

George G. Grabowicz

Ukrainian-Russian Literary Relations in the Nineteenth Century: A Formulation of the Problem

Since my avowed concern is with formulations, I should state at the outset that from my perspective the relation between Ukraine and Russia is not that of an "encounter," even a "historical encounter," but something much more intimate and long-lasting—in the language of Soviet pathos, a historical and indissoluble embrace or, as others might see it, a Sartrean *No Exit*. At the same time, since this article follows my earlier discussion of Polish-Ukrainian literary relations (which was also first presented in this same hospitable setting), I should stress that from the perspective of modern Ukrainian history and literature the Russian-Ukrainian relationship is undoubtedly the more central, and, especially in the nineteenth century, incomparably more complex.¹ My concern here, as stated by the subtitle, is not with the entire range and massive contents of this relationship, but with the principles and concepts by which we can systematize and facilitate our understanding of it; a comprehensive treatment, one which is sorely needed, would require the dimensions of a monograph. But even at this preliminary stage, the broad implications, and the difficulties, of this undertaking are clear. They are best indicated by the fact that, apart from the chronological designation,² all the terms employed to describe this investigation—not only "literary relations," but above all the meaning of the words "Ukrainian" and "Russian"—require fundamental re-examination.

It is undoubtedly quite revealing of the present political situation that for all the attention devoted to Russian-Ukrainian literary relations, this question is hardly ever constituted as a scholarly, or conceptual, or theoretical problem. This is primarily, of course, the case in Soviet scholarship, where the relationship between Ukrainian and Russian literature—like any number of larger and smaller issues—is understood only within the confines of official ideology, of *raison d'état*; the content and the dimensions of this subject, as well as the approaches to it, are strictly circumscribed and watched over by the highest organs.³ One hardly needs to be enlightened as to the nature of these strictures; they are, above all, the teleological (and millenarian-utopian) notion of the drive to unification between the Russian and Ukrainian peoples, and the implicit and explicit older brother/younger brother relation between them.⁴ The major corollary to these roles, one that is invariably applied in actual historical

exegesis, is that it was the progressive forces in both nations that furthered, and the reactionary forces that impeded, this unification. These dogmas, of course, are never far from any Soviet literary criticism or scholarship, but they become particularly obtrusive and stultifying in discussions of this relationship. Two illustrations may be in order here. In an article on Lesia Ukrainka and Russian literature of the 1880s and 90s, Oleksandr Biletsky turns to one of her poems, "Napys v pustyni," a work clearly based on Shelley's "Ozymandias" (and in fact typifying her penchant for elaborating the "great," "Western" literary themes) and proceeds to argue that, if anything, the model here is provided by Nekrasov, not Shelley. "Before looking afar," he says,

we must look closer to home, and here, after all, in immediate proximity to Lesia Ukrainka, was the democratic Russian literature, both the older and the contemporary, and this is what constitutes—along with the equally immediate Ukrainian literature—that closest of contexts, to which we must turn first when we study the poet.⁵

What is so telling here, along with the undercurrent of traditional xenophobia, is that this argument is made by an otherwise serious and conscientious scholar, and one who is particularly well acquainted with Western literatures. The second example concerns the relationship of Belinsky to Shevchenko, and particularly the ongoing attempt by the Soviet Ukrainian critic F.Ia. Pryima, among others, to attribute to Belinsky an unsigned, positive review of Shevchenko's *Kobzar* and thus, in contravention of all existing evidence, to show that the Russian critic did, in fact, also express favourable opinions on the Ukrainian poet.⁶ In answer to those Soviet scholars who were not swayed by Pryima's tenuous reasoning (and these included such eminent figures as M.K. Hudzii and Oksman), the critic Ie. Kyrliuk noted, unambiguously, that "we, Soviet scholars, must not forget that this essentially academic problem also possesses a current political aspect."⁷ The "theoretical" basis on which this not so subtle warning rests is precisely the dogma of the "progressive" writer and the imperative to trim the facts to the historiosophic scheme.

In non-Soviet scholarship the question of Russian-Ukrainian literary relations is also hardly posed as a *problem*. For nationalistically minded Ukrainian critics the relationship is largely perceived as one of national antagonisms and not so much a literary relationship as one of political and social oppression. In general, the occasional Western studies that impinge on this subject turn to discrete, individual moments, and not to the entire phenomenon. One may argue, in fact, that since the Revolution no real attempt has been made to conceptualize this relationship, to treat it as a complex literary, cultural and historical problem. The early Soviet (in a very real sense: non-Soviet) works of Zerov or Fylypovych or Sypovsky turn to selected aspects, but not to the whole.⁸ The major non-Soviet history of Ukrainian literature, by Dmytro Chyzhevsky, which in its Ukrainian version extends only

to the period of Romanticism, and in its English version treats "Realism" in a skimpy and idiosyncratic manner, is more attuned to the Western connections of Ukrainian literature, and is generally uninterested in the actual social and cultural context.⁹ In short, a subject that attracted so much intelligent, unfettered and provocative attention in the pre-Revolutionary period—from Kulish, Kostomarov, Drahomanov and Franko, to name only the prominent Ukrainian critics—is now, a century later, either largely ignored or systematically distorted.

For the purpose of this discussion, and with the intent of making a provisional model for a future, more thorough investigation, I would propose treating the Russian-Ukrainian literary relationship in terms of five separate rubrics or aspects: 1) The legacy and influence that an individual writer, primarily the belletrist, but also the critic or scholar, of one literature may have on the other. 2) The simultaneous, or, more rarely, the sequential participation of individual writers in both literatures. (This bilingual bridging of the two literatures is almost exclusively a characteristic of Ukrainian writers and, again, it applies to both the creative artist and the critic and scholar.) 3) The major historical events and developments, primarily pertaining to cultural politics, that affect and mould both the individual literatures and the relationship between them. These are, to be sure, *extrinsic* factors or moments—the suppression of the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius, the Ems ukase of 1876, and so on—but they are certainly more than mere "historical background." They are very much factors that determine the profile of Ukrainian literature and thereby, too, the nature of its relation to Russian literature. 4) The history of the various attitudes to this relationship, the attempts at conceptualizing the problem. This rubric is as fascinating as it is broad: it seems that anyone even remotely interested or involved in both Ukrainian and Russian literature also expressed an opinion on their interrelation, and these opinions range from scholarly and systematic studies to the occasional and scurrilous comments of publicists or agents provocateurs. A central theme here—one which cuts across such diverse fields as philology, linguistics, social and political ideology, administrative and educational policy, and so on—is the question of the "right" of Ukrainian literature and language to exist. The fifth and last rubric is a synthetic one, and its essence is not so much the historical data as the historiographic model. The specific concern here must be a functional periodization of nineteenth-century Ukrainian literature, in short, a means of systematizing the *intrinsic* history of the literature by focusing, on the one hand, on the appearance and disappearance of conventional literary norms and values (Classicism, Romanticism, Realism, and so on), and, on the other, even more intrinsically, on the underlying cultural sets and premises, the deep structures, so to speak. It is here, finally, that we can establish the more fundamental differentiae between the two literatures.

These five categories, of course, are not always clear-cut, and they differ in their importance for literary history. The third category, for example, the realm of cultural politics, so to speak, underlies all the others, and in some respects is more the canvas than the subject of the picture. The fourth category, the broad gamut of opinions on the Ukrainian language and literature, and their "right to exist," is as much a subject of Ukrainian intellectual history, or modern Ukrainian history *tout court*, as it is of literary history. It dramatically reinforces the perception that the history of Ukrainian literature, and its relation to Russian literature, is much more than a literary matter. The second, seemingly natural and self-evident rubric, the content of which is the bilingualism of nineteenth-century Ukrainian writers, is actually profoundly problematical; the fact that until mid-century, and beyond, virtually all the Ukrainian writers also wrote in Russian suggests that in this period the distinction made between Ukrainian and Russian as between two different, presumably *national* literatures, may require rethinking. Each of these aspects, however, constitutes a valid frame of reference or strategy for approaching the many-faceted phenomenon in question; none of them can be ignored if the goal is a comprehensive treatment. And, indeed, with varying degrees of success, each has been so used at one time or another. In fact, there have even been attempts to examine the "deep structures," that is, differences in the essential nature, the "national profile," the make-up and function of the two literatures—but for the most part, these have been unsystematic and couched in metaphor rather than analytic judgment.

*

The first category mentioned is by far the largest in terms of actual studies. In a sense, it is quite natural that the study of literary relations be focused on such moments as the influence or, generally, the resonance of a writer of one literary tradition with or in another, particularly a neighbouring literary tradition; this, after all, not only subtends a *discrete* set of facts, but also, on the face of it at least, a set of *literary* facts. It would seem to offer, in short, the most intrinsically literary approach to the subject. As reflected, for example, by Holdenberh's survey of bibliographic sources for the study of Ukrainian literature, Soviet (i.e., Soviet Ukrainian) investigations of Russian-Ukrainian literary relations are totally dominated by this literary-historical paradigm: except for one bibliography of Russian literature in Ukrainian translation, and two bibliographies dealing with translations of the various literatures of the Soviet Union into Russian, all the works described are determined by the formula "N. N. and Ukraine" (the actual writers being, in alphabetical order, Gogol, Gorky, Korolenko, Lermontov, Maiakovsky, Nekrasov, Pushkin, Tolstoi, Turgenyev, and Sholokhov).¹⁰ There is also, of course, the obverse of this, whereby a Ukrainian writer is examined in terms of his contacts with, his interests and reception in Russian literature. Not surprisingly—given the

objective, historical state of affairs, as well as the obligatory proportion of attention—the set is more circumscribed here, with the emphasis falling above all on Shevchenko;¹¹ beyond him, the focus is most often on such writers as Franko, Myrny, Hrabovsky, Kotsiubynsky, and a few others.¹²

In either case, the characteristic strength of the approach is the mass of factual data that is usually adduced. For example, in Pryima's study of Shevchenko in nineteenth-century Russian literature, which examines Russian literary influences on Shevchenko and on early nineteenth-century Ukrainian literature as such, which deals with Shevchenko's contacts with various Russian figures, his reception in Russian criticism and literary life, his legacy in Russian society and, in a word, the battle over Shevchenko, there is a wealth of useful references and facts.¹³ Unfortunately, it is only raw data. That which purports to be the organizing theory or historiosophic conception is, as already suggested, only a reductive and crude dogma and teleology.

No less a problem is the narrowness and selectivity of the focus. In the various contemporary Soviet studies on Shevchenko and Russian literature, be it Pryima's monograph or the relevant article in the *Shevchenkivskiyi slovnyk*, virtually all of the attention is devoted to the ideological side of the question (the critical pronouncements, the polemics, administrative or police measures, etc., etc.), but so central a moment—for the literary scholar—as the impact or resonance of Shevchenko's poetics is seldom addressed.¹⁴ A more general statement of this problem is that Soviet critics invariably treat the relationship in question not as that of a literature to a literature, but of a "progressive" literature to a "progressive" literature. That which remains outside this exclusionary paradigm, i.e., the ideas or the roles of those deemed to be "reactionary" (be they Ukrainian or Russian), is bracketed out, reduced to a caricature, or, most frequently, ignored. To this we shall return.

One should, perhaps, qualify this judgment by noting that periods of political thaw bring with them a certain increase in critical and intellectual integrity, and veracity. Thus in 1961, in a striking example of critical housecleaning, O. Biletsky denounced, among other distortions, the absurd lengths to which some critics had gone to make Shevchenko a "faithful follower" of the Russian revolutionary democrats, which included making him a follower of Dobroliubov, who at the time in question was in his early teens.¹⁵ These improvements, however, are only relative—and often very transitory. One can note, for example, that the same Biletsky, in an article on Pushkin and Ukraine that was originally written in 1938, but which received several redactions, the last, posthumously, in 1966, argued not only that Pushkin's true counterpart and ally in Ukrainian literature was Shevchenko, but that Kulish, for whom throughout his life Pushkin was a model and an ideal to whom he devoted poems and whose works he imitated, was, in fact, Pushkin's deceitful, ideological enemy.¹⁶ So sweeping a distortion of historical and literary fact can only evoke our commiseration for the scholar who once felt obliged to make it,

and later lacked the nerve to renounce it.¹⁷

The point of my argument is not ideological but methodological: the principal and unavoidable flaw of various studies juxtaposing the writer with neighbouring literature, be it *qua* "Pushkin and Ukraine" or "Panas Myrny and Russian literature," is not merely that their ideological premises are so simplistic and reductive, nor even that the influence always seems to be in one direction (while one need not accept the official Soviet metaphor that Ukrainians invariably "learned from" and "followed" their Russian counterparts, there is little doubt, and certainly no shame in admitting, that the flow of literary models, theories and ideas was precisely from the imperial centre to the provinces). The problem with the critical paradigm in question is that in its implementation it leaves no room for, nor does it show any consciousness of, a *literary system* that would underlie and make sense of the manifold facts that are strung together in the critic's narrative. A minor but telling illustration of the potential speciousness of a literary "fact" that is given without reference to its context occurs in the above-noted article on Myrny and Russian literature, in which the author argues that "one of the eloquent proofs of Panas Myrny's loving relation to the culture of the Russian people was his fervent wish to celebrate in Ukraine, in 1902, the fiftieth anniversary of Gogol's death."¹⁸ It apparently never occurred to the author that for Myrny Gogol may have been a Ukrainian writer.

The system to which I am referring, of course, is not to be confined even to the whole set of the given *writer's* attitudes, values and convictions. It is precisely the given *literature's* values, norms and "interests" that must be conceptualized and, to the extent possible, reconstructed. In large degree this devolves on what the anthropologists would call "cultural readiness."¹⁹ And this, of course, works in both directions: just as the first attempt to translate Pushkin into Ukrainian—Hrebinka's semi-burlesque rendition of "Poltava"—was a kind of cultural misunderstanding, so also the early (and indeed later) Russian perceptions of Shevchenko—even the extremely favourable ones—hardly perceived the qualities, the "cultural language," that was so stunningly manifest to virtually all Ukrainians. In sum, without a sense of the cultural code into which the given elements (ideas, models, etc.) are being transposed, a discussion in terms of the paradigm of influence, or interest, or resonance, runs the high risk of being arbitrary and mechanical; by its very focus on an individual writer rather than on a broad social process, or a readership, it can only give a selective picture.

Whereas the first rubric dominated discussions of Russian-Ukrainian literary relations, the second, pertaining to the manifest and unmistakable phenomenon of bilingualism, has been virtually ignored. Yet it is here, in the eloquent fact that to the middle of the nineteenth century, and beyond, virtually all the Ukrainian writers also wrote in Russian (frequently more than in Ukrainian), that we begin to see the outlines of the complexity of the problem before us.

The few critical and scholarly comments that have been devoted to this problem have been tentative at best. Soviet critics who discuss Shevchenko's Russian writings, for example, or those of Kvitka or Hrebinka, invariably see them as expressing an immanent (and "progressive") drive for "unification" (*iednannia*);²⁰ by way of further explanation, they may argue that turning to the Russian language was also motivated by practical concerns, in effect the desire for wider dissemination of their works. Every so often there appears the not insignificant argument that Russian was used (for example by the writers just named) to deal with themes that were broader and more general (e.g., social) than those usually dealt with in Ukrainian-language writings. Thus, for example, S.D. Zubkov says that the first reason that various early nineteenth-century Ukrainian writers turned to Russian when writing prose was that Ukrainian, confined as it then was to the level and style of burlesque, did not offer the breadth and subtlety of expression that the more developed system of Russian prose did. "The second reason," he goes on, "may have been the desire to turn society's attention to Ukraine. The recognition in Russian society of works by Ukrainian writers brought them out from a narrow, national frame and gave great social weight to the problems raised in these works."²¹ An equally typical claim is that of N.E. Krutikova: "Collaboration in Russian literature was also valuable in that it became for Ukrainian writers one of the paths for directly joining in the democratic and humanistic ideas of progressive Russian society and in [working for] the desideratum of national character (*narodnist*) and realism. This could not be reflected in their Ukrainian creativity. It is interesting to note, [however,] that Kvitka and Hrebinka were often much more radical in their Russian works . . . the general tenor of Russian realist prose, its humanistic tendency, the spirit of challenging the destructive social norms had an emotional impact on the participants in this process and activated the better, democratic sides of their world-view."²² Similar examples could be produced at will. At this juncture, however, two moments should be pointed out. One, of course, is the turgid, rhetorical and ultimately vague mode of expression. While facts are introduced (but seldom truly marshalled according to a hierarchy of criteria), the interpretative matrix, as already noted, is much too crude for anything but the broadest generalizations. This, unfortunately, characterizes not only discussions of Russian-Ukrainian relations, but much of contemporary Soviet Ukrainian literary scholarship. The more important moment, to be sure, is the content of these judgments. They are characterized, among other things, by a more or less unconscious shifting of essential criteria. As we see in the statements of Zubkov, and in the general line of reasoning, the distinction that is addressed is the one between the imperial centre, with its consciousness, literary culture and values, and the provinces. This distinction, however, is "nationalized," in effect, presented as that of "Russian" *vis-à-vis* "Ukrainian." As we shall see below, this leads to one of the most profound and widespread misconceptions in the approaches to the problem at hand.

For non-Soviet Ukrainian critics, the Russian-language writings of Ukrainian writers are most often treated as something of an embarrassment, like a skeleton in the closet; for some they are a hedging on the writer's national commitment. For many others, including most Western critics, this is largely a *terra incognita*. For virtually all, however, language is seen as determining literature: what is written in Russian belongs in the category of Russian literature. (While there is ambivalence about some works—for example, one detects a certain reluctance on the part even of Soviet critics to call Shevchenko's Russian-language *Zhurnal* [Diary] a part of Russian literature—there also seems to be a growing willingness in some recent works to designate such writings as part of Russian literature, pure and simple).²³ That this is not an ideological judgment, but a reflection of a much deeper cognitive set, is attested by the revealing fact that even in the very liberal 1920s, when any number of "sensitive" literary and cultural matters were investigated, the linguistic basis for the demarcation between Russian and Ukrainian literature remained unchallenged.²⁴

The matter must now be addressed directly and forcefully: as important as it is, the linguistic basis cannot be accepted as the ultimate determinant of a national literature—and if it is, the inevitable result will be precisely the confusion we encounter in the history of Ukrainian literature and in the question of Russian-Ukrainian literary relations (particularly of the early nineteenth century). As I have argued elsewhere,²⁵ the use of the language criterion to determine a literature is not only faulty in its logic (and in effect a continuation of the Romantic, or, more precisely, Herderian identification of a people [*Volk*] and its spirit [*Volksgeist*] with its language), but is also, notwithstanding the absence up to now of a clearly articulated counter-argument, not at all followed in scholarly and literary-historical practice. For by relying solely on language as a criterion one would not be able to demonstrate the continuity of various literatures as they shift linguistic mediums (for example, from Latin to the vernacular, as in the case of Polish or Hungarian), or the separate identity of different literatures sharing the same language (e.g., English, American, Canadian), or, finally, the selfsameness of a literature, like Turkish, which, depending on its genre system, uses various linguistic vehicles (in this case Persian, Arabic and Turkish). In the case of Ukrainian literature—compounded as the matter is by the absence of an authoritative institution, be it a state or an Academy of Sciences—this confusion, which is essentially based on a dissociation of literature from its social context, has led to radical misconstructions of historical reality.

Having rejected the Romantic and quasi-metaphysical notion of literature as the emanation (the "spirit") of a "nation", i.e., a *Volk* and a *Volksgeist*, we must replace it with what I take to be a more rational, and certainly more empirical definition of literature as a reflection, product and function of a society. As such, "literature," or, more precisely, literary products and processes reflect that

society and serve its needs; the structures and the mode of existence of a society are reflected in its literature. If that society is, among other things, bilingual, so too will be its literature. At various times in its history, this has been (not entirely uniquely) the peculiar fate of Ukrainian literature. In the multinational Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth the use of the *lingua franca*, Polish—depending on genre and function—did not signify rejection of one's identity. (We see it used, for example, in a panegyric by one Ukrainian churchman [Ivan Velychkovsky] to another [Lazar Baranovych]. The "patriotism," the Ukrainian "national" and literary consciousness of the former can hardly be doubted.) The same applies to the Russian Empire and its *lingua franca*—it applies, that is, up to that time, somewhere in the last third of the century, when after the ground-breaking works of Shevchenko and Kulish, the system of Ukrainian literature came to shift to a monolingual basis.

To hold the contrary, I submit, is to misread history. If "Ukrainian literature" is understood simply as literature in Ukrainian, or, in other words, if no distinction is made between the literature in Ukrainian and the literature of Ukrainian society, then it must follow that since in the first three decades of the nineteenth century there is little Ukrainian-language literature to speak of, there was at that time little if any Ukrainian society. Now, although the question of when the modern Ukrainian nation came into being is arguable, there is no denying that a Ukrainian society—and not just a peasant mass—did exist and did satisfy its literary needs, although only partially and at first, as it were, only informally in the Ukrainian vernacular. And it is precisely the middle and upper levels of that society—and not the *narod*, the peasant mass—that produced (with but a few notable exceptions, primarily Shevchenko) the writers and activists who effected the national revival of the nineteenth century. It must be stressed, however, that the identification of "Ukrainianness" with "peasant-hood" or "muzhikdom" (i.e., the *narod*)—which is, in effect, the indentification that determines the equation of "Ukrainian literature" with literature written in the Ukrainian vernacular, the "language of the people"—was made not only by those, like Belinsky, who were hostile to the Ukrainian national revival, but by the very mainstream of that revival, i.e., the spokesmen of *narodnytstvo*, above all Kostomarov. To this, too, we shall return.

In sum, it is essential to recognize that a large body of works written in Russia, from the *Istoriia Rusov* to the later writings of Kulish and Kostomarov, are part of Ukrainian literature. Such a reformulation carries with it some important consequences. One is the task of determining the criteria of redefinition. As I have argued elsewhere,²⁶ this is a synthetic judgment, involving above all the cultural context, and not at all a mere discrimination of ethnic origins. To take one rather clear-cut example, V.G. Korolenko, who was ethnically Ukrainian, who lived much of his life in Ukraine and in his writings often turned to a Ukrainian subject matter, can hardly be considered, and indeed in no serious quarters is considered, a Ukrainian writer. A very different

situation, however, obtains in the case of Gogol, the one writer who best exemplifies some of the complexities of Russian-Ukrainian literary relations. Gogol has been considered a Ukrainian (*as well as a Russian*) writer in the past (and not only, as we shall see, by nationalistic revisionists), and he indeed should be so considered now. Again, the basis for this judgment lies not in his ethnic origin or in his use of Ukrainian themes (although neither element is insignificant); still less is it a question of territorial ties. (After all, Shevchenko himself spent only a fraction of his mature, creative life in Ukraine.) In fact, while all these moments—language, thematic focus, ethnic origin and even territorial ties—may play a greater or lesser role, the issue of whether a given writer is, as in this case, a Russian or a Ukrainian writer must be resolved with finer tools than any one, or any combination, of these criteria can provide.

The case of Gogol is, of course, too involved to allow for a comprehensive answer in the framework of this overview. At the same time, he is too important a presence for us not to attempt at least a preliminary resolution. It is clear, at any rate, that historically, in his own lifetime and throughout the nineteenth century, Gogol was considered a Ukrainian writer (as well as a Russian one). In one of the first academic histories of Ukrainian literature of the nineteenth century (written, it must be noted, from a position of all-Russian loyalism), Nikolai [Mykola] Petrov treats Gogol at length (along with such writers as Maksymovych, Bodiansky, Hrebinka and Storozhenko) in a chapter entitled “Ukrainian Nationalism or the National School in Ukrainian Literature.” For Petrov, to choose only the most explicit formulation, “Gogol, who contains in his Ukrainian stories all the elements of earlier and contemporary Ukrainian literature, appears as a worthy culmination of the new Ukrainian literature in the first period of its development.”²⁷ In his history, which takes the form of a book-length critique of Petrov’s study, M.P. Dashkevych finds fault with many of his predecessor’s formulations, but not those concerning Gogol as a Ukrainian writer. For him, “in the figure of Gogol Ukrainian creativity decisively directed all-Russian literature [*obshcherusskuiu literaturu*] onto the path of naturalism.”²⁸ More than two decades earlier, the polemic between Maksymovych and Kulish concerning Gogol, carried on in *Osnova* and other journals, implicitly placed Gogol at the very centre of the Ukrainian literary process.²⁹ And some twenty-odd years before that, N.A. Polevoi, in his attack on Ukrainian literature as something artificial and anachronistic, singles out Kotliarevsky and Gogol as the culprits who started this futile and perhaps harmful exercise. “The followers of Kotliarevsky and Gogol,” he argues, “revealed the comic side of the notion of the artificial creation of independent Ukrainian poetry, and of the idea that Ukraine can be the subject of drama, epic and lyrical poetry, the novel, and such narratives as would form a separate literature; [in fact] all this constitutes only a particular element of all-Russian poetry and literature.”³⁰

It should be obvious here that these various attitudes, while revealing a consistent climate of opinion, also raise as many questions as they answer. For one, on the level of methodology, they remind us that the historian's task is to critically re-evaluate the historiographic formulas of the past, and not merely accept them if they prove convenient.³¹ Our concern here, however, is specifically with the existence of a consensus and not with the validity of the judgments it contains. In terms of the substance of these attitudes, it must be noted, of course, that for all these scholars or critics Gogol was also, and for some primarily, a Russian writer. (Kulish, perhaps more than others, was willing to stress this fact. In his various writings on Gogol, beginning with his "Ob otnoshenii malorossiiskoi slovesnosti k obshcherusskoi" (the epilogue to *Chorna rada*), he sees Gogol's greatest achievement in the fact that he opened the eyes of Great Russian, or "North Russian" society to Ukraine and its past, that through his talent he made his homeland an object of charm and interest,³² that he furthered the friendship between the two peoples, and, not least of all, that he made a tremendous linguistic impact on the Russian language, expanding and indeed shifting its basis.³³) For all of them, moreover, the central, though in varying degree conscious and explicitly stated premise is that being a Ukrainian writer and a Russian writer is not mutually exclusive, that like Gogol one can exist with such a *dvoedushie*. This consensus was manifest throughout much of the nineteenth century. In time, however, there came a shift in the mainstream of opinion and indeed in the operant categories. There occurred, in short, a fundamental "nationalization" of cultural and political life and consciousness. In his psychologically oriented study of 1909, D.N. Ovsianiko-Kulikovskiy now speaks of Gogol as an *obshcheruss na malorusskoi osnove*.³⁴ Later, in Soviet treatments, and also in the West, even this *osnova* is hardly considered: Gogol is simply and straightforwardly seen as Russian writer who happens to be of Ukrainian origin.

To argue that Gogol is a Ukrainian writer does not, of course, mean that we are turning back the clock of history; we are not trying to resurrect the attitudes and the overall state of national consciousness in Ukraine and Russia of a century ago. It is essential, however, for us to be able to reconstruct these attitudes and consciousness, or, more generally, the prevailing cultural set precisely in order to reconstruct with any confidence the nature of the two literatures—Russian and Ukrainian—as systems. For it is only in terms of the overall system of the literature that we can answer the question of whether a given writer participates in it, or "belongs" to it. To approach the issue by attempting to determine whether the writer, in this case Gogol, is a "Ukrainian writer" is problematical not only because the criteria involved (blood, language, themes, etc.) are particular, but also because the very idea of what it is to be a Ukrainian writer (and indeed a "Ukrainian") is in a state of becoming.³⁵ The literature taken as a system—while clearly also a dynamic, evolving phenomenon—provides a much more concrete and testable set of criteria for

resolving the problem at hand.

The most concrete evidence that Gogol is also a Ukrainian writer is provided by critical praxis: his writings—especially, of course, the early Ukrainian stories, but, to some extent at least, his later works, like *Revizor* or *Mertvyie dushi* as well—are not fully comprehensible without reference to the context of Ukrainian culture and its traditions and Ukrainian literary culture and its traditions.³⁶ For our present purposes, more important than the adequacy of critical perception and interpretation is the literary-historical aspect—the literature as a set of norms and values, as a system. And here it is clear that in that historical period, roughly from Kotliarevsky to Shevchenko (and somewhat beyond), Gogol's work is quite consistent with the norms, values, and concerns of Ukrainian literature. The reliance in one set of genres of Ukrainian literature of that time—from the *Istoriia Rusov* to Shevchenko's *Zhurnal*—on Russian as a natural medium is quite evident (and these works have traditionally been considered—present Soviet revisionism aside—as part of Ukrainian literature). Gogol's gamut of literary, historical, and folkloric associations and subtexts, his formal and comic devices, his range of metaphor and symbolism, in short, any number of features of his poetics partake of the system of Ukrainian literature of the time. At the same time it must be noted that Gogol departs—with time, more consciously and consistently—from this system and moves into an all-Russian one. This movement is expressed not just by overt themes (the urban, above all) and concerns (the problem of the artist), or by conscious ideological formulations (the emphasis on an all-Russian patriotism as revealed, for example, in the second redaction of *Taras Bulba*), but most of all perhaps by his sense of a broad all-Russian audience, a sense, to be sure, that is already implicit in his Ukrainian stories. This shift does not invalidate our argument, however. As a writer Gogol participates in both literary systems. Beyond that it is clear that at that time it was in the nature of the all-Russian, imperial literary culture to include the Ukrainian, and for Ukrainian, conversely, to be part of, to participate, to a large if not total extent, in the imperial literary culture.

In the course of the second half of the nineteenth century this relationship was fated to undergo substantial change. At the turn of the century, around the time that the Russian Imperial Academy of Sciences determined officially that Ukrainian was a language and not a dialect, the all-Russian literary culture became simply the Russian literary culture, and the option of bilingualism ceased to exist.

A further, not unimportant, consequence of our focus on bilingualism is that of noetic precedent, so to speak: having performed this reformulation we may be more conscious of, and more ready to accept, the fact that such constructs as “national literature” (be it Ukrainian or Russian), just like the notions of “literary period” (Classicism or Romanticism), are above all historiographic formulas that periodically require rethinking.

*

The third rubric, as I have noted, is more the domain of social, political and intellectual historians. In touching upon it here we are again reminded to what extent the Ukrainian literary phenomenon is coterminous with the social and political one. Moreover, insofar as traditionally nothing that occurs in Russia is outside the interest of the government, the literary domain is also a state matter, indeed also a matter of state security. Clearly, though, what I am speaking of here are Ukrainian-Russian relations as they pertain to literature, that is, Ukrainian literature, and not specifically literary relations.

The range of moments that enter this picture, that is, the various events and decisions—political, administrative, educational, police, etc.—that affect and shape Ukrainian literature is both large and heterogeneous. It involves such matters as the decisions to open a university in Kharkiv and Kiev, to prosecute the Brotherhood of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, and of course the decision, first in 1863 and then more forcefully in 1876, to ban the use of the Ukrainian language and to stifle Ukrainian literature and the separatism that the government saw lurking in it. I shall focus briefly on the latter step and its profound literary implications.

In one sense, the Ems ukase of 1876 can be seen as the most definitive, unequivocal statement in the ongoing debate in Russia about the right of the Ukrainian language and literature to exist and develop. The damage this decision did to Ukrainian literature and culture, particularly mass education, is indubitable. But its ultimate effect was quite different from that originally intended. Without overdramatizing the matter, and with all due care not to oversimplify the complex historical picture, one could argue that the most important consequence of this act was to shift Ukrainian literature out of the provincial mode. This is not at all to argue that at that moment Ukrainian literature—in its thematic range, artistic sophistication, conscious *Weltanschauung*, etc.—became any less provincial than it may have been. In range and complexity and sophistication the ethnographic realism of a Myrny or a Nechui-Levytsky could still hardly be compared to the realism of a Tolstoi or a Dostoevsky. But this is not the point, nor is this the kind of comparativism that I consider productive. The point is twofold. In concrete practice Ukrainian writers from the Russian Empire now turn to Galicia to publish their works and in so doing not only begin the arduous process of unifying two heretofore separate Ukrainian literatures (and, to a certain extent, languages), but also—*volens nolens*—expand their consciousness, their field of vision, beyond the bounds of the Russian Empire. Probably as important, however, were what I would consider the structural implications of this act. For by deciding to proscribe (for all practical purposes, if not by law) the pursuit of Ukrainian literary activity the Russian government was implicitly removing it from the status of provincial literature and reclassifying it as something “subversive,” “separatist,” proto-nationalist. It goes without saying, of course, that these

qualities must already have existed—more or less openly, as in Shevchenko, or *in potentio*. Only the time-table of their germination and fruition was unknown. But the administrative act, and its brutality, could not but bring this issue to a head: after the Ems ukase the option of being a Ukrainian-provincial writer in the mould of a Kotliarevsky or Kvitka, that is, reconciling one's language and themes and emotions (the "Ukrainian" component) with one's circumscribed political, social and intellectual horizons and one's loyalty to the state (the "provincial" component) was no longer feasible. It is highly ironic, of course, that precisely then, as an apparent response to this new situation, two new models of a provincial-adaptive response were being formulated—Kulish's "homestead mentality" (*khutorianstvo*) and Kostomarov's programme of "a literature for home use," primarily for the edification and education of the masses. These, however, were only defensive reactions; they were not a prognosis of the reaction of the coming generation of Ukrainian writers.

*

The issue we confront now, the range of conceptualization of the problem of Ukrainian-Russian literary relations, could easily take up, as I have suggested, an entire monograph, let alone a single paper. It would take that much merely to summarize the opinions of such thinkers and writers as Drahomanov, Kostomarov, Kulish or Belinsky, or of such scholars as Pypin, Petrov and Dashkevych, not to mention a host of minor publicists. Here again my task, as I see it, is to outline the major formulas.

The first subset in this broad category is, as already noted, the long-standing debate in both Russian and Ukrainian writings on the "right to life" question. It is quite paradoxical that the first voices expressing doubt about the future of the Ukrainian language (let alone literature) were those of Ukrainian writers—Maksymovych, Metlynsky, even Kostomarov, indeed even Kulish in his early novel *Mikhailo Charnyshenko*. This stance, which was largely a function of Romantic melancholy and nostalgia for a passing way of life, was dispelled by the appearance of Shevchenko. The Russian reactions to Shevchenko, particularly that of Belinsky, put the matter with new directness. While the opinions on the *Kobzar* of 1840 were largely favourable, the prospect of Ukrainian literature, especially a literature not merely confined to local colour or the low genres (travesty, burlesque, etc.), evoked more reservations than enthusiasm. Belinsky's consistently negative reaction to Shevchenko was occasioned precisely by his principled opposition to literary "separatism" and the political separatism that it necessarily implied.³⁷ In time the debate was joined by a host of major and minor figures,³⁸ but it soon became quite academic—not so much because of the decisions of 1863 and 1876, but because, as Drahomanov put it so well, discussing the *right* of Ukrainian literature to exist was beside the point—what mattered was whether it existed.³⁹ And however flawed or unsatisfactory its appearance, exist it did.

The actual discussions and conceptualizations concerning the nature of Ukrainian literature, and therefore, inevitably, also its relation to Russian literature can generally be divided into the analytical-descriptive and the prescriptive; not infrequently, especially in the writings of Drahomanov, the two categories overlap. The descriptive approach, beginning with Kulish's perceptive and provocative overview, "Ob otoshenii malorossiiskoi slovesnosti k obshcherusskoi," culminated in time in a series of scholarly histories of Ukrainian literature, most of them written by Russians: Pypin and Spasovich, Petrov, and Dashkevych.⁴⁰ Already the second edition of Pypin and Spasovich's history shows a growing commitment to the discipline and, of course, the belief that its object is real, alive and permanent. By the time of Dashkevych's history, the discipline and the phenomena it deals with are treated as entirely self-evident.

The major prescriptive model, one that is in principle shared, despite various divergences, by all the major Ukrainian participants in the discussion (Kulish, Kostomarov, Drahomanov, Nechui-Levytsky, and Hrinchenko), is that Ukrainian literature is and should be a literature *for, by and of* the people. Russian literature, by contrast, is, in their general consensus, a *cosmopolitan* or *imperial* literature and one which largely, if not primarily, reflects the concerns and perspectives of a ruling class, indeed a state. Ukrainian literature is and should be *democratic* and concerned with the lot of its broad constituency. The most extensively argued and at the same time the most radical expression of this idea appears in the writings of Kostomarov, for whom the prime and sufficient cause for the birth and growth of Ukrainian literature is precisely this concern for speaking to and of the people, the *narod*, in a language they understand; this could not and cannot be done in Russian.⁴¹

Drawing on ideals posited earlier by Kulish and Kostomarov, Drahomanov proceeds to systematize the notion of a fundamental class-based (and class-oriented) differential between the two literatures into a model which, I would submit, still holds considerable heuristic validity. As formulated in a long article entitled "Literatura rosiiska, velykoroska, ukrainska i halytska" (1873), he argues that within the one Russian state there are two Rus' nations (an echo of Kulish and Kostomarov) and three literatures: the all-Russian (*obshcherusska*) imperial literature, one created by the combined efforts of Ukrainians as well as Russians; the Great Russian literature which expresses the ethnic nature, concerns and spirit of the Great Russians; and finally the Ukrainian literature.⁴² For all its difficulties, the model is useful, particularly for highlighting the shift in literary systems that occurs in the course of the first half of the nineteenth century, that is, the "nationalization" of what had been an imperial supra-national literature (and, as Kostomarov would argue, a supra-national language as well) into its constituent national components. Again following Kulish and Kostomarov, Drahomanov believes that in this one respect—the shift to popular-based, "national" (*narodna*) literature—Ukrainian

literature preceded Russian, and even, to some small extent, served as a model for this transition.

At the same time, however, more than any contemporary, Drahomanov is aware of the great differences in artistic quality and range, in simple matters of quantity, that exist between the two literatures. For him, nineteenth-century Ukrainian literature is undeniably a child of *Russian* (not Great Russian) literature, and for the foreseeable future destined to be its provincial appendage; as such its entirely honourable task is to learn from it and grow with it. The alternative, as he argues at length in his polemics with those, i.e., Nechui-Levytsky and Hrinchenko, who would hermetically separate Ukrainian literature from Russian and stress its national uniqueness, is both provincialism and self-induced stagnation.⁴³ This we shall now place in a broader context.

*

The final, and probably the most central issue in this discussion, is the interaction, and before that, even more basically, the differentiation between Russian and Ukrainian literature *as systems*. The importance of this for the history of nineteenth-century Ukrainian literature can hardly be overstated: while the conclusions drawn here may be far from insignificant for our understanding of Russian literature, they are vastly more important for Ukrainian literature, for it is primarily in its relation to Russian literature, and especially in the changes that occur in this relationship, that the character of Ukrainian literature is defined.

The deep differences between the two literary processes become most apparent when we postulate a common scheme of periodization. Thus, while in Russian literature there is a well-established tradition of dealing with the nineteenth century simply by decades (a device that Iefremov borrows for his history⁴⁴), the use of such arguably more intrinsic categories as Classicism, Romanticism, Realism, and so on is not only widely encountered in practice, but is also justified in principle. The same scheme can hardly be said to apply—certainly not with the same degree of “fit”—to Ukrainian literature.⁴⁵ Ukrainian Romanticism, to choose the one period that offers the greatest typological similarity, is still essentially different from Russian Romanticism,⁴⁶ the difference is even more pronounced in the case of Realism (and indeed has led some critics generally to qualify the Ukrainian phenomenon as “ethnographic realism”). In the case of Classicism, it is very much an open question whether that phenomenon—as a distinct period, as a distinct poetics and set of norms and values in *Ukrainian literature*—actually existed apart from Russian (i.e., all-Russian, imperial) literature.

What is really at issue here is not the invariable time lag, the “delayed” appearance, and the greater or lesser dependence of the Ukrainian phenomena on the analogous Russian phenomena, or indeed models; it is not a matter of the generally smaller, more circumscribed range of works and forms (the fewer

talents, as some would say) appearing in Ukrainian literature; and it is not, speaking now on a more intrinsic level, the generally narrower register of themes and concerns (the Byronic theme and stance, for example, a central component in both Polish and Russian Romanticism, is scarcely evident in Ukrainian Romanticism). The issue is rather with the totality of the system, that is, with the operant dynamics or rules that are always, persistently, remolding all the constituent literary phenomena and relations.

Despite the twin dangers of tautology (the preceding is true of all systems, of course) and of nominalism (i.e., the ostensible willingness to see Ukrainian literature as something *sui generis*), this assertion must be maintained: the system and the dynamics of Ukrainian literature differ much more from (in this case) those of Russian literature than the conventional literary-historical categories ("Romanticism," "Realism," etc.) allow us to perceive.

The differences in question are perhaps best revealed in the nature of the given system's transitions. In Russian literature, for example, the shift from Classicism to Romanticism, or Romanticism to Realism, is reflected, first of all, on a broadly differentiated gamut of genres and individual works; to speak of the movement from, say, Classicism to Romanticism is to speak about changes in the entire fabric and in the very essence of Russian literature. Secondly, it is a shift that is eminently *conscious*. It is argued and elaborated in a highly developed critical literature and in a host of programmatic statements, polemics, etc. Thirdly (and this may also be taken as an extension of the preceding moment), the given shift in values, norms and conventions resonates with an actively involved audience. There is, in short, a differentiated readership, considerable sectors of which are not only generally sophisticated but also specifically attuned to the aesthetic and formal aspects of literary creativity.

The picture in Ukrainian literature is radically different. In the analogous time-frame (for example, the onset of Romanticism), Ukrainian literature not only shows a narrower base, as I have already noted, but also one that has little if any differentiation. On the contrary, in the various publications of this time, especially the "almanacs,"⁴⁷ there is a marked tendency toward literary syncretism: all differences of style or approach are subordinated to the primary fact of participating in the new Ukrainian literature. By this same token, there is hardly any discussion, let alone polemic, concerning the premises and practice of the new poetics, be it Romanticism or Realism;⁴⁸ there is a small core of critical commentary, but it is almost exclusively focused on the basic "existential" questions—the validity of Ukrainian as a literary language, the need and the right of Ukrainian literature to exist—and not on such "secondary" matters as that literature's aesthetic or formal profile.⁴⁹ Finally (and this again is only the obverse of the same coin), the audience for Ukrainian literature is only peripherally attuned to the aesthetic and formal dimension. This is so, it must be stressed, only in their expectations, in their cognitive and emotional set, *with regard to Ukrainian literature*; in its

sophistication and aesthetic requirements this same audience can be one with the all-Russian readership when the object is the overarching imperial literature. Thus, most importantly, it is the mental set and the function of literature that are different here, with the Ukrainian phenomenon expressing above all the thematic, the phatic, and the cathartic components of literary communication.

It is more than apparent, of course, that such categories as Classicism, Romanticism, and Realism do not adequately convey the internal dynamics of Ukrainian literature; they do not constitute genuine phases of its historical development, and to compare the two literatures, or even to speak of their interaction only, or even primarily, in this framework is to misconceive the historical reality.

What is the "historical reality" in nineteenth-century Ukrainian literature? Or, to return to the arguments begun above, what structures are revealed in this system's essential transitions? The answer, sketchy though it may be, must lie in a new model of periodization, the primary basis for which are precisely those factors—above all those reflecting the cultural context, but also the social and political—that are missing from the conventional schema of literary periods.

The three periods that I would postulate here are of very unequal duration.⁵⁰ The first, and by far the longest, lasts from the beginnings of modern Ukrainian literature to the time of Shevchenko; the traditional termini that one would invoke here are 1798, the year of the publication, in St. Petersburg (!), of Kotliarevsky's *Eneida*, and 1861. The former date, however, is only symbolic, for the publication of Kotliarevsky's travesty, without his knowledge or approval, was in many respects an anomaly, an accident, and *as a process* modern Ukrainian literature can be said to begin only around the 1820s. The latter date, 1861, does indeed mark a clear divide: not only the death of Shevchenko, but also the appearance of the first and highly important Ukrainian literary and cultural journal, Kulish's *Osnova*. The second period, therefore, has a clear beginning, but its end is much less distinct—it falls somewhere in the late 1880s or early 1890s. The last period thus also begins somewhat indistinctly, but it ends, quite clearly, with World War I and the Revolution.

The literary and cultural content of these periods is much more important, of course, than the dates of demarcation, and here, while risking some schematism, we can perceive the following general patterns. The first period, lasting well over half a century, is a time of beginnings and of self-discovery. It is the discovery of one's ethos (Kotliarevsky's *Eneida*), of literary forms and conventions (sentimental, pre-Romantic and Romantic), of history and folklore. This element of discovering or of initiating, where virtually every major literary work introduces a new form,⁵¹ where the very potential of the language as a literary medium is being continually tested,⁵² and where there are few if any literary traditions to fall back on, clearly supersedes, as I have argued above, any differentiation by literary style or *Weltanschauung*. (The writer Hulak-

Artemovsky, who is as willing to pattern himself on the Polish Classicist Krasicki as on the Polish Romantic Mickiewicz, is a telling case in point.) These features must also lead us to question the traditional recourse of subdividing this early period into the pre-Shevchenkian and the Shevchenkian, with 1840, the year of the appearance of the first *Kobzar*, as the date of demarcation. For while one cannot overestimate the importance of Shevchenko, his work, in terms of the criteria I am stressing here, only continues and culminates the process of literary and national self-discovery and self-assertion.

The essential and perhaps, at first glance, paradoxical concomitant of this process is that in this period Ukrainian literature reveals itself in many respects as a provincial phenomenon. All the Ukrainian writers also write in Russian; virtually all of them also publish in all-Russian periodicals. More to the point, they show quite clearly—at the very least in their choice of subject matter and of tone or level of discourse—that they write differently for the all-Russian and the Ukrainian audience. This is not to contradict our earlier conclusions concerning bilingualism; a great number of Russian-language works of Ukrainian authors should indeed be considered part of Ukrainian literature, and the author's sense of his audience should not by itself determine our understanding of the literary-historical phenomenon. At the same time, the sense that for virtually all these writers Ukrainian literature was a subset of imperial, all-Russian literature is inescapable, and this does define both their self-awareness and the nature of this literary phase. For that matter, in political terms, for all the Ukrainian writers of this period Ukraine is part of Russia. Characteristically, Shevchenko is the only exception, and a partial one at that: he rejects this verity in the visionary and mythical modality of his Ukrainian poetry, but he surely accedes to it in his Russian prose. What is more, his immensely influential poetic statement on the relationship of Ukraine to Russia, and, specifically, on the future of his nation, is couched in millenarian terms; as I have argued elsewhere, were it to be translated into the language of political thought it would constitute a radical anti-statist populism, or even anarchism.⁵³ Thus, in effect, the thought of this entire period, including the utopian-Slavophile program of the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius, and including Shevchenko, is distinctly pre-political. As such it corresponds to the provincial, pre-national tenor of the literature of this time.

The real issue of this argument, however, is to be found not in the intellectual or political background but in the literature itself, in its internal make-up and distribution of functions. In short, the provincial character of early nineteenth-century Ukrainian literature is reflected above all in its system of genres, where, especially in the earliest phase, there is a specialization in the "low" or popular genres (mock-epic, travesty, fables, etc.) and a virtual absence of the "high" (ode, tragedy, epic, etc.). It is precisely this state of affairs that led Chyzhevsky to speak of this literature as "incomplete."⁵⁴ In time, this "imbalance" was redressed—on the one hand, by the normal broadening and

development of the literature, and, on the other, more immediately, by the levelling and "democratizing" tendency of Romantic norms (which norms, even while not totally determining the overall profile of Ukrainian literature at this time, were never insignificant). Nevertheless, throughout this first period, some functions or genres were never represented: such "high" genres as, for example, the philosophical meditation that one associates with Tiutchev, translations of the broad range of literary forms (this despite the early interest in translations by such writers as Hulak-Artemovsky and Borovykovsky), and, above all, literary criticism and theory. The latter is the most revealing "structured absence." Not only was there little if any literary criticism, i.e., of the various discussions about the nature and function of literature that so characterized the Polish and Russian scene, but little if any polemics. If polemical notes are heard they are almost invariably reactions to skeptical remarks voiced by Great Russians⁵⁵—and this absence of critical heterodoxy, and the concomitant (if not fully articulated) sense of external threat and internal self-sufficiency (with the strength and inspiration to come from the roots, the *narod*), are, again, the strongest indicators of the undifferentiated and provincial cast of the Ukrainian literature of this time.

Given this profile, we can speak of Ukrainian-Russian literary relations in this period only in a very qualified way; at any rate, this is emphatically not a relationship between two clearly defined national literatures, say English and French, or Polish and Russian, but rather one between two soft-edged entities, with one of them in many respects a subset of the other. It must be remembered, however, that just as Russian literature is at this stage an imperial literature with an ever more pronounced national basis, so also Ukrainian literature is then a provincial literature progressively discovering its national—not provincial—past, and future. Both entities, in short, are in a process of transition. In this configuration, moreover, it is most difficult to speak of the one moment in the relationship which has traditionally drawn the most attention—namely, the question of influence. In fact, it can be argued that as the two systems are crystallizing the issue of influence becomes marginal. On the one hand, it is clear that in Russian literature the interest in things Ukrainian is highest in the first decades of the nineteenth century, and reaches its apogee in the 1820s and—especially in terms of historicist interest—in the writings of the Decembrists; Gogol is the climax before a rapid decline. The subsequent, thorough discussion—above all by Belinsky—on the course of Russian literature as a national literature finds little room for questions of Ukrainian themes, models or influences. In Ukrainian literature, on the other hand, the very development of the awareness of a separate identity militates against accepting others' models—even, or perhaps especially, those of the "older brother." It is only in the subsequent period that this resistance to Russian literary influences was expressed consciously and programmatically; now it expresses itself informally and emotionally⁵⁶—but it is no less real, and

no less structurally central. And it is one of the clearest failings of Soviet scholarship that so central (and historically "normal") a structure in the literary process is either ignored or denounced as retrograde "nationalism."⁵⁷

The second period in the schema I am proposing here is very much a transition: it is both a continuation of and a departure from the preceding period. Its onset plainly coincides with the activity of Kulish's *Osnova* (1861–2); indeed his "Ob otnoshenii malorossiiskoi slovesnosti k obshcherusskoi" (1857) is already a harbinger of a new stage in the literary process. The most important feature of this period, precisely as signalled by Kulish's epilogue-essay, is that what had only recently been largely an aggregate of literary works, and a relatively small circle of writers,⁵⁸ has now become a literature. It has become this not so much by sheer quantitative growth as by the emergence of new literary traditions (above all, Shevchenko's) which, while challenging older models (i.e., Kotliarevshchyna), introduce differentiation and new vitality. In general, many of the lacunae of the preceding period are filled in, most significantly, perhaps, in the range of translations (and in literary criticism).⁵⁹ The above-discussed Ems ukase of 1876, coming as it does at what is nearly the exact midpoint of the period, spells the end of the political option of a provincial literature; and the subsequent contacts with Western Ukraine, as well as the phenomenal growth of its journals and publications, signal the first stages of a truly national literature. Taken as a whole, however, the period from the early 1860s to the early 1890s shows a literature that is neither fully provincial nor fully national. In the matter of bilingualism, for example, the use of Russian by Ukrainian writers (in Russian Ukraine, of course) is much less pronounced than before, but it is not rare; it is still quite common in literary criticism (especially when a broad audience is intended—as, for example, in various articles by Drahomanov),⁶⁰ and it is occasionally used in belles-lettres, e.g., by Marko Vovchok, Kulish, Hanna Barvinok, Storozhenko, Svydnytsky, Hlibov, Konysky and others. (It is worth noting that all these are writers of the older generation; their younger colleagues, such as Nechui-Levytsky, P. Myrny, Karpenko-Kary, *et al.*, write only in Ukrainian. It is even more important to note, however, that this residual bilingualism is also to be found in Western Ukraine, where, for example, Iu. Fedkovych writes some early poetry in German and Franko some prose in Polish. We are thus dealing with a general structure in the development of Ukrainian literature, and not something specific only to the Russian sphere.)

The writers' attitudes on or conceptualizations of Ukrainian literature *vis-à-vis* the Russian also reveal this as an era of transition. The picture here, to use the favourite terms of Marxist-Leninist pseudo-exegesis, is complex and contradictory. But rather than leave it at that pass, or adjudicate it in terms of progressives vs. reactionaries, we can elaborate briefly on our preceding discussion of prescriptive stances by postulating a model that distributes the positions in question. As I see it, these positions—each of them fundamentally

concerned with the relationship of Ukrainian to Russian literature—divide along two axes, which I will provisionally call the “political” and the modal. On the “political” axis the opposition is between “federalists” and “nationalists” (in effect, protonationalists), between those like Drahomanov and Kostomarov who saw Ukrainian literature, in the present and the foreseeable future, as having to exist in a partnership, indeed a professedly junior partnership with Russian literature, and those like Hrinchenko, Nechui-Levytsky and, to a lesser extent, Kulish, who saw the essence and future of Ukrainian literature in its opposition to Russian literature, and in a precondition of full autonomy and freedom from influences. (Again it must be stressed that the term “political” is used here more by way of analogy, to suggest the primacy of either coexistence or opposition in the respective positions, and not as a description of the intrinsic character of these positions.) Cutting across this axis and sharply separating the—in some respects—very unlikely bedfellows that are produced here is the modal axis, as I have called it. The opposing modes may be considered, again in a somewhat approximate way, as the Positivist and the Romantic. It is the opposition between, on the one hand, those like Drahomanov and Kulish who emphasize universal cultural and literary values, the world and attitudes of learning and Enlightenment, and who actively and indefatigably work on realizing concrete, “organic” achievements, who are, in a word, unalloyed *Kulturträger*s, and, on the other, those like Kostomarov, Hrinchenko, Nechui-Levytsky and others who are animated above all by an emotional, indeed nativist commitment to things Ukrainian and who in a very real sense (though characteristically not altogether consciously) place Ukraine, or rather the Ukrainian *narod*, on a separate, implicitly superior existential plane, where its cultural and literary existence becomes virtually self-sufficient. (It is quite clear, of course, that the major legacy animating this stance is that of Shevchenko, and that this perspective on the *narod* and its needs draws generically on his vision of a holy *communitas*.⁶¹ It is also very indicative that the earliest, and to this day perhaps the sharpest challenges to this vision and its ominous implications for “normal,” structured nationhood were made precisely by Kulish and Drahomanov.)

Thus we can postulate a fourfold schema produced by two intersecting and equally important axes of oppositions. In one quadrant, so to speak, is the position manned by Kostomarov. His idea of Ukrainian literature as a “literature for home use” is in this period the most conservative, old-fashioned and, very soon, the most discredited stance. Its origins are deeply rooted in Kostomarov’s populism (*narodnytstvo*) and can be traced throughout his writings from the 1842 “Obzor sochinenii pisanykh na malorossiiskom iazyke,” through his articles on Marko Vovchok (1859) and Shevchenko (1861), to his late works. It is presented most directly in his introduction to the section on Ukrainian literature in Gerbel’s 1871 anthology of Slavic poetry.⁶² The basic argument of this essay is one we have encountered before: Ukrainian literature is a literature

for and about the people; its very *raison d'être* is to be accessible to the *narod* and to teach the educated about the *narod*. Thus for him the desire to raise the Ukrainian language to the level of an "educated" language, to present in it the works of a Byron or a Mickiewicz, is artificial since, on the one hand, the all-Russian language is as much Ukrainian as it is Great Russian, and, on the other, since the *narod*, in effect the peasantry, have no need for such writings. The elaboration of these positions in the several articles published in the early 1880s⁶³ is also clearly motivated by a desire to defend Ukrainian literature and the Ukrainian movement (*Ukrainofilstvo*)—if necessary by dissimulation—from official Russian harassment and persecution.⁶⁴ It is not surprising that this (all too typically Ukrainian) effort at mimicry and accommodation was seen, for example by Drahomanov, as a form of opportunism,⁶⁵ later, more nationalistic and more perfervid critics were much harsher in their judgement. And yet the balanced view, as signalled many times by Drahomanov himself, and later so eloquently by Hrushevsky, is to see Kostomarov above all as a major architect of the Ukrainian renaissance of the first half of the nineteenth century. His later views, specifically on the role of Ukrainian literature in connection with the Russian, reflect not only the tenacity with which he held to his earlier Slavophile, federalist, and populist positions, but also his deeply emotional, almost nativistic and transnational understanding of the Ukrainian cause, and within that of Ukrainian literature.⁶⁶

Drahomanov's position (our second, adjoining quadrant) is on the same side as Kostomarov's in view of his belief, as we have already seen, that Ukrainian literature is a "child" of all-Russian literature and that for the foreseeable future its opportunities for growth and development lie with the latter. At the same time, his position is on the other side of the modal axis by virtue of his quintessential rationalism and positivism. While he is a "federalist" like Kostomarov (though for him, of course, the overarching context is now socialism), and while he, too, places major stress on the obligation that Ukrainian literature has before the *narod*, Drahomanov is adamant about its need to grow and expand, to become as "educated" and sophisticated as possible—drawing *first* on the immediate and ready Russian model, but optimally on what for him is the universal standard, i.e., the European. In Drahomanov, and later *mutatis mutandis* in his disciple Franko, the cause of a creative interaction with Russian literature, an openness to the best—in effect the progressive and realist—strains that its highly developed tradition can offer, finds its strongest advocate.

The antithesis to this stance, in our scheme a quadrant that is diagonally opposite to Drahomanov's "positivist federalism" but adjacent to Kostomarov's nativist variant, is the position of such writers as Nechui-Levytsky and Hrinchenko. It was, of course, inevitable that it would be with them that Drahomanov conducted his most basic polemic,⁶⁷ for to his "federalism" and socialism they counterposed an elemental nationalism, while his rationalism

and positivism were countered by their emotional and intuitive patriotism. As much as they could be charged, and were indeed so charged by Drahomanov, with a lack of any clear political program, their stance with regard to Ukrainian-Russian relations in the literary sphere was unambiguous: as expressed at greatest length by Nechui-Levytsky in his "Siohochasne literaturne priamovannia" (1878) and then *Ukrainstvo na literaturnykh pozvakh z Moskovshchynoiu* (1891), it was a program of separation and self-sufficiency. Far from being a potential model, Russian literature was alien in its cosmopolitanism and often the very weapon of denationalization. The essence and the racial (!) basis of Ukrainian literature is its native, folk poetry, and this literature will grow without the aid, and indeed despite the oppression, of the Russian state.⁶⁸ This, in fact, is a central thesis of the latter highly discursive and chaotically conceived essay (in effect a book-length polemic with Pypin's review of Ohonovsky's history of Ukrainian literature)⁶⁹: Ukrainian literature can exist and develop without statehood, while a literature with the patronage of a state—emblematically the Russian—is not thereby rendered any more viable or attractive.⁷⁰ Here, both the facile compounding of the notions of literature and state, and, even more, the ultimately metaphoric understanding of nation and of national literature reveal a species of Romantic and nativist thought.⁷¹

The fourth position, occupied by Kulish, contiguous on one side with the "nationalist" position of Nechui-Levytsky and Hrinchenko and on the other with the positivism of Drahomanov, and constituting the total antithesis of Kostomarov, is in some respects quite problematical (and thus not a very proportionally situated quadrant). It presupposes that we focus primarily on Kulish's later views (and not on his early, seemingly unqualified *narodnytstvo*), and, beyond that, that we consider his actual literary efforts as more important than his various pronouncements. Given this, Kulish, for all his contradictions and inconsistencies, can be seen as a precursor of the later, essentially twentieth-century understanding of Ukrainian literature. Although his understanding of the national cause was certainly more cultural than political, his thinking, in its concern for the essentially Ukrainian, is in the final analysis more "nationalist" than "federalist"; much more clearly, his openness to literary influences and models, be they Russian or European, the range of his translations, and his fundamental concern for a rational and structured, not metaphysical and nativist, cast to Ukrainian literature and culture place him on the same side with Drahomanov and later writers and critics. It is not at all surprising that during the renaissance of Ukrainian scholarship in the 1920s, precisely when a linkage was made between national culture and structures of statehood, Kulish was one of the most studied and commented figures of the nineteenth century.

For all their (to be sure, schematically highlighted) differences, these four positions all share a common basis—all are more or less determined by the

premises of *narodnytstvo*, and the Ukrainian cause in general, and literary matters in particular, are perceived largely in terms of the *narod* and its needs. A shift from this state of affairs becomes evident in the 1890s and comes to characterize the last period of nineteenth-century Ukrainian literature. In the literary sphere the central movement is the growing differentiation of the literary audience and the literature itself: the central literary figure of this period, the prose (!) writer Kotsiubynsky, is no longer addressing the *narod*, but the sophisticated reader; the modernist (and, of course, still very tentative and timid) premises of Vorony and later the *Moloda muza* constitute an open break with the aesthetic ideals of *narodnytstvo* and the imperative of the writer's civic duty. In the political sphere this period is marked by nothing less than the crystallization of national consciousness; in practical matters this is the attainment of *sobornist*, the establishment of a consensus, and the co-ordination of efforts between Ukrainians living under Russian and Austro-Hungarian rule;⁷² in symbolic terms this is the highly significant change in self-designation: "conscious" Ukrainians are no longer called, or call themselves, *Ukrainofily*—they are now simply "Ukrainians."⁷³ The Ukrainian cause is no longer the property of a small circle of intellectuals, the object of a sect, but a growing national movement.

The emergence of a national, differentiated literature, the disappearance—indeed the structural impossibility—of bilingualism, produces a radical transformation in Russian-Ukrainian literary relations. These relations continue to have and to increase their ramifications, their various points of contact, interaction, mutual influence, etc. But now the partners in this exchange are on more or less equal footing. For some decades—at least until the depredations of the Stalinist thirties—Ukrainian literature and Russian literature become commensurate entities.

Notes

1. Cf. "The History of Polish-Ukrainian Literary Relations: A Literary and Cultural Perspective," *Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present*, ed. Peter J. Potichnyj (Edmonton and Toronto, 1980), 107–31.
2. As we shall see below, in Ukrainian literature, as in so many others, the nineteenth century extends up to the period of the First World War.
3. Emblematic of this is the first chapter of L. I. Holdenberh's *Bibliohrafichni dzherela ukrainskoho literaturoznavstva* (Kiev, 1977), entitled "Osnovopolozhnyky Marksyzmu-leninizmu pro literaturu. KPRS i ukrainska literatura."
4. Compare, for example, the very title of one milestone collection of articles: *Rosiisko-ukrainske literaturne iednannia* (Kiev, 1953). Characteristically, the rhetoric is always more turgid on the Ukrainian side: the earlier (slightly smaller)

- Russian edition of this collection was simply *Russko-ukrainskie literaturnye sviazi* (Moscow, 1951).
5. Oleksandr Biletsky, "Lesia Ukrainka i rosiiska literatura 80–90–x rokiv," *Zibrannia prats u piaty tomakh* (Kiev, 1966), 4: 605.
 6. A thorough discussion of this matter is given in Victor Swoboda's "Shevchenko and Belinsky," *Shevchenko and the Critics 1861–1980* (Toronto, 1980), 303–23.
 7. Cf. *ibid.*, 323.
 8. Cf. M. Zerov, *Nove ukrainske pysmenstvo* (Munich, 1960) [originally published in Kiev, 1924]; P. Fylypovych, "Shevchenko ta ioho doba," in *Literatura* (New York, 1971) [originally published in Kiev, 1925]; and V. Sypovsky, *Ukraina v rosiiskomu pysmenstvi* (Kiev, 1928).
 9. Cf. Dmytro Chyzhevsky, *A History of Ukrainian Literature* (Littleton, 1975) and my *Toward a History of Ukrainian Literature* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981).
 10. Cf. Holdenberh, *op. cit.*, 54–62.
 11. Cf., e.g., F. Ia. Priima, *Shevchenko i ruskaia literatura XIX veka* (Moscow, 1961).
 12. Cf. the articles in *Rosiisko-ukrainske literaturne iednannia*: M. P. Pyvovarov's "Panas Myrnyi i rosiiska literatura," Ie. P. Kyrlyuk's "Ivan Franko i rosiiska literatura," O. I. Kyseliov's "Pavlo Hrabovskyy i peredova rosiiska kultura," and L. D. Ivanov's "Literaturnyi protses v Rosii 90–900–kh rr. i tvorchist M. Kotsiubynskoho."
 13. *Op. cit.*; cf. also his popularizing *Shevchenko i rosiiskyy vyzvolnyi rukh* (Kiev, 1966). This pattern, where the Ukrainian version is the popular, and the Russian the scholarly one, is not at all uncommon.
 14. See, for example, *Shevchenkivskyy slovnyk u dvokh tomakh* (Kiev, 1977).
 15. See O. Biletsky, "Zavdannia i perspektyvy vyvchennia Shevchenka," *Zbirnyk prats deviatoi naukovoï Shevchenkivskoi konferentsii* (Kiev, 1961), 13–25.
 16. See O. Biletsky, "Pushkin i Ukraina," *Zibrannia prats u piaty tomakh* (Kiev, 1966), 219–28.
 17. Timing, or, if one prefers, consonance with the latest stage of Marxist-Leninist teaching is of crucial importance here: Biletsky, who died in 1961, simply did not live to see, and take advantage of the—partial, to be sure—rehabilitation of Kulish in 1969 (i.e., with the publication of Panteleimon Kulish, *Vybrani tvory*, Kiev, 1969).
 18. Pyvovarov, *op. cit.*, 303.
 19. The first to use this concept in Ukrainian literature, without naming it as such, was P. Fylypovych.
 20. See for example, S. D. Zubkov, *Ruskaia proza G. F. Kvitki i E. P. Grebenki v kontekste russko-ukrainskikh literaturnykh sviazei* (Kiev, 1979). The premises and the—to a large extent predetermined—conclusions of this study are stated succinctly at the end: "The analysis of the entire Russian corpus of Kvitka and Hrebinka, taken in its historical development and with due consideration of little-known publications and new material, gives irrefutable support to the thesis—which is important both in the literary-historical and the ideological

- sense—that their turning to the Russian language was natural and organic and that their participation in Russian literature was fruitful. It also serves to persuasively reject bourgeois-nationalist conjectures that distort the true picture of the relation of the two brotherly literatures in the past, of their [drive to] unification” (p. 268).
21. *Ibid.*, 12.
 22. *Shliakhamy druzhby i iednannia: rosiisko-ukrainski literaturni zviazky* (Kiev, 1972), 19.
 23. Cf. Zubkov, *op. cit.*, *passim*.
 24. See for example Fylypovych’s review of Sypovsky’s study (footnote 8 above), where a number of minor points are touched upon, but the major question of what literature and literary tradition some of the works belong to is not discussed; *Literatura: zbirnyk pershyi* (Kiev, 1928), 254–8.
 25. Cf. *Toward a History of Ukrainian Literature*, 98–100.
 26. *Ibid.*, *passim*.
 27. N. I. Petrov, *Ocherki istorii ukrainskoi literatury XIX stoletia* (Kiev, 1884), 199–200.
 28. N. P. Dashkevich, “Otzv o sochinenii g. Petrova ‘Ocherki istorii ukrainskoi literatury XIX stoletia,’” *Zapiski imperatorskoi akademii nauk*, vol. 59 (St. Petersburg, 1889), 99. On the next page Dashkevych speaks of Gogol as “a great Ukrainian writer”; cf. also p. 56, where he speaks of Ukrainian literature in general and mentions in one breath Gogol, Kvitka, Storozhenko and Levytsky. However, he does not agree with Petrov’s inclusion of Gogol among the writers of the “national school”; cf. pp. 134–9 and *passim*.
 29. Cf. M. D. Bernshtein, *Ukrainska literaturna krytyka 50–70-x rokov XIX st.* (Kiev, 1959), pp. 116–17 and *passim*.
 30. See *Biblioteka dlia Chteniia*, 1838, cited in Dashkevich, *op. cit.*, 39.
 31. Cf. my “Some Further Observations on ‘Non-historical Nations’ and ‘Incomplete’ Literatures: A Reply,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* V, no. 3 (September 1981): 369–88.
 32. Compare Kostomarov’s comment: “That [the experience of reading Gogol’s *Vechera na khutore bliz Dikanki* and *Taras Bulba*] was perhaps the first awakening of that feeling toward Ukraine which gave an entirely new direction to my activity. I read Gogol with a passion, I reread him and could not get enough of it: I don’t know—it occurred to me—how I could not see what was so close and all around me! I shall really have to learn it all!” *Russkaia mysl*, no. 5 (1882): 202; cited in Dashkevich, *op. cit.*, 72 n.
 33. Panteleimon Kulish, *Vybrani tvory* (Kiev, 1969), 482–3. This is subsequently echoed by B. Eikhenbaum, *Lermontov* (Leningrad, 1924), 135.
 34. See D. N. Ovsianiko-Kulikovsky, *Sobranie sochinenii*, tom I, *Gogol* (Moscow-Petrograd, 1923), especially chapter V: “Gogol—obshcheruss na malorosskoi osnove. K voprosu o natsionalnom-obshcherusskom znachenii ego,” 126–33.
 35. Thus, as seen above, the flexible, or indeed nebulous basis for determining Gogol’s Ukrainianness: for Petrov he is a Ukrainian writer of the “nationalist”

- orientation, i.e., one who focuses on the national past, on national-folk customs, etc.; for Dashkevych he exemplifies "Ukrainian creativity"; for Ovsianiko-Kulikovskyy he is an ethnic Ukrainian presence in all-Russian literature and culture, etc.
36. Much has been written on this; cf., among others, I. Mandelshtam, *O kharaktere gogolevskogo stilja* (Helsingfors, 1902), V. Gippius, *Gogol* (Leningrad, 1924), V. Chaplenko, *Ukrainizmy v movi M. Hoholia* (Augsburg, 1948), George S. N. Luckyj, *Between Gogol' and Ševčenko* (Munich, 1971).
 37. Cf. Swoboda, op. cit. Cf. also George S. N. Luckyj, *Between Gogol' and Ševčenko*, 70–71.
 38. See P. K. Volynsky, *Teoretyčna borotba v ukraïnskii literaturi* (Kiev, 1959).
 39. M. P. Drahomanov, "Po voprosu o maloruskoï literature," *Literaturno-publitsystychni pratsi u dvokh tomakh* (Kiev, 1970), 1: 371.
 40. See A. N. Pypin and V. D. Spasovich, *Obzor istorii slavianskikh literatur* (St. Petersburg, 1865) and *Istoriia slavianskikh literatur* (St. Petersburg, 1879); N. I. Petrov, *Očerki istorii ukraïnskoï literatury XIX stoletia*, op. cit. and N. P. Dashkevich, *Otzyv o sochinenii g. Petrova*, op. cit.
 41. See his article, "Maloruskaia literatura," in Gerbel's *Poeziiia slavian* (St. Petersburg, 1871), 157–63.
 42. Op. cit., 80–220.
 43. See, among others, his "Lysty na Naddnipriansku Ukraïnu," "Chudatski dumky pro ukraïnsku natsionalnu spravu," "'Nad Chornym morem: povist Ivana Levytskoho," and other essays in *Literaturno-publitsystychni pratsi u dvokh tomakh*, op. cit.
 44. Cf. Serhii Iefremov, *Istoriia ukraïnskoho pysmenstva* (Kiev-Leipzig, 1924).
 45. Cf. *Toward a History of Ukrainian Literature*.
 46. While stating this I still accept the literary-historical and typological validity of the notion of "Romanticism"; this is not the stand that René Wellek warns us about in his polemic with Arthur O. Lovejoy. Cf. "The Concept of Romanticism in Literary History" and "Romanticism Re-examined" in René Wellek, *Concepts of Criticism* (New Haven, 1963).
 47. Compare, for example, *Lastivka* of 1841, the subtitle of which is "Sochineniia na Malorossiiskom iazyke." It includes such representatives of the classicist, burlesque tradition as Kotliarevsky and Porfyrii Korenytsky, the classicist-sentimentalist (and pre-Romantic) Kvitka, the early Romantics Borovykovsky, Chuzhbinsky, Zabyla, and Pysarevsky (who also appears under his pen-name of S. Shereperia), Shevchenko and Kulish, and Hrebinka, the editor. The contents, as described on the title page, are also revealing: "Povesti i razkazy, nekotoryia narodnyia malorossiiskiiia pesni, pogovorki, poslovitsy, stikhotvoreniia i skazki".
 48. There is nothing resembling the "battle of the Classicists and the Romantics" that we see in Polish literature (cf. *Walka romantyków z klasykami*, Wrocław, 1960) or in Russian literature (cf. "Russia/ Romaničeskij-Romantičeskij- Romantizm," in *'Romantic' and its Cognates*, ed. Hans Eichner (Toronto, 1975), 418–74).
 49. Cf., For example, Shevchenko's critical comments on Kotliarevsky in the preface

- to the unpublished, 1847 edition of the *Kobzar*.
50. For present purposes, I am confining myself to Ukrainian literature in the Russian Empire. A consideration of western Ukrainian literature would require some adjustments, but the overall model does retain its validity.
 51. Many of these—the literary ballad, the Byronic *poema*, etc.—are, of course, also being newly discovered in Polish and Russian literature.
 52. The most frequently cited illustration of this is Kvitka's "Letter to the publishers of *Russkii vestnik*" (first published in *Moskvitianin* 6, no. 20 (1849): 327–34), where he notes that "I wrote *Marusia* to prove to one unbeliever that something gentle and moving can be written in the Ukrainian language." "I wrote *Soldatskyi patret*, he continues, "to stop critics from explicating that of which they know nothing." See Hr. Kvitka-Osnovianenko, *Tvory u vosmy tomakh* (Kiev, 1970), 8: 96. Cf. also his letters to P. O. Pletnev (15 March 1839), A. O. Kraevsky (25 October 1841) and others elaborating this same issue; *ibid.*, pp. 140–42, 258–60 and *passim*. At the same time, one cannot but notice that these statements were made only in private correspondence, or, as in the case of the first letter, published posthumously. The forthright personal opinion did not translate into a literary-historical fact.
 53. Cf. my *The Poet as Mythmaker: A Study of Symbolic Meaning in Taras Ševčenko* (Cambridge, 1982), 134.
 54. My reservations regarding this term, and the theory behind it, are given in *Toward a History of Ukrainian Literature* and "Some Further Observations on 'Non-historical Nations' and 'Incomplete' Literatures: A Reply," *op. cit.*, *passim*.
 55. Cf. P. K. Volynsky, *Teoretychna borotba v ukrainskii literaturi (persha polovyna XIX st.)* (Kiev, 1959), 141–210 and *passim*. Shevchenko's above noted criticism of Kotliarevsky is the exception that proves the rule.
 56. The quintessential examples here—characteristically expressed in poetry, not in critical discourse—are Shevchenko's biting comments on Russian literary models in the prologue to his *Haidamaky*, e.g., "Spivai pro Matrioshu,/Pro Parashu, radost nashu,/Sultan, parket, shpory,—/Ot de Slava!!!" Cf. also Hrebinka's introduction and epilogue to *Lastivka*, Kvitka's letters, and so on.
 57. To be sure, the fetishization of such resistance by the nationalistically minded, its elevation to the role of prime determinant in the Ukrainian literary process, is equally wrong-headed.
 58. Cf. M. Maksymovych's letter to D. Zubrytsky (22 April 1840), where he—still at this late date—states, "In our country one cannot have a literature in the South Russian language, we can only have, and do have, individual works—of Kotliarevsky, Kvitka (Osnovianenko), Hrebinka and others," *Halychany* 1, no. 2 (1863): 107–9; cited in P. D. Tymoshenko, *Khrestomatiia materialiv z istorii ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy* (Kiev, 1959), 1: 204.
 59. Kulish, with his translations of the Bible, of Shakespeare, of a host of contemporaries and classics is, of course, the prime *Kulturträger*.
 60. It goes without saying that it is still the exclusive language of scholarship and theory—cf. the writings of O. O. Potebnia.

61. Cf. *The Poet as Mythmaker*, passim.
62. *Poeziia slavian. Sbornik luchshikh poeticheskikh proizvedenii slavianskikh narodov v perevodakh russkikh pisatelei*, ed. N. V. Gerbel (St. Petersburg, 1871).
63. See "Malorussskoe slovo," *Vestnik Evropy*, 1881, no. 1; "Ukrainofilstvo," *Russkaia starina*, 1881, no. 2; "Zadachi ukrainofilstva," *Vestnik Evropy*, 1882, no. 2.
64. Already in his article in *Poeziia slavian* (op. cit., 162), Kostomarov speaks of the 1863 Valuev administrative decision forbidding the use of Ukrainian in non-belletristic writings as destroying Ukrainian literature; the 1876 Ems ukase was much more drastic, of course. See Fedir Savchenko, *The Suppression of the Ukrainian Activities* (Munich, 1970).
65. Cf. "Lysty na Naddnpiriansku Ukrainu," *Literaturno- publitsystychni pratsi*, 1: 452. Cf. S. Iefremov's critical comments in his *Fatalnyi vuzol* (Kiev, 1910), and Dmytro Doroshenko, *Mykola Ivanovykh Kostomarov* (Kiev-Leipzig, n.d.), 72–80 and passim.
66. Cf. Mykhailo Hrushevsky, "Kostomarov i Novitnia Ukraina," *Ukraina*, vol. 3 (12) (1925): 3–20. It is interesting to note, however, that there are some similarities in Drahomanov's and Kostomarov's positions. They both share the belief that the Ukrainians were the first (and the Great Russians only followed suit) in rebelling against the lethargy of great-power bureaucracy, the ossification of structured society, etc.—in short, the above-discussed premise of the democratic principle in Ukrainian literature and culture (cf. Hrushevsky, *ibid.*, 15). Both of them share a profound sense of disgust with Russian despotism, and though less pronounced in Drahomanov, he, too, shares with Kostomarov an undercurrent of anarchism.
67. Cf. footnote 43, above. Joining the polemic, very much in the spirit of Drahomanov, was Ivan Franko; cf. his "Literatura, ii zavdannia i naivazhnyshi tsikhy," *Molot*, 1878, 209–15 (Ivan Franko, *Tvory v dvadtsiaty tomakh* [Kiev, 1955,] 16: 5–13), an answer to Nechui-Levytsky's "Siohochasne literaturne priamuvannia," *Pravda*, 1878, nos. 1 and 2.
68. I. Bashtovy [Nechui-Levytsky], *Ukrainstvo na literaturnykh pozvakh z Moskovshchynoiu* (Lviv, 1891), 122 and passim.
69. See Omelian Ohonovsky, *Istoriia literatury ruskoj* (Lviv, 1878–93) and Pypin's review: "Osobaia russkaia literatura," *Vestnik Evropy*, September, 1890.
70. *Ukrainstvo na literaturnykh pozvakh z Moskovshchynoiu*, 124–5. Indeed, Nechui-Levytsky is willing to draw on any source that supports his anti-statist argument. Thus: "The first founder and architect of the first temporal kingdom—so St. Augustine tells us—was Cain, the fratricide. He began building cities and laid the basis and the beginning of human statehood. On just such a fratricide was founded the city of Rome, which later became the capital of the world and which united in one state all the kingdoms of the world," etc.; *ibid.*, 142–3. Here, the connection to Shevchenko's mythical thought, his dichotomy of structure and *communitas* as tantamount to the opposition of good and evil (cf. his "Saul"), is striking.
71. For example: "The state has the power only to expand the form and not the spirit or essence of literature, for the state is in itself only a form, while the nation, in the broad sense of the term, is a living force which has the power to create the

very content, the very spirit of literature, for it is in its nature a kind of living, creative force, a life force, like the life force of nature, which in ways unknown to us, drawing on its inexhaustible life forces, created forever and ever living beings, living creatures, living plants and living flowers." Ibid., 124.

72. Emblematic of this may be Hrushevsky's transfer, in 1907, of the *Literaturo-naukovyi vistnyk* from Lviv to Kiev.
73. Cf. the conclusion of Lesia Ukrainka's letter to her uncle, Drahomanov, 17 March 1891: "Speaking of which, I must say that we have rejected the term 'Ukrainophiles,' and simply call ourselves Ukrainians, for that is what we are, without any "philism." Lesia Ukrainka, *Tvory v desiaty tomakh* (Kiev, 1965), 9: 63.

Bohdan R. Bociurkiw

The Issues of Ukrainization and Autocephaly of the Orthodox Church in Ukrainian-Russian Relations, 1917–1921*

Among the principal characteristics of Eastern Christianity has been a close interdependence of religion and ethnicity on the one hand, and a positive relationship between church and state on the other hand. Wherever state and nationality coincided (which was rare until the nineteenth century), the Orthodox Church in its institutional and social aspects has become a national church. Under such circumstances, sooner or later, the national state intervened to end ecclesiastical dependence on the “mother church” abroad, usually by unilaterally proclaiming autocephaly of the national church, since the previous ruling church centre often opposed the diminution of its flock.¹

The doctrine of “symphony” of spiritual and temporal powers, given the state’s claim to sovereignty over its subjects, has generally led to a situation in which the physical preponderance of an autocratic state would result in the Orthodox Church’s subjection to the powers that be. Hence the caesaro-papist pattern of Byzantine history or the transplanted “Erastian” pattern of Peter the Great’s ecclesiastical reforms.

Such a confluence of political and ecclesiastical authority could not but generate serious problems, both political and religious, whenever the Orthodox Church happened to exist in a multi-national empire—Byzantine, Ottoman, or Russian—since the church generally identified itself with the dominant or favoured nationality (e.g., the Greeks in the Ottoman Empire) within the state. It was thus inevitable that, with the crystallization of national consciousness and the rise of nationalist movements among subject Orthodox peoples, strivings for national independence should sooner or later also produce

*This paper is part of a larger project on contemporary Ukraine. The author would like to acknowledge the financial support received for this project from the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta, the Shevchenko Foundation, and the Iwachniuk Ukrainian Studies and Research Fund at the University of Ottawa.

All dates in the text will be given according to the New Style (Gregorian calendar), which was officially introduced by the Soviet Government on 1 February 1918, by redating it 14 February. Dates of periodicals are listed in the end notes in both the Old Style (Julian calendar) and the New Style until the adoption of the latter.

Ukraine and Russia in Their Historical Encounter

Edited by
Peter J. Potichnyj, Marc Raeff,
Jaroslaw Pelenski, Gleb N. Žekulin

Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press
University of Alberta
Edmonton 1992

Copyright © 1992 Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Main entry under title:

Ukraine and Russia in their historical encounter

Papers from the first Conference on Ukrainian-Russian Relations held on Oct. 8-9, 1981 in Hamilton, Ont.

ISBN 0-920862-84-5

1. Ukraine — Relations — Soviet Union — 2. Soviet Union — Relations — Ukraine — Congresses. I. Potichnyj, Peter J., 1930- II. Conference on Ukrainian-Russian Relations (1st: 1981: Hamilton, Ont.)

DK 508.57.S65U4 1992

327.47'71047

C92-091407-1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be produced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

PRINTED IN CANADA

Table of Contents

Introduction

- The Problem of a Ukrainian-Russian Dialogue / *Omeljan Pritsak* ix

History

A. Medieval and Early Modern History

- The Contest for the “Kievan Inheritance” / *Jaroslav Pelenski* 3
- Muscovite Perceptions of Other East Slavs before 1654—An Agenda for Historians / *Edward L. Keenan* 20
- The Unloved Alliance: Political Relations between Muscovy and Ukraine in the Seventeenth Century / *Hans-Joachim Torke* 39

B. Modern History

- Ukraine and Imperial Russia: Intellectual and Political Encounters from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Century / *Marc Raeff* 69
- Paul I and Ukraine / *Edgar Hösch* 86
- Ukrainian and Russian Women: Co-operation and Conflict / *Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak* 101

Politics

- Myth and History in the Evolution of Ukrainian Consciousness / *John A. Armstrong* 125
- Ukrainian and Russian Perceptions of the Ukrainian Revolution / *John S. Reshetar, Jr.* 140
- Political Relations Between Russians and Ukrainians in the USSR: the 1970s and Beyond / *Yaroslav Bilinsky* 165

Culture and Religion

- The Mask of Culture: Baroque Art in Russia and Ukraine,
1600–1750 / *James Cracraft* 201
- Ukrainian-Russian Literary Relations in the Nineteenth Century:
A Formulation of the Problem / *George G. Grabowicz* 214
- The Issues of Ukrainianization and Autocephaly of the Orthodox
Church in Ukrainian-Russian Relations, 1917-1921
/ *Bohdan R. Bociurkiw* 245

Economy and Demography

- Demographic Change among Russians and Ukrainians in the Soviet
Union: Social, Economic and Political Implications / *Ralph S. Clem* 277
- Socio-economic Changes in the USSR and Their Impact
on Ukrainians and Russians / *Peter Woroby* 296

Conclusion / *Nicholas V. Riasanovsky* 327

Appendix: On Ukrainian-Russian Relations

- To the Conference on Russian-Ukrainian Relations in Toronto
/ *Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn* 332
- Open Letter to the Conference on Russian-Ukrainian Relations and to
the Conference of Peoples Enslaved by Communism (Strasbourg)
/ *Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn* 336
- On the Need of Russian-Ukrainian Dialogue (Commentary on
Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's "Open Letter to the Conference
on Russian-Ukrainian Relations") / *Jaroslav Pelenski* 337

Contributors 343