the bark of a linden tree, or a green lizard stirs in the brushes—seems startled and shudders frightfully and runs after her mother Oh, it is now time for a young lass to give thought to her maidenhood: it does not take forever for a berry to ripen on the vine, nor should a lass spend a lifetime by her mother's side; Oh, it is time for the little calf to be weaned from its mother.")

But, as always with Hulak-Artemovs'kyj, this "Ukrainization" is a kind of deviation of the language. It has, for example, an unnaturally sentimental tone (*kizon* 'ka—little kid, *manen* 'ka—dear little, *suxen* 'kyj—dry, shrivelled-up, etc.). It is interesting however that, this feature notwithstanding, Hulak-Artemovs'kyj was somehow able to retain the general intonation of the original even though he replaced Horace's meters with the more common Russian ones. Thus, in the bacchantic lyric "To Parxom" there is a discrepancy between the travesty's overall content and tone which are comic and its "sound" which is actually quite moving. This is one of the secrets of the comic impression of Hulak-Artemovs'kyj's travesties. Of course, he also wrote travesties that were entirely in the "low style," such as the *pjanyc* 'ki (drunken) lyrics:

Ox! ox! ox! ox!
Zubiv ^{vv}*ščos* ' z *dvox*
i nih ne doličusja!
^y*Žyvit na smix—*
z koval's 'kyj *mix.*
Zdajet'sja ž, i ne dmusja! . . .

Odna noha
^{ščos} ' *škutyl* 'ha
druha zovsim zakljakla
Taka nud 'ha,
taka tuha,
^{ščo} *čort zna, de i dit* 'sja!

("Oh! oh! oh! oh! My teeth—around two, I think, and my feet—I cannot count them all! My stomach is mockery—it is

a smith's bellows. Maybe I won't manage to get there! . . .
 One foot is somehow lame, the other is completely numb.
 Such weariness, such affliction, the devil knows what I
 can do with myself!")

3. Besides his humorous travesties, Hulak-Artemovs'kyj wrote serious works, including fables (numbering seven in all). One of the most popular genres of Classicism, fables could be written in a more colloquial and "low" language. Their plots were very often traditional, passing from one fabulist to another. Hulak-Artemovs'kyj took his plots from the Polish fables of I. Krasicki and then expanded them, often to a considerable extent. For example, from the four lines of Krasicki's "*Pan ta sobaka*" ("The Master and the Dog"), Hulak-Artemovs'kyj creates 183! He could do this by adding numerous little details and anecdotes based on various folk sayings appropriate to his theme. Occasionally he borrowed from the oral tradition—as in the catalog of absurdities in the lengthy fable *Solopij ta Xivreja*. The vocabulary, comprising only a few vulgarisms, contains many diminutives found rather infrequently in the common language: *slizon'ky* (teardrops), *rybka* (small fish), *rotenja* (dainty little mouth), *xvostyk* (short little tail), *rizočky* (little sticks), *uzen'kyj* (awfully narrow), *kaška* (pap), etc. In most fables a "moral" or didactic lesson follows the narrative proper. In Hulak-Artemovs'kyj's fables—whether it was because he could not formulate a moral in general terms or could not find the appropriate words to express it in the vernacular—the moral always takes the form of a concrete image as in the following examples:

Oj, pravdu djadyňa neboha hovoryla:
Ščo til'ky na sviti velykym rybkam žyt'
A nam malym v kulak trubyt'!

("Oh, my poor old auntie spoke the truth: That in this world only big fish can survive, while we small fry have to go begging!")

or:

Ščo Boh poslav, čy to bahato, čy to trošky, –
V kušyr zalizšy, jila movčky . . .

("Whatever God sent, whether a great deal, or only a little,—
 She would crawl into her water-plant and eat quietly. . . .")

The most popular of Hulak-Artemovs'kyj's fables was the lengthy *The Master and the Dog*. Perceived as a satire against serfdom, the work does contain, in fact, bitter words about the peasant's lot. He also wrote fables (*prykazky*) such as:

Cikavyj ta movčun.

Cikavuj, movčuna zustrivšy raz, spytav:
“Vid čoho holosnyj tak dzvin toj na dzvinnyci?”
– “Vid toho ščo (koly ne vtneš seji durnyci)
v seredyni, jak ty, porožnij vin” skazav.

The Busybody and the Saynothing.

The Busybody meeting the Saynothing one day asked:
 “Why is that bell in the bell tower so loud?”
 – “Because of the fact, that (if you really want to know)
 it is hollow at the core, like you,” he replied.

The avoidance of serious words to express moral themes is also seen in the unfinished “message” (another classical conceit) to Kvitka, entitled “*Spravžnja dobrist*” (“True Goodness”). However, serious words (albeit rather ponderous) may be found in Hulak-Artemovs'kyj in his paraphrases of the Psalms. These indicate that, when he wanted to, Hulak-Artemovs'kyj could write in a different type of language and that he could have created an elevated Ukrainian classical style:

Kudy vid duxa ja Tvoho i de sxovajus’?
De vid lycja Tvoho vteču ja i prytajus’?
Čy v nebo polynu, to y Ty ž na nebesy,
čy v peklo zsunusja, to y v pekli Ty jesy.
Pozyču kryla ja u rann’oji zirnyci,
kraj morja poleču, de y ne litaly ptyci—
i tam pospiješ Ty rukoju zaxopyt’
druhoju v hlybyni mene mors’kij spynyt’ . . .

(“Whither can I flee Thy spirit and where can I hide?
 Where can I escape Thy face and conceal myself? Should
 I soar to the firmament, Thou too art there in heaven;

should I descend to hades, there too, in hell, Thou art. I shall borrow the wings of the first star of morning, to the ends of the ocean shall I fly, where even birds never flew—and there too will Thou be to seize me with one hand and with the other to retain me in the depths of the sea. . . .”)

But Hulak-Artemovs'kyj did not create a high style for Ukrainian literature. In the work of this representative of Ukrainian Classicism, Ukrainian literature was comprised of odd genres of largely vulgar language and remained merely an appendage to other literatures.

It is consistent with Hulak-Artemovs'kyj's not very lofty literary-theoretical thinking that he accepted the new post-classical literature without any of the resistance typical of Classicists elsewhere. He even “translated” some works of the new, non-classical type—e.g., the ballads “*Pan Tvardovs'kyj*” by Mickiewicz and “*Rybalka*” (“The Fisherman”) by Goethe. However these translations, too, came out as travesties. Goethe's serious ballad turned into:

Voda šumyt' . . . voda hulja! . . .
Na berezi rybalka moloden'kyj
na poplavec' hljadyt' i promovlja:
lovit'sja, rybon'ky, velyki i malen'ki . . .
Ščo rybka smyk, to serce t'ox! . . .

Až—hul'k! Z vody divčynon'ka plyve,
i kosu zčisuje i brivkamy morhaje . . .

Vona j morha, vona j kyva: . . .
Koly b ty znava, jak rybalkam
u mori žyt' iz rybkamy harnen'ko,
ty b sam pirnuv na dno k lynam
i paruboc'keje oddav by nam serden'ko . . .

Vona j morha, vona j spiva . . .
Hul'k! . . . prysnuly na synim mori skalky! . . .
Rybalka xljup! . . . za nym šubovst' vona!
I bil'sh nide ne bačyly rybalky . . .

("The water murmurs . . . the water dances! . . . On the bank a youthful fisherman gazes at his rod's float and declares: bite, dear fish, both large and small. . . . With every tug on the line, this heart pounds madly! Then suddenly, from out of the waves a maiden emerges, she combs her tresses and, showing her dainty brows, winks! . . . And she winks, and she beckons: . . . If only you knew how grand it would be for fishermen to dwell in the sea with the fishes, you would yourself plunge into the deep to join the carp and trustfully confide to them your tender heart. And she winks and she chants. . . In a flash . . . the sunbeams on the blue waves shatter! Splash goes the fisherman! With the maid rushing after! And never again was the fisherman anywhere to be seen. . . .")

Included here are forms considered dialectal today: *hulja*, *morha*, *spiva*. Also, there are so many verbal forms that their use creates an impression of parody: *smyk*, *t'ox*, *hul'k* (twice), *xljup*, *šubovst'*. The diminutives provide the main interest; their frequent use by Hulak-Artemovs'kyj suggests a desire to increase the "folk" quality of the language: *moloden'kyj*, *poplavec'*, *rybon'ky*, *serden'ko*, *koxannjačko*, *divčynon'ka*, *brivkamy*, *ljuben'kyj*, *harnen'ko*, *sonečko*, *červonen'kyj*, *veselen'ki*, *ziron'ky*, *nižen'ky*, *kistočky*, *hlybšen'ko*. All this occurs in the space of forty lines! If one were not familiar with Hulak-Artemovs'kyj's paraphrases of the Psalms, one might think that he considered the Ukrainian language unfit to convey serious ideas.

Worse still is his "paraphrase" of a romantic elegy by Lermontov, the tragically somber *Pečal'no ja gljažu na naše pokolen'e* (*Sadly I Behold Our Generation*). While the author of the elegy grieves over the lack of creativity in the current generation, the "paraphrase" rendering is a travesty in such lines as:

*Z poxmilla nudjat'sja, jidjat' za horobcja,
Ob Semen dryžat', ob Petri zranku mlijut';
a sxopyt'sja trjascja . . . gvalt! klyčte panotcja! . . .*

("Faint from their hangovers, they eat like sparrows,
Semen is seized by shuddering, in the wee hours Petro
succumbs to swooning; then a fever flares up . . . help!
Call the priest! . . .")

Whereas Lermontov laments that his contemporaries will not bequeath to posterity a worthy spiritual heritage, Hulak-Artemovs'kyj travesties the idea:

*Nixto po jix duši ta y ne lyzne horilky.
I rokiv čerez sto na cvyntar pryjde vnuk,
de hrišni kosti jix v odnu kopycju sperly,
poverne čerep jix, ta v lob nohoju stuk!
ta y skaže: "jak žyly, tak durnjamy i vmerly!"*

("No one will refuse a swig of brandy to save his soul.
A century passes, and a grandson enters the churchyard
where their sinful bones lie in a heap, one on top of the
other. He will turn over a skull, and with his foot give
the forehead a poke! And he will say: 'Fools they were
in life and fools they have died!' ")

4. The linguistic mastery of Hulak-Artemovs'kyj's works must be acknowledged. Their rich lexicon includes numerous rare words as well as the normal quotidian vocabulary; it also embraces jargon (primarily of drunkards, carters and seminarians) and, above all, vulgarisms. The wealth of phraseology, equal to Kotljarevs'kyj's, consists of individual expressions probably carefully collected during the course of a lifetime. In addition, the language of Hulak-Artemovs'kyj cannot be charged with the minor impurities (Russianisms, Polonisms, Slavonicisms) found in Kotljarevs'kyj. Even in his paraphrases of the Psalms, the Slavonicisms are not numerous—perhaps fewer than in Ševčenko. This led to the high regard in which his works were held by the Romantics (Kostomarov, Kuliš) who otherwise felt completely alien to their spirit. It is interesting that in his imitations of folk songs (their themes taken from his own family life), Hulak-Artemovs'kyj employed a traditional folk meter rather than the usual "tonic" versification he used elsewhere (in imitation of Russian verse—see Ch. XII, pt. F, no. 5).

5. The influence of both masters of travesty may be seen in the works of other writers such as Kvitka's six "*Špyhačky abo po-moskovs'komu epihramy*" ("Little Stingers or Moscow-Style Epigrams"), published in 1833, and Bilec'kyj-Nosenko's over 300-fable *Prykazky* which did not appear in print until 1871. (In his other works [translations] Bilec'kyj-Nosenko was already imitating the Romantics [see Ch. XII, pt. H].) Stepan Rudykovs'kyj (1784-1851) also left fables and tales; Stepan Pysarevs'kyj (d. 1839)—songs, among other things; Petro Pysarevs'kyj—fables; K. Puzyna (1790-1850)—odes including the Ukrainian

populist ode *Malorossyjs'kyj krest'janin* (*The Little Russian Peasant*) and politically radical odes in classical form. An extra literary work is the coarse verse tale about the death of a drunkard, *Vakula Čmyr*, which appeared in Pavlovs'kyj's Ukrainian grammar (1818).

None of these authors produced anything above mediocre quality. The most notable attempts at verse poetry were the imitations of folk songs: the best may be found in the plays of Kotljarevs'kyj and Kvitka arranged in the sentimental, tender "salon" style (see pt. E). Their renditions follow the classical norm according to which the folk song was only a literary trifle. This theory was completely reversed by the Romantics.

6. Western Ukraine was dominated for a long time by a formless "classicism" together with an admixture of the old Baroque tradition. Typical of its works were panegyric odes and creations in the high style such as *Domobolije* (*Nostalgia*), 1822, by O. Levyc'kyj and *Vozzrynije strašylyšča* (*Vision of Terror*), 1838, by S. F. Lysynec'kyj. Attempts to move from the Church Slavonic-Ukrainian tradition to the Russian were not successful despite Levyc'kyj's enthusiasm for the language in which he wrote:

*Puskaj vezdě pisat' iskusstvo soveršenno,
ty znaješ', čto jazyk naš lučše nespravenno,
ne sobran iz drugix, on drevnij korennoj,
ispolnen vsëx krasot, bogatyj sam soboj;
v nem ptič'ix posvistov, protjažnyx nět napěvov,
ni zvukov nemilyx, ni dikix uxu revov,
kakija slyšatsja v čužix jazykax nam,
zatëm, čto naš jazyk ot nix svoboden sam . . .*

("Though the art of writing is perfect everywhere, you know that our language is incomparable, not a compilation from other tongues; ours has ancient roots, possessing every possible charm; it has a wealth all its own. In it there are not the whistlings of birds, no drawn-out melodies, it has no unpleasant sounds nor bellowing terrifying to the ear such as we hear in foreign tongues, for our language has freed itself from them. . .")

These lines, while relatively successful in themselves, would suggest even the most romantic notions about the musicality of the language! In Transcarpathia, limited attempts were made to paraphrase Russian Classicists (Sumarokov); the

most interesting was that of the talented Vasyl' Dohovyč (1783-1849), who in 1832 published eighteen such poems. His compositions included not only odes written entirely in Slavonic, but also Classicist "folk songs" containing strong elements of the vernacular:

*Zaspivaj my, zozulen'ko—ku!
Koj ty spivaješ, mni lehen'ko—ku, ku!*

*Po zelenyx dubrovnax, ku!
čuty holos po zvorynax, ku, ku!*

("Dear little cuckoo, let's have a tune—coo! When you sing I feel so fine—coo, coo! Throughout the green groves, coo! You can hear your voice across the valleys, coo, coo!")

Dohovyč also wrote travesties and "drunken" songs (*pjanyc'ki*) such as:

*Duren' bem ja žurytysja
ta y dekolý ne vpytysja,
koj i tomu čas.*

*Naj sja durjat' stari didy,
kotrym braly uže sidy, —
stari didy—skupindy!*

*Malo ščastja tu na sviti—
bida v zymi, bida v liti
syrotam ljudem . . .*

("A fool would I be to worry all the time and never take a drink on occasion, when I had the chance. . . . Let the old fogies make fools of themselves, those who were hoarders are already gray haired old fogies—the misers! . . . Scant happiness is there in this world—misery in winter, misery in summer for poor orphaned mankind. . . .")

or:

*Ljuba moja holubyce,
horilčana korčazyce!*

*ne dav bem tja i za sestru
y za maj mylu posestru.*

*V tebe rotyk hej kruhlyčka,
a jšče jaki mudri lyčka.
Koby ty mja cjulovala,
naj by sobi žona spala . . .*

*O, koby mož zvorožyty,
tebe na žonu zminyty,
obes' rodyla divčyny,
xoč čotyry korčazyny . . .*

("My precious little darling, my good old brandy jug!
Not even for my sister would I trade you nor for my
sweetheart fair. Round as can be is your little mouth,
and your face, how wonderful. If only you were here
to kiss me, I would let my wife go right on sleeping.
. . . O, if only I were a magician, I would turn you
into my wife; would that you give birth to girls—four
little brandy pots. . .")

Another Transcarpathian, Myxajlo Lučkaj, noted for his 1830 Church Slavonic-Ukrainian grammar, travestied Ovid. The tradition of ode-writing continued in Galicia and Transcarpathia until recent times.

E. DRAMATIC LITERATURE

1. Most dramatic works of Ukrainian Classicism also belonged to an uncommon genre—that of "comic operas." Originally meaning light comic scenes with incidental songs, comic operas were linked to the Baroque dramatic tradition of *intermedia* and interludes and to both the Western and Russian "comic opera." The most famous Russian example was the work of A. Ablesimov (1748-1783) entitled "*Mel'nik—koldun, obmanščik i svat*" ("*The Miller-Sorcerer, Cheat and Match-Maker*"), first performed in 1799. During the Baroque period the comic scenes had been merely intermission entertainment for serious dramatic presentations. With Classicism, Russian "operas" developed alongside serious tragedies and comedies, but Ukrainian drama was characterized by the same basic trait common to all other genres of Ukrainian Classicism: it was an "incomplete literature" of an "incomplete nation." In every instance,

however, dramatic literature contributed to the national awakening in the same way as other genres—through the introduction of the vernacular.

2. It appears that the first efforts were again by Kotljarevs'kyj: the "operetta" "*Natalka Poltavka*" ("*Natalka from Poltava*") and the "vaudeville" "*Moskal'-čarivnyk*" ("*The Soldier-Sorcerer*"), both first staged in 1819. The plays are miniatures in form. Their content is traditional: Natalka is deeply in love with Petro, a poor youth who is seeking his fortune in a foreign land. Meanwhile, Vybornyj (an elected deputy) enters into matchmaking with her on behalf of Voznyj (bailiff), whom Natalka's mother prefers as a son-in-law. However, Petro returns and the bailiff himself expedites the union of the happy lovers. "*The Soldier-Sorcerer*" consists of the elaboration of a trivial anecdote and is modelled on a French vaudeville: in the absence of her *čumak* (husband), Tetjana is visited by the clerk Fyntyk. Just as they are sitting down to dinner, Tetjana's husband, Myxajlo Čuprun, returns home. A soldier freshly billeted there has overheard Tetjana's conversation with Fyntyk. Claiming to be a sorcerer, he uncovers (with the help of his "magic") some food and then the "devil," Fyntyk, whom he succeeds in expelling from the house.

Kotljarevs'kyj's considerable dramatic skill is readily apparent, particularly in "*Natalka Poltavka*." To his credit are the clear development of the action, the exceptionally lively dialog and the definite moments of dramatic tension to the fullest extent possible in light drama. The characters are well drawn through their language and, in part, through their psychology. Admittedly, Kotljarevs'kyj's originality here is not very great: he followed non-Ukrainian tradition as well as that of *intermedia* and *vertep*. Individual roles are well constructed; but there are some scenes and situations that are primitive to the point of caricature, and sentimental to the point of artifice. The peasants are not treated as peasants here but as elegantly dressed "salon" style *paysans*, as required by Classicist poetics. However, their dramatic qualities as well as their historical value have insured for these plays a permanent place in theatrical repertoires.

The language is very good, almost totally stripped of the coarse caricature-like elements found in *Enejida* and in the odes. But the strongest aspect of both plays is their songs, especially in "*Natalka Poltavka*" which has twenty while "*The Soldier-Sorcerer*" has twelve. There are many different kinds—Russian and Ukrainian, typical opera and vaudeville pieces, satiric songs (*kuplety*), arias, duets and ensembles as well as sentimental romantic numbers. They also contain imitations of folk songs which sometimes seem quite funny (e.g., when non-folk song stanzas are used). In these songs, the best of which became actual folk songs later, Kotljarevs'kyj employed an old method familiar to Baroque verse writers—creating a humorous song from excerpts of various folk songs. It is

particularly interesting that while he maintained the Russian tonic verse in his Russian numbers, Kotljarevs'kyj wrote his Ukrainian songs in a meter which deviates the most from the tonic principle—the rhythm he adopted here was that of the traditional Ukrainian folk song.

Songs such as "*Vijut' vitry*" ("The Winds Are Blowing"), "*Did rudyj*" ("Red-Haired Grandfather"), "*Čoho ž voda kalamutna*" ("Why Is the Water So Troubled"), "*Oj, pid vyšneju*" ("Oh, Under the Cherry Tree"), contain some ornaments not typical of the folk style. Among them are traditional sayings usually found in comic songs of the era, like "*Bidnist' i bahatstvo jest' Boža volja, z mylym jix dilyty-ščaslyvaja dolja*" ("Poverty and wealth are decided according to God's will; to share them with a loved one is a happy fate") or "*De zhoda v simejstvi, tam myr i tyšyna*" ("Where there is family harmony, there is also peace and tranquility"). There are also expressions of sentimental melancholy: "*Zhornu ja ručen'ky, zhornu ja bilen'ki, ta j nežyvyj stanu*" ("I will fold my little arms, my tender white arms and will quietly die") and (since in general there is constant lamenting in Kotljarevs'kyj), "*A ja marmo časy traču, odyn v sviti til'ky plaču*" ("But in vain do I waste my time, alone in the world, all I can do is weep"); of romance: "*Spišy, mylyj*" ("Make haste, dear one"); and of Russian patriotism: "... *car bilyj, duže smilyj*" ("... the white tsar most bold").

However, these songs do contain, in addition, ornaments which are typical of folk song style. Among them are epithets: stormy (*bujni*) winds, a black-browed (*čornobryvyj*) sweetheart, just a tiny (*nevelyčka*) little rivulet, a clear (*čyste*) field, tender white (*bilen'ki*) little arms; lexically coordinated compounds: *sriblom-zolotom* (silver-gold), *vynom-medom* (honey wine); repetitions: "*vijut' vitry, vijut' bujni*" ("the winds are blowing, blowing wildly"), "*homin homin po dibrovi*" ("an echoing, echoing through the grove"); and parallelisms: "*Čoho ž voda kalamutna? Čy ne xvylja zbyla? Čoho ž i ja smutna teper? Čy ne maty byla?*" ("Why is the water so troubled? Surely a strong wind must have churned it up? Why too am I now so distressed? Surely, my mother must have beat me, perhaps?"), "*Vijut' vitry . . . O, jak bolyt' moje serce . . .*" ("The winds blow . . . oh, how my heart aches"), "*Tuman pole pokryvaje . . . maty syna prohanjaje*" ("A fog covers the field . . . a mother drives out her son"). There are also snatches of lines from folk songs such as: "*Oj buv, ta nema, ta pojixav do mlyna*" ("Oh, he was here, now he's not, for he has gone to the mill"), "*na poli, na pisočku, bez rosy na sonci . . .*" ("in the sun, on the dewless field and sand . . ."). And in his use of Slavonic verses, Kotljarevs'kyj imitated both the *vertep* tradition as in "*Oj, hore mni hrišnyku sušču*" ("Oh, woe is me, a true sinner") and the Baroque "worldly song": "*Oj dolja ljuds'kaja—dolja jest' slipaja*" ("Oh,

human fate--fate is blind"), dedicated to Dmytro Tuptalo. Another song begins with the Skovorodian "*Vsjakomu horodu nrav i prava*" ("Each city has its own customs and laws"); it continues, however, in a vein that is not only un-Skovorodian but hardly even in the oral folk tradition of the "*lirnyky*."

Thus, no less than *Enejida*, Kotljarevs'kyj's dramatic works are repositories of Ukrainian material. However, the image of folk life conveyed by them is not as vivid as in the *Enejida*. For while the travesty genre of the *Enejida* demanded a certain "uncultivated" quality, the genre of the "comic opera," based on folk life, required "drawing room gentility." Accordingly, Kotljarevs'kyj created plays from peasant life but for the *salon*, and songs which, despite their many folk elements, are really "pseudo-folksongs." Nevertheless, the father of modern Ukrainian literature should not be blamed for this aspect of his work, for the style of his works was determined by the style of his time and by the poetics of Classicism.

3. Kotljarevs'kyj's plays, especially "*Natalka Poltavka*" also contain a definite ideological coloration characteristic of their author—"enlightened humanism." Honesty and goodness triumph over all obstacles, although the obstacles in these plays are not very large. Kotljarevs'kyj's heroes are soft-hearted and sensitive like himself. And insofar as the plays were close to reality, if only for their language (as against the unnatural, non-vernacular language of Russian "comic operas"), they had national significance for they awoke a love for the Ukrainian people. Kotljarevs'kyj himself showed definite affection in his plays although admittedly toward the Ukrainian *paysan* rather than toward the true peasant. Such idealization has prevailed into modern times: no wonder then that even in the twentieth century Vynnyčenko could still write the comedy pamphlet "*Moloda krov*" ("Young Blood").

4. Vasyl' Hohol'-Janovs'kyj (died 1825), the father of Mykola Hohol' (Nikolaj Gogol'), wrote two plays. One, "*Roman ta Paras'ka*" or "*Prostak*" ("*The Simpleton*"), has survived, while the other, "*Sobaka-vivecja*" ("*Dog or Sheep*"), is known only from tradition and quotation. "*Dog or Sheep*" is based on an oral anecdote about a soldier who tricks a peasant by convincing him that an old nag of a horse (in Hohol', a sheep) is not an old nag, but a soldier: "*ne škapa, a moskal*" (in Hohol', a dog). The plot of "*Roman ta Paras'ka*" is a rather complicated variant of "*The Soldier-Sorcerer*" although, unlike Kotljarevs'kyj, Hohol' does not use elements of French *vaudeville*. Hohol' 's play has in some scenes considerably more caricature than has "*The Soldier-Sorcerer*". It also lacks the numerous songs and artificiality of the opera genre and thus is closer to genuine comedy. The most original feature in Hohol' 's works is its "macaronism": operative in "*Dog or Sheep*" because of its main characters, it is

also found in its mixture of various languages—Ukrainian, Russian and Church Slavonic (spoken by Hohol' 's *djak*, the counterpart of Kotljarevs'kyj's Fyntyk). It is this linguistic potpourri that is one of the main stylistic devices used by Hohol' 's son in his early Russian tales. On a theatrical and literary level, "*Roman ta Paras'ka*" is equal to the dramas of Kotljarevs'kyj.

5. A somewhat backward step is represented by Kvitka's Ukrainian opera "*Svatannja na Hončarivci*" ("*Matchmaking in Hončarivka*"). Its plot is primitive—the engagement of a wealthy but dull-witted youth, and it has a happy ending. Again, there is the soldier who dupes the Ukrainians but, this time, to the satisfaction of the heroes. The more than twenty songs are composed in the same way as the various types of musical pieces in "*Natalka Poltavka*." However, they contain fewer folk elements: e.g., the numbers, based on the folk songs "*Čy se ž taja krynyčen'ka*" ("Is This Really the Same Well"), and "*Obmitajte dvory*" ("Sweep Out the Yards"). There is more vulgarism and parody in them: e.g., "*Xarcyzyjaka mene byv*" ("The ugly cut-throat beat me"), "*na kuročci pirjačko rjaboje*" ("the poor chicken with the speckled little feathers"). And, the play's characters are not individualized at all. Such shortcomings cannot be redeemed—either by the play's pleasant (though overly simple) language, or by any of its individually successful features such as its witty "drunkard" motif.

Weaker still is Kvitka's vaudeville "*Boj-žinka*" ("*The Termagant*") whose songs are in part borrowed from Kotljarevs'kyj. In his later plays Ukrainian is used only partially—a demonstration of Kvitka's belief that the Ukrainian language had a limited role in literature, that it was unsuitable for the portrayal of educated people, landowners and even petty officials! Among Kvitka's bilingual Ukrainian-Russian plays are the popular "*Šel'menko—volosnyj pysar*" ("*Šel'menko—the District Clerk*") and "*Šel'menko—denščyk*" ("*Šel'menko—the Orderly*"). These, along with two later Russian plays on the life of Ukrainian gentry, appear to be better constructed. However, even here Kvitka was unable to rise above a fairly primitive brand of comedy.

While the plot of Kvitka's comedy "*Priezžij iz stolicy*" ("*A Visitor from the Capital*") may have inspired Gogol' 's "*Revizor*" ("*Inspector General*") and while "*Šel'menko—the Orderly*" remained in the repertory of the Ukrainian theatre up to the beginning of the twentieth century, the literary and theatrical merits of Kvitka's plays are not very great. It appears that the only reason "*Matchmaking*" is still played today is that it allows for the performance on stage of song and dance.

Also for the stage Kvitka rewrote one of his prose tales "*Ščyra ljubov*" (see below, pt. F, no. 2), it became the first serious Ukrainian drama; unfortunately, its theatrical version did not improve the story, one of Kvitka's weakest. Its

overly "psychological" plot—the renouncing of her own personal happiness by the middle-class heroine (her marriage to an officer—her beloved—so as not to jeopardize his career) precluded the possibility of lively, brisk action. Also, mingled with the serious scenes were scenes of vulgar parody such as the episode of the unsuccessful matchmaking of the functionary-drunkard. In fact, the seriousness itself often descended into melodrama. For these reasons the play, which was published only later, was never performed on stage.

6. In Ukrainian literature the style of "*Natalka Poltavka*," of the comedy-operetta, flourished far too long. It was even found in later plays already displaying certain hints of romantic motifs as well as a romantic attitude toward folk poetry. However, this does not mean that these plays were Romantic; in fact, they remained closely linked to the old classical genre of "comic opera." Such plays include a "*Natalka Poltavka*" set in the Kuban', "*Čornomors'kyj pobut na Kubani*" ("*Life of the Kuban' Kozaks*") by Kuxarenko (1836) and "*Čary*" ("*Sorcery*") by Kyrylo Topolja (1837). The theme of "*Sorcery*," based on the folk song "*Oj, ne xody, Hrycju*" ("Oh, Hryc, Don't Go . . ."), gives rise to a tragic plot which, however, does not compare with the motifs of romantic ballads; also, the folk songs used in this work for the song selections are authentic. Other plays of this type were "*Kupala na Jvana*" ("*St. John's Eve*") by Stephan Pysarevs'kyj (1838, published 1840), and the anonymous operetta written in the 1830s, "*Ljubka, abo svatannja v seli Ryxmax*" ("*Sweetheart, or Matchmaking in the Village of Ryxmy*"), another poor copy of "*Natalka*." These works are imitations, although in the process of vulgarizing their models they emphasized the *ethnographic* elements and to a certain extent, introduced *tragic* situations into the comedies. Plays of this type still appeared on the Ukrainian stage throughout the next decade.

F. PROSE

1. In the history of literature the development of prose often follows that of verse. Ukrainian literature of the nineteenth century adheres to this pattern: during the first half of the century there were relatively few literary works in prose. It is with the stories of Kvitka-Osnovjanenko (1778-1843) that Ukrainian prose begins. Kvitka was a writer of considerable talent but his style set him apart; for all its original artistic devices it was "antiquated," having little relation to contemporary Ukrainian and foreign literatures. He remained, on the whole, within the thematic and stylistic limits of Classicism, although his period of writing coincided with the flowering of Romantic literature—from which he did adopt, perhaps, a few themes and techniques.

Having already written several "old-fashioned" anecdotal stories in Russian, Kvitka, in 1833, began his Ukrainian tales. His first, "*Saldac'kyj patret*" ("Portrait of a Soldier," 1830) was a travesty. Affirmation of the genre is contained in the work's title, "*patret*," a vulgarism, and in its subtitle, "*latyns'ka pobrexen'ka*" (a Latin tall tale), "*po-našomu rozkazana*" ("told in our own words"). The story involves two anecdotes, one about a painter whose works (in particular, a portrait of a soldier) cannot be distinguished from their live subjects. The other is about a cobbler who, having pointed up the artist's flaws in his rendering of boots, proceeds to criticize the clothing portrayed in his painting; he is rebuked: "*Švec' znaj svoje ševstvo, a v kravectvo ne mišajsja*" ("Cobbler, stick to your own trade and do not interfere with the tailor's"). Woven into the story is a description of a market that is rich in parody.

As well as such travesties, Kvitka wrote caricatures, using another form typical of Classicism—the anecdotal sketch. These stories were constructed on the basis of popular anecdotes: "*Parximove snidannja*" ("Parxim's Breakfast," 1841) is an anecdote about a fool who bought horseradish for breakfast—"*Bačyly oči, ščo kupuvaly, jizte, xoč povylaz'te*" ("Eyes, [you] see what you bought; eat it up though you may pop out of your sockets"). "*Pidbreač*" ("The Liar's Helper," 1843) involves a matchmaker who exaggerates not only the positive but even the negative characteristics of the young suitor. "*Na puščannja-jak zavjazano*" ("How to Do it Up Right During the Fast," 1841) relates an attempt to consume enough food all at once to last the entire Lenten period. "*Kupovanyj rozum*" ("Purchased Intelligence," 1842) is an anecdote about a schoolboy who loses his mind completely as a result of having to attend school in a foreign land. The genre outlived Classicism—to be retained in the works of Romantics (Storoženko), Realists (Nečuj-Levyč'kyj), and later, *feuilleton* writers, as well as in other literatures (for example, the impressionist Chekhov). Even elements of the "coarse" language found in Kvitka survived for a long time.

The themes of three of Kvitka's tales were borrowed from the tradition of popular legends. "*Mertvec'kyj Velykden*" ("Easter of the Dead," 1833) is based on the superstition that Easter Mass is celebrated for the dead by a priest who is also deceased. The popular belief is "explained" as the experience of a drunk peasant and is transposed from Easter Day to the first day of Lent and the ritual of rinsing the mouth. "*Konotops'ka vid'ma*" ("The Witch of Konotop," 1837) recounts how a Cossack captain and a clerk drowned witches in a pond. "*Ot tobi i skarb*" ("What a Treasure!" 1837) tells the story of Xoma Masljak who, having squandered his fortune in a search for treasure, decides to sell his soul to the devil; and during his rendezvous with Satan he swears an oath. But it is to no avail for he gets caught on some thorns and when he is rescued he recounts his

adventures and dies. Kvitka made substantial alterations to these legends which he regarded as expressions of popular ignorance; for him they become mere anecdotes. This was at a time when works were already appearing in Russian treating this same Ukrainian material aesthetically (e.g., stories of N. Gogol'); not only was it presented in an engaging form but it was permeated with the spirit of Romanticism. According to this world view, these traditional themes were the deepest expression of the national soul. Later, these same superstitions were given new and symbolic significance by Ševčenko [see below, "*Vid'ma*" ("The Witch")] and the treasures in "*Velykij l'ox*" ("The Great Vault"). Kvitka's attitude toward popular beliefs was one of typically enlightened disregard and even scorn.

Kvitka's moralistic stories must be considered next. The most typical of them, "*Dobre roby—dobre j bude*" ("As You Sow, So Shall You Reap," 1837), depicts the ideal peasant, Tyxon Brus, who singlehandedly saves his whole community from starvation—a story modelled perhaps on Karamzin's "*Flor Silin*." "*Perekotypole*" ("The Feathergrass," 1843) is a tale about a murder in the steppe and about its disclosure by a clump of feathergrass called by the dead man to witness against the murderer. The disturbing recollection of his victim's dead body, provoked by the confrontation with the feathergrass last seen in the dead man's fist, leads the murderer to confess [a variant of the famous plot from Schiller's ballad "*Die Kraniche des Ibykus*" ("The Cranes of Ibykus")]. "*Kozyr-divka*" ("A Lively Wench," 1838) is the story of a girl of such spirit that in her bid to free her fiancé from an unlawful charge she petitions the highest authorities "*až do gubernatora*" ("right up to the governor himself")—a motif perhaps derived from Puškin's "*Kapitanskaja dočka*" ("The Captain's Daughter").

The transition to "tragic" content is marked by "*Serdešna Oksana*" ("Poor Oksana," 1841), the story of a peasant girl who is seduced and abandoned. The tale reminds one of Ševčenko's "*Kateryna*," a work written at almost the same time, although quite independently. The heroine of Kvitka's story displays considerable moral strength which enables her to save herself as well as her child. In the same vein is "*Boži dity*" ("God's Children," 1840) the story of two children adopted by a compassionate neighbor after their parent's death. One of them becomes a soldier, serving as an officer during the 1831 Polish uprising, and later marries happily.

Two tales with tragic endings form a separate group: they are nevertheless closely related to the stories of preceding groups through their general tone and idealized heroes. They are "*Marusja*" (1833) and "*Sčyra ljubov*" ("Sincere Love," first Russian version 1839), another work whose plot Kvitka rendered in

dramatic form (its Ukrainian text appearing later). The heroine of "Sincere Love," a girl from a middle class family, refuses to marry her beloved, an officer, so as not to harm his career, then pines away with grief and dies. In "*Marusja*" the heroine dies during the absence of her fiancé; the fiancé thereupon enters a monastery. The mood of both extremely sentimental stories is quite different from that of Kvitka's moralistic tales. However, the narrative tone is the same—broad and tranquil: their sad endings notwithstanding, the final chords of both stories are those of reconciliation, affirming faith in the life after death.

2. All of Kvitka's works are distinguished by considerable artistic skill. The plots are simple; apart from their various complications and the narrator's digressions (see below), they remain in each story the focus for the entire tale. There is quite a variety of characters, but with a preponderance of idealized figures, some of whom are far too exalted and some of whom are simply "good folk" with no trace of unusual heroism. Kvitka's talent for portraying good folk or "positive types" recalls that of some later writers such as Marko Vovčok and the Russian Leskov. At times his storytelling ability is incomparable: he narrates on a broad scale pausing to include those details which conform to his taste for ethnographic description and the *minutiae* of *pobut*. The inner experience of the characters are often conveyed through external details: "*Hirko-hirko zaplakav*" ("He wept bitter bitter tears"), "*Blidnyj—blidnyj, . . . oči, mov u mertvoho dyvljat'sja j ne bačut' ničoho; ruky nače sudorohy pokorčyly, a sam jak lyst trusyt'sja*" ("He was pale as a ghost . . . his eyes, like a dead man's, gazed out but saw nothing; his hands were contorted as if seized by convulsions, and he himself shook like a leaf"); "*Ruky j nohy zatrusylsja, u žyvoli poxololo, i dux znajavs', a sam ni z mısca*" ("His arms and legs began to tremble, he felt a cold sensation in his stomach, he lost his breath and he froze in his tracks")—describing the awakening of love; "*Zdryhnuv kripko, nače jomu xto snihu za spynu nasypav*" ("He shuddered from head to toe as if someone had put snow down his back"); "*T'oxnulo v žyvoli*" ("There was a flutter in his stomach").

All of Kvitka's tales are constructed as actual accounts not of the author but of some particular, although otherwise non-characterized, narrator (known in Russian as the *skaz* narrator)*. From time to time the storyteller expresses his opinion: "*Ta sčō j kazaty*" ("What more can be said"), "*Hospody! jak povalyv narod . . .*"; ("Lord! what a crowd there was . . ."), "*Toj rušnyk . . . ta sčō to vže*

*"Skaz" style is the attempt to write in the name of a fictitious author; its language recalls that of actual storytelling, systematically employing features of conversational style. "Skaz" assumed its greatest importance during the period of Realism when it was also practiced by a few Ukrainian writers. It did not, however, acquire its theoretical base until more recent times.

harno vyšytyj buv!" ("What a towel . . . was it ever beautifully embroidered!"). He says in an aside "*O bodaj tobi,*" ("Oh, how could you!"), etc.; or he interrupts himself: "*Kete lyšen' tabaky!*" ("Only give me enough tobacco"), "*Til'ky u neji i na dumci ščo . . . til'ky xotiv bulo rozkazaty, ob čim naša xorunživna dumala, . . . taž os' i pryšla do neji babusja*" ("What she was thinking about was that . . . I only wanted to relate to you what was on our heroine's mind . . . and then her granny came into the room"). The narrator may suffer a temporary lapse of memory about something: "*Buv . . . jakys' maljar . . . os' na umi motajet'sja, jak joho zvaly, ta ne zhadaju . . .*" ("There was this painter . . . his name is somewhere in my head but I just can't think of it . . ."); a page later it will have come to him: "*Te, te, te, teper zhadav*" ("Yes, yes, yes, now I remember"). This, of course, increases the impression of authenticity conveyed by the story. Kvitka's storyteller, "the fictitious author," is—although denied further characterization—supposed to be a simple, apparently uneducated fellow, little concerned with moralizing (see below). And, all the characters—except for a few landowners (who, on occasion, even speak Russian) and the rare clerk, ensign or captain—are peasants, either poor or rich.

Accordingly it is this standard, set by the narrator, which determines both the language and style of the stories. The style is broad, encompassing reports of events and, at times, extended tableaux of folk scenes and customs such as the market, Easter, breaking the Lenten fast, weddings, matchmaking, "little graves," funerals, spell-casting, etc. The occasional accounts of superstitions are treated with irony, as if they were mere anecdotes. On the whole, the language is fairly homogeneous although individual instances of word games à la Kotljarevskyj are to be found. The devils in hell speak French; the peasants fracture the Russian language ("*uhomonna palata,*" "*projixsodytel'stvo*") as does the narrator himself: "*prokljatyj kompot*" instead of "*kapot*" (damned compote, instead of confounded housecoat). Following the tradition of *vertep* and of "*The Soldier-Sorcerer*," is the "learned" clerk's "Slavonic." It is florid beyond measure: "*Voždelinnogo umoizstuplenija, za dnevnym mistoprebyvanijem, vam, pane sotnyku, utreusugubljajemo.*" Russian usage is caricatured in the spurious form, "*jiskajes.*" Songs are also found ("*Marusja*") as well as proverbs and sayings such as "*Švec', snaj svoje ševstvo . . .*" ("Cobbler, stick to what you know") and "*Jižte oči . . .*" ("Eat up, you eyes . . ."). The phraseology contains such folk material: "*Napik rakiv*" ("He turned red with shame"), "*bil's kopy lyxa ne narobljat'*" ("They can't cause much greater misfortune"), "*Xoč do sto bab ne xody*" ("Don't even consult a hundred old women"), "*povernuty u Brexunivku*" ("to return to Liars' Town"). The comparisons too are the popular type: "*Dyvyt'sja . . . očycjamy, odnym u Kyjev, a druhym u Bilhorod*" ("He

gazes . . . with one eye toward Kiev, and the other toward Bilhorod”), “*Rozlyvajut’sja jak ta rička*” (“They are overflowing, like that little rivulet”), “*Nače joho xto trjoma kožuxamy vkryv*” (“It was as though some one had covered him up with three sheepskins”), etc. Popular anecdotes are also used (for example, in “There’s a Treasure . . . !”) as well as favorite traditional anecdotal situations such as the conversation of the brave young woman (“*kozyr-divka*”) and the judge who does not understand Ukrainian.

The language is vernacular; the occurrence of vulgarisms is much rarer, however, even in the anecdotal stories, than in Kotljarevs’kyj. Nevertheless, they are to be found—often in serious context where they create an extraordinarily incongruous effect. Some examples are “*patret včēše*” (“he dashes off a portrait”), “*povedencija*” (conduct), “*šljatys*” (“you gad about”), “*švendjaty*” (“to roam about”), “*Molodycja harna, ne uzjav jiji kat*” (“The devil take it but she is a beautiful woman!”), “*Vesillja udraly*” (“They forced their way into the wedding celebrations”), “*ljapasa po mordi daty*” (“to give a slap across the face”), “*Včystyv hramotu*” (“He did away with the document”), “*utne*” (“strike up [re: church chants]”), “*molotyty*” (“to thrash away”—referring to eating), “*učyste po uxu*” (“he boxes him across the ears”), “*mota varenyky*” (“he devours the varenyky”), “*čēše*” (“he dashes off”), “*škvaryty*” (“to beat”—[literally, to roast]). As well, there are rare words such as “*tymfa*” (meaning *pynxva*—coarse jest), a favorite of Kotljarevs’kyj; diminutives including even “*serdyten’ko*” (“in a little bit of a tiff”); and dialectal forms (from the Xarkiv area): “*mota*” instead of *motaje* (dissipates) and “*učyste*” instead of *včystyt’* (disposes). Short verbal forms abound: *sip*, *hul’k*, *fit’-fit’*, *čerk*, *pljus’*, *šelest’*, *berkyc’*, *zyrk*, *šarax*, *dryb-dryb-dryb*, *xrjap*, *ljap*, etc. Invectives also occur, although they are rare and always quite refined. Yet, on the whole, Kvitka does approach a kind of normalization of language albeit at the “low” level of peasant speech (a result, perhaps, of the peasant themes of his stories). While it was unsuitable for depicting city life and educated society, much less for use in the high genres, the language of Kvitka was, potentially, more compatible with a “complete literature” than that of all other writers of the Classicist period.

Kvitka’s lexicon, however, is inferior to Kotljarevs’kyj’s. Here and there descriptions of garb, food, beverages may be found which require a complex vocabulary, but such instances are few. The following, for example, are accounts of the beverages at a Black Sabbath.

*Bulo i rens’ke, bulo i dons’ke, včō po četvertaku
butylka; buly usjakiji vyna, i červone, i žovte; buly*

*pljašky i zasmoljuvani i drotom pozaplitovani;
 bula i vyšnivka, i ternivka, i dulivka, bulo i
 pyvo kabac'ke, tak, deševen'ke, dlja usjakocho rozxodu,
 ta buv i hruševyj kvas, vže spytyj. A usjaki horilky
 okremo stojaly; ta i do bisa ž jix tam bulo!
 Bula i pinna, i poluharna, i zapikanka, i polyn'kova,
 i korinkova, i na kalhan, i na sosnovi šyšky hnata . . .*

*Pyv maderu, šataj-morhaj, šataj-na-xvist, rejeveje, barbos'ke,
 šalpans'ku i porčene pyvo.*

("There was both Rhenish wine and some from the Don, at a quarter of a karbovanets' a bottle; there were all kinds of wines, both red and white; there were little flasks sealed with tar and some with braided wire; there was cherry brandy, and blackberry liqueur and pear cordial, there was also tavern beer and so cheap that everyone could afford it, then too there was pear *kvas*, now quite weak. And over to one side stood all kinds of brandy; and what a devil of a lot of them there were! There was brandy and a half gallon, and spiced whisky and absinthe, and spiced brandy distilled from galingale and pine cones. . . He drank madeira, some "sway and wink," some "shake your bottom," a dog's drink, champagne and foul beer.")

As the excerpts show, Kvitka progresses from the material of an ethnographic compilation to a parody of the corrupted peasant language.

3. It is difficult to determine the basic sources of Kvitka's style. To a large extent, it appears that Kvitka was an original writer without models or sources. Relatively speaking, his writing was a belated phenomenon. While he was familiar with Romantic literature, his only borrowings from it (from Gogol', for example) were minor motifs and, to a certain degree perhaps, its interest in ethnographic details. Moreover, his attitude toward folk life did not in any way resemble the ideological infatuation typical of Romantics. Kvitka recounts everything in an epic fashion, even when he is enthusiastic over something specific, such as the beauty of folk clothing. For, in the common people he was seeking not that which was peculiarly Ukrainian, but that which was universal. Still less did he believe that popular customs and superstitions contained any sort of profound meaning. His perspective on the world was characteristic of the

Enlightenment—from above. This attitude may even be detected in the *skaz* of his narrator, although he is a peasant himself.

Kvitka's attempts at historical writing were in Russian. Two examples—"Golovatyj" (1839) and "*Tatarskie nabegi*" ("Tatar Raids," 1844)—reveal that he treated Ukrainian history as if it too were anecdotal material. This, again, was typical for Classicism. Kvitka's adaptations from Russian Sentimentalism (see Ch. XI) were few. In the latter's "philanthropic" strain in particular (represented by Dostoevskij's early stories of the 1840s), it brought to the forefront the figure of the "sensitive" and "tearful" author and hence was the opposite of Kvitka's epic narrative. The simple plots of Kvitka's historical stories were old, in part (see above).

The folk tale genre was not a new phenomenon. It had influenced the later attempts by George Sand, B. Auerbach, Grigorovič and Turgenev, along with the later attempts of the "natural" school (see Ch. XIII). In fact, the writings of Kvitka's Russian contemporaries, M. Pogodin, Dal' and Gogol' resemble his own: even Kvitka's *skaz* technique may be explained, to some degree, through their influence. As for the depiction of bourgeois, merchant life—it had already been undertaken by the Classicist of Russian literature: V. Lukin, "*Ščepetil'nik*" ("The Punctilious One," 1765); M. Čulkov, "*Peresemešnik*" ("The Scoffer," 1789); Ivan Novikov, *Poxoždenie Ivana, gostinnogo syna* (*The Adventures of Ivan, the Innkeeper's Son*, 1785-86), and some articles in N. Novikov's satirical journals, 1772-74); P. Plavilšykov, the comedies "*Bobył'*" ("*The Landless Peasant*") and "*Sidelec*" (published in his collected works, 1816), and, on the threshold of Sentimentalism, A. Radiščev's "*Putešestvie*" ("Journey [from Petersburg to Moscow]," 1790, and even his "anonymous" articles, 1772). Whether Kvitka was actually familiar with many of the works of this tradition is unimportant. The fact that he began his career as a Russian writer indicates that he was interested in Russian literature. As such, he also could have been acquainted with Western European experiments in the "peasant novel"—for example, in German literature, those of I. H. Pestalozzi (1781), and of H. Zschokke (1823), the idylls of W. Miller and the Alemanian poems of J. P. Hebel (translated into Russian by Žukovskij), etc. From works such as these, Kvitka might also have learned about the serious treatment of folk themes and the serious use of the vernacular.

This does not, however, diminish Kvitka's reputation and importance as a writer who towered as far above his predecessors of the eighteenth century as Kotljarevskij towered above Osipov. He created his own style—although within the bounds of the classical tradition of the folk tale. For Kvitka was a "belated" Classicist, writing at a time when Ukraine was becoming profoundly

"provincial," lagging behind Russian "centers" by about ten years. And because of this he was able to extend his hand to the first representatives of Realism which, in some respects, harked back to Classicism.

4. Kvitka's tales are of note from the ideological point of view as well. Because he remained within the religious, Christian tradition of Classicism, Kvitka, far more than his spiritual kin Kotljarevs'kyj, was able to give vivid representation in his stories to the fundamental ideas of his world view. Christianity is thus embellished with practicality as Kvitka preaches a "Christian humanism": "*Brat naš—usjak čolovik, xoč z našoho sela, xoč z druhoho, xoč z horoda, xoč nimec, xoč turok, use čolovik, use bože sozdanije*" ("Every man is our brother, whether he be from our village or from another, or from the city, whether he be a German or a Turk, he is still a man, still a creation of God"). In this world all of us are "*taki ž hosti, jak ty i usjak čolovik—čy car, čy pan, čy arxyjerej, saldat čy lyčman*" ("guests, the same as you and every man whether he be tsar, master, bishop, soldier or old shepherd"). This tendency later gained for Kvitka the sympathy of the "populists" among Romantics and Realists alike. Less attention was given to the frequent strains of Christian moralism: in almost every story Kvitka earnestly presents some kind of "moral," some useful teaching. This feature sharply distinguishes him from the Romantics for whom poetry is its own end.

Kvitka may also touch upon Christian dogma as in "*Marusja's*" final chord of reconciliation "*Day Hospody myloserdnyj, ščob ty tam znajšov svoju Marusju*" ("May merciful God help you find your Marusja in the other world"). He may allude to a Christian moral as in "Sincere Love": "*Ja spolnyla samyj svjatišyj zakon Joho: dušu moju položyla za moho druha, ščob vidvernuty vid n'oho hore! Sebe ne zmohla, ne združala zberehty . . . Ja staralasja . . . ne zmohla . . . ja čolovik*" ("I fulfilled His [God's] most sacred commandment; I sacrificed my soul for my friend to save him from woe! Myself, I was unable, I did not have the power to save. . . I tried . . . I failed . . . I am human"), or in "The Feathergrass": "*Tak-to sud Božyj ne poterpiv nepravdy; i xoč jak kinci buly zaxovani, tak Boh objavyv*" ("In this way, Divine Justice did not suffer falsehood; and even though the traces were hidden, God revealed the truth"). Sometimes the moral is quite primitive as in "The Liar's Helper," "*Duže nedobre dilo brexaty*" ("It is a very bad thing to lie"). Most often the "moral" is set forth in general terms at the beginning or the end of the story and in the same language as the tale itself. Interestingly, Kvitka at the outset of "Sincere Love" even ventures an exposition of Aristophanes' theory of love from Plato's *Symposium*. And in "What a Treasure!" the description of hell borders on parody and seems inspired by E. Swedenborg.

Clearly, Kvitka was a "tendentious" writer. Occasionally, however, this propensity was carried to extremes, outweighing the artistic aspirations of a work, and eventually spoiling it, as in "As You Sow, So Shall You Reap" and in many places in other works. In "*Marusja*" for example, the heroine delivers a harangue against evening parties! Kvitka's exaggeration and "idealization" know no bounds. At times, the style used in the depiction of his heroes is so excessively lofty that the characters almost seem like caricatures. In fact, for *Marusja* and *Haločka* ("Sincere Love") the descriptions of both their exterior appearance and spiritual nature approach parody.

The morality preached by Kvitka is almost exclusively universal. Only infrequently is there a hint of anything resembling national sentiment such as "*Xiba treba soromytysja svoho rodu!*" ("How is it possible to be ashamed of one's origins!"). Topical satire is also infrequent. A rare example is the sharp, witty account in "*A Lively Wench*" of contemporary judicial practice, or rather malpractice. Surprisingly, Kvitka, despite such moral sensitivity, could also portray scenes of cruelty, sometimes without any trace whatever of human feeling. One such instance, a witch-drowning, which proves fatal for some of the victims, is followed by the remark "*Tut jij i amin'*" ("And it was curtains for her"). Then, the casual narrative report "*Kotru vtopyly, a kotru vidvolaly*" ("Some women they drowned and others they rescued"), and an utterance by one of the meekest peasants "*Spoločit' moju žinku . . .*" ("Give my wife a scare . . ."). Hence, it appears that in his works, Kvitka's "morality" was both too strictly preached and imperfectly practiced. If it were not for this "tendentiousness" (another old-fashioned, non-Romantic trait), Kvitka, of all his contemporaries, would be the writer closest to our own times.

5. As a publicist, Kvitka's writings are limited to the preface to "Portrait of a Soldier" entitled "*Suplika do pana izdatelja*" ("Supplication to Mr. Editor") and the brief "*Lysty do ljubeznych zemljakiv*" ("Letters to My Dear Countrymen," 1839).

Both articles demonstrate even more forcefully than his stories the inadequacy of his stylistic and linguistic devices to the task of creating a modern literature. The "Supplication" (1833) is written in the style of travesty: "*nexaj že znajut' i našyx*" ("let them know our people too"), "*konponuje*" ("he is composed of"), "*navernjakaly*" (to constantly say "probably"), "*zakolupne za dušu*" ("it pricks the soul"), "*kyšky boljat' vid smixu*" ("his guts hurt from laughing"). Such phraseology hardly supports the idea that the Ukrainian language could "produce" (*vtjaty*) a work that would be "both ordinary and tender, clever and useful." The "Letters," aimed at the masses, was an attempt to popularize certain concepts about the tsarist regime. While it sustained a

serious tone on the surface, it remained at a very primitive level: "*Ne ležy: sjudy-tudy motnysja, sokyркоj porubaj, cipkom pomaxaj, skotyńkoju poroby, ot v tebe vpjat' hrošyky*" ("Never rest, bustle about here and there, hack away with your hatchet, swing your club, work like a horse, now you've got a few coins again"). In this work Kvitka presents some fine paraphrases from fables as well as an excellent portrait of a drunkard:

*Pyka jomu nevmyta ta . . . podrjapana, volossja rozkudovčene,
šapky kat-ma! . . . Xoč i pidperezanyj, tak odyń kinec' tak
i voločyťsja za nym; soročka rozxrystana, a časom i porvana,
jak i svytyna; spyna vsja u hlyni, odyń čobit na nozi,
a druhyj, jak spav vin u šynku, tak znjato . . .*

("His mug was dirty and scratched; his hair dishevelled and he had no hat at all! . . . And though he did wear a belt, one end of it dragged along behind him; his shirt was unbuttoned to the waist and even torn in places; so was his jacket; his back was all muddy, he had one shoe on, the other had been pulled off when he was sleeping in the tavern. . . .")

However, this language, even though slightly more serious, has only a limited function. The ideology of the "Letters" is, like that of the later Gogol', reactionary. Nevertheless, it also contains the thought that "*Ne vse ž dlja moskaliv, može treba i dlja nas ščonebud*" ("Not everything is for the Russians; perhaps we deserve to have something too"). In a letter to Maksymovyč, Kvitka declared that it was imperative to write in that language "which is spoken by ten million people and which has its own charms which cannot be expressed in another language, its own phraseology, humor, irony and everything else which a proper language should have." Kvitka's prose, as the highest achievement of the "old school" of Ukrainian literature in the vernacular, itself demonstrates the need for some sort of new ideology which would raise Ukrainian to the level of other "proper" languages.

Kvitka also translated a few texts from the Scriptures for Sreznevskij's *Slov'jans'ka čytanka (Slavonic Reader)*. These excerpts (including the Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the beginning of the Gospel According to St. John), constituted Kvitka's first attempts at high language. Apparently, he never began work on a planned *Istoriya Ukrajiny (History of Ukraine)*.

6. Among the prose efforts of others, the writing of Hulak-Artemovskij is worth mentioning: e.g., his travestied ode *Deščo pro toho Haras'ka (A Note*

About That Horace) for which he provided only the parody introduction “*Vono to bač, po našomu Haras’ko, a po-moskovs’ky Horacij—O! vže vony xoč ščo,—perekoversajut’ po-svojemu*” (“You see, we say Haras’ko, but in Russian it’s Horace—Oh! no matter what it is—they twist it to their own way”). In this same style he wrote “*Pysul’ka do redaktora Ukrajins’koho Hincja*” (“A Note to the Editor of the *Ukrainian Messenger*”) which contains not only vulgar witticisms (the confusion of “*latyns’kyj*” [Latin] with “*lytvyns’kyj*” [Lithuanian]), but also a lexicon in the same style as that used for the travesty of the Odes of Horace. Instead of *hovoryty* (to speak), there are the verbs: *brjaznuty* (to make a jingling sound), *verzty* (to babble), *rozdabarjuvaty* (to digress), *papljaty* (to prattle); for writing verses—the terms *najalozyty* (to grease), *perom nadrygaty* (to jerk with the pen), *bazhraty* (to scribble). The phraseology consists of examples such as: “*Jaka vže tam u xrina robota*” (“What kind of work could there be”); “*Rodymi šče ne povylazyly*” (“The birthmarks haven’t yet appeared”); “*A tam sxovajus’ v domovynu ta j pokažu jim z-za pazuxy ot-taky zdorovec’ku dulju*” (“I’ll hide there in the grave and from within my coffin I’ll flash them a royal fig sign like this”). Naturally, in a language such as this nothing could be written except travesty. It is interesting that the Romantic Hrebinka, in his articles in Ukrainian [the preface and afterword to *Lastivka* (*The Swallow*), 1841], employed a style of the same level, although of a different tone (sentimental-idyllic): “*Už ja tak dumaju, ščo nema i na sviti kraščoho miscja, jak Poltav’s’ka hubernija*” (“I firmly believe that there is no place on earth more beautiful than the province of Poltava”). After praising Ukrainian maidens and Pyryatyn buns (a passage, reminiscent in its context of Kotljarevs’kyj) Hrebinka bids goodbye to his simple countrymen with farewell wishes such as “*Ščob vynnyci davaly nam z kožnoho puda vidro pinnoji horilky*” (“May the vineyards give us a bucket full of brandy for each pound of our weight”). Clearly, among prose writings of the same level, it is Kvitka’s tales with their stylistic peculiarities and serious language which are to be preferred.

G. THE NATURE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF UKRAINIAN LITERARY CLASSICISM

1. The literature of Ukrainian Classicism heralded Ukraine’s literary rebirth, and, to a certain limited extent, its national awakening. In every instance, the authors of this period began to use the vernacular consistently for the first time—although not usually in serious works or high genres. The practice was undertaken partly as a diversion and partly in imitation of foreign literatures which relegated to the low genres (travesty, grotesque, burlesque) those dialects

and languages which did not yet have their own literatures, e.g., the Italian dialects and the Provençal language. Politically and culturally the period of Classicism was the time of Ukraine's greatest national decline. It was not that the process of denationalization had itself progressed very far, but that it embraced precisely that group of people who, in times such as these, should have been the leaders of its cultural life: the nobility and the higher clergy. As a result, Ukraine was "incomplete" as a nation.

Its literature was likewise incomplete. At the head of its established genres stood the mock-heroic poem, the comic opera, the travestied ode, and, among the more "legitimate" categories, the tale and fable. The characteristically classical high style was represented only by the paraphrases of the Psalms by Hulak-Artemovs'kyj (whose writings were, in any case, an anachronism, appearing at a time when the ideology of Romanticism was already beginning to prevail). Even the venerable category of satire, to which transition easily could have been made from travesty, did not exist! Creditable efforts in the serious ode, epic and tragedy were all lacking. Because this incomplete literature could not possibly satisfy all intellectual interests, it was relegated to the status of an appendage to other literatures.

2. Another symptom of national decline was the appearance of "Ukrainian" works in foreign languages. Admittedly, there are only a few examples of the phenomenon: in the Polish poem "*Sofijówka*" by S. Trembecki (1735-1811), there is a description of the Ukrainian landscape. Ukraine is treated fleetingly by J. U. Niemcewicz (1758-1841) in his *Śpiewy historyczne* (*Historical Songs*, 1816) and by T. Swencki (1774-1837) in his "*Opis starożytnej Polski*" ("A Description of Ancient Poland"), as well as by N. Muśnicki (1765-1806) in *Pułtawa* (1805).

The most representative writing of this type was done, however, by Ukrainians themselves. Among the first was Vasyl' Narižnyj (1780-1825), a native of Myrhorod. He was a talented writer of Russian novels that were at least twenty years out of date in literary terms. Following the style and pattern of the Classicist adventure novel (with very insignificant elements from Russian Sentimentalism), they portrayed characters who were predominantly Ukrainian types. *Rossijskij Žil' Blaz* (*A Russian Gil Blas*, 1814) includes not only a Ukrainian milieu, but even Skovoroda. Other works were completely dedicated to Ukraine: the moralizing, didactic novel *Aristion* (1822), the historical adventure *Bursak* (*The Seminarian*, 1824), the "*pobutova*" comedy *Dva Ivana* (*Two Ivans*, 1825) and the unfinished historical novel *Garkuša*. Also of interest is *Slovenski večera* (*Slavic Evenings*, 1809-1819), a collection of fictional tales dealing with the ancient princely era of Ukraine. Narižnyj's works occupied an

important position in Russian literature of that time exerting certain influence on N. Gogol'.

The Russian language works of Kvitka deserve mention. Besides the translations of his Ukrainian tales, he published numerous stories in Russian (most of which were stylistically antiquated) as well as the popular novel *Pan Xaljav's'kyj* (1840). His old-style comedies remained in theatrical repertoires until the twentieth century: among the most notable were *Šel'menko pisar* (*Šel'menko—the Clerk*, 1831) and *Šel'menko denščik* (*Šel'menko—the Orderly*, 1840) in which the role of Šel'menko is played in Ukrainian throughout. In the field of light comedy, a few rather weak comedies based on Ukrainian life were written by Prince A. Šaxovskij, a belated Russian Classicist, but without any knowledge of the Ukrainian language or way of life. His most famous work, *Kazak stixotvorec* (*The Cossack Poet*), performed in 1812 and published in 1815, had contributed to the staging of *Natalka Poltavka*. In the early nineteenth century during the brief period of Russian Sentimentalism, there appeared a number of accounts of journeys through Ukraine which were of interest partly because of their material on folk customs. Well received by readers of the day, these travel accounts included those of V. Izmajlov (1800-1802), Prince P. Šalikov (1803-1804), I. Dolgorukov (1810), the Xarkovite I. Vernet (ten articles, 1816-1819), and A. Levšin (1816). In this same style were the sketches, novels and tales written in the 1820s and 1830s (published in the 1850s) by the teacher of Gogol' and Hrebinka, I. Kul'žynskij; his writings probably contain more ethnographic material than those of all his contemporaries. The true flowering of the "Ukrainian school" in Russian literature, however, came only with Romanticism (see Ch. XII, pt. C).

3. Unlike Classicism in other literatures, Ukrainian Classicism did not disappear from the consciousness of Ukrainian society. For, in the first place, Ukrainian Classicism was "incomplete" and therefore "untypical" (later, it was not even understood to have been Classicism). Second, it was this period that introduced the Ukrainian vernacular into literature. Because of this accomplishment even its enemies, the Romantics and the Realists, either praised Classicism or became reconciled to it. It was also pardoned for its feeble national consciousness (enlightened Classicism tended toward cosmopolitanism) and its arrogant and disdainful attitude toward the common people. It is for these reasons that the traditions of "Kotljarevščyna" thrived in Ukrainian literature for such a long time. While the danger of travesty tradition was keenly sensed by a few Romantics (Kuliš), it survived nevertheless—right up to the present day.

4. Whereas the Ukrainian Baroque had penetrated national boundaries and fertilized the literature of several neighboring countries, Ukrainian Classicism

forfeited all its spheres of influence on foreign literatures. Even in the "Ukrainian schools" it was not Ukrainian *literature* which influenced these foreign literatures but Ukrainian life. One exception was Belorussia whose modern literature began with a Belorussian reworking of Kotljarevs'kyj's *Enejida* (prior to 1845).

XI.

UKRAINIAN SENTIMENTALISM

1. Certain works examined in the preceding section, primarily the tales of Kvitka, as well as *Natalka Poltavka*, have sometimes been regarded by scholars as "sentimental." The term has been used not in the psychological meaning of the word, but in its historico-literary sense, as a particular literary current (Zerov) and related to the Russian Sentimentalist school of Karamzin.

The Karamzinian school, a specifically Russian phenomenon, numbered among its attributes a linguistic reform. According to it, linguistic variants used in certain literary genres either fell into decline or were abolished altogether. The literary genres themselves remained the same as those prevalent in Classicism. However, the genres which the Sentimentalists cultivated (poetic letter or epistle [*poslannja*], idyll, travel account) were different from those preferred by the Classicists: the ode, for example, fell into disuse, although tragedy was maintained by the Sentimentalist Ozerov. Moreover, the ideology of Russian Sentimentalism was different, reflecting the influences of the various forms (although not the basic ideas) of Western "Preromanticism," including that of the bourgeois novel. The combination of all these elements into a viable whole was the personal accomplishment of Karamzin and a few of his followers.

2. It is impossible to apply the characteristics of the Russian Sentimentalist school to Kvitka, or, to a lesser degree, to Kotljarevs'kyj. Some of Kvitka's stories are of the travesty anecdote type—"Portrait of a Soldier," "Purchased Intelligence," "Parxim's Breakfast," "The Liar's Helper"—and are written in a style totally alien to the sentimental tradition. Other stories are characterized by sensibility and tender scenes but they too lack a sentimental style—the sensitive depiction of events together with the subjective impressions of the author

himself (e.g., exclamations of “*ax!*” and “*uvy!*”). They bear no trace of Preromantic gloom (Ossianism), nor of the Karamzinian device of “periphrasis” (“diurnal light” instead of “sun,” “this noble animal” instead of “horse”), nor any detailed ironic descriptions (Sterne’s influence on the Karamzinian school). Perhaps the only feature linking Kvitka with Russian Sentimentalism is a love for moral maxims: a trait also common to Classicism. Although the same type of Christian world view is shared by Kvitka and some Russian Sentimentalists, this does not establish *literary* affinity. If anything, Kvitka’s moralism is more characteristic of the pre-Karamzinian era.

Kvitka’s type of story—smoothly flowing, with fully rounded images and precision of expression—is (although somewhat primitive) entirely in the tradition of Classicist prose. Nor does Kvitka’s independent discovery of material from peasant life in any way connect him with Russian Sentimentalism where this sort of subject did not exist. As for Kvitka’s sensibility, it was more likely influenced by the Ukrainian national character and folk song tradition. The sentimental elements in Kotljarevs’kyj are even more closely tied to this tradition, although here possible influences from Russian Sentimentalism should not be completely discounted.

3. Having brought about a linguistic and stylistic reform of Russian literature, Russian Sentimentalism, although not a widespread trend, rightly deserves delineation as a separate section in Russian literary history. In the history of Ukrainian literature, however, it is impossible to create a separate literary current out of a few works by Kvitka and a single work of Kotljarevs’kyj. If Kvitka and Kotljarevs’kyj really were subject in some small degree to the influence of Russian Sentimentalism or corresponding Western trends, it is probable that they themselves were not aware of any difference at all between these currents and their own. Such was their basis in the classical literary tradition. Similarly, neither did Hulak-Artemovs’kyj or Bilec’kyj-Nosenko realize, in paraphrasing the ballads of Bürger and Goethe, that these works belonged to a genre totally foreign to their own Classicist poetics. Given therefore that the degree of differentiation in Ukrainian literature of this period was so slight, it behooves literary historians to refrain from exaggerating it, trying to create various classifications for only a handful of poets.

XII.

ROMANTICISM

A. LITERARY ROMANTICISM

1. Romanticism in literature was a literary current which arose in Germany at the end of the eighteenth century and gradually overtook the literature of all Europe. It is difficult to give a scholarly definition of Romanticism since during the course of several decades and among various nationalities, Romantic literature assumed different forms, and since its individual representatives were quite distinct, one from the other. It is easier to present a summary of the characteristic features of the various Romantic trends, for Romantics everywhere paid great attention to the establishment and presentation of their ideology and to the formulation of the basic principles of their poetic theory.

2. The Romantic movement did not appear at the same time in every country. In Germany and England it arose around 1795; for the Russians and Poles it appeared after 1815; and for the other Slavs and for the French, still later. However, long before the emergence of actual Romanticism there were isolated figures and strains of Preromanticism. In England it partly took the form of Ossianism, the sombre poetry of "night and graveyard" inspired by the heroic Celtic songs of Ossian (in reality, the forgeries of James Macpherson); partly, it was characterized by the bourgeois novel. In France it took the form of "Rousseauism," the cult of feeling, which Rousseau evolved in theory and then applied to poetic practice. In Germany it encompassed "*Sturm und Drang*" ("Storm and Stress"), the cult of the "free" man, and some other tendencies; as well, it advanced the ideas of Herder, including his protest against placing too

high a value on reason, and his interest in folk poetry. Ukrainian Romanticism was also affected by these preromantic currents, although, for the most part, indirectly via Western Romanticism.

3. The most direct way to understand the nature of Romantic ideology and Romantic poetry is from the perspective of the historical opposition assumed by Romanticism in relation to the eighteenth century trends of Classicism and the Enlightenment. Reacting against the poetics of Classicism, Romanticism constructed its own theory of poetry which it followed in literary practice. In challenge to the philosophy of the Enlightenment, Romanticism developed its own world view without which it is impossible to understand the ideological content of Romantic works or even Romantic poetics. The leading ideas of Romanticism that are found in Ukrainian Romantic writers will be discussed later.

4. The Enlightenment belief was that reason was the fundamental power of cognition. The world and man were considered to be completely "knowable" either with the help of the intellect or the understanding of enlightened experience. Finally, all reality was thought to be the sum of (or constructed from) its simple elements. Conversely, the Romantic world view held that the intellect was only one of the faculties of human spirit, and not even the highest: it was incomplete and inadequate to perceive reality by itself. Reality was not seen as merely the sum of separate elements or parts. On the contrary, since the Romantics believed that the whole was always itself the predeterminant of its separate parts, reality was held to be not only broader, but higher than all its isolated parts (the separate elements making up the whole).

This change in the basic principles of outlook required new methods of perception. The Romantics therefore developed various theories which sought to correct traditional logic, either by altering or supplementing its rules. Most often, however, the demand was not merely for logical, but extra-logical perception, the cognition of the senses or "intuition," and sometimes "poetic intuition." Poetry stood next to science as another, not inferior, path to knowledge.

In rejecting the tradition of rational cognition, the Romantics began to notice and to seek out the internal contradictions, antitheses and contrasts in various spheres of existence. Perhaps their greatest service lay in recognizing in man, in the historical process, and in social life, those internal contradictions which prevented the very link between these spheres that was so eagerly sought by Romanticism. This search led the Romantics to important (although rarely implemented) discoveries in natural science, the social sciences and psychology.

5. Romanticism's attitude to the world, man, and God was different from that of the Enlightenment.

For the Romantics the world was not a simple mechanism composed of separate parts like a clock with its many cogs, but rather, a living organism whose parts were ordered and directed by the whole. They saw the world as being not completely accessible to our understanding, as revealing only particular aspects and spheres, preventing our apprehension of any others or of the whole. They believed, moreover, that there were forces and spheres in the world that were mysterious, hidden, unknowable. The investigations by the Romantics into these dark corners of the world, which they called the "night side of life," not only revived old superstitions but were valuable contributions to scholarship.

Man was not merely a reasoning animal or mechanism (machine) as the most radical representatives of the Enlightenment had thought. According to the Romantics, he was a complex entity comprised of multifarious higher and lower elements. He belonged to two different worlds, in fact to many worlds: he straddled them and was subject to their influences. Man's psychic life in particular was seen as dependent on the material sphere on the one hand; on the other, it was amenable to spiritual inspiration. Man was believed to contain as many mysterious forces as did the earth itself, a mysteriousness which, from the point of view of the intellect, stemmed from "the unconscious." All deviations from "the normal," reasonable states of mind—madness, dreaming, ecstasy, inspiration, premonition, "the dark side of the soul"—all such experiences, providing man an escape from commonplace existence into other perhaps higher spheres, were deemed to be profoundly significant. The Romantics attributed a particularly high value to love: it, they believed, opened the doors of "the unlimited" to man affording him glimpses of another world and experiences which would take him beyond the boundaries of everyday reality.

God was thought of not as merely the Creator who presented laws to the world and then abandoned it to their direction (eighteenth century "deism"), but rather as a live being. To be sure, the Romantics relegated this being to a mystical obscurity so lofty as to be generally inaccessible to human perception and national understanding, although somewhat more approachable via the senses. While undermining in this manner the meaning of dogmatic theology, Romanticism at the same time elevated the significance of Church ritual. For this non-intellectually-based tradition was thought to affect most strongly the deepest irrational facets of a human being and to probe most profoundly the roots of that distant past which, for the Romantics, were also related to the highest sphere of existence.

In essence, the philosophical world view of Romanticism was: the world is irrational, "miraculous" and complicated; man is fundamentally complex and

closely linked with other mysterious spheres; God ranges beyond all rational perception although he is nevertheless accessible through the media of the senses and tradition.

6. However, man does not simply stand between particular spheres and forces of being, nor is he merely an object of influences; he is also agent and subject in the historical process. For the Enlightenment this historical process signified constant evolution toward betterment—through continuous improvement and knowledge together with the various creative achievements of intelligent individuals. The Romantics' view of man and the historical process stemmed from their concept of man in general as having a dual nature. On the one hand he was a vital, free character, creating his own laws and transcending all the other spheres which surround him; on the other, he was only a component of larger totalities such as society, the religious community, the state, the nation. Hence, for the Romantics, man in history and society was a peculiar, paradoxical entity-free creative agent, yet mere tool of the historical process, of human institutions, and of higher phenomena such as "the spirit of the people," "the spirit of history," etc.

The Romantics, however, did not believe that the historical process was composed simply of isolated human actions. Rather, it was taken to be the manifestation of higher powers, a process which led to a lofty goal, although every stage in its development had its own inner meaning. The distant past was seen not merely as preparation for a better future, but also, because of its many contributions to spiritual wealth, as valuable in itself. In this way, those epochs forgotten or neglected by the Enlightenment, in particular the Middle Ages and in part the Baroque, were "discovered" by Romanticism. Even in such "pre-historical" areas as national customs, folk poetry, folk culture as a whole, and language, among other things, the Romantics perceived the deepest meaning and spiritual significance. They revived historical studies and played an important role in the establishment of scientific ethnography and modern linguistics. Of more consequence, however, than Romanticism's contribution to studies in history and the social sciences, were Romantic ideas on society and the history of national consciousness and of modern national movements. No longer were the concepts of nationality and national language somehow incomprehensible as they had been for the Enlightenment which would have preferred one common language for the entire world. No matter what their real natures, the national past and present assumed profound significance as the direct revelation of "the national spirit." It was in this way that national movements acquired spiritual motivation and justification—as necessary elements of the historical process.

7. Romanticism also introduced radical changes in the areas of poetic

theory and practice. Just as its ideological changes were directed against the Enlightenment, the changes in poetics were a reaction against Classicism. The aim of Romantic poetics was simply the destruction of the entire system of prescriptions of Classicist poetics and, in fact, the repudiation of rules in general.

In its opposition to Classicism, Romanticism turned, in some cases, to a high appreciation of Baroque poetry. This led to "rediscoveries" of several forgotten poets of the Baroque, among which perhaps the most notable were Shakespeare and the Spanish dramatists.

8. As a result of the change in world view, the subject matter of works of literature was enriched to an extraordinary degree. The Romantics perceived and depicted the world altogether differently than had the Classicists: they brought to light the mysterious side of the world. Moreover, they regarded nature as a living thing, and everywhere revealed and emphasized its vital interconnection with man. Romanticism's new perception of nature also extended to that vast mysterious element in it and ultimately to those "other worlds" hidden behind its everyday appearance. These were the characteristics of the "night side" of nature which, the Romantics believed, were in fact most accessible to man at night. Night became a favorite theme of nature lyrics, giving rise to "night poetry." Traces of the "other worlds" broke loose into everyday reality in both personified and impersonal form with the development of the fantastic tale. Folk beliefs were used very effectively in this genre since the Romantics believed that it was through the fantastic figures of superstition that the existence of "other worlds" was most clearly sensed. In poetry too, such demonic forces came to play a considerable role. However, even without the presence of these fantastic characters, new methods of representing spiritual life were cultivated—such as focusing on abnormal or unusual experiences. Madness, sleeplessness, ecstasy, the "night side" of the psyche all were portrayed. Equally important to the Romantics were powerful experiences such as love and creative inspiration. Romanticism also stressed other deviations of spiritual life including dissoluteness, sin, crime. Often a person's life was described in terms of its dependence on his "fate" which was regarded as the reflection of a man's inner being. The fate of a particular person, or family, or nation thus became a favorite theme of Romantic poetry.

Romanticism was of particular significance in the portrayal of history in literature. The emergence of the modern historical novel, for example, is principally attributable to the influence of the Romantic world view. The Romantic writer wanted to see the past, first of all, in its own, original coloration; on the other hand, he saw in the whole of the past a gradual and meaningful development. This serious attitude of the poet to the past

completely altered the character of historical *belles lettres*. No longer did it comprise collections of curious anecdotes and adventures; rather, it consisted of attempts to understand and express the meaning and significance of past epochs of the national life. For the Romantic saw in the past not only its heroes but also society, the masses, and nations.

Religious poetry, steeped in the moralism of the Enlightenment, also assumed an emotional quality. In fact, a general religious tendency spread among many writers in all spheres and in all types of literature.

Opposing strict regulation of the formal side of poetry, Romanticism advocated the principle of "free creativity" of the poet, and of "free form" that was dependent on poetic inspiration alone. Free form was adopted by the already established genres: in order to convey this impression, poets often would purposely ruin structural order, impart incomplete form to their work, avoid compositional symmetry and permit various other vagaries in the formal structure. Another characteristic of free form was a deliberate vagueness in plot development: particular moments in the course of the action were left in unexplained obscurity.

Traditional ideas about poetic genres were destroyed. The Romantics relished a mixing of genres (a technique encountered earlier, but only rarely): prose was combined with poetry, and lyrical passages were introduced into epic poems, etc.

Finally, Romanticism introduced genres and forms that were altogether new. One of them, the Romantic or "Byronic" poem, named after its most famous practitioner, was totally different from the epic poems of Classicism (see below, pt. F). A genre that became very popular was the ballad, a short epic tale (often fantastic) written in verse and modelled on old traditional dance songs. Imitations of folk songs were revived, although this time not simply as "drawing room" diversions as they had been under Classicism. The Romantics endeavored to create the kind of work that would conform as closely as possible to the character of actual folk songs. Frequently, these imitations deceived scholars as well as the ordinary reader, even when this was not their conscious intention. Publications also appeared of collections of genuine folk songs. Among prose forms the tale flourished: no longer dismissed as a trifling amusement, it often contained serious matter. Imitations of folk tales appeared as well, along with accounts and collections of actual folk tales.

Clearly, style was another area in which Romanticism deviated from Classicism. Language, for example, was enriched in order to accommodate the new images and themes such as the "night side" of the world and of the soul. Interest in unusual states of mind required various new words and phrases to

describe the vague, unknown, mysterious, psychic conditions and moods. Style became more refined in order to convey the vague and mysterious generally. "Synaesthesia"—i.e., the technique of employing words in paradoxical combinations such as comparing sounds with colors—became widespread. Interest in history led to the use of numerous archaic words, especially in the historical tale. In their stylizations of folk poetry, writers adopted the same stylistic devices found in folk songs and tales. A certain number of vernacular and rare words were also introduced into the language, but for serious use, not simply as curios as they had been for the travesty forms of Classicism. In flouting Classicist injunctions, Romantic style underwent significant change among the various writers and genres, as well as from country to country.

One of the most characteristic features of Romantic poetics was "symbolism." Its theory was that if beyond this world of actuality there is another, higher world, then every object, every element of existence in this world points and alludes to something in this higher world of which it is the image and symbol. Accordingly, the Romantics availed themselves of old traditions, particularly of folk poetry, and cultivated symbolism to an extent hitherto unprecedented. Every poetic image, every picture, every thought in their writing was supposed to have a two-fold meaning. Everything had in addition to its direct meaning, a deeper significance denoting a specific element in the higher world. A similar phenomenon had existed in the literature of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and in Baroque poetry. Romantic symbolism used images which conformed to its world view, including psychological, philosophical, and historico-philosophical symbols which sometimes became crystallized into complex allegories or "mysteries" requiring special explanations and interpretation. Often, however, symbolic significance was also imparted to light lyrical landscapes and even to descriptions of *pobut*, and to Romantic verses and sketches.

It is interesting that Romanticism avoided the images, symbols and, particularly, the figures of classical mythology. Instead, images from national mythology were used.

9. The individual came into his own in Romanticism—as a being linked with the various spheres of existence, and as a creature whose character as a living physical and spiritual organism was a reflection of the organization of these other spheres in the universe, itself another living organism. Man was seen both as a repository of accumulated historical recollections and diverse social influences and as a creative essence. In poetry, the figure of the poet himself acquired a particularly preeminent role representing his aspiration to be an all-embracing, complete individual, a participant in the most varied forms of life.

The Romantic poet often attained this comprehensiveness because he became a volatile, perpetually variable character: like Proteus, he was constantly changing his style, his personality, his interests and sometimes even his views. Poetry was regarded as preceptor of the people; hence, the poet was supposed to be prophet, teacher, guide, as well as independent creator. This accounts for the fact that in Romantic literature, the poet frequently styled himself as a prophet and genius free from the laws and norms of everyday reality. Sometimes this pose was refined to such a point that the poet purposely portrayed himself as a "demonic" figure able to comprehend even negative states of being including madness and depravity. Works were composed in such a manner as to appear to have sprung purely from untrammelled inspiration, independent of any laws, rules or limitations. The cult of the poet as genius was one of the characteristic features of the literary culture of Romanticism: the poet was thought (or supposed) to be "the leader" of his nation, if not of mankind in general, he was the "prophet" of the future, and even a "god" (as the Russian Romantic Baratynskij termed the Polish poet Mickiewicz).

10. Like every cultural and literary trend, Romanticism had its inherent weaknesses which led ultimately to its decline. These negative traits included, first of all, a certain instability, a want of thought, and a tendency to leave great plans and designs unfulfilled. Plans, intentions, dreams and visions regularly took precedence over reality. Unrestrained fantasy and a contempt for concrete, common reality led Romantic poets into a world of fantasy. Only with great difficulty could they return to real life where they would remain "lost" forever. No less pernicious was the cultivation of sentiment and mood. The Romantic frequently regarded experience and spiritual states as fulfillment in themselves; he limited himself to them instead of realizing his ideals and dreams in real life. It was from criticism of these negative traits that later opposition to Romanticism often developed on the part of representatives of succeeding literary developments, especially the so-called Realists.

B. UKRAINIAN ROMANTICISM

1. Romanticism was unique among literary tendencies in that it contributed to the "awakening" of young nations or those that had become detached from contemporary European culture. Its role in the awakening or rebirth of Slavic nations was particularly notable: it encouraged an interest in, and high regard for folk poetry, popular customs, and the past (especially its neglected, underestimated periods); and it fostered an interest in one's own nationality and a love for uncultivated nature. These considerations necessarily turned the

attention of spokesmen for the East European peoples toward their own antiquity, their own folk lore and way of life, and their own lands. The fact that the artistic devices of folk poetry were being used in literature was also significant: it undoubtedly inspired the representatives of those peoples in whom this poetry still thrived to make their own literature flourish and to develop it in new directions. Also important in this connection was the influence of the Preromanticism of Herder.

2. It is not surprising, therefore, that Romanticism influenced, by complex means, not only Ukrainian Romantic literature whose scope was relatively limited, but also Ukrainian literature generally. It left a marked impression on all subsequent literary development, and penetrated profoundly into the national consciousness.

The philosophy of Romanticism had, on the one hand, an extraordinary significance for the development of Ukrainian studies in all their branches. The historic past and its various epochs became factors of the national consciousness solely in the light of the Romantic attitude to the past. For this reason, historical studies constituted, during the period of Romanticism, an integral part of the national movement. On the other hand, national life itself appeared to the eyes of Romantics as exceptionally full, valuable, and rich. Not only the gathering of ethnographic material, but also its application in various cultural spheres, especially in literature, became another national goal. Thus, the two basic themes of Ukrainian Romanticism, "the people" and history, became at the same time the basic problems of the national movement.

The development of Ukrainian literature was aided to an extraordinary degree by the fact that its writers, in particular Ševčenko, were far more closely associated with the true life of the people than were the majority of Romantics in the West or in neighboring lands. Therefore, they were in fact able to make broader and freer use of the resources of folk poetry than was the case of Romanticism in many other countries. It was not even necessary for Ukrainian poets to turn to the Romantic theory of poetry for certain elements of their poetics. For, as it often seemed to these poets and as it often actually was, it was possible to adapt them for literature from folk poetry.

3. The problem of language was more involved. The first Ukrainian Romantics, including the brilliant writer Gogol', were lost to Ukrainian literature (see below, pt. C, no. 2) because they wrote in Russian. The exceedingly small amount of literature in the Ukrainian language which existed until 1825 belonged to the travesty genres and failed to inspire any imitations among the young writers that had been aroused by the ideology of Romanticism. They were justified to a certain degree in sensing that these works "made fun" of the

people, of folk poetry, and of the Ukrainian language. The early Romantics succeeded in replacing this mockery of Ukrainian provincial life with a "vogue" for all things Ukrainian. However, it was only after further evolution of the Romantic ideology that works of real creative power were produced in the Ukrainian language—by the younger generation of Ukrainian Romantics.

4. Romanticism in the West "rediscovered" Baroque literature—admittedly not in its entirety, but at least certain of its representative figures including Jacob Boehme, Friedrich von Spee, Angelus Silesius, as well as Shakespeare. Ukrainian Romanticism was not as fortunate since it was impossible to appreciate a literature written in a foreign language: Ukrainian Baroque literature was to be found in Church Slavonic (Ukrainian redaction) or in a "mixed" Ukrainian-Church Slavonic language. However, the Romantics were attracted to isolated literary figures (Skovoroda) and to the ideological content of particular works. Nor was it fortuitous that the Romantics discovered the Ukrainian chronicles of the Baroque period—significant both for Ukrainian national consciousness and for scholarship—and that they revived, to a certain degree, interest in Skovoroda. Nevertheless, the typical Romantic reaction was that of Kuliś who rejected outright all Ukrainian Baroque literature as "academic obscurity." With few exceptions, such as Maksymovych, the attitude of other representatives of Romanticism to the Ukrainian literary Baroque was similar to Kuliś's—indifference or hostility or totally unhistorical criticism (e.g., condemning its failure to use the vernacular).

5. The development of Ukrainian Romanticism was a complicated process, linked with the various personal changes of fortune of individual writers and with the political conditions of this difficult period. Operative factors included the Romantic cult of personal goodwill, the Romantic individualism in the face of the deteriorating ties between the separate centers of Ukrainian life. These led to the fact that the Romantic movement broke down into the history of particular groups and sometimes into the biographies of particular individuals, as, in fact, had been the case in Western Romanticism.

The birth of Ukrainian Romantic literature and ideology took place in the 1820s and 1830s in Xarkiv, but by the beginning of the 1840s the literary movement in this center was practically dead. Toward the end of the 1830s a Romantic movement on a small scale was set into motion in Galicia. The 1840s saw the brilliant beginning of Romanticism in Kiev in the formation of the "Brotherhood of Sts. Cyril and Methodius" (*Kyrylo-Methodijivs'ke Bratstvo*), but its development was arrested because of persecution from the authorities. The Romantic movement smouldered during the following years and was restricted to the individual efforts of isolated writers. Toward the end of its existence

it flared up once more in its new and final center in Petersburg during the term of the activity of the journal *Osnova* (*Foundation*). This period marked the end of the literary Romantic movement in the Ukraine on a broad scale although individual Romantics remained true to their ideology, altering it only to a certain extent under the influence of altogether new times.

In many Romantic circles a leading ideological role was often played by individuals who did not themselves become Ukrainian writers. A number of these ideologists of the history of literature must be acknowledged.

The Romantics' interest in history and in popular *pobut* engendered studies on the collection, publication and adaptation of this historical and ethnographic material. One by one, collections of Ukrainian folk poetry, primarily folk songs, were published by Prince M. Certelev (1819), a non-Romantic himself, and by M. Maksymovyč (collections published in 1827, 1834, 1849), I. Srezněv's'kyj (*Zaporožskaja starina—Zaporožian Antiquity*, 1833-38), and P. Lukaševyc (1836). Collections of Galician songs were published by the Poles Waclaw Zaleski (z Oleska) and Żegota Pauli in 1833 and 1839-40, respectively. At about the same time the Western Ukrainian *Rusalka Dnistrovaja* (*The Dniester Mermaid*, 1837) appeared. These Romantic publications ended with A. Metlyn's'kyj's song collection (1854), P. Kuliš's *Zapiski o Južnoi Rusi* (*Notes on Southern Rus'*, 1856-57), and some later editions based, for the most part, on studies undertaken by the Romantics, including a collection of proverbs and sayings by Nomys (1864), and a collection of songs by Ja. Holovac'kyj (1863-65).

If the publication of works of folk poetry had the effect of sustaining the activity of Romantic poets, providing them with themes and motifs, and acquainting them with the folk outlook and devices of folk poetry, historical studies had a still greater significance. They revealed to the Ukrainian reader his first glimpse, albeit incomplete and inadequately elucidated, of Ukraine's past. Among these works were histories of Ukraine by Bantyš-Kamens'kyj (1822, with new editions in 1830 and 1842), Markevyč (1842), and Skal'kovs'kyj (studies on Zaporozhian history, 1840). Of special importance were the publication of the chronicles *Istoriija Rusov* (1846), and of the Cossack chronicles of Samovydec' (1846), Velyčko (1848 and later), and Hrabjanka (1854). The appearance of stories about the Sič by the Zaporozhian centenarian Korž (1842), together with the numerous publications of documents to which Maksymovyč and Bodjans'kyj made a particular contribution, also served for the most part to fan the Romantic enthusiasm for Ukrainian history in much the same way as the later studies of Kostomarov did.

Travel accounts and descriptive writing about Ukraine contain the least reflection of Romantic views. The most important works of this type,

Zakrevs'kyj's description of Kiev (1836) and Svinjin's accounts of individual parts of Ukraine (beginning with 1829), have no trace of the Romantic world view.

6. Some Ukrainian Romantics lived to see not only the predominance of a different literary current, inimical to Romanticism (i.e., Realism), but also the reemergence at the end of the century of sentiments greatly reminiscent of the old Romanticism. These moods, which would soon develop into new styles, were those of impressionism, partly, and, to a greater degree, of modernism and symbolism. A considerable number of individual features of Ukrainian Romanticism survived, as well, in those immediately following generations whose outlook was altogether different. Other facets of this survival included not only the impression of continuity that was prevalent in Ukrainian literature throughout the entire nineteenth century, but also the acknowledged large, positive role played by Romantic motifs in the establishment of the Ukrainian national movement and modern Ukrainian literature. Still another factor was that the position of the greatest Ukrainian poet, Ševčenko, was never equalled among writers of the later period. In addition, because Ukrainian literature remained incomplete even after Romanticism, the Realists in their turn attempted to remedy this situation: their view was that literature should be a reflection of real life. However, since the conception of real Ukrainian life was for the most part limited to that of "the common people," any interest in this life constantly had to contend with the treatment already given it by the Romantics in their works and scholarly studies. For this reason, at least one branch of Realism—the ethnographic—was as closely tied to the Romantic tradition as was possible. In other kinds of Realism, significant although unconscious influences of Romanticism may be found. Another leading aspect of its "survival" was the definite kinship that existed between Ukrainian Romanticism and the Ukrainian national character and the personal character of individual Realists. It is interesting that those Romantics (such as Kuliš) who reappeared on the literary scene later were very often received with misunderstanding and hostility.

7. Among the important features of the activity of Ukrainian Romantics was their uncommonly keen aspiration to overcome the historical incompleteness of Ukrainian literature. Their conscious cultivation of multifarious literary genres together with their attempt to establish a direct relationship with world literature (by means of Ukrainian studies and translations) represent some of the most significant contributions of Ukrainian Romantics to Ukrainian literary development. In this way, even though its literary production was not large, Ukrainian literature during the period of Romanticism was approaching the ideal of a "full-fledged" literature, one that would satisfy the spiritual requirements of

all social groups. This triumph of Ukrainian Romanticism was but temporary: political conditions made the actual realization of a Romantic program impossible; moreover, the ideology and literary views of the Realists favored a renewed and considerable thematic narrowing of Ukrainian literature (see Ch. XII, pt. J, no. 7).

C. "UKRAINIAN SCHOOLS" IN FOREIGN ROMANTIC LITERATURE

1. The fact that Ukrainian thematic material first appeared in the Romantic literature of foreign countries provides clear evidence of the political and cultural decline of Ukraine at this time. Her neighbors were already beginning to divide among themselves the territories of the once autonomous land, now in its death throes for several decades. However, while the emergence of the "Ukrainian schools" can be regarded as a deplorable sign, it is important to recognize at the same time the enormous significance contained in the introduction of Ukrainian themes to the literary stage. For example, valuable historical and ethnographic material was discovered; for when Ukrainian Romantics began to rework these themes, in every instance and often before everything else, they would seek to stress as much as possible those features peculiar to the people they were describing. Foreign language Romantic literature on Ukrainian themes served, even much later, to draw readers' attention to the Ukrainian people and to its history; it was also instrumental in awakening, in individual denationalized Ukrainians, a sense of national consciousness. As well, this literature demonstrated to Ukrainian writers at the very outset of their creativity that it was possible to treat Ukrainian themes in the context of modern literary poetic practice without necessarily descending to travesty.

2. Russian Romantics were attracted to Ukrainian themes as to all that was exotic. Moreover, the exotica of Ukraine (and the Caucasus) was, geographically, the closest. In addition, they were enraptured with themes from Ukrainian history and with its leitmotif of the struggle for liberation against Poland and against Russia. A sizeable contribution was also made to the rise of the Russian Ukrainian school by a number of Ukrainians working in the north who turned to literature to give expression to their longing for their homeland.

The first efforts of the school were the works of the Russian poet K. Ryleev (1797-1826). Under the influence of the *dumy* of Niemcewicz (see Ch. X, pt. G, no. 2), he wrote the *duma* "*Bogdan Xmel'nickij*" (1822), as well as other original ballad-style *dumy*. Following this he progressed to other Ukrainian themes. Under the influence of the *Istoriija Rusiv*, recent scholarly literature

(Bantyš-Kamens'kyj, 1822) and information he received from Ukrainian friends, he began to dwell on his constant theme of the Ukrainian struggle for independence. His poems *Vojnarovskij* (1824) and *Nalivajko* (1825) with their forcefulness of expression and their idea of the fight for freedom had a powerful effect even on Ukrainians. On their behalf, M. Markevyč thanked Ryleev, adding "the spirit of Polubotok may still be found among us." The literary activity of Ryleev ended after the Decembrist Revolt when he was hanged along with other of its leaders. His legacy of unfinished works on Ukrainian themes included the poem *Xmel'nickij* and an outline for the drama *Mazepa*. In his works, Ryleev adhered to some degree to the poetics of Ukrainian *dumy* and folk songs.

Immediately following the poems of Ryleev and the second-rate novel of E. V. Aladin, *Kočubej*, (1827), Puškin appeared on the scene with his *Poltava*. This Byronic poem portrayed Mazepa as a negative, yet great figure: for, according to the theory of the Byronic poem, an unfavorable moral characterization does not in any way diminish the elevated stature of a hero. In the poem the theme of Ukraine's struggle for liberation was given vivid presentation although only as a secondary motif.

The twenties saw the beginning of the activity of Romantic authors of Ukrainian extraction who adopted Ukrainian themes for their works in prose or verse.

Various Ukrainian themes appeared in the writings of Orest Somov (pseudonym, Porfirij Bajskij, 1793-1833), a native of Poltava. He employed practically all the possible types of Ukrainian material in his works which comprised a historical novel (*Gajdamaki*, published in fragments, 1826-29), fantastic novellas based on folklore ("Rusalka"—"The Mermaid"; "Klady"—"Buried Treasures," 1829; "Kievskie ved'my"—"Witches of Kiev," 1833); a story dealing with a popular custom ("Svatovstvo"—"Matchmaking," 1831), and *Brodjačij ogon'—The Wandering Fire*, 1832, a work incorporating a conscious attempt to link contemporary Ukraine with the ancient princely era. Being a Ukrainian, Somov was able to portray the way of life of the peasants and small landowners, to present ethnographic details forcefully, to call upon historical anecdotes, and to transpose particular Ukrainian words into the Russian language of his works.

Mykola Markevyč (1804-1860), perhaps under the influence of Ryleev, began to publish in 1829 *Ukrainskie melodii* (*Ukrainian Melodies*, appearing separately in 1831), consisting of 36 Romantic ballads in Russian based on Ukrainian themes of a historical and fantastic nature. In a gesture which increased the authenticity of the ethnographic material, Markevyč attempted to present in the introduction and notes to the work a complete description of Ukrainian folk beliefs, of the national character and annual rituals, and of folk

poetry, both that which deals with *pobut* and that which deals with history. His description included all its heroes right up to Polubotok, Palij, Vojnarovs'kyj and Mazepa.

While these first Ukrainian Romantics of the Ukrainian school of Russian literature restricted themselves to a routine literary treatment of Ukrainian material, Mykola Hohol' (Gogol', 1809-52), the son of Vasyli', represented a completely different kind of phenomenon. A writer of world stature, he began to publish stories on Ukrainian themes in 1830, and in 1831-32 and 1835 published four volumes (*Večera na xutore bliz Dikan'ki—Evenings on a Homestead Near Dikan'ka* and *Mirgorod*) which made Russian literary history. Somewhat later (1840) he produced his novel, the newly expanded *Taras Bul'ba*, and worked on a tragedy, which he later burned, dealing with the time of Xmel'nyc'kyj.

To this day, Gogol' 's relationship to the Ukrainian national problem has not been definitively established. His works certainly betray no concern for it: in the spirit of the best Romantic traditions, they unite interesting narrative with the resolution of certain purely literary exercises and ideological problems. Although he had not set himself the task of ethnographic and historical accuracy (for which he was criticized by Andrij Storoženko and Kuliš'), he was able to create sensitive, vivid, charming and (because of their general tone), extraordinarily faithful pictures of the Ukrainian landscape, life and national character. And, in *Taras Bul'ba* he succeeded in elevating scenes from Ukrainian history to the level of a great Romantic epic as he combined stylistic elements from folk *dumy* with the narrative approach of Walter Scott and Homer. In addition, Gogol' developed in his works the basic principles of the Romantic outlook and also alluded to the main features of his own ideas; his writings, therefore, are not merely amusing, but are the completely serious manifestations of his opinions.

Gogol' 's verbal talent was phenomenal: the rhythm of his language, his originality of expression (explained in part by his faulty knowledge of Russian), his use of Ukrainian phraseology, especially of folk songs (which he collected, carefully studied, and made the subject of an interesting article) with excerpts of which he sometimes composed entire pages of his stories. All of these features of Gogol' 's writings, along with their peculiar "bilingualism," make his work a true monument of world Romantic literature and one that succeeded in drawing many Ukrainians home again. It was not without reason that Ševčenko, in 1844, hailed him as "my great friend" and "brother."

Evhen Hrebinka (1812-48), a countryman and follower of Gogol', although hardly his equal, was another leading representative of the Ukrainian school in Russian literature (his activity as a Ukrainian writer *per se* will be examined

later). His works, published in three collected editions—1848, 1852 and 1901—enjoyed considerable popularity; in fact, some of his lyrics became Russian folk songs. Stylistically, his works are an imitation of Gogol', but without the latter's brilliant originality. They are practically devoid of any ideological content, and have a definite sentimental coloration. They include verses on Ukrainian motifs, tales of the fantastic, historical novels (*Zolotarenko*, 1842, and *Čajkovskij*, 1843) and even poems (*Bogdan*, 1843). Hrebinka's best works, however, are his unpretentious ethnographic sketches, based on folk anecdotes, on the life of small Ukrainian landowners. It is these sketches which establish Hrebinka's link with "Naturalism," the final stage in the development of Russian Romanticism (see Ch. XIII).

Next to the writings of these outstanding representatives of the Ukrainian school are a number of individual works on Ukrainian themes by well-known Russian writers. Worthy of mention are the novels of F. Bulgarin (1789-1859) for their depiction of the Ukrainian past: *Dimitrij Samozvanec* (*Dimitrij, the Pretender*, 1830) presented the first literary account of the *Sič*, and *Mazepa* (1833-34) offered a close portrait of its subject as a Ukrainian Machiavelli. Descriptions of Ukrainian superstitions and of the landowners' way of life are contained in *Savelij Grab* (1842) by V. Dal' (1801-72), a writer of Danish origin. And in "Petrus'" (1831), a story in the tradition of *Natalka Poltavka*, the characters actually speak fairly good Ukrainian: its author, M. Pogodin (1800-75) made the effort of mastering the language, perhaps under the tutelage of Maksymovyč.

Numerous Ukrainian Romantics also contributed to the Ukrainian school of Russian literature: Borovykovs'kyj, Kostomarov, Čužbys'kyj, Kuliš, Storoženko and even Ševčenko, whose Russian tales were published posthumously. Others wrote exclusively in Russian; one, Pogorel'skij (Perovskij, 1787-1836), master of the fantastic novella, was the author of *Monastyрка* (*The Cloistered Maiden*), an adventure novel providing the background for an ethnographic description of the life of Ukrainian landowners. Several were the authors of historical novels: P. Golota (*Mazepa*, 1832; *Nalivajko*, 1833; *Xmel'nickij*, 1834, in which the Ukrainian language, songs and ethnographic material were used extensively; A. Čurovskij [*Zaporožskie naezdy* (*Zaporožian Raids*, 1837)]; O. Kuzmič [*Kazaki* (*The Cossacks*, 1843), *Nabeg v stepi* (*Raid on the Steppe*, 1844), *Xmel'nickij*, 1846), etc.]; V. Korenevskij (*Getman Ostrjanica*, 1846). This same period saw the beginning of the literary activity of G. Danilevskij (1829-90), whose early stories on Ukrainian themes (tales, 1847-55) were closely related to Romanticism, but whose later work was in Realistic and Naturalistic sketches. Notable representatives of the naturalist trend of stories drawn from

Ukrainian life are M. Kovalevskij (from 1848 on) and K. Kotljarevskij (from 1851 on), among others. During the 1850s, O. Storoženko published a novel, *Brat'ja bliznecy* (*Twin Brothers*), as well as stories from Ukrainian life, and began to issue his works in Ukrainian (see below, pt. G, no. 6). This period also witnessed the rise of D. L. Mordovec' (Mordovcev, 1830-1905), a writer of no fixed style: his first works using Ukrainian themes contained vestiges of historical Romanticism although later ones were completely different.

While the Ukrainian school of Russian literature is of considerable significance in the history of Ukrainian *culture*, it is of less interest to the history of Ukrainian *literature*. One problem worth investigating, however, would be that of the "adaptation" of many of these works: how successful, for example, are the Ukrainian translations of Narežnyj's *The Seminarian*, or certain works of Gogol'?

3. The Ukrainian school in Polish literature sprang up for partly the same reason as in Russian literature—the Romantics' attraction to the exotic. Another contributing factor was the lack of indigenous Polish historical songs: Ukrainian folk songs very easily, therefore, were able to become the source for Polish works as well. Moreover, there was the conscious aspiration of Polish Romanticism for a certain regionalism. A further motive which developed later was the longing of some Polish exiles for their homeland, for the majority of representatives of the Ukrainian school of Polish literature were born in Ukraine.

Strictly speaking, the Ukrainian school in Polish literature was limited to three Romantic poets: A. Malczewski (1793-1826) whose sole work, the Byronic poem *Marja*, portrayed Ukraine during its knightly Cossack period; Bohdan Zaleski (1802-86), whose numerous verses of different types such as his imitations of folk songs and *dumy*, celebrated an idyllic and elegaic Ukraine, enveloped in an atmosphere of authorial melancholy; and S. Goszczynski (1801-76), who used the style of "Romantic terror" in his vision of *hajdamak* Ukraine (*Zamek kaniowski—Castle of Kaniov*, 1828). While their attitude toward the past and the present was from the Polish point of view, the members of the Ukrainian school nevertheless had a sincere affinity for Ukraine: in fact, it was in their works that those characteristically Romantic Ukrainian themes were first recognized (the Cossack, the *hajdamak*, the *kobzar*—minstrel). They also made particularly effective use of the Ukrainian landscape for Romantic symbolism: night, steppe, wind, lone horseman, graves, etc. In addition, they frequently employed Ukrainian linguistic elements.

Apart from the Ukrainian school in the narrow sense of the term, there were numerous writers who either wrote individual works on Ukrainian themes, or employed certain Ukrainian material in their writings. In the works of Słowacki,

for example, a number of Ukrainian motifs may be found as well as separate works on Ukrainian themes (*Dumka ukraińska, Zmija—The Snake*) incorporating Ukrainian linguistic elements. The most popular writer who dealt with Ukrainian themes was M. Czajkowski (1808-86); his mediocre *Powieści Kozackie* (*Cossacks' Tales*, 1837), Romanticized adventure novels, were enormously successful even with Ukrainian readers.

The theme of the Ukrainian material in Polish literature has not yet been properly investigated. Mention could be made of T. A. Olizarowski (1811-71), the brothers S. Groza (1793-1849) and A. Groza (1807-75), M. Gosławski (1805-1834) and especially of the writer, critic and scholar, Michał Grabowski (1807-63), the mentor of B. Zaleski and Kułiś (whose intellectual development, including his negative views on the Cossacks, was influenced by Grabowski).

Some figures in the Polish Ukrainian school, such as T. Padurra, S. Ostaszewski, A. Szaszkewicz, K. Ciegiewicz, went so far as to begin to use Ukrainian in their works (see below, pt. H, nos. 2 and 7).

4. On the whole, the most interesting of these Ukrainian schools, from the Ukrainian point of view, is the Russian. It provided an outlet for the literary aspirations of numerous Ukrainians. Indeed, many of its works read like direct translations from the Ukrainian; and frequently, traces of their authors' national consciousness could be detected in them. Moreover, the use of a foreign language which was at that time more highly developed permitted the introduction of the most radical and modern of literary forms (especially Gogol' and Hrebinka). The activity of the Polish Ukrainian school, on the other hand, did not extend beyond its Polish horizons. It had little linguistic or stylistic connection with Ukrainian folk poetry which had succeeded in fertilizing the creativity of the Ukrainian Romantics. Consequently, these Polish works offered little to Ukrainian writers beyond the example of their method of employing Ukrainian material and some isolated stylistic features.

Certain works by representatives of the Ukrainian schools became known in the West very quickly. Through the translations of Puškin, Gogol', Ryleev and M. Czajkowski, the West European reader was introduced to Ukraine. These works even inspired foreign imitations. In German literature, for example, although it would be an exaggeration to speak of a Ukrainian school, it should be noted that there was a sizeable number of works with Ukrainian material that came to German authors via the Ukrainian schools of Russian and Polish literatures (see below, pt. J, no. 4).

D. THE XARKIV ROMANTIC SCHOOL

1. The first Romantic group in Ukraine centered around Xarkiv University, which had earlier played a prominent role in the development of intellectual life in the nation. It was here, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, that discussion had first focused on ideas important to the national development, such as German idealism and Romanticism (Schelling). However, the development of Ukrainian literary Romanticism was not directly associated with these beginnings of philosophic debate. It can be traced, rather, to the end of the 1820s when a small group of students gathered around Izmajil Sreznevs'kyj (1812-80), a young Russian student and later brilliant professor. A concern with modern literature, especially Russian and Polish, and with religious problems and German philosophy led them to ponder the issues of the philosophy of history. An ethnographic interest, primarily Sreznevs'kyj's, led them directly to the study of, and enthusiasm for, Ukrainian folk poetry. By means of the Ukrainian material compiled by Sreznevs'kyj himself and other members of the group, as well as their familiarity with the first folk song collections to be published, and their acquaintance with the Western Romantic attitude toward folk poetry, the Xarkiv circle came to understand the peculiar qualities of the Ukrainian people. For, according to Sreznevs'kyj, folk poetry was the essence of the Romantic: in it "everything is wild, like the leafy forests and the steppes," "everything is impulsive like a whirlwind flying across the steppe" with nothing of the "stiff elegance" of classical poetry. Even the Ukrainian *bandurist* reminded Sreznevs'kyj, steeped as he was in Romantic literature and ethnography, of the figure of a Scandinavian bard.

Besides Sreznevs'kyj, other members of the circle who assumed importance a little later were Amvrosij Metlyns'kyj (1814-70) and Mykola Kostomarov (1817-85), both of whom became professors also. Their philosophical notions went much deeper. For Metlyns'kyj, who combined the ideas of Herder with those of Romanticism and Hegel, folk poetry was "the revelation of the eternal ideas of the human soul," intimately bound up with all of existence and with the customs and the way of life of the people. Language, in Metlyns'kyj's view, was one of the most significant forces in national development; it was the basis of a nation's identity and of its very being. Kostomarov, a Romantic visionary at the time, believed that through folk poetry one could touch the very depths of the national spirit and the national character. For, according to him, a nation was a personality like man; it had its own definite ideal, its own character, and its own spiritual life whose most faithful reflection was poetry itself. Moreover, man was thought to have a "secret eye" which allowed him to perceive the spiritual

nature of a people, and a "secret voice" which revealed to him the link between a nation's spirit and its material existence (its *pobut*).

From this consideration of a people's present, it was natural to turn to the past. The *dumy* were found to contain the same vision of the past as that in *Istoriija Rusiv*, which was acknowledged as an important historical source. This enthusiasm of the Xarkiv group for the *Istoriija Rusiv* and for the *dumy* confirmed its members in the Romantic thesis that folk poetry provided the deepest possible reflection of the entire past history of a nation. In 1843, Kostomarov published a dissertation "*Ob istoričeskom značeenii russkoj narodnoj poezii*" ("On the Historical Significance of Folk Poetry") in which he stressed that the serious interest in folk poetry was associated with the decline of Classicism. Not surprisingly, his thesis was challenged by representatives of the old scholarship, Classicists such as Hulak-Artemovs'kyj, among others. Kostomarov also believed that folk poetry was thoroughly symbolic. As well as studying the symbolism of Slavic poetry, Kostomarov investigated Slavic mythology, thus anticipating late Romanticism in the West where symbolism and mythology figured among the principal interests (Creuzer, Schelling).

In addition, the Xarkovites undertook their own literary activity in the vernacular. This represented their attempt to become folk singers themselves, to participate in the creation of what they regarded to be the greatest national treasure, poetry. However, they did not take the path of simple imitation of folk poetry. Following the example of the Romantic poetry of other primarily Slavic nations, they produced works which, while in the popular spirit, were directed toward educated society. They chose not to step backward but to move forward.

The literary production of Xarkiv school found its way into separate publications of Russian periodicals, into individual collections of the members' works (Metlyns'kyj, 1839; Kostomarov, 1839-40), and into literary miscellanies published in Ukraine and elsewhere: *Ukrajins'kyj al'manax—Ukrainian Almanac*, 1831; *Utrennjaja zvezda—Morning Star*, 1833-34; *Ukrainskij sbornik—Ukrainian Miscellany*, 1838 and 1841; *Snip—Sheaf*, 1841; *Molodyk—New Moon*, four issues 1843-44; *Lastivka—The Swallow*, in St. Petersburg, 1841; and the *Kievljanin—The Kievan*, edited by M. Maksymovyč in 1840-41. In these publications, works of the older generation—the Classicists—were represented together with those of the Romantics.

2. The precursor of Xarkiv Romanticism was Lev Borovykovs'kyj (1806-89), who graduated from Xarkiv University before the actual flowering of Romanticism in the student circles. During his early years as a student in the provinces (Poltava and elsewhere) he wrote, over a period of time, about 75 verses in Russian and a great many (600 by his own account) "fables and

proverbs." He himself managed to publish only a few of his verses; and in 1852, Metlyns'kyj published around 180 of his fables.

In several ways, Borovykovs'kyj was associated with the Classicist tradition. As a student he had acquired a good knowledge of Classical literature and had been obliged to study Classicist poetics. Moreover, of his 180 fables, a total of 42 appear to be imitations of the Classicist Polish and Russian fables of Krasicki and Krylov, respectively. In addition, elements of travesty can be detected in his fables ("*najlučša ptycja—kovbasa*"—"the finest bird is a sausage"). However, on the whole his tone is serious; it is based on Krasicki's abbreviated, compact, sharp-witted style and then given a certain Romantic folk accent. Thus, the Pole's refined style of clever disquisition is transformed in Borovykovs'kyj into the still more concise traditional folk style of proverbs and adages whose text is often shorter than in Krasicki. The following excerpts from paraphrased and original fables (respectively) by Borovykovs'kyj are illustrative:

*Skupyj ne spav—robjyv, skupyj ne jiv—kopyv,
a vid toho . . . "Šče bil'sj rozbahativ?"
Ni, okoliv.*

("The miser didn't sleep—he just worked; the miser didn't eat—he just made his pile, and what did it get him . . .
'Did he become wealthier?' No, he croaked.")

*Raz kryla v vitrjaka hudily j gergotaly,
ščo vse selo vony nasušnym hoduvaly;
a kamin', pjaternja i koleso . . . movčaly.*

*Prykazujut', ščo xto movčyt',
toj dvox navčyt'.*

("Once, the windmill's vanes hummed and gabbled that they provided the whole village with its daily bread. The millstone and the lantern wheel just kept quiet. . . .
It is said that he who is silent is the wisest of them all.")

The folkish quality here is not only vulgar (*okoliv*—he "croaked"), but also apt, stylistically (using an epithet—*našušnyj* [daily]—without its noun, bread, a common device in Kuliš). With Borovykovs'kyj the fable merges with other genres, such as the epigram:

*Drukarju, ne drimaj, de treba—točku stav,
ščob mokrym nas rjadnom zlyj krytyk ne napav;
bo je j taki: ne najde tolku—bude tyxo;
ne najde ž točky—lyxo . . .*

("Printer, don't drowse. Where needed, put periods, so that some malicious critic will not suddenly attack us. For the species does exist: should he miss the meaning, he's quiet enough; but should he miss a period—look out!")

However, in other verses, Borovykovs'kyj appears as a true Romantic. His translations or paraphrases are totally different from Hulak-Artemovs'kyj's travesties which were published at practically the same time (1838). He translated the same authors as Hulak (Mickiewicz, Puškin, Žukovskij), perhaps in order to emphasize the extent of the distinction between his Romantic conception of poetry and Classicist travesty. In a translation from Horace, lightly Ukrainianized, he describes rural life on a Ukrainian homestead (*xutir*):

*. . . jak blidnuju pokaže osin' tvar,
i spila ovošč požovtije,
vin trusyt' jabluka i sušyt' na uzvar
ta na zymu ozyme siję;
abo rozlišys' spyt' pid dubom na travi,
pid bokom ričen'ka lepeče,
v levadi pisen'ok spivajut' kosari
i soloveječko ščebeče.*

(" . . . when autumn reveals her pale face, and, ripening, colors the fruit, he shakes down the apples and dries them for a compote, and sows the winter wheat. Or else, he sleeps under an oak, stretched out on the grass while a little stream babbles nearby, and in the meadow reapers are singing and a little nightingale is warbling.")

Borovykovs'kyj's translations from Žukovskij and Mickiewicz are Romantic ballads. In "Marusja," which was based on Žukovskij's "Svetlana," which in turn had been based on Bürger's ballad "Lenore," Borovykovs'kyj "Ukrainianized" a number of the ethnographic details. The thematic material, however, is genuinely Romantic—the flight at night with a dead lover, Romantic landscapes, and Romantic tableaux:

*Sily v sanky: koni mčat',
 až iskrjat' nohamy,
 položocky až šumljat',
 snih letyt' kločkamy:
 zzadu tak, jak dym kuryt',
 Step kruhom synije,
 misjac' iz-za xmar blyščyt',
 til'ky—til'ky mrije . . .*

("They settled down in the sleigh: the horses fly, their feet fairly flashing from the speed; the runners hiss, the snow whirls around in clumps. Just behind, there are curls of smoke and the steppe is turning blue all 'round. The moon glimmers from behind the clouds, only barely visible . . .")

Moonlit landscapes appear in Borovykovs'kyj, both in "*Zymnij večir*" ("Winter Evening") from Puškin, and in an original poem, "*Nič*" ("Night"). Typically Romantic images also are used in the ballad "Farys" (from Mickiewicz): one of them is the mad gallop of the Arab horseman across the desert:

*Mčy, litavče bilonohyj,
 skaly i hraky—z dorohy! . . .*

*Jak čoven veselyj, vidčalyvšy v more
 po synim krystali za vitrom letyt',
 i veslamy vodu i pynyť i ore . . .*

("Fly, whitefooted meteor! Cliffs and rocks—out of the way! Like a happy boat, cast off into the sea, which races after the wind along the blue crystal waters, its rudder ploughing the waves into foam . . .")

Attention to the rhythmic and musical aspects of the verses is characteristic of Borovykovs'kyj's translations.

Equally good, however, are Borovykovs'kyj's own original creations, chiefly ballads and *dumy*. The themes of the ballads include selling one's soul to the devil, murder, and poisoning. Borovykovs'kyj's treatment of these themes is often closely connected with folk songs which he sometimes simply adopted in composing his own verse:

*Na zaxodi rannje nebo
 mov krovju zalyto,
 pryšly visti do myloji,
 ščo myloho vbyto.
 Ne na vijni joho vbyto,
 zatjahneno v žyto:
 červonoju kytajkoju
 ručen'ky prykryto . . .*

("In the west the early sky seemed drenched with blood,
 word came to the sweetheart that her lover was no more.
 Not in battle was he killed and dragged into the rye: a
 bit of red taffeta covering his dear hands. . . .")

Borovykovs'kyj's *dumy* on various historical subjects are, for the most part, ballads. Here one encounters Cossacks, Palij, *hajdamaky* and, once again, night:

*Sadylosja sonce za synim Dniprom,
 za sonečko, večir spuskavsja;
 za vecorom—niččju, jak synim suknom,
 i pole, i lis ukryvavsja.
 Miž xmaramy misjac' tyxen'ko kotyvs',
 i na nebi zvizdy zajmalys',
 a pinjavi xvyli dniprovi dulys'
 i bereh vysokij lyzaly . . .*

("Behind the blue Dnieper, the sun was setting behind the
 sun, evening was descending; and in the train of evening,
 the garment of night was enveloping field and forest. The
 moon rolled leisurely among the clouds; in the heavens,
 the stars were being lit while the foamy waves of the
 Dnieper began to swell, lapping the high shore. . . .")

There are references to folk poetry and to gloomy Romantic solitary figures (here, in the Byronic mold!):

*Nesy mene, konju, zahraj pid sidlom,
 za mnoju nixto ne žališe,
 nixto ne zaplače, nixto z kozakom
 tuhy po stepu ne rozsije.
 Čužyj meni kraj svij, čužyj meni svit,*

*za mnoju simja ne zanyje—
xiba til'ky pes mij, ostavšys' v vorit,
holodnyj, jak ridnyj, zavyje.*

("Carry me away, my steed, set the saddle afire with your speed. No one cares about me, no one will weep; for this Cossack no one will sow the steppe with grief. I am a stranger in my own country, and a stranger in the world; nor will any family pine for me—except perhaps my dog, left behind at the gate, hungry, who will howl, as if my kin.")

Here are portraits of a *hajdamak* chieftain:

*Ponuryj otaman pid dubom sydyt'
i usy na palec' motaje;
ne xoče vin rady ni z kym rozdilyt',
nixto joho dumky ne znaje . . .*

("The morose *otaman* sits under an oak tree and winds his mustache 'round his finger; no counsel does he want with anyone, no one knows his thoughts. . . .")

and of the demonic Palij (the final lines of the characterization being a variation of a motif from *Slovo o polku Igoreve*):

*De buv zamok—popelyšče,
de buv horod—tam kladbyšče,
vraž'e pole krovju močyt'
i ob kamin' šablju točyt'*

*Xto v travi—vrivni z travuju?
xto v vodi—vrivni z vodoju?
xto u lisi—vrivni z lisom?
niččju—perevertnem—bisom?*

Palij!

("Where there was a castle—ashes remain, where there was a town—a cemetery lies; he drenches enemy fields with blood and sharpens his sabre on a stone. Who in the grass is as grass? Who in the water is as water? Who

in the forest is as the forest? And at night, becomes a werewolf? (Palij!)"

The style of Borovykovs'kyj's poems is entirely Romantic. The language is solemn even in humorous passages. Folk songs tend to be used, as well as diminutives, although only in moderation and only those which belong to the spoken language (e.g., *matusja*). Also found are epithets typical of folk poetry (bright eagle, gray geese, white swans, broad fields, black clouds, prickly thorn, high grave), and parallelism between two images, a common folk song device.

*Ponad hajem, ponad polem
tuman naljahaje;
v odnim šatri cyhanočka
ohon' rozkladaje . . .*

("Over the meadow, over the field a fog descends; in a certain tent, a young Gypsy woman is kindling a fire. . . .")

"Incomplete" rhymes, another characteristic of Ukrainian folk songs, are sometimes used (*hory-holi, rada-sestra, step-serp, tuman-pidnjavs*); and sometimes there are direct quotations from these songs. All of these features, as well as the themes and images (see excerpts above) Borovykovs'kyj uses, define him as a Romantic poet. Other features are attributable to Borovykovs'kyj's own personal style and perhaps to the influence of Bohdan Zaleski. For example, his tendency (found in his fables too) toward short, aphoristic expression (see above, quotation from "Palij") which prevents his verses from becoming excessively diffuse and, at times, lends a proverb-like quality to individual lines:

*Bez xliba-syt, bez xaty-pan,
hustyj tuman-joho župan.*

("He lacks food, but is full, he lacks a house, but is lord, the dense fog is his mantle."—Quoted from "*Volox*"—*The Wallachian*, a paraphrase from Puškin.)

Of course, there are also instances of muddled, complicated phrasing in his work.

It was with a purpose that Borovykovs'kyj was so attentive in gathering folk songs (some of which appeared in Metlyns'kyj's collection) together with "over 1,000" proverbs and sayings, recognizing them to be a "rich treasure-trove of ballads, legends and *dumy*"; for these were the true source of Romantic poetry.

Borovykovs'kyj used some of the material from his compilations in his Russian works as well.

3. The literary output of Amvrosij Metlyns'kyj (pseudonym, Mohyla, 1814-70) was considerably larger. Apart from the poetic pursuits of his early years (until 1850), Metlyns'kyj was also a professor of literature at Xarkiv University and Kiev, and the author of philosophical treatises on culture and literature in which he combined the ideas of Hegel with Romantic motifs. The task of art, he contended, was to create an ideal of beauty from its individual components scattered throughout the world. Since man stands midway between the material and spiritual worlds, and since "words" represent a union of both these worlds (their sounds expressing the material world, their thoughts, the spiritual), it is "words" which have an effect on the two sides of man's nature. And it is because poetry does engage, in this way, the whole of man's being that it produces such a powerful impression on the individual and on mankind in general. Metlyns'kyj, in according this great significance to literary creativity as a whole, naturally did not minimize his own poetic efforts: in them he expressed his deepest thoughts, desires and apprehensions.

Metlyns'kyj's poetry is characterized by a tone of gloomy melancholy. His favorite landscape is, like Borovykovs'kyj's, night—but night accompanied by storm, thunder, lightning and fire:

*Jak to v burju na nebovi halas povstane,
v čornyx xmarax tak hrjakne, ščo strax,
i za xvyleju vynyrne xvylja, ta j hrjane,
j ozovet'sja v lisax, na horax . . .*

*V tuman ziron'ky poxovalys',
i misjac' u xmary zaplyv;
ričky doščovi snuvalysja,
staryj Dnipr šumiv, homoniv . . .*

("When in a storm the heavens start crashing, from the black clouds there comes such a roar, it is terrifying! Wave upon wave, the thunder rolls in, reverberating in the forests and on the mountains. . . . The little stars were hidden in the fog and the moon floated into the clouds; rivulets of rain shimmered all 'round and ancient Dnieper rushed and roared. . . .")

or:

*Burja vyje, zavyvaje,
i sosnovyj bor triščyt'*

*v xmarax blyskavka palaje,
 hrim za hromom hrjukotyť;
 to, jak uhol', nič zčornije,
 to, jak krov, začervonije.
 Dnibr klekoče, stohne, plače,
 hryvu syvuju trjase;
 vin reve j na kamin' skače
 kamin' rve, hryze, nese . . .
 Hrim ŷčo hrymne, v bereh hrjane—
 z puščy polumja prohljane.
 Zapalalo i stemnilo,
 zastohnalo v nebesax;
 došč lynuv . . . Zahomonilo
 na horax, poljax, v lisax.
 I z doščamy ta z hromamy
 Dnibr reve miž berehamy—*

("The tempest shrieks and howls, and the pine forest crackles, in the clouds lightning blazes, crash upon crash the thunder rages; the night blackens like coal, and now it flashes, blood-red. The Dnieper boils and groans and laments, shaking its gray mane it roars and surges up on the rocks, crumbling, gnawing and carrying stone away. . . . The thunder cracks, rumbling into the forest—and from a thicket there is a flash of fire. In the heavens a conflagration, then darkness. . . . And then a groan was heard; the rain came pouring down in torrents, resounding through forest, field and hill. And with all the cloudbursts and thunderpeals the Dnieper roars between its banks.")

or:

*V čornyx xmarax, v čornyx xmarax
 z nebom misjac' i zirky,
 červonijut' v čornyx xmarax,
 hrajut', hrajut' blyskavky.
 Hrjak, i daleko zahurkotilo!
 Viter sxvatyvsja, i zahulo!
 V luzi, v dibrobi zahomonilo;
 more povstalo i zarevlo!*

*Triskotnja v borax, bo sosny vitr i hrim striljaje;
Halas! Hrim i viter zemlju j more b'je, karaje . . .*

("In the black clouds, the dark black clouds, the moon, the stars and the sky are all hidden, the black clouds glow red as flashes of lightning dart here and there. Thunder struck and rumbled off in the distance. The wind sprang up and suddenly died down! Through meadow and grove—a reverberation: the sea swelled up and began to roar! The pine forest crackles, its trees assaulted by the thunder and wind; crash! The land and the sea, too, are thrashed, chastized. . . .")

Alongside this violent, nocturnal landscape, there is another, the grave-covered steppe ("*na hrobovyšču v nič hlupu*"—"in a cemetery in the still of night"). For Metlyn's'kyj, these *mohyly* (grave-mounds) with their corpses are the testimony of a past which seems to be gone forever: a *hetman* steps out of his grave and listens:

*Na storoži moje uxo,
a vse tyxo, a vse hluxo . . .
Čy kozak i kin' umer?
Čy orel bez kryl, bez per?*

("My ears are on the alert, but all is quiet, all is still. . . .
Can the Cossack and his horse be dead? Can the eagle
have no wings or feathers?")

In other poems, fallen Cossacks hold disquisitions in their graves; but they, too, will be forgotten:

De nedavno kozak homoniv . . .

*tam po stepu tyxo
tuman rozljahajet'sja,
a misjac' z-za xmary
pohljane y xovajet'sja . . .*

*Čuješ, jak i viter
zasvystav, zahomoniv . . .
Plače oplakuje
kozakiv, svojix brativ:*

*Po stepax, po bajrakax,
u piskax kistky poxovaje;
pisnju pomynal'nuju,
pisnju dovhuju spivaje . . .*

("Where not long ago a Cossack spun his tales
now that steppe is silent, fog extends everywhere, and from
behind the clouds the moon in hiding gazes out
Did you hear, even the wind whistled and sighed. It is la-
menting, bewailing the Cossacks, its kin: it is burying their
bones in the sands, in the steppes, in the valleys; it is sing-
ing that endless song, their requiem. . . .")

To Metlyns'kyj it seems that only words and poetry are still alive in Ukraine. Accordingly, his next favorite image is that of the *bandurist*; however, he is the last *bandurist* ("*Ostannij bandurysta*") simply expressing the hope that poetry will not die with him:

*Može i pisnja z vitrom xodytyme,
dijde do sercja, serce palatyme;
može j bandury šče xto učuje,
j serce zanyje i zatoskuje . . .
I banduru i mene
kozačen'ko spomjane . . .*

("Perhaps my song too will spread with the wind, touch
someone's heart and will set it afire; perhaps someone will
still hear the *bandura*, and his heart will ache and grieve.
And both my *bandura* and I will be remembered by some
young Cossack. . . .")

Metlyns'kyj addresses himself, either directly or through his heroes, to the reader, to nature, and to God. The extreme pathos in his appeals reflects his lack of certainty that anyone is listening:

*Xaj že hrim nas počuje, ščo v xmarax konaje . . .
Xaj naš holos daleko po vitru nese . . .
Xaj Dnibr starodavnij 'd nas pisnju počuje,
poky vin nas v more ne vnese, ne vkyne,
poky mova y holos v nas do tla ne zhyne . . .*

("Let the thunder hear us while chastizing the clouds. . . .
Let the wind carry our voices far away. . . . Let the ancient
Dnieper hear our song before he carries us off or throws us
into the sea, and before our language and our voice perish
altogether. . . .")

Metlyns'kyj sees himself as the last *bandurist* or the last Cossack ("*Kozak ta burja*"—"The Cossack and the Storm") whose voices resound throughout Ukraine for the last time, like the final flourish of national life. However, deeper and stronger than this voice is "the cry of the heart":

*Ni! kryk—to šče ne kryk, jakyj učuje uxo
i do jakoho myr pryvyk.
Otto strašnišyj kryk, jak tyxo, hluxo,
zamovk jazyk, bo v serci kryk!*

("No! This cry is not a cry the ear can perceive, nor one
known to the world. It is the most terrible cry, so quiet
and still, the tongue is silent, for the heart is crying!")

Metlyns'kyj's poems, all equally pessimistic and gloomy, are themselves the embodiment of this "cry of the heart." His fervent desire is this:

*Hrim napusty na nas, Bože, spaly nas u požari,
bo i v mene i v banduri vže hlas zamyraje.
Vže ne hrymityme, vže ne horityme, jak v xmari
pisnja v narodi, bo vže naša pisnja konaje. . .*

("Unleash your thunder on us, God, let your fires con-
sume us, for my voice and that of the *bandura* are now
fading. No longer will our song, as if in the clouds, re-
verberate and glow in our people, for our song is now
dying. . . .")

The figure of Metlyns'kyj as a poet is always highlighted by this hopeless tone of darkest despair. This same vein is also maintained in several poems which seem to have no symbolic significance; they simply present gloomy melancholy impressions. However, because no individual can truly live and create if he lacks all hope, there are some poems of Metlyns'kyj's in which he expresses the feelings of a Ukrainian and Russian patriot (a not infrequent combination at that time) and a Slavophile. Clearly, there was no contradiction for Metlyns'kyj

between his poems about his native language and customs on the one hand, and his historical and philosophical world view on the other.

The poetry of Metlyns'kyj is philosophical throughout—for the most part, historico-philosophical. Admittedly, it is that kind of philosophical poetry in which every thought appears only in concrete form, as an image. This accounts for the dearth of abstract words in his work which, however, is rich in the lexicon of the Romantic tradition (*kozak, hetman, mohyla, hajdamaka, bandurysta, bandura*).

The form which his poems assume is often fantastic or “free” with no definite plot and with frequent changes of rhythm. Only a few poems adhere to the Romantic genres of ballads—e.g., “*Pokotyple*” (“The Feathergrass”) with the same plot as Kvitka’s poem “*Pidzemna cerkva*” (“The Underground Church”), seemingly based on Mickiewicz’s *Świtez*—and songs. Metlyns'kyj’s translations (from the Czech manuscript of Dvůr Králové, from works of the Czech, Čelakovský and the Germans L. Uhland, J. Kerner, A. Grün, and from Slavic folk songs) are, in some respects, closer to Ukrainian folk poetry than are his original poems. However, Metlyns'kyj’s language seems the farthest removed of all Ukrainian Romantics, from the folk language. Except for isolated diminutives (*xmarka, zirka, nič'en'ka*—the diminutives of cloud, star, night, etc.), there are very few folk song expressions (such as “*mohyla z vitrom hovoryla*”—“the grave-mound spoke with the wind,” “*voron krjače*”—“the raven is cawing”). While Metlyns'kyj’s vocabulary was not extensive, it was the first attempt to create a new language, a language for the educated person. The attempt failed; his words were forgotten, and now often seem quaint and awkward (even though his Russiansims and Slavonicisms are rare—e.g., *hlas*, etc. Nor is the contemporary reader impressed with Metlyns'kyj’s verse: the rhythm varies and is often incorrect; also, the rhymes are identical, mainly grammatical. Yet, while Metlyns'kyj’s poems would hardly be popular today, their historical importance cannot be denied.

4. Continuing in the same direction and with the same forms was the modest poetic legacy of the noted historian Mykola Kostomarov (pseudonym, Jeremija Halka, 1817-85). The sole difference was its tone, an optimistic faith in the future of the Ukrainian people. Kostomarov shared neither Metlyns'kyj’s gloomy prognostics nor his naive belief in “the white czar.” The images he used to describe contemporary life were, however, practically identical: the grave-mound in which “*maty ridnesen'ka*” (“our dear mother”) slept; and murky night:

*De Zadniprovja kraj opustilyj,
de nema xat, bovvanijut' mohyly,*

*de nema halasu, vyjut' vovky,
de bula Sič, žyly kozaky,
xodyv ja niččju, misjac' červonyj
sydiv u xmari i burju nahonyv . . .*

("There in the deserted lands beyond the Dnieper, where there are no houses, only massive grave-mounds where no noise is heard except wolves howling, where the Sič once was and where Cossacks lived, I used to walk at night; the crimson moon sat in the clouds inciting a storm. . . .")

But the singer is successful in calling the mother forth from the grave. Then, from out of the dark forest emerges "*jakas' molodycja*" ("some kind of young woman"), the poet's muse who demands of him songs "*dlja vsjoho rodu, . . . dlja vsij rodyny*" ("for all his people . . . for all his family"). Kostomarov, like Metlyns'kyj, regarded song and poetry as perhaps the greatest force of the time that could regenerate the Ukrainian people. This rebirth was viewed by him within the wider framework of the regeneration of the entire world:

*Prokynut'sja vsi narody,
zavit vičnyj pryjmut',
vorohiv tysjačolitnix
vorohy obijmut' . . .*

("All nations will awake from slumber, and receive the immortal covenant, enemies will embrace enemies of millennia. . . .")

The nations inferred are primarily the Slavic nations: Kostomarov responded to a much stronger degree than other Xarkovites to the ideology of Slavophilism.

Kostomarov seems to have had a fairly optimistic faith in the victory of the eternal forces of "*pravda j volja*" ("truth and liberty") which, for him, were most clearly represented by Christianity. His poetry is suffused with the theme of "truth and liberty": the poet rises up against "*rozvinčanyj pravdoju tyran*" ("the tyrant whom truth can overthrow"), against those who:

*. . . v haslo nevoli
obertaje xrest vsečesnyj,
haslo pravdy j voli . . .*

(“. . . would transform the all-holy cross, the signal of truth and freedom, into a signal of slavery. . .”)

and also against a culture which is alienated from the people. As a historian, Kostomarov saw clearly that times were changing. His poet, Mytusa, knows that after this period has passed (when “*hustijut' xmary*”—“clouds have gathered”) then “*znovu rozkonyt' sonce tuman vikovičnyj*”—(“once more, the sun will disperse the all-pervading fog”). Both the ancient princely era and the *hetman* period are celebrated by Kostomarov, the historian, in “Mytusa,” “*Lastivka*” (“The Swallow”) and “*Did pasičnyk*” (“The Old Beekeeper”), respectively. But, what is most important, he recognizes in this past the roots of a national tradition that has continued into the present. Into the mouth of a hero from the times of Volodymyr Monomax, he places these words:

*Blahoslovy, stara maty,
na dobreje dilo,
za svjatuju rus'ku zemlju
oddat' dušu j tilo . . .*

(“Give me your blessing, venerable mother, in this sacred mission: that I may give my soul and body for the holy land of Rus'. . .”)

However, the subject matter of this ballad is borrowed from a *duma* about Konovčenko; moreover, the work seems autobiographical in intent (as if addressed to his own mother!). For Kostomarov, the emphasis on the historical unity of Ukraine is associated with a consciousness of its territorial integrity:

*Od Sosny do Sjana vona prostjahnulasja,
do xmary Karpats'koji vona dotorknulasja,
Čornomors'koju vodoju umuvajet'sja,
luhamy, jak kvitočkamy, kvitčajet'sja . . .*

(“She stretched from Sosna to Sjan, she touched the clouds of the Carpathians, she bathes in the waters of the Black Sea, and is bedecked with meadows, as if they were flowers. . .”)

Himself Kostomarov saw in the role of singer and prophet:

*Spivatymu, spivatymu, poky hlasu stane,
xoč i sluxat' ne zaxočut', ja ne perestanu . . .*

("I will sing, I will sing as long as I have voice, even if they should not want to listen, I will not stop. . . .")

A separate, although small group of Kostomarov's poems is composed of his philosophical poetry. Not only does he pay a debt to historiosophy, he also borrows from philosophic Romanticism. In the following typical example of philosophical "night poetry," Kostomarov develops the favorite Romantic idea (foreshadowing J. Kerner and Tjutčev) of the contrast between nature--everlasting, yet indifferent to man, and the world of man--mutable, yet self-important:

*Vyjdu niččju na mohylu,
hroby bovvanijut',
pohljažu ja v jasne nebo,
tam zori zorijut'.*

*Rivnym ruxom, žyvym ruxom,
vičnoju krasoju,
bez upynu i bez liku
plynut' nadi mnoju.*

*Plynut' zori v ladnim xori
vičnymy šljaxamy,
ne nam, ne nam, ditjam praxa
ljubovat'sja vamy . . .*

*Nas nevolja naša dolja
na svit porodyla,
podražnyla svobodoju,
ta j ne vdovol'nyla.*

*Dala rozum, piznavaty,
ščo my durni zrodu,
dala serce narikaty
na vlasnu pryrodu.*

*Svitjat' zori, jak svityly,
i budut' svityty,*

*a my, na nyx podyvšys',
ljažem v zemlju tlity . . .*

("I climb the mound at night, the graves loom large, I glance up toward the bright sky, there the stars are shining. . . . With a steady, gliding motion and with infinite grace, freely and interminably, they sail over my head. The stars flow by in an orderly choir along countless routes; it is not for us to admire you, children of dust as we are. . . . Our fate bore us into a world of bondage; she teased us with freedom for a while, but then thwarted us. She gave us a mind to recognize our inherent ignorance; she gave us a heart to reproach our human condition. . . . The stars are shining, as they have in the past, and as they will in the future. But we, after we have done gazing at them, will lie down in the earth to decay. . . .")

Related to this historiosophic and natural-philosophic symbolism are poems of a lyrical, melancholy nature—"Tuha" ("Longing"), "Nadobranič" ("On Bidding Goodnight") which also render their due to certain Romantic subject matter. The remainder of Kostomarov's work consists of love lyrics in the style of folk poetry (e.g., parallelism between man's experiences and phenomena of nature), and translations (Byron, Mickiewicz, the Dvůr Králové manuscript).

The type of language used by Kostomarov is reminiscent of Metlyn's'kyj's. It, too, was an attempt to create a language of educated society, and it encountered the same difficulties as Metlyn's'kyj's. However, Kostomarov made more extensive use of the lexicon and phraseology of the folk song. He wrote paraphrases of folk tales, and in his love lyrics he imitated the language of folk songs. Apart from this, he wrote paraphrases of entire songs. These contained few quotations, but did adhere to the spirit of the song as this excerpt from the already-cited ballad "The Swallow." The following will illustrate this:

*Sidla konja, meč znimaje,
ide za polkamy.
Stara maty z žalju mlije,
k zemli prypadaje,
svoje dytja nepokirne
speršu proklynaje,
a napotim požalila,
ta j molyt'sja Bohu,*

ščob dav Hospod' molodomu
ščaslyvu dorohu . . .

.....

Odmovljaje knjaz' staršy—

"Česnaja vdovyce!

Oženyvsja syn tvij mylyj:

vzjav sobi divycju,

narjadnuju j bahatuju,

z mnohymy skarbamy,

kosa jiji šovkovaja

ubrana kvitkamy . . ."

("He saddles his horse, raises his sword and rides off to join the regiments. His aged mother, faint with worry, falls to the ground, at first cursing but then pitying her disobedient child; and finally she prays to God, beseeching him to grant the youth safe passage. . . . The prince in command announces: 'Esteemed widow! Your dear son is married. He took a rich maiden of great wealth, gorgeous raiment and silken hair adorned with flowers. . . .')"

However, even Kostomarov's imitations of folk songs were not without errors in language and cumbersome phraseology.

Kostomarov paid a great deal of attention to versification too. He introduced several innovations, including the use of "internal rhyme," the rhyming of individual words in the same line, as in a poem quoted above, "*Zori*" ("Stars"): "*plynut' zori/ v ladnim xori; nas nevolja/ naša dolja*." He instituted new meters, such as the successful "elegiac distych"; it is represented in a poem which, in extremely typical Romantic fashion, protests the overestimation of ancient Hellas (a tendency, revived with Classicism, which diverted the attention of contemporaries away from their own national life):

*pamjat' posmertna tvoja zaslipljaje manoju nam oči,—
my, na tebe hljadjučy, ne bačyly sami sebe.*

("Your posthumous fame dazzled us with delusion; we contemplated you and were blind to ourselves.")

"*Davnyna*" ("Antiquity"), on the same theme, is another of these poems typified by foreign words (e.g., Sparta, *ilot* [helot]) and allusions to events outside the

poem. Such poems were introduced into Ukrainian literature by the Xarkiv Romantics with a view toward making it a more truly complete literature for a complete nation.

In addition, Kostomarov wrote several interesting Romantic folk-style ballads, often with fairy-tale plots.

5. Also characteristic of the attempt to create a "full-blown" literature were Kostomarov's dramatic efforts. During the brief period of his literary activity he completed the plays "*Sava Čalyj*" (1838) and "*Perejaslavs'ka nič*" ("*The Night at Perejaslav*," 1839) and began several other dramatic works, e.g., "*Kosyns'kyj*," "*Mazepa*," "*Ukrajins'ki sceny 1649*" ("*Ukrainian Scenes from 1649*"), and from Roman history "*Mučenycja Fevronija*" ("*Fevronija the Martyr*"). His Russian contributions included the drama "*Kremucij Kord*" and translations of Shakespeare (Kostomarov's principal mentor in dramatic poetry, although sometimes he looked to Schiller). The tragedies of Kostomarov are filled with dramatic tension and, in the Romantic tradition, end in the death of the heroes. Sava Čalyj (portrayed unhistorically as a 17th century figure) dreams of becoming *hetman*, but the elders choose his father, Petro. Sava decides to join the Polish side, but first he marries Kateryna, the fiancée of his friend, Hnat Holyj. The Poles demand of Sava that he agree to institute Church Union; meanwhile, Hnat is inciting the Cossacks against Sava. Thus, Sava finds himself alone between two opposing camps. The Cossacks finally kill Sava and Kateryna, and even Hnat, when they discover that his accusations against Sava were false. The tragedy "*The Night at Perejaslav*" combines tableaux of the national life of 1649 and of the uprising with scenes from the individual drama of the leader of the insurgents, Lysenko. His sister Maryna is in love with the Polish *starosta* (senior town official). Lysenko and the *starosta* fight a duel, wounding each other; thus, this drama, too, ends in the death of the two leading characters.

In Kostomarov's plays, the conflicts are not only external, but also internal, within the heroes' souls. Sava (like Shakespeare's Coriolanus) is the author of his own fate: he abandons his fatherland in the conviction that the Cossacks acted unjustly in failing to recognize his merit and to elect him as *hetman*. However, he remains conscious of his duty toward his own people and rejects the Polish proposal (Church Union) that would bring oppression to his homeland. Kostomarov complicates this internal conflict with others, both external and internal: Sava learns that Hnat has been courting Kateryna; also, his rival for the *hetmanstvo* is his own father, etc. Similarly, Maryna is beset by internal conflict: her soul is torn between love for her homeland and for one of its enemies. And, as a further complication of the conflict, Kostomarov makes Maryna the sister of the leader of the insurgents.

Kostomarov avoided, perhaps intentionally, almost all ethnographic detail. Nor was his presentation of historical background very successful (or, it may not even have been one of his concerns). But it is not really important that historical truth is undermined by the vagaries of the sources from which he drew (*Istoriia Rusiv*, forged *dumy*). For Kostomarov's tragedies are "high tragedies" with abstract heroes. In fact, their speeches are, in the Shakespearean manner, often totally detached from all concrete action, as in this monolog of Lysenko:

... *ščo odna*
duša joho bezsyl'na, dyvljučysja
na hirku dolju myloji rodyny,
lita nad neju sokolom po xmarax
i, bačučy brativs'ke lyxo, stohne,
i darom poryvajet'sja, jak xvylja,
ščo po Dnipru v nehodu poxodžaje,
klekoče, rvet'sja, syvym pylom xlys'ka,
xotila b nače bereh ves' zalyty . . .

("... that only his soul, powerless, beholds the bitter fate of his beloved family as it ranges over it like a falcon in the clouds. And seeing the fraternal strife, it groans. Then, unaccountably, it surges up, like a wave that buffets the Dnieper in foul weather. It roars and breaks up, throwing off a gray spray as if it wanted to deluge the entire bank. . . .")

The weakness of Kostomarov's dramas does not consist in this abstract quality, however. It is attributable, rather, to the fact that Kostomarov fails to endow the scenes of concrete action with the kind of impressive, dazzling locutions and inspired vocabulary that characterize the writing in all of Shakespeare's tragedies. Kostomarov's language is composed of many diverse elements: in crowd scenes, for example, he incorporates both high style (including Slavonicisms) and vulgarisms. However, Kostomarov cannot be charged with "Kotljarevščyna," for the type of abusive epithets and coarse expressions used by him may be found even in Shakespeare. Besides, their role and function in Kostomarov differs completely from Kotljarev's'kyj. Perhaps the only similarity with the Kotljarev's'kyj tradition lies in the presence of songs and a few sentimental dialogs. All of this could not excuse his dramas for being insufficiently scenic; nor, in particular, did it endear them to the later, and still ethnography-oriented, Ukrainian stage. No new tradition could be forged by these rather ponderous plays.

Later writings of Kostomarov comprise a "macaronic" tale with Ukrainian

dialog: “*Černihivka*” (“A Černihiv Maiden”), numerous historical works and an interesting analysis of “the two nations”—Russia and Ukraine—which contains, along with some simplistic views of the problem, certain penetrating thoughts. These later efforts, while quite relevant to the history of Ukrainian intellectual culture, do not belong to that narrowest of circles, the works of Ukrainian *belles-lettres*; they do retain, nevertheless, many traces of the Romantic world view. The most important of these works, *Knyhy bytyja* (*The Books of Genesis*), written with the closest collaboration of Kostomarov, is, however, part of the history of Kievan Romanticism.

6. Among several lesser poets standing on the periphery of the Xarkiv circle, the name of I. Sreznevs’kyj must again be considered, now for his own poetic efforts—the fake *dumy* in *Zaporožian Antiquity*. Although these “forgeries” were not genuine folk creations, they are interesting revelations of the degree to which the Romantics of the time understood the style of folk poetry. While the factual side of these fakes was taken from *Istorijs Rusiv*, their musical texts were sometimes based on actual folk *dumy*, and sometimes were created independently and with much more ideology than the originals. The devices of folk poetry were used extensively; indeed, it is partly because of these fake *dumy* that certain poetic formulae in later Ukrainian Romantic poetry were already “commonplaces”: “*v surmy zasurmyly*” (“they began sounding the *surmy*” [military trumpets]), “*u bubny vdarjajut*” (“they are beating the drums”), “*revnuly harmaty*” (“the cannons roared”), etc. Ševčenko himself made abundant use of this wealth of expressions and images. Of course, it is not clear whether Sreznevs’kyj masterminded the forgery himself or whether he was the accomplice of a friend.

O. Korsun (1818-91) began to write poetry in the Kotljarevs’kyj tradition. He also collected and made paraphrases of popular superstitions regarding them as mere anecdotes. Apart from his primitive Slavophilism, Korsun became interested in Romantic poetry. He wrote paraphrases of Russian and Czech poetry; and in 1845 he greeted Ševčenko with a poem in which he in fact requested of the poet merely “*holosinnja nad trunoju*” (“a lament over the coffin”) and “*pisni pro kolyšnje*” (“songs about bygone eras”).

Myxajlo Petrenko (born in 1817) was the author of several poems having motifs of Romantic longing for the remote, symbolized for him by the sky:

*Tonu tam dušeu, tonu tam očamy,
hlyboko, hlyboko, pomiž ziron'kamy.
Tonu tam hlyboko, jak kamin' toj v mori.
Ni! tak hynu v nebi, jak v ljutomu hori:
v joho temnu propast' ja kynuvsja zmalu . . .*

*Pokryte xmaramy, mov xvyljamy te more,
ščo tam ty movyšč v vyšyni?*

.....
*I mova sja, j velyka rič
dlja mene temna tak, mov taja nič . . .*

(“There I sink my soul, there I sink my eyes, deeply, deeply among the little stars. There I sink deeply, like that stone in the sea. No! Then I am lost, as in a fierce tempest: since childhood have I hurled myself into its dark abyss. . . . Covered with clouds as is that sea with waves, why do you keep silent there in the heights? . . . And this language, and great matters, are for me as obscure as that night. . . .”)

He is despondent because he has no wings: “*Dyvljus’ ja na nebo ta j dumku hadaju, čomu ja ne sokil, čomu ne litaju*” (“I gaze at the sky and brood over the thought: why am I not a falcon, why can I not fly”). For he feels that the sky is “his refuge” as he hears the “heavenly music” of the stars. None of these typical themes of “night poetry” rises above the level of doleful lamentation however. The monotonous images and vocabulary (I grieve, I weep, I moan, sorrow, melancholy, tears, torment, grief) confirm Petrenko’s poems in the mold of sentimental romances. Nevertheless, Petrenko’s work is significant and unique in that he forsook folk song subject matter and attempted to relate the language and themes of his romances more closely to the spiritual life of the educated person. Unfortunately, although melancholy Romantic poetry was now able to pose questions of universal human concern against a background of sorrow and melancholy, and to philosophize, thereby escaping hopeless pessimism, Petrenko could not rise to the challenge. Only occasionally does a truly Romantic image appear in his work: a song is “*holos z toho sveta*” (“a voice from that other world”), the melody of a song is frenzied, “*bezumna ta v nočnuju poru*” (“insane, especially by night”).

Considerably more interesting is the work of a relative of Borovykovs’kyj, Opanas Špyhoc’kyj (dates unknown), who published between 1830 and 1835. His poems that appeared in print include only excerpts from his translation of Puškin’s *Poltava*, a ballad and some translations of sonnets by Mickiewicz of which the following provides an illustration:

*Naplyv ja na rozlyv suxoho okeanu,
nyrjaje v zilli viz i, mov miž xvył’ čovnok,*

*plyve miž povnyx luk do kylymu kvitok;
 mynaju ostrovy zeleni ja burjanu.
 Smerkaje vže; nihde ni šljaxu, ni kurhanu;
 šukaju šljaxovyx na nebi ja zirok.
 Hen' blys'! Čy xmara to? To ziron'ky svitok?
 Ni! To synije Dnistr—to svitlo Akkermanu . . .*

("Floating along, I came up against the inundation of a waterless ocean. My cart plunges into some plants and, like a boat among waves, it flows through the deluged meadows toward a carpet of flowers; green islands and weeds pass by me. Dusk is already approaching; not a pathway or a barrow is to be seen; I seek in the sky for stars to guide me. There's a flash! Is it only a cloud? Or is it the small light of some little star? No! It is the blue Dniester—the light of Akkerman. . .")

It was during the 1840s that the works began to appear of Jakiv Šcholiv (1824-98), probably the most distinguished poet of the Xarkiv circle. However, he resumed writing several decades later and it is to this other period of Ukrainian literature that the majority of his works belong. His earlier efforts, despite their formal masterliness, are in the Petrenko vein, not of meditations, but of the poems characterized by vagueness of mood.

E. WESTERN UKRAINE

1. The emergence of a literature in the vernacular was even more significant in Galicia than in the territory of Russian Ukraine. For here in Western Ukraine the Romantic movement, through the works of Austrian Slavs, was greatly instrumental in the actual awakening of national sentiment (there being no question yet of revival!). An important part was also played by the publication of Maksymovyč's collection of Ukrainian songs and of other such works.

The beginnings of the national awakening originated with a small group of seminarians in Lviv, despite the fact that they had little contact with the latest West European poetry (Schiller as well as the Romantics were strictly forbidden in the religious seminaries of the 1830s). The "Ruthenian Triad," as this group was called, consisted of Markijan Šaškevyč (1811-43), Ivan Vahylevyč (1811-66) and Jakiv Holovac'kyj (1814-88). Their first collection of poetry using the vernacular did not reach print. But in 1835, Šaškevyč succeeded in publishing an

ode in *Holos Halyčan* (*Voice of the Galician People*) in Lviv, and in 1837 their famous collection *Rusalka Dnistrovaja* appeared.

For Šaškevyč, the awakening of Ukrainians was the final stage in the process of the general awakening of the Slavic people. He ascribed to literature a vital role in national life: "The literature of every nation is its very life. It is the way the nation thinks, it is the reflection of its soul. It should spring up and mature within the nation itself. Literature is the first requirement of every nation."

Ukrainian Romantic literature in Galicia was characterized by qualities of mellowness, tenderness and lyricism. This was due partly to the fact that the first representatives of national literature here were ecclesiastics, partly to Šaškevyč's own personal disposition, and partly to the peculiar nature of Austrian literary life in the Metternich era (and in the provinces!).

The fate of all the members of the "Ruthenian Triad" was unfortunate. Šaškevyč came to a premature death; Vahylevyč ended his days in the Polish camp; and Holovac'kyj, while he did make some valuable contributions in scholarship, eventually became a hardened Moscovophile. Other leaders took their place in the national development of Galicia.

2. Šaškevyč, because of his brief and difficult life, left only a small literary legacy. But what he did write, chiefly poetry, indicates that he possessed artistic talent. His poems are, for the most part, songs, broadly melancholic in mood, and delicate and tender in tone—perhaps too delicate for the content, which is quite gloomy at times. Folksong imitations and possibly the influence of Polish versification led Šaškevyč to reject (although not as radically as Ševčenko) the use of regularly alternating stresses, the essence of "tonic versification" (see below, pt. F, no. 5):

*Iz-za hory, iz-za lisa
vitrec' povivaje;
skažy, skažy, tyxyj vitre,
jak sja myla maje?*

*Čy zdorova, čy vesela,
lyčko rumjanen'ke?
Čy sumuje, čy horjuje,
čy lyčko blidnen'ke?*

*Bo ja tužu, bo ja plaču,
sl'ozamy vmyvajus',
veseloji hodynnon'ky
vže ne spodivajus' . . .*

*Jak by meni kryl'cja maty,
sokolom zletity, —
tjažku tuhu iz serden'ka
pry mylij rozbyty! . . .*

("From behind the hills, from behind the forest, the breeze comes wafting. Tell me, tell me, gentle breeze, how fares my beloved? Is she well, is she gay, is she rosy-cheeked? Does she sorrow, does she grieve, is her poor face pale? For I languish, for I weep, and drench my face with tears; no more do I hope for happy times. . . . If only I had wings to fly off like a falcon—to my beloved, there to dissipate my heart's oppressive grief! . . .")

As well as such melancholy songs, Šaškevyč wrote hymns with patriotic appeals:

*Rus'ka maty nas rodyla,
rus'ka maty nas povyla,
rus'ka maty nas ljubyla, —
čomu ž mova jej ne myla?
čom sja nev vstydaty majem?
čom čužoju poljubljajem? . . . **

("Mother Ruthenia gave us birth, Mother Ruthenia took care of us, Mother Ruthenia gave us love,—why should her language not be dear to us, why must we be ashamed of it? Why do we love another? . . .")

or:

*Razom, razom, xto syl maje —
honit' z Rusy mraky t'mavi!
Zavyst' naj nas ne spynjaje,
razom k svitlu, druhy žvavi!*

("All together now, those who are strong—chase out of Ruthenia the fogs of ignorance! Let jealousy not hinder us, together, toward the light, bold-hearted friends!")

**Jej* = *jij*; *nev* = *neju*.

Šaškevyč can strike the same tender notes with patriotic material as he does in his songs:

*Až mylo zhadaty, jak to serce bjet'sja,
koly z Ukrajinu rus'kaja pisen'ka
tak mylo, solodko kolo sercja vjet'sja,
jak kolo myloho divka rusjaven'ka . . .*

(“It is ever so pleasant to call to mind how the breast flutters when a Ruthenian ballad from Ukraine entwines itself around the heart as charmingly and sweetly as a fair-haired maiden around her sweetheart. . . .”)

While the works of Kvitka, Metlyn's'kyj and even Ševčenko did reach Šaškevyč toward the end of his brief life, it was impossible for his works to become popular with Eastern Ukrainians. For Galician poetry was based on the local language. In contrast to the Xarkovites who wrote in what was virtually the only language of a newly colonized (albeit large) territory, the Galicians wrote in the Western Ukrainian language, employing the various dialects of this region. Only in recent times with the development of the use of dialects in modern poetry has the work of Šaškevyč (and other representatives of Galician Romanticism) become understood in Eastern Ukraine. During his own time his poetry was denied popularity primarily because of its dialectal forms, such as “*zapus-tylas'*” (literally, she let herself go too far) for *zapusyla jesy*, etc.; “*z nedolev'*” for *z nedoleju* (due to misfortune), *nado mnov* (over me), *sja dolja dila* (good fortune has been lost), etc. There are also individual dialectal words like *cvitka* (flower), *zacvyla* (it began blossoming), “*harazd*” for *ščastja* (luck), “*sly*” for *koly* (when), “*rozpuskajes'*” for *rozkryvajet'sja* (it is unfolded), etc. In particular, there are words which in Eastern Ukraine have different meanings, different shades of meaning or slightly different forms: *syven'ki* . . . *oči* (quite gray eyes), *čuduješsja* (you are amazed), *zhirčyvajes'* (you are becoming bitter), etc. Perhaps the greatest havoc was played by the accents which, from the point of view of the Eastern Ukrainian language, seem most unusual: *xmaróju*, *bilesén'kym*, *dumáješ*, *búla*, *ridnája*, etc. The phraseology, too, must have been confusing to the Eastern Ukrainian, even though it often merely came from Galician Pidlisja: *tuha iz serden'ka* (sorrow from the heart), “*pry myli*” for *kolo myloji* (near his sweetheart), *jasni hromy* (flashing lightnings). Some lines are practically unintelligible to the Eastern Ukrainian. Among the bewildering figures of speech are: “*Vkryvalam tja čornov mrakov*” (“I covered you with a black fog”), “*Učynylas' momu sercju z harazdom rozluku*” (“You bade my heart take leave of happi-

ness”), “*Xvylja jiji pociluje i napered strilyt’*” (“The wave kisses it, and in a flash is gone”). In a fully developed literature, poetry with a dialectal flavor can be charming; but for the still incomplete Ukrainian literature of the time it was a superfluous luxury.

The subject matter of Šaškevyč’s poetry is not very extensive. Apart from the national motifs (whose images include *bandurist*, *hetman*, *kozak* and *mohyla*), there are tender notes of sorrow and melancholy with characteristic diminutives: *hiren’ka hodyno* (o, grievous hour), *slizon’ky* (little tears), etc. Not unexpectedly, Šaškevyč’s poetry contains a considerable amount of symbolism which, however, is not very complex or profound, but rather typically Romantic. For example, the poet listens to the past:

... *po mohylax ljahav ja*
bucimto spočyty, a to pidsluxaty,
jak to stara buval’ščyna bude rozmovljaty . . .

(“I lay upon the grave-mounds, as if to rest, but really so as to overhear the ancient past talking. . . .”)

or soars above the earth on an eagle:

Pustyv orel bystre oko
v vičnist’ nezmiryumu,
sjahnuv duxom hen hlyboko
v hlybin’ nezmyslymu . . .

(“The eagle cast his keen eye toward boundless eternity, and his spirit reached far and deep into the incomprehensible abyss. . . .”)

The typical words here are *nezmiryumu* (boundless) and *nezmyslymu* (incomprehensible). In another conventional image, life is symbolized by a flower that fades after blooming only briefly:

Cvitka dribna
molyła nen’ku,
vesnu ranen’ku:
“Nene ridnaja!
Vvoly my volju,
daj meni dolju

*ščob ja zacvyła,
ves' luh skrasyła . . .*"

.....

*"Donju holubko,
žal' meni tebe,
harnaja ljubko,
bo vyxor svysne,
moroz potysne,
burja zahude;
krasa zmarnije
lyčko zčornije
holovon'ku sklonyš,
lyston'ky zronyš, –
žal' sercju bude."*

("A tiny flower implored of her mother, the early Spring: 'Mother, my dear! Grant my wish, give me good fortune that I may bloom and adorn all the meadow. . . .' 'My darling daughter, I grieve for you, my pretty one, for whirlwinds will come whistling, frosts will descend, storms will rage. Your beauty will fade, your dear face will darken, your tiny head will droop and you will lose your little leaves. And it will break my heart.'")

Included among the landscapes that figure in Šaškevič's poetry is the Romantics' favorite, night:

*Svit vže smerkom počorniv,
sumnen'ko puhač zapiv,
Ni tam ljudej, ni tam xaty!*

*Blud tu svyščę, tuman hraje,
v husti lisy zavede . . .*

.....

*Temna, tyxo i strašnen'ko,
časom lyš voron zakrjače,
zakrjače sumnen'ko.*

("The world now grew dark with twilight, the horned owl began his mournful screech. Not a soul nor a dwelling could be seen! One can go astray here, the fog hovers and will lead

you into the impenetrable forest. . . . It is dark, still and terrifying. Only the raven begins cawing from time to time, cawing dolefully. . . .")

or:

*Sonce jasne pomerklo, svit pit'ma nasila,
všyr i vzdovž dovkola sum sja rozljahaje,
čaharamy hustymy t'ma vovkiv zavyla,
nad tynom opustilym halok hamir hraje*

.....
*Navyslo jasne nebo čornymy xmaramy,
tjažkymy husti bory sklonylys' tuhamy,
zojknuly dubrovy i lisy zastohnaly. . .*

("The bright sun disappeared, darkness settled over the world; gloom extends all around, the length and breadth of the earth. Packs of wolves are howling through the dense bush; the caw of the jackdaws reverberates over the lonely paling. . . . The bright sky was covered by a mass of black clouds; the massive pines were bowed with heavy sorrows, the oak groves sighed and the forests began to groan. . . .")

Šaškevyč's poetic efforts are also represented by a couple of ballads, a paraphrase of a popular anecdote, a few folksong imitations and one poor attempt at a *duma*—"Obloha L'vova Xmel'nyc'kym" ("The Siege of Lviv by Xmelnyč'kyj"). Translations from Polish (an excerpt from Goszczyński's *The Castle of Kaniv*), Serbian (songs) and Czech (manuscripts of Dvůr Králové) complete the sphere of Šaškevyč's Romantic-Slavophile interests.

Šaškevyč wrote little prose, but of a varied nature. Remarkably enough, it was more closely related to the norms of literary language of a later period. It embraces his essays, including the very interesting "*Starovyna*" ("Former Times"), a Romantic, publicistic look at antiquity in which Šaškevyč perceived "the countenance of centuries" and the "spirit of his forefathers." It extends to the paraphrase of a folk tale, fables in prose (fourteen), children's religious ditties, and material for a *Čytanka* (reader). The following is his prose description of a nocturnal landscape: "*Sonce spočylo, smerklosja. Tyxa pit'ma nasila tyxi ta uzki zvory, viter bujnyj osinnyj metav xmaramy vid verxa do verxa i hnava spolovilym lyst'om z hir v temni rozdoly, to znov pid krutu stremenu, skrypljačy holymy hiljamy vidvičnoji dubyny, mov velyčajučysja svojeju ljutostiju, a ruhajučys' z jix*

neduhy; zvir šelepótiv čaharamy za žyrom, časamy vovk holodom pertyj dyvnymy zavyv holosamy; peristi opoky, zakljati nad bezvistjamy stojaty, zdavalysja pry nastyhlij ničnij mraci prožyvaty ta svoji minjaty stanovyšča, pro-xodjačysja mov nični mary. . .” (“The sun retired, it grew dark. A silent obscurity pervaded into the peaceful and narrow hollows; the tempestuous autumn wind tossed the clouds about from crest to crest and blew the faded leaves from the hills to the dark lowlands. Then, under a steep promontory it arose again, creaking through the naked branches of the oak wood, seeming to exult in its own fury while railing against their infirmity. In the bushes, a wild animal rustled, pursuing its prey. Now and then there could be heard the strange sounds of a relentless wolf, howling from hunger. With the encroaching night fog, the streaked chalk cliffs hanging over the abyss appeared to come to life and to shift their position like approaching nocturnal phantoms. . .”)

In addition, Šaškevyč left several examples of prose in the high style—in his sermons, translations from the Bible (John, Matthew) and “*Psalmj Ruslanovi*” (“The Psalms of Ruslan”). This is an excerpt from one of them: *Toj, ščo zveliv ničomu zrodyty svity, velyčnoje sonce i misjac’ i t’my zvizd, ščo veliv temnoti perekynutysja v svitlo, z ktoroho doloni sverknuly ohni i vdaryly vody, ktoroho nevydyme oko bačyt’ hadky duš našyx, kotoryj sprjah soboju beznačatok i bezkonec’, ktoroho serce vs’omu svitu serce, a volja harazd vsix vikiv i vsix storon ščastje, —toj z toboju, Boh z toboju.* (“He who out of nothing bade to give birth to the universe, the radiant sun and the moon and many stars, who bade the darkness to become light, from whose palm fires flashed and waters crashed, whose unseen eye perceives the thoughts of our minds, whose being is without beginning and without end, whose heart is the heart of all the world and whose will is the good fortune of all times and the happiness of all places, He is with you, God is with you.”)

3. Second only to Šaškevyč in Galician Romanticism was the talented poet Mykola Ustyjanovyč (1811-85). His rather belated literary activity—from the late 1840s to the early 1850s—was influenced, to some degree, by the literature of Eastern Ukraine. However, most of his poems share the same features as Šaškevyč’s work—dialectalisms: *vesnov* (in spring), *z tobov* (with you), “*plače syna*” for *plače za synom* (she weeps for her son), *perejmyla* (she caught), *sy* (himself, herself, itself), *ty* (yourself), etc.; peculiar accents, more frequent here than in Šaškevyč: *vyskazuváv*, *užás*, *oazáx*, *sylámy*, *naukú*, *krasavýci*, *tatarýn*, *porohańmy*, etc. Numerous diminutives: *tuhen’ka* (tender sorrow), *dušycja* (dear little soul), *hiren’ki* (exceedingly grievous), even *slavon’ka Avstriji* (quite the glory of Austria); and many Church Slavonicisms. In Ustyjanovyč, too, there are only a small number of ballads or poems of the

balladic type, and few song forms and motifs such as:

*Letiv orel z čužynon'ky
ta j stav povidaty
za kervavi dolynon'ky,
za spaleni xaty;*

*ta za kosti bilen'kiji,
vyprani doždžamy,
za mohyly vysokiji,
sypani rukamy . . .*

*Plače divča, plače maty,
z žalju ne vtyxaje,
ščę j svobody ne vydaty,
j mylyj ne vertaje.*

("An eagle came flying from a foreign land and stopped to tell about blood-soaked valleys, about homes reduced to ashes; and about poor white bones, washed by the rains, about high grave-mounds created by human hands. . . . The maiden weeps, the mother weeps, unreconciled with their grief; nor is freedom yet to be seen, nor does their dear one return.")

Ustyjanovyč prefers more complex meters and strophic structures which perhaps accounts for the fair number of (partly successful) "high solemn" anthems of greeting, hymns, and congratulatory verses in his work. Motifs of Austrian patriotism are frequent: e.g., "*De Avstrija, tam naš raj*" ("Where you find Austria, there you find our paradise"). There are also poems with rather dolorous national motifs, such as "*Dumaty hluxo, litamy, vikamy, na nimij čornij mohylī*" ("Over the years and ages, thinking becomes obscured on the mute black grave-mound") or "*snyty o ščasti i kozac'kij slavi*" ("to dream of good fortune and Cossack glory"), or further:

*I na krest vbytyj vražymy rukamy,
ne znay toj narid svobidniščoj doli
nad plač samotnyj bezsonnymy nočamy,
nad svjatoj viry nadiju na hrobi . . .*

("And nailed to a cross by enemy hands, that people knew

no freer fate than the lonely weeping of sleepless nights,
than the hope of holy faith in the grave. . . .")

Ustyjanovyč had a faculty for presenting his ideas in aphorisms; unfortunately these formulations often became lost in lengthy, colorless verses:

*Bo rus'ka dumka—sumnyj xrest na hrobi,
a rus'ka mova—sorom na podobi,
a rus'ke serce—tuha`stepovaja,
a rus'ka dolja—syrota nimaja . . .*

("For a Ruthenian song—is like the mournful cross on a grave; the Ruthenian language—is the image of ignominy; the Ruthenian heart—is the sorrow of the steppe; and the Ruthenian destiny—is to be a mute orphan. . . .")

*Jedna maty jix plekala,
jedna sud'ba byla,
jedna ljubov jix vjazala,
jedna smert' zlučyla . . .*

("One mother brought them up, one fate buffeted them, one love bound them together, and one death united them forever. . . .")

*Kto nese bil'su prysluhu dlja svita,
dlja svojix bratyj, jak toj, ščo vikamy
holodnym xliba podaje dosyta,
kormyt' deržavy svojimy rukamy?*

("Who is of greater service to the world and to his brother than he who, in all ages, gives the hungry all the bread they desire, and who feeds the state with his own hands?")

Ustyjanovyč thus formulates his thoughts about the destiny of Ukraine, about the interrelationship of its individual, severed parts, and about the value of agricultural labor. The best poem of the aphoristic type is the religio-philosophical "*Sotvorytel*" ("The Creator"). Surprisingly, in his numerous didactic poems, these felicitous constructions are less common.

They do, however, embellish entire verses of his *songs*:

*Sumno, marno po dolyni,
počornily bili kvity
požovk lyst na derevyni,
ptax poletiv v inši svity.*

*Od zapada syvi xmary
cilu zemlju zalyvajut',
čaharamy nični mary
z vitramy sja rozmovljajut' . . .*

*Čoho tužys, kalynon'ko,
holovon'ku naxyljajes?
Čoho plačes, divčynon'ko
sljozamy sja zalyvaješ?*

*Čy tja dolja pokynula?
Čy ne maješ matusen'ky?
Čy ty krasa zahynula?
Čy hovorjat' vorižen'ky?*

*Ni mnja dolja pokynula,
ni ne maju matusen'ky,
ni my krasa zahynula
ni hovorjat' vorižen'ky,*

*jno my tužno za vesnoju,
ščo tak borzo perecvila.
Kudy hljanu myslen'koju,
nema toho, ščo m ljubyla*

("It seems sad and empty in the valley, the white flowers have turned dark, the leaves have yellowed on the trees, the birds have flown to other climes. From the west, gray clouds pour over the entire earth; like bushes, the night phantoms converse with the winds. . . . Why do you grieve, dear cranberry, why do you bow down your little head? Why are you lamenting, dear maiden and bursting into tears? Has good fortune forsaken you? Have you no mother? Have you lost your beauty? Do your enemies speak ill of you? No, good fortune has not left me; no, I have my mother still; no, my beauty has not faded; no,

enemies do not defame me. Rather, I am grieving for the spring, which passed so swiftly. No matter where I look, heavy hearted, I cannot see him whom I loved.”)

They are also found in a poem (an imitation of a Polish verse by Korzeniowski) that is a fine example of a verse whose many dialectalisms are, in fact, thematically motivated:

*Verxovyno, svitku ty naš!
Hej, jak u tebe tut mylo! . . .*

*.
Z verxa na verx, a z boru v bir
z lehkoju v serci dumkoju,
v čeresi kris, v rukax topir,
bujaje legin' toboju . . .*

*I koly b pyrs lid z xrehta vid
i vedmid' šybnuv lisamy,
zavijav juh, zahrav Beskyd,
Čeremoš huknuv skalamy:*

*To my to čas, to my to pish',
molodče, nu že v roztvory!
Ovečci splav z kučerej plisn'
i dali, dali na hory!*

*Litom cilym, by nič, by den',
xlopci huljajut' tam naši,
svobidna tam voda, ohen',
dovoli lisa i paši.*

*Tam pan ne klav lancihom mež,
voroh ne stanuv stopoju,—
bujnaja tam zemli odež,
plekana pisnej rosoju . . .*

(“Highlands, you are our little world! Oh, how pleasant it is to live among you! . . . From hillcrest to hillcrest, and from pine forest to pine forest, lighthearted, gun in belt, hatchet in hand, a strapping youth ranges over you. . . . And when ice erupted from a column of water, when

suddenly a bear appeared in the woods, the south wind blew, the mountain echoed, and the Čeremoš[✓] roared at the rocks: This is our time, this is our song. Young man, off into the valleys! Wash off the must from the hair of your sheep, and away, away to the mountains! All summer long, by night and by day, our young men go awandering there. Water runs free there, as does the deer, and there is plenty of forest and pasture. There no landlord sets limits to the fields; nor is there any foe. There earth's luxuriant garment is nourished by the songs of the dew. . . .")

Ustyjanovyč wrote stories as well as poetry: two of his best-known tales represent the finest examples of Ukrainian prose between Kvitka and Kuliš. The themes of both stories deal with the country. "*Mest' verxovyncja*" ("The Revenge of a Highlander") concerns the enmity of two youths because of a girl. But, instead of killing his rival in the mountains, the hero of the tale saves him from a bear. "*Strasnyj četver*" ("Maundy Thursday") is the story of a girl who is carried off by *hajdamaks*. Ustyjanovyč succeeds in developing his simple plots in an interesting yet compact manner. For example, various kinds of narration are used: it may be authorial; it may be that of the characters who tell about the past, etc. Dialectalisms abound—as befits the highlands settings; and Slavonicisms are present in the author's narration: *rekut'* (say), *počtenniji* (the esteemed ones), *obstojaťel'stva* (circumstances), "*spuskaty tosklyvu holovku na voz-dyxajušču hrud*" ("to lay an anxious head on a sighing breast"), etc. His landscapes are admirably described: "*Nema nad Zeleni svjata . . . Vyjdeš na pole—raj! Zemlja prystrojena v cvity, krasujet'sja, mov v vinci viddanycja hoža, a lisy zelenijut', jakoby v svjatočnyx ryzax; polja, zasijani zolotym zernom, vypuskajut' peršyj kolos nadiji, a v sadax derevyna, obijana vonnym molokom, až tjahne v svij xolodočok.*" ("There is no finer feast-day than Whitsuntide. . . . You go out into the field—it is a paradise! The earth, adorned with flowers, is resplendent, like a garlanded bride; and the forests, verdant in green, seem attired in ceremonial raiment; the field sown with golden grain sprouting their first hopeful spikes, and in the orchards, a sapling, besprinkled with fragrant water, fairly strains toward his shelter of shade.") "*Sumno šumily bory, mov lyxym tovsja zapadovec' po tisnyx deprax ta dykyx jarovax. Do polonyn uxopyvsja hrubyj tuman, i sim i tam po verxax zaljah uže snih taborom na stale zymovannja. Nebo pryodilosja olovom, lisy počornily, navit' zelena jalycja potemnila, zatužyla. Z boriv koptily husti studeni dymy, jakby piv svita horilo . . . Den' promynuv, jak hodyna, temna nič jala pryľahaty zemlju . . . Pusto učynylosja po verxax, hluxyj*

homin, rozkolysanyj šumom boriv ta šepotamy tysjači potokiv, rozlyvsja po ciliij pryrodi i lysē bejkannja na medvedja rozkryvalo z-pid polonyny tot smertel'nyj sum osinn'oji na verxovynax noči. . ." ("The pine forests murmured mournfully, the west wind gadded about, as if possessed, through overgrown gorges and foaming springs. As far up as the mountain pastureland a dense fog took hold, and here and there along the crests snow had already laid camp for the winter duration. The sky was clothed in lead, the forests filled with gloom, even the green fir tree darkened and grieved. From out of the pines came billows of thick cold smoke—as if half the world were on fire. . . . The day passed as if it had been but an hour, dark night began to press close to earth. . . . Across the barren summits, a hollow echo, set off by the rustle of the pines and the murmur of thousands of streams, poured out over all of nature; and only the noise of some creature bleating at a bear disclosed, under the surface of the pastureland, that deathly sadness of an autumn night in the highlands. . . .")

The dialogs are well contrived—with images assisting in the depiction of the characters' experiences: "*V moijj hrudy peresuvalysja zavjazky vsjakoho čuvstva, jak sja peresuvaje koralyk za koralykom po šovkovij nytcī*" ("In my heart the embryos of feelings of every kind have passed through, just as on a silk thread, one coral pushes through another"); "*Na lyce joho osila na xyvl'ku neopysana mjakist' i tuha, mov večirnij sumrak na usmyrene more*" ("For a moment, an indescribable softness and sorrow settled on his face, like the evening twilight on a calm sea"). At times they are excessively Romantic: "*Boh . . . prostyv meni za toje peklo, ščo nošu v mojim serci*" ("God . . . forgave me for this hell that I carry in my heart"), etc. "Maundy Thursday" takes the form of a story of inexorable fate (*sud'ba*) which is foretold in a dream; "The Revenge of a Highlander" is presented as a moral tale. From time to time, moral and religious observations are interjected which, unlike the Kvitka tradition, have more than a merely superficial relationship to their stories. However, Ustyjanovyč also wrote stories that are purely moral, didactic. In "*Staryj Jefrem*" ("Old Jefrem"), an old peasant from the Lviv area lectures the author over the course of 30 pages, only occasionally relating some adventure or tale to him. "*Dopust Božyj*" ("Divine Justice"), a very primitive piece (for the masses!) is a story about the evil consequences of cursing. "*Nič na Veržavi*" ("Night on Veržava") presents a wonderful picture of the mountains at night; and "*Tolkuščemu otverzet'sja*" ("To Him That Knocketh It Shall Be Opened") is a stylized narration (again, with its moral) of the childhood reminiscences of the Galician Metropolitan Jaxymovyč. All of these examples assure for Ustyjanovyč's prose a prominent place in Ukrainian literature although in order to read it a dictionary is required.

4. The legacy of the other Galician Romantic poets is small. Jakiv

Holovac'kyj wrote a few verses in the song genre with morals such as "*Xto pracjuje, ore, sije, toj i plodiv sja nadije*" ("He who toils, plows and sows can look forward to reaping the fruits of his labor") or:

*Lučče plysty potyxon'kym
ta pevnem'kym xodom,
obmynaty ostrovon'ky,
kaminnja j kolody.*

("It is best to flow along at a calm and steady pace, to avoid islets, rocks and logs.")

His other works included paraphrases of Serbian songs that are characterized by a great many dialectalisms, and also prose paraphrases of fables and folk anecdotes. To Ivan Vahylevyč can be attributed some unfinished balladic tales in verse ("*Madej*," "*Žulyn ta Kalyna*"). The prose fables of both writers are all based on old Slavic models. So, too, are the verses and panegyrics of Anton Mohylnyc'kyj (1811-73) and his unfinished lengthy poem "*Skyt Manjavs'kyf*" ("The Monastery of Manjava"), as are the poems of B. Didyc'kyj—"Kon-jušyj" ("The Equerry," 1853), and "*Buj Tur Vsevolod*" (1860). Their dialectal flavor as well as their Slavonicisms combined to set these works apart from that line of linguistic development which Galician poetry later followed during the period of Realism. In a complete literature, these works would have found their place.

5. Transcarpathian Ukraine remained totally outside the literary development of the other parts of Ukraine. A small number of its writers had not yet even come to understand the importance of a national language. It is possible that notes of Romanticism can be found in some of the few eighteen poems of Vasyľ Dovhovyč (see Ch. X, pt. D, no. 6). As a scholar of Western culture (Kant, in particular), and living in a Hungarian milieu, Dovhovyč was able to learn about modern Romantic poetry earlier than could the Galicians. However, in his imitations of folk songs it is difficult to perceive anything more than the playful verses typical of Classicism. Oleksander Duxnovyč (1803-64) was more closely connected with Galician Romanticism: although he wrote in a "mixed" language, his verses reflect the national and psychological motifs of the Galician Romantics:

*Ja Rusyn byl, esm i budu,
ja rodyłsja Rusynom,
čestnyj moj rod ne zabudu
ostanus' eho synom;*

*Rusyn byl moj otec, maty,
 russkaja vsja rodyna,
 Rusyny sestry j braty
 j šyroka družyna;
 velykij moj rod j glavnyj,
 miru est; sovremennij,
 duxom j syloju slavnyj,
 vsim narodam priemnyj . . .*

("A Ruthenian I have been, am now and shall be, a Ruthenian I was born; I shall not forget my honorable kin, I shall always be its son; Ruthenian was my father, mother, Ruthenian—all my family; Ruthenian are my sisters and brothers, and my merry friends. My family is large and important, contemporary with the world, renowned in spirit and strength, friendly to all people. . . .")

or:

*Hor'ko stenja, rydaju,
 skorbľju na samotnost',
 y sej čas proklynaju
 ubihšu svobodnost' . . .*

("Shaking bitterly, I sob, and grieve over my loneliness, and then curse my transient freedom. . . .")

or:

*Poduvaj vitryku.
 Poduvaj lehon'ko,
 naj moja mylen'ka
 spočyne tyxon'ko.*

*Dvyhnsja pečal'no
 v hlubokij žalobi,
 ne derzaj vijaty
 na jej čornim hrobi . . .*

*Pry mylen'koj hrobi
 jamu iskopite,
 sosxnutoje tilo
 pry nij pohrebite . . .*

. . . *Da každyj uvydja*
dernovyj toj pokrov,
skažet požuľaju:
se tut ležyt' ljubov.

("Waft from time to time, little breeze, waft by, ever so gently, so my beloved may sleep peacefully. Stir only sorrowfully and in deep mourning; do not dare to blow on her black grave. . . . Next to the grave of my darling, dig a hole for me; my shrivelled body, bury next to her. . . . And everyone who sees that turf-covered pall will say with pity: here lies love.")

As may be seen in the final excerpt, the new orthography brings the verse's language closer to that of folk poetry. However, this was not always possible; for there are also verses by Duxnovyč of the type:

Rozu ljubyx
uveselyx
Vzor moj eju nevyanno,
vsehda cvila,
veselyla
vse očen'ko ljubymo . . .

("I loved the rose and it charmed my sight innocently: constantly it bloomed and spread cheer. My eye admired it. . . .")

Collections of poetry such as *Pozdravlenie Rusynov* (*Ruthenian Well-Wishing*, 1852) and other verses as late as the 1860s contain a significant number of typically Romantic motifs: on nationality (one's native language—a vague notion to most authors) and melancholy (grief for the deceased). However, because of their linguistic peculiarities and their small artistic merit, these poems have no place in the general history of Ukrainian literature; they belong, rather, to the complex regional tradition.

6. Although its origins had preceded Kievan Romanticism, Romantic poetry in Western Ukraine was quick to embrace the poetic creativity of the greatest poet of Ukrainian Romanticism—Ševčenko. The different fates of Galician and Transcarpathian Romanticism illustrate the extent to which political conditions there influenced literary development. For, within a couple of

decades, the literature of Galicia rose to the level of Eastern Ukraine; Transcarpathia, on the other hand, vanished altogether from the history of Ukrainian literature for a very long time.

Certain features of Galician Romanticism merit consideration in the context of specifically Austrian literary currents ("Biedermeier") and as such can hardly be discussed as a particular aspect of Ukrainian literature (see Ch. XIII).

F. KIEVAN ROMANTICISM

1. Toward the mid-1840s, Kiev became the second center of the Romantic movement as Ukrainian youth were drawn to its university (founded in 1834). Its first rector, the philosopher-Romantic Maksymovyč, succeeded in using his position to stimulate activity in the field of Ukrainian studies. Myxajlo Maksymovyč (1804-73) began his scholarly career in Moscow as a natural scientist and Romantic philosopher, a proponent of the Romantic philosophy of Schelling. In Kiev he revealed himself to be a tireless researcher of Ukrainian antiquity and, primarily, of ethnography in which he had been actively involved in Moscow. His collections of Ukrainian songs (1827, 1834, 1848), among the best to this day, had a great influence on Romantic literature. To be sure, he adhered to the "Russo-Ukrainian" view which permitted the Ukrainian language only in specific literary genres as well as in Western Ukraine (where the use of Russian was not practicable for it was unknown). Somewhat later he published his Ukrainian translation of "The Tale of the Host of Ihor" (1857) and the Psalms (1859), together with several poems, a few of which appeared only posthumously. For the most part Maksymovyč's poetic language alternates between the two poles, high style (with Church Slavonicisms), and folk. Modest in size and significance, the poetic legacy of this philosopher-Romantic remained somehow outside the mainstream of Romanticism.

It was also during this period of the thirties and forties that the Kievan Academy began to flourish once more. Having undergone reforms which saw the abolition of its old traditions, it now became caught up in the philosophical movement of the day (Hegel and, in part, the philosophy of Romanticism inspired by Schelling).

2. In the forties, Kiev brought together Kostomarov, who became a professor in its university, Kuliš, and Ševčenko, already a well-known poet and author of *Kobzar* ("The Minstrel," 1840). The group also included several students who left no distinguished mark on the history of Ukrainian literature, although there were some interesting and original figures among them, in particular, M. Hulak (1822-99) and V. Bilozers'kyj (1825-99). "The Kievan

youth," wrote Kuliš later, "were deeply enlightened by the Gospels; this youth was of high spiritual purity." V. Bilozers'kyj, for example, appeared to some as "the guiding star of Bethlehem"; he was "the image—with his angelic peace of soul and gentleness of speech—of a life of purity and truth in the very highest degree; of poetic enthusiasm; of completely practical, lively and ceaseless activity; and, above all, of an ardent love for Christ." The Christianity of the Kievans was blended with the philosophy of Romanticism. Their mentor in this was a professor of the Academy and formerly of the university, P. Avsenev (1810-53), a Russian who was particularly enraptured by Christian mysticism and Romantic ideology (Schelling, Novalis, G. H. Schubert and others). He met frequently with Bilozers'kyj, Hulak and O. Markovyč, lending them books and influencing them, primarily through private discussions. In addition to this philosophic Romanticism, the Kievan youth engaged in the reading of Romantic *belles lettres*, especially Ukrainian folk literature (the collections of Maksymovyč and Sreznivs'kyj) and Slavophile material. In the light of these sources, the problem of "the national spirit" inevitably took on a new perspective: the secrets of the human soul, those that "are engraved in the heart by the hand of God," became irrevocably associated with the spiritual unity of the entire nation. And, for the Ukrainians, as perhaps for Slavs generally, this spiritual unity was inseparable from Christianity. The destiny of the Ukrainian people was considered to be bound up with a religious reawakening. Accordingly, all sermons, "Christian and scholarly," delivered to Ukrainian landowners had to point toward a resolution of both political and sociological problems. Likely, there are echoes here of the Christian socialism of the earlier French "reactionary" (traditionalist) Lamennais and of Russian (some of the so-called "Slavophile") and Polish trends of this type.

Instead of the Romantic enthusiasm for the past displayed by the Xarkovites who scarcely considered the future and saw very little in it, for the Kievans it was precisely the *future* which became the fundamental motif of their world view: "The Christian religion gave the world a new moral spirit. . . . The Saviour revealed to man love, peace, freedom, equality for all and brotherhood among nations—these new goals were disclosed to all peoples in order to establish in them the great idea of the unity of mankind." The good of Ukraine can be served only "by fulfilling the testament of our Divine Saviour"; all men must strive for "the establishment of God's truth, for . . . the achievement of freedom, brotherly love and the common good" (Bilozers'kyj). "The Slavic peoples will awake . . . truth and equality shall prevail" (Kostomarov).

It was natural that an organization with this platform should then be created—the "Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius"—although the idea

itself probably belonged to Hulak. The society with its rituals, alphabet, icons and rings, did not flourish for long; early in 1847 its members were arrested. Nevertheless, the brief period of its existence was remarkably productive, both in literature and ideology.

Kievan Romanticism itself smouldered throughout the entire decade. Until 1850 it centered around a professor of literary theory, M. Kostyr, and from 1850 to 1854, around his successor, A. Metlyn's'kyj, who came to Kiev from Xarkiv. However, their disciples, including those who formed a group around Kostyr, did not in any way distinguish themselves in the field of Ukrainian literature.

3. The ideological program of the Cyrillo-Methodians was laid out in a work whose author was Kostomarov, *Knyhy bytija ukrajins'koho narodu* (*The Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People*). Like similar works in the West and in the Slavic world (Mickiewicz, the Slovak L. Štúr; the existence of an unknown work, *Naddnistrjanka—The Maid of Dniester*—of which “The Books” were an imitation, as Kostomarov assured the authorities, is highly questionable), the document is written in a biblical style. It begins with a tableau of the history of the world up to its salvation according to God's plan: “God created the world and decreed that every family and every tribe [should] seek God who is close to man, and that all people worship him and believe in him, and love him, and prosper.” But “history” saw the decline of God's law; nevertheless, “the Lord, the Heavenly Father of the human race, was merciful and sent his Son to earth so as to reveal to the people God, the King and Master. And God's Son came to earth so as to disclose truth to the people so that this truth would free the human race.” But even after the coming of Christ, decay has continued: “czars” and “popes” replace Christ's rule with their own; the French Revolution is a mistake for “without faith in Christ there can be no freedom.”

In the second half of the book the Slavs are depicted as heirs to “the kingdom of God”; but they, too, betrayed the trust, quarrelling among themselves and adopting everything from the West. A broader portrayal is given to the history of Ukraine and its subjugation. The upshot is that “the true Slav” (elsewhere, “the true Ukrainian”) “loves neither the czar nor any master, but loves and reveres God alone—Jesus Christ.” The work concludes with a Romantic picture of the “rebirth” or “resurrection” of Ukraine: “Ukraine lies in the grave,” “And Ukraine will rise from her grave and once more call unto all her brothers. . . .”

This work lays the foundations for the future not only in ideology but also in literature: it thus continued the tradition of the Xarkiv Romantics. The Ukrainian language of the document probably seemed bare even to the peasant

reader; however, it was handled in "high" biblical style, in opposition to the burlesque of Kvitka's "Letters to My Dear Countrymen" (see above, Ch. X, pt. F, no. 5).

4. At this time there already existed works in the new Ukrainian language whose importance exceeded that of the Xarkiv Romantics. In fact, these poetic works also contributed greatly to the consolidation of the brethren's views, if not to their actual formulation; and they promoted their belief in the future of Ukraine. These were the poems of the talented poet Taras Ševčenko. Kuliš later wrote: "The brothers looked upon Ševčenko as a kind of heavenly luminary, and their view was correct. . . ." Kostomarov noted, "Ševčenko's muse tore away the veil from national life. It was terrifying and sweet, painful and enchanting to contemplate it! . . . Taras' muse sundered subterranean crypts that for centuries had been fettered by a myriad of locks and seals."

Ševčenko (1814-61) began to write poetry in St. Petersburg around 1837. In 1840 he published a collection of eight poems under the title of *Kobzar*, in 1841 his long poem *Hajdamaky*, and in 1844 the two works appeared together. Individual poems continued to be published after these St. Petersburg and Xarkiv collections. Over the next three years during which he visited Ukraine, Ševčenko worked on the manuscript of *Try Lita (Three Years)*. In 1847 he was preparing to release a new enlarged edition of the *Kobzar* when he was arrested; the first years of his exile and military servitude then followed till 1850. During the last part of his life (1857-61), after his return to society, Ševčenko resumed writing poetry. In 1860 he published another edition of the *Kobzar*, including in it those later verses which the censors allowed. All subsequent editions of the *Kobzar*, in particular the Prague edition of 1874, contained new poems. It was only with the editions of 1907, 1908 and 1910 that the complete text of all Ševčenko's poetry was provided. However, work continues on his texts to this day.

5. The poetry of Ševčenko produced an enormous impression not only on the Cyrillo-Methodians but on all readers in general (not excluding the older generation). It was something entirely new, immense and distinguished—in form as well as in content. A poet could scarcely have caused such a sensation or found such general recognition had he lacked the extraordinary poetic properties of Ševčenko's verse, had he been a second-rate poet.

The poetic qualities of Ševčenko's work undoubtedly stem in part from its intimate relationship with folk poetry. For, Ševčenko did not simply paraphrase folk songs—he created songs which *are* folk songs in nature. He did not merely follow the ethnographer's path and amass a wealth of folk poetics. Rather, the language of folk poetry seemed to be native to him.

Mention must be made first of the rhythm of his poems. It has been noted that Classicist writers had begun to imitate, to some degree, the rhythm of folk songs. Ševčenko developed this trend further. Examples may be found in his work of attempts to write in meters familiar to him from previous Ukrainian and Russian poetry. But gradually he cultivated meters typical of folk songs such as the *kolomyjka* (rhythmical dance tune), 8a, 8b, 8c, 6b:*

<i>Plyvut' sobi spivajučy;</i>	— ' — ' — —
<i>more viter čuje.</i>	' — ' —
<i>Poperedu Hamalija</i>	— ' — — — ' —
<i>bajdakom keruje . . .</i>	— — ' — ' —

("Thus they sail, singing the while; the sea hears the wind arise. At their head, Hamalija directs his vessel on. . . .")

and the *koljadka* (Christmas carol):

<i>Z Trubajlom Al'ta/ miž osokoju</i>	— ' — ' — — — ' —
<i>zišlys' z'jednals',/ mov brat z</i>	— ' — ' — / — ' — ' —
<i>sestroju,</i>	
<i>i vse te, vse te/ raduje oči,</i>	— — ' — / ' — — ' —
<i>a serce plače,/ hljanut' ne xoče . . .</i>	— ' — ' — / ' — — ' —

("In among the reed-grass, the Alta and the Trubajlo drifted apart and then came together again, like brother and sister, and always this gladdens the eyes, but the heart weeps and does not wish to look. . . .")

Ševčenko rejected the tradition of regularly alternating stress (found in Kotljarevs'kyj, in imitation of Russian poetry). In his verses the alternation of stresses is considerably freer, in accordance with the laws of Ukrainian folk poetry: a rhythmic unit is composed not of one or two syllables, but of an entire

*This formula and later ones characterize the stanzas of poems: the figures indicate the number of syllables in a line, the letters designate the rhymes. Capital letters (A, B, C) represent so-called "masculine rhymes" (the accent falling on the last syllable), while lower case letters (a, b, c) denote "feminine rhymes" (the accent falling on the penultimate syllable). Letters followed by an apostrophe (a', b', c') refer to "dactylic rhymes" (the accent falling on the third to the last syllable in the line).

line.* But the *kolomyjka* and *koljadka* rhythms are not the only ones to be found in Ševčenko's poems. Changes and variations of verse often occur within the same poem (e.g., the wealth of rhythms in "Hamalija"); there are also experiments employing an extraordinary variety of rhythms, such as the amazing lyrics he wrote "in the fortress" or those inscribed in his "bootleg notebooks" during his exile:

Oj odna ja odna, 6a. 7b. 6C. 7b.
jak bylynočka v poli,
Ta ne dav meni Boh
ani šťastja, ni doli . . .

("Alone am I, indeed alone, as a poor little blade of grass in the field. Not to me did God give either happiness or good fortune.")

Ponad polem ide 6A. 6A. 8b. 8b. 5A.
ne pokosy klade,
ne pokosy klade-hory!
Stohne zemlja, stohne more,
stohne ta hude!

("Over the fields he goes, not mere strips does he mow, not mere strips of meadow mows he down, but mountains! The earth groans, the sea groans, groans and rages!")

Oj, stričččka do stričččky— 8a'. 8a'. 8b. 8b.
merežaju try ničen'ky,
merežaju, vyšyvaju,—
u nedilju pohuljaju . . .

("Oh, ribbon and lace as well—do I embroider three long nights now, I embroider, I sew—but on Sunday I'll have some fun. . .")

Jakby meni čerevyky, 8a. 8a. 5B. 8c. 8c. 5B.
to pišla b ja na muzyky,—

*The discovery of the folk character of Ševčenko's poetry can be attributed to S. Smal'-Stoc'kyj. Further contributions to this scholarship have been made by Kyryl Taranovs'kyj who, however, often seems to adapt Ševčenko's versification to his own theories.

horen'ko moje!
Čerevykiv nemaje,
a muzyka hraje, hraje,
žalju zavdaje! . . .

("If I had a pair of shoes, I would go out to dance. Woe is me! No shoes have I, and the music plays and plays, causing me sorrow! . . .")

I bahata ja, 5A. 5A. 5b. 5A.
i vrodlyva ja,
ta ne maju sobi pary—
beztalanna ja! . . .

("And rich am I, and beautiful, too. Yet I have no mate—poor me! . . .")

Porodyla mene maty 8a. 8a. 5B. 8c. 8c. 5B.
u vysokyx u palatax,
šovkom povyla.

U zoloti, oksamyti,
mov ta kvitočka ukryta,
rosła ja, rosła . . .

("My mother bore me in lofty chambers, and swaddled me in silk. In gold and in velvet garbed, I grew and grew like some sheltered flower. . . .")

Oj, ne pjut'sja pyva, medy, 8A. 5B. 8c. 5B.
ne pjet'sja voda;
pryključulas' z čumačen'kom
u stepu bida . . .

("Alas, no longer are the beer and mead quaffed, nor do they drink the water. A čumak met with misfortune in the steppe. . . .")

Oj pišla ja u jar za vodoju, 10a. 10a. 6b. 6b. 7c'. 6b.
až tam mylyj huljaje z druhoju.

*A taja druhaja,
rozlučnycja zľaja—
bahataja susidon'ka,
vdova molodaja . . .*

(“Alas, I went to the ravine to fetch some water, and there my darling was cavorting with another. And she, my wicked rival, is my neighbor, a wealthy young widow. . . .”)

U peretyku xodyla 8a. 4b. 8a. 4b. 8c. 8c. 4b.
po orixy,
mirošnyka poljubyla
dlja potixy
Mel'nyk mele, šeretuje,
obernet'sja, pociluje—
dlja potixy . . .

(“Down to the thicket I strolled to gather some nuts. I fell in love with a miller, just for fun. The miller husks and grinds the grain, then turns around and kisses me, just for fun. . . .”)

However, the inherent musicality of Ševčenko's poetry is not attributable merely to this wealth of rhythms. There are other contributing factors.

The rhymes used by Ševčenko are a radical departure from the previous tradition of Ukrainian rhyme, with the sole exception of the poetry of Skovoroda (see Ch. VII, pt. C, no. 7). For during the Baroque, Classical and Romantic periods, Ukrainian versification, like the poetry of the West and of neighboring countries, aimed for complete correspondence of endings in both words of a rhyme: *kunjaje—spivaje*, *hroši—mixonoši*, *pyty—robyty*, *maty—daty*, *dožyt'—sydyt'*, etc. Ševčenko broke with this tradition altogether. Partly imitating folk songs, and partly following Baroque spiritual songs and perhaps even Skovoroda [“*ta j spysuju Skovorodu abo 'Try carije so dary'*” (“and I would copy excerpts from Skovoroda or the carol ‘Three Kings and Gifts’”)], he replaced “complete” rhymes with “incomplete” (certain of the sounds are only approximately the same) as in *vika—kaliku*, *divčata—maty*, *krajiny—domovynu*, *xati—brata*, *vdovo—rozmovu*, *muko—ruky*, *postynja—domovyny*, *brovy—movu*, *movu—dibrovy—slovo*, etc. Or, one of the endings may contain an extra sound (a type of rhyme seldom found in Baroque poetry): *pidkralys'—ukraly*, *molylas'—včyla*, *mohyly—malosyl'nyj*, *rujinax—Vkrajina*, *rozrujnje—sumuješ*, *kajdany—pohanyj*,

temnycjax – vdovyce, litys’ – dity, Trjasylo – vkrylos’, pid tynom – xatyny, sxoronyla–žurylas’, etc. Or, the two variations may be combined (one sound is different, and, in addition, one of the endings contains an extra sound): *Ukrajino–hyněš, šukaje–pidrostaťut’, nadiju–revily, ruky–vysokyj, nevoli–polem.* Or, finally, there may be various differences between the two endings although a definite consonance is still detected: *stohne–proxolone, plata–plakta’, kormylom–xvyľjax, smijučys’–skriz’,* etc. And occasionally there are changes of accent: *kráju–dajút’, očerét–večérjat’,* etc. Such incomplete rhymes are not random occurrences in Ševčenko; his poetry fairly abounds with them.

Nor does this “inexactitude” or “incompleteness” of rhyme weaken in any way the impression produced by the poetry. Rather, the incomplete rhymes enable Ševčenko to avoid the monotony of rhyme that arises from the frequent use of the same grammatical form as with Kotljarevs’kyj: *motornyj–provornyj, dav–nakyvav, trojanciv–lanciv,* and, sometimes, with Ševčenko himself: *hul-jaly–spivaly, znaje–škandybaje, mlila–nimila, torbyna–dytyna, niženjata–divčata, staroho–tovstoho.* For this reason, the rhymes introduced by Ševčenko are most unexpected, original and rich. It may be noted that Russian versification did not establish the same type of reform until the beginning of the twentieth century, some sixty years after Ševčenko. Interesting, too, is the fact that the first Russian writer to use these rhymes in the second half of the nineteenth century was A. Tolstoj who was familiar both with Ukrainian folk songs and Ukrainian poetry. Ševčenko, however, found still other ways of totally releasing the hidden euphonies that accompany incomplete rhyme. First of all, he made abundant use of “internal rhyme,” that is, rhyme between different words of the same line (actually, a common rhyme in Romantic ballads).*

Hamalija! serce mlije . . .

jest’ u mene dity, ta de jix podity . . .

usjudy, de ľjudy . . .

toj muruje, toj rujnuje . . .

i carjata, i starčata . . .

miž jaramy, nad stavamy . . .

ne dvi noči kari oči . . .

xto spytaje, pryvitaje . . .

a tym časom syči vnoči . . .

*In Ukrainian Baroque poetry also, “internal rhymes” of a similar kind could be found in “leonine” verses.

*prolita^ujut', zabyra^ujut'
vse dobro z soboju . . .*

*i svjataja tvoja slava
jak pylyna lyne . . .*

*spy, Čyhryne, nexaj hynut'
u voroha dity!
Spy, het'mane, poky vstane
pravda na sim sviti! . . .*

*babusen'ko holubon'ko,
ska^užy, bo ty zna^uješ, –
xo^uče daty mene maty
za staroho zamiž . . .*

Ševčenko's "internal rhyme" is another feature that is not incidental or restricted to particular lines or poems. It is a device that is systematically employed to bring forth the euphony which is forfeited, to some degree, through incomplete rhyme. But there are also other devices used by Ševčenko to secure the maximum "sonority" of his verse.

Ševčenko's verse is by far the most tuneful, sonorous and harmonious of all Ukrainian writers before and after him. In fact, there are few Romantic poets in the world, whose poetry was oriented toward musicality to such a great extent, who have attained a similar internally euphonic language (Clemens Brentano).

Ševčenko achieved such rare sonority first, through simple repetition of the same or related words. In the spirit of folk songs he repeats words:

*Ukrajino, Ukrajino,
nen'ko moja, nen'ko . . .*

("Ukraine, Ukraine, dear mother mine, dear mother. . .")

*Jim zostasla' dobra slava,
mohyla zostasla' . . .*

("Their good name remained to them, the grave remained. . .")

mynuv rik, mynuv druhyj . . .

("one year passed, another passed. . .")

or various forms of the same word:

... *bo spočynu,*
jak bat'ko spočynuv . . .

("... for I will take my rest as my father took his rest . . .")

i vsi počyly. Syvyj v xatu
i sam pišov opočyvaty . . .

("and all rested. And in the house the old man himself went
 to take a rest. . . .")

or, he accumulates repetitions in one brief stanza:

Mynajut' dni, mynajut' noči
mynaje lito
 *i ne znaju,*
čy ja žyvu, čy dožyvaju,

A daj žyty, sercem žyty

A šče hirše–spaty, spaty,
i spaty na voli . . .

("The days are passing, the nights are passing, the summer
 passes . . . and I know not whether I live, or fade.
 But let me live, and passionately. But it is far worse
 to sleep, to sleep, to sleep in liberty. . . .")

Suggestively, imperceptibly, entire poems are constructed from constant repetitions:

Sadok vyšnevyj kolo xaty,
xrušči nad vyšnjamy hudut',
pluhatari z pluhamy jdut',
spivajut' idučy divčata,
a materi večerjat' ždut'.
Simja večerja kolo xaty,
večirnja ziron'ka vstaje,
dočka večerjat' podaje . . .

*Zatyxlo vse. . . Til'ky divčata
ta solovejko ne zatyx.*

("A cherry orchard stands beside the cottage; above the cherry tree, May bugs are humming. The plowmen head home with their plows, the girls sing as they walk along, and mothers wait supper for them. The family sups outside the cottage, the little evening star is rising, the daughter lends a hand with supper. . . . Everything has become hushed, only the girls and the nightingale are not yet still.")

*Iz-za haju sonce sxodyt',
za haj i zaxodyt';
po dolyni uvečori
kozak smutnyj xodyt'.*

*Xodyt' vin hodynu,
xodyt' vin i druhu,—
ne vyxodyt' čornobryva
iz temnoho luhu,*

ne vyxodyt' zradlyvaja . . .

("From behind the grove the sun rises, and behind it, it sets; in the valley during the evening, a sad Cossack walks. An hour he walks, and then another—the black-browed beauty does not come from the dark meadow, the treacherous one does not come forth. . . .")

The numerous harmonies arising from such repetitions are enhanced by the euphonies existing among different words; the effect produced is extraordinary, for example:*

<i>Moja poradon'ka svjataja</i>	mo-do
<i>moja ty dole molodaja</i>	mo-dol-molod

*In order to illustrate this harmony ("euphony"—sometimes termed "instrumentation") in Sevcenko's poetry, the examples below present, along with their poetic sources, those syllables that are repeated in various words. It is impossible to indicate all the repetitions of sounds, since often the same vowels and consonants repeat themselves line after line. For the most part, only complete syllables or groups of sounds are illustrated here.

("My sacred counsel, you my young fate . . .")

Whole stanzas of Ševčenko's poems are constructed on the bases of the sonorous repetitions present in entirely different, unrelated words, as in:

<i>bez myloho skriz' mohyla</i>	myloh-mohyl
<i>Čy to nedolja ta nevolja,</i>	čy-to-ne-olja-ta-olja
<i>čy to lita ti, letjačy . . .</i>	čy-to-lit-ti-let

("without my beloved, everywhere it is like a grave . . .
Whether it be misfortune and bondage, whether it be
that these years, flying by . . .")

or:

<i>korovy pidut' po dibrovi,</i>	rovy-pi-dut'-po-di-br-ovi
<i>divčata vyjdut' vodu brat' . . .</i>	di-at-dut'-du-br-at'

("the cows walk through the grove, the girls go out to fetch
water . . .")

<i>. . . idut' molyt'sja</i>	sja
<i>čenci za Husa. Z-za hory</i>	če-ci-za-sa-za-hory
<i>červone sonce až horyt' . . .</i>	če-on-on-ce-hory

(" . . . the monks go to pray for Hus. From behind the hill,
the red sun fairly blazes . . .")

<i>ščob ja postil' vesela slala,</i>	s-l-se-s-la-la
<i>u more sliz ne posylala . . .</i>	sl-sy-la-la

("in order that I make my bed cheerfully and not drown it
in the sea of tears . . .")

<i>Selo! selo! veseli xaty,</i>	se-lo-se-lo-ve-seli-ty
<i>veseli zdaleka palaty . . .</i>	ve-seli-al-al-ty

("Village! O village! Cheerful cottages, and, at a distance,
cheerful mansions. . .")

<i>Šyrokiji sela;</i>	se-la
<i>a u selax u veselyx</i>	se-la-ve-se-ly
<i>i ljude veseli . . .</i>	ve-se-li

("Broad villages; and in the cheerful villages, the people are cheerful, too. . . .")

<i>Po dibrovi viter vyje,</i>	po-ro-vi-vi-vy
<i>huljaje po polju</i>	lja-po-po-lju
<i>kraj dorohy hne topolju</i>	ra-do-ro-po-lju
<i>do samoho dolu . . .</i>	do-do-lu

("Through the grove the wind howls, it runs riot over the field; it forces the poplar at the side of the road to bend right down to the ground. . . .")

or:

<i>Čyhryne, Čyhryne!</i>	čyh-ry-ne-čyh-ry-ne
<i>vse na sviti hyne,</i>	vse-na-svi-hy-ne
<i>i svjataja tvoja slava,</i>	svja-s-va
<i>jak pylyna, lyne</i>	ly-na-ly-ne
<i>za vitramy xolodnymy . . .</i>	vi-my-ny-my

("Čyhyryn, o Čyhyryn! Everything in the world perishes, even your sacred glory is borne away like dust by the cold winds. . . .")

Ševčenko could, through the very sound of his verses, evoke a specific effect, somewhat like a musical melody. The following excerpts illustrate the somber "instrumentation" of poems having the sounds "r," "u," "or," "ol":

<i>Vitre bujnyj, vitre bujnyj!</i>	vit-re-buj-nyj-vit-re-buj-nyj
<i>ty z morem hovoryš, –</i>	ty-ore-ory
<i>zbudy joho, zahraj ty z nym,</i>	dy-ty-ny
<i>spytaj syne more . . .</i>	yt-ne-ore

("Wild wind, o wild wind! You talk with the sea; awaken it, roar out with it; ask the blue sea. . . .")

<i>U nedilju vraci rano</i>	ra-n-ra-no
<i>pole krylosja tumanom;</i>	pol-los-tu-man-om

<i>u tumaní na mohyli,</i>	tum-an-na-mo-li
<i>jak topolja, poxylylas'</i>	pol-po-ly-las'
<i>molodycja molodaja.</i>	mo-lod-mo-lod
<i>Ščos' do lona pryhortaje</i>	os'-do-lo-na
<i>ta z tumanom rozmovljaje:</i>	tu-ma-nom-mo
<i>"Oj, tumane, tumane!</i>	tu-ma-ne-tu-ma-ne
<i>Mij latanyj talane!</i>	la-ta-ny-ta-la-ne
<i>Čomu mene ne sxovaješ</i>	mu-me-ne-ne
<i>otut sered lanu?"</i>	tu-la-nu

("Early one Sunday morning, the field was covered in mist; in the mist upon a grave-mound, like a poplar, bent, was a young maiden. She presses something to her breast and speaks to the mist: 'O mist, mist! My miserable lot! Why will you not conceal me here in the middle of the meadow?' ")

A gloomy symphony resounds from the lines:

<i>Niby serce odpočyne,</i>	ni-ne
<i>z Bohom zahovoryt' . . .</i>	oho-aho-vory
<i>A tuman, nenače voroh,</i>	tum-an-ne-na-voro
<i>zakryvaje more</i>	za-ry-va-ore
<i>i xmaron'ku roževuju,</i>	aro-ro
<i>i t'mu za soboju</i>	t'um-za-oju
<i>rozstylaje tuman syvyj,</i>	ro-tum
<i>i t'moju nimoju</i>	t'moju-moju
<i>opovyje tobi dušu . . .</i>	

("As though at rest, the heart begins to talk with God. And the fog, enemy-like, covers the sea and a little rose-colored cloud; and the gray mist spreads darkness behind it and encases your soul with silent gloom. . . .")

These examples do not represent merely isolated instances, but are characteristic of Ševčenko's poetry in every period of his creativity. While this "instrumentation" assists the poet in some cases to evoke a certain mood in the reader, another technique is sometimes used by which the sounds themselves portray a particular scene, such as the rustle of the wind through the sedges in the reed-grass:

<i>Viter v haji ne huljaje,</i>	
<i>vnoči spočyvaie;</i>	ci-s-cy
<i>prokynet'ska, tyxesen'ko</i>	sja-xe-se
<i>v osoky pytaie:</i>	so
<i>"Xto se, xto se po cim boci</i>	xto-se-xto-se-ci-ci
<i>čese kosu? xto se?</i>	ce-se-su-xto-se
<i>Xto se, xto se po tim boci</i>	xto-se-xto-se-ci
<i>rve na sobi kosy?</i>	so-sy
<i>xto se, xto se?"—tyxesen'ko</i>	xto-se-xto-se-xe-se
<i>spytaie-povije . . .</i>	

("In the grove, the wind is subdued; at night, it is still; it awakes, and quietly asks the reed grass: 'Who is it, who is it who, over here, is combing her tresses? Who is it? Who is it, who is it who, over there, is tearing her hair? Who is it, who is it?' it asks, gently stirring. . . .")

or:

..... šelestyt'	še-le-st
požovkle lystja; hasnut' oči	zo-ly-st-snu-čy
zasnuly dumy, serce spyt';	snu-ly-se-e
i vse zasnulo . . .	se-za-snu-lo

(" . . the yellowed leaves are rustling; my eyes grow dim, my thoughts have fallen asleep, my heart slumbers; and everything has fallen asleep. . . .")

Occasionally in Ševčenko's poetry, it is the considerations of sound and the musical qualities of language rather than the idea behind a poem which govern its choices of words and syntax.

Ševčenko employed a great variety of musical devices in his many kinds of verses that range from typical "lyrical" "folk song" poems (e.g., the majority of his "songs," and a considerable number of his long poems), to declamative, rhetorical verses such as the impassioned passages in his long poems, his poems dedicated to poets Kotljarev'skyj, Gogol', etc., his paraphrases of Holy Writ, and his "epistle" "*Do mertvyx i žyvyx . . .*" ("To the Dead, to the Living . . ."), as well as different other types of verses. The musical construction also varies from one type of poem to another. It should be noted that even in his prose works in Russian, Ševčenko sometimes used these same devices in order to increase the resonance of the language: the repetition of words and of syllables (to be sure, principally in descriptive and lyrical passages).

Because of its very musicality and the peculiar influence it has on the reader, Ševčenko's language, for all its accumulation of identical sounds, does not produce any monotonous or artificial effect. Its tie with the language of folk songs is very close indeed, although it does not copy it slavishly but, rather, reshapes it creatively. This may be seen below in the examination of the distinguishing features of Ševčenko's language.

6. As has been noted, the similarity of Ševčenko's work to popular songs does not represent any sort of servile imitation. Ševčenko created freely, using the stylistic forms of the folk song. A few of the most characteristic traits of his language can now be observed.

Ševčenko liked "word-pairs," a typical feature of folk songs, especially the *dumy*: *sriblo-zloto* (silver-gold), *daleko-vysoko* (far off-lofty), *čajkoju-vdovycej* (gull-widow), *šťastja-dolja* (fortune-fate), *mylyj-čornobryvyj* (black-browed-sweetheart), *jarom-dolom* (ravine-bottom), *tjažko-važko* (heavy-burdensome), *smutnyj-neveselyj* (sad-unhappy), *med-horilka* (mead-brandy), *panove-molodci* (gentlemen-youths), *žyv-zdorov* (alive-healthy), *vije-povivaje* (winnows-blows gently), *surmy-šabli* (bugles-sabres), *plakav-rydav* (wept-sobbed), etc. Besides these traditional expressions, there are also those perhaps created by the poet himself in order to convey his own images: *zahulo-skazalo* (roared-pronounced), *spivaty-rozmovljaty* (to sing-to converse), *žurba-mova* (sadness-speech), *sljozy-slova* (tears-words), *sljozy-riky* (tears-rivers), etc.

Using the example and sometimes, no doubt, only the spirit of folk songs, Ševčenko made constant use of fixed epithets for certain words: *šljax ta doroha* "byti" ("beaten" path and road), *konyk voronen'kyj* (a little horse, quite raven-maned), *viter bujnyj* (violent wind), *synje more* (dark blue sea), *červona kalyna* (red cranberry bush), *dribni sljozy* (fine little tears), *temnyj haj* (gloomy grove), *zelenyj bajrak* (verdant valley), *orly "syziji"* or *"syzokryliji"* ("grayish-blue" eagles, eagles "with gray-blue wings"), *bile lyčko* (white complexion), *čorni brovy* (black brows), *kari oči* (hazel eyes), *vysoki mohyly* (high grave-mounds), *step šyrokyj* (broad steppe), *čorni xmary* (black clouds), *zori červoni* (red stars). In the folk song manner, Ševčenko may employ epithets alone to designate the subject: *voronen'kyj* (quite black [little horse]), *bujnesen'kyj* (ever so boisterous [wind]), *čornobryvyj* (black-browed [youth]), *syzokrylyj* (gray-blue winged [eagle]), *synje* (dark blue [sea]), *bilolycyj* (white-faced [moon]), *ljute* (bitter [grief]), *kozače* (a Cossack's [heart]), etc.

Liberal use is made of the poetic devices of folk songs such as parallelism between natural phenomena and human events or feelings:

*Vstaje xmara z-za Lymanu,
a druhaja z polja:
zažurylas' Ukrajina—
taka jiji dolja . . .*

*zakrjakaly čorni kruky,
vyjmajučy oči;
zaspivaly kozačen'ky
pisnju tiji noči . . .*

("From behind the Lyman, a cloud is rising, and another from the field: Ukraine is grieving; such is her fate. . . . The black ravens screamed as they plucked out the eyes; and the young Cossacks gave a song in that night. . . .")

*Sumno, sumno sered neba
sjaje bilolycyj.
Ponad Dniprom kozak ide,
može z večornyci.*

("Sadly, sadly in the middle of the heavens, the pale-faced moon is shining. Along the Dnieper walks a Cossack, perhaps coming from a party. . . .")

*Na horodi kolo brodu
barvinok ne sxodyt';
čomus' divčyna do brodu
po vodu ne xodyt' . . .*

("In the orchard near the ford, there is no periwinkle sprouting; for some reason the maiden to the ford by water does not come. . . .")

Using another favorite device of folk poetics (antithesis), the poet opposes different events in order to make his narration clearer.

*To ne viter, to ne bujnyj . . .
to ne lyxo, to ne tjažke . . .*

("That is not the wind, not the wild wind . . . that is not misfortune, not great misfortune. . . .")

Ščaslyva holubka: vysoko litaje,
polyne do Boha—myloho pytaty.
Koho ž syrotyna, koho zapytaje?

("Lucky little dove: how high it soars, flying away to God
to inquire of the dear one. Whom does a poor orphan have
to turn to? . . .")

Vže ne try dni, ne try noči,
bjet'sja pan Trjasylo . . .

("For more than three days now, for more than three
nights, Pan Trjasylo has been fighting. . . .")

Ne kytajkoju pokrylys'
kozac'kiji oči . . .
Orel vyjnjav kari oči
na čužomu poli! . . .

("It was not taffeta that covered the Cossack's eyes. . . .
An eagle plucked out his hazel eyes in a strange land! . . .")

Ne ščebeče solovejko
v luzi nad vodoju,
ne spivaje čornobryva,
stoja pid verboju,
ne spivaje—jak syrota,
bilym svitom nudyt' . . .

("No more does the nightingale warble in the meadow by
the water, no more does the black-browed maiden sing as
she stands under the willow. She does not sing—she is like
an orphan, weary of life. . . .")

Often, an expression is either taken directly from a folk song (or forged *duma*), "revnuly harmaty" ("the cannon roared"), or is created in the folk song style in imitation of some actual song phrase: "Plyve čoven, vody poven" ("The boat sails, full of water"); "Z vitrom mohyla v stepu rozmovljaje" ("The grave-mound on the steppe converses with the wind"); "Mohyla z bujnym vitrom v stepu hovoryla" ("On the steppe, the grave-mound was talking with the wild wind"); "Ne kytajkoju pokrylys' kozac'kiji oči" ("It was not taffeta that covered the

Cossack's eyes"); "*kozac'keje bile tilo, v kytajku povyte*" ("the white Cossack body, swathed in taffeta"); "*Syne more vyhravaje*" ("The dark blue sea is becoming playful"); "*Zasypljut' piskom oči*" ("They pulled the wool over their eyes"), etc.

Ševčenko was not restricted to this folk song material, however; he also used "elevated" language, particularly in the lyrics in which he bemoans his fate, in the political poems ("*Kavkaz*"—"The Caucasus," "To the Dead, to the Living"), and in the paraphrases of the Psalms. Sometimes Slavonicisms are employed: "*ne tvorjaj blahaja*" ("does not perform good deeds"), *vskuju* (till when), *vnušy* (instill). Even here, however, Ševčenko's language, on the whole, is pure, equally capable of expressing folk themes— "*Kateryna*" ("Katherine"), "*Najmyčka*" ("The Servant Girl")—and political thoughts and visions, depicting scenes from the ancient Cossack way of life, and rendering paraphrases for the moving words of the Holy Scriptures. The modern reader does not sense in Ševčenko's work any of the artificiality noticeable in the poetry of Kostomarov or Metlyns'kyj. In fact, several linguistic features characteristic of the older writers are hardly found at all in Ševčenko, e.g., short verbal forms such as *šubovst'*, *bux*, *hul'k*, which had abounded in classicist writings and which had become vulgarisms. Besides a few regional expressions, Ševčenko uses the device of "association" sometimes found in popular speech: "*jak toj popil*" ("like those ashes"), "*krovaviji tiji lita*" ("those bloody years"), "*xreščenoji tiji movy*" ("of that Christian language"), "*tijeju čajkoju*" ("with that gull"), etc. and in older literature. There are practically no examples of the vulgar, coarse language of Kotljarevs'kyj and others. To be sure, in rare instances such expressions may be found in Ševčenko: *utny* (as in "*zahraj: utny, bat'ku*"—"strike up: play your heart out, father"), "*kobzar vškvaryv*" ("the *kobzar* flailed away"), "*oddy-rajut'*" ("they tore off [dancing]"), "*šmyhljaje*" ("disappears in a flash"), etc. Some of them, perhaps, had not yet acquired the print of vulgarity. And when they are used in other passages, it is clearly for a specific function—to caricature the upper classes: for, while Ševčenko uses respectful terms in talking about the Ukrainian people, vulgar expressions are employed for the czars, *hetmans*, provincial governors and for the high synod of Constance which ordered that Jan Hus be burned at the stake. Accordingly, Nicholas I is described thus: "*satrapa v mordu zatopyv*" ("smashed a governor in the mug"), "*ta v pyku joho jak zatopyt'*" ("and takes such a swipe at his snout"), "*toj menšoho v puzo*" ("he then punched his next-in-line in the belly"); the Constance synod: "*zvirem zarevily*" ("roared like beasts"), "*hurto zarevily*" ("they roared altogether"); Bohdan (Xmel'nyc'kyj): "*v bahni svynjačim*" ("in a pig's filth"), etc. It is interesting that when Ševčenko had to render Russian speech in his verse, he

always used vulgar expressions—and for the same reason that they are found in his depictions of the “upper circles.” Consequently, the distribution of elevated and coarse language in Ševčenko is altogether different from, indeed opposite to, the practices of the Classicists.

7. However, not all the stylistic devices of Ševčenko are exclusively folk in origin. The use of the poetics of the folk songs was, after all, an established Romantic procedure. And Ševčenko did employ other devices of Romantic poetry as well; for it was obviously a poetic trend that he knew and loved. Perhaps he felt in Romanticism an affinity with folk poetry which, even without his conscious intention, would have become the basis of his poetic creativity.

This adoption of the forms of folk poetry, especially by Ševčenko, far from being in the Classicist “drawing-room” style, was entirely in line with the aspirations of Romanticism. Ševčenko’s marvelous imitations of folk songs from the time of his exile have already been discussed. In addition, the poet availed himself of the peculiarly Ukrainian form, the *duma*; imitating it in his long poem “*Slipyj*” (“The Blind Man,” or “*Nevol’nyk*”—“The Captive”). However, Ševčenko also took from Romanticism poetic forms widely known at the time as emblematic of the Romantic style: the ballad and the Romantic (or Byronic) long poem. Both forms run counter to the Classicist theory of genres. The ballad, a tale of some largely tragic event, generally has a fantastic or historical character, and unites, within itself, epic, lyric and dramatic elements (speeches). It thus destroys the strict division of genres that was a canon of Classicist poetics. In Ukrainian poetry, the ballads of Ševčenko did not, therefore, constitute anything particularly novel. At the beginning he wrote only longer ballads (“*Pryčynna*” [“Bewitched”], “*Topolja*” [“The Poplar”], “*Lileja*” [“The Lily”], “*Rusalka*” [“The Mermaid”], “*Čoho ty xodyš na mohylu*” [“Why do you take walks to the gravemound”]). Here, however, he was already proceeding from the traditional type of ballad narrative to ballads having an original structure in which the main character tells about her own fate (“The Lily,” “The Mermaid”). Besides these, Ševčenko composed wonderful short ballads that were clearly related to folk song: “*Xustyna*” (“The Kerchief”) or “*U nedilju ne huljala*” (“On Sundays, she did not gad about”), “*Xustka*” (“The Kerchief”), “*Xustyna*” (“A Kerchief”) or “*Čy to na te Boža volja?*” (“Was It the Will of God?”), “*Kolo haju v čystim poli*” (“Beside a Grove in an Open Field”), “*U tijeji Kateryny*” (“In the House of a Certain Katherine”). Even his historical poems such as “*Tarasova nič*” (“Night of Taras”) and “*Hamalija*” are in the ballad genre.

Ševčenko also wrote numerous Byronic poems. These are “free form” poems where there is not only a mingling of genres, but sometimes even the

introduction of prose into the poetry: "*Hajdamaky*," "*Sotnyk*" ("The Captain"), and where the author does not merely depict events, but also gives wide expression to his own feelings and thoughts. The long list of works in this favorite of Ševčenkian genres comprises: "*Katherine*," "*Hajdamaky*," "*Černycja Marjana*" ("Mariana, the Nun"), "*Sova*" ("The Owl"), "*Jeretyk*" ("The Heretic"), "*Nevol'nyk*" ("The Captive"), "*Najmyčka*" ("The Servant Girl"), "*Vid'ma*" ("The Witch"), "*Knjažna*" ("The Princess"), "*Moskaleva krynycja*" ("The Soldier's Well"), "*Varnak*" ("The Convict"), "*Tytarivna*" ("The Sexton's Daughter"), "*Maryna*" ("Maryna"), "*U Vyl'ni, horodi preslavnim*" ("In the Celebrated Town of Vil'no"), "*Sotnyk*" ("The Captain"), "*Petrus*" ("Little Peter"), including an 1857 reworking of "The Soldier's Well." Ševčenko's later poems "*Neofity*" ("The Neophytes") and "*Marija*" ("Mary") also contain typical features of the Byronic poem.

All the characteristics of the Byronic poem may be found in Ševčenko's works. The Byronic poem is constructed out of separate tableaux between which there is no direct connection or logical transition. In Ševčenko, all gradations of coherence exist, from the most logical development of action in "*Katherine*" (although basically there are separate scenes here too) to the complete disintegration of epic plot development. The poem begins *in medias res*, without any lengthy preparation: "*Ne sluxala Kateryna ni bat'ka ni nen'ky . . .*" ("Katherine did not listen to her father or her mother . . ."), "*U nedilju vraci rano . . .*" ("Early one Sunday morning . . ."), "*U Ohlavi . . .*" ("It happened in Ohlav . . ."); sometimes the exposition is preceded by a general introduction of a lyrical nature: "*Koxajtesja, čornobryvi . . .*" ("Fall in love, black-browed maidens . . ."). The narrative proper is continually interrupted by the author interjecting his own reflections: "*Otake to na sim sviti robljat' ljudjam ljudy . . .*" ("Such are the wrongs that people do to people on this earth . . .")—a forty line digression; "*Syrota sobaka maje svoju dolju . . .*" ("An orphaned puppy has its own particular fate . . .")—eleven lines; "*To ne viter, to ne bujnyj . . .*" ("It is not the wind, nor any hurricane . . .")—twenty four lines. Or the author may address his characters: "*Kateryno, serce moje . . .*" ("Katherine, my poor dear . . .")—eight lines; "*Ne plač, Kateryno . . .*" ("Weep not, Katherine . . .")—eleven lines; or the reader: "*Otake to lyxo, bačyte, divčata . . .*" ("See, young maidens, thus trouble comes . . .")—nine lines; "*Ne pytajte, čornobryvi . . .*" ("Do not ask, my black-browed beauties . . .")—seventeen lines; or himself, as he wonders what is happening to the characters: "*De ž Katrusju pryhornula? Čy v poli, čy v xati? . . .*" ("Where has it [the night] sheltered Katie in a field, or in a cottage . . .")—six lines, "*De ž Katrusja bludyt' . . .*" ("And where is Katie wandering now . . ."), "*. . . Ščo ž to bulo z prevosxodytel'noju? Ščo ty teper*

robýtymeš z soboju? . . .) ("What happened with her excellency? What will you do with yourself now? . . ."). The author may interject narrative digressions of a still different type: *" . . . A tym časom kete lyš kresalo ta tjutjunu, ščob, znajete, doma ne žurylys' . . .*" ("Meanwhile, only give me enough flint and tobacco so they won't worry at home . . ."). Other interruptions are created by characters' speeches which, occasionally, have but secondary significance in the unfolding of the action ("The Captain," "The Witch," "*Hajdamaky*," "The Soldier's Well"). At the same time, while scenes of a general nature are given broad depiction, the principal events in the plot development are only briefly mentioned: *"De ž ty, Jaremo? De ty? Podywysja! A vin, mandrujučy, spiva"* ("Where can you be, Jarema? Where are you? Look at this! But he is on his travels, singing all the while"), *"Jarema z Lejboju prokralys' až v budynok . . ."* ("Jarema and Lejba slipped right into the building . . ."), etc. Besides the general devices used by the Romantic Byronic poem in the disintegration of the epic form, Ševčenko employs his own, including numerous incidental songs ("*Hajdamaky*," "Mariana, the Nun," "Maryna," "The Captain"). The difference between this free form and that of Classicist tradition is obvious when one compares the depiction of events in Ševčenko with the smoothly flowing exposition of the course of action even in Kotljarevskij's *Enejida*, a travesty! For his conclusions, Ševčenko either presents an extensive lyrical vignette or simply breaks off the action as abruptly as he started it: *"A maty vže spala!"* ("And the mother was already asleep!"), *"Dva trupy na poli najšly i na mohyli pochovaly"* ("They found two corpses in the field and buried them on the grave-mound"), *"I povolik Petrus' kajdany až u Sybir . . ."* ("And young Peter dragged his chains all the way to Siberia . . ."), *"Sumujučy, u burjani umerla z holodu. Amin'"* ("Grieving, she died of hunger in the tall grass. Amen").

The style of Ševčenko's Byronic poems is typical of his poetry as a whole. The omissions and digressions in the depiction of events are equally characteristic of his ballads and other poems, evoking the impression of a certain "poetic vagueness." Incidents which the Classicists or the later Realists would have related in great detail (the wanderings of Katherine, the participation of Jarema-Halajda in all the events of the uprising, the adventures of the Cossacks in foreign lands, the experiences of individual characters) are rendered only through allusions. The Romantic poem thus forfeits breadth of portrayal. Indeed, Ševčenko's poems, inasmuch as they are Byronic poems, may be only miniatures in size ("*Hajdamaky*" is the sole exception, approaching the proportions of an un-Romantic epic). At the same time, however, the Romantic poem, and Romantic poetry in general, greatly elevates other facets that contribute rather to the "depth" of the content. For, Romanticism held that everything

had a dual significance, and that all events (but mainly historical events, the life of nature, and of a nation) had a *symbolic* meaning. Ševčenko himself openly declared his attitude toward symbolism when he wrote “*Velykyj l’ox*” (“The Great Vault”), which he called a “mystery.” Purposely somewhat vague, the symbolism of the mystery here is a metaphoric explanation of the entire past and present of Ukraine. (But this same symbolic meaning is also present in other passages in Ševčenko in which the symbolism, unfortunately, is not obvious to the non-Romantic reader.) Even the censors of the time understood, however, that in “Katherine” was a symbolic representation of the fate of Ukraine: accordingly, they expunged this symbolic portrayal at the beginning of the fourth canto:

*Popid horoju jarom dolom,
mov ti didy vysokočoli,
duby z Het'manščyny stojat';
v jaru hrebel'ka, verby v rjad,
stavok pid kryhoju v nevoli . . .*

(“At the base of the mountain, in the low valley, like some high-foreheaded grandfathers, there stand oaks from the *Hetman* era. By a small dam, willows grow in rows, while the pond is kept in captivity under the ice. . . .”)

Also symbolic is the “*orel čornyj*” (“black eagle” that is Russia) in the introduction to the *Kobzar*. The extraordinary number of symbolic motifs in the poetry of Ševčenko cannot all be investigated here. However, the image of the seduced girl and mother (*maty-pokrytka*) to which Ševčenko returns repeatedly is worthy of note. Whether the image derived from personal experience, or whether it came to him second hand, is immaterial. What is clear is that the image symbolizes the fate of Ukraine, seduced and deceived by the Russian soldier who abandons his son; the son represents Ševčenko’s generation which must avenge its mother. Later, this symbolism became altered (see below, pt. G, no. 2). Another of Ševčenko’s symbolic themes is that of the *kobzar*, the *bandurist*—known earlier in the Polish Ukrainian school and among the Xarkiv Romantics in the symbol of the poet. Other symbols for the poet were the nightingale and the eagle (from “The Tale of the Host of Ihor”).

8. Thematically, Ševčenko’s poetry is altogether Romantic, and it is perhaps most Romantic for the fact that it is totally national and totally Ukrainian. The steppe and the sea: primarily a steppe in which the wind is blowing, and a turbulent, agitated sea; grave-mounds in which the Ukrainian past

is buried; a stormy night—"Reve ta stohne Dnibr šyrokyj" ("Broad Dnieper roars and groans")—is completely in the tradition of Ukrainian Romanticism (see examples above, pt. E, nos. 3 and 4), and conflagration. Ševčenko's landscape is, for the most part, volatile and "dynamic"; once more the wind is a Romantic image. As well as these landscape themes, there are the human figures: first, the *bandurist*, a favorite theme of the Ukrainian Romantics, is developed by Ševčenko into a philosophy of poetry enunciated in his verses dedicated to the poets Kotljarevs'kyj, Hrebinka, Gogol'. Then there is the theme of the Cossack as a fighter for freedom; the peasant—in whom resides the potential to be this Cossack; the young maiden; the mother who grieves over the fate of her children; the oppressor of the people (often, a foreigner). All of these themes, whether taken from folk poetry or from personal experience, acquire a symbolic character in Ševčenko's work: they are images of Ukraine. Again, this symbolic ambiguity is typically Romantic.

Of course, Ševčenko uses general romantic themes as well: the fantastic (mermaids, a woman who turns into a plant; see, for instance, Czech ballads of K. Erben), madness ("The Witch," "The Owl"), etc. Indeed, it is the exclusively Romantic thematic material of "Romantic terror" that dominates the poems of Ševčenko; the fate of his heroes is always death or destruction:* suicide ("Katherine"), madness ("The Witch," "The Owl," "Maryna"), brigandage ("The Convict"), Siberian exile ("The Convict," "Little Peter"), infanticide ("The Sexton's Daughter"), the poisoning of a husband ("Little Peter"), the rape of a daughter ("The Princess"), loneliness ("The Captain," "The Soldier's Well"), torture, fire, the murder of one's children, capital punishment ("Hajdamaky,"—"The Heretic"), etc. Only "The Servant Girl" and "The Captive" have relatively happy endings. It is perhaps this tendency towards "Romantic terror" that constitutes the greatest historical limitation of Ševčenko's poetry. This weakness is most perceived in lines such as:

*do sl'oz, do krovy, do požaru—
do vs'oho, vs'oho ja pryvyk.
Bulo, mov žabu tu, na spysi
spečeš dytynu na ohni . . .*

("to tears, to blood, to fire—to all, all have I become accustomed. You will roast the child on the fire as if it were that frog on a spear. . .")

*In this respect, Ševčenko may be compared with Janko Kral', a Slovak Romantic akin to the Ukrainian poet.

or:

*Maryna hola na-holo
pered budynkom tancjuvala
u pari z matirju, i-strax!—
z nožem okrovnym v rukax
i pryspivuvala:
“Čy ne ce ž ta kumasja,
ščo pidtykalasja? . . .”*

(“Maryna, stark naked, danced in front of the building with her mother, and horror! bore a bloody knife in her hands, and sang as she danced: ‘Is this not my crony dear who is all dressed up? . . .’”)

It was not merely impressive images of the past that Ševčenko took from Ukrainian historical songs and literature. For several ideas (with which, indeed, he is now identified) may be found in his work. In imitating the name of the popular historical song, *duma*, Ševčenko, perhaps not gratuitously, began from the very outset to speak of his own works as *dumy*, or *dumky*: and beyond their images, there are, in fact, many thoughts and ideas in them. They comprise, for example, the extremely masterful “poetic formulae” which, next to the musicality of his work, are among the main characteristics of Ševčenko’s poetry. These “formulae” are verse aphorisms containing a thought that is often sharply formulated and reinforced by consonance, rhyme or other euphonic devices:

<i>bo vas lyxo na svit na smix</i>	s-ly-x-na-s-na-s-x-
<i>porodylo . . .</i>	yl

(“for ill-fate in mockery gave you life . . .”)

<i>Boritesja—poborete:</i>	bo-te-bo-te
<i>vam Boh pomahaje;</i>	va-b-po
<i>za vas syła, za vas volja</i>	za-va-la-za-va-lja
<i>i pravda svjataja.</i>	av-v-vja-aja

(“Struggle—and you will vanquish: for God is your succor. On your side is strength, on your side is freedom, and holy truth.”)

Even without any “instrumentation,” these formulae are clear and expressive—the finest examples of Ukrainian aphoristic language to this day:

*Od moldavanyna do fina
na vsix jazykax vse movčyt' . . .
Bo "blahodenstvuje" . . .*

("From the Moldavian to the Finn, all tongues are silent . . .
for all are quite content. . . .")

*Ljudy hnut'sja, jak ti lozy,
kudy viter vije;
syrotyni sonce svityt',
svityt' ta ne hrije . . .*

("Whether the wind blows, people will bend, like willows;
the sun may shine on an orphan, too, but it will only shine;
it does not warm. . . .")

*V svoji xati—svoja pravda,
i syla i volja!*

("In your own house—there prevails your own truth, and
strength and freedom!")

*Ot de, ljudy, naša slava,
slava Ukrajiny!*

*Bez zolota, bez kamenju,
bez xytroji movy,
a holosna ta pravdyva,
jak Hospoda slovo!*

("Here is where, good people, lies our glory, the glory of
Ukraine! Without gold, nor stone, nor cunning speech, it
is renowned and true like the Word of God!")

There is hardly a verse that does not contain such poetic formulae.

The substance of these poetic formulae is clearly centered around a few basic ideas or concepts: *Slovo* (Word), *Pravda* (Truth), *Slava* (Glory). These are the three fundamental concepts pervading all of Ševčenko's poetical thought. "Glory" signified for Ševčenko the whole national culture, all the past traditions which are inherent in a nation and which are its strength for the future: "*Vše hyne—slava ne poljaže*" ("Everything will perish—but glory shall never die").

Ševčenko believed:

*I zabudet'sja sramotnja davnjaja hodyna,
i ožyve dobra slava, slava Ukrajiny!
I svit jasnyj, nevečernij, tyxo zasijaje!*

("And the shame of bygone times will be forgotten, and true glory will revive, the glory of Ukraine! And a clear light, not a twilight, will shine forth tranquilly!")

Other Ukrainian Romantics had also dreamt of this "glory" which could still be revived. Ševčenko was alone, however, in his suffering "za pravdu na sviti" ("for truth in the world"). According to him, eternal "truth" (or "truth and liberty") was intimately connected with "glory"; and, in every instance, it lay in the future. None of the Ukrainian Romantics had dared such bitter criticism of the past or, especially, of the present: "Skriz' nepravda, de ne hljanu" ("There is injustice everywhere, no matter where I look"); "Rozbijnyky ljudojidy pravdu poboroly" ("Cutthroats and cannibals have routed truth"). But Ševčenko's aspirations were not for the past or the present—only for the future:

*Nexaj že serce plače, prosyt'
svjatoji pravdy na zemli . . .*

("Let the heart then weep, let it pray for holy truth on earth. . . .")

*Može šče raz sonce pravdy
xoč skriz' son pobaču . . .*

("Perhaps I shall once more see the sun of truth, even if only through a dream. . . .")

*Vstane pravda, vstane volja,
i Tobì odnomu
poklonjat'sja vsi jazyky
vo viky i viky . . .*

("Truth will arise, freedom will arise, and to Thee alone will people of all tongues bow, for ever and ever. . . .")

The very totality of the tendency here, of all the wishes and the hopes for the future, made of Ševčenko a poet-prophet. For he was, in fact, toiling for the future; and his tool was the “Word”:

... orju
svij perelih, ubohu nyvu,
ta siju slovo: dobri žnyva
kolys' to budut' . . .

(“I plough my fallow ground, poor land that it is, and sow the ‘word’: a fine harvest will they make one day. . . .”)

Komu z jiji (dumu.; D.Č.) pokažu ja,
i xto tuju movu
pryvitaje, uhadaje
velykeje slovo . . .

(“To whom shall I show it [my thought], and who will greet this speech and divine my mighty ‘word’ . . .”)

The poet’s “mighty word” and his “word-tears” aspire in his verses to become fiery words:

pošly meni svjateje slovo,
svjatoji pravdy holos novyj,
.....
podaj duši ubohij sylu,
ščob ohnenno zahovoryla,
ščob slovo plamenem vzjalos',
ščob ljudjam serce roztopylo,
i po Ukrajinі poneslos',
i na Ukrajinі svjatylos'
te slovo . . .

(“send me the holy word, a new voice of the sacred truth . . . give my poor soul strength and ardent speech, that my word may take fire and melt people’s hearts, and that that word may spread throughout Ukraine and become sanctified in Ukraine. . . .”)

In a certain way, the poet's words are the words of God, for the poet is a divine prophet. Moreover, "truth and freedom" and "glory" do not depend on the poet's bidding, but come directly from the word of God, from His will:

*My virujem Tvojij syli
i slovu žyvomu . . .*

*Nenače sriblo kute, byte
i semykraty perelyte
ohnem v hornyli, slovesa
Tvoji, o Hospody, takiji . . .*

("We believe in Thy power and Thy living word. . . . Like silver, forged, coined and shot through with fire in the melting pot sevenfold—such, o Lord, are Thy words. . . .")

Ševčenko thought of his own poetic creativity in just these terms—as a word which would regenerate national life, which would call to a new life all those who had "fallen asleep," which would "awaken" them. The concept of the "resurrection" of Ukraine had remained obscure with the Romantics; in Ševčenko it was joined with biblical imagery:

*I, o dyvo! Trupy vstaly
i očy rozkryly;
i brat z bratom obnjalysja,
i prohovoryly
slova tyxoji ljubovy
na viky i viky . . .*

("And, a miracle happened! The corpses arose and opened their eyes; and brother embraced brother and they uttered words of tender love for ever and ever. . . .")

and with altogether new, revolutionary invocations, heard for the first time in Ukrainian literature:

*. . . vstavajte,
kajdany porvite,
i vražožu zloju krov'ju
volju okropite . . .*

("... arise, sunder your chains and with your foes' unholy
blood baptize your freedom. . . .")

*... hromadoju obux stalyt',
da dobre vyhostryt' sokyru,
ta j zaxodytysja budyt',
a to prosypyt' sobi neboha
do sudu Božoho strašneho . . .*

("... one must harden the back end of the axe and
sharpen the hatchet well, and prepare to awaken [freedom],
or else it, a poor wretch, will sleep through until Judgment
Day. . . .")

Ševčenko's images and concepts continue to invite various interpretations, for as a poet he could not possibly express himself in the completely transparent manner required of politicians. Nevertheless, one idea has always clearly emerged from all his images, thoughts and concepts of "Truth," "Freedom," "Glory" in the name of which he "stood" on the crossroads . . . like Ezekiel—Ševčenko's notion of Ukraine and the Ukrainian people as vital and complete entities or collectives, as "personalities" in the family of nations and powers. For him, Ukraine's "slumber" (no longer death) did not signify any loss of customs or even of language: as a lad from the country, he knew that no such loss existed and felt that it did not threaten.* He regarded her condition simply as the result of the political oppression of the Russian government, and of czarism. This idea, which Ševčenko expressed in but a few instances, broke completely with the Ukrainian tradition of Russian patriotism that had dominated the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It insured Ševčenko's place not only in the history of literature, but also in the history of Ukrainian political thought.

9. A position quite apart from his poetic legacy is occupied by Ševčenko's "Ukrainian play," "*Nazar Stodolja*." The play, the sole extant dramatic effort of Ševčenko, was first written in Russian during the poet's St. Petersburg period, and later translated into Ukrainian. The drama has a fairly traditional plot: the daughter of a captain, who wants to marry her off to a wealthy colonel, runs

*That the Ukrainian language was dying was a popular supposition among Kotljarevs'kyj's contemporaries and admirers who expected his work merely to remain as a remembrance of the dead past. However, it was also a frequent topic among "Ukrainophile" linguists and professors of the Romantic era! No wonder, then, that it was "on a grave-mound" that the poet "played his *kobza*."

away with Nazar. The father catches the fugitives, but Nazar's friends free him and want to kill the captain. Nazar saves the life of the captain, who then suddenly repents and enters a monastery "to atone for his iniquity." With the exception of some effective scenes, the drama has the character of a primitive Romantic melodrama. The language is impure, perhaps the result of unfinished translation: e.g., the word "*batjuška*" (Russian—father) which sounds dreadful coming from a Ukrainian girl. The dramatic action is interrupted by songs, dances, and the presentation of an ethnographic scene of matchmaking. The play is no worse, but neither is it any better, than other Ukrainian melodramas of the nineteenth century.

10. After Ševčenko, the figure who left the deepest traces in Ukrainian intellectual history was Pan'ko (Pantelejmon) Kuliš (1819-97). While it is true that during the Kievan period of Romanticism his role as a writer had not emerged fully, he was, however, already the author of several works in Russian: including stories, a remarkable essay—"*Pamjatnaja kniga dlja pomeščikov Černihovskoj gubernii*" ("A Book of Instructions for the Landowners of Černihiv Province")—reminiscent of Kvitka's *Letters* and of Gogol's later *Vybrannye mesta iz perepiski s druž'jami* (*Selections from Correspondence with My Friends*), a historical sketch—"*Povest' ob Ukraine*" ("A Story About the Ukraine"), a Romantic historical novel—*Mixail Čarnyšenko*—and one work in Ukrainian—*Ukrajina* (*Ukraine*, 1843; see below). His Ukrainian poems, his story "*Orysja*" as well as various ethnographic materials were all, at this time, either ready to be printed or already printed; however, they were not published. His Ukrainian novel *Čorna rada* (*The Black Council*) was a similar case: only its few sections that were in Russian were published.

Nevertheless, the personality of Kuliš, the young writer, may be clearly perceived from these works. The later Kuliš may have struck his contemporaries as a man of constantly changing convictions, opinions, interests and passions. However, the beginnings of his later development can already be found in the creativity of his early years and it is a development which, from the perspective of our own time, appears to have contained more stability than change. Kuliš's fate was that of the typical Romantic: his "instability" was merely a manifestation of a Romantic aspiration for "wholeness" and diversity. He was a representative of that particular Romantic type who strives to achieve his ideal of diversity by way of perpetual movement and continual change—a path which often led to catastrophe and tragedy. Kuliš, however, emerged from these alterations as the same indefatigable writer and ardent proponent of his own ideas whom often, to be sure, no one wanted to hear and, as a prophet, whom nobody followed. Despite all, Kuliš never stopped working, or preaching, or writing.

Kuliš's thought derived from varied sources. First, there were the personal influences exerted upon him by the vague Ukrainophilism and Slavophilism of Maksymovyč, whom Kuliš assisted in his scientific studies. Then there figured the influences of the foreign schools—of the Russian Slavophile Pletnev and the Polish Ukrainophile Grabowski (see above, pt. C, no. 3). Kuliš's principal sources, however, were his own tireless studies, both in Ukrainian and foreign fields. Many Ukrainian writers drew upon sources that were discovered by chance; Kuliš's sources were always new sources and often altogether unexpected and removed from Ukrainian subject matter.

Ukraine aspires to the lofty style of Kostomarov's *Books of the Genesis*. In it, Kuliš attempted, with the help of folk *dumy*, to create a great Ukraine historical epic which he compared with *The Iliad*. Kuliš himself supplemented the *dumy* wherever they were inadequate to his purposes: he thus created new *dumy* in the tradition of the old and then joined them with the genuine folk poetry. However, *Ukraine* was not a forgery, for Kuliš carefully indicated the origins of his texts. It consisted of twelve *dumy*, its first section taking the narrative through to the time of Xmelnyc'kyj. While the work no longer holds any interest for the reader, it is not without any merit. The stylization of the language in the spirit of the *dumy* is, for example, consistent and faithful to its models. Many of the conventional folk song epithets may be found: "*hirki sl'ozy*" ("bitter tears"), "*ščyryji molytvy*" ("fervent prayers"), "*bezbožyj Batyj*" ("godless Batyj"), "*vovky siromanci*" ("poor gray wolves"), etc. There are numerous set expressions derived from the *dumy*: "*surmy surmyly*" ("the bugles sounded"), "*Vijs'ko zbyraty, v poxid vystupaty*" ("gather the troops, start out on the campaign"), "*kozaky teje začuvaly*" ("the Cossacks heard that"). Kuliš also makes abundant use of "word pairs," a particularly characteristic device of the *dumy*: *med-vyno* (mead-wine), *dumaje-hadaje* (thinks-surmises), *vypytuje-spodivaje* (inquires-hopes for), *pyše-vypysuje* (writes-writes out), *kurhany-mohyly* (mounds-grave-mounds); some of them are Kuliš's own creations. The following are typical lines of *Ukraine*:

*Ta po šyrokomu ta po dalekomu Dunaječku
zlaja burja vyxožaje-vystupaje,
kozakiv do zemli čuždoji provožaje.
A z nyzu bujnyj viter vije-povivaje.*

("And over the broad and lengthy Danube, a foul tempest
mounts and builds, and conveys the Cossacks to foreign soil.
And from the lowland a violent wind blows and rages.")

Apart from the *dumy*, Kuliš drew on "The Tale of the Host of Ihor":

*Todi vže na Vkraini ridko de pluhatari na volykyv hukaly,
a častiše vorony na poljax kryčaly,
trup diljačy pomiž soboju,
a halky svoju rič hovoryly,
zbyrajučys' letity na kryvaveje pole . . .*

A samiji dereva od žalosty do zemli pryklonylys' . . .

("And that time in Ukraine only seldom did plowmen call out to their bullocks. More often, it was the ravens cawing in the fields as they divided a corpse among them, and the jackdaws discoursing about their own matters as they prepared to fly over the bloody field. . . . And even the trees bowed down to the ground out of sorrow. . . .")

Unfortunately, Kuliš did not avoid certain unsuitable images. And in a few instances *dumy* were juxtaposed with historical folk songs of a different type; one of them, a song about the mythical Pivtora-Kožux ("One and a Half Sheepskin"), even contains notes of travesty.

The short story "*Orysja*" concerns a captain's daughter who first meets her intended while she is with her servants washing clothes in a creek (Trubajlo). This situation, as Kuliš himself remarked, parallels the meeting of Odysseus and Nausicaa (from the sixth canto of the *Odyssey*). The story seems to be in the style of Kvitka except that Kuliš's writing is serious, and without any disdain or condescension toward his heroes. The description of *Orysja* is still somewhat exaggerated in its idealization: *Orysja "krašča j nad jasnu zorju v pohodu, krašča nad povnyj misjac' sered noči, krašča j nad same sonce"* ("was even more beautiful than a bright star on a clear night, more beautiful than full moon at midnight, more beautiful than the sun itself . . ."). However, a little later the tone becomes completely serious. There are some beautiful images:

*mov v zerkali, vydno v vodi i nebo, i kruču
z tymy kudlatymy korinnjamy, ščo pereplutalys' iz
xmelem, i kučerjavi vjazy, ščo povybihaly na
samyj kraj i poprostjahaly zeleni lapy nad ričkoju.*

("reflected in the water, as if in a mirror, were the sky and the ravine with those matted roots which had become entangled with the hop plants, and the leafy elm trees which

ran along the very edge of the water and extended their large green arms over the creek.”)

*Iz-za syvoji borody staroho Hryvy, iz-za biloji
zyny, červonije lito—poven viz divčat u kvitkax
ta v namysti . . .*

(“From behind the gray beard of old Hryva, from behind white winter, is the flush of summer—a wagon-full of girls decked in flowers and beads. . .”)

Everything has a folk quality, but without coarseness.

11. The most distinguished of Kuliš's early works was his historical novel *The Black Council* (published in its entirety in 1857). It was created on the basis of serious historical studies and with the help of certain artistic devices with which Kuliš had become familiar in the works of the founder of the historical novel, Walter Scott. To a great extent, Kuliš's novel was an attempt to correct the idealized image of the Cossacks presented in Gogol's *Taras Bul'ba* as a united body living for the sole ideal of national and religious struggle. Kuliš sought to change the sublime but non-individualized imagery of Gogol in which perhaps the sole character to be given a vivid, concrete portrayal as a person is the Romantic hero, Andrij. Kuliš's task was exactly that which Ševčenko had set himself in his poetry: not to depict some idyllic, obscure figure of Ukraine, but to present an image that was truly alive and full-blooded, instead of one that was picturesque, sweet, charming and only seemingly vivid. The varied and sometimes negative reality which is Kuliš's vision of Ukraine is the more valid, for Ukraine, past or present, has never been a homogeneous whole. Kuliš wanted to present not some grand monument but a complete picture and one that was true to life, reflecting the various Ukrainian characters and classes of the past along with their peculiar interests, aspirations and ideals. To portray such an image, especially a “living” image, was the conscious national task which Kuliš set himself.

The Black Council clearly does not match the high linguistic level attained by Gogol. However, it does have its own considerable artistic merits. The action centers around two stories, successfully interwoven: one concerns the Black Council of 1663 and its election of Brjuxovec'kyj as *hetman* in place of Somko; the other is the story of Petro Šramčenko and Lesja Čerevanivna, Somko's betrothed, who marries Petro after Somko's death. The author is chiefly concerned with portraying the diverse characters (social figures and individuals) and

groups which made up the Ukrainian population. The work is "a novel of psychological types and social conflicts" (Viktor Petrov). 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 multi-faceted 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.

With the exception of his pale women (although Kuliš does stress the role of women in Ukraine), the psychological portrayal of the different types is largely determined by the heroes' participation in events: there are egoists ("*usjake, jak zvirjuka, pro svoju til'ky škuru ta pro svoj berlih dbaje*")—"everyone is like a wild animal concerned only about his own skin and his own lair"—says Šram about them), men of ideas (Somko, Šram), and secondary figures (Čerevan' Zolotaranko). The egoists prevail while the men of ideas die in the struggle for their beliefs; however, in their victory the former do not actually attain their goals either. In Kuliš's view, the deepest and most valuable qualities in Ukrainian life were to be found in those people whose participation in events was not based on emotion: these were the minstrel "*Božyj čolovik*" ("A Godly Man") and the Zaporozhian, Kyrylo Tur. The ideal which inspires Somko, knightly honor and the struggle for "truth," is a lofty one; but still higher is the awareness that everything is vanity.

The novel has a considerable number of Romantic aspects: a duel, the abduction of a maiden, the nocturnal pursuit, effective mass scenes, a prison. However, in contrast to *Mixail Čarnyšenko* where these same motifs appeared, their depiction here is extremely natural; as a result, the reader does not notice their traditional character. The vocabulary contains several ethnographic and archaic words which Kuliš, for the most part, either explains or reveals through the context: "*Žovniry konsystujučy v horodax*" ("The soldiers billeted in the towns"), as well as descriptions of lodgings, wearing apparel or dishes. Often these outdated expressions are quite successful ("*nedruh otčyznyj*")—a non-friend of the fatherland). On the whole, the language is rather formal; at times it gives the impression of being narrated by someone else, perhaps a contemporary of, or participant in, the events of the novel: "*Ščo til'ky v Bibliji propysane, use*

černec' toj mov žyve spysav skriz' po manastyrevi' ("All that which had been written down only in the Bible that monk inscribed throughout the whole monastery as if it were the living word"), *Usi vzjalys' za svjatyj xlib'* ("They all set about the holy bread"), Lesja *"povypysuvala holubon'ko, sriblom, zolotom i blakytynym šovkom usjaki kvitky i merežky"* ("prettily traced all kinds of flower designs and fancy-work with silver, gold and azure silk thread"), etc.

Kuliš also gathered effective popular expressions for his use—occasionally they are archaic (see above) also: *"nedoljašky"* ("Polonized Ukrainians"), *"ljads'kyj"* ("Polish"), *"Dzvonyv šableju"* ("He made his sword clang"), *"Vdaryly z harmat"* ("They fired the cannon"), including at times quotations from the Chronicles. The participants in the Black Council *"služyly til'ky po brovarjax, po vynnycjax ta šče po laznjax hrubnykamy . . ."* ("worked only in the brew houses, wine cellars as stokers in bath houses . . ."—from Samovydec', see Ch. VI, pt. H, no. 2). Most often, however, they are modern expressions (there are phrases from Hrebinka and Ševčenko), mainly popular in nature while not being vulgarisms: *"Toho dovidujemos'"* ("We are inquiring about it"), *"Doskočyv skarbu"* ("He suddenly acquired a fortune"), *"Siv xutorom"* ("He stayed put on the homestead"), *"Pobralys' hajem"* ("They went through the grove"), *"Ja neju xodyla"* ("I was pregnant with her"), *"zložyty ruky"* ("to shake hands [in agreement]"), etc. To a certain extent, the characters' speech is individualized: Čerevan', who does not pronounce his "r's," says always *"bhate," "bhatyku"* (for *brate, bratyku* [brother]), and once *"phavda"* (for *pravda* [truth]). However, Kuliš does not carry this linguistic characterization to extremes: thus, his characters even use vulgarisms on occasion: *"Harbuza vteljušyt'"* ("She will refuse her hand in marriage").

Kuliš, therefore, shared the common aspiration of all Romantics—the creation of a language for a "full-blown" literature. After the poetry of Ševčenko, *The Black Council* represents the most distinguished step taken by Romanticism toward such a language. The only area in Kuliš (as, in fact, in Ševčenko) remaining outside this Ukrainian linguistic sphere to some degree is that of religious reflections: Kuliš's characters depend on the Church Slavonic texts from the Bible.

12. The details of Kuliš's ideology were not yet very clear in this early period. However, two motives could be perceived from the outset. The first was characteristic of all Romantics and received special emphasis in Ševčenko's work—the will to comprehend the Ukrainian past and present as one broad, all-embracing, and diverse life. Kuliš aspired to an image of Ukraine that was neither sentimental or precious, as often in Kvitka, nor grandly monumental, as in *Taras Bul'ba*, but one that reflected the full life of a social organism.

Combined with this Romantic vision was the (also Romantic) longing for "depth": unity was perceived not *in* things, but beyond them. In this respect, Kuliš was no less a symbolist than Ševčenko. He saw beyond the scenes of stormy events and the struggles of different people to something more profound and universal—the struggle of "truth and injustice." In *The Black Council* the songs of the minstrel also assume symbolic meaning: his songs are "like sorcery"; he was blind, like Homer, yet he saw that which the sighted person never sees. Even such an earthly person as Ivanec' Brjuxovec'kyj becomes a symbolic figure: his ill-fated agitation and his influence on the masses are like some sort of magic, diabolical spells. There are symbolic landscapes: night "which inspires a thought as does the Holy Word"; Kiev—as Jerusalem, a theme of old Ukrainian literature. The Cossacks are also symbolic figures: despite their physical solidity, they are like a dream, "for to them, everything seems foolish . . . whether to live, or to die. . . ."

It was with this feature of Zaporožian psychology that is associated the second fundamental motif of the early Kuliš—his attitude of "Romantic irony" or more correctly "Christian irony." Kuliš here regards history, reality, and life as playthings, trifles, "the vanity of vanities" as "A Godly Man" declares. A Godly Man and Kyrlylo Tur are symbols of these mystic-Christian ideological motifs of the early Kuliš, motifs which—as he suggested at the time—were the leading internal forces of Ukrainian life and Ukrainian history. Both the true Christianity of A Godly Man and the "foolishness" of Kyrlylo Tur are expressions of the same inner search for God (themes found in St. Augustine and repeated in Skovoroda). The merrymaking (*hul'nja*) of the Zaporožians is another manifestation of this same "hazardous yet somehow sad" outlook on the world: "they made merry, and demonstrated by their revelry that everything in the world is a chimera," for "even the whole world could not fill the Cossack soul . . . God alone can fill it." Life "will bring you sweetness and light, you think: what happiness! Then you look more closely—everything is a delusion." "Everything"—except this judgment on human actions, and except the final verdict on good and evil, on the living and the dead, which Kuliš places in the mouth of A Godly Man: "*Ivancja Brjuxovec'koho Hospod' hrixom uže pokarav; a pravednomu čolovikovi jakoji treba nahrady? . . . Slavy treba myrovi, a ne tomu xto slaven. Myr nexaj' navčajet'sja dobru, sluxajučy, jak oddavaly žyžn' za ljuds'ke blaho, a slavnomu slava u Boha!*" ("Ivanec' Brjuxovec'kyj has been punished by the Lord for his sin; but what kind of recompense does the righteous man need? . . . It is the world which is in need of glory, not he who is already renowned. Let the world learn goodness, let it hear how life itself was given for the good of mankind; but for him who has a good name, glory comes only from God.")

This, then, is Kuliš's assessment of the value of mankind and all things human, and also his comment on their existence: "*Zaverjuxa . . . polamle stare derevo . . . a čomu ukazav Hospod' rosty j cvisty, te j ostanet'sja, i krasujet'sja veselo ta pyšno, mov iz rodu i xurtovyny ne bačylo . . .*" ("A snowstorm . . . breaks an old tree into pieces . . . but what the Lord ordered to grow and to flourish, that will remain, looking happy and proud, as if it had never in its life seen a blizzard"). Such historical optimism sustained Kuliš even during the most difficult days of Ukraine's history.

13. Of the other members of the Brotherhood, V. Bilozers'kyj (1825-99) was active only as a journalist (editor of *Osnova—The Foundation*) and other journals. Opanas Markovyč (1822-67) was, for a time, thought to be the author of the stories of Marko Vovčok until it was discovered that they were written by his wife. Oleksandr Navroc'kyj (1823-1902) began to write Ukrainian verse in 1847. His translations, including works of Mickiewicz, Xomjakov, Goethe, Schiller, Byron and Heine, were typical not only in their choice of authors but in their themes, e.g., Romantic theme of night in Xomjakov's "*Zvezdy*" ("Stars"); later, Navroc'kyj also turned to social poetry (theme of the suppressed peasantry). Employing folk song rhythms to a certain degree, he also imitated many of Ševčenko's rhymes (*haji—povivaje, haju—spivaješ, todi—rybariv*, etc.). However, he failed to maintain rhymes of true consonance (e.g., he rhymed *t'mi—zemli, xudobu—torbu*) or to liberate himself from grammatical rhymes despite the example of Ševčenko's incomplete rhymes. Besides following Ševčenko, Navroc'kyj also used rhythms borrowed from the Russian poet Kol'cov:

*Pole moje, pole,
ne orane pole!
Dole moja, dole,
neprohljadna dole!*

.....
*Hljanu ja na pole—
husto zelenije,
ne žyto—pšenycja—
trava polovije.*

.....
*Hodi! potyxon'ku
v šynok pomandruju,
tijeji lyxoji
trošky pokuštiju.*

*Z večora do ranka
budu kušuvaty—
v zelenim bajraci
doli vyhljadaty.*

("Field, oh my field, unplowed field! Fate, oh my fate, impenetrable fate! . . . I gaze at the field—it is a luxuriant green; not the wheat but the grass is turning yellow. . . . Enough! Quietly I shall set off for the tavern, to sip a little of that nasty stuff. . . . From evening till morning to imbibe—to contemplate my fate in the green ravine.")

Typical ornaments of the folk song style may be perceived here (word pairs, epithets without their subjects, "*tijeji lyxoji*," etc.), as well as a number of Russianisms (*neprohljadna*, *potyxon'ku*). In fact, Navroc'kyj also wrote Russian verse. He was not able, however, to attain popularity as a poet.

14. The Brotherhood of Sts. Cyril and Methodius existed for only a short time. The coming together in it of Kuliš, Kostomarov, Ševčenko and the other brethren might, therefore, appear to be some sort of accident. However, Kievan Romanticism *per se* does have its own distinctive features which unify Ševčenko's prophetic works of genius, the *Books of the Genesis*, as well as the first literary efforts of Kuliš. These features belong to the Romantic ideology which this circle clearly elaborated in social, political and (in accordance with the spirit of the Romantic world view) "messianic" terms. Instead of a program focused on the idealized past of the *Istoriia Rusiv*, and on popular *pobut*, their program, which evolved gradually, was entirely devoted to the Ukrainian present and future. While infected to a large degree by the spirit of social Christianity and political Slavophilism, its principal characteristic was its concept of Ukraine as a living national whole, whose life forces had not been spent or died. The Kievan Romantics had in front of them, not some idyllic image, but the figure of Ukraine as a completely whole organism with real needs, aspirations and interests and conflicts of interests, both in the past and in the present. Their ideas were influenced not only by Romanticism, but by already well-known post-Romantic forces: the social Christianity of Lamennais and the social and political currents of the West. Such a fervent eschatological program could not survive as a practical plan of action; however, it remained for a long time in the consciousness of Ukrainian society as the beginning of some sort of *volte-face*, like "the sound of the Archangel's trumpet announcing the Resurrection." Kuliš later recalled: "*Koly hovoreno koly-nebud' po pravdi, ščo serce ožylo, ščo oči*

zahorilysja, ščo nad čolom u čolovika zasvityvsja polomjanyj jazyk, to ce bulo todi u Kyjevi." ("When someday it will be affirmed that the heart quickened, that the eyes lit up, that a tongue of fire lit up a man's forehead—this is how it really was in those days in Kiev.")

G. LATE ROMANTICISM

1. The terror associated with the latter years of the reign of Nicholas I came to an end with the death of the emperor in 1855. And there began, in the life of all the nations of the Russian empire, a revival which, from the outset, acquired the characteristics of a social movement. This was an entirely logical development since the fundamental concerns of the time revolved around the preparation for the abolition of serfdom and those new social phenomena which stemmed from this and other reforms.

During the final years of Nicholas' regime, there was no longer complete censorship in Ukraine. Works which had no explicit political tendency were not in any jeopardy with the authorities. The year 1848 saw the publication of Metlyns'kyj's *Južno-Russkij Sbornik* (*A Southern Russian Collection*); in 1852, Borovykovs'kyj's *Bajky* (*Fables*) were published, and in 1855 a collection of poetry by Afanas'ev-Čužbysn'kyj, as well as some other works, were issued. But the beginning of the new regime brought a much wider and heretofore unprecedented development of literary production in the Ukrainian language. In 1856-57, the prolific Kuliš published his two-volumed *Zapiski o Južnoj Rusi* (*Notes on Southern Rus'*), one of the best Ukrainian collections of ethnographic material designed not so much for the experts as for the broader circle of readers. It was in the *Notes* that Ševčenko's "The Servant Girl" first appeared, anonymously. In 1857, Kuliš published *The Black Council*, republished the tales of Kvitka in a separate collection, and published the stories of Marko Vovčok. During 1860-62, he began to issue a series of pamphlets for popular consumption, and in 1860 he produced a collection—*Xata* (*The Cottage*)—containing works by Ševčenko, Ščoholiv, P. Kuz'menko, Marko Vovčok and Hanna Barvinok. In 1857 and 1859, Maksymovyč's Ukrainian translations of "The Tale of the Host of Ihor" and of the Psalms were published; in 1858, a collection of verses by S. Metlyns'kyj appeared; and in 1859 in Saratov, Danylo Mordovec' and Kostomarov published their *Malorususkij literaturnyj sbornik* (*Little Russian Literary Collection*) containing works of both, etc. As early as 1853, the journal *Černigovskie Gubernskie Vedomosti* (*The Province of Černigov News*) began to publish Ukrainian poetry: works of Zabila, Kuz'menko, O. Šyšac'kyj-Illič, O. Konys'kyj, L. Hlibov, among others, appeared here.

2. The main center of literary life at this time was the St. Petersburg monthly *The Foundation* during the brief period 1861-62. Its editor was a member of the Brotherhood, V. Bilozers'kyj; its contributors included Ševčenko, Kuliš and Kostomarov, and, of the new writers—Kuz'menko, Marko Vovčok, Mordovec', Hlibov, Hanna Barvinok, Konys'kyj, Rudans'kyj, Storoženko. The reason for the decline of *The Foundation* stems not so much from the divergence of its contributors' literary positions as from its failure to create a single political platform for all of Ukrainian society. For the contributors to *The Foundation* comprised not only older writers but also representatives of the new generation whose participation in the monthly was actually more intimate. This was the significant factor, especially since the developments of the new epoch, the social reforms, the beginnings of new programs in the Ukrainian field (Sunday schools, readings for the masses, theatrical productions) led the new generation to altogether different political feelings and set before it completely new and practical goals. (Echoes of these new currents, particularly the strengthening of the political notes, may also be found in the works of the later Romantics.) The failure to achieve unity was, nevertheless, a positive sign; it indicated that Ukrainian society was beginning to develop that artistic differentiation, that division into various trends which is a manifestation of all integral national life. Unfortunately, however, the collapse of *The Foundation* ruined that literary base which this monthly had so actively provided.

It is no accident that differences of opinion arose among the members of the literary world at the beginning of the 1860s for only the older writers and very few younger ones (P. Kuz'menko, Storoženko) were still Romantics in the 1850s and 1860s. Moreover, the Romantic vestiges that did remain with some of the representatives of the new literary ideas were restricted to their earlier works. The orientation of the majority of the new writers was toward the modern literary trends which were then flourishing in the West and in Russian literature. In effect the young generation had been educated on the writings of the "Young Germany" movement, George Sand, Turgenev and Nekrasov; or, at the very least, it adopted their literary aspirations and attempted to transpose them to Ukrainian soil.

3. Ševčenko, the most eminent member of the older generation of Romantics, produced almost no poetry at all during his period of exile (1851-56). Instead, he turned his pen to the writing of short novels in Russian which belong to the Ukrainian school of Russian literature. Although of uneven quality, they are interesting examples of Ševčenko's efforts in that "transitional" style of the "natural school"* instituted by Gogol' in Russian literature and later adopted by

*See Ch. XIII, no. 4.

Kuliš in his Russian tales of the 1850s. In addition, Western writers of this same style (particularly George Sand, and perhaps Dickens) undoubtedly exerted considerable influence on Ševčenko. His prose style also contains traces of the "Byronic poem." Thematically, Ševčenko continued to use Ukrainian subject matter; apart from his autobiographical tale "*Xudožnik*" ("The Artist") he limited himself to depicting scenes from the life of the Ukrainian peasant-serf and the Ukrainian landowning class. At the end of his exile the great poet resumed the writing of verse.

Traditionally, the later verses of Ševčenko are printed as the final part of the *Kobzar*. Attempts have been made to find in these works new realistic elements, and to discover a new "classical" style (not the typical eighteenth century classicism but that of Goethe and Schiller). However, these views are not very well established. For when Ševčenko returned in 1857 to the writing of poetry in Ukrainian (with a new version of "The Soldier's Well," 1847), his work was still characterized by the features of the "Byronic poem" or the Romantic "free poem." Yet more significant is the fact that even his new poems on new themes ("Neofity" ["The Neophytes"] and "*Marija*" ["Mary"] and the semi-parody "Saul") are completely in the tradition of the "free poem": each of the poems is constructed of individual scenes; and the author continually interrupts the narration, addressing either other characters or himself. In "The Neophytes," the digressions include: "*I ty, i čy odna ty . . .*" ("And you, are you the only one . . .")—ten lines; "*O Nerone . . .*" ("O, Nero . . .")—11; "*Hore z vamy, koho blahaty vy pryjšly? . . .*" ("Woe to you! Whom have you come to entreat?")—13; "*I vy, plebeji—hřežkosiji*" ("And you, plebeians—peasants")—4; "*Ljutyj, ljutyj, merzennyj starče*" ("Fierce, fierce loathsome old man Rome")—8; "*De ž ty bula? De ty sxovalas'*" ("Where were you? Where were you hiding?")—11; etc. And in "Mary": "*O, svite naš nezaxodymyj*" ("O, our unfading light")—27; "*O, starče pravednyj*" ("O, righteous old man")—16; "*De ž podivs' dyvočnyj host' otoj lukavyj*" ("Where may that strange elusive guest be now?")—8; "*Marije, horen'ko z toboju . . .*" ("Mary, what woe is yours . . .")—5; "*Hore nam bulo b . . .*" ("What misfortune would have befallen us . . .")—5; etc. An examination of the new poems readily discloses that they preserve all the other features of the "free poem" as well.

Ballads were the only genre in which Ševčenko ceased to write during this period, a time when Realists such as Nekrasov were developing a new type of Realistic ballad. However, the verses "*Tytarivna-Nemyrivna*" ("The Sexton's Daughter of Nemyriv") and "*Nad Dniprovoju šahoju*" ("By Dnieper's Banks Along the Sands") do contain elements of the ballad style. In addition, Ševčenko continued to write short poems in the folk song manner: "*Oj, na hori romen*

cvite" ("On the Hillside a Camomile is Blooming"), "*Oj, maju, maju ja očenjata*" ("Alas, I Have, I Have Two Lovely Little Eyes"), "*Oj, dibrovo, temnyj haju*" ("Oh, Oak Grove—Dark Wood"), "*Teče voda*" ("The Water Flows"), and paraphrases Serbian songs. Not only did his imitations of Holy Scripture (Psalms, Hosea, Ezekiel) continue into this later period, but there was also an increase in the number of Ševčenko's subjective lyrics, contemplative verses typical of later Romanticism. The proportion of social and political (including anti-clerical sentiments) poems was augmented; but this merely reflected the general mood of the times. The form of Ševčenko's verse scarcely changed at all: except for the presence of more frequent exact rhymes, everything remained as it had been in his early works. Ševčenko even retained his favorite devices of "instrumentation":

<i>Oj dibrovo, temnyj haju,</i>	te-haju
<i>tebe odjahaje</i>	te-be-haje
<i>tryči na rik . . . Bahatoho</i>	ba-ha-to
<i>sobi bat'ka maješ.</i>	bi-ba-aje
<i>Raz ukryje tebe rjasno</i>	ra-uk-ry-rja
<i>zelenym pokrovom,</i>	ok-ro
<i>až sam sobi dyvujet'sja</i>	sa-so-dy-vu-sja
<i>na svoju dibrovu . . .</i>	di-ro-vu

("Oh, Oak grove, dark wood, you are clothed thrice a year. . . . You must have a rich father. Once he winds 'round you an abundant cloak of green, he himself marvels at his oak grove. . . .")

Word-pairs, too, prevailed: "*stonom—dzvonom*" ("in a ringing wail"), "*ohnem—sl'ozuju*" ("with ardent tears"), "*xvalyš—vyxvaljaješ*" ("you praise—you laud"). Perhaps the only new feature in the later works was a certain lexical deterioration in the political poems in the intrusion of sharp words; however, these were also to be found in Ševčenko's earlier political poems. In fact, it appears that Ševčenko attempted to "lower" the language purposely with the help of the popular speech "epithets" "*toj*," "*taja*," etc.: "*toj-synklyt*" ("such a council"), "*svjatohto toho apostola Petra*" ("of the blessed apostle Peter"), "*i povely . . . toho apostola*" ("and they led him . . . the great apostle").

Thematically, the sole new element was the rejection of Ukrainian historical subject matter. The poet's perspective now was the present and the future, as in "*Jakby ty, Bohdane pjanyj*" ("If drunk, Bohdan, you . . .") and the prophetic

"*Buvaly vojny*" ("Once there were wars"):

*Ostalys' šašli, hryzut',
žerut' i tljat' staroho dida.
A od korinnja tyxo, ljubo
zeleni parosti rostut'.
I vyrostut': i bez sokyry,
až zareve ta zahude,
kozak bezverxyj upade,
roztroščyt' tron, porve porfiru,
rozdavyt' vašoho kumyra,
ljuds'kiji šašli! . . .
. . . a my pomolymosja Bohu
i nebahatiji i nebohi.*

("There remain the woodworms, gnawing, devouring and rotting the old oak. But from the root, gently and softly, new shoots are growing. And they will grow up: and without any axe the headless Cossack will come down with a roar and a rumble and shatter the throne to pieces. He will tear the purple robes to shreds, and crush your idol, you human worms! . . . and we who are not rich or poor will say a short prayer to God.")

Moreover, Ševčenko's attention was now clearly turned to the individual, with special emphasis on his right to life and happiness. While these notes may have been autobiographical, they also appear to have a philosophical base ("anthropologism") stemming from Ševčenko's profound meditations. It must be in the context of this change of outlook that one should regard what is a new variant on an old theme in "The Neophytes" and "Mary." As in earlier works, mother and child appear; here, however, the child becomes a prophet and preacher, apostle and Messiah of a new reality. The mother follows him and continues his work even after his death. Of course, the national symbolism found in the earlier poems should be perceived here too. For these poems about the mother and her fighter-son, an apostle or the Messiah himself, were the expression of Ševčenko's new hopes for the future Ukraine. His hopes were never realized; some weeks before his death he wrote with sadness:

*I den' ide, i nič ide . . .
I, holovu sxopyvšy v ruky,*

*dyvuješšja: čomu ne jde
apostol pravdy i nauky?**

("The day passes, as does the night. . . . And, seizing hold of your head in your hands, you wonder: why does the apostle of truth and knowledge not come?")

4. Although this "apostle of truth and knowledge" did not appear after Ševčenko's death, the tradition continued in Ukrainian literary life. The only radical change was in tone and style: Romanticism ended and Realism began. Here, too, the dividing line between these literary trends was as vague as that between other Ukrainian literary styles. It was, in fact, the extraordinary and ever-increasing influence of Ševčenko in Ukrainian literature which erased still further the boundaries between the literature of Romanticism and that of the later period. Nevertheless, the poetry of the post-Ševčenko era was altogether different from that of the "*kobzar*." The only writer of the Romantic era to consciously adhere to the Ševčenko tradition in the later period (although with his own particular imprint), was P. Kuliš.

Kuliš did not resume writing poetry until after the death of Ševčenko; the 1862 publication of the collection *Dosvitky* (*Glimmers of Dawn*) was his first poetic venture since *Ukrajina*. He himself declared that he wanted to imitate Ševčenko's legacy, his *kobza*:

*Oj, movčav ja, brattja,
slovom ne ozvavsja,
poky bat'ko ukrajins'kyj
pisneju vpyvavsja.
Čy do viku ž, brattja,
budemo movčaty?
Blahoslovit' meni kobzu
nimuju uzjaty!
Pidtjanu ja struny
na holos vysokyj.
Ne sumuj, Tarase bat'ku,
v mohyli hlybokij . . .*

*These lines clearly indicate that Ševčenko did not see such an "apostle" in either Belinskij, Cernyševskij, Nekrasov or even Herzen, contrary to the opinion of contemporary Soviet scholars.

("I was silent, brothers, I did not say a word as long as our Ukrainian father was filling himself with song. But, brothers, are we going to be silent forever? Bless me so that I might take up my mute *kobza*! I will tighten its strings to a strident pitch. Do not grieve, father Taras, in your deep grave-mound. . . .")

He wanted to continue the work of Ševčenko:

Čy ž meni po tobi
sumom sumuvaty?
Čy tvoju robotu
vzjaty dokinčaty?

Dokinčaju, brate,
ne zahynu marne,
vtišu Ukrajinu,
matir beztalannu . . .

("Should I grieve for you in sorrow! Or should I take up your work and finish it? I will finish it, brother, and will not die in vain. I will gladden Ukraine, our unfortunate mother. . . .")

It is in the imitation of Ševčenko that both the strength and weakness of Kuliš's *Glimmers* reside.

While Kuliš's verse seems to use Ševčenko's meters for the most part, the fact is that he almost always (the exceptions being a few lyrics and isolated passages) mixed these imitations of folk song rhythms with the conventional Russian type of tonic meter characterized by completely regular alternation of stresses. This tendency, notwithstanding his frequent changes of rhythms, makes Kuliš's verse seem monotonous in comparison with Ševčenko's. Further, it lacks Ševčenko's original rhymes: incomplete rhymes are rare (*marne-beztalannu*, *poxovaly-malo*, *čudo-luda*, *joho-sribnorohyj*, *prožyvaju-svjataja*, etc.), while faulty rhymes are common (*panstvo-ptactvo*, *varenym-pomerlyx*). Ševčenko's incomparable musicality is also missing in Kuliš, although when his verse follows Ševčenko faithfully, it often leads to quite successful euphonies in individual lines:

<i>Didy syvi hovorlyvi,</i>	di-dy-ho-vi-ly-vi
<i>holubon'ky burkotlyvi . . .</i>	ho-bo-bu-ko-ly-vi

("Garrulous gray-haired old-timers, peevish old grumblers. . .")

or in particular expressions, as in "*u temnij temnoti*" ("in deepest darkness"), or (the repetition of "r") in "*Blysnula hrimnycja iz čornoji xmary*" ("the thunder flashed through the black cloud") and "*revnuly harmaty*" ("the cannon roared").

Like other poets of the period, Kuliš was simply not aware of these features of Ševčenko's verse. He did, nevertheless, have an extraordinary affinity for imitating the folk song style; and here he met with considerable success. However, what for Ševčenko was a matter of the heart, was for Kuliš a matter of the intellect. He did not create songs freely, but was a diligent imitator of folk songs of which he was a connoisseur. For this reason one may find intermingled in his work numerous epithets (Ševčenko's or sometimes his own) that are derived from poetry: *višče serce* (prophetic heart), *čyste pole* (empty field), *žovti pisky* (yellow sands), *dribni sl'ozy* (abundant tears), *molodyk srib-norohyj* (silver-horned new moon), *lany neorani* (unplowed grainfields), *vysokiji dumy* (profound thoughts), along with the occasional "academic," contrived epithets: *bezzatneje ptactvo* (homeless birds), *vjale serce* (faded heart), etc. Word-pairs are also employed in Kuliš's poetry: *plakaty-rydaty* (to weep—to sob), *bredu-perexožu* (I wade—I traverse), *vovky-siromanci* (wolves—poor gray things), *očamy-zorjamy* (with eyes like stars), *šyroke-hlyboke* (broad and deep); and often folk songs are quoted directly:

*Tyxo Dunaj, tyxo
nese čystu vodu . . .*

("The Danube quietly, ever so quietly, carries the pure water along. . .")

*Ne po odnim kozačen'ku
zaplakala maty . . .*

("Not for only one Cossack youth did the mother weep. . .")

*Čom, Dunaju, stav ty muten,
stav ty muten, kalamuten . . .*

("Why, Danube, have you become troubled, have you become troubled and turbid. . .")

*Oj ne vstyh' že kozak Holka
na konyka sisty—
staly jaho pancernykiv
na kapustu sikty . . .*

("Alas, the Cossack Holka could not manage to mount his pony—so they began to cut his warriors to pieces. . . .")

*Xožu berehamy,
ta j ne naxožusja . . .*

("I wander along the banks, and I never grow weary. . . .")

Kuliš, in fact, used the poetics of folk songs to a greater degree than did Ševčenko. Yet his poems are much farther removed from folk songs than are Ševčenko's. Apart from folk songs, Kuliš also made use of a work he particularly liked, "The Tale of the Host of Ihor," which inspired the frequent phrase in his poetry "*struny žyvi*" ("living strings") and such lines as:

*Nykly travy žaloščamy,
hnulos' drevo z tuhy . . .*

("The grasses faded away with grief, the tree was bent with sorrow. . . .")

*Spysamy oraty,
trupom zasivaty. . .
Oj jaki to budem žnyva
z toho sivu maty?*

("To plow with spears, to sow with a corpse. . . . Alas, what sort of harvest will we have from such a sowing?")

Kuliš still used Romantic forms: ballads and long poems (*Nastusja*, *Velyki provody* [*Easter Week*]), or genres with definite traits of Romantic poems and songs, but chiefly historical *dumy*.

Moreover, Kuliš's poetry was thoroughly symbolic (see below). It was a complex cultural-philosophical and psychological symbolism more reminiscent of the tradition of Xarkiv Romanticism than of Ševčenko. For while Ševčenko's themes implied explicit admiration for all things Cossack, Kuliš's views tended to negate the notion of any positive role of the Cossacks in Ukrainian history. Kuliš

did, however, adopt Ševčenko's symbols of *pravda* (truth) and *slovo* (the word): "*Naša pravda, narodnja osnova*" ("Our truth, foundation of the people"); "*a my budem svjatu pravdu sijaty v narodi*" ("and we will sow holy truth among the people"); "*Spočyvaje naše slovo v nimyx hrobovyščax*" ("Our word is resting in silent cemeteries"); "*Ožyvyt' žyveje slovo ridnu Ukrajinu . . .*" ("The living word will revive Ukraine, our native land"). Associated with these symbols was the image of the *kobzar* who foretells: "*. . . bude žyty naše slovo, bude*" ("... our word will live, it will"). Kuliš added to Ševčenko's symbolism, his own motif—"culture" (the source of which was the heart; see below):

*Stepy moji šyrokiji,
cilyno odvičnja!
Xto zore vas ta zasije—
slava tomu vična!*

("My broad steppes, virgin soil from time immemorial!
He who will plow you up and plant you—to him will be
eternal glory!")

Glimmers of Dawn is generally acknowledged to be an original and influential poetic collection in its own right; as such it is a rare phenomenon in Ukrainian literature. Still more original and of equal artistic value were Kuliš's second collection, *Xutorna poezija* (*Poetry of the Homestead*), which appeared in 1882 and the much later *Dzvin* (*The Bell*, 1893). During this time, Kuliš underwent many changes in personal fortune, state of mind, and historical outlook. He arrived finally at a complete censure of the historical role of the Cossack period in Ukrainian history, and a recognition of the cultural contribution of Poland and Moscow in Ukraine. Echoes of these ideas in the reflective, cultural-philosophic verses of these collections incensed his contemporaries and confirmed even subsequent scholars in their opposition to the poetry of the later Kuliš. Another factor contributing to the negative reception given to these collections was their "belated" style: these were reflective lyrics in the spirit of late Romanticism with extremely vivid Romantic images and ideas that were only partly rendered in the new phraseology of the times. On the one hand, Kuliš's poetry, both individual verses and entire cycles, constituted a poetic polemic not only with Kostomarov, Mordovec' and the majority of Ukrainian society critical of the Russian absolutism of Peter I and Catherine II, but also with Ševčenko whose enthusiasm for the Cossacks now revealed to Kuliš the significance of his "word." Yet, at the same time, Kuliš's poetry was also represented by charming landscapes and sincere lyrical verse.

The most positive formal feature of the later poems of Kuliš was their rhythm. Having by now abandoned folk song meters almost entirely, he introduced into Ukrainian poetry a completely new store of tonic meters and a great variety of strophes. In fact, this rhythmical wealth redeems the poverty of rhymes, especially the unsuccessful incomplete rhymes: *rozdilennja—plemja*, *požariv—terzaly*, *popivstvo—lyxojimstvo*, etc. In addition, Kuliš developed considerable skill in aphoristic expression: his poetic formulations often match those of Ševčenko, although they may not always be as engaging. Typical examples include the well-known:

*Narode bez puttja, bez česty i povahy,
bez pravdy u zavitax predkiv dykyx . . .*

("O senseless people, without honor or esteem, and without truth, following the testaments of savage ancestors. . .")

or this self-characterization:

*Ja ne poet i ne istoryk, ni!
Ja pioner z sokyroju važkoju:
teren koljučyj v ridnij storoni
vyrubuju trudjaščoju rukoju . . .*

("I am no poet or historian, no! I am a pioneer with a mighty axe: the thorny terrain in my native land I am clearing with my industrious arm. . .")

or this hymn to homesteads:

*Pisnjamy my tut z Bohom rozmovljajem,
vselenna sercu našomu vidkryta,
i oblasti my šyrši dosjahajem,
niž ta bidnota, zolotom okryta . . .*

("Here we share songs with God, the universe is open to our hearts; and we attain broader spheres than those poor souls who are burdened with gold. . .")

As well, there are compressed, concentrated tableaux such as:

*Od Vysly do Suly kurylos' požaryšče,
solodke kuryvo turec'komu sultanu . . .*

*I xlib, mov zoloto, v stepax zakolyxavsja,
i kopy prostjahlys' až po sami Porohy! . . .*

("From the Vistula to the Sula the smoke from the fire
could be seen, fumes that are sweet to a Turkish sultan. . . .
And the gold-like grain waved in the steppe, and the
sheaves stretched right up to the very Rapids! . . .")

And this is the introductory song to *Poetry of the Homestead*:

*Kobzo moja, neporočna utixo,
čom ty movčyš, zadzvony meni styxa,
holosom pravdy svjatoji dzvony,
našu tisnotu hirku spomjany.
Može čyje šče ne spidlene serce
važko zabjet'sja, do sercja ozvet'sja,
jak na banduri struna do struny . . .*

("Kobza mine, o my pure joy, why are you silent? Play
a gentle tune for me. Ring out with the voice of holy
truth, remind us of our bitter oppression. Perhaps some-
one's heart not yet debased will be profoundly moved,
and respond to another soul like the strings of the *bandura*,
one string answering another. . . .")

The language of the later collections of Kuliš strikes the modern reader as unusual because of its numerous Slavonicisms: *blah* (good), *prax* (dust), *hrjadušče* (future), *hlavenstvo* (supremacy), *vrah* (enemy), *istočnyk bytija* (source of life), *vertohrad* (garden); rare words and neologisms: *timoxa* (clever person), *perebovk* (ringing), *vahonyty* (to be pregnant), *v brytan* (among the English), *mohota* (power); compound words: *vcjac'kovuje* (he will adorn), *vbezpečuje* (he will insure); and uncommon accents: *prósviti*, *v kacapá*, *krový*, *horodyščé*, etc. There are also many compound words, however, that are not only pleasing but also creditable: *zemnoprostorni* (the earth's expanses), *kosa travožerna* (grass-eating scythe), *samitnodremlyvyj* (solitary dreamer), *zolotoi-skrjavij* (sparkling gold-colored). Kuliš was, in fact, creating a suitable language for "lofty ideas" and as early as in his *Glimmers of Dawn* he had "tuned" his *kobza* "for a high voice." Nevertheless, he could not avoid prosaisms entirely: "*žorstokij atavizm tatars'koji Moskvj*" ("the barbaric atavism of Tatar Moscow"), *samum* (scorching south wind), *hurykany* (hurricanes), *instynkt*

(instinct), *praktyčnišoji* (more practical), *uzurpaciji* (usurpation), *bezplatnyj* (free of charge). When such expressions appear in lyrical verses in place of more elevated terminology, the impression created is altogether different.

Thematically, the later poetry of Kuliš remained in the Romantic tradition, despite his enthusiasm for the theme of learning:

*Nauko-nene! vykuj ty nam pluha,
i nym sama oraty pomožy . . .*

("Knowledge—our mother! Forge a plow for us, and help us to till the soil with it. . . .")

This "positivist" influence (Kuliš speaks in particular of the "natural sciences" popular during the 1860s) does not negate the fundamental features of his essentially Romantic world view; moreover, the theme of "learning" is limited in Kuliš:

*vovik nauci ne obnjaty,
vsjoho, ščo Ty (Boh) sozdav jesy . . .*

("science will never grasp all that Thou [God] hast created. . . .")

His main themes are the old, well-known ones: the resurrection of Ukraine, the word and its agent, the poet-prophet, truth, the heart, culture:

Sudyty Ukrajinu ridne slovo bude—

*Jedynyj skarb u tebe—ridna mova,
zakljatyj dlja susids'koho xyžactva:
vona tvoho zyt'tja micna osnova,
povniše nad usi skarby j bahatstva . . .*

("It is her own 'word' which will pass judgment on Ukraine— Your only treasure is your native tongue, implacable in the face of your neighbor's rapacity: it is the strong foundation of your life, more beautiful than all treasures and wealth. . . .")

In addition to the traditional image of the poet-*kobzar*, the sole living person among a nation of dead men, there is now the figure of the poet-prophet, a typically Romantic image. While expressions of modesty may be found:

*. . . v mojim nemudrim slovi
bula jakas' nevidoma syl'a . . .*

(" . . . in my foolish word, there was some kind of unknown power. . . .")

there are also images such as "the divine breath of poetry," "a prophet who will justify the prophet" (Gogol'), "thou immortal czar; thou lord over all the czars," "cathedral of holy truth." Poetry, Kuliš thought, was that force which would regenerate Ukraine:

*Kobzo-orlyce! zaklyč-zadzvony z vysokosty,
ščob na tvij poklyk stari pozrostalysja kosti
i nepovynno prolytaja krov ožyla . . .
Čaramy slova rozmaj, mov tu xmaru, nedolju,
slovo nam verne i sylu davneznu i volju . . .*

("O kobza, little eagle! Call forth, ring out from on high, so that at your bidding ancient bones might grow together and innocently spilt blood might revive. . . . Dispel our misfortune like a cloud with the power of your words. The word will restore to us our bygone power and liberty. . . .")

Poetry will revive not only the nation and humanity, but also the world of nature:

*očystylas' pryroda, mov voskresla,
u obrazi poeziji svjatoji . . .*

("nature was cleansed in the image of holy poetry, and was as if reborn. . . .")

As in Romanticism, the poet-prophet lives and "sings" in "sacred solitude" "a luminous song about a distant world":

*duša joho kypyt', rokočut' hrozno struny,
i sypljut' na zemnyx bohiv svoji peruny.*

("his soul is boiling, his chords roar, all athunder, and dispatch their lightning bolts on the gods of earth. . . .")

The poet's word here is "the word of truth":

. . . *nasypaly*
vysoki mohyly.
V tyx mohylax ridnym trupom
pravdu prydušyly . . .

(" . . . they formed the high grave-mounds. In those grave-mounds they smothered the tender body of truth. . . .")

. . . *prosvičena pravda nimuje.*
Zahovoryt' vona
i do samoho dna
pereverne lukavu sporudu . . .

(" . . . enlightened truth is silent. She will speak and overturn the cunning structure to the very bottom. . . .")

The image of Bojan, poet of the ancient princely period, was, for Kuliš, a symbol of the eternal prophetic role of poetry. The foundations of the outlook which gave rise to these images in Kuliš will be discussed later.

Among Kuliš's published writings (posthumous, as well as those which appeared during his lifetime) are several long poems comprising both finished and unfinished works—e.g., *Xutorni nedoharky* (*Candle-ends of a Country Homestead*). *Nastusja* and *Velyki provody* (*Easter Week*) are historical poems, the second containing a typical Kuliš image in the figure of the noble *kul'turnyk*, Holka, who fails to find understanding in his native Ukrainian milieu and comes to a tragic end. Oriental themes and a lofty impression of Eastern culture dominate the poems *Mahomet ta Xadyza*—in which Kuliš unfolded his Romantic philosophy of love—and *Marusja Bohuslavka*, an unfinished work, despite at least three revisions to the poem as a whole and the reworking of thirteen of its cantos. Of his publicistic poems, "*Uljana ključnycja*" ("Uljana, the House-keeper"), also unfinished, was intended to be a kind of poetic outline of *Xutorna filosofija* (*Country Homestead Philosophy*); "*Hryc'ko Skovoroda*," another fragmentary "candle-end" ("*nedoharok*"), elaborates the theme of Ukrainian culture; *Kuliš u pekli* (*Kuliš in Hell*) is an inspired, but not so successfully executed, satire directed at the political and cultural enemies of Kuliš. All of Kuliš's poems, including lengthier ones he undertook, are contemplative in nature, typical of late Romanticism and of individual poets of the

post-Romantic period such as C. Brentano's "*Romanzen vom Rozenkranz*" ("Ballad of the Rose Garland"), Ogarev's "*Jumor*" ("Humor"), or the later poems (some barely started) of Lamartine and Hugo. Indeed, the latter shares with Kuliš that peculiar fusion of Romantic outlook with that of the enlightenment "of the sixties."

It is characteristic of Kuliš's poems that they often lack incidents: even likely and varied action (as in *Marusja Bohuslavka* or "*Skovoroda*" where the entire life of the philosopher was to have been presented) recedes before the poet's extended lyrical images and his still more diffuse reflections on various themes. Their formal features resemble those of Kuliš's later verses, particularly the use of different verse forms. While his poems are cumbersome from the viewpoint of composition, they are interspersed with a considerable number of brilliant passages—perhaps more, in fact, than in Kuliš's lyrics. For the most part, however, these masterly pieces are lost amid the argumentation for which even such a poet as Kuliš, with his talent for apt expression, was unable to provide felicitous poetic formulation. Nevertheless, the better passages have continued to affect readers right up to the present day. They even acquired a certain popularity when, regrettably, they were taken out of context. The following excerpt from "*Uljana, the Housekeeper*" is representative of Kuliš's *xutorna* philosophy:

*O tyxi xutory, velyki u malomu,
velyki tym, ščo je najlučše, krašče v nas,
bajdužne pyšnomu i hordomu Sodomu . . .*

.....
*Vy, ljubi vtečyšča koxannja i nadxnennja
vid kamenjuk-ljudej bez sercja j bez uma!
Šče ne doznaly vy pryruky prosviščennja,
šče vas ne ponjala akademična t'ma:
podajte ž haslo nam novoho voskresennja,
spravdit' obicjanku svjaščennoho Pys'ma,
ščo istynu kolys' my sercem zrozumijem,
nevolju rozumom peremohy zdolijem.*

("O tranquil *xutory*, great though small in size, great in that which is the best and the finest in us, and indifferent to proud and haughty Sodom. . . . You, beloved refuges of love, and inspiration from heartless, mindless, hardened people! You have not experienced the compulsions of enlightenment; you are not yet in the grasp of academic obscurity. Give us then a signal

for the new resurrection; fulfill the promise of the Holy Scripture that one day we will understand the Truth with our hearts and we will triumph over bondage with our minds.”)

Also typical is the natural philosophy of these endearing lines from *Marusja Bohuslavka*:

*Nad stepamy sonce sjaje,
viter podyxaje,
podyxaje, mov na kobzi
tyxostrunnij hraje.*

*Ponačipljuvamo husto
struny zolotiji
na stepy, balky z ričkamy,
bajraky krutiji.*

*Sjaje sonce, viter vije,
tyrsu naxyljaje:
Do struny struna na kobzi
styxa promovljaje*

*bačyš okom, čuješ uxom,
sercem rozumiješ,
a skazaty—zaspivaty
holosno ne vmiješ.*

*Neskazanne, nevymovne
kobza promovljaje,
i svjatymy počuttjamy
serce napovnjaje.*

*I voznosyt' joho vhoru
vid zemnoho lona,
mov krylati duxy-koni
boha Apollona,*

*ščob spohljanulo z-pid neba
na se žyzni more,
de, mov xvylja jaru xvylju,
vira viru bore, . . .*

*i poeziji spasennym
nadyxom spovnylos',
do vsix vir i vsix jazykiv
rivno pryxylylos'.*

("Over the steppes the sun is shining, the wind is gently blowing, blowing, as if strumming on a soft-stringed *kobza*. In dense suspension hang the golden chords throughout the steppes, creek-filled valleys and steep ravines. The sun shines, the wind blows, bending the feather grass low. Quietly speaks the *kobza*, string to string. You see with your eye, you hear with your ear, you understand with your heart, but to speak, to sing aloud, you are unable. The *kobza* utters the inexpressible, the ineffable, and fills the heart with holy feelings. And it, like winged horse-spirits of the god Apollo, bears it [the heart] aloft away from the terrestrial realm in order that it may look down from under the sky upon this sea of life, where faith struggles against faith, like waves battling on a shore, and it was filled with the saving breath of poetry, and found equal welcome among all faiths and all tongues.")

Despite such passages (frequent in his longer poems), the poems of Kuliš seem to be works whose chief end is not poetic, but publicistic.

A similar situation prevails in Kuliš's plays. These include *Koliji* (dramatic scenes—Kuliš published only one act) and a trilogy: "*Bajda*" (1884), "*Sahajdaš-nyj*," "*Tsar Nalyvaj*" (the latter two dramas were published posthumously). "*Koliji*," a play of dialogs given by the representatives of various social groups, is a lively presentation in the style of the crowd scenes in *The Black Council*. The trilogy, an attempt at high drama, contains everything except dramatic tension. Drama, action, and tension are limited to scenes dealing with the common people or particular heroes such as "*Bajda*'s" Hanža Andybēr, a figure whom Kuliš imbued with all the qualities he found most repugnant in the Ukrainian historical tradition—rapacity, brigandage, etc. All other scenes are widely ranging theoretical discussions or debates involving not the will or the character of the personages, but their thoughts. In *The Black Council* Kuliš had succeeded in embodying the social and ideological conflicts of Ukrainian life in vividly drawn personalities. In the trilogy, he was either unable, or unwilling, to do this: instead of a struggle of living forces, there are only debates. However, these discussions, in which monolog often outweighs dialog, allowed Kuliš to display

his brilliant faculty for theoretic and philosophic expression. The various aphoristic formulations of Kuliš's historical and social ideas are almost classical in style. Bajda, for example, affirms:

*. . . U mene vira—pravda,
molytva—česni podvyhy lycars'ki,
posty j bdinnja—poxody, nuždy, pracja,
a raj—nad zlom kryvavyj sud kozac'kyj . . .*

(“. . . For me, faith is truth; prayer—noble heroic deeds, my fasting and vigil—campaigns, misery, toil; and paradise—bloody Cossack justice prevailing over evil. . . .”)

and:

*Ne dyvo kraj šyrokyj zvojuvaty,
červonu krov z piskom peremišaty,
zasypat' popelamy, sliz'my zmyty,
i kin'my vytoptat' malen'ki dity.
Spasenna rič—usi xaty j palaty
pid nepoxybnyj sud ponaxyljaty,
potužnoho vid napadu vpynjaty,
bezsyloho v napasti rjatuvaty . . .*

(“It is no miracle to subdue a broad land, to mix red blood with sand, to cover it with dust, to wash it with tears, and to trample the small children with horses. The saving grace is to make all the cottages and palaces bow before infallible justice, to prevent the powerful from attacking, to help the powerless that are in misfortune. . . .”)

Another declaration comes from the hermit monk, Zosym (“*Sahajdašnyj*”):

*Xvaly, mudrahelju, svoju osvitu;
my sercem, Bohom sercja žyvemo.
Vid rozumu j nauky til'ko cvitu,
vid sercja ž plodu vičnoho ždemo.*

(“Vaunt your learning, o cunning one; we live by the heart and in God. From reason and knowledge there is only a blossom; from the heart, we look forward to eternal fruit.”)

However, neither such locutions (whose form attests certain Shakespearean influence) nor their occasional beautiful images (often echoes from "The Tale of the Host of Ihor") succeed in redeeming Kuliš's plays as dramas. There are some lively figures in these works; however, they are secondary characters. The main characters are, almost without exception, personifications of abstract ideas that may be either simple or complex. Of an altogether different type are two other dramatic efforts of Kuliš: "*Irodova moroka*" ("Herod's Trouble," 1879)—a light stylization of the *vertep* drama; "*Xutorjanka*" ("A Country Woman," 1877)—a stylization of the biblical "Song of Songs" as a kind of nuptial oratory, "a hymn of praise sung by the bride before the assembled wedding guests" (Kuliš's own description). The largely simple language of these two lesser dramas is quite unlike the other plays where the language is archaic and cumbersome with many rarely used words and neologisms which, while not devoid of some merit, failed to achieve popularity. Nor have they any appeal for the contemporary reader who also recoils from the rhetorical speeches of the abstract heroes of these plays and from their occasional strange, faulty accents.

Next to his poetry, it is the prose of Kuliš which constitutes his best work. These few short stories (all published during the period 1860-68) follow in the stylistic tradition of Kvitka, and were, in fact, written for "the people." One of them, "*Sira kobyla*" ("The Gray Mare"), the story of a poor fellow who kills himself and drowns his horse is amazingly reminiscent of Kvitka's travesty genre, including such stories as "Portrait of a Soldier." However, other stories are serious and distinguished from Kvitka's work by their great conciseness, on the one hand, and on the other, by the psychological complexity of their plots. Kuliš who, in his Russian stories, had also tended to depict psychically complex, and perhaps somewhat pathological situations, now built his peasant tales on similar problems, popularly presented. It was a protest against primitive psychology, just as the social antithesis illustrated in *The Black Council* was a protest against primitive historical portrayal. "*Pro zlodija v seli Hakivnyci*" ("About the Thief in the Village of Hakivnycja") concerns an actual thief who repents and whom the community does not commit to court justice but, rather, itself punishes and forgives. The *xutorjanyn*, who is the story's narrator, concludes "but what, my good people of the cities, would you have done with such a man?" "*Hordovyta para*" ("A Proud Couple") is a tale about lovers whose pride leads to their parting and to tragedy: they both commit suicide. "*Divoče serce*" ("A Maiden's Heart") takes up the favorite Kvitka motif of the fidelity of a maiden to a young man who has been recruited as a soldier. Here the girl follows him to the city but falls in love with another; her young man "lived out his whole life as a lonely soldier, like a withered old oak." "*Martyn Hak*" is a story

about *hajdamaky*. The new *otaman* of monks-turned-*hajdamaky*, Hak becomes disillusioned with *hajdamak* life and is ready to betray his men; however, they learn of it and kill him. "*Sičovi hosti*" ("Guests from the Sič") is another *hajdamak* tale, here narrated by an "old grandfather" not with enthusiasm but with misgivings and sadness. Perhaps the only story written for the educated reader was "*Potomky ukrajins'koho hajdamactva*" ("Descendants of the Ukrainian Hajdamaky"); Kuliš's unfinished novel *Braty* (*The Brothers*), a kind of paraphrase from his Russian work *Aleksej Edinorog*, had the same orientation. These interesting contemporary legends about the last Zaporožians, legends in which reality was freely interwoven with fantasy, had no real plots; rather, they were a series of sketches. In them Kuliš replaced the well-balanced types and idyllic images of Kvitka with Romantic fragmentation, internal tragedy, and psychological complexity. Kuliš's stories are thus a kind of popularizing of the psychology of his contemporary, Dostoevskij.

Linguistically, all of Kuliš's stories are presented as *skaz* tales, the narratives of a *xutorjanyn*, a *babusja*, an old grandfather, a great-grandfather or of some unknown narrators, but never of Kuliš himself. As a result, the language is relatively simple, but rhythmical. The psychology resides principally in the plot, while the feelings of the characters are described in a somewhat archaic style: "*I na serci tobi tyxo i jakos' smutno, i znjavs' by ta j poletiv, spivajučy ponad zemleju . . .*" ("And in your heart it is still and somehow sad, and you would rise up and fly away over the earth, singing . . ."). The *skaz* narration also produces occasional picturesque landscapes juxtaposed with a language that is somewhat coarse in places, as well as figures inspired by *vertep*:

*Zaporožec z usyma, . . . čorni, čorni ta dovhi ta
rozkišni . . . Župan na jomu šovkovyj červonyj, až
svityt'sja, jak ohon'; šapka červona poxyljasta; pojas
zolotyj; za pojasom pistoli, pry boku šablja;
kul'baka i stremena—vse te v ščyrim zoloti, až horyt'; . . .*

("A Zaporožian with whiskers . . . black, black and long and luxurious. . . His mantle of red silk fairly gleamed, fire-like. His red hat was set at a rakish angle; his sash was golden; inside the sash were two pistols, at his side a sabre; his saddle and stirrups were all of pure gold, and seemed ablaze; . . .")

In addition, there are popular adages and sayings: "*Čuža storono, daleka zemle xolodna, ne plodjuča, pluhom ne orana, kupjam zasijana*" ("O foreign country,

distant cold land, infertile, unplowed bush-covered"). These felicitous stories, in which Kuliš appears as a worthy Romantic follower of Kvitka, are the most endearing for being so few.

Perhaps Kuliš's most forceful prose is contained in his publicistic writings, his popular treatises of a scholarly nature (historical sketches) and certain letters of his extensive, but only partially known correspondence. The most essential feature of these works is, of course, beyond the scope of this present study. The language of this prose can be characterized, however; in every instance it appears as unusually light and fluid (see above, Kuliš's description of the Cyrillo-Methodians). In style it is sensitive and artistically "full-blooded," although to the contemporary taste it may appear excessively lofty.

When one adds to this his Russian tales, learned and publicistic writings, one becomes aware of the extraordinary breadth of Kuliš's creativity and literary talent.

Kuliš's work in translations is also noteworthy. His principal efforts in this area included translations and paraphrases from Holy Scripture, notably a paraphrase in verse of the Psalms (1868-71), as well as translations from Shakespeare (1882) and a collection—*Pozyčena Kobza* (*Borrowed Kobza*, 1897)—with translations from Schiller, Goethe, Heine and Byron. The linguistic labors involved in producing these translations were colossal. Kuliš, who contributed more than any of his contemporaries toward the creation of "high" and lyrical styles in Ukrainian literature, consciously eschewed all tones of travesty or "*Kotljarevščyna*." (The only elements in Kuliš's work that appear artificial today are the diminutives which he was unable to avoid.) For example, while his practice of appending the patronymic to the names of biblical characters ("Davidenko Avessalom") may seem surprising, it can scarcely be called vulgar.* The following are passages from his paraphrase of a Goethe poem (previously examined in the version by Hulak-Artemov's'kyj, "The Fisherman"; see above, Ch. X, pt. D, no. 3):

*Voda šumuje, rozlylas'
i povni poviddju vsi berehy j zatony . . .*

*Pid spiv šyrokyj divonjok
sydyt' nad ričkoju rybaločka, pyl'nuje,
čy plavle styxa poplavok,
čy v vyrvi krutyt'sja, čy v nurtyni nurtuje.*

*This was, in fact, an old device dating back to the eleventh century work of Hamartolos who wrote about "Alexander, son of Philip" of Macedon.

*Až os' voda pid poplavkom
zakolylalasja i v pini rozdilylas',
ne sribna rybon'ka z perom,
vrodlyva divčyna—rusaločka zjavylas'.*

*Spivaje styxa do joho
i, mov sopiločka, prynadno promovljaje: . . .*

.....

*Koly b ty znaw, jak rybon'kam
iz namy v nurtyni huljaty veselen'ko,
viddavs' by j sam uves' ty nam
i hravs' by z rybkamy j divčatkamy ljuben'ko.*

*Hornulas' do kolin joho,
ta ručenjatamy nižnymy obijmala
Do lona vabyła svoho . . .
Rybalka znyk . . . voda blyščala i movčala.*

("The water roars, overflowing all its banks and backwaters submerged with the inundation. . . . Amid the expansive singing of maidens, there sits a fisherman upon his river perch, keeping watch over his floating cork to see if it is gently stirring, or spinning violently, or plunging into the abyss. Suddenly the water under the cork began to babble and, within its spray, to part; it was not a little silver fish that appeared with a feather, but a beautiful girl-mermaid. Softly she sings to him, and begins to speak winsomely, reed-like: . . . If only you knew what a merry time the dear little fish have sporting with us in the deep, you would give yourself wholly to us and frolic ever so pleasantly with the little fish and the tender maidens. . . . She clung to his knees, embracing them with her slender little arms, luring him to her bosom. . . . The fisherman disappeared . . . the water glistened and was still.")

Kuliš also followed Hulak-Artemovs'kyj in a paraphrase of the same Psalm (139) which had resulted in a fine rendition by the older author:

*Kudy b ja vtik vid Tvooho duxu,
ukryvsja vid jasnoho lyku.
Na nebo—Ty na nebi sjaješ;
uv ad—i v adi Ty vladyka.*

*Viz'mu v zori ja kryl šyrokox
ta poleču za okeany, —
i tam, v pustyni tajemnyčij,
Tvoja ruka mene dosjahne . . .*

(“Where could I flee from Thy spirit, hide from [Thy] radiant countenance? To heaven? Thou shinest in heaven; to hell? Even in hell, Thou art lord. I shall take to the stars with outspread wings and shall fly beyond the oceans—and there, too, in the impenetrable wilderness, Thy hand will reach me. . . .”)

The translations of Kuliš are not always creations of true poetry. The most artistry is contained in *Borrowed Kobza*: a work conforming, partly consciously, to the aim of a “pioneer with a heavy axe.”

5. In all of Kuliš's works may be found traces of the basic tenets of his philosophy. Its main idea was the Romantic notion of the dual character of man—a combination of that which is external and superficial with that which is profound, essential and concealed in man, hidden in the “heart.” Kuliš's enquiry and its oscillation were motivated by questioning the inherent nature of man: of what does it really consist, and what is merely superficial? Similarly differentiated were the two spheres of the “collective personality” of Ukraine:

*Oj serden'ko zakryteje,
tyxyj raju, tyxyj raju . . .*

(“Oh, dear concealed heart, tranquil paradise, tranquil paradise. . . .”)

*Hlybokyj kolodjaz',
til'ky dno blyščyt'sja:
tvoja dumka hlybše
u serci tajit'sja . . .*

(“Deep well, only the bottom glistens: your thought is deeper, being hidden in your heart. . . .”)

... *tyxi zori*
u čystij neba vysoti
poblyskujut' u krasoti
na dyvnim prostoroni morja:
tak sjaje sercja hlybyna,
ščo viruje ne navmannja . . .

("... in the clear vault of the sky, the quiet stars glimmer in their beauty on the wondrous expanse of the sea: in the same way radiates the depth of the heart whose faith is not a random thing. . .")

"At the bottom of the soul" there are "things of poetry," "grief" and "thoughts" (*pomysly*), that is, ideas, faith and hope for the future:

Oj šyroko, oj hlyboko
dumkoju zajmaju,
a šče šyršu, a šče hlybšu
ja nadiju maju . . .

Oj, nexaj moji nadiji
budut' moji dity:
u serden'ku harjačomu
ljubo jix nosyty.

("Oh, how broadly, oh how deeply am I engaged in thought, but still broader and still deeper is the hope in me. . . . Oh, let my hopes be my children: how delightful it is to carry them in a fervent heart.")

It is, therefore, to the "heart" that Kuliš directs his question about the future:

... *dyvujus', radiju, u sercja pytaju:*
skažy, višče serce, čy skoro svit bude?

("... I marvel, I rejoice and I inquire of my heart: tell me, prophetic heart, will we soon behold the light of day?")

Kuliš symbolized that line leading from a better past to a better future in the image of the heart of his hero Holka from *Easter Week*:

*Oj, bahato u Slavuti
dyvnoho, svjatoho;
najdyvніше—ščyre serce
Holky molodoho.*

*Rozterzane, kryvaveje,
bjed'sja pid vodoju
i vsju vodu ispovnjaje
dumoj svjatoju . . .*

("Oh, there is much in Slavuta that is wondrous and sacred:
but by far the most wondrous is the sincere heart of young
Holka. Rent and bloody, it beats under the water, filling
all the deep with holy thought. . . .")

For Kuliš believed "*Zabudet'sja imja moje, a serce v dalekomu potomstvi ozovet'sja*" ("My name will be forgotten, but my heart will echo even in distant generations"). The heart of man contained the universe in microcosm—"Ja v serci mojomu vselennuju nosyla" ("I carried the universe in my heart")—as well as God and all his Divine gifts:

*Serce čyste, mylostyve,
dar najkraščyj Boha,
najpevniša, najprostiša
do nebes doroha . . .*

("Pure, kind heart, God's finest gift and the most certain
and most simple road to heaven. . . .")

*Mij xram u serci. Tam ja vozxvaljaju,
koho, jak zvaty, j na imja ne znaju.*

("My temple is in my heart. There I praise him whom I cannot address, for I do not even know his name.")

According to Kuliš: "*Treba uhoždaty til'ky Bohovi, a Boh hovoryt' nam čerez naše serce. Xto serce svoje očystyt' od usjakoji skverni, toj zrobyt' joho xramom Božyjim.*" ("It is necessary to please only God; and God speaks to us through our hearts. He who purges his heart of all corruption, makes of it a sanctuary of God."); and "*Ljuds'kyj rid sered svojeji temnoty ta pomylok, bezustanno čynyt' božestvenne dilo pravdy i žyzni. Jak sonce ne perestaje robyty svoje dilo posered*

noči, posered buri, posered xolodu i mrjaky, tak ljuds'ka duša ni na xvylynu ne zupynjajet'sja v svojemu pravednomu zaxodi kolo porjadkovannja rodu ljuds'-koho. Prjamuvannja jiji časom skryva temrjava, a ščo vona prjamuje do Boha, do Joho rozumu, do Joho pravdy, to se rič pevna." ("The human race with its ignorance and erring ways carries out unremittingly the divine task of truth and life. Just as the sun does not cease doing its work in the dead of night, in the middle of a storm, and in the midst of cold and fog, so the human soul does not pause for a moment in its righteous labors of bringing order into the human race. Sometimes it goes awry or heads in an obscure direction; nevertheless, the end toward which it strives is God, His reason, His truth: this is certain.")

A recurrent theme in Kuliš's philosophy was that this "uncovering" of the heart, the realization of its potential and the dismissal of everything fortuitous and external was essential to the "resurrection of Ukraine." Thus, this resurrection was seen as simply a return to the sources of true life, to "ancient culture" (for it, too, resides in the heart). "Return to the family of *kulturnyks*" was Kuliš's cry to his people:

*. . . Naša ridna Ukrajina
nedovidoma hlybynja mors'kaja
i vol'nosty narodnjoji bezodnja.*

("Our native Ukraine, unfathomed ocean deep and bottomless, repository of national freedom.")

Kuliš's call was to the culture of ancient Rus', the chief element of which—language, was an "everlasting treasure" belonging to the heart of the nation: "*velyka bo syla v prostomu narodn'omu slovi i v prostij narodnij pisni, i tajna toji syly— v ljuds'kyx sercjax, a ne v ljuds'komu rozumi. Te slovo sercem ljudy vymovyly.*" ("for its great strength lies in the simple language of the people and in the simple folk song; and the secret of this strength is in human hearts and not in the human intellect. It is through the heart that people uttered this word.") A foreign language may be a language of the intellect but it is the native language that is faithfully kept by the common people and they, in their hearts, are the most intelligent of all. The motivation for Kuliš's appeal can be seen from the following:

*Otčestvo sobi gruntujmo v ridnim slovi:
vono, vono odno vid pohuby vteče,
pidderžyt' naciju na predkivs'kij osnovi,
narodam i vikam vsju pravdu prореče. . .*

("We base our fatherland in the native word: it, it alone will escape ruin; it will support the nation on the foundations laid by our ancestors; it will speak the whole truth to the people and to the ages. . . .")

This "philosophy of the heart" also furnished the basis for Kuliš's *xutir* philosophy: "*Pryrodnja prostota daje ljudyni čyste serce . . . Nijaka nauka takoho pravdyvoho sercja ne dast' . . .*" ("Natural simplicity gives a person an unblemished heart. . . . No knowledge provides such a pure heart. . . ."). This "rustic philosophy" of the heart was considered to be that "eternal," ancient, immutable "downright Gospel" truth which we comprehend with the heart.

Kuliš's "philosophy of the heart" carried over into particular notions of his as well, including his Slavophile opposition of the *xutir* and Europe, and his opposition of man and woman (matriarchal ideas of later Romanticism!):

. . . *dux naš robyt'sja v duši žinočij . . .*
Rozkišno žyvučy rajamy-xutoramy,
stolyčnogo vony ne znajut' dušohubstva,
mov zori, v čystoti kruh žyzni soveršajut',
pisnjamy vičnymy sercja nam prosviščajut' . . .

(" . . . our spirit grows in a woman's soul. . . . Living in splendor in *xutir* paradises, they do not know big-city murder; they complete the circle of life in purity, like the stars; with immortal songs they illuminate our hearts. . . .")

It was also reflected in his idealization of antiquity (no longer the Cossack past, but the princely period of ancient Rus') and in his previously noted thoughts about the poet, etc. Although these typically Romantic motifs were developed for the most part in a symbolic manner, Kuliš must be declared a Romantic to the end. Clearly it was the Romantic world view which preserved him in the midst of all his many diverse ideas for Ukraine. However, the philosophy was, by this time, an anachronism, the source of the atmosphere of obscurity and hostility surrounding Kuliš during the last years of his life. It made of him during his lifetime a solitary figure, and, after his death, for a period—a forgotten son of Ukraine.

Kuliš was not afraid of "lofty" or philosophical themes, both of which were completely foreign to the writers and readers of an era dominated by materialism and positivism. Nor did he shrink from a high style or elevated language—

also alien to the period. Because of this, his poetry had a certain power even though it did not achieve widespread recognition. He remained a witness to the existence as well as the possibility of a "high" Ukrainian culture beyond the limitations of the depths into which Ukrainian literature and spiritual culture were being drawn by the incipient Populist Realism.

6. The works of another Romantic, Oleksa Storoženko (1805-74), also began appearing in the pages of *The Foundation*. A two-volume edition of his stories containing twenty three items (two more in prose), *Marko prokljatyj* (*Marko, the Cursed*), was issued posthumously (1879). His Russian works, in which he largely maintained Ukrainian themes, spanned the period 1857 to 1865. With their lively narratives, their successful use of the vernacular as the language of narration, and their undertone of mellow humor, Storoženko's writings were deemed to be an impressive achievement of Ukrainian literature. In theme, all of his works are Romantic, either completely—drawing on fantastic and historical material, or partially—stemming from folklore, primarily popular anecdotes and tales. Storoženko himself alluded to the enormous role which, he felt, was inherent in folk poetry and in the popular tradition of historical tale: "A single oak has remained but with many acorns on it," "Our dear mother, Ukraine, has not forsaken us without her blessing." *The Foundation* added the following note to one of his stories: "Our nation—is a grand and prolific poet" as it were, providing our poets with "eternally fresh and potent seeds for greater poetic creativity." Admittedly, Storoženko's views of the future of Ukraine were pessimistic: "We have only our memories to live with." It was, indeed, through remembrances that Storoženko lived his life. Almost all of Storoženko's stories are created from folklore material, widely known tales, or local, family and personal accounts. Among his writings are also, simply, "*Spohady*" ("Recollections") about the famous Zaporozhian centenarian Korž. The final days of Zaporozhe and the later fate of the Zaporozhians are depicted in such stories as "*Doroš*"—reminiscences about an old Zaporozhian beekeeper whose grove is protected even after his death by his spirit; or "*Kindrat Bubnenko-Svydkyj*"—the remembrances of an old veteran about *hajdamačyna*. Others include "*Mežyhors'kyj did*" ("The Old Man of Mežyhorja")—the recollections of an ancient crone about a still older Cossack warrior; "*Prokip Ivanovyč*," written in the form of memoirs of a Zaporozhian about the destruction of the Sič; "*Holka*," and others.

Storoženko's tales of fantasy form a rather large group consisting of works such as "*Zakoxanyj čort*" ("A Devil in Love"), an account of how the hero chanced upon a devil enamoured of a witch, how this witch resolved to escape by obtaining God's mercy, how the devil, who served as the hero's mount (as in

Gogol's "*Noč pered Roždestvom*" ["Christmas Eve"] was torn to pieces by the hero's comrades), and finally how the hero came to marry the witch. "*Žonatyj čort*" ("A Married Devil") is an engagingly related tale about the collaboration of a peasant with a devil: the devil, having brought sickness upon the people, is "banished" by a peasant with whom he is in league. "*Se baba ščo čort jij na maxovyx vylax čoboti oddavav*" ("She Was Such a Hag That the Devil Gave Her Boots to Her with a Pitchfork") recounts the story of a vile woman whom even the devil was loath to approach too closely. A tale probably based on real events, "*Sužena*" ("The Betrothed") concerns a maiden whom fate betroths to the hero: it is the Romantic theme of love for an unknown woman. The lovers first see each other only as visions, but afterward meet in reality "for the Lord gave to the two of them but a single heart." The content of the tale "*Čortova korčma*" ("Tavern of the Devil") is clear from its title. The subject of "*Mirošnyk*" ("The Miller") is the premonition of another's death as well as that of one's self (see, for instance, Gogol's "Old World Landowners").

Storoženko also undertook reworkings of popular stories, tales and anecdotes, often accumulating diverse material in a single work: "*Včy lynyvoho ne molotom, a holodom*" ("Teach the Lazy Man Not with a Hammer but with Hunger") is comprised of an amalgam of anecdotes about the lazy; in "*Ne v dobryj čas*" ("Without Luck") is a collection of anecdotes about a fool; and "*Skarb*" ("Treasure") consists of a combination of various anecdotes concerning sluggards and treasures which accrue to the idler without any effort whatever. "*Dva braty*" ("Two Brothers") is a variation of the tale about two destinies; "*Try sestry*" ("Three Sisters") presents a story reminiscent of the folk tale popularized in Puškin's "*Skazka o care Saltane*" ("The Tale of Tsar Saltan"). And, in the genre of ethnographic depiction, here—not about the life of the peasants, but about small landowners—is the well-known "*Vusy*" ("Whiskers").

In Storoženko's view, the folk tales which he reworked perhaps lacked the profundity of philosophic Romanticism but were full of beauty, charm and poetry. For him they were a manifestation of Ukrainian nature: "*Naša čudova ukrajins'ka vroda, nahritaja harjačym poludennym soncem, naviva na dumy nasinnja poeziji ta čar. Jak pšenycja zrije na nyvi i skladajet'sja u kopy i skyrды, tak i vono, te nasinnja, zapavšy u serce j dumky, zrije slovesnym kolosom, i skladajet'sja u narodni opovidannja i legendy.*" ("The marvellous beauty of our Ukraine basking in the hot sun of noonday inspires thoughts with the seeds of poetry and wonders. Just as wheat ripens in the field and is bound into sheaves and shocks, so in the same way the issue of those seeds [of poetry], having fallen into the heart and mind, matures into a verbal spike and then assumes the form of popular stories and legends.")

It was, therefore, if not a philosophic function, then at least an aesthetic, national one that nature poetry assumed for this belated Romantic.

Like Gogol's *Mertvyje duši* (*Dead Souls*), Storoženko's long "poem" in prose, *Marko, the Cursed* was a long time in the writing. It is the story of a great sinner who commits incest with both his mother and sister and then murders them. Rejected by the earth, he wanders about the world, ultimately finding his way into hell. The action of the poem is transposed by Storoženko to the Xmel'nyč'kyj period. Unfortunately, although his poem was more extensively developed in plot and narration than any of Storoženko's other works, he was unable to complete it. Despite the author's intention that the work was to be a grand Ukrainian epic, its subject was hardly a particularly national one; it was thus difficult to group national anecdotes around it (in fact, there are almost none in the poem). Moreover, Storoženko simply lacked the knowledge to create a historical tableau. Today, this massive structure commands less interest than Storoženko's short stories.

Marko, the Cursed belongs to a small number of works by Storoženko that are written in an epic style. In most cases the author withdraws his presence, placing the narrative in the mouth of some other person ("Have you heard, gentlemen? . . ." [*skaz*]) who, generally, is of the common people—as attested by his vocabulary—*xront* (front), *škadron* (squadron), etc. Sometimes, Storoženko fulfills two artistic tasks at once. For example, the narrator of "The Old Man of Mežyhorja" is an old *babusja* who is constantly confused and absent-minded; and, the tale of the "devil in love" is narrated by the grandson of the old man whose story it follows. In this way a double perspective is created according to which even the fabulous may seem real.

The subject matter used by Storoženko is very complicated. It is the result of combining and reworking various folk tales as well as borrowing from literary sources: reminiscences from Gogol are not only frequent but almost word-for-word. In addition, the accuracy of the author's attributions of his sources is often doubtful (in his stories, such attributions are not even entirely clear). The language contains a good number of vulgarisms, but these are explained, for the most part, by the role played by the narrator. Also common are coarse jokes as well as excessively crude incidents (brawls, etc.); nor did Storoženko shrink from elements of impropriety even when largely irrelevant to the development of the narrative. The shades of humor in his writings are generally effective but sometimes too thickly applied. Humorous notes can, for example, find their way into narratives of quite terrible events—the justification being, of course, that Ukrainians "do not laugh at the misfortune of others, only at their own." Although he imitated Gogol, Storoženko does not bear comparison with him.

For, first, he overburdened his narratives with too much material; second, his recasting of it in his own creative laboratory was insufficiently decisive; and, in general, he merely linked together or combined various motifs in a superficial manner.

Storoženko's works also lack the deep ideological approach found in Gogol'. While not completely alien to Storoženko, his "ideology" consists, for the most part, of personal observations placed in extremely mechanical fashion either grouped together at the end of his works, or, in the case of his stories, dispersed throughout the narrative. Mention has already been made of his Romantic appreciation of folklore. Also found in Storoženko are particular remarks of a religious character: "It was a large soul . . . it wanted to live in heaven and on earth at the same time," "With the cross as a key he unlocked for himself the gates into the kingdom of heaven"; as well as of a primitive moralistic type: "He is no orphan, whom God has bestowed with a tender heart and rapturous soul," "What is happiness on earth?" (from a long meditation at the end of "The Treasure"), etc. Another facet of Storoženko's "ideology" was his extraordinarily idyllic attitude toward everything, including serfdom, the horrible corporal punishments among soldiers and the fierce temper of landowners (see "*Prokip Ivanovyč*" and "The Miller"). He accepted all as something normal: sometimes he merely laughed in derision, and sometimes he actually praised his savage heroes. For the readers of the 1860s this was now intolerable.

Clearly more important, however, was the fact that Storoženko's Romantic stories appeared to his contemporaries as outdated stylistically. In his view of the Ukrainian past, Storoženko ranged from *The Black Council* to *Taras Bulba*, and in his tableaux of village life—from Ševčenko to Kvitka. At times, elements of a new style ("naturalism"—perhaps from Gogolian influence) do run through his work, as in his comparisons of people with objects and animals: a person is described as being dry "*jak spljuščenyj čornobryvčyk miž lystamy psaltyrja*" ("as a marigold flattened out between the leaves of a psalter"), or "*Pyka . . . jak novyj p'jatak*" ("It was a snout . . . like a new five-kopeck piece"). However, because of the relative poverty of Storoženko's lexicon, its lack of expressions for the higher spheres of thought and for feelings, there was a necessary and severe limitation of all his creative potential in general, and of any possible forward movement in particular—whether toward the enrichment of style or the creation of new forms.

Storoženko's most unsuccessful work was "*Harkuša*." Belonging to the genre of "dramatic scenes," it is a dreadful example of Ukrainian melodrama of the later period. In the matter of a minute the characters pass from being on the point of suicide to participating in songs and dances! Maidens captured by

bandits are made by the author to serve as a chorus and ballet before being set free. Primitive effects abound. The psychological side of the action is completely fantastic: the characters instantly fall in love with one another whenever the author requires it; Harkuša and his entire band are immediately rehabilitated under the influence of a few words from an eighteen-year-old captain's wife. And a sixteen- or seventeen-year-old maiden is presented as a feminine *raisonneur*, the representative of the author's wisdom. It is astonishing that the creator of Storoženko's stories could also have been the author of such a play.

Unlike Kuliš, Storoženko attempted to prolong the ascendancy of ideological Romanticism. As a result, he fell into the depths which Romanticism had occupied even earlier and over which Realism was now triumphant. However, since Storoženko was of no significance either to the lofty Romantic tradition or to Realism in its growing supremacy, his role in the history of Ukrainian literature was both incidental and short-lived. Storoženko himself, after having experienced a remarkable productivity over the course of two to three years, fell silent as the critics became unfavorable. For, Romanticism after 1862 was an anachronism.

7. It is to the periphery of Ukrainian literature that the figure of Petro Kužmenko (1831-67) belongs. His publications, appearing after 1859, include several lyric poems, the legend "*Pohane pole*" ("Evil Field") and the folk tale "*Ne tak ždalosja, ta tak sklalosja*" ("It Never Happens As Expected"). While his verses recall the tender lyrics of Petrenko, they are more closely related to popular songs. However, it is unclear whether it is from folk songs or from Ševčenko that Kužmenko derived his motifs (three roads, cursed grave-mounds), and epithets ("white-faced" moon). He can be considered a Romantic only inasmuch as he failed to achieve explicitly "Realistic" themes.

8. Many individual Romantic features may be found in the early poetry of S. Rudans'kyj (1834-73). The Romantic tradition was the source not only for the ballad form of his *nebylyci* (fables) and the symbolism of his Slavophile poem "*Car Solovej*" ("Tsar Nightingale"), but also for his personal Slavophilism including his strange Ukrainianized transformations of poetic terms. However, the style, language and composition of the majority of Rudans'kyj's works, even his ballads, were in the spirit of the new literary current, Realism. Moreover, only undistinguished echoes of Romantic poetry emanated from the early verses of Galician poets of the post-Romantic period (K. Klymkovyč, V. Šaškevyč).

H. OTHER POETS OF UKRAINIAN ROMANTICISM

1. The existence of groups and circles in which ideas were crystallized and from which individual poets drew their poetic inspiration was a characteristic of Romantic poetry not only in Ukraine but also in other lands. However, Romanticism also embraced those independent and isolated poets and thinkers who went their own way without regard to literary society at large. In Ukrainian Romantic literature, there are no examples of poets of the latter type, or at least none of any distinguished merit. In his later years, Kuliš belonged to this category; but even he, in his earlier period, received much stimulation from the Kievan circle. Thus, in Ukraine the Romantic poets who remained isolated outside the literary centers were of minor importance.

2. One writer who was completely isolated was Tymko (Xoma) Padura (1801-70), a Pole. For a long time (from 1825) his songs circulated orally and in manuscript form, a portion of them being published only in 1844. His Romanticism, consisting of a fascination with the Cossacks, was expressed in the style of "Romantic terror":

*Kozak pana ne znay zvika,
bo zrodyvsja na stepax,
stavsja ptaxom z čolovika,
bo ris v kins'kyx stremenax.*

.....
*Joho sl'oza ne spynjaje,
vin ne ljubyt' lesnyx slov;
ščo tam v nebi—vin ne znaje,
a na zemli znaje krov.*

*Sam jak dykyj syn pryrody,
de pokaže mstyvu tvar,
krasjat' zemlju, krasjat' vody
krovy ričky i požar . . .*

.....
*Nam najmyl še tak kinčyty,
jakby dušu čort sxvatyv!*

("The Cossack never knew a master, for he was born on the steppes; though a man, he became a bird, for he grew up in horses' stirrups. . . . Tears do not stop him, he abhors

flattering words; what there may be in heaven, he knows not—but on earth, he knows blood. Himself, he is like a savage son of nature; wherever he may show his countenance, there the earth glows fiery red and the water, crimson from the bloody rivers and conflagrations. . . .
 . . . It would be most merciful for us to stop here; it is as though the devil had seized the soul! . . .”)

In every instance, Cossack history was considered by Padura to be something great; a “Slavic Marathon” is his vision of the Sič:

*O maty naša! ty jedyne vil'ne
 v cilij slov'janiv rodyni
 čado rozkišne, horde svavil'ne . . .*

(“O, our mother! You alone are free in the entire family of Slavs, o magnificent, proud, self-willed child. . . .”)

However, Padura also depicted the Cossack as having idyllic relations with the Pole:

*Odna maty, odni xaty,
 razom v poli stavav kiš;
 razom žylos', razom bylos',
 v odnim horšku priv kuliš . . .*

*Zvika vil'ni i svavil'ni,
 ne puskaly šabel' z ruk;
 razom v radax, razom v zvadax,
 ščo ž urjadyly dlja vnuk?*

(“The same mother, the same houses, together they pitch camp in the field; together they lived, together they fought, in a single pot they cooked their gruel. . . . Ever free and headstrong, never losing hold of their swords; together in councils, together in disputes. What have they arranged for their grandchildren?”)

In part, Padura imitated folk songs, even *dumy*, although typical folk song expressions are few: “*Na mohyli voron krjače*” (“On the grave-mound a raven is cawing”), “*V tim surmy ozvalys'*” (“At that, the *surmy* were sounded in

reply”), etc. Most noticeable in his work, however, are Romantic motifs—from images of Cossacks to landscapes: “*Vže mračni tumany dunulys' z vitrom za mohyly . . .*” (“The misty fog by now had disappeared with the wind behind the grave-mound”):

*Z-pid xmar misjac', jak ptax na mohyli,
tužyt' bezsonnyj v nebesnij pustyni . . .*

*Zakotyvsja misjac' v xmarax,
svyšče burja po horax . . .*

*Sumno, sumno, misjac' hlyboko
za xmaru v nebo zabih . . .*

*Nič bula temna, viter z nyy šyrokyy
z lystjam z dolyny kotyv čorni xmary . . .*

(“From under the clouds, the moon, like a bird on a grave-mound, languishes fitfully in the celestial wasteland. . . . The moon has set in the clouds, a storm whistles over the hills. . . . Sadly, sadly, the moon pursued the cloud into the heavens. . . . The night was dark, the wind from the broad fields sent the black clouds rolling along with leaves from the valleys. . . .”)

Padura clearly had a definite influence on Xarkiv Romanticism in its early stages. The language in his works may not always be good (*slov* for *sliv*; *dlja vnuk* for *vnukiv*; *ščadky* for *naščadky*), but there are few errors. Moreover, the meters found in his verses are not tonic in most cases, but are closely related to the rhythms of folk poetry used later by Ševčenko.

3. The most outstanding of the Ukrainian unaffiliated poets was Jevhen Hrebinka (1812-48), although the center of his attention lay in his Russian works, particularly those belonging to the “Ukrainian school.” As a younger fellow student of Gogol’ in Nižyn, he often imitated the style of his great countryman with considerable skill but without the latter’s depth or brilliance. In fact, his Ukrainian writings lagged behind his own Russian works, which evolved from Romanticism to “naturalism”: at the same time, his Ukrainian works merely developed from *Kotljarevščyna* to a rather timid incipient Romanticism. Perhaps Hrebinka’s greatest service to Ukrainian literature lay in his publication of the almanac *The Swallow* (1841) and his role in furnishing Ševčenko with information about Romanticism—primarily, Russian Romanticism.

Hrebinka began his literary career with a paraphrase of Puškin's *Poltava* (1831). The work is, in some respects, a travesty: for while its tone is not exactly that of the *Enejida*, it contains enough traits of the burlesque to completely destroy all motifs of the struggle for freedom which pervade Puškin's poem, and to effectively stifle the tragic, heroic notes surrounding the figure of Mazepa (and of Peter the Great). Illustrative of this treatment are such lines as: "Zbyralas' . . . pesyholovciv čereda" ("A herd of dog-headed men gathered"). Puškin describes the Cossack in love with Mary in the following manner: "*Esli kto, xotja slučajno pred nim Mazepu nazyval, to on blednel, terzajas' tajno i vzory v zemlju opuskal*" ("If anyone mentioned Mazepa in front of him even accidentally, he turned pale, suffered secret torments and lowered his eyes to the ground"). In Hrebinka, his experiences are portrayed thus:

*Najkraščyj buv miž kozakamy
odyn šče molodyj kozak,
i cej z druhymy parubkamy
harbuz isxrumav, neborak . . .
Imja presučoho het'mana
.....
kusavšy čornyj us, vorčav . . .*

("Among the Cossacks the finest was one who was still a young fellow. And he with the other youths was rebuffed in marriage, poor dear. . . . After biting his black mustache, he growled out the name of the hetman, a very bitch of a man. . . .")

Instead of "*Na plaxe gibnet Čečel' smelyj*" ("On the block brave Čečel perished"), Hrebinka writes "*I zhynuv Čečel', jak bloxa*" ("And Čečel was killed, like a flea"). In his version, the wife of Kočubej rejects Mazepa's proposal of marriage to her daughter with these words: "*Brydkyj, merzennyj! hljan', pohanec'! Čy možna? ni, paskudnyj lanec'!*" ("Abominable, loathsome man! See here, villain! Is it possible? No, you nasty wretch!"). In addition, however, there are passages which, while unequal to those in Puškin's work, succeed in conveying the Romantic style of his poem. The burlesque style also prevails in Hrebinka's Ukrainian correspondence and in his brief prose writings (foreword and afterword to *The Swallow*).

Hrebinka's significance in Ukrainian literature lies in his fables (*prykazky*) and other verses. His fables, numbering around thirty, constitute a definite

contrast to those of Borovykovs'kyj. They are quite conversational, with lengthy expositions and often unnecessary details.

While Hrebinka's lively, witty fables belong to a genre favored by Classicism, Hrebinka contrived to destroy the traditional form. His fables were also a departure from the travesties typical of the genre in Ukrainian Classicism. Their vivid language is pure, containing relatively few vulgarisms, notwithstanding the fact that the fables were directed at the peasant. The following example of the short ballad "*Jačmin*" ("Barley") is illustrative:

Syn

Skažy meni', bud' laskav, tatu!
čoho jačmin' naš tak poris,
ščo koloskiv prjamyx ja baču tut bahato,
a dejaki zovsim sxyllylysja unyz.
Mov my, nehramotni, pered velykym panom,
mov pered sudovym na stijci kozaky.

Bat'ko

Oti prjamiji kolosky
zovsim pustisin'ki, rostut' na nyvi darom,
kotri ž pokljaknuly—to boža blahodat':
jix hne zerno, vony nas musjat' hoduvat'.

Syn

Toho ž to holovu do neba zvolyt' drat'
nas pysar volosnyj, Onys'ko Xarčovytyj!
Až vin, baču . . .

Bat'ko

Movčy! počujut'—budeš bytyj.

("Son: Tell me please, daddy, why has our barley grown in such a way that many plants here, I see, are straight and tall? And why are several completely bowed down like us, illiterates, before the mighty lord, like Cossacks standing guard for the judge?

Father: Those rigid plants are altogether barren; they grow in the field to no purpose. Those that are bent over with weight are God's blessing: bowed by their kernel, they must feed us.

Son: That is why our district clerk Onesimus Gluttonly dares to lift his head to heaven! And I see that he. . .

Father: Quiet! You'll be overheard—and be beaten.”)

While their plots are to some extent taken from foreign literatures (Krasicki, Krylov), their linguistic purity and model composition create of Hrebinka's fables significant examples of this genre in Ukrainian literature.

Hrebinka also wrote a few lyrical verses, mainly songs whose typically sentimental feelings of sorrow were characteristic of the minor poets of Ukrainian Romanticism. The most famous of these verses, “*Ni, mammo, ne možna neljuba ljubyt'*” (“No, mamma, it is impossible to love an unloveable man”) became a popular song as did several of Hrebinka's Russian lyrics.

4. Although he spent practically his entire life in Moscow, Osyp Bodjans'kyj (1808-77), became renowned as a publisher of Ukrainian monuments and in his early years was known as a Ukrainian poet. It was apparently under the influence of Maksymovyč at Moscow University that Bodjans'kyj turned to the study of folk poetry. His master's dissertation “*O narodnoj poezii slovjanskix plemen*” (“On the Folk Poetry of Slavic Races,” 1837) was one of the first Romantic investigations of this theme in Ukrainian literature. Between 1833 and 1835 he produced several poems as well as a separate collection *Nas'ki ukrajins'ki kazky* (*Our Own Ukrainian Tales*) under the pseudonym Is'ko Materynka. The Romantic motifs in his poems, based on fairy tales (three riddles), as well as national sources (“epitaph” to Bohdan Xmel'nyč'kyj, and the verse dedicated to “Kyrylo Rozum”), were treated in a primitive manner in a language which, while pure and simple, was hardly poetic. His *Tales* were a naive attempt at “ethnographic Romanticism.”

The stories of Xoma Kuprijenko, *Malorossijskie povesti i rasskazy* (*Little Russian Tales and Yarns*, 1840) were attributed to folk tales from the author's village. In fact, they were very inept imitations, stylistically and thematically, of Gogol'. “*Nedobryj viščun*” (“Evil Soothsayer”) is the story of a witch-sorceress, while “*Utoplencyja*” (“The Drowned Girl”), recalling Gogol'’s “*Majskaja noč'*” (“A May Night”), concerns a drowned maiden who assists in bringing about the marriage of two peasant lovers. “*Jak nažyto, tak i prožyto*” (“Easy Come, Easy Go”), a variant of Gogol'’s “*Večer nakanune Ivana Kupala*” (“St. John's Eve”), is an account of a peasant who, for the sake of a treasure, sells his soul to the devil. “*Ni! ne vtečeš'*. . .” (“No You Won't Escape . . .”) is the story of a sorcerer who quits his grave after death and seeks his wife. The literary value of this ethnographic-fantastic Romanticism is minimal indeed.

Also ethnographic in character are the forged *dumy* of O. Šyščak'kyj Illyč

(1828-59), modelled on the Romantic forgeries of Sreznevs'kyj. Šyšač'kyj's own verses and poems, published in Černihiv in two volumes in 1856-57, are of mediocre quality.

5. Two poets, both from the Poltava area, who stood quite apart from the narrow confines of the Ukrainian literary circles, were Viktor Zabyla (1808-69) and Oleksander Afanas'ev-Čužbys'kyj (1817-79). Theirs was that Romanticism of sadness and sorrow whose most prominent representative was M. Petrenko.

Zabila indulged in different variations of the same theme: "*Šonce sxodyt'—ja nužusja, a zaxodyt'—plaču*" ("When the sun rises, I am weary, and when it sets, I weep"); "*Čilyj vik svij use plaču na lyxu hodynu*" ("All my days I ceaselessly bewail my misfortune"). The motif of unhappy love is the cause of the poet's sorrow:

*Povijaly vitry bujni
z xolodnoho kraju,
rozlučyly z divčynoju,
kotru ja koxaju . . .*

("Turbulent winds began to blow from the cold regions;
they took leave of the girl I love. . . .")

*. . . kotru ljublju divčynon'ku,
tijeji ne baču,
dovho j čutky ja ne maju
pro mylu divčynu . . .*

(" . . . the dear girl whom I love—her I no longer see. Nor,
for a long while, have I even had news of the tender
maiden. . . .")

Instead of the nightingale, it is the owl that the poet wants to hear:

*Puhač meni tak hodyt'sja:
stohne—ne spivaje . . .
Nexaj stohne kolo mene
ta smert' vozviščaje . . .*

("The owl suits me so: it sighs—it does not sing. . . .
May its plaintive hoots surround me and foretell of
my death. . . .")

*Oдно meni teper v sviti
 til'ky vže zostalos'
 ščob skoriše serce moje
 z svitom poproščalos'.*

("Only one thing now is left me in this world—the wish
 that my heart would soon bid farewell to the earth.")

The sincerity of feeling does not compensate for the monotony of mood, the lack of original images and the linguistic poverty, at times, of his not always correct language.

Čužbys'kyj, who also wrote numerous prose works in Russian, was faithful to the tone of the sensitive song-romance. The following verse achieved unusual popularity:

*Skažy meni pravdu, mij dobryj kozače,
 ščo dijaty sercju, koly zabolyt'?
 Jak serce zastohne i hirko zaplače
 i duže bez ščastja vono zakvylyt'?*

("Tell me the truth, my fine young Cossack, what can a
 heart do if it begins to ache? When the heart begins to
 moan and to burst into bitter tears, and begins a dire
 lament from its loss of happiness. . . ?")

Čužbys'kyj's imitations of folk songs were also quite successful:

*. . . kozaka zhadaite,
 kotryj des' to na čužyni,
 serdeha ubohyj,
 pide šukat' pomiž ljud'my
 svojeji dorohy,
 kotryj vik svij promandruje
 z pustymy rukamy,
 vstavajučy j ljahajučy,
 vmyjet'sja sljozamy . . .*

("Think of the Cossack who somewhere there in an alien
 land, poor destitute fellow, goes searching among people
 for his path, who spends his life wandering with empty

hands, who, on waking up and lying down to sleep, is bathed in tears. . . .")

. . . *travka zviane, travka zsoxne*
konju voronomu,
otrutoju voda stane
meni, molodomu.

Na tij šovkovij travyci
bahato otruty,
a z tijeji krynyčen'ky
pyv mij voroh ljutyj.

(" . . . the grass withers, the grass shrivels up before the raven-maned steed, the waters turn to poison for me, a tender youth. In this silken, fine, young grass, poison abounds; and from this source my fierce enemy drank.")

His depiction of Ukrainian landscapes was also masterful:

Mov synjaja strička, Donec' pid horoju,
kruh joho lisy ta šyroki luhy;
mov kylym zelenyj zdajut'sja vesnoju
u kvitax paxučyx joho berehy . . .

A tam zelenije hora za piskamy,
čerez horu stežečka het' prostjahlas',
pišla po bajrakax, horamy, stepamy . . .

("Like a dark blue ribbon, the Donec winds under the mountain, around it, woods and broad meadows; in spring, its banks in fragrant flower give the appearance of a green carpet. . . . And there, behind the sands, the mountain turns a green color and through the mountain, a little path stretches far away traversing ravines, hills, steppes. . . .")

Čužbyns'kyj's Romanticism embraced the past as well, but only that which was "ancient," "memorable," etc. Even the poetry of Ševčenko was regarded by Čužbyns'kyj as, simply, singing "on the ruins of the Sič."

His images are well-drawn but undermined by his frequently unsatisfactory language: "na tij travyci . . . bahato otruty," "mov kylym . . . zdajut'sja . . . berehy," "čerez horu," etc.

Another Romantic was Semen Metlyns'kyj, brother of Amvrosij. His collections *Mova z Ukrajiny* (*A Message from Ukraine*, 1858; part two, 1864) are, almost entirely, imitations of folk poetry, and of the verse of Amvrosij Metlyns'kyj, Puškin and Lermontov. The predominance of sorrowful motifs in his work doubtless stems from Metlyns'kyj's models. Nevertheless, its presence justifies considering the author together with the most distinguished of the melancholy poets of Ukrainian Romanticism.

It is interesting that the secondary Ukrainian Romantic poets imitated Ševčenko but failed to adapt either his rhythms or his rhymes.

6. Ukrainian Romantic literature was also characterized by some admirable works of mixed style. These were long poems, influenced to some degree by the Romantic Byronic poem through the example of Russian writers and of Ševčenko, yet never rising above the level of travesty (often despite the intention of the author). Among the works of this type were P. Korenyc'kyj's *Večomyci* (*Evening Party*, 1841) which combined the style of the *Enejida* with borrowings from Puškin; S. Oleksandriv's *Vovkulaka* (*The Werewolf*, 1841) with its Romantic plot; the idyllic poem *Natalja* (1844) and the adventure poem *Haras'ko* (1845), modelled after Puškin's *Kavkazskij plennik* (*The Prisoner of the Caucasus*) by M. Makarovs'kyj (1783-1846); as well as *Do čumakiv* (*To the Carters*) and *Hajdamaky* (1855) by P. Moračevs'kyj (1806-?). It has already been noted that Hrebinka made use of burlesque elements in his paraphrase of *Poltava*, a Romantic poem. Similar features are to be found in the rather mediocre ballads (including "Jivha," a paraphrase of Bürger's famous *Lenore*) and other translations of Bilec'kyj-Nosenko. The few anonymous works extant in both printed and manuscript form (including an 1828 fragment of the long poem *Kočubej*) are practically all characterized by this same mixed style. The influence of "Kotljarevščyna" was not easy to overcome. Moreover, where there was no interest in problems of literary style, it was natural that Romantic poems with lines such as the following should have been produced:

*A ja kobzu lyš nastroju,
tu, ščo v Orfija ukrav,
pid Parnas'koju horoju
jak v šynku iz nym huljav . . .*

*A hrek, nabyvšy dobre šlunok,
smijavsja ta lyhav pyvce . . .*

... *naša kobza v Peterbursi*
kolys' to bude hraty v lad...

("And I will but tune the *kobza*, the one I stole from Orpheus under the mountain of Parnassus while cavorting with him in the tavern. . . . Then the Greek, packing his stomach right full, laughed and gulped down the good beer. our *kobza* will someday play grandly in Petersburg. . . .")

7. There were several Polish poets besides Padura who wrote in Ukrainian. The verses of A. Szaszkiewicz, the "king of the *balahuly*" (Jewish drivers of covered wagons), were merely funny anecdotes, while those of S. Ostaszewski (1797-1875), including *Piv kopy kazok dlja veseloho myra* (*A Few Dozen Tales for a Merry World*, 1850) and *Piv sotni kazok dlja veselyx ljudej* (*Half a Hundred Tales for Merry People*, 1869) were based on popular legend and contained features of travesty. Other Polish poets who wrote in Ukrainian (K. Cięglewicz, Jan Poźniak, L. Węgliński) have been almost completely forgotten.

I. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF UKRAINIAN ROMANTICISM

1. The influence of Romanticism on later Ukrainian literature was considerable. First and foremost, it provided Ukrainian literature with its greatest poet of modern times—a fact which contributed significantly to the extraordinary permanence of Romantic influence. The other, non-Ševčenkian, tradition which outlived the specific period of Romanticism was that of the sensitive and sorrowful romance, a tradition rooted in folk song.

The types of influence Romanticism exercised were partly formal and partly thematic. For, while Ševčenko's verses were "imitated," they were somehow always transposed into the familiar rhythms of Russian, German and other Romantic poetry—namely, conventional, tonic meters. As a result, the unique charm of Ševčenko's verse was completely destroyed, as seen from the poetry of Kuliš. Nor was any attention given to the other qualities of Ševčenko's verses, such as their "instrumentation" (see above, pt. F, no. 5). Accordingly, despite the apparent superficial similarity of post-Ševčenkian verse with that of Ševčenko, the poetry of Ševčenko's epigones was destined to remain dry, monotonous and harmonically impoverished.

A far greater influence was exerted by the subject matter of Ukrainian Romanticism—again, primarily that of Ševčenko—on the literature of Ukrainian

Realism. On the one hand there was the idealization of the Cossacks; on the other, tragic themes from peasant life which were becoming increasingly stronger in Ukrainian prose and drama. Since the theme of peasant suffering is altogether natural in a "Realistic" drama, and that of Cossack Romanticism totally outside the limits of Realistic subject matter, it follows that Realism could have been ushered in with *The Black Council* and its depiction of social problems. However, Kuliš's novel did not inaugurate this trend. And it is in large measure to the influence of the Romantic, literary and scholarly tradition that one must ascribe the continuance of Cossack themes for decades on end. It was also the influence of Romantic, and precisely Ševčenkian themes, which led to the tragic undertones of so many dramas dealing with peasant life. The plays of Kropyvnyč'kyj, Karpenko-Karyj and Staryč'kyj are filled not only with this type of subject matter, but also with certain motifs and figures taken from Ševčenko's Byronic poems. In later Ukrainian literature, the various allusions, echoes and motifs derived from Romantic poetry are countless.

2. However, no matter how notable the influences of the literary material of Romanticism on subsequent literature, Realism was still able to transform them to a large degree, to imbue them with its own character and shape. The Cossack struggle became a struggle for social justice; almost all Romantic literature became interpreted as "populist" by Realists of a certain type. Romantic ideology was another matter. Several of its motifs were adopted by Realism, thereby changing altogether the "realistic" coloration of the later trend. In the first place, the customs, *pobut*, popular beliefs and folk poetry which the Romantics had revealed as containing the highest values of national life remained within the sphere of artistic attention of Ukrainian Realism. Moreover, these revelations often concealed from the Realists the very things which, in fact, interested them, or might have interested them—the social conditions of the life of the people. "Ethnographic Realism" thus was a kind of combination of Realist aims with Romantic tradition.

Nor in the period of Ukrainian Realism was there a dissipation of the Romantic enthusiasm for the past, especially the Cossack period: it thrived, albeit in the peculiar "stylized" form of Realism. However, in comparison with the Romantic period, this latter-day ethnographicism and idealization of the past represented a considerable decline. In ethnographic material they no longer perceived the profound essence of the national soul, nor did they recognize it as the means through which the character of the people could be discovered. Rather they saw in it, at best, only some "popular wisdom" and quite primitive morality, and, at worst, simply material without any deep meaning. In the historical past they did not seek the specific features of a particular era or of a

moment in history, but, for the most part, merely explained it to suit contemporary requirements. Ukraine's colorful, robust past was thus shrouded altogether by nineteenth-century Ukrainian life, sad, and in decline. Certainly without the heritage of Romanticism, Ukrainian Realism would have been even more impoverished, both thematically and ideologically.

Another of Romanticism's revelations was its understanding of the nature of a nation and of the process of its life. For the Realists, the concept of the nation as an integral organism or as a "being of a higher level" whose life flows from a single source ("the heart" according to Kuliš) was, of course, an exceedingly mystical notion. However, it is clear that the Realist period would never have attained even its quite superficial understanding of the nation had it not been for the education provided for generations of Ukrainian intelligentsia by Romantic literature. Still more significant was the change brought about by Romanticism in the understanding of the life process of the Ukrainian nation. In the pre-Romantic period the general notion had been that the Ukrainian nation either had died or was dying. Even later, Hulak-Artemovs'kyj could mock Kuliš who spoke of the "Cossack mother" (Ukraine) as already dead; but apart from some tasteless jokes directed at Kuliš, he was able to do no more than bid his farewell to her in the phrase of a requiem—"may the kingdom of heaven be hers." Romanticism introduced the concept of "national regeneration," of the resurrection of the nation—a word and a notion which survived into all the post-Romantic periods despite changes in fundamental points of view toward the nature of a nation. Moreover, just as the Romantics had invested a word and a literature with such extraordinary significance, so later Ukrainian ideologies all linked the nation's revival with the literary and linguistic reform of Kotljarevs'kyj, even though national life continued on its path of further decline for a long time afterward.

In addition to the literary and national elements of the Romantic ideology, which stayed with the "average Ukrainian intellectual," in later years were many individual and less significant elements of the Romantic view regarding life and the world. These, however, belong to the realm of cultural history.

3. The most important feature and contribution of Ukrainian Romanticism was its conscious attempt to create a "complete literature" capable of satisfying the requirements of all circles and strata of Ukrainian society. The aspiration toward a complete literature was achieved chiefly in the creation of a "complete language," an all-'round language well suited for use in all spheres of literature and life. Of course, due partly to political conditions and partly to the considerable breakdown in the national complexion of the Ukrainian people or more properly to the disintegration of its upper classes, the actual attainment of this

Romantic aspiration was not achieved. There was perhaps a certain illusion of a complete literature, but in reality there were practically no dramas, and not much prose—only one novel and a few stories. Nor did the poetic endeavors of the Romantics bear comparison quantitatively with the prodigious creativity of Baroque versifiers. However, all literature had found its ideal and set a definite goal to be attained in the future.

To their efforts toward the creation of a complete literature were added, in the 1860s, the contributions of the representatives of the modern generation, the Realists. In fact, they succeeded in bringing closer the goal of a complete literature through their prolific output and through the variety of genres they employed. However, the breadth and fullness of literature diminished considerably during this period since the Realists tried to reflect in their works the “real” contemporary life of the Ukrainian people. And, inasmuch as the overwhelming majority of the people consisted of the peasantry, there was an excessive preponderance of peasant themes in this period. Kuliš, aware of the requirements of a complete literature, had written part of his works in Russian; no doubt it was also partly due to the lack of Ukrainian publishing houses and readers, and to censorship. But even in *The Black Council* and in his later poems, he did not shrink before lofty ideological themes. He was not afraid to write for “the few” or for “the future reader” for whom works of the “high style” alone must be prepared and produced. The Realists, on the other hand, consciously avoided lofty subject matter. Of course, to some degree, this too resulted from conditions of censorship; however, it was also due to their general lack of interest in these themes. Accordingly, they made no effort whatever to prepare for the new reader from the upper classes. Only in Galicia did a happier situation exist which was largely responsible later for the leading role played by Galicia in Ukrainian development.

4. Foreign literatures, especially those of Slavic countries, were also drawn—indeed, because of the very ideology of Romanticism—to Ukrainian Romantic poetry. The number of translations produced was relatively small, however. Apart from the first translations which were in Czech, numerous translations from Ševčenko may be found chiefly in the south Slavic literatures of the Bulgarians and the Serbs. The result was that the influence of Ševčenko became a factor in south Slavic literature. Good translations of Ševčenko were also done by Poles (mainly L. Sowiński and W. Syrokomla-Kondratowicz). In Russian literature the translations are numerous but generally of poor quality.

Of greater significance were echoes of the Ukrainian folk poetry that had been discovered by the Romantics. Such echoes, in imitation of Cossack Romanticism, were to be found among the Czechs, and chiefly among the Slovaks. In

German literature too, after 1840, a small group of works appeared which had Ukrainian subject matter. In 1845 *Die poetische Ukraine (Poetic Ukraine)* was published by F. Bodenstedt, and 1843 saw the publication of Ukrainian folk songs in *Balalajka* by W. Waldbrühl. An original collection of verses on Ukrainian themes entitled *Ukrainische Lieder (Ukrainian Songs)* was published in 1841 by A. M. Jochmus-Mauritius; in 1844 the poem "Mazeppa" by G. E. Stäbisch appeared; and in 1850, "Gonta" by R. von Gottschall. Also published were the Romantic tragedies of C. J. Starck—*Schlacht bei Poltawa (Battle Near Poltava, 1855)* and von Gottschall's *Mazeppa* (translated into Ukrainian in 1865 by Fed'kovyč), as well as the historical novel *Mazeppa* by A. Mützelburg. As early as 1831, A. Chamisso had paraphrased part of Ryleev's *Vojnarovskij* into masterful German tercets; another inferior, although fuller, translation of this work was published in 1847 by I. Golovin. Around 1846 there appeared German translations of the Polish *Ukrainian Tales* by M. Czajkowski. The internal connections involved in the development of this Ukrainian-German Romantic literature have as yet not been investigated at all.

5. The universal historic service performed by Romanticism included its discovery of folk poetry and its considerable role in the elaboration of modern historical thought. These services were also rendered by Ukrainian Romanticism. The numerous collections of Ukrainian folk songs that were already in existence at the time had arisen directly out of the Romantic enthusiasm for folk poetry. Even the few collections published later owed their appearance to this Romantic fascination. And, most importantly, it was because of their Romantic belief that folk poetry contained profound philosophic meaning as well as the essence of the national spirit that scholarly collections were able to bring about the widespread dissemination of folk song themes and the use of their devices in imitative poetry. Research into folk poetry continued into the post-Romantic period. The gathering and the study of folklore both advanced considerably hereby. Folk poetry ceased to be idealized; it came to be regarded instead as merely ethnographic, historical and literary material.

The enormous role played by Ukrainian Romanticism in the study of Ukrainian history is a fact that is often overlooked. Yet the discovery and the publication of the basic sources from the *hetman* period are the undisputed achievements of the Romantic era. The initial enthusiasm which greeted the "*Istorijs Rusiv*" as well as other chronicles and folk song materials may have been quite uncritical. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that it was the Romantics—with their characteristic determination to discover in the past that which was unique and distinctive in relation to the present—who did much to overcome the naive idealization of Ukrainian antiquity. It was also the Romantic

world view to which the scholarship of Kostomarov and Kuliš was indebted in large measure. And when the further development of historical studies had far outstripped the old, Romantic historiography, a complete transformation came about in the manner in which literature treated historical material. While Ševčenko and Kuliš had attempted to highlight Ukraine's past in all its grandeur, they were able to approach it as a living thing, multifaceted and full of vitality. During the period of Realism, however, this was replaced with an idealization of the past: a completely naive celebration of it came to dominate both the historical novel and drama. Any pretense to a critical attitude to the past—if not as a whole, then to isolated features in it—was forfeited altogether.

6. The greatest contribution of Ukrainian Romanticism lay in the formal achievements of its literary production. And, while such achievements are generally ascribed to the genius of Ševčenko, the majority of those basic formal features was present among earlier Ukrainian Romantics. The main feature was the transition from the linguistic tradition of Kotljarevs'kyj—i.e., travesty, with its one-sided and quite uncommon lexicon including vulgarisms, burlesque and obscure words—to a modern, standardized language, well-suited to serious poetic genres and to express the feelings and ideas of a “full-fledged nation.” The establishment of modern forms such as the Romantic ballad or the “free poem” and their stylistic Ukrainianization was another of the pioneering services rendered by the Romantics. The musicality of poetic language—the very basis of Romantic poetics—is indebted to Ševčenko for its greatest examples. In verse form there were further accomplishments: e.g., the old syllabic versification was finally abandoned. In addition to developments in tonic meter (based on accent) which had been adopted from the Russians, there was an original verse, inspired by folk song meter, which was created by Ševčenko, although, as mentioned previously, not imitated by other Romantics.

The formal achievements of the Romantics are best appreciated when compared with the neglect of the formal aspects of a work typical of the period of Realism.

7. The end of Ukrainian Romanticism was not the kind of natural death met by Romanticism in the West and in neighboring countries. There, a certain saturation of the Romantic style led to a sharp change in literary direction. But it was difficult to become “saturated” with the relatively few works which Ukrainian Romanticism had provided. Rather, the end of Ukrainian Romanticism and the victory of a new style were brought on by extra-literary factors: the social situation which required a new literary approach to problems; and, more important, the literary development of Western and neighboring

countries, especially that of Russia which, at that time, was exerting an unprecedented strong influence on Ukrainian literary development.

Of course, it should not be imagined that Romantic literature survived in Ukraine for very long after its decline in the rest of Europe. Ukrainian literature, like any other, lives in close connection with the literatures of other nations. However, at this particular time, the process of literary development in Ukraine became disoriented—almost exclusively in imitation of foreign development.

Ukrainian Realism was indeed characterized by a certain originality but it was almost entirely of a negative nature, due primarily to the overwhelming predominance of peasant themes. Other directions in which Realism developed, such as the “psychological novel” which provided the greatest works of Realist literature, remained in embryonic form. The canon of Realist poetics—“being true to life”—thus paradoxically found its expression in the narrowing of subject matter of literary works to peasant themes. Consequently, notwithstanding the unusual size and generally good quality of its literary production, the achievements of Romantic literature toward the goal of a “full-fledged” literature were once again jeopardized.

XIII.

“BIEDERMEIER” AND THE “NATURALIST SCHOOL” IN UKRAINE

1. Not long ago a new concept, borrowed from the world of fine arts, was developed in German literary history—“Biedermeier.” The continuing debate which it engendered has left certain matters unresolved—including the distinctive features of the trend and its representative writers. In every instance, the basic features of “Biedermeier,” as characterized primarily by Austrian literature, have been defined as “late Romantic,” a form of Romanticism known either as “bourgeois Romanticism” or “outdated Romanticism.” The principal ideological motifs of Romanticism in the literary Biedermeier period are vague and elusive. Individualism and revolutionary fervor receded before *supra*-individual imperatives in matters of state, religion and customs; once again tradition exerted its attraction. An avid thirst for nothing less than the entire world gave way to peaceful labors and composure. Stridency and impulsiveness were replaced by mildness and calm. Pursuit of the extremes, including the abnormal and the forbidden, was supplanted by an aspiration toward honor, humility and modesty as the fundamental virtues of man. Language became more tranquil, more correct, more moderate and more static. Besides these basic features, there are others which scholars have isolated including certain contradictory ones: the coincidence of an idyllic character and frenzy, the coexistence of pessimism and sadness along with a longing for soft and gentle beauty. Also differentiated were some traits characteristic of only a few writers such as respect for antiquity which, to a large extent, had been lost by Romanticism, etc. Typical representatives of the Biedermeier style were L. Uhland, A. Stifter, A. von Droste-Hülshoff, F. Grillparzer, G. Keller, and O. Ludwig. Similar features were found to exist in Czech and Slovak literatures as well.

2. An attempt was made (by I. Pan'kevych) to extend the Biedermeier classification to the history of Ukrainian literature. The sole basis for the attempt was certain tender notes in the work of M. Šaškevyč and one particular story of M. Ustyjanovyč! Quite without foundation was the suggestion of affinity between this style and the creativity of Kvitka, Hulak-Artemovs'kyj and A. Metlyns'kyj.

There is, however, no necessity for any special "Biedermeier" section in the history of Ukrainian literature—not only because the writers who do appear in it are few and undistinguished, but principally because even these writers are not very indicative of the Biedermeier style. It was a time when in Western Europe (Germany) Biedermeier represented a reaction to Romanticism; it was a sign of a "sobering-up" after the excesses of Romantic ideas, and it signified a departure from them. But in Ukraine there were no grounds whatever for any reaction against Romanticism; least of all was there such motivation within the personal development of individual poets. Isolated concrete features of Biedermeier poetry may, of course, be found among particular poets—not only Šaškevyč, but also the melancholy lyricists Petrenko, Zabyla, Čužbyns'kyj, S. Metlyns'kyj and the early Ščoholiv—and also in the prosaists M. Ustyjanovyč and, partly, O. Storoženko. However, as for Hulak-Artemovs'kyj and Kvitka, who were not Romantics at all, and A. Metlyns'kyj, who was a belated Romantic—all three had nothing in common with Biedermeier. Moreover, those features of Biedermeier style which were present in Ukrainian poets arose not through any organic development but through simple borrowing. Šaškevyč, for example, took from Austrian literature. Others borrowed from Biedermeier-related Russian poets, principally from Lermontov who, as an anti-nationalist and Byronist, was scarcely typical of Biedermeier. Further, in addition to the stylistic borrowings from Biedermeier literature found in the Ukrainian poets mentioned above, there were also important influences of Romantic poetry which was not of the Biedermeier strain at all—primarily, that of Ševčenko. It should be concluded, therefore, that the Biedermeier style was largely restricted to German literature and to those literatures under its direct influence; the traces it left in Ukrainian literature were quite insignificant.

3. Much more closely related to Ukrainian literature was another Russian form of Romanticism-in-decline—the so-called *naturalnaja škola*. Fundamental to Romanticism had been the concept of two worlds between which stood man. At first Romanticism either depicted both worlds, the one along with the other—or portrayed the higher, "other worldly" sphere alone. The *naturalnaja škola*, on the other hand, began to portray only the lower, "worldly" sphere. The Romantic depiction of this world had been predominantly negative—based on

caricature and the grotesque. The principal features of this latter, post-Romantic, pre-Realist transitional style* consisted of exaggeration of the negative portrayal of reality so as to particularly emphasize its emptiness and baseness. Metaphors and similes were used which contributed to the impression of "the lower depths"; e.g., people, unattractive for the most part, were compared with animals or inanimate objects. Landscapes were often gloomy, melancholy and dull: rain, fog, gray, dirty cities, etc. The clothing depicted was old and patched-up or torn, and detailed descriptions abounded of the "coarse" side of life: how people eat, drink and snuff tobacco. And the language of the characters was inept and primitive. In this literature, elements of fantasy were either absent or relegated to the background of the extraordinarily gray prose of the life portrayed. Although the representatives of the *naturalnaja škola* did not overlook serious tragedies altogether, they were mainly interested in the everyday tragedies of existence whose heroes were the ordinary people—gray, common, poor and unfortunate. In fact, they preferred to create works without "heroes"—*pobutovi*, physiological sketches.

The founder of the Russian *naturalnaja škola*, principally in his "Petersburg" tales, was the Ukrainian N. Gogol—and Ukrainians figured among his most prominent followers, e.g., Hrebinka and Kuliš in their Russian writings. Adherents of this trend in the West included E.T.A. Hoffmann in certain of his later stories ("*Berliner Erzählungen*"), J. Janin in his articles and tales, Balzac, to some degree, and mainly Dickens in his early novels. Similar stylistic features were also to be found, interestingly enough, in tales with Ukrainian themes written by the Pole J. Kraszewski (*Ułana*, 1843) who stood mid-way between Romanticism and Realism.

4. The literature of the *naturalnaja škola* must not be labelled "naturalism." It was a style reflected in the early works of Turgenev, Dostoevskij, Gončarov and some other Russian writers who later moved on to Realism. The Ukrainian writers who were close to the *naturalnaja škola* included Ševčenko in his Russian stories (still unpublished at that time), and Kuliš in his Russian stories of the 1850s, and, to a degree, Marko Vovčok in certain of her Russian stories. Among the Russian poets, Nekrasov most approaches the style of the *naturalnaja škola*; there are also some echoes in the Ukrainian poems of Rudans'kyj. There is, however, less justification to create of the *naturalnaja škola* a separate niche in the history of Ukrainian literature than existed in the case of the Biedermeier style.

*The term "naturalism" was later used to designate completely different styles.

XIV.

REALISM IN UKRAINIAN LITERATURE*

1. What, in fact, is realism? The Realists often answered this question much too easily: "Realism is a depiction of reality as it really is." Such a response, unfortunately, engenders many misunderstandings, for every literary style draws on the images and colors of reality. Even works of fantasy have no other sources for their material but reality: no matter how Martians are depicted, they always look either like people or some other earthly animals or like machines or inanimate objects. The important thing is not where the Realists found their material, but *how* they portrayed it, and *which linguistic and stylistic devices* they used in the portrayal. Such devices have been the subject of this book throughout. The question now to be considered is: which devices were used by Realism in contrast to Romanticism, the style which it replaced.

First of all, of course, it is necessary to establish the qualities which made the Romantic style unique in comparison with its preceding epoch. In comparison with all literary development beginning with classical antiquity, Romantic literature was revolutionary. The substance of this revolution consisted in the rejection of those norms which had been considered compulsory for literary works and from which very few authors had allowed themselves to deviate.

*At the time I was preparing my book *Istorijsja ukrajins'koji literatury* (*A History of Ukrainian Literature*), I was unable to provide a concluding chapter on Realism. This was due, chiefly, to the fact that the libraries in which I was working, in Europe and in the United States, lacked the writings of the Ukrainian Realists. I wish here to present on a different scale than in the book proper, albeit in the form of a brief study, an outline of the literature of this period. I admit that this study will not be exhaustive and that it will probably have a considerable subjective coloration.

Since this examination is concerned with the distinctive features of a given author's entire creativity, only certain works of each author will be cited.

The writing of even the most nominal Romantic departed from ancient tradition. The names of the classical genres such as the ode, satire and *poema* were discarded and replaced with new genres: the ballad, mystery (Ševčenko's "The Dream" and "The Great Vault," and some works of Kuliš), romantic long poem (for its structure, see chapter on Ševčenko) and others. Even the external character of Romantic literature was a denial of the numerous prescriptions of the Classicist era. No longer did tsars and heroes appear—except in satirical contexts. No longer did the poet depict himself as a singer accompanying himself on the lyre. This image gave way to another: the poet as a national singer—a *bandurist* or *lirnyk*, a *perebendja* (garrulous poet-minstrel) who wanders about the world finding his throne in the steppe away from literature—to be replaced by a peasant cottage or abandoned ruins. The poet was not some sort of court poet-laureate. He was a potential leader of the people who might have been able to guide them to a better future; but in actuality he was either a persecuted exile or a prisoner of the government or of society. The reality of Russian life bestowed authenticity upon this new image as the poet became, in fact, a persecuted prophet.

The new features of Romantic literary works demonstrated to the reader that the essence of modern literature was freedom, specifically, *creative freedom*, untrammelled by any canons or traditions. Poets also liked to express this creative freedom by publishing works in the form of fragments and excerpts supposedly from unfinished works, but containing omissions, ambiguities and allusions unknown and, therefore, incomprehensible to the reader. Nevertheless, the freedom of the Romantic revolution did not go so far as to abandon all traditional ornaments of style. The technique of emphasizing the meaning of particular words and images by means of stylistic devices survived in the forms of hyperbole, the formation of words in an unusual manner or using them in a different sense (e.g., grotesque) and, most important, metaphor, the comparison of an object with another, seemingly unrelated but somehow analogous (maiden—flower, man—oak, eagle—rock, speech or writing—implements of battle). Such devices as metaphor were well known in folklore (song or tale) and were cultivated by the Romantics. They were rejected, however, by the literary revolution of Realism which replaced the metaphorical style of Romanticism with a different stylistic device—metonymy. The Realist did not compare one thing with another; instead, while keeping his object of depiction in mind, he described it by referring to something closely associated with it or to its surroundings (the Russian term *sreda* was sometimes used by Ukrainian Realists).

Metaphor and metonymy are both linguistic devices that are fundamental to

the creation of new words. Some metaphor-derived words include: *pero* (pen), recalling a time when this writing instrument was really a bird's feather (*pero*); *vydelka* (fork), by analogy with the farmer's *vyla* (pitchfork); *zručnyj* (dextrous), derived from *ruka* (hand), originally referring to objects easily held in the hand. The following are examples of words that were metonymically-created neologisms: *misto* (city), in the sense of the inhabitants of the city ("*Ves' Kyjiv zanepokojenyj*" ["All of Kiev was troubled"]); *skljanka* (glass), in the sense of its contents ("*Ja vypyv dvi skljanky čaju*" ["I drank two glasses of tea"]).

With the advent of Realism more information came to be known about an object—not through comparison but through expanding its depiction to include the origin of the object, its development, and its surroundings. A maiden was, therefore, not seen as a flower but as the child of a certain social class and a detailed description was provided of her childhood environment, her upbringing and her early life, etc. A person was to be defined according to his social class. Because of this requirement imposed on a work, that it contain such information about its characters, its dimensions were broadened and the surroundings became almost as important as the object itself. Realism thus was a "metonymic style": it is because of this that the sweep of Realist creations is much greater than that of Romantic writings. The imperative created for Ukrainian literature by these large-scale works was onerous indeed.

2. The emergence of Ukrainian Realism was associated with the ambiance of Russian Realism and, to a certain extent, with related trends in western Europe. Its appearance coincided with a period that was particularly difficult for Ukraine and characterized by turbulent conditions in all Ukrainian territories. In Austria serfdom was abolished in 1848. And in eastern Ukraine following the death of Nicholas I began the era of "great reforms" spearheaded by the abolition of serfdom here too, and by an easing of restrictions on the printed word. Both reforms brought consequences which were extremely important for the Ukrainian population of the tsarist empire. For (as often happens), as soon as some political improvement was achieved, the more immediate and limited aims of certain intellectual circles were exchanged for further and broader, albeit still Utopian, programs of reform which led to socialism and even to anarchism (in the true meaning of the word, directed toward the complete overthrow of the state). The proponents of the radical ideology lost interest to a certain extent in "moderate" reforms based on the still poorly developed, capitalist system. Their aim was to introduce a radical reconstruction of the social order, a goal they would bring about in conjunction with the other peoples of the empire. In pursuing this course, they often abandoned purely Ukrainian matters and entered into the formation of active Russian organizations. The very

primitive Ukrainian (illegal) political organization consisting of so-called *hromady* (communities) remained the focus for political moderates among whom were many eminent people, lacking, however, in political experience and the traditions of political action.

There are epochs in history which pose certain problems in some areas, such as that of linguistic development. The Ukrainian language faced such a problem in the post-Romantic period—how to develop so as to become the language of a “full-fledged” nation (discussed in the chapter on Classicism). It was imperative that the literary language develop so that it could serve all possible literary genres. While Ukrainian Classicism had established the foundations for the development of the literary language (Kotljarevs’kyj, Kvitka), Romanticism’s contribution lay to a large extent in freeing literature from the narrow genres to which Classicism had restricted it (travesty, satire, light comedy, fable). The development of the language then had to follow two directions. The first was that of linguistic enrichment or lexical expansion. The second was that of nuance and shading, for the language had to be suitable for use in broader cultural spheres than merely *belles-lettres*. It had to serve as the mode of expression for scholarly thought; it had to become the medium for political struggle. In order to achieve these aims, it was impossible to limit the language to the use of the biblical (Church Slavonic) lexicon. It was necessary to borrow from the folk language, and, on the basis of these words, to create neologisms as Kuliš had done. It was necessary to borrow from other languages as well, especially non-Slavic ones, and to create new words using the same methods already used for this purpose by other Slavic and non-Slavic languages.

In considering the ways in which Realism confronted the two problems of how to expand the lexicon and how to accommodate it to broader spheres, it should be realized that its conduct of the development of the literary language was somewhat circuitous. This deviation stemmed from the fact that Realism consciously limited literary themes to those spheres in which the Ukrainian language was already being used—the depiction of the village and its inhabitants, and, to a limited degree, the portrayal of a small-size city and certain intellectual circles who still used Ukrainian in their daily lives. This corresponded to “reality” and consequently was deemed to be “realistic.”

As might be expected, there were two currents which were encompassed within the boundaries of Realism: one which considered the task of linguistic development to be *only* the expansion of the lexicon on the basis of the popular language; the other which demanded the enrichment of stylistic devices so as to serve the wider cultural sphere as well as *belles-lettres*. But at this point it is necessary to examine the conditions under which the Ukrainian people were

living at this time. The Ukrainian language was used not only within the borders of tsarist Russia, but also across the frontier in Austro-Hungary, particularly in Galicia. In fact, Galicia and Bukovina were also the locations of journals and publishing houses whose existence was indispensable. In Russia, Ukrainian organs of the press had long ceased to function, having been supplanted by Russian publications. (Their language, to be sure, was accessible to a segment of Ukrainians because of the influences of the Russian school; even the first Ukrainian journal, *The Foundation*, appeared partly in Russian.) Because of this, Galician journals and publishing houses enjoyed the considerable cooperation of east-bank Ukrainians.

Certain obstacles, however, stood in the way of the union of the two parts of the Ukrainian territory. In the first place, both parts of the Ukrainian nation had long-standing linguistic traditions which dated back many decades. Second, the two parts of the Ukrainian people were torn apart by religion: Western Ukraine was dominated by the Uniate Church to which Eastern Ukraine was violently opposed. In Galicia, the Ukrainian population had to coexist with a Polish one which was strongly developed culturally. This struggle against Polish influence was as significant as that against Russian influence in the East. Some possibilities for cooperation between the two parts of the Ukraine did exist, and they were seized upon by the writers of Eastern Ukraine. However, West-Ukrainian publications encountered certain difficulties of circulation in Eastern Ukraine. For example, the use of Ukrainian terminology was mandatory in the West even in governmental and legal practice. But in Ukraine, the sphere of Ukrainian usage was considerably smaller in the 1870s and 1880s than it had been in the middle of the century. (The testimony of teachers and professors from the 1840s indicates that they did not have a good command of Russian at the time of their studies; the language of daily usage in small and middle gentry circles and in small cities, including often their Jewish population, was also Ukrainian in this early period.) However, during the latter decades, as Professor Shevelov has shown, the literary language of the East came to reflect the lexicon of Western Ukrainian to a considerable extent. The following are examples of such Galician words: *zymno* (cold), *zasada* (principle), *pryxył* (inclination), *rozryvka* (amusement), *pomnyk* (monument), *zaliznycja* (railway), *čemnyj* (polite), *kazkovyj* (fabulous), etc. The majority of Galician words appeared in publicistic works at the end of the century (see below). In every instance, the literature of Realism followed two directions: first of all, the path of vernacular purism (using words of common speech exclusively) and secondly, the path leading toward the expansion of the literary language so it might be used in all cultural spheres. As shall be seen, both directions found their followers.

3. It is altogether natural that the first representatives of Realism should be closely connected with the traditions of Romantic literature. For these traditions, blessed with the legacy of the founders of Romantic literature, particularly Ševčenko's, survived into the future. Among the poets most intimately associated with the traditions of folk poetry, songs, tales and anecdotes were, first, Leonid Hlibov (1827-93), known best of all as a fabulist who in his works made use not only of traditional fable plots, but of Ukrainian motifs to illustrate them; and Stepan Rudans'kyj (1834-73), author of many largely humorous songs ("Spivomovky"). Much more significant were the Bukovinian Osyp-Jurij Fed'kovyč (1834-88) and the Eastern Ukrainian writer Marko Vovčok (pseudonym of Maria Markovyč, 1834-1907).

As a native of Bukovina, Fed'kovyč began to write in both Ukrainian and German. A soldier, government official and editor of periodicals and books (in Lviv), he developed a broad literary activity. In addition to his verses, he wrote stories (published by Drahomanov in Kiev in 1876) and theatrical pieces which, however, remained unsuccessful. Quite apparent in his verses is the influence of Ukrainian folk song and of Ševčenko. In his prose works, the influence of Kvitka is still evident, although without the vulgarisms which offended the reader of the 1860s. Elements such as a sentimental sensitivity (an unhappy love often involved), occasional didactic moralism, and extended ethnographic depictions of folk customs, are all suggestive of works of earlier periods. It should be observed that there were also features of local dialect in Fed'kovyč's verses which made them hard to understand for Eastern Ukrainian readers.* Another facet of Fed'kovyč's activity was that of popularizer.

Substantial elements of Romantic style are also to be found in the numerous works of Marko Vovčok which were popular in both Eastern and Western Ukraine. It is a source of amazement to Ukrainian readers that this woman of Russian origin, who first became acquainted with Ukrainian life through her husband (the Ukrainian O. Markovyč who was associated with the Cyrillo-Methodians), managed to attain such an extraordinary command of Ukrainian vernacular. Her choice of themes for Ukrainian life could not yet be termed a sign of Realism; rather, it was still under the influence of the Ševčenko era, in particular, the influence of the plots of Ševčenko's ballads and long poems. Her *Narodni opovidannja* (*Folk Stories*), eleven in number, appearing in 1857, won the appreciation not only of Ševčenko, but of the Russian author whose stories

*The following are examples of such words: *ljuna* (*misjac'*—moon), *oz'meš* (*viz'meš*—you will take), *potočyly* (*zabraly/zaxopyly*—they marched away), *rukov* (*rukoju*—by hand), *obručkov* (*obručkoju/kablučkoju*—with an engagement ring), etc.

of peasant life were similar in tone to Vovčok's, I. S. Turgenev, an admirer of her Russian stories also. *Folk Stories*, depicting the fate of the Ukrainian people (especially women) under serfdom, appeared in 1859 in Russian translation. The later Ukrainian stories of Marko Vovčok were published the following year. While not showing any trace of Turgenevian influence, they bore the same basic tendency: the human figures and personal experiences of the peasants were portrayed in such a way as to preclude any right of the landowners to dominate them; nor were the masters depicted in any way as humanly superior to their "subjects." For the most part, the stories were narrated by a serf-woman, and are testimony to Marko Vovčok's exceptional skill in imitating the style of the living vernacular. To this end she used the images and figures of speech of folk songs and tales: "*Sonečko vže za synju horu zapalo*" ("The dear sun has already set behind the blue mountain"); a girl "*jak bylyna u poli*" ("like a blade of grass in the field"); "*Strepenulaš' jak syva zozulen'ka*" ("She shook herself like a gray little cuckoo"); "*Xoroša, jak zorja jasna*" ("She was as beautiful as a bright star"). This feature as well as certain allusions (*understood* by the readers of the day) to literary tradition (from Ševčenko to Shakespeare) distinguish the style of Marko Vovčok from the later style of more "consistent" Realists by the considerable role played by stylistic ornaments (e.g., metaphor). At times her plots also recall the motifs of folk songs. To these were subsequently added motifs from Ukrainian tales and legends transposed into the present (the idealized outlaw of "Karmeljuk"; "Lymerivna"). The later novel *Try doli* (*Three Destinies*) emphasizes psychological motifs much more strongly.

In addition to the Romantic elements in the style of Marko Vovčok, there was also a certain sentimental quality as well as a monochromatic characterization of the heroes (as "black" or "white"). Later the writer fell silent; although she would live much longer she rarely turned her attention to Ukrainian literary activity. Marko Vovčok's talent, which extended even to her Russian translations, was such that her works continue to be avidly read today by adults as well as children.

The legacy of Marko Vovčok also includes three feuilletons about Paris in which, interestingly, the author was unable to avoid foreign words or borrowings from the French. While she spent a considerable length of time in Western Europe, the question of the Europeanization of the Ukrainian language rarely confronted her. Recognizable words such as the following may be found in her feuilletons: *kafe*, *kofij*, *zuav*, as well as such neologisms as *pospilyčnyj* (*suspil'nyj*—social) and the fine creation "*cylošybne steklo*" (a picture window). But there are also such puzzling words as *nadryhunčyk*, *šasnuty*, *nevizna*. Admittedly these feuilletons were not destined for the same popular audience as were the stories.

It must be acknowledged that even representatives of late Ukrainian Realism could not free themselves from the influence of the style of Marko Vovčok. This may be observed in the early efforts of Panas Myrnyj in the 1870s; even more significant parallels may be drawn to the stylistic features in the early works of Ivan Nečuj-Levyč'kyj (1838-1918). A religious school instructor in both seminary and academy, and high school teacher mainly in territories outside Ukraine in the Russian pedagogical system, he first appeared in print in the Lviv *Pravda* (*Truth*) in 1868. By 1885 he had retired from teaching (when he was only forty-seven years old) and was engaged in literary activity exclusively. It is interesting that in his own early stories "*Dvi Moskovky*" ("Two Soldiers' Wives") and "*Rybalka Panas Krut*" ("The Fisherman Panas Krut"), Levyč'kyj followed Marko Vovčok's example in modeling his style on that of folk poetry: a mother weeps for her daughter "*jak horlycja za ditkamy*" ("like a turtle dove for her children"); "*jak ternočok čorni švydki oči*" ("quick black eyes like thorn berries"); "*jak dvi veselky dvi tonki čorni brovy*" ("two fine black eyebrows like two rainbows"). The most important feature, however, in these early works of this eminent Realist was the author's extraordinary skill in imitating popular speech, which he wanted to maintain free from all foreign influences. In Levyč'kyj's later works, elements of Romantic style disappeared practically altogether.

4. In truth, the first and most consistent representative of Realism *per se* was writing as early as the 1860s. However, his work remained unknown until the end of the Realist era, being published only in 1898. This first work of pure Realism, and practically devoid of all elements of Romantic tradition, was the autobiographical (to a certain degree) novel *Ljuborac'ki* by Anatol' Svydnyč'kyj (1834-71). Its appearance in 1898 created a strong impression on Ukrainian readers notwithstanding the fact that Realism was hardly a novelty to them. The novel, Svydnyč'kyj's major work (apart from minor contributions to periodicals), was written in the style of a chronicle, mainly as a long series of conversations. The nature of the chronicle also allowed the use of Polish and Russian expressions by individual characters. There are no idyllic scenes or positive heroes whatever in this chronicle novel, the account of an unfortunate clerical family—in particular, of the son who bears the author's name, Anatol'.

There was yet another Realist, the scholar and historian Orest Levyč'kyj (1849-1922), whom literary histories ignore for some reason. Written in a mixed language composed mainly of ancient Volynian and placed like real gems within a Russian text, his works appeared between 1875 and 1902. They included various "essays"—*Očerki vnutrennej istorii Malorossii* (*Essays on the Internal History of Little Russia*), *Očerki starinnogo byta Volyni i Ukrainy* (*Essays on*

the Ancient Way of Life of Volynia and Ukraine)—which provided vivid “realistic” tableaux of life in ancient Ukraine. In every instance, the most important component of Levyc’kyj’s style was his use of old Ukrainian of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

5. “Modern” Realism, almost totally devoid of elements of Romantic style, emerged in the 1870s with the work of I. Nečuj-Levyc’kyj. Not long after his first efforts, Nečuj-Levyc’kyj began to write stories which broke with Romantic tradition, and he rapidly became well known as an excellent story teller, interesting and lively—especially when he hid behind a narrator who was of the common people. His most successful stories and discourses were based on or narrated by women—not the sentimental, sensitive heroines of Marko Vovčok, but peasant or middle-class women, or even the educated wives of priests and professors. Levyc’kyj’s greatest skill, linguistic characterization, ensured moreover that the language of his works was not only truly popular but, above all, feminine speech. All of Levyc’kyj’s female characters are fine examples of those “evil women” immortalized in old anecdotes and jokes. They often begin as kind and compassionate young maidens; but as they grow old they become relentlessly venomous and embroiled in bitter conflicts which are unnecessary both for them and their husbands.

Nečuj-Levyc’kyj’s novels do not always have a definite plot: the work that is perhaps his best, *Kajdaševa simja* (*The Kajdaš Family*, 1879), does not even have a conclusion. The novel’s masculine characters do not evolve or change at all, while the women seem to fall under the sway of some sort of demons of spite and fractiousness. The double story “*Baba Paraska ta Baba Palažka*” (“*Baba Paraska and Baba Palažka*,” 1874) about the mutual accusations of two women who live in the same village is a testimony to Levyc’kyj’s linguistic skill. For the rhythm of the women’s language and their intonation dominates their accusations against one another so that a reader fluent in Ukrainian can read both monologs (over twenty pages in all) faultlessly, capturing the same tone and mood which the author wished to impart to his protagonists. Levyc’kyj’s earlier peasant novels included *Mykola Džerja* (1878), the tale of a peasant who seeks work in a foreign land, and *Burlačka* (*A Vagrant Girl*, 1881), the story of a girl who undergoes terrible hardships while working far from home; by the end of the novel, however (although not at the end of her life), she seems to be the only woman who has mellowed and achieved a certain equilibrium.

While it is unnecessary to enumerate all of Nečuj-Levyc’kyj’s stories which deal with peasant life, their frequent lack of a dominant idea (and—surprisingly for a Ukrainian writer—of humor) should be acknowledged. On the other hand, when he stepped beyond peasant themes or those dealing with the petty middle

class, as in the novel *Pryčepa* (*An Intruder*, 1869), Levyc'kyj lost his instinct for language. The poverty of his linguistic program stands out with extraordinary clarity in his attempts to portray the life of the intelligentsia: *Nad Čornym morem* (*On the Black Sea Coast*, 1890); that of the Old-World clergy and their families: *Starosvits'ki batjušky ta matušky* (*Old-Fashioned Clerics and Their Wives*, appearing in Russian translation in 1884, and in Ukrainian in 1888); and even academic circles (clearly the Kiev Theological Academy) in *Xmary* (*Clouds*, written around 1870 but not published until 1908). The difficulty consisted in the impossibility of creating vivid, authentic images of non-peasant life with the aid of an exclusively peasant language. None of Levyc'kyj's urban intellectuals, clerical families, as well as the relatives of professors and students, have either the words or expressions with which to articulate their thoughts (if, in fact, they have any thoughts). A similar case is that of the two professors: in every instance the one is depicted as a complete fool (an altogether invalid impression of Kievan Academy professors), while the other, a professor of philosophy (bearing the name of Daškevyč and modeled after the famous professor of philosophy, P. Jurkevyč, who later became the tutor of V. Solovev in Moscow) is unable to give any clear expression to his national ideas and fears. A young student with national and political inclinations is also depicted by external features only. In the same way, the discussions among the intellectuals in Kišinev are quite trivial (*On the Black Sea Coast*); there is only one character, a Greek, who is portrayed as a truly thinking person. The conversations of priests' families (*Old-Fashioned Clerics* . . .) are also generally of a petty nature, dealing with official duties, etc.; religious ideology never figures in their content. It is interesting that these novels often contain foreign words (unknown to peasants); however, these terms are almost always related to aspects of middle-class life such as dwellings, furnishings, food, dress—e.g., *al'tanka* (bower), *bufet* (buffet), *kanapa* (sofa), *punš* (punch, liquor), *rom* (rum), *akvavit* (liquor), *buket* (bouquet), *hirljanda* (garland), *lokony* (curls), as well as *fantastyčnyj* (fantastic), *narkotyčnyj* (narcotic), *fraza* (phrase), etc.

During the latter part of his life, however, Nečuj-Levyc'kyj frequently inveighed against the modernization of the Ukrainian literary language. In his polemics, published in special tracts, he showed himself favorable to the admission of Galician words of "genuinely popular dialects"; but occasionally his ideas led him to such formulations as "*Dlja literatury vzircem knyžnoho jazyka povynen buty imenno jazyk sil's'koji baby z jiji syntaksom*" ("The model of a literary language should, in fact, be the speech and syntax of a village crone"). Levyc'kyj's attack on "artificial" and "coined" words in modern Ukrainian was quite witty in places and could have made an impression on fairly broad circles

of young people and of provincial intelligentsia. However, the artistic defects of Levyc'kyj's own novels of the life of the intelligentsia made it impossible for his linguistic theories to be put into practice.

On a considerably higher spiritual level were the novels and tales of another author who employed the common language exclusively—Panas Myrnyj (pseudonym of Panas Rudčenko, 1849-1920). Attempts at translations from Russian literature were followed by publication of his story "*Lyxyj poputav*" ("It's the Devil's Doing") in the Lviv *Pravda* in 1872. By 1875 he had completed, with the collaboration of his brother (pseudonym Ivan Bilyk), the large novel *Xiba revut' voly, jak jasla povni* (*When One Has Enough, One Does Not Complain*) or *Propašča syła* (*Wasted Strength*) which was published in Geneva in 1880, but did not appear in Ukraine until 1903. It is the story of a peasant who, as a result of bitter experiences with the injustices of Russian society and administration, becomes a robber. The novel presents not only the figure of the hero, Čipka, but also broad social and political scenes as well as images of Čipka's contemporaries who, for the most part, have been reduced to passive figures. Čipka's wife, Halja, is presented as being in the same circumstances—which ultimately drive her to commit suicide. In its composition the novel adheres to the requirements of Realist stylistic theory: the author depicts the evolution of his hero together with the pre-history of his village and, in addition, he describes the figures of the Russian and Polish masters and landowners dating back to the period of serfdom. On the one hand the novel tries to convey an objective picture of reality. On the other it presents masterly satirical impressions of conditions in the villages and small towns—tableaux which, while not evoking the active opposition of the characters in the novel, did elicit such feelings in its readers. The banning of the novel in Russia was thus politically inevitable.

Over the course of a long period of time during which he published short stories dealing with various types of people from the city and the intelligentsia, Myrnyj worked on a second novel, *Povija* (*A Fallen Woman*), a rather "unfinished" piece of writing which he completed around 1905. This novel, too, is primarily not merely a portrayal of an individual and her fate—that of the heroine, Xrystja, who is driven into prostitution by circumstance. It is also a portrayal of the environment and the surroundings which thrust her onto this path. In addition to the heroine, other female characters are presented, some of whom share her fate. To some readers, the novel appeared to be an idealization of the village, whose positive qualities peculiar to the Ukrainian character were lost by its inhabitants only in the city. It was a false impression. The author was presenting a view of the new, post-reform village and was demonstrating that even here people were becoming degenerate under the influence of the new

conditions scarcely much better than the old. Then, the author changes his narration to the city where at every instance there is a conspicuous expansion of that village question which certain Realists would have wanted to retain: the problem of the village women in the city.

It was in Ukrainian theatre that this issue survived the longest. For, apart from its categorical obligations to the people, Ukrainian theatre was also characterized by grave literary defects, in particular the maintenance of the peasant problem exclusively and the cultivation of other, especially historical, themes on this same linguistic level. It is interesting to note that Realists such as Nečuj-Levyč'kyj and Myrnyj were unable to create "successful" plays which might have survived in the repertoire of Ukrainian theatre.

Of course, Myrnyj's works were not the only ones which, while known to merely a certain narrow circle of readers, were greatly significant in the awakening of national and political consciousness among those wider groups which they managed to reach from time to time. For Eastern Ukraine, however, works from the urban *milieu* and the intelligentsia were particularly important, as they emphasized the fact that the Ukrainian language, even if a peasant language, could become the language of the socially and politically concerned middle, upper and urban strata of the population. Even such minimal propaganda had great significance in Eastern Ukraine during this period.

6. To be sure, among the writers of the period of Realism there was no lack of adherents of the other trend either—that of the lexical extension of Ukrainian beyond quotidian language and peasant usage. It should simply be recognized that, for various reasons, society's familiarity with their views was much less than its knowledge of the views of Nečuj-Levyč'kyj and his supporters, which seemed so persuasive on first glance. There were, however, a large number of these writers—as shall be seen among those wider circles of the population in Eastern Ukraine which were able and which aspired to have access to certain works of Ukrainian literature and to the theatre.

Among the first of those who supported expansion of the function of the Ukrainian language were writers whose views reflected a belated Romanticism enlivened somewhat by a respect for the ideals of Realism. Their number included, for example, Olena Pčilka (Kosač), 1849-1930. While not opposed to increasing the number of vernacular words in the literary language, neither was this intelligent and independent writer against borrowing from other languages, including Slavic, nor the use of coined words and neologisms. She judiciously pointed out that the supporters of an exclusively popular language were, in fact, restricting the use of Ukrainian to private life and domestic usage, a warning which had already been given clear expression earlier (by Kostomarov, for

example). She declared "let our literary language accept coined words then, that is if there is a reason for it." In resisting linguistic stagnation and "narrow *narodnist'*," she opposed

the tendency to allow the national question to be the primary consideration always. And if this be the decision with regard to language, then all else must be treated in the same way . . . whether music or whatever, let the primary criterion for all be national: Consequently, even learning should not be encouraged; that philosophy which one of our peasants has is enough.

Moreover, she defended the Galician intelligentsia which created, as it were, its own language according to its cultural requirements.

Olena Pčilka prepared for her own independent work in the field of lexicon enrichment by doing translations of the tales of Hans Christian Andersen and of the stories of Gogol'. Later, she wrote original stories dealing with the life of people in the city, with the intelligentsia and with Ukrainian youth. Her works, which were published in Galician periodicals, won the appreciation of Ivan Franko despite the fact that her political views reflected only a moderate liberalism. Included among her accomplishments was the editorship of a Ukrainian language journal for children, particularly Eastern Ukrainian children (who did not understand Galician children's literature). Here too, she attempted to introduce neologisms, which were not always successful: such, for example, was her bid to replace an old folk word (itself a borrowing from the Byzantine), *kyt* (whale), with a barely suitable word, *vel'ryb*, modeled on the Czech. Considerably better were the neologisms Pčilka developed for intellectual language and also her borrowings from the Galician literary language. To her may also be ascribed the first use of such words as *mystectvo* (art), *peremožec'* (conqueror), *promenystyj* (radiant), *naležnyj* (belonging), *uročystyj* (solemn), *kultura* (culture), *atmosfera* (atmosphere). Also found in her work, however, are such rather unfelicitous neologisms as *zaharlyvyj* (zealous) instead of simple borrowings from foreign (particularly classical) languages such as *enerhijnyj* (energetic) from the Greek.

Pčilka's stories, which also appeared in separate collections (three in number from 1907 to 1911) were not especially strong literary works. Similarly, her theatrical pieces—like the plays of many other writers of the time—were either unsuccessful or denied stage presentation altogether. The stories which she published in the 1880s were concerned to a limited extent with village life, with which Pčilka was very familiar. But in a few tales ("Tovaryšky" ["Girlfriends," 1887], "Pigmalion," 1884) she touched upon cultural and political questions

registering a negative attitude toward the radical slogans of a segment of the Ukrainian intelligentsia of the day. Her tradition of Realism was particularly associated with the depiction of broad scenes and the detailed portrayal of characters as well as the attempt to understand their interior lives. The stories of Olena Pčilka are, in fact, good sources of information about Ukrainian life for the period from the 1870s to the 1890s. Later, at the beginning of the twentieth century, her works presented images of the new Ukrainian middle class and of the new type of landowner and industrialist. Pčilka (whose kin included Drahomanov and the famous poetess, Lesja Ukrajinka, her daughter) was sometimes attacked by Ukrainian critics and writers who belonged to the linguistic "school" of Nečuj-Levyč'kyj. The fact that she was interested in portraying the personal experiences of her characters led to the charge that she was unnecessarily imitating foreign models (mainly the Russian psychological novel of, for example, Lev Tolstoj and Dostoevskij). Also considered "unnecessary" was her cross-over to the sphere of Galician literature. She disliked symbolism (the "Decadents").

Another proponent of such views about the further development of Ukrainian literature was an older contemporary of Olena Pčilka, Myxajlo Staryč'kyj (1840-1904), the author of numerous verse and prose works in Ukrainian and Russian. His Ukrainian verse efforts were, to a certain extent, experiments in the use of Ukrainian as a "cultivated language." Like Olena Pčilka, he began by translating foreign writers (as well as the well-known Russian and Polish poets) such as Heine, Goethe, Byron, Hugo and the prose tales of H.C. Andersen. These attempts were rather weak in the main for, generally, even the works of secondary poets are difficult to translate adequately. Frequently, Staryč'kyj had to use words which merely provided verse lines with a certain rhythm. He also employed neologisms, the creation of which is the province of only the most gifted poets; consequently, his "coined words" often were objects of derision for his readers. The most amazing of these words, however, were not Staryč'kyj's own inventions; they were the contrivance of witty critics and parodists. Nor were his neologisms especially bold: *bajdužist'* (indifference), *mučen'* (martyr), *tružen'* (toiler), *dohidec'* (a useful person), *zradectvo* (treachery), *rozdoljy* (expansive), *šumljavyj* (rustling), *iskrytysja* (to sparkle), *poryvannja* (striving). Several were understandable only from their contexts: *žaxnyj* (frightful), *strymčak* (restrained character). He also sometimes used rare words from the folk language. These, however, seemed artificial to his readers; they included: *ketjah* (cluster), *šarity* (to dawn), *uščuxnuty* (to diminish), etc. Staryč'kyj's efforts clearly demonstrated that the coming of new words required not only a special gift *per se*, but also the ability to introduce them into works which will

remain memorable. Quite unmemorable, however, are Staryc'kyj's verse attempts which seem to lack some essential quality—lightness or a musical quality or, possibly, cleverness of construction or of particular expressions. Staryc'kyj's best verses, perhaps, were his translations of Serbian epic songs although here, too, experts may detect many deviations.

Staryc'kyj's dramatic works had a somewhat paradoxical fate: not only were they presented on stage in other than their original authorized form, but Staryc'kyj himself (for reasons to be discussed later) was forced to contribute to the changes in them—or, it might be said, to their ruin.

The Ukrainian language prose works of Staryc'kyj dealt mainly with peasant themes. The new post-reform village was portrayed without any idealization of the peasants and without excessive ethnographic details. A few tales of peasant life as well as many of his stories about the petty intelligentsia (especially theatrical artists) were written in Russian. Staryc'kyj also wrote novels and tales dealing with Ukrainian history—the seventeenth century, chiefly, but also the eighteenth century uprising—that were very successful. But, despite the author's source studies, his depiction of events often seems rather primitive, stemming in part from the mistaken notion of the complete and everlasting unity of the Ukrainian people. It was a point of view which dominated Ukrainian *belles lettres* from the time of Gogol's *Taras Bul'ba* (although Kuliš in *The Black Council* had attempted, not without success, to destroy this idea). Because of difficulties with language, among other things, Staryc'kyj published some of his historical tales in Russian. The large number of Staryc'kyj's works which were written in Russian is proof not only that the "coining" of words was not a matter for every poet, but also that the nature of readers in Eastern Ukraine was such that they could not easily grasp these neologisms.

Still other writers contributed to the enrichment of the Ukrainian language. A notable example from Eastern Ukraine was Borys Hrinchenko (1863-1910), whose works dealt with peasant material and, in addition, some foreign "Western" themes. Also important were his numerous translations and popularizing efforts (e.g., works on geography), as well as his collecting of ethnographic materials and, finally, his publication of a dictionary of the Ukrainian language (in fact, he was only the coordinator of material collected by voluntary researchers).

Another Eastern Ukrainian prosaist worthy of note was Volodymyr Leontovyč (pseudonym, Levenko, 1866-1938). His well-written stories treated the life of professionals and landowners in whose Ukrainianization he laid great store. They presented a large number of social problems, but practically ignored the personal (especially the erotic) experiences of their main characters.

A different situation prevailed in Western Ukraine. There was no need, here, to campaign for the widening of the literary language into all cultural spheres. On the contrary, forces existed which demanded such an extension: primarily these were governmental interests which feared expansion of Russia or of "Russophilism." Ukrainian society for its part was anxious about the broadening spheres of influence of the Polish language which, despite all obstacles, was making inroads among the mixed populations of the cities and was already being reflected in the pronunciation of Ukrainian. (While on a theatrical tour in Galicia before the war, 1914, the famous actor Hnat Jura reported hearing the children of his Galician colleagues saying "*si smije*" instead of the Eastern Ukrainian "*smijet'sja*" [he laughs].)

The Eastern Ukrainian who stood closest to Galician literary life was O. Konys'kyj (1836-1900), a publicist and biographer of Ševčenko, as well as a writer of Russian stories. Tymofij Borduljak (1863-1938), a Catholic priest and writer of stories based chiefly on peasant material, felt obliged to attribute to his own peasant background the fact that there was a certain one-sidedness in his work; and, in imitation of Nečuj-Levyč'kyj's lame argument, he also imputed the linguistic limitations of his stories to his origins. Foremost among the many, although not always recognized, collaborators of periodicals or publishers of their own work should be cited Natalja Kobryns'ka (1855-1920). An unquestionably talented author, she began writing stories of a traditional, realistic character dealing with the people. Then in the 1890s she turned to stories or "fairy tales" whose psychological and symbolic content attested a relationship to Ukrainian Modernism—a trend which, as shall be seen, did not sunder ties with Realism in any violent or thoroughgoing manner—as was the case in Polish and Russian literature.

Of course, the leading writer of Galicia was incarnated in the person of Ivan Franko (1856-1916). However, he did not stand in any way at the head of Galician literature; for he was a socialist, a fact which led many Galician writers to avoid him and others to become his declared enemies. Franko was a talented prosaist as well as poet, although his poetry developed further and in many more directions than did his prose works. He was also a fine, diligent and learned Slavist whose works were admired even among those people indifferent to his literary activity, and which have retained their importance to the present day.

Franko shared completely the views of Olena Pčilka and others regarding the development of the language. Moreover, the role he played not only in Galician but also, by all accounts, in Ukrainian literature as a whole, was as significant as that of Ševčenko. It is scarcely worthwhile to attempt any summary characterization of Franko's creativity. Nevertheless, for readers aware

of Franko's importance, mention should be made of his particular place in Ukrainian Realism and in its development, especially in the history of Ukrainian verse.

Franko did not stop at gaining a place for Realism in Western Ukraine which already had a firm tradition (although neither old nor brilliant) in literature and journalism. He also had to battle to justify his own linguistic position and, as well, to fight for a certain political ideal which at first seemed hopeless to his Galician contemporaries—socialism. Only the incredible creative energy of Franko could have taken up these different tasks at one time—problems which each require all the strength and devotion of the individual. Franko's Realism is not completely illustrated by his literary works; he also presented his concept of Realism in a theoretic treatise. This was not a form that had been used by writers in Eastern Ukraine where Realism had crept imperceptibly—not without the considerable influence of Russian literature—into well prepared ground. Franko's notion of Realism demanded of him certain large goals. Although he labeled himself a "microscopist," a writer who sees and portrays details, this was not his aim. He wanted, rather, to demonstrate "that which was universal, eternal and immortal in the particular, the partial, and the accidental." This is, in fact, a better and clearer description of Realism than the term "typization," a designation applicable only in circumstances where there is sufficient material to allow the portrayal of types. Franko, an early, even "premature," Ukrainian socialist "acquired the habit of discovering the entire world in a drop of water," of viewing the *minutiae* of life through his creative microscope. Because of his closer proximity to the European world he was able to look through his microscope into the future ("microscopic astronomy") which at that time had touched the Ukraine only fleetingly. Some Eastern Ukrainian poets also considered themselves socialists, but their socialism was oriented toward the altogether unsocialistic village. Franko, however, expressed his hopes for a proletarian (scientific) socialism, and with much superior force as illustrated by his striking and expressive tableaux *Boryslavs'ki opovidannja* (*Boryslav Stories*). He supported the Eastern Ukrainians in their linguistic struggle as a matter of course, and to the extent that he studied the language, including that of Nečuj-Levyč'kyj. Stylistically, however, he was schooled in the West (which in no way lessens his merits)—or, to be more specific, he had to create his own style. It was only with Lesja Ukrajinka that Franko was connected—but this was through a certain world view.

It should be remembered that Franko was also a scholar and publicist (his research into the different linguistic devices used in these various branches of the literary language deserves further study). This accounts for the particular

attention he paid to investigating the beginnings and sources of conflicts—whether contemporaneous or future. He delighted, for example, in stories about children and he provided for the adult characters of his prose detailed descriptions of their motivations. In addition, he turned to the thirteenth century in order to find the sources of contemporary life (“*Zaxar Berkut*”). Franko viewed reality, therefore, from a loftier perspective than most—that of a literary master who was both a scholar and a political person as well as an artist, although the reader saw nothing but the latter.

Franko’s psychological depiction was peculiarly characteristic of the author: while he perceived some affinity with Myrnyj’s handling of the style, the work of the latter was less brilliant as well as more positive. In his struggle against primitivism of form and content, Franko sought his standards outside Ukraine: the psychological skills of Tolstoj, Turgenev and even Dostoevskij were the models he set himself. He observed the social conflicts dividing the Ukrainian people and portrayed them as no one else had done (although these antagonisms had been perceived by Kuliš, a Romantic, and quite unlike Franko in his depiction of the past in *The Black Council*). These vivid pieces (e.g., “*Perexresni stežky*” [“The Crossroads”])—are the finest results of Franko’s “microscopic astronomy.” Not only did Franko present certain human types in his work; social groups too were described: as well as the peasantry and the proletariat he portrayed the Ukrainian and foreign bourgeoisie, modern capitalists and the clergy. The rich variety of his depiction approaches the symbolic quite often. However, Franko should not, therefore, be regarded as a “symbolist,” a label which cannot be affixed to Gorky considerably later. Soviet critics writing about Gorky’s connection with Franko seem to assume that Franko was Gorky’s disciple, forgetting that the latter wrote at a much later date. Or alternately, such criticism treats Franko’s significance as consisting merely in the fact that Gorky was drawn to make some quite trivial remarks about him later.

While Franko produced approximately one hundred pieces of prose (including nine longer novels), he was also the author of works of poetry which often lead the reader into the living, intimate world of the poet’s experiences. However, his collections are so different in form and style that reading the series of them produces the impression of having encountered a succession of separate, individual poets. This was not because of any change in the poet or his philosophy. It was, rather, the result of a development in form, and of a union of lyrical motifs with motifs from the other spheres of Franko’s activity, including the publicistic (*Polemični virši* [polemical verses]) and the scholarly (see, for instance, *Mij izmaragd* [My Emerald], 1885 and 1911 as well as other collections). Such an interest in form was uncommon among Ukrainian Realistic

poets (except for Staryc'kyj's not particularly remarkable efforts), and even more rare among their Russian counterparts. Franko employed many different verse forms: apart from his sonnets (including the prison series) and tercets dealing with various subjects, he imitated classical meters (Horace) such as the epigrammatic couplet and traditional Ukrainian forms (e.g., *spivomovky*). In *My Emerald*, he not only used themes and titles taken from ancient Ukrainian collections, but also presented tales which were imitations of apocryphal stories (for example, the tale about the drunkard whom they had to admit into paradise, or the parodies of hagiographies such as that of Saint Grozdij from the south Slavic tradition transformed by Franko into Saint Seledij). He also translated and imitated classical and Hindu works as well as numerous Western and Slavic works.

Franko's verses date back to the 1870s with the publication in 1887 of the major collection *Z veršyn ta nyzyn* (*From Heights and Depths*; enlarged second edition, 1893). Then there followed the collection *Zivjale lystja* (*Withered Leaves*, 1896), *My Emerald* (1897), *Iz dniv žurby* (*From the Days of Sorrow*, 1900), *Semper tiro, Davne j nove* (*The Ancient and the Recent*, a 1911 reworking of *My Emerald* supplemented with the political *Iz zloby dnja* [*Out of the Evil of the Day*]); and finally *Iz lit mojeji molodosti* (*From the Days of My Youth*, 1914). Within the collections were lengthy cycles and individual poems ("Vyšens'kyj" in *From the Days of Sorrow*), although "Mojsej" ("Moses"), a poem with extensive political symbolism, appeared separately in 1905. Indeed, an interesting political orientation characterizes much of Franko's poetry. Humor, satire and political polemics are all features of his earliest works, such as *Kamenjari* (*The Stonecutters*, 1878). And his first collection opens with the characteristic poem "Vičnyj revoljucioner" ("Eternal Revolutionary") whose title refers to "Spirit," the nature of which is developed in later images: science, thought and freedom.

In the twentieth century, the poetic collections of Franko together with Lesja Ukrajinka's dramatic poems of the same period were hailed by the Modernists as their own. Like Ukrajinka's works, Franko's collections and separate poems bore titles taken from foreign languages: *Semper tiro*, *Excelsior*, *Ex nihilo*, *Plain Air*. For the Modernists (and "Decadents"—a label incorrectly applied to Modernists in general, to second-rate polemicists, and even to Franko), such foreign designations were a means of setting themselves apart from the simple reader.

Franko's creativity, too, was aimed at the intellectuals—who, however, may indeed have sprung from the common people. The times had already produced such people! Moreover, Franko tried constantly to adapt his language to Eastern

Ukrainian norms. Consequently, it was no impediment for the reader to encounter in the national-tragic poem "*Ivan Vyšens'kyj*" the Galician, student expression "*spik mene*" for *zrizav na ispyti* (to fail in an examination), as is said in Eastern Ukraine. Other examples include the descriptions of the church bells on Mount Athos: "*oklykajes' Vatoped*" "*rozlyvajes' Iveron*" for the Eastern Ukrainian *vidklykajet'sja* and *rozlyvajet'sja*—to be sure the latter word was rarely used here to describe church bells. Franko always wanted to be not just a regional poet but a poet of universal Ukrainian stature; he achieved his goal.

Mention might be made here of Franko's pupils, in particular, Olha Kobyljans'ka (1863-1942): ultimately, however, she must be placed among the Modernists.

7. The theatre played a distinguished part in the history of Ukrainian Realistic literature. To some degree this corresponded to the role played by the theatre among some other Slavic nations; but, on the whole, nowhere else did theatre acquire such significance as it did in Ukraine. At times here it seemed to stand at the very center of literary development—a situation which, unfortunately, did not accurately reflect the true literary value of the dramas. However, the authors alone were not to blame for this. Rather, general practice was such that the plays of the leading writers (as discussed above) did not reach the stage in Eastern Ukraine; or if, as with the works of Staryc'kyj, they did achieve stage presentation, their authors were obliged, by imperatives not limited to censorship, to lower their quality.

Indeed, in addition to the usual censorship, there existed a special theatrical censorship capable of forbidding the presentation of plays approved by the regular censorship and already in print. Beyond these, a censorship of local authorities existed which could prevent the mounting of plays passed by the other two. But there was also the "censorship" of Ukrainian theatre itself: for, while Ukrainian theatre was able to play an important role in the development of Ukrainian consciousness, it failed to contribute to its elevation and, indeed, actually lowered it. The illusion was, therefore, engendered that within the limits of the Russian empire no "complete" Ukrainian nation existed or could ever exist. (For a discussion of this notion see chapter on Ukrainian Classicism above.) In fact, the reason Ukrainian theatre had such a peculiar influence is contained in the quality of the dramatists, in the influence of the older Ukrainian theatrical tradition and, perhaps most important, in the low cultural level of the audiences attending Ukrainian theatrical productions. This statement deserves further elaboration.

The history of the Ukrainian theatre is a long one. Its vernacular tradition alone dates back to the first attempts at *intermedia* by the Baroque Polish and

Ukrainian Church Slavonic theatre. Following these were the comedies of Kotljarevs'kyj and Vasyľ Hohol'. Moreover, it is clear that the story tellers and narrators of real-life anecdotes (*komiky*, in whom Nečuj-Levyč'kyj was interested) were the predecessors of such famous Ukrainian actors as Karpo Solenyk (1811-51) and Myxajlo Ščepkin (1788-1863). The later, however, acquired their fame only partly through the small number of Ukrainian plays then in existence, but mainly through works in Russian, e.g., those of Nikolaj Gogol' and even of Šaxovs'koj; accordingly, the talent of such actors was uselessly forfeited. In addition, there were the rather primitive plays of Kvitka and such forgotten authors as Topolja, Kuxarenko, etc. Another factor was that the first Ukrainian presentations were amateur affairs. At the end of the 1850s they were being produced by Marko Vovčok and her husband, O. Markovyč; at the same time amateur productions were being organized in Černihiv and Kiev.

The founding of a permanent theatrical troupe resulted from the initiative of Kropyvnyč'kyj in Bobryneč' and of the brothers Tobilevyč in Jelizavet (Jelizavetgrad). Again there emerged the problem, not uncommon in the history of literature, that the theatrical qualities of plays do not necessarily always correspond to their literary qualities. Even the amateur artists were dissatisfied with attempts to mount older plays (e.g., Kvitka's "Bilingual," Russo-Ukrainian plays about Šelmenko, and Ševčenko's "*Nazar Stodolja*"). New plays were required. From the beginning they were provided by the amateur Kropyvnyč'kyj. Somewhat later it became clear that one of the Tobilevyč brothers (pseudonym, Karpenko-Karyj) was an even better theatrical author (although hardly notable as a literary artist). These plays were to the complete satisfaction of his brothers as amateurs, and also suited the new actresses, amateurs too, very much. As well as the Tobilevyč brothers, who appeared on stage as Sadovs'kyj and Saksahans'kyj, Kropyvnyč'kyj and Karpenko-Karyj were also fine actors. The performances of these actors and actresses were highly popular not only with the Ukrainian public but also in foreign cities (St. Petersburg) and among audiences generally neutral or even hostile toward Ukrainians. These successes outside Ukraine coincided with long periods during which Ukrainian theatre was prohibited within the country and its leading figures were often subjected to persecution by the authorities.

Because he lacked a good education, M. L. Kropyvnyč'kyj (1840-1910), a native of the Xerson region, had to earn his living as a court clerk. His acting career dated from 1871 which marked the beginning of association with various Russian troupes which also presented Ukrainian plays from time to time. In 1874 he had occasion to work in Galicia, an experience which contributed to his development as a theatrical figure. After 1881, Kropyvnyč'kyj organized a

Ukrainian troupe in Eastern Ukraine and visited the major regions of the Russian Empire. By the 1860s he had already begun to mount his own plays ("*Daj sercu volju, zavede v nevolju*" ["*Give Your Heart Freedom and It Will Enslave You*"], 1863, later rewritten) as well as other pieces (plays based on themes by Ševčenko: *Nevol'nyk* [*The Captive*] and Gogol' [*Taras Bul'ba*]), and to write some original dramas ("*Doky sonce zijde-rosa oči vyjst'*" ["*Until the Sun Rises, the Dew Will Corrode the Eyes*"], "*Hlytaj abož pavuk*" ["*The Profiteer or the Spider*"], etc. Then at the end of his life he started to write plays dealing with contemporary subjects (war).

Kropyvnyč'kyj possessed an absolute power evident not only in his knowledge of a scene but in his ability to convey primitive humor as in his extraordinarily popular comedy "*Po reviziji*" ("*After the Inspection*") based on the experiences of village "bureaucracy." However, an examination of the content of the individual plays reveals that the author was merely presenting pictures of social oppression which were already common knowledge ("*Hlytaj*") as well as extremely primitive depictions of tragic tension which even his contemporaries treated sceptically as "melodramas." Nevertheless, with a view to the enthralled audiences who belonged to the real "people," that public which could be taught but whose tastes could not be easily accommodated, Kropyvnyč'kyj, as was the tradition in Ukrainian theatre, combined dramas of tragic intensity with songs and dances—scenes which Ukrainian intellectuals characterized thus: "*Vypjemo horilky—potancjujemo*" ("We'll drink our brandy, then we'll dance"). It thus became necessary for Ukrainian troupes to maintain dancers, singers, as well as the almost circus-like *komiky*. The latter were particularly noted for their improvisations—their own comic scenes placed within any play whatever; for example, such a *komik* (often very good) might stand in front of a tavern assuming the tragic tone of a Hamlet and pondering the questions "To go, or not to go" (into the tavern) or "To drink, or not to drink." Kropyvnyč'kyj was also the creator of comic female types as well as individual scenes of verse declamations.

Admittedly, Kropyvnyč'kyj, with his own productions, demonstrated to certain segments of the urban population that the Ukrainian theatre was an authentic theatre and that Ukrainian was a literary language. On the other hand, however, virtually the entire character of this theatre was a throw-back to the era of Kotljarevsk'kyj or even earlier, to that of the interludes. It also invited the imitation of theatrical entrepreneurs who saw that Ukrainian theatre could become a good business and who either shamelessly abbreviated Ukrainian plays or combined their own works. A favorite play of the time was "*Pan mirošnyk abo satana u boščci*" ("*Master Miller or a Satan in a Cask*"). Ukrainian intellectuals

were later stirred to combat such entrepreneurs whom Vynnyčenko collectively called "Harkun-Zadunajs'kyj."

Only in certain respects can Karpenko-Karyj (pseudonym of I. Tobilevyč, 1845-1907) be compared with Kropyvnyč'kyj. From the beginning he resembled Kropyvnyč'kyj for what they both lacked—serious ideas about the themes they depicted in their works. However, Karpenko also imitated some of Kropyvnyč'kyj's negative features—perhaps because of the successes which, somehow, the very defects of Kropyvnyč'kyj's theatre brought him.

Karpenko-Karyj first began working as a minor government official. However, he was dismissed because of unreliability and sent to Novočerkask in 1884, and later (1889) to his own *xutir* where he devoted his time to his self-education and to literary activity. He worked diligently until his serious illness in 1904, producing eighteen plays and a number of paraphrases of foreign works. His repertory alone enabled Ukrainian theatres to exist without seeking for other, foreign material.

The first works of Karpenko-Karyj, whose theatrical career proper was begun in conjunction with his brothers, were ethnographic plays based on peasant life. Although the social motifs which he developed were commonplace, the author's grasp of a scene served him well: thus, every play had attractive masculine and feminine roles and was well constructed. However, in the tradition of Kropyvnyč'kyj, they contained that peculiar mixture which combined tragedy with songs and dancing (and at that time the directors added even more of these elements to their productions). Only the last plays of Karpenko-Karyj rose above the mediocre level. However, at the end of the nineteenth century, it was too late for plays of this type. While readers were impressed by the variety of character-types (some already dated) in the play "*Čumaky*" ("*Wagoneers*," 1897), the main problem of the work—human happiness—was, unfortunately, posed in a rather primitive manner. It was scarcely necessary at that point in time to declare that happiness does not rest in money!

It was during an earlier period that Karpenko-Karyj had presented his best works which could have built a fine theatrical career: "*Martyn Borulja*" (1886), "*Xazjajin*," ("*The Landlord*," 1900), and "*Sujeta*" ("*Vanity*," 1903). To this list might be added the tendentious but well-written play "*Ponad Dniprom*" ("*On the Dnieper*," 1897), dedicated to attempts of Ukrainian populists of the time to organize peasant associations. As it happened, however, it was not until after the author's death that his plays received first-rate performances. It was only then that actors appeared who were interested in playing the role of more than just a simple naive peasant (or worse, peasant woman).

While these, the better plays of Karpenko-Karyj, were no longer dependent

on the motif of drinking and the presence of dancers, they had not yet dispensed with a humor that was still very primitive. They had at their base—perhaps in consideration of their peasant audiences—an old-fashioned didacticism. Martyn Borulja's abortive attempt to prove his noble descent results in psychic instability; but were passions such as his very typical? In "*The Landlord*," Terentij Puzyr (like the hero of an earlier play, "*Sto tysjač*" ["*A Hundred Thousand*," 1889]), an already wealthy man introduces husbandry into his large estates, making them into well-organized "economies." He takes shameless advantage of his farm laborers ignoring their tearful entreaties which reach him through his daughter; he is incapable of associating with the intelligent people of his area. Here, Karpenko-Karyj supposedly foresees the beginnings of a popular movement against the exploitation of such proprietors. However, was this type of wealthy Ukrainian always the rule? Indeed, at that time, the Ukrainian cultural movement itself was actually being supported by rich landowners such as Čykalenko and Symyrenko. The author's weakest moralizing occurs in "*Vanity*," the play most popular with the children (although with adults as well) of the older generation. The children of the well-to-do peasant Barylčenko received a good education; however, his son, a school inspector, feels ashamed of his parents when they visit his city lodgings because of their peasant dress and their use of Ukrainian. But here, too, the audiences must have asked: is it always thus? And, from this point of view, should children therefore be denied a higher education and be left in the "peasant" condition of their parents? The overly primitive although quite brilliantly demonstrated moral found in these, the better plays of Karpenko-Karyj, had the effect, at the beginning of the twentieth century, of contributing to the misunderstanding, and even to impeding the development of the Ukrainian village.

Plays having historical subject matter were also part of Karpenko-Karyj's repertoire: "*Palyvoda 18 st.*" ("*Madcap of the 18th Century*," 1893), "*Lyxa iskra*" ("*Evil Spark*," 1896), "*Sava Čalyj*" (1899), and "*Handzja*" (1902). While the amount of Ukrainian patriotism in them is considerable, there is little comprehension of historical events (in "*Handzja*," the political conflict between Dorošenko and Xanenko is reduced to that of rivalry over a woman, Handzja). But historical dramas provided material for colorful productions with pseudo-historical costumes and decor and fantastic figures with incredible whiskers and tufts, etc. In effect, it was a very unfortunate regression to the theater of pre-Ševčenkian times.

The fact which most astonishes the contemporary reader is that the followers of the theatrical tradition of Kropyvnyčkyj should number among them such a supporter of the cultural development of the Ukrainian language as

Myxajlo Staryc'kyj (1840-1904). The legacy of this cultural aristocrat, a translator of "*Hamlet*" (unpublished), includes several plays which later become Ukrainian favorites of the "Harkun-Zadunajs'kyj" type as well as the creation of a theatrical troupe which he himself headed. His Ukrainian plays were adapted to the level of the audiences of the day. Although he also wrote historical plays, his theater was characterized by such trappings as amazingly long whiskers, trousers as wide "as the Black Sea" and embroidered shirts, and—in his tragedies—singing and dancing. Such external effects remained a facet of Staryc'kyj's work until the end of his life.

As has already been noted, Staryc'kyj was a supporter of the ideas of Olena Pčilka concerning the Ukrainian language's need for cultural elevation. Yet in his own theatrical works he submitted to the examples of Kropyvnyč'kyj. And, in several cases, he "amended" his works by augmenting their ethnographic ornaments. The only explanation possible is that he was impressed by the success enjoyed by Kropyvnyč'kyj's plays. In this mold was Staryc'kyj's immensely popular "*Jak kovbasa ta čarka, to mynet'sja i svarka*" ("*With Sausage and Liquor, the Quarrelling Will Pass,*" 1873), a vaudeville differing from his famous comedy "*After the Inspection*" only by its lack of even the minimal (critical) ideology found in the latter play. Staryc'kyj's other plays (not all of which reached the stage), while equally as popular, were among the worst things in the repertoire of the Ukrainian theater. These were "*Ne sudylos'*" ("*It Was Not Destined,*" 1881, first performed in 1884) where the author drew a skeptical portrayal of populist liberals; "*Oj ne xody, Hrycju, ta j na večornyci*" ("*O, Don't Go to the Party, Hryc,*" 1887) which depicts the tragic fate of Hryc' against a background of song and dance; "*U Temrjavi*" ("*In the Darkness,*" 1892), a play dealing with the village milieu; as well as "*Za dvoma zajcjamy*" ("*Chasing Two Hares,*" 1883) which is set in the city and "*Talan*" ("*Fate,*" 1893), a play dealing with the life of intellectuals, specifically the fate of an actress; and later historical plays, "*Xmel'nyč'kyj*" (1897), "*Oborona Buši*" ("*The Defense of Buša,*" 1899), characterized by an incredible idealization of Cossack leaders. Political and social motifs may be found in Staryc'kyj's plays. But, in articles and private letters, Staryc'kyj wrote primarily about the necessity of scenic effects, colorful ethnographic material, etc. With such precepts, the theater could hardly become an educational medium for the people, much less for the intelligentsia.

The fate of the theater was altogether different in Western Ukraine where for a long time there simply was no thriving theatrical life. Travelling companies existed on translations and borrowings (from the Austrian theater). Even Franko, the author of several plays himself, was unable to bring it life. For, blind

to the weaknesses of Eastern Ukrainian theater, he envisaged that Galician theater should stage concrete representations of contemporary events. The majority of his plays written in the 1890s and consisting of four complete dramas and a few minor theatrical pieces were long considered to be nothing more than reading material. Only "*Ukradene ščastja*" ("*Stolen Happiness*") received stage presentation—in Lviv in 1893 and in Kiev in 1904; in Eastern Ukraine its real influence and meaning were not felt until recent times.

Indeed, the fate of the Ukrainian theater was dependent not only upon its authors or its actors, but also upon the consumers of its art. In this fact lay the tragedy of Eastern Ukrainian Realistic theater. One wonders what success Ukrainian theatrical productions might have achieved had they been even somewhat restrained in their use of singing and dancing, had they refrained from placing them in such contexts where they destroyed almost completely the edifying nature of a scene. Rarely did the peasants of the city attend theater in Eastern Ukraine. Rather, it was a diversion for the petty middle-class and the servant class; later, after 1905, soldiers were also admitted into Ukrainian theaters. In this way the respect of Ukrainian youth for "its theater" was lost; it waned gradually, but the principal consequence was that the theater had forfeited its influence. It remained little more than an opportunity to hear the Ukrainian language in a social situation and, at that, to observe the lack of comprehension of the illiterate audiences—their laughter at tragic scenes or for no reason at all other than hearing a language which for them was not only unaccustomed but also, for their society, inadmissible. Such a state of affairs reduced intelligent young people to despair and to a sense of national shame and disgrace.

8. The role played by poetic verse in the literary consciousness of the Realist period was clearly an important one. It is interesting, however, that apart from the work of Franko it did not produce anything *exceptional*. Models of good Realistic poetry were provided by the already cited Hlibov and Rudans'kyj, the former adopting the older (Classicist) form of the fable, while the latter (in his *Humoristic Poems*) followed the example of the peasant anecdote (with its grotesque exaggerations of bribery, injustice and masters' whims as in "*Jixav jakos' zasidatel' . . .*" ["A Certain Juror Went Riding By . . ."]). Original creations, not borrowings, these verses paralleled those of the famous Russian Realist poet Nekrasov. Until the end of the century, the poetry of Franko received only minimal response in Eastern Ukraine. The figure of Staryc'kyj as a lyric poet also remained unknown to the majority of the public.

There was a definite need in Ukraine for a verse poetry accessible to the broader circle of readers: such a lyric was the song (*pisnja*). During the Romantic

period it was adapted (turned into a folk song) to a great number of poems; the process continued into the period of Realism. Yet, curiously, Ševčenko's revolutionary formal innovations in this verse were practically ignored. Hence, while the number of poets who left their mark on the history of Ukrainian song was considerable, not all of their work was original. The words of the song "*Koly rozlučajut'sja dvoje*" ("When the Couple Comes to Separate") is merely M. Slavyns'kyj's translation of a poem by Heine (its melody, a sentimental deformation of Schubert). Representative of the lyric poetry of Galicia were the numerous works of S. Vorobkevych (1836-1903) who was also a composer (he set to music some of Ševčenko's lyrics). Some of the poets of Eastern Ukraine who might be mentioned are P. Hrabovs'kyj (1864-1902), I. Manžura (1851-1893), Volodymyr Samijlenko (1864-1925). While the legacy of these and other poets included revolutionary lyrics, their greatest popularity lay in their satiric and lyrical songs. The genuine lyric talent of Jakiv Ščoholiv (1824-1898) characterized even his earliest belated Romanticist period; later he followed Hlibov in producing lyrics which are some of the most charming of Ukrainian songs. He also contributed to the lexical enrichment of the language.

The younger poets, Lesja Ukrajinka, Voronyj, Oles', had already gone beyond the limits of essentially Realistic tradition. But there were others—poets sincerely searching for Realism and a revolutionary spirit—who remained within the folk (or perhaps pseudo-folk) song, chiefly because of those traces of Romantic stylistics and tonality surviving in their works (a partial consequence of the provincial nature of Ukrainian literature).

9. Ukrainian Realism, tied to the currents of other European literatures, could not remain static or changeless for long. Unlike the case of Kuliš who remained a fixed Romantic throughout his life (and, therefore, was largely ignored), Ukrainian Realism elaborated, in advance, a hundred (not to say one thousand) year program for itself. But this program was obliged to change within forty years, and its platforms (the espousal of the peasant language and the peasant way of life) had to be abandoned—except perhaps by retrogrades of the "Harkun Zadunajs'kyj" variety.

Realism was quite unable to dominate verse poetry. For the latter was, of all genres, the greatest repository of the vestiges of Romanticism whose strong roots in Ukraine resulted from the vital role it had played in the process of national revival. The first and most distinguished poet whose creativity rose above the routine and overcame pure Realism in verse poetry was the daughter of Olena Pčilka and the kinsman of M. Drahomanov, to whom she was indebted not only for his advice, but for her own personal education and acquaintance with scholarly literature upon which she drew during her quite extraordinary career.

Lesja Ukrajinka (1871-1913), inspired by her mother and by Staryc'kyj, adopted the important idea of the necessity of the cultural expansion and elevation of the Ukrainian literary language. Her poetic beginnings were lyric verses and translations, chiefly from Heine. Today it is impossible to be overly delighted with her lyrics. One is struck by the optimism of this girl who was gravely ill (a desperate tubercular condition), which compelled her to travel around the world in search of a better climatic environment, severely restricted her work and ultimately led her to an early grave. Lesja Ukrajinka concludes the history of Ukrainian Realism having made the invaluable contribution of a literary form which led literature far beyond the limits of Realism and which made Ukrainian literature a world literature for the first time.

The poetic work of Lesja Ukrajinka, which represented only the first half of her literary creativity, could not be considered extraordinary in either theme or form (although its rhythm, strophic structure, euphony in some respects [melodiousness] and much of its lexicon are noteworthy). In 1891 she was writing verses which were very similar in rhythm to those of Heine. However, ten years later she acknowledged that the young poet Oles' (whose language irritated her because of a certain untidiness) had outstripped her; yet, for her to write lyrical verses it was, she felt, no longer worthwhile.

Even before this, however, she had begun to write dramatic pieces; attempts such as "*Blakytyna trojanda*" ("*The Sky Blue Rose*," 1908) revealed an affinity for Ibsen as well as appreciation for Maeterlinck. However, in "*Lisova pisnja*" ("*Forest Song*," 1911) in which she combined Gogol' and Hauptmann, she had again been outstripped by Oles' in his "*Vesniana kazka*" ("*Spring Tale*" or "*Nad Dniptom*" ["*Over the Dnieper*"]). In fact, when M. Sadovs'kyj, a conservative theater director, learned that Lesja Ukrajinka too was preparing a similar work (i.e., "*Forest Song*"), he commissioned the translation of the second-rate play "*Zaczarowane Kolo*" ("*The Enchanted Circle*") by Lucian Rydel, a representative of the "Young Poland" school, and presented it every week for two years!

Lesja Ukrajinka's attitude toward the Ukrainian theater of the day was a critical one. The plays of Staryc'kyj "grieved her deeply"; Karpenko-Karyj she considered to be not a writer but a dilettante who, moreover, lacked any aesthetic sense. Accordingly, she began her own independent path to the theater: she moved from a concern for the expansion of the literary language to the search for expansion of literary forms—and in an altogether new direction.

It was after the writing of several longer poems—*Samson*, *Robert Bruce*, *Davnya kazka* (*An Old Tale*), including some with dramatic elements—*Oderžyma* (*A Woman Possessed*, 1901), that she turned to drama—the already cited "*Sky Blue Rose*"—at the end of the nineteenth century. She then progressed to the

smaller drama (whether or not she followed the example of Puškin or Hugo von Hofmannsthal is unimportant), an entirely new form which she developed as the "dramatic poem" and of which she contributed fifteen examples (some were known as "dialogs," while she called the larger ones "dramas"). They are significant from the formal aspect for they are symbolic works (Ukrainian literary historians are constantly trying to decipher their symbolism): they lead their subjects far beyond the compass of Ukrainian themes into the realm of world spiritual history. In vain do Ukrainian literary scholars search in them for any symbolic representation of Ukrainian problems. Lesja Ukrajinka's first plays of this type (from early Jewish history) provoked a storm of protest from the critics: why does the poet stray so far from actuality, they asked, failing to understand the significance of the gigantic step the poet had taken on to the field of world literature. In the second place, they charged, her plays were excessively rhetorical and declamatory and, therefore, unsuited to stage presentation. Even contemporary literary historians occasionally repeat these amazing allegations. To be sure, the little dramas of Lesja Ukrajinka could not be adapted to the theater of Kropyvnyč'kyj or of his followers for they are characterized by a total absence of sumptuous costumes, song and dance, drinking and Cossack figures. The critics did not understand that the theater must fulfill the requirements of the poets, rather than *vice versa*. They forgot that rhetorical and declamatory elements were also found in classical tragedy as well as in Shakespeare and in the dramas of French Classicism where they dominated the stage and enthralled the audience—and without drinking and dancing. . . .

The Ukrainian Realistic theater was incapable of presenting the "exotic" plays of this talented authoress. Even the label "exotic" was an imperceptive one to apply to the dramatic poems of Lesja Ukrajinka. They were remote from Ukrainian contemporary life only because they were dealing with universal human themes. In other words, Lesja Ukrajinka raised Ukrainian literature to the level of a world literature, one which treats themes that are common and important to mankind as a whole (involving situations which happen not only in Ukraine, but everywhere in the world and at any moment in the historical process). In the dramatic poems, these problems are presented in a concentrated, intense form. It was by disregarding the boundaries of a certain people or of a certain time that Lesja Ukrajinka, possibly for the first time in the history of Ukrainian literature, was able to create works that belonged to the heritage both of Ukraine and of the world (even Ševčenko's "Caucasus" requires commentaries if it is to be read by a non-Ukrainian, while for the "exotic" plays of Lesja Ukrajinka, they are unnecessary). In fact, the "dramatic poems" prompted M. Pavlyk to express the hope that the authoress would return to works with

social themes! It is possible that the dramatic poems do not present these problems at their ultimate and most profound level, and perhaps they fail to provide final decisive answers to these questions. But if there are any Ukrainian works which are able to speak not only to fellow Ukrainians but also to humanity at large, these works are the dramatic poems—a fact that would hold true even if they had appeared in prose translation.

Lesja Ukrajinka took a phenomenal step beyond the narrow confines of Realism and beyond the confines of Ukrainian literature in general. It was an achievement which has been scarcely appreciated to the present day. Yet if the poetess really developed her own works as a result of having outgrown the positions of Realism (which is more than doubtful), then it was a great service on behalf of Realism toward the cause of Ukrainian literature which had otherwise suffered considerably because of this trend.

It is clear that Lesja Ukrajinka herself understood that the further development of Realism in Ukrainian literature was impossible. She rejected its limitations and inaugurated a new era in the history of Ukrainian literature. It is interesting that she had formulated the outline of a dramatic poem—“*U puščī*” (“*In the Wilderness*,” 1910)—as early as the 1890s, but did not return to remake it until the end of her life. Because both her smaller and major dramas deal with various times and various peoples, they are indeed “exotic”: not in the sense of strange, incomprehensible “exotica,” but, simply, in that they involve strange peoples and distant times. Represented here are classical antiquity (Greece and Rome), the Middle Ages, the world of Mohammed, the Puritans of North America, Spain; only in one of Lesja Ukrajinka’s last plays is Ukrainian subject matter used: “*Bojarynja*” (“*The Noblewoman*,” 1910). Several plays are concerned with early Christianity: “*U katakombax*” (“*In the Catacombs*,” 1906), “*Rufin i Priscilla*” (“*Rufinus and Priscilla*,” 1911), “*Advokat Martijan*” (“*The Advocate Martianus*,” 1913), “*Na rujinax*” (“*In the Ruins*,” 1904). The main theme of the plays is the historical process and the human aspirations operating within it. Certain elements of symbolism may be noticed in the depiction of the historical process, including rare allusions to Ukrainian life.

Certainly, the symbolism of Lesja Ukrajinka also helped to lead her beyond the boundaries of Realism: of special significance is her “fairy tale” “*Forest Song*,” a work altogether within the framework of symbolism in Slavic literatures.

10. It is not possible here to trace the development of Ukrainian literature in the other directions it followed in breaking away from Realism, a trend which never held full sway especially in the poetry of Franko. However, mention should be made of certain lesser poets who renounced Realism, although in a

form which is not altogether clear: in western Ukraine, V. Pačovs'kyj (1878-1942), P. Karmans'kyj (1878-1956), and in eastern Ukraine, M. Černjavs'kyj (1867-1937), M. Filjans'kyj (1873-1945) whose work still retained Romantic echoes.

Some of the most prominent figures of the new literature drew the attention of Lesja Ukrajinka. They included Mykola Voronyj (1871-1937), self-educated (and with hardship), whom she regarded as a genuine poet and whose works also earned her reserved praise for their content. "*The Spring Tale*" of Oles' (Oleksander Kandyba, 1878-1944), whose creativity had "outstripped" that of Lesja Ukrajinka herself (see above), was considered by her to be a masterpiece. One of his semi-folkish verses, "*Xvylja*" ("The Wave," 1912), although written much earlier, prompted her to observe that such rhymes as "*dzen'ky-bren'ky*" could be written not only by the young writers (reference to Čuprynka, 1879-1921), but also by the older ones.

Her impressions of late-Realistic and post-Realistic prose are of interest. Many of Kocjubyns'kyj's writings failed to gain her favor ("diffuse," "tasteless," "written without internal motivation" were her comments). Only a work which genuinely broke with Realism, Kocjubyns'kyj's *Tini zabutyx predkiv* (*Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors*, 1913), impelled her to true admiration. The work of V. Vynnyčenko who did not, in her opinion, go beyond the forms of late Realism, received a mixed reaction from Lesja Ukrajinka: while acknowledging the quality of his prose, she confessed that she was revolted by various features of Vynnyčenko's work such as coarseness and a certain primitivism. Later, she declared that because she had not experienced Vynnyčenko's evolution as a theatrical writer, she could not express an opinion about the ideological development in his later plays. In some respects, Vynnyčenko was related to certain Russian symbolists with extremely idiosyncratic views of morality; his style, however, remained Realistic, on the whole.

Since the Revolution of 1917, the development of Ukrainian literature has been conditioned, to a large extent, by extra-literary factors. In many instances, elements of Realism have survived and continue to survive, albeit in part artificially.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography does not pretend to be complete. For each chapter I have listed only those editions of texts and those studies that will aid the reader in familiarizing himself with the current status of research; if a more recent study reviews previous scholarship in its area of concern, then the earlier works are not listed. However, in those instances where general works are lacking, more specialized ones have been included. Due to the absence of readily available materials, some of the sections of this book are not provided with bibliographies; the reader can acquire more detailed information about the issues involved from other general surveys of Ukrainian literature. The inclusion of any particular work does not necessarily indicate this author's agreement with its conclusions or hypotheses. A list of the abbreviations used will be found at the end of the bibliography (page 638).

GENERAL HISTORIES

S. Jefremov: *Istorija ukrajins'koho pys'menstva*, I-II. Kiev-Leipzig, 1919-24 (general survey of all Ukrainian literature). // M. Voznjak: *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury*, I, II, III. Lviv, 1920-24 (to the end of the eighteenth century). // M. Hruševs'kyj: *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury*, I-V. Kiev-Lviv, 1923-27 (to the beginning of the seventeenth century). // Akademija Nauk SSSR: *Istorija russkoj literatury*, I, II, 1-2. Moscow, 1941-48. // A. Pypin: *Istorija russkoj literatury*, I-IV. St. Petersburg, 1911-13 (Ukrainian literature only up to the eighteenth century). // D. Čiževskij: *Comparative History of Slavic Literatures*. Nashville, 1971. // *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury*, I-VIII. Kiev, 1967-71.

OLD LITERATURE

(Mainly the Eleventh to the Thirteenth Centuries)

P. Vladimirov: *Drevnjaja russkaja literatura Kievskogo perioda XI-XIII vekov*. Kiev, 1901. // M. Speranskij: *Istorija drevnej russkoj literatury*, I. Moscow, 1921. // V. Istrin: *Očerki istorii drevnerusskoj literatury domongol'skogo perioda (11-13 vv.)*. Petersburg, 1922. // N. Gudzij: *Istorija drevnej russkoj literatury* (many editions, the latest 1966). N.K. Gudzij: *History of Early Russian Literature*. New York, 1949. // A. Orlov: *Kurs lekcij po drevnej russkoj literatury*. Moscow-Leningrad, 1939. // D. Tschizewskij: *Geschichte der Alt-russischen Literatur im 11, 12 und 13 Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt/Main, 1948.

ANTHOLOGIES OF TEXTS

O. Bilec'kyj: *Xrestomatija davn'oji ukrajins'koj literatury*. 3d ed. Kiev, 1967. // N. Gudzij: *Xrestomatija po drevnerusskoj literatury* (many editions, the latest 1962). // Ad. Stender-Petersen: *Anthology of Old Russian Literature*. New York, 1954. // F. Buslaev: *Istoričeskaja xrestomatija*. Moscow, 1861. // G. Kušlev-Bezborodko: *Pamjatniki staroj russkoj literatury*, I-IV. Edited by M. Kostomarov and A. Pypin. St. Petersburg, 1860-62. // A. Ponomarev: *Pamjatniki drevnerusskoj cerkovno-učitel'noj literatury*, I-IV. St. Petersburg, 1894-98. // N. Nikol'skij, *SORJa*, 82 (1907). // M. Voznjak: *Stare ukrajins'ke pys'menstvo*. Lviv, 1922.

CHAPTER I: PREHISTORIC PERIOD

PART B.

F. Buslaev: *Istoričeskije očerki russkoj narodnoj slovesnosti i iskusstva*, I-II. Moscow, 1861. // Modern scholarly view in Hrušev's'kyj, I and IV (see above, "General Histories"). // E. Mahler: *Die russische Totenklage*. Leipzig, 1936. // E. Aničkov: *Jazyčestvo i drevnaja Rus'*. St. Petersburg, 1914. // V. Mansikka: *Die Religion der Ostslaven*. Leningrad-Helsinki, 1922. // P. Altkirch in *AfsPh*, 30 (1909). // N. Pavlov-Sil'vanskij in *ŽMNP*, 1905, 6. // A. Ljaščenko in *U*, 1926, 4.

PART C.

A. Stender-Petersen: *Die Varaegersage als Quelle der altrussischen Chronik*. Aarhus, 1934.

PART D.

M. Hruševs'kyj, I (see above, "General Histories"). // G. Baesecke: *Die indogermanische Verwandschaft des Hildebrandliedes*. Göttingen, 1940. // A. Ljaščenko in *PDP*, 190 (1921). // B. Jarxo in *IORJa*, 22 (1917), 2. // D. Čyževs'kyj in *ZfsPh*, XXII (1954), 2. // G. Krek: *Einleitung in die Geschichte der slavischen Literatur*. 2d ed. Graz, 1887 (an outdated work).

CHAPTER II. TRANSLATED AND BORROWED LITERATURE

PART A.

Discussions in General Works—Compare A. Krumbacher: *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*. 2d ed. Munich, 1897; and M. Murko: *Geschichte der älteren südslavischen Literaturen*. Leipzig, 1908 (both are outdated).

PART C.—Section a.

S. Sever'janov: *Suprasl'skaja rukopis'*. St. Petersburg, 1904 (*Menaia* for March). // V. Malinin: *10 slov "Zlatostruja" 12 veka*. St. Petersburg, 1910. // Excerpts from *Prologue* in A. Ponomarev: *Pamjatniki drevnerusskoj cerkovno-učitel'noj literatury*, III and IV (cited above, "Anthologies of Texts").

PART C.—Section b.

G. Kušlev-Bezborodko: *Pamjatniki staroj russkoj literatury*, III (see above, "Anthologies of Texts"). // N. Tixonravov: *Pamjatniki otrečenoj literatury*, I-II. St. Petersburg, 1863. // J. Porfir'ev in *SORJa*, 17 (1877) and 42 (1888). // I. Franko: *Apokryfy i legendy z ukrajins'kych rukopysiv: Pamjatky ukrajinsko-rus'koji movy i literatury*, I-V. Lviv, 1896-1910. // N. Tixonravov: *Sočinenija*, I. Moscow, 1898.

PART D.—Section a.

Malalas—V. Istrin in *SORJa*, 89-91 (1903-5), includes a list of texts previously published by Istrin. // **Hamartolos**—V. Istrin, *Knigy vremeni'nyja . . . Georgija*

Mnixa, I-II. St. Petersburg, 1920-30. // Flavius—V. Istrin: *La Prise de Jérusalem* . . . , I-II. Paris, 1934. // *Istorija iudejskoj vojny Iosifa Flavija v drevnerusskom perevode*, ed. N.A. Meščerskij. Moscow-Leningrad, 1958. // Hexameron—ČOID, 1879. // Physiologus—A. Karneev: *Fiziolog*. Moscow, 1890. // J. Rajnov: *Nauka v Rossii*. Moscow-Leningrad, 1940.

PART D.—Section b.

Texts—G. Kušlev-Bezborodko: *Pamjatniki staroj russkoj literatury* (see above, “Anthologies of Texts”). // A. Pypin: *Očerki literaturnoj istorii starix povestej i skazok russkix*. St. Petersburg, 1858. // A. Orlov: *Perevodnye povesti feodal'noj Rusi* . . . Leningrad, 1834. // V. Veselovskij in *SORJa*, 40 (1886). // I. Franko in *ZNTŠ*, 8, 10, 18, 20. // Digenis—M. Speranskij in *SORJa*, 99 (1922). // V. Istrin: *Aleksandrija russkix xronografov*. Moscow, 1898. // *Stefanit i Ixnilat*: *PDP*, 16, 27 (1877-78) and 64, 78 (1880-81). // *Varlaam and Josaphat*: *PDP*, 88 (1887).

PART E.

V. Sobolevskij in *SORJa*, 88 (1910). // R. Jakobson in *IORJa*, 24 (1919). // N. Trubeckoj in *ZfsPh*, XI (1934).

PART F.

M. Murko (cited above, pt. A; an outdated work). // V. Sobolevskij in *RFV*, 1900; *SORJa*, 88 (1910). A supplement to Murko. // Olaf Jensen [R. Jakobson]: *Co daly naše zeme Evrope a lidstvu?* Prague, 1940. // N. Nikol'skij: “Povest' vremennix let,” *SAN*, 2 (1930), 1.

CHAPTER III. PERIOD OF MONUMENTAL STYLE

PART A.

V. Sobolevskij: *Neskol'ko myslej o drevne-russkoj literature*. St. Petersburg, 1903. // A. Orlov in *Pamjati Sakulina*. Moscow, 1931. // R. Jagoditsch: *Jahrbücher f Kultur u. Geschichte der Slaven*, NF, XI (1935). // Articles by A. Nikol's'ka in the collection in honor of Sobolevskij (1928) and Orlov (1934). // Sedel'nikov, S, VIII (1929-30). // D. Čyževs'kyj in *HSS*, II (1954) and *Festschrift für Max Vasmer*, 1955.

PART B.

V. Čagovec: *Prepodobnyj Feodosij Pečerskij*. Kiev, 1901 (also *KUI*). // I. Eremin in *TODRL*, V (1947). // I. Ždanov: *Sočinenija*, I. St. Petersburg, 1904. // A. Ponomarev: *Pamjatniki drevnerusskoj cerkovno-učitel'noj literatury*, I (see above, "Anthologies of Texts"). // N.L. Tunickij: *V pamjat' stoletija . . .*, II. 1915. // P. Vladimirov: *Drevnjaja russkaja literatura Kievskogo perioda XI-XIII vekov*. Kiev, 1901. // D. Čyževs'kyj, *ZfsPh*, XXIV (1955), 1.

PART C.

For a list of texts see below, pts. D and H. // N. Nikol'skij in *SORJa*, 82; *IORJa*, 8 (1903); *BL*, III (1917). // E. Petuxov in *IORJa*, 9 (1904), 4, p. 129ff. // V. Sobolevskij in *IORJa*, 6 (1901). // A. Leonid: "Žitie i čudesa sv. Nikolaja . . .," *PDP*, 1881. // O. Bahrij in *IORJa*, 19 (1914).

PART D.

G. Fedotov: *Svjatye drevnej Rusi X-XVII st.* Paris, 1931. // *Russische Heiligenlegenden*. Zurich: C. Benz, 1953. // N. Serebrjanskij: *Drevne-russkie knjažeskie žitija*. Moscow, 1915 (also *ČOID*). // Texts—Borys and Hlib—D. Abramovič: *Pamjatniki drevne-russkoj literatury*, II. Petersburg, 1916. // S. Buhoslavs'kyj: *Pamjatky XI-XVIII vv. pro knjaziv Borysa ta Hliba*. Kiev, 1928; and *IORJa*, 29 (1924). // Theodosius—*ČOID*, 1858, 1879, 1899. // A. Šaxmatov in *SORJa*, 64 (1899) and *IORJa*, 1 (1896). // D. Abramovič, *IORJa*, 3 (1898).

PART E.

S. Šimanovskij: *Svjatoslavov Izbornik 1076 g.* Warsaw, 1894. // A. Popov in *RES*, 14-15 (1934-52). // I.U. Budovnic, *TODRL*, X (1954). // *Izbornik 1076 goda*, ed. S. Kotkov. Moscow, 1965.

PART F.

Editions of Texts—Laurentian Chronicle (see below, pt. H). // I. Ivakin: *Kn. Vladimir Monomax*, I. Moscow, 1901. // A. Orlov: *Vladimir Monomax*. Moscow, 1946. // M. Alekseev in *TODRL*, II (1935). // I.U. Budovnic in *TODRL*, X (1954).

PART G.

Editions of Texts—M. Venevitinov: *Xoždenie igumena Daniila v svjatuju zemlju:*

Pravoslavnyj Palestinskij Sbornik, 3, 9. St. Petersburg, 1885. // Commentaries—A.S. Norov: *Xoždenie ig. Daniila*. St. Petersburg, 1864. // P. Zabolotskij in *RFV*, 1899.

PART H.

Editions of Texts—"Lavrent'evskaja letopis'," *PSRL*, I; and especially several editions of *Povest' vremennyx let* (notably the two-volume edition published in 1950; the commentaries are of a questionable nature). // A. Šaxmatov: *Razyskanija o drevnejšix russkix letopisnyx svodax*. St. Petersburg, 1908. // A. Šaxmatov: *Povest' vremennyx let*, I. St. Petersburg, 1916. // A. Šaxmatov in *TODRL*, IV (1939). // M. Priselkov: *Istorija russkogo letopisanija*. Leningrad, 1940; *Letopisec Nestor*. Petersburg, 1923. // E. Perfeckij: *Russkie letopisnye svody i ix vzaimootnošenija*. Bratislava, 1922. // D. Lixačev: *Russkie letopisi*. Leningrad, 1947. // I. Eremin: *Povest' vremennyx let*. Leningrad, 1947. // *The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* (English transl. and commentary by G. Perfeckij). Munich, 1973.

PART I.

Editions of texts by Rybnikov, Gil'ferding, Ončukov, Markov, Grigor'ev, V. Miller, Tixonravov and V. Miller. An evaluation of new editions by Carapkina in *ZfsPh*, 16 (1939). // M. Speranskij: *Russkaja ustnaja slovesnost'*, I-II. Moscow, 1916-19; and *MPB*, 1953 (contains a good selection of texts). // **Secondary Sources**—V. Miller: *Očerki russkoj narodnoj slovesnosti*, I-III. Moscow, 1897-1925. // A. Skaftymov: *Poetika i genezis bylin*. Moscow-Saratov, 1924. // R. Trautmann: *Die Volksdichtung der Grossrussen*, I. *Das Heldenleid*. Heidelberg, 1935. // A. Veselovskij: *Južno-russkie byliny*. St. Petersburg, 1884 (from *SORJa*, 36). // V. Propp: *Russkij geroičeskij epos*. Leningrad, 1955. // **Articles**—B. Sokolov in *RFV*, 1916. // B. Jarxo in *IORJa*, 1917. // A. Ljaščenko in *Sertum Bibliologicum*, II, 1922. // N. Trubeckoj in *Z zagadnieň poetyki*, VI. Vilnius, 1937.

PART J.

Editions of Texts—*Strannik*, 1888. // *ČONL*, 14 (1900). // **Texts and Secondary Materials**—A. Popov: *Obzor xronografov russkoj redakcii*, I-II. Moscow, 1886. // V. Istrin in *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, 1898. // *Russkaja Pravda*, many editions such as that of E. Kars'kyj: *Russkaja Pravda po drevnejšemu spisku 1282 g.* Leningrad, 1930; and B. Grekov: *Pravda Russkaja*, I-III. Moscow, 1940-63.

CHAPTER IV. PERIOD OF ORNAMENTAL STYLE

PART A.

Compare the items listed under Ch. III, pt. C. // T. Sušyc'kyj in *ZNTK*, IV. // K. Kalajdovič: *Pamjatniki russkoj slovesnosti XII v.* Moscow, 1821.

PART B.

Texts of the sermons of Cyril of Turiv can be found in K. Kalajdovič (see above, pt. A) and A. Ponomarev (see above, "Anthologies of Texts"). A better edition of texts is to be found in M. Suxomlinov: *Rukopisi gr. Uvarova*, II. Moscow, 1858. // **Secondary Materials**—M. Suxomlinov: *Issledovanija i stat'i po russkoj literature i prosvěščeniju*. St. Petersburg, 1889 (*Slavistic Printings and Reprintings*. The Hague, 1970). // V. Vinogradov in *V pamjat' stoletija*, II. // N. Nikol'skij: *O literaturnoj dejatel'nosti Klimenta Smoljatiča*. St. Petersburg, 1892. // E. Petuxov: *Serapion Vladimirskij*. St. Petersburg, 1888. // **Shorter Studies**—Byčkov in *BL*, III (1917). // X. Loparev in *PDP*, 98 (1894). // P. Vladimirov in *ČONL*, 4. // V. Sobolevskij in *IORJa*, 6 (1901) and 14 (1915), 1. // M. Obolenskij in *Kievljanin*, 1855.

PART C.

See also pts. B and D. // N. Serebrjanskij (see Ch. III, pt. D). // I. Eremin in *IORJa*, 30 (1925). // N. Nikol'skij in *IORJa*, 8 (1903), 1 (No. II). // D. Čyževs'kyj in *ZfsPh*, XXIV (1955), 1.

PART D.

Editions of Texts—D. Abramovič in *Pamjatniki slavjanorusskoj pis'mennosti*, II (1911) and *Kyjevo-Pečers'kyj Pateryk*. Kiev, 1930. // V. Jakovlev: *Drevnie kievskie religioznye skazanija*. Warsaw, 1875. // A. Šaxmatov in *ŽMNP*, 1898, 3 and *IORJa*, 2 (1897). // D. Abramovič in *IORJa*, 6-7 (1901-2). // G. Fedotov (see Ch. III, pt. D).

PART E.

Ipat'evskaja letopis'. St. Petersburg, 1871 (and in *PSRL*, II). // A. Orlov in *IORJa*, XXXI (1926) and *TODRL*, V (1947). // M. Hruševs'kyj in *ZNTŠ*, 8, 41, 52. // I. Eremin in *TODRL*, VII (1949). // Studies by E. Perfeckij and M. Priselkov quoted above, Ch. III, pt. H. // V. Pašuto: *Očerki po istorii Galicko-Volynskoj Rusi*. Moscow, 1950. // D. Čyževs'kyj in *Südost-Forschungen*, XII (1953).

PART F.

See above, Ch. III, pt. H. // The most important information is included in M. Hruševs'kyj's multi-volume history (see above, "General Histories").

PART G.

E. Barsov: *Slovo o polku Igoreve kak xudožestvennyj pamjatnik kievskoj družinnoj Rusi*, I-III. Moscow, 1887-90 (and in *ČOID*, 1883-89). // V. Peretc: "K izučeniju 'Slova o polku Igoreve'," *IORJa*, 28-30 (1924-26) and separately, Leningrad, 1926. // V. Peretc: *Slovo o polku Ihorevim: Pamjatka feodal'noji Ukrajiny-Rusy*. Kiev, 1926. // Articles by V. Ržyha in *U*, 1926, 2; *S*, 4 (1925), 6 (1926), 12 (1933). // M. Peterson in *S*, 14 (1934). // V. Birčak in *ZNTŠ*, 95-96. // H. Gregoire, R. Jakobson and M. Szeftel: *La Geste du Prince Igor*. New York, 1948. // R. Jakobson in *Speculum*, 1952.

PART H.

See above, pts. D and F.

PART I.

Texts—N. Zarubin: *Slovo Daniila Zatočnika po redakcijam XII i XIII vv. i ix peredelkam, Pamjatniki drevnerusskoj literatury*, III. Leningrad, 1932. // **Studies**—P. Mindalev: *Molenie Daniila Zatočnika*. Kazan, 1914. // V. Ščurat in *ZNTŠ*, 9 (1896). // B. Romanov: *Ljudi i nruvy drevnej Rusi*. Leningrad, 1947. I. Franko in *ZNTŠ*, 35-36. // E. Petuxov in *SORJa*, 42 (1887). // A. Ponomarev, III (see above, "Anthologies of Texts").

PART J.

Cyril of Turiv's prayers in *Pravoslavnyj Sobesednik*, 1856. // Clement Smoljatyč: N. Nikol'skij (see above, pt. B). // **Historical Monuments**—See above, Ch. III, pt. I. // *Annotated Palea*: see A. Michajlov in *ZfsPh*, IV (1927). // Text of the *Annotated Palea*: "*Paleja Tolkovaja*." *Trud učenikov Tixonravona*. Petersburg, 1892.

CHAPTER V. LITERATURE OF THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES

A. Sobolevskij in *SORJa*, 74 (1903). // A. Jacimirskij: *Grigorij Camblak*. St.

Petersburg, 1904. // Dosyfej: I. Nikol'skij in *SORJa*, 82. // Bogomil Texts—J. Ivanov: *Bogomilski knigi i legendi*. Sofia, 1925. // K. Dobrowolski in *Reformacja w Polsce*, III (1924). // A. Veselovskij in *ŽMNP*, 1876, 3-4. // On Hussitism—M. Hruševs'kyj, IV (see above, "General Histories"). // There is no good survey of works discussing the Judaizers. A. Klibanov, *Reformacionnye dviženija v Rossii v XIV-pervoj polovine XVI vv.* Moscow, 1960. // The following items are inadequate: D. Oljančyn in *Kyrios*, I (1936) and Fr. Erlenbusch (D. Čyževs'kyj), *Co daly naše zeme Evrope a lidstvu?* Prague, 1940. // Texts—S.L. Neverov in *KUI*, 1909. // V. Zubov: *Istoriko-matematičeskie issledovanie*, III (Moscow, 1950). // Chronicles—*PSRL*, XVII. // T. Sušyc'kyj: *Zaxidno-rus'ki litopysy jak pamjatky literaturni*, I-II. Kiev, 1922-24. // Ju. Tyxovs'kyj in *KS*, 1893, 9.

CHAPTER VI. RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION

PART A.

K. Xarlampovič: *Zapadno-russkie pravoslavnye školy*. Kazan', 1898. // M. Hruševs'kyj: *Kul'turno-nacional'nyj rux na Ukrajinі v 16 ta 17 vv.* Kiev, 1912. // D.S. Nalyvajko, "Ukrajina v zaxidnojeuropejs'kyx istoryko-literaturnyx pamjatkax doby Vidrodžennja," *Slovjans'ke literaturoznavstvo i folklorystyka*, 1968, 1969, 1970.

PART B.

G. Kušeleev-Bezborodko: *Pamjatniki drevne-russkoj literatury*, I-II. St. Petersburg, 1860. // Articles—E. Kars'kyj in *IORJa*, 1897, 4; and *VUI*, 1894, 2 and 1898, 2. // A. Veselovskij: *Iz istorii romana i povesti*, II. St. Petersburg, 1888. // V. Hnatjuk in *ZNTŠ*, 16.

PART C.

P. Popov: *Počatky drukarstva u slovjan*. Kiev, 1924. // P. Vladimirov: *Doktor Francisk Skorina*. St. Petersburg, 1888. // I. Ohijenko: *Istorija ukrajins'koho drukarstva*, I, Lviv, 1925. // I. Ohijenko: "Apostol 1574 r.," *NZ UVAN*, II (1953). // R. Jakobson: *Ivan Fedorov's Primer of 1574*. Cambridge, Mass., 1955. // I. Evseev in *Xristianskoe Čtenie*, 1912-13 (about the Ostrih Bible). // I. Ohijenko: *Ukrajins'ka literaturna mova 16 st.*, I-II. Warsaw, 1930. // P. Žytec'kyj in *IORJa*, X (1905), 4.

PART D.

Texts—"Pamjatniki polemičeskoj literatury," *RIB*, I-II (1876-1903), 4, 7, 19. // *AjuzR*, I, 7. // *Akty, odnosjaščiesja k istorii Zapadnoj Rossii*, IV. St. Petersburg, 1851. // *Pamjatky ukrajinsko-rus'koji movy i literatury*, 5. // **Secondary Materials**—K. Studyns'kyj: *Perestoroha, rus'kyj pamjatnyk počatku XVII v.* Lviv, 1895. // P.K. Jaremenko, *Perestoroha, ukrajins'kyj antyunijats'kyj pamflet počatku XVII st.* Kiev, 1963. // N. Petrov in *TKDA*, 1894, 2-4. // K. Koperžyns'kyj in *ZUNT*, 21 (1926). // I. Tretiak: *P. Skarga*. Kraków, 1912. // *Juvilejna knyha v 300-litni rokovyny smerti Ipatija Potija*. Lviv, 1914. // M. Voznjak: *Pys'mennyc'ka dijəl'nist' Ivana Borec'koho na Volyni i u L'vovi*. Lviv, 1954.

PART E.

Z.I. Dauhjala: *Z belaruskaga pis'menstva XVII stal. Pracy Belaruskaga Dzjarzaunaga Universytetu u Mensku*, 16 (1927). Includes texts and stories. // *Atky Ju.-Z. Russii*, II (1865), No. 158.

PART F.

A. Sobolevskij in *ČONL*, 12 (1898). // S. Ščeglova: *Virši prazdničnye i obličitel'nye*. . . . Moscow, 1913 (*PDP*). // **Works by Peretc**—see Ch. VII, pt. C. // Ukrajins'ka Akademija Nauk: *Ukrajins'ki narodni dumy*, I, ed. K. Hruševs'ka. Kiev, 1927. // F. Kolessa: *Ukrajins'ki narodni dumy*. Lviv, 1920. // Articles by F. Kolessa in *ZNTŠ*, 49, 71-74, 76, 130-32. // P. Žiteckij: *Mysli o narodnyx malorusskix dumax*. Kiev, 1893 (Ukrainian trans., Kiev, 1919). // Trans. of German religious songs in *ČOID*, 1849.

CHAPTER VII. THE BAROQUE

PART A.

D. Čyževs'kyj: *Poza mežamy krasny*. New York, 1952. // Articles by Čyževs'kyj in *Arka*, 4-5 (1947); *Zahrava*, 4 (1947). // D. Čyževs'kyj: *Ukrajins'kyj literaturnyj barok*. *Narysy*, I-III. Prague, 1941-44 (also *Praci ukrajins'koho istorično-filohichono Tovarystva v Prazi*, III-V). // S. Golubev, I-II (see above, Ch. VI, pt. E). // I. Franko: *Karpatorus'ke pys'menstvo 17-18 vv.* Lviv, 1900. // M. Popov: *Zamitky do istoriji ukrajins'koho pys'menstva 17-18 vv.*, I-II. Kiev, 1923. // I.V. Ivan'ko, "Pro ukrajins'ke literaturne barokko," *Radjans'ke literaturoznavstvo*, 10 (1970).

PARTS B AND C.

Works by Vyšens'kyj—*KS*, 1889, 4 and 1890, 6. // *AjuzR*, I, 7. // Ivan Vyšens'kyj: *Sočinenija*. Edited by J. Eremin. Moscow-Leningrad, 1955 (a better edition of Vyšens'kyj's works; commentaries are inadequate). // Ivan Vyšens'kyj: *Tvory*. Edited by J. Eremin. Kiev, 1959. // **Secondary Materials**—I. Franko: *I. Vyšens'kyj*. Lviv, 1895. // M. Hruševs'kyj, V (see above, "General Histories"). // D. Čiževsky, *Annals*, 1951, 2. // B. Gröschel: *Die Sprache Ivan Vyšens'kyj's*. Vienna, 1973.

PART D.

V. Peretc: *Istoriko-literaturnye issledovanija i materialy*, I-II. St. Petersburg, 1900. // M. Voznjak: *Materijaly do istoriji ukrajins'koji pisni i virši*, I-II. Lviv, 1913-25. // Ju. Javors'kyj: *Materialy dlja istorii starinnoj pesennoj literatury*. Prague, 1934. // V. Peretc: *Issledovanija i materialy po istorii starinnoj ukrainskoj literatury*, I-III. Leningrad; 1926 and 1929. // D. Čyževs'kyj: *Do džerel symboliky Skovorody*. Prague, 1931. // **Articles**—V. Peretc in *ZNTS*[✓], 86, 101; *ŽMNP*, 1905-7; *IORJa*, IV (3-4), VI (2), VII (1). // M. Voznjak in *ZNTS*[✓], 108-9, 133. // I. Franko in *KSt*, 24, 34; *ZNTS*[✓], 41, 70, 113. // V. Hnatjuk in *ZNTS*[✓], 91. // Comp. numerous texts in *KSt*.

PART E.

V. Peretc: *Issledovanija i materialy po istorii starinnoj ukrainskoj literatury*, II. Leningrad, 1928. // V. Sreznevskij in *Trudy Komissii XIII arxeologičeskogo s'ezda v Xar'kove*, and separately (1905, Klymovs'kyj). // V. Horlenko in *ČONL*, 6 (1892, I. Horlenko).

PART F.

V. Peretc: *Issledovanija*, I (see above pt. C). // P. Vladimirov: *Velikoe Zercalo*. Moscow, 1884. // S. Ptašickij: *Srednevekovye zapadnoevropejskie povesti v russkoj i slavjanskoj literaturax*, I. St. Petersburg, 1897. // **Articles**—M. Gudzij in *ČONL*, 23, 2. // S. Ševčenko in *RFV*, 1909, 3-4. // V. Naumenko in *KS*, XII. // Petro Mohyla's tales about miracles appeared in *AjuzR*, I, 7.

PART G.

Texts—V. Rezanov: *Drama ukrajins'ka*, I: *Starovynnyj teatr ukrajins'kyj*, pts. 1,

3-6. Kiev, 1926-29. // V. Rezanov: *Pamjatniki ruskoj dramatičeskoj literatury*. Nižen', 1907. // V. Antonovyč and M. Drahomanov: *Istoričeskie pesni maloruskogo naroda*, II. Kiev, 1875 (contains text of *God's Mercy*). // **Secondary Materials**—V. Rezanov: *Iz istorii ruskoj dramy*. Moscow, 1910. // V. Rezanov: *K istorii ruskoj dramy*. Nizen, 1910. // N. Petrov: *Očerky ukraïnskoj literatury 17-18 vv., preimuščestvenno dramatičeskoj*. Kiev, 1911. // Ja. Hordyns'kyj in *ZNTŠ*, 130-31. // M. Voznjak: *Počatky ukrajins'koji komediji*. 1st ed. Lviv, 1920 (2d ed. New York, 1954). // V. Peretc in *U*, 1926, I. // Ju. Šerex in *HSS*, 2 (1954).

PART H.

Texts—L. Karpovyč's sermons in *ČONL*, 1878, 1. // M. Smotryč'kyj's sermons in *ČONL*, 20, 2-3. Edited by S. Maslov. // **Dmytro Tuptalo of Rostov—Tvorenija** (many editions, 3-5 volumes). // S. Javors'kyj: *Propovedi*, I-III. Moscow, 1804-5. // F. Prokopovyč: *Slova i reči*, I-III. St. Petersburg, 1760-63. // G. Konys'kyj: *Sočinenija*. St. Petersburg, 1835. // **Original (Ukrainian) Texts of Dmytro Tuptalo of Rostov's Sermons**—1884, 2. // A. Titov: *Propovedi svjatitelja Dimitrija, mitropolita rostovskogo na ukraïnskomy narečii*. Moscow, 1909. // H. Bužyns'kyj: *Propovedi*. Juriev, 1901. // H. Skovoroda—*Sočinenija Grigorija Savviča Skovorody*. Edited by D. Bahalij. Xarkiv, 1894. // *Sobranie sočinenij G.S. Skovorody*, I. Edited by V. Bonč-Bruevič. St. Petersburg, 1912. Hryhorij Skovoroda: *Povne zibrannja tvoriv*, I-II. Kiev, 1973. // **About the Baroque Sermon**—M. Neumayr: *Die Schriftpredigt im Barok*. Paderborn, 1938. // J. Langsch: *Die Predigten . . . von Simeon Polockij*. Leipzig, 1940. // **About Stavrovec'kyj**—A. Koltonovskaja in *Letopis' Večernix Vyššix Ženskix Kursov*, I. Kiev, 1914. // **About Galjatovs'kyj**—I. Ohijenko in *RFV*, 1910, 1914. // *Sbornik Xar'kovskogo istoriko-filologičeskogo obščestva*, 19 (1913). // *Letopis' Ekaterinoslavskoj Arxivnoj Komissii*, 10. // M. Markovskij: *Antonij Radivilovskij, južno-russkij propovednik XVII v.* Kiev, 1894 (and in *KUF*). // I. Šljapkin: *Sv. Dimitrij Rostovskij i ego vremja*. St. Petersburg, 1891. // M. Popov: *Svjatitel' Dimitrij Rostovskij i ego trudy (1709-1909 gg)*. St. Petersburg, 1910. // Ju. Samarin, "Stefan Javorskij i Feofan Prokopovič" in his *Sočinenija*, V. Moscow, 1880. // I. Čistovič: *Neizdannija propovedi St. Javorskogo*. Moscow, 1867. // P. Morozov: *F. Prokopovič kak pisatel'*. St. Petersburg, 1880 (and in *ŽMNP*). // Ju. Šerex, "Stefan Yavorsky and the Conflict of Ideologies in the Age of Peter I," *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXX, 1951. Ivan Velyčkovs'kyj: *Tvory*, Kiev, 1972.

PART I.

Vremenna Komissija dlja razbora drevnix aktov: *Letopis' Samovidca po novootkrytym spiskam s priloženiem trex malorossyiskix xronik: Xmel'nickij, "Kratkogo opisaniia Malorosii" i "Sobranija istoričeskogo"*. Kiev, 1878; *Dejstviia prezl'noj . . . trudom Grigorija Grabjanki sobrannaja i samobitnix starožilov svedetel'stvi utveržennaja*. Kiev, 1854; *Letopis' sobytij v Jugo-Zapadnoj Rossii v XVII—m veke. Sostavil Samoil Veličko . . .*, I-IV. Kiev, 1848-54 (volume I also published by VUAN, Kiev, 1929). // *Istorija rusov ili Maloj Rossii*, ČOID, I, 1846-14. // D. Dorošenko: *Ohljad ukrajins'koji istoriohrafiji*. Prague, 1925. (English ed. *Annals*. 1957.) // S. Narižnyj in *Praci ukrajins'koho istorično-filolohičnoho tovarystva v Prazi*, II (1939). // Ukrainian translation of *Istorija rusiv* edited by O. Ohloblyn and translated by V. Davydenko (New York, 1956). // *Litopys Samovydcja*. Kiev, 1971.

PART J.

Text of the *Palinodija* in *Pamjatniki polemičeskoj literatury v Zapadnoj Rusi*. RIB, I. St. Petersburg, 1878. // Prokopovyč's *Dialogues*—P. Verxovskij: *Duxovnyj reglament*, I-II. Rostov, 1916. // F. Morozov (see above, pt. G). // Skovoroda—See above, pt. G. // Secondary Materials—V. Zavitnevič: *Palinodija*. Warsaw, 1883. // P. Verxovskij (see above). // D. Čyžev's'kyj: *Filosofija H.S. Skovorody*. Warsaw, 1934. D. Tschizewskij, *Hryhorij Skovoroda*, Munich, 1973. // Domec'kyj—S. Brailovskij: *K literaturnoj dejatel'nosti Gabrilla Domeckogo*, IORJa, IX (1904), 4.

PART K.

D. Čyžev's'kyj: *Filosofija na Ukrajinі. Sproba istoriohrafiji*. Prague, 1926 (2d ed. of part I, 1929). // D. Čyžev's'kyj: *Narysy z istoriji filosofiji na Ukrajinі*. Prague, 1931. // D. Čyžev's'kyj: *Filosofija H.S. Skovorody* (see above, pt. I). // S. Maslov in ČONL, 24, 2. // G. Florovskij: *Sud'by russkogo bogoslovija*. Paris, 1937. // K. Xarlampovič: *Malorossijskoe vlijanie na veliko-russkiju cerkovnuju žizn'*, I. Kazan', 1914. // A. Brueckner: *Dzieje kultury polskiej*, II-III. Kraków, 1931 (2d ed. 1945; reprint: *Tysiąc lat kultury polskiej*, II. Paris, 1955-56). // D. Čyžev's'kyj, "Biblioteka Prokopovyča," NZ UVAN, II (1953).

CHAPTER VIII. LITERATURE WRITTEN IN LATIN

P. Fedenko: *Ukraina latina*. Prague, 1937. // Comp. A. Brueckner (see above, Ch. VII, pt. J).

CHAPTERS X AND XI – GENERAL HISTORIES

M. Petrov: *Očerki istorii ukrajinskoj literatury XIX stoletija*. Kiev, 1884. // M. Daškevyč: Review of Petrov's history in his *29 otčet o prisuždenii premij imeni gr. Uvarova*. St. Petersburg, 1888. Pp. 37-103. // O. Hruševs'kyj: *Z istoriji ukrajins'koj literatury*. Kiev, 1918. // D. Dorošenko: *Pokažčyk literatury ukrajins'koju movoju v Rosiji za rr. 1798-1897* (*Zbirnyk Ukrajins'koho Universitetu v Prazi 1925* and separately). // *Xrestomatija novoji ukrajins'koj literatury*, I-II, ed. M. Plevako. Xarkiv, 1928. // *Istorija ukrajins'koj literatury*. Kiev, 1967-71, II-III.

CHAPTER X. CLASSICISM

PART A.

M. Zerov: *Nove ukrajins'ke pys'menstvo*, I. Kiev, 1924. // M. Zerov: *Do džerel*. Kraków, 1943. // D. Čiževsky: *Comparative History of Slavic Literatures* (see above, "General Histories"). // F. Neubert: *Der französische Klassicismus und Europa*. Stuttgart-Berlin, 1941.

PART B.

M. Voznjak: *Istorija ukrajins'koj literatury*, II, 2 (see above, "General Histories"). // D. Čyževs'kyj: *Ukrajins'kyj literaturnyj barok* (see above, Ch. VII, pt. A).

PARTS C AND D.

Iroikomičeskaja poema, ed. B. Tomaševskij. Leningrad, 1933. // I. Kotljarevs'kyj: *Tvory*. Edited by S. Jefremov. Kiev, 1909 (2d ed., 1918). // An edition of Kotljarevs'kyj by J. Romančuk in *RP*, I (1904). // An edition by N. Daškevyč in *KSt*, 1898, X. // I. Žytec'kyj: "*Eneida*" *Kotljarevskogo*. Kiev, 1900 (or *KSt*, 1899-1900; Ukrainian translation, 1919). // K. Studyns'kyj: *Kotljarevs'kyj i Artemovs'kyj*. Lviv, 1901. // M. Markovs'kyj: *Najstaršyj*

spysok Eneidy. . . . Kiev, 1927 (*ZbUAN*, 44). // A. Muzyčka in *ČS*, 1925, 1-2. // A. Jensen in *ZNTŠ*, 107-8. // Ja. Ajzenštok in *Ukrajins'ki Propileji*, I: *Kotljarevščyna*. Xarkiv, 1928. // P. Pljušč in *Zapysky Instytutu Movoznavstva AN USSR*, II-V (1946-47). // Ju. Ševel'ov: *Tradycja i novatorstvo v leksyky i stylistyky Kotljarevs'koho*. *Zapysky Xarkivs'koho Universitetu*, 20 (1940). // *Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj u dokumentax, spohahax, doslidžennjax*. Kiev, 1969.

PART E.

Texts—For Kotljarevs'kyj see above, pts. C and D. // For works of V. Hohol': *Osnova*, 1862, II. // For Kvitka's works see below, pt. F. // D. Antonovyč: *Trysta rokiv ukrajins'koho teatru*. Prague, 1925. // *Rannja ukrajins'ka drama*. *Zbirnyk*, edited and with an introduction by P. Rulin. Kiev, 1928. // L. Bilec'kyj in *ZNTŠ*, 99, 149. // P. Petrenko: *H. Kvitka*. Xarkiv, 1931.

PART F.

Editions of Kvitka's Works—*Sočinenija*, I-V. Edited by A. Potebnja. Xarkiv, 1887-94 and later in *RP*, II, 1-2; Kiev, 1918 (vols. 1, 3 with an article by V. Bojko); Xarkiv, 1927-28 (vols 1-2, with an article by A. Šamraj). *Tvory*, I-VIII, Kiev, 1968-70. // M. Plevako: *O stile i jazyke povesti Kvitki "Marusja"*. Xarkiv, 1916. // O. Finkel' in *Pluh*, XI (1928). // M. Zerov in *ŽR*, 1928, 12. // O. Kolessa: *Rannja ukrajins'ka povist'*. Prague, 1927 (*Ukrajins'kyj universitet v Prazi 1921-26*: report). // *Kvitka-Osnovjanenko: Vybrani tvory: Zbirnyk na 150-riččja narodžennja, 1778-1928*. Xarkiv, 1929.

PART G.

V. Sipovs'kyj: *Ukrajina v rosijs'komu pys'menstvi*, I. Kiev, 1928 (*ZbUAN*, 58).

CHAPTER XI. UKRAINIAN SENTIMENTALISM

Studies by M. Zerov and O. Kolessa cited above, Ch. X, pt. F. // G. Gukovskij: *Russkaja literatura 18 v.* Moscow, 1939.

CHAPTER XII. ROMANTICISM

PARTS A AND B.

P. Kluckhohn: *Das Ideengut der deutschen Romantik*. Halle, 1942 (2d ed., 1954). // A. Beguin: *L'âme romantique*. Marseilles, 1934 (2d ed., 1945). // D. Čyževs'kyj in *Die Welt der Slaven*, I, 1955. // P. Fylypovyč in *U*, 1924, 3. // N. Hnatyšak on the ballad in *NK*, 1935-36. // D. Čyževs'kyj: *Narysy z istoriji filosofiji na Ukrajinі* (cited above, Ch. VIII, pt. J; contains a section of the world view of the Ukrainian Romantics).

PART C.

On the "Ukrainian School" in Russian Literature—V. Sipovs'kyj (cited above, Ch. X, pt. G), reviewed by V. D-s'kyj in ČS, 1929, I. // On Ryljejev—V. Maslov: *Literaturnaja dejatel'nost' Ryljejeva*. Kiev, 1912 and in *KUI*. // On Somov—V. Danilov in *RFV*, 1908, 3 and 4. // S. Brajllovskij in *RFV*, 1908, 4; 1909, 1-4. // On N. Gogol'—V. Gippius: *N. V. Gogol'*. Leningrad, 1924. // On Hrebinka—See below, pt. I. // On Kul'žinskij—M. Speranskij in *Izvestija istorično-filosofičeskogo Instituta v Nežine*, 23 (1910). // On Narežnyj—N. Belozerskoja: *Vasilij Trofimovič Narežnyj. Istoriko-literaturnyj očerk*. Petersburg, 1896. // Ju. Solov'ev in *Besedy, Sbornik*. Moscow, 1915. // On Ethnography—A. Pypin: *Istorija ruskoj etnografii*, III. St. Petersburg, 1894. // Historical study by D. Dorošenko: *Ohljad ukrajins'koji istoriohrafiji*. Prague, 1925. // On the "Ukrainian School" in Polish Literature—K.H. Meyer: *Die Ukraine in der polnischen Romantik*. Berlin, 1932. // J. Tretiak: *B. Zaleski*, I-III. Kraków, 1911-14. // V. Hnatjuk in ČS, 1927, 6. // M. Močul'skij in *U*, 1917, 1-2 and *NK*, 1936, 5-12. // About Słowacki—Ja. Ryxlyk in *Zapysky Nižens'koho*, *INO*, 8-9 (1928-29).

PART D.

Texts—A. Šamraj: *Xarkivs'ka škola romantykyv*, I-III. Xarkiv, 1930. // Metlyn's'kyj's and Kostomarov's works in *ZbUAN*, 96 (1928). // M. Kostomarov: *Tvory*, I-II. Kiev, 1967. // Metlyn's'kyj's Works—*Dumky i pisni*. Edited by Kyrylo Studyn's'kyj. Lviv, 1897. // Secondary Materials—A. Šamraj's articles in *Xarkivs'ka škola romantykyv* (cited above) and separately under the same title (Xarkiv, 1930). // On Borovykovs'kyj—O. Finkel' in *LA*, 1931, 6. // M.

Voznjak in *ZNTŠ*, 1936-37. // On Kostomarov—D. Dorošenko: *M.I. Kostomarov, joho hromads'ka i literaturno-naukova dijal'nist'*. Kiev, 1920. // V. Petrov: *Kostomarov i Alina*. Xarkiv, 1928. // *Ukrajins'ki poety-romantyky 20-40-x rokiv XIX st.* Kiev, 1968.

PART E.

Works by Šaškevyč in *RP*, III, 1. // *Pysannja*, ed. by M. Voznjak. Lviv, 1912. // Works by Ustyjanovyč in *RP*, III, 2. // Works by Vahylevyč in *RP*, III, 1. // Works by Holovac'kyj in *RP*, III, 1. // Works by Mohyl'nyč'kyj in *RP*, III, 2. // O. Terlec'kyj in *LVV*, 1903, 6-12. // K. Studyns'kyj: *Heneza poetyčnyx tvoriv M. Šaškevyča*. Lviv, 1901. // Ja. Jarema: "M. Šaškevyč jak liryk-poet," *Zvit gimnaziji Franca-Josyfa I v Ternopoli*, 1911. // V. Lev in *ZNTŠ*, 161 (New York, Paris, 1953; on language). // On Carpatho-Ukrainian Literature—V. Birčak: *Literaturne stremljenja Podkarpatskoe Rusi*. Užhorod, 1921. // Ju. Javors'kyj in *Praci I-ho kongresu slavistiv v Prazi*, 1925. // On Duxnovyc—I. Sozans'kyj in *ZNTŠ*, 86. // *Pys'mennyky zaxidnoji Ukrainy*. Kiev, 1965.

PART F.

M. Voznjak: *Kyrylo-metodijivs'ke bratstvo*. Lviv, 1921. // J. Goląbek: *Bractwo sw. Cyryla i Metodego w Kijowie*. Warsaw, 1935 (employs older materials). // V. Mijakovs'kyj in *Za sto lit*, I, II. // **Texts of Ševčenko's Works—Povne vydannja tvoriv**. Edited by P. Zajcev, II-XV. Warsaw, 1934-38. // *Povne vydannja tvoriv Tarasa Ševčenska*, I-V. Leipzig, 1918-20. // Numerous Soviet editions especially in 10 vols. (Kiev, 1939-63). // P. Zajcev: *Žyttja Tarasa Ševčenska*. Munich, 1955. // O. Konys'kyj: *Taras Ševčenko-Hrušivs'kyj. Xronika joho žyttja*, I-II, Lviv, 1898-1901. // M. Drahomanov: *Ševčenko, ukrajinoфіly j socializm*. Lviv, 1906. // Articles in *Taras Ševčenko: Zbirnyk*. Kiev, 1921; *Ševčenko ta joho doba*, I-II (*ZbUAN*, 1928-30). // *Pamjati T.H. Ševčenska*. Kiev, 1939. // *Ševčenko. Annals of UVAN*, 1-5 (New York, 1950-55). // Articles by P. Zajcev, L. Bilec'kyj and others in the Warsaw edition of Ševčenko's works (see above). // *U*, 1925, 1-2. // A. Bahrij: *Ševčenko v literaturnoj obstanovke*. Baku, 1925. // A. Bahrij: *T.H. Ševčenko*, I-II. Xarkiv, 1930-31. // B. Navroc'kyj: *Hajdamaky*. Kiev, 1928. // B. Navroc'kyj: *Ševčenkova tvorčist'*. Kiev, 1931. // O. Doroskevyč: *Etjudy z Ševčenkoznastva*. Xarkiv-Kiev, 1930. // S. Smal'-Stoc'kyj: *T. Ševčenko. Interpretaciji*. Warsaw, 1934. // M. Šaginjan: *Taras Ševčenko*. Moscow, 1945 (also 1950 ed.). // *Ševčenko and Other National Literatures*—O. Kolessa in

ZNTŠ, 3. // Ja. Hordyns'kyj and V. Ščurat in ZNTŠ, 119-20. // Ševčenko and the Oral Tradition—I. Franko in ZNTŠ, VI, 119-20. // V. Petrov: "Estetyčna doktryna Ševčenska," *Arka*, X (1943), 3-4. // P.A. Zajončkovskij: *Kirillo-mefodievskoe obščestvo*. Moscow, 1959. // *Taras Ševčenko, 1814-1861: A Symposium*, eds. V. Mijakovs'kyj and G.Y. Shevelov. Hague, 1962. // *Slovnyk movy Ševčenska*. Kiev, 1964. // G.S.N. Luckyj: *Between Gogol' and Ševčenko*. Munich, 1971.

PART G.

Works by O. Storoženko—RP. // *Tvory*, I-II. Introduction by B. Lepkyj. Berlin, 1922 (incomplete). // *Tvory*, I-IV. Introduction by A. Šamraj. Xarkiv-Kiev, 1927-28. // I. Stešenko in ZNTŠ, 43. // I. Žytec'kyj in KSt, 1905, 9. // Works by Kuliš—*Sočinenija i pis'ma*, I-V. Kiev, 1908-10 (incomplete). // RP (six volumes, incomplete). // *Tvory*, I-IV. Berlin, 1922-23 (incomplete). // *Tvory*, I, III, VI. Kiev, 1930-31 (incomplete). // Pantelejmon Kuliš. *Zbirnyk Prac' Komisiji dlja vydavannja pamjatok novitn'oho pys'menstva*. Kiev, 1927. // V. Petrov: *Pantelejmon Kuliš u pjatdesjati roky*, I. Kiev, 1929. // Review by V. Peretc in *Naukovyj zbirnyk Leninhraďs'koho tovarystva*, III (ZbUAN), 1931. // V. Petrov: *Romany Kuliša*. Xarkiv, 1930. // O. Doroškevyč: *Kuliš i Myloradovyčivna. Lysty*. Kiev, 1927. // D. Čyževs'kyj: *Narysy z istoriji filosofiji na Ukrajinі* (cited above, Ch. VIII, pt. J) and in *Orient und Occident*, 13 (1932). // M. Zerov: Introduction to P. Kuliš, *Poezii*. Xarkiv-Kiev, 1927 (reprint: Lviv, 1939). // Earlier Works About Kuliš—V. Šenrok: *P.A. Kuliš*. Kiev, 1901. (KSt, 1900-1901). // D. Dorošenko: *P.O. Kuliš, joho žyttja i literaturno-hromads'ka dijal'nist'*. Kiev, 1918; Leipzig, 1923. // O. Hruševs'kyj in LNV, 1909, 9-12. // V. Ščurat: *Filosofična osnova tvorčosty Kuliša*. Lviv, 1922.

PART H.

Works by Padura in RP, I. // V. Hnatjuk: "Padura, Ryljejev i dekabrysty," *ZIFV*, XVIII, 1928. // Hrebinka's works in RP, I. // A. Kupčinskij: *Žizn' i dejatel'nost' Grebenki*. Kiev, 1900. // V. Lesevič: "P. Grebenka," *Russkaja Mysl'*, I, 1904. // A. Bahrij in LA, 1931, 1-2. // On Zabila—I. Franko in LNV, 1906, 3. // On Ostaševs'kyj—V. Hnatjuk in LV, 1906, 1-6. // On A. Šaškevyč—V. Hnatjuk in *Juvilejnyj zbirnyk na pošanu Myxajla Serhijevyča Hruševs'koho z nahody šist'desjatoji ričnyci ta sorokovyx rokovyn naukovoji dijal'nosti*, II. Kiev, 1928.

PART I.

Ukrainian Literature Abroad—V. Sipovs'kyj (see above, pt. D). // **Russian Translations**—A. Bahrij: *T. G. Ševčenko v russkix perevodax*. Baku, 1925. // **Polish Translations**—P. Zajcev in the Warsaw edition of Ševčenko's works, XIV (cited above, pt. H). // **Influences on Bulgarian Literature**—I. Šyšmanov: "Taras Ševčenko . . .," *Studii, recenzii, spomeni, pisma*. Sofia, 1969. // V.S. Čilingirov in *ZNTŠ*, 119-20. // M. Mandryka in *ZIFV*, 5. // D. Šelud'ko in *ZIFV*, 18 and 23. // **Influences on Slovak Literature**—Wl. Bobek: *Slovensko a slovanstvo*. Bratislava, 1936. // **Influences on Czech Literature**—P. Bohac'kyj in *ZNTŠ*, 1927. // *Sto padesat let česko-ukrajinských literárních styků*, ed. O. Zilys'kyj. Prague, 1968. // **Ties with Germany**—D. Doroschenko: *Ukraine und das Reich*. Leipzig, 1942.

CHAPTER XIII. THE "BIEDERMEIER" AND THE "NATURALIST SCHOOL" IN UKRAINE

Articles by W. Brecht, W. Bietak, P. Kluckhohn, G. Weydt in *Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift fuer Literatur-und Geistesgeschichte*, IX (1931), XII (1934), XIII (1935). // I. Pan'kevyc in *Praci ukrajins'koho istoryčno-filolohičnoho tovarystva v Prazi*, III (1941). // **About Naturalism**—V. Vinogradov: *Gogol' i natural'naja skola*. Leningrad, 1925; *Etjudy o stile Gogolja*. Leningrad, 1926; *Evoljucija russkogo naturalizma*. Leningrad, 1929 (contains some material on the "Ukrainian school" in Russian literature). // D. Čiževskij: *Comparative History of Slavic Literatures* (cited above, "General Histories").

CHAPTER XIV. REALISM

O. Ohnovs'kyj: *Istorija literatury rus'koj*. Lviv, 1891-93. // N. Petrov: *Očerki istorii ukrainskoj literatury XIX st.* Kiev, 1884. // M. Drahomanov: "Ukrajins'ke pys'menstvo 1866-73 rr.," *LNV*, X-XII, 1902. // I. Franko: "Z ostannix desjatylyt' XIX v.," *LNV*, VII-IX, 1901. // S. Jefremov: *Istorija ukrajins'koho pys'menstva*, Kiev-Leipzig, 1919, II. // M. Zerov: *Vid Kuliša do Vynnyčenska*. Kiev, 1929. // D.V. Čalyj: *Stanovlennja realizmu v ukrajins'kij literaturi*. Kiev, 1956. // M.D. Bernštein: *Ukrajins'ka literaturna krytyka 50-70-x rokiv XIX st.* Kiev, 1959.

ABBREVIATIONS OF NAMES OF PERIODICALS, COLLECTIONS AND SERIES

<i>AfsPh</i>	<i>Archiv fuer slavische Philologie</i>
<i>AjuzR</i>	<i>Arxiv jugo-zapadnoj Rossii</i>
<i>Akty Ju. i</i> <i>Z. Rusi</i>	<i>Akty k istorii južnoj i zapadnoj Rusi</i>
<i>Annals</i>	<i>The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.</i>
<i>BL</i>	<i>Bibliografičeskaja Letopis'</i>
<i>ČOID</i>	<i>Čtenija v Moskovskom Obščestve istorii i drevnostej</i>
<i>ČONL</i>	<i>Čtenija v obščestve Nestora Letopisca</i>
<i>ČŠ</i>	<i>Červonyj Šljax</i>
<i>HSS</i>	<i>Harvard Slavic Studies</i>
<i>IAN</i>	<i>Izvestija po russkomu jazyku i slovesnosti Akademii Nauk</i>
<i>IORJa</i>	<i>Izvestija Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Akademii Nauk</i>
<i>KS or KSt</i>	<i>Kievskaja Starina</i>
<i>KUI</i>	<i>Kievskie Universitetskie Izvestija</i>
<i>LA</i>	<i>Literaturnyj Arxiv</i>
<i>LNV</i>	<i>Literaturno-Naukovyj Visnyk</i>
<i>MBP</i>	<i>Malaja Biblioteka Poeta</i>
<i>NK</i>	<i>Naša Kul'tura</i>
<i>NZ UVAN</i>	<i>Naukovyj Zbirnyk Ukrajsn'koji Vil'noji Akademiji Nauk u SŠA</i>

<i>PDP</i>	<i>Pamjatniki Drevnej Pis'mennosti i Iskusstva</i>
<i>PSRL</i>	<i>Polnoe Sobranie Russkix Letopisej</i>
<i>RES</i>	<i>Revue des Etudes Slaves</i>
<i>RFV</i>	<i>Russkij Filologičeskij Vestnik</i>
<i>RIB</i>	<i>Russkaja Istoričeskaja Biblioteka</i>
<i>RP</i>	<i>Rus'ka pys'mennist</i>
<i>S</i>	<i>Slavia</i>
<i>SAN</i>	<i>Sbornik po russkomu jazyku i slovesnosti Akademii Nauk</i>
<i>SORJa</i>	<i>Sbornik Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Akademii Nauk</i>
<i>TKDA</i>	<i>Trudy Kievskoj Duxovnoj Akademii</i>
<i>TODRL</i>	<i>Trudy Otdela drevne-russkoj literatury Akademii Nauk SSSR</i>
<i>U</i>	<i>Ukrajina</i>
<i>UVAN</i>	<i>Ukrajins'ka Vil'na Akademija Nauk u SŠA</i>
<i>V pamjat' stoletija</i>	<i>V Pamjat' stoletija Moskovskoj Duxovnoj Akademii (Moscow, 1915)</i>
<i>VUAN</i>	<i>Vseukrajins'ka Akademija Nauk</i>
<i>VUI</i>	<i>Varšavskie Universitetskie Izvestija</i>
<i>ZbUAN</i>	<i>Zbirnyk Ukrajins'koji Akademiji Nauk</i>
<i>ZfsPH</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie</i>
<i>ZIFV</i>	<i>Zapysky istoryčno-filolohičnoho viddily Ukrajins'koji Akademiji Nauk</i>
<i>ŽMNP</i>	<i>Žurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosvěščenija</i>
<i>ZNTK or</i>	
<i>ZUNT</i>	<i>Zapysky Ukrajins'koho Naukovoho Tovarystva v Kyjevi</i>

<i>ZNTŠ</i>	<i>Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenko u L'vovi</i>
<i>ŽR</i>	<i>Žyttja i Revoljucija</i>

* *
*

Because of the unavailability of certain materials at this time, I was occasionally forced to give incomplete bibliographical references—the volume number of a periodical or series but not its date, and vice versa.

INDEX OF NAMES AND TITLES

Prepared by Alexandra Chernenko-Rudnytsky

Since the detailed Table of Contents for this book provides subject access to the contents, this is an index only of names and titles.

Titles in the index are in English translation, with cross references from the original title. In a few cases, textual reference has been to the original title of the work (e.g., Ševčenko's *Kobzar*), and in these cases the index entry is for the original title with a cross reference from the English translation. Pseudonyms and double names are entered under the form most frequently used in the text, with cross references from the other form. Entries for names or titles in footnotes include the letter "n" after the page reference (i.e., "24n"). All indexed titles have been italicized, whether they refer to separately published works or to individual pieces contained in collective publications.

Abgar, tale of, 64
Ablesimov, Aleksandr (1748-1783),
415
About Cats (Klymentij), 298
About Obedience (Domec'kyj), 352
About the Reading of Books (Collection of 1076), 98
About the Thief in the Village of Hakivnycia (Kuliš), 554

Abraham, 339; legend of, 47; life of,
45
Absalom, lament for, 21
Acindynus (Abbot of the Kievan Caves
Monastery), 166
Acts of Paul and Thekla, 46
Acts of the Apostles, 243, 268
Adam, 316, 339; head of, 113; lives of
Adam and Eve, 45; manuscript of,
151; tales about, 47

- Adam's Speech to Lazarus in Hell*, 215-16, 218
- Adrijanova-Peretc, Varvara (1888-), 5
- Adventures of Ivan, the Innkeeper's Son* (Novikov), 427
- Advice* (Vyšens'kyj), 265
- Advice to the Wealthy* (Collection of 1076), 98
- Advocate Martianus* (Ukrajinka), 617
- Advokat Martijan*. See *Advocate Martianus*.
- Aeneas. See Enej.
- Aeneid*. See *Enejida*.
- Aeneid* (Blumauer), 383
- Aeneid* (Virgil, 312, 381-83
- Aeneid*, travesties of, 382
- Aesop, fables of, 27
- Afanas'ev, Oleksander. See Čužbyns'kyj, Oleksander.
- After the Inspection* (Kropyvnyč'kyj), 609, 612
- Agapitus (monk), 167-68
- Agrippa von Nettesheim, Heinrich Cornelius (1486-1535), 356
- Akir, story about, 64; tale about, 206
- Akir the Wise, 212. See also *Tale of Akir the Wise*.
- Aleksandrija*. See *Alexandreis*.
- Aleksej Edinorog* (Kuliš), 555
- Alexander of Macedon (356-323 B.C.), 36, 185, 232; tales about, 40, 53-55, 316-17, 389
- Alexander, son of Philip* (Hamartolos), 389, 556n
- Alexandreis*, 54-55, 60, 185, 220, 234, 242-43, 317
- Alexis, Saint, 5; drama about, 322-23. See also *Life of Alexis*.
- Alfavit ryfmany složennyj*. See *Alphabet Put Together in Verse*.
- Algazali (1058-1111), 232
- Alipius (icon-painter), 168
- Al'oša Popovič, 127, 189, 210, 257
- Alphabet Put Together in Verse* (publ. Maksymovyč), 296
- Alsted, Johann Heinrich (1588-1638), 356
- Aldorf (countess), story about, 316
- Altercation of the Soul with the Body* (Nekraševyč), 380
- Anastasia-Verxuslava (princess-nun), 221
- Ancient and the Recent* (Franko), 606
- Andersen, Hans Christian (1805-1875), 600-601
- Andrella, Myxajlo (priest), 351
- Andrew, Apostle, 22, 114, 122, 324
- Andrew Bogoljubskij (prince), 140, 164-65, 179
- Andrew of Crete, Saint, 107
- Andrew the Simple, 89. See also *Life of Andrew the Simple*.
- Andrew Volodymyrovyč. See Andrij Volodymyrovyč.
- Andrij Volodymyrovyč (Prince of Perejaslav), 172, 212
- Angelus Silesius (1624-1677), 446
- Anna, Saint, lament of, 21; Virgin's mother, 304
- Annotated Palea*, 221
- Antiquity* (Kostomarov), 473
- Antithesis* (Potij), 249
- Antonius-Dobrynja of Novgorod. See Dobrynja, Antonius ("the Pilgrim") of Novgorod.
- Antonius of the Kievan Caves Monastery, Saint, 83-84, 90, 94, 97, 110, 119, 168. See also *Life of Antonius*.
- Antyryzys*. See *Antithesis*.
- Apocalypse*, 45, 47, 249, 309
- Apocrisis* (anonymous), 248
- Apokryzys*. See *Apocrisis*.
- Apollo, 325, 552
- Apollonius of Tyre, narrative about, 315
- Apostle* (12 and 13th centuries), 39
- Apostle* of the year 1307, 209
- Apostol Danylo (het'man; 1654-1734), 326
- Areas (monk), 167
- Areopagitika*, 227
- Aristion* (Narižnyj), 432
- Aristophanes, 336, 428

- Aristotle, 51, 53, 55, 212, 220, 232-33, 237, 267-68, 270
 Arius, 150-51
 Arsenius (Bishop of Tver), 166
 Artemovs'kyj-Hulak, Petro. See Hulak-Artemovs'kyj, Petro.
 Artist (Ševčenko), 537
 Asmud, legend about, 35
Assumption of the Blessed Virgin (Tuptalo), 322
As You Sow, So Shall You Reap (Kvitka), 422
 Athanasius (monk), 220
 Athanasius of Alexandria, 39, 44, 62
 Athanasius of Rus', 230
Athanasius Replies (Collection of 1076), 98
 Athanasius the Hermit, 167
 Attila, 63
 Auerbach, Berthold (1812-1882), 427
 Augustine, Saint (Bishop of Hippo; 354-430), 532
 Augustus (Caesar; 63 B.C.-14 A.D.), 343
 Avsenev, Petr (1810-1853), 496
 Avvakum (protopop; 1620 or 1621-1682), 274

Baba Paraska and Baba Palažka (Levyc'kyj), 596
Baba Paraska ta Baba Palažka. See *Baba Paraska and Baba Palažka*.
Babusja na tomu sviti. See *Little Old Woman in the Other World*.
 Bacon, Francis (1561-1626), 356
Bajda (Kuliš), 552
Bajky. See *Fables*.
 Bajskij, Pofirij (pseud.). See Somov, Orest.
 Balaban, Hedeon (bishop; 1530-1607), 205
Balalajka (folk song), 582
 Baldwin (King of Jerusalem), 110-12
Ballad of the Rose Garland (Brentano), 550

 Balzac, Honoré de (1799-1850), 587
 Bantyš-Kamens'kyj, Dmytro (1788-1850), 447, 450
 Baranovyč, Lazar (1620-1693), 338, 358, 362
Barlaam and Josaphat, 58-59, 163, 316, 337
 Barlaam of the Kievan Caves Monastery, 110
Barley (Hrebinka), 572
 Bars'kyj, Vasyl', Hryhorovyč. See Hryhorovyč-Bars'kyj, Vasyl'.
 Baruch, apocalypse of, 47
 Barvinok, Hanna (pseud., 1828-1911), 535-36
 Basil (monk), 168-70
 Basil the Great (Bishop of Caesarea; 330-379), 51, 319; sermons of, 43-44, 70, 105, 108, 227. See also *Hexaemeron of Basil the Great*.
 Batiga, *starina* about, 189
Battle Between Seven Honorable Virtues and the Seven Capital Sins, 310
Battle Near Poltava (Starck), 582
Battle of the Frogs and the Mice, Greek Material on One Side, Cossack on the Other, Darned Anew with a Nimble Thread (Dumytraško), 403
 Batu, campaign of, 189, 210; tale about the death of, 211
Bdžola. See *Bee*.
Beda's Chronicle. See *Chronicle of Beda*.
Bee, 52-54, 64, 211-12
 Bela (Magyar king), 185
 Belinskij, Vissarion (1811-1848), 540n
Bell (Kuliš), 544
 Benjamin, Saint, 92
Beowulf (8th century), 207
Berliner Erzählungen (Hoffmann), 587
 Bermjata (boyar), 188
 Berynda, Pamva (d. 1632), 320, 349
Beside a Grove in an Open Field (Ševčenko), 515

- Best Kind of Dream* (Gawatowicz), 328
Betrothed (Štoroženko), 564
Bewitched (Ševčenko), 515
Bible (general), 21, 27-28, 39-41, 45, 47, 53, 63, 67, 71, 73, 77, 80, 82, 84-86, 88, 96, 98, 105, 108, 111, 144, 151-54, 165, 169, 173, 179-180, 183-85, 206-207, 210-12, 220-21, 227, 234, 243-44, 247, 254, 320, 335, 340, 352, 430, 514, 531, 538, 551, 556. See also parts of the *Bible* under their particular names.
 Bielski, Marcin (1495-1575), 125
 Bilec'kyj, Oleksander (1884-1961), 8
 Bilec'kyj-Nosenko, Pavlo (1774-1856), 403, 412, 436, 577
 Bilozers'kyj, Vasyľ (1825-1899), 495-96, 533, 536
 Bilyk, Ivan (pseud., 1845-1905), 598
Biser. See *Pearl* (*Biser*).
Black Council (Kuliš), 349, 526, 529, 531-32, 535, 552, 554, 566, 579, 581, 602, 605
 Blahoslav, Jan (1523-1571), 19, 254
Blahoutrobije Marka Avrelija. See *Kindness of Marcus Aurelius*.
Blakytina trojanda. See *Sky Blue Rose*.
 Blessed Virgin. See *Mary, Virgin*.
Blind Man (Ševčenko), 515
 Blumauer, Johannes (1755-1798), 381-82, 389
Bobyl'. See *Landless Peasant*.
 Boccaccio, Giovanni (1313-1375), 317, 356
 Bodenstein, Friedrich Martin von (1819-1892), 582
 Bodin, Jean (1530-1596), 356
 Bodjans'kyj, Osyp (1808-1876), 255, 447, 573
 Boehme, Jacob (1575-1624), 446
Bogdan (Hrebinka), 452
Bogdan Xmelnickij (Niemcewicz), 449
 Bohdanovyč, Ippolit (1744-1803), 357, 377
Bohohlasnyk, 282
Bohorodyce Divo. See *Hail, Virgin, Mother of God*.
 Boileau-Despréaux, Nicolas (1636-1711), 371-73, 382, 402, 404
 Bojan (epic poet), 124, 130-31, 137, 192, 194-96, 201, 204, 549
Bojarynja. See *Noblewoman*.
Boj-žinka. See *Termagant*.
 Bonjak the Mangy (Šoludyvyj; khan of the Polovci), 19, 67, 116
Book about Death, 354
Book of Daniel, 231
Book of Ecclesiastes, 40
Book of Esther, 64
Book of Genesis, 309
Book of Hosea, 212
Book of Instructions for the Land-owners of Černihiv Province (Kuliš), 526
Book of Isaiah, 212
Book of Joshua, 231
Book of Judges, 40
Book of Nahum, 40
Book of Proverbs, 40
Book of Psalms, 40, 62, 81, 105, 212, 231. See also *Psalms*.
Book of Ruth, 40, 231
Book of Sirach, 211-12
Book of the Wisdom (Hamartolos), 196
Book of Wisdom (Collection of 1076), 98
Book of Zachariah, 40, 58
Books of Moses, 40, 231
Books of Solomon, 231
Books of the Genesis of the Ukrainian People (Kostomarov), 476, 497, 527, 534
Books of the Maccabees, 246
Books of the Prophets, 40
 Borduljak, Tymofij (1863-1936), 603
 Boris (Bulgarian tsar), 63, 115
 Borovykovs'kyj, Levko (1806-1889), 452, 456-60, 462-63, 477, 535, 572
Borrowed Kobza (Kuliš), 556, 558

- Borys, Saint (prince; d. 1015), 11, 14, 20, 79-82, 88-89, 90-93, 97, 115, 121, 133, 153-54, 163-65, 169, 170, 210, 324. See also *Tale* (of Borys and Hlib) and *Lives of Saints Borys and Hlib*.
- Boryslav Stories* (Franko), 604
- Boryslavs'ki opovidannja*. See *Boryslav Stories*.
- Bova (prince), tale about, 242-43, 316
- Boz, or Booz. See Bus.
- Boži dity*. See *God's Children*.
- Bran' česnyx sedmy dobroditelej z sedmy hrixamy smertnymy*. See *Battle Between Seven Honorable Virtues and the Seven Capital Sins*.
- Brat'ja bliznecy*. See *Twin Brothers*.
- Bratkovs'kyj, Danylo (d. 1702), 358
- Braty*. See *Brothers*.
- Brentano, Clemens (1778-1842), 504, 550
- Breviary*, 267-68
- Brjuxovec'kyj, Ivanec' (Ivan) (het'man; d. 1668), 529, 532
- Brodjačij ogon'*. See *Wandering Fire*.
- Bronski, M., 248, 265
- Brothers* (Kuliš), 555
- Brückner, Aleksander (1856-1939), 224
- Bruno, Giordano (1548-1600), 356
- Brunswick, story about, 316
- Bucolics* (Vergil), 403n
- Bučyns'kyj-Jaskol'd, Oleksander (last half of the 17th-early 18th century), 309
- Buddeus, Johann Franz (1667-1729), 364
- Buddha, 59
- Budny, Symon (16th century), 244
- Buj Tur Vsevolod* (Didyc'kyj), 492
- Bulgarin, Fadej (1789-1859), 452
- Bürger, Gottfried August (1747-1794), 436, 458, 577
- Buried Treasures* (Somov), 450
- Burlačka*. See *Vagrant Girl*.
- Bursak*. See *Seminarian*.
- Bus (King of Antes), 22; epos about, 207
- Buslaev, Fedir (1818-1897), 7, 118
- Bužyns'kyj, Havrylo (d. 1731), 342, 356
- By Dnieper's Banks Along the Sands* (Ševčenko), 537
- Bylina*. See *Starina*.
- Byron, George Gordon (1788-1824), 472; translations of, 533, 556, 601
- Cain, 47, 69, 92, 95, 150
- Čajkovskij* (Hrebinka), 452
- Callisthenes (of Olynthus; 360-328 B.C.), 54
- Candle-ends of a Country Homestead* (Kuliš), 549
- Captain* (Ševčenko), 516-17, 519
- Captain's Daughter* (Puškin), 422
- Captive* (Ševčenko), 515-16, 519, 609
- Čardano, Girolamo (1501-1576), 356
- Čary*. See *Sorcery*.
- Časoslovec'*, 243
- Castle of Kaniów* (Goszczyński), 453, 484
- Catherine, Saint, drama about, 322
- Catherine II (Russian empress; reigned 1762-96), 544
- Caucasus* (Ševčenko), 514, 616
- Cautious Objection* (Vyšens'kyj), 267
- Čecaumenus (Byzantine voivode), 109
- Čelakovský, Frantisek Ladislav (1799-1852), 468
- Černigovskie Gubernskie Vedomosti*. See *Province of Černigov News*.
- Černihiv Chronicle*. See *Chronicle of Černihiv*.
- Černihivka*. See *Černihiv Maiden*.
- Černihiv Maiden* (Kostomarov), 476
- Černjavs'kyj, Mykola (1868-1946), 618
- Černycja Mariana*. See *Mariana, the Nun*.
- Černyševskij, Nikolaj (1828-1889), 540n
- Certelev, Mykola (1790-1869), 447

Čet'i Minei. See *Menaea for Daily Reading*.

Četveroevangelije. See *Tetraevangelion*.

Chamisso, Adelbert von (1781-1838), 582

Charitable Sozomenus (Collection of 1076), 98; story about, 103

Charlemagne (emperor), 207

Charles XII (King of Sweden), 348

Chasing Two Hares (Staryc'kyj), 612

Chekhov, Anton (1860-1904), 421

Choeroboscus, George, 51

Christ, 45, 47-48, 50, 53-55, 107, 110-13, 133-34, 140-44, 146-47, 149-50, 155-56, 164, 176, 216, 218-19, 229, 231, 242, 245, 250, 255-56, 268, 272, 284-85, 296, 302-303, 307, 312, 320, 322, 326, 333-34, 337, 339, 342, 352, 378, 380-81, 496-97

Christmas Eve (Gogol'), 564

Chronicle (general), 3, 18, 20-28, 30, 34, 38-40, 46, 52-54, 63, 66-69, 71, 79-80, 82-83, 88, 97, 99, 104, 115, 117-23, 126-30, 132-33, 135, 152, 163-64, 169, 187-89, 196, 201, 204, 206, 209-210, 212, 224, 227, 234, 277, 343, 531

Chronicle of . . .

Beda, 27; *Constantine Manassius*, 50; *Cosmas of Prague*, 92; *Dalimil*, 27; *Georgius Hamartolos* (the Sinner), 49-50, 54, 64-65, 115, 135, 185; *Georgius Sincellus*, 49; *Hajek*, 27; *Hamartolos*, *Georgius*—see *Georgius Hamartolos*; *Hrabjanka*, 447; *Jerlyč*, 293, 300, 349, 358; *John Malalas*, 49-50, 54-55, 62, 115, 135, 183, 185, 196;

Malalas, John—see *Chronicle of John Malalas*; *Manassius, Constantine*—see *Chronicle of Constantine Manassius*; *Nestor*, 65-66, 118, 127, 167; *Nicon*, 124, 190; *Novgorod*, 115, 120, 122, 187;

Chronicle of . . . (cont'd)

Rostov, 167; *Sincellus, Georgius*—see *Chronicle of Georgius Sincellus*; *the Grand Duchy of Lithuania*, 234; *the Kievan Caves Monastery*, 166-67; *Tverian*, 226; *Velyčko*, 300, 309, 347, 447. See also *Cossack Chronicle*, *Eye-Witness Chronicle*, *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, *Hustyn' Chronicle*, *Hypatian Chronicle*, *Kievan Chronicle*, *Laurentian Chronicle*, *Perejaslav Chronicle*, *Primary Chronicle*, *Short Kievan Chronicle*, *Suzdalian Chronicle*, *Western Rus' Chronicle*, *Western Ukrainian Chronicle*.

Chronicle . . .

of the year 907, 28; of the year 912, 26; of the year 946, 27; of the year 1044, 119; of the year 1054, 108; of the year 1074, 24; of the year 1172, 165; of the year 1073, 120; of the year 1093, 122; of the year 1106, 128; of the year 1113, 121; of the year 1114, 135; of the year 1151, 190; of the year 1199, 155; of the year 1245, 165; of the year 1247, 211; of 13th century, 19; of the year 1514, 209

Chronograph According to the Long Text, 135

Chronograph Compiled from Ancient Chronicle (Safanovyč), 247

Chronology (Rymša), 254

Chrysostom (anthology of sermons), 44

Chrysostomos, John. See *John Chrysostomos*.

Church Slavonic-Ukrainian Grammar (Lučkaj), 415

Cicero, Marcus Tullus (106-143), 24n, 356, 363

Cięglewicz, Kasper (1807-1886), 454, 578

Citizen's Conversation with the Peasant and the Church Singer (Prokopovyč), 354

- Claudius (emperor), 372
 Clement, Saint, 156
 Clement (Klym) Smoljatyč (Metropolitan of Kiev; 12th century), 53, 76-77, 152-54, 156, 220-21, 223
 Clerk of Ostrih (pseud.), 248
Climax (Klimakos), 5, 44, 227
Cloistered Maiden (Pogorelskij), 452
Clouds (Levyč'kyj), 597
 Čobotko ("bogatyř and giant"), 126
Čodex Suprasliensis. See *Menaem*.
Čoho ty xodyš na mohylu. See *Why Do You Walk Upon the Grave-Mound?*
Čoho ž voda kalamutna. See *Why Is the Water So Troubled?*
Collection (Svjatoslava) of 1073, 45, 50-51, 61-62, 98, 220
Collection (Svjatoslava) of 1076, 22, 52, 97-98, 103, 105, 108, 211-12
Collection of 13th century, 52
Colloquy of the Three Prelates, 48
 Comenius, Johann Amos (1592-1670), 270, 274, 319, 356
Commandments of Twelve Patriarchs, 45, 47, 108
Comprehensive Synopsis (Koxanov's'kyj), 348
Concerning Spiritual Rules (Prokopovyč), 354
Concerning the Call to the Law and the Perfection of Those Who Abide By It (Domec'kyj), 351
Concerning the Destruction of Hell, 322, 327, 333
Confession (Nekraševyč), 380
Confession of Eve, 46-47, 84
Confession of Faith (Hilarion), 71
Constantine Manassius Chronicle. See *Chronicle of Constantine Manassius*.
 Constantine of Ostrih. See *Ostroz'kyj*, *Konstantyn*.
 Constantine the Great, Saint (274-337), 92
 Constantine the Presbyter (10th century), 44, 62
Conversation Between a Follower of the Union of Brest and a Monk (Potij), 249
Convict (Ševčenko), 516, 519
 Copernicus, Nicolaus (1473-1543), 238, 343
Coriolanus (Shakespeare), 474
Čorna rada. See *Black Council*.
 Čornobyl's'kyj, Kmita. See *Kmita Čornobyl's'kyj*.
Čornomors'kyj pobut na Kubani. See *Life of the Kuban Kozaks*.
Čortova korčma. See *Tavern of the Devil*.
 Cosmas, Saint (of Korsun'), 64
 Cosmas Indicopleustes (of Alexandria; 6th century A.D.), 51, 64
Cosmas of Prague Chronicle. See *Chronicle of Cosmas of Prague*.
Cosmography, 232
Cossack Chronicle, 6, 118, 447. See also *Chronicle of Hrabjanka*, *Chronicle of Velyčko*, and *Eye-Witness Chronicle*.
Cossack and the Storm (Metlyns'kyj), 467
 Cossack Plaxta, song about, 19
Cossack Poet (Šaxovskij), 433
Cossacks (Kuzmič), 452
Cossacks' Tales (Czajkowski), 454
Cottage (publ. by Kuliš), 535
Country Homestead Philosophy (Kuliš), 549
Country Woman (Kuliš), 554
 Coypeau d'Assoucy, Charles (1605-1675), 403
Creator (Ustyjanovyč), 487
Crossroads (Franko), 605
 Crouzer, Georg Friedrich (1771-1858), 456
Crowned and the Tracer, 58
Crown of Christ (Radyvylovs'kyj), 336
Čtenie (of Borys and Hlib). See *Lives of Borys and Hlib*.

- Čul'kov, Mixail (1743-1792), 427
 Čumaky. See *Wagoneers*.
 Čuprynka, Hryhorij (1879-1921), 618
 Čurajivna, Marusja (semi-mythical author), 452
 Čurovskij, A., 452
 Čurylo, 60, 125, 188, 224
 Čužbys'kyj, Oleksander (pseud., 1817-1875), 452, 535, 574-76, 586
Cvtna. See *Songs for Eastertide*.
 Cyclops, legend about, 35
 Čykalenko, Jevhen (1861-1929), 611
 Cyprian (Metropolitan of Kiev; 14th century), 228, 230
 Cyril (scribe), 179
 Cyril (Constantine), Saint (827-869), 51, 62-63, 98, 218; Brotherhood of, 496, 534; mission of, 114. See also *Lives of Saints Cyril and Methodius*.
 Cyril of Alexandria, Saint (376-444), 44
 Cyril of Turiv (bishop; 12th century), 18, 21, 46, 59, 66, 125, 137-38, 140-41, 143, 147, 149-53, 157, 162-63, 217n-220, 227-29, 320
 Cyril the Philosopher, the Slavic missionary. See Cyril (Constantine), Saint.
 Cyrus (Persian king), 53
 Čy se ž taja krynyčenka. See *Is This Really the Same Well?*
 Čy to na te Boža volja? See *Was It the Will of God?*
 Čyževs'kyj, Dmytro (1894-), 353
 Czajkowski, M. (1804-1886), 454, 582
 Czechowicz, Marcin (1532-1613), 224
 Czobotko. See Čobotko.

Daj sercju volju, zavede v nevolju. See *Give Your Heart Freedom and It Will Enslave You*.
 Dal', Vladimir (1801-1872), 427, 452
Dalimil's Chronicle. See *Chronicle of Dalimil*.
 Damian, Saint (of Korsun'), 64
 Daniel. See Danylo Romanovyč.
 Daniel, Abbot (the Pilgrim), 110-13
Daniel's Sermon, 215
Daniel's Supplication. See *Supplication of Daniel*.
 Danilevskij, G. See Danylevs'kyj, Hryhorij.
 Dante, Alighieri (1265-1321), 46
 Danylevs'kyj, Hryhorij (1829-1890), 452
 Danylo Apostol. See Apostol Danylo.
 Danylo Lovčan (father of Ivan; epos figures), 190
 Danylo Romanovyč (King of Halyč; 1201-1264), 125, 179-81, 183-86, 209, 218, 221
 Darius (Persian king), 185, 317
 Daškevyč, Mykola (1852-1908), 4
 David (King of Judah and Israel), 21, 28, 45, 55, 113, 127, 216, 221, 339
 David, Saint (Christian name). See Hlib, Saint.
 David Ihorevyč (Prince of Volynia; 1059-1112), 86-87, 115-16
 David Rostyslavyč (Prince of Smolens'k; 1140-1197), 178, 195
 David Svjatoslavyč (Prince of Černihiv; d. 1123), 154
Davnja kazka. See *Old Tale*.
Davnje j nove. See *Ancient and the Recent*.
Davnyna. See *Antiquity*.
Davydenko Avessalom (Kuliš), 556
 Dažboh (myth.), 195-96
Dead Souls (Gogol'), 565
De arte poetica (Horace), 237
De arte poetica (Prokopovyč), 364
Death of Pilate (apocr.), 47
Decameron (Boccaccio), 317, 337
Deeds of Digenis, 55-57, 185, 191, 206, 224
Deeds of the Romans, 315-16
Deeds of Troy, 55, 224, 242
Defense of Buša (Staryc'kyj), 612
Defense of the Council of Florence (Potij), 249

- Demetrius, Saint, 228
 Demetrius (voivode), 210
 Demetrius of Salonica, Saint, 92. See *Life of Demetrius of Salonica*.
 Demjan Kudenevyč (epos figure), 190
De processione Spiritus Sancti (Zörnrikau), 364
Depths (anthology of sermons), 44
 Descartes, René (1596-1650), 356
Descendants of the Ukrainian Hajdamaky (Kuliš), 555
Deščo pro toho Haras'ka. See *Note about That Horace*.
Description of Ancient Poland (Swencki), 432
Descriptio veteries et novae Poloniae (Sarnicki), 125
Devgenievo dejanie. See *Deeds of Digenis*.
Devil in Love (Storoženko), 563
Dialogue Between the Lumberman and the Merchant (Prokopovyč), 354
 Dickens, Charles John Huffam (1812-1870), 537, 587
Dictys Cretensis (of Knossos), 55
Did pasičnyk. See *Old Beekeeper*.
Did rudyj. See *Red-Haired Grandfather*.
 Didyc'kyj, Bohdan (1827-1908), 492
 Digenis Akritas, Basilius (probably 10th century), 55-57, 64, 125. See also *Deeds of Digenis*.
 Dimitri (Tuptalo), 302
Dimitrij Samozvanec. See *Dimitrij, the Pretender*.
Dimitrij, the Pretender (Bulgarin), 452
 Dimitri the Pretender (1582-1591), 128
 Diogenes ("the Cynic"; 412-323 B.C.), 52
Dioptra (Skovoroda), 300
Discourses of Pope Gregory, 62
Dispute Between the Soul and the Body (Nekraševyč), 323
 Diva Obyda (myth.), 196-97, 202
Divine Justice (Ustyjanovyč), 491
Divoče serce. See *Maiden Heart*.
 Djuk Stepanovyč (epos figure), 60, 187-88
 Długosz, Jan (1415-1480), 120, 125, 187, 190, 206
Dniester Mermaid, 447, 479
Dobre roby—dobre i bude. See *As You Sow, So Shall You Reap*.
Dobrotoljubyje. See *Love of Goodness*.
 Dobrynja (uncle of Volodymyr the Great; 10th century), 116, 127
 Dobrynja, Antonius ("the Pilgrim"; of Novgorod; 12th century), 113
 Dobrynja Nikityč (epos figure—"bohatty"), 36-37, 127, 129, 131, 210
Do čumakiv. See *To the Carters*.
Dog or Sheep (Hohol'-Janovs'kyj), 418
Doky sonce zijde—rosa oči vyjist'. See *Until the Sun Rises the Dew Will Corrode the Eyes*.
 Dolgorukov, Ivan (1764-1823), 433
Do Ljubky. See *To My Sweetheart*.
 Domec'kyj, Havrylo (d. after 1708), 351-52, 361
Do mertvyx i žyvyx See *To the Dead, to the Living . . .*
 Dometian (Serbian hieromonach), 76
Domobolije (Levyč'kyj), 413
 Don Juan, 188
Dopust Božyj. See *Divine Justice*.
 Dorošenko, Petro (het'man; 1627-1698), 348, 399, 611
 Doroškevyč, Oleksander (1889-1946), 8
 Dorotheus (abbot), 227
 Dositheus (Abbot of the Kievan Caves Monastery; 14th-15th centuries), 230
 Dostoevskij, Fedor (1821-1881), 427, 555, 587, 601, 605
Dosvitky. See *Glimmers of Dawn*.
 Dovhalevs'kyj, Mytrofan (18th century), 328
 Dovhanyč, Vasyl'. See *Dovhovyč, Vasyl'*.

- Dovhovyč, Vasyl' (pseud., 1783-1849), 414, 492
- Drahomanov, Myxajlo (1841-1895), 593, 601, 614
- Dream* (Sevčenko), 11, 13, 589
- Dream of the Virgin Mary*, 231
- Droste-Hülshoff, Annette E., Freiin von (1797-1848), 585
- Drowned Girl* (Kuprijenko), 573
- Duhem, Pierre (1861-1916), 238
- Duma* (general), 118, 124, 126, 248, 256-59, 281, 322, 449-51, 453, 456, 459, 462, 475-76, 511, 513, 515, 520, 527-28, 543, 569, 573
- Duma ukraïnska* (Slowacki), 454
- Dumytraško, Konstantyn (1814-1886), 403
- Dunaj, epos about, 189
- Duxnovyč, Oleksander (1803-1865), 492, 494
- Duxovnyj regljament*. See *Concerning Spiritual Rules*.
- Dva braty*. See *Two Brothers*.
- Dva Ivana*. See *Two Ivans*.
- Dvi Moskovky*. See *Two Soldiers' Wives*.
- Dvi Rus'ki narodnosti*. See *Two Nations of Rus'*.
- Dvůr Králové Manuscript*, 468
- Dyv (myth.), 193, 196-97, 199-200, 202
- Dzvin*. See *Bell*.
- Dzwonowski, Jan (17th century), 19
- Easter of the Dead* (Kvitka), 421
- Easter Week* (Kuliš), 543, 549, 559
- Easy Come, Easy Go* (Kuprijenko), 573
- Edda*, 26-27
- Edmund (King of the English; 980-1016), 108
- Egil, legend about, 35
- Eight Beatitudes* (Maksymovyč), 309
- Ej hodi nam žurytysja pora perestaty*. See *Hey, We Have Done Enough Worrying, It Is Time To Stop*.
- Eladij, tale about, 319
- Elias Stepanovyč (boyar and epic figure), 180, 189
- Elizabeth (daughter of Jaroslav the Wise; d. 1076), 129
- Elizabeth (mother of John the Baptist), 43, 113
- Elizabeth (Russian empress; 1709-1761), 276, 323, 342
- Emerald* (anthology of sermons), 44
- Enchanted Circle* (Rydel), 615
- Eneida* (Osipov-Kotel'nickij), 381-82
- Enej, 382-83, 388-91, 398-99
- Enejida* (Kotljarevs'kyj), 9, 11, 366, 372, 381-83, 388-93, 399-400, 402-403, 416, 418, 434, 517, 571, 577
- Enlightenment* (Blumauer), 382
- Enoch, prophecies of, 46; visions of, 47. See also *Enoch's Book*.
- Enoch's Book*, 47
- Enumeration of the Various Trees* (Klymentij), 305
- Ephrem Syrus (d. 373), sermon of, 43, 71
- Epicurus (341-270 B.C.), 52
- Epiphanius of Cyprus, Saint (315-402), 47
- Epistle* (general), 267
- Epistle* (George of Zarub), 154
- Epistle* (Peter of Antioch), 64
- Epistle about Sunday*, 230
- Epistles of the Hierarchs*, 221
- Epistles of Theodosius*, 221
- Epistle to Thomas* (Smoljatyč), 219-20
- Epistolija o neděľě*. See *Epistle about Sunday*.
- Equerry* (Didyc'kyj), 492
- Erasmus (monk), 167
- Erasmus of Rotterdam (?1466-1536), 239, 356, 363
- Erben, Karel' (1811-1870), 519
- Erysichthon, 37
- Essays on the Ancient Way of Life of Volynia and Ukraine* (Levyč'kyj), 595-96

- Essays on the Internal History of Little Russia* (Levyč'kyj), 595
Eternal Revolutionary (Franko), 606
Ethica Hieropolitica, 300
Eucharisterion (the Kievan), 295
Euchologion, 41
 Eudoxius, Saint, 92
 Euhemerus, 50
 Euphemius of Alexandria, 47
 Eustacius, 167
 Eustaphius Placidus, 92
 Euthymios of Trnovo (patriarch; 14th century), 227-29
 Evagrius (deacon), 167
Evangelije-aprakos, 39
 Eve, lament of, 151; lives of Adam and Eve, 45. See also *Confession of Eve*.
Evening Party (Korenyc'kyj), 577
Evenings on a Homestead Near Dikan'ka (Gogol'), 451
Everlasting Wisdom, 330
Everyone Sincerely Longs for Peace, 294
Evil Field (Kuz'menko), 567
Evil Soothsayer (Kuprijenko), 573
Evil Spark (Karpenko-Karyj), 611
Evxarysterion. See *Eucharisterion*.
Excelsior Ex Nihilo (Franko), 606
Explanatory Paleja, 51
Eye-Witness Chronicle (Samovydec'), 344, 447
 Ezekiel, 212, 525, 538

 Fablan, Ibn, 18
Fables (Borovykovs'kyj), 535
Fair (Nekraševyč), 380
Fallen Woman (Myrnyj), 598
Farys (Borovykovs'kyj), 459
Fate (Staryč'kyj), 612
Feathergrass (Kvitka), 422, 428
Feathergrass (Metlyns'kyj), 468
 Fed'kovyč, Jurij (Osyp; 1834-1888), 582, 593
 Fedos the Greek, 221

Fevronija the Martyr (Kostomarov), 474
Few Dozen Tales for a Merry World (ed. by Ostaszewski), 578
 Filjans'kyj, Mykola (1873-193?), 618
 Fiol, Schweipolt (d.c. 1525), 243
 Firdusī, Abū al Qāsem Mansūr, or Hasan (Persian poet), 35
First Door to Christian Seemliness (Skovoroda), 352
Fisherman (Goethe), 410, 556
Fisherman Panas Krut' (Levyč'kyj), 595
Fiziolog. See *Physiologus*.
 Flacius Illyricus, 249
 Flavius, Josephus. See *Josephus Flavius*.
Flor Silin (Karamzin), 422
Flos Polonicus, 125
Folk Stories (Marko Vovčok), 593-94
Forest Song (Ukrajinka), 615, 617
Former Times (Šaškevyč), 484
Fotij. See *Photius*.
Foundation (journal), 447, 533, 536, 563, 592
 Franko, Ivan (1856-1916), 5-6, 59, 216, 263, 319, 600, 603-607, 612-13, 617
 Frederick I, Barbarossa (d. 1190), 176
Frisian Laws, 33, 133
From Heights and Depths (Franko), 606
From the Days of My Youth (Franko), 606
From the Days of Sorrow (Franko), 606
 Furies, 322
 Fylypovyč, Anastasij (17th century), 344
 Fylypovyč, Pavlo (1891-1937), 7

 Gabriel (archangel), 113, 339
Gajdamaki (Somov), 450
Galician Gospel (of 1144), 39

- Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, 19, 21, 24, 30, 55, 57, 60, 66, 76, 125, 137, 171, 179, 181-88, 209-10, 218, 276
- Galileo Galilei (1564-1642), 238
- Galjatovs'kyj, Ioannikij (d. 1688), 88, 313, 336
- Gandža Andyber, *duma* about, 257
- Garden of Divine Songs* (Skovoroda), 283
- Garkuša* (Narižnyj), 432
- Gawatowicz, Jakub (1598-1679), 328, 358
- Gemistus Pletho, Georgius (1355-1450), 356
- Gennadius II (Patriarch of Constantinople; d. 1468), 52, 212
- George (Georgij; prince's Christian name). See Jaroslav I, the Wise.
- George (Georgios; metropolitan; d. 1072), Epistle of, 134
- George, Saint (dragon-slayer), 3, 5-6, 48, 64, 131, 184
- George Choeroboscus. See Choeroboscus, George.
- George L'vovyč. See Jurij L'vovyč.
- George of Zarub (monk), Epistle of, 154
- George Volodymyrovyč of Suzdal'. See Jurij Volodymyrovyč.
- Georgius Hamartolos. See Hamartolos, Georgius.
- Georgius Hamartolos Chronicle*. See *Chronicle of Georgius Hamartolos*.
- Georgius Sincellus Chronicle*. See *Chronicle of Georgius Sincellus*.
- Gerasimus (monk), 42
- Gerbel', Mykola (1827-1883), 3
- Gesta Romanorum*. See *Deeds of the Romans*.
- Getman Ostrjanica* (Korenevskij), 452
- Girlfriends* (Pčilka), 600
- Give Your Heart Freedom and It Will Enslave You* (Kropyvnyč'kyj), 609
- Gizel', Inokentij (d. 1683), 166, 338, 347, 351
- Gleb Volodevič, *starina* about, 127
- Glimmers of Dawn* (Kuliš), 540-41, 544, 546
- Glubina*. See *Depths*.
- Glykas, Michael (12th century), 211
- God's Children* (Kvitka), 422
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von (1749-1832), 410, 436, 537; translation of, 533, 556, 601
- Gogol', Nikolaj (1809-1852), 3-4, 315, 329, 349, 392, 418-19, 422, 426-27, 430, 433, 445, 451-54, 510, 519, 526, 529, 536, 548, 564-66, 570, 573, 587, 600, 602, 608-609, 615
- Golden Chain* (anthology of sermons), 44
- Golden Legend*, 242
- Golden Mother* (anthology of sermons), 44
- Goliath, 28, 127
- Golota, P. (19th century), 452
- Golovatyj* (Kvitka), 427
- Golovin, Ivan (1813-1884), 582
- Gončarov, Ivan (1812-1891), 587
- Gonta* (Gottschall), 582
- Gorky, Maxim (1868-1936), 605
- Goslawski, Maurycy (1802-1834), 454
- Gospel* (general), 39-40, 44, 62, 168, 244-45, 266-68, 309. See also parts of the *Gospel* under their particular names.
- Gospel of Jacob*, 47-49, 113, 151
- Gospel of John*, 153, 430
- Gospel of Nicodemus*, 47-48, 62-63, 151, 216
- Gospel of Thomas*, 47
- Goszczyński, Seweryn (1801-1876), 453, 484
- Gottschall, Rudolf von (19th century), 582
- Grabowski, Michał (1807-1863), 454, 527
- Grace of God* (anonymous), 324, 330-31
- Grand Duchy of Lithuania Chronicle*. See *Chronicle of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania*.
- Gray Mare* (Kuliš), 554

- Great Mirror*, 315-16, 318, 337
Great Vault (Ševčenko), 422, 518, 589
 Gregorovič, Dmitrij (1822-1900), 427
 Gregory (Bishop of Bilhorod), 78
 Gregory (monk of the Kievan Caves Monastery), 133
 Gregory Camblak (metropolitan; d. 1419), 228-29
 Gregory I, the Great, Saint (Pope; c. 540-604), collection of, 42; story about, 315-16. See also *Discourses of Pope*.
 Gregory of Nazianzus, Saint (the theologian; c. 329-c.389), 25, 44, 78, 151
 Gregory Palamas, 227, 230
 Gregory the Miracle-Worker, tale about, 167
 Gregory the Sinaiite, 227, 230
 Grillparzer, Franz (1791-1872), 585
 Grotius, Hugo (1583-1645), 354, 356
 Groza, Alexander (1807-1875), 454
 Groza, Sylvester (1793-1849), 454
 Grün, Anastasius (1806-1876), 468
Guests from the Sič (Kuliš), 555
 Guiscardo, tale about, 317
Gumbold's Life of St. Wenceslas. See *Life of St. Wenceslas*.
 Gustavus Adolphus (King of Sweden; 1594-1632), 348
 Gyda (wife of Volodymyr Monomax), 108
 Gza (Polovcian prince), 205
- Hail, Virgin, Mother of God* (Maksymovyč), 309
Hajdamaky (Moračevs'kyj), 577
Hajdamaky (Ševčenko), 349, 498, 516-17, 519
Hajek's Chronicle. See *Chronicle of Hajek*.
Half a Hundred Tales for Merry People (ed. by Ostaszewski), 578
- Halka, Jeremija (pseud.). See Kostomarov, Mykola.
Hamahija (Ševčenko), 500, 515
 Hamalija, Semen (1743-1822), 357
 Hamartolos, Georgius, 196, 389, 556n
Hamartolos Georgius Chronicle. See *Chronicle of Georgius Hamartolos*.
Handzja (Karpenko-Karyj), 611
 Hannibal (247-183 B.C.), 27
 Harald the Bold (King of Norway), 129
Haras'ko (Makarovs'kyj), 577
Harkuša (Storoženko), 566-67
Harmonija al'bo sohlasije viry. See *Harmony, or Unity of Faith*.
Harmony, or Unity of Faith (Potij), 249
 Harold II (King of the English; d. 1066), 108
 Hauptmann, Gerhart (1862-1946), 615
 Hebel, Johann Peter (1760-1826), 427
 Hedeon Balaban. See Balaban, Hedeon.
 Hegel, George Wilhelm Friedrich (1770-1831), 455, 463, 495
 Heine, Heinrich (1797-1856), translation of, 533, 556, 601, 614-15
 Heinrich of Plauen (1370-1429), 27
Hellenic and Roman Chronograph, 221
 Herbest, Benedyct (1531-1593), 247
 Herbinus, Jan (1633-1676), 125
 Herbut, Jan (1508-1576), 351
 Hercules, myth of, 107, 185
 Herder, Johann Gottfried von (1744-1803), 437, 445, 455
Heretic (Ševčenko), 516, 519
 Herod (King of Judaea; 4 B.C.), 47, 321, 330, 333, 339
Herod's Trouble (Kuliš), 554
 Herzen, Alexander (1812-1870), 540n
He Sold a Cat in a Sack (Gawatowicz), 328
Hexaameron (general), 50-51, 54, 71, 232. See also *Hexaemerons* under their particular names.
Hexaameron of Basil the Great, 51, 108

- Hexaemeron of John the Exarch of Bulgaria*, 62
- Hey, We Have Done Enough Worrying, It Is Time To Stop* (Holovatyj), 295
- Hilarion (Metropolitan of Kiev in 1051), 21, 66-67, 69, 71-74, 76, 98, 103, 127, 137-38, 147, 152-53
- Hildebrand, song about, 35
- Hippolytus (d.c. 230), 220
- Historical Songs* (Niemcewicz), 432
- History of the Jewish War* (Flavius), 50, 54, 185
- History of the Rusy* (or Russes). See *Istorija Rusov*.
- History of Ukrainian Literature* (Čyževs'kyj), 588n
- History of Ukrainian Literature in the Nineteenth Century*, 4
- Hlib, Saint (prince; d. 1015), 11, 14, 20, 79, 80, 82, 85-86, 88-89, 90-93, 97, 115, 133, 153-54, 163-65, 169, 210, 324. See also *Tale of Borys and Hlib*, and *Lives of Saints Borys and Hlib*.
- Hlib Jurijevyč (Prince of Perejaslav; 1155-1171), daughter of, 203
- Hlib of Novhorod (prince), 128
- Hlib of Novhorod-Sivers'k (prince), 190
- Hlibov, Leonid (1827-1893), 535-36, 593, 613-14
- Hlib Rostyslavvyč (prince), sons of, 195
- Hlytaj* (Kropyvnyč'kyj), 609
- Hlytaj abož pavuk*. See *Profiteer or the Spider*.
- Hobbes, Thomas (1588-1679), 354, 356
- Hoffmann, Ernst Theodor Amadeus (1776-1822), 587
- Hofmannsthal, Hugo von (1874-1929), 616
- Hohol', Mykola. See Gogol', Nikolaj.
- Hohol'-Janovs'kyj, Vasyľ' (1780-1825), 418-19, 451, 608
- Holka* (Storoženko), 563
- Holos Halyčan*. See *Voice of the Galician People*.
- Holovac'kyj, Jakiv (1814-1888), 447, 478-79, 492
- Holovatyj, Antin (last Zaporožian Cossack; 1797), 295
- Holy Scripture*. See *Bible*.
- Homer, 35, 52-53, 55, 185, 220, 313, 343, 451, 532
- Horace (65-8 B.C.), 237, 356, 371, 405-407, 458, 606
- Hordovyta para*. See *Proud Couple*.
- Horlenko, Joasof, Saint (Bishop of Bilhorod; 1705-1754), 310-12, 360
- Horpynyda, abo vxoplena Prozerpyna*. See *Horpynyda, or Kidnapped Proserpine*.
- Horpynyda, or Kidnapped Prosperine* (Bilec'kyj-Nosenko), 403
- Hosea, 538
- Hosius, Stanislaus (1504-1579), 356
- Hrabjanka, Hryhorij (d. 1738), 2, 345, 347, 349, 447. See also *Chronicle of Hrabjanka*.
- Hrabjanka Chronicle*. See *Chronicle of Hrabjanka*.
- Hrabovs'kyj, Pavlo (1864-1902), 614
- Hrebinka, Jevhen (1812-1848), 431, 433, 451-52, 454, 519, 531, 570-73, 577, 587
- Hrinčenko, Borys (1863-1910), 602
- Hrolfr (myth.), legend about, 35
- Hruševs'kyj, Myxajlo (1866-1934), 7, 124, 171, 222, 350
- Hryc'ko Skovoroda* (Kuliš), 549-50
- Hryhorovyč-Bars'kyj, Vasyľ' (d. 1747), 344
- Hugo (German translator), 300
- Hugo, Victor Marie (1802-1885), 550, 601, 616
- Hulak-Artemovs'kyj, Petro (1790-1865), 367, 405-412, 430, 432, 436, 456, 458, 495-97, 556-57, 580
- Hülshoff-Droste, Freiin von. See Droste-Hülshoff, Annette E., Freiin von.

- Humor* (Ogarev), 550
Humoristic Poems (Rudans'kyj), 613
Hundred Thousand (Karpenko-Karyj), 611
 Hus, Jan (1369-1415), 243, 507, 514
Hustyn' Chronicle, 344
Hypatian Chronicle, 30, 50, 114, 122, 131, 163, 171, 186-87, 344

 Ibsen, Henrik Johan (1828-1906), 615
Ibykus Cranes (Schiller), 422
 Ihor I (Kievan prince; d. 945), 17, 29, 73, 121
 Ihor Ol'hovyč (prince-monk; d. 1147), 152, 163-64, 179
 Ihorovyči. See Ihor's supporters.
 Ihor's supporters, 182
 Ihor Svjatoslavyč (Prince of Novhorod-Sivers'kyj, later of Černihiv; 1151-1202), 29, 173, 177, 186, 191-93, 196, 202-205, 208, 224
Iliad (Homer), 193, 527
 Il'ja Morovec' (or "Muromec'"; epic hero), 35-37, 128, 189
 Il'ja Muravlenin (or "Muravlin"; epic hero), 126, 128
 Il'ja Stepanovyč. See Elias Stepanovyč.
 Illustrious Prophetess, tale about, 242
In Memory and Praise of Prince Volodymyr, 84, 97, 120
 Innokentij Irkutskyj, Saint, 360
 Inokentij Gizel'. See Gizel', Inokentij.
Inspector General (Gogol'), 419
Instruction (Jaroslav the Wise), 108
Instruction (Volodymyr Monomax), 66-68, 103-108, 224
Instructional Gospel (of 1619), 335
Instructional Gospel (Stavrovec'kyj), 152
Instruction of a Father to a Son (Collection of 1076), 98
Instruction of Xenophon and St. Theodore (Collection of 1076), 98
In the Beginning Was the Word (Hilarion), 76
In the Catacombs (Ukrajinka), 617
In the Celebrated Town of Vil'no (Ševčenko), 516
In the Darkness (Staryc'kyj), 612
In the House of a Certain Katherine (Ševčenko), 515
In the Ruins (Ukrajinka), 617
In the Wilderness (Ukrajinka), 617
Intruder (Levyč'kyj), 397
 Ioan Maksymovyč, Saint (1651-1715), 296-309
 Iov Zalizo of Počajiv (abbot), 248
 Irene (princess), 73
 Irkuts'kyj, Innokentij. See Innokentij Irkuts'kyj.
Irodova moroka. See *Herod's Trouble*.
 Isaac, story of, 115; tale about, 18, 139, 168-70
 Isaiah, apocalypse of, 47
 Is'ko Materynka (pseud.). See Bodjans'kyj, Osyp.
 Isocrates, 52
Is This Really the Same Well? (Kvitka), 419, 429
Istoriia Rusiv (or *Rusov*), 348-49, 369, 377, 447, 449, 456, 475-77, 534, 582
Istoriia Semy Mudreciv. See *Story of the Seven Wise Men*.
Istoriia ukrajins'koji literatury. See *History of Ukrainian Literature*.
 Istrin, Vasilij (1865-1937), 5
 Itlar' (Prince of Polovci), 33
It Never Happens As Expected (Kuz'menko), 567
It's the Devil's Doing (Myrnyj), 598
It Was Not Destined (Staryc'kyj), 612
 Ivan (Černihiv merchant), 128
 Ivan Konovčenko-Udovyčenko, *duma* about, 257, 470
 Ivan, legend of, 190
 Ivan Vyšens'kyj. See Vyšens'kyj, Ivan.
Izbornik. See *Collection*.
Iz dniv žurby. See *From the Days of Sorrow*.
 Izjaslav I Jaroslavyč (Prince of Kiev; 1024-1078), 20, 69, 95, 119

- Izjaslav II Mstyslavych (Prince of Kiev, of Volynia, and of Perejaslav; d. 1154), 20, 69, 164, 172-73, 178, 185, 220-21
- Izjaslav Volodymyrovyč (son of Prince Monomax), 107; widow of, 109
- Iz lit mojeji molodosty*. See *From the Days of My Youth*.
- Izmajlov, Vladimir (1773-1830), 433
- Izmaragd*. See *Emerald*.
- Izosima (monk), 221
- Iz zloby dnja*. See *Out of the Evil of the Day*.
- Jačmin'*. See *Barley*.
- Jacob (monk), 97
- Jagić, Vatroslav (1838-1923), 5
- Jak kovbasa ta čarka, to mynet'sja i svarka*. See *With Sausage and Liquor, the Quarrelling Will Pass*.
- Jak nažyto, tak i prožyto*. See *Easy Come, Easy Go*.
- Jakubs'kyj, Borys (20th century), 8
- Janin, Jules Gabriel (1804-1874), 587
- Jan Vyšatyč. See Vyšatyč, Jan.
- Jarmarok*. See *Fair*.
- Jaropolk I. Svjatoslavych (Kievan prince; d. 980), 118, 123
- Jaropolk Izjaslavych (prince, son of Izjaslav I), 20
- Jaroslav (warrior), 177
- Jaroslav I, the Wise (Kievan prince; 978-1054), 28-30, 38, 49, 52, 71, 73, 76, 82, 91, 108, 115, 117, 119-20, 123, 125, 129-31, 135, 170, 198-99, 202
- Jaroslavna (princess; daughter of Jaroslav Osmomysl, Ihor's wife), 192, 197, 201, 203-204, 224
- Jaroslav Osmomysl Volodymyrovyč (Prince of Galicia; d. 1187), 188, 195, 208
- Jaroslav Vsevolodovyč (Prince of Cernihiv; d. 1246), 201
- Jasyns'kyj, Varlaam (metropolitan), 301-302, 324
- Javors'kyj, Stefan (1658-1722), 277, 338, 340-42, 355-56, 362, 364-65
- Jaxymovyč, Hryhorij (Galician metropolitan; 19th century), 491
- Jefremov, Serhij (1876-?), 6, 224
- Jelysaveta. See Elizabeth (daughter of Jaroslav the Wise).
- Jeretyk*. See *Heretic*.
- Jerlyč, Joaxym (Juxym; 1598-1674?), 2, 231
- Jerusalem Liberated* (Tasso), 308
- Jesus. See Christ.
- Jevšan, Mykola (pseud. of M. Fedjuška; 1889-1919), 7
- Jivha* (Bilec'kyj-Nosenko), 577
- Joan (Pope), story about, 243
- Joasof Horlenko, Saint. See Horlenko, Joasof, Saint.
- Job, lament of, 323
- Jochmus, Anthony Moritz (19th century), 582
- Johannes Scholasticus, 51
- John (the Apostle), 143, 312, 337; *Bible* of, 485
- John I (metropolitan), 133
- John II (metropolitan), Epistle of, 134
- John Chrysostomos, Saint (345-407), sermons of, 43-44, 62, 70, 78n, 115, 264, 276. See also *Life of John Chrysostomos*.
- John Damascenus, 44, 59, 62
- John Klimakos. See Klimakos, John.
- John Malalas Chronicle*. See *Chronicle of John Malalas*.
- John the Baptist, 47, 50, 113, 218, 337, 339
- John the Exarch (of Bulgaria), 51. See also *Hexaemeron of John the Exarch of Bulgaria*.
- John the Hermit, 167, 170
- John the Theologian. See John (the Apostle).
- Jonathan, 21
- Josaphat. See *Barlaam and Josaphat*.

- Joseph (patriarch), drama about, 322
 Joseph, Saint, 92
 Joseph of Arimathea, 140, 143-44, 149; story of, 47
 Joseph Soltan (metropolitan), 235
 Josephus Flavius (A.D. 37-95?), 50, 54, 64, 185, 206, 210
Journey (Radišev), 427
Judaic Chronograph, 221
 Judas, 92, 150
 Julian (the Apostate), 83
Jumor. See *Humor*.
 Jura, Hnat (1888-), 603
 Jurij L'vovyč (King of Galicia and Volynia, 14th century), 24
 Jurij Volodymyrovyč (Prince of Suzdal'), 172, 178
 Jurkevych, Pamphil (1827-1874), 597
Just Description . . . of the Council of Brest (Potij), 249
 Justinian (emperor), 49
Just Scale, 5
Južno-Russkij Sbornik. See *Southern Russian Collection*.
 Kabasilas, 227
Kajdaševa simja. See *Kajdaš Family*.
Kajdaš Family (Levyč'kyj), 596
 Kalajdovyč, Konstantyn (1792-1832), 3
 Kalin (tsar; epos figure), 189, 210
 Kal'nofojs'kyj, Atanasij (17th century), 126
Kamenjari. See *Stonecutters*.
 Kamens'kyj, Dmytro Bantyš. See Bantyš-Kamens'kyj, Dmytro.
Kamen' very. See *Rock of Faith*.
Kamin' (Javors'kyj), 364
 Kandyba, Oleksander. See Oles'.
 Kant, Immanuel (1724-1804), 492
 Kantemir, Antiox (1708-1744), 357
Kapitanskaja dočka. See *Captain's Daughter*.
 Kapnist, Vasyľ' (1758-1823), 357, 377
 Karamzin, Nikolaj (1766-1826), 422, 435
 Karmans'kyj, Petro (1878-1956), 618
Karmeljuk (Marko Vovčok), 594
 Karna (myth.), 202-203
 Karpenko-Karyj (pseud., 1845-1907), 579, 608, 610-11, 615
 Karpovyč, Leontij (d. 1620), 314, 335
Kateryna. See *Katherine*.
Katherine (Sevčenko), 422, 514, 516, 518-19
Kavkaz. See *Caucasus*.
Kavkazskij plennik. See *Prisoner of the Caucasus*.
Kazaki. See *Cossacks*.
 Keller, Gottfried (1819-1890), 585
 Kepler, Johann (1571-1630), 238, 356
Kerchief (Sevčenko), 515
 Kerner, Justinus (1786-1862), 468, 471
Key to Learning (Galjats'kyj), 336
Key to the Kingdom of Heaven (Smotryč'kyj), 247-48
Kievan (almanac), 456
Kievan Caves Monastery Chronicle. See *Chronicle of the Kievan Caves Monastery*.
Kievan Chronicle, 29-30, 66, 114, 137, 171-74, 176, 179-81, 183, 185-87, 210
Kievljanin. See *Kievan*.
Kievo-Pečers'kyj Paterik. See *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*.
Kievskaja Starina, 3
Kievskie ved'my. See *Witches of Kiev*.
Kindness of Marcus Aurelius (Kozáčyns'kyj), 323
Kindrat Bubnenko-Švydkyj (Storoženko), 563
Kirik's Questions. See *Questions* (Kirik)
Klady. See *Buried Treasures*.
 Klimakos, John, 5, 44
Ključ carstva nebesnoho. See *Key to the Kingdom of Heaven*.
Ključ rozuminija. See *Key to Learning*.
 Klonowicz, Sebastjan (1545-1602), 21, 125, 188, 358

- Klopstock, Friedrich Gottlieb (1724-1803), 46
- Klymentij (hieromonax and poet; end of 17th to 18th centuries), 213, 279, 298, 505, 337, 387n
- Klymkovyč, Ksenofont (1835-1881), 567
- Klymovs'kyj (Klymiv), Semen (cossack; 18th century), 310
- Klyryk Ostroz'kyj. See Clerk of Ostrih.
- Kmita Čornobyl'skyj (16th century), 125-26, 128
- Knjažna*. See *Princess*.
- Knyha o smerti*. See *Book about Death*.
- Knyhy bytija ukrajins'koho narodu*. See *Books of the Genesis of the Ukrainian People*.
- Knyhy makavejs'ki*. See *Books of the Maccabees*.
- Kobjak (epos figure), 195
- Kobryns'ka, Natalija (1851-1920), 603
- Kobyljańs'ka, Ol'ha (1863-1942), 607
- Kobzar* (Ševčenko), 495, 498, 518, 537
- Kochanowski, Jan (1530-1584), 239
- Kochanowski, Piotr (1566-1620), 308
- Kocjubyns'kyj, Myxajlo (1864-1913), 618
- Kočubej* (anonymous), 577
- Kočubej* (Aladin), 450
- Kol'cov, Aleksej (1809-1842), 533
- Kolji* (Kuliš), 552
- Kolo haju v čystim poli*. See *Beside a Grove in an Open Field*.
- Koly rozlučajuts'ja dvoje*. See *When the Couple Comes to Separate*.
- Konaševyč-Sahajdačnyj, Petro. See Sahajdačnyj, Petro Konaševyč.
- Končak (Polovcian khan), 182, 192, 205
- Kondratowicz-Syrokomla, W. See Syrokomla-Kondratowicz, Władysław.
- Konjušyj*. See *Equerry*.
- Konotops'ka vid'ma*. See *Witch of Konotop*.
- Konovčenko-Udovyčenko, Ivan. See Ivan Konovčenko-Udovyčenko.
- Konrad (Mazovian prince; epos figure), 189
- Konys'kyj, Oleksander (1836-1900), 535-36, 603
- Konys'kyj Hryhorij (Jurij; 1717-1795), 307, 323, 328, 348; sermons of, 342, 377
- Kopystens'kyj, Zaxarija (d. 1627), 259, 350, 356
- Korenevskij, V., 452
- Korenyc'kyj, Porfirij (d. 1854), 577
- Kormčaja*. See *Nomocanon*.
- Korsun, Oleksander (1818-1891), 476
- Korsun' Legend*, 88, 97
- Korž (Zaporožian centurion), 447, 563
- Korzeniowski, Jozef (1797-1863), 489
- Kosač, Larysa. See Ukrajinka, Lesja.
- Kosač, Ol'ha. See Pčilka, Olena.
- Kosiv, Syl'vestr (Metropolitan of Kiev), 166
- Kostomarov, Mykola (1817-1885), 3, 11, 171, 412, 447, 452, 455-56, 468-76, 495-98, 514, 527, 534-36, 544, 583, 599
- Kostyr, Mykola (1818-1853), 497
- Kosyns'kyj* (Kostomarov), 474
- Kotel'nickij, A. (dates unknown), 481-82, 403
- Kotljarevskij, K., 453
- Kotljarevs'kyj, Ivan (1769-1838), 9, 11, 260, 278, 366-67, 372, 381-89, 392-93, 395-404, 412-13, 416-19, 424-25, 427-28, 431, 434-46, 475-76, 499, 503, 510, 514, 517, 519, 525n, 580, 583, 591, 608-609
- Kovalevskij, Mixail (1757-1807), 453
- Koxanovs'kyj, Pantelejmon (17th century), 348
- Kozačyns'kyj, Myxajlo (1687-1756), 323, 358

- Kozak Stixotvorec'*. See *Cossack Poet*.
Kozak ta burja. See *Cossack and the Storm*.
 Kozarin (historical personage), 128
 Kožumjaka, 36-37
Kožumjaka, 127
Kozyr-divka. See *Lively Wench*.
 Kral', Janko (1822-1876), 519n
Králové Dvůr Manuscript. See *Dvůr Králové Manuscript*.
Kraniche des Ibykus. See *Ibykus Cranes*.
 Krasicki, Ignacy (1735-1801), 408, 457, 573
 Kraszewski, Józef (1812-1887), 587
Kratkoslovnyj otvit Feodula. See *Terse Reply of Feodul*.
Kremucij Kord (Kostomarov), 474
Krexivs'kyj apostol, 244-45
Krojnika z litopysciv starodavnyx. See *Chronograph Compiled from Ancient Chronicles*.
 Kropyvnyč'kyj, Marko (1840-1910), 579, 606, 608-612, 616
 Krowicki, Marcin (1501-1573), 364
 Krylov, Ivan (1768-1844), 454, 573
 Kukša (missionary), 167
 Kuliš, Oleksandra Bilozers'ka-. See Barvinok, Hanna.
 Kuliš, Pantelejmon (Pan'ko; 1819-1897), 4, 11, 14, 224, 349, 375, 402, 412, 433, 446-48, 451-52, 454, 457, 490, 495-96, 498, 526-37, 540-50, 552-62, 567-68, 578-81, 583, 587-89, 591, 602, 605, 614
Kuliš in Hell (Kuliš), 549
Kuliš u pekli. See *Kuliš in Hell*.
Kulyna (song), 358
 Kul'žyns'kyj, Ivan (1803-1884), 433
Kupala na Ivana. See *St. John's Eve*.
Kupovanyj rozum. See *Purchased Intelligence*.
 Kuprijenko, Xoma (19th century), 573
 Kurakin, Aleksej (prince, governor-general; 1759-1829), 404
 Kurbskij, Andrej (Russian prince; d. 1583), 240
 Kuxarenko, Jakiv (1800-1862), 403, 420, 608
 Kuz'menko, Petro (1831-1867), 535-36, 567
 Kuzmič, O., 452
 Kvitka, Hryhorij (1778-1843), 409, 412-13, 419-31, 433, 435-36, 468, 481, 490, 491, 498, 526, 528, 531, 554-56, 566, 591, 593, 608
 Kvitka-Osnojanenko, Hryhorij. See Kvitka, Hryhorij.
 Kyrylo Rozum. See Rozum, Kyrylo.
 Kyrylo Trankvilion Stavrovec'kyj. See Stavrovec'kyj, Kyrylo Trankvilion.
Labyrinth of the World (Comenius), 270
 Lamartine, Alphonse de (1790-1869), 550
 Lamech, 45, 47
 Lamennais (1782-1854), 496
Landless Peasant (Plavil'sčykov), 427
Landlord (Karpenko-Karyj), 610-11
Laodicean Letter, 233, 235
 Laščevs'kyj, Varlaam (Vasyľ'; 1704-1774), 323
 Lassota, Erich (Austrian diplomat), 126
Lastivka. See *Swallow* (almanac).
Lastivka. See *Swallow* (Kostomarov).
Laurentian Chronicle, 114-15
 Laurentius the Hermit, tale about, 167-68
 Lazarus, 146, 216, 245, 323, 333
Lectern (Boileau), 373, 404
 Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm (1646-1716), 362
Leimonarion (*Limonar'*). See *Spiritual Meadow*.
 Leo. See Lev.
 Leon (Leontij; metropolitan; d. 1004?), Epistle of, 134

- Leonore* (Bürger), 458, 577
Leontovyč, Volodymyr (1866-1933), 602
Lermontov, Mixail (1814-1841), 411-12, 577, 586
Lesja Ukrajinka (pseud.). See *Ukrajinka, Lesja* (pseud.).
Leskov, Nikolaj (1831-1895), 423
Leszek, the White (Prince of Cracow; 12th-13th centuries), 190
Letter from Heaven. See *Epistle about Sunday*.
Letter of Jude, 46
Letter of Pilate to Emperor Tiberius (apocr.), 47
Letter of Prester John, 59
Letter of the Monks of Mt. Athos (Vyšens'kyj), 265
Letter of Volodymyr Monomax, 51
Letters of the Apostles, 233
Letters of the Unenlightened People, 253
Letters to My Dear Countrymen (Kvitka), 429-30, 498, 526
Letter to All the People Living in the Polish Lands (Vyšens'kyj), 265
Letter to Pope . . . Sixtus IV (Potij), 249
Letter to Prince Oleh, 104
Levenko (pseud.). See *Leontovyč, Volodymyr*.
Lev I. Danylovyč (Prince of Galicia and Volynia; ca. 1225-1301), 184
Levšin, Aleksej (1798-1879), 433
Levyč'kyj, Ivan Nečuj-. See *Nečuj-Levyč'kyj, Ivan*.
Levyč'kyj, Josyp (1801-1860), 413
Levyč'kyj, Orest (1849-1922), 595-96
Liar's Helper (Kvitka), 421, 428, 435
Life (general), 41-42, 46, 89-90, 92, 96-97, 113, 227, 313, 318
Life of Adam, 151
Life of Alexis, 43, 242
Life of Andrew the Simple, 43, 64
Life of Anthony the Great, 43
Life of Antonius of the Kievan Caves Monastery, 96-97, 167
Life of Apollinary of Ravenna, 62
Life of Basil the New, 48, 115
Life of Chrysogonus, 62
Life of Conon of Isauria, 42
Life of Constantine of Murom, 76
Life of Demetrius of Salonika, 64, 83
Life of Prince Dmitri Ivanovič of Moscow, 76
Life of Georgius, 48
Life of John Chrysostomos, 43
Life of Juliana, 50
Life of Macarius of Rome, 64
Life of Moses, 64
Life of Nicetas, 46, 48, 83
Life of Nicholas the Wonder-Worker, 43
Life of Nyfont of Novgorod, 48, 76
Life of Paul, 50
Life of Philaretus the Charitable, 42
Life of Prokopius of Ustjug, 76
Life of Sabbas of Palestine, 43, 96
Life of St. Benedict, 62
Life of St. John the Good, 62
Life of St. Leonius of Rostov, 76
Life of St. Ludmila, 43, 62, 89
Life of St. Ol'ha, 97
Life of St. Stephen, 62
Life of St. Theodosius, 18, 42, 67, 69, 89, 93-94, 121, 125, 138, 166, 168, 170, 205
Life of St. Vaclav. See *Life of St. Wenceslas*.
Life of St. Vitus, 62
Life of St. Volodymyr the Great, 97
Life of St. Wenceslas, 43, 62-63, 83, 89, 92, 96
Life of Sava, 76
Life of Simeon, 76
Life of Stephen of Perm, 76
Life of Stephen of Surož, 64
Life of the Kuban Kozaks (Kuxarenko), 420
Life of Theodore of Studion, 64
Life of Theodore of Tyro, 48
Lileja. See *Lily*.
Lily (Sevčenko), 515
Limonar'. See *Leimonarion*.

- Listy temnyx ljudej*. See *Letters of the Unenlightened People*.
- Lithos* (Mohyla), 350
- Lithuanian Chronicle*. See *Chronicle of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania*.
- Litopys "Samovydcja."* See *Eye-Witness Chronicle*.
- Little Old Woman in the Other World*, 319
- Little Peter* (Ševčenko), 516, 519
- Little Russian Literary Collection*, 535
- Little Russian Peasant* (Puzyna), 413
- Little Stingers in Russian "Epigrams"* (Kvitka), 412
- Liturgicon*, 41
- Lively Wench* (Kvitka), 422, 429
- Lives of Adam and Eve*, 45
- Lives of Saints Borys and Hlib*, 89, 90-93, 97, 121-22
- Lives of Saints Cyril and Methodius*, 2, 89
- Lives of Simeon and Sava*, 76
- Lives of Two Varangian Martyrs*, 97
- Ljubka, abo svatannja v seli Ryxmax*. See *Sweetheart, or Matchmaking in the Village of Ryxmy*.
- Ljuborac'ki* (Svydnyč'kyj), 595
- Ljucenko, J. (1776-1854), 403
- Lobysevyč, Opanas (dates unknown; 18th century), 403n
- Locke, John (1632-1704), 356
- Logic* (Maimonides), 232
- Longing* (Kostomarov), 472
- Losyc'kyj, Myxajlo (monk of Hustyn; 17th century), 343
- Love of Goodness* (Velyčkovs'kyj), 359-60
- Lučkaj, Myxajlo (pseud., 1789-1843), 415
- Ludwig, Otto (1813-1865), 585
- Lukasevyč, Platon (1809-1882), 447
- Lukin, Vladimir (1737-1794), 427
- Lukjanov (Moscow priest), 126
- Lutrin*. See *Lectern*.
- Lymerivna* (Marko Vovčok), 594
- Lysty do ljubeznyx zemljakiv*. See *Letters to My Dear Countrymen*.
- Lysynec'kyj, S. F., 413
- Lyxa iskra*. See *Evil Spark*.
- Lyxyj poputav*. See *It's the Devil's Doing*.
- Macarius[✓] Cort (bishop), 234
- Machiavelli, Niccolo (1469-1527), 356, 452
- Macijevyč, Arsenij (1697-1772), 356, 360
- Macpherson, James (1736-1796), 437
- Madcap of the 18th Century* (Karpenko-Karyj), 611
- Madej* (Vahylevyč), 492
- Maeterlinck, Maurice (1862-1949), 615
- Magelona (Magylena; princess), story about, 315
- Mahomet ta Xadyza* (Kuliš), 549
- Maiden Heart* (Kuliš), 554
- Maid of Dniester*, 497
- Maimonides, Moses (1135-1204), 232-33
- Majskaja noč'*. See *May Night*.
- Makarovs'kyj, Myxajlo (1783-1846), 577
- Maksymovyč, Ioan. See Ioan Maksymovyč.
- Maksymovyč, Myxajlo (1804-1873), 3, 430, 446-47, 452, 456, 478, 495-96, 527, 535, 573
- Mal (Derevljanians' prince), 29
- Malalas John Chronicle*. See *Chronicle of John Malalas*.
- Mala podorožna knyžycja*. See *Small Travelling Companion Book*.
- Malczewski, Antoni (1793-1826), 453
- Malorossijskie povesti i rasskazy*. See *Little Russian Tales and Yarns*.
- Malorossijskij krest'janin*. See *Little Russian Peasant*.
- Malorusskij literaturnyj sbornik*. See *Little Russian Literary Collection*.
- Mamaj (Tatar khan), 209

- Manassius Constantine Chronicle*. See *Chronicle of Constantine Manassius*.
- Man's Peace with God* (Gizel'), 351
- Manžura, Ivan (1851-1893), 614
- Maple Stands by the Water* (Skovoroda), 301
- Margarit*. See *Pearl (Margarit)*.
- Mariana, the Nun* (Ševčenko), 516-17
- Marienlieder* (Rilke), 46
- Marija. See Mary (Virgin).
- Marija*. See *Mary* (Ševčenko).
- Marinka Kajdalovna, *starina* about, 127. See also Maryna Mnišek.
- Marja* (Malczewski), 453
- Mark (monk), 168
- Markevych, Mykola (1804-1860), 447, 450
- Marko Prokljatyj*. See *Marko, the Cursed*.
- Marko, the Cursed* (Storoženko), 563
- Marko Vovčok (pseud., 1834-1907), 423, 533, 535-36, 587, 593-96, 608
- Markovyč, Jakiv (1696-1770), 356
- Markovyč, Marija Vilins'ka-. See Marko Vovčok (pseud.).
- Markovyč, Opanas (1822-1867), 496, 533, 593, 608
- Married Devil* (Storoženko), 564
- Martin (monk), 165
- Martyn Borulja* (Karpenko-Karyj), 610-11
- Martyn Hak* (Kuliš), 554
- Marusja* (Borovykovs'kyj), 458
- Marusja* (Kvitka), 422-24, 428-29
- Marusja Bohuslavka* (Kuliš), 549-51
- Marusja Bohuslavka, *duma* about, 257-58
- Mary* (Ševčenko), 46, 516, 537, 539
- Mary, Virgin, 45, 47-48, 62, 107, 113, 133, 140, 143, 176, 184, 189, 216, 218-19, 228, 231, 275, 283, 285, 296, 304, 320, 322, 337, 340
- Maryna* (Ševčenko), 516-17, 519
- Maryna Mnišek (princess; wife of Dimitri the Pretender), 128. See also Marinka Kajdalovna.
- Master and the Dog* (Hulak-Artemovs'kyj), 408-409
- Master Miller or a Satan in a Cask*, 609
- Matchmaking* (Somov), 450
- Matchmaking in Hončarivka* (Kvitka), 419
- Matthew, the Apostle, 309; *Bible* of, 485
- Maundy Thursday* (Ustjanovyč), 490-91
- Mauritius, Anton (pseud.). See Jochmus, Anthony Moritz.
- Maxim the Greek, 248
- Maximus the Confessor, 52, 227
- May Night* (Gogol'), 573
- Mazepa* (Golota), 452
- Mazepa* (Kostomarov), 474
- Mazepa* (Ryleev), 450
- Mazepa, Ivan (het'man; 1639-1709), 276, 294, 309, 324, 348, 450-52, 571
- Mazeppa* (Gottschall), 582
- Mazeppa* (Mützelburg), 582
- Mazeppa* (Stäbisch), 582
- Meč Duxovnyj*. See *Spiritual Sword*.
- Meditations on the Passion of Christ* (Volkovyč), 320
- Melchizedek, 45
- Meleško (castellan of Smolens'k), speech of, 251-53, 259
- Melissa (Maximus the Confessor), 52
- Mel'nik-koldun, obmanščik i svat*. See *Miller-Sorcerer, Cheat and Match-Maker*.
- Melusina, story about, 316
- Menaea*, 221, 234
- Menaea* (Bulgarian), 41
- Menaea* (of 1489), 83, 125, 227
- Menaea for Church Services*, 41
- Menaea for Daily Reading* (Tuptalo), 2, 43, 62, 313
- Menaeum* (*Codex Suprasliensis*), 196
- Menander (c. 343-291 B.C.), 53, 64

- Menecius, work of, 21
Menologion (or *Synaxarion*). See *Prologue*.
 Merlin, tale about, 46
Mermaid (Ševčenko), 515
Mermaid (Somov), 450
Mertvec'kyj Velykden'. See *Easter of the Dead*.
Mertvyje duši. See *Dead Souls*.
Message from Ukraine (Metlyns'kyj), 577
 Mestra, 37
Mest' verxovyncja. See *Revenge of a Highlander*.
Metamorphoses (Ovid), 37
 Methodius, Saint (825-885), 51, 62; mission of, 114. See also *Lives of Saints Cyril and Methodius*.
 Metlyns'kyj, Ambrosij (1814-1870), 3, 447, 455-57, 462-63, 465-69, 472, 481, 497, 514, 535, 577, 586
 Metlyns'kyj, Semen (19th century; dates unknown), 577
 Metternich (Winneburg), Clemens (1773-1859), era of, 479
Mežyhors'kyj did. See *Old Man of Mežyhorja*.
 Michael (metropolitan), Epistle to the pope of 1470, 235
 Michael, Saint, 189
 Michael Olel'kovyč (Lithuanian prince), 231
 Michael Potok. See Myxail Potok.
 Michael Svjatoša. See Myxail "Svjatoša."
 Mickiewicz, Adam (1798-1855), 410, 444, 459, 468, 472, 477, 497, 533
Mij izmaragd. See *My Emerald*.
 Mikula (bogatyry), 126
Miller (Storoženko), 564, 566
 Miller, Johann Martin (1750-1814), 427
 Miller, Vsevolod (1848-1913), 124
Miller-Sorcerer, Cheat and Match-Maker (Ablesimov), 415
 Milton, John (1608-1674), 46, 404
Minei. See *Menaea*.
Minstrel. See *Kobzar*.
Mirgorod (Gogol'), 451
 Miriam, 155
Mirošnyk. See *Miller*.
Mirror of Theology (Stavrovec'kyj), 351
Mirylo pravedne. See *Just Scale*.
Miscellanea sacra (Prokopovyč), 364
 Mohammed, 617
 Mohuta (brigand), 128
 Mohyla, A. (pseud.). See Metlyns'kyj, Ambrosij.
 Mohyla, Petro (Kievan metropolitan; 1596-1647), 88, 152, 166, 276, 296, 302, 313, 336, 350, 356, 363
 Mohylnc'kyj, Antin (1811-1873), 492
Mojsej. See *Moses*.
 Mokrijevych, Samijlo (d. 1712), 309
Molenie Daniila Zatočnika. See *Supplication of Daniel the Exile*.
Moloda krov. See *Young Blood*.
Molodyk. See *New Moon*.
Monastery of Manjava (Mohylnc'kyj), 492
Monastyрка. See *Cloistered Maiden*.
 Moračevs'kyj, Pylyp (1806-1879), 577
 Mordovec' (Mordovcev), Danylo (1830-1905), 453, 535-36, 544
Morning Star (almanac), 456
 Morovec' . See Il'ja Morovec' .
 Morsztyn, Hieronim (Jarosz; c. 1580-c. 1626), 317
 Moschos, 42
 Moses (Abbot of Vydubec'kyj Monastery), 171, 176, 186; sermon of, 155
Moses (Franko), 606
 Moses, 322, 337; life of, 45, 47; See also *Book of Moses*.
 Moses the Hungarian, 167, 170; story of, 224
Moskal'čarivnyk. See *Soldier-Sorcerer*.
Moskaleva krynycja. See *Soldier's Well*.

- Mother of God. See Mary (Virgin).
Mova z Ukrajiny. See *Message from Ukraine*.
 Mstyslav Danylovyč (Prince of Volynia; d. c. 1290 or 1308), 24
 Mstyslav Jaroslavyč (prince; d. 1223), 180
 Mstyslav Mstyslavovyč (Prince of Galicia; d. 1228), 206
 Mstyslav Romanovyč (Prince of Kiev; d. 1223), 209
 Mstyslav Volodymyrovyč (Kievan prince; 1076-1132; son of Volodymyr Monomax), 122
 Mstyslav Volodymyrovyč (Prince of Tmutorokan' and Černihiv; d. 1036), 28, 117, 129-30, 132, 199
Mučenyjca Fevronija. See *Fevronija the Martyr*.
Mudrist' predvičnaja. See *Everlasting Wisdom*.
Muka Xrystova. See *Passion of Christ*.
 Muretus (Marc Antoine Muret; 1526-1585), 356
 Muromec'. See Il'ja Morovec'.
 Musnicki, Nikodem (1765-1805), 432
 Mützelburg, Adolf (19th century), 582
My Emerald (Franko), 319, 605-606
Mykola Džerja (Levyč'kyj), 596
 Mykola Svjatoša. See Nicholas Svjatoša.
Mylost' Božija. See *Grace of God*.
 Myrnyj, Panas (pseud., 1849-1920), 595, 598-99, 605
Myr z Bohom čoloviku. See *Man's Peace with God*.
Mystery of Mysteries, 211
 Mytusa (famous singer), 125, 179
 Mytusa (Kostomarov), 470
Myxail Čarnyšenko (Kuliš), 526, 530
 Myxail Potok (dragon-slayer), 36-37, 48, 188
 Myxail "Svjatoša" (Prince of Černihiv; 13th century), 165, 167, 170; entry into a monastery of, 234
 Myxajlyk, legend of, 190
Nabeg v stepi. See *Raid on the Steppe*.
Načal'naja dver' ko xrystyjans'komu dobropraviju. See *First Door to Christian Seemliness*.
Nad Čornym morem. See *On the Black Sea Coast*.
Nad Dniprom. See *Over the Dnieper*.
Nad Dniprovoju sahoju. See *By Dnieper's Banks Along the Sands*.
Naddnistrjanka. See *Maid of Dniester*.
Nadobranič. See *On Bidding Goodnight*.
Najlipšyj son. See *Best Kind of Dream*.
Najmyčka. See *Servant Girl*.
Na kuročci pirjačko rjaboje. See *Poor Chicken with the Speckled Little Feathers*.
Nalivajko (Bantyš-Kamens'kyj), 450
Nalivajko (Golota), 452
 Nalyvajko, Dem'jan (d. 1627), 248
 Nalyvajko, Severyn (d. 1597), 348
Na puščannja-jak zavjazalo. See *How to Do It Up Right During the Fast*.
 Narižnyj (Narežnyj), Vasyl' (1780-1825), 432
Narodni opovidannja. See *Folk Stories*.
Na rujinax. See *In the Ruins*.
Nas'ki ukrajins'ki kazky. See *Our Own Ukrainian Tales*.
Nastusja (Kuliš), 543, 549
Natalja (Oleksandriv), 577
Natalka from Poltava (Kotljarevs'kyj), 416, 418-20, 433, 435, 452
Natalka Poltavka. See *Natalka from Poltava*.
Nauka, al'bo sposib zložennja kazanij. See *Teaching, or the Manner of Composing a Sermon*.
 Nausicaa, 528
 Navroč'kyj, Oleksander (1823-1892), 533-34
Nazar Stodolja (Ševčenko), 525, 608
 Nebuchadrezzar (King of Babylon), 268
 Nečuj-Levyč'kyj, Ivan (1838-1918), 11, 421, 595-99, 601, 603-604, 608
Nedobryj viščun. See *Evil Soothsayer*.

- Nehalevs'kyj, Valentine (second half of 16th century), 244
- Nekraševyč, Ivan (d. 1796), 323, 328, 380-81
- Nekrasov, Nikolaj (1821-1878), 536-37, 540n, 587, 613
- Neofity*. See *Neophytes*.
- Neophytes* (Ševčenko), 13, 516, 537, 539
- Nero, 322, 537
- Nestor, 42, 63, 65, 66-67, 69, 80, 90-96, 113, 118-19, 121-22, 125
- Nestor's Chronicle*. See *Chronicle of Nestor*.
- Ne sudylos'*. See *It Was Not Destined*.
- Ne tak ždalosja, ta tak sklalosja*. See *It Never Happens As Expected*.
- Ne v dobryj čas*. See *Without Luck*.
- Nevol'nyk*. See *Captive*.
- Nevskij, Aleksandr (1221-1263), 218
- New Moon* (almanac), 456
- New Ruthenian Peasant Idylls* (Zimorowicz), 358
- New Testament* (general), 45-47, 71-72, 112, 143, 336
- Nibelungenlied*, 127, 193
- Nič. See *Night*.
- Nicephorus (metropolitan; 1104-1120), letter of, 104; Epistle of, 134
- Nicetas the Hermit, 168
- Nicholas I (Russian tsar; 1796-1855), 4, 514, 535
- Nicholas of Cusa, 356
- Nicholas Svjatoša, Saint (monk in the Kievan Caves Monastery), 154
- Nicholas the Wonder-Worker, Saint, 64, 79, 88, 133; sermons about, 340. See also *Life of Nicholas the Wonder-Worker*.
- Nič na Veržavi*. See *Night on Veržava*.
- Nicon (abbot), 119, 167
- Nicon of Montenegro, *Pandects* of, 64
- Nicon's Chronicle*. See *Chronicle of Nicon*.
- Niemcewicz, Julian Ursyn (1758-1841), 432, 449
- Night* (Borovykovs'kyj), 459
- Night of Perejaslav* (Kostomarov), 474
- Night of Taras* (Ševčenko), 515
- Night on Veržava* (Ustjanovyč), 491
- Nil Sorskij (1433-1508), 230
- Ni, mam, ne mozna neljuba ljubyt'*. See *No, mamma, it is impossible to love an unloveable man*.
- Ni, ne vtečeš* See *No, You Won't Escape* . . .
- Noah, 47, 341; story of, 45
- Noblewoman* (Ukrajinka), 617
- Noč pered Roždestvom*. See *Christmas Eve*.
- No, mamma, it is impossible to love an unloveable man* (Hrebinka), 573
- Nomocanon*, 51
- Nomys, Matvij (pseud. of M. Symonov; 1823-1901), 447
- Nosenko, Pavlo Bilec'kyj. See *Bilec'kyj-Nosenko, Pavlo*.
- Note about That Horace* (Hulak-Artemovs'kyj), 430-31
- Notes on Southern Rus'*, 447, 535
- Note to the Editor of the Ukrainian Messenger* (Hulak-Artemovs'kyj), 431
- Novalis (pseud. of F. L. Hardenberg; 1772-1801), 496
- Novgorod Chronicle*. See *Chronicle of Novgorod*.
- Novikov, Nikolaj (1744-1818), 427
- No You Won't Escape* . . . (Kuprijenko), 573
- Nyfont (Bishop of Novgorod), 221. See also *Life of Nyfont of Novgorod*.
- Ob istoričeskom značenni russkoj narodnoj poezji*. See *On the Historical Significance of Russian Folk Poetry*.
- Obloha L'vova Xmel'nyc'kym*. See *Siege of Lviv by Xmel'nyc'kyj*.

- Oblyčenie diavola myroderžca*. See *Unmasking of the Devil, the Ruler of the World*.
- Obmitajte dvory*. See *Sweep Out the Yards*.
- Oborona Buši*. See *Defense of Buša*.
- Oborona soboru florentijs'koho*. See *Defense of the Council of Florence*.
- Obšyrnyj synopsys*. See *Comprehensive Synopsis*.
- Očerki istorii ukrainskoj literatury 19 st.* See *History of Ukrainian Literature in the Nineteenth Century*.
- Očerki starinnogo byta Volyni i Ukrainy*. See *Essays on the Ancient Way of Life of Volynia and Ukraine*.
- Očerki vnutrennej istorii Malorosii*. See *Essays on the Internal History of Little Russia*.
- Octateuch*, 40
- Octoechos*, 41, 243, 268
- Oderžyma*. See *Woman Possessed*.
- O, Don't Go to the Party, Hryc'* (Staryc'kyj), 612
- Odysseus* (myth.), 35, 55, 528
- Odyssey* (Homer), 528
- Oedipus the King*, story of, 315
- Ogarev, Nikolaj* (1813-1877), 550
- Ohonovs'kyj, Omeljan* (1833-1894), 4
- Ohorodok Mariji Bohorodyci*. See *Orchard of Mary, Mother of God*.
- Oj ne xody, Hrycju, ta j na večornyci*. See *O, Don't Go to the Party, Hryc'*.
- Oj, pid vyšneju*. See *O, Under the Cherry Tree*.
- O kotax*. See *About Cats*.
- Oktojix*. See *Octoechos*.
- Old Beekeeper* (Kostomarov), 470
- Old-Fashioned Clerics and Their Wives* (Levyc'kyj), 597
- Old Jefrem* (Ustjanovyč), 491
- Old Man of Mežyhorja* (Storoženko), 563, 565
- Old Tale* (Ukrajinka), 615
- Old Testament* (general), 39-40, 45-47, 71-72, 111-12, 143, 149, 155, 168, 221, 231, 239, 243-44, 264, 336
- Old World Landowners* (Gogol'), 564
- Oleh I the Seer* (Viščyj; Kievan prince; d. 912?), 20, 22, 26, 28, 31-32, 34-35, 37, 120-21, 126, 169
- Oleh Ihorevyč* (son of Prince Ihor of Novhorod-Sivers'kyj), 197
- Oleh Svjatoslavyč* (Prince of Derevljans; d. 977), 118, 123
- Oleh Svjatoslavyč* (Prince of Tmutorokan' and Černihiv; d. 1115), 104, 107-109, 201-202, 213
- Oleksandriv, S.* (1790-1850), 577
- Oleksij Popovyč*. See *Al'oša Popovyč*.
- Oles'* (pseud., 1878-1944), 614-15
- Ol'ha* (princess, wife of Vsevolod, daughter of Hlib Jurijevyč), 203
- Ol'ha, Saint* (Kievan princess; d. 969), 22, 24, 27, 29-30, 90, 97, 120, 122, 126, 212, 219. See also *Life of St. Ol'ha*.
- Olizarowski, Tomasz August* (1811-1879), 454
- O narodnoj poeziji slavjanskix plemen*. See *On the Folk Poetry of Slavic Races*.
- On Bidding Goodnight* (Kostomarov), 472
- One Hundred Maxims* (Gennadius), 52, 98, 212
- One Who Loves Christ*, 77
- Onicephorus* (monk), 167-68
- On Justice, Truth, and Courage* (Klymovs'kyj), 310
- On Spiritual Value* (Hilarion), 76
- On Sundays, She Did Not Goad About* (Ševčenko), 515
- On the Black Sea Coast* (Levyc'kyj), 597
- On the Dnieper* (Karpenko-Karyj), 610
- On the Folk Poetry of Slavic Races* (Bodjans'kyj), 573

- On the Historical Significance of Folk Poetry* (Kostomarov), 456
- Opis Starożytniej Polski*. See *Description of Ancient Poland*.
- O poslušanyji*. See *About Obedience*.
- Opraksija (wife of Volodymyr), 127
- O pravosudiju, pravdi i bodrosti*. See *On Justice, Truth, and Courage*.
- Or (poet), 125
- Orchard of Mary, Mother of God* (Radyvylovs'kyj), 336
- Orichovius-Ruthenus. See Orzechowski, Stanisław.
- Origin of the Holy Ghost* (Zörniskau), 349
- Ortnit* (German poem), 128
- Orysja* (Kuliš'), 526, 528
- Orzechowski, Stanisław (1513-1566), 364
- Osipov, Nikolaj (1751-1799), 381-82, 389, 391, 427
- Osm' blaženstv*. See *Eight Beatitudes*.
- Osmohlasnyk*. See *Octoechos*.
- Osnova*. See *Foundation*.
- Osnovjanenko Hryc'ko (pseud.). See Kvitka-Osnovjanenko, Hryhorij.
- Ossian, 437
- Ostaszewski, Spyrydon (1797-1875), 454, 578
- Ostrih Bible*, 246
- Ostromir (mayor of Novgorod), 39
- Ostromir Gospel*, 17, 39
- Ostroz'kyj, Konstantyn (Prince of Ostrih, 1463-1533), 209, 234
- Ostroz'kyj, Vasyl' Konstantyn (Prince of Ostrih; 1527-1608), 246-49, 351
- Otto (emperor), story about, 316
- Ot tobi i skarb*. See *What a Treasure*.
- O, Under the Cherry Tree* (Kotljarevs'kyj), 47
- Our Own Ukrainian Tales*, 573
- Out of the Evil of the Day* (Franko), 606
- Over the Dnieper* (Oles'), 615
- Ovid (43 B.C.-17 A.D.), 37, 356, 415
- Ovlur ("Lavor"), 192
- O vozvannju do zakonu i o doskonalosty všedšyx v neho*. See *Concerning the Call to the Law and the Perfection of Those Who Abide By It*.
- Owen, John (1560-1622), 297, 356
- Owl (Ševčenko), 516, 519
- Ox, tale about, 36-37
- Ozerov, Vladislav (1769-1816), 435
- Pačovs'kyj, Vasyl' (1878-1942), 618
- Padurra, Tymko (1801-1871), 454, 568-70, 578
- Palij, Semen (d. 1710), 451, 460-61; poem about, 461-62
- Palinodija* (Kopystens'kyj), 350
- Palladius (4th century), 42
- Palyvoda 18 st*. See *Madcap of the 18th Century*.
- Pamjatnaja kniga dlja pomeščikov Černigovskoj gubernii*. See *Book of Instructions for the Landowners of Černihiv Province*.
- Pamva Berynda. See Berynda, Pamva.
- Pan'kevyč, Ivan (1887-1958), 586
- Pan mirošnyk abo satana u bočci*. See *Master Miller or a Satan in a Cask*.
- Pannonian Lives*, 2
- Pan Tadeusz* (Mickiewicz), 313
- Pan ta sobaka*. See *Master and the Dog*.
- Pan Tvardovs'kyj* (Mickiewicz), 410
- Pan Xaljavs'kyj* (Kvitka), 433
- Paremejnik*. See *Paroemenarium*.
- Paroemenarium*, 40, 108, 227
- Parximove snidannja*. See *Parxim's Breakfast*.
- Parxim's Breakfast* (Kvitka), 421, 435
- Passion of Christ*, 242
- Patericon* (general), 42-43, 53, 169
- Patericon of Rome*, 42, 62
- Patericon of Sinai*, 42
- Patericon of 1650*, 126
- Patericon of Skete*, 42, 227
- Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, 2, 21, 42, 66, 79, 80, 83, 85, 96-97, 120, 126, 133, 137-38, 165-71, 221, 224, 227, 230, 234

- Paul, the Apostle, Epistles of, 63, 268, 339. See also *Life of Paul, Revelations of the Apostle Paul*.
- Pavlov's'kyj, Oleksij (c. 1770-c. 1822), 413
- Pavlyk, Myxajlo (1855-1928), 616
- Pčela*. See *Bee*.
- Pčilka, Olena (pseud., 1849-1930), 599-601, 603, 612, 614
- Pearl (Biser; anthology of sermons)*, 44
- Pearl (Margarit; anthology of sermons)*, 44
- Pearl (Žemčug; anthology of sermons)*, 44
- Peasant Idylls (Szymonowicz)*, 358
- Pečal'no ja gljažu na naše pokolen'e*.
See *Sadly I Behold Our Generation*.
- Pentateuch*. See *Books of Moses*.
- Perebyjnis, song about, 206
- Perejaslav Chronicle*, 187.
- Perejaslavs'ka nič*. See *Night at Perejaslav*.
- Perekotypole*. See *Feathergrass*.
- Perepjat, legend about, 190
- Peresemešnik*. See *Scoffer*.
- Peresopnyc'ka Evanhelija*, 244
- Perestoroħa*. See *Warning*.
- Peretc, Volodymyr (1870-1953), 5, 7, 215-16
- Peretc-Adrijanova, Varvara. See Adrijanova-Peretc, Varvara.
- Perexresni stežky*. See *Crossroads*.
- Perly mnohocinni*. See *Priceless Pearls*.
- Perovskij, Aleksej. See Pogorel'skij, Aleksej.
- Perun (myth.), 23-24
- Pestalozzi, Johann Heinrich (1746-1827), 427
- Peter (apostle), 143, 268, 322, 330, 337, 339, 538
- Peter I (Emperor of Russia; 1672-1725), 310, 339, 341-42, 544, 571
- Peter II (Emperor of Russia; 1715-1730), 326
- Peter from Provence (count), story about, 315
- Peter of Antioch, 64
- Peter's Golden Keys*, 315
- Peter the Snuffler, tale about, 243
- Petrarch (Francesco Petrarca; 1304-1374), 350
- Petra Zoloti ključ*. See *Peter's Golden Keys*.
- Petreev (wanderer), 128
- Petrenko, Myxajlo (1817-?), 476-78, 574, 586
- Petro Huhnyvyj. See Peter the Snuffler.
- Petrov, Mykola (1840-1921), 4
- Petrov, Victor (Domontovyč, P., pseud., 1894-1969), 7-8, 530
- Petrus'*. See *Little Peter*.
- Philosopher's Aims (Algazali)*, 232
- Photius (Ščerbac'kyj)*, 323
- Photius the Philosopher (patriarch), 51, 63
- Physiologus*, 51, 54, 64, 108, 212, 220
- Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni (1463-1494), 356
- Pidbreač*. See *Liar's Helper*.
- Pidzemna cerkva*. See *Underground Church*.
- Pigmalion (Pčilka)*, 600
- Pilate, Pontius, 140, 144, 242
- Pilgrimage of Abbot Daniel*, 46, 110, 113
- Pisna*. See *Songs for Lent*.
- Pisni Haras'ka*. See *Songs of Haras'ko*.
- Pisni pro čotyry ostanni reči ljudyny*. See *Songs about the Four Ultimate Things of Man*.
- Piv kopy kazok dlja veseloho myra*. See *Few Dozen Tales for a Merry World*.
- Piv sotni kazok dlja veselyx ljudej*. See *Half a Hundred Tales for Merry People*.
- Plain Air (Franko)*, 606
- Plato (c. 428-c. 348 B.C.), 51, 53, 220, 233, 237, 267-68, 270, 428
- Plavil'sčikov, Peter (1760-1812), 427
- Plaxta (cossack). See *Cossack Plaxta*.
- Pletenec'kyj, Jelysej (1550-1624), 296
- Pletho. See *Gemistus Pletho*, Georgius.
- Plutarch (c. 46-c. 126), 356

- Poemen the Faster, 582
Poetic Ukraine, 582
Poetische Ukraine. See *Poetic Ukraine*.
Poetry of the Homestead (Kuliš), 544, 546
Poezija slavjan. See *Slavic Poetry*.
Pogodin, Mixail (1800-1875), 427, 452
Pogodin Collection. See *Hypatian Chronicle*.
Pogorel'skij, Aleksej (1787-1836), 452
Pohane pole. See *Evil Field*.
Pokotypole. See *Feathergrass*.
Polemical Verses (Franko), 605
Polemični virši. See *Polemical Verses*.
Poletyka, Hryhorij (c. 1724-1784), 348, 357, 359
Poloc'kyj, Symeon (Samujil Petrov'skyj; 1629-1680), 357
Poltava (Puškin), 450, 477, 571, 577
Polubotok, Pavlo (het'man; 1660-1724), 450-51
Polycarp (monk of Kievan Caves Monastery), 165-70, 234
Polyphemus, legend about, 35
Ponad Dniprom. See *On the Dnieper*.
Poor Chicken with the Speckled Feathers (Kvitka), 419
Poor Oksana (Kvitka), 422
Poplar (Sevčenko), 9-10, 12-13, 515
Popovič, Alexandr. See Al'oša Popovič.
Porada. See *Advice*.
Po revizji. See *After the Inspection*.
Portrait of a Soldier (Kvitka), 421, 429, 435, 554
Porus (king), 234
Posel'stvo do papeža Syksta IV. See *Letter to Pope Sixtus IV*.
Potij, Ipatij (metropolitan; 1541-1613), 23, 249-51
Potocki, Wacław (1625-1696), 358
Potok, Michael. See Myxail Potok.
Potomky ukrajins'koho hajdamactva. See *Descendants of the Ukrainian Hajdamaky*.
Poučenie. See *Instruction*.
Povest' ob Ukraine. See *Story about Ukraine*.
Povija. See *Fallen Woman*.
Powieści kozackie. See *Cossacks' Tales*.
Poxoždenie Ivana, gostinnogo syna. See *Adventures of Ivan, the Innkeeper's Son*.
Poxožennja sv. Duxa. See *Origin of the Holy Ghost*.
Pozdravlenie Rusynov. See *Ruthenian Well-Wishing*.
Požniak, Jan (1811-1883), 578
Pozoryšče myslennoje. See *Spiritual Theatre*.
Požycena Kobza. See *Borrowed Kobza*.
Pravda. See *Truth*.
Pravda voli monaršej. See *Truth of the Ruler's Will*.
Priceless Pearls (Stavrovec'kyj), 335
Priezžij iz stolicy. See *Visitor from the Capital*.
Primary Chronicle (or *Old*; "Načal'nyj"), 17, 19-30, 171-73, 183. See also *Chronicle of the Year . . .*
Princess (Sevčenko), 516, 519
Priselkov, Mixail (1881-1941), 171
Prisoner of the Caucasus (Puškin), 577
Pritočnik (Collection of 1483), 233
Prochorus, tale about, 167, 169
Prodav kota v mišku. See *He Sold a Cat in a Sack*.
Prodromos, Theodore, petitions of, 211
Profiteer or the Spider (Kropyvnyč'kyj), 609
Prokip Ivanovyč (Storoženko), 563, 566
Prokopovyč, Teofan (1681-1736), 301, 324, 333, 342, 349, 354, 356, 364-65
Prolog. See *Prologue*.
Prologue, 42, 59, 62, 64, 80, 162, 165, 221
Prologues, 315
Propašča syła. See *Wasted Strength*.
Prosfonima, 254

- Prostak*. See *Simpleton*.
 Proteus, 444
Proud Couple (Kuliš), 554
Province of Cernigov News, 535
Pro zlodija v seli Hakivnyci. See *About the Thief in the Village of Hakivnycja*.
Pryčepa. See *Intruder*.
Pryčynna. See *Bewitched*.
Prykazky (Bilec'kyj-Nosenko), 412
Psalms, 113, 173, 243, 267-68, 339, 409, 411-12, 432; imitation of, 538; paraphrase of, 556-57; Ševčenko paraphrases of, 514; translation of, 495, 535
Psalms of Ruslan (Šaškevyč), 485
Psalmi Ruslanovi. See *Psalms of Ruslan*.
Psalter. See *Book of Psalms*.
Psalters (fortune telling), 40
 Puffendorf, Samuel (1632-1694), 345
Pultawa (Mušnicki), 432
Punctilious One (Lukin), 427
Purchased Intelligence (Kvitka), 421, 435
 Puškin, Aleksandr (1799-1837), 422, 450, 454, 458-59, 462, 477, 571, 577, 616
Putešestvie. See *Journey*.
 Putjata. See *Zabava Putjatyčna*.
Put' k vičnosti. See *Road to Eternity*.
 Puzyna, Konstantyn (1790-1850), 412
 Pypin, Aleksandr (1833-1904), 4, 6
Pysanyje do vsix u Ljads'kij zemli. See *Letter to All the People Living in the Polish Lands*.
 Pysarevs'kyj, Petro (dates unknown; 19th century), 412
 Pysarevs'kyj, Stepan (d. 1839), 412, 420
Pysul'ka do redaktora Ukrajins'koho Hincja. See *Note to the Editor of the Ukrainian Messenger*.
Questions (Athanasius), 44
Questions (Kirik), 110, 220-21
 Rachel, lament of, 321
 Racine, Jean (1639-1699), 404
 Radiščev, Aleksandr (1749-1802), 427
 Radyvylovs'kyj, Antonij (d. 1688), 5, 336-37, 388
Raid on the Steppe (Kuzmič), 452
 Ramus, Peter (1515-1572), 356
 Raša, proverb of, 173
Raxuba drevam roznym. See *Enumeration of the Various Trees*.
Recollections (Storoženko), 563
 Rededja (legendary hero), 28, 129-30, 132
Red-Haired Grandfather (Kotljarevs'kyj), 417
 Rej, Mikołaj (1505-1569), 125, 188, 239, 274
Religiosae Kijovienses cryptae, sive Kijovia subterranea . . . (Herbinus), 125
Resurrection of the Dead (Konys'kyj), 323
Retoryčna ruka. See *Rhetorical Hand*.
Revelation of St. John the Divine on Mount Tabor, 48
Revelation of St. Methodius of Patara (or Olympus), 48, 115
Revelations of the Apostle Paul, 48
Revenge of a Highlander (Ustyjanovyč), 490-91
Revizor. See *Inspector General*.
 Revyc'kyj, Anton (18th century), 364
 Rezanov, Volodymyr (1867-1936), 7
Rhetorical Hand (Javors'kyj), 340
 Rilke, Rainer Maria (1875-1926), 46
 Rjurik (Kievan prince), 122, 195
 Rjurik Rostyslavyč (Prince of Zvenyhorod; 11th century), 155-56, 186
Road to Eternity (Domeč'kyj), 351
 Robert Bruce (Ukrajinka), 615

- Rock of Faith* (Javors'kyj), 364
 Rohnida (Princess of Polock), 22, 24
 Rohoža, Myxail (metropolitan; d. 1599), 22, 254
Roksolanki to jest ruskie panny. See *Roxolans or Ruthenian Girls*.
 Roman Mstyslavyč (Prince of Galicia and Volynia; d. 1205), 22, 182, 185, 189-90
 Roman Svjatoslavyč ("the Beautiful"; prince, d. 1079), 130
Roman ta Paras'ka or Prostak. See *Simpleton*.
Romanzen vom Rozenkranz. See *Ballad of the Rose Garland*.
Rossijskij Žil' Blaz. See *Russian Gil Blas*.
Rostov Chronicle. See *Chronicle of Rostov*.
 Rostyslav (prince), 212
 Ročyslav (Prince of Smolensk), 220
 Rostyslav I Mstyslavyč (Kievan prince; d. 1168), 178-79
 Rostyslav Vsevolodovyč (prince; brother of Volodymyr Monomax), 167, 198, 201, 204
 Rousseau, Jean Jacques (1712-1778), 404, 437
Roxolania (Klonowicz), 358
Roxolans or Ruthenian Girls (Zimorowicz), 358
Rozhovor derevodila z kupcem. See *Dialogue Between the Lumberman and the Merchant*.
Rozhovor hračdanyňa z seljanyňom ta pivcem cerkovnym. See *Citizen's Conversation with the Peasant and the Church Singer*.
Rozmova berestjanyňa z bratčikom. See *Conversation Between a Follower of the Union of Brest and a Monk*.
Rozmysljannje o mucy Xrysta. See *Meditations on the Passion of Christ*.
 Rozum, Kyrilo, verse dedicated to, 573
 Ruban, Vasyľ (1739-1795), 377
 Rudans'kyj, Stepan (1834-1873), 23, 34, 536-37, 587, 593, 613
 Rudčenko, Ivan. See Bilyk, Ivan (pseud.).
 Rudčenko, Panas. See Myrnyj, Panas (pseud.).
 Rudykovs'kyj, Stepan (1784-1851), 412
Rufin i Priscilla. See *Rufinus and Priscilla*.
Rufinus and Priscilla (Ukrajinka), 617
Rusalka. See *Mermaid* (Ševčenko).
Rusalka. See *Mermaid* (Somov).
Rusalka Dnistrovaja. See *Dniester Mermaid*.
Rus'ka pravda. See *Rus' Law*.
Rus' Law, 29, 135
Russian Gil Blas (Narižnyj), 432
Russian Tales and Yarns (Kuprijenko), 573
 Rustam and Suhrab, Persian tale about, 35
Ruthenian Well-Wishing, 494
Rybalka. See *Fisherman*.
Rybalka Panas Krut'. See *Fisherman Panas Krut'*.
 Rydel, Lucian (1870-1918), 615
 Ryleev, Kondratij (1795-1826), 449-50, 454, 582
 Ryls'kyj, Maksym (1895-1964), 313
 Rymša, Andrij (16th century), 254
Rymski Dijannja. See *Deeds of the Romans*.
 Rystencko, O., 5
 Saavedra Falandro, Diego de (1584-1648), 300
 Sacrobosco, John (d. 1256), 232
Sad božestvennyx pėsnej. See *Garden of Divine Songs*.
Sadly I Behold Our Generation (Lermontov), 411
 Sadows'kyj, Mykola (pseud. of Tobilevyč; 1856-1933), 608, 615
 Sahajdačnyj, Petro Konaševyč-(het'man; d. 1622), 76, 279, 282, 293, 396, 399

- Saint John's Eve* (Gogol'), 573
Saint John's Eve (Pysarev's'kyj), 420
Sajadašnyj (Kuliš), 552-53
 Sakovyč, Kasijan (1578-1647), 76, 350
 Saksahans'kyj, Panas (pseud., 1859-1940), 608
Saldac'kyj partret. See *Portrait of a Soldier*.
 Šalikov, Petro (1768-1852), 433
 Samijlenko, Volodymyr (1864-1925), 614
 Samijlo Kiška, *duma* about, 257
Samovydcja Litopys. See *Eye-Witness Chronicle*.
 Samovydec' (pseud.), 2, 531
Samovydec' Chronicle. See *Eye-Witness Chronicle*.
 Samson, 125
Samson (Ukrajinka), 615
 Samuel (Bulgarian king), 60-61
 Sand, George (1804-1876), 427, 536-37
 Sarnicki, Stanisław (1532-1597), 125
 Šaškevyč, Markijan (1811-1843), 478-85, 586
 Šaškevyč, Volodymyr (1839-1885), 567
Saul (Ševčenko), 537
Sava Čalyj (Karpenko-Karyj), 611
Sava Čalyj (Kostomarov), 474
Savelij Grab (Dal'), 452
 Savior. See Christ.
 Šaxmatov, Aleksej (1864-1920), 5
 Šaxovskij, Aleksandr (1777-1846), 433, 608
 Scarron, Paul (1610-1660), 381-82
 Ščepetil'nik. See *Punctilious One*.
 Ščepkin, Myxajlo (1788-1863), 608
 Ščerbac'kyj, Georgij (d. 1754), 323
 Schelling, Friedrich (1775-1854), 455-56, 495-96
 Schiller, Friedrich (1759-1805), 422, 474, 478; translation of, 533, 537, 556
Schlacht bei Poltava. See *Battle Near Poltava*.
 Scholasticus. See Johannes Scholasticus.
 Schubert, Franz (1797-1828), 614
 Schubert, Gotthilt Heinrich (1780-1860), 496
 Šcoffer (Čulkov), 427
 Šcoholiv, Jakiv (1823-1898), 34, 478, 535, 586, 614
 Scott, Walter (1771-1832), 529-30
Scriptures. See *Bible*.
 Ščyra ljubov. See *Sincere Love*.
Secret of Secrets, 232
Selections from Correspondence with My Friends (Gogol'), 526
 Šel'menko-denščyk. See *Šel'menko—the Orderly*.
 Šel'menko, plays about, 608
 Šel'menko—the District Clerk (Kvitka), 419, 433
 Šel'menko—the Orderly (Kvitka), 419, 433
 Šel'menko—volosnyj pysar. See *Šel'menko—the District Clerk*.
Seminarian (Narižnyj), 432, 453
 Semjunko (boyar), 181
Semper tiro (Franko), 606
 Seneka, Lucius Annaeus (c. 4 B.C.-65 A.D.), 372
 Sęp-Szarzyński, Mikołaj (d. 1581), 358
 Serapion (Bishop of Vladimir), 139, 156-58, 160-62, 266
Serdešna Oksana. See *Poor Oksana*.
Sermon about God's Punishments (John Chrysostomos), 19, 69, 71, 115
Sermon about Innocence, 77
Sermon about Lying (Vyšens'kyj), 267
Sermon of Cyril the Philosopher, 218
Sermon of Law and Grace (Hilarion), 66, 67, 71, 76
Sermon of One Who Loves Christ, 18, 77
Sermon on Princes, 153
Sermon on the Destruction of the Land of Rus', 218
Sermon on the First Sunday after Easter (the Feast of Thomas), 140

- Sermon to a Stylite*. See *Sermon to Those Who Have Abandoned This World*.
- Sermon to Those Who Have Abandoned This World* (Hilarion), 76
- Servant Girl* (Ševčenko), 514, 516, 519, 535
- Šestodnevi. See *Hexaemeron*.
- Šestokril. See *Six Wings*.
- Ševčenko, Ihor, 98
- Ševčenko, Taras (1814-1861), 1, 7, 9, 11-14, 34, 46, 113, 306-307, 349, 367, 393, 402, 412, 422, 445, 448, 451-52, 476, 479, 481, 494-95, 498-500, 502-504, 506n, 507-511, 514-21, 523-26, 529, 531-45, 566-67, 570, 576-79, 581, 583, 586-87, 589, 593-94, 603, 608-609, 614, 616
- Ševyr'ov, Stefan (1806-1864), 3-4
- Sexton's Daughter* (Ševčenko), 516-19
- Sexton's Daughter of Nemyriv* (Ševčenko), 537
- Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors* (Kocjubyns'kyj), 618
- Shah Namah* (Firdusi), 35
- Shakespeare, William (1564-1616), 11, 277, 319, 333, 441, 446, 475, 594, 616; translations of, 474, 556
- Sheaf* (almanac), 456
- Shevelov, George, 592
- Short Kievan Chronicle*, 234
- Sičovi hosti. See *Guests from the Sič*.
- Sidelec* (Plavil'sčykov), 427
- Siege of Bilhorod, tale of, 32
- Siege of Lviv by Xmel'nyc'kyj* (Šaškevyč), 484
- Sielanki*. See *Peasant Idylls*.
- Sielanki nowe ruskie*. See *New Ruthenian Peasant Idylls*.
- Sigismund III (Polish king; 1566-1632), 251
- Sigismunda, tale about, 317
- Sincere Love*, 419, 422-23, 428-29
- Silvester (Abbot of the Vydubec'kyj Monastery), 104, 114, 118-22
- Simeon (tsar; 9th-10th centuries), 62
- Simon (author of *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*), 165-69, 221
- Simon (Varangian prince), 168
- Simon of Mesopotamia, 221
- Simon the New Theologian, 227
- Simpleton* (or *Roman ta Paras'ka*; Hohol'-Janovs'kyj), 418-19
- Sincellus Georgius Chronicle*. See *Chronicle of Georgius Sincellus*.
- Sirach* (Collection of 1076), 98
- Sira kobyla*. See *Gray Mare*.
- Sirko, Ivan (Košovyy otaman), 347
- Six Wings* (Lunar Table), 232
- Skal'kovs'kyj, Apollon (1808-1899), 447
- Skarb*. See *Treasure*.
- Skarga, Piotr (1536-1612), 268, 274
- Skazanie*. See *Tale*.
- Skazka o care Saltane*. See *Tale of Tsar Saltan*.
- Sklovskij, Victor (1893-), 7
- Skol'nik, tale about, 36
- Skoryna, Francisk (c. 1490-1535), 40, 125, 243-44, 254
- Skovoroda, Hryhorij (1722-1794), 51, 53, 103, 213, 220, 272, 276-77, 283, 288, 290, 293, 299-301, 306-307, 310, 312, 323, 339, 342-43, 352-54, 356-57, 361, 365, 377, 393, 432, 446, 502, 532
- Sky Blue Rose* (Ukrajinka), 615
- Skyt Manjavs'kyj*. See *Monastery of Manjava*.
- Slavic Evenings* (Narižnyj), 432
- Slavic Poetry* (Kostomarov), 3
- Slavonic Reader* (Sreznevs'kyj), 430
- Slavyns'kyj, Maksym (1866-1945), 614
- Slipyj*. See *Blind Man*.
- Slovenski večera*. See *Slavic Evenings*.
- Slov'jans'ka čytanka*. See *Slavonic Reader*.
- Slovo nikojego Xristolubcja*. See *Sermon of One Who Loves Christ*.
- Slovo o karax Božix*. See *Sermon about God's Punishments*.

- Slovo o polku Igorevi*. See *Tale of Ihor's Campaign*.
Slovo o zakone i blagodati. See *Sermon on Law and Grace*.
Slovo o zbuřenju pekla. See *Concerning the Destruction of Hell*.
 Słowacki, Juljusz (1809-1849), 453
Služebnik. See *Liturgicon*.
Služebnye Minei. See *Menaea for Church Services*.
Small Travelling Companion Book, 244
 Smal'-Stoc'kyj, Stepan, 500n
 Smoljatyč, Clement. See Clement (Klym) Smoljatyč.
 Smotryc'kyj, Herasym (d. 1594), 247-48, 254
 Smotryc'kyj, Meletij (Maksym; 1578-1633), 276, 335, 349-50, 358, 361
Snake (Słowacki), 454
Snip. See *Sheaf*
Sobaka-vivcja. See *Dog or Sheep*.
 Sobolevskij, Alexej (1856-1929), 5, 221
 Socrates (d. 399 B.C.), 52
Sofijówka (Trembecki), 432
Soldier-Sorcerer (Kotljarevs'kyj), 416, 418, 424
Soldier's Well (Ševčenko), 516-17, 519, 537
 Solenyk, Karpo (1811-1851), 608
 Solomon (King of Israel), 45, 338-39; parables of, 58; proverbs of, 211-12; tale about, 64
Solopij ta Xivreja, 408
 Solovej (brigand), *starina* about, 128
 Solovej Budimirovič, 126, 129, 151, 225
 Solov'ev, Vladimir (1853-1900), 597
 Somov, Orest (1793-1833), 450
Son. See *Dream*.
Son Bogorodici. See *Dream of the Virgin Mary*.
Song of Songs, 63, 212, 231, 554
Songs about the Four Ultimate Things of Man, 382
Songs for Eastertide, 41
Songs for Lent, 41
Songs of Haras'ko (Hulak-Artemovs'kyj), 405
Sorcery (Topolja), 420
Sotnyk. See *Captain*.
Sotvorytel'. See *Creator*.
Southern Russian Collection (Metlyns'kyj), 535
Sova. See *Owl*.
 Sowiński, Leonard (1831-1887), 581
 Spee, Friedrich von (1591-1635), 446
 Sperans'kij, Mixail (1863-1938), 5
Spheres (Sacrobosco), 232
Śpiewy historyczne. See *Historical Songs*.
 Spinoza, Benedictus de (1632-1677), 356
Spir duši i tila. See *Dispute Between the Soul and the Body*.
 Spiridion, tale about, 167-68
Spiritual Meadow, 42
Spiritual Sword (Baranovyč), 338
Spiritual Theatre (Vyšens'kyj), 267
Spohady. See *Recollection*.
Spor duši z tilom. See *Altercation of the Soul with the Body*.
Spovid'. See *Confession*.
Spravžnja dobrist'. See *True Goodness*.
Spring Tale (Oles'), 615, 618
Špyhačky abo po-moskovs'komu epihramy. See *Little Stingers in Russian "Epigrams."*
 Špyhoc'kyj, Opanas (dates unknown), 477
 Sreznev'skyj, Izmail (1812-1880), 4, 430, 447, 455, 476, 496, 574
 Stäbisch, G. E., 582
 Starck, C. J., 582
Starina, 110, 124, 126-29, 131-32, 151, 187-90, 207, 210, 224, 257
Starosvits'ki batjušky ta matušky. See *Old-Fashioned Clerics and Their Wives*.
Starovyna. See *Former Times*.
Stars (Kostomarov), 473
Stars (Xomjakov), 533

- Staryc'kyj, Myxajlo (1840-1904), 579, 601-602, 606-607, 612-13, 615
- Staryj Jefrem*. See *Old Jefrem*.
- Staszewicz, A., 454
- Stavro Godinovič, *starina* about, 128
- Stavrovec'kyj, Kyrylo Trankvilion (d. 1646), 152, 218, 258, 276, 281, 321, 335, 351, 356
- Stefanit i Ixnilat*. See *Crowned and the Tracer*.
- Stefanovič-Venclovič, G., 358
- Stephen the Voivode, song about, 19
- Sterne, Laurence (1713-1768), 436
- Stifter, Adalbert (1805-1868), 585
- Stojit' javir nad vodoju*. See *Maple Stands by the Water*.
- Stolen Happiness* (Franko), 613
- Stonecutters* (Franko), 606
- Storoženko, Andrij (1790-1857), 451
- Storoženko, Oleksa (1805-1874), 421, 452-53, 536, 563-67, 586
- Story about Ukraine* (Kuliš), 526
- Story of the Indian Kingdom*, 59-60, 188
- Story of the Seven Wise Men*, 316
- Sto tysjač*. See *Hundred Thousand*.
- Strastnyj četver*. See *Maundy Thursday*.
- Štryboh (myth.), 196-97
- Štúr, L. (1815-1856), 497
- Suffering Christ*, 320
- Sujeta*. See *Vanity*.
- Sumarokov, Alexandr (d. 1777), 413
- Suplika do pana izdatelja*. See *Supplication to Mr. Editor*.
- Supplication of Daniel*, 4, 22, 39, 65-66, 103, 136, 138, 204, 211-13, 215
- Supplication to Mr. Editor* (Kvitka), 429
- Suxomlinov, Mixail (1828-1901), 4
- Suzdalian Chronicle*, 187, 209
- Sužena*. See *Betrothed*.
- Svatannja na Hončarivci*. See *Matchmaking in Hončarivka*.
- Svatovstvo*. See *Matchmaking*.
- Svetlana* (Žukovskij), 458
- Svinjin, Pavel (1787-1839), 448
- Svitla prorocycja*. See *Illustrious Prophetess*.
- Svjatopolk I Volodymyrovyč, the Accursed ("Okajannyj"; Prince of Turiv; c. 980-1019), 28-30, 67, 80-82, 90-92, 123, 129-30, 170
- Svjatopolk II Izjaslavyč (Kievan prince; 1093-1112), 86-87, 116, 122, 127
- Svjatoslav (son of Prince Ihor of Novhorod-Sivers'kyj), 197
- Svjatoslav I Ihorevyč, the Conqueror (Kievan prince; c. 964-972), 63, 73, 130, 212
- Svjatoslav II Jaroslavyč (Kievan prince; d. 1076), 45, 51, 69, 95, 117, 119, 120-21
- Svjatoslav III Vsevolodovyč (Kievan prince; 1176-1194), 29, 138, 154, 192-95, 197, 201-204, 208
- Svjatoslav Sivers'kyj (father of Prince Ihor of Novhorod-Sivers'kyj), 197-98
- Svydnyč'kyj, Anatolij (1834-1871), 595
- Swallow* (almanac), 431, 456, 570-71
- Swallow* (Kostomarov), 470, 472
- Swedenborg, Emanuel (1688-1772), 428
- Sweep Out the Yards* (Kvitka), 419
- Sweetheart, or Matchmaking in the Village of Ryxmy* (anonymous), 420
- Swencki, T. (1774-1837), 432
- Świteż (Mickiewicz), 468
- Syl'vester Kosiv. See Kosiv, Syl'vester.
- Symposium* (Plato), 428
- Symyrenko, Lev (1855-1920), 611
- Synaxarion* (or *Menologion*). See *Prologue*.
- Synopsis*, 2, 347
- Syrokomla-Kondratowicz, Władysław (1823-1862), 581
- Šyšač'kyj-Ilyč, Olexander (1828-1859), 535, 573
- Szaszkiewicz, Anton (1813-1880), 578
- Szymonowicz, Szymon (1558-1629), 358

- Tajemnycja tajemnyc'.* See *Mystery of Mysteries.*
- Talan.* See *Fate.*
- Tale* (of Borys and Hlib), 14, 20, 46, 66, 80-81, 83, 88-91, 93, 133, 137, 169, 210
- Tale about the Blinding of Vasył'ko,* 79, 86-87, 115, 210, 224
- Tale of Akir the Wise,* 57, 206, 212
- Tale of Events beyond the Don,* 191, 209, 234
- Tale of Ihor's Campaign,* 21-22, 29-30, 34, 40, 46, 50, 57, 66, 96, 124-25, 130-32, 138, 154, 167, 173, 177, 182, 186, 190-97, 199, 201-209, 213-14, 216-18, 222, 224, 234, 461, 495, 518, 528, 535, 543, 554
- Tale of Isaac,* 83-85
- Tale of the Four Monks of the Kievan Caves Monastery,* 83
- Tale of the Host of Ihor.* See *Tale of Ihor's Campaign.*
- Tale of Tsar Saltan* (Puškin), 564
- Tancred, tale about, 317
- Taranovs'kyj, Kyryl, 500n
- Taras Bul'ba* (Gogol'), 451, 529, 531, 566, 602, 609
- Tarasova Nič.* See *Night of Taras.*
- Tasso, Torquato (1544-1595), 308, 345
- Tatar Raids* (Kvitka), 427
- Tatarskie nabegi.* See *Tatar Raids.*
- Tavern of the Devil* (Storoženko), 564
- Teaching or the Manner of Composing a Sermon* (Galjatovs'kyj), 336
- Telegonos, 35
- Termagant* (Kvitka), 419
- Termina o lži.* See *Sermon about Lying.*
- Terrible Change,* 323
- Terse Reply of Feodul* (Vyšens'kyj), 267
- Tetraevangelion,* 39
- Theodore (monk), 168-70
- Theodore of Studion, sermons of, 44, 64, 70. See also *Life of Theodore of Studion.*
- Theodore of Suzdal (Fedorec), 165
- Theodore Tyro, Saint, 36, 48. See also *Life of Theodore Tyro.*
- Theodosius, Saint (of Kiev), 24, 29, 65-66, 69-71, 79, 83, 85, 93-97, 110, 115, 133, 168, 221, 234
- Theodosius of Crypt, 39, 220
- Theodosius the Greek (Fedos), 69
- Theology* (Damascenus), 44, 62
- Theophilus (monk), tale about, 170
- Theophrastus (pupil of Aristotle), 212
- Thietmar of Merseburg (975-1018), 127
- Thomas, 219-20
- Thomas, the Apostle, 140, 144, 219
- Three Destinies* (Marko Vovčok), 594
- Three Sisters* (Storoženko), 564
- Three Years* (Ševčenko), 498
- Threnos* (Smotryč'kyj), 350
- Tiberius (42 B.C.-37 A.D.), 343
- Tidrekssaga* (Norwegian), 128
- Timothy, the Scholar, 179
- Tini zabutyx predkiv.* See *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors.*
- Titus (priest), 167
- Tixonravov, Nikolaj (1832-1893), 4
- Tjapinskij, Vasilij (c. 1540-c. 1603), 244
- Tjutčev, Fedor (1803-1873), 471
- Tobilevyč (brothers), 608
- Tobilevyč, Ivan. See *Karpenko-Karyj* (pseud.).
- Tobilevyč, Panas. See *Saksahans'kyj, Panas* (pseud.).
- Todors'kyj, Symon, 356, 359; sermons of, 342
- To Him That Knocketh It Shall Be Opened* (Ustjanovyč), 491
- Tolkovaja Paleja.* See *Explanatory Paleja.*
- Tolkovaja Psaltir* (variant of *Psalter*), 39
- Tolkuščemu otverzet'sja.* See *To Him That Knocketh It Shall Be Opened.*
- Tolstoj, Alexej (1817-1875), 503
- Tolstoj, Lev (1828-1910), 34, 601, 605

- To My Sweetheart* (Hulak-Artemovs'kyj), 406
To Parxom (Hulak-Artemovs'kyj), 407
Topolja. See *Poplar*.
Topolja, Kyrylo (dates unknown; first half of the 19th century), 420, 608
Torčyn (Hlib's cook), 82
Toržestvennik (Cyril of Turiv), 141
To the Carters (Moračevs'kyj), 577
To the Dead, to the Living . . . (Ševčenko), 510, 514
Tovaryšky. See *Girlfriends*.
Tragedokomedija. See *Tragicomedy*.
Tragicomedy (Laševs'kyj), 323
Trankvilion Stavrovec'kyj, Kyrylo. See *Stavrovec'kyj*, Kyrylo
Trankvillion . . .
Treasure (Storoženko), 564, 566
Trebnik. See *Euchologion*.
Tree of the Cross (apocr.), 46-48, 113
Trembecki, Stanislaw (c. 1739-1811 or 1812), 432
Triod'. See *Triodion*.
Trioda Cvitnaja. See *Triodion for Eastertide*.
Triodion, 41, 243
Triodion for Eastertide (of 1631), 296
Tristan and Isolde, 242-43
Trojan, 196-97
Trojanskoe dejanie. See *Deeds of Troy*.
Trubeckoj, Nikolaj (1890-1938), 131
Truby sloves propovidnyx. See *Trumpets of Words Preached*.
True Goodness (Hulak-Artemovs'kyj), 409
Trumpets of Words Preached (Baranovyč), 338
Truth (journal), 595, 598
Truth of Ruler's Will (Prokopovyč), 354
Try doli. See *Three Destinies*.
Try lita. See *Three Years*.
Try sestry. See *Three Sisters*.
Tsar Nalyvaj (Kuliš), 552
Tsar Nightingale (Rudans'kyj), 567
Tsar Solovej. See *Tsar Nightingale*.
Tudor, Stepan (pseud. of Oleksjuk; 1892-1941), 173
Tugarin Zmejevič, starina about, 127
Tuha. See *Longing*.
Tuhor-khan (Polovcian prince), 127
Tundal (knight), tale about, 242
Tuptalo of Rostov, Dmytro, Saint (1651-1709), 2, 6, 88, 281, 296, 302, 305, 313, 321-22, 326, 333, 338-41, 356, 360-62, 418
Tur, Kyrylo, 532
Turgenev, Ivan (1818-1883), 536, 587, 594, 605
Tverian Chronicle, 226
Twin Brothers (Storoženko), 453
Two Brothers (Storoženko), 564
Two Ivans (Narižnyj), 432
Two Nations of Rus' (Kostomarov), 3
Two Soldiers' Wives (Levyč'kyj), 595
Tytarivna. See *Sexton's Daughter*.
Tytarivna-Nemyrivna. See *Sexton's Daughter of Nemyriv*.
Učytel'noje jevanhelije. See *Instructional Gospel*, 152
Ugly Cut-Throat Beat Me (Kvitka), 419
Uhland, Johann Ludwig (1787-1862), 468, 585
U katakombax. See *In the Catacombs*.
Ukradene ščastja. See *Stolen Happiness*.
Ukraine (Kuliš), 526-27, 540
Ukrainian Almanac, 456
Ukrainian Grammar (Pavlovs'kyj), 413
Ukrainian Melodies (publ. by Markevyč), 450
Ukrainian Miscellany (almanac), 456
Ukrainian Scenes from 1649 (Kostomarov), 474
Ukrainian Songs (collection), 582
Ukrainian Tales (trans. by Czajkowski), 582
Ukrainische Lieder. See *Ukrainian Songs*.

Ukrainskie melodii. See *Ukrainian Melodies*.
Ukrainskij sbornik. See *Ukrainian Miscellany*.
Ukrajina. See *Ukraine*.
Ukrajinka, Lesja (pseud., 1871-1913), 242, 601, 604, 606, 614-18
Ukrajins'ki sceny 1649. See *Ukrainian Scenes from 1649*.
Ukrajins'kyj al'manax. See *Ukrainian Almanac*.
Ułana (Kraszewski), 587
Ułjana klušnycja. See *Ułjana, the Housekeeper*.
Ułjana, the Housekeeper (Kuliš), 549-50
Underground Church (Kvitka), 468
U nedilju ne huljala. See *On Sundays, She Did Not Grieve About*.
Unija . . . See *Union* . . .
Union . . . (Potij), 249
Universae matheseos brevis institutio (Revyč'kyj), 364
Unmasking of the Devil, the Ruler of the World (Vyšens'kyj), 267, 270
Until the Sun Rises, the Dew Will Corrode the Eyes (Kropyvnyč'kyj), 609
Upuščy. See *In the Wilderness*.
Uroš the Fifth, drama about, 323
Uspinnja Bohorodyci. See *Assumption of the Blessed Virgin*.
Ustyjanovyč, Mykola (1811-1885), 485-87, 490-91, 586
U temrjavi. See *In the Darkness*.
U tijeji Kateryny. See *In the House of a Certain Katherine*.
Utoplenycja. See *Drowned Girl*.
Utrennjaja zvezda. See *Morning Star*.
U Vyl'ni, horodi preslavnim. See *In the Celebrated Town of Vil'no*.
Užasnaja izmina. See *Terrible Change*.

Vagrant Girl (Levyč'kyj), 596
Vahylevyč, Ivan (1811-1866), 478-79, 492

Vakula Čmyr, 413
Vanity (Karpenko-Karyj), 610-11
Varlaam i Iosaf. See *Barlaam and Josaphat*.
Varnak. See *Convict*.
Vasilij Ignatovič (or *Pjatnycja*, epos figure), 189
Vasyl'ko Romanovyč (Prince of Volynia; 1204-1269), 125, 181
Vasyl'ko Rostyslavyč (Prince of Terebovlja), 85-86, 89, 122. See also *Tale about the Blinding of Vasyl'ko*.
Večera na xutore bliz Dikan'ki. See *Evenings on a Homestead Near Dikan'ka*.
Večer nakanune Ivana Kupala. See *Saint John's Eve*.
Večornyci. See *Evening Party*.
Veles (myth.), 195-96
Velyčko, Samuel (Samijlo), 2, 345
Velyčko's Chronicle. See *Chronicle of Velyčko*.
Velyčkovs'kyj, Ivan (d. 1726), 53, 277, 296-97, 303-306, 345, 356, 359, 361
Velyčkovs'kyj, Pajisij (1722-1794), 259, 268, 357, 359-60
Velyke Zercalo. See *Great Mirror*.
Velyki provody. See *Easter Week*.
Velykyj l'ox. See *Great Vault*.
Vernet, Ivan (second half of the 18th-early 19th centuries), 433
Veselovskij, Alexandr (1838-1906), 7
Vesnjanja kazka. See *Spring Tale*.
Vičnyj revoljucioner. See *Eternal Revolutionary*.
Vid'ma. See *Witch*.
Vij (Gogol'), 315
Vijut' vitry. See *Winds Are Blowing*.
Vinec' Xrystov. See *Crown of Christ*.
Virgil (70-19 B.C.), 55, 356, 381-83, 403n
Virgile travesti (Scarron), 381-82
Virgin. See *Mary, Virgin*.
Virgin's Harrowing of Hell, 46, 48
Vision of Terror (Lysynec'kyj), 413

- Visitor from the Capital* (Kvitka), 419
- Vives, Juan Luis, 356
- Vjačeslav of Turiv (prince; 12th century), 20, 178
- Vladimir. See Volodymyr.
- Vladymyr* (Prokopovyč), 324, 330
- Voice of the Galician People* (Šaškevyč), 479
- Vojnarovskij* (Bantyš-Kamens'kyj), 450
- Vojnarovskij* (Ryleev), 582
- Vojnarovs'kyj, Andrij (c. 1680-1740), 451
- Vol'ga (or Volx Vseslavič; epic figure), 36-37, 55, 126, 132
- Volodymyr (prince; epic figure), 187-89, 257
- Volodymyr I, the Great, Saint (Kievan prince; d. 1015), 17, 20-21, 24, 28, 30, 41, 46, 63, 71, 73, 80, 82, 90-92, 97, 114, 116, 120, 122-24, 127-30, 135, 212, 324, 330. See also *In Memory and Praise of Prince Volodymyr*; *Korsun' Legend*; *Life of St. Volodymyr the Great*.
- Volodymyr II Monomax (Kievan prince; 1053-1125), 19-20, 66-68, 78, 87, 103-109, 115-16, 121-22, 127-28, 133-34, 152, 154, 182, 224, 470
- Volodymyr Ihorevyč (Prince of Putyvel'; d. 1212), 208
- Volodymyrko Volodarevyč (Prince of Galicia; d. 1152), 173
- Volodymyr Monomax's *Letter*. See *Letter of Volodymyr Monomax*.
- Volodymyr Vasył'kovyč (Prince of Volynia; 13th century), 20-21, 24, 76, 179, 183-86, 189
- Volos (myth.), 23-24
- Volovyč, 125
- Volox*. See *Wallachian*.
- Volynian Gospel*, 245
- Volyns'ka evanhelija*. See *Volynian Gospel*.
- Vorobkevyč, Sydir (1836-1903), 614
- Voronyj, Mykola (1871-1937), 614, 618
- Voskresennja mertvyx*. See *Resurrection of the Dead*.
- Vovčok, Marko. See Marko Vovčok.
- Vovčyj Xvist (voivode), 22
- Vovkovyč, Joannikij (first half of the 17th century), 320
- Vovkulaka*. See *Werewolf*
- Voznjak, Myxajlo (1881-1954), 222
- Vozzrinije strašylyšča*. See *Vision of Terror*.
- Vseslav Brjačyslavyč (Prince of Polock), 36-37, 126, 164, 194, 196, 199
- Vsevolod Jaroslavvyč (Kievan prince; 1030-1093), 95, 106, 121-22
- Vsevolod Jur'jevvyč (Prince of Suzdal'), 195
- Vsevolod Svjatoslavyč ("Buj-Tur," Prince of Kursk; d. 1196), 191, 195, 198, 203-204
- Vsi pokoju ščyro prahnut*. See *Everyone Sincerely Longs for Peace*.
- Vusy*. See *Whiskers*.
- Vybrannye mesta iz perepiski s druž'jami*. See *Selections from Correspondence with My Friends*.
- Vynnyčenko, Volodymyr (1880-1951), 418, 610, 618
- Vyšatyč, Jan, 85-86
- Vyšens'kyj* (Franko), 606-607
- Vyšens'kyj, Ivan (c. 1550-1620), 14, 78, 155, 230, 241, 243, 247, 251, 258-59, 263-70, 272-76, 320, 360, 364
- Vytautas (prince), eulogy of, 234
- Wagoneers* (Karpenko-Karyj), 610
- Waldbühl, W., 582
- Wallachian* (Borovykovs'kyj), 462
- Wandering Fire* (Somov), 450
- War Between the Mice and the Frogs*, 372
- Warning*, 76, 249, 258, 265
- Was It the Will of God?* (Ševčenko), 515
- Wasted Strength* (Myrnyj), 598
- Wave* (Oles'), 618
- Węgliński, Lew, 578

- Wenceslas, Saint, 92. See also *Life of St. Wenceslas*.
Werewolf (Oleksandriv), 577
Western Rus' Chronicle, 234
Western Ukrainian Chronicle, 122
What a Treasure (Kvitka), 421, 425, 428
When One Has Enough, One Does Not Complain (Myrnyj and Bilyk), 598
When the Couple Comes to Separate (Slavyns'kyj), 614
Whiskers (Storoženko), 564
Why Do You Walk Upon the Grave-Mound? (Sevčenko), 515
Why Is the Water So Troubled? (Kotljarevs'kyj), 417
Winds Are Blowing (Kotljarevs'kyj), 417
Winter Evening (Borovykovs'kyj), 459
Witch (Sevčenko), 422, 516-17, 519
Witches of Kiev (Somov), 450
Witch of Konotop (Kvitka), 421
Withered Leaves (Franko), 606
Without Luck (Storoženko), 564
With Sausage and Liquor, the Quarrelling Will Pass (Staryc'kyj), 612
Woman Possessed (Ukrajinka), 615
Word of Aphroditian about the Miracle in the Land of Persia, 46, 48
Words of the Holy Prophets, 221
Worek Judaszów (Klonowicz), 125
Wujek, Jakub (1541-1597), 274

Xanenko, Mykola (het'man; 1691-1760), 356, 611
Xarczyżaka mene byv. See *Ugly Cut-Throat Beat Me*.
Xarko, a Zaporozhian Chief (Kuxarenko), 403
Xar'ko Zaporožs'kyj Košovyj. See *Xarko, a Zaporozhian Chief*.
Xata. See *Cottage*.
Xazjajin. See *Landlord*.
Xenophon, 52-53

Xiba revut' voly, jak jasla povni. See *When One Has Enough, One Does Not Complain*.
Xmary. See *Clouds*.
Xmel'nickij (Golota), 452
Xmel'nickij (Kuzmič), 452
Xmel'nickij (Ryleev), 450
Xmel'nyc'kyj (Staryc'kyj), 612
Xmel'nyc'kyj, Bohdan (het'man; 1595-1657), 206, 293-94, 324-26, 330-31, 333, 345-46, 348, 451, 514, 527, 565, 573
Xmel'nyc'kyj, Ivan (lecturer; 1742-1794), 359
Xodorec' (or Xodorok) Jurijovyč, 186
Xomjakov, Alexej (1804-1860), translations of, 533
Xors (myth.), 196
Xoženie palomnika Daniila. See *Pilgrimage of Abbot Daniel*.
Xronolohija. See *Chronology*.
Xrystos pasxon. See *Suffering Christ*.
Xudožnik. See *Artist*.
Xustyna. See *Kerchief*.
Xutorjanka. See *Country Woman*.
Xutorna Filosofija. See *Country Homestead Philosophy*.
Xutorna Poezija. See *Poetry of the Homestead*.
Xutori nedoharky. See *Candle-Ends of a Country Homestead*.
Xvylja. See *Wave*.

Yfika ijeropolitika. See *Ethica Hieropolitica*.
Young Blood (Vynnyčenko), 418

Zabarella, Francisco Kardinal (1360-1417), 356
Zabava Putjatyčna (niece of Volodymyr), 127, 129
Zabila, Viktor (1808-1869), 535, 574, 586

- † *Zabomyšodrakivka, s hrečes'koho lycja na kozac'kyj vyvorot na švydku nytku pereštopana*. See *Battle of the Frogs and the Mice, Greek Material on One Side, Cossack on the Other, Darned Anew with a Nimble Thread*.
Začapka. See *Cautious Objection*.
Zachariah, 92
Zachariah. See *Book of Zachariah*.
Zacharias, 47
Zaczarowane kolo. See *Enchanted Circle*.
Zadonščina. See *Tale of Events Beyond the Don*.
Za dvoma zajcjamy. See *Chasing Two Hares*.
Zakoxanyj čort. See *Devil in Love*.
Zakrevs'kyj, Mykola (1805-1871), 448
 † *Zalanský, Havel*, 274
Zaleski, Bohdan (1802-1886), 453-54, 462
Zaleski, Wacław (from Oleska; 1799-1849), 447
Zamek kaniowski. See *Castle of Kaniov*.
Zapiski o Južnoj Rusi. See *Notes on Southern Rus'*
Zaporožian Antiquity (publ. by Sreznevsk'kyj), 447, 476
Zaporožian Raids (Čurovskij), 452
Zaporožskaja starina. See *Zaporožian Antiquity*.
Zaporožskie naezdy. See *Zaporožian Raids*.
Zaxar Berkut (Franko), 605
Zbyrujs'kyj, Dionysij (Bishop of Xolm), tale about, 314
Žegota, Pauli (19th century), 447
Želja (myth.), 203
Žemčug. See *Pearl (Žemčug)*.
Zercalo bohoslavija. See *Mirror of Theology*.
Zerov, Mykola (1890-1941), 7, 14, 435
Zivjale lystja. See *Withered Leaves*.
Zlataja cip'. See *Golden Chain*.
Zlataja maticja. See *Golden Mother*.
Zlatoust. See *Chrysostom*.
Žmija. See *Snake*.
Zolota legenda. See *Golden Legend*.
Zolotarenko (Hrebinka), 452
Zonatyj čort. See *Married Devil*.
Zori. See *Stars*.
Zörnrikau, Adam (1652-1691), 349, 360, 364
Zschokke, Heinrich (1771-1848), 427
Zubov, Vasilij, 232
Žukovskij, Vasilij (1783-1852), 427, 458
 † *Žulyn ta Kalyna* (Vahylevyč), 492
Z veršyn ta nyzyn. See *From Heights and Depths*.
Zvezdy. See *Stars*.
Zwierzyniec (Rej), 125
Zymnyj večir. See *Winter Evening*.
Žytije. See *Life*.
Zyzanij-Tustanovs'kyj, Lavrentij (d. after 1634), 248, 256

An OVERVIEW of the TWENTIETH CENTURY

George S. N. Luckyj

Revised and updated by permission of
University of Toronto Press Incorporated
© University of Toronto Press 1992

1.

EMERGENCE OF MODERNISM

MODERNISM

In the early nineteenth century, Ukrainian literature had become an expression of national identity, and so it remained throughout the century. The emerging modernism was by no means an attempt to shun the populism and realism that ruled supreme at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. We saw in the preceding chapter that these two tendencies, the old populism and the new modernism existed side by side. The former thrived as a natural defense against the tsarist colonial policy of domination and Russification. In the absence of political opposition (which was banned), writers assumed the role of defenders of the national identity, concentrating on language and culture. They clung to familiar forms and styles and addressed the general reader. The modernists, on the other hand, tried to look beyond national boundaries and stereotypes and advocated (and sometimes practiced) art for art's sake, without abandoning the "people," though preferring their own coteries. Both were pulling in different directions, but tried not to be hostile to each other.

The awakening national consciousness, which first flared up in the romantic poetry of Taras Ševčenko, reached a widening readership despite the tsarist bans on Ukrainian publications in 1883, 1876, and 1881. These prohibitions began as early as 1720 with Tsar Peter I forbidding the publications of church

books in old Ukrainian. This policy of political and cultural coercion was partially circumvented by printing works in Ukrainian in Austro-Hungary (Galicia), from where they spread to all of Ukraine. The guiding ideas of this literature were strongly populist and the style was realistic. The life of the downtrodden peasantry was the predominant subject-matter. Only at the end of the nineteenth century did new trends appear in Ukrainian literature that conveniently go by the name of modernism. Thus populism and modernism survived in different forms and disguises until the end of the twentieth century. Tensions between the two were recently characterized by the scholar, Kovaliv, as “mutually regenerative,” a “spontaneous movement ahead, with views turned back into the past.”¹

In one of his essays,² Ivan Franko, the leading Galician writer and critic, provided an incisive look at the literature of that time. Despite censorship and political oppression Franko saw much progress in Ukrainian literature during the last decades of the nineteenth century. This he attributed to the appearance of some young writers—for example, Kryms’kyj, Xotkevych, Stefanyk, Kocjubyns’kyj, and Kobyljans’ka—who showed “a close observation of life, a very serious understanding of art and its social function and strong faith in the future of our national development.”³ “Modern versification,” he continued, “has made great progress towards purity of language and melodiousness in poetry.... Our prose ... has acquired poetic flight, melodiousness, grace, and variety....”⁴ The young writers had been educated on the best European models, which followed “the new studies in psychology” and depicted “inner spiritual conflicts” rather than external events.

This essay was first published in 1901, but three years earlier Franko had written an article “Internationalism and Nationalism in Modern Literature,”⁵ in which he characterized, on the whole favorably, the modernist trends in Western European literature, as long as they contained a “healthy kernel (*zdrove zerno*).” (Verlaine might be a genius, but was an alcoholic, and Maupassant’s obsession with sex was wrong.) Curiously enough, Franko seemed oblivious of *fin-de-siècle* Vienna, but argued that “nationalism and internationalism are not at all contradictory.”⁶ Also in 1898 he published a major essay on aesthetics⁷ in which he pleaded for literary criticism devoid of political, social, or religious ideas.⁸ He disagreed with much of the French and German contemporary criticism as well as with the Russian critic Dobroljubov, and pleaded for recognition of the role of the subconscious in literary creation, stating “To compare poetic imagination with dreams and, beyond that, with hallucinations is not an idle game.”⁹ Large parts of the essay were devoted to “poetry and music” and “poetry and painting.”

Franko also played a key role in the only literary monthly, *Literaturno-naukovyj vistnyk* (Literary and Scientific Herald), which, under the editorship of Myxajlo Hruševs’kyj, began to appear in Lviv in 1897. Franko was *de facto*

its literary editor and a frequent contributor. Volovymyr Hnatjuk was a third member of the editorial board. The journal stood above the political parties of the time and was truly representative of both Western and Eastern Ukraine. Beginning with its earliest issues the journal devoted much space to Western European literature. Translations and review articles appeared on Maupassant, Verlaine, Kipling, D'Annunzio, Maeterlinck, Ibsen, Strindberg, Hauptmann, Schnitzler, and others. Ukrainian modernist writers such as Vynnyčenko, Kobyljans'ka, Jackiv, Stefanyk, and Oles' appeared side by side with such older authors as Nečuj-Levyč'kyj and Hrinčenko. In 1907, following the revolution of 1905 and the relaxation of censorship in Russia, the journal was transferred to Kyiv. One issue of the *Herald* in 1901 carried an announcement by Mykola Voronyj:

With the aim of compiling and publishing here, in the Black Sea region, the Katerynodar, a Ruthenian-Ukrainian almanac that, in form and content, could at least in part approach the modern currents and trends of contemporary European literature, and wishing to enroll the widest possible range of contributors, I am asking my friends a great favor—kindly to take part in a joint enterprise and with their pens assist in achieving this goal.... Putting aside many worn-out tendencies and compelling morals that again and again have forced our young writers onto the path of cliché and narrow-mindedness and also avoiding works that are blatantly naturalistic and brutal, one would like instead to have works with a small dose of originality, with a free, independent outlook, and with contemporary content. One would like to have works with some philosophy, in which there would shine even a small piece of that distant blue sky, which for centuries has beckoned to us with its unreachable beauty, with its unfathomable mystery....The closest attention should be paid to the aesthetic aspect of the works.¹⁰

This modernist appeal materialized two years later with the publication of the almanac *Z nad xmar i z dolyn* (From Above the Clouds and the Valleys, 1903), edited by Voronyj. It was not as radical as its editor would have liked, but it was nevertheless a landmark in Ukrainian literature. Its introduction consisted of a literary duel between Franko and Voronyj. Despite a theoretical attack on modernism, Franko contributed to the almanac his fine lyrical poems "Zivjale lystja" (Withered Leaves). Most contributors—Voronyj, Ščurat, Lesja Ukajinka, Karmans'kyj, Kobyljans'ka, Xotkevyč, Lypa, Kocjubyns'kyj, Kryms'kyj—were modernists, but there was also traditional verse and prose by Franko, Hrabovs'kyj, Hrinčenko, Nečuj-Levyč'kyj, and Samijlenko. What Voronyj had suggested was carried out by and large.

An important feature of the almanac was the participation of writers from both Eastern and Western Ukraine. In the east they were influenced by Russian symbolism and in the west by the Western European *Kulturkreise* of Cracow, Prague and Vienna. Russian censorship was relaxed (the almanac appeared, in a strange orthography, in Odesa) and a few years later, after the "revolution" of 1905, it was almost withdrawn. At the same time the Russian academy of sciences acknowledged Ukrainian as a separate language. These steps led to vital changes in the status of Ukrainian literature in Russia. More and more, writers were convinced of the autonomy of their art.

There was also, however, considerable opposition to the budding modernism. The major populist critic, Serhij Jefremov, vehemently attacked it in a long series of articles, "V poiskax novoj krasoty" (In Search of a New Beauty), published in 1902 in *Kievskaja starina* (Kievan Antiquity). He savaged the feeble "Poezija v prozi" (Poetry in Prose) by Hnat Xotkevych and spent most of his anger on Ol'ha Kobyljans'ka. He admitted that she had talent, but was unable to find anything valuable in her short modernist stories or her ambitious feminist novel *Carivna* (The Princess). The heroine, he argued, was passive, her actions were inadequately motivated, and the idea, borrowed from Nietzsche, of a striving to be a superman in defiance of the dark mob, unacceptable. According to Jefremov, Kobyljans'ka's "aristocratism" was simply based on a "dubious morality." She idealized nature and her language was impure. Even her other novel about the peasantry, *Zemlja* (Earth), had serious shortcomings. In the end Jefremov condemned Kobyljans'ka for "her contempt for simple folk." Another woman writer, Natalija Kobryns'ka, drew Jefremov's ire for departing from her early realistic stories and attempting to write like a symbolist. Finally, Jefremov dug up a little-known modernist publisher of *Zyvi struny* (Living Strings), which published Stanislaw Przybyszewski in Ukrainian. This led him to conclude that the basic tendency of Ukrainian modernism was to glorify sex, a charge that was patently absurd. His fear that in pursuit of "pure beauty" they had reached "animal depravity" was quite unjustified. Jefremov's hostility was rooted in his inability to see modernism as a reaction against the status quo. True, many of the modernist products were artistically deficient, yet they could not be regarded, as Jefremov described them, as "hashish" or as an escape from the writer's real duty to his people.

Unfortunately, the strong reaction to Jefremov's article remained unpublicized. Long letters to *Kievskaja starina* from Lesja Ukrajinka and Hnat Xotkevych were not published. Xotkevych also wrote an irate letter to the *Herald*¹¹ and Lesja Ukrajinka expressed her views in private letters.¹² Writing to her mother in 1909, she complained that Jefremov's article was "a pit into which everything was thrown," whether a "decadent" hair-style or "trendy colors."¹³ Earlier, in a letter to Pavlyk in 1903, she characterized Jefremov's

article as "superficial" and "blindly certain about areas of which he was ignorant (French literature and the history of modern trends)."¹⁴

Two years later, in 1904, Jefremov repeated his argument in an article in *Kievskaja starina*, "Na mertvoj točke" (At a Standstill), in which he criticized Voronyj's almanac very harshly. He also attacked Katrja Hrynevyčeva's article in the *Herald*¹⁵ in which she argued that "no one can criticize what he does not understand." Jefremov ridiculed Voronyj's polemics with Franko and reviewed individual contributions to the almanac with a great deal of sarcasm. They were full of "vague symbolism" and "impenetrable mysticism," and they "slavishly imitate foreign models," "have nothing positive in them," and "are indifferent to social problems." All this may have been true, yet it did not amount to a serious criticism of the new trend. Jefremov tried to see in modernism only a temporary, transitional phase to a more "healthy" literature that would serve the interests of the people. In the end he saw such "fresh strength," strangely enough, in Vynnyčenko's works, and advised Voronyj to abandon the "clouds" and dwell in "the valleys."

About the same time, in the first decade of the new century, modernist tendencies in literature appeared in Western Ukraine, which was then under Austrian rule. A loosely organized group of young writers, Moloda Muza (the Young Muse) emerged in 1906. Among its members were Volodymyr Birčak, Stepan Čarnec'kyj, Myxailo Jackiv, Petro Karmans'kyj, Ostap Luc'kyj, Vasył' Pačovs'kyj, Osyp Turjans'kyj, and Sydir Tverdoxlib. Also associated with them was the poet Bohdan Lepkyj. The composer S. Ljudkevych and the sculptor M. Paraščuk were also members of the group. In 1907 Ostap Luc'kyj published an article in *Dilo* (Deed)¹⁶ that was greeted as a manifesto of the Young Muse. He began by describing the "new wave" in Western European letters and art that was influenced by the writings of Nietzsche, Ibsen, and Maeterlinck. This "loss of all hope," the upheaval of values, and the "new mystical skies" could also be seen in Ukrainian literature, primarily in the works of Ol'ha Kobyljans'ka. The older writers (Karpenko-Karyj, Nečuj-Levyc'kyj, Franko, Myrnyj) held that truth must be "sensible, objective, and useful to everyone." The older critics, such as Jefremov, ridiculed those who wrote differently. Yet "a reaction set in" against the old school in literature. "Artistic creation," according to the new school, "was neither a nurse nor a propagandist"; its only sanction is the "inner, spiritual need of the creator, which may not be locked into a rational drawer." Instead of "cold reason" the new writers follow "the fires of their own hearts.... Poetry must, above all, be poetry." This new tendency in literature "gave us Kobyljans'ka, Stefanyk, Kocjubyns'kyj, Lesja Ukrajinka, Lepkyj, Ščurat, and many others."¹⁷ Hence also arose the Young Muse, whose task was to foster the new literature through its publications.

In comparison with Russian and Polish modernist manifestos Luc'kyj's article was mild and moderate. It simply stated the present literary situation. However, less than a month later, also in *Dilo*¹⁸, it was viciously attacked by Ivan Franko. At the beginning of his angry reply, which was no doubt also motivated by anger at Luc'kyj's parodies of his work, Franko reminded his readers that he had in the past favorably reviewed the modernist poetry of Vasyl' Pačovs'kyj. He then launched his attack. Franko had never heard that "God was dead." Nietzsche's influence was ephemeral and the "great spiritual crisis" in Europe of which Luc'kyj was writing was non-existent. He ridiculed the idea that literature must show a new sensibility. In Ukrainian literature Kobyljans'ka's talent "has recently shown a marked weakening." Older writers deserved respect, while the new writers had failed to captivate the readers with their "subtleties" and "sincerity in human relationships." The latter, wrote Franko, "must not become a part of a literary program."¹⁹ At the end he fulminated against the publishing activities of the Young Muse. About the same time there appeared an equally sarcastic review by Franko in the *Herald* of some verse published by the Young Muse.²⁰ Altogether his attitude to the Young Muse was uncompromising. "One must put an end," he wrote in a letter to Hruševs'kyj, "to the demoralization, the stupidity, and the pretensions of our Young Muse."²¹

The harshness of Franko's criticism evoked little protest. His authority remained unchallenged and no real polemic between the traditionalists and the modernists in Ukraine ever took place. It is noteworthy, however, that the defenders of the status quo (Jefremov, Franko) showed occasional appreciation of modernist literature.

For some time—since February, 1906—the Young Muse had a journal, *Svit* (The World), published by Vjačeslav Budzynovs'kyj, but edited by the "Young Musians." After the relaxation of censorship in Russia, another modernist journal, called rather traditionally, *Ukrajins'ka xata* (Ukrainian Home), was established in 1909 in Kyiv. It was edited by Pavlo Bohac'kyj and Mykyta Šapoval, whose literary pseudonym was Sribljans'kyj. Its leading critic and theoretician was Mykola Jevšan (Fedjuška), whose series of essays was published separately.²² Following Nietzsche and Ruskin Jevšan pleaded for a new aesthetic culture, whose aim would be "an original and harmonious human being, who would not conflict with others or with himself and who could be self-sufficient and happy."²³ And again, the role of art, like that of religion, was "to prepare an elevated atmosphere in the upbringing of individuals and whole generations so that their hearts might accept everything beautiful, joyful, and noble."²⁴ Jevšan was a harsh critic of modernist poetry, calling it "powerless," "without ideas," and "isolated from life." He liked grandiloquent terminology, calling on his countrymen to "breathe with full lungs" and to emulate a "free man." According to Sribljans'kyj, impressionism in art and

individualism in life were the ways to “liberate mankind from all the negative aspects of social life.”²⁵

Xatiane (Homers), as they were called, had a large following, not so much because of the modernist platform, but because, as their editorial policy stated, “the aim was to turn our thoughts to the path of progress, where better ideals of humanity are shining—freedom, equality, brotherhood.”²⁶ Both Jevšan and Sribljans’kyj were also fervent nationalists. The contributors to the journal included the poets Oles’, Čuprynka, Lepkyj, Voronyj, Černjavs’kyj, Ryl’s’kyj, Tyčyna and Svidzins’kyj and the prose writers Vynnyčenko, Žurba, Kobyljans’ka, and Kybal’čyč. The journalism it produced, by Andrij Tovkačevs’kyj and Sribljans’kyj, included articles on American democracy. The journal, which was often attacked by the newspaper *Rada* (Council), continued till the outbreak of the First World War, when all Ukrainian publications were banned. A recent study attributes to *Ukrajins’ka xata* a certain cultural elitism and sophisticated nationalism.²⁷

On the whole, Ukrainian modernism was moderate, unwilling or unable to put forward bold new theories, experiment with new styles and structures, or reach the extreme of “decadence.” In the best available treatment of what its author calls Ukrainian “pre-symbolism,”²⁸ too much stress is laid on the innovative achievement of modernism. In fact, many modernists could not entirely divorce themselves from the realistic tradition. While preaching “art for art’s sake,” they still wished to serve the national cause. Their aim was perhaps best expressed in a letter to Panas Myrnyj, written in 1903 by Myxajlo Kocjubyns’kyj and Mykola Černjavs’kyj:

For one hundred years of its existence our modern literature (for historical reasons) was nourished largely by the village, village life, and ethnography. The peasant, the circumstances of his life, his uncomplicated, for the most part, psychology—that is almost all that engaged the imagination and talent of the Ukrainian writer. There are a few exceptions. Our educated reader, brought up on the better models of contemporary European literature, which is rich not only in themes but in the manner of constructing plots, has the right to expect from his native literature a wider field of observation, a true depiction of all aspects of life of everybody, not merely one social stratum, and would wish to encounter in our belles-lettres the treatment of philosophical, social, psychological, historical and other themes.²⁹

There was, therefore, a basic agreement on the need for departure from the old themes and modes of expression, but there was less certainty as to where to turn next. The search for new forms lasted for several decades and produced

some excellent results. It was, moreover, buoyed up by the revolution of 1917–20 and continued to influence literature till the onset of Stalinism in 1930. It showed the decided impact of Western European literary models and continued Europeanization of Ukrainian literature.

The twentieth century was greeted in the collection of “exotic” poems by the promising young Oriental scholar, Ahatanhel Kryms’kyj (1871–1942) entitled *Pal’move hillja* (Palm Branches, 1901). In his introduction, discussing “profane” love, he admitted that his works were meant “not for people with frayed nerves and lacking vigor.”³⁰ In the poems themselves he confessed his subjectivism and egotism, searching always for “refined aesthetic feelings.” The “groans of millions steeped in famine and injustice” did not interest him. The lyrical narrator of *Palm Branches* is similar to Andrij Lahovs’kyj, the hero of his modernistic novel of the same title. Written between 1894 and 1904 this novel, autobiographical despite the author’s protestation to the contrary, has all the ingredients of “decadence”: narcissism, sex, homoeroticism, mysticism, even Sufism. In 1905 Lesja Ukrajinka wrote a very long letter to Kryms’kyj with the sharp and detailed criticism of a sympathetic reader.³¹

Kryms’kyj was also the author of *Povistky ta eskizy z ukrajins’koho žyttja* (Tales and Sketches from Ukrainian Life, 1896) and *Bejruts’ki opovidannja* (Beirut Short Stories, 1906). Soon after the revolution of 1905 he stopped writing and dedicated himself with great success to scholarship. He was a victim of Stalin’s purges in the 1930s, but has been posthumously rehabilitated. Here is Soviet critic Babyškin’s assessment of Kryms’kyj’s early poetry:

His poetry had everything: juvenile emulation, youthful extremism in the search for truth, and unearthly honesty about himself and others. His hero could be light-hearted and waver and retreat from his own happiness, could quit in the face of love and invent some social reasons for quitting and fleeing far away. He could be pensive, could affirm life and sometimes look at it from the distance of centuries, in order to say that everything is vanity and at the same time conclude that life is worthwhile.

That was Kryms’kyj’s poetry, consonant with his time and at the same time unique. Not only because Kryms’kyj’s poetic hero was chiefly placed against a background of Syrian and Lebanese landscapes, but because of its merciless truthfulness, which frightened some away and consoled others by being clear and comprehensive. His hero was the product of his era, who condensed within himself the pains and vacillations within someone in a bourgeois society, someone who was talented and exceptional and who thought and sensed everything more subtly and therefore more painfully. This was

painful for the Ukrainian intelligentsia who, in addition to the general nervousness of those who were searching for an often could not find a place in this era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, felt very painfully the national oppression of their own freedom-loving and unhappy people.³²

Another modernist, Vasyl' Pačovs'kyj (1878–1942), made his debut in 1901 with a collection of lyrical love poems, *Rozsypani perly* (Scattered Pearls), which was warmly greeted by Franko. Two years later Pačovs'kyj published *Son ukrajins'koji noči* (The Dream of a Ukrainian Night), a nationalist poem that foreshadowed his later play *Sonce rujiny* (The Sun of the Ruin, 1909), which was lacking in real poetic power. However, only in his collection *Ladi i Mareni* (For Lada and Marena, 1912) did he recapture his earlier fire.

Critics have pointed out an affinity between the early Pačovs'kyj and Tyčyna.³³ Franko's critique is still the best appraisal of Pačovs'kyj:

Mr. Pačovs'kyj has demonstrated to us that he is a great master of our language, a true and talented poet, who has deeply attuned his ear to the melody of our folk-songs and folk language and who has mastered the technique of verse as few among us have; he can, with one touch, move responsive chords in our souls, awakening the desired mood and sustaining it until the end. In a word, in quality and poetic power Mr. Pačovs'kyj's book has roused in me enormous, pleasurable response.... His poetry flows naturally, unforced, as the simplest expression of his feeling. Even if this feeling is still not very deep and the circle of impressions not wide, even if his melodies are monotonous, all the more credit should be given to his talent, which can express the simplest and most trivial things poetically, not stereotypically, can paint with fresh, not borrowed colors.³⁴

Some notoriety was acquired among the modernists by Petro Karmans'kyj (1878–1956), whose collection *Z teky samovybyvci* (From a File of a Suicide) was published in 1899. His second collection, *Oj, ljuli smutku* (Sleep Well, My Sorrow, 1906), had this characteristic foreword by a friend, Myxajlo Jackiv: "We were born by chance, unfortunately, to destroy cheap minds, to disturb the sweet languor of the philistines. We baptize our children with the tears of our people, temper them in the fire of our hearts, and lead them forth to the Temple of Beauty. Here there is some comedy: many do not take us seriously, but our audience is large. This is the lineage of comrade Petro. His book is meant for those who will accompany us, for those, as Przybyszewski wrote, who 'hew new paths in the primeval forests.'"³⁵

Karmans'kyj published other collections of pessimistic lyrics: *Plyvem po morju t'my* (We Sail on the Sea of Darkness, 1909) and *Al fresco* (1917). He also translated Dante. After the revolution of 1917 he spent some time in South America, producing a travel book *Miž ridnymi v pıvdennij Ameryci* (Among Relatives in South America, 1923). He also left some vivid recollections of the Young Muse—*Ukrajins'ka bohema* (Ukrainian Bohemians, 1936). After 1941 he wrote several pro-Soviet tracts.

Two minor poets of the Young Muse deserve to be mentioned: Stepan Čarnec'kyj (1881–1944) was also a drama critic and a feuilletonist under the pseudonym Tyberij Horobec'. He published a collection of poetry, *V hodyny sumerku* (During Twilight Hours, 1908), and some short stories and sketches in *Dykyj vynohrad* (Wild Grapes, 1921). Another poet and translator was Sydir Tverdoxlib (1886–1922), author of a collection of verse, *V svičadi plesa* (In the Mirror of the River, 1908). He also wrote short stories and translated from and into Polish—*Antologia współczesnych poetów ukraińskich* (An Anthology of Contemporary Ukrainian Poets, 1911). He was killed by Ukrainian nationalists for his pro-Polish stand.

Bohdan Lepkyj (1872–1941), who lived in Krakow, where he later taught Ukrainian literature at the university, was a mentor for many young Galician poets. He was very prolific, publishing many collections of poems, among them *Strižky* (Stanzas, 1902), *Lystky padut'* (The Leaves Are Falling, 1902), and *Nad rikoju* (On the River, 1905), as well as short stories, *Z sela* (From the Village, 1898); a novel *Pid tyxyj večir* (On a Quiet Evening, 1923); a tetralogy, *Mazepa* (1926–27) and a historical novel *Krutiž* (Whirlpool, 1941). A recent view of Lepkyj's achievement is not very different from earlier criticism: "One cannot consider Bohdan Lepkyj as a poet of acute social observation or as a master of conceptual philosophic thinking; his nature is reflective. His lyrical self dominates the personal, the inner world prevails over external reality. The poet's dominant theme is longing, which determines the romantic strain of his feeling and thinking."³⁶

Two of the major poets in Eastern Ukraine were modernists: Mykola Voronyj and Oleksander Oles'. Voronyj (1871–1942) received his higher education in the West (Vienna, Lviv) and was first attracted to the theater and journalism. In 1900, upon returning to Russian Ukraine, he joined the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party (RUP). He published an almanac *Z nad xmar i z dolyn* (see above), and continued working for the theater. His first collections of poems were *Liryčni poeziji* (Lyrical Poems, 1912) and *U sjajvi mrij* (The Splendor of Dreams, 1913). In the foreword to the latter Spyrydon Čerkasenko wrote: "The characteristic features of Voronyj's creativity are activism, fervor, and search. Organically, he cannot accept old forms and dull repetitions and sees the creation of new forms, new rhythms, images, and symbols as the main task of poetry.... Also there is nothing more sacred for him than Ukraine....

Yet, most of all, Voronyj is a poet of love. Woman, this mysterious sphinx, with a smile or heaven and hell, always attracts the poet's attention, his songs of happiness and suffering, his bright faith and deep despair."³⁷ The play *Kazka staroho mlyna* (The Fable of the Old Mill, 1916) by Spyrydon Čerkasenko (1876–1940) showed obvious modernist influence.

Soviet scholar, Oleksander Bilec'kyj, assessed Voronyj's work in these words:

The literary predispositions of his poetic work are clear: first of all, a striving to escape from the populist stereotype and, second, to raise Ukrainian poetry to the level of contemporary European poetry. Third, to put forward in theory and practice the principle of pure art, with an absolute renunciation of any tendentiousness.... A thought arises about Voronyj's dependence on foreign models. The poet himself pointed out the French poets from whom he learned the craft of verse—especially Verlaine and, in part, Mallarmé. He feels an inner affinity with Verlaine....³⁸

After the failure of the Ukrainian national revolution Voronyj left Ukraine for the West. He returned to Ukraine in 1926, however, and saw a volume of his poems published in 1929. During the 1930s he fell victim to the Stalinist purges. He has been rehabilitated and republished posthumously.

Oleksander Oles' (real name Kandyba, 1878–1944) was a prolific lyric poet who gained popularity with the collection *Z žurboju radist' obnjalas'* (Joy and Sorrow Embraced, 1907), which also greeted the 1905 revolution. He was the author of "dramatic etudes": *Po dorozhi v kazku* (On the Way to a Fable, 1910) and *Nad Dnipro* (On the Dnipro, 1911). He forecast the tragic failure of the 1917 revolution, after which he emigrated. He lived in Prague from 1924 until his death, continuing to write poems full of nostalgia, despondency and satire. His "neo-romanticism" has been criticized by Fylypovyč³⁹ and Zerov:

Oles's poetic manner has been regarded as belonging to symbolist tradition. Fylypovyč's article demonstrated the poet's distance from ... symbolism; his feeling for the world consists in a naive contrast between life and a dream, prose and poetry. "Everything that happens in our life is commonplace"—it is prose. "Poetry is conceived in nature, untouched by human hand," "in the moonlight and amid the stars, in the shadows and mysteries of night with its nightingale, in the spring, which calls to life flowers and butterflies." This is an imitation of the old romanticism, which survived in Ukrainian and Russian poetry, declining all the time. For a while, Oles' with his direct strong talent revived it and "the fire that slept

in the ashes" flared up, but only for a short time, to be extinguished forever. Even Oles's symbols have nothing in common with the enveloping of the subject in a complex and whimsical mass of associations, so characteristic of the poetry of Mallarmé, Vjačeslav Ivanov, Innokentij Annenskij, Blok, etc.⁴⁰

Banned for decades in Soviet Ukraine, selected poems of Oles' were republished there in 1964 with a preface by Maksym Ryl's'kyj.

Two minor poets with decidedly modernist leanings deserve to be mentioned: Mykola Filjans'kyj (1873–1938) and Hryc'ko Čuprynka (1879–1921). Filjans'kyj was the author of *Liryka* (Lyrics, 1906), *Calendarium* (1911) and *Ciluju zemlju* (I Kiss the Earth, 1928). Jevšan praised *Calendarium* for "its purity and nobility of tone and its depth ... he succeeded in harmonizing his Ukrainian psyche with elements of modern European, primarily French, poetry."⁴¹ Čuprynka, who began and ended as a traditionalist, showed some originality in *Ohnecvit* (Fiery Flower, 1910), which was reviewed by Šapoval as "gay and light-hearted ... the work of a symbolist poet, and adherent of pure art."⁴² Filjans'kyj was arrested in 1937 and perished in the Gulag. Čuprynka was shot by the Bolsheviks in 1921. In 1988 he was rehabilitated, with the following commentary by Mykola Žulyns'kyj:

Hryc'ko Čuprynka's poetry is a *sui generis* cardiogram of the heartbeat of the Ukrainian intelligentsia of the first decade of the twentieth century. This was a complex period of our intellectual history, tied emotionally to an active awakening of the national consciousness and the inevitable new paths of cultural and literary development, a dynamic pursuit of new images, forms, and modes of expression. A definite role in this striking renewal was played by symbolism, which at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries stretched its wing over Ukraine.⁴³

A major pre-modernist poet and dramatist who began writing at the end of the nineteenth century was Lesja Ukrajinka (real name Larysa Kosač, see chapter XIV). Daughter of the populist writer Olena Pčilka (1849–1930) and a niece of the father of Ukrainian democratic socialism, Myxailo Drahomanov (1841–95), she became the leading writer of her generation. Her first collection of verse, *Na krylax pisen'* (On Wings of Song, 1893), gave but a small foretaste of her later, fiery revolutionary poetry. Her poetic cycle, *Nevil'nyči pisni* (The Songs of the Slaves, 1893), prompted Franko's famous saying that Lesja Ukrajinka was "more of a man" than anyone else in Ukraine. She overcame her crippling tuberculosis, which ended her life prematurely, by writing inspired, life-affirming poems. Some of them, "Čontra spem spero," "Zavždy

ternovyj vinec' " (Always a Wreath of Thorns), "Slovo čomu ty ne tverdaja krycja" (Word, Why Are You Not Like Tempered Steel?) have become examples of the finest poetry since Ševčenko. Her lyrical talent was thus assessed by Borys Jakubs'kyj, the editor of her first collected works:

Two sources of creativity lie in Lesja's soul. One, which she cultivated and tempered throughout the long struggle of her life, is the element of true revolution, a rejection of tradition, a struggle not for life but for death and a limitless dedication to revolutionary ideals in their romantic form. This provided Lesja's deep lyricism with fiery themes calling for obstinate struggle with the slogan "kill me—I'll not yield." This part of Lesja Ukrajinka's poetry will not lose its interest for a long time.... Side by side with these fiery calls there is a long row of poems with an open admission of her weakness and powerlessness and the sorrow this caused her.⁴⁴

Much greater is Lesja Ukrajinka's achievement as a dramatist. She wrote several dramatic poems—*Oderžyma* (A Possessed Woman), *Kassandra*, *Orhija* (Orgy), *Na rujinax* (On the Ruins), *Vavylons'kyj polon* (The Babylonian Captivity), *Na poli krovy* (On the Field of Blood), *U pušči* (In the Wilderness)—as well as plays—*Blakytyna trojanda* (The Azure Rose, 1896), *Rufin i Priscilla* (Rufinus and Priscilla, 1906), *Bojarynja* (The Boiar's Wife, 1910), *Lisova pisnja* (A Forest Song, 1911), and *Kaminnyj hospodar* (The Stone Host, 1912). Many scholars have pointed out that she often borrowed her subjects from world history and literature. C. Bida commented, "In Lesja Ukrajinka's plays two aspects seem to blend: the personal and the national on the one hand, and the universal on the other. In dramas there is nothing personal that does not have universal significance; and the most intimate national problems always find close parallels in the history of other nations."⁴⁵

Mykola Zerov evaluates her two last plays accordingly:

Not until the end of her life did [Lesja Ukrajinka] come to grips with real drama. *The Stone Host* and *A Forest Song* are dramas in the fullest sense of the word. Here, the depth of ideas, the sparkling dialogue, the variety of themes and motifs, the psychological significance of the characters are supplanted by movement, diversity of action, the visual beauty of the scenes. Lesja Ukrajinka's plays represent the highest point in the development of Ukrainian drama. In all of our literature there is nothing more powerful and stage-worthy than *The Stone Host* and *A Forest Song*.⁴⁶

One of Lesja Ukrajinka's plays, *The Boiar's Wife*, because of its strong anti-Russian bias, was banned in Soviet Ukraine and was excluded from publication until 1989. Lesja Ukrajinka also left some literary criticism and a remarkable collection of private letters. In a letter to Kobyljans'ka she "did not wish to lay down my arms and renounce the neoromantic flag."⁴⁷

Of the modernist women prose writers the most prominent was Ol'ha Kobyljans'ka (1863–1942). Born and raised in Bukovyna, she was under strong German influence. Some of her early short stories and sketches ("Valse Melancolique," 1898) were modernist *par excellence*. Her first novels, *Ljudyna* (A Human Being, 1894) and *Carivna* (Princess, 1896), were feminist in spirit. Mykola Jevšan thus characterized her early work:

In [Kobyljans'ka's] works a new, ideal sphere is opened to us, giving a view into a new land, where the human spirit is cleansed of earthly dust and finds refuge from the stormy waves of life. Here we are bereft of all hope and aspiration and only one passion awakens in us: to rise even higher on the scale of perfection, to sculpt one's own soul so that it may shine with beauty and burn with ardent love. We turn away from everyday cares burdening our soul and begin rather to listen to the inner voice in which there beats eternity's pulse. In sacrificing ourselves we do not see any debasement; on the contrary, we are happy, since in reverence to the ideals of love and beauty we see the beginning of a new kingdom, when new life will begin for the individual with the possibility of the harmonious development of all our spiritual forces.⁴⁸

Apart from modernist short stories Kobyljans'ka also wrote two fine novels with a village setting: *Zemlja* (The Earth, 1902) and *Vnedilju rano zillja kopala* (On Sunday Morning She Dug for Herbs, 1909). The latter work, according to Fylypovyč, "is not epic, but lyric or lyric-epic, it is not 'prose,' which demands observations and thoughts about life, but 'poetry,' rhythmical images in which, first of all, we hear a voice with a typical composition of lyrical verse or a ballad."⁴⁹ *Zemlja* was regarded by Franko as Kobyljans'ka's best work. Unfortunately, Kobyljans'ka was heavily influenced by popular German literature (E. Marlitt) of the type represented by the magazine *Gartenlaube* and many of her novels, such as *Čerez kladku* (Across the Footbridge, 1912), fall into the category of stilted sentimental literature.

The woman who persuaded Kobyljans'ka to start writing in Ukrainian rather than in German, Natalija Kobryn's'ka (1851–1920), was herself a writer. Her symbolist stories "Duša" (Soul, 1898) and "Roža" (The Rose, 1899) appeared in a magazine. In 1901 she published an essay on August Strindberg. Kobryn's'ka also wrote realistic stories—for example, *Zadlja*

kuska xliba (For a Piece of Bread, 1884)—and was the leader of the Ukrainian feminist movement. She was instrumental in publishing a women's almanac *Peršyj vinok* (The First Wreath, 1887).

One of the most original modernist prose writers was Vasyl' Stefanyk (1871–1936). The son of a peasant from the region of Pokuttia, he wrote his very short stories in the local dialect. A fellow writer once dubbed Stefanyk “a poet of peasant despair.” But he is a truly great writer in the expressionist manner. His first collection of short stories, some of them true miniatures, was *Synja knyžečka* (Little Blue Book, 1899), followed by *Kaminnyj xrest* (The Stone Cross, 1900), *Doroĥa* (The Road, 1901), and *Zemlja* (The Earth, 1926). His most creative period came during his student days in Krakow, where he rubbed shoulders with the Polish writers of *Młoda Polska* (Young Poland). A contemporary review by I. Truś ran as follows:

Stefanyk's works lack conscious reflexes, lack a clear point of view. He coldly outlines the plot, takes in a rich collection of observations of the village and transmutes it with the great warmth of his artistic feeling. The picture he creates is true to life, but is more elevated than an account by a journalist or policeman, because he gives us not only facts and moments but the impression any sensitive man would have if he had observed that scene or character. For him the starting point is an event or condition, but he makes his way deeper into the psychology of the people and thus brings his story to a conclusion. Hence his peasants are barely outlined, but they are psychologically deeply convincing. The artist does not bend his stories to a social doctrine, does not use them to promote anything. He acts as a true artist: he is guided by intuition and feeling.⁵⁰

Another contemporary comment came from Lesja Ukrajinka (1900): “Stefanyk is not a populist; his *narod* (people) is not the bearer of ‘foundations and virtues,’ which are unknown to ‘rotten intellectuals.’ But precisely the absence of these ‘foundations and virtues,’ disclosed by an able and loving hand, makes a greater and more profound impact on thinking and sensitive readers than all the panegyrics, full of the best intentions, to the idealized people in populist literature.”⁵¹

An older writer, the greatest Ukrainian impressionist, was Myxajlo Kocjubyns'kyj (1864–1913). He began as a realist with “Andrij Solovejko” (1884) and “Dlja zahal'noho dobra” (For the Common Good, 1895). Gradually, however, he forsook the realistic story in favor of short impressionist psychological sketches such as “Na kameni” (On the Rock, 1902), “Cvit jabluni” (The Apple Blossom, 1902), and “Intermezzo” (1908). He is also the

author of two outstanding short novels, *Fata Morgana* (1903–10) and *Tini zabutyx predkiv* (Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors, 1911). The first is set during a peasant rebellion in a village, the second among the Huculs in the Carpathian mountains. Bohdan Rubchak's comments are illuminating:

Fata Morgana, Kotsiubynsky's largest work, is built around a confrontation between the two kinds of dreams. Each of the peasant heroes plays out the drama of his own dream against the tragic panorama of public events (peasant unrest around 1902). Some of those dreams are enslaving delusions; others are liberated acts of intentionality towards the distant horizons of the future. All fail equally, the self-deluded dreamers destroying the self-chosen dreamers, to be destroyed in their turn by the punishing hand of the world.... It seems to me that *Shadows* outgrows its pastoral and sociological aspects, although admittedly it does carry traces of both. The meticulously researched and detailed background should not be taken for more than what it is: a dynamic canvas that serves as a backdrop for Kotsiubynsky's triangular structure of opposing forces—the poet's thirst for the ultimate horizons of existence, catalyzed by an outside source of inspiration, versus the cruelly inhibiting horizons of the world.⁵²

A writer who, because of his innovations in the novel and in drama belongs to the modernist camp, was Volodymyr Vynnyčenko (1880–1951). His first short story, “Krasa i syła,” (Beauty and Strength, 1902), showed his powers as an observer of both proletarian and bourgeois milieus. Many of his stories are realistic recreations of life in Ukrainian cities. His first play *Dyzharmonija* (Disharmony), appeared in 1906. It propagated Vynnyčenko's new morality, which he called “honesty with oneself.” A novel with that title appeared in 1907. Many other plays followed, some of them gaining later an international reputation: *Velykyj Molox* (The Great Moloch, 1907), *Bazar* (Market-place, 1910), *Brexnja* (A Lie, 1910), *Čorna pantera i bilyj medvid'* (Black Panther and White Bear, 1911). According to O. Stavyc'kyj, “Vynnyčenko maintains in his plays that bourgeois morality also prevails among those who fight the established order, that they too, are dominated by low instincts and passions. By preaching ‘honesty with oneself’ Vynnyčenko wanted to remove this fatal disharmony by preaching that the immoral is moral, and by justifying everything committed by his heroes driven by sheer egoism. In place of the old ‘bourgeois morality’ he substituted an open declaration of amorality.”⁵³

Vynnyčenko is also the author of several novels, the best of them being *Zapysky kyrpatoho Mefistofelja* (Notes of a Pug-Nosed Mephistopheles, 1917). His novels have been assessed as follows: “Vynnyčenko's novels are

full of movement, dynamism, unexpected episodes in which the author forces us to believe; they are devoid of the elegiac meditations or intellectual reflections that we find in Kocjubyns'kyj. Vynnyčenko's novels have interesting plots, intrigues, and, despite their paradoxes, are never dull. His artistic style is fragmentary, energetic, vivid in its originality, although not always refined, but rather flamboyant and unfinished. This is a typically impressionistic style."⁵⁴

Vynnyčenko continued writing after emigrating in 1920. His Utopian novel, *Sonjašna mašina* (The Solar Machine) appeared in 1928. He envisaged a future when the machine would make work unnecessary. His works were very popular in Ukraine in the 1920s. Afterwards they were banned because of his earlier participation in the nationalist government of the Ukrainian People's Republic in 1918–19. He was rehabilitated in 1988.

In 1902 Lesja Ukrajinka wrote in a private letter that "Jackiv is the most fashionable belles-lettres writer in Galicia.... He writes rather unevenly, sometimes very well, sometimes strangely but more often beautifully."⁵⁵ Myxajlo Jackiv (1873–1961) was a member of the Young Muse and wrote modernistic short stories. His collections are: *V carstvi satany* (In the Kingdom of Satan, 1900), *Z poeziji v prozi* (From Poetry in Prose, 1901), *Kazka pro persten'* (Fable About the Ring, 1907), *Čorni kryla* (Black Wings, 1909), and *Blyskavyci* (Lightning, 1912). He is also the author of the novels *Ohni horjat'* (Fires Are Burning, 1902) and *Tanec' tinej* (The Dance of the Shadows, 1916). Some critics—for example Lukjanovyč—thought his modernism was merely "decorative." It is true that alongside the modernist there was also a realist writer in Jackiv, and some of his stories have a certain sociological interest.

Another major talent was Hnat Xotkevych (1877–1938), who began as a modernist with *Poezija v prozi* (Poetry in Prose, 1902). He is remembered chiefly for his realistic novel set among the Huculs, *Kaminna duša* (A Soul of Stone, 1911), in which sex is seen as a major force in human action. While Jackiv lived to accept the Soviet occupation, Xotkevych perished during the purges of the 1930s. He has been posthumously rehabilitated and republished. Xotkevych left very acute observations on the development of Ukrainian literature in the first decade of the century: "The reason for the poverty of our contemporary literature lies in our own poverty, in the illiteracy and backwardness of our nation, in its political lawlessness, and in the lack of culture among our intelligentsia."⁵⁶

Yet this judgment seems too harsh if we consider the total impact of literary modernism. A few years after Xotkevych wrote these words, almost the contrary could have been said about Ukrainian literature: that it had matured to a remarkable degree. From our discussion so far, it is clear that the definition of modernism, which was a vital new force, expanded beyond the usual interpretation and included all those works and writers who broke away from the

realist-populist tradition and were innovators in many new directions. Very few writers or works in Ukrainian literature were in the strict sense of the word, 'modernist.' Very few took the hint from that prophet of modernity, Nietzsche, who according to L. Kolakowski, "pursued everything to the end: the world generated no meaning and no distinction between good and evil. Reality was pointless...."⁵⁷

Reality, for Ukrainian writers, was rooted in the debatable status of the Ukrainian language. Although in 1905 the Russian Academy of Sciences granted the language separate status, that language was not widely used (in schools or public life). Many Ukrainian writers clung to the romantic idea of the literary language as being close to the language of the peasants.⁵⁸ The positivist trend of the late nineteenth century, moreover, stressed the importance of writing in a language that could be understood by the peasants. At the same time modernism revolutionized the Ukrainian literary language by introducing many new, foreign elements. This prevented Ukrainian from becoming a "language for domestic use only," as Kostomarov and others had advocated. But linguistically and thematically the romantic and positivist ideals lingered on. One must, therefore, turn to those writers in the early twentieth century who continued the traditions of the nineteenth century. Most of them espoused the well-established realist and populist models of the past.

TRADITIONALISM

A giant figure among these writers is that of Ivan Franko (see chapter XIV), whose literary career began in the late nineteenth century but continued well into the twentieth. Franko's genius was manifold: he was a prominent activist in socialist and radical circles, and he was a journalist, a scholar, a literary critic, and a writer in all three genres—poetry, prose, and drama. Friendly with Drahomanov, he yet came to believe in a free and independent Ukraine, a belief that he expressed in "Poza mežamy možlyvoho" (Beyond the Bounds of the Possible, 1900), which the Soviet editors have excluded from his works. The son of a village blacksmith, he considered himself an ordinary "worker of the pen" and labored tirelessly until in 1908 a serious illness turned him into a semi-invalid. His collected works have recently been published in fifty volumes, albeit in heavily censored form.

By 1900 Franko was an established writer. In 1900 he published a novel *Perexresni stežky* (Cross-Paths), and in 1907 another—*Velykyj šum* (The Great Roar), both of them realistic in style, but with strong overtones of a thriller. In 1905 the appearance of his *Boryslavs'ki opovidannja* (Tales from Boryslav) showed his constant social concern, as Rudnyc'kyj indicates in his biography, *Ivan Franko*:

French naturalism did not have any influence on Franko until his first stories and novels appeared. Even then, after he became familiar with it, this influence was not so strong that it is possible to consider Franko a follower of the naturalist school. What Franko particularly noticed in naturalism had existed in a subdued form in our populist novels: the depiction of a social milieu. But Franko thought of social milieu as a citizen who wants to participate and influence it. The true naturalists observed the social process as researchers who did not want to spoil things by taking a personal attitude.⁵⁹

In 1905 Franko published his splendid long poem *Mojsej* (Moses). Based on a biblical theme, it discussed in philosophical terms the problem of national leadership. George Shevelov puts the poem in the context of Franko's creative work:

The year 1905 was, in Franko's life, a year of reckoning between life and death, a year of overcoming doubts and vacillations, going beyond the bounds of the possible and leading not an intended direction but giving content to a man's and a nation's life and creating the highest good—spiritual values. As the doomed Kocjubyns'kyj wrote in his last works about the glory of life, so did Franko, in his tetralogy *Moses* (poetry), "Sojčyne krylo" (Jay's Wing, prose). "Pid oborohom" (Under a Haystack, memoirs), and "Odvertyj lyst do halyc'koho ukrajins'koho molodiži" (An Open Letter to Ukrainian Galician Youth, journalism). The highest achievement of this tetralogy is *Moses*.... The intertwining of the three aspects alone—the personal, the social, and the philosophic—makes *Moses* one of the peaks of Ukrainian literature. On the formal side, too, the poem towers above the poetry of its time....⁶⁰

M. Rudnyc'kyj pointed out that some of the earlier poetry of Franko was attuned to symbolism: "*Zivjale lystja*" (Withered Leaves, 1896) for long remained the collection that would attract readers of a new generation. From the point of view of composition this is a most compact cycle, and most varied as to form. This lyrical confession with overtones of dejection and despair was more forceful than the hymn "Vičnyj revoljucioner" (The Eternal Revolutionary), which is good programmatic verse, suitable for martial music."⁶¹

Realist writers continued writing after 1900. In that year Borys Hrinčenko (1863–1910) published a novel about village life, *Sered temnoji noči* (During a Dark Night), showing not so much "class struggle" among the peasants as the all-pervasiveness of a criminal mentality. A continuation of this novel was

Pid tyxymy verbamy (Under the Quiet Willow Trees, 1901), pleading for more enlightenment in the village. The doyen of populist writers, Ivan Nečuj-Levyč'kyj (1838–1918) wrote in 1900 a short novel *Bez put'tja* (Senseless), a bitter satire on the decadent movement. The hero and heroine end up in a lunatic asylum. A few years later, Nečuj wrote a long article about “modernist lunatics,” whose works he dismissed mostly as “quaint, obscene, or rubbishy.” The article remained unpublished until 1968. This was a great pity, for if this piece of utterly reactionary populist ideology had appeared in print it might have provoked a spirited reply by one of the modernists. Three years later he wrote a melodramatic tale, set in a village, *Na gastrol'jax v Mykytjanax* (Guest Appearances in Mykytjany, published in 1911). In 1902 another older writer, Myxajlo Staryč'kyj, the author of popular historical novels, wrote the novel *Bezbatčenko* (Fatherless, published in 1908) on the agony of illegitimacy. Panas Myrnyj continued writing populist stories and plays after 1900.

Three short-story writers stand out for their contribution to Ukrainian realism. They are Stepan Vasyľčenko (1878–1932), Les' Martovyč (1871–1916), and Marko Čeremšyna (real name Ivan Semanjuk, 1874–1927). Vasyľčenko's highly poetic prose often recreates the world of children; Martovyč is a master of depicting the materialist outlook of the peasants; and Čeremšyna, like Stefanyk, is at his best in psychological sketches of peasants. “Čeremšyna—a lyricist at heart, in the sense that he seizes on individual moments in life and can enjoy them whether they are pleasant or unpleasant, and wishes only to preserve them before they vanish. What appears to us an ‘epic’ quality is not the result of a balanced view of the world in which he lives but rather of accommodation with that world, which is presented without any explanation.”⁶²

A protege of Ivan Franko, Osyp Makovej (1867–1925) was a prose writer of some importance. Author of a series of short stories (*Naši znakomi*, Our Acquaintances, 1901); the novel *Zalissja* (1897), which depicts the life of a clergyman in an impoverished village; and the historical novel *Jarošenko* (1905), he earned his meager living as a writer and editor for *Bukovyna*. Critic O. Zasenکو explained that Makovej's often satirical stories are of great value as a portrait of his times.

One of the central themes of Makovej's prose was the life of Galician bourgeoisie. The world of petty, egotistical private interests, of superstition in everyday life, of respect for official ranks, of careerism, of neglect of civic duties—all this was reflected in many stories, sketches, and feuilletons by Makovej. He knew the bourgeois milieu very well. He looked at it not from a distance, but from within, and penetrated deeply into the world of fantasies and

conceptions of his heroes—merchants, officials, the clergy, and the intelligentsia.⁶³

A writer who in his youth flirted with modernism—in a collection of short stories, *Straždannja molodoji ljudyny* (Sufferings of a Young Person, 1901)—but who later turned to realism was Antin Krušel'nyč'kyj (1878–1941). In 1898–1918 he wrote a novel *Budennyj xlib* (Daily Bread), in a strange mixture of styles. He is best remembered for the novel *Rubajut' lis* (They Are Cutting the Forest, 1914), in which the rich exploiters assume giant proportions. In the 1920s Krušel'nyč'kyj migrated to Soviet Ukraine, where he was later arrested. He has since been rehabilitated and republished. Another minor though not insignificant writer was Arxyp Teslenko (1882–1911), who spent long period of time in jail because of his revolutionary activity. He is the author of many laconic short stories of peasant life and of a long story *Stračene žyttja* (A Lost Life, 1910) in which the heroine is driven to suicide.

Four poets in the traditionalist camp deserve to be mentioned. Volodymyr Samijlenko (1864–1925), a talented translator of Homer and Dante, was best-known for his humorous verses. His poems were collected in the volume *Ukrajini* (For Ukraine, 1906). Mykola Černjavsk'kyj (1868–1946) was praised by Jevšan for his “warm lyricism, altruistic urges ... and idealism.”⁶⁴ Among his many collections of poetry were *Donec'ki sonety* (The Donec' Sonnets, 1898) and *Zori* (Stars, 1903). His works were banned by the Soviets in the 1930s, after he was arrested. He was posthumously rehabilitated. Two women wrote lyrical verse: Xrystja Alčevs'ka (1882–1932), the author of *Tuha za soncem* (Longing for the Sun, 1906), and Uljana Kravčenko (real name Šnajder, 1860–1947), the author of the collection *Prima vera* (1885). Unfortunately Kravčenko was rather unproductive in her later years. Finally, Oleksander Kozlovsk'kyj (1876–98) was a poet of promise. His only collection of verse, *Mirty i kyparysy* (Myrtles and Cypresses), was published posthumously in 1905, with a laudatory preface by Ivan Franko.

The contest between traditionalists and modernists was ultimately resolved to the advantage of the latter. Andrij Nikovsk'kyj wrote in 1912 that “Ukraine has a right to a higher culture and follows the path that is destined to her ... Ukrainian literature has gone far beyond the Ukrainian public.”⁶⁵ Yet, although outdistanced, the traditionalists continued to exist and to appeal to a wide readership. This bifurcation of literary development continued well into the twentieth century.

So deeply ingrained was the populist notion that literature ought to serve the people that any departure from it was sometimes regarded as an act of national betrayal. Jefremov could not conceive of literature as independent from social and national life, yet modernists often tried to reach an independent position. They did so in the name of “beauty” and “art,” both elusive qualities

for the populists. This dichotomy lasted far into the twentieth century. It was not entirely resolved by the revolution of 1917, an event of literary as well as of political importance.

2.

THE FAILED REVOLUTION, 1917–32

On the eve of the 1917 revolution, most Ukrainian intellectuals desired more freedom and cultural autonomy for their country. Some went further and pleaded for political independence. However, the Ukrainian population as a whole was given over to either apathy or anarchy. After the downfall of tsarism in February 1917, Ukrainians formed a committee, *Central'na Rada* (Central Rada), which soon assumed the trappings, if not the powers, of a government. The revolution in Ukraine was fought primarily for national liberation, though, in fact, civil war prevailed, with the nationalist, Bolshevik, White, and anarchist forces fighting one another. After many changes of government, and the proclamation of an independent Ukrainian People's Republic in January 1918, the country was overrun by the Russian Red Army. A Soviet Ukrainian government came to power in 1919. The nationalist forces failed to gain wide support, especially after Lenin promised Soviet Ukraine linguistic and cultural autonomy.

The bloody internecine strife, a national awakening, and social upheaval left an indelible mark on the Ukrainian history of that era. Despite an inability to develop its own infrastructure, the leaders of the People's Republic, among whom were the historian Hruševs'kyj and the writer Vynnyčenko, showed a definite nucleus of pluralistic party politics. However difficult it may have been in wartime, modern Ukrainian democracy has its roots in the revolution. The failure of a national revolution was followed a few years later by the failure of the Soviet socialist revolution, when despite a military victory, Party centralism put an end to the early tendency towards "all power to the Soviets." The beginning of Soviet totalitarianism goes back to Lenin's policy of supreme one-party rule, including the establishment of the Cheka, and the propagation of class hatred. True, in 1921, forced by economic collapse, Lenin initiated the New Economic Policy (NEP), which was a "temporary compromise with capitalism," allowing some private enterprise and initiative. In the realm of culture the NEP period (1921–28) coincided with liberalization and relative tolerance. Yet even during the liberal era of the 1920s the Communist Party made no secret of the fact that it wanted art and literature to promote its ideology.

In Ukraine various literary groups, from Hart (Tempering) to Proletcult served this purpose. The favored "proletarian writers" were not necessarily of

working-class origin, but were mouthpieces for party ideology. Following the 1925 Party resolution on literature, various groups, among them apolitical "fellow-travelers," were allowed to flourish. In Ukraine this policy coincided with the so-called Ukrainization, an attempt to introduce the Ukrainian language into the state administration.⁶⁶ This provided an added stimulus for Ukrainian literature. The Ukrainian language was now firmly established in the educational system, and some learned institutions—for example, the Academy of Sciences—created during the war of liberation, were allowed to grow and develop. All in all, the atmosphere of the late 1920s was very conducive towards the development of literature. Some Bolsheviks who were at the same time Ukrainian patriots, such as Šums'kyj and Skrypnyk, were in positions of real power, and many indigenous Ukrainian socialists (former Borotbists or Ukapiests) held key posts in the press, for example, Ellan Blakytnyj. A decade of relative non-interference by the Party in literature produced some of the liveliest literary debates and finest literary achievements.

With the collapse of the nationalist forces in 1919 some writers, among them Oles', Voronyj, and Vynnyčenko, left Ukraine for the West, but those who stayed by and large continued the modernist tradition of innovation and experimentation. Symbolism, which had many adherents in Russia, was best represented in Ukraine by Pavlo Tyčyna (1891–1967). His first collection of poems, *Sonjašni kljarnety* (The Sunny Clarinets, 1918), is his best. Apart from superb nature lyrics, it contained several poems about the revolution, the last poem "Zolotyj homin" (The Golden Echo) being a lyrical meditation on fratricidal strife and national spontaneity. There followed the brooding *Zamist' sonetiv i oktav* (Instead of Sonnets and Octaves, 1920), *Pluh* (The Plough, 1920), and *Viter z Ukrajiny* (Wind from Ukraine, 1924), all of them accomplished collections of introspective and metaphysical verse. One of the warmest and most perceptive assessments of the early Tyčyna came, oddly enough, from the old populist, Jefremov, in his history of Ukrainian literature:

What Tyčyna has given our literature indeed constitutes a great treasure. It so happened that this young dreamer, with a look directed deep inside him, in his very first book appears so profoundly original and mature and at the same time so tied to the best traditions of our literature that there could be no doubt that a new, fresh, and captivating page has been written in it. Tyčyna took from the old soil a humane treatment of themes, a deep national coloring, and the most beautiful language, [forming] a laconic style that in its simplicity, lyricism, and compactness reminds us of the manner of our great prose writer, Vasyl' Stefanyk. Possibly of world stature, Tyčyna through his form is a deeply national poet because he has used what was best in earlier generations. He drank in, as it

were, all the beauty of the popular language and has used it with great taste and mastery in a most sophisticated manner. He has added to this his dreaminess and depth, brilliant form, and a flexible sonorous verse technique, usually scorned by our writers with the exception of two or three mannerist poets.⁶⁷

Ideological interpretations of the early Tyčyna poems range from the Soviet left (Leonid Novyčenko⁶⁸) to Christian right (Vasyl' Barka⁶⁹), but they tell us little about his inimitable poetry. In the late twenties and early thirties this saintly poet, under the pressure of ever-increasing controls, underwent a deep change. His early prophecy about "kissing the Pope's slipper" came true, and the new Tyčyna, bereft of his poetic powers, became a Stalinist bard (see later).

Ukrainian futurism began before the revolution and is associated with one poet, Myxail' Semenko (1892–1938). He wrote many collections of verse, the most important being *Derzaniĵa* (Daring, 1914) and *Kobzar* (The Minstrel, 1924). He acquired notoriety as the *enfant terrible* of Ukrainian literature, following his blistering attack on Taras Ševčenko, whose cult he considered to be most damaging to Ukrainian culture. For this he was attacked by Jevšan and Sribljans'kyj as a "literary idiot," a traitor to his country, and a plagiarist.⁷⁰ Recently, Oleh Ilnytzyk came to the defense of Semenko:

Semenko's appearance in 1914 symbolized the end of one literary era as well as the beginning of another. His Futurism was the first of the many post-Modernist trends that were consciously committed to revitalizing Ukrainian literature and, in a broader sense, Ukrainian culture. This characteristic makes Futurism and Semenko the forerunners of the "renaissance" of the 1920s....The main difference is that Semenko knew and advocated the influence of Europe in its most radical guise. In this respect he may well be considered the most European of his contemporaries, and his movement was one more important indicator of just how innovative Ukrainian literature became between 1914 and 1930.⁷¹

Semenko was arrested and later shot in 1938. His rehabilitation has been at first only partial. An associate of Semenko, especially in the journal *Nova Generaciĵa* (New Generation), was the futurist poet Geo Škurupij (1903–43), who was also a successful prose writer. Doroškevyč wrote: "It seems that nowhere except in Škurupij's [works] can one see the unhealthy psychology of a suburban bourgeois, spoilt by the streets of a large city. While Semenko lived in the world of the bohemian cafe, Škurupij loves the capitalist city with its parasols, "blind lamp posts," made-up women, and other characteristics.

Only in this way can we explain his “hymns”—among them a hymn to a “greasy sausage” to which one of his heroes “prays fanatically, pressing his nose against the window pane.”⁷² Škurupij shared Semenko’s fate in the Gulag. He has been rehabilitated.

Maksym Ryl’s’kyj (1895–1964) was a modernist who was first published in *Ukrajins’ka xata*. After the revolution he, along with Mykola Zerov, Pavlo Fylypovyč, Myxajlo Draj-Xmara, and Osval’d Burkhardt, participated in the so-called neo-classicist group, which sometimes tried to emulate the French Parnassians. Ryl’s’kyj’s first collection of poems, *Na bilyx ostrovax* (On the White Islands, 1910), was followed by *Pid osinnimy zorjamy* (Under the Autumn Stars, 1918), *Synja dalečin’* (Sky-Blue Distance, 1922), and *Trynadcjata vesna* (The Thirteenth Spring, 1925). Once more, Doroškevyč sums up these early poems:

The poet loves life, but in a static form, he loves the land and sees here a higher harmony.... The catastrophic era of capitalist wars and revolution has not touched the themes of the collection in the least.... The genre frame of the poems recreates the traditions of Puškin’s school, and the subtle aestheticism and Epicureanism, apart from the classical forms, constitute the main stream, which is called neoclassicism. The style, saturated with full, rich images, brilliant, sunny metaphors, and fragrant epithets, as well as the laconic phrase—all these elevate his second collection high in Ukrainian poetry. This is aided by the metric virtuosity, especially in the sonnet form.⁷³

Ryl’s’kyj’s early poems are perhaps the only genuine neoclassicist works. Later, in the 1930s, he followed Tyčyna’s path, changing his outlook and style according to Party dictates. In his penetrating article “The Legend of Ukrainian Neoclassicism”⁷⁴ George Shevelov argues that some of the neoclassicists—for example Draj-Xmara and Fylypovyč—were simply symbolists and that even the *maître* of the group, Mykola Zerov (1890–1937), hid behind the facade of classicism. Zerov, who was a professor of literature at Kyiv University, published translations—*Antolohija ryms’koji poeziji* (An Anthology of Roman Poetry, 1920) and a collection *Kamena* (Camena, 1924). He was better-known for his scholarly works, such as *Nove ukrajins’ke pys’menstvo* (New Ukrainian Literature, 1924) and for critical essays in *Do dжерel* (To The Sources, 1926) and *Vid Kuliša do Vynnyčenko* (From Kuliš to Vynnyčenko 1928). Shevelov believes that Zerov’s best poetry has only a shell of classicism:

The hard form of classicism, a stand above all things and time—was a refuge from the poet's feeling of disillusionment, loneliness, the world's illusoriness, man's meanness and loss of faith, which was his deepest reaction to the brutal and dirty reality of his day. Zerov was not a neoclassicist in the full sense of the term; he searched for classicism and desperately yearned for it, but only infrequently did he reach a classical harmony not only of word and form but also of outlook. More often than not the symmetrical form masked and stilled the cry of his tormented soul.⁷⁵

Zerov certainly had a premonition of the terror that claimed his life in the Gulag. His collections, *Sonnetarium* (Munich, 1948), *Catalepton* (Philadelphia, 1951) and *Corollarium* (Munich, 1958), were published posthumously, along with his lectures on the history of literature, which appeared in Canada in 1977. He was rehabilitated in 1966.

Pavlo Fylypovyč (1891–1937) was the author of two collections of poems, *Zemlja i viter* (Earth and Wind, 1922) and *Prostir* (Space, 1925), as well as several scholarly studies. Like Zerov and Draj-Xmara, he lived among academics in Kiev. All three ended their careers in the Gulag. As Ju. Serex pointed out:

Fylypovyč wrote symbolist poems even in 1925 [writes Shevelov] but his attraction to neoclassicism grew stronger all the time. While neoclassicism is negligible in *Zemlja i viter*, it sets the tone in *Prostir*.... Partly, his symbolism contained kernels of neoclassicism. In a typically symbolist poem “Na potalu kaminnym kryham” (Defying the Stone Boulders), the poet wrote about himself: *I give up my anxious soul/ And the coldness of thought ...* and the last component, which no symbolist need stress—the *cold calmness of thought*—appeared very clearly in the symbolist poems of Fylypovyč, later dominating his poetry and distancing it from the *anxious soul*.⁷⁶

Myxajlo Draj-Xmara (1889–1939) published a collection of poems *Proros-ten'* (Young Shoots, 1926), and a monograph on Lesja Ukrajinka. His poem about the neoclassicists, “Lebedi” (The Swans, 1928), earned him years of incarceration. His *Letters from the Gulag* (New York, 1983), was published after his official rehabilitation. Recently, some of his very revealing diaries were published in Ukraine.

Closely allied to the neoclassicists were Viktor Petrov (1894–1969) and Myxajlo Mohyljans'kyj (1873–1942). The former, known as Domontovych, was a literary scholar, the author of seminal studies of Pantelejmon Kuliš. His first belletristic work, *Divčynka z vedmedykom* (A Girl with a Teddy Bear,

1928) foreshadowed his later novels, written and published in emigration. Myxajlo Mohyljans'kyj wrote at first in Russian but then switched to Ukrainian, perhaps under the influence of Kocjubyns'kyj. In his short stories he searched for the harmony of personal and social life. He also showed an interest in the subconscious. His novel *Čest'* (Honor), written in the 1920s, was first published in 1990.

Like the neoclassicists, another group of writers, Lanka (The Link), were officially classed as "fellow-travelers." This misnomer, invented by Trotsky, put all the writers who wished to avoid politics into one convenient category, ascribing to them left leanings that none of them in fact had. Lanka's most prominent prose writer was Valerijan Pidmohyl'nyj (1901–41), who became a major novelist in the 1920s. He was the author of many short stories and the novels *Ostap Šaptala* (1922), *Misto* (The City, 1928), and *Nevelyčka drama* (English translation, *A Little Touch of Drama*, 1930). Pidmohyl'nyj was also a translator of French literature, which in turn influenced him. A dissertation by Maxim Tarnawsky has been written on Pidmohyl'nyj and Maupassant.⁷⁷

From his very earliest works to his last, Pidmohyl'nyj consistently focuses his attention on instinctual, sexual, and creative energies. In the cluster of thematic motifs that characterize his work, particularly the early works, these energies are associated with revolutionary anarchism, hunger, dreamy romanticism, the night, and especially, the steppe. This thematic cluster, defined earlier as the magic of the night, is essentially parallel to the Dionysian version of Nietzsche's Will to Power. The association becomes more precise in the two novels, where the differentiation between the magic of the night and its polar complement, reason, is most acutely delineated. But the two novels are not thematically identical. Where in *Misto* he saw or at least envisioned the possibility of a harmony or unity between the two forces, in *Nevelyčka drama* the possibility is gone.... In his last novel Pidmohyl'nyj has moved beyond Nietzsche to an existential position that no longer allows for idealized harmony or transcendent affirmation.⁷⁸

Like so many of his contemporaries, Pidmohyl'nyj perished in the Gulag. He was in the midst of his literary career. In 1988 he was tentatively rehabilitated. His last known work, discovered recently, was *Povist' bez nazvy* (A Story Without a Title).

Another member of Lanka was a major poet, Jevhen Plužnyk (1898–1936). He was the author of the collections *Dni* (Days, 1926), *Rannja osin'* (Early Autumn, 1927), and *Rivnovaha* (Equilibrium, 1933). He also wrote a novel *Neduha* (Illness, 1928), and some plays. Writer M. Ryl's'kyj described

Pluzhyk's struggle as a poet: "[Plužnyk] was a dreamer who was ashamed of his dreaminess. A poet who did not believe in his poetry.... Hence the solitude. The solitude of a recluse? On the contrary, the solitude of one who wants to be with people.... And there is another striking feature of this lonesome man who loves people: the hope in the future, which, at times, reaches something like a mystical ecstasy."⁷⁹ Sensing the changes of political climate Plužnyk attempted to elevate Communism in his poetry, but to no avail. He was arrested and died in the Solovky Islands. He has since been rehabilitated and republished.

A minor expressionist poet, Todos' Os'mačka (1895–1962) was also a member of Lanka. His collections were *Kruča* (Precipice, 1922), *Skyts'ki ohni* (Scythian Fires, 1925), and *Klekit* (The Gurgling, 1929). To avoid arrest he feigned insanity. After the Second World War he went to the United States, where he re-emerged as a writer (see pp. 765 and 767).

A talented prose writer and member of Lanka (later of MARS) was Borys Antonenko-Davydovyč (1899–1984). He was the author of the play *Lycari absurdu* (The Warriors of the Absurd, 1924) and collections of short stories and sketches: *Zaporošeni syljuety* (The Dusty Silhouettes, 1925), *Synja vološka* (The Blue Cornflower, 1927), and *Zemleju ukrajins'koju* (Across the Ukrainian Land, 1930). His novel *Smert'* (Death, 1928) became controversial. Antonenko-Davydovyč spent more than two decades exiled in the Gulag before being rehabilitated and republished in the 1950s.

A major poet who stood halfway between Lanka and the neoclassicists and who preserved his integrity in difficult times was Volodymyr Svidzins'kyj (1885–1941). He was the author of the collections *Liryčni poeziji* (Lyrical Poems, 1922), *Veresen'* (September, 1927), and *Poeziji* (Poems, 1940). He also translated Aristophanes. During the war evacuation in 1941 he was burned alive in a house set on fire by the Soviet forces. A collection of his poems *Medobir* (Honey Hills, 1975) appeared in the West. Ivan Džuba wrote of him in 1968:

Silence and loneliness are Svidzins'kyj's most frequently used concepts, the most persistent search for conditions of spiritual revelation...In general his poetry is quite varied. It is strange that a poet who wrote so little (at least we know little of what he wrote), who appeared so passive, so estranged from life (a man stewing in his own juice) could, in fact, be so rich, varied, and multifaceted. He is, at the same time, a subjective lyricist and skilled at epic verse; sorrowful meditation and calmness of vision are his as much as existential *Angst*.... His poetry is not so much the poetry of imagination, the energy of feeling, or metaphoric-associative thinking (although all these elements are present) as the poetry of observation.⁸⁰

There were also many writers who welcomed the revolution and the Soviet regime and tried to spread optimism about it in their works. These were often given the name of "proletarian writers," though few of them were of working-class origin. What mattered most was their dedication to the Communist cause. Among the foremost in this category were the so-called first brave ones (*perši xorobri*). "Those in the forefront of the Ukrainian intelligentsia, the better, the stronger and the more consistent, were led from the idea of a national rebirth by the logic of class struggle to the idea of class liberation, to the forging of the path of history by the sledgehammer of the proletarian dictatorship. This curved path of history was taken by the pioneers of the Ukrainian intelligentsia—'the first brave ones'—Myxajlyčenko, Zalyvčyj, Čumak."⁸¹

Vasyl' Čumak (1900–19), author of *Zaspiv* (Invocation, 1919), was executed by the Denikin forces. He describes the revolution as a new religion in this passage from *Zaspiv*: "Revolution. Socialist. The crisis of concepts and norms. The crisis of religion. Let us smash the old Tablets. We carry the scriptures of the First One to an execution. We must create new concepts and norms immediately. A new religion. The scriptures—a formula for the revolutionary outlook of the proletariat in the struggle for socialism."⁸² Hnat Myxajlyčenko (1892–19), author of *Blakytynj roman* (The Blue Novel, 1918–19) and several short stories, was also executed by the Denikin forces. His modernistic novel was called "a strange synthesis of eroticism and revolution."⁸³ His style has no forerunners and no followers. The editor of his works, Hadzins'kyj, wrote: "Hnat Myxajlyčenko was an idealist, but in a very limited and definite sense, that is, in his demands that a human being be not ordinary but a real human being. Not a *homo sapiens* or *homo homini lupus est*, but a new human being in a new society, which was to be created by revolution. Some Nietzschean type of the 'red superman.' "⁸⁴ Andrij Zalyvčyj (1892–1918), the author of some short stories, was executed by the Hetmanite forces. He completes the martyred trio of the first Communist writers.

A proletarian poet of clearly propagandist bent, Vasyl' Ellan Blakytynj (1893–1925), played a prominent role as editor of the daily *Visti* (News). He was the author of a collection of verse, *Udary molota i sercja* (Blows of the Hammer and Heart, 1920), and some parodies. Blakytynj was the first Ukrainian writer to conceive of an elitist literary organization that he called an "academy." After his untimely death, the project was taken over by Mykola Xvyl'ovyj, who in 1925 founded VAPLITE, the Vil'na Akademiya Proletars'koji Literatury (Free Academy of Proletarian Literature). Under Xvyl'ovyj's undisputed leadership, this organization played a prominent part in uniting many leading writers around a platform of quality literature, while paying lip service to the Communist cause. The Vaplitians, in an apt phrase by Ju. Šerex, "led Ukrainian literature and the Ukrainian people away from [the constraints] of provincialism and placed them eye-to-eye with the world as an

equal partner.”⁸⁵ It was this orientation to the West, rather than its later alleged nationalism, that led to the dissolution of VAPLITE in 1928.

Mykola Xvyl'ovyj (real name Fitilov, 1893–1933) was not only a charismatic literary personality but a major prose writer and essayist. He was a member of the Communist Party, but believed in an independent Soviet Ukraine, free of Russian influence. His two collections of poems were *Molodist'* (Youth, 1921) and *Dosvitni symfoniji* (Pre-Dawn Symphonies, 1922). He also published a collection of exquisite short stories in the neoromantic tradition: *Syni etjudy* (Blue Etudes, 1923), *Osin'* (Autumn, 1924), *Tvory* (Works, 1927), and an unfinished novel *Val'dšnepy* (The Woodcocks, 1927). Xvyl'ovyj acknowledged the continuity between his aesthetics and that of the “Xatjany” whom he regarded as his precursors. A contemporary reaction to his works was by V. Jurnec':

I would call Xvyl'ovyj a formless writer. I think this best characterizes his creative work as it stands before us today. In his creative personality there are various, sometimes contradictory, forces, which like a wild wind, attract and direct him although he ought to be their master. To consider all this from a class point of view, these forces, as we tried to argue, are mostly of bourgeois character, with a strong tendency towards decadence. This does not mean that Xvyl'ovyj is a spokesman for the new bourgeoisie, which is being born in our complex economy. He is the spokesman of disillusion, he doubts if we shall realize, with all our forces, the socialist ideal. Therefore, only indirectly, against his own will, he sadly creates for the benefit of hostile forces.⁸⁶

Jurij Šerex described Xvyl'ovyj's disillusionment with the revolution and how his profound lyricism led to a great literary achievement.

Xvyl'ovyj loved insanely the scent of the word, to use his beloved expression. He wove words into arabesques and patterns, spread them out in funeral processions, mastered them in dancing groups. Sometimes he found Ukrainian words inadequate, he wished for greater contrasts, stronger scented aromas—he borrowed French and Russian words. The purists were angry with him. Poor linguists. Xvyl'ovyj loved the scent of words, for words, for him, were not a screen from life or a reflection of life, as the Marxists would have it. They were a part of life. Xvyl'ovyj was madly in love with life.⁸⁷

Writer M. Čyrkov points out the parallels to Xvyl'ovyj's prose in Russia. "One can easily find bridges between Xvyl'ovyj and Pil'njak, Zamjatin, even to Belyj, as far as artistic methods and even content are concerned."⁸⁸

Xvyl'ovyj's contribution as an essayist is equally important, primarily because it initiated the so-called literary discussion (1925–28), the last free debate on Ukrainian culture in Soviet Ukraine.⁸⁹ His collections of essays were *Kamo hrjadešy* (Whither Are You Going? 1925), *Dumky proty tečiji* (Thoughts Against the Current, 1926), and *Apolohety pysaryzmu* (Apologians of Scribbling, 1927). In these essays Xvyl'ovyj boldly criticized the Communist graphomaniacs (red *Prosvita*), and called on Ukrainian writers to turn away from Russia, pointing instead to Western Europe as the source of real culture, invoking the coming of the "Asiatic Renaissance." His slogan "away from Moscow" was, of course, most controversial and provoked a response from Stalin himself:

Xvyl'ovyj's demands that the proletariat in Ukraine be immediately de-Russified, his belief that "Ukrainian poetry should keep as far as possible from Russian literature and style," his pronouncement that "proletarian ideas are familiar to us without the help of Russian art," his passionate belief in some messianic role for the young Ukrainian intelligentsia, his ridiculous and non-Marxist attempt to divorce culture from politics—all this and much more in the mouth of this Ukrainian Communist sounds (and cannot sound otherwise) more than strange. At a time when the Western European proletarian classes and their Communist Parties are full of affection for Moscow, this citadel of the international revolutionary movement, at a time when Western European proletarians look with enthusiasm to the flag that flies over Moscow, this Ukrainian Communist Xvyl'ovyj had nothing to say in favor of Moscow except to call on Ukrainian leaders to run away from Moscow as fast as possible. And this is called internationalism.⁹⁰

There is no doubt that Xvyl'ovyj's literary policy and his strident ideology amounted in the eyes of the Party to a serious deviation. He was hounded by Communist officials after his work was criticized in many journals and newspapers. Xvyl'ovyj tried to elude the attacks and founded a new, avant-garde journal, *Literaturnyj jarmarok* (Literary Fair, 1929), but in the end, as a gesture of protest, he committed suicide in 1933. His works and ideas were banned until 1988, when he was partially rehabilitated. Today he has been restored to a position he deserves.

The following well-known writers belonged to VAPLITE: Bažan, Dniprovs'kyj, Dosvitnij, Dovženko, Janovs'kyj, Johansen, Xvyl'ovyj, Kuliš,

Senčenko, Slisarenko, Smolyč, Sosjura, and Tyčyna. Some of the Vaplitians, like the popular poet Volodymyr Sosjura (1898–1965) were converts to Communism. Early in the revolution Sosjura fought in Petljura's nationalist army, only to go over later to the Bolsheviks. In 1921 he published a collection *Červona zyma* (Red Winter), which established him as a "proletarian" poet. Jakiv Savčenko wrote in 1925:

We shall not make a mistake if we say that Sosjura is the poet of the revolution. He is least-influenced, almost uninfluenced by the artistic outlook of the pre-revolutionary era.... He was formed and educated by the revolutionary struggle, which endowed him with the strong integrity of class character.... Sosjura's sociological and psychological foundation is firm. Socially he is tied to the working masses and he is also psychologically with them. He is not split into two, not weakened by the mood and individualistic culture of the previous era.⁹¹

A different view of Sosjura is held by Vasyľ Hryško, who published the poet's banned verses:

One can talk here about a more complex and deeper ambivalence, connected to the serious inner conflict not of an average man but of an active, creative individual, called upon to shape external reality. One can talk about a man, who sincerely and voluntarily chose the Communist ideology, shaping it to his personal and national character and who remains faithful to this ideology whatever its historical metamorphoses. But at the same time this human being tries to be "honest with himself," believing deeply in the consonance of his character with his ideology and therefore he is open about himself.... Such a person experiences the point of sharp collision of these two forces and this causes a permanent conflict with Soviet reality....⁹²

Sosjura's inner conflict is most evident in his collection *Serce* (Heart, 1931). He continued to express it in the 1930s and later.

A much less popular but much more original poet, Mykola Bažan (1904–83), began writing as a futurist. He was the author of the collections *17-y patrul'* (The 17th Patrol, 1926), *Riz'blena tin'* (The Sculpted Shadow, 1927), *Budivli* (Buildings, 1929), and *Doroħa* (The Road, 1930). Ju. Lavrinenko attempted to define Bažan's style:

What is Bažan's style? Futurism? Expressionism? Baroque? Romanticism à la Hoffmann? It would be vain to force a master of poetry into other frameworks. True, futurism gave the poet an inner freedom from psychological and aesthetic inertia ... expressionism gave him the taste of a passionate consciousness, a thirst for life.... The Ukrainian and Western baroque offered the totality of detail, and the romanticism of Hoffmann and Gogol' gave him the expansive world of fantasy.... Perhaps because of this it is not beauty but force that plays a part in Bažan's style, the force of the elements, contrasts, and rhythms. And most of all, the force of humanity governed by universal laws.⁹³

Already the young Bažan, who kept well away from politics, may be regarded as one who was inclined towards the powers that be. E. Adel'heim wrote in 1974, "Vaplitians oriented themselves towards the reactionary romanticism of the West. Bažan exposed it. The Vaplitians cultivated the idea of eternal conflict between the romantic dream of the artist and reality. Bažan wrote about the tragic nature of such conflicts. The Vaplitians, lastly, idealized the split man who lives simultaneously in two worlds. Bažan dreamt of the integrated monolith of the human soul. The poet's challenge to reactionary ideals is clear."⁹⁴ This challenge became much clearer in the 1930s when the publication of Bažan's fine long poem *Slipci* (The Blind Men) was forcibly interrupted. Soon afterwards, under official pressure, he went over to "socialist realism."

A career similar to that of Bažan was pursued by the talented prose writer Jurij Janovs'kyj (1902–54). In the 1920s he distinguished himself through his short stories: *Mamutovi byvni* (The Mammoth's Tusks, 1925) and *Krov zemlji* (Blood of the Soil, 1927). In 1926 O. Bilec'kyj described Janovs'kyj's style when writing, "Janovs'kyj constructs his stories openly, with all the 'means uncovered' as the formalists would say. And these artistic means are not directed so much towards construction, as to the destruction of the old form, towards a break with tradition.... Both G. Škurupij and Ju. Janovs'kyj were tied to a futurist group of writers, the former still remaining in the group, which helped both writers to free themselves from tradition and become 'Europeanized.' "⁹⁵

Janovs'kyj is the author of two romantic novels, *Majster korablja* (The Master of the Ship, 1928) and *Čotyry šabli* (Four Sabers, 1930). In 1928 Janovs'kyj published a collection of poetry *Prekrasna Ut* (The Most Beautiful Ut, second edition 1932), hoping for a socialist success (Ut is an acronym for "Ukrajina trudjaščyx," Ukraine of the Workers). His novel *Four Sabers* was in the meantime sharply attacked by official critics such as O. Kylymnyk:

The writer romanticizes in every way the heroes of his novel, and their reckless behavior. As part of the idealization of the Zaporozhian Cossacks memories are offered of the Zaporozhian Sich and its glorious heroes, who are, according to Janovs'kyj, the forefathers of his own heroes, whom he sometimes also compares to Napoleon's marshals, etc. However, the activities of these heroes are shown without any connection to proletarian leadership. The writer failed to show the leading and guiding role of the Communist Party in the people's struggle against the external and internal enemies of the young socialist country.⁹⁶

The talented prose writer, Oles' Dosvitnij (1891–1934), was active member of the Communist Party and traveled to China and the United States. He wrote the novels *Amerykanci* (The Americans, 1925), *Xto* (Who, 1927), *Nas bulo troje* (There Were Three of Us, 1929), and many short stories. The satirical novel *The Americans* is “a book more interesting as a memoir than as a literary work,” wrote critic Oleksander Bilec'kyj.⁹⁷

Has anyone noticed the mastery with which Dosvitnij depicts what might be called the exotic? Have our critics noticed the beautiful pictures of the ‘warm Korean autumn’?.... Our era is not the time for large epics and compositionally perfect canvasses. Consciously or intuitively Dosvitnij came to this conclusion. In any case, he advances along a very interesting path.... Was it not Dosvitnij who gave us a chance to smell the contemporary Orient and Occident? Was it not he who painted the depths of unknown oceans over which his *Rembrandt* travels? Was not he who gave us the entire gallery of traveling revolutionaries?⁹⁸

Despite his attempts to conform to the Party line, Dosvitnij was arrested and perished in the 1930s. He has been rehabilitated in the late 1980s.

Oleksa Slisarenko (1891–1937) started as a futurist poet and later turned to prose. His collections of poems included *Na berezi kastal's'komu* (On the Castile Shore, 1918), *Poemy* (Poems, 1923), and *Bajda* (1928). Among his prose works were collections of short stories, *Plantacji* (Plantations, 1925) and *Kaminnyj vynohrad* (Stone Grapes, 1927), and the novels *Bunt* (Rebellion, 1928) and *Čornyj anhel* (The Black Angel, 1929). Ja Savčenko described his style by saying, “Slisarenko's prose is a very interesting attempt to create a story purely through plot development. Slisarenko is above all a storyteller, a fabulist. His attention is chiefly centered on the moment. From this are derived the specific devices of his creativity. He never clutters the plot with redundant episodes, taking only two or three of them, tying them together through a

causal relationship, and leading the plot to a logical conclusion.”⁹⁹ Slisarenko was shot after his arrest in the 1930s. He was rehabilitated in 1957.

The prose writer Ivan Senčenko (1901–75) may be best remembered for one very short work. He wrote and re-wrote *Červonohrads'kyj cykl'* (Červonohrad Cycle, 1929–69), *Solomjans'kyj cykl'* ('Solomjanka Cycle, 1956–57) and *Donec'kyj cykl'* (Donec'k Cycle, 1952–64)—all about the Ukrainian working class, but the most remarkable, satirical and prophetic piece, *Iz zapysok* (The Notes [of a Flunky]) appeared in 1927. This banned piece of writing was recovered in 1988 with the following commentary by Mykola Žulyns'kyj:

With pride, cocky self-satisfaction, joyfully and confidently the “grandiose and incomparable Flunky” lays down his system of flunkysim, the moral-philosophical principles of the conscious depersonalization of man, the renunciation of his own self, the transformation of a personality into a “cog and wheel” of the social mechanism, the order established by the “incomparable Pius.” Senčenko’s happy, thirty-year old Flunky has a “strong body, red cheeks, a flexible spine and rubber feet.” The most important task for the Flunky is to solidify the testament of flunkysim, that is: to instill into his children obedience, humility, silence; to spread the system of flunkysim throughout society and mankind and to extirpate from man the Promethean spirit, the need to think and to have one’s own opinion. The main thing is to think like everybody else....¹⁰⁰

Although severely criticized, Senčenko managed to survive the purges. His early work is his best and was praised by Oleksander Bilec'kyj: “[Senčenko is] a prose writer who struggles with the lyricist in himself, with the poet of moods. The former is always the winner. The impressionistic style deprives characters and events of clarity; the story, designed as a story, is suddenly transformed into a *Stimmungsskiz*, the plot evaporates and the uncertain game between the writer and the reader (à la Xvyl'ovyj) ends in a draw.”¹⁰¹

Majk Johansen (1895–1937) was a versatile writer, with serious scholarly interests. He was the author of collections of poems: *Dhori* (Upwards, 1921), *Revoljucija* (Revolution, 1923), *Dorobok* (The Output, 1924), as well as short stories, collected in *17 xvylyn* (17 Minutes, 1925). Johansen also wrote a parodistic novel, *Podorož učenoho doktora Leonardo i joho majbutn'oji koxanky prekrasnoji Alcesty u slobožan's'ku Švejcariju* (The Journey of the Learned Doctor Leonardo and His Future Mistress, the Beautiful Alceste, into Slobožans'ka Switzerland, 1930). In 1928 he published a formalist study *Jak budujet'sja opovidannja* (How a Short Story Is Built). Here is an evaluation

of his early poetry by A. Lejtes: "Johansen is a typical jeweler of sounds, a talented digger in verbal depths, a philologist of poetry. His mastery of alliteration is undisputed. At first he appears to be a refined decadent of the type of Verlaine.... Along the magnetic field of the revolution his verse playthings were no longer playthings; they become inspired figures of social significance."¹⁰² Johansen was shot in Kiev on October 27, 1937.

Somewhat similar in his style to Johansen was Leonid Skrypnyk (1893–1929), the author of an experimental, satirical novel, written like a film scenario, called *Inteligent* (The Intellectual, 1929).

Petro Panč (1891–1978), a writer who continued in the realist tradition, produced several collections of short stories. Among them were *Solomjanyj dym* (The Straw Fire, 1925) and *Myšači nory* (The Burrows of Mice, 1926), and a collection of tales *Holubi ešelony* (The Blue Echelons, 1928). A. Šamraj wrote in 1927, "Panč showed himself to be a talented observer of the new mores in the provinces. His better tales attract by their sheer realism and by an absence of stylistic and ideological hyperbole.... Panč's precise realistic sketches are attuned to the old realistic school but in the technique of this young writer there is a dynamism and a learned literary manner, lacking in the old literature."¹⁰³

Today we know that even in those supposedly liberal days Panč and other writers were subjected to severe censorship. In 1990 a Soviet critic wrote that "Panč has thoroughly 'ploughed over' his novel *The Blue Echelons* (1928). He has deleted from it the tragic lyricism of the hero, the captain of the Ukrainian People's Army, Lec'-Otamanov."¹⁰⁴ Similar cuts were made in Holovko's novel *Bur'jan* (Weeds, 1927). Since some manuscripts of works mutilated in the 1920s-30s have still been preserved, it is hoped that uncensored editions may now be published.

In addition, new demands were quite candidly being made on the writers as V. Zajec' pointed out:

The dogged question "either-or" posed by the logic of life backs each of them against the wall, demanding an unequivocal answer (not just a declaration, but in their creative work too) which determines the place of the literary artist in a complex intertwining of social forces. It is then that some writers depart from the revolution, openly castigating its successes or hide themselves behind politically neutral themes, reflecting reality in a crooked mirror, or flee from reality into the world of romantic illusion, while others, on the contrary, set themselves ideologically on the side of the proletariat. Petro Panč belongs to the second category of contemporary Ukrainian writers.¹⁰⁵

A writer with a gift for psychological analysis and an inclination towards satire was Hryhorij Epik (1901–37). He was the author of collections of short stories, including *Na zlami* (The Turning Point, 1926) and *V snihax* (Amid the Snows, 1928), the novels *Bez gruntu* (Without Ground, 1928) and *Nepija* (1930), and the collection *Tom satyry* (A Volume of Satire, 1930). O. Kylymnyk wrote of Epik's works:

Having gone over to the literary organization VAPLITE, Epik experienced the negative influence of its defective theoretical and aesthetic tendencies. As a result, works like *Nepija* appeared in which the writer resorts to excessive psychologizing, wallowing in the human psyche, which has lost its true path and has in effect abandoned those ideological principles for which it fought. This person, in Epik's novel, is a Komsomol leader, a district secretary, Marko. His love for the 'nepija' Rita becomes pathologically antagonistic, leading to a loss of perspective, making him politically blind.¹⁰⁶

Such "mistakes" were not forgiven Epik, even when he tried desperately to write the kind of prose that was required. His last two novels, *Perša vesna* (The First Spring, 1931) and *Petro Romen* failed to please the official critics. The former dealt with collectivization, the latter was written at the request of the Komsomol to "create a positive type of young worker." Such demands alone were enough to destroy any serious writer. Soon after this Epik was arrested, accused of belonging to a terrorist organization. He was shot in November 1937.

Jurij Smolyč (1900–76) began his career in the theater. He wrote a novel of adventure, *Ostannij Ejdzvud* (The Last Agewood, 1926), and a Wellsian novel *Hospodarstvo doktora Gal'vanesku* (The Household of Dr. Galvanescu, 1928). Even in the 1920s when this was not obligatory, he betrayed an interest in the unmasking of alleged anti-Soviet activities, shown in *Pivtora ljudyne* (One Man and a Half, 1927), which he later developed into a fine art. The target of the novel *Fal'syva Mel'pomena* (The False Melpomene, 1928) was Ukrainian "bourgeois nationalism," which became a special preoccupation for Smolyč.

A prose writer of lesser importance was Oleksander Kopylenko (1900–58), the author of a long story, *Bujnyj xmil'* (Wild Hops, 1925), and a novel, *Vyzvolennja* (Liberation, 1929). As B. Snajder described, the author's "disgust with the city of the NEP era deepened, and there is an obvious inclination to counterpoise the cleanliness of the steppe and the soil as well as the unspoiled village morality against the dirty city."¹⁰⁷ Kopylenko was soon criticized for

his "pessimism" and "individualism," and he heeded the critics and changed his style. This may have saved his life.

A very different writer, whose works had philosophical overtones, was Arkadij Ljubčenko (1899–1945), the author of a collection of short stories, *Buremna put'* (Stormy Passage, 1927), and a book of sketches that a critic called a "philosophical mystery," *Vertep* (1930; the title is the Ukrainian word for traditional puppet theater). Ju. Šerex wrote that *Vertep's* juxtaposed scenes "outline a basic moral idea—an idea of eternal disquiet and the concomitant idea of Ukraine's messianism. There arises, with great persuasiveness, faith in man and faith in Ukraine, which penetrates the entire *Vertep* as well as the Ukrainian cultural renaissance of the 1920s. Ljubčenko's materialism, although this sounds like a paradox, grows out of his faith. It becomes transformed into great idealism."¹⁰⁸

Ljubčenko refused to be evacuated with other writers during the German invasion of 1941. He died in Germany, where he left the archives of VAPLITE, whose secretary he was. The archives have been preserved in the West. He also left an interesting diary.

Ivan Dniprovs'kyj (1895–1934) wrote poetry, short stories and plays. The romantic play *Ljubov i dym* (Love and Smoke, 1925) was followed by the revolutionary drama *Jablunevyj polon* (Apple Blossom Captivity, 1926). Dniprovs'kyj, whose works were banned after his death, also left some interesting personal letters, which were published posthumously. He died of tuberculosis in Yalta.

A close friend of Dniprovs'kyj, Mykola Kuliš (1892–1937), became the greatest Ukrainian playwright of the Soviet era. A prolific writer, he began his career as dramatist with two overtly propagandist but mildly expressionist plays, *Devjanosto sim* (Ninety-Seven, 1924) and *Komuna v stepax* (A Commune in the Steppes, 1925). However, after becoming a close friend of Les' Kurbas, the director of the Berezil theater, Kuliš produced four masterpieces: *Narodnij Malaxij* (The People's Malaxij, 1928), *Myna Mazajlo* (1929), *Patetyčna sonata* (Sonata Pathétique, 1930), and *Maklena Grasa* (1933). Various critics have tried to assess his greatness. According to Ju. Javrinenko,

Kuliš will enter the history of Ukrainian literature and theater as the creator of neo-Baroque drama. The genesis of his style is very complex. For Kuliš the Ukrainian tradition of the *Ninety-Seven* and *Commune in the Steppes* did not reach further than Tobilevyč [nineteenth century Ukrainian dramatist]. But later he appropriated the tradition of the Ukrainian *Vertep* and the treasures of the dramatic poems of Lesja Ukrajinka, whose influence may be seen in *Sonata Pathétique*. Kuliš grew in the artistic atmosphere of

Pavlo Tyčyna, Mykola Xvyl'ovyj, and Les' Kurbas and the Berežil theater. It was they who pushed him towards the study of European and world drama. Yet master that he was, he copied nothing. In *Xulij Xuryňa* Kuliš writes that he could not accept the framework of the ancient, Shakespeare or Molierean drama, since the material and spirit of his age could not be compressed into it.¹⁰⁹

George Shevelov warns against any simplistic political interpretation of Kuliš:

The theme of Kuliš's creativity was how man becomes human. This is a tragic theme and has always been so through the ages. Kuliš explored it honestly and profoundly. He offered no solutions, programs, slogans, advice, or prescriptions. His works were not written to answer the question: 'What Is to Be Done?' He was neither Černyševskij nor Lenin. He was without exaggeration a writer of genius, and he knew and sensed that in some cases great helplessness offers a key to great art. He was also a great craftsman able to treat this theme in different ways from the tragi-comic *The People's Malaxij* à la Don Quixote, to the playfulness and humor of *Myna Mazajlo*, from the helicons of *Sonata Pathétique* to the elegy of hopelessness in *Maklena Grasa*.¹¹⁰

Finally, Soviet critic N. Kuzjakina, who did much to restore Kuliš's good name after his rehabilitation, wrote:

With their atmosphere of intellectual dispute Kuliš's plays belong to the twentieth century, and the dramatist and his heroes take it for granted that man can think rationally, see the causes and effects of some social tendencies and see them in perspective. At the same time a great deal of Kuliš's plays is openly and clearly lyrical. The form of the lyrical drama is born from the recognition of the significance of human emotions as a means of knowing truth, taking into account the complex spiritual world of man and his emotional depth as expressions of humanity. In this respect Kuliš's theater appeals both to reason and to the emotion of the spectators. In his best works "ratio" and "emotio" are organically united, addressed to the complete human being and all the means of cognition. From this point of view, Kuliš, a sober researcher of social life, carefully analyses his subject while remaining a lyric writer. He offers an example of a rare combination of the contrasting literary gifts.¹¹¹

Despite his efforts to write some conformist plays, Kuliš could not avoid arrest. He was executed in the Gulag in November 1937. In the 1960s and later in the 1980s he was rehabilitated and today none of his plays are proscribed.

Kuliš's successes and failures were very much tied to the fate of the Berežil Theater, directed by Les' Kurbas (1887–1942), who also perished in the Gulag. It was the production by Berežil of *The People's Malaxij* and *Myna Mazajlo*, as well as the close friendship between Kuliš and Kurbas, that were so important for Kuliš the artist. As the last Vaplitian to be considered here, Kuliš epitomized the tragedy of the Ukrainian Communists. A Party member, like Xvyl'ovyj and Kurbas, he naively hoped that the Ukrainian Communist Party would be able to protect the Ukrainian literary renaissance. The terror, not fully unleashed until the 1930s, swept away mercilessly both those who were Communists and those who were not, crushing everything showing independence and spontaneity.

Among the non-Communists was a group of writers, diverse in their literary tendencies, who in 1934 faced the firing squad. The most talented of these was Hryhorij Kosynka (1899–1934), the author of several collections of remarkable impressionistic short stories: *Na zolotyx bohiv* (Against the Gold Gods, 1922), *Maty* (Mother, 1925), and *V žytax* (In the Wheat Fields, 1926), as well as the story *Faust*.

Hryhorij Kosynka has usually been characterized as a dazzling writer, rich in images and rhythm in a work of prose, a cultured writer who simultaneously wrote in a very narrow vein. He was unwilling to widen this vein, being more inclined to probe deeper and improve his artistic insights, and had no fear of repeating certain motifs and psychological sketches.... Kosynka throughout his work is the last follower of the impressionist Ukrainian village short story. He is, however, a forceful follower and develops what he found in Stefanyk, Vasyl'čenko, and, in part, in Kocjubyns'kyj, at a time when new social themes were developing directly contrary to this trend in Ukrainian literature.¹¹²

Executed along with Kosynka for alleged participation in a terrorist counter-revolutionary organization was Oleksa Vlyz'ko (1908–34). This young poet's collections were *Za vsix skažu* (I Will Tell for All, 1927) and *Žyvu, pracuju* (I Live, I Work, 1930). B. Kovalenko describes Vlyz'ko as being, "one of the few representatives of revolutionary optimism. This optimism is natural to the poet, but so far appears rather superficial. It must be made more profound and philosophically well grounded to avoid the trivial. The author must seriously think about having close contact with revolutionary

society and acquiring the psychology of the proletarian class in order to enrich his work thematically and avoid abstraction.”¹¹³

Another writer, Dmytro Fal’kivs’kyj (1898–1934), was executed at the same time as Kosynka and Vlyz’ko. He was the author of the poem *Čaban* (Shepherd, 1925) and the collection *Obriji* (Horizons, 1927), *Na požaryšči* (After the Fire, 1928), and *Polissja* (1931). Jakiv Savčenko wrote that Fal’kivs’kyj “was enchanted by the cold reflection of the old, dying days.”¹¹⁴ More recently, his poetry has again been criticized in *Istrorjia Ukrajins’koji Literatry*: “The leading motif of Fal’kivs’kyj’s work, especially the poems included in the collection *After the Fire*, is the conflict between the interests of the individual and those of society, and doubts about the revolutionary struggle, which demands the sacrifice of the unique human life. Fal’kivs’kyj’s lyrical hero is not the builder of new life, but a dejected and passive man, a sacrifice for a distant goal.”¹¹⁵

The fourth writer to be executed in 1934 was Kost’ Burevij (1888–1934). He wrote a long story, *Xamy* (Boors, 1925); a book of essays *Evropa čy Rosija* (Europe or Russia, 1925); a verse parody, *Zozendropija* (1928) under the pseudonym Edvard Strixa; and a comedy *Čotyry Čemberleny* (Four Chamberlains, 1931). His play *Pavlo Polubotok*, written “for the drawer,” was published in the West in 1955. Burevij was most talented as a parodist. Ju. Šerex described Burevij’s work them writing, “*Zozendropija* was a slap in the face not only to futurism, but to the entire ‘proletarian’ literature. It mercilessly revealed the vulgar and primitive essence of this literature, its helplessness, clumsiness, and slavish dependence on political programs. In fact, Edvard Strixa’s mask was twofold. He donned the mask of a futurist in order to parody futurism, but the very parody of futurism was a mask to ridicule all genuine Soviet literature and, through it, the Soviet regime.”¹¹⁶

Another group of writers virtually annihilated in the purges was Zaxidnja Ukrajina (Western Ukraine), consisting of immigrants from western parts of Ukraine (what was then Poland and Romania). Among them was a talented prose writer, Volodymyr Gžyc’kyj (1895–1973), author of the controversial novel *Čorne ozero* (The Black Lake, 1929). The novel, set in the Altai autonomous region, explored the behavior of Russians and Ukrainians among the natives of Asia. S. Šaxovs’kyj wrote that the heroine, Tanja, “tries to defend her indeterminate position; she still has an incorrect understanding of patriotism and local exclusiveness. It seems to be that complete isolation will save the little people from hemorrhage.”¹¹⁷ The author was severely chastised for his “incorrect view.” In his writing, to use the official phrase, “there came a long pause (*nastupyla tryvala pauza*).”¹¹⁸ In reality, Gžyc’kyj ended up in the Gulag, survived, and rewrote *The Black Lake* to the Party’s liking.

An immigrant from the west who shared Gžyc'kyj's fate was Dmytro Zahul (1890–1938), a native of Bukovyna. His collections of poetry were *Z zelenyx hir* (From the Green Mountains, 1918), *Naš den'* (Our Day, 1923), and *Motyvy* (Motifs, 1927). He also translated Goethe and Heine. Critic Saxovs'kyj regarded him as a symbolist: "Behind his new pose of life's realist there lurks the old shadow of the incorrigible idealist. In his new songs, glorifying the birth of the new, there are heard notes of spiritual anguish and sorrow."¹¹⁹

Vasyl' Bobyns'kyj (1898–1938) was a native of Western Ukraine who, during the revolution, fought in the ranks of the nationalist Sich Sharpshooters and later became a staunch Communist. M. Dubyna wrote that his early poetry collections *Niž koxannja* (Night of Love, 1923) and *Tajna tancju* (Mystery of Dance, 1924) "displayed narrow, personal motifs ... from which minor melodies are heard."¹²⁰ Bobyns'kyj wrote a long poem *Smert' Franka* (Franko's Death, 1926) and many propagandist verses. These did not save him from the Gulag.

Another Western Ukrainian, who shared Bobyns'kyj's fate, was Myroslav Irčan (1897–1937), a prolific playwright and prose writer. Among his works are *Rodyna štikariv* (The Family of Brush-makers, 1923), *Bila malpa* (The White Monkey, 1928), *Z prerij Kanady v stepy Ukrajiny* (From Canadian Prairies to Ukrainian Steppes, 1930), and *Placdarm* (Place d'Armes, 1933). He lived for some time in Canada. He was regarded as "the most productive of the writers beyond the ocean, known through his stories and plays, sometimes perhaps overextended, but on the whole dynamic."¹²¹

A very different writer, in temperament and conviction, was Myxajlo Ivčenko (1890–1939), the author of some short stories collected in *Imlystaju rikoju* (Along a Misty River, 1926), and of the novel *Robitni syly* (Working Forces, 1930). He was once called a "pantheistic lyricist."¹²² According to Oleksander Bilec'kyj, "a lyrical devotion to the soil and complete union with it—this lyricism is the main charm of Ivčenko's stories. There would be very little without it. Plot does not interest him. There is no variety of characters or depth of observation in his final works. In the end, they are also lacking in thought. The revolution has left some trace, but the author has not experienced it deeply."¹²³ *Working Forces* got Ivčenko into trouble; he was arrested and perished in internal exile.

A different spirit pervades the prose works of Andrij Holovko (1897–1972). "The images of Holovko's works, their life-confirming optimism, their cheerfulness and joy of victory inspire the reader with such energy and joy of life, call him to move 'forward and upward,' to fight and to win, to embody in practice the best ideal of mankind—Communism."¹²⁴ Holovko's novel *Burjan* (Weeds, 1927) was directed against the *kurkuls* (well-to-do peasants) and earned much praise. Few knew that it was heavily censored. O. Kylymnyk wrote in 1962, "The novel also had great educational and cognitive value for

the countries of the people's democracies that, using the experience of the Soviet Union, are marching towards socialism."¹²⁵ In 1932 Holovko published a novel *Maty* (Mother)—which he was forced to rewrite in 1935—emulating Gorky's novel of the same title. The path towards "socialist realism" was secure.

A gifted poet who followed his own direction and tried to lead the Avangard (avant-garde) group was Valerijan Poliščuk (1897–1942). He was strongly influenced by Walt Whitman. Some of his many collections of poems are *Vyboxy syly* (Explosions of Force, 1921), *Radio v žytax* (Radio in the Rye Fields, 1923), *Divčyna* (A Girl, 1925) and *Hryhorij Skovoroda* (1929). "Valerijan Poliščuk could do much more than he already has, with his drive forward, eternal searchings, self-education, and following Western European as well as Eastern literature. His desire to create something new, to illumine a path into the future as well as to beautify the present, will last for a long time."¹²⁶ Too individualistic for the tastes of the Party, Poliščuk was arrested in 1934 for belonging to the Center of Anti-Soviet Borotbist Organization and died in a concentration camp. Some of his poems were republished after his rehabilitation.

Two writers of humorous prose did not escape arrest and incarceration. One of them, Ostap Vyšnja (real name Hubenko, 1889–1956) was the most popular writer of the day, the author of several volumes of *Vyšnevi us'mišky* (Vyšnja's Smiles, 1925–27). While most of his humor is drawn from the life of the peasants and the proletariat, some is directed against the bureaucracy and occasionally against himself ("Autobiography"). He returned from the Gulag in the 1940s and continued writing.

Jurij Vuxnal' (1906–37) was another humorist, who wrote *Žyttja i dija'l'nist' Fed'ka Husky* (Life and Activity of Fed'ko Huska, 1929). He was shot in 1937 and has been posthumously rehabilitated. His works have been republished.

In a genre not too far removed from that of Vyšnja and Vuxnal' are the works of Serhij Pylypenko (1891–1943): *Bajkivnycja* (Book of Fables, 1922) and *Bajky* (Fables, 1927). I. Kapustjans'kyj described Pylypenko's work when writing: "In his fables Pylypenko shows a double aim. First of all, this is an attempt to introduce a new kind of folk-story (the plots of the *Book of Fables* have nothing in common with Aesop's traditional fables), and secondly, this is the first attempt in the Ukrainian language to organize proletarian consciousness through a fable."¹²⁷ Pylypenko will mostly be remembered as the founder and leader of the organization of peasant writers Pluh (*The Plough*). Along with many other members of the group he was arrested and died in internal exile.

Ideologically very different was the poet Mykola Tereščenko (1898–1966), whose greatest contribution was made in the field of translation (Verhaeren). His early love of futurism was short-lived, and he became a Communist true believer as early as 1920s. In 1968, O. Zasenکو wrote of Tereščenko's contribution.

The urban motifs in the poet's works were very prominent and led to the glorification of technology, the machine, and not of the people who created and directed it. This, of course, was borrowed from the futurists, with whom Tereščenko had creative contacts in the 1920s. Yet even then the revolutionary principle was decisive in the poet's creativity. A correct understanding of the general development of Soviet society, outlined by the Communist Party, made it possible for Tereščenko to join the ranks of the builders of socialism, Soviet culture and literature.¹²⁸

Two playwrights deserve to be mentioned. Jakiv Mamontov (1888–1940) was the author of two popular plays: *Respublika na kolesax* (A Republic on Wheels, 1928) and *Roževe pavutynnja* (Pink Cobwebs, 1928). Ju. Kostjuk describes the former as “a sharp, devastating satire on various puppet anti-democratic ‘governments’ that, during the period of civil war, the international interventionist band of imperialists and the internal bourgeois-nationalist, Maxnovite anarchist, and other counter-revolutions tried to foist upon the working masses of Ukraine.”¹²⁹ This and many other propagandist plays by Mamontov did not secure his future. He was purged, but rehabilitated in the 1950s.

Ivan Kočerha (1881–1952) was a very different dramatist, who at first wrote in Russian. He was the author of the plays *Feja hirkoho mihdalju* (The Bitter Almond Fairy, 1926), *Marko v pekli* (Marko in Hell, 1930), and *Pisnja pro Svičku* (Song about Svička, 1931). The first of these was, in the opinion of such critics as N. Kuzjakina, “not interesting because of its social ideas and tendencies, which are marginal and not organic to the work, but because of the masterfully drawn ancient customs and the humorous interchanges in various situations.”¹³⁰ In the late 1920s, in response to Party demands, he wrote a series of “agitka” plays, which Kuzjakina described as “neither true to life nor character.”¹³¹ These “schematic” works may have saved his life. His unquestioned talent appeared later.

A dramatist who, more than Kočerha, reflected the requirements of the Party, was Ivan Mykytenko (1897–1937). He wrote some prose and the plays *Dyktatura* (Dictatorship, 1929), *Kadry* (The Cadres, 1930), and *Divčata našoji krajiny* (Women of Our Land, 1932). “The main idea of *Dictatorship*,” critic M. Syrotjuk wrote, “is the struggle of the Communist Party and the Soviet state to strengthen the friendship between the working class and the working peasantry, a friendship that is the life-giving basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat.”¹³² *The Cadres*, on the other hand, was a play about the struggle for the new higher education in the “period of reconstruction.” An interesting

play by Mykytenko was *Solo na flejti* (Solo on the Flute, 1933-36) in which he brilliantly satirized a Soviet careerist. These plays, written in response to the first five-year plan propaganda, did not prevent a tragic denouement. Mykytenko allegedly shot himself before he could be arrested in 1937.

Another surprising victim of the purges was the dedicated Communist writer, Ivan Kulyk (1897-1937), who for some time in the 1920s served as a Soviet consul in Canada. He is best remembered as a translator of Walt Whitman and Carl Sandburg and as the editor of an anthology of American poetry (1928). He wrote a long poem *Čorna epopeja* (Black Epic, 1929) about the blacks in the United States.

A more talented poet and translator, Vasyl' Mysyk (1907-83), was also a victim of the Gulag. He was the author of the collection *Travy* (Grasses, 1927), *Blakytnyj mist* (The Blue Bridge, 1929), and *Čotyry vitry* (Four Winds, 1930). After his release from the camp he was rehabilitated and his works republished.

A promising young prose writer, Borys Teneta (1903-35), was the author of a collection of short stories, *Lysty z Krymu* (Letters from the Crimea, 1927), and the novels *Harmonija i svynušnyk* (Accordion and Pigsty, 1928) and *Nenavyst'* (Hatred, 1930). He committed suicide during a police interrogation. A poet whose talent remained unfulfilled was Leonid Černov (1899-1933). His short stories are collected in *Sonce pid veslamy* (Sun Under the Oars, 1927) and his poems in *Na rozi bur* (Crossing the Storm, 1934). As a young man he traveled to China and India. He was one of the few writers of some originality to die a natural death.

The poet Andrij Paniv (1899-1937), one of the founders of Pluh, was the author of a collection, *Večirni tini* (Evening Shadows, 1927). Like many of the lesser lights of "peasant" writers, he ended his days in a concentration camp where he was executed. He was rehabilitated in 1960. His fate was shared by Oleksander Sokolovs'kyj (1896-1938). Sokolovs'kyj's historical novel *Bohun* (1931) was described in *Istoriya Ukrajins'koji Literatury* as "nationalist contraband."¹³³ A mammoth novel about the changing conditions in Soviet central Asia, *Roman Mižhirja* (The novel of Mižhirja, 1929) was written by Ivan Le (1895-1978). The second part of the novel appeared five years later, after the author took the advice of his critics to transform his hero. Later Le excelled in the genre of historical fiction.

One of the "peasant" poets with a Komsomol mentality was Pavlo Usenko (1902-75). He was praised for his lyrical talent which was hard to detect.

The relative liberalism of the 1920s came to an end at the close of the decade. The political events heralding the change were the ending of the NEP in 1928 and the initiation, in the same year, of the first five-year plan—both preliminaries to

the consolidation of absolute power in the hands of Joseph Stalin. The policy of "Ukrainization" was soft-pedaled and eventually abandoned.

These developments signaled the tightening of Party controls not only over the economy, but over cultural life as well. The forced mobilization of all human resources for the carrying out of the first five-year plan had a most direct influence on literature. Thematically and stylistically it was propelled, by ceaseless exhortation and criticism, towards the goals of Communist propaganda. What in the 1920s was the prerogative of Communist writers alone now became the universal yardstick of literary creation. No exceptions were tolerated.

Literary life in the 1920s revolved around several literary groups and organizations—Pluh, Hart, VAPLITE, the neoclassicists, the futurists, the constructivists, etc. This variety brought about lively controversies and polemics and allowed for a certain cultural pluralism, which was never tolerated later. An event extraordinary in itself was the "literary discussion" (1925–28), the last free debate on cultural and political issues in Ukraine. Various cultural and aesthetic theories were represented, and the result was that Ukraine, although Communist, came to have a high culture of its own. But gradual pressure from the Party, often combined with police action, led to the dissolution of some groups in the late 1920s and the creation of VUSPP, Vse-Ukrajins'ka Spilka Proletars'kyx Pys'mennykiv (All-Ukrainian Alliance of Proletarian Writers), as the Party watchdog over literature. Then suddenly, in April 1932, by Party decree, all remaining literary groups were dissolved to prepare the way for the creation of the All-Union Writers' Union, in which national bodies were to become mere branches of the new literary bureaucracy centered in Moscow.

These transformations, entirely forced from above, coincided with the beginning of the arrests of writers that later, in Ukraine, became a wholesale purge. Of the fifty-seven writers discussed in this chapter, thirty-six, or almost two-thirds, perished in the Gulag. This pogrom had catastrophic effects on literature. In the 1920s the various genres had developed their own practitioners, who followed different models and practices. The most varied field was that of poetry where such different talents as Bažan, Plužnyk, Ryl's'kyj, Svidzins'kyj, Tyčyna, and Zerov forcefully enlarged the horizons of Ukrainian poetry. In prose, too, the first-rate talents of Janovs'kyj, Johansen, Xvyl'ovyj, Kosynka, Pidmohyl'nyj, and others showed great promise. In drama Kuliš and Kurbas were of world stature. The modernist impulse of innovation and experimentation was alive and well. The entire era was a time when literature in Ukraine came closest to its European pluralistic patrimony. One can and should study it in that context. The literary criticism of the decade produced some striking achievements in, for example, the work of Bilec'kyj, Doroškevyč, Jakubs'kyj, Korjak, and Zerov. They were gradually supplanted

by official critics whose methods were more akin to police denunciation. A stern new muse was showing its face—the face of a policeman.

3. THE TRAUMA OF SOCIALIST REALISM, 1934–53

It took more than two years, from April 1932 to August 1934, to prepare for the formation of the Writers' Union, at the First Congress of Soviet Writers in Moscow. The delay was partly due to some passive resistance on the part of reluctant writers, but also to a new constellation of political power, with Stalin emerging after the Party Congress in 1932 as the undisputed leader. The first five-year plan was declared completed ahead of schedule in 1932 (fraudulently, as we now know), and the stage was set for the "building of socialism in one country." The opposition within Party ranks and within peasantry had been crushed, and the intellectuals, who had been banished to the Gulag, provided ample warning to their colleagues that the Party would tolerate no wavering. As Petro Panč said during the Moscow congress, "the victory looks significant only when it is achieved by conquering the obstacles."¹³⁴

In Ukraine, the obstacles were often writers themselves, who had to be "liquidated." The purges referred to in chapter 2 reached much greater proportions as the 1930s progressed. My study¹³⁵ of the human losses estimated that 254 writers perished in the thirties as a result of police repression. More recent figures, provided by a Russian researcher in 1988, put the toll of all Ukrainian writers "liquidated" in the 1930s at 500,¹³⁶ half the total of all Soviet writers who perished at that time. This literary blood bath was accompanied by purges of Ukrainian scholars, teachers, and clergymen. At about the same time, especially in 1932–33, the man-made famine during the forced collectivization in Ukraine swept away nearly seven million peasants.¹³⁷ A few years later, the Communist Party of Ukraine was decimated and the entire government of the country incarcerated.

Traumas such as these were devastating, yet not a word was printed about these tragedies. The destruction of the entire country was received either with silence or with renewed calls to build Communism. Only in 1988, during the era of *glasnost*, was the fate of literature in the 1930s admitted. A. Pohribnyj wrote of this fate:

The sad statistics of one Muscovite literary enthusiast [E. Beltov] became known from 1000 cards that he made out for writers (not only members of the Writers' Union) who were victims of repression, almost half were those who wrote in our republic.

So did Stalin's and Kaganovič's heroes trample our literature. Let us add to this martyrology a great number of writers (sometimes of great stature) who violated their own talents to fit in with Stalinist ideology and also those who remained honest only by twisting their creations and whittling them in half, and the conclusion is obvious: during the ill-fated personality cult there was a pogrom of Ukrainian literature as such....¹³⁸

Speaking in 1988, Borys Olijnyk declared that "the fact [is] that if not four out of five, then literally two out of three Ukrainians were either shot or driven into Stalin's camps, from which only a few returned."¹³⁹

Much remains to be discovered about the details of the purges. Why, for instance, did they include some faithful Communists and Party hacks such as Kulyk and Mykytenko? For the time being, perhaps, Arthur Koestler's dictum about the "purge of the purgers" may explain this. Some critics in the West—for example, Shevelov—suggested that the purges were directed primarily against those writers who used universal themes in their works¹⁴⁰ and that they were an attempt to force narrow, ethnic parameters. There is some truth in this, but it is also true that hundreds of those "liquidated" did not have universal pretensions.

Were there any protests against this blood bath? The most telling was the suicide of Mykola Xvyl'ovyj in May 1933, followed a few months later by the suicide of Mykola Skrypnyk, an old Bolshevik and at the time the commissar of education in Ukraine. In 1937 Panas Ljubčenko, the head of the Soviet Ukrainian government, also committed suicide before his expected arrest. There were other writers who took their own lives rather than face the purges. Other forms of protest were impossible under the existing police terror. Some writers—Xvyl'ovyj in his short stories, Zerov and Plužnyk in their poetry, Dniprovs'kyj in his letters—expressed dark forebodings about the future. But the general silence on the one hand and the congratulatory salvos of Party propaganda about the destruction of the "enemies of the people" on the other, amounted almost to obscenity.

The Writers' Congress in Moscow in 1934 approved the statute of the new Writers' Union with its rights and obligations. The executive bodies of the Union became a part of the *nomenklatura* with all the residual duties and benefits. The Soviet intelligentsia became the handmaiden of the Party. Ideologically, a new theory or "method" of "socialist realism" was proclaimed as binding on all writers. According to this theory, literary works had "to reflect reality in its revolutionary development" and "educate readers in the spirit of socialism."¹⁴¹ Maksim Gorky—known for his insulting remarks about Ukrainians (in a letter to Ukrainian writers he referred to their language as a "dialect")—was enthroned as the patron saint of the new Soviet literature. A

long period of sustained control of literature by the Party followed, which, with some minor exceptions during the Second World War, lasted till Stalin's death in 1953.

The pluralistic, liberal atmosphere of the 1920s was constantly permeated by calls to build a new proletarian revolution, dedicated to the ideals of communism. Some writers did not heed these calls and continued their own work, but many listened with attention to the proclamation of a new era. There was some skepticism, but there was also a great deal of idealism. All the writers paid lip service to the revolution, and many hoped that new policies would lead to greater human happiness. It is therefore impossible to dissect the souls of writers caught in a terrible dilemma in the thirties, when it was made perfectly clear that the time for vacillation was over and that their works must from then on be totally dedicated to "the people," that is, to the Party, which allegedly represented the people's interests. There are indications that those who escaped the purges did find it difficult to embrace "socialist realism" at first, but that gradually they all willingly supported it. Self-censorship became the practice of the day. Silence was often construed to be a counter-revolutionary act.

Of paramount importance here is the case of Pavlo Tyčyna, some of whose early works, especially *Zamist' Sonetiv i Oktav* (Instead of Sonnets and Octaves, 1920) were frowned upon. A short collection of his verse, *Černihiv* (1931) may be viewed as a transition from the early, lyrical Tyčyna to the later glorifier of Stalin. G. Grabowicz, discussing the genre of the collection, states: "It seems clear that it is not reportage, nor even so much a veristic dramatic portrait, as it is a vision, a distillation of the popular Ukraine in transition, presented through the verbal analogue of a musical composition—not a 'symphony' like *Skovoroda*, but a cantata. It is a polyphony of voices and rhythms and moods ... captured with manifold artistry and subtly modulated control. It is yet another instance of Tyčyna's restless creativity discovering new forms."¹⁴²

By 1934, Tyčyna was ready to turn a new leaf with the publication of a collection *Partija vede* (The Party Leads). The chief poem of this collection, with the same title, was printed in Ukrainian in *Pravda* in 1933. There followed *Čuttja jedynoji rodyny* (The Feeling of a United Family, 1938), *Stal' i nižnist'* (Steel and Tenderness, 1941) and many propagandistic verses written during and after the war. "The central theme of [Tyčyna's] poetic works during the war," writes a critic, "was the theme of the socialist fatherland. The native land, in Tyčyna's verses, is painted at a moment of mortal danger as a picture of a proud and invincible mother."¹⁴³ At the time of the battle of Stalingrad Tyčyna wrote a long and beautiful elegy, "Poxoron druha" (The Burial of a Friend, 1943). Between 1920 and 1940 he labored on a long poem *Skovoroda*, which, according to an émigré critic, has anti-Stalinist overtones.¹⁴⁴ For his

loyalty Tyčyna was rewarded with medals and high official posts; he was for a while the minister of education in Soviet Ukraine. A significant commentary on Tyčyna under Stalin appeared in Soviet Ukraine in 1988: "Writers and artists such as Tyčyna, Ryl's'kyj, Bažan, Sosjura and others experienced moral torture and were forced to write 'Long live Stalin'.... We are talking about the 'barrack socialism' of the 1930s. Barracks are for the army and an army has to take a loyalty oath. Writers also had to take such an oath, every book began with such an oath.... It must be said that Pavlo Tyčyna's verses written to support and propagate the official course were strangely weak and sometimes almost parodies."¹⁴⁵ Attempts to maintain that Tyčyna, under Stalin, remained true to his poetic form, seem spurious.

Maksym Ryl's'kyj was another prominent poet who after 1930 placed himself at the service of the Party. In that year he wrote a poem, first published in 1965, in which he admitted that, for a brief time, he had been arrested and spent some time at the house of Compulsory Labor (BUPR).¹⁴⁶ This experience had the intended effect, and in 1932 Ryl's'kyj published a collection, *Znak tereziv* (The Sign of Libra), which began with the poem "A Declaration of the Duties of the Poet and the Citizen." The collection "bore witness to the decisive turnaround in the poet's consciousness during the years of the first five-year plan, his desire to become a builder and singer of the classless socialist society."¹⁴⁷ There followed the collections *Kyjiv* (Kyiv, 1935), *Lito* (Summer, 1936), and *Zbir vynohradu* (Gathering of Grapes, 1940), all "permeated with a gay, optimistic view of life, a passionate love for contemporary life, for the people and its leader—the Communist Party."¹⁴⁸ During the war, apart from Soviet patriotic verse, Ryl's'kyj wrote a long poem *Žaha* (Yearning, 1943), dedicated to his native land, which drew a great deal of official criticism. Critics were not pleased with the collection *Mandrivka v molodist'* (Travel into My Youth, 1944), either, and the poet had to rewrite it. He returned to stark Communist propaganda in *Mosty* (Bridges, 1948), only to revert after Stalin's death to the early lyricism in his collection *Holosijivs'ka osin'* (The Autumn of Holosijiv, 1959).

Volodymyr Sosjura overcame his waverings and became a Party stalwart. We know now that in 1929 he started to write "for the drawer" a novel *Tretja rota* (the name of his native village), which was first published in 1988. It expressed his frustrations, disappointments, and anger with the regime. On the surface, however, Sosjura remained a "socialist realist." In 1932 he published the collection *Vidpovid'* (The Answer), which included the poem "Dniprelstan" (The Dniro Dam, first written in 1926). In this volume he lashed out, as he used to do in the 1920s, against Ukrainian "bourgeois nationalists" especially Dmytro Doncov and Jevhen Malanjuk in Polish Ukraine. During 1933 and 1934 the poet did not publish "a single book of poems and was rarely printed in the periodical press."¹⁴⁹ In 1940 he published a long autobiographical poem, *Červonohvardijec'* (Red Guardsman).

Near the end of the war he wrote a short poem, "Ljubit' Ukrajinu" (Love Ukraine, 1944), which a few years later was sharply attacked as "nationalist." This, once more, produced in Sosjura a sobering effect, and a decade later he wrote: "The Party has taught me to understand life as an eternal creation, an endless movement towards the new and the better.... It gives us unbreakable wings, magnificent wings to soar aloft. To serve people as a Communist is the greatest happiness on earth."¹⁵⁰

The fourth major poet who was untouched by the purges was Mykola Bažan. In 1932 he wrote a poem, "Smert' Hamleta" (Hamlet's Death), containing these lines: "The only great and true humanity/Is the Leninist class-warfare humanity."¹⁵¹ Always given to philosophical poetry, he now embraced Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism. Leonid Novyčenko sums up this conversion: "Chaos was always hateful for Bažan, particularly the chaos of confusion and despair. 'The will fixes the decision, form rises out of chaos,' And so his Communist builder enters the ruins and the image of this poem becomes the symbolic picture of the new day."¹⁵² In 1935–37 Bažan wrote a long poem *Bezsmertja* (Immortality), about Kirov. It ends with the lines: "Live, immortal life./The life of the bolsheviks!"¹⁵³ During the war Bažan wrote *Stalinhreds'kyj zošyt* (The Stalingrad Notebook, 1943) and *Kyjivs'ki etjudy* (The Kyiv Etudes, 1945). After the war he traveled to England and Italy and left some very questionable impressions of both countries. Not until the 1960s did he return to his earlier muse.

Jurij Janovs'kyj's prose was often criticized in the 1920s for its romanticism. Now, having placed himself at the disposal of the regime, he used his earlier technique to write ideologically more appropriate works. In 1935 he published *Veršnyky* (Riders), a novel curiously reminiscent in both structure and tone of the earlier *Four Sabres*. In 1984 M. Ostryk wrote a comparison of the two novels.

In style, imagery, and general structure the author achieved unity between the legend and concrete historical reality, between the social psychology of the era and the precision of ideological evaluation. The military and historical panorama in this condensed heroic epic is much wider than in the *Four Sabres*. There are the battles between the partisan units and the red detachments, episodes of underground work in enemy camp, strategic leadership by the Party of the working masses, while among the heroes there are not only those created by the author's imagination, but also historic personages, well-known revolutionaries, and prominent military leaders.¹⁵⁴

In 1957, with the title *Les Cavaliers*, the novel appeared in French translation with a glowing preface by Louis Aragon. Janovs'kyj's play *Duma pro Brytanku* (A Duma About Brytanka) was published in Russian in 1937 and in Ukrainian a year later. It dealt with the revolution and the civil war. After the war, Janovs'kyj's novel *Žyva voda* (Living Waters, 1947) was severely criticized; it reappeared in radically revised form, entitled *Myr* (Peace), after the author's death. Also first in Russian, Janovs'kyj's play *Dočka prokurora* (The Procurator's Daughter) was performed in 1954, a week before his death.

Petro Panč continued writing propagandist prose. In the novel *Obloha noči* (The Siege of Night, 1932–35) he returned to the theme of civil war. V. Dončyk described Panč's style by stating, "his artistic experience from his earlier anti-bourgeois stories in the collection *The Blue Echelons*, particularly the unmasking of the negative characters, Panč depicts the multifaceted counter-revolutionary camp, all sorts of monarchists, bourgeois nationalists, anarchists, Mensheviks, all united by a fear of revolution, or simply opportunists and cowards who would rather wait and see what happens."¹⁵⁵ After the war Panč wrote a historical novel *Homonila Ukrajina* (Ukraine Was Humming, 1958) about Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj and Maksym Kryvonis. According to Dončyk, "The Marxist-Leninist understanding of phenomena and social processes helped the author to depict correctly the class stratification among the Poles and Ukrainians and subtly stress the social and class elements in popular mass movement. Many striking episodes and portraits, as well as characters, convincingly confirm the belief about the age-long relationship between the Ukrainian and Russian peoples and show how the idea of the re-unification of the two brotherly peoples was born among the masses."¹⁵⁶

Three prose writers left unscathed by the purges were Smolyč, Kopylenko, and Holovko, who continued their activity in the 1930s and 1940s. Smolyč lampooned the "bourgeois nationalists" in *Po tej bik sercja* (On This Side of the Heart, 1930) and derided capitalism in *Sorok visim hodyn* (Forty-Eight Hours, 1933). *Ščo bulo potim* (What Happened Later, 1934) is propagandist science fiction. His autobiographical trilogy—*Dytynstvo* (Childhood, 1937), *Naši tajny* (Our Secrets, 1936), and *Visimnadcjatylitni* (The Eighteen-Year-Old, 1938)—was very popular, as was the autobiographical *Teatr nevidomoho aktora* (The Theater of the Unknown Actor, 1940). During and after the war Smolyč was a prolific journalist, expressing his venom for the nationalists. In 1953 he published an epic novel about the civil war in 1919, *Svitanok nad morem* (Dawn over the Sea). He continued writing until his death.

Oleksander Kopylenko wrote his novel *Narodžujet'sja misto* (A City Is Born) about the "socialist construction" in 1931–32. He also wrote novels for young people, one of which was *Duže dobre* (Very Good, 1936). He did not distinguish himself as a socialist realist writer either during or after the war. Andrij Holovko worked a long time on his novel *Artem Harmaš* (1951–60),

about the perennial topic of the struggle between the Communists and nationalists during the revolution. The evil spirit of nationalism had to be exorcised forever. A convert to socialist realism, Mykola Tereščenko, published several collections of poetry during the war, among them *Vinok slavy* (The Wreath of Glory, 1942). Yet he also continued writing sonnets and translating.

In 1933 Ivan Kočerha's philosophical play *Majstry času* (Masters of Time) was quite successful. His *Vybir* (The Choice, 1938) is a play on a topical issue of 1937, suspicion of treason. Its first performance was in Moscow in 1939, but afterwards the play was banned. It was not until 1944, under the impact of the war, that he wrote his greatest play, *Jaroslav Mudryj*, born "of a sharp feeling of the greatness of national traditions ... when his patriotism and national feeling became weightier in his creative life."¹⁵⁷

Ivan Le continued writing about village life in a novel about the new Soviet woman, *Istoriya radosti* (The Story of Joy, 1938). In 1940 he published a historical novel, *Nalyvajko*. Le found a "positive hero" in sixteenth-century Ukraine. This led him to write a trilogy *Xmel'nyc'kyj* (1939–64), which completed his career.

Apart from those writers who began their careers in the 1920s, many new faces entered the literary scene as Party controls were tightening, and distinguished themselves during the period of "socialist realism." They were often valued not so much for their talent as for their devotion to the Party. The most prominent of them, who became the leading playwright of the era as well as the commanding *apparatchik* of the Ukrainian branch of the Writers' Union was Oleksander Kornijčuk (1905–72). His first play, *Na hrani* (On Edge, 1928), showed his interest in the problems of the Soviet "creative intelligentsia," a subject to which he later returned. Fame came to him with his plays *Zahybel' eskadry* (Death of a Naval Squadron) and *Platon Krečet*, both appearing in 1934. While the former deals with the revolution and the civil war, the latter, in his own words, "demonstrated the rupture of human thought, free from mysticism and idealism, in the struggle for a new life."¹⁵⁸ The surgeon Platon Krečet is the embodiment of the new Soviet superman, the apogee of "sunny optimism, humanism, and patriotism." In 1938 Kornijčuk wrote the play *Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj*. As quoted from *Pravda*, the hero, "a brave and courageous man, well educated and a good diplomat, has met the expectations of his era, the longing of the people, and the thoughts and hopes of the working masses. The greatest human and statesmanlike achievement of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj was the Perejaslav Council (1654), which proclaimed the reunification of Ukraine with Russia."¹⁵⁹

During the war Kornijčuk wrote a topical propaganda play, *Front* (1942), excerpts from which appeared in *Pravda*. In 1945 he wrote his "American" play, *Misija mistera Perkinsa v krajinu bil'sovykiv* (The Mission of Mr. Perkins into the Land of the Bolsheviks). The first signs of the post-Stalin "thaw" are

clearly seen in Kornijčuk's *Kryla* (The Wings, 1954), showing the old opportunist at his best. As the secretary of the Ukrainian branch of the Writers' Union for more than fifteen years, he dominated literary life and was richly rewarded with medals and honors.

A much more talented writer, of Jewish descent, was Leonid Pervomajs'kyj (1908–73), who was primarily a poet but who also wrote prose and plays. As a young member of the Komsomol he produced two collections of poetry, *Nova liryka* (New Lyrics, 1934–37) and *Barvinkovyj svit* (The Periwinkle World, 1937–39). "Pervomajs'kyj's poetry grew organically from the idea of the 'unique and immortal' time of the first five-year plans, the industrialization period, and the collectivization of agriculture, and therefore one can sense in it the aroma of the times, the rhythm of the epoch, the rhythm of work, of storm brigades in factories and collective farms, the pathos of the tempos. The poet's works are permeated by joy in the people's achievements in economic and cultural construction."¹⁶⁰ The true greatness of Pervomajs'kyj was not fulfilled until after 1953.

Another Jewish writer, writing in Ukrainian, was Natan Rybak (1913–78), who became known chiefly for his two novels, *Pomyłka Onore de Balzaka* (The Mistake of Honoré de Balzac, 1940) and *Perejaslavs'ka rada* (The Council of Perejaslav, 1949–53). The former was based on Balzac's relationship with Evelyn Hanska, and as critic V. Belajev describes, "truthfully depicts Balzac's errors and limitations. The author shows the power of money and Balzac's bourgeois enthusiasm for grandiose titles as well as his fruitless attempts to grow rich through speculation."¹⁶¹ Belajev also wrote that the historical novel about Perejaslav depicts, predictably, "the brave struggle of the Ukrainian people shoulder to shoulder with their Russian brethren against foreign exploiters."¹⁶² Even Soviet critics admitted that in doing this "Rybak solves the problem too simply, by forcing his heroes to deliver fierce tirades."¹⁶³

A writer who began his career in the 1920s and who wrote about the village and the city proletariat was Jakiv Kačura (1897–1943). He also wrote the historical novel *Ivan Bohun* (1940), which B. Burjak described as "the first attempt in a Ukrainian historical novel to reveal, from the position of Marxist-Leninist science, the profound content of the re-unification of Ukraine with Russia and its historic role in the lives of the two fraternal peoples."¹⁶⁴ An interest in history and literary history was also shown by Leonid Smiljans'kyj (1904–66), the author of *Myxajlo Kocjubyns'kyj* (1940) and a play about Ivan Franko—*Mužyc'kyj posol* (The Peasant Deputy, 1945), and by Oleksander Il'čenko (1909–93), the author of a novel about Ševčenko, *Serce žde* (The Heart Awaits, 1939). Il'čenko also later wrote the best-seller *Kozac'komu rodu nema perevodu* (There Is No End to the Cossack Breed, 1944–47), the first successful Ukrainian "whimsical" novel. A writer of historical fiction who

served some time in the Gulag was Zinajida Tulub (1890–1964), the author of *Ljudolovy* (Men Catchers, 1934), which she revised three times. She continued her career in the 1960s.

A minor writer, Jakiv Baš (1908–86) was the author of the popular war thriller *Profesor Bujko* (1946), which he later adapted into a play. A writer who specialized almost entirely in the genre of juvenile literature, which was not exempt from propaganda, was Oles' Dončenko (1902–54). He produced more than 50 volumes. Kost' Hordijenko (1899–?) was an orthodox prose writer, author of the novels *Dity zemlji* (Children of the Earth, 1937) and *Čužu nyvu žala* (She Mowed a Foreign Meadow, 1940). Another “socialist realist” of some repute was Oleksa Desnjak (1909–42), the author of the novel *Desnu perejśly bataliony* (The Battalions Have Crossed the Desna, 1937).

Two prominent “socialist realist” poets were Teren' Masenko (1903–70), and Andrij Malyško (1912–70). Masenko specialized in eulogizing the Soviet “fraternal family of nations.” In 1937–38 he wrote a novel in verse, *Step* (Steppe). N. Nud'ha describes Masenko's style by stating, “The author, with great warmth and love, speaks of the beauty of the southern steppe, of the pleasant if somewhat naive figures of working peasants, their lives and customs. The fresh, changing colors, laid on without sharp contrast, and the soft lyricism, pathos, and humor in the depiction of his native land are used in the creation of this poetic work.”¹⁶⁵

A talented lyricist, who had to fight many battles with the censor, was Andrij Malyško. His early collection of poems was *Bat'kivśčyna* (Native Land, 1936). V. Ivanysenko wrote of Malyško's poems, “Throughout all Malyško's early works there appears the symbolic, generalized portrait of the land. The land, where a man was born, grew up, and learned to be happy. A free and joyful land, richly soaked with the blood of fathers and grandfathers. This land is the most beautiful, the richest, the most intimate in the world. The greatest happiness is to live on this native land, to enjoy its beauty and to make it more beautiful and wealthier. The rich, generous, free, and blooming land is a synonym for the Soviet fatherland.”¹⁶⁶ Ivanysenko thought Malyško's long poem *Prometej* (Prometheus, 1946) was the “synthesis of a new philosophy of life arising in a time of great trials [of war].”¹⁶⁷ In 1950 he published a collection of scurrilous verse about America, *Za synim morem* (Beyond the Blue Sea).

The period of the flowering of “socialist realism” (1932–53) was sterile as far as literary accomplishment in more universal sense goes. At best, many of the prominent works, praising Stalin and the Party, could be classed as a new hagiography, reminiscent of the medieval lives of the saints. In the twentieth century this was an anachronism. Much of this literature was kitschy and should be regarded as part of the popular culture. Under Stalin's rule Soviet society was transformed, but not as the glowing literary works portrayed it to

be—not towards greater humaneness and freedom. On the contrary, terror, coercion, and wholesale murder created, in the words of a Soviet writer in 1988, “an atmosphere of fear among both old and young. This could be explained by repression, unjustified accusations of our national writers, many court proceedings, silencing, and persecution.”¹⁶⁸

Some slackening in the coercion occurred during the Second World War. Many writers were forcibly evacuated from Ukraine as the Germans advanced, but some managed to stay behind. Many joined the Red Army, and, in general, Ukrainian patriotism, although with a Soviet accent, was encouraged in literature. Immediately after the war hopes were expressed for greater artistic freedom. These hopes were soon dashed, however, when in 1946 Andrej Ždanov delivered his attack on the Russian journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*. In Ukraine, the Zhdanovist period of repression (1946–53) was also widely felt. The need for *partijnost'* (Party spirit) in literature was openly proclaimed and made compulsory. In this connection, in 1951 Sosjura was severely attacked for the poem “Ljubit' Ukrajinu” (Love Ukraine).

“Socialist realism” brought some new themes, favored by the Party, to Ukrainian literature. Among them was the obligatory subject of the “friendship of Soviet peoples.” Works by Ryl's'kyj, Bažan and many others belong to this category. There was an immediate response to the Second World War in the novels *Krov Ukrajiny* (Ukraine's Blood, 1943) by Vadym Sobko (1912–81) and *Praporonosci* (Standard-Bearers, 1946–48) by Oles' Hončar (1918–95). The reconquest of Western Ukrainian territories was portrayed in *Bukovyns'ka povist'* (Bukovynian Novel, 1951) by Ihor Muratov (1912–73) and *Nad Čeremošem* (Over the Čeremoš, 1952) by Myxajlo Stel'max (1912–83). Yet most literary works kept to well-worn themes: socialist construction in the cities, collectivization in the villages, with those old stand-bys—the revolution and civil war and the ever-present struggle against “bourgeois nationalism.” In all those works the positive hero shone, the “new Soviet man,” a Utopian creation if ever there was one. In the words of a prominent émigré critic, “from the perspective of the future, this twenty-year period (1930–50) will yawn like a dead vacuum. Maybe a line or a stanza here and there, or a paragraph of prose will be found, which will testify to the tragedy of men conscious of their talent who were unable to leave behind a whole work.”¹⁶⁹ Yet the enforced vision of revolution and social progress under Communism could not be openly questioned by anyone in Ukraine.

4.

THE THAW AND AFTER, 1953–72

Immediately after Stalin's death in March 1953, “socialist realism” was challenged in Russia. In Ukraine it took a little longer, but with Khrushchev's

secret speech about Stalin's crimes at the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956, Ukrainian writers, too, began to deviate from the accepted norm.

In 1956, a lyrical autobiographical novel, *Začarovana Desna* (The Enchanted Desna), was published by Oleksander Dovženko (1894–1956). Dovženko, an original member of VAPLITE in the 1920s, was a world-famous film director. His film scenarios, some written in the 1920s, were reworked and first published as “film-tales” in the 1950s: *Zemlja* (Earth, 1955), *Arsenal* (1957), *Ščors* (1957), *Povist' polumjanyx lit* (A Story of Fiery Years, 1957), and *Ukrajina v ohni* (Ukraine in Flames, 1966). Dovženko lived in Moscow for many years, banned from Ukraine. His fascinating diary was published in censored form in the late 1950s, and not until 1988–94 were the deleted passages, critical of Stalin and Stalinism, made public. Maksym Ryl's'kyj wrote this about Dovženko's art: “Oleksander Dovženko was a widely talented man, calling to mind the artists of the Renaissance era. His love of sharp tones and contrasts, of the visible world with its limitless play of color and light and shadow, with its living beauty, made him akin to the artists of the Renaissance and to those of the Romantic era as well as all those who glorify the abundance of life.”¹⁷⁰

A prose writer who came to prominence under Stalin but became a leader in his field after Stalin's death was Myxailo Stelmax. His novel *Velyka ridnja* (A Great Family, 1951), full of praise for Stalin, was reworked into another novel with a lugubrious title *Krov liuds'ka ne vodycja* (Human Blood Is Not Water, 1957), where all the passages about Stalin were simply deleted. His other “epic” works were *Xlib i sil* (Bread and Salt, 1959) and *Pravda i kryvda* (Truth and Injury, 1961). In the novel *Čotyry brody* (Four Fords, written and rewritten in 1961–74), he attempted some mild criticism of Stalinism. Otherwise, his glorification of village life under Stalin's rule amounts, at best, to what Milan Kundera called “political *kitsch*”; at worst, to an obscenity.

An older writer who finally came into his own after Stalin's death was Leonid Pervomajs'kyj. His intimate, lyrical long poem *Kazka* (A Fable, 1958) was severely criticized. His philosophical play, *Vštyel' istoriji abo ondonohyj soldat* (A Teacher of History or the One-Legged Soldier), written in 1956, was first published in 1995. His best work, oddly enough in prose, as Pasternak's *Doctor Živago*, is the novel *Dykyj med* (Wild Honey, 1962). Critic I. Koselivec' praised Pervomajs'kyj novel for both its style and accuracy.

This novel is without precedent in the entire canon of Ukrainian literature for its compositional structure. It deals with the difficult experience of Soviet men during the Ješov era and during the Second World War up to today. The author refused to tell the story chronologically. He shifts events unexpectedly in time and space, using different devices: reminiscences, diaries, unexpected meetings, etc. Such a novel could

only be written by someone who was thoroughly familiar with the contemporary European novel, particularly the French novel, which was strongly influenced by Marcel Proust. The dominant motif in Pervomajskij's novel is the Proustian search for "lost time."¹⁷¹

After Khrushchev's speech to the Twentieth Party Congress some of the writers who had perished in the purges were rehabilitated (the dates were noted here), and those who were still alive among them—Vyšnja, Gžyc'kyj, Antonenko-Davydovyč—were allowed to return home. The rehabilitation was very selective and incomplete. The republished works were inevitably "selected," and many prominent writers—for example, Xvyl'ovyj, Pidmohyl'nyj—were still, for the time being, proscribed. Yet the result of this partial vindication of Stalin's victims was incalculable. Some older writers from the first generation of Soviet Ukrainian literature became human once more and strayed a little beyond Party control. Unfortunately, the ever-cautious Tyčyna was not among them. For him no return was possible to the earlier lyricism that made him famous.

Two other doyens of literature, Ryl's'kyj and Bažan, were capable of sensing and responding to the winds of change. Ryl's'kyj did this in a collection of verse, mentioned earlier, *Holosijivska osin'* (The Autumn of Holosijiv, 1959), and even more openly in a series of articles *Večirni rozmovy* (Evening Conversations, 1962), in which he welcomed the youngest generation of poets. Mykola Bažan recaptured some of his early glory in *Čotyry opovidannja pro nadiju; varijaciji na temu R. M. Rilke* (Four Tales About Hope; Variations on a Theme by R.M. Rilke, 1966). Jurij Smolyč, too, published several volumes of interesting and revealing memoirs about the 1920s: *Rozpovid' pro nespokij* (The Tale About Restlessness, 1968), *Rozpovid' pro nespokij tryvaje* (The Tale About Restlessness Continues, 1969) and *Rozpovidi pro nespokij nemaje kincja* (The Tale About Restlessness Has No End, 1972). Smolyč was reprimanded, however, for writing sympathetically about the "odious" personalities of the 1920s.

Several writers turned to historical themes, dealing with them less dogmatically than in the previous years. Among them was Semen Skljarenko (1901–62), author of *Svjatoslav* (1959) and *Volodymyr* (1962). and Pavlo Zahrebel'nyj (b. 1924), the author of *Dyvo* (A Marvel, 1968). Zinajida Tulub published a novel about Ševčenko's years in exile, *V stepu bezkrajim, za Uralom* (Amid the Limitless Steppes Beyond the Urals, 1964). Hryhorij Tjutjunnyk (1920–61) avoided the clichés of "socialist realism" in his novel about a collective farm, *Vyr* (Whirlpool, 1959–61). In the 1960s Vasyľ Kozačenko (1913–93) wrote a novel, *Koni voronji* (Raven Black Horses), in which he devoted a chapter to the famine of 1932–33. The novel remained

unpublished until 1988. A woman novelist of some distinction was Iryna Vil'de (1907–82). She wrote about family life and women. Her early work, *Metelyky na špyl'kax* (Pinned Butterflies, 1936), written before the Soviet occupation of Galicia, may be her best. Later she received a Ševčenko state prize for her novel *Sestry Ričyn's'ki* (The Ričyn's'ki Sisters, 1958–64). Two dramatists should be mentioned: Mykola Zarudnyj (1921–1991) and Oleksij Kolomijec' (1919–1991). *Planeta Speranta* (The Planet of Hope, 1965) by Kolomijec' attracted much attention. Oleksander Levada's *Faust i smert'* (Faust and Death, 1960) was another popular play in the sixties and seventies.

Oles' Hončar was born in 1918 and belongs to the recent generation of writers, although he was first published in 1938. His reputation as a fine prose writer was established by the trilogy *Praporonosci* (Standard-bearers, 1946–48). His celebrated novel *Ljudyna i zbroja* (Man and Arms, 1959) is described in a history of Soviet Ukrainian literature as follows:

Many novels about war have appeared in world literature during the last few decades. Man is depicted in many of these foreign works as a helpless, beaten creature. The hard life in the trenches, constant danger, the horror of war quickly destroy people, deaden their feelings, limit their interests. Recall, for example, Richard Aldington's novel *Death of a Hero* or Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front*. In Hončar's novels as in all Soviet literature dedicated to war themes, the horrors of war and its evil are contrasted with the invincible force of humanity, encouraged in our citizens by the socialist way of life.¹⁷²

Hončar's *Sobor* (The Cathedral, 1968) is a very different novel. At first it was favorably received, then violently attacked and banned, only to be republished in 1988. Hončar, a veteran "socialist realist," had committed the unpardonable sin of fanning nationalist passions. The novel, which is inferior in style, centers on the problem of a sense of historical awareness among some Soviet citizens whose small town is dominated by an ancient Cossack church. The cathedral becomes a symbol of the spiritual thirst of Ukrainians and of their national memory, which no amount of Communist ideology can quench. The novel prompted a spirited response in Ukrainian *samvydav* (clandestine publishing). During the era of *glasnost* Hončar became a staunch defender of language rights.

A radically new phenomenon, uncontrolled by the Party, was the appearance in the 1960s of a group of young writers labeled *šist'desjatyky*, the sixtiers. The group must be seen as a result of the struggle of "children" against "fathers," a conflict that was not unknown in the socialist societies. The "sons" could not forgive their "fathers" for their humility towards Stalin, and they

themselves felt unburdened by the grim realities of the past. The sixtiers were mostly poets, and included Vasyľ Symonenko, Ivan Drač, Vitalij Korotyč, Lina Kostenko, and Mykola Vinhranovs'kyj. Stylistically they differed a great deal from one another, and did not form a single group. What united them was a new awareness of the function of poetry. They vigorously objected to the simplistic Soviet view of life and rediscovered human anguish and suffering as well as the fragility of human relationships. Their disenchantment rarely led them to a feeling of alienation. The forcefulness of their protests underscored their sense of engagement. Yet all paused to lift their voices to the level of "eternal scores" (Drač) and to "pass from soul to soul (from tongue to tongue) freedom of the spirit and the truth of the word" (Kostenko). Occasionally they succeeded. They did so in a language free from the clichés of the previous three decades, vibrant with new images and intricacies. Their achievement is all the more striking since it flew in the face of Khrushchev's pronouncements on literature in 1962, which tried to re-impose the straitjacket of *partijnost'*.

A poet who, because of a distinct and more traditional style, stood a little apart from the sixtiers, was Vasyľ Symonenko (1935–63). His first collection was *Tyša i hrım* (Silence and Thunder, 1962). *Zemne tjažinnja* (Earth's Gravity) appeared posthumously in 1964. A selection of his poems, some previously unpublished, and his diaries, *Bereh čekan'* (The Shore of Expectation), appeared in 1965 in New York. It may be regarded as the first appearance of Ukrainian *samvydav* abroad. It reveals Symonenko's great civic courage in openly denouncing in his poems the deep-seated vestiges of Stalinism. His uncompromising tone, his traditional style, and his deep love of Ukraine are reminiscent of Ševčenko. No wonder that long after his death from cancer he became a cult figure among young Ukrainians. In 1966 another collection of his verse appeared in Ukraine, but after that he was virtually banned. "It is unjust," wrote Mykola Žulyns'kyj in 1988, "to keep silent not only about the works of this poet, but also about his tragic fate. Symonenko was not destined to reach his full development and the literary milieu in Čerkasy [the poet's home town] was not favorable to creative flights...."¹⁷³

The oldest of the sixtiers and the most talented was Lina Kostenko (b. 1930). Her first collection, *Prominnja zemli* (Earthly Rays), appeared in 1957. It was followed by *Vitryla* (Sails, 1958) and *Mandrivky sercja* (The Wandering Heart, 1961). The collection *Zorjanyj intehral* (The Starry Integral), although it was announced in 1963, never appeared, and for a long time Kostenko remained silent. A master of the laconic and often aphoristic phrase, she is basically a lyric poet. It is the quiet, exploratory, inward looking direction of her best poems that so delighted the reader and infuriated the official critic. Only very occasionally do Kostenko's poems criticize Soviet society, where she finds "many swindlers and skeptics," especially among writers who love

"glory and comfort" ("Estafety"). After a long silence, Kostenko re-emerged prior to the era of *glasnost*.

The most prominent of the sixtiers was Ivan Drač (b. 1936). In 1961 he published a long poem, *Niž u sonci* (Knife in the Sun), which created a sensation. It is a philosophical meditation on Ukrainian history, with the poet accompanied by the "eternal devil." His first collection of verse, *Sonjašnyk* (Sunflower, 1962), confirmed his reputation as an intellectual poet of great originality. Drač's power lies in the daring use of association. In a preface to the collection Leonid Novyčenko warned that this tendency might carry the poet beyond accepted Soviet norms and reflect his "deep break with reality."¹⁷⁴ It is true that Drač's thirst for discovering reality as it is, unvarnished by ideology, compels the reader to think independently. His other collections were *Protuberanci sercja* (Protuberances of the Heart, 1965) and *Do džerel* (To the Sources, 1972). Drač has also translated into Ukrainian some poems by Garcia Lorca, Norwid, Allen Ginsberg, and Voznesenskij. He continued to be published well into the era of *glasnost*.

Mykola Vinhranovs'kyj (b. 1936) came to literature via film. His talent was first noted by Oleksander Dovženko. His first poems attracted attention by their strong evocation of nature in Ukraine. The collections of poems were many, among them *Atomni preljudy* (Atomic Preludes, 1962) and *Sto poezij* (A Hundred Poems, 1967). Vinhranovs'kyj has also published collections of short stories.

Vitalij Korotyč (b. 1936) is a physician by profession. His first collection of poems *Zoloti ruky* (Golden Hands), was published in 1961. Next came *Zapax neba* (The Scented Sky, 1962), *Vulycja vološok* (The Street of Cornflowers, 1963), and *Tečija* (Current, 1965). His poems ring with deep sincerity, which by itself, of course, does not guarantee excellence. He was a committed writer, was a member of the Communist Party, yet he is very sensitive to human problems. In 1965 he spent some time in Canada, describing the country in a reportage. His later career took him to Moscow as editor of *Ogonek*. Still later, while in the United States, he denigrated his former colleagues in Ukraine.

The young poets of the 1960s, according to B. Kravciv, "began a real revolution. Not only the patriotic and humanistic themes in their creative works were new, but the personal has been rehabilitated in poetry."¹⁷⁵ An émigré critic published an anthology of sixty poets of the sixties¹⁷⁶ in which he listed many of those who joined this mass movement. Among them were Vasyl' Holoborod'ko (b. 1942), Volodymyr Javorivs'kyj (b. 1942), Ihor Kalyneč' (b. 1939), Tamara Kolomijec' (b. 1935), Roman Kudlyk (b. 1941), Oles' Lupij (b. 1938), Borys Mamajsur (b. 1938), Borys Nečerda (b. 1939), Petro Skunc' (b. 1942), Leonid Talalaj (b. 1941), Robert Tretjakov (b. 1936), Mykola Vorobjov (b. 1941), Volodymyr Zatuljviter (b. 1944) and Iryna Žylenko (b. 1941). Most of them

continued to publish their works during the Brezhnev era and have survived until *glasnost*.

The most prominent prose writer among the sixtiers was Jevhen Hucalo (1937–95), one of the most talented short story writers of his generation. His collections were *Jabluka z osinn'oho sadu* (Apples from an Autumn Orchard, 1964), *Skupana v ljubystku* (Bathed in Lovage, 1965), and *Xustyna šovku zelenoho* (A Green Silk Kerchief, 1966). In one of his collections, *Peredžuttja radosti* (Intimations of Joy, 1972) he attempts to discuss some sensitive topics like religion and collaboration with the Germans during the war. Most of his stories deal with village life, but they deal with it in a manner that is not socialist-realist. M. Zulyns'kyi describes his focus as the “love of ordinary people, love of life in its not always visible complexity, a desire to discover the extraordinary in the ordinary, the festive in the everyday, the drama in comedy, and the life-affirming in tragedy. He shows great skill in creating an emotional atmosphere around a situation, the cobweb-like psychological picture of a good deed, the knowledge of an unseen logic in the movements of a character, the understanding and rewarding of an honest person, while unmasking the morally depraved.”¹⁷⁷

In an interview Hucalo said “most significant period of my life was the second half of the 1960s, when I wrote the stories ‘Mertva zona’ (The Dead Zone), ‘Rodynne vohnyšče’ (The Family Hearth), ‘Sil’s’ki včyteli’ (Village Teachers), ‘Podorožni’ (Travelers), which I regard as objective, realistic prose ... I am sorry that I did not move in this direction further. The reason was noisy criticism that wounded me.”¹⁷⁸

The new wave of writers was greatly helped by the partial rehabilitation and republication of writers who perished in the purges. Among them were Antonenko-Davydovyč, Bobyns'kyj, Čečvjans'kyj, Dosvitnij, Draj-Xmara, Epik, Gžyc'kyj, Johansen, Irčan, Xotkevyč, Kosynka, Kuliš, Kulyk, Kyrylenko, Mamontov, Mykytenko, Mysyk, Plužnyk, Poliščuk, Pylypenko, škurupij, Slisarenko, Vlyz'ko, Vyšnja, Zahul, and Zerov. Among those denied rehabilitation were Xvyl'ovyj, Pidmohyl'nyj, Semenko, and Svidzins'kyj. The rehabilitation process was conducted half-heartedly. Usually, one selected volume of the purged writer's works was published in a limited edition. The facts and details of the purges were never released, but covered up with euphemistic phrases like “he left the ranks of Soviet literature.”

An important event in the late 1960s was the publication of an eight-volume history of Ukrainian literature. Volumes 6 and 7, which appeared in 1970 and 1971, covered Ukrainian literature up to the Second World War. The purges were not mentioned, but pages were devoted to those writers who later fell into disfavor—for example, seventeen pages to Xvyl'ovyj. This partial rehabilitation had lasting repercussions. The return of so many prominent names could not but stimulate to forces of renewal. Considering the severity of the repression in Ukraine, the

regeneration of literature in the 1960s was truly remarkable. It spilled over into the prohibited channels of *samvydav*, which fueled the dissident movement.

The dissident movement in Ukraine dates from 1964. In May of that year a fire destroyed a part of the collection of the library of the Academy of Sciences in Kyiv. A letter of protest was soon circulating in *samvydav*, blaming the KGB for instigating the fire. The document, like so many petitions, protests, and letters written in the next few years, demanded justice and freedom of speech, as well as criticizing the authorities for Russification and national discrimination. Some of the documents have literary and scholarly value. They stand on a par with works of poetry and fiction that also appeared in *samvydav*.

Foremost among the dissenters was the literary critic, Ivan Dzjuba (b. 1931), who in 1959 published a collection of essays, *Zvyčajna ljudyna čy miščanyn?* (An Ordinary Man or a Philistine?). In 1962 he wrote an open letter to the secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine, Petro Šešest, and enclosed his treatise *Internacionalizm čy rusyfikacija?* (Internationalism or Russification?, published in English in London in 1968). Dzjuba was primarily concerned with securing the civil liberties and cultural freedom promised by Lenin. His call was for a drastic reform of the Soviet system along Leninist principles, which, he argued, had been corrupted by Lenin's successors. Dzjuba's masterful documentation of the Russification of Ukraine is the strength of the book. His first transgressions against the regime went unpunished because of his poor health and because Petro Šešest was half-inclined to listen to him. Later, however, these factors failed to keep him out of jail. Dzjuba's career continued after his recantation and has lasted well into the period of *glasnost* and after.

The first wave of arrests of dissidents occurred in 1965, when among others the critic Ivan Svitlyčnyj (1929–94), the historian Valentyn Moroz (b. 1936), and the writer Myxajlo Osadčyj (1936–94) were placed under arrest. The secret trials of these men, held in 1966, the year of the Sinjavskij-Daniel trial in Russia, attracted little attention abroad, but produced an important collection of documents, similar to Ginzburg's "white book," by Vjačeslav Čornovil (b. 1938)—*Lyxo z rozumu* (Woe from Wit, Paris, 1967, translated as *Chornovil Papers*, Toronto, 1968). The most interesting part of the collection deals with Soviet justice, or rather the lack of justice, well documented by specific cases, interrogations, and eyewitness reports, collected by Čornovil.

A promising literary critic whose works found their way through clandestine channels was Jevhen Sverstjuk (b. 1928), author of *Sobor u ryštuvanni* (Cathedral in Scaffolding, included in English in *Clandestine Essays*, 1976). This is a long essay defending and interpreting Oles' Hončar's novel *The Cathedral*, which touched on vital problems of Ukrainian history. Sverstjuk pursues Hončar's historical observations to their logical conclusion and discusses in trenchant terms the Ukrainian national character, Ukrainian servility

to foreign masters, and the absence of national pride in contemporary Ukraine. Yet his argument is not ultra-nationalist. He combines his concern for Ukraine with more universal themes of concern for ecology, education, and indeed, openness (*hlasnist'*). However, for Sverstjuk, as for Solženicyn in his Nobel Prize lecture, national literature has a moral and cognitive role to fulfill. Sverstjuk's essay on Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj, "Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj smijet'sja" (Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj Is Laughing) is a successful attempt to draw an analogy between the times of Kotljarevs'kyj, when the very existence of Ukrainian literature was threatened by Russia, and the present day, when it was once more in danger of succumbing to Soviet Russian osmosis.

The historian Valentyn Moroz was an essayist with distinct literary qualities. His *Reportaž iz zapovidnyka Beriji* (Report from the Beria Reservation, London, 1971) offers a superb analysis of totalitarianism, where everything is directed to produce a human cog (*hvyntyk*). Although at times reminiscent of Orwell, Moroz was an optimist, confident that his countrymen would allow themselves to be guided by *oderžymist'*, possessedness, or a national fanaticism. Later Moroz was arrested, spent some time in a camp, but was released and allowed to go to the United States. He currently lives in Canada.

Two writers who were arrested and whose works circulated only in *samvydav* were Ihor Kalyneč' and Myxajlo Osadčyj. Kalyneč' was the author of *Vohon' Kupala* (Kupalo's Fire), which was published in Kiev in 1966. Afterwards three collections appeared abroad: *Poeziji z Ukrajinjy* (Poems from Ukraine, 1970), *Pidsumovujučy movčannja* (Summing-Up Silence, 1971), and *Koronuvannja opudala* (The Crowning of a Scarecrow, 1972). With great poetic virtuosity Kalyneč' evokes nostalgia for the past and reflects on religion, love, and the process of history. His last collection is a series of religious meditations without the slightest ideological overtone. Osadčyj was the author of a striking autobiographical novel about a concentration camp, *Bil'mo* (Cataract, New York, 1976). A very promising young poet who shared Kalyneč's and Osadčyj's fate was Hryhorij Čubaj (1949–82), the author of a long Eliotesque poem "Vidšukuvannja pryčetnoho" (Search for an Accomplice). Čubaj's best collection of poems, *Hovoryty, movčaty i hovoryty znovu* (To Speak, To Be Silent, and To Speak Again) was published posthumously in 1990. After his release from the camp, the older writer Borys Antonenko-Davydovyč published a controversial novel about generational conflict, *Za šyrmaju* (Behind the Screen, 1963), and a book of reminiscences, *Z daleka i zblyz'ka* (From Far and Near, 1969).

In April 1972 Petro Šelest was removed from his position as first secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine. This signaled the end of the "thaw" and the tightening of controls on literature. In 1972 a second wave of arrests of dissidents swept across Ukraine. The victims were Sverstjuk, Stus, and many others, some arrested for the second time. The clandestine *Ukrajins'kyj visnyk*

(Ukrainian Herald), eight issues of which appeared, was discontinued. In the words of Valerij Ševčuk, who came into prominence a little later,

Let us recall the political arrests of 1965 and 1972, let us recall that the post-sixtier poets were deliberately excluded from literature and that therefore literary development was crushed. Some of the sixtiers—M. Vinhranovs'kyj, Ju. Ščerbak, I. Žylenko, V. Symonenko, and the present author were removed from the literary process; some found themselves behind bars—O. Berdnyk, V. Zaxarčenko, A. Ševčuk, I. Svitlyčnyj, V. Ruban, and others; the Ukrainian school of translators formed in the 1960s was destroyed; L. Kostenko remained silent. O. Hončar was ostracized because of his *Cathedral*, as well as B. Antonenko-Davydovyč for his journalism. Ukrainian literature was thus not in a state of stagnation, like Russian, it was in a state of pogrom.¹⁷⁹

Was it possible to return, under the stagnating regime of Leonid Brezhnev, to Stalinism? Fortunately, not.

5. FROM STAGNATION TO RECONSTRUCTION, 1972-88

Both the ideological tendentiousness and the stultifying artistic sameness were seriously subverted by developments during the "thaw." The Soviet reader, fed on a diet of "socialist realism" and saccharine Communist poetry came to savor a new and tastier menu. Contemporary literature, much of which remained unread, was suddenly supplemented by readable works. All this meant that despite the consolidation of power in the hands of Brezhnev and Suslov, the days of immaculate "socialist realism" were numbered. Certainly, the old tendencies never quite disappeared, and among the faithful "socialist realists" who churned out the familiar stuff were many writers—among them Vasyl' Bol'shak, Mykola Iščenko, Rostyslav Sambuk, and Jurij Zbanac'kyj and a host of others—who need not detain us. The poems about Lenin, the novels about civil war and collectivization, as well as about the Second World War heroism, continued to be written with the old Communist zeal. The perennial defamation of Ukrainian nationalists was still an important priority. "To fight against these traitors," wrote Pavlo Zahrebel'nyj in 1981, "to unmask them before the entire world is one of the most noble tasks of our literature."¹⁸⁰ One must never come to terms with the defeated enemy.

A good example of "socialist realism" with a new face is provided by the work of Vasyl' Zemljak (1923–77), author of the award-winning novels *Lebedyna zhraja* (The Swan Flock, 1971) and *Zeleni mlyny* (1976). According to the official blurb with which all Soviet works were now provided, the novels, in the words of V. Dončyk, "portray a wide canvas that embraces the period from the first organization of communes to the victorious fulfillment of the great patriotic war." Dončyk went on to say this "restructuring of the Ukrainian village" is described without any mention of the great famine, but in the manner "steeped with humor, some good irony, smiles, a broad application of relative skepticism, the use of mythology and allegory, and in general searching out more effective imagery and innovative form."¹⁸¹ It was not until 1988 that the deep cuts the novels were subjected to at the time of publication were revealed in the press. One of the editors of these editions, A. Skrypnyk, admitted that "they were forced to leave out of the work many of the author's thoughts, some episodes, and even whole chapters that were unacceptable at the time.... In the chapter "Holodni koni" (Hungry Horses) Vasyl' Zemljak tells of the famine of 1933, an event so tragic and so cruel that it cannot be omitted from the epic story of that time."¹⁸² Perhaps a revised edition with all the omissions restored, would enhance this work, which in its general thrust remains "socialist realist," or perhaps it is beyond repair.

A more talented prose writer was Hryhir Tjutjunnyk (1931–80), author of many collections of short stories. Among them are *Zavjaz'* (Buds, 1966), *Derevij* (Yarrow, 1969), *Bat'kivs'ki porohy* (The Parents' Threshold, 1972), and *Xolodna mjata* (Cool Mint, in English, 1986). Like Čexov's depiction of the barbarism of Russian village life, Tjutjunnyk's art focuses on the dark side of a Ukrainian village after the Second World War. O. Honchar wrote of Tjutjunnyk as being, "Soft-spoken, and the possessor of a refined lyrical vision, Hryhir Tjutjunnyk could often be scathing and ruthless. His stories breathe a withering sarcasm and scorn when he dwells on characters who disregard the moral standards of socialist society, defile their consciences and the wisdom of national traditions, and aspire to live the totally egotistical lives of grabbers and parasites."¹⁸³ Tjutjunnyk's life, according to an article written by M. Slabošpyc'kyj published during Gorbachev's thaw, "was devilishly hard, his writing difficult, followed by inevitable harsh strictures in print.... The nameless heroes of criticism looked at his texts with a magnifying glass, searching for ideological deviations and, upon them, thoroughly castrated him."¹⁸⁴ Harassed and hounded, Tjutjunnyk took his own life on March 5, 1980.

Jurij Ščerbak (b. 1934) is a physician who started writing prose in the 1960s. Among his works are *Jak na vijni* (As in Wartime, 1966) and *Malen'ka futbol'na komanda* (A Small Football Team, 1973). He is also the author of a major novel, *Barjer nesumisnosti* (The Barrier of Incompatibility, 1971), in which, according to M. Žulyns'kyj, he wanted to "show the role of contingency, illogicality, and unpredictability in human actions."¹⁸⁵ Ščerbak's work has strong existentialist overtones. Žulyns'kyj stated he also represents

The strengthening of the philosophical and ethical trend in artistic depictions of the world.... The human being had to be alienated for a time from reality in order to break the customary ways of looking at the world, to destroy the stereotypes and clichés. The use of the hyperbolic and grotesque, the introduction of fantastic images, folktales, and legends was implemented by a desire to stop for a while the uninterrupted process of life and to lead a character beyond his limits in order to evoke different reflections and thus stimulate the need for a philosophical reassessment of man and the world.¹⁸⁶

Ščerbak took an active part in the ecological debates of the 1980s and wrote about the catastrophe at Čornobyl'. He is at present the Ukrainian ambassador in Washington.

Valerij Ševčuk (b. 1939) is another writer whose career suffered under Brezhnev's "stagnation." He is the author of *Naberežna 12* (12, The Esplanade, 1968), full of existential overtones, and *Večir s'vjatoji oseni* (A Blessed Autumn Evening, 1969). During the 1970s Ševčuk concentrated on translating Ukrainian medieval and baroque texts into modern Ukrainian. In 1979 he published a collection of short stories, *Kryk pivnja na svitanku* (Cockcrow at Dawn), and a novel, *Na poli smyrennomu* (On the Field of Submission), in which he ventured into the supernatural. A great mythological prose achievement was *Dim na hori* (The House on the Hill, 1983). Then in 1986 he was awarded a prize for his fine historical novel, *Try lystky za viknom* (Three Leaves Outside the Window). Writing of Ševčuk's mythological, religious, and philosophical topoi, Marko Pavlyshyn argues:

Shevchuk has created readings of the past that are not guided by the beacon of state ideology, that do not reiterate the thesis of the beneficent centrality of Moscow, and that allude to a former wealth, autonomy, and dignity of Ukrainian culture.... Shevchuk is far more radical. He seeks an alternative to authority itself: escape from the world's structures; the baroque ideal most frequently invoked in the first two narratives of *Try lystky*, might well serve

as an emblem of his work as a whole. It is, therefore, with the purpose of transcending immutable and exclusive hierarchies of cultural values that Shevchuk's prose delivers to the reader materials that might help shape a new Ukrainian cultural identity or identities.¹⁸⁷

"The novel *Na poli smyrennomu*," declared Ševčuk in an interview, "is to be the first in a cycle of historical tales (or novels, I am not sure of the definition) in which I want to trace the history of the human psyche (not in general, but the one that is dear to me) throughout the course of the history of my people.... Perhaps it will take my entire life to write this book."¹⁸⁸ Ševčuk has almost fulfilled his promise.

Another writer who could have said the same thing, but whose scope is much smaller than Ševčuk's, is Roman Ivanyčuk (b. 1929). His first historical novel *Mal'vy* (Hollyhocks, 1969), dealing with the problem of "janissarism" (loss of national memory), was severely criticized and subsequently banned. In an interview he declared, "the past is an inseparable part of our being; we always stand between the past and the future, as if in the center of a circle, and if the most terrible thing should happen—the loss of human memory—mankind would be unable to respond to the world, to pass on the experience it has gained, which is coded in love and hate, to the next generation, and therefore mankind would lose its future."¹⁸⁹

Ivanyčuk's other historical novels were *Čerlene vyno* (Red Wine, 1977), about the siege of a castle in the fifteenth century; *Manuskrypt z vulyci rus'koji* (Manuscript from Ruska Street, 1979), about Lviv in the sixteenth century; *Voda z kamenju* (Water from a Stone, 1981), about Markijan Šaškevyč; *Četvertyj vymir* (The Fourth Dimension, 1984), about the Cyrillo-Methodian Mykola Hulak; *Šramy na skali* (Scratches on Rock, 1987), about Ivan Franko; and *Žuravlynyj kryk* (The Call of the Cranes, 1988), about the Zaporozhian *otaman* Kal'nyševs'kyj. The latter book appeared more than a decade after it was written. The novels of Ivanyčuk do not illustrate, but rather relive, history and have found a warm response among many readers. Recently he published some memoirs.

A novelist of wider range, but whose greater achievement is also in the historical genre, is Pavlo Zahrebel'nyj (b. 1924). Having started with propagandist novels against the West-*Evropa 45* (Europe-45, 1959), *Evropa-Zaxid* (Europe-West, 1961), and against the nationalists—*Šepit* (1966)—he moved on to history in his novel *Dyvo* (Marvel, 1968). The composition of *Dyvo*, which focuses on the construction of St. Sophia Cathedral in Kyiv, according to V. Faščenko, "resembles the architecture of the cathedral, which is imaginatively depicted in the novel. The unusual plans, transitions, additions, devil-may-care asymmetry, are hidden in purposefulness and harmony. Everything

resembles a native song.”¹⁹⁰ Faščenko stated that the overall tendency of the novel is “to show the indestructibility of national history, through which all that is good enters our spiritual heritage and favors the formation of the communist mentality of the Soviet man.”¹⁹¹ However, Zahrebel’nyj’s narration touches on what, in Milan Kundera’s terms, a novel ought to do: “A novel examines not reality but existence.”¹⁹² According to V. Dončyk the same is true of the three following novels: *Jevpraksija* (1974), *Roksoljana* (1979), and *Ja, Bohdan* (I, Bohdan, 1982). “Jevpraksija and Roksoljana led a fight to save their personalities, their dignity, their fate, and they excelled spiritually because they were victorious. This only happened because their struggle was nurtured by love for their native land, and the hope of seeing it helped them to preserve their personalities, prevented them from being absorbed by a foreign environment.”¹⁹³

The novel about Bohdan Xmel’nyc’kyj created a great stir. Dončyk stated, “We have not seen any work like this in Ukraine. Disputes, confessions, polemics, philosophical generalizations, and human reflections—all this against a background of epochal historical events, in fact, in the thick of these events, which are portrayed not in objective sequence but transformed by the hero’s consciousness, interpreted in the light of painful questions, asked both of himself and the reader, considered from the point of view of the hero’s own times and from the pinnacle of our age.”¹⁹⁴ Although Xmel’nyc’kyj is still praised for the union with Russia at Perejaslav, he is also hailed as the creator of the Ukrainian nation. While acknowledging this, Marko Pavlyshyn persuasively states his caveat against the novel:

How should one evaluate the novel? It would be easy to take refuge in what is probably the most popular silent assumption of literary criticism: those works are good which are complex and erudite, and whose interpretation stimulates the critic to engage in a multitude of reflections. According to these criteria *Ja, Bohdan* is undoubtedly an important and valuable work. But to the reader who is used to the cultural and literary traditions of the West, the work will appear too dull and too slow. Its style and structure are masterly mannered, but the entire tone is solemnly serious, without the slightest playfulness, irony, or self-parody. The content offers nothing unexpected or novel. There are too few open problems that could lead to a wide discussion. All of the main questions have already received their definitive answers outside literature, and the novel serves only to elucidate them. True, this ritual apologia is performed with great skill. But it is a feature of medieval hagiography, not of the modern novel.¹⁹⁵

In 1988 Zahrebel'nyj published a mildly controversial novel *Pivdennyj komfort* (Southern Comfort).

A writer whose great potential was only half-realized is Volodymyr Drozd (b. 1939). He is the author of two collections of short stories, *Maslyny* (Olives, 1967) and *Bilyj kin' Šeptalo* (The White Horse Sheptalo, 1969), and two novels, *Yrij* (Fantasy Land, 1974) and *Spektakl'* (A Spectacle, 1985). M. Žulyns'kyj described Drozd's contribution to Ukrainian literature when writing:

In the novels, novellas, and short stories of Volodymyr Drozd conscience is a kind of barometer that measures the pressure of the moral atmosphere of society, in a micro situation, in one's own awareness of the world, in one's thoughts, emotions, and actions. Conscience may be civic-minded and brave but it may also be helpless, it may capitulate before an irrepressible thirst for glory, well-being, blind careerism. Drozd meditates on the problems of bravery and the helplessness of conscience in his novellas *Balada pro Slastjona* and *Samotnij vovk*.... Volodymyr Drozd unmasked in an artistically original and civically uncompromising way widespread antisocial and amoral phenomena—opportunism, careerism, demagogic speculation in contemporary issues, and social parasitism. Using a form of monologue he “forced” the reality in the person of the narrator to condemn the appearance of “Slastionovism” to recreate the process of its upward rise and moral collapse. *Samotnij vovk* is permeated with the pathos of the dismemberment of the egocentric mentality and behavior of ... Andrij Šyšyha, who, through hypocrisy and opportunism, tries to reach the pinnacle of social well-being.¹⁹⁶

In the novel *Spektakl'* Drozd tries to analyze the career of a Soviet writer. According to Žulyns'kyj, “There are many features in the spiritual and moral conformism of the writer Jaroslav Petrunja. No doubt, if he could, Petrunja would look back at his past and categorically say to himself: ‘It was there and then that I chose the path of compromise with conscience for ephemeral fame, comfort, official prestige, and so lost my soul.’ ”¹⁹⁷ It would be unjust to regard this and other works of Drozd simply as a mirror of contemporary Soviet society with its positive and negative aspects. His strength lies in the polyphonic, whimsical and grotesque form that makes his novels truly modern. Perhaps, in the atmosphere of *glasnost* he will write a truly great novel—this is within his reach.

Jurij Mušketyk (b. 1929) is the author of several popular novels written in the traditional, non-experimental style. Among them are the historical novels *Semen Palij* (1954) and *Jasa* (Radiance, 1987), about the Zaporozhian *košovyj*

Ivan Sirko. Sometimes his works are written in direct response to Party policy—for example, *Serce i kamin'* (Heart and Stone, 1962), outlining the new agricultural policy—or to a problem that the Party presents for discussion—as in *Den' prolitaje nad namy* (Day Passes Over Us, 1967), about Soviet youth. *Žorstoke myloserdja* (Cruel Mercy, 1973) is about German fascism.

L. Fedorovs'ka wrote in 1982, "The ability to gain self-knowledge and a correct evaluation of oneself is according to the author, not some relative objective, but a guarantee of eternal constructive effort, the object of which is man himself. To create oneself does not mean to change one's soul basically, to orient one's inner 'I' to something quite different, it means to achieve one's own personal level, to learn to live a moral life."¹⁹⁸ Mušketyk's concept of morality is, of course, Soviet, permeated with the ideals of collectivism and optimism. This he reveals in his "village prose" piece, *Pozycja* (Position, 1982), which was awarded a prize. The novel *Vernysja v dim svij* (Return to Your Home, 1981) and many of his short stories are dedicated to this "moral search." Mušketyk is a sophisticated "socialist realist," forever sensitive to the latest twist and turn of the Party line.

There are several prose writers of the second rank, who have become prominent in the past two decades. Among them is Oles' Lupij (b. 1938), who made his literary debut as a poet. In his novels and short stories, full of cardboard characters—*Hran'* (The Edge, 1968), *Vidlunnja osinn'oho hromu* (The Echo of Autumn Thunder, 1976), *Nikomu tebe ne viddam* (I Won't Give You Back to Anyone, 1984)—he depicts life in his native Western Ukraine. Lupij has also written film scenarios. Nina Bičuja (b. 1937) is a talented prose writer also from Western Ukraine. Bičuja has written stories for children as well as a collection of prose, *Rodovid* (Lineage, 1984), and a "novel-essay" about Kuliš and Kurbas, *Desjat' sliv poeta* (Ten Words of a Poet, 1987).

Yet another well-known writer from Western Ukraine is Roman Fedoriv (b. 1930), the long-time editor of the Lviv journal *Žovten'* (October, now renamed *Dzvin*, The Bell). He is the author of several collections of short stories and the novels *Zban vyna* (A Pitcher of Wine, 1968), *Kamjane pole* (Stony Field, 1978), and *Žorna* (Millstones, 1983). Especially evocative of the Galician past is the "novel-essay" *Tanec' čuhajstra* (Čuhajster's Dance, 1984). Despite occasional journalistic sallies against Ukrainian émigrés, Fedoriv, in the words of critic V. Kačkan, "represents a movement into history, historical memory, and the historic roots of the people."¹⁹⁹

Stepan Pušyk (b. 1944) is a promising prose writer from Western Ukraine who wrote the short novel *Pero zolotoho ptaxa* (The Feather of a Golden Bird, 1978) and the historical "novel-essay" *Halyc'ka brama* (Galician Gate, 1988).

A Transcarpathian writer of some reputation is Ivan Čendej (b. 1922), author of many short stories and the novels *Ptaxy polyšajut' hnizda* (Birds Are Leaving Their Nests, 1965) and *Krynyčna voda* (Well Water, 1980). The

former novel attempts to show "how socialism came to a Transcarpathian village." M. Žulyns'kyj wrote that Čendej "revealed a need to preserve a harmonious balance between the past and the present, the present and the future in natural, spiritual terms."²⁰⁰

An original writer of great versatility is Volodymyr Javoriv's'kyj. As well as some short stories and journalism he wrote the novels *Ohljan'sja z oseni* (Turn Back from Autumn, 1979), *A teper idy* (Now, Go, 1983), *Avtoportret z ujavy* (An Imaginary Self-Portrait, 1984), and *Druhe pryšestija* (The Second Coming, 1986). His art is "generous in laughter, jokes, humor, parody, burlesque, and fantasy."²⁰¹

Serhij Plačynda (b.1928) is the author of *Kyjivs'ki fresky* (Kyivan Frescoes, 1982) and a novelistic biography of Jurij Janovs'kyj (1986). He is at present an activist in the Ukrainian ecological movement and a deputy in parliament.

The poets of the era of stagnation did less well than the prose writers. The reasons were openly described by A. Makarov in 1988: "Gross administrative intervention in the literary process, artificial limitations placed on freedom of creation, and ruthless interference by a whole army of officials in purely literary affairs during the period of stagnation forced the poets to be very cautious, to watch out for the man with the briefcase, and to come to terms with conformism in their environment."²⁰²

A prominent poet, who started her career in the 1960s, was Lina Kostenko, who had great difficulty with the censors in publishing her poems. Her historical novel in verse, *Marusja Čuraj*, appeared in 1979, but it was not acclaimed and awarded the Ševčenko prize until 1987. In 1980 she published a collection of poems *Nepovtornist'* (Not to Be Repeated), and in 1987, *Sad netanučyx skul'ptur* (The Garden of Unmelting Sculpture). Some of her poems (*Berestečko*), written in 1970, were published for the first time in the era of *glasnost*. Today, Kostenko is the undisputed reigning poet of Ukraine.

Platon Voron'ko (1913–88) was a Communist true believer who received many prizes for his collections of poems. Among them were *U svitli blyskavyc'* (In the Light of Lightning, 1968), *Zdvyh-zemlja* (Victorious Earth, 1976), and *Sovist' pamjati* (The Conscience of Memory, 1980). In his imitations of folk poetry he remained an eternal optimist.

Stepan Olijnyk (1908–82) was known for his satiric verses directed against idle peasants and foreign imperialists. Some of his barbs hit out at Soviet philistinism in defense of "Communist morality." A poet born in Western Ukraine, who sometimes attempted to go beyond "socialist realism," was Dmytro Pavlyčko (b. 1929). His early nonconformism was seen in his collection *Pravda klyče* (Truth Is Calling, 1957), which was banned. Subsequent collections in the 1960s and 1970s included some good sonnets in *Bili sonety* (The White Sonnets), *Kyjivs'ki sonety* (Kyivan Sonnets), and *Sonety podil's'koji oseni* (Sonnets of the Podillian

Autumn). *Istorija Ukrajins'koji Literatury* wrote he is concerned with "eternal problems: good and evil, love and hate, life and death, labor, creativity, and human happiness."²⁰³ Pavlyčko is also known as a translator. In the era of *glasnost* he has become one of the leaders of Rux (Movement for Reconstruction) and has left the Communist Party.

A more orthodox poet is Borys Olijnyk (b. 1935), author of the collection *Vybir* (Choice, 1965), *Vidlunnja* (Echo, 1970) and many others. He has also written poems about Lenin. In *Zaklynannja vohnju* (Incantation of Fire, 1978) he lashed out against the United States.

A poet of the first rank, who was incarcerated in the 1970s and died in a concentration camp in Perm oblast, was Vasyl' Stus (1938-85). As a martyr he has become a cult figure in Ukraine. Collections of his poems were published in the West: *Zymovi dereva* (Trees in Winter, 1970), *Sviča v svičadi* (A Candle in a Mirror, 1977), and *Palimpsesty* (Palimpsests, 1986). After 1989 many of his poems were published in Ukraine, and at this writing a complete edition of his poetry is in preparation. Born of anguish and suffering in the camps, his poetry is directed at his homeland. In the words of George Shevelov, it is "unprogrammable poetry ... which can endlessly vary around the same theme and normally remains lyrical. Its richness lies in the variety of experience and in its intensity."²⁰⁴ Another critic, B. Rubchak, pointed out that Stus's "prison poetry is permeated with Ševčenko's thoughts, his power, courage, and rebelliousness."²⁰⁵ The impact of Stus's poetry on the contemporary Ukrainian reader is very significant.

Several poets of the same generation—Holoborod'ko, Nečerda, Ruban, Žylenko, and others—had their best poems banned, censored, and mutilated. Another victim of the 1970s repression was the poet Mykola Rudenko (b. 1920). He was arrested in 1977 for founding the Ukrainian Helsinki Group. After serving a sentence in a camp he was allowed to emigrate to the United States, where most of his collections of poems were published. According to a critic, Rudenko's poetry, pedestrian at first, showed some "richness in cosmological and philosophical themes."²⁰⁶ He was also the author of a novel *Orlova balka* (Eagle's Valley, 1982).

Oles' Berdnyk (b. 1927) began as a science fiction writer and ended as a Christian mystic. He spent many years in a concentration camp. Outstanding among his many books are *Okocvit* (Eye-Flower, 1970), and *Zorjanyj korsar* (Stellar Corsair, 1971). Some of his *samvydav* works—for example, *Svjata Ukrajina* (Sacred Ukraine, 1980)—have been published in the West.

An original poet who avoided a brush with Soviet law was Pavlo Movčan (b. 1939), the author of the collections *Kora* (Bark, 1968), *Holos* (Voice, 1982), *Žolud'* (Acorn, 1983), *Porih* (Threshold, 1988), and *Sil'* (Salt, 1989). "The basic concepts of his poetic text," writes Ivan Dzjuba, "are movement, space and time—the prime elements of being. Concentration on these elements

is a mark of a philosophical poet."²⁰⁷ In the era of *glasnost* Movčan has become politically active. The short-lived but vital liberal currents allowed some young poets (Vasyl' Herasymjuk, Ivan Malkovyč, Taras Fedjuk, Vjačeslav Medvid') to appear in print for the first time. They were the forerunners of the so-called "eightiers" (*visimdesjatnyky*).

By 1985 literature in Ukraine showed signs of new life. The approaching political crisis was to some extent foreshadowed by the decay of some literary works showing the need for a revival of the literary process. A national renewal was just around the corner.

6.

WESTERN UKRAINE AND EMIGRATION, 1919–39

After the First World War some Ukrainian provinces remained outside Soviet Ukraine, under Polish, Czechoslovakian, and Romanian rule. Galicia, Volhynia, and Polissia came to be part of Poland; Transcarpathia, part of Czechoslovakia; and Bukovyna, part of Romania. In all these lands the development of Ukrainian language, education, and literature was hindered by various government measures. Yet, relatively speaking, these areas enjoyed greater creative freedom and an absence of direct political control. The most advanced in many respects was Galicia with its capital city of Lviv. Here, in the early 1920s, several literary groups sprang up.

A special place in Galician literature is occupied by those poets who were in the ranks of the Ukrainian *Sičovi Strilci*, the Ukrainian Sharpshooters. Lev Lepkyj, Roman Kupčyns'kyj, and others wrote poems that were often turned into songs. They were published in the journal *Šljaxy* (Pathways, 1915). Roman Kupčyns'kyj (1894–1976) was also the author of a prose trilogy, *Zametil'* (Snowstorm, 1928–30), and the humorous feuilletons that he published in *Dilo* (Deed) under the pen name Halaktijon Čipka. The long dramatic poem *Velykyj den'* (A Great Day, 1921) was less successful.

The modernist group Mytusa (the name of a legendary singer) was formed around the journal of that name published in 1922 and edited by Vasyl' Bobyns'kyj, who later emigrated to Soviet Ukraine. Apart from Bobyns'kyj, Škrumeljak, Holubeč, and Pidhirjanka, a prominent poet of the group was Oles' Babij (1897–1975), author of several collections of poems: *Nenavyst' i ljubov* (Hate and Love, 1921), *Hniv* (Anger, 1922), *Hucul's'kyj kurin'* (The Hucul Detachment, 1928), and erotic verses *Za ščastja omanuju* (Happiness Through Delusion, 1930). He gradually abandoned modernist verse in favor of patriotic poetry and prose. A remarkable anti-war novel *Poza mežamy bolju*

(Beyond the Limits of Pain, 1922), was written by Osyp Turjans'kyj (1880–1933).

Among the Galician writers in the 1920s were many Sovietophiles. They centered around the journals *Novi šljaxy* (New Pathways, 1929–32), *Krytyka* (1933), and *Vikna* (Windows, 1928–32). One of the foremost among them was Antin Krušel'nyč'kyj (1878–1935), whose major works appeared before the First World War and who came to the pro-Soviet camp via the nationalist route; he was a cabinet minister in the Ukrainian People's Republic. In 1934 he emigrated to Soviet Ukraine, only to be arrested a year later.

Jaroslav Halan (1902–49), who also belonged to a Sovietophile group Horno, was a journalist and pamphleteer rather than a serious writer. Among his plays are *Don Kixot z Etenhajma* (Don Quixote from Ettenheim, 1927) and 99% (1930). He was assassinated by a Ukrainian nationalist.

Stepan Tudor (1892–1941) was the author of the novels *Marija* (1930) and *Den' otcja Sojky* (The Day of Father Sojka, 1932–47), an anti-Vatican tirade. Oleksander Havryljuk (1911–41) wrote a short story, *Najivnyj muryn* (The Naive Black Man, 1930), and Petro Kozlanjuk (1904–65) was the author of the collection of short stories *Xlops'ki harazdy* (The Peasant Woes, 1927) and the trilogy *Jurko Kruk* (1934–56). On the whole, this group of writers left behind little of merit, except in journalism and satire.

To counter the Sovietophiles two nationalist groups of writers appeared, with a much larger following. The first of them was Lohos (Logos), the organization of Catholic writers (most Western Ukrainians were Greek-Catholics). Their leader was the critic Hryhorij Lužnyč'kyj (1903–90). From 1930 to 1939 works by members of Lohos were published by the journal *Dzvony* (Bells), edited by Mykola Hnatyšak and Petro Isajiv. This journal also published the works of the talented prose writer, Natalena Koroleva (1888–1966), who lived in Czechoslovakia. She wrote the historical prose works *Vo dni ony* (Once Upon a Time, 1935), *1313* (1935), and *Lehendy starokyjivs'ki* (Ancient Kyivan Legends, 1942–43). Her last novel, *Quid est Vevitas*, was republished in Kyiv in 1996 to much critical acclaim.

Works of the best poet of the entire generation, Bohdan Ihor Antonyč (1909–37), a native of the Lemko region, were also published in *Dzvony*. Antonyč's collections of poems were *Pryvitannja žyttja* (Greetings to Life, 1931), *Try persteni* (Three Rings, 1934), *Knyha Leva* (The Book of the Lion, 1936), *Zelena jevanhelija* (The Green Evangelium, 1938), and *Rotaciji* (Rotations, 1938). The imagist poetry of Antonyč is summed up by Bohdan Rubchak:

From his second book onward, Antonych was carefully orchestrating every collection by excluding much more material than he included. His selections were not motivated by quality alone, since some of the poems that were left out are obviously better than many of those which made it into the books. They were motivated by the

persona that Antonych was carefully constructing—the *persona* of the poet as Orpheus. The haunting poem “The Home Beyond a Star” is its crowning chord. This poem proclaims the unity of earth and horizon, of immediacy and distance, of transcendence and immanence. But above all it proclaims the unity of poetry and the world.²⁰⁸

The great beauty of Antonyč’s poems was instantly recognized by both critics and readers. After 1939, however, he was declared to be a “bourgeois nationalist” and his works were banned in Soviet Ukraine until 1967, when a collected edition was published in Kyiv. In the same year the collected works of Antonyč appeared in New York, and in 1966 in Bratislava. Now his reputation in Ukraine seems to be secure.

A group of poets with a decidedly nationalist orientation gathered around the journal *Visnyk* (The Herald, 1933–39), edited by a distinguished critic, the father of Ukrainian “integral nationalism,” Dmytro Doncov (1883–1973). The leading poet of this group, Jevhen Malanjuk (1897–1968) was born in Xerson province in eastern Ukraine and served as an officer in the army of the Ukrainian People’s Republic. He emigrated in 1920, and in the period between the wars lived mostly in Prague and Warsaw. His collections of poetry include *Stylet i stylos* (Stiletto and Stilo, 1925), *Herbarij* (Herbarium, 1926), *Zemlja i zalizo* (Earth and Steel, 1930), *Zemna Madonna* (The Earthly Madonna, 1934), and *Persten’ Polikrata* (The Ring of Polycrates, 1939).

Even in his first collection, *Stylet i stylos*, Malanjuk threw down the gauntlet to everything coming from Russia and to everything weak and feeble in the Ukrainian psyche. He contrasted the strength, manliness, and will of the Ukrainians with their weaknesses, their love of singing, their mawkishness and love of peace, comparing these characteristics to Rome on the one hand to Greece on the other. The poet must [according to him] form his nation, building in the hearts of his readers a firm and uncompromising national consciousness.... Yet a poet of Malanjuk’s stature would not do so by being merely a fighter, a builder, or an ideologue. He must also talk of the universal, that is, of the personal. Malanjuk is conscious of this Janus-like bifurcation and sometimes mentions it in his works. At a time when the poet as a tribune must be strong, proud, and dedicated to his ideal—the poet as human being is conscious of his solitude, his helplessness in the face of the universe.²⁰⁹

Malanjuk continued writing during the second emigration to the United States. A writer who regularly contributed to *Visnyk* but who lived in Germany was the old neoclassicist Jurij Klen (pseudonym of Osval'd Burkhardt, 1891–1947). In 1937 he published a long poem *Prokljati roky* (The Cursed Years). He continued to write after the Second World War.

Bohdan Kravciv (1904–75), who belonged to a secret organization of Ukrainian nationalists, lived in Lviv and was a member of the *Visnyk* group. His collections of poems were *Doroha* (The Way, 1929), *Promeni* (Sun Rays, 1930), and *Sonety i strofy* (Sonnets and Stanzas, 1933). “Kravciv’s first two collections are neoromantic. Artistically he comes close to the poetry of Vlyz’ko, Janovs’kyj, and the early Ryl’s’kyj. These works are full of optimism, a desire to travel, a longing for distant exotic lands. One can see here the ‘vitaism’ of Soviet poetry of the 1920s and 1930s on the one hand, and the optimism, voluntarism, and some formal features of the Visnykists, like Malanjuk, on the other.”²¹⁰ In his third collection Kravciv emerged as an accomplished neoclassicist. After the war he continued his career in the United States.

A scholarly young archeologist who became a distinguished poet, ideologically close to *Visnyk*, was Oleh Ol’žyč (1908–44). Son of the modernist poet Oles’, he lived in Prague and later became one of the leaders of the Ukrainian nationalist underground. His collections of verse are *Rin’* (Gravel, 1935), *Veži* (Towers, 1940), and *Pidzamča* (1946). In his poetry “purely romantic themes, permeated by heavy symbolism, are curbed by the frame of the classical form. His best poems tell of mankind’s past, of the prehistory and early history of Western civilization.”²¹¹ In 1944 Ol’žyč was tortured to death by the Nazis. Today he is a cult figure in Ukraine.

Ol’žyč’s tragic fate was shared by another talented poet, Olena Teliha (1907–42), who lived in Prague and Warsaw and contributed to *Visnyk*. She was shot by the Germans. A collection of her verse, *Duša na storožy* (A Soul on Guard), was published posthumously in 1946. Teliha, whose poetry is a strange mixture of nationalist fervor and feminine emotion, is now being idolized.

A poet of great stature, who lived in Prague but was published by *Visnyk*, was Oleksa Stefanovyč (1899–1970). His collections are *Poeziji* (Poems, 1927) and *Stephanos I* (1938). “All Stefanovyč’s works demonstrate the great range of his talent, the wide horizons of his scanty *oeuvre*, underlined by sharp contrasts. The flowering and ripening of nature is opposed to a world-destroying desert. There is the richness, full-bloodedness, and eroticism of life, as well as the bony, Holbein-like dances of death. There are hymns to a woman’s body and clear mystical visions.”²¹²

Among those poets who emigrated to Central Europe there was, for a while, a “Prague school.” A prominent member of this group, besides Teliha and others,

was Jurij Darahan (1894–1926), the author of a single collection, *Sahajdak* (A Quiver, 1925). A leading star, who was also a talented sculptor, was Oksana Ljaturyns'ka (1902–70). Her collections of poetry were *Husla* (Psaltery, 1938) and *Knjaža emal'* (Princely Enamel, 1941). A superb craftsman, Ju. Ševel'ov wrote Ljaturyns'ka had a vision “of an ancient separateness of Ukrainian spirituality, which showed itself best in folk art and which she believed must be preserved at all costs. Ljaturyns'ka saw this spirituality as ‘pantheism’, an ideal world view, the search for eternal values, rooted in one’s own soul, which create a new world.”²¹³

A Prague poet who followed a “lyric-Epicurean” philosophy was Mykola Čyrs'kyj (1903–42), the author of the collection *Emal'* (Enamel, 1941). Lavro Myronjuk (1887–?) was a very talented émigré poet who met a tragic fate. He spent most of his time in mental hospitals in Prague and Vienna. He did not publish a collection of verse, and most of his poems that have survived were saved by his friends. Many of his themes are religious, and his metaphors are very forceful and sometimes surrealist. Some critics compare him to Kafka.

Another center of émigré writers was Warsaw. Here Jurij Lypa (1900–44) formed the group called Tank. A physician and an amateur scholar, Lypa left three collections of poetry: *Svitlist'* (Radiance, 1925), *Suvorist'* (Sternness, 1931), and *Viruju* (Credo, 1938). He is an original poet, but his main achievement lies in his prose: the novel *Kozaky v Moskoviji* (Cossacks in Muscovy, 1934), short stories in *Notatnyk* (Sketchbook, 1936–37), and essays *Bij za ukrajins'ku literaturu* (The Battle of Ukrainian Literature, 1935) and *Pryznačennja Ukrajiny* (Ukraine's Destiny, 1938). In his prose works Lypa preached integral nationalism with racial overtones. He was tortured to death by the Communists.

The leading poet of the Warsaw group was Natalija Livyc'ka-Xolodna (b. 1902), the author of masterly erotic poems in *Vohon' i popil* (Fire and Ashes, 1934) and patriotic verse in *Sim liter* (Seven Letters, 1937). In the 1930s she belonged to a group called My (We) in Warsaw, which centered around the magazine of that name. Livyc'ka-Xolodna reached the apogee of her fame as a poet in her old age in the United States.

A literary magazine published in the 1930s in Lviv, *Nazustrič* (Encounter), provided a platform for some Galician writers. The leading theoretician of the group was the brilliant literary critic Myxajlo Rudnyc'kyj (1889–1975), the author of poems, *Oči ta usta* (Eyes and Mouth, 1932); of short stories, *Nahody i pryhody* (Occasions and Adventures, 1929); and of essays, *Vid Myrnoho do Xvyl'ovoho* (Between Myrnyj and Xvyl'ovyj, 1936). The best poet in the group was Svjatoslav Hordyns'kyj (1906–93). Hordyns'kyj was the prolific author of the collections *Barvy i liniji* (Colors and Lines, 1933), *Buruny* (Storms, 1936), *Slova na kamenjax* (Words on Stones, 1937), *Viter nad poljamy* (Wind over the Fields, 1938), *Lehendy hir* (Legends About Mountains, 1939), and *Sim lit* (Seven

Years, 1939). The editors of *Koordynaty* wrote of Hordyns'kyj's style by stating, "In Hordyns'kyj's poetry one can see, on the one hand, great erudition and, on the other, wide interests. In other words he is an eclectic poet. We find in his rich poetry several types crossing and separating, but never merging. It is, therefore, difficult to talk about his creations as a complete monolithic poetic world."²¹⁴ Hordyns'kyj, an accomplished painter, was also known as a translator and an amateur scholar.

Jurij Kosač (1909–90) was an original talent in prose, poetry, and drama. He lived in Warsaw and Paris. His collections of poems were *Čerlen'* (Redness, 1935) and *Myt' z majstrom* (A Moment with the Master, 1936). There were also collections of novellas—*Sonce sxodyt' v Čyhyryni* (The Sun Rises in Čyhyryn, 1934) and *Dyvymos' v oči smerti* (We Look Death in the Eyes, 1936)—and short stories—*Čarivna Ukrajina* (Enchanting Ukraine, 1937) and *Klubok Arijadny* (Ariadne's Knot, 1937). According to *Koordynaty*, "Jurij Kosač is a versatile writer. His works, in many genres, are permeated with his restless personality and a colorful, though sometimes journalistic, style. Yet often he leaves his work unfinished and displays too many literary influences. As a result, his achievement, although sometimes brilliant, is rather uneven."²¹⁵

The most promising novelist in Galicia in the 1930s was Ulas Samčuk (1905–88), the author of a trilogy, *Volyn'* (Volhynia, 1932–37). The work according to B. Kravciv, "portrayed the collective image of a young Ukrainian at the end of the 1920s and the beginning of the 1930s, who is trying to find a place for Ukraine in the world and for her cultural and national development."²¹⁶ Samčuk's other novels were *Kulak* (The Fist, 1932), *Marija* (1934), and *Hory hovorjat'* (The Mountains Are Speaking, 1934). His career as a novelist continued less successfully after 1946.

Leonid Mosendz (1897–1948) was a chemist by profession and lived in Czechoslovakia. He was a minor poet, author of the collection *Zodijak* (1941), and also wrote a short novel *Zasiv* (Sowing, 1936). His major novel appeared later. The modernist novelist Bohdan Lepkyj (see earlier chapter) was very popular in Galicia through his historical fiction. Other historical novelists published in Galicia during this period were Andrij Čajkovs'kyj (1857–1935), Osyp Nazaruk (1883–1940), and Julijan Opil's'kyj (1884–1937). Especially noteworthy are Nazaruk's novels *Roksoljana* (1930) and *Jaroslav Os'momysl* (1920), and Opil's'kyj's *Idu na vas* (I March Against You, 1918). Another historical novelist, Katrja Hrynevčeva (1875–1947), was the author of *Šolomy v sonci* (Helmets Under the Sun, 1929). The prose writer Halyna Žurba (1888–1979) began her literary career in the pre-revolutionary *Ukrajins'ka xata*. She wrote the novels *Zori svit zapovidajut'* (Stars Announce a Dawn, 1933) and *Revoljucija ide* (A Revolution Is Coming, 1937), and in 1975 her engaging autobiography was published.

To sum up, one can say that in the period between the wars Ukrainian writers west of the river Zbruč were less productive but more fortunate than those in Soviet Ukraine. The region produced one truly major poet, Antonyč, but lagged behind Soviet Ukraine in innovative prose. The stamp of emigration, with its nostalgia for and idealization of Ukraine, was a characteristic of the work of many writers in Prague and Warsaw, overshadowing whatever contacts they might have had with Central and Western Europe—for they kept in touch with Paris, Berlin, and Rome, not to mention Vienna. Most Western Ukrainian writers, with the exception of Sovietophiles, were nationalist and anti-Communist in their ideology. There were frequent crossings of swords with their Soviet counterparts: Malanuk versus Sosjura, Doncov and Xvyl'ovyj. The future of "greater Ukraine" moved their feelings more than anything else and often outweighed artistic considerations. It all came to an abrupt end in 1939, with the incorporation of Western Ukraine into the U.S.S.R. Only the émigré writers, now strengthened by the influx of new refugees from Soviet occupation, defiantly continued their isolation from their native land.

7.

THE SECOND EMIGRATION AND DIASPORA, 1945–90

World War II brought untold suffering to the Ukrainian people. Their territory and population were ravaged by both the Wehrmacht and the Red Army. Politically and militarily Ukrainian resistance to German and Russian occupation showed itself in partisan warfare (UPA). With the exception of some significant insurgent poetry, throughout the hostilities literature remained silent about the war-torn territories.

After the war, in 1945, a group of Ukrainian refugees formed an organization called *Mystec'kyj ukrajins'kyj rux* (MUR), in Fuerth, Germany. It was headed by Ulas Samčuk, with Jurij Šerex (the pseudonym of George Y. Shevelov) as his deputy. The organization held three conventions and published three MUR collections. According to the chief ideologist of MUR, Jurij Šerex, "the initiators of MUR thought that the path to world recognition lay solely in the unique, organic, and inimitable originality of Ukrainian literature. Hence came its declaration to serve, in an accomplished form, its people and thereby win authority in world art."²¹⁷

At the same time, members of MUR tried to steer clear of émigré politics. Their concept of a national literature with its own style has been sharply attacked recently by G. Grabowicz.²¹⁸ Yet it is possible to point to solid literary achievements of MUR in the short period of 1945–49. In prose, Jurij Kosač

contributed a historical novel *Den' hnivu* (The Day of Anger, 1948); Dokija Humenna (b. 1904–96) wrote a trilogy, *Dity šumac'koho šljaxu* (Children of the Milky Way, 1948–51); Leonid Lyman (b. 1922) published excerpts from a novel, *Povist' pro Xarkiv* (A Tale About Kharkiv, English translation 1958); Ivan Bahrjanyj (1907–63) offered a successful novel of adventure, *Tyhrolovy* (The Hunters and the Hunted, 1946; English translation 1954); Viktor Domontovych produced a long story *Doktor Serafikus* (1947), as well as a superb modernistic novel *Bez gruntu* (Rootless, 1948); and Ulas Samčuk published an autobiographical novel *Junist' Vasylja Šeremety* (The Youth of Vasył Šeremeta, 1946–47). Samčuk's novel about the great famine, *Temnota* (Darkness, 1957), was published in the United States. In the field of drama, *Dijstvo pro Jurija peremožcja* (A Play About Jurij the Conqueror, 1947) by Kosač and *Blyznjata šče zustrinut'sja* (The Twins Will Meet Again, 1948) and *Dijstvo pro velyku ljudynu* (A Play About a Great Man, 1948) by Ihor Kostec'kyj (1913–83) should be mentioned. Kostec'kyj's plays are very innovative.

The DP (Displaced Persons) poets were especially active. Older ex-Soviet poets wrote some fine works: for example, *Poet* (The Poet, 1947) by Todos' Os'mačka and *Popil imperij* (Ashes of Empires, 1946) by Jurij Klen. Klen also wrote a short book of memoirs, *Spohady pro neokljasykiv* (Memories of the Neoclassicists, 1947). A major new poet, Vasył' Barka (b. 1908), emerged among the refugees from Eastern Ukraine. As a DP he published two collections of poems: *Apostoly* (The Apostles, 1946) and *Bilyj svit* (A White World, 1947). B. Bojčuk and B. Rubcak described Barka's poetry: "Barka's *Weltanschauung* is based on two traditions: an ascetic, Slavic, and beneficent, biblical religion on the one hand, and a sensual love for the colorful riches of life, perhaps originating in folklore, on the other."²¹⁹

Another newcomer, the brother of Mykola Zerov, was Myxajlo Orest (1901–63), author of the collection of poems *Duša i doljac* Soul and Fate, 1946). Ivan Bahrjanyj published the collection of poems *Zolotyj bumerang* (The Golden Boomerang, 1946) and Bohdan Nyžankivs'kyj (1909–86) the collection *Šedrist'* (Generosity, 1947). Ostap Tarnavs'kyj (1917–93) produced *Slova i mriji* (Words and Dreams, 1948), Ihor Kačurovs'kyj (b. 1918) wrote the collection *Nad svitlym džerelom* (On the Bright Water Well, 1948) and Jar Slavutyč (b. 1918) wrote *Homin vikiv* (The Echo of Centuries, 1946). Oleh Zujevs'kyj (1920–96) was the author of *Zoloti vorota* (The Golden Gate, 1947), Myxailo Sytnyk (1920–59) of *Vidlitajut' ptyci* (The Birds Are Flying Off, 1946), and Leonid Poltava of *Žovti karuseli* (Yellow Carousels, 1948). Bohdan Kravciv's selected poems were entitled *Korabli* (Ships, 1948).

By 1949 MUR had stopped functioning. A new emigration, beyond the Atlantic, awaited most of the DP writers. They must, therefore, be judged as émigrés who preserved some of the best traditions of Ukrainian literature and often looked back rather than ahead.

Before we leave the European scene and follow the émigrés to the United States and Canada, where most of them were destined to live, it is necessary to glance at that part of the Ukrainian territory that had remained outside the Soviet Ukraine—the Presov region of Eastern Slovakia. After 1945 this area underwent gradual Ukrainization, leaving behind both Russian and Rusyn literary and linguistic influences. In 1951, by Party decree, Ukrainian was introduced into Transcarpathian schools in Slovakia as the language of instruction. About the same time new literary magazines were founded, among them *Duklja* (a quarterly after 1953, a bimonthly after 1966). Literary life was enlivened by the so-called Prague Spring, when the literary movement was led by a talented critic and scholar, Orest Zilyns'kyj (1923–76). After the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 this momentum was lost.

Several poets in Transcarpathia deserve to be mentioned. Vasyl' Grendža-Dons'kyj (1897–1974) started writing poetry in the 1920s. Among his very traditional collections are *Šljaxom ternovym* (Along a Thorny Path, 1924–64) and *Misjačni hruni* (The Moon's Hills, 1969). He also wrote plays and novels. Fedir Lazoryk (b. 1913) was the author of *Slovo hnanyx i holodnyx* (The Word of the Hungry and Persecuted, 1949). Ivan Macyns'kyj (1922–87), whose first work had been in Russian, published *Prystritnyky* (Encounters, 1968). Jurij Bača (b. 1932) was imprisoned following the invasion of 1968. The most promising poet of the younger generation was Stepan Hostynjak (b. 1941), the author of *Proponuju vam svoju dorohu* (I Propose My Way to You, 1965) and several other collections.

Among the prominent Transcarpathian prose writers were Vasyl' Zozuljak (b. 1909), the author of the epic trilogy *Neskoreni* (Unconquered, 1962–73), Myxailo Šmajda (b. 1920), the author of *Triškat' kryhy* (The Ice Is Breaking, 1958), and Jeva Biss (b. 1921), whose short stories were collected in *Sto sim modnyx začisok* (One Hundred and Seven Modern Hairdos, 1967) and *Apartment z viknom na holovnu vulycju* (Apartment with a Window Facing Main Street, 1969). Orest Zilyns'kyj commented on her work:

Nevertheless this is prose in which the central place is occupied not by the story line, not by the narration of events, but by the creative discovery of the inner world of the protagonists.... There is an interest in the social topic, a meaningful, well-developed story, and a desire to unravel the wider contexts of reality. Firstly, she enlarges the thematic sphere, successfully showing the life of the pre- and post-war intelligentsia; secondly, she gives this a new psychological dimension, raising the common human images to a common denominator of important moral ideas.²²⁰

Other prose writers from Transcarpathia were Vasyl' Dacej (b. 1936) and Josyp Selepec' (b. 1938). No outstanding playwrights came from that region.

The shores of the New World proved hospitable to the second wave of émigré writers. They dispersed across the North American continent and settled in cities, chiefly New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, Montreal, Toronto, and Winnipeg. Although they eked out a modest existence (they were used to that), they found the time to write and to publish. They clung to familiar themes and continued their writing careers undisturbed. Some were past their prime, but others achieved new fulfillment. Like most émigré writers of other nationalities, Ukrainian poets and prose writers, living in an "encapsulated community," were little affected by their new North American cultural milieu which to them remained very much Ukrainian. Only a little later did the situation alter.

The doyen of émigré poets, Jevhen Malanjuk, published several collections of poetry—*Vlada* (Power, 1951), *Ostannja vesna* (The Last Spring, 1959), and *Serpen'* (August, 1964)—as well as two volumes of incisive essays, *Knyha sposterežen'* (A Book of Observations, 1962–66). In his poems the old apocalyptic vision of Ukraine remained unaltered. His pamphlets on Little-Russianism, Bolshevism, and Mazepa are full of stimulating ideas.

Bohdan Kravciv published two collections of verse, with untranslatable titles, in the United States: *Zymozelen'* (1951) and *Dzvenyslava* (1962). His collected works in two volumes appeared in New York in 1968–70. The poems of the prolific Vasyl' Barka appeared in several collections: *Okean* (The Ocean, 1959), and *Lirnyk* (The Lyre Player, 1968). He also wrote prose—*Žovtyj knjaz'* (The Yellow Prince, 1963) about the great famine (translated in 1981 into French). A monumental four-volume cycle of poems, *Svidok* (Witness) was published in 1981. Strikingly different from the rather conventional poets of the diaspora was Zinovij Berežan (1920–68), a professional physician (and an accomplished bandurist), whose posthumously published poems appeared in a small edition of the collection *Na okrajinax noči* (On the Edges of Night, 1977).

Todos' Os'mačka wrote a novel about the collectivization of agriculture, *Plan do dvoru* (A Plan for the Court, 1951), and a collection of short stories, *Rotonda dušohubciv* (A Rotunda of Murderers, 1956). He also translated Shakespeare and Oscar Wilde. Leonid Mosendz's greatest work, his novel dealing with Hebrew history, *Ostannij prorok* (The Last Prophet, 1960), was published posthumously.

Ivan Bahrjanyj, who remained in Western Europe, published in 1950 a novel about a Soviet prison, *Sad hetsymans'kyj* (The Orchard of Gethsemane, which appeared in a French translation and was also republished in Ukraine in 1990). Ihor Kačurovs'kyj, who also stayed in Europe, wrote some excellent

prose: *Šljax nevidomoho* (The Path of the Unknown One, 1956), *Dim nad kručeju* (The House on the Cliff, 1966), as well as some translations.

Oleh Zujevs'kyj, who emigrated to the United States and later to Canada, issued the collection of poems *Pid znakom Feniksa* (Under the Sign of the Phoenix, 1958). He is a translator of Emily Dickinson, Rilke, Mallarmé, and Stefan George. Jar Slavutyč published his collected poems *Trofeji* (Trophies, 1963) in Canada. He also translated Keats. Oleksa Veretenčenko wrote two collections of poems: *Dym vičnosti* (The Eternal Fire, 1951) and *Čorna dolyna* (Black Valley, 1953). Natalija Livyc'ka-Xolodna went to the United States, where she published a volume of late poems, *Poeziji stari i novi* (Poems Old and New, 1986), which drew praise from George Shevelov.

Jurij Kosač, living in New York, joined a Sovietophile circle. He continued to publish some good prose, such as the historical novels, *Volodarka Pontydy* (Regina Pontica, 1987), *Suzirja lebedja* (The Constellation of the Swan, 1983), and *Čortivs'ka skelja* (The Devil's Rock, 1988). Another prose writer, Ulas Samčuk, published a book of war memoirs, *Pjat' po dvanadcjatyj* (Five Past Twelve, 1954), and two somewhat less successful novels, *Na tverdi zemli* (No Solid Land, 1968), and *Čoho ne hojit' vohon'* (What Fire Doesn't Heal, 1959). The old émigrés were showing some signs of exhaustion. Most valuable, however, were the collected editions of such writers as Klen, Kravciv, and Ljaturyns'ka.

A new generation of poets, born in Europe in the late 1920s and 1930s but hardly classifiable as émigrés, came to the fore in the United States in the late 1950s and the 1960s. Their works differed radically in style and structure from those of their predecessors. Their experience was of the New World, with only an occasional echo of the homeland. Some of them formed the so-called New York Group of Poets and published their works under the group's auspices as well as in the journal *Novi poeziji* (New Poems). Among the founders of the group, which had no organizational structure, were Emma Andijevs'ka, Bohdan Bojčuk, Patricia Kilina, Bohdan Rubčak, Jurij Tarnavs'kyj, Ženja Vasyl'kivs'ka, and Vira Vovk. They were united "by a common desire for renewal in literary expression. All the members of the New York Group had their own individual interests and each created in his own way, without any obligation to adhere to a program."²²¹ The innovation that the group brought to Ukrainian literature was not only linguistic but ideological. They downgraded provincialism and opened up new vistas to the outside world.

The most avant-garde writer in the New York Group, who later lived in West Germany, was Emma Andijevs'ka (b. 1931). Her first poems were greeted with both great approval and severe disapproval. Her publications are *Narodžennja idola* (Birth of an Idol, 1958), *Ryba i rozmir* (Fish and Measurement, 1961), *Pervni* (Elements, 1964), *Bazar* (Market Place, 1967), *Pisni bez tekstu* (Songs Without Text, 1968), *Nauka pro zemlju* (Earth Sciences, 1975), and *Vigiliji* (Vigils, 1987). An early critic noted that "Andijevs'ka has created

a world of her own ... a world that is rarely beautiful and moving. As with children's painting one can apply to her Cvjetajeva's words about Pasternak: a complete opening—only an opening into a different world and under a different sky than Pasternak.... The world and the sky reveal themselves to Andijevs'ka as unique; her poetry is international or, if you will, universal."²²² Andijevs'ka's great originality in the use of language and poetic structure is not limited to her poetry. Her novels, notably *Herostraty* (Herostratoses, 1971), *Roman pro dobru ljudynu* (A Novel About a Good Person, 1973), and *Roman pro ljuds'ke pryznačennja* (A Novel About Human Destiny, 1982), have won critical acclaim.

Ženja Vasyľkivs'ka (b. 1929) published a single collection of verse *Korotki viddali* (Short Distances, 1959). Patricia Kilina (b. 1936), of non-Ukrainian origin, learned the language well enough to write three collections of verse: *Trahedija džmeliv* (Tragedy of the Bumblebees, 1960), *Lehendy i sny* (Legends and Dreams, 1964), and *Roževi mista* (Pink Cities, 1969). Her philosophical poetry is very different from that of Vira Vovk (b. 1926), a professional linguist and professor of literature in Rio de Janeiro. Vovk's collections include *Čorni akaciji* (Black Acacias, 1961), *Ljubovni lysty knjažny Veroniky do kardynala Džovanni Batisty* (Love Letters of Princess Veronica to Cardinal Giovanni Battista, 1967), and *Kappa Xresta* (Kappa Crucis, 1969). She has also written Ukrainian and Portuguese poems in *Mandala* (1980), *Tryptyx* (Triptico, 1982), and *Svjatyj haj* (Bosque Sagrado, 1983), and the prose works *Duxy i derviši* (Ghosts and Dervishes, 1956) and *Vitraži* (Stained Glass Windows, 1961). Vovk is a very prolific writer and translator. In many of her works—for example, *Ikonostas Ukraïny* (The Iconostasis of Ukraine, 1988)—she shows her abiding interest in her native land.

The leading poets among the men of the group were Bohdan Bojčuk, Bohdan Rubčak, and Jurij Tarnavs'kyj. Bojčuk (b. 1927) is the author of *Čas bolju* (A Time of Pain, 1957), *Spomyny ljubovy* (Memories of Love, 1963), *Virši dlja Mexiko* (Verses for Mexico, 1964), *Mandrivka til* (Journey of Bodies, 1967), *Virši vybrani i peredostanni* (Poems Selected and Next to Last, 1983), and a long poem, *Podorož z učytelem* (Journey with a Teacher, 1976). His plays *Dvi dramy* (Two Dramas, 1968) consist of *Holod-1933* (Famine-1933) and *Pryrebeni* (Doomed). A selection of his poetry in English translation, *Memories of Love*, was published in 1989.

An original talent in poetry was shown by Bohdan Rubčak (b. 1935), whose collections are *Promenysta zrada* (Bright Betrayal, 1960), *Divčyni bez krajiny* (To a Girl Without a Country, 1963), *Osobysta Klio* (A Personal Clio, 1967), and *Krylo Ikarove* (The Wing of Icarus, 1983). In 1989 a Soviet Ukrainian magazine (*Žovten*) published a selection of Rubčak's poetry, with the following appreciation, stressing the poet's "ability to preserve his spiritual core, his roots among many cultural influences.... The hero of Rubčak's poetry is a man

of contemporary urban culture, in a world of a hundred mirrors, the 'dove-colored sky' of the street, not the 'blue sky of the spring,' full of nostalgia, capable of resurrecting 'the miracle of forgotten deities,' to enliven the old roots of Slavic mythology, the indestructible elements of family and people."²²³

Jurij Tarnavs'kyj (b. 1934), a scientist by profession, is the author of *Žyttja v misti* (Life in a City, 1956), *Popoludni v Pokipsi* (Afternoon in Poughkeepsie, 1960), *Idealizovana biohrafija* (An Idealized Biography, 1964), *Bez Espaniji* (Without Spain, 1969), and the short novel *Šljaxy* (Pathways, 1961). "Of the entire New York Group Jurij Tarnavs'kyj has, perhaps, the fewest forerunners, especially in Ukrainian or general Slavic literature. Ukrainians have in him not only a very talented poet, but also an envoy to the modern congress of poets, who often create in two languages and consciously reject any peculiarities determined by their national roots." In 1970 Tarnavs'kyj published his collected poems in one volume, *Poeziji pro niščo i inši poeziji na cju samu temu* (Poems About Nothing and Other Poems on the Same Subject). His English novel *Meningitis* appeared in 1978. Recently he published another novel in English.

Outside the New York Group the following contemporary poets deserve to be mentioned: Marta Kalytovs'ka (1916–90), Jurij Kolomyjec' (b. 1930), and Lida Palij (b. 1926), who has recently received the Tyčyna award in Kyiv. Some excellent poetry continues to come from the pen of Oleh Zujevs'kyj.

The least developed literature in the diaspora is in Australia, where an older prose writer, Dmytro Nyčenko (pseudonym Čub, b. 1905) and the satirical poet Zoja Kohut (b. 1925) have published their work.

The post-modernist era has not yet produced any outstanding writers in the diaspora. A host of young men and women continue to write and publish quasi-modernist poems, some in English but most in Ukrainian. In the latest wave of Ukrainian writers in the diaspora the following have made a name for themselves: Roman Baboval (b. 1950 in Belgium), the author of *Podorož poza formy* (Travel Beyond Forms, 1972), *Nišni perekazy* (Evening Legends, 1987), and *Pamjat' fragmentarna* (Fragmentary Memory, 1994); Marija Revakovyč (b. 1960 in Poland, now in the United States), the author of *Z miška mandrivnyka* (From a Traveler's Bag, 1987) and *Šepotinnja, šepotinnja* (Whispering, Whispering, 1989); Myxajlo Myxajljuk (b. 1946 in Romania), author of the novel *Ne vir kryku niščoho ptaxa* (Don't Trust the Call of the Night Bird, 1981); Ivan Kovač (b. 1946 in Romania), author of *Žyttja bez komy* (Life Without a Coma, 1986); Mykola Korsjuk (b. 1950 in Romania), author of a collection of short stories *Čužyj bil'* (Alien Pain, 1985); Tadej Karabovyč (b. 1959 in Poland), author of *Volohist' zemli* (Dampness of the Soil, 1986); and Jurij Havryljuk (b. 1964 in Poland), author of *Neherboviji genealohiji* (Genealogies Without a Crest, 1988). A special place in the diaspora is held by a Soviet Ukrainian immigrant to Germany, Mojsej Fišbejn (b. 1946), author of *Zbirka bez nazvy* (Without a Title, 1984). So far, nothing truly outstanding has been written in Australia, with the exception of the memoirs

of Nytchenko. In Canada several published authors of Ukrainian descent—among them Myrna Kostash, Ted Galay, and Andrew Suknaski—are writing in English. In the United States, Askold Melnyczuk's novel *What Is Told* (1994) was praised by the *New York Times*.

The existence of the New York Group purified Ukrainian literature. Questions have been raised about parallel literary developments in Ukraine and the diaspora. There are few similarities except for the general striving here and there to rediscover the function of poetry. Since 1988 many poets of the diaspora have been published in Ukraine. This is more than a symbolic gesture of cultural unity. It is an acknowledgment of the end of the enforced isolation of Soviet Ukrainian literature and its re-admission to a European home. Despite some political and economic uncertainties in Ukraine the future of Ukrainian literature seems at the moment assured. It has received much help from the emigration and the diaspora.

8.

THE ERA OF GLASNOST, 1987-90

The literary developments of that era must, once more, be seen in the light of the political events that had transformed Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The engineer of these changes was Mikhail Gorbachev, who came to power in 1985. Two years later, in announcing his plan of *perestrojka*, restructuring, and *glasnost*, openness, he declared: "I agree that there should be no forgotten names or blank spots in either history or literature. Otherwise, what we have is not history or literature but artificial, opportunistic constructs."²²⁴ This quotation was seized upon in Ukraine and indeed in the entire Soviet Union by those who wanted to restore "forgotten names" and fill the "blank spots" in literature. Gradually it has led to the widespread, almost complete rehabilitation of those writers who perished in the 1930s. In Ukraine it has meant the restoration of hundreds of names, this time including Mykola Xvyl'ovyj, Valerijan Pidmohyl'nyj, Myxajlo Semenko, and many others who were still banned in the 1960s. The destruction of the Ukrainian intelligentsia in the 1930s has come to be viewed as similar in nature to the destruction of the Ukrainian peasantry in the man-made famine of 1932-33 in which seven million peasants were said to have perished.

One of the questions that was raised was just how many writers actually were destroyed. Unexpected help in estimating the losses came from a Russian source. In 1988, a Russian researcher, Eduard Beltov, published the results of his study of the purges of all Soviet writers; of these, "almost 500" came from Ukraine (see earlier chapter). Beltov's staggering figure may be a little inflated. My own research showed 254 writers as victims of the purges. Later,

in 1989, Mykola Žulyns'kyj gave the total approximate figure as 300.²²⁵ In 1989 *Literaturna Ukraïna* began publishing weekly listings and short biographies of the victims of repression. The grim task still continues today. It is to be followed by the republication of the banned works, if the supply of paper allows it.

Among the many republished or newly discovered works, some have particular human and intellectual rather than artistic interest. In this category are Sosjura's reminiscences, Xvyl'ovyj's article "Ukraïna ɛy Malorosija" (Ukraine or Little Russia), Hryhorij Kočur's publication of some early poems by Tyčyna, and letters from the Gulag by Zerov and Pidmohyl'nyj. Very little of value has come from the meager literature "for the drawer" (written but unpublished under Stalin and Brezhnev). The state of cultural deprivation is greater today in Ukraine than in Eastern Europe. It has not been relieved by the discovery of old losses. True, some memory and reverence for the European high culture has survived, ironically enough, just when this high culture is being questioned by political correctness in the free societies of the West.

In 1986, at the Congress of Writers, important ecological and national issues were debated in the wake of the Chornobyl disaster. At the end of 1987 an important conference was convened by the Academy of Sciences in Kyiv and the Ukrainian Writers' Union, setting out guidelines for the restoration of the literature of the 1920s and 1930s.²²⁶ The rehabilitation of writers has spread to the pre-Soviet period. Not only have the prominent writers of the nineteenth century—for example, Pantelejmon Kuliš and Borys Hrinčenko—been republished, but the Ukrainian modernists of the twentieth century, such as Oles' and Voronyj, have been returned to their readers as well. Literary scholars and critics have begun to rewrite the history of Ukrainian literature from a non-Soviet point of view. This is not always easy, but genuine attempts are being made at an objective evaluation. A history of Ukrainian literature in two volumes, published in 1988, was severely criticized for its old stereotypes. The first two volumes of the *Ukrainian Literary Encyclopedia*, in Ukrainian, (1988, 1990) contained many entries for writers hitherto banned as well as information on many émigré writers. These are good signs of a determined drive to re-evaluate the literature of the past. Unfortunately, the publication of the remaining volumes of the encyclopedia has been stalled by adverse economic conditions.

The years 1989 and 1990 saw intense political activity in Ukraine, in which many writers were involved. Ivan Drač, Dmytro Pavlyčko, Volodymyr Javorivs'kyj and others came to head the People's Movement in Ukraine for Restructuring, known as Rux, an umbrella organization of reform-minded and democratic individuals. The Ukrainian Helsinki Group, no longer underground, was part of it. Rux adopted an openly nationalist platform, espousing full Ukrainian sovereignty. In cultural matters it pleaded for the restoration of the Ukrainian heritage and for independence from Moscow. In some ways Rux's orientation was similar to that of

VAPLITE; a leader of Rux, Drač, admitted that he was following in the footsteps of Xvyl'ovyj.²²⁷ The fact that the political leadership of the reform movement was largely in the hands of writers bears a striking resemblance to the situation in 1917.

The new atmosphere of openness and free discussion has been very stimulating for the flow of new ideas, but less for creative writing. Many authors, busy with politics, had no time or desire to write. There is, therefore, a hiatus in literary creativity, which especially affects the older writers. Ukraine has never lacked poets, however, and some of the younger ones are full of promise. A new label—*visimdesjatnyky* (the eightiers)—has been attached to them, and they all seemed to share a bent towards the personal lyric. Without attempting to evaluate them, I list the following: Jurij Andrukhovych (b. 1960), Nataka Bilocerkev' (b. 1954), Pavlo Hirnyk (b. 1956), Oleksander Hrycenko (b. 1957), Viktor Kordun (b. 1946), Oleh Lyseha (b. 1949), Viktor Neborak (b. 1961), Oksana Paxlovs'ka (b. 1956), Mykola Rjabčuk (b. 1953), Volodymyr Cybul'ko (b. 1964), Oksana Zabužko (b. 1960), and above all, Ihor Rymaruk (b. 1958). Bohdan Rubčak, a perceptive critic, comments:

The younger poets of our time present a tremendous variety of styles, techniques, and thematic fields. One may even say that such variety is almost too dizzying. This is especially evident in the various critical texts—manifestos of sorts—where one direction seems to replace another almost as quickly as literary theories replace each other in the West. The young poet Nataka Bilocerkev', for example, assures us that the young poets who made their debuts in the mid 1980s are now hopelessly antiquated, to be presently replaced by a "new wave."²²⁸

Rubčak distinguishes the "philological" poets as well as the creators of the "poetry of statement," and ends with this observation: "It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that dozens of poems published in periodicals last year were devoted to the danger in which the Ukrainian language finds itself today. We have also seen strong passages, or entire poems, devoted to the hymning of the language as such. The language of poetry, in particular, is glorified as the only salvation in our world—the only love that will never betray."²²⁹

The following were the best collections of poetry at the time: *Ikar na metelykovyx krylax* (Icarus on the Wings of a Butterfly, 1990) by Vasyl' Holoborod'ko, *Pohuljanka odyncem* (Walking Alone, 1990) by Mykola Vorobjov, *Zemlja* (Earth, 1998) by Gennadij Moroz, *Dyrygent ostann'oji svičky* (The Conductor of the Last Candle, 1990) by Oksana Zabužko, and *Xymera* (Chimera, 1989) by Vasyl' Ruban. The poets Oleh Lyseha and Jurij Andrukhovych also wrote prose, and together with Jevhen Paškovs'kyj and Volodymyr Dibrova showed a

great deal of promise. According to critic Oksana Zabužko, "the unexpected appearance of new and maturing prose is a most interesting phenomenon, completely new in its artistic thought and view of the world."²³⁰

Of great benefit to Ukrainian literature was the recent publication in Ukraine of some émigré writers, hitherto denounced as "bourgeois nationalists." Among them were Jurij Klen, Jevhen Malanjuk, Oleh Ol'žyč, Olena Teliha, and many others. Many writers living and writing in the diaspora also appeared in print in Ukraine. The artificial "iron curtain" for decades dividing the homeland and the emigration has been torn down. Some Ukrainian scholars living in the West appeared in print in Soviet Ukrainian journals. Many Ukrainian writers have visited the United States and Canada. The Ukrainian chapter of PEN International included both Soviet Ukrainian and émigré writers.

Looking back at almost a century of Ukrainian literature, one is struck by the great changes, reflecting the political upheavals in the country. Unprotected by any national laws, constantly harassed by the police, with readership intimidated by the country's oppressors, the writers fought a defensive battle for survival. At times, during the Stalin era, it seemed that even survival was uncertain. The role that literature assumed, as it did in the nineteenth century, of protecting human and national rights, drew it away from artistic pursuits. Yet the modernists' call to serve "pure beauty" was never abandoned. There were always some writers who tried to follow that path. Many, however, were forced to write programmatic works that now seem valueless. The corruption of some of the most talented writers who had to serve the Communist Party was a sad testimony not so much to human frailty as to the effectiveness of terror. There is ample evidence that while some were subdued but not conquered, many prostituted their art in the service of an ideology. The ravages of this moral decay will not disappear quickly.

Understandably writers, once freed from political controls, will turn to the neglected topics of recent history with all its traumas. Already this trend is in evidence, with many prose works and poems dedicated to the famine of 1932–33. There is, indeed, a whole host of themes, hitherto forbidden, which may now be appealing. There may, however, be also disenchantment with politics and history altogether, and this may provide a stimulus for the exploration of the self or for ecological concerns, which, after Chornobyl, are uppermost in many minds. In either case, the new literature may also be fantastic or surrealist or existential rather than plainly realistic.

The recent climate of renewal during the era of *glasnost* has revived hopes for the free development of literature. This is what most writers in this century either secretly or openly desired. However, freedom imposes responsibilities

that many were yet unable or unwilling to undertake. The organizational structure of the Writers' Union called for radical reform, if not outright abolition. Yet there was a certain reluctance to step out of this Stalinist structure. Only the future will tell if a return to an earlier and happier time, when there were many groups and circles of writers, is possible. The heritage of command and monopoly was hard to shake. Literary bureaucrats were still alive and well.

The recent links with the diaspora forecast an end to a long period of isolation. Not much has been said in these pages about those who, under difficult circumstances, have tried to keep in touch with foreign literatures: the translators. Some of them, for example—Mykola Lukaš, Hryhorij Kočur—are now viewed as having performed a heroic task. More translations from foreign literature are on the way; the journal *Vsesvit* (Universe) has been dedicated exclusively to translation. Recently, this valuable publication, a true center of intellectual life, celebrated its 50th anniversary. Zerov's and Xvyl'ovyj's calls for a pro-Western orientation are no longer despised. The heritage of the émigré writers from Western Europe and America is now cherished and acknowledged. Yet, in the perceptive words of the Australian critic, Marko Pavlyshyn, a real change in cultural attitudes was still far off:

The hagiographic quality of writing about literature, especially in encyclopedia articles, biographical compendia and general histories, had been especially marked during High Stalinism and again in the 1970s. Literary history read like an account of the same ideologically sound person writing the same ideologically sound work over and over again. This, of course, has now changed. Not only are there new biographical motifs which, if invoked, signify favorable evaluation of a given writer by the critic or historian (books banned by the censorship, obstruction of publication, editorial mutilation, conflicts with officialdom and the KGB, even imprisonment), but the biographies themselves have become more factual, individualized, realistic and lively. The [literary] iconostasis, one might observe, is evolving from its Byzantine to its Baroque form. In particular, the central salvation narrative which the iconostasis illustrates is being modified: it no longer beckons toward the classless society, or the happy community of nations fused into one under the benign inspiration of the great Russian people....

What happens to the new members of the iconostasis? They tend to be frozen into static poses, like everyone else. The rehabilitated from the 1920s and 1930s—Volodymyr Vynnychenko, Mykola Khvylovy, the neoclassicists Mykola Zerov, Mykhailo Drai-Khmara and Pavlo Fylypovych, the émigré Oleksander Oles, to name only the most prominent— are, for the moment at least, being treated as holy objects. Their names are honored (often by inclusion in long lists of newly honorable names), their life stories are told, and the nature of their conflict with the Soviet state and its inevitable outcome are recorded. Often their works are published, either for the first time after a long hiatus, or in more complete and less expurgated editions. But there is little discussion of them as texts.²³¹

The past was at last being re-evaluated without ideological strictures. Yet, ironically enough, the abolition of strictures has led to no blossoming but rather to the languishing of literature. However, there was also hope for a fresh start in the never-ending process of innovation in literature.

9.

AFTER INDEPENDENCE

The national referendum of December 1991, in which an overwhelming majority of Ukrainians voted for independence, had no immediate impact on literature. The literary establishment (the Writers' Union and the agencies responsible for publications) remained almost intact. The declaration of independence itself led to some public feeling of euphoria. Some disoriented writers became self-styled politicians and others tried to cling to their jobs or explore new avenues. Few realized that the old attitudes acquired during the past 70 years of Soviet rule were still persisting. The devastation that remained was enormous, but time was needed to assess its nature. It almost dwarfed the natural feeling of relief and freedom, even joy, which most writers experienced. "Societal renewal," wrote Ukrainian-American scholar Oksana Grabowicz, "and the new national identity were no longer seen only in terms of the cultural revival, but also in terms of moral 'purification,' a need to come to terms with social demoralization, inhumanity, and the whole communist past as well."²³² The same scholar continued commenting on "the negative self-image of Ukrainians as a consequence of their centuries-long existence under colonial rule."

Slowly, literature came to reflect some of these profound dilemmas of the new freedom, which at first seemed rather precarious. A great deal of scholarly and critical activity was directed, even more intensely than in the era of

glasnost, towards republication and re-evaluation of works banned by the Soviets. Digging up the recent and not so recent past became the preoccupation of many (e.g., Serhij Bilokin', Leonid Čerevatenko, Mykola Žulyns'kyj, et al.). Many writers of the diaspora (e.g., Rubčak, Tarnavs'kyj, Andijevs'ka, Palij) were, in the course of the next few years, published and discussed in Ukraine. Scholarly symposia, with participating guests from the West, took place in Kyiv, Kharkiv and Lviv. Some literary critics of the diaspora (George Shevelov, George Grabowicz, Marko Pavlyshyn) made a triumphal appearance in Ukraine. These were fruitful developments which helped to establish a new, liberal climate. However, there seems to be no realization as yet that, in future, the writers from diaspora, despite their claims to "symbiosis" with the motherland, may become of far less significance than they have been so far.

Knowledge of the literature of the past, always an important factor in the present, was enriched by the publication not so much of suppressed works, as by newly-discovered letters, diaries, and memoirs of writers (e.g., Xvyl'ovyj, Pidmohyl'nyj, Tjutjunnyk, Blyznec', Stus) who tended to be crowned with new laurels. The first scholarly histories of the literature of the early twentieth century were being published, the most ambitious, a joint effort under the editorship of Vitalij Dončyk in 1993–94.

However, the publication of books, journals and even newspapers like *Literaturna Ukraïna* soon became difficult and sometimes ground to a halt. This was the result of the fast-approaching economic crisis which led to a shortage of paper and printing materials as well as to inflation. Indeed, soon after the initial euphoria was over, the entire country, impoverished and despoiled, plunged into a very serious economic and political upheaval which adversely affected the press, the media, and art and literature in general. The tangible privileges which the members of the old Writers' Union had enjoyed, gradually disappeared. This led to some hardship among scholars and the literati, but, on the other hand, it had the positive effect of eliminating much graphomania only to be replaced by the new one. Kyiv bookstalls became flooded by Russian-produced literature of sensational and pornographic nature.

The dire straits in literary production might have led to the blossoming of *publicystyka* (publicism, or irregular column writing, but not journalism) which had a long tradition in Ukraine. These essay-type columns, often written by prominent writers, appeared in newspapers and almanacs and were devoted to current cultural problems. The doyenne of Ukrainian poets, Lina Kostenko, excelled in this genre, a true master of the biting phrase ("Ukrainian poetry is a child born in prison," "the avant-garde poets break windows, when we need to break prison-bars.") While the established journals—*Vitčyzna*, *Kyjiv*, *Dnipro*—started to appear intermittently, the leading journal of the diaspora *Sučasnist'* was from 1992 on published and edited in Kyiv. It appears regularly,

while the Kyiv *Vsesvit* and the Kharkiv *Berezil'* struggle bravely against heavy odds. The fate of the only scholarly periodical *Slovo i čas* (Word and Time, formerly *Radjans'ke literaturoznavstvo*) is precarious. On the other hand, many ephemeral and sometimes very interesting almanacs (*Četver*, *Pereval*, *Ji* [a letter in the Ukrainian alphabet]) appear from time to time. A Union list of the independent press in Ukraine (by B. Yasinsky) was prepared by the Library of Congress in 1992. Similar efforts are being made by Ukrainian libraries, including the monthly *Teka*, published by *Prosvita* in Lviv. Perhaps eventually a bibliographic record of this chaotic era will appear.

Ever since 1991 writers and critics have been engaged in a serious and protracted debate as to what kind of animal this new literature should be. Facing the utter demoralization, even degradation of their country, they argued about a possible way out of the post-colonial chaos. Some were aware, in this difficult and painful time, of the need for "de-mythologization, desacralization of phenomena, concepts and figures" (Ljudmyla Taran); others swore that "we do not need martyrs but independent artists" (Vasyl' Herasymjuk); while still others warned of commercialization and a "new freedom from chains which leads to the perversity of doing anything you like" (Volodymyr Brjuggen). The trauma of past oppression dominated much of the discussion. Perhaps the most articulate spokesperson for this was Lina Kostenko. Ukrainian culture, according to her, has been "blockaded for centuries," Ukrainian writers had, in solitude, to perform the superhuman task of saving the language which was banned and derided. Now, however, they faced a different task, the precise nature of which is difficult to determine. She understands the desire to correct past lies, and she is optimistic about the writers' creative energies. Kostenko also represented women writers and critics who came to play a new role after independence. Among these was her daughter, Oksana Paxl'ovs'ka, as well as Oksana Zabuzko and Solomija Pavlyčko. All made signal contributions, especially in making contacts with the West. Among male writers—the essayists Jevhen Sverstjuk and Serhij Plačynda discussed religion and the environment. Much of the *publicystyka* was devoted to Chornobyl and its aftermath. The tone of these essays was serious. Almost none of the writers indulged in the glib, patronizing cleverness which often marks Western post-modernism. But irony, sarcasm, and satire were soon to appear in some literary works.

The links to past literary styles and themes were very strong. Especially in the field of the novel the old socialist-realist habits were hard to shake. Indeed, much of prose literature remained on a populist level, appealing to an unsophisticated reader and fulfilling the function of popular culture. Historical fiction continued to be produced, with Ukrainian nationalism replacing Soviet patriotism (Jurij Mušketyk's novel about Hetman Polubotok), *Het'mans'kyj skarb* (The Hetman's Treasure, 1993), Pavlo Zahrebel'nyj's *kaleidoscopic Tysjačolinnij Mykolaj* (A Thousand-Year Old Nicholas, 1994), and Roman

Ivanyčuk's *Orda* (The Horde, 1992). After all, the Communists had had their day; now it was nationalism's turn, often led by former Communists, who "had seen the light." The above-mentioned novel by Zahrebel'nyj, written in 1988–91, is a good example of a readable "yarn" mostly about Ukraine under Stalin, full of profundities, revelations, all smothered with cynicism. The mass reader might have remained faithful to a familiar genre, but a poll taken in 1991 among writers themselves, favored the innovators—Volodymyr Dibrova, Jurij Vynnyčuk, Bohdan Žoldak, Jevhen Paškovs'kyj, Vasyl' Herasymjuk.

Reviewing the literary production in 1992,²³³ Ivan Dzjuba obviously looked and found both new talent or old talent in a new garb. He praised the "whimsical" historical novel *Nalyvajko* (1992) by Mykola Vinhranovs'kyj. Whimsicality (*xymernist'*) is in the old Ukrainian tradition, which has new followers in the work of Jevhen Hucalo, Valerij Ševčuk and others. Dzjuba also mentioned favorably two short novels by Andrušovyč, *Rekreaciji* (Recreations, 1992) and *Moskovijada* (1993), which created a minor scandal by their general irreverence and the use of four-letter words. Both works are a product of carnivalist poetics and contain sharp satire and a serious subtext despite the grotesque elements. Some critics have welcomed it as a true post-colonial expression of new cultural concepts, while at the same time harking back to the *vertep*. Full of irony and playfulness, these novels sparkle with extraordinarily vital language. The third part of this "trilogy," tentatively titled "A Perversion," was scheduled to appear in 1996. It is significant that these prose works, as well as much truly innovative poetry, originated in Western Ukraine.

Very different, though no less subversive of old values, was the novel *Bezodnja* (The Abyss, 1992) by Jevhen Paškovs'kyj. In the words of critic Solomija Pavlyčko it is "overwhelmingly bleak ... [The hero] has no home, not only in the real, but in the spiritual sense. As an anti-intellectual type from lower depths, he speaks little and he does not think too much. He merely sees and feels.... The novel is a howl of pain and despair."²³⁴ After long being banned, sex and violence have made their way into the novel, almost with a vengeance. Jurij Vynnyčuk's story of prostitutes, *Divy noci* (Maiden Nights, 1992) and Valerij Ševčuk's *Horbunka Zoja* (Hunchback Zoja, 1995) contain no violence or the seamier side of life, but could be classed as erotic. On the other hand, Hucalo's *Šal* (Frenzy, 1995) is tempestuous and explicit. According to M. Naydan, Hucalo also wrote a long "epos-eros ... a collective discourse of voices on sex, feelings, desires and illusions" in *Blud, abož rozpusta i vyrodžennja v nas, na Ukrajinі* (Fornication or Lewdness and Degeneracy Among Us in Ukraine, 1993). Many Ukrainian prose writers reflect in their works what Michael Naydan has aptly called "familial dysfunctionality" in Ukrainian society. They also are at sea in post-Soviet reality.²³⁵

Greeted as a major novel, Volodymyr Drozd's contemplative *Lystja zemli* (Leaves of the Earth, 1993) drew opposing critical comments. To Mykola

Žulyns'kyj it was "a voice of historical memory ... showing the indestructibility of the people"; to Marko Pavlyshyn it "concentrates on the old forms of cognition without proposing new ones." Like many other writers Drozd is concerned with moral problems. Contrary to the post-modernist disdain for absolute truth, Ukrainian novelists and poets of a more traditional persuasion, show an interest in morality at a time when their country is looking for safer moorings. Like many East European intellectuals they try to draw the difficult line between good and evil. The very prolific Ševčuk tried to explain his alienated characters by saying that "when a hero searches for moral values, when he wants to feel hopeful about the world, he takes a social stand: a society can be called healthy only when the people who live in it are harmonious."²³⁶

A real challenge to the old pseudo-morality as well as to all accepted literary traditions came from a group of avant-garde poets *Bu-Ba-Bu* (Burlesque, Farce, Buffoonery) formed as early as the 1980s by Jurij Andrukhovych, Oleksander Irvanec' and Viktor Neborak. The group was very active until 1994. In 1995, in Lviv, they published a collection of their irreverent but lively writings entitled *Bu-Ba-Bu*. They represented not only a violent reaction against the old populist poetry, but, according to N. Bilocerkevich, against "all stereotypes and clichés ... [and substituting for it] parody, satire, caricature and pyrotechnics."²³⁷ This "dehermetization" of poetry and of all lyricism as well as of national conventions struck a responsive chord in many young readers. Other groups of rebels among the poets included *Propala hramota* (The Lost Certificate) and *Luhosad* (The Meadow Orchard), which celebrated its 10th anniversary in 1993. The latter group preferred to be regarded as "rearguard" rather than "avant-garde" and were led originally by Ivan Lučuk, Nazar Hončar and Roman Sadlovs'kyj. The latest gathering of young poets is *Nova degeneracija* (New Degeneration, with Stepan Prociuk, Ivan Cyperdjuk, Ljubomyr Strynahljuk), no doubt a reincarnation of Myxajl's Semenko's futurists of the 1920s. Four unaffiliated poets of some originality, who were published earlier, are Viktor Kordun, Rajisa Lyša, Volodymyr Cybul'ko and Ivan Malkovyč. The distinguished poet, Ihor Kalyneć, disillusioned, stopped writing verse.²³⁸ This might have happened because poetry in Ukraine no longer is a voice of dissent. As one of the poets, Oksana Zabuzko, astutely observes, "Ukrainian poetry has been destined to be governmental opposition ... because it functioned to maintain national identity by giving an eloquent voice to a particular collective consciousness, and by promoting the language beyond the boundaries marked for a dying species."²³⁹ All this has now changed. An innovative prose writer Konstjantyn Moskalec' (b. 1963) published a long story with the telling title "Where Am I to Go?" (*De meni poolitysja?*). Will the poets change too? The collection *Molode vyno* (Young Wine, 1994) by the very youngest poets is promising. The existence of such groups and the talk of a "third wave" in literature testify to its new vitality. The Bu-ba-buists, particularly, have both enriched

Ukrainian literature and created a stimulating intellectual climate. T. Hundorova wrote that their reinvigorated language especially in their prose "leads to a creative linguistic discourse, not vitiated by cant and hypocrisy."²⁴⁰ Yet at the same time, some poets gloried in their newly-found national freedom. According to scholar O. Zabuzhko, "Here lies the crucial difference between the status of Ukrainian and Russian poets. Contrary to our Russian counterparts, we were not allowed to love our country. But love for one's country is not just a slogan of romantic nationalism as it may seem at first glance. In terms of poetry, it is perhaps the most crucial thing, for it suggests that the poet considers his or her mother tongue to be the most valuable thing on earth."²⁴¹

As was to be expected, the variety of groups and tendencies led to occasional clashes. This culminated in an exchange initiated by the article "Koleso" (The Wheel), published in October 1994 in *Literaturna Ukraïna* by Jurij Mušketyk. As a representative of the traditional mimetic literature he not only defended the latter with vigor, but launched an attack against the avant-garde. He argued that realistic literature was closer to national and humanist values and that "post-modernism" and "postavangardism" showed no respect for the national interest. He also warned against foreign influences. Mušketyk was the chairman of the somewhat discredited but still influential Writers' Union and his article was taken as the view of the literary establishment. Another defense of traditionalism was made in an article by Bazylev's'kyj, *Varvaryzacija* (Barbarization). The rebuttals to *Koleso* were few (Volodymyr Morenec') and rather ineffective.²⁴² The absence of an articulate opposition to Mušketyk signified, perhaps, not only the theoretical weakness of the avant-garde, but also the prevalence of an undying populism. The youngest, post-modernist generation may also not want to enter into a dispute with the traditionalists for whom they feel contempt. The literary situation is further complicated by the unresolved ambivalence between traditional nationalism and aesthetic modernism, which was noted at the beginning of this overview. Today, Ukrainian scholars study the unique conditions of modernism which were shackled by colonial oppression.²⁴³ The ravages of colonialism (in Ukraine, Russian culture and language are still prevalent and the Russian minority is still privileged) make it difficult for writers to abandon the national cause, indeed the national revolution which has remained incomplete.

Yet it would be impossible to deny a new spirit of cultural crisis. The onset of liberty brought great ferment. If creativity is called forth by stress, there is plenty of it in today's Ukraine. Literary and critical discourse have become more complicated. It is exemplified by the most recent controversy over O. Zabuzhko's "sex novel." There is a great deal of experimentation, even negation. The *fin-de-siècle* malady may have infected more writers with decadence than it did a century ago. As often before, from such a turmoil there may emerge a new literature. But it will have to coexist with the old one.

Footnotes

- ¹Ju. Kovaliv, "Nepviznanyj sfinks čy odvična Popeljuška," *Sučasnist'* 2, 1995, 161.
- ²I. Franko, "Z ostannix desjatyliť XIX v." *Zibrannja tvoriv* (Kyiv, 1984), v. 41.
- ³*Ibid.*, p. 250.
- ⁴*Ibid.*, p. 523.
- ⁵I. Franko, "Internacionalizm i nacjonalizm v sučasnyx literaturax," *Zibrannja tvoriv*, v. 31.
- ⁶*Ibid.*, 34.
- ⁷I. Franko, "Iz secretiv poetyčnoji tvorčosty," *Zibrannja tvoriv*, v. 31.
- ⁸*Ibid.*, p. 53.
- ⁹*Ibid.*, p. 71.
- ¹⁰"Xronika: ukrajins'kyj al'manax," *Literaturno-naukovyj vistnyk* (hereafter *LNV*) 16 (1901), 14.
- ¹¹*LNV*, 6 (1903).
- ¹²L. Ukrajinka, *Tvory v dvanadcjaty tomax* (Kyiv, 1979), v. 12.
- ¹³*Ibid.*, p. 29.
- ¹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 51.
- ¹⁵K. Hrynevyčeva, "Nerozuminnja jako dokaz," *LNV*, 6 (1903).
- ¹⁶O.L. "Moloda muza," *Dilo*, 18 November 1907.
- ¹⁷All quotations are from O.L.[Luc'kyj's] article, reprinted in *Ostap Luc'kyj—Molodomuzec'* (Toronto, 1968), 55-9.
- ¹⁸I. Franko, "Manifest Molodoji Muzy," *Dilo*, 13 December 1907.
- ¹⁹*Ibid.*
- ²⁰I. Franko, "Pryvezeno zillja z tr'ox hir na vesillja, *Moloda Muza*" 5, *LNV*, 40 (1907).
- ²¹I. Franko, *Zibrannja tvoriv*, v. 30, 331.
- ²²M. Jevšan, *Pid praporom mystectva* (Kyiv, 1910).
- ²³*Ibid.*, p. 8.
- ²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 12.
- ²⁵M. Sribljans'kyj, "Na sučasni temy," *Ukrajins'ka xata*, 2 (1911), 116.

- ²⁶“Vid redakciji,” *Ukrajins’ka xata*, 1 (1909), 2.
- ²⁷O. Ilnytzyk, “Ukrainska khata and the Paradoxes of Ukrainian Modernism,” *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, Winter 1994.
- ²⁸B. Rubčak, “Probnyj let—introduction to Jurij Luc’kyj,” ed. *Ostap Luc’kyj—molodomuzec’* (Toronto, 1968).
- ²⁹M. Kucjubyns’kyj, *Tvory v šesty tomach* (Kyiv, 1961), v. 5, 338.
- ³⁰A. Kryms’kyj, *Tvory v pjaty tomach* (Kyiv, 1972), v. 1, 23.
- ³¹L. Ukrajinka, *Tvory v dvanadcjaty tomach* (Kyiv, 1972), v. 12, 137-50.
- ³²O. Babyškin, *Ahatanhel Kryms’kyj* (Kyiv, 1967), 53-54.
- ³³M. Stepnjak, “Poety Molodoji Muzy,” *Červonyj šljax*, n.1 (1933).
- ³⁴I. Franko, *Zibrannja tvoriv*, v. 33, 176.
- ³⁵P. Karmans’kyj, *Oj ljuli smutku* (Lviv, 1906), 5.
- ³⁶*Istorija ukrajins’koji literatury XX stolittja* (Kyiv, 1993), I, 38.
- ³⁷S. Čerkasenko, introduction to M. Voronyj, *U sjajvi mrij* (Kyiv, 1913), 6-9.
- ³⁸O. Bilec’kyj, “Mykola Voronyj,” *Zibrannja prac’* (Kyiv, 1965) v. 2, 612-14.
- ³⁹P. Fylypovyč, introduction to O. Oles’, *Vybrani tvory* (Kyiv, 1925).
- ⁴⁰M. Zerov, *Do džerel* (Kyiv, 1926), 75-76.
- ⁴¹M. Jevšan, “Naš literaturnyj biljans za 1912 rik,” *LNV* 61 (1913), 167.
- ⁴²M. Šapoval, “Novyny našoji literatury,” *LNV* 49 (1912), 626.
- ⁴³M. Žulyns’kyj, “Hryhorij Čuprynka,” *Literaturna Ukrajina*, 28 July 1988.
- ⁴⁴B. Jakubs’kyj, “Liryka Lesji Ukrajinky,” *Tvory* (New York reprint 1953), v. 2, XIX.
- ⁴⁵C. Bida, “Life and Work,” *Lesia Ukrainka* (Toronto, 1968), 46-47.
- ⁴⁶M. Zerov, “Lesja Ukrajinka,” *Do džerel* (Krakow-Lviv, 1943), 176.
- ⁴⁷L. Ukrajinka, *Tvory*, v. 12, 48.
- ⁴⁸M. Jevšan, *Pid praporom mystectva*, 79.
- ⁴⁹P. Fylypovyč, introduction to O. Kobyljans’ka, *V nedilju rano zillja kopala* (Buenos Aires, 1954), lv.
- ⁵⁰I. Truš, “Vasyl’ Stefanyk,” *Budučnist’*, 1 July 1899. Here reprinted from *Vasyl’ Stefanyk v krytyci ta spohadax* (Kyiv, 1970), 41.
- ⁵¹L. Ukrajinka, “Ukrajins’ki pys’mennyky na Bukovyni,” *Tvory*, v. 8, 74.

⁵²B. Rubchak, "The Music of Satan and the Bedeviled World," in M. Kotsiubynsky, *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors* (Littleton, 1981), 93-104.

⁵³O. Stavyc'kyj, "Dramaturhija," *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury v vos'my tomax* (Kyiv, 1968), v. 5, 471.

⁵⁴O. Doroškevyč, *Pidručnyk istoriji ukrajins'koji literatury* (Kharkiv, 1927), 231.

⁵⁵L. Ukrajinka, *Tvory*, v. 11, 318.

⁵⁶H. Xotkevyč, "Literaturni vražinnja," *LNV* 43 (1908), 120.

⁵⁷L. Kolakowski, "Modernity on Endless Trial," *Encounter*, March 1987, 10.

⁵⁸See Ju. Ševel'ov, *Ukrajins'ka mova v peršij polovyni dvadcatohoho stolittja (1900-41)* (New York, 1987), 402.

⁵⁹M. Rudnyc'kyj, "Ivan Franko," *Vid Myrnoho do Xvyl'ovoho* (Lviv, 1936), 169-70.

⁶⁰Ju. Ševel'ov, "Poza meži možlyvoho," in Ivan Franko, *Mojsej* (New York, 1968), 118-19.

⁶¹M. Rudnyc'kyj, *Vid Myrnoho do Xvyl'ovoho*, 172.

⁶²*Ibid.*, 262.

⁶³O. Zasenکو, introduction to Osyp Makovej, *Vybrani tvory* (Kyiv, 1961), 23-24.

⁶⁴M. Jevšan, "Mykola Černjavs'kyj; proba xarakterystyky," *LNV* 50 (1910), 253.

⁶⁵A. Nikovs'kyj, "Ukrajins'ka literatura v 1912 r." *LNV* 61 (1913), 182.

⁶⁶For details see Luckyj's *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine: 1917-34* (New York, 1956).

⁶⁷S. Jefremov, *Istorija ukrajins'koho pys'menstva* (Kyiv-Leipzig, 1924), v. 2, 355-6.

⁶⁸L. Novyčenko, *Poezija i revoljucija* (Kyiv, 1979).

⁶⁹V. Barka, *Xliborobs'kyj orfej abo kljarnetyzm* (Munich, 1961).

⁷⁰O.S. Ilnytzkyj, "Anatomy of a Literary Scandal: Myxajl' Semenko and the Origins of Ukrainian Futurism," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, December 1978, 478.

⁷¹*Ibid.*, 497-99.

⁷²O. Doroškevyč, *Pidručnyk*, 295.

⁷³*Ibid.*, 297-98.

⁷⁴Ju. Šerex (G.Y. Shevelov) "Lehenda pro ukrajins'kyj neoklasycyzm," (written in 1944), *Ne dlja ditej* (New York, 1964).

⁷⁵*Ibid.*, 131.

⁷⁶*Ibid.*, 146-7.

⁷⁷M. Tarnawsky, "Valerijan Pidmohyl'nyj, Guy de Maupassant and the Magic of the Night." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1986. For Tarnawsky's book on Pidmohyl'nyj see the Bibliography.

⁷⁸M. Tarnawsky's dissertation, 311-12.

⁷⁹M. Ryl's'kyj, "Pro dvox poetiv," *Žyttja i revoljucija*, n. 5 (1925), 85.

⁸⁰I. Dzjuba, "Zasvityvsja sam od sebe," *Literaturna Ukrajina* 22 October 1968.

⁸¹M. Jalovyj, "Perši xorobri," *Červonyj šljax*, n. 9 (1923), 115.

⁸²V. Čumak, Zaspiv, here quoted from *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury* (Kyiv, 1970), v. 6, 105.

⁸³M. Johansen, "Erotyzm v novij ukrajins'kij poeziji," *Žovten'* (1922), 98-99.

⁸⁴V. Hadzins'kyj, introduction to H. Myxajlyčenko, *Xudožni tvory* (Kharkiv, 1929), 69.

⁸⁵Ju. Šerex, *Ne dlja ditej*, 66.

⁸⁶V. Jury nec', here quoted from Lejtes and Jašek, *Desjat' rokiv ukrajins'koji literatury (1917-27)* (Kharkiv, 1928), v. 1, 527.

⁸⁷Ju. Šerex, *Ne dlja ditej*, 55.

⁸⁸M. Čyrkov, "Mykola Xvyl'ovyj u joho prozi," *Žyttja i revoljucija*, n. 10 (1925), 43.

⁸⁹For a detailed discussion see M. Shkandrij, *Modernists, Marxists and the Nation; The Ukrainian Literary Discussion of the 1920s* (Edmonton, 1992).

⁹⁰I.V. Stalin, *Sočinenija* (Moscow, 1948), v. 7, 153.

⁹¹Ja. Savčenko, "Volodymyr Sosjura," *Žyttja i revoljucija*, n. 8 (1925), 19-20.

⁹²V. Hryško, ed., in Sosjura, *Zasudžene i zaboronene* (New York, 1952), 9.

⁹³Ju. Lavrinenko, "Mykola Bažan," *Rozstriljane vidroždennja* (Paris, 1959), 307-8.

⁹⁴E. Adel'hejm, *Mykola Bažan* (Kyiv, 1974), 31.

⁹⁵O. Bilec'kyj, "Pro prozu vzahali ta pro našu prozu 1925 r.," *Červonyj šljax*, n. 3 (1926), 155-56.

⁹⁶O. Kylymnyk, *Jurij Janovs'kyj* (Kyiv, 1957), 61.

⁹⁷O. Bilec'kyj, "Pro prozu vzahali...", 143.

⁹⁸M. Xvyl'ovyj, here quoted from Lejtes and Jašek, v. 1, 142.

⁹⁹Ja. Savčenko, here quoted from Lejtes and Jašek, v. 1, 447.

¹⁰⁰M. Žulyns'kyj, "Ivan Senčenko," *Literaturna Ukrajina*, 22 September 1988.

¹⁰¹O. Bilec'kyj, "Pro prozu vzahali...", 150.

¹⁰²A. Lejtes, here quoted from Lejtes and Jašek, v. 1, 195.

¹⁰³A. Šamraj, *Ukrajins'ka literatura* (Kharkiv, 1927), 259-60.

¹⁰⁴V. Skurativs'kyj, "Zamist' pisljamovy," *Prapor*, n. 9 (1990), 86.

¹⁰⁵V. Zajec', "Na čil'nomu misci," in *Pro Petra Panča* (Kyiv, 1961), 70-71.

¹⁰⁶O. Kylymnyk, "Tvorchist' Hryhorija Epika," in H. Epik, *Tvory* (Kyiv, 1958), 7-8.

¹⁰⁷B. Šnajder, "Oleksander Kopylenko," in *Tvory* (Kyiv, 1961), v. 1, 13.

¹⁰⁸Ju. Šerex, "Kolir nestrymnyx palaxtin'," *Mur al'manax* (n.p. 1946), v. 1, 156.

¹⁰⁹Ju. Lavrinenko, "Mykola Kuliš," *Rozstriljane vidroždžennja* (Paris, 1959), 655-56.

¹¹⁰Ju. Šerex, *Ne dlja ditej*, 81.

¹¹¹N. Kuzjakina, *Pjesy Mykoly Kuliša* (Kyiv, 1970), 452.

¹¹²F. Jakubovs'kyj, here quoted from Lejtes and Jašek, v. 1, 247.

¹¹³B. Kovalenko, *ibid.*, 75.

¹¹⁴Ja. Savčenko, *ibid.*, 516.

¹¹⁵*Istoriya ukrajins'koji literatury*, v. 6, 191.

¹¹⁶Ju. Šerex, "Istoriya odnijeji literaturnoji mistyfikaciji," in A. Strixa, *Parodezy, Žozendropija, Avtoekzekucija* (New York, 1955), 255.

¹¹⁷S. Šaxovs'kyj, "Volodymyr Gžyc'kyj," *Ukrajins'ki radjans'ki pys'mennyky* (Kyiv, 1976), v. 8, 176.

¹¹⁸*Ibid.*, 171.

¹¹⁹A. Lebid', "Od symbolizmu do revoljucijnoji literatury," *Žyttja i revoljucija*, n. 6-7, (1925), 33.

- ¹²⁰M. Dubyna, "Neskorene slovo poeta," in V. Bobyns'kyj, *Poeziji* (Kyiv, 1967), 13.
- ¹²¹Lejtes and Jašek, v. 1, 193.
- ¹²²O. Bilec'kyj, "Pro prozu vazhali...", 135.
- ¹²³*Ibid.*
- ¹²⁴O. Kylymnyk, "Z čystyx dzerel žyttja," in A. Holovko, *Tvory* (Kyiv, 1962), v. 1, 6.
- ¹²⁵*Ibid.*, 21.
- ¹²⁶I. Kapustjans'kyj, here quoted from Lejtes and Jašek, v. 1, 387.
- ¹²⁷*Ibid.*, v. 1, 370.
- ¹²⁸O. Zasenka, "Plomin' žyttja—ridnij literaturi," in M. Tereščenko, *Tvory* (Kyiv, 1968), v. 1, 19.
- ¹²⁹Ju. Kostjuk, "Tvorčyj šljax Jakova Mamontova," in Ja. Mamontov, *Tvory* (Kyiv, 1962), 18.
- ¹³⁰N. Kuzjakina, *Dramaturh Ivan Kočerha* (Kyiv, 1968), 62.
- ¹³¹*Ibid.*, 97.
- ¹³²M. Syrotjuk, "Slovo pro myteja," in I. Mykytenko, *Tvory* (Kyiv, 1964), v. 1, xxiv.
- ¹³³Quoted in *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury*, v. 6. 359.
- ¹³⁴Here quoted from *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury* (Kyiv, 1971), v. 7, 9.
- ¹³⁵G. Luckyj, *Keeping a Record: Literary Purges in Soviet Ukraine (1930s), a Bio-Bibliography* (Edmonton, 1987).
- ¹³⁶Interview with Eduard Bel'tov in *Knizhoe obozrenie*, n. 25 (1988).
- ¹³⁷R. Conquest, *The Harvest of Sorrow* (New York, Oxford, 1986).
- ¹³⁸A. Pohribnyj, "Pro mimikriju-pavljukliju, zabuti imena abo bili pljamy," *Literaturna Ukrajina*, 15 September 1988.
- ¹³⁹B. Olijnyk, "Perebudovu slid pohlybljuvaty," *Literaturna Ukrajina*, 5 January 1989.
- ¹⁴⁰Ju. Šerex, *Ne dlja ditej*, 82.
- ¹⁴¹Quoted in G. Struve, *Russian Literature Under Lenin and Stalin* (Norman, 1971), 262.
- ¹⁴²G. Grabowicz, "Tyčyna's Černihiv," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, March 1977, 113.
- ¹⁴³S. Šaxovs'kyj, "Pavlo Tyčyna," *Literaturni portrety* (Kyiv, 1960), v. 1, 58.

¹⁴⁴Ju. Lavrinenko, *Na šljaxax syntezy kljarnetyzmu* (New York, 1977).

¹⁴⁵S. Tel'njuk, "Narodovi je čym hordytysja," *Literaturna Ukrajina*, 6 October 1988.

¹⁴⁶M. Ryl's'kyj, "Mynajut' dni odnomanitni," *Iskry vohnju velykoho* (Kyiv, 1965), 78.

¹⁴⁷O. Bilec'kyj, "Tvorčist' Maksyma Ryl's'koho," in M. Ryl's'kyj, *Tvory v desjaty tomax* (Kyiv, 1960), v. 1, 21-22.

¹⁴⁸*Ibid.*, 25.

¹⁴⁹Je. Radčenko, *Volodymyr Sosjura* (Kyiv, 1967), 108.

¹⁵⁰*Ibid.*, 181.

¹⁵¹M. Bažan, *Tvory v čotyr'ox tomax* (Kyiv, 1984), v. 1, 119.

¹⁵²*Ibid.*, 24.

¹⁵³*Ibid.*, 179.

¹⁵⁴M. Ostryk, in Jurij Janovs'kyj, *Opovidannja, romany, pjesy* (Kyiv, 1984), 21.

¹⁵⁵V. Dončyk, introduction to Petro Panč, *Povisti, opovidannja, humoresky, kazky* (Kyiv, 1985), 18.

¹⁵⁶*Ibid.*, 23.

¹⁵⁷N. Kuzjakina, *Dramaturh Ivan Kočerha* (Kyiv, 1968), 208.

¹⁵⁸Quoted from *Pravda*, 24 December 1934, in I. Duz', *Oleksander Kornijčuk* (Kyiv, 1963), 46.

¹⁵⁹*Ibid.*, 70.

¹⁶⁰O. Kudin, "Leonid Pervomajs'kyj," *Literaturni portrety* (Kyiv, 1960), v. 1, 544.

¹⁶¹V. Belajev, "Natan Rybak," *Literaturni portrety*, v. 2, 355.

¹⁶²*Ibid.*, 361.

¹⁶³*Ibid.*, 363.

¹⁶⁴B. Burjak, "Jakiv Kačura," *Ukrajins'ki radjans'ki pys'mennyky* (Kyiv, 1958), v. 3, 228.

¹⁶⁵H. Nud'ha, "Teren' Masenko," *Tvory v dvox tomax* (Kyiv, 1963), 14.

¹⁶⁶V. Ivanysenko, "Dobrom nahrите serce," in A. Malyško, *Tvory v pjaty tomax* (Kyiv, 1962), v. 1, 8.

¹⁶⁷*Ibid.*, 20.

- ¹⁶⁸V. Herasymčuk, "V jakiz my ryby pidemo?" *Literaturna Ukrajina*, 3 November 1988.
- ¹⁶⁹I. Košelivec', *Sučasna literatura v URSR* (New York, 1964), 246.
- ¹⁷⁰M. Ryl's'kyj, "Oleksandr Dovženko," in O. Dovženko, *Tvory v tr'ox tomax* (Kyiv, 1958), v. 1, 6.
- ¹⁷¹I. Košelivec', *Sučasna literatura v URSR* (New York, 1964), 266-67.
- ¹⁷²*Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury* (Kyiv, 1964), 808.
- ¹⁷³M. Žulyns'kyj, "Vasyl' Symonenko," *Literaturna Ukrajina*, 24 March 1988.
- ¹⁷⁴I. Drač, *Sonjašnyk* (Kyiv, 1962), 13.
- ¹⁷⁵B. Kravciv, *Šistdesjat' poetiv šistdesjatyx rokiv* (New York, 1967), V.
- ¹⁷⁶*Ibid.*
- ¹⁷⁷M. Žulyns'kyj, *Nablyžennja* (Kyiv, 1986), 93.
- ¹⁷⁸*Ibid.*, 95.
- ¹⁷⁹V. Ševčuk, "Demokratyzacija, hlasnist', literatura," *Kyjiv*, n. 11 (1988), 5.
- ¹⁸⁰P. Zahrebel'nyj, "Osjahennja prostoty," in P. Panč, *Tvory v šesty tomax* (Kyiv, 1981), v. 1, 12.
- ¹⁸¹V. Dončyk, *Jednist' pravdy i prystrasti* (Kyiv, 1981), 129.
- ¹⁸²A. Skrypnyk, "Povertajučys' do Vavilona," *Literaturna Ukrajina*, 13 October 1988.
- ¹⁸³O. Honchar, "A Portrayer of Truth," in H. Tiutiunnyk, *Cool Mint* (Kyiv, 1986), 5.
- ¹⁸⁴M. Slabošpys'kyj, "Z henetyčnoji pamjati narodu," *Literaturna Ukrajina*, 26 January 1989.
- ¹⁸⁵Interview, in M. Žulyns'kyj, *Nablyžennja* (Kyiv, 1986), 175.
- ¹⁸⁶*Ibid.*, 194.
- ¹⁸⁷M. Pavlyshyn, "Mythological, Religious, and Philosophical Topoi in the Prose of Valerii Shevchuk," *Slavic Review* 4, 1991, p. 913.
- ¹⁸⁸M. Žulyns'kyj, *Nablyžennja*, 228.
- ¹⁸⁹*Ibid.*, 206.
- ¹⁹⁰V. Faščenko, *Pavlo Zahrebel'nyj* (Kyiv, 1984), 99.
- ¹⁹¹V. Faščenko, "Hlybin' i rozmajittja dyvosvitu," in P. Zahrebel'nyj, *Tvory* (Kyiv, 1979), v. 1, 11.

- ¹⁹²M. Kundera, *The Art of the Novel* (New York, 1986), 42.
- ¹⁹³V. Dončyk, *Istyna-osobystist'* (Kyiv, 1984), 185.
- ¹⁹⁴*Ibid.*, 191.
- ¹⁹⁵M. Pavlyšyn, "Ja Bohdan (spovid' u slavi) Pavla Zahrebel'noho," *Sučasnist'*, n. 9 (1985), 35.
- ¹⁹⁶M. Žulyns'kyj, *Nablyžennja*, 153-58.
- ¹⁹⁷*Ibid.*, 168.
- ¹⁹⁸L. Fedorovs'ka, *Romany Jurija Mušketyka* (Kyiv, 1982), 170.
- ¹⁹⁹V. Kačkan, *Roman Fedoriv* (Kyiv, 1983), 124.
- ²⁰⁰M. Žulyns'kyj, *Nablyžennja*, 81.
- ²⁰¹*Ibid.*, 269.
- ²⁰²A. Makarov, "Pisni poxmuryx dniv," *Literaturna Ukrajina*, 19 May 1988.
- ²⁰³*Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury* (Kyiv, 1988) v. 2, 669.
- ²⁰⁴Ju. Ševel'ov, "Trunok i trutyzna," in V. Stus, *Palimpsesty* (New York, 1986), 21.
- ²⁰⁵B. Rubčak, "Peremoha nad prirvoju," *Vasyl' Stus* (Baltimore-Toronto, 1987), 321.
- ²⁰⁶V. Swoboda, "The Evolution of Mykola Rudenko's Philosophy in His Poetry," *Studia Ucrainica*, n. 4 (1988), 83.
- ²⁰⁷I. Dzjuba, "Ciljušča sil' samopiznannja," in P. Movčan, *Sil'* (Kyiv, 1989), 9.
- ²⁰⁸B. Rubchak, introduction to B. Antonych, *Square of Angels* (Ann Arbor, 1977), xix-xx.
- ²⁰⁹B. Bojčuk and B. Rubčak, *Koordynaty* (New York, 1969), v. 1, 35-36.
- ²¹⁰*Ibid.*, 266-67.
- ²¹¹*Ibid.*, 161.
- ²¹²*Ibid.*, 66.
- ²¹³Ju. Ševel'ov, "Nad kupkoju popelu ščo bula Oksanoju Ljaturyns'koju," in O. Ljaturyns'ka, *Zibrani tvory* (Toronto, 1983), 63.
- ²¹⁴*Koordynaty*, v. 2, 302.
- ²¹⁵*Ibid.*, 88.
- ²¹⁶B. Kravciv, "Samčuk," in V. Kubijovyč, ed. *Encyklopedija ukrajinoznavstva* (Munich, 1973), 2704.

- ²¹⁷Ju. Šerex, "Ukrajins'ka emihracijna literatura v Evropi 1945-49," *Ne dlia ditej*, 233.
- ²¹⁸H. Hrabovyč, "Velyka literatura," *Sučasnist'* n. 7-8 (1986).
- ²¹⁹B. Bojčuk and B. Rubčak, *Koordynaty*, v. 2, 62.
- ²²⁰O. Zilyns'kyj, "Na šljaxu do ljudynoznavstva," *Duklja*, n. 1 (1968), 55.
- ²²¹V. Vovk in an interview by I. Fizer, *Sučasnist'* n. 10 (1988), 16. See also M. l' nyc'kyj, "Meandry vnutrišnix kraevydiv, Tvorčist' poetiv N'ju Jorks' koji hrupy," *Dzvin*, 7, 1995.
- ²²²E. Rais, "Poezija E. Andijevs' koji," *Sučasnist'*, n. 2 (1963), 51.
- ²²³B. Rubčak, "Rozryv-trava," *Žovten'*, n. 6 (1989), 6.
- ²²⁴Here quoted from "Gorbachev Sets Guidelines for Journalists," *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, v. 39, n. 7 (18 March 1987), 7. For the original see M. S. Gorbačev, *Izbrannye reči i staty* (Moscow, 1987), v. 4, 373.
- ²²⁵M. Žulyns'kyj, "Iz falanhy vybuvaly najkrašči," *Sučasnist'*, n. 10 (1989), 32.
- ²²⁶For details see G. Luckyj, *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917-34*, 2nd ed. (Durham, 1990), 258-63.
- ²²⁷*Ibid.*, 266.
- ²²⁸B. Rubchak, "Because We Have No Time; New Poetry in 1988," in R. Bahry, ed. *Echoes of Glasnost in Soviet Ukraine* (Toronto, 1990), 131.
- ²²⁹*Ibid.*, 147.
- ²³⁰O. Zabuzko, "1989-yj uvijde v literaturu pid znakom nadiji," *Literaturna Ukrajina*, 26 April 1990.
- ²³¹M. Pavlyshyn, "Aspects of the Literary Process in the USSR: The Politics of Re-Canonization in Ukraine After 1985," *Southern Review* (Adelaide), 1, 1991, pp. 19-20.
- ²³²Oksana Grabowicz, "The Legacy of Colonialism and Communism," *Perspectives on Contemporary Ukraine*, March-April 1995, 6.
- ²³³I. Dzjuba, "Nove slovo v novij Ukrajinii," *Literaturna Ukrajina*, 19 November 1992.
- ²³⁴S. Pavlychko, "A Catfish for Your Thoughts: Ukrainian Literature at the Turning Point," *Agni* (Boston, 1994), 39, 197-98.
- ²³⁵M. Naydan, "Ukrainian Prose of the 1990s as It Reflects Contemporary Social Structures," *Ukrainian Quarterly*, Spring 1995.

²³⁶Quoted in L. Tarnašyn's'ka, "Svoboda vyboru—jedyna forma samorealizaciji v absurdnomu sviti," *Sučasnist'*, n. 3, 123.

²³⁷N. Bilocerkivec', "Bu-ba-bu ta in. abo deščo pro ukrajins'kyj poetyčnyj neoavangard," *Literaturna panorama—1990* (Kyiv, 1990), 122-24.

²³⁸See the revealing interview in the Polish journal *Kultura* (Paris), June 1995.

²³⁹Oksana Zabuzhko, "Reinventing the Poet in Modern Ukrainian Culture," *Slavic and East European Journal*, Summer, 1995.

²⁴⁰T. Hundorova, "Postmodernists'ka fikcija Andrukovyča z postkolonijal'nym znakom pytannja," *Sučasnist'*, n. 9, 1993, 83.

²⁴¹O. Zabuzhko, op. cit., p. 272.

²⁴²See also: M. Pavlyshyn, "From Osadchy to the 'Koleso' Controversy: Modernity and Its Meanings in Ukrainian Culture Since the 1960s." Forthcoming in *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*.

²⁴³I. Hundorova, "Jevropejs'kyj modernizm čy jevrolejs'ki modernizmy," *Slovo i čas*, 2, 1995. See also: M. Pavlyshyn, "Post-Colonial Features in Contemporary Ukrainian Culture," *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies*, v. 6, n. 2, 1992.

Bibliography

Only books in English and some entries in encyclopedias have been listed. For dissertations, articles and translations of single works consult: Piaseckyj, Oksana. *Bibliography of Ukrainian Literature in English and French: Translations and Critical Works (1950-1986)*. Ottawa, University of Ottawa Press, 1989; Tarnawsky, Marta. *Ukrainian Literature in English*. Edmonton, CIUS, 1989; and Wynar, Bohdan. *Ukraine: A Bibliographic Guide to English-Language Publications*. Englewood, CO, Libraries Unlimited, 1990.

Abbreviations used: CIUS—Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies; HURI—Harvard Institute of Ukrainian Studies

Critical Works

Bida, C. *Lesya Ukrainka: Life and Work*. (trans. V. Rich). Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.

Carynnyk, Marko. *The Poet as Filmmaker* [O. Dovzhenko]. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1973.

Frick, David. *Meletij Smotryc'kyj*. Cambridge: HURI, 1995.

Grabowicz, George. *Toward a History of Ukrainian Literature*. Cambridge: HURI, 1981.

———. *The Poet as Mythmaker: A Study of Symbolic Meaning in Taras Ševčenko*. Cambridge: HURI, 1982.

Gudzy, N. K. *History of Early Russian Literature*. New York: Macmillan, 1949.

- Identifications: Ethnicity and the Writer in Canada* (ed. J. Balan). Edmonton: CIUS, 1982.
- Ilnytzkyj, Oleh. *Ukrainian Futurism, 1914-1930: An Historical and Critical Study*. Cambridge: HURI, 1995.
- Kubijovyč, Volodymyr. (ed.) "Literature," *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963, vol. 1.
- Kubijovyč, V., and Struk, D. H. (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984-93, 5 vols.
- Lindheim, R., and Luckyj, G. (eds.) *Towards an Intellectual History of Ukraine. An Anthology of Ukrainian Thought from 1710 to 1995*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- Luckyj, George. *Between Gogol' and Ševčenko: Polarity in the Literary Ukraine, 1798-1847*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1971.
- . *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917-34*. 3rd ed. Durham: Duke University Press, 1990.
- . *Panteleimon Kulish: A Sketch of His Life and Times*. Boulder: East European Monographs, 1983.
- . *Ukrainian Literature in the 20th Century: A Reader's Guide*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.
- Luckyj, George. (ed.) *Shevchenko and the Critics, 1861-1980*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.
- Luznycky, Gregory. *Ukrainian Literature Within the Framework of World Literature; A Short Outline of Ukrainian Literature from Renaissance to Romanticism*. Philadelphia: America, 1961.
- Makaryk, Irena. *About the Harrowing of Hell: A Seventeenth-Century Ukrainian Play in Its European Context*. Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1989.
- Mandryka, M. *History of Ukrainian Literature in Canada*. Winnipeg: Ukrainian Free Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1968.
- Manning, Clarence. *Ukrainian Literature: Studies of the Leading Authors*. Freeport: Books for Libraries Press, 1971.
- Marshall, R. H., and Bird, T. E. (eds.) *Hryhorij Savyč Skovoroda*. Edmonton: CIUS, 1994.
- Mijakovskyj and Shevelov, G. Y. (eds.) *Taras Ševčenko, 1814-61; A Symposium*. The Hague: Mouton, 1962.
- Mudrak, M. *The New Generation and Artistic Modernism in the Ukraine*. Ann Arbor: U.M.I. Research Press, 1986.
- Rubchak, Bohdan. (ed.) *Studies in Ukrainian Literature*. New York: The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Science in the U.S., 1984-85.
- Shabliovsky, Yevhen. *Ukrainian Literature Through the Ages*. Kiev: Mystetstvo, 1970.

- Shankovsky, I. *Symonenko: A Study in Semantics*. Munich: Ukrainisches Institut fuer Bildungspolitik, 1977.
- Shevelov, George Y. *The Ukrainian Language in the First Half of the Twentieth Century (1900-41): Its State and Status*. Cambridge: HURI, 1989.
- Shkandrij, M. *Modernists, Marxists and the Nation: The Ukrainian Literary Discussion of the 1920s*. Edmonton: CIUS, 1992.
- Sirka, J. *The Development of Ukrainian Literature in Czechoslovakia in 1945-1975*. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang, 1978.
- Struk, D. *A Study of Vasyl Stefanyk: The Pain at the Heart of Existence*. Littleton: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1973.
- Struminsky, Bohdan. *Pseudo-Meleshko: A Ukrainian Apocryphal Parliamentary Speech of 1615-18*. Cambridge: HURI, 1984.
- Tarnawsky, Maxim. *Between Reason and Irrationality: The Prose of Valerijan Pidmohyl'nyj*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.
- "Ukrainian Literature," (G. Luckyj) in *The Everyman Companion to East European Literature* (ed. R. Pynsent). London: Dent, 1993, pp. 550-55.
- "Ukrainian Literature" (G. Luckyj) in *World Literature Since 1945* (ed. I. Ivask). New York, Ungar Publ. 1973, pp. 668-73.
- "Ukrainian Literature," (L. Rudnytsky) in *Modern Slavic Literatures* (ed. V. Mihailovich). New York: Ungar Publ. 1972-76, pp. 448-532.
- "Ukrainian Literature," (V. Swoboda) in *The Penguin Companion to European Literature* (ed. A. Thorley). New York: McGraw Hill, 1969, pp. 779-81.
- Wexler, Paul. *Purism and Language: A Study in Modern Ukrainian and Belorussian Nationalism (1840-1967)*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1974.
- Zaitsev, P. *Taras Shevchenko: A Life*. (trans. G. Luckyj). Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Translations and Works Written in English

- Anthology of Soviet Ukrainian Poetry* (ed. Z. Honcharuk). Kiev: Dnipro, 1982.
- Antonenko-Davydovych, Borys. *Duel* (trans. Yu. Tkacz). Melbourne: Lastivka Press, 1986.
- . *Behind the Curtain* (trans. Yu. Tkacz). Doncaster: Bayda Books, 1980.
- Antonych, B. I. *Square of Angels, Poems* (trans. M. Rudman, P. Nemser, and B. Boychuk). Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1977.
- Asher, O. *Letters from the Gulag: The Life, Letters and Poetry of Michael Dray-Khmara*. New York: R. Spiller, 1983.
- Australia's Ukrainian Poets* (ed. R. Morrison). Melbourne: The Hawthorn Press, 1973.

- Bahriany, Ivan. *The Hunters and the Hunted*. Toronto: Burns and MacEachern, 1954.
- Before the Storm: Soviet Ukrainian Fiction of the 1920s* (trans. Yu. Tkacz, ed. G. Luckyj). Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1986.
- Berdnyk, Oles. *Apostle of Immortality* (trans. Yu. Tkacz). Doncaster: Bayda Books, 1984.
- Boychuk, B. *Memories of Love* (trans. D. Ignatow and M. Rudman), Riverdale: The Sheep Meadow Press, 1989.
- Chornovil Papers*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.
- Dibrova, Volodymyr. *Peltse and Pentameron* (trans. H. Hryn). Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1996.
- Dovzhenko, Oleksander. *The Enchanted Desna* (trans. A. Bilenko). Kiev: Dnipro, 1979.
- Down Singing Centuries; Folk Literature of the Ukraine* (trans. F. R. Livesay). Winnipeg: Hyperion Press, 1981.
- Drach, Ivan. *Orchard Lamps* (ed. S. Kunitz). New York: The Sheep Meadow Press, 1978.
- The Edificatory Prose of Kievan Rus'* (trans. W. Veder). Cambridge: HURI, 1994.
- Franko, Ivan. *Moses and Other Poems* (trans. V. Rich and P. Cundy). New York: Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1973.
- . *Poems and Stories* (trans. J. Weir). Toronto: Ukrainska knyha, 1956.
- . *Selected Poems* (trans. P. Cundy). New York: Philosophical Library, 1948.
- . *Stories* (trans. A. Bilenko). Kiev: Mystetstvo, 1972.
- . *Zakhar Berkut* (trans. M. Skrypnyk). Kiev: Dnipro, 1987.
- Gzhytsky, V. *Night and Day* (trans. I. Press). Edmonton: CIUS, 1988.
- The Hagiography of Kievan Rus'* (trans. P. Hollingsworth). Cambridge: HURI, 1992.
- Honchar, Oles. *Man and Arms* (trans. A. Bilenko). Kiev: Dnipro, 1985.
- . *The Cathedral* (trans. Yu. Tkacz and L. Rudnytzky). Washington: St. Sophia Religious Association of Ukrainian Catholics, 1989.
- Hutsalo, Ievhen. *A Prevision of Happiness* (trans. E. Manning). Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1974.
- The Hypatian Codex: The Galician-Volynian Chronicle* (trans. G. Perfecky). Munich: W. Fink, 1973.
- Kalynets, Ihor. *Crowning the Scarecrow* (trans. M. Carynnyk). Toronto: Exile Editions, 1990.
- Khvylovy, Mykola. *Stories from the Ukraine* (trans. G. Luckyj). New York: Philosophical Library, 1960.
- . *The Cultural Renaissance in Ukraine: Polemical Pamphlets, 1925-26* (trans. M. Shkandrij). Edmonton: CIUS, 1986.

- Kocherha, Ivan. *Yaroslav the Wise* (trans. W. May). Kiev: Dnipro, 1982.
- Korniichuk, Oleksandr. *Wings* (trans. J. Gibbons). Moscow: Foreign Languages Publ. n.d.
- Kostash, Myrna. *All of Baba's Children*. Edmonton: Hurtig Publ., 1977.
- Kostenko, Lina. *Selected Poetry: Wanderings of the Heart* (trans. M. Naydan). New York: Garland Publ., 1990.
- Kotsiubynsky, Mykhailo. *Fata Morgana and Other Stories* (trans. A. Bernhard et al.). Kiev: Dnipro, 1980.
- . *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors* (trans. M. Carynnyk). Littleton: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1981.
- Kulish, Mykola. *Sonata Pathetique* (trans. G. and M. Luckyj). Littleton: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1975.
- Kulish, Panteleimon. *The Black Council* (trans. G. and M. Luckyj). Littleton: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1973.
- Kvitka-Osnovianenko, Hryhorii. *Marusia* (trans. F. Livesay). New York: Dutton, 1940.
- Kyriak, Illia. *Sons of the Soil*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1959.
- Lev Krevza's *A Defense of Church Unity and Zakharija Kopystens'kyj's Palinodia* (trans. B. Struminsky). Cambridge: HURI, 1996.
- The Life of Paisij Velychkov's'kyj* (trans. J. Featherstone). Cambridge: HURI, 1989.
- Lysenko, Vera. *Yellow Boots*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1954.
- Medieval Russia's Epics, Chronicles and Tales* (ed. S. Zenkovsky). New York: Dutton, 1974.
- Melnyczuk, Askold. *What Is Told*. Boston: Faber and Faber, 1994.
- Modern Ukrainian Short Stories* (ed. G. Luckyj). Rev. ed., Englewood: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1995.
- The Muse in Prison* (trans. Ya. Slavutych). Jersey Cit: Svoboda Press, 1956.
- Mushketyk, Yuri. *Cruel Mercy* (trans. O. Panasyev). Kiev: Dnipro, 1986.
- Myrny, Panas. *Do Oxen Low When Mangers Are Full?* (trans. O. Kovalenko). Kiev: Dnipro, 1990.
- Nechui-Levytsky, Ivan. *Mikola Dzherya* (trans. O. Kovalenko). Kiev: Dnipro, 1985.
- New Writing from Ukraine* (ed. M. Naydan). Somerville: Zephyr Press, 1996.
- On the Fence: An Anthology of Ukrainian Prose in Australia* (trans. Yu. Tkacz). Melbourne: Lastivka Press, 1985.
- Osadchy, Mykhailo. *Cataract* (trans. M. Carynnyk). New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1976.
- Osmachka, Teodosii. *Red Assassins*. Minneapolis: Denison, 1959.

- The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery* (trans. M. Heppel). Cambridge: HURI, 1989.
- Pavlychko, Solomea. *Letters from Kiev* (trans. M. Kostash). Edmonton: CIUS, 1992.
- Pidmohyl'ny Valerian. *A Little Touch of Drama* (trans. G. Luckyj). Littleton: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1972.
- The Poetical Works of Taras Shevchenko* (trans. C. Andrusyshen and W. Kirkconnell). Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964.
- Poetry of Soviet Ukraine's New World: An Anthology*. Unesco, Ashford, Norbury, 1986.
- The Russian Primary Chronicle; Laurentian Text* (trans. S. Cross and O. Sherbowitz-Wetzor). Cambridge: The Medieval Academy of America, 1963.
- Ryl'sky, Maksym. *Selected Poetry* (trans. G. Evans). Kiev: Dnipro, 1980.
- Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus'* (trans. S. Franklin). Cambridge: HURI, 1991.
- Shevchenko, Taras, Song out of Darkness, Selected Poems* (trans. V. Rich). London: The Mitre Press, 1961.
- . *Selected Works* (trans. J. Weir). Moscow: Progress Publishing, n.d.
- Shevchuk, Valeriy. *The Meek Shall Inherit the Earth*. Kiev: Dnipro, 1989.
- Slovo o polku Ihorevim. Song of Igor's Campaign* (trans. V. Nabokov). New York: Vintage Books, 1960.
- Soviet Ukrainian Short Stories*. Kiev: Dnipro, 1983-85.
- Stefanyk, Vasyl. *The Stone Cross* (trans. J. Wiznuk and C. Andrusyshen). Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1971.
- Stus, Vasyl. *Selected Poems* (trans. J. Lassowsky). Munich: Ukrainische Freie Universitaet, 1987.
- Sverstiuk, Ievhen. *Clandestine Essays* (trans. G. Luckyj). Cambridge: HURI, 1976.
- Taras Shevchenko, the Poet of Ukraine; Selected Poems* (trans. C. Manning). Jersey City: Ukrainian National Association, 1945.
- Tarnawsky, Yuriy. *Three Blondes and Death*. Boulder: Fiction Collective Two, 1993.
- Teliha, Olena. *Boundaries of Flame. A Complete Collection of Poetry* (trans. O. Prokopiw). Baltimore: Smoloskyp, 1977.
- Tiutiun'nyk, Hryhir. *Cool Mint, A Collection of Stories* (trans. A. Bilenko). Kiev: Dnipro, 1986.
- Turiansky, Osyp. *Lost Shadows* (trans. A. Mykytiuk). New York: Empire Books, 1935.
- Ukrainka, Lesia. *Hope; Selected Poetry* (trans. G. Evans). Kiev: Dnipro, 1975.
- Ukrainian Dumy* (trans. G. Tarnawsky and P. Kilina). Toronto: CIUS and HURI, 1979.
- The Ukrainian Poets; 1189-1962* (trans. C. Andrusyshen and W. Kirkconnell). Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963.

- Vovchok, Marko. *After Finishing School* (trans. O. Kovalenko). Kiev: Dnipro, 1983.
- . *Ukrainian Folk Stories* (trans. N. Pedan-Popil). Saskatoon: Western Producer Prairie Books, 1983.
- Vynnychenko, Volodymyr. *Selected Short Stories* (trans. T. Prokopov). Wakefield, Longwood Academic, 1991.
- Vyshnia, Ostop. *Hard Times* (trans. Yu. Tkacz). Melbourne: Bayda Books, 1981.
- Written in the Book of Life: Works by 19-20th Century Ukrainian Writers* (trans. M. Skrypnyk). Moscow: Progress Publishing, 1982.
- Yarmarok: Ukrainian Writing in Canada Since the Second World War* (eds. J. Balan and Yu. Klynovy). Edmonton: CIUS, 1987.
- Zahrebelny, Pavlo. *From the Point of View of Eternity*. Moscow: Progress, 1978.

Index

- Adel'heim, Jevhen, 717
 Alcevs'ka, Xrystja, 705
 Aldington, Richard, 743
Al fresco, 694
All Quiet on the Western Front, 743
Amerykanci, 718
 Andievs'ka, Emma, 768, 769, 777
 "Andrij Solovejko," 699
 Andruxovyc, Jurij, 773, 779, 780
 Annenskij, Innokentij, 696
Antologia wspolczesnych poetow ukrainskich, 694
Antolohija rymy'skoj poeziji, 709
 Antonenko-Davydovyc, Borys, 712, 742, 746, 748, 749
 Antonyc, Bohdan Ihor, 759, 760
Apartment z viknom, 766
Apolohety pysaryzmu, 715
Apostoly, 765
 Aragon, Louis, 736
 Aristophanes, 712
Arsenal, 741
Artem Harmas, 736
A teper idy, 756
Atomni preljudy, 745
 "Autobiography," 727
Avtoportret z ujavy, 756
- Babij, Oles, 758
 Baboval, Roman, 750
 Babyskin, Oleh, 692
 Baca, Jurij, 766
 Bahrjanyj, Ivan, 764, 765, 767
Bajda, 718
Bajkivnycja, 727
Bajky, 727
Balada pro Slastjona, 754
 Balzac, Honore, 738
Barjer nesumisnosti, 751
 Barka, Vasyl', 708, 765, 767
Barvinkovyj svit, 738
Barvy i liniji, 762
- Bas, Jakiv, 739
Bar'kivscyna, 739
Bar'kivs'ki porohy, 750
Bazar (Andijevs'ka), 768
Bazar (Vynnycenko), 700
 Bazylevs'kyj, V., 781
 Bazan, Mykola, 715, 716, 717, 730, 735, 740, 742
Bejruts'ki opovidannja, 692
 Belajev, V., 738
 Bel'tov, Eduard, 771
 Belyj, Andrej, 715
 Berdnyk, Oles', 749, 757
Bereh cekan', 744
Berestecko, 756
 Berezan, Zinovij, 767
Berezil', 778
Bezbatcenko, 704
Bez Espaniji, 770
Bez gruntu (Domontovyc), 764
Bez gruntu (Epik), 721
Bezodnja, 779
Bez puttja, 704
Bezsmertja, 735
 Bicuja, Nina, 755
 Bida, Constantine, 697
Bij za ukrajins'ku literaturu, 762
 Bilec'kyj, Oleksander, 695, 717, 718, 719, 726, 730
Bili sonety, 758
Bil'mo, 748
 Bilocerkivec', Natalka, 773
 Bilokin' Serhij, 777
Bilyj kin' Septalo, 754
Bilyj svit, 765
 Bircak, Volodymyr, 683
 Biss, Jeva, 765
Blakytina trojanda, 697
Blakytyni eselony, 736
 Blakytynyj, Ellan Vasyl', 707, 713
Blakytynyj mist, 729
Blakytynyj roman, 713
 Blok, Alexander, 696

- Blud...*, 779
Blyskavyci, 701
Blyznjata sce zustinutsja, 765
Blyznec', Viktor, 777
Bobyns'kyj, Vasył', 726, 746, 758
Bohac'kyj, Pavlo, 690
Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj, 737
Bohun, 729
Bojarynja, 697, 698
Boichuk, Bohdan, 765, 768, 769
Bol'sak, Vasył', 749
Boryslavs'ki opovidannja, 702
Brexnja, 700
Brezhnev, Leonid, 746, 749, 772
Brujuhhen, Volodymyr, 778
Bu-ba-bu, 780
Budennyj xlib, 705
Budivli, 716
Budzynovs'kyj, Vjaceslav, 690
Bujnyj xmil', 721
Bukovyna, 704
Bukovyns'ka povist', 740
Bunt, 718
Buremna Put', 722
Burevij, Kost', 725
Burjak, B., 738
Burjan, 720, 726
Burkhardt, Osvald, 709
Buruny, 762

Caban, 725
Cajkovs'kyj, Andrij, 763
Calendarium, 696
Carivna, 688, 698
Carivna Ukrajina, 763
Carnec'kyj, Stepan, 689, 694
Cas bolju, 769
Catalepton, 710
Cecvjans'kyj, Vasył', 746
Cendej, Ivan, 755, 756
Ceremsyna, Marko, 704
Cerevatenko, Leonid, 777
Cerez kladku, 698
Cerkasenko, Spyrydon, 694, 695
Cerlen', 763
Cerlene vyno, 752

Cernihiv, 733
Cernjavs'kyj, Mykola, 691, 705
Cernov, Leonid, 729
Cervona zyma, 716
Cervonohrads'kyj cykl', 719
Cervonohvardijec', 735
Cest', 711
Cetver, 778
Cetvertyj vymir, 752
Ciluju zemlju, 696
Cipka, Halaktion, 758
Clandestine Essays, 747
Coho ne hojit' vohon', 768
"Contra spem spero," 696
Corna dolyna, 768
Corna epopeja, 729
Corna pantera i bilyj medvid', 700
Corne ozero, 725
Corni akaciji, 769
Corni kryla, 701
Cornovil, Vjaceslav, 747
Cornovil Papers, 747
Cornyj anhel, 718
Corollarium, 710
Cortivs'ka skelja, 768
Cotyry brody, 741
Cotyry Cemberleny, 725
Cotyry opovidannja pro nadiju, 742
Cotyry sabli, 717, 735
Cotyry vitry, 729
Cubaj, Hryhorij, 748
Cumak, Vasył', 713
Cuprynka, Hryc'ko, 691, 696
Cuttja jedynoji rodyny
Cuzu nyvu zala, 739
Cuzyj bil', 770
Cvetajeva, Marina, 769
Cvit jabluni, 699
Cybul'ko, Volodymyr, 773, 780
Cyperdjuk, Ivan, 780
Cyrkov, M., 715
Cyrs'kyj, Mykola, 762

Daniel, Julij, 747
D'Annunzio, Gabriele, 687
Dacej, Vasył', 767

- Dante Alighieri, 694, 705
 Darahan, Jurij, 762
Death of a Hero, 743
Den' hnivu, 764
Den' otcja Sojky, 759
Den' prolitaje nad namy, 755
De meni poditysja, 780
Derevij, 750
Derzannja, 708
Desjat' sliv poeta, 755
 Desnjak, Oleksa, 739
Desnu perejsly batalijony, 739
Devjanosto sim, 722
Dhori, 719
 Dibrova, Volodymyr, 773, 779
 Dickinson, Emily, 768
Dijstvo pro Jurija peremozcja, 765
Dijstvo pro velyku ljudynu, 765
Dilo, 689, 690, 758
Dim na hori, 751
Dim nad kručeu, 768
Dity cumac' kogo sljachu, 764
Dity zemli, 739
Divcata nasoji krajiny, 728
Divcyna, 727
Divcyna z vedmedykom, 710
Divcyni bez krajiny, 769
Divy noci, 779
 "Dlja zahal'noho dobra," 699
Dni, 711
Dnipro, 777
 Dniprovs'kyj, Ivan, 715, 722, 732
 Dobroljubov, Nikolaj, 686
Docka prokurora, 736
Do dzerel (Drac), 745
Do dzerel (Zerov), 709
Doktor Serafikus, 764
 Domontovyc, Viktor, 710, 764
 Doncenko, Oles', 739
 Doncov, Dmytro, 734, 760, 764
 Doncyk, Vitalij, 736, 750, 753, 777
Donec'ki sonety, 705
Donec'kyj cykl, 719
Don Kixot z Etenhajma, 759
Dorobok, 719
Doroha (Bazan), 716
Doroha (Kravciv), 761
Doroha (Stefanyk), 699
 Doroskevyc, Oleksander, 709, 730
 Dosvitnij, Oles', 715, 718, 746
Dosvitni symfoniji, 714
 Dovzenko, Oleksander, 715, 741, 745
 Drac, Ivan, 744, 745, 772, 773
 Drahomanov, Myxajlo, 696, 702
 Draj-Xmara, Myxajlo, 709, 710, 746, 776
 Drozd, Volodymyr, 754, 779
Druhe pysestija, 756
 Dubyna, M., 726
Duklja, 766
Duma pro Brytanku, 736
Dumky proty teciji, 715
 "Dusa," 698
Dusa i dolja, 765
Dusa ne storozji, 761
Duxy i dervisi, 769
Duze dobre, 736
Dvi dramy, 769
Dyktatura, 728
Dykyj med, 741
Dykyj vynohrad, 694
Dym vicnosti, 768
Dyrygent ostann'oji svicky, 773
Dytynstvo, 736
Dyvo, 742, 752
Dyvymos' v oci smerti, 762
Dyzharmonija, 700
 Dzjuba, Ivan, 712, 747, 757, 779
Dzvenyslava, 767
Dzvin, 755
Dzvony, 759

Emal', 762
 Epik, Hryhorij, 721, 746
 "Estafety," 745
Evropa cy Rosija, 725
Evropa-45, 752
Evropa-Zaxid, 752

Fal'kivs'kyj, Dmytro, 725
Fal'syva Mel'pomena, 721
 Fascenko, V., 752, 753
Fata Morgana, 700
Faust (Kosynka), 724
Faust i smert', 743
 Fedjuk, Taras, 758
 Fedoriv, Roman, 755
 Fedorovs'ka, L., 755
Feja hirkoho mihdalju, 728
 Filjans'kyj, Mykola, 696
 Fisbejn, Mojsej, 770
 Franko, Ivan, 686, 687, 689, 690, 693,
 696, 702, 703, 705, 752
Front, 737
 Fylypovyc, Pavlo, 695, 698, 709, 710, 776

Galay, Ted, 771
 Garcia Lorca, Federico, 745
Gartenlaube, 698
 George, Stefan, 768
 Ginsberg, Allen, 745
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang, 726
 Gogol', Nikolaj, 717
 Gorbachev, Mikhail, 750, 771
 Gorky, Maxim, 727, 732
 Grabowicz, George, 733, 764, 777
 Grabowicz, Oksana, 776
 Grendza-Dons'kyj, Vasyl', 766
 Gzyc'kyj, Volodymyr, 725, 726, 742,
 746

Hadzins'kyj, Volodymyr, 713
 Halan, Jaroslav, 759
Halyc'ka brama, 755
Harmonija i svynusnyk, 729
 Hauptmann, Gerhart, 687
 Havryljuk, Jurij, 770
 Havryljuk, Oleksander, 759
 Heine, Heinrich, 726
 Herasymjuk, Vasyl', 758, 778, 779
Herald (LNV), 686, 687, 688, 689-90,
 748-49
Herbarij, 760
Herostraty, 769

Het'mans'kyj skarb, 778
 Hirnyk, Pavlo, 773
 Hnatjuk, Volodymyr, 687
 Hnatysak, Mykola, 759
Hniv, 758
 Hoffmann, Ernst, 717
 Holoborod'ko, Vasyl', 745, 773
Holod, 769
Holos, 757
Holosijivs'ka osin', 734, 742
 Holovko, Andrij, 720, 726, 727, 736
 Holubec', Mykola, 758
Holubi eselony, 720
 Homer, 705
Homin vikiv, 765
Homonila Ukrajina, 736
 Honcar, Nazar, 780
 Honcar, Oles', 740, 743, 749, 750
Horbunka Zoja, 779
 Hordijenko, Kost', 739
 Hordyns'kyj, Svjatoslav, 762, 763
 Horobec', Tyberij, 694
Hory hovorjat', 763
Hospodarstvo doktora Gal'vanesku, 721
 Hostynjak, Stepan, 766
Hovoryty, movcaty, 748
 Hrabovs'kyj, Pavlo, 687
Hran', 755
 Hrinchenko, Borys, 687, 703, 772
 Hrusevs'kyj, Myxajlo, 686, 690, 706
 Hrycenko, Oleksander, 773
Hryhorij Skovoroda, 727
 Hrynevycyeva, Katrja, 689, 763
 Hrysko, Vasyl, 716
 Hucalo, Jevhen, 746, 779
Hucul's'kyj kurin', 758
 Hulak, Mykola, 752
 Humenna, Dokija, 764
 Hundorova, Tamara, 780
Husla, 762

Ibsen, Henrik, 687, 689
Idealizovana biohrafija, 770
Idu na vas, 763
Ikar na metelykovyx krylax, 773
Ikonostas Ukrainy, 769

- Il'cenko, Oleksander, 738
 Ilnytzyj, Oleh, 708
Imlystoju rikoju, 726
Inteligent, 720
 "Intermezzo," 699
Internacionalizm cy rusyfikacija?, 747
 Ircan, Myroslav, 726, 746
 Irvanec', Oleksander, 780
 Isajiw, Petro, 759
 Iscenko, Mykola, 749
Istoriya radosti, 737
Istoriya ukrajins'koji literatury, 725, 729, 746, 757
Ivan Bohun, 738
 "Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj smijet'sja," 748
 Ivanov, Vjaceslav, 696
 Ivanycuk, Roman, 752, 779
 Ivanysenko, V., 739
 Ivcenko, Myxajlo, 726
Iz zapysok xoluja, 719
- Ja, Bohdan*, 753
Jabluka z osinn'oho sadu, 746
Jablunevyj polon, 722
 Jackiv, Myxajlo, 687, 689, 693, 701
Jak budujetsja opovidannja, 719
Jak na vijni, 751
 Jakubs'kyj, Borys, 697, 730
 Janovs'kyj, Jurij, 715, 717, 730, 735, 756, 761
Jarosenko, 704
Jaroslav Mudryj, 737
Jaroslav Osmomysl', 763
Jasa, 754
 Javorivs'kyj, Volodymyr, 745, 756, 772
Jevpraksija, 753
 Jefremov, Serhij, 688, 689, 690, 705, 707
 Jevsan, Mykola, 690, 691, 696, 698, 705, 708
Ji, 778
 Johansen, Majk, 715, 719, 720, 730, 746
Junist' Vasylja Seremety, 765
Jurko Kruk, 759
 Jury nec, Volodymyr, 714
- Kacura, Jakiv, 738
 Kacurovs'kyj, Ihor, 765, 767
Kadry, 728
 Kafka, Franz, 762
 Kaganovich, Lazar, 732
 Kalnysevs'kyj, Petro, 752
 Kaly nec', Ihor, 745, 748, 780
 Kaly tovs'ka, Marta, 770
Kamena, 709
Kamjane pole, 755
Kaminna dusa, 701
Kaminnyj hospodar, 697
Kaminnyj xrest, 699
Kaminnyj vynohrad, 718
Kamo hrjadesy?, 715
Kappa Xresta, 769
 Karabovyc, Tadej, 770
 Karmans'kyj, Petro, 687, 689, 693, 694
 Karpenko-Karyj, Ivan, 689
Kassandra, 697
Kazka, 741
Kazka pro persten', 701
Kazka staroho mlyna, 695
 Keats, John, 768
 Khrushchev, Nikita, 740, 742, 744
Kievskaja starina, 688, 689
 Kilina, Patricia, 768, 769
 Kipling, Rudyard, 687
 Kirov, Sergei, 735
Klekit, 712
 Klen, Jurij, 761, 765, 768, 774
Klubok Arijadny, 763
Knjaza emal', 762
Knyha Leva, 759
Knyha sposterezen', 767
 Kobryns'ka, Natalija, 688, 698
 Kobyljans'ka, Ol'ha, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 698
Kobzar (Semenko), 708
 Kocerha, Ivan, 728, 737
 Kocjubyns'kyj, Myxajlo, 686, 687, 689, 691, 699, 701, 711, 724
 Kocur, Hryhorij, 772, 775
 Koestler, Arthur, 732
 Kohut, Zoja, 770
 Kolakowski, Leszek, 702
 Kolomijec', Oleksij, 743

- Kolomijec', Tamara, 745
 Kolomyjec', Jurij, 770
Komuna v stepax, 722
Koni voroniji, 742
 Kopylenko, Oleksander, 721, 736
Kora, 757
Korabli, 765
 Kordun, Viktor, 773, 780
 Korjak, Volodymyr, 730
 Kornijcuk, Oleksander, 737, 738
 Koroleva, Natalena, 759
Koronuvannja opudala, 748
Korotki viddali, 769
 Korotyc, Vitalij, 744, 745
 Korsjuk, Mykola, 770
 Kosac, Jurij, 763, 764, 765, 768
 Koselivec', Ivan, 741
 Kostash, Myrna, 771
 Kostec'kyj, Ihor, 765
 Kostenko, Lina, 744, 745, 749, 756, 777, 778
 Kostjuk, Ju., 728
 Kostomarov, Mykola, 702
 Kosynka, Hryhorij, 724, 725, 730, 746
 Kovac, Ivan, 770
 Kovaliv, Turij, 686
 Kovalenko, B., 724
 Kozacenko, Vasyi', 742
Kozac'komu rodu nema perevodu, 738
Kozaky v Moskoviji, 762
 Kozlanjuk, Petro, 759
 Kozlovs'kyj, Oleksander, 705
 "Krasa i syla," 700
 Kravcenko, Uljana, 705
 Kravciv, Bohdan, 745, 761, 763, 765, 767, 768
Krov ljuds'ka ne vodycja, 741
Krov Ukrainy, 740
Krov zemli, 717
Kruca, 712
 Krusel'nyc'kyj, Antin, 705, 759
Krutiz, 694
Kryk pivnja na svitanku, 751
Kryla, 738
Krylo Ikarove, 769
 Kryms'kyj, Ahatanhel, 686, 687, 692
Krynycna voda, 755
Krytyka, 759
 Kryvonis, Maksym, 736
 Kudlyk, Roman, 745
Kulak, 763
 Kulis, Mykola, 715, 722, 723, 724, 730, 746, 755
 Kulis, Pantelejmon, 710, 712
 Kulyk, Ivan, 729, 732, 746
 Kundera, Milan, 741, 753
 Kupcyns'kyj, Roman, 758
 Kurbas, Les', 722, 723, 724, 730, 755
 Kuzjakina, Natalia, 723, 728
 Kybal'cyc, Nadija, 691
Kyjiv, 734, 777
Kyjivs'ki etjudy, 735
Kyjivs'ki fresky, 756
Kyjivs'ki sonety, 756
 Kylymnyk, O., 717, 721, 726
 Krylenko, Ivan, 746

Ladi i Mareni, 693
 Lahovs'kyj, Andrij, 692
 Lourinenko, Jurij, 716, 722
 Lazoryk, Fedir, 766
 Le, Ivan, 729, 737
 "Lebedi," 710
Lebedyna zhraja, 750
 Lec-Otamanov, 720
Lehendy hir, 762
Lehendy starokyjivs'ki, 759
Lehendy i sny, 769
 Lejtes, Aleksandr, 720
 Lenin, Vladimir, 706, 747
Leningrad, 740
 Lepkyj, Bohdan, 689, 691, 694, 763
 Lepkyj, Lev, 758
Letters from the Gulag, 710
 Levada, Oleksander, 743
Lirnyk, 767
Lirycni poeziji (Svidzins'kyj), 712
Lirycni poeziji (Voronyj), 694
Liryka, 696
Lisova pisnja, 697
Literaturna Ukrainy, 772, 777, 781
Literaturno-naukovyj vistykyk, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 748, 749

- Literaturnyj jarmarok*, 715
Lito, 734
 Livyc'ka-Xolodna, Natalija, 762, 768
 Ljaturyns'ka, Oksana, 762, 768
 Ljubcenko, Arkadij, 722
 Ljubcenko, Panas, 732
 "Ljubit' Ukrajinu," 735, 740
Ljubov i dym, 722
Ljubovni lysty, 769
 Ljudkevyc, Stanislav, 689
Ljudolovy, 739
Ljudyna, 698
Ljudyna i zbroja, 743
 Luc'kyj, Ostap, 689, 690
 Lucuk, Ivan, 780
Luhosad, 780
 Lukas, Mykola, 775
 Lukjanovyc, Denys, 701
 Lupij, Oles', 745, 755
 Luznyc'kyj, Hryhorij, 759
Lycari absurdu, 712
 Lyman, Leonid, 764
 Lypa, Ivan, 687
 Lypa, Jurij, 762
 Lysa, Rajisa, 780
 Lyseha, Oleh, 773
Lystja zemli, 779
Lystky padut', 694
Lysty z Krymu, 729
Lyxo z rozumu, 747
- Macyns'kyj, Ivan, 766
 Maeterlinck, Maurice, 687, 689
Majster korablja, 717
Majstry casu, 737
 Makarov, A., 756
Maklena Grasa, 722, 723
 Makovej, Osyp, 704
 Malanjuk, Jevhen, 734, 760, 761, 764, 767, 774
Malen'ka futbol'na komanda, 751
 Malkovyc, Ivan, 758, 780
 Mallarme, Stephane, 695, 696, 768
Mal'vy, 752
 Malysko, Andrij, 739
 Mamajsur, Borys, 745
- Mamontov, Jakiv, 728, 746
Mamutovi byvni, 717
Mandala, 769
Mandrivka til, 769
Mandrivka v molodist', 734
Mandrivky sercja, 744
Manuskrypt z vulyci ru'koji, 752
Marija (Samcuk), 763
Marija (Tudor), 759
Marko v pekli, 728
 Marlitt, Eugenie, 698
 Martovyc, Les', 704
Marusja Curaj, 756
 Masenko, Teren', 739
Maslyny, 754
Maty (Holovko), 727
Maty (Kosynka), 724
 Maupassant, Guy de, 686, 687, 711
Mazepa, 694
 Mazepa, Ivan, 767
Medobir, 712
 Medvid', Vjaceslav, 758
 Melnychuk, Askold, 771
Memories of Love, 769
Meningitis, 770
 "Mertva zona," 746
Metelyky na spyl'kax, 743
Mirty i kyparysy, 705
Misja mistera Perkinsa, 737
Misjacni hruni, 766
Misto, 711
Miz ridnymi v pivdennij Ameryci, 694
 Mohyljans'kyj, Myxajlo, 710, 711
Mojsej, 703
 Moliere, Jean, 723
Molode vyno, 780
Molodist', 714
 Morenec', Volodymyr, 781
 Moroz, Gennadij, 773
 Moroz, Valentyn, 747, 748
 Mosendz, Leonid, 763, 767
 Moskalec', Konstjantyn, 780
Moskovijada, 779
Mosty, 734
Motyvy, 726
 Movcan, Pavlo, 757, 758
 Muratov, Ihor, 740

- Musketyk, Jurij, 754, 778, 781
Muzyc'kyj posol, 738
 Mykytenko, Ivan, 728, 729, 732, 746
Myna Mazajlo, 722, 723, 724
Myr, 736
 Myrnyj, Panas, 689, 691
 Myronjuk, Lavro, 762
Mysaci nory, 720
 Mysyk, Vasyl', 729, 746
Myt' z majstrom, 763
 Myxajljuk, Myxajlo, 770
 Myxajlycenko, Hnat, 713

Naberezna 12, 751
Na berezi kastal's'komu, 718
Na bilyx ostrovax, 709
Nad Ceremosem, 740
Nad Dniprom, 695
Nad rikoju, 694
Nad svitlym dzerelom, 765
Na gastroljax v Mykytjanax, 704
Nahody i pryhody, 762
Na hrani, 737
Najivnyj muryn, 759
 "Na kameni," 699
Na krylax pisen', 696
Nalyvajko (Le), 737
Nalyvajko (Vinhranovs'kyj), 779
 "Na mertvoj tocke," 689
Na okrajinax noci, 767
 Napoleon Bonaparte, 718
Na poli krovj, 697
Na poli smyrennomu, 751, 752
Na pozarysci, 725
Narodnij Malaxij, 722, 723, 724
Narodzennja idola, 768
Narodzujet'sja misto, 736
Na rozi bur, 729
Na rujinax, 697
Nas bulo troje, 718
Nas den', 726
Nasi tajny, 736
Nasi znakomi, 704
Na tverdig zemli, 768
Nauka pro zemlju, 768
 Naydan, M., 779

 Nazaruk, Osyp, 763
Na zlomi, 721
Na zolotyx bohiv, 724
Nazustric, 762
 Neborak, Viktor, 773, 780
 Necerda, Borys, 745
 Necuj-Levyč'kyj, Ivan, 687, 689, 704
Neduha, 711
Neherboviji genealohiji, 770
Nenavyst', 729
Nenavyst' i ljubov, 758
Nepija, 721
Nepovtornist', 756
Neskoreni, 766
Nevelycka drama, 711
Nevil'nyci pisni, 696
Ne vir kryku nicnoho ptaxa, 770
New York Times, 771
Nic koxannja, 726
Nicni perekazy, 770
 Nietzsche, Friedrich, 688, 689, 690, 702, 711
Nikomu tebe ne viddam, 755
 Nikovs'kyj, Andrij, 705
Niz u sonci, 745
 Norwid, Cyprian, 745
Notatnyk, 762
Nova generacija, 708
Nova liryka, 738
Nove ukrajins'ke pys'menstvo, 709
Novi poeziji, 768
Novi sljaxy, 759
 Novycenko, Leonid, 708, 735, 745
 Nud'ha, N., 739
 Nytcenko, Dmytro, 770, 771
 Nyzankivs'kyj, Bohdan, 765

Obloha noci, 736
Obriji, 725
Oci ta usta, 762
Oderzyna, 697
 "Odvertyj lyst," 703
Ogonek, 745
Ohljan'sja z oseni, 756
Ohnecvit, 696
Ohni horjat', 701

- Oj, ljuli smutku*, 693
Okean, 767
Okocvit, 696
Oles', Oleksander, 687, 691, 694, 695, 696, 707, 772, 776
Olijnyk, Borys, 732, 757
Olijnyk, Stepan, 756
Ol'zyc, Oleh, 761, 774
Opil's'kyj, Julijan, 763
Orda, 779
Orhja, 697
Orest, Myxajlo, 765
Orlova balka, 757
Orwell, George, 748
Osadcyj, Myxajlo, 747, 748
Osin', 714
Os'macka, Todos', 712, 765, 767
Osobysta Klio, 769
Ostannja vesna, 767
Ostannij Ejdzvud, 721
Ostannij prorok, 767
Ostap Saptala, 711
Ostryk, M., 735

Pacovs'kyj, Vasyl', 689, 690, 693
Palij, Lida, 770, 777
Palimpsesty, 757
Pal'move hillja, 692
Pamjat'fragmentarna, 770
Panc, Petro, 720, 731, 736
Paniv, Andrij, 729
Parascuk, Myxajlo, 689
Partija vede, 733
Paskovs'kyj, Jebhen, 773, 779
Pasternak, Boris, 741, 769
Patetyčna sonata, 722, 723
Pavlo Polubotok, 725
Pavlycko, Dmytro, 756, 757, 772
Pavlycko, Solomija, 778, 779
Pavlyk, Myxajlo, 688
Pavlyshyn, Marko, 751, 753, 775, 777, 780
Paxl'ovs'ka, Oksana, 773, 778
Pcilka, Olena, 696
Peredcuttja radosti, 746
Perejaslavs'ka rada, 738

Pereval, 778
Perexresni stezky, 702
Pero zolotoho ptaxa, 755
Persa vesna, 721
Persyj vinok, 699
Persten' Polikrata, 760
Perversion, 779
Pervni, 768
Pervomajs'kyj, Leonid, 738, 741, 742
Petljura, Symon, 716
Petro Romen, 721
Petrov, Viktor, 710
Pidhirjanka, Marijka, 758
Pidmohyl'nyj, Valerijan, 711, 730, 742, 746, 771, 772, 777
"Pid oborohom," 703
Pid osinnimy zorjamy, 709
Pidsumovujucy movcannja, 748
Pid tyxyj vecir, 694
Pid tyxmy verbamy, 704
Pidzamca, 761
Pid znakom Feniksa, 768
Pilnjak, Boris, 715
Pisnja pro Svicku, 728
Pisni bez tekstu, 768
Pivdennyj komfort, 754
Pivtora ljudyny, 721
Pjat' po dvanadcjati, 768
Placdarm, 726
Placynda, Serhij, 756, 778
Plan do dvoru, 767
Planeta Speranta, 743
Plantaciji, 718
Platon Krecet, 737
Pluh, 707
Pluznyk, Jevhen, 711, 712, 730, 732, 746
Plyvem po motju t'my, 694
Podotoz z ucytelern, 769
"Podorozni," 746
Podoroz poza formy, 770
Podoroz ucenoho doktora Leonardo, 719
Po dorozji v kazku, 695
Poemy, 718
Poet, 765
Poeziji, 761
"Poezija v prozi," 688, 701
Poeziji pro nisco, 770

- Poeziji stari i novi*, 768
Poeziji z Ukrajiny, 748
 Pohribnyj, A., 731
Pohuljanka odyncem, 773
 "Poxoron druha," 733
 Poliscuk, Valerijan, 727, 746
Polissja, 725
 Poltava, Leonid, 765
Pomyłka Onore de Balzaka, 738
Popil imperij, 765
Popoludni v Pokipsi, 770
Porih, 757
Po toj bik sercja, 736
Povistky ta eskizy z ukrajins'koho zyt'tja, 692
Povist' bez nazvy, 711
Povist' polumjanyx lit, 741
Povist' pro Xarkiv, 764
Poza mezamy bolju, 758
 "Poza mezamy mozlyvoho," 702
Pozycja, 755
Praporonosci, 740, 743
Pravda, 733, 737
Pravda i kryvda, 741
Pravda klyce, 756
Prekrasna Ut, 717
Prima vera, 705
 Procjuk, Stepan, 780
Profesor Bujko, 739
Prokljati roky, 761
Promeni, 761
Promenysta zrada, 769
Prometej, 739
Prominnja zemli, 744
Propala hramota, 780
Proponuju vam svoju dorohu, 766
Prorosten', 710
Prostir, 710
Protuberanci sercja, 745
 Proust, Marcel, 742
Pryreceni, 769
Prystritnyky, 766
Pryvitannja zyt'tja, 759
Pryznacennja Ukrainy, 762
 Przybyszewski, Stanislaw, 688, 693
Ptakhy polysajut' hnizda, 755
 Pushkin, Alexander, 709
 Pusk, Stepan, 755
 Pylypenko, Serhij, 727, 746

Quid est Veritas, 759

Rada, 691
Radio v zytax, 727
Rannja osin', 711
Rekreaciji, 779
 Remarque, Erich, 743
Reportaz iz zapovidnyka Beriji, 748
Respublika na kolesax, 728
 Revakovyc, Marija, 770
Revoljucija, 719
Revoljucija ide, 763
 Rjabcuk, Mykola, 773
 Rilke, Rainer Maria, 768
Rin', 761
Rivnovaha, 711
Riz'blena tin', 716
Robitni syly, 726
Rodovid, 755
Rodyna scitrariv, 726
 "Rodynne vohnysce," 746
Roksoljana (Nazaruk), 763
Roksoljana (Zahrebel'nyj), 753
Roman Mizhirja, 729
Roman pro dobru ljudynu, 769
Roman pro ljuds'ke pryznacennja, 769
Rotaciji, 759
Rotonda dusohubciv, 767
 "Roza," 698
Rozeve pavutyynnja, 728
Rozevi mista, 769
Rozpovid' pro nespokij and sequel, 742
Rozsypani perly, 693
Rubajut' lis, 705
 Ruban, Vasyl', 749, 773
 Rubcak, Bohdan, 700, 759, 765, 768, 769, 773, 777
 Rudenko, Mykola, 757
 Rudnyc'kyj, Myxajlo, 702, 703, 762
Rufin i Priscilla, 697
 Ruskin, John, 690

- Ryba i rozmir*, 768
Rybak, Natan, 738
Ryl's'kyj, Maksym, 691, 696, 709, 711, 730, 734, 740, 741, 742, 761
Rymaruk, Ihor, 773

Sad hetsymans'kyj, 767
Sad netanucyx skulptur, 756
Sadlovs'kyj, Roman, 780
Sahajdak, 762
Sal, 779
Sambuk, Rostyslav, 749
Samcuk, Ulas, 763, 764, 765, 768
Samijlenko, Volodymyr, 687, 705
Samotnij vovk, 754
Samraj, Ahapij, 720
Sandburg, Carl, 729
Sapoval, Mykyta, 690
Savcenko, Jakiv, 718, 725
Saxovs'kyj, S., 725, 726
Scedrist', 765
Schnitzler, Arthur, 687
Scerbak, Jurij, 749, 750, 751
Scors, 741
Scurat, Vasyľ', 687, 689
Selepec', Josyf, 767
Selest, Petro, 747, 748
Semenko, Myxail', 708, 709, 746, 771, 780
Semen Palij, 754
Sencenko, Ivan, 716, 719
Sepit, 752
Sepotinnja, *sepotinnja*, 770
Serce, 716
Serce i kamin', 755
Serce zde, 738
Sered temnoji noci, 703
Serex, Jurij, 710, 713, 714, 725, 764
Serpen', 767
Sestry Ricyn'ski, 743
Sevcenko, Taras, 685, 697, 708, 743
Sevcuk, Valerij, 749, 751, 752, 779
Shakespeare, William, 723, 767
Shevelov, George, 703, 709, 710, 723, 762, 768, 777
Sil', 757

Sil's'ki vcyteli', 746
Sim lit, 762
Sim liter, 762
Simnadciat' xvylyn, 719
Simnadcjatyj patrul', 716
Sinjavskij, Andrej, 747
Sirko, Ivan, 755
Skljarenko, Semen, 742
Skovoroda, 733
Skrumeljak, Jura, 758
Skrypnyk, Leonid, 720
Skrypnyk, Mykola, 707, 732
Skunc', Petro, 745
Skupana v ljubystku, 746
Skurupij, Geo, 708, 709, 717, 746
Skyts'ki ohni, 712
Slabospyc'kyj, M., 750
Slavutyc, Jar, 765, 768
Sljax nevidomoho, 768
Sljaxom ternovym, 766
Sljaxy (Tarnawskyj), 770
Sljaxy (journal), 758
Slipci, 717
Slisarenko, Oleksa, 716, 718, 719, 746
Slova i mriji, 765
Slova na kamenjax, 762
"Slovo, comu ty..., " 697
Slovo hnanyx i holodnyx, 766
Slovo i cas, 778
Smajda, Myxajlo, 766
Smert', 712
Smert' Franka, 726
"Smert' Hamleta," 735
Smiljans'kyj, Leonid, 738
Smolyc, Jurij, 716, 721, 736, 742
Snajder, Borys, 721
Sobko, Vadym, 740
Sobor, 743, 747, 749
Sobor v rystuvanni, 747
Sojcyne krylo, 703
Sokolovs'kyj, Oleksander, 729
Solomjans'kyj cykl, 719
Solomjanyj dym, 720
Solomy v sonci, 763
Solo na flejti, 729
Solzenicyn, Alexander, 748
Sonety i strofy, 761

- Sonety podil's'koji oseni*, 756
Sonjasna masyna, 701
Sonjasni kljarnety, 707
Sonjasnyk, 745
Sonce pid veslamy, 729
Sonce rujiny, 693
Sonce sxodyt' v Cyhyryni, 763
Sonnetarium, 710
Son ukrajins'koji noci, 693
Sorok visim hodyn, 736
Sosjura, Volodymyr, 716, 734, 735, 740, 764, 772
Sovist' pamjati, 756
Spektakl, 754
Spohady pro neoklasykiv, 765
Spomyny ljubovy, 769
Sramy na skali, 752
Sribljans'kyj, M., 690, 691, 708
Stalin, Joseph, 715, 730, 731, 732, 733, 740, 741, 742, 743, 772, 774
Stalinhreds'kyj zosyt, 735
Stal' i niznist', 733
Staryc'kyj, Myxajlo, 704
Stavyc'kyj, O., 700
Stefanovyc, Oleksa, 761
Stefanyk, Vasyl', 686, 687, 689, 699, 704, 707, 724
Stel'max, Myxajlo, 740, 741
Step, 739
Stephanos I, 761
Stopoezij, 745
Sto Sim modnyx zacisok, 766
Stracene zyttja, 705
Strazdannja molodoji ljudyny, 705
Stricky, 694
Strindberg, August, 687, 698
Strixa, Edvard, 725
Strynahljuk, Ljubomyr, 780
Stus, Vasyl', 748, 757, 777
Stylet i stylos, 760
Sucasnist', 777
Suknaski, Andrew, 771
Sums'kyj, Oleksander, 707
Suslov, Mikhail, 749
Suvorist', 762
Suzirja lebedja, 768
Sverstjuk, Jevhen, 747, 748, 778
Svjata Ukrajina, 757
Svjatoslav, 742
Svjatyj haj, 769
Svica v svicadi, 757
Svidok, 767
Svidzins'kyj, Volodymyr, 691, 712, 730, 746
Svit, 630
Svitanok nad morem, 736
Svitlist, 762
Svitlycnyj, Ivan, 749
Symonenko, Vasyl', 744, 749
Synja dalecin', 709
Synja knyzecka, 699
Synja voloska, 712
Syni etjudy, 714
Syrotjuk, M., 728
Sytnyk, Myxajlo, 765

Tajna tancju, 726
Talalaj, Leonid, 745
Tanec' cuhajstra, 755
Tanec' tinej, 701
Taran, Ljudmyla, 778
Tarnavs'kyj, Jurij, 768, 769, 770, 777
Tarnavs'kyj, Ostap, 765
Tarnawsky, Maxim, 711
Teatr nevidomoho aktora, 736
Tecija, 745
Teliha, Olena, 761, 774
Temnota, 765
Teneta, Borys, 729
Terescenko, Mykola, 727, 728, 737
Teslenko, Arxyp, 705
Tini zabutyx predkiv, 700
Tjutjunnyk, Hryhir, 750, 777
Tjutjunnyk, Hryhorij, 742
Tobilevyc, Ivan, 722
Tom satyry, 721
Tovkacevs'kyj, Andrij, 691
Trahedija dzmeliv, 769
Travy, 729
Tretjakov, Robert, 745
Tretja rota, 734
Triscat' Kryhy, 766
Trofeji, 768

- Trotsky, Leon, 711
 Trus, Ivan, 699
Try lystky za viknom, 751
Trynadcjata vesna, 709
Try persteni, 759
Tryptyx, 769
 Tudor, Stepan, 759
Tuha za soncem, 705
 Tulub, Zinajida, 739, 742
 Turjans'kyj, Osyp, 683, 759
 Tverdoxlib, Sydir, 683, 694
 Tycyna, Pavlo, 691, 693, 707, 708, 709,
 716, 723, 730, 733, 734, 742, 770,
 772
Tyhrolovy, 764
Tysa i hrim, 744
Tysjacolitnij Mykolaj, 778

Udary molota i sercja, 713
 "Ukrajina cy Malorosija," 772
Ukrajina v ohni, 741
Ukrajini, 705
 Ukrajinka, Lesja, 687, 688, 692, 696,
 698, 699, 701, 710
Ukrajins'ka bohema, 694
Ukrajins'ka xata, 690, 691, 709, 763
Ukrajins'kyj visnyk, 748
U pusci, 697
 Usenko, Pavlo, 729
U sjajvi mrij, 694
U svitli blyskavyc', 756

Val'dsnepy, 714
 "Valse Melancolique," 698
 Vasyl'cenko, Stepan, 704, 724
 Vasyl'kivs'ka, Zenja, 768, 769
Vavylons'kyj polon, 697
V carstvi satany, 701
Vcytel istoriji, 741
Vecirni rozmovy, 742
Vecirni tini, 729
Vecir svjatoji oseni, 751
Velyka ridnja, 741
Velykyj den', 758
Velykyj molox, 709

Velykyj sum, 702
Veresen', 712
 Veretencenko, Oleksa, 768
 Verhaeren, Emile, 727
 Verlaine, Paul, 686, 687, 695, 720
Vernysja v dim svij, 755
Versnyky, 735, 736
Vertep, 722
Vezi, 761
V hodyny sumerku, 694
 "Vicnyj revoljucjoner," 703
Vid Kulisa do Vynnycenka, 709
Vidlitajut' ptyci, 765
Vidlunnja, 757
Vidlunnja osinn'oho hromu, 755
Vid Myrnoho do Xvyl'ovoho, 762
Vidpovid', 734
 "Vidsukuvannja prycetnoho," 748
Vigiliji, 768
Vikna, 759
 Vinhranovs'kyj, Mykola, 744, 745, 749,
 779
Vinok slavy, 737
Virsi dlja Mexiko, 769
Virsi vybrani, 769
Viruju, 762
Visimnadcjatylni, 736
Visnyk, 760, 761
Visti, 713
Vitczna, 777
Viter nad poljamy, 762
Viter z Ukrajiny, 707
Vitrazi, 769
Vitryla, 744
Vlada, 767
 Vlyz'ko, Oleksa, 724, 746, 761
V nedilju rano zillja kopala, 698
Voda z kamenju, 752
Vo dni ony, 759
Vohon' i popil, 762
Vohon' Kupala, 748
Volodarka Pontydy, 768
Volodymyr, 742
Volohist' zemli, 770
Volyn', 763
 Vorobjov, Mykola, 745, 773
 Voron'ko, Platon, 756

- Voronyj, Mykola, 687, 689, 691, 694,
 695, 707, 772
 Vovk, Vira, 768, 769
 Voznesenskij, Andrej, 745
 "V poiskax novoj krasoty," 688
Vsesvit, 775, 778
V carstvi satany, 701
V snihax, 721
V stepu bezkrajim, 742
V svicadi plesa, 694
Vulycja volosok, 745
 Vuxnal', Jurij, 727
Vybir (Kocerha), 737
Vybir (Olijnyk), 757
Vybuxy syly, 727
 Vynnycenko, Volodymyr, 687, 691,
 700, 701, 706, 707, 776
 Vynnycuk, Jurij, 779
Vyr, 742
Vysnevi usmisky, 727
 Vysnja, Ostap, 727, 742, 746
Vyzvolennja, 721
V zytax, 724
- Wells, H. G., 721
What Is Told, 771
 Whitman, Walt, 727, 729
 Wilde, Oscar, 767
- Xamy*, 725
Xlib i sil', 741
Xlops'ki harazdy, 759
Xmel'nyc'kyj, Bohdan, 736, 753
Xmel'nyc'kyj, 737
Xolodna mjata, 750
 Xotkevyc, Hnat, 686, 688, 701, 746
Xto, 718
Xulij Xuryna, 723
Xustyna sovku zelenoho, 746
 Xvyl'ovyj, Mykola, 713, 714, 715, 719,
 723, 724, 730, 732, 742, 746, 764,
 771, 772, 773, 775, 776, 777
Xymera, 773
- Yasinsky, B., 778
Yrij, 754
- Zabuzko, Oksana, 773, 774, 778, 780,
 781
Zacarovana Desna, 741
Zadlja kuska xliba, 699
Zaha, 734
 Zahrebel'nyj, Pavlo, 742, 749, 752, 753,
 754, 778, 779
 Zahul, Dmytro, 726, 746
Zahybel' eskadry, 737
 Zajec', V., 720
Zaklynannja vohnju, 757
Zalissja, 704
 Zalyvcyj, Andrij, 713
Zametil', 758
Zamist' sonetiv i oktav, 707, 732
 Zamjatin, Jevgenij, 715
Zapax neba, 745
Zaporoseni suljuety, 712
Zapysky kyrpatoho Mefistofelja, 700
 Zarudnyj, Mykola, 743
Za scastja omanoju, 758
 Zasenka, D., 704, 727
Zasiv, 763
Zaspiv, 713
Za synim morem, 739
 Zatuljoiter, Volodymyr, 745
Za syrmoju, 748
Zavjaz', 750
Za vsix skazu, 724
 "Zavzdy ternovyj vinec'," 697
 Zaxarcenko, V., 749
Zban vyna, 755
Zbanac'kyj, Jurij, 749
Zbirka bez nazvy, 770
Zbir vynohradu, 734
Zdaleka i zblyz'ka, 748
 Zdanov, Andrej, 740
Zdvyh-zemlja, 756
Zelena jevanhelija, 759
Zeleni Mlyny, 750
Zemleju ukrajins'koju, 712

- Zemlja* (Dovzenko), 741
Zemlja (Kobyljans'ka), 688, 698
Zemlja (Moroz), 773
Zemlja (Stefanyk), 699
Zemlja i viter, 710
Zemlja i zalizo, 760
Zemljak, Vasyl', 750
Zemna Madonna, 760
Zemne tjazinnja, 744
Zerov, Mykola, 695, 697, 709, 710, 730, 732, 746, 772, 775, 776
Zilyns'kyj, Orest, 766
"Zivjale lystja," 687, 703
Z miska mandrivnyka, 770
Z nad xmar i z dolyn, 687, 694
Znak Tereziv, 734
Zodijak, 763
Zoldak, Bohdan, 779
Zoloti ruky, 745
Zoloti vorota, 765
Zolotyj bumerang, 765
"Zolotyj homin," 707
Zolud', 757
Zori, 705
Zori svit zapovidajut', 763
Zorjanyj integral, 744
Zorjanyj korsar, 757
Zorna, 755
Zorstoke myloserdja, 755
Zovten', 769
Zovti karuseli, 765
Zovtyj knjaz', 767
Zozendropija, 725
Zozuljak, Vasyl', 766
Z poeziji v prozi, 701
Z prerij Kanady v stepy Ukrainy, 726
Z sela, 694
Z teky samovybyvci, 693
Zujevs'kyj, Oleh, 765, 768, 770
Zulyns'kyj, Mykola, 696, 719, 744, 746, 751, 754, 756, 772, 777, 780
Zuravlynyj kryk, 752
Zurba, Halyna, 691, 763
Zvezda, 740
Zvycajna ljudyna, 747
Zylenko, Iryna, 745, 749
Zymovi dereva, 757
Zymozelen', 767
Zyttja bez komy, 770
Zyttja i dijat'nist' Fed'ka Husky, 727
Zyttja v misti, 770
Zyva voda, 736
Zyvi struny, 688
Zyvu, pracuju, 724
Z zelenyx hir, 726
Z zurboju radist' obnjalas', 695



ISBN 1-56308-522-4



9 00000



9 781563 085222