

# The History of Polish-Ukrainian Literary Relations: A Literary and Cultural Perspective

*George G. Grabowicz, Harvard University*

THE COMPLEXITY OF THE SUBJECT at hand stems not only from the weight of the material and the task of dealing with two literatures and two different cultural traditions and contexts. Above all, it is occasioned by the difficulty of penetrating beneath the surface of manifest literary and historical data and through the welter of centuries-old biases, misconceptions and peripheral considerations to discover the actual, real structures of the relationship. This, undoubtedly, is a formidable challenge, and here I can only outline the scope of the problem and posit hypotheses for its conceptualization.

The question of contacts between Polish and Ukrainian culture began to receive systematic attention already in the early 19th century, most notably through the notion of the "Ukrainian school" in Polish Romantic literature, but to this day actual scholarship has not progressed beyond accumulation of data, narrowly-drawn studies comparing individual writers, studies on shared themes and attitudes, or specialized studies on, for example, the role of Ukrainian folklore in Polish literature. It is indicative that several investigations written by Ivan Franko at the turn of the century still constitute the most broadly-conceived treatment of the problem.<sup>1</sup> In short, neither Ukrainian scholarship, with its greater quantity and lesser quality, nor the occasional Polish studies, which are fewer but more solid, have attempted a synoptic analysis of the history and the structures of this relationship.

In attempting just such an approach we must postulate that an adequate understanding of the Polish-Ukrainian literary relationship can come only from a consideration of its entire history. An investigation of one period or moment (as is done, for example, by H. Verves),<sup>2</sup> even if that period or moment is central, will not yield the necessary insights. It is surely clear that a sense of the historical continuum is desirable not simply "in and of itself," to satisfy an abstract or pedantic notion of "the whole literature," but precisely because the cultural dimensions of the problem are not described by or confined to any one literary period: their contours will be revealed only in a historical perspective.

The first step toward this perspective is that of periodization. It seems to me that there are four basic periods or phases in the history of Polish-Ukrainian literary relations; periods or phases, that is, which more or less equally characterize *both* literatures. These are, first, the earliest period, from the last decades of the 16th century to well into the 18th century, comprising the latter part of the Polish Renaissance and most of the Polish and Ukrainian Baroque.<sup>3</sup> The second is the Romantic period, including as a distinct adjunct, the pre-Romantic phase, and covering in time roughly the first half of the 19th century. The third period is the post-Romantic, and it extends, strange as it may at first seem, up to the second World War. The fourth and last is the post-war period.

It is more than obvious, of course, that these periods are quite heterogeneous. The Romantic (and pre-Romantic) period, while not without its internal differentiation, is by far the most coherent, largely because of the "common platform" that the Romantic *Weltanschauung* and literary premises provide. The first period, while much longer, and having a somewhat blurred beginning and end, is also relatively coherent, with its selfsameness provided by the shared institutions and ideology (in the broadest sense) of the *Rzeczpospolita*. The third period, of almost one hundred years, might be seen as totally lacking in coherence and identity since it comprises such different literary phases as Realism (and Positivism), Modernism or Symbolism, and the various post-Symbolist movements. And yet, when we remember that we are dealing not with literary periods and conventions as such but with deep literary and cultural structures of perception, and when we remind ourselves that until 1939 a large part of Ukraine continued to be seen as part and, indeed, was a part of Poland, the idea of this period, as reflective of a particular cognitive and emotional set — for both Poles and Ukrainians — should become more plausible. The fourth period is perhaps the most self-evident, and its underlying structure is the new, post-war political

reality.

As we approach the concrete material, a major theoretical and methodological issue will remain open: the definition, the full *content* of the notion of "literary relationship" will be established only in and through the historical process and the literature of each period. Now, the matter for investigation is simply the general phenomenon of literary contact between the two sides.

\*\*\*

Polish literary treatments of Ukrainian subject matter in the oldest period are manifold and many in number, but not so varied as to defy classification into several distinct categories, and certainly not as massive as Franko's image of a mountain range receding into a hazy distance would suggest.<sup>4</sup> (In fact, it is rather dwarfed by the corresponding Ukrainian treatment of and reliance on the Polish sphere.)

Perhaps the first Polish work of this period to touch on Ukrainian matters is the brochure *Baptismus Ruthenorum* (appearing in two editions in 1544) of Stanisław Orzechowski, a major figure of the Polish Renaissance and coiner of the revealing and so frequently cited formula "gente Ruthenus natione Polonus." Orzechowski's interest in Ukrainian (Ruthenian) affairs was not confined to biographical moments — his mother was a daughter of a Ukrainian priest, and in his pen names (Orichovius Roxolanus, Orichovius Ruthenus) he continued stressing his background — but was quite substantive and topical. Thus the *Baptismus Ruthenorum* attacks the Catholic hierarchy's practice of requiring Ukrainian Orthodox to be baptized again, and argues for the validity and equality of the Eastern faith. The argument is later repeated in his brochure against celibacy, *De lege coelibatus contra Syricium* (1547). In fact, as Hrushevsky presents it, throughout his life-long polemics with the Church hierarchy on the issue of celibacy Orzechowski would also defend the Orthodox faith and press for reconciliation with it.<sup>5</sup> (The reaction to Orzechowski of the Ukrainian circles of that time is not documented, but in his *Palinodija* (1619-22), Zakhariia Kopystensky clearly expresses his appreciation of Orzechowski, whom he calls a "pravyi i staryi pravdy movtsa Liakh".)<sup>6</sup> At this time, too — in 1549 — there appeared a verse dialogue "Rozprawa księdza z popem," which was once attributed to Mikołaj Rej, but is now considered to be the work of an unknown, though certainly Protestant author.<sup>7</sup> Here again, the attack on celibacy and on corruption in the Catholic church is buttressed by Orthodox arguments. These works can be seen, in one sense, as a prologomena to the great religious polemic of the late sixteenth and the seventeenth century, but it is significant, as Hrushevsky pointedly

notes, that later Ukrainian polemicists never utilized, and perhaps never knew, these early reformist Polish writings.<sup>8</sup>

Undoubtedly the most striking, the most strident, if not the most profound, form of literary contact in this period was the religious polemic focusing on the Union of Brest of 1596, which lasted intermittently throughout the seventeenth and into the eighteenth century. Its participants are Poles and Ukrainians, Catholics, Uniates and Orthodox. Brückner observes:

In entering the battle they never fight to discover the truth; each of them is already in its full possession, and thus the best arguments, if they come from the opposing side, are deflected without a trace, like peas from a wall, and the whole polemic is confined to perpetual repetitions of the same charges and proofs, and the main point is to confound, malign or ridicule the opponent in the eyes of one's own camp.<sup>9</sup>

The participation of Poles in this long polemic is much smaller than that of the Ukrainians: Piotr Skarga is the only outstanding figure (and such writers as Boym or Bembus are rather forgotten now), while on the Ukrainian side there is a host of major writers — Vyshensky, Kopystensky, Potii, Smotrytsky, Baranovych, *etc. etc.* But what is most significant from our perspective is that very soon, that is, beginning with Smotrytsky's *Threnos* (1610), the polemic, from both the Uniate and Orthodox positions, comes to be conducted exclusively in Polish. Whether this is to be seen as doing damage to the development of Ukrainian literature, as Franko claims,<sup>10</sup> is a matter which we cannot examine now, but it is indicative of the powerful influence of Polish culture. Brückner expresses this very eloquently:

... even when [these authors] wrote in Ukrainian, they thought in Polish, they came from Polish schools, they drew on Polish works. And these monuments make a strange impression with their Polish syntax and lexicon but with Ukrainian endings and printed in Cyrillic; monuments not of the Union of Brest or Lublin or Horodlo but of a deeper, a spiritual union, one which bears witness to the Polish culture's conquests in the East.<sup>11</sup>

His all but explicit conclusion that this literature is Polish (*n.b.* that his title to the study, "Spory o unie w dawnej literaturze", does not spell out *which* literature) is erroneous, however — as is Franko's implicit concurrence in the article cited above.<sup>12</sup> The problem of the bilingualism (even multi-

lingualism) of Ukrainian literature at various stages of its history is a central one, but it cannot be discussed in greater detail here.<sup>13</sup> For the moment we have only a striking illustration of the pervasive influence of Polish culture and literature in this period.

A very early form of Polish interest in things Ukrainian were simple descriptions of the region. It is in two such works that Franko sees the first beginnings of the "Ukrainian school". One of these is Bartłomiej Paprocki's *Panosza, to jest wystawienie panow i panią ziem ruskich i podolskich z męstwa, z obyczajow i z innych spraw pocziwych* (1575), a work on heraldics, a systematic description, in verse, of the nobility of these territories. The second is Sebastjan Klonowic's *Roxolania* (1584; in Latin), a much more comprehensive treatment of the so called Ruś Czerwona. It focuses not on the gentry, and not only on the cities (a fragment on Lviv was translated by Franko)<sup>14</sup> but particularly on a detailed description of the life and customs of the Ukrainian peasantry. The regional framework in these authors' approach to the Ukrainian lands is also argued by the context provided by their other works: Paprocki, for example, later turns his attention to heraldic descriptions of the nobility of Prussia, and of Poland proper, and Klonowic develops his descriptive talents in his well-known *Flis* (1595).

Soon a more specific interest in Ukraine, its people, its local color and — setting the pattern for centuries to come — in its folklore, also becomes apparent. The most prominent instances of such folkloristic efforts (both *qua* collections and as stylized imitations) are the "Pisnia pro kozaka i Kulynu" (1625) and, of much later provenance, a manuscript collection of songs attributed to the Polish poet Dominik Rudnicki.<sup>15</sup> Many more must surely have existed, and some may still be found in various *silvae rerum*. But the introduction of Ukrainian folklore and of depiction of the Ukrainian folk into Polish literature is associated with two outstanding poets of this period, both of them natives of Lviv, Szymon Szymonowic and Bartłomiej Zimorowic. Szymonowic's idylls, *Sielanki* (1614), which are generally considered the highest achievement in this genre in old Polish literature, interweave elements of everyday gentry and folk *pobut* with a classicist and mythological framework. In perhaps the most famous of these idylls, "Żeńcy," Szymonowic paints, through the dialogue of two peasant girls reaping, an evocative picture of the harsh life of the serfs in the midst of a beautiful and fertile countryside. On the other hand Zimorowic's *Roksolanki* (1654) a cycle of poems celebrating his wedding, rather than depicting everyday realia interweaves elements of folk song and folk poetics, and above all stylizes and organizes the epithalamium along the lines of the drama of the folk wedding ritual.

The Ukrainian phenomenon that massively drew the attention of

Polish writers, however, was the Khmelnytsky revolution. The literature associated with this is large and extremely heterogeneous in nature and quality, and it has not yet been fully studied or collected.<sup>16</sup> It ranges from the immediate reaction, the *pobudka* or "clarion call", to the laments, the curious hybrid genre of panegyric reportage, the satires (of such distinguished authors as Starowolski, Łukasz and Krzysztof Opaliński) to epic treatments, foremost among them being Samuel Twardowski's *Wojna domowa*, and later to long historical accounts (e.g., Kochowski's *Annales*).<sup>17</sup> In a category of their own are the artistically valuable and emotionally moving idylls of Zimorowic (*Kozaczyzna* and *Burda ruska*) which depict with grief and graphic detail the destruction of a land that had once flowed with milk and honey and now flows with blood. The range of attitude in these works is also great — from the anger and hatred of a Białobocki to the pained sense of guilt of a Radziwiłł or an Opaliński. There is also a significant patterning, namely that in all the longer or introspective works there is an awareness that several elements — the religious, the social, and the national or ethnic — combine in the revolution. And at the same time — very significantly — there is virtual unanimity in the belief that this is an internal matter, that these are one's own countrymen, subjects, serfs that are rebelling with a "rankor zażarty." (Białobocki uses the image of dogs [Cossacks] joining the wolf [the Tatars] against their master: *i.e.*, his "Brat Tatr abo liga wilcza ze psem na gospodarza do czasów terażniejszych stosująca".) Thus, along with a clear sense of difference (religious, social and ethnic) there is a superceding sense of oneness, with its overriding components being legitimacy and authority.

A Ukrainian subject matter appears, of course, in various other forms: in historical works (not on the Khmelnychchyna) such as, for example, Wacław Potocki's *Wojna chocimska* with its sympathetic depiction of Sahaidachny and his Cossacks; in the genre of the humorous *fraszki*, with their stereotyped Rusin, and in works that express sympathy with the lot of the oppressed and even stress their moral superiority.

In all these works the unifying feature is that the Ukrainian sphere is not foreign, that it is different but one's own. The major rubrics under which the literary treatments fall — folkloristic or regional interest, accounts of common history or of *internal* religious or armed strife, etc. — all tend to support this reading, and they are, of course, an actualization in literature of the political reality of the multinational Commonwealth. As a corollary of this basic structure of the *content* there is a basic structure in the *modality* of approach. And this simply rests on the fact that with perhaps the partial exception of the religious polemic, where the arguments of the other side were at least mentioned, if not really considered, there is no acknowledgement of the possibility that the

Ukrainian side may have an interpretation or a given treatment of its own domain. In short, Ukrainian themes, phenomena from Ukrainian life, history, etc. are for the most part simply taken as a kind of "raw material" unmediated by any cultural "rights of ownership", and not at all in the way one takes a Petrarchan sonnet or an account of a western European political development. And this is due not only to the aggressiveness and strength of Polish culture (of which Brückner, with justifiable pride, reminds us); to a large measure this is a natural consequence of the disproportion and imbalance between the two literatures. The Ukrainian literature of that time is dominated — thanks to its debilitating pseudo- (or quasi-) Byzantine legacy — by the religious sphere, as regards both its thematics and the vast majority of the writers.<sup>18</sup> Because of this tradition, and other factors too complex to elaborate here, it was not equipped to deal fully with its own domain. It is revealing that the *Synopsis* written under the aegis of Gizel' (first published 1670-74), this "first textbook on East European history (makes) no mention ... of the Zaporozhian Host, although the author or authors of the *Synopsis* had lived under the protection of the Cossack State"<sup>19</sup> and that the first Ukrainian historical accounts of the Khmelnychchyna were modelled on Polish histories.

The impact of Polish literature on the Ukrainian in this first period of the relationship was massive indeed. One can begin with the written language itself, in which Polish had made tremendous inroads. As George Shevelov once observed, this ultimately became a positive influence, because the Ukrainian language survived the influence and assimilated it. Had it not, it would be considered a negative influence (if there were anyone to worry about it). Polish was the *lingua franca* of the multi-national Commonwealth, and it was used by eminent writers (Potii, Baranovych, Velychkovsky, Prokopovych, *et al.*) and by major political figures, in the documents and correspondence of a Khmelnytsky or a Mazepa, for example. They and their verbal expression did not become any less Ukrainian for it.

Apart from the language question, Polish literature itself was a pervasive influence, above all a normative influence providing a range of literary models for the Ukrainian writer. In the poetic theory of the Kievan Mohyla Academy such poets as Jan and Piotr Kochanowski were the models for, respectively, lyric and epic poetry.<sup>20</sup> Twardowski's *Wojna domowa* was translated and utilized in later Ukrainian accounts of the Khmelnytsky period.<sup>21</sup> Courses on poetics taught Ukrainian students to write poetry in "Slavic" and Polish. The influence of the models was not total of course; Ukrainian literature did maintain its distinct profile and was not by any means a mere copy of the Polish. There was, moreover, a tendency to oppose everything that was new, and Polish, a tendency

epitomized by Vyshensky. For all that, the influence of Polish literature, especially in the incentive it gave for Ukrainian writers to strive for literary sophistication (cf. especially Velychkovsky), was unmistakable, and valuable.

The shared language, literary norms and themes argue for the fact that a considerable part of the Ukrainian literature of this time partakes of a *common context* with Polish literature. One may postulate that from the perspective of many Ukrainian writers the Polish model was appropriate for works expressing a "higher" genre or expressing a "higher" style (a phenomenon not at all isolated in world literature — cf. Turkish literature with its use of Persian and Arabic depending on the genre — and not to be interpreted as indicative of any "incompleteness" of the literature). The most tangible instance of this is the bilingualism of Ukrainian literature: the use of Polish for works written in a cosmopolitan tone and in an elevated, high style (again Velychkovsky). This clearly stems from the biculturalism of the upper strata of Ukrainian society, and it suggests the great difficulties facing Ukrainian literature of this time. It is fully understandable that the mainstay for Ukrainian literature was provided for the most part by the most conservative, the most "self-sufficient" (to put it mildly) elements of Ukrainian society — the church and the clergy. It is revealing that the Ukrainian nobleman and poet Daniel Bratkowski, who was an ardent defender of the Ukrainian Orthodox and the peasants, and who was executed in consequence of his involvement in this cause, wrote only in Polish. But, however imperfectly, Ukrainian literature survived the pressures on it. The reason, one might suspect, was not only the resilience of the national spirit, the culture, but also the fact that, just as the ascendancy of Polish culture was becoming manifest, Poland's political power was rapidly declining.

In the period of Classicism the relationship is quite abbreviated. In Trembecki's fine poem *Sofiówka*, describing the magnificent park of the magnates Potocki in the vicinity of Uman', there are only a few general references to a turbulent Ukrainian past; in Książnin's rococo-sentimental drama, *Troiste wesele*, there is a merry singing and dancing Cossack who effects the reunion of the lovers (and this motif is later bitterly parodied by Słowacki in his *Sen srebrny Salomei*; cf. below). Both the *descriptio* in *Sofiówka* and the literary reworking of folk elements, especially the wedding, in *Troiste wesele* clearly echo the earlier period's treatments of the Ukrainian sphere. There are also historico-ideological references to the Ukrainian past, i.e., in the writings of the representatives of the Polish Enlightenment. Thus, in his *Przestrogi dla Polski*, Stanisław Staszic speaks of the alienation of the Cossacks as one of the basic causes of Poland's downfall.<sup>22</sup> Similarly, Kajetan Koźmian speaks of the Cossack uprisings as

one of the tragic consequences of religious intolerance and persecution.<sup>23</sup> But the most eloquent expression of this conception occurs in the Romantic period in the writings of the greatest Polish historian of the time, Joachim Lelewel. In his synthetic history of Poland Lelewel sees the Cossacks as the only element within the Polish body politic that refused to bow to enserfment. They transmitted their profound sense of freedom to the peasant masses, and the resultant wars depopulated Poland and prepared its collapse.<sup>24</sup>

In Ukrainian literature of the period of Classicism there are a few translations, or paraphrases, of Polish works, for example Hulak-Artemovskiy's elaboration of Krasicki's fables, but no particular literary conception or awareness can be said to emerge.

A rather fuller intervening phase between the first and second period of our schema is provided by pre-Romanticism. It too is not an actual phase or category of the literary relationship in question, but some of the phenomena it contains are most significant. In Polish literature there is above all a new conceptualization of history and, what is more interesting, a turning to the Polish-Ukrainian past to illustrate it. Specifically, there is the focus by two writers, the well-known and very influential Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz and the minor (but quite good) poet Tymon Zaborowski, on the figure of Bohdan Khmelnytsky in two dramas by the same name. In Niemcewicz's *Bohdan Chmielnicki* (1817), the Cossack Hetman is a fierce and destructive despot, akin to Attila; in Zaborowski's *Bohdan Chmielnicki* (1822) he is an enlightened leader battling for the freedom of Ukraine — and Poland — against the tyranny of the magnates. Both works, however, share a common Slavophile program, both see the historical reality of an oppressed people's "holy" vengeance (with Khmelnytsky the incarnation of God's wrath), and both grieve over the fratricidal conflict between Ukrainians and Poles. For Ukrainian literature on the other hand, the Polish sphere is again a source of literary models. Thus Ukrainian pre-Romanticism (and here one must include both the "Classicist" Hulak-Artemovskiy and the "Romantic" Borovykovskiy) try their hand at a new Romantic idiom by translating none other than Mickiewicz.

\*\*\*

In the Romantic period the relationship between Ukrainian and Polish literature attains considerable resonance, and in Polish literature the contact between the two cultures becomes quite complex and many-faceted. As throughout, my approach must be an overview and dispense with the luxury of close analysis. And it must begin with a challenge to the traditional critical premises, specifically the understanding of and

emphasis on the "Ukrainian school." For one thing, in terms of sheer quantity of effort and activity, this was hardly the center of gravity: as illustrated in detail in recent studies<sup>25</sup> the dominant focus of the Polish literati of this time was the collecting and imitating of folklore. But even as an artistic phenomenon the "school" of Malczewski, Goszczyński and Zaleski is only partially central. Indeed, we can speak of the "school" as a valid category only with reference to two writers and two works: Malczewski's *Maria* (1825) and Goszczyński's *Zamek kaniowski* (1828); the particular content of this category would be the introduction of a new Romantic historicist concern, and the first steps toward a literary myth of Ukraine. Later, for a number of Polish Romantics, history and myth were to become the major modes of perceiving the Ukrainian past, and this past, in turn, would be seen as the key to the tragedy of Polish history. Zaleski, the third member of the triad (who actually was the first to broach the Ukrainian theme in his poetry, in 1822) can best be understood, along with Michał Czajkowski and Tymko Padurra, in terms of the very curious and very revealing phenomenon of Cossacophilism.

The essential, defining feature of the Cossacophilism of a Zaleski, Czajkowski or Padurra was the writer's total identification with the Cossack past, with Cossackdom—as he saw it, of course. Each, on numerous occasions, spoke and wrote of himself, and was addressed and known, as a "kozak"; the work of each is predominantly focused on Ukraine and its Cossack past—in the case of Czajkowski this is virtually his only theme; each (especially Padurra who is clearly the weakest writer of the three) tried his hand at writing in Ukrainian. It should be stressed that this identification with Ukrainian culture was significantly different from that of the "balahuly" so vividly described by Franko.<sup>26</sup> The "balahuly" (the term refers to a Jewish pedlar's cart) were young Polish noblemen who in their carousing affected peasant manners, language, dress, *etc.*, and whose main goal was to shock, to *ēpater* the local gentry. The predecessors of both the "low" variant of the "balahuly" and the "high" variant of the Cossackophiles were such early nineteenth century enthusiasts and eccentrics as Prince August Jabłonowski who became "Kniaź Mykoła, the Cossack Prince" after he exchanged his wig for an *oseledets* and fitted out his serfs into a small Cossack army (which was very quickly disbanded by the Russians); or Wacław Rzewuski, the addressee of Mickiewicz's *Farys*, who after passing through his Arabic phase exchanged his burnoose for a *zhupan*, and, now no longer Emir Tadz-el-Faher but Attaman Revukha, surrounded himself with "Cossacks" and listened for days to the *dummy* of his bard Tymko Padurra.

Historically, this nineteenth century Cossackophilism goes back to a "legend" (or myth) of dual Cossack-gentry origins and loyalty, and the

belief (and in Czajkowski's case the actual fact) of hereditary ties to the Ukrainian gentry and the Cossack *starshyna*. It also expresses the local patriotism and the desire for self-definition that was inherited from the Cossack tradition, and postulates the prerogatives of greater freedom, of exoticism of behavior and dress, and a sense of superiority towards one's gentry brethren from "Crown Poland." Psychologically, especially in the writings of Czajkowski and Zaleski, this can be seen as a kind of infantile fixation — a manic focus on the land, the experiences, the emotions of one's childhood — which was nurtured, we must remember, by the central fact that for most of their adult lives both writers were exiles from their homeland. Zaleski's depiction of the Cossack past is almost exclusively idyllic; his version of the Ukrainian myth is naive and sentimental. Czajkowski, on the other hand, is much more "realistic," even harsh, in various moments, and his historicist interpretation, his belief in an immanent and transcendent Polish-Cossack friendship, is basically self-projection; his novels (e.g. *Wernyhora*, *Hetman Ukrainy*) are still readable, if not by far as good as Sienkiewicz's; artistically his best works are his earliest *Powieści kozackie* (1837) with their stylization on oral narrative.

However, the Polish Romantic interest in Ukraine was not at all confined to these positions, and, in fact, there existed a coherent body of literary expression — and theory — that directly challenged the enthusiastic premises of the Cossacophiles. These were the conservative writers of the so called St. Petersburg Coterie, most prominently Michał Grabowski and Henryk Rzewuski. They too felt themselves to be "Ukrainians" (and this, of course, applies to all the Romantics here discussed: their identification was regional, and on this same basis Mickiewicz and Syrokomla called themselves "Lithuanians," and Jan Barczewski was called a "Byelorussian") but their stance was poles apart, as it were, from any idealization of the Cossacks. On the contrary, in their prose Rzewuski and Grabowski (and such second-rank followers as Fisz and Groza) focused their attention on the Haidamak uprisings and showed the Ukrainian side as anarchic and often bloodthirsty. The interest of these writers was primarily regional and historical, and for them Ukraine was the land where old Polish traditions and customs had been most fully preserved. The emphasis on ties to the land, on history and tradition, was synthesized in the idea of family history. For Michał Grabowski, the author and champion of the "Ukrainian school of Polish poetry," family history became the major vehicle for presenting *national* history; it was to be the key to the national experience.

To the extent that it was recognized, the indigenous Ukrainian population was to accept the patriarchal order (cf. Grabowski's *Koliszczyzna i stepy*) and, at best, to aspire to upward mobility into gentry ranks (cf.

"Sawa" in Rzewuski's *Pamiętki Soplicy*). Interestingly enough, the absolute value put on a conservative ethos and tradition led such a writer as Rzewuski (in his *Zaporożec*) to see Ukraine — now conceived as a direct inheritor of Kievan Rus' — as preferable to a Poland perverted by foreign influences and radical thought. Here, paradoxically, the Cossacophile Czajkowski and the conservative Rzewuski found common ground.

The regional enthusiasm of the "Ukrainian school" and its champion Grabowski did not pass unchallenged. Józef Ignacy Kraszewski, who at first associated with Grabowski's circle and who later turned to a Ukrainian subject matter (*qua* peasant theme and social justice, however), attacked the excesses, the clichés and the epigonism rampant in the school led by Grabowski, and called "Ukrainomania" one of the "moral diseases of the nineteenth century."<sup>27</sup> Similarly Mickiewicz, impatient with the facile, third-rate imitations of Zaleski's poetry that had received such easy access to the pages of the *Tygodnik Petersburski*, the organ of the "Coterie," observed that the "Ukrainians" were riding their Ukrainian horse to death and that someone should knock them off.<sup>28</sup>

It was a poet who is usually, and correctly, not associated with the "school", however, who provided a radically new and profound conception and vision of the Ukrainian past and its implication for Poland. This was the great Romantic Juliusz Słowacki. His interest in the Ukrainian subject began conventionally, with the juvenile Zaleski-like "Dumka ukraińska" and then the vivid but eclectic *Żmija*; in *Wacław*, a rethinking of the subject of Malczewski's *Maria*, his vision of the Ukrainian past is already resonant and tragic; in his last works on the Ukrainian theme, *Beniowski* (especially the later Cantos) and above all in his symbolist masterpiece, perhaps the most difficult drama in nineteenth century Polish literature, *Sen srebrny Salomei*, his vision achieves all the intricacy and power of myth. It is a myth about the death, in the common blood of the massacres and the reprisals of the *Koliivshchyna*, of the "silver Ukraine" of ideal — and hence dream-like — gentry-Cossack amity, and from it the birth of two new, still only faintly perceived entities, the Polish and the Ukrainian. At the end of this drama the figure of the bard and prophet Wernyhora, who was resurrected from legend by Lelewel to foster Polish-Ukrainian friendship on the eve of the 1830 uprising and who was so frequently depicted by the Polish Romantics who turned to the Ukrainian theme, is seen going off to conceal himself—but not to die, for he is immortal—among the *kurhany*. And this is a fitting culmination to a uniquely productive theme in Polish Romanticism.

As we turn to the Ukrainian counterpart, the picture must surely look pale by comparison, but this is only because of the extraordinary strength of the Ukrainian theme in Polish Romanticism. In fact, Ukrainian

literature of this time is not at all restricted in its contacts with the Polish sphere. The early influence of Mickiewicz on such as Hulak-Artemovskiy and Borovykovskiy (Ukrainian pre-Romanticism began, after all, with translations of "Pani Twardowska" and *Farys*) now becomes creatively remolded in the work of the foremost Ukrainian Romantic, Taras Shevchenko. His inspired political satire "Son (komediia)" echoes in the images of the flight to St. Petersburg and in the impressions of the city Mickiewicz's "Ustep" to *Dziady* Part III. (To be sure, it also echoes, polemically, the flight to St. Petersburg of Vakula, riding the devil, in Gogol's "Noch pered rozhdestvom"). Shevchenko's "mystery" "Velyky liokh" shows even closer parallels to *Dziady* Part II. In his *Haidamaky* there is evidence to indicate that Shevchenko is consciously taking issue with Goszczyński's *Zamek kaniowski* and the version of the *Koliivshchyna* presented in Czajkowski's *Wernyhora*.<sup>29</sup> Indeed, *Haidamaky*, the first modern Ukrainian historical work, is also the first work (after the *Istoriia Rusov*, which is still strongly under the influence of the Cossack chronicles) to address itself to the Polish-Ukrainian past. But the mutual strife in this past, the violent antagonisms that the poem portrays, are not seen as the essence of the relationship, and the postscript to the poem envisions, in terms of Slavophile ideals, a happier future. Similarly, the exile poem "Poliakam" again posits an essential friendship between the two nations.

But it is only in the literary activities of Panteleimon Kulish, the second pillar of Ukrainian Romanticism, that we see a programmatic interest in Polish history and literature. The core of this interest was his close relationship with Michał Grabowski,<sup>30</sup> with whom he shared a common interest in antiquarian pursuits, in old memoirs, chronicles and family histories, in the Scottian novel, and not least of all, in a conservative ideology that saw the Polish historical role in Ukraine as constructive, as a cultural mission, and the Cossacks, particularly the Zaporozhians, and Khmelnytsky too, as anarchic and destructive.

The historical theme and the Polish-Cossack conflict is also the vehicle for other Romantics, such as Kostomarov, the late-Romantic Storozhenko, and then such late- (or rather pseudo-) Romantic writers as A. Chaikovsky or A. Kashchenko with their juvenalia. This element also occurs in Western Ukrainian Romanticism, e.g., M. Shashkevych, although there it is quite indistinct.

The work that is perhaps the most central to the Polish-Ukrainian literary relationship in the Romantic period, and that most readily reveals the impact of Polish literary models, comes not from the realm of history but of prophecy. And this is Kostomarov's *Knyhy byticia ukrainskoho narodu*, the translation-adaptation of Mickiewicz's *Księgi narodu i pielgrzymstwa polskiego*. Originally known as the *Zakon bozhyi*, this work constituted the

ideological platform of the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius, and in time came to be seen as the first manifesto of the new Ukrainian national consciousness. Close study has shown divergences and differences of emphasis between the *Ksigg* and the *Knyhy bytiia*.<sup>31</sup>, but what is most revealing for us now is the very fact that so central a position in modern Ukrainian intellectual history is based on a Polish model.

The Romantic period also witnessed the first contact and collaboration between *groups* of writers, *i.e.*, between the Polish "Ziewonia" group (A. Bielowski, L. Siemieński and J. Dunin-Borkowski) and the Ukrainian "Ruska Triitsia" (M. Shashkevych, Ia. Holovatsky and I. Vahylevych), in their common investigation of and enthusiasm for Ukrainian folklore. These contacts, principally in the 1830's, prefigure the deeper and more extensive relations between various literary circles in the following period.

\*\*\*

The third, post-Romantic, period is undoubtedly the most difficult to discuss, for it not only embraces, as I have noted, different literary periods and movements, but beyond that is not characterized by any one given attitude or conception. Rather it is characterized precisely by a multiplicity of them. What then is the common denominator, the structure which in the context of the whole history of the relationship makes this a valid period? To answer this we might indulge in metaphor: if on the political plane (*i.e.*, with reference to the Commonwealth's attitude toward the Cossacks) the Polish-Ukrainian relationship has been compared to that of a mother or stepmother with her children, on the cultural plane the whole history is emblematic of a marriage, which, like most marriages, is between unequal partners, and, like many marriages, is destined for dissolution. In the first phase of literary relations, even while this marriage was being effectively undermined from the political side (through Khmelnytsky's "infidelities," as the Poles might have put it, with the Khan, the Tsar and the Sultan), the (cultural) marital bonds were still whole, as illustrated by the sense of a common literary context. Romanticism on the other hand, because of the primacy of the historicist focus, and of the Slavophile ideas, had a distinct "restorationist" bias, and constituted an attempt, either in conscious ideology and action (Czajkowski) or through symbolic and mythical narrative (Słowacki) to conjure up the former state of "more perfect union". This was certainly more pronounced in Polish literature, but it was not entirely foreign to Ukrainian literature either. It is none other than Shevchenko who writes (in "Poliakam"):

Shche iak buly my kozakamy,  
A unii ne chut bulo,  
Otam-to veselo zhylos!  
Bratalys z volnymy liakhamy,  
Pyshalys volnymy stepamy...

Nas poriznyly, rozvely,  
A my b i dosi tak zhyly...

The significant difference between the earliest period and that of Romanticism, however, is that in both literatures the relationship, the turning to the other side, even if to evoke a vision of unity and brotherhood, is *distanced*; it has become a literary theme or stance, as seen by the very notion of a "school"; the implicit sense of a common literary context no longer obtains. Now, in the post-Romantic period, awareness of cultural and literary separateness, of distinct histories and traditions and of separate destinies becomes much more pronounced, but, especially for the Polish side, it is not yet fully accepted, let alone accepted by all.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that for both societies, for all of the latter half of the nineteenth century, up to World War I, the cultural and literary relationship is overshadowed by intense, often acrimonious political and ideological controversy. The ill-fated 1863 uprising and the consequent anti-Polish campaign in Russia which was joined by some Ukrainian writers, also became major factors. It is naturally tempting therefore, to forego the effort of determining the basic structures of the relationship, and to simply present (cf. Verves)<sup>32</sup> a mass of undigested data. (The Manichean struggle of progressive and reactionary forces, the former seeking to foster brotherhood and the latter hatred between the two nations, is not a structure, nor even a dialectic, but a banality.)

Perhaps the most important feature of this period is that the Polish side, for the first time, turns in a *concerted way* not only to Ukrainian affairs, history, folklore, etc., but to *Ukrainian literature as such*. The point of focus is, understandably, Shevchenko. Already during his lifetime there was alarmed reaction to his poetry, but there was also a fiery defense.<sup>33</sup> In 1861, the year of Shevchenko's death, Leonard Sowiński published a study of Shevchenko's poetry with an appended translation of the *Haidamaky*.<sup>34</sup> Sowiński's presentation of the poem is apologetic, his sensibility is shocked — but he does publish it. The resulting cries of outrage, and then the voices raised in defense of the truth and importance of Shevchenko's message, were not soon stilled, and they signalled a more radical polarization of Polish attitudes. (But for all the polemics and differences of

opinion, it was still a Pole who wrote the first monograph study devoted to Shevchenko.)<sup>35</sup> The heat engendered by the discussion also tended to shift the form of expression to historical and political writing and away from belles-lettres. The actual literary treatments are in quality and quantity inferior to the Romantic ones. A historicist focus still predominates, as for example in the sympathetic belletrized sketches of Antoni Rolle, or such a novel as *Na kresach* by Rawita-Gawroński, but they pale into insignificance before the work that to this day embodies — on the popular level, of course — the Polish version of the Polish-Ukrainian past: Sienkiewicz's *Ogniem i mieczem*. Along with enormous popularity it also evoked sharp dissention in some respects, quite like the furor raised by the *Haidamaky*. The conservative Cracow circles were effusive in their praise (S. Tarnowski saw in Sienkiewicz an equal of Homer, Dante and Shakespeare); other critics, like B. Prus or, speaking for virtually all Ukrainians, Ivan Franko, were rather dismayed. One cannot analyze the work here; one can only note that it is a work that in its skillful blend of legend and adventure and history captured a whole ethos and consciousness, and thus is also a work that resists the intellectual and ideological demands raised against it. But that it also furthered chauvinist tendencies is hardly questionable. (It is also necessary to add here that only a few years earlier P. Kulish had published his *Khutorna poeziia* and his *Krashanka rusynam i poliakam na velykden 1882 r* in which he presented a rather similar picture of the Polish "cultural mission" on the one hand, and a dark, anarchic Cossack rabble on the other. His positions by now, however, had no resonance in the Ukrainian community, and their effect could certainly not be compared to that of *Ogniem i mieczem*.)

During this time Ukrainian literature, in some contrast to the preceding period, was showing heightened interest in the Polish sphere. One form of this was in translations: in poetry, for example, Hrabovsky translated Asnyk and Konopnicka, Franko made various translations from Mickiewicz (and Asnyk too), and later Lesia Ukrainka translated and paraphrased Konopnicka. The influential *Kievskaia starina* published (in Russian) translations of Polish prose on the Ukrainian theme — Kraszewski's novels, the sketches of Rolle, Rawita-Gawroński's *Na kresach*. Rather more indicative of a new phase in the relationship was the development of genuine contacts between individual writers. To be sure, there had been some contacts before, e.g., between Kulish and Grabowski, but they were still the exception. Now these contacts became broader and more regular. Kulish for one played a prominent role in his one-man effort to counter what he called the literary "haidamatstvo" and achieve a common sense of purpose on a conservative platform, to reunite the sundered halves of one higher unit.<sup>36</sup> But the figure who epitomized these

contacts was Ivan Franko. His correspondence and personal friendship included many important Polish writers of this time: Orzeszkowa, Kasprowicz, Krzywicki, Żeromski, Niemojewski, *etc.*; with many of these he collaborated on various literary projects, worked as a colleague on Polish periodicals, and participated actively in Polish political life.<sup>37</sup> Franko, who also wrote several novels and shorter prose pieces in Polish, was the major popularizer of Polish literature in the Ukrainian community; his critical studies and reviews ranged over much of Polish literature, although he was most interested in the "Ukrainian school". While placing great value on good Polish-Ukrainian relations, he steadfastly expressed the Ukrainian perspective, as he saw it, whether in his study of the old Polish literature on the Kholmynychyna, his critique of Zaleski's poetry or Sienkiewicz's *Ogniem i mieczem*, or the "political philosophy" of Mickiewicz, whom he otherwise generally admired and translated extensively. In *Ein Dichter des Verrates* (1897) he condemns what he takes to be Mickiewicz's Wallenrodism, and the subsequent glorification of guile and deceit: "The times must have been melancholy indeed if a poet of genius could stray on such erroneous paths, and it is a sad state of affairs if a nation considers such a poet, without reservation, to be its greatest national hero and prophet, and feeds its young generations with the poisonous fruits of his spirit".<sup>38</sup> This, of course, immediately occasioned a polemic, and even today a leading critic speaks of Franko's article as a "paszkwil," and "a painful and malicious attack on the Polish bard".<sup>39</sup> Apart from the validity of the charge and the counterargument (which is obviously that Wallenrodism is presented by Mickiewicz as the *tragedy* of deceit, and that Wallenrod is a persona and not the author himself) two elements in this affair must be kept in mind. One is the personal context — Franko's own experience with such duplicity in his political struggle with reactionary Polish elements in Galicia, and his own deep psychological concern with the charge of treason which had been leveled against him for his contacts with the Poles, and which he analyzes in one of his best poems, the eminently Wallenrodian "Pokhoron" (1899). The second is the national context and the fact that with all the best intentions Polish-Ukrainian relations were far from smooth. To insist, as do Soviet critics (again Verves), that the only conflict was between "progressives" and "reactionaries" irrespective of nationality, and that the corresponding camps saw eye to eye, is simply silly.

Such differences and conflicts figure prominently in the Ukrainian literary depictions of the Polish side. Beside those writers who couch their negative portrayal of the Poles in a historical mode (the above-mentioned Storozhenko, still active in the 80's, Starytsky, *etc.*) a number of Ukrainian writers turned to the conflict in the present. A. Svydnytsky, author of the

first Ukrainian realist novel, *Liuboratski* (written in 1862, published in 1886) depicts the process of the denationalization of Ukrainian youth under the influence of Polish, and Russian, education, and shows, through the fate of the young heroine, how they learn from the Poles to scorn their own "low" culture. The realist Nechui-Levytsky in his novels *Prychepa* (which was actually translated into Polish) and *Burlachka* also develops this theme. But the last and best work in the realist tradition, Les Martovych's *Zabobon* (1911; 1917), while still showing the threat of denationalization in Polish-Ukrainian contacts, especially through marriage, treats the Polish characters without recourse to stereotypes and with sympathetic humor.

A very distinct subperiod in the overall post-Romantic period is the turn of the century, the time of Polish and Ukrainian modernism, of the *Młoda Polska* and *Moloda Muza*. In Cracow, in the last years of the nineteenth and the first years of the twentieth century the contacts are not only between individual writers but are now between Polish and Ukrainian literary circles, and they are furthered by common artistic as well as ideological attitudes. Tetmajer, Kasprowicz and Przybyszewski are on the one hand translated (e.g., V. Shchurat's translation of Tetmajer's programmatic, "decadent" poem "Eviva l'arte!"), and, on the other hand, their stance and mood are broadly incorporated into Ukrainian poetry. (In all objectivity, however, the Ukrainian writers of the *Moloda Muza* are derivative, and none of them approaches the craft and talent found in the *Młoda Polska*.) The point of greatest affinity is between the Polish poet and prose writer Władysław Orkan and the outstanding Ukrainian writer of this time, Vasyl Stefanyk. In the corpus of Orkan's work there are, as Verves' research has shown,<sup>40</sup> various plans and sketches from the years 1896-99 — none of them realized — for works on Ukrainian historical themes, e.g., a drama on Sahaidachny and a novel ("Ruiny") on the Khmelnytsky period. In the early 1900's Orkan was the leading Polish enthusiast of Ukrainian literature. The most notable fruit of this is the key role he played in publishing an anthology of Ukrainian literature, *Młoda Ukraina* (1902), with his own translations, and his introduction for the *Antologia współczesnych poetów ukraińskich* (1911). At the same time Stefanyk was warmly received in Polish literary criticism.

And it is precisely in the Polish critical reaction to Stefanyk and his fellow Ukrainian writers that we find revealed an important clue to a basic structure in the Polish-Ukrainian literary relationship of that time. In 1900, in the influential Warsaw journal *Wędrowiec*, in an article entitled "Janosiki", the critic Adam Grzymała-Siedlecki writes about the new wave of writers who were creating a genuine literature of the people, a "literatura narodowa." "Their names," he says "are Władysław Orkan, Vasyl Stefanyk, Lepky, Józef Jedlicz, Andrzej Stopka, Władysław Jarosz....

They were all born in the Carpathian region, and they were all nourished by peasant misery."<sup>41</sup> The argument by Verves that Stafanyk is included in this new wave of Polish "national" literature to give it greater substance and weight begs the more basic question.<sup>42</sup> For the underlying non-differentiation between Polish and Ukrainian literature, or, alternatively, the regional conception of Ukrainian, that is, Galician Ukrainian literature, is manifest enough. One need not prove that this idea was universally accepted (it certainly was not, but neither was it a solitary instance) to demonstrate the existence of the structure in question. If the distinctness, the separateness of Ukrainian literature is conceded by part of the society, say the "progressive part", and is actively or passively resisted or disbelieved by another part, then this very absence of consensus is part of the cultural set. What is in fact part of the (in this case Polish) cultural perspective, a structure in the literary relationship we are discussing, is the non-resolution, the blurring of the relationship.

We can find substantiation for this on another plane, that of socio-political ideology. For just as regionalism was a means for "compromise" on this issue, so also was the question of social justice and the answer of socialism. For a major element in the Polish understanding of Ukrainian literature in the second half of the nineteenth century — as exemplified by the *positive and negative* reception of Shevchenko and the "practical" use made of the *Kobzar*,<sup>43</sup> and as exemplified by the basis of literary cooperation between Franko and various Polish writers — was that it was a literature *defined by its social ideology and provenance*. Again without arguing at all for the exclusiveness or total dominance of such views, there is no doubt that they were present in greater or lesser measure. The literary relationship, in short, was not literature/literature, but, to use the term favored by the Soviets, "progressive literature"/"progressive literature" or socially engaged/socially engaged literature, or peasant theme/peasant theme. The Polish writers who were not "progressive" did not much care for, or indeed recognize Ukrainian literature. For the official Soviet interpretation this is as it should be: literature *should be* solely the domain of progressive forces, and Soviet literature today is (all the rest is *samizdat* or *samydyav*). But the ought-to-be reality is not historical reality, and there is certainly no question that in this period the Polish-Ukrainian literary relationship was not like that of Polish to French, or German or even Russian literature. There the perception of the other literature was not defined by and limited to any particular concerns, themes or ideology.

The interwar years are really a transition, a prologomena to the fourth and last period of our historical reconstruction. They are characterized by a marked decline in literary contacts, quite probably because of the antagonisms engendered by the Polish-Ukrainian war and

the political dissatisfaction of the Ukrainians now incorporated into Poland. Polish literary contacts with Soviet Ukraine were not encouraged by either government. It is remarkable, for example, that for all the vitality of Ukrainian poetry in western Ukraine and Poland proper, there is, apart from Antonych, with his early echoes of Wierzyński and Tuwim, hardly any trace of contact with the very exciting Polish poetry of the time. Considerably more interest was forthcoming from Soviet Ukraine, dealing on the one hand with the present or the recent past (i.e., the Polish-Soviet war), as for example, Tychyna's *Chernihiv* (1931) or *Shablia Kotovskoho* (1938), or with the classics of the past. It is here that we encounter Maksym Rylsky, the most gifted translator of Polish literature into Ukrainian, and a true Polonophile. His translations of Mickiewicz's *Sonety krymskie* and *Pan Tadeusz* (for which he won the Stalin Prize, and, perhaps more importantly, the universal esteem of poets and readers), his translations of Słowacki's poetry, and that of many others, have contributed to the enrichment of both Ukrainian and Polish literature.

A Polish writer of this period frequently associated with Ukrainian interests is Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz. Because of his attachment to Ukraine and his early years spent there, because of his frequent recourse to it in his works, it has been suggested that he thought to be a kind of one-man "Ukrainian school" within the Skamander group. The very appositeness of this term for Iwaszkiewicz's depiction of Ukraine is also revealing for us. For, as with the Romantic "Ukrainian school" of one hundred years earlier, Iwaszkiewicz, in the opinion of one Polish critic, sees Ukraine as "the last reservoir of old-Polish traditions", and, like Słowacki, he creates rhapsodies, replete with lexical Ukrainianisms, to its natural richness and exoticism and to the Polish-Ukrainian past that it evokes.<sup>44</sup> Thus the tradition of a common Polish-Ukrainian fatherland, expressed with naive enthusiasm by Wincenty Pol in his *Pieśń o ziemi naszej* (1843), lived on, in a specific aesthetic variant to be sure, in a writer as intellectually sophisticated and subtle as Iwaszkiewicz.

There were also a few writers (and publicists), such as those associated with the *Biuletyn polsko-ukraiński*, who saw Ukrainian matters not only through an aesthetic and autobiographical prism, but with a certain ideological and historiographic perspective as well. The most noteworthy of these was Józef Łobodowski. Although his poetry dealing with Ukrainian themes was collected and published only after the war, for the most part it had been written in, reflects, the period before it. From his elemental identification with the Ukrainian land and its past, from his anguish over the fratricidal conflicts and from his forebodings about the future of both the Polish and the Ukrainian people, Łobodowski creates an intense, historically charged and basically tragic vision of the Polish-

Ukrainian relationship.<sup>45</sup> In a very real sense, Łobodowski's vision also recapitulates the Polish Romantics of the "Ukrainian school". His (friendly but pointed) poetic polemic with the Ukrainian writer Sviatoslav Hordynsky, for example, echoes the poetic polemic between Słowacki and Krasziński; and indeed the world of Słowacki's Ukrainian poetry provides a model and basic framework for Łobodowski. On the other hand, to take the revealing *Pieśni o Ukrainie*, his call to struggle against the common Muscovite enemy, his passionate belief in the glory and "manifest destiny" of a Polish-Ukrainian alliance, distinctly recalls the pathos of the Cossacophile Czajkowski. From the historical perspective, however, what is as eloquent as the poetry itself is the fact that in his stance Łobodowski was a solitary figure among his contemporaries.

\*\*\*

The final break with a common Polish-Ukrainian tradition — with the possibility of such a tradition — came with the post-war period. The divorce between the two cultures was effected by political fiat, and with this also came normalization. The terms for understanding and discussing and "relating to" the given literature were at first prescribed by official directives, and in time have become assimilated into the new cultural content. The rancor and the grievances have been removed, at least from the manifest plane of literary expression, but the literary contacts are, thereby, rather tame. For the most part they are confined to translations and to literary scholarship — the translations are, on balance, done better by the Ukrainians, precisely because the best poets attempt them (not only those of the older generation, Rylsky, Bazhan, Pervomaisky, but also those of the younger generation, as, for example, Drach, who translated Norwid). The scholarship is almost always better when done by the Poles — when they do it at all: for, in general, the field of Polish-Ukrainian relations does not have very high priority in Polish scholarship. Each side's understanding of the other's literature had undoubtedly been clarified, although on the Polish side it is hindered by tepid interest (for each book like Jędrzejewicz's *Noce ukraińskie* or like the Biblioteka Narodowa's edition of Shevchenko there are several Ukrainian studies on Polish literature) and by the willingness to accept, especially in synoptic studies (*e.g.*, the anthology *Literatura ukraińska*)<sup>46</sup> the Soviet perspective, with its emphasis on such things as the "folk character" (*narodnist/ludowość*) of Ukrainian literature.

While from the Ukrainian side the history of Ukrainian-Polish relations can be treated, if at all, only in the more distant past and under very rigorous strictures, Polish writers have turned to the more recent

past, and in so doing have shown some diversity. Thus, in a poem entitled "Słowa o nienawiści" (1955), Andrzej Kuśniewicz sought to depict the roots of the tragic conflicts and to exorcize the hatred between the two peoples. In a more recent work, the prize-winning novel *Strefy* (1971), he again turned to the subject of the uneasy relations among the various nationalities of pre-war Galicia. In another acclaimed novel, *Góry nad czarnym morzem* (1961), Wilhelm Mach broached, without rancor, the very touchy subject of the Polish-Ukrainian conflict in the Lemko region in the immediate post-war period. And in the novel *Czarna Róża*, written in the following years, Julian Strykowski treated (through the appropriate ideological prism, to be sure) various milieus (Polish, Ukrainian, Jewish) in connection with the pre-war Communist movement in Poland.<sup>47</sup>

These more or less introspective and balanced treatments, however, have also had an accompaniment in a "lower" mode. These were the quasi-belletristic depictions, epitomized by Jan Gerhard's *Łuny w Bieszczadach* (1959), of the Polish (and Soviet) campaign against Ukrainian nationalists on the territory of post-war Poland. As is typical of mass literature, they relied above all on crude melodrama and inflammatory stereotypes. Though ostensibly directed against "bad Ukrainians," the "bourgeois nationalists," their effect — given the indiscriminating readership for which they were intended — was to bring disrepute to all things Ukrainian and to make the very term connote banditry.

But the bitter seeds of this conflict also gave rise to a phenomenon that in quality, if not quantity, more than counter-balances the negativism of the former. This is the poetry of Jerzy Harasymowicz, with its background of Ukrainian-Lemko origins and of his experience of forced resettlement with the Lemko population of Poland. It is a highly evocative poetry, charged with reminiscences and meditations on a time and a culture that have ceased to exist. At times, however, the personal trauma expands into a historical vision, and in his most remarkable poem, "Bitwa pod Białą Cerkwią",<sup>48</sup> we are given yet another, this time surrealist and mystical, portrait of the eternal Polish-Ukrainian problem. Perversely, the "Ukrainian school" will not die, and Harasymowicz, the last Polish-Ukrainian bard, who once styled himself a "Wielki Ruski Książę Polskich Pastorafek", lives, like a modern-day Wernyhora, alone, somewhere in the Bieszczady (Beskidy).

\*\*\*

My conclusions are brief. A central, defining feature of the Polish-Ukrainian literary relationship seems to be the fact that for much of its history it was not a relationship of literature to literature but of culture to

culture, and of a literature (the Polish) to a culture (the Ukrainian). In other words, for various lengths of time, the Polish relationship to Ukrainian culture or the Ukrainian sphere (e.g., folklore, history, the landscape) was not mediated by Ukrainian literature, by the Ukrainian version. If literature is the code, the "language" by which a culture sees and expresses itself and its version of reality, then the "code-given-truth" (to use Jakobson's neat definition for every perception of reality) was not recognized, was not accepted. And this, of course, is the natural consequence of the objective political and social balance of power between the two sides.

In the first period of our historical schema, moreover, the relationship, based on bilingualism and biculturalism, was, as I have indicated, particularly complex, and in analyzing it one must guard against both ahistorical criteria and reductive concepts. The notion of a national literature, of "Polish literature" and "Ukrainian literature" is in one sense a historiographic formula that may tend to obscure the actual system and organization of the literature at a given historical moment, and particularly the relation of that literature to other literary systems. Specifically, one could argue that, say in the seventeenth century, the relationship of Ukrainian literature to Polish literature was not one between two distinct literatures, but rather one between levels of literary expression determined by language (each possessing a specific degree of *dignitas*) or between systems of genres, or even between clusters of literary themes: some to be rendered in Latin, some in Polish, some in Ukrainian.<sup>49</sup> The actual, conscious consensus, among the writers and the reading public, as to the existence of two separate entities was still far in the future. But if our basic axiom is that literature is an expression of a culture (and the distinctness of Ukrainian culture at this time is not at all questionable) and hence already endowed with specific identity, and especially if we maintain a historical perspective and thus see the continuity of literary tradition (however strained and tenuous at times), then, despite the fact that the system of Ukrainian literature was defined largely (but not totally — cf. Vyshensky) by the literary system produced by the culture of the Polish Commonwealth, it is valid for us to examine this period too in terms of two distinct "national" literatures.

The final question before us is to determine, if only in broad outline, the historical dynamics of this relationship. Diachronically this is rather evident: it is a process of growing mutual awareness, of separation, and, ultimately, of a kind of equalization. (Had Poland been incorporated into the Soviet Union, there might have been even greater equality.) For the synchronic dimension one must postulate a model of exchange. The model that Polish literary culture provided to the Ukrainian was one not so much

of ideas (although it was that too) as of forms, norms and conventions. The history of the Ukrainian side of the relationship, from Velychkovsky to the *Knyhy bytiia*, to the not-fully comprehending enthusiasm of the modernists for Przybyszewski is precisely a history of such influences. The model provided by Ukrainian culture to the Polish was two-fold. One was that of "ready content", the "raw material" — folklore, local color, legends, etc. — to be used and remolded according to the applicable conventions and norms. The other was a model of *action*. Whether as concrete and terrifying events (the Khmelnychchyna), or as forms of behavior — for the "balahuly," the Cossacophiles, the revolutionary ideologues of a "Gromada Humań" — the Ukrainian mode of existence was fascinating and attractive, and had an uncanny hold over the emotions and the imagination.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup>T.I. Pachovsky, "Ivan Franko pro 'Ukrainsku shkolu' v polskii literaturi", *Slovianske literaturne iednannia*, (Lviv, 1958).
- <sup>2</sup>H.D. Verves, *Ioan Franko i pytannia ukrainsko-polskykh literaturno-hromadskykh vziaimyn* Kiev, 1957, his *Vladyslaw Orkan i ukrainska literatura*, Kiev, 1962, and especially his *Holovni problemy ukrainsko-polskykh literaturnykh vziaimyn XIX st.*, (Kiev, 1958).
- <sup>3</sup>Occasional literary contacts, of course, existed much earlier (Długosz in his *History*, for example, draws upon Old Rus' chronicles and gives valuable information about Ukraine) but they hardly constitute an actual period of relations in the sense of the scheme employed here.
- <sup>4</sup>I. Franko, "'Korol Balahuliv' Antin Shashkevych i ioho ukrainski virshi", *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Shevchenka (ZNTS)*, LVII, No. 1, 1904, pp. 1-34.
- <sup>5</sup>M. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia ukrainskoi literatury*, New York, 1960, V, pp. 215-220.
- <sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 220.
- <sup>7</sup>*Nowy Korbut*, Warsaw, 1965, III, p. 161.
- <sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 222.
- <sup>9</sup>A Brückner, "Spory o unie w dawnej literaturze", *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, X, 1896, pp. 578-644.
- <sup>10</sup>I. Franko, "Charakterystyka literatury ruskiej XVI-XVIII wieku", *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, VI, 1892, p. 701.
- <sup>11</sup>A. Brückner, *op. cit.*, p. 579.
- <sup>12</sup>I. Franko, "Charakterystyka...", *op. cit.*, pp. 701-2.
- <sup>13</sup>George G. Grabowicz, "Toward a History of Ukrainian Literature," in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, I, No. 4, pp. 407-523.
- <sup>14</sup>T.I. Pachovsky, *op. cit.*, p. 28.
- <sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 27 and M. Vozniak, "Iz spivanyka Dominika Rudnytskoho", *ZNTS*, CL, pp. 243-252.
- <sup>16</sup>I. Franko, "Khmelnychchyna 1648-1649 rokiv v suchasnykh virshakh", *ZNTS*, 1898, XXIII-XXIV, and my unpublished *The Khmelnytsky Revolution of 1648 in the Contemporary Polish Literature*.
- <sup>17</sup>George G. Grabowicz, "Samuel Twardowski's, 'Wojna domowa': Literary Context and Aspects of Genre", *For Wiktor Weintraub*, (The Hague, 1975).
- <sup>18</sup>Orest Zilynsky's excellent study "Dukhova heneza pershoho ukrainskoho vidrozhennia", *Stezhi*, I, No. 7-8, pp. 6-20.

- <sup>19</sup>Omeljan Pritsak and John S. Reshetar, "The Ukraine and the Dialectics of Nation-Building", *The Development of the USSR*, Donald W. Treadgold, ed., (Seattle, 1961), p. 240.
- <sup>20</sup>Ryszard Łużny, "Teofan Prokopowicz a literatura polska", *Slavia Orientalis*, 1966, No. 3.
- <sup>21</sup>G. Grabowicz, "Samuel Twardowski's...", *op. cit.*, p. 170n.
- <sup>22</sup>See particularly the section devoted to the magnates, "Do panów, czyli możnowładców", in *Pisma filozoficzne i społeczne* (Kraków, 1954), I, p. 225.
- <sup>23</sup>Kajetan Kozmian, *Pamiętniki*, (Poznań, 1858), I, p. 26.
- <sup>24</sup>Marian Henryk Serejski, *Joachim Lelewel* (Warsaw, 1953), pp. 103-4.
- <sup>25</sup>R.F. Kyrchiv, *Ukrainsky folklor u polskii literaturi (period romantyzmu)*, (Kiev, 1971).
- <sup>26</sup>I. Franko, "Korol Balahuliv", *op. cit.*
- <sup>27</sup>*Tygodnik Petersburski*, 1839, no. 17, pp. 97-8.
- <sup>28</sup>Adam Mickiewicz, *Dzieła*, XV (Warsaw, 1955), pp. 226-7.
- <sup>29</sup>Taras Szewczenko (Shevchenko), *Wybór poezji* (Wrocław, 1974), pp. lv-lxii.
- <sup>30</sup>V. Hnatiuk, "Polskyi literator M.A. Grabovsky (Grabowski) i ioho pryiateliuvannia z P.O. Kulishem", (Vseukrainska Akademiia Nauk), 1928, Zapysky, Istor. Viddilu, (Kiev, 1928).
- <sup>31</sup>Stefan Kozak, "Knyhy byttia Ukrainśkoho narodu Mykofy Kostomarova i Księgi narodu i pielgrzymstwa polskiego Adama Mickiewicza", *Slavia Orientalis*, 2, 1973, vol. xxii.
- <sup>32</sup>H.D. Verves, *Ivan Franko...*, *op. cit.*
- <sup>33</sup>Taras Szewczenko, *Wybór poezji*, *op. cit.*, p. CXI. See also Vasyl Shchurat, "Pershi polski holosy pro Shevchenka (1842-1844rr)", in his *Vybrani pratsi z istorii literatury*, Kiev, 1963.
- <sup>34</sup>T. Szewczenko, *Studium przez L. Sowińskiego z dodatkiem, "Hajdamaków"*, Wilno, 1861.
- <sup>35</sup>G. Bataglia, *Taras Szewczenko, Życie i pisma jego*, (Lwów, 1865).
- <sup>36</sup>P.O. Kulish, *Krashanka rusynam i poliakom na velykden 1882 roku*, (Lviv, 1882), p. 20, cited in Verves, *Ivan Franko*, p. 89.
- <sup>37</sup>Verves, *ibid.*, *passim*.
- <sup>38</sup>Cited in Maria Janion, *Romantyzm, Studia o ideach i stylu*, (Warsaw, 1969), p. 16.
- <sup>39</sup>*Ibid.* But, as Wiktor Weintraub notes, "The most passionate ... of all the detractors of *Wallenrod* was Mickiewicz himself. We know a number of the poet's utterances about the poem, all of them coming from his later years and all of them expressing disapproval and shame. When the poet was once jokingly asked what he would do if he were rich, he replied that he would buy up all extant copies of *Wallenrod* and burn them: 'because by praising treason I raised that heinous idea in my nation.'" (cf. *Dzieła wszystkie*, XVI, p. 283), *The poetry of Adam Mickiewicz*, (The Hague, 1954), p. 133.
- <sup>40</sup>Verves, *Orkan...*, *passim*.
- <sup>41</sup>A. Siedlecki, "Janosiki", *Wędrowiec*, 1900, No. 50, p. 988, cited in Verves, *Orkan*, p. 174.
- <sup>42</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 175.
- <sup>43</sup>Taras Szewczenko, *Wybór poezji*, p. cxvi.
- <sup>44</sup>Wacław Kubacki, "Proza Iwaszkiewicz", in *Ję. rostaw Iwaszkiewicz* (Warsaw, 1968), pp. 175-201.
- <sup>45</sup>See, for example, Józef Łobodowski, *Modlitwa na wojnę*, (London, 1947); and his *Złota hramota*, (Paris, 1954); and *Pieśń o Ukrainie*, (Paris, 1959).
- <sup>46</sup>M. Jakóbiec, ed., *Literatura ukraińska*, (Warsaw, 1963).
- <sup>47</sup>I would like to thank Professor Bohdan Osadczyk for bringing some of these works to my attention.
- <sup>48</sup>*Życie literackie*, Kraków, Aug. 12, 1973, XXIII, No. 32.
- <sup>49</sup>I am grateful to Professor Riccardo Picchio for his valuable comments during a discussion of this paper at the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies, Harvard University.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## *Introduction*

*Transliteration of Place Names and Proper Names*

*Acknowledgements*

<i>I Historical Legacy</i>	1
IVAN L. RUDNYTSKY	
Polish-Ukrainian Relations: The Burden of History	3
ANDRZEJ KAMIŃSKI	
Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Its Citizens: Was the Commonwealth a Stepmother for Cossacks and Ruthenians?	32
FRANK E. SYSYN	
Ukrainian-Polish Relations in the Seventeenth Century: The Role of National Consciousness and National Conflict in the Khmelnytsky Movement	58
OREST SUBTELNY	
Mazepists and Stanisławists: The First Ukrainian Emigres	83
<i>II Cultural Relations</i>	97
JÓZEF ŻOBODOWSKI	
A Polish View of Polish-Ukrainian Influences	99
GEORGE G. GRABOWICZ	
The History of Polish-Ukrainian Literary Relations: A Literary and Cultural Perspective	107
VASYL MARKUS	
The Religious Situation of the Ukrainians in Poland and of the Poles in Ukraine	132
<i>III Economic Ties and Communications</i>	147
VOLODYMYR N. BANDERA	
The Structure of Economic Interaction Among Neighbouring Nations in East Europe	149
GEORGES MOND	
Some Remarks on Polish-Ukrainian Relations as Seen Through Polish Eyes	170
BORYS LEWYŹKYJ	
Political and Cultural Cooperation Between the People's Republic of Poland and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	195
ROMAN SZPORLUK	
The Role of the Press in Polish-Ukrainian Relations	212



# The History of Polish-Ukrainian Literary Relations: A Literary and Cultural Perspective

*George G. Grabowicz, Harvard University*

THE COMPLEXITY OF THE SUBJECT at hand stems not only from the weight of the material and the task of dealing with two literatures and two different cultural traditions and contexts. Above all, it is occasioned by the difficulty of penetrating beneath the surface of manifest literary and historical data and through the welter of centuries-old biases, misconceptions and peripheral considerations to discover the actual, real structures of the relationship. This, undoubtedly, is a formidable challenge, and here I can only outline the scope of the problem and posit hypotheses for its conceptualization.

The question of contacts between Polish and Ukrainian culture began to receive systematic attention already in the early 19th century, most notably through the notion of the "Ukrainian school" in Polish Romantic literature, but to this day actual scholarship has not progressed beyond accumulation of data, narrowly-drawn studies comparing individual writers, studies on shared themes and attitudes, or specialized studies on, for example, the role of Ukrainian folklore in Polish literature. It is indicative that several investigations written by Ivan Franko at the turn of the century still constitute the most broadly-conceived treatment of the problem.<sup>1</sup> In short, neither Ukrainian scholarship, with its greater quantity and lesser quality, nor the occasional Polish studies, which are fewer but more solid, have attempted a synoptic analysis of the history and the structures of this relationship.