

# HISTORIOGRAPHY OF UKRAINIAN LITERATURE\*

SERHIJ JEFREMOV

This brief study by Academician Jefremov, entitled *Dorohoju syntezu — Ohljad istoriohrafii ukraїns'koho pyšmenstva*, appeared in "Zapysky istoryčno — filolohičnogo viddilu," Vseukraїns'ka Akademija Nauk, Knyha 2-3, Kiev, 1923. The translation of it given below is slightly abridged, and supplemented by a short bibliography from 1923 up to the present, compiled by GEORGE LUCKYJ. Both parts of the present article deal only with comprehensive surveys of Ukrainian literature and do not mention studies of particular periods, genres or authors.

Although Ukrainian literature is centuries old and its origin reaches back to the beginning of the history of the Ukrainian people, the historiography of Ukrainian literature is still a comparatively young branch of scholarship. The reason why this should be so is supplied by history itself. Before the Ukrainian literary renaissance, which took place at the end of the eighteenth century, a history of Ukrainian literature could not have been expected, since there had been very little history written of literature in general. However, even after the crucial renaissance period, Ukrainian literature was often regarded, not as a product of the national spirit and continuous old traditions, but rather as a positive or negative accident, a product of the whim of a group of frivolous and idealist people. This attitude made itself felt in the works devoted to Ukrainian literature; and since accidents do not always deserve investigation into their causes and whims have obviously no underlying laws of logic, the first studies of Ukrainian literature have the character of random subjective observations, based not on facts and critical criteria. The early historians were often guided by emotion rather than by reason, and were really trying to find their way in the dark.

And yet, even in these early critical studies suggestions of a sound historical instinct can be traced. Some of the finest students of Ukrainian literature, although handicapped firstly by the lack of

\* This is the first of a series of earlier studies of lasting value by Ukrainian scholars. It is hoped that translations of similar publications will appear in later issues of the *Annals*.

knowledge which prevented them from gaining the right perspective with regard to the past, and secondly by feeling that they stood on very shaky ground, were confident that there was an organic unity existing between the apparently disjointed events in Ukrainian literary history, and that its development followed a definite course. This historical instinct prompted some early researchers to link their thoughts into the chain that was to become the historiography of Ukrainian literature. Even a brief account of this early historiography may be of great value to all those interested in the history of Ukrainian literature and certain conclusions may be deduced from it.

The first writer who stressed the need for a historical conception of the development of Ukrainian literature was the well-known Galician scholar and patriot of the earlier half of the nineteenth century — Ivan Mohylnyčkyj (1777-1831) who as a canon of Pere-myšl was a staunch defender of the right to education in the vernacular and an adviser to the famous V. Kopitar in Ukrainian affairs. A man of wide vision, he was equipped with a scholarly knowledge of his own country's past, and he devoted much of his time to the defense of the vernacular and its use in literature. He wrote an apologia for the common speech of the Galician peasants, *Vedomost o ruskom jazyce*<sup>1</sup> which during his lifetime appeared only in an abridged Polish translation (*Rozprawa o jezyku ruskim*, 1829) and was later on twice published in Russian.<sup>2</sup> In this work Mohylnyčkyj not only defended the independent status of the Ukrainian — or, as he calls it “Ruthenian” (ruška mova) language — as being different from both Polish and Russian, but he also linked contemporary Ukrainian literature with the older works of literature which had their origin in the Ukraine. He carefully selected all the ancient works which have unmistakable Ukrainian characteristics; he demonstrated the unity of those Ukrainians living on the banks of the Dnieper with their brothers along the Dniester; he analyzed carefully and thoroughly the word *rúškyj* which he adopted

<sup>1</sup> Published in *Ukrainško — ruškyj archiv* (Lviv, 1910), Vol. V.

<sup>2</sup> I. Mogilevskij (sic!), *O drevnosti i samobitnosti južno-russkago jazyka*, *Žurnal Min. Nar. Prosv.*, 1839 and *Zapsyky o južnoj Rusy*, (St. Petersburg, 1857), Vol. II.

for the Ukrainian language in preference to other usages. His *Vedomost* had, as an appendix, what was the first Ukrainian anthology of Ukrainian literature<sup>3</sup> compiled according to the historical principle. In that appendix Mohylnyčkyj included the ancient *hramoty* of the Princes and translations from the Bible; devoted much space to F. Skoryna, and gave extracts from the Lithuanian Statute and legal documents. He also included selections from the works of Berynda, Galjatovskyj, and Radyvylivskyj, as well as verses from *Bohohlasnyk* — right up to the selections from Kotljarevskyj's *Eneida* and the verses from Pavlovskyj's *Hramatyka*. At that time the book as a whole was a work of the greatest value and significance, both from the scholarly and social points of view. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that generations of Galician scholars and intellectuals, such as Levyčkyj, Holovackýj, and others, used Mohylnyčkyj's work as a guide in their later researches.

There is no doubt about the purpose which guided Mohylnyčkyj in his work. "Having convinced himself," he wrote in *Vedomost*, "with the help of all the available documents, of the ancient origin and great beauty of the Ruthenian language, the reader, not being especially well acquainted with the history of his own country, may ask why such a beautiful language has survived only among the common people, Greek-Catholic clergy, and the lower gentry in towns and villages?"<sup>4</sup> And, with a real sense of history and logic, he went on, "why has the South Ruthenian literature fallen into such decay at the present time, when it could enrich us by works of high artistic quality?"<sup>5</sup>

That Mohylnyčkyj should ask this question at the time of Ivan Kotljarevskyj's first faint attempts to revive Ukrainian literature in the vernacular — attempts of which he was aware — makes his approach to the problem of the historiography of Ukrainian literature even more interesting. Theoretically, that is, Mohylnyčkyj came to the same conclusions as those upon which, later, the practice of

<sup>3</sup> Ja. Hordynskyj, *Perša proba chrestomatiï z ukraїnśkoï literatury, Zapysky naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenka*, vol. CXXV.

<sup>4</sup> Українсько — ру́ський Archiv, Vol. V. pp. 23-24.

<sup>5</sup> Zapysky o južnoj Rusy, Vol. II. p. 267.

the first writers of the Ukrainian literary renaissance was based. "His penetrating views were not expressed in vain," Kuliš wrote when republishing Mohylnýkyj's *Vedomost*<sup>6</sup>. And, indeed, the history of Ukrainian literature did assume the course foreshadowed by the instinct and love of this scholar.

The first scholarly and methodical studies of the history of Ukrainian literature, published between 1830 and 1860 contained accounts of contemporary literature. It might even be said that starting with the work of Osyp Bodjanškyj (1808-1876), who under the pseudonym "Mastak" published a history of Ukrainian literature in 1834, it became rather common, indeed almost a matter of form, to begin any history of Ukrainian literature with the early nineteenth century, that is, with Kvitka's novels. To this type of historical record belong the studies by M. Kostomarov (in *Molodyk* for 1844, and in Herbel's *Poezija Slavjan*, 1871); A. Metlynskyj (*Skubent Čupryna*); M. Hatcuk; and P. Kuliš (studies in *Russkaja Beseda*, *Russkij Vestnik*, *Chata*, and *Osnova*). According to all of these, Ukrainian literature began with Kotljarevskyj's *Eneida*; no consideration was given to his predecessors and no attempt was made to link the literature in the vernacular with earlier sources. Valuation of single authors was also standardized. All regarded Kotljarevskyj's works as negative, condemning them as a "rambling tomfoolery" and preferring Hulak Artemovskyj and especially Kvitka whom they regarded as the father of Ukrainian literature. Much attention was usually devoted to Ševčenko and Marko Vovčok. Writers like Borovykovskyj, Hrebinka, and Metlynskyj were mentioned at random together with such single works as *Čary* by Kyrylo Topolo or *Naški ukraїnski kazky* by Iško Maternyka (Bodjanškyj).

This schematized pattern is most obvious in the works of Pantalejmon Kuliš, who best expressed the views of his generation on the origins and values of Ukrainian literature. "The appearance of Kotljarevskyj with his *Aeneas*" wrote Kuliš in *Chata*, "caused uproarious laughter, since the common Ukrainian people were

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 260.

depicted as quite eccentric. The contemporary Ukrainian intelligentsia felt itself elevated above such vulgarities, and their laughter directed against Kotljarevskyj's masterpiece meant a crucial test for Ukrainian literature. In fact, this laughter nearly killed the first attempt to create Ukrainian literature in the vernacular."<sup>7</sup>

This, however, was the voice of a critic who had been upset by malice, rather than that of a cool and objective historian. Literary historians still lacked the necessary sense of perspective. They still refused to see the development of Ukrainian literature against the background of Ukrainian history and as they still regarded it merely as an appendix to Russian literature, they naturally made no mention of Ukrainian literature before Kotljarevskyj, for what was written in the Ukraine before that time had been annexed by Russian literary historians as a part of Russian literature.

This early period of the historiography of Ukrainian literature ends with the publication of P. Petračenko's *Kratkij istoričeskij očerk ukraïnskoj literatury* which appeared in Warsaw in 1861 as an appendix to the history of Russian literature. Following in the steps of Kuliš, Petračenko after a short introduction devoted ten pages to the discussion of Kvitka, Ševčenko, and Marko Vovčok as well as Kuliš himself. This work had all the drawbacks of previous histories of Ukrainian literature — the chief being a complete lack of historical perspective.

Much deeper and broader was the approach to historiography made by two Galician scholars and writers: Ivan Vahylevyč (1811-1866) and Jakiv Holovačkyj (1814-1888). Since they were not under Russian influence, they were not hindered in their writings except by the accepted pattern of Russian literary historians. It may be said that they followed Mohylnyčkyj whose influence on the literary revival in Galicia was significant. Both of them, writing in the 1840's, left valuable histories of Ukrainian literature, taking into account the literature of the old Ruš and the Lithuanian—Polish period. *Zametki o ruskoj literature* by Vahylevyč appeared in

<sup>7</sup> Kuliš, *Perednje slovo do hromady. Pohljad na ukraїnsku slovesnist, Chata*, (St. Petersburg, 1860), pp. XVII-XVIII.

1848, and Holovačkyj's *Tri ustupitelni predpodavanija o ruskoj slovesnosti* came out in 1849.

"In my lectures" declared Holovačkyj, "I propose to consider the main literary achievements of the Ruthenian people in their historical order so as to gain a better appreciation of these works."<sup>8</sup> This in fact he did, tracing the origins of contemporary literature back to the acceptance of Christianity by Ruš. However, both Holovačkyj and Vahylevyč had many shortcomings. Vahylevyč's history was full of factual errors, and his accounts of modern writers were too sketchy. Something better might have been expected from Holovačkyj, who was an acknowledged authority and a specialist in literary history. He was the first to be elected to the chair of Ukrainian language and literature, established in 1848 at Lviv University. Yet, in spite of his high qualifications, Holovačkyj showed strange bias in favor of the ancient literature and neglected the greater part of modern literature. His *Tri vstupitelni predpodavanija*, excellent as far as its methodology and the survey of the earlier periods are concerned, is lamentably superficial in its treatment of the latest period. Perhaps the Moscowphile spirit, which Holovačkyj was to develop was already evident here, for his dislike of vernacular literature is beyond doubt. "Some modern Ukrainian writers" he writes in the closing chapter of his history, "in attempting to express themselves in the language as spoken by the people and in the popular Ukrainian spirit in order to separate themselves from the Russian traditions, went to the other extreme."<sup>9</sup> It is no wonder that some of Holovačkyj's students, later prominent literary historians<sup>10</sup> remembered well Holovačkyj's conservatism; and we are obliged to say that both these Galician historians, Vahylevyč and Holovačkyj, had small influence on the Eastern Ukraine and failed to produce a scholarly and comprehensive history of Ukrainian literature, although their studies contributed much to the progress of historiography.

<sup>8</sup> I. Onyškevych, *Ruška biblioteka, tom III. Pysanja M. Šaškevyc̄ha, I. Vahylevyc̄ha i Ja. Holovačkoho* (Lviv, 1884), p. 333.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 347.

<sup>10</sup> O. Ohonovskiy, *Istorija literatury ruškoj*, (Lviv, 1894), IV, pp. 95.

The next important contribution in this field was the history of Slavic literatures (*Obzor istorii slavjanskich literatur*, 1865) by O. Pypin and V. Spasovič. In the second and thoroughly revised edition which appeared under the title *Istorija slavjanskich literatur* (vol I. St. Petersburg, 1879), O Pypin included his comprehensive history of Ukrainian literature. It began with the Lithuanian period, since Pypin regarded literature prior to that time as the "common treasure of both branches of the Russian people."<sup>11</sup> After giving an extensive review of all types of earlier literature, he dealt at length with the nineteenth century period and summed up the Ukrainian literary revival as springing from the old traditions under the influence of the Slavic movement for national regeneration. Pypin's history extended to the 1880's and contained an account of the literature of the Galician revival. It can be regarded as a pioneer study of great value and is still of interest today.

In the 1870s there appeared several minor historical studies of Ukrainian literature which deserve to be mentioned. To these belong: Pavlyn Svjencyćkyj's *Vik XIX u dijach literatury ukrainśkoi*, Lviv, 1871; M. Drahamanov's *Literatura rosijška velykoruška, ukrainška* 1873-74); O. Konyškyj's *Istorija ruško-ukrajinškoho pyšmenstva XIX vika* (published under the pseudonym 'Košovyj' in *S'vit*, 1881-82) and his *Zarysy ruchu literackiego Rusinów*, *Atheneum*, Warsaw, 1885. None of these can be regarded as of major importance to the course of Ukrainian historiography, although they contain a wealth of new critical appraisals of Ukrainian literature.

It was during the 1880s that the first outstanding historiographic studies of Ukrainian literature began to be written. In 1880 there appeared *Očerki iz istorii ukrainskoy literatury XVIII veka* by Professor M. Petrov (1840-1921). It was republished in a revised edition in the *Trudy Kievskoj Duchovnoj Akademii*, 1909-1911, and later separately as *Očerki iz istorii ukrainskoy literatury XVII i XVIII vekov*, Kiev, 1911. In the early 1880s the journal *Istoričeskij Vestnik* began publishing the second work of the same scholar, which later, in 1884, appeared in book-form with the title *Očerki istorii ukrainskoy*

<sup>11</sup> A. N. Pypin and V. D. Spasovič, *Istorija slavjanskich literatur*, (St. Petersburg, 1879), Vol. I. p. 317.

*literatury XIX stoletija.* This book prompted many criticisms (Konyšyj, Komarov, Daškevyč) and was yet another stepping stone on the road to scholarly interpretation of the history of Ukrainian literature. The first book mentioned was meant, as the author explained,<sup>12</sup> as an introduction to the history of Ukrainian literature in the nineteenth century. It was devoted to the historical survey of earlier literature, going back to the period of Kiev Rus'. The strict historical approach shown by Petrov was thus carried to its logical conclusion by regarding the earliest literature of the Kiev period as the source of evolution of all writing in the Ukraine.<sup>13</sup>

Petrov was aware, however, of the complex problem of the earlier history of literature written in the Ukraine. "Only further historical research," he wrote, "can untie the Gordian knot of the intermixed relations of the two branches of Russian literature." Petrov attempted to supply an answer to this problem in his book, but he did this without the support of documents and materials which he hoped future research would bring to light. His main error was that he took for granted the dependence of Ukrainian literature on Russian literature. Yet apart from that, his work contained most valuable material, had a sound methodological basis, and, coming from a Russian authority on literature as a recognition of the ancient Ukrainian literary traditions it gave to Ukrainian historiography the stamp, as it were, of scholarly approval.

Petrov's work was to a large extent supplemented and corrected by the history of another great Russian scholar, Academician Daškevyč (1852-1908) who, for a long time, was Professor at Kiev. This history appeared in St. Petersburg, in 1888 as *Otzyv o sočinenii g. Petrova: Očerki istorii ukraïnskoj literatury XIX stoletija* (*Otchet o 29-m prisuzdenii nagrad grafa Uvarova*, St. Petersburg, 1888). Although intended at first as a review of Petrov's book, it soon expanded into an entirely new work. Contrary to Petrov, Daškevyč believed that "Ukrainian literature of the nineteenth century showed its own independence and genius while remaining closely tied to

<sup>12</sup> N. I. Petrov, *Očerki iz istorii ukraïnskoj literatury XVII i XVIII vekov* (Kiev, 1911), p. 2.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

folk traditions.”<sup>14</sup> The borrowings, according to him, did not obliterate native spontaneity.<sup>15</sup> Developing further Pypin’s view of the influence of the Slavic national revival on Ukrainian literature of the nineteenth century, Daškevyc was the first to see a close bond between Ukrainian literature and the main currents of European culture, without forgetting “the ancient traditions of native creativeness.”<sup>16</sup> He analyzed carefully those “common European trends which came to be reflected in Ukrainian literature sometimes with the help of Polish or Russian literature, but often quite apart from them.”<sup>17</sup> Daškevyc’s work formed the cornerstone necessary for the solid foundation of modern Ukrainian literary historiography.

Starting in 1886, the journal *Zorja* began publishing the monumental work of O. Ohonovskyj (1833-94), Professor at Lviv university, entitled *Istorija literatury ruškoj*, which later appeared in four parts (six volumes) in Lviv, 1887-1894, but remained unfinished because of the author’s death in 1894. “We regard the Little Russian or Ukrainian literature” wrote Ohonovskyj in the introduction to his history, “as separate from Russian literature, because the Ukrainian people is separate from the Great Russian people.”<sup>18</sup> Having thus established as a fact what certain of his predecessors were hesitant about, Ohonovskyj looked to the literature of Kievan Rus as the immediate source of all the later Ukrainian literature.<sup>19</sup> Ohonovskyj argued further that while Ukrainian literature since Kotljarevskyj was popular (*narodnja*), the literature prior to that

<sup>14</sup> *Otčet o 29 -m prisuzženii nagrad gr. Uvarova* (St. Petersburg, 1888), p. 55.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.* p. 263.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.* p. 109.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.* p. 55.

<sup>18</sup> *Istorija literatury ruškoj*, (Lviv, 1887), I, p. VIII.

<sup>19</sup> Ohonovskyj’s view was severely attacked by several scholars, among them—O. Pypin. In his article *Osobaja istorija russkoj literatury* (*Vestnik Evropy*, 1890) Pypin tried to reject Ohonovskyj’s argument that the Kiev period can be regarded as the beginning of Ukrainian literature. A detailed reply to Pypin may be found in Ohonovskyj’s *Mojemu krytykovi — Vídpovid A. Pypinovi*, Lviv, 1890 and I. Levyćkyj-Nećuij’s (*I Baštovyj*) *Ukrainstvo na literaturnych pozvach z Moskovsc'ynoju* (Lviv, 1819). This discussion was yet another aspect of Ukrainian-Russian relations and is a part of the controversy between “Southerners” and “Northerners.”

lacked the truly popular element, since its development was hindered first by Church-Slavic Byzantine influences, then by Polish culture and medieval scholasticism, and finally by the cultural oppression of Tzarist Muscovy. For that reason Ohonovśkyj paid much more attention to the literature of the nineteenth century than to that of earlier periods. In spite of a great wealth of biographical and bibliographical material Ohonovśkyj's work had very serious deficiencies. Because of the lack of any systematic approach, it failed to show the historical development, and resembled a collection of separate monographs on various writers rather than a history of literature. Besides that, the biographies of authors were often stereotyped, and contained unnecessary pseudo-patriotic commentaries. Little consideration was given to the circumstances which conditioned the work of the various literary figures mentioned. It must therefore be said that Ohonovśkyj ended the period of the collection of material in historiography without having arrived at a clear synthesis of all the available facts.

The following histories of literature published in the last two decades of the nineteenth century were useful compilations of available material: *Ohljad nacjonalnoj prace halickych rusynov*, published in *Zorja* (1887) by V. Kocovśkyj; *Literaturni stremlinnja halyčkych rusyniv vid 1772 do 1872 r.r.* by O. Terlećkyj (1850-1902), published under the pseudonym "Ivan Zanevyc" in *Žyttja i Slovo*, (1894-95). *Halyčko — ruške pyšmenstvo 1848-1865 r.* was written by the same author and published posthumously in *Literaturno — naukovyj Vistnyk* (1903).

As the publication of Kotljarevskyj's *Eneïda* in 1798 is usually regarded as the birthday of modern Ukrainian literature, the appearance of *Stolittje obnovlenoi ukrainško — ruškoï literatury* by Professor Oleksander Kolessa in 1898 may be regarded as marking its centenary. This work was published in *Literaturno-naukovyj Vistnyk*, Vol. I. Then, the turn of the century witnessed the beginning of the publication of Professor Mychajlo Hruševskyj's monumental *History of Ukraine — Ruś (Istorija Ukrainsky — Rusy)* which had most valuable observations on literature, especially in the first, third and sixth volumes.

Two important contributions in the field of the historiography of Ukrainian literature made at the beginning of the twentieth century must be mentioned. In the twelfth volume of *Bol'saja Enciklopedija* Borys Hrinčenko published his *Malorusskaja literatura*, and in the forty-first volume of Brockhaus and Efron's *Enciklopedičeskij Slovar* there appeared Ivan Franko's *Južno—russkaja literatura*. Franko's historical survey was intended to develop later into a much larger work, and in *Zapysky naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenka* for 1909 there even appeared his introduction to this proposed history of Ukrainian literature.<sup>20</sup>

Franko was the first to use the comparative method together with a psychological approach in his evaluation of literature. "No literature" he wrote, "can be free from foreign influences . . . A historian of literature must show the effect of the foreign influence on a national literature as well as the contribution which this literature made to world literature. While treating literature as an aspect of the history and culture of a nation, he must bring out all its positive and negative features, remembering that knowledge of the historical background is not enough in itself, for literature is created by outstanding personalities rising above the mass and often guiding it along the path of progress."<sup>21</sup>

It is indeed a great pity that Franko's projected large history never came to be written. Instead, he published in 1910 a *Narys istorii ukrainškoj—ruškoj literatury do 1890 r.* which disappointed those who were awaiting the expected large volume; and as this was written during Franko's illness, it has none of the good qualities of the author's earlier critical writings, being very chaotic and full of errors.

Less scholarly, and intended for the general reader, were the following surveys of Ukrainian literature published during the first decade of the twentieth century: *Sučasne ukraїnske pyšmenstvo v joho typovych predstavnykach* (first published in *Literaturno—naukovyj vistnyk*, 1907-1908) by O. Hruševskyj; *Demokratičeskaja*

<sup>20</sup> Franko, *Teorija i rozvij istorii literatury*, *Zapysky naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenka*, vol. LXXXIX, p. 5.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.* p. 15-16.

*literatura* (published in *Russkaja Mysl*, 1907) by O. Lotoćkyj; *Ukrainskaja literatura v XIX veke* (in *Istorija Rossii v XIX veke*) by S. Rusova; and *Ohljad istorii ukrainško—ruškoj literatury*, Lviv, 1910, by O. Barvinškyj. Somewhat more comprehensive was the study by B. Lepkyj *Načerk istorii ukrainškoj literatury*, Kolo-myja, 1909.

During World War I Ukrainian scholarship suffered much under the Russian censorship as well as from military and social upheavals. Not only the muses, but the sciences also were silent *inter arma*. Three works which appeared during that period deserve to be mentioned: first, *Starinnaja ukrainskaja literatura* by Academician V. Perete; second, *Novaja ukrainskaja literatura* by the present writer (both printed in *Otec̄estvo*, Petrograd, 1916); and third, the latter survey in a more complete form which appeared as *Ukrainskaja literatura* in the forty-second volume of Granat's *Enciklopedičeskij Slovar*. Two other works published in Vienna are of equal importance. They are — *Z istorij ukrainškoj literatury*. (1915) by B. Lepkyj and V. Simovyč, and *Ukrainstvo v Rosii* (1917) by Volodymyr Dorošenko.

The period of the Revolution (1917-1921) was marked by the further ruin and decay of scholarship. Very little was written, and still less printed. However, beginning with 1922, it is possible to speak of the rise of certain new movements in the development of literary historiography. The present writer's *Korotka istorija ukrainškoj pyšmenstva*, Kiev, 1918, and *Rozmovy pro ukraїnškych pyšmennyykiv*, Part I — II, Poltava, 1918, by V. Ščepotjev were intended for the general reader. A work which, because of its superficiality and lack of originality, cannot be recommended was D. Rudyk's *Korotkyj ohljad ukrainškoho pyšmenstva z vyimkamy tvoriv*, Uman', 1920. Finally, the last and most interesting attempt to write a full history of Ukrainian literature was made in the first two parts of *Istorija ukrainškoj literatury* by Mychajlo Voznjak,<sup>22</sup> published in 1920-21.

As was to be expected, this excellent scholar, having used all

<sup>22</sup> The second volume appeared in 1921, the third in 1924, in Lviv.

the available sources, succeeded in composing a work of great value. The only criticism which might be made of the parts that have appeared so far is that the material presented is often too detailed, and that the overall plan is not logical or consistent. Voznjak's emphasis on the early enmity between Kiev and Suzdal, his theory of the Ukrainian origin of the "byliny," and the very hypothetical chapter on Bojan, are the weakest parts in this otherwise competent study.

The historiography of Ukrainian literature is now entering into the period of fulfillment. It began as a series of critical studies written without any historical perspectives, but today it has behind it a quarter of a century of scholarly attempts at a synthesis, and before it a new generation of scholars who have all the means to produce a truly scholarly and authoritative history of Ukrainian literature.

### Post-Revolutionary Period (1923-1949)

As the next important contribution to the Ukrainian historiography of the period not covered by the author, the second enlarged edition of his own *Istorija ukraїnskoho pyšmenstva*, Vols. I—II, (Kiev-Leipzig, 1924) must be mentioned. The second volume is especially valuable since it contains a critical appraisal of the recent post-revolutionary period as well as an extensive bibliography at the end of each chapter.

Four other general surveys of Ukrainian literature which were intended for use as school text books are: *Ukraїns'ka literatura; pidručna knyha dlya staršych grup semynaryčnoi školy*, Kiev, 1922, and *Pidručnyk istorii ukraїnskoj literatury*, Kharkiv-Kiev, 1924, both by O. Doroškevyč; *Istorija ukraїnskoj literatury*, vols. I, II, Lviv, 1920-21, by O. Barvinškyj; and *Istorija ukraїnskoj literatury*, vol. I. Kališ, 1922, by L. Bilečkyj.

In 1923 there appeared the first volume of the large *Istorija ukraїnskoj literatury* by that outstanding Ukrainian historian Michael Hruševskyj. Within the next few years a further five volumes were published in the following order: Vol. I. (Folk Literature), Lviv-

Kiev, 1923; Vol. II. (Kiev Period), Lviv-Kiev, 1923; Vol. III. (Kiev and Halyč-Volyn' Period), Lviv-Kiev, 1923; Vol. IV. (Folk Literature in the late Kiev Period and in the XIII-XVII cent.), Kiev, 1925; Vol. V. Part One, (XV-XVI cent.), Kiev, 1926; Vol. V. Part Two, (The First Revival: 1580-1610), Kiev, 1927.

Hruševskyj's approach to literature is clearly stated by him in the preface to volume one:

What a citizen should find of value in studying literature is not the evolution of the literary language, style, and form as they are reflected in the works of various writers, but an understanding of literature as a function of social life, as a reflection of reality, of the mutual relationship between the author and his social environment. A history of literature must provide the reader with a key to the archives of human documents... and must teach him to evaluate not only the reflection of social life, but also to investigate all forms and stages of this social life of a single people or a whole group of peoples, of races, and finally of mankind as a whole. Only then can works of literature reveal to the reader their deepest meaning, and the history of literature, studied from the sociological angle, will assume a truly great importance.<sup>28</sup>

In his work Hruševskyj followed closely this formula and his history of literature is therefore, in the opinion of most scholars, the most modern synthesis of Ukrainian literary achievements as seen against the background of the social, political, and cultural history of the Ukraine and Eastern Europe.

A searching study of modern Ukrainian literature viewed as part of the Western European literary development is Mykola Zerov's *Nove ukrainske pyšmenstvo*, Kiev, 1924.

Three histories of Ukrainian literature written from the standpoint of Marxian literary theory are: V. Korjak's *Narys istorii ukrainškoj literatury*, Vol. I, *Literatura pereburžuaazna*, Kharkiv, 1925, Vol. II. *Buržuaazne pyšmenstvo*, Kharkiv, 1929; A. Šamraj's *Ukrainška literatura — styslyj ohljad*, Kharkiv, 1926; and V. Korjak's *Ukrainška literatura; Konspekt*, Kharkiv, 1928 (revised in 1931).

Strictly in accordance with the Marxian view of literature, Kor-

<sup>28</sup> M. Hruševskyj, *Istorija ukrainškoj literatury*, Vol. I. p. 21.

jak divides Ukrainian literature into the periods of (1) tribal existence, (2) early feudalism, (3) Middle Ages, (4) commercial capitalism, (5) industrial capitalism, (6) financial capitalism, (7) proletarian dictatorship. Šamraj, while following the Marxian line, admits that "it is a great mistake to assume that social-economic phenomena alone determine literary developments... Literature is not political economy, but simply literature."<sup>24</sup> In dividing literature into periods Šamraj attempts "to emphasize the special nature of literary developments."

The further development of the historiography of Ukrainian literature was aided by the work of commissions and societies organized for that purpose under the auspices of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev. Under this heading must be placed the Permanent Commission of the VUAN<sup>25</sup> for the Publication of the Memoirs of Modern Ukrainian Literature, founded in 1919 and consisting of such scholars as Jefremov, Loboda, Novýčkyj, and Fylypovyc; the Historical and Literary Society affiliated to the VUAN, founded in 1922; the Society of Friends of Ukrainian Culture, Literature, and Language in Leningrad, founded in 1921 and after 1923 affiliated with the VUAN; and finally, the Commission for Ancient Ukrainian Literature, created in 1927 through the initiative of the Academician Volodymyr Peretc. The splendid work of these scholars which might be regarded as preparatory to a new history of literature remained without a synthesis and was largely discontinued after 1930. Of minor importance was a series of school textbooks of the history of Ukrainian literature, such as *Zahalnyj kurs ukraїns'koї literatury* (1930) edited by O. Bilečkyj, and *Ukraїns'ka literatura*, Second Edition, Kiev, 1940, edited by P. Volynskyj. Two Soviet encyclopedias have long accounts of Ukrainian literature: *Bol'saja Sovjetskaja Enciklopedija*, Vol. LV, 1947 (articles by O. Bilečkyj, S. Maslov, and S. Šachovskoj), and *Literaturnaja Enciklopedija*, Vol. XI, 1939 (articles by O. Bilečkyj, Je. Kyryljuk, and L. Pidhajnyj).

At the time of the severest oppression of Ukrainian scholarship

<sup>24</sup> A. Šamraj, *Ukraїns'ka literatura* (Kharkiv, 1926), p. 6.

<sup>25</sup> VUAN — Vseukraїns'ka Akademija Nauk.

in the U.S.S.R., the Ukrainian centres of learning in Western Ukraine (Lviv), Prague, and Warsaw carried on their studies in the field of Ukrainian historiography. The most outstanding contribution originating abroad was D. Čiževsky's *Istorija ukrainskoj literatury*, Vol. II (Renaissance, Reformation, Baroque), published in Prague in 1942. A later work by the same author is *Geschichte der altrussischen Literatur im 11, und 13 Jahrhundert; Kiever Epoche*, Frankfort a/Main, 1948.

The only recent Soviet history of Ukrainian literature, published in 1945 (*Narys istorii ukrainskoj literatury* by S. Maslov and Je. Kyryljuk) was severely condemned by a special Party decree of August 24th, 1946. The charges against it were that (1) "the authors have distorted the Marxian-Leninist interpretation of the history of Ukrainian literature which they represented in a bourgeois nationalist spirit. The history of Ukrainian literature is shown as existing apart from the class struggle, as a process isolated from that struggle. The authors ignore the class struggle as the basic law of the development of class society and instead allow the national element to play the decisive part in the development of writers' work." (2) "The 'Outline' shows traces of the theory according to which the Ukrainian past is classless and devoid of bourgeois influence. This theory is central in the conception of the 'school' of M. Hruševskyj." (3) "The 'Outline' does not show the great and fruitful influence of Russian culture and literature on the development of Ukrainian culture and literature, it ignores their relationship and it exaggerates the influence of Western European literatures."<sup>26</sup>

It is difficult to believe that with such criteria contemporary Soviet Ukrainian scholarship can accomplish anything in the field of historiography. However, Ukrainian scholarship in Europe, Canada, and in this country, tries, under difficult circumstances, to continue the tradition of objective research in the history of Ukrainian literature. The latest and best examples of this are the first

<sup>26</sup> Pro perekručennja i pomylky u vysvitlenni istorii ukrainskoj literatury v "Narysi istorii ukrainskoj literatury"; z postanovy CK KP (b) U vid 24. VIII. 1946. *Literaturna Hazeta*, September 5th, 1946.

volume of Professor Leonid Bilečkyj's *Istorija ukraїns'koї literatury*, Augsburg, 1947, and *Istorija ukraїns'koї literatury*, Two volumes, Munich, 1947, by V. Radzykevych. By far the most informative is the brief account of the history of Ukrainian literature by M. Hlobenko, L. Bilečkyj, Je. Pelenškyj, D. Čiževsky, Ju. Blochyn, I. Korovyčkyj, and V. Lev in the 10th Fascicle of the *Encyklopedija Ukraїnoznaſtva*, Munich-New York, 1950, published by the Naukove Tovarystvo im. Ševčenka. It is to be hoped that other studies, now well under way, will be completed and published shortly.