



The President and Fellows of Harvard College

A DECADE OF TYČYNIANA

Author(s): GEORGE G. GRABOWICZ

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (March 1978), pp. 119-129

Published by: [Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41035770>

Accessed: 29/09/2014 23:55

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and *The President and Fellows of Harvard College* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

REVIEW ARTICLES

A DECADE OF TYČYNIANA

GEORGE G. GRABOWICZ

The Tyčyniana published since the poet's death in 1967 is remarkable for both its quantity and diversity. Surely in that time no Ukrainian writer has been the focus of as much attention as Pavlo Tyčyna. Writing about Tyčyna, or editing and commenting his works, has become a *sui generis* growth industry in Soviet Ukrainian letters. The poet who wrote "Za vsix skažu . . ." now has the favor returned by a large segment, if not the whole, of the literary community. The attention is certainly not misplaced: the consensus that Tyčyna is the greatest Ukrainian poet of this century is felt on both sides of the ideological divide. Not unexpectedly, this broad interest is actualized in various focuses and approaches, and in works differing greatly in quality.

The production of works by and on Tyčyna can be divided into four fairly discrete categories: new editions of Tyčyna's already published poetry;¹ editions of Tyčyna's unpublished or "forgotten" works, principally his poetry, but also articles and speeches;² memoirs, interviews,

¹ ARFAMY, ARFAMY. . . . By Pavlo Tyčyna. Kiev: "Dnipro," 1968. 95 pp.
VYBRANI TVORY. By Pavlo Tyčyna. Edited by S. S. Zinčuk. Kiev: "Dnipro," 1971.
Vol. 1: 393 pp. Vol. 2: 363 pp.

TVORY V DVOX TOMAX. By Pavlo Tyčyna. Edited by O. I. Kudin. Kiev: "Dnipro," 1976. Vol. 1: 415 pp. Vol. 2: 423 pp.

JUNOSTI NEPEREMOŽNYJ DUX. By Pavlo Tyčyna. Edited by Lidija Petrivna Tyčyna. Kiev: "Molod'," 1974. 263 pp.

ŽYVY, ŽYVY, KRASUJSJA. By Pavlo Tyčyna. Edited by Hryhorij Donec'. Kiev: "Dnipro," 1975. 190 pp.

² PODOROŽ DO IXTIMANA. By Pavlo Tyčyna. Edited by V. O. Pidpalyj. Kiev: "Radjans'kyj pys'mennyk," 1969. 125 pp.

V SERCI U MOJIM. . . . By Pavlo Tyčyna. Edited by S. S. Zinčuk. Kiev: "Dnipro," 1970. 302 pp.

SKOVORODA. SYMFONIJA. By Pavlo Tyčyna. Edited by L.M. Novyčenko et al. Kiev: "Radjans'kyj pys'mennyk," 1971. 401 pp.

KVITNY MOVO NAŠA RIDNA. By Pavlo Tyčyna. Edited by H. M. Kolesnyk. Akademija Nauk URSR, Instytut movoznavstva im. O. O. Potebni. Kiev: "Naukova dumka," 1971. 205 pp.

recollections, etc.;³ and criticism.⁴

The first category is comprised exclusively of popular editions offering selections of Tyčyna's poetry. In normal circumstances they would not merit close scrutiny. The reviewer would comment on an editorial choice, on the physical format, or on the illustrations, and reserve discussion of more substantive issues for a scholarly or academic edition. However, circumstances in the Soviet Ukraine are not entirely "normal." Given official control and vigilance, every publication and every edition reflects an official interpretation. More specifically, there is no scholarly, academic, or complete edition of Tyčyna's work: since the early 1930s all editions of his poetry have been selections, including the multivolume editions of 1946, 1957, and 1961. In each, censorship was the sole principle of selection. Offending poems, such as "Vijna" in *Sonjašni kljarnety* or "Mesija" in *Pluh*, were simply deleted. In fact, it was a sign of progress when the deletion began to be admitted by the qualification "Iz knyhy" preceding the title of the given collection; in the 1946 edition, there was no such concession to historical fact. Under such circumstances, the publication of an academic, presumably uncensored, edition of Tyčyna's work — which, according to L. Novyčenko, was already planned in 1970 — seems quite impossible.⁵ (The censoring of Franko's poetry in the recent fifty-volume [!] edition of his works tends to reinforce this conclusion.)⁶ The popular new editions, then, perform a valuable service:

Z MYNULOHO — V MAJBUTNJE. By *Pavlo Tyčyna*. Edited by Stanislav Tel'njuk. Kiev: "Dnipro," 1973. 343 pp.

NARODNI PISNI V ZAPYSAX PAVLA TYČYNY. Edited by *B. I. Surža*. Kiev: "Muzyčna Ukrajina," 1976. 174 pp.

³ SPIVEC' NOVOHO SVITU: SPOHADY PRO PAVLA TYČYNU. Edited by *H. P. Donec'*. Kiev: "Dnipro," 1971. 510 pp.

PRO PAVLA TYČYNU. Edited by *H. P. Donec'*. Kiev: "Radjans'kyj pys'mennyk," 1976. 291 pp.

PAVLO TYČYNA: ŽYT'TJA I TVORČIST' U DOKUMENTAX, FOTOHRAFIJAX, ILJUSTRACIJAX. Edited by *V. I. Hrunicev* and *S. M. Šaxovs'kyj*. Kiev: "Radjans'ka škola," 1974. 262 pp.

⁴ ČERVONYX SONC' PROTUBERANCI. By *Stanislav Tel'njuk*. Kiev: "Radjans'kyj pys'mennyk," 1968. 187 pp.

PAVLO TYČYNA: OČERK POETIČESKOGO TVORČESTVA. By *Stanislav Tel'njuk*. Moscow: "Xudožestvennaja literatura," 1974. 273 pp.

PAVLO TYČYNA — LITERATUROZNAVEC' I KRYTYK. By *Z. M. Hruzman*. Kiev: "Dnipro," 1975. 194 pp.

FILOSOF'SKI MOTYVY U TVORČOSTI PAVLA TYČYNY. By *B. L. Korsuns'ka*. Kiev: "Naukova dumka," 1977. 224 pp.

⁵ *V serci u mojim*, p. 35.

⁶ Cf., for example, Ivan Franko, *Zibrannja tvoriv u p'jattedesjaty tomax*, vol. I (Kiev, 1976); the cycle "Ukrajina" in *Z veršyn i nyzyn*.

each, in its own way, is a small step toward revealing the poet behind the official rhetorician.

The first posthumous edition of Tyčyna's poetry, the slim volume entitled *Arfamy, arfamy ...* (1968), may be seen, in retrospect, as a harbinger of positive developments. By dispensing with the customary foreword or introduction, which more often than not is an exercise in bombast, it signals a new approach and allows the poetry to speak for itself. More importantly, the edition is genuinely selective, approaching its subject not through the customary chronological order, but through thematic and modal divisions (i.e., the "purely" lyrical poems, the revolutionary and tribunicial ones, the hymns to the new order, etc.). The selection throughout reflects a concern with aesthetic quality, and the early poetry and the lyrical principle predominate; the very title may be seen as symbolically resurrecting this side of Tyčyna. The other two small volumes, *Junosti neperemožnyj dux* (1974) and *Žyvy, žyvy, krasujśja* (1975) have no striking faults or merits, and are similar in format to the last selection of Tyčyna's poetry published during his lifetime, *Ljudyni himn* (1966).⁷ Their principal value is to make a fairly good selection of Tyčyna's poetry available to a large readership.⁸ *Junosti neperemožnyj dux* performs an additional service by including four longer works. Unfortunately, it also contains a more than usually clichéd foreword.

It is the larger, two-volume editions of 1971 and 1976, however, that achieve a modest rollback of the censorship in force since the early 1930s. Between them, the two editions reinstate the poems "Skorbna maty (I-IV)," "Išče ptašky," "Tuman/Enharmonijne," and "Zolotyj homin" from *Sonjašni kljarnety*⁹ (still missing is the excellent poem "Vijna"), republish the cycle "Madonno moja" from *Pluh* (still missing are such poems as "Na mohyli Ševčenska, III," "26.II/11.III [Na den' Ševčenska]" part II, "Palit' universalny," "Hnatovi Myxajlyčenko" and "Mesija"), complete the cycle "V kosmičnomu orkestri" from *Viter z Ukrajinny*,¹⁰ add two poems to the two usually allowed from *Černihiv* (thus making exactly half of the cycle available),¹¹ and, perhaps most significantly, include four

⁷ Pavlo Tyčyna, *Ljudyni himn. . .* (Kiev, 1966).

⁸ Their combined edition is six times that of the previous edition, *Ljudyni himn. . .*

⁹ "Tuman" and "Zolotyj homin" were included in the 1946 edition. The latter is given there in a somewhat bowdlerized version.

¹⁰ In a recent edition the seventh part was omitted — perhaps because it mentions Christ and Myxajlyčenko.

¹¹ Cf. G. Grabowicz, "Tyčyna's *Černihiv*," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 1, no. 1 (March 1977): 79-113.

poems, with antistrophes (again exactly one-half of the collection) from the heretofore proscribed *Zamist' sonetiv i oktav*. (At this rate — assuming no relapses — a more or less complete canon of Tyčyna's poetry can be expected to be published in the Soviet Ukraine by the centenary of his birth, in 1991.) The more recent and larger of these editions also has bibliographical and explanatory notes appended to each volume, and it is here that we learn that this publication is conceived as the fullest edition yet published of Tyčyna's poetry.¹² It seems reasonable to presume that it is also the compromise solution to the as-yet-unpublishable academic edition. In their bibliographical capacity the notes are undoubtedly useful, and the explanations, too, are occasionally helpful (we learn, for example, that the neologism "social-cergibeli" from *Černihiv* is based on the name of the chief of police in the Brüning government in Germany).¹³ For the most part, however, the explanations are crude, and when dealing with the newly rehabilitated "controversial" works, vulgar and distorting in the extreme. For example, the poem "Ispyt" from *Zamist' sonetiv i oktav*,

Тільки що почали ми землю любити, взяли
заступа в руки, колоші закачали. . .
— ради бога, манжети надіньте, що-небудь їм
скажіть: вони питають, чи єсть у нас культура!
Якісь цибаті чужоземці покурювали крізь
пенсне.
А навколо злидні — як гудина, як гич!
А навколо земля, столочена, руда. . .
Тут ходив Скворода.

is given this elucidation: "This poem is a grotesque directed against the false bourgeois civilization and the rotten culture of the West and its 'missionaries'; at the same time, the unique native culture (*samobut'nja vitčyznjana kul'tura*) and its new shoots are passionately asserted."¹⁴ Judging by this, one would be inclined to think that an undogmatic and sophisticated reading of Tyčyna's poetry, where "humanism" (or "abstract humanism") and "symbolist poetics" are not terms of opprobrium,¹⁵ is still far in the future. As we shall see, this is not altogether the case.

¹² *Tvory v dvox tomax*, 1:387.

¹³ *Tvory v dvox tomax*, 1:396. Cf. also "Tyčyna's *Černihiv*," p. 109.

¹⁴ *Tvory v dvox tomax*, 1:390. Cf. also the notes to "Zolotyj homin," p. 389, etc.

¹⁵ *Tvory v dvox tomax*, 1:390.

Compared with the modest gains of the above, two publications appearing in close succession, in 1970 and 1971, constitute a dramatic breakthrough. They are, respectively, the collection of Tyčyna's unpublished and "forgotten" poetry, *V serci u mojim*, and the monumentally conceived but fragmentary *Skovoroda. Symfonija*, on which Tyčyna worked between 1920 and 1940. *V serci u mojim*, with its selection of new poems from virtually every period of Tyčyna's creativity, with a number of outstanding works, and, above all, with its revelation — in the late Tyčyna — of a private lyrical voice largely unaffected by the public stance of official spokesman, made, as is now apparent, an indelible mark on the Ukrainian literary scene. The collection not only resurrected some of Tyčyna's poems (which are now included, for example, in the editions mentioned above), but it also genuinely deepened the understanding of his poetry. A closer analysis of this collection has already been attempted.¹⁶ One can only note here that it casts extremely valuable light on the basic structures of Tyčyna's poetry, the interplay of the personal and the impersonal, the lyrical and the tribunicial. This book also adds to our perception of the thematic range of his work, especially the intimate love poetry and the confessional and meditative poems. Moreover, it obliges the critic to reexamine the poet's creative evolution, and to discard any facile, ideological scheme of periodization.

Whereas *V serci u mojim* illustrates the range of Tyčyna's poetry, *Skovoroda. Symfonija* intimates its depth. Despite its unfinished state, numerous redactions, and the manifest changes in its "ideological" and "philosophical" premises, the essence of the poem is unfragmented. In fact, it reflects an abiding, intense concern of Tyčyna's poetry. For *Skovoroda* is not so much an epic canvas about the eighteenth-century poet-philosopher and his participation in and transformation by social upheavals (i.e., the hajdamak uprising and the *Kolijivščyna*), as Soviet scholarship and Tyčyna himself professed it to be, as it is an extended meditation on what is surely the central issue in Tyčyna's ethos — the poet and his relation to society, to the people. Tyčyna's identification with Skovoroda (already signaled in his early poetry, i.e., in *Zamist' sonetiv i oktav*) is total. The deliberations on social theory and materialism, the movement from a sense of social injustice to a realization of the inevitability of class conflict, the agonizing over the inadequacy of one's earlier creativity (because of its "abstract humanism"),¹⁷ all these manifestly

¹⁶ Cf. G. Grabowicz, "The Poetry of Reconstitution: Pavlo Tyčyna's *V serci u mojim*," *Recenzija* 2, no. 2 (Spring 1972): 3–29.

¹⁷ Cf. the section entitled "Perše vydinnja Skovorody."

reflect Tyčyna and the massive pressures of his world — not those of the Baroque poet.

But askew as it is, the historiography does not affect the aesthetic core of *Skovoroda*. The long poem-symphony — both as poetic autobiography, self-analysis and programme, and as a vision of the Ukrainian past particularly telling in its comic and satiric scenes — has become a centerpiece of Tyčyna's oeuvre. And the greatest commendation that can be made for this edition is that it does justice to the work. It is painstakingly and lovingly reconstructed, and it is provided with a sensitive and thoughtful introduction, by Stanislav Tel'njuk, and notes that are remarkably informative and free from cant. In the entire spectrum of Tyčyniana under discussion, *Skovoroda. Symfonija* is the unqualified highpoint.

Publication of other portions of Tyčyna's voluminous works has produced editions that seem paler by comparison, as well as some that are quite revealing. *Podorož do Ixtimana*, first published in 1969 in the journal *Vitčyzna* and then in a separate edition, is a long narrative-lyrical poem, dated 1950–1967, that is based on Tyčyna's visits to Bulgaria. While not devoid of good moments, the poem is far from Tyčyna at his best. (Its curious afterword, by Zaxar Hončaruk, is in effect a collage of citations from Tyčyna held together by breathless poetic prose ruminating on the musical principle in Tyčyna's poetry; its style is reminiscent of another poet-commentator on Tyčyna, the émigré Vasyl' Barka.)¹⁸ Rather more interesting than *Podorož do Ixtimana* is the small volume entitled *Kvitny movo naša ridna*, an intriguing potpourri of several of Tyčyna's articles about language, letters and fragments of letters dealing with poetry and language, poems and fragments of poems, a selection of his aphorisms and "winged" expressions, and, finally, as perhaps the most valuable contribution, a dictionary of Tyčyna's neologisms complete with references to the poetic source. The palpably synthetic format, the repeated paeans to the Ukrainian language and to poetic inventiveness, and, especially, Tyčyna's criticism (although mild, to be sure) of the bastardization (i.e., Russification) of the Ukrainian language in the Soviet press (in two articles, written in 1938 and 1940), when viewed in terms of the maximal sensitivity of the language issue in the Soviet Ukraine today, cannot but lead to speculation about the motives behind this work. (The introduction was written by the ultimate official Soviet

¹⁸ Cf. Vasyl' Barka, *Xliborobs'kyj Orfej, abo kljarnetyzm* (Munich and New York, 1961).

authority on the Ukrainian language, the academician I. K. Bilodid — but it is eminently circumspect and cautious.) Whatever the motives and larger function of the book, it is unquestionably valuable for having assembled certain poetic-linguistic material and for giving us occasional glimpses into Tyčyna's poetic laboratory. One of its most interesting pieces is a fragment of a letter to Zerov in which Tyčyna differs with him on the question of styles in his own poetry. As fragmentary and indirect as the debate is, it shows the incisiveness of Zerov's criticism, and, in contrast, the ineptness of much of present-day Soviet criticism on Tyčyna.

A subsequent edition of Tyčyna's articles, speeches and sketches, *Z mynuloho — v majbutnje*, published in 1973, makes a very different impact. It is a large collection of about seventy occasional pieces, averaging about three to four pages. Most are published for the first time and virtually all date from Tyčyna's later years (the majority from the 1950s and 1960s, the earliest from the mid and late 1930s), when he had become an official spokesman, polemicist, and elder for the Soviet Ukraine and for Soviet Ukrainian literature. The collection was apparently originally conceived by Tyčyna himself, but its actual realization, the selection and the editing was done by S. Tel'njuk, with characteristic great care and empathy. In his introduction Tel'njuk notes that

Each of these articles and notes, every sketch, memoir, or interview published in this book is, above all, a human document. In speaking, for example, about Komensky or Petófi, Gorky or Aseev, Ioanisian or Kolas, Pavlo Tyčyna not only gives us something new for understanding the greatness of these writers (which we can, to be sure, also find in other sources), but enlightens every fact, even the well-known, with the unique soft warmth of his great heart, opening to us ever new dimensions of his soul.¹⁹

This, unfortunately, is only occasionally true. Indeed, when speaking of his past, or of his friends and colleagues — Vasyl' Ellan Blakytynj, Les' Kurbas, Maksym Ryl's'kyj, etc. — Tyčyna can both evocatively portray the man and reveal his own benign and gentle character. But these pieces are in the minority; the greater number are written in Tyčyna's public, official voice, and here the same emotional and pathetic principle turns them into empty rhetoric and cliché. As he castigates "Western imperialists" and "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists," or praises Dmytro Pavlyčko for his *chef d'oeuvre* "Pljuju na papu," Tyčyna is, sadly, no different from any run-of-the-mill Soviet propagandist; as he gives socialist realist

¹⁹ *Z mynuloho — v majbutnje*, p. 4.

advice to young poets and approvingly cites fragments from hack versifiers (cf. “Do molodi mij holos”) he is the typical Soviet gerontocrat and reactionary. But what is most embarrassing is the interpretation by Soviet critics of such rhetorical, pathos-laden pieces as literary criticism, indeed literary scholarship. Leaving aside the usual and expected barrage about the essential revolutionariness, the identification with the “people,” in a word, the bolshevism *avant la lettre* of Ševčenko, Franko, or Lesja Ukrajinka,²⁰ one can turn to Tyčyna’s comments on other well-known writers to illustrate the problem. A talk on Mickiewicz, for instance, begins with this sentence: “Today we solemnly celebrate the 150th anniversary of the birth of the great Polish revolutionary poet, thinker, and founder of modern Polish literature, Adam Mickiewicz.”²¹ The opening statement of the very next article, on Gogol’, is: “The worth of every writer is measured by many qualities of his creative spirit. But the first of these qualities is his patriotism, his love for his fatherland.” It continues:

In his concept of patriotism Gogol’ included everything: his love for his suffering, enserfed people; his fierce hate for tsarist autocracy, his hate for the foreign ideology that was hostile to the Russian people [and yet] was imposed on Russia by foreign newcomers who surrounded the tsar’s throne; his perpetual desire for cooperation between nations; and, above all, his belief that his nation will in the future finally become the first among the first in the entire world.²²

All this may be interesting as an example of Tyčyna’s literary associations or his phantasy (viewing Mickiewicz through the prism of a Ševčenko or a Kotljarevs’kyj? making Gogol’ into Tyčyna’s image and likeness?) or simply his repetition of established Soviet verities, but it has nothing to do with literary criticism or scholarship. To imply otherwise is to mock these disciplines — and to mock Tyčyna. There should be no misunderstanding here: these writings by Tyčyna (as also his odes to Stalin, or the elegy for the Kruty dead) should be recorded and published, for they are part of his canon and part of history. Their genre, however, their essential rhetorical, exhortatory mode, should be clearly recognized, for it is plain that Tyčyna is no more a scholar or reasoning literary critic in these pieces than he is an objective historian in *Skovoroda*. (Perhaps saddest of all is the fact, as the letter to Zerov mentioned above makes clear, that this was not always Tyčyna’s mode of literary analysis. The difference between the

²⁰ E.g., “Lesja Ukrajinka, with all her tireless activity, honestly performed the tasks required of her by the progressive revolutionary forces of that epoch.” *Z mynuloho — v majbutnje*, p. 80.

²¹ *Z mynuloho — v majbutnje*, p. 120.

²² *Z mynuloho — v majbutnje*, pp. 123–24.

lucidity and lightness in that fragment of correspondence and the heavy-handed, unsubtle pronouncements of this book is painfully obvious.)

At the core of the third category of Tyčyniana are two collections of memoirs edited by H. P. Donec': *Spivec' novoho svitu: Spohady pro Pavla Tyčynu* (1971) and *Pro Pavla Tyčynu* (1976). The first, larger volume contains over one hundred, mostly short (three-to-four page) notes, recollections, or sketches devoted to Tyčyna. Most are published for the first time, although a larger number is taken from the collection *Pavlovi Tyčyni* published during the poet's lifetime, in 1961. The second, smaller volume contains over forty articles of slightly greater length, just under half of which are published for the first time. In both collections the range is predictably great. There are short poems (by Sosjura, Malyško, Drač), letters or notes to Tyčyna (e.g., by Bažan), longer memoirs (e.g., by Smolyč), articles with an analytical bent (Ryl's'kyj, Novyčenko), short rhetorical pieces, etc. Their date of writing also varies greatly, from perhaps the earliest comment, by Vasyl' Ellan Blakytynj, written before 1925, to the vast majority written toward the end of Tyčyna's life and dedicated to him posthumously. The vast majority are laudatory and panegyric; a few, as noted, are more analytical. Some are informative and interesting, some are dull and predictable. Among all of them, one stands out sharply — "Zhadujučy Tyčynu," by the poet Leonid Pervomajs'kyj. Consciously avoiding elevated rhetoric or pathos or praise, Pervomajs'kyj recounts, with great objectivity and a kind of sombre introspection, some of his meetings with Tyčyna, and in the process reveals much about each writer and about the complex, difficult times they lived through.

A very different history is presented in the album *Pavlo Tyčyna: Žyttja i tvorčist' u dokumentax, fotohrafijax, iljustracijax* (1974). Published by "Radjans'ka škola," its aim is frankly propagandistic. There are numerous photographs and excerpts from his poems and excerpts from comments on his work, but, in sum, Tyčyna the poet is decidedly secondary to Tyčyna the Minister of Education, the Party Member, and the Hero of Socialist Labor.

Were it not for one critic, the category of critical studies on Tyčyna would appear rather bleak. The publications discussed here are frequently accompanied by introductory essays, but they break no new ground and do not even attempt a critical, analytical stance. Leonid Novyčenko's introduction to *V serci u mojim* is one exception, for it seeks to sketch out at least some of the major thematic and evolutionary lines in Tyčyna's poetry. However, two other articles by Novyčenko on Tyčyna

written in this period are quite disappointing.²³ Put in the best light, they deal with the politics and orthodoxy of Tyčyna, rather than with his poetry. In fact, it is doubly disappointing to observe that an article written by Novyčenko more than thirty years ago, on “Poxoron druha,”²⁴ is considerably more analytical and outspoken, and much more attuned to the poetic phenomenon itself, than are his present essays.

Two recent, specialized studies, Z. M. Hruzman’s *Pavlo Tyčyna — literaturoznavec’ i krytyk* (1975) and B. L. Korsuns’ka’s *Filosofs’ki motyvy u tvorčosti Pavla Tyčyny* (1977), mark the low point of Tyčyna studies. As literary scholarship or criticism, they hardly merit discussion. The first work, an instance of “popular scholarship” at its worst, is simply a rehashing of the clichés Tyčyna promulgated as part of his official duties. It is no more than an exercise in dogma and banality. On any given page one can find such critical judgments as:

Noting that V. I. Lenin was severe and honest in his views, principled and uncompromising in his estimation of such or another work, Tyčyna exhorted [us] to learn from Lenin and to hold high and always live up to the calling of a Soviet writer.²⁵

Similarly, Korsuns’ka, in her study, neatly defines philosophy as the battle against religious convictions (ultimately for Marxism), and with that proceeds to an altogether predictable exegesis of Tyčyna, especially his *Skovoroda*. Hers, too, is essentially a ritual, not an analytical quest.

Semen Šaxovs’kyj’s *Pavlo Tyčyna: Žyttjepys poeta i hromadjanyna*,²⁶ although published in 1968, was written well before Tyčyna’s death, and in approach as well as chronology clearly antedates the publications discussed here. It, too, is a popularizing work (“Knyha rozraxovana na najšyrše kolo čytačiv. . .”) which combines a reading of Tyčyna’s poetry with a biographical treatment. As a literary study it is perhaps a cut above the efforts of Hruzman and Korsuns’ka, but only marginally so.

The real counterpoint is provided by the critic and poet Stanislav Tel’njuk, already encountered as co-editor of the excellent *Skovoroda* and editor of the problematical *Z mynuloho — v majbutnje*. With the appearance of his other two works, *Červonyx sonc’ protuberanci* (1968) and the Russian-language *Pavlo Tyčina: Očerki poetičeskogo tvorčestva* (1974), Tel’njuk must be seen as the most serious and dedicated Tyčyna scholar in the Soviet Union today. The first of his studies, as Tel’njuk

²³ Cf. Leonid Novyčenko, *Žyttja jak dijannja* (Kiev, 1974).

²⁴ “Pravda našoho času,” in *Žyttja jak dijannja*, pp. 164–79.

²⁵ *Pavlo Tyčyna — literaturoznavec’ i krytyk*, p. 37.

²⁶ Semen Šaxovs’kyj, *Pavlo Tyčyna: Žyttjepys poeta i hromadjanyna* (Kiev, 1968).

notes, is conducted on the borderline between literary criticism and personal memoir. More than half of the work, however, is devoted to a close reading of Tyčyna's poetry, primarily his early work. Despite its engagé, manifestly sympathetic stance (or perhaps because of it), Tel'njuk's criticism emerges as remarkably sophisticated and subtle. It is also outspoken — for when necessary Tel'njuk is willing to question the oversimplification of even a Novyčenko. His second study, *Pavlo Tyčyna*, which is a mature elaboration of the first, stands as probably the best Soviet treatment of Tyčyna since the 1930s. The book is certainly not without flaws, principally a reliance on reductive ideological readings (although these are often mandatory), a frequently unquestioning acceptance of Tyčyna's own "ideological" or "philosophical" premises (e.g., the discussion of *Skovoroda*), and empathy that at times tends to overwhelm critical distance. These are well compensated, however, by the author's merits — acuity of judgment, sensitivity to poetry, and a readiness to oppose and directly polemicize with narrowmindedness and vulgarizations (as clearly manifested in his enlightened discussion of *Zamist' sonetiv i oktav* and *Černihiv*). For the present, these are considerable achievements. One can only hope that it will be the efforts of Tel'njuk, and not the more recent productions mentioned above, that set the tone for future Tyčyna study in the Soviet Ukraine.

Harvard University