

TYČYNA'S ČERNIHIV

GEORGE G. GRABOWICZ

Ч Е Р Н І Г І В

Павло Тичина

МІЙ ДРУТ РОБІТНИК ВОДИТЬ
МЕНЕ ПО МІСТУ Й ХВАЛИТЬСЯ

Василеві Еллану

Доганяємо їх доганяєм
як коня що вітрами переня
ти й бачиш сам ростем щодня
ростем ми туго так як жолудь
а все ж дерзотний сміх
 Та хіба ж не завше молодь
 молодіша од усіх

Де хилилась вербичка у полі
там тепер паротягове депо
Проходять рейки через по
летять історію історять
Учора ще ж « раби »
 сьогодні глянь як твердо творять
 філософію доби

Через річку ліниву і сяйну
що мутна́ ж та розслаблена уся
нова вже мисль явилася
Мережно — пружна стекла й стисла

мисль напориста
перекинулася повисла
в формі дужного моста

Прокладаємо ріжем ламаєм
ні жалю ані жалощів нема
бо це ж сплянованість сама
Ану ж оклепуйте оклинням
щоб сила життяна
влила прийдешнім поколінням
вина

Забудовуєм високо й гордо
аж глухим догукнулася луна
Нехай ще вище йде вона
Знанням Загостренням Сталінням
щоб сила життяна
влила прийдешнім поколінням
вина

Ще ж лежать під землею багатства
ще ж енергія річки охляна
Черпнім достаньмо аж до дна
Ану ж оклепуйте оклинням
щоб сила життяна
влила прийдешнім поколінням
вина вина

КУПУЄМО ГАЗЕТУ

В Берліні й Ессені
у Рурі й Вестфалі
стривожені піднесені
до найвищої фалі

Робітничі райони
за поліцейських часів
дали
чотири мільйони
шістсот тисяч голосів

злети аероплянами
Заливчими Елланами
в майбутнє колосись

Ми славимо ми хвалимо
ми дійдем до мети
Чи облавом чи звалами
а Захід все ж обвалимо
щоб далі знов іти

Незборено залізяно
пройти без каяття
не спать голубосизяно
наукою пронизано
щоб все було життя

Ми славимо ми хвалимо
ми дійдем до мети
Чи облавом чи звалами
а Захід все ж обвалимо
щоб далі знов іти

**А ЧИ НЕ ЄСТЬ ЦЕ САМІ НАХВАЛКИ
АБОЖ ЗАПАМОРОЧЕННЯ ВІД УСПІХІВ**

О ні ми ясно кажемо
з заводом школу зв'яжемо
у всі знання узуємось
врізаємось шлюзуємось
політехнізуємось

Штурмуєм панські устрої
у нас доба індустрії
в нас темп і тлум понтонові
труди і дні двотонові
залізобетонові

Нехай Європа кумкає
а в нас одна лиш думка є
одна одна турбація

традицій підрізація
колективізація

Не батькова не неніна
дочка і мас і Леніна
ця мисль усім звідомлена
незламлена незломлена
переусвідомлена

Гей бідняки-безхлібники
і ви одноосібники
за хемію за звільнення
електрику допильнення
фондоусупільнення

Нехай ми ізольовані
хай дні в нас мозольовані
були ми єсть і будемо
весь світ ми перебудимо
пере-перебудимо

« ПІСЛЯ ЦЬОГО ЗРОЗУМІЛО » РОБІТНИК
КАЖЕ « ЧОГО УКР-ВАРШАВСЬКОМУ
СМІТТЮ ТАК ЗАРАЗ ВЕСЕЛО »

Пани мої ріднесенькі собаки сучині
танцюйте не танцюйте до танц-терору зучені
не витанцюється

Обернися порося на карася
Чоботу чоботу чоботу пілсудчини
поклонітеся

Такі ви кроткі пани мої оєвропеєні
до шляхти польської задком наліплені наклеєні
ну просто ж не намілуватися

Обернися порося на карася
Чоботу чоботу чоботу пся-кrevини
поклонітеся

Не спиться щось панам тим більше генералові
Безробіття Повстання Підпал на підпалові

тільки вітре подми

Світ настає ніп не свистає

а заборгованість закордонному капіталові
а й з податками

Хвалився колись хвалько а зараз знов хизується
що Україну й Білорусь по праву польщизується
в ім'я орла тюрми чи ви чуєте в ім'я хреста

Світ настає ніп не свистає

Фантазується вельможеству ох і фантазується
від убожества

Хлібний ринок усох Експорту як наплакано
Трясе ж тебе всю Грбзяно зарізякано
Це не Польща а трясця сама

« Гопки рижя » а в рижої й духу нема

Не одним її фашизмом пожмакано
кільканадцятьома

Та й що ждять од буржуазії крім покорщини
від буржуазії що з рбзпадом Австро-Угорщини
ще бач н а д і е т ь с я

Будуть пани дуться поки полопаються

А кордони чоботом поморщені
коли й не зникнуть до кінця
переміняться

ДУЛИСЬ ПАНИ Й 25 ЛІТ ТОМУ РОБІТНИК ЗГАДУЄ 1905 РІК НА ЧЕРНІГІВЩИНІ

Що за шум із Катлавана

Чи тнуть пана дрипапана

чи то черні хвальба

Чому хвальба чому ще й черні

Тож Конотопські майстерні

залізничні майстерні

між болот між сіл між ям

розбурхалися полум'ям

Корюківські заводи

Кролевець Підлипне

Попівка Батурин

Загребелля

Бурхали та все ще мало
 ой шуміло ж шумувало
 як те п'яне вино
 Чому вино чому ще й п'яне
 Тож із Віхвостова селяни
 найбідніші селяни
 б'ють поміщика у скон | "Fata morgana"
 не беззаконство а закон | Коцюбинського

Били їх та все ще мало
 Робітництву б сили стало
 так не встигло село
 Чому село чому не встигло
 Бо дрібновласництво не звалило
 власництво не звалило | Хоч ми його
 бач «здобришав» пан і піп | Фінансовим
 і маніфестом цар прилип | Маніфестом

Хай би краще не добришав
 Хай би потім менше вішав
 бо на черзі ж ізнов
 Чому ізнов чому на черзі
 Це ж не бюргерство в Нюрнберзі
 цехівство в Нюрнберзі | Ліонське перше
 Не Ліонський бунто-човг | розуміється
 і не Хмельницький-Пугачов | повстання
 а не друге

Човгала й рука «владичня»
 клюнула Дев'ятим Січня
 гульк аж рибка й бере
 Чому бере чому ще й рибка
 Глянь Тюремная повна глибока
 ремна набита глибока
 «що ж попавсь годуй шур'я | Їхня іронія
 це вам вся й аграрія» | звичайно

Рух притух Село вже снуло
 Враз Потьомкіном струснуло
 аж на много ясніш
 Чому ясніш чому на много

Бо вже ж вісниками нового вісниками нового й Ради і Кронштадт і Шміт профспілки як динаміт	А все це зробила ідея збройного повстання
---	---

**ТУТ САМЕ ДЕМОНСТРАЦІЯ ПРОХОДИТЬ
 ГЕТЬ ШКІДНИКІВ СМЕРТЬ ІНТЕРВЕНЦІЇ**

ЛЕНІН

Одно тільки слово
 а ми вже як буря
 Готово
 Напружим в один бік направим в другий
 і крешем і кришим і крушим як стій

ЛЕНІН

Всього лиш п'ять літер
 а скільки енергій
 Так рвіте ж
 Царям не допоможуть ні брехні ні жест
 Шумуй вишумовуй залізний протест

І от він вмер І кажуть різно
 то се то те Непманючє
 Клянемся клятвою залізною
 що ворог жоден не втече

І от він вмер І кажуть з сміхом
 « тепер державам спокійніш
 дихнем хоч раз колишнім дихом
 грошнем свободоньку за гріш »

Нехай же знають « патріоти »
 нехай повідомлять « міщан »
 не заспокоїмось ми доти
 аж поки з поля весь бур'ян

не вирвемо А вирвем грізно
 Багнетом Критики мечем

Клянemся клятвою залізно
що ворог жоден не втече.

СТАРА УКРАЇНА ЗМІНИТИСЬ МУСИТЬ

Перекочуючи насичуючись
кількісно якісно перехлюпуючись
проймаючи взаємно протилежності
запереченням старого вибухаючи
прямуем за законом діалектики
до незмірénного майбутнього

Отже перепони всі досліджено
отже глибини всі розгадано
отже з'ясовано всі недомудрення
Розженімось ціюкнім по історії
може відкришиться нам віломок
од незвичайного майбутнього

Як часто з дрібного незадоволені
ми зневіряємося хилимося падаем
ми спотикаємося глухнемо
і нам уже не чути як поршнями
ходить двігот по всесвіту
від непосидючого майбутнього

Загоряйсь палай заокрилюйся
включайсь та не млявістю байдужого
не божевіллям і не одчаем сп'янілого
а прістрасною силою свідомости
щоб ми були чіткіші й неспокійніші
від неспокійного майбутнього

Виділяй не повторюйсь ув'язуйся
Одплили а вже далеко від берега
Над глибинами суховійно негбдяно
Корабель здригається поршнями
Ходить двигот такий же по всесвіту
від нестаріючого майбутнього

Перекочовуючи насичуючись
кількісно якісно перехлюпуючись
проймаючи взаємно протилежності
запереченням старого вибухаючи
прямуєм за законом діалектики
до незмірénного майбутнього

TYČYNA'S ČERNIHIV

Чи можна
не гоготать, коли доба, доба
гогоче!
Сковорода, « Симфонія »

After *Zamist' sonetiv i oktav*, *Černihiv* is Tyčyna's most heavily censored collection of poetry. The former, since its first appearance in a separate edition in 1920, and, subsequently, in the "collection of collections," *Zolotyj homin* (1922), has not been reprinted even in part, and only recently have excerpts from it been cited in the better Soviet studies on Tyčyna.¹ *Černihiv*, first published in 1931, and included in full in the third (1932) edition of Tyčyna's poetry, has in all subsequent editions been reduced to only two poems: the first, "Mij druh robitnyk vodyt' mene po mistu j xvalyt'sja," and "Lenin" (i.e., "Tut same demonstracija proxodyt'..."). Most recently, two more poems have been "rehabilitated," making precisely one half of the collection accessible to the general reader.² The fate of both collections is yet another monument to the Soviet approach to literature, but while the pattern of censorship—or, indeed, self-censorship³—as applied even to the "bard of the Revolution" is all too familiar, the history of *Černihiv* has its peculiar ironies. Thus, though it deals with eminently sanctioned themes—industrialization, revolutionary ardor, the transformation of society, Lenin himself—and treats them with ostensible orthodoxy, it still suffered the same fortune as the "ideologically vacillating" and "idealistically humanist" *Zamist' sonetiv i oktav*. Despite a few initial positive reactions, notably the enthusiastic reviews by the poet Nikolaj Aseev and the critic A. Lejtes,⁴ negative opinions came to hold sway.

¹ See S. Tel'njuk, *Pavlo Tyčyna* (Moscow, 1974); there are also more guarded references to it in Leonid Novyčenko's *Poezija i revoljucija* (Kiev, 1959).

² Cf. Pavlo Tyčyna, *Vybrani tvory*, 2 vols. (Kiev, 1971). The poems are "Kupujemo hazetu" and "Stara Ukrajina zminytys' musyt'."

³ Thus Semen Šaxovs'kyj (*V majsterni poetyčnogo slova* [Kiev, 1958], p. 100) states with Stalinist impudence that Tyčyna himself freely concurred in the suppression of his own work. Functionally, of course, it matters little whether the censorial principle is external or internalized. As far as the creative personality is concerned, however, the latter is by far more pernicious—and, sadly, quite typical for the Soviet sphere.

⁴ Cf. Šaxovs'kyj, *Pavlo Tyčyna* (Kiev, 1968), pp. 132-33, and Tel'njuk, *Pavlo Tyčyna*, p. 155.

The reasons for the disfavor are rather obvious, and the more official the critic the more frankly he was wont to state them as nothing other than the poet's "formalism" and his "inability to correlate form and content." Typical of the categorical and unabashedly simplistic judgments on *Černihiv* is this by Arsen Iščuk:

The deep ideas, the great historical meaning of *Černihiv*, a work constructed out of rich and vital material, were not conveyed by the poet to the reader because the form he chose did not correspond to the content. Here the poetry loses much as a result of a crying contradiction between content and form.

A striking example of this is the poem entitled "A čy ne jest' ce sami naxvalky abo ž zapomoročennja vid uspixiv." The theme of the poem is the year of the great leap. It is a complex, responsible, historically significant theme. It requires means of artistic treatment that would assure an emotional contact of the reader with the ideas embodied in the given image. One should speak in an elevated and solemn voice about the national events which are the basis of this work. The poet, however, chose the form of a "častuška"...⁵

To be sure, since that time such critics as O. Bilec'kyj (in his introduction to the 1957 and the 1961 editions of Tyčyna's poetry) and particularly S. Tel'njuk in a recent study have sought to defend *Černihiv*.⁶ But however much they try to explain and mitigate, they make quite clear both the vehemance of the initial hostility and the tenacity of the views that hold this work and this phase as a "xvoroba rostu."⁷ The same kind of retrograde poetics (coupled, of course, with different ideological premises) motivated the émigré poet and critic Jevhen Malanjuk as he pronounced *Černihiv* a "psychopathic collection of autoparodies."⁸ The literary dogmatism of both camps notwithstanding, however, *Černihiv*, far from being a detour, is in the very mainstream of Tyčyna's poetic development; rather than an aberration, it is, from both a synchronic and a diachronic perspective, a centerpiece of his œuvre.

In a real sense *Černihiv* is nothing less than a "missing link" in the complex evolution of the poet; it is a key to understanding the road (which for some is a precipitous slide)⁹ from *Sonjašni kljarnety*

⁵ Arsen Iščuk, *Pavlo Tyčyna* (Kiev, 1954), p. 85.

⁶ Cf. Tel'njuk, *Pavlo Tyčyna*, pp. 148-60.

⁷ Cf. Šaxovs'kyj, *V majsterni*; Iščuk, *Pavlo Tyčyna*; and O. Hubar, *Pavlo Tyčyna: Literaturnyj portret* (Kiev, 1958), p. 60. In the introduction to the three-volume 1946 edition, Leonid Novyčenko also felt obliged to say that *Černihiv* was excessively "experimental," indeed "destructive," and thus justifiably forgotten (Pavlo Tyčyna, *Vybrani tvory*, 3 vols. [Kiev, 1946], 1: 9).

⁸ Je. Malanjuk, *Knyha sposterežen'*, vol. 1: *Proza* (Toronto, 1962), p. 302.

⁹ Cf. G. Grabowicz, "The Poetry of Reconstitution: Pavlo Tyčyna's *V serci u mojim*," *Recenzija* 2, no. 2 (1972): 3-29.

and *Pluh* to *Partija vede* and the later poetry. *Černihiv*, in short, highlights the various changes that occur in Tyčyna's poetry—of thematic focus, of prosodic and linguistic devices, of the poet's ideology and his stance with respect to the represented world. It does this by virtue of an artistry that is unique in both its condensation and the brevity of its flowering. As with all the previous collections, the style and Weltanschauung of *Černihiv* is peculiarly its own, but this is also the last *collection* to express the range of poetic complexity that is associated with Tyčyna's earlier poetry; the later poetry, i.e., that which remained unimpaired by the official desideratum of a leveling to the lowest common denominator, achieved its aesthetic effects by different, "simpler," and more traditional means. Bilec'kyj is undoubtedly correct in considering *Černihiv* to be, by reason of its manifest content, the beginning of a new period in Tyčyna's work.¹⁰ After the highly engagé and tribunicial moments of *Viter z Ukrajinjy* (1924) (cf. "Vidpovid' zemljakam," "Za vsix skažu," "Velykym brexunam"), the later 20s saw a greatly decreased tempo of creativity and self-expression, primarily in the meditative, inward-turning poetry of the "Kryms'kyj cykl" (1925) and the pained and no less reflective, in fact, almost mystical "Čystyla maty kartoplju" (1926), for which Tyčyna was accused by People's Commissar Čubar of "peddling a nationalist opiate under the banner of proletarian art."¹¹ To be sure, meditative and introspective elements and a mystical sense of oneness with the cosmos, with nature and with the community of man is also quite pronounced in *Viter z Ukrajinjy*. In its unqualified turning to the social and communal, however, *Černihiv* marks a sharp departure from the poetry preceding it. It is as if Tyčyna were finally fulfilling a deeply felt imperative, an imperative which in one poem he stresses by having it voiced by nature herself:

Весна встає, весна встає,
 весна до мене промовляє,
 дитя моє!
 Зеленими листочками,
 голубими бчками:
 чом не гориш огнем-співом,

¹⁰ Pavlo Tyčyna, *Tvory*, 6 vols. (Kiev, 1961-62), 1:28.

¹¹ For a discussion of this attack and of Tyčyna's reply, see George S. N. Luckyj, *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917-1934* (New York, 1956), p. 122.

ЧОМ НЕ З КОЛЕКТИВОМ?
 Весна призналася до мене
 зеленими листочками.¹²

Černihiv, in a word, actualizes the “kolektyv” and thus sets the tone for much of Tyčyna’s later poetry. It does so, however, with the full range of his poetic resources, and without breaking the threads of motifs and themes from his previous collections.

Černihiv, which Tyčyna himself called a “poetic sketch” (*narys v poezijax*), has been compared to a form of literary reportage.¹³ According to Bilec’kyj, its hero is “that very city in which the poet spent his childhood and partially the years of his early manhood, the city that was returned its youth by Soviet rule.” “The time of the action of this collection,” he continues, “comprises one day which is typical not only for the life of the new Černihiv, but for all the Soviet Ukraine.”¹⁴ While there is an element of truth in them, these observations require deeper scrutiny. This is particularly so because the manifest content of the collection (which Bilec’kyj considers simple and straightforward)¹⁵ is subtly qualified by the very mode and manner of presentation. This is not only a question of what the early critics saw as a tension between the “form” and the “content” of the poetry. Here, even the “content”—the subject matter—is more complex than it seems on the surface. The conventional argument that this collection simply depicts the new “socialist” achievements and that, further, “the poet’s main intent is to recreate the pathos and the heroicism of people at work, to recreate the high tempos with which the people realized the task of socialist reconstruction, the activity, energy, and effectiveness of the masses that is the basic feature of the new age,”¹⁶ does nothing other than reduce a complex structure to a narrow ideological reading.

The key to this structure may perhaps best be found in the dramatic principles of this work. For *Černihiv* is above all a dramatization of the present day—a dramatization, however, that in its stylization, its formal features, in its telescoping of the ethos of the whole society and in its presentation of a highly charged, monochromatic ideology, is very

¹² Pavlo Tyčyna, *V serci u mojim* (Kiev, 1970), p. 81.

¹³ Iščuk, *Pavlo Tyčyna*, p. 83.

¹⁴ Tyčyna, *Tvory*, 1:28.

¹⁵ Tyčyna, *Tvory*, 1:28-29.

¹⁶ Iščuk, *Pavlo Tyčyna*, pp. 82-83.

much like a modern equivalent of the mystery play. The dramatic tendency is, of course, quite pronounced throughout Tyčyna's work. In *Sonjašni kljarnety* it appears as dramatic vignette (e.g., "Po xlib jšla dytyna," "Odčynjajte dveri"), as dramatized narrative ("Skorbna maty," "Vijna," and especially "Zolotyj homin"), and in virtually all the other poems as dramatization of lyrical perception. In the early period it is expressed most fully in the "feerija-drama" *Dzvinkoblakytne* (1915-17) and the psychodrama *Rozkol poetiv* (1919).¹⁷ Subsequently, *Zamist' sonetiv i oktav* relies on a unique montage of reflection and dramatic vignette. While the straightforward and conventional drama (or "dramatic poem," as Tyčyna calls it) *Ševčenko i Černyševs'kyj* (1939) is not altogether successful, his two other long works, the heroic-epic "Šablja Kotovs'koho" (1938) and the "symphony" *Skovoroda* (1920-40), show the dramatic principle at a highly effective and masterful level. Tyčyna's ability to evoke a "transcendent" dramatism is revealed in his superb (and still censored) poem "Čystyla maty kartoplju." The entrance of the crazed father who believes himself to be God projects a total, mystical dramatic tension that enfolds all of reality—the inanimate and the human, the mundane and the sublime:

Навстіж з розгону розкрилися двері, і звідти кричало:
Падайте долу: явився Христос! Зустрічайте, співайте,
Бийте в кімвали, тимпани: явився Христос-бог і цар ваш!
Тиша настала. Чавун зашипів. Грізно-синя — тиша — у
вікнах —

Благословляючи направо й наліво, увіходив
до хати бог: у сорочці під поясок,
босий, лоб узенький у два пальці.

Бог: Утомився я! Сяду, посижу. А що там ти вариш?
Знаєш, сьогодні возносивсь на небо і так було жалько,
Так же вас жалько.

For the most part, *Černihiv* is far removed from such mystical overtones. As we shall see, however, it embodies Tyčyna's dramatic drive on various levels of its structure, ranging from the overall construction where the central issues appear like players on a stage and are given "stage directions," through the device of a dialogue between the poet's persona and an archetypal worker, to the dramatic content

¹⁷ Cf. Grabowicz, "Poetry of Reconstitution," pp. 13-14.

of individual poems, and, finally, to the smallest semantic and poetic units, all of which throb with movement and energy.

The essential, determining feature of the dramatic portrait that is *Černihiv* is its focus on the people, the *narod*, and the concomitant utilization of the forms and devices of popular literature. Setting aside closer analysis for later, we can now note several outstanding moments in this development. First, *Černihiv* marks the beginning of Tyčyna's turning in the 1930s to popular burlesque and vulgarian forms; this culminates, and is most successful, in the already mentioned Homeric-Gogolian poem "Šablja Kotovs'koho", but it also plays a major role in the collections *Partija vede* (1934) and *Čuttja jedynoji rodyny* (1938). Tyčyna's recourse to the tradition of the Ukrainian *vertep* and the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century *intermedia* and the achievement of various, largely comic effects through a characteristic juxtaposition of low and buffonic with elevated and bookish styles has been noticed (though not with reference to *Černihiv*). What has not been noted is that these forms had attained currency on the Ukrainian literary scene. Specifically, this was in the spirit of the *Literaturnyj jarmarok*, the almanac of the officially disbanded VAPLITE.¹⁸ In slightly more than a year of existence and in the face of increasingly ominous official disfavor, it proceeded to publish a number of works of lasting literary merit by various "oppositionist" writers.¹⁹ The almanac was indeed run as a fair, with a melange of very heterogeneous contributions and with a given (anonymous) writer—a self-styled "Jamarkom," representing a fictitious editorial board of 697 members—serving as a master of ceremonies for each issue.²⁰ His running commentary or guided tour through the almanac (replete with many sly Aesopian allusions) was explicitly called an *intermedium*. In the course of this, various objects of discourse—be they people from a conjured-up crowd, or writers like Bažan or Hoffmann, or herrings in a barrel—would materialize and add their voices to the polyphony of the fair. Dynamism, vitality and an irrepressible sense of the comic are projected as the basic characteristics of the Ukrainian tradition and the present "young Ukraine," and this portrayal is given historico-literary credence not only by references to the *intermedia* but to Gogol's all-Ukrainian

¹⁸ VAPLITE (Vil'na akademija proletars'koji literatury) was a major unofficial literary organization of the late 20s uniting some of the most outstanding Ukrainian writers of the day, including Tyčyna. Cf. Luckyj, *Literary Politics*, p. 122.

¹⁹ Cf. Luckyj, *Literary Politics*, pp. 151-57.

²⁰ Cf. *Literaturnyj jarmarok* 1 (December 1928): 246-47.

Fair, as well.²¹ These same characteristics, and the central notion of a bustling microcosm of the Ukraine, are also at the heart of Tyčyna's *Černihiv*.

Černihiv is also quite obviously constructed as a cycle of statements coming directly from the people. This projection of the *vox populi*, as one variant of the above-noted use of popular forms, characterizes Tyčyna's poetry of the 30s—primarily in *Partija vede*, but also in the war poetry of *Peremahat' i žyt'*. (In one sense, this can be seen as a transitional stage between the early impressionist, symbolist and predominantly "subjective" phase, and the late "objective" phase, where he overtly assumes the stance of a quasi-official spokesman for the nation, as epitomized by the war poem "Ja utverždajus'." The difficulty with such a periodization, however, is that it can be clearly shown that the intimate and the tribunicial elements have coexisted from the beginning—cf., for example his pre-*Sonjašni kljarnety* poetry or "Za vsix skažu" from *Viter z Ukrajiny*. The determining difference is, rather, the degree to which one or the other tendency predominates, as well as the total acceptance of the official line in the late "public" poetry.) In *Černihiv* there is a two-fold effect to the projection of the people's voice. One is thematic and ideological: as their feelings and words are made the stuff of poetry, the *narod*, the working people are apotheized, and their values become the new aesthetic, precisely as Tyčyna had foreseen in *Rozkol poetiv*.²² The other effect is more subtle. By reason of the dramatic structure of the poetry and in consequence of the direct addresses by the "players," the persona of the poet disappears—he becomes a mere spectator whose presence is mentioned or implied only in the "stage directions," i.e., the titles of the poems. Essentially, however, this is an illusion, for what is in fact established is a form of aesthetic distance: the persona of the poet is

²¹ *Literaturnyj jarmarok* 1:6. There are subtle layers of irony in these references to Gogol' ("naš trahičnyj zemljak") and to the "jarmarok" as his "soročyns'ka' vyhadka."

²² Cf., for example, the words of the Worker:

Я буду й есть, як був повік,
поет-голода, робітник.
Всепролетарська сім'я —
ідеологія моя.

or those of the Communist:

Червоний впав аероліт:
естетика компромісова —
за вітром полетіла...

distanced, "hidden," yet he is clearly discernible, not through subjective or lyrical signals, but through the formal properties of the poetry itself. Significantly, tensions and ironies spring up between the thematic and formal spheres, and orthodox ideology is counter-balanced by subjective nuances.

* * *

The first poem, "Mij druh robotnyk vodyt' mene po mistu j xvalyt'sja," introduces the fundamental theme of *Černihiv*—the dynamism of great social changes, or, as Soviet critics would say, the "pathos" of industrialization and the five-year plan. In three descriptive and three exhortatory stanzas, it sets a boldly militant tone for the whole work and also sounds the specific motifs that will subsequently be elaborated: the transformation of former "slaves" into worker-architects of the future ("učora šče ž raby..."), the imperative of total, indeed ruthless, commitment ("ni žalju ani žaloščiv nema..."), the measureless vistas of construction and energy ("Zabudovujem vysoko i hordo... Šče ž ležat' pid zemleju bahatstva..."). But while the tone and totality is new, the poem's statement still draws upon and modulates motifs from Tyčyna's earlier poetry. Such, for example, is the welcoming of a new urban Ukraine, which had been expressed (to be sure, with more qualms and nuances) a decade earlier in the cycles "Vulycja Kuznečna" and "Xarkiv" in *Viter z Ukrajinu*. Still more striking is the elaboration of the theme of youth and of youthful energy. An immediate precursor in the militant, exhortatory key was "Pisnja kom-somol'civ," a direct prefiguring of the songs of *Partija vede*.²³ For example:

То не вітер з двох боків
з нашого і з того, —
то завихрилося скрізь
бурано і много. —
Молодого, молодого,
молодистого!

The boundless optimism, the inebriation of youth ("Ta xiba ne zavše molod'/ molodiša od usix") is also central to *Sonjašni kljarnety*, and the refrain of the last three stanzas, "ščob syła žyznjana/ vlyła pryjdešnim

²³ It is dated 1921 and became part of *Viter z Ukrajinu*. Though included in the 1946 edition of Tyčyna's poetry, it has been deleted from the subsequent ones.

pokolinnjam/ vyna," distinctly echoes "Zolotyj homin," the poem of elemental, national rebirth, where the poet, quintessentially identified with the nation, exclaims:

І всі сміються як вино:
 І всі співають як вино:
 Я — дужий народ.
 Я молодий!

But the structure that animates this poem and proceeds to become a conceptual axis of the whole cycle is the interrelation of idea and reality. Again it can be established that in his earlier poetry Тучына had juxtaposed the concrete manifestation of a "hard reality" with the idea or even the "metaphysical nature" of a phenomenon. The prime example of this can be the extended meditation on the idea and the reality of the Revolution in *Zamist' sonetiv i oktav*, but one can also find it expressed in such miniatures as "Odčynjajte dveri." In *Černihiv* idea and reality are yoked explicitly. On the one hand, this is the notion of the idea made flesh—as expressed most succinctly in the third stanza:

Через річку ліниву і сійну
 що мутна ж та розслаблена уся
 нова вже мисль явилася
 Мережно — пружна стекла й стисла
 мисль напориста
 перекинулась повисла
 в формі дужного моста.

Similarly, in the following stanza, it is the galvanization of great effort ("Prokladajemo rižem lamajem") solely by the idea ("bo ce ž spljanovanist' sama"). On the other hand, this is the metamorphosis of concrete facts and events into ideas or an abstract reality, as when, in the second stanza, steel rails create history,

Проходять рейки через по
 летять історію історять

or when the fruits of construction and industrialization become the "philosophy of an age." Thus, from the beginning, the process of change is total, involving both the physical and the spiritual spheres.

The second poem, “Kupujemo hazetu,” immediately immerses us in this new world through its most pervasive features—mass media and official ideology. In counterpoint to the preceding, the focus of this poem is “international,” and the mode satiric. We find here the topicality that one expects of a newspaper—and this is projected not only by the account of German elections, but also by the abuse heaped upon the socialists, which the Comintern then considered more vile than the fascists (“Tremtit’ socijal’-cergibeli...”). However, this intellectual and political primitivism, so typical for the Soviet reality being depicted, is doubly distanced. The statements are clearly those of the newspaper, not the poet’s persona; moreover, as a corollary to this and as counterbalance to the impoverishment of thought, they are maximally stylized. As we shall see below, the lexical and prosodic features of this poem clearly associate Tyčyna with avant garde tendencies in Russian and Ukrainian poetry.

The following poem, “Zustričajemo komsomol’civ oburenix ukraj i zнову škidnyctvo vykryto,” reinforces our perception of the organic and polyphonous nature of *Černihiv*. The outraged komsomol youths denouncing some “sabotage” could be encountered either in the street or in the columns of the newspaper, it matters little where—the phenomenon is typical for the society and essential for its dramatic portrayal. The most striking aspect of their statement is the way in which semantic structures seem to collapse. Incomplete sentences predominate, and there is a general feverish piling up of phrases, a nervous repetition and adumbration of words and notions that forcefully projects overheated emotions and overflowing dedication, precisely as signaled in the title.

Beneath the surface turbulence, however, there again appear ideas rooted in Tyčyna’s earlier poetry. The first, expressed in the opening stanza, is the pained awareness that whatever his progress, there is a dark side to man. It can, of course, be dismissed ideologically as political sabotage (and the title invites such a simple reading), but the very formulation, “Jaremne rabs’ke ihove,” recalls the refrain from “Pljaž” in the “Kryms’kyj cykl’”—“Jaki šče raby my, jaki šče raby!”—and clearly refers to deep human flaws that cannot be gauged or explained by political criteria. As the son said in “Vijna”:

Немає... ворога
Тай не було.
Тільки й єсть у нас ворог —

Наше серце.
 Благословіть, мамо, шукати зілля,
 Шукати зілля на людське божевілля.

In turn, the reference to “svoje” in the second stanza echoes the concluding antistrophe of *Zamist' sonetiv i oktav*:

Орел, Тризубець, Серп і Молот... І кожне виступає
 як своє...
 Своєж рушниця в нас убила.
 Своє на дні душі лежить.

The optimistic counterthrust, the hope for a new life expressed in the third stanza,

рости ушир увись
 злети аероплянами
 Заливчими Елланами
 в майбутнє колосись

also has a deeper core. For the line “Zalyvčymy Ellanamy,” with its evocation of “flowing grainfields” (i.e., “zalyvni lany”), names two writers closely connected with the Revolution and the Ukrainian literary renaissance,²⁴ and shows that here for all the Stakhanovite loudness a Ukrainian historical perspective is also involved. The last line, “v majbutnje kolosys’,” reveals the belief that the nation—for it is the implicit object of address—will bloom with the fruit, the legacy of its sons repossessed by the soil. Here there is a direct continuation of the imagery of the masterful “Hnatovi Myxajlyčenku” (a poem now censored, and Myxajlyčenko, like Zalyvčyj, officially forgotten);²⁵ the identification of the revolutionary poet with his nation,

²⁴ Andrij Zalyvčyj (1894-1918), a founder of the Borot'bist party and a budding prose writer, died in Černihiv in the uprising against the hetman. Vasyl' Ellan-Blakytynj (1892-1925), to whom the first poem of *Černihiv* is dedicated, was a poet and journalist, leader of the Borot'bist party, founder of the literary group Hart, and personal friend of Tučyna's; before his early death he was a major presence on the Ukrainian literary scene. For their membership in the Borot'bists (Ukrainian communists not dominated by Russians) both became non-persons. In 1956 Ellan-Blakytynj was rehabilitated but is now again officially forgotten.

²⁵ Hnat Myxajlyčenko—writer, critic, and Borot'bist—was executed by the Denikinists in 1919.

the absorption of his martyrdom into the nation's destiny, is quite explicit:

Не уявляем, як ти тлієш,
як у землі сирій лежиш, —
бо завше ти живеш, гориш,
бо вічно духом пломенієш.

Ще ти воскреснеш, зазориєш,
в мільйонах встанеш, закипиш:
чого, чого, народе, спиш,
чом не дерзаш ти, не смієш?

(And, one may add, Tučyna also projects for himself this same absorption into and immortality in the hearts of the *narod* in his testament—"Šče ne raz kolys' rozkvitnu.")²⁶

In *Černihiv*, however, the idea of a national legacy remains in the subtext, not only so as to escape the charge of bourgeois nationalism (of which Tučyna, like virtually every other Ukrainian writer, was accused),²⁷ but primarily because of the different focus of his poetry. "Zustričajemo komsomol'civ," in fact, voices loud assertiveness and confident prognostication. This flows over into the following poem, where it reaches still greater intensity. The title itself, "A čy ne jest' ce sami naxvalky abož zapamoročennja vid uspixiv," echoes Stalin's well-known speech enjoining constant vigilance against overconfidence,²⁸ while the poem paraphrases the goals of the newly inaugurated five-year plan. In the already established pattern, the minimal semantic load, where thought is reduced to slogans, is matched by highly inventive linguistic and formal devices. In the preceding poem one saw how reason was sacrificed to hyperbole and verbal exuberance, as, for example, in the refrain, "Čy oblavom čy zvalamy/ a Zaxid vse ž obvalymo/ ščob dali znov ity." Now, it is pushed to the limit:

Нехай Европа кумкає
а в нас одна лиш думка є
одна одна турбація
традицій підрізація
колективізація

²⁶ Cf. *V serci u mojim*, p. 114.

²⁷ See Tučyna's own reference to this in the poem "26-II (11-III)," part 2 in *Pluh*; cf. also Tel'njuk, *Pavlo Tučyna*, pp. 172-73.

²⁸ See "Golovokruženie ot uspehov," *Pravda*, 2 March 1930, no. 60, and his *Sočinenija*, 13 vols. (Moscow, 1946-51), 12: 191-200.

Не батькова не неніна
 дочка і мас і Леніна
 ця мисль усім звідомлена
 незламлена незломлена
 переусвідомлена.

Here again the verbal hyperbolism (“pereusvidomlena,” “pere-perebudemo”) echoes Tučyna’s earlier motifs, particularly of the “plakat” poems in *Pluh* (e.g., “Perezorjujut’ zori”). The major effect, however, is one of comic, buffo exaggeration. Such lines as “tradycij pidrizacija/kolektyvizacija” (a singularly appropriate characterization), or the designation of the great new idea (be it “politexnizacija,” “kolektyvizacija,” or “fondoususpil’nennja”) as the daughter of the masses and Lenin, can indeed be perceived as being parodic, as the scandalized Šaxovs’kyj notes.²⁹ The effect is surely intended. For example, the description of the idea in the fourth stanza as “zvidomlena/ nezlamlena nezlomlena/ pereusvidomlena” conveys nothing so much as a metamorphosis of that idea into mumbling; one need only add “zamamljana.” In short, the slogan-mongering of the day is duly portrayed, and the verbal devices themselves become a form of Aesopian commentary. Nevertheless, as we shall see, the verbalism and the incantations also have a deeper, non-comic significance.

The following two poems continue with the dramatization of the attitudes and the ethos of his society as the worker, functionally a master of ceremonies or stage director, signals a new theme—the role of the class enemy, first as embodied by the Ukrainian émigrés in Warsaw, and subsequently, in a historical reflection on the 1905 Revolution. The involved title of the first poem—“‘Pislja c’oho zrozumilo’ robitnyk kaže ‘čoho Ukr-Varšavs’komu smittju tak zaraz veselo’”—again stresses Tučyna’s characteristic elliptical and telescoped construction. The reason for the gloating of the Poles and the Ukrainian émigrés (the “Ukr-Varšavs’ke smittja”) can be deduced from the concluding stanza of the preceding poem, where the Soviet Union’s political isolation and general economic difficulties were explicitly noted:

Нехай ми ізольовані
 хай дні в нас мозольовані...

²⁹ Šaxovs’kyj, *Pavlo Tučyna*, p. 136.

This poem, therefore, is intended to be a crushing rejoinder to their *Schadenfreude*. Along with the various topical references (to the economic and political problems of Piłsudski's Poland in stanzas three and five, to its imperialist ambitions in stanza four, to the alleged toadyism of the Ukrainian émigrés) this poem, more than any other, reveals the intermedial and burlesque elements of *Černihiv*. They range from bawdy vulgarity (“do šljaxy pol's'koji zadkom nalipleni naklejeni”), to mock sympathy (“Pany moji ridnesen'ki...”), to such folk devices as diminutives, synonymy (“sobaky sučyni”), the metrics themselves, and, most overtly, the folk saying in the fourth line of each stanza.

Where “Pislja c'oho zrozumilo'” is a political lampoon, the following poem, “Dulys' pany j 25 lit tomu robitnyk zhaduje 1905 rik na Černihivščyni,” exemplifies popular history. Though there is no intent to mock, the diction, images, and devices are no less burlesque than in the preceding poem. The masterful development here, however, is the way in which Tyčyna establishes nuances and polyphony even within the confines of an account that is stylized to be “simple.” Echoes of folk narrative, for example, are found in the series of three rhetorical questions in the opening of the first stanza, as well as in the repetition, with but slight variation, of the opening lines of stanzas two and three: “Buxaly ta vse šče malo... Byly jix ta vse šče malo...” But what is most effective for projecting a setting of oral narrative are the questions that occur in the fourth line of each stanza. They are precisely like the interruptions of some naive listener, and the narrator, interestingly enough, sometimes answers them explicitly (stanzas three and six) and sometimes seems to ignore them. The context of the narrative is further amplified as the worker makes an aside in each stanza. This favorite device of Tyčyna's has a possible dual purpose. It may be seen as an aside directed to the persona of the poet, since he (more than, say, the naive interlocutor) would understand the reference to Kocjubyns'kyj's *Fata morgana*, for example, or to the first (not the second!) Lyon uprising. (In the latter case the word “rozumijet'sja” stresses the privy nature of this communication.) At the same time these asides can be seen as an oral equivalent—for their diction is indeed that of informal speech—of the footnotes or glosses that every “proper” history should have. In either case, they increase the dramatism of the poem.

The next poem leads us to the conclusion of *Černihiv*, although not,

as some have argued, to its culmination.³⁰ For long one of the two poems of *Černihiv* to remain uncensored (along with “Mij druh...”), it was always entitled “Lenin.” But as we see from the full title, “Tut same demonstracija proxodyt’ het’ škidnykiv smert’ intervenciji,” it is fully a part of the dramatic structure and not at all intended to be distinct by reason of ideological weightiness. As throughout, the title is essential, for it puts the poem in the context of the whole, like the scene of a play’ thus revealing its structure and elucidating the operant associations. Here a demonstration passes, as we are told, and the second part of the title is nothing other than the signs being carried, or, more likely, the slogans that are shouted: “Het’ škidnykiv!” “Smert’ intervenciji!” The opening “Lenin” —which is capitalized precisely like the title—is one of them; it is the slogan of slogans, the most galvinizing watchword of all. (It is rather less likely that it would be a sign or portrait of Lenin, for the entire emphasis is on the verbal dimensions. If *Černihiv* were to be staged, however, a portrait of Lenin would certainly be appropriate here.) The text of the poem is the reaction, the resonance elicited by this potent name. Even more, it is a reassertion of the principle expressed at the very beginning—the power of the incarnate idea. In fact, this was already stated quite explicitly at the end of the preceding poem, where references to the Revolution of 1917 *in action* (“Rady i Kronštadt i Šmit/ profspilky jak dynamit”) are given this explanation in the “gloss”: “A vse ce zrobyla ideja zbrojnoho povstannja.” Now, the architect of that Revolution and the reality that is *Černihiv* is apotheized. His name is the catalyst-idea for great upheaval, be it the Revolution (“burja”) or the building of the Socialist Workers’ State:

ЛЕНИН

Одно тільки слово

а ми вже як буря...

ЛЕНИН

Всього лиш п’ять літер

а скільки енергій...

As the poem goes on to show, it, like all great ideas, lives on after his death. The last four stanzas are an oath, sworn by the entire assembly, to

³⁰ Cf. Tel’njuk, *Pavlo Tyčyna*, p. 156; his argument is motivated by the thematic and ideological “weightiness” of Lenin and not by the structure of *Černihiv* as such.

remain faithful and ruthlessly dedicated to his principles.³¹ In this there is, of course, a strong echo of Stalin's speech on the death of Lenin.³² It is also the core of the official secular religion of *Černihiv's* world.

That religion and that world are given culminating expression in the last poem, "Stara Ukrajina zminytys' musyt'." The situation can well be visualized as a final *mise-en-scène*, where the peripatetic poet and the worker, the marchers ("demonstracija") from the preceding scene-poem, the komsomol youth, indeed, all the players, join in a final statement synthesizing the whole work. Whether one sees the dramatism of *Černihiv* in analogy to a cantata (with its narrative interspersing single "arias" with recitatives and choruses) or whether one sees it as a libretto for a historico-ideological folk opera in the spirit of "The East is Red," this last poem is the crescendo. The fact that it is recited or sung by the entire company is again clearly indicated by the title, which, in contrast to the others, is general and all-encompassing. But whereas the setting is unambiguous, the poem itself is complex.

In one sense, "Stara Ukrajina" can be taken as a catalogue of current Marxist-Leninist formulas: it has even been suggested that here Tyčyna was consciously attempting to incorporate into poetic form the Marxist "philosophy" that he, like other writers ("engineers of human souls"), was being taught at "special seminars."³³ This Soviet reading of the motivation (and thus of the poetics) of the work is predictably trite. On the contrary, rather than the poet subordinating himself so such philosophy, it is the latter that is absorbed and transformed into a higher poetic vision. Characteristically, the elements of this vision are typical and orthodox, and yet peculiarly qualified. Thus we have the "law of dialectics," the transformation of quantity into quality, the teleology of inexorable History with which each stanza culminates; we have also the crass hyperbole of Soviet (particularly Stalinist) rhetoric:

Отже перепони всі досліджено
отже глибини всі розгадано
отже з'ясовано всі недомудрення...

³¹ As Tel'njuk points out, the last four stanzas were written much earlier, in 1924, on the occasion of Lenin's death, and only the first two were written concurrently with *Černihiv*, i.e., sometime in 1929-30; cf. Tel'njuk, *Pavlo Tyčyna*, p. 157.

³² See his "Po povodu smerti Lenina," *Pravda*, 30 January 1924, no. 23, and *Sočinenija*, 6:46-51.

³³ Cf. Šaxovs'kyj, *Pavlo Tyčyna*, p. 134.

We have typical self-criticism (stanza three), then self-exhortation (stanzas four and five), and finally the archetypical metaphor of the ship of state on its sublime but perilous journey.³⁴ The manifest semantic plane, however, is subjected to far-reaching qualifications (and this term hardly captures the essential shifts that are involved). The first “filter” seems to be that of irony. The opening line (“Perkočovujučy nasyčujučys’”), which can be taken as a concrete reference to demographic shifts from village to city and to improvements in agriculture, already presents the phenomenon in an unflattering or “naturalistic” light. The following three lines, especially “kil’kisno jakisno perexljupujučys’,” seem to simplify abstract ideas to the point of parody. Similarly, the optimism of the above-cited lines of the next stanza is simplistic to the point of silliness. Yet, while the possibility of irony is not to be denied, because it inheres in the aesthetic distance that Tyčyna maintains throughout the cycle, it is not a determining mode. The reason for this is not because certain elements—such as nomadic wandering, the “sloshing over” of quantity into quality, the “exploding” of the old—become appropriate in terms of the metaphor of a ship passing through stormy seas. Rather, it is because a different and insistent tone becomes dominant. This is a tone, or aura, that seeks to reflect what, for want of a better term, can be called a quasi-mystical experience of man faced with transcendent, eternal powers. In one sense these are the cosmic forces (“poršnjamy/ xodyt’ dvyhot po vsesvitu”) that Tyčyna had apotheized earlier in “V kosmičnomu orkestri.” This is also the inexorable flow of life and the need to accept and grow with it that he later epitomized in “Poxoron druha.” Here, this transcendency is above all the Idea or the Power of History, perceived most simply as the future. It is not the rationalist absolute of Marx and Hegel, but something as sublime as the Divinity, and “Stara Ukrajina” is nothing less than a hymn to it. The poem’s hymnal properties are established not only on the semantic level, that is, in the striving for the future and the desire to possess at least a fragment of it:

Розженімось цюкнім по історії
 може одкришиться нам віломок
 од незвичайного майбутнього

or in the confession of weakness and unworthiness in the face

³⁴ Arthur Koestler in *Darkness at Noon* speaks of the pervasiveness of this metaphor in Comintern (and not only Soviet) pronouncements.

of it (stanza three), or, finally, in the fervent exhortation to become more perfect and more like it (stanza four). The full sense of this experience, structurally so similar to a religious one, must also be conveyed by non-semantic elements. The poem has a remarkably resonant instrumentation, with rich alliteration and internal rhymes and a general sonorousness that is particularly emphasized by its tonic meter. The lines, as one critic has noted, have the inexorable drive of breakers striking a ship.³⁵ The regularity, the repetitions, the flow of long syntactic units give the whole a strong sense of incantation, which is climaxed by the build-up to and then the falling cadence in the last line of each stanza. Here there is a most effective fusion of meaning, sound, and rhythm. The invocations to the future—"do nezmirennoho... od nezvyčajnoho... vid neposydjučoho... vid nespokijnoho... vid nestarijučoho... do nezmirennoho majbutn'oho"—seem to echo the synonyms for the Deity that one encounters in Christian liturgy (as in the refrain, "Svjatyj Bože, Svjatyj Kripsyj, Svjatyj Bezsmertnyj pomyluj nas"). While there is no doubt that Tyčyna rejected Christian dogma quite early in his life, it is also rather evident that the deep structure of an emotional openness to and resonance with the infinite remained with him.

This indeed leads us to a crucial point. The sense of partaking in great, transcendent forces—the Revolution, the nation, the cosmic orchestra—has been a manifest feature of Tyčyna's previous poetry. It was expressed at its "purest"—that is, least topical and most "mystical" and emotional—in the poem-manifesto "Sonjašni kljarnety":

Я був — не Я. Лиш мрія, сон.
Навколо — дзвонні згуки,
І пільми творчої хитон,
І благовісні руки.

Прокинувсь я — і я вже Ти:
Над мною, підо мною
Горять світи, біжать світи
Музичною рікою.

І стежив я, і я веснів:
Акордились плянети.
Навік я взнав, що Ти не Гнів, —
Лиш Соняшні Клярнети.

³⁵ Tel'njuk, *Pavlo Tyčyna*, p. 158.

In "Stara Ukrajina," the feeling of being part of a cosmic rhythm (in "Sonjašni kljarnety": "U tanci ja, rytmičnyj rux,/ V bezsmertnim vsi planety") is given in a different key: the poem is colored by a peculiar dread or angst, which can be taken as a uniquely Tyčynian form of *timor Dei*. (It is understood that on this deeper level the poem is no longer defined solely by the *mise-en-scène* and the *vox populi*; it clearly differs from the others in its complexity, and here the voice of the poet is most discernible. On the other hand, this sense of uneasiness is not out of tune with the whole of *Černihiv*, for, as we have seen, it portrays a whole society and ethos, and not simply a social realist celebration of "achievements.")

The perception of an angry God, of sinister forces, of the antipode to the feeling expressed in "Sonjašni kljarnety" ("Navik ja vznav, ščo Ty ne Hniv...") is not new for Tyčyna. It animates *Zamist' sonetiv i oktav* and is epitomized in the apocalyptic notes of such poems as "Mesija." Its most pithy formulation is contained in "Viter" in the fearful question of those who flee the Revolution: "Ščo ty za sylo jesy?" In *Černihiv's* culminating poem, the undercurrent of dread is given subtly and on more than one plane. In the opening (and closing) stanza there are no "negative" elements, except perhaps for the general indication of setting out on uncharted waters (and this restlessness is then amplified by every epithet for the future). By the second stanza, however, there is already a discordant note. The insistent assertion of achievement with the anaphoric "otže" culminates with a subdued "može odkryšytsja nam vylomok/ od nezvyčajnoho majbutn'oho." In the next stanza, the notion of this mere fragment is elaborated into an extended depiction of failure and inadequacy :

Як часто з дрібно́го незадоволені
ми зневіряємося хилимося падаєм
ми спотикаємося глухнемо
і нам уже не чути як поршнями
ходить двігот по всесвіту
від непосидючого майбутнього

The exhortation of the following stanza shows the ever-present pitfalls, even in acceptance :

включайсь та не млявістю байдужого
не божевільям і не одчаем сп'янілого...

Finally, when the image of the ship is introduced, the setting is quite somber, and the journey is defined solely by dangers and the absence of any firm bearings:

Одплили а вже далеко від берега
 Над глибинами суховійно негбдяно
 Корабель здригається поршнями
 Ходить двигот такий же по всесвіту
 від нестаріючого майбутнього

When the opening stanza is now repeated, we see that its assertions are made in the face of unknown perils; it seems to intuit (analogously to the prescience of the last line of *Zamist' sonetiv i oktav*) that the course ahead—in actuality, the Stalinist 1930s—is unlike any traveled before. Along with this circular construction and the absence of any clear resolution, there are non-semantic elements that contribute to a sense of unease. Primarily, this is the insistent, inexorable rhythm, which, in contrast to the preceding poems, shows no irregularities, no exclamations, no intimation of individuality. Instead there is a heightened sense of impersonality. Man, the passenger on the Ship of State, is in no position to affect its course; all he can do, as we see from the exhortation in stanza four, is to become part of the process and to become conscious of it.

* * *

To speak of the formal properties of *Černihiv* is to speak of its meaning. This is so not only by reason of the generally accepted idea that form and content are inseparable in poetry, but also because of the programmatic nature of the work itself. *Černihiv* expresses the essence of the new life in various ways, but above all by capturing its sounds and rhythms. To a degree unmatched in his total oeuvre Tyčyna makes use of the language of newspapers, of party slogans and exhortations, of everyday expressions, broad popular humor, and the “agit-prop” idiom. This is epitomized by his weaving in of well-known moments from Stalin’s speeches—the above-noted echo of the “dizzy from success” speech, as well as the eulogy for Lenin, with its drumbeat of “kljaněmsja tebe tovarišč Lenin...”³⁶ (Tyčyna, in fact, makes a rather clear allusion to Stalin in the term “zalizno”—i.e., “Kljanemsja kljatvoju zalizno.”) Characteristically, he is quite ready

³⁶ See fn. 32. It is interesting to note that the device of a thematic refrain in a eulogy was later used with great mastery in “Poxoron druha.”

to bare the device, as, for example, in "Kupujemo hazetu," which is replete with newspaper jargon and which delights in rhyming, with the help of neologisms if need be, exotic, "impossible" words: *čvartija-kompartija, jeresnja-veresnja*, etc.

Indeed, neologisms are the center of gravity of the formal searchings in this work. They can be of various kinds, based, for example, on proper names ("Stalinnja," "Zalyvči Ellany," "Nepmanjuče," "polšczyzujet'sja," etc.) or on foreign words ("ihove," "psja-krevyna," "cergibeli");³⁷ they can be neutral ("oklynnja," "Spljanovanist'," "proladano," "holubosyzjano," "pokorščyna") or comic and vulgar ("zarizjako," "oevropejeni," "drypavana," etc.).³⁸ The latter category, especially, is used to establish ironic counterpoint and distance between the poet and the represented masses. It is most condensed in "A čy ne jest ce naxvalky..." the "answer" to Stalin's injunction. The mockery here is inescapable—a mockery not so much of a given phenomenon or goal (e.g., collectivization) as of the frenzy of its propagation. Hence the inimitable "Nexaj Evropa kumkaje..." etc. The foil, or "model," here is the pseudo-sociological jargon of journalism and propaganda, the coining of words for "processes" ("pidrizacija") or "states of consciousness" ("pereusvidomlena," "pereperebudemo," "nedomudrennja," etc.). The neologisms of *Černihiv* constitute an extraordinarily high percent of the total lexical stock—undoubtedly the highest in Tyčyna's poetry, and most probably the highest in any longer work in modern Ukrainian. And this is true, one may add, without counting the "logical" neologisms—namely, such unexpected but very telling (and ironic) expressions as "u vsi znannja uzujemos'," "ne odnym jiji fašyzmom požmakano," "kil'kisno jakisno perexljupujučys'," etc.

In sum, the word is the focus of attention. But it is brought to center-stage not only by the various forms of "building up" or "slovotvorenja." The same effect is also attained by "breaking down" the word, by creating enjambments within the word itself. This is used much more rarely—in fact, only twice, both times in the first poem, "Mij druh..." Thus, in the first stanza it is a play on "perenjatyj":

Доганяємо їх доганяєм
як коня що вітрами переня

³⁷ To be sure, *ihove* is now accepted as a Ukrainian word, equivalent to the Russian *igo*; *cergibeli* is most probably a variation on the Polish *ceregiele*.

³⁸ The last is not as opaque as Šaxovs'kyj assumes (*Pavlo Tyčyna*, p. 135) and is most probably a conflation of *zadrypanyj* and *pan*.

ти й бачиш сам ростем щодня

and in the second, on "pole":

*Де хилилась вербичка у полі
там тепер паротягове депо
Проходять рейки через по
летять історію історять.*

(Tyčyna is fond of this device, which nicely imitates the flow and ellision of natural speech. In "Pisnja traktorystky," for example, one stanza ends with "ta j pojidem, ta j poji..." and the next begins with "Dym dymok od mašyn...." Unfortunately, this is also where the heavy hand of the censor, ever wont to dot the *i*'s, makes itself felt: in all the later editions of *Černihiv* the offending "gaps" are filled in.) The third stanza of "Mij druh..." however, shows the direction in which this device evolves. As Tyčyna rhymes "sjajnu" with "usja" (which is typical of the oblique rhymes in this poem) and then begins the next line with "nova," we see that the truncation of words is effectively continued into a masterful gamut of internal rhymes. Clearly, these and other aspects of the virtuosic instrumentation of *Černihiv* require a separate study.

The dominance of the spoken word and living speech is strongly reflected in the meters and rhythms of *Černihiv*, and, not least, in the total absence of punctuation. It has already been observed that some of the poems, particularly "Kupujemo hazetu," "A čy ne jest' ce naxvalky," and "Zustričajemo komsomol'civ," approximate the complex tonic and syllabotonic principles of the *častuška*.³⁹ Apart from these, and the regular amphibrachic and iambic "Tut same demonstra-cija proxodyt'," the prevailing meter of *Černihiv* is tonic. Thus in "Stara Ukrajina" there are two phrase accents in each line (in the opening line this also corresponds to the word stress). In the first poem, "Mij druh," there are three accents per line, with the exception of the last two lines, the "refrain," which has two (and in the last line of the fourth and fifth stanza, only one). The shifting accentual meter is more complex in "Pislja c'oho zrozumilo" and in "Dulys' pany." The effect of a dynamic, restless, natural rhythm and of new tempos and energies is

³⁹ Cf. A. Kviatkovskij's "Rytmologija narodnoj častuški," *Russkaja literatura* 2 (1962): 92-116.

achieved throughout, however. For Tučyna this is the only appropriate means for presenting the new “content,” one that is defined by “the people” themselves:

у нас доба індустрыі
в нас темп і тлум понтонові
труди і дні двотонові
залізобетонові

Finally, the word, or human speech, is also an innermost theme of *Černihiv*. Every poem, without exception, portrays or makes specific reference to boasts, threats, vows, curses, or shouts. Apart from the very title of the first poem these are, for example :

Ми славімо ми хвалімо...
О ні ми ясно кажемо...
Нехай Европа кумкае...
Хваліўсь колісь хвалько а зараз знов хизуеця...

чи то черні хвальба
Чому хвальба чому ще й черні...
Крычце што найвышце це нація...
Клянемся клятвой залізно...

This explosion of noise (“zaperečennjam staroho vybuxajučy”) is countered by the theme of deafness, which has already been introduced in “Mij druh” (“až hluxym dohuknulasja luna”), but which is stated fully in “Stara Ukrajina”: “my spotykajemosja hluxnemo/ i nam uže ne čuty jak poršnjamy/xodyt’ dvyhot po vsesvitu....” This deafness is, on the one hand, the inability to perceive the new reality, something reminiscent of “I bude tak” from *Pluh*:

І буде так —
Сліпі: деж те небо — я не бачу?
Глухі: мені здаецца, правду яб почув!
Калікі: плачу,
Од болю крычу!

On the other, as stressed by the imperfective aspect of the verb ("hluxnemo"), it is an inevitable human reaction to the ever-present noise. In keeping with the introspective nature of this poem and in true dialectical fashion, we are shown that assertiveness is inevitably accompanied by doubt.

* * *

Even a brief summation of the thematic interests and formal premises of *Černihiv* indicates a close correspondence to the poetics of constructivism. The reasons that this has not drawn critical attention may be several: that Tyčyna, as far as we know, never espoused the loudly proclaimed doctrines of the constructivists; that *Černihiv* was a passing phase in Tyčyna's poetry so that discussion of it never went much beyond polemics; and, finally, that without accompanying theoretical pronouncements, constructivist poetry (as witnessed by the work of the foremost Ukrainian constructivist, Valerijan Poliščuk) was not as easily distinguishable as its proponents believed. The similarities, nevertheless, are quite compelling. Apart from the obvious thematic desideratum of contemporaneity and immediate experience—and, indeed, the identification of constructivism with socialism⁴⁰—the constructivists also placed maximal theoretical stress on the word. For Kornelij Zelinskij said, "the word is the arena, the battleplace of poetry with meaning."⁴¹ From this flowed such elaborations as the "loading-down" of the word ("gruzifikacija slova") with the goal of maximalizing the expressiveness of the smallest units, as "v malom mnogoe, v točke—vsë";⁴² from this also came the "local principle," that is, the construction of a theme from its most typical components (e.g., words or sounds), the replacement of the voice of the author by that of his personages, and the use of jargon and argot.⁴³ Thus, Il'ja Sel'vinskij's "Vor" (1922) is composed largely of thieves' jargon, and "Raport" (1923) of the telegraphic style of military reports, the gypsy poems of the sounds of Romany and of gypsy music. Formal and acoustic experimentation impinged on "zaum," as, for example, in Sel'vinskij's "Cyganskij val's na gitare":

⁴⁰ See Kornelij Zelinskij, *Poezija kak smysl: Kniga o konstruktivizme* (Moscow, 1929).

⁴¹ Zelinskij, *Poezija kak smysl*, p. 129.

⁴² Cf. the constructivist collection *Mena vsech* (1924) cited by A. A. Morozov in *Bol'shaja sovetskaja enciklopedija*, 3rd ed., s.v. "Konstruktivizm."

⁴³ Cf. Zelinskij, *Poezija kak smysl*, p. 140 and passim; and Morozov, "Konstruktivizm."

Нно́чь-чи? Сон-ы. Прох? ла́дыда
 Здесь в алле́йях загалохше?-го сады,
 И доно́сится́ то́лько стон'ы? гитта́оры:
 Та́ратинна-та́ратинна-тан...⁴⁴

The tendency to irony and comic effects that is so pronounced in this poet's early work is also reflected in A. Čičerin's variations (or parodies) on the *častuška*, for example, in his "D've instruèmy" :

Ка пусыкы мая
 Мелькарубельная,
 Атайдити, лбуда,
 Я напу! дрянная.⁴⁵

While *Černihiv* does not approach such "zaum," the parallels with constructivist theory and practice extend to all the essential points. If there is a major divergence or differing premise, it is that for Tyčyna constructivist principles are not taken as a defining credo on the nature of poetry, but are utilized with other heterogeneous elements (e.g., the old Ukrainian intermedial tradition) to produce a characteristic polyphony. Without considering these parallels, however, neither a picture of the poetics of *Černihiv* nor of constructivist elements in Ukrainian poetry is complete.

Returning now to our opening question on the genre of *Černihiv*, it seems clear that it is not a reportage, nor even so much a veristic dramatic portrait, as it is a vision, a distillation of the popular Ukraine in transition, presented through the verbal analogue of a musical composition—not a "symphony" like *Skovoroda*, but a cantata. It is a polyphony of voices and rhythms and moods, captured with manifold artistry and with subtly modulated control. It is yet another instance of Tyčyna's restless creativity discovering new forms.

⁴⁴ Il'ja Sel'vinskij, *Izbrannye proizvedenija* (Leningrad, 1972), p. 65.

⁴⁵ *Častuška*, ed. V.S. Baxtin (Moscow, 1966), p. 50.

OBSERVATIONS ON UKRAINIAN EROTIC FOLK SONGS

KRYSTYNA POMORSKA

Why do folk songs please our ear not only by their music but also by their lyrics? Why do they puzzle us although they offer a steady core of imagery and repetitive “lyrical plots”? The feeling of a puzzle seems to come from the impression of a non-sequitur, of some strange dissociation between the two sequences of phenomena a song presents. Indeed, what *is* the connection between “digging a well” and “loving a girl” or that between a “vegetable garden” and “boys” in this popular couplet:

Чи і в вас, як і в нас, на городі буряки,
Чи і в вас, як і в нас, усі хлопці дураки!

It is a particular kind of parallelism consisting of two types of activity that on the surface lack any *tertium comparationis* (or *oppositionis*), whereas parallelism in literature is usually based on a more explicit similarity or contrast. The seeming dissociation between paralleling sequences endows folk songs with a surrealistic touch, comparable to occurrences in written literature where effects are devoid of causes—as, for example, in Gogol’s “The Nose.”

However, one must bear in mind that the basic parallelism in folklore represents a *fixed* inner symbolic pattern. Although not perceived by the general participant, this pattern is nevertheless very old and universal in the Slavic folk heritage, recognized and investigated by ethnographers, folklorists, and linguists. The same symbolism has also been widely used beyond the scope of folklore. Today it can be observed even in the most modern forms of art—e.g., the cinema.¹ The pattern present in the songs selected here can be reduced to the following symbols:

¹ Cf. the Russian film *The Cranes are Flying*, or the recent film, based on Ukrainian folklore tradition, *The White Bird with a Black Mark*, which came out in the school of Dovženko.