

PHILOLOGY

UDC 82.09

DOI 10.56378/TZTP20230224

Tadeusz SUCHARSKI

Professor of humanities in the field of literary studies, profesor (Wydział Filologiczno-Historyczny), Pomeranian University in Słupsk, Arciszewskiego str., 22A, 76-200, Słupsk, Poland (tsucharski@wp.pl)

ORCID 0000-0002-4342-3519

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Sucharski, T. (2023). Parisian *Kultura* in relation to ukrainian emigrant literature. *Innovations in scientific, technical and social ecosystems [Scientific journal]*, 5, pp. 40–56, doi: 10.56378/TZTP20230224

PARISIAN *KULTURA* IN RELATION TO UKRAINIAN EMIGRANT LITERATURE

Abstract. *The purpose of research* is to present the activities of the Polish émigré magazine *Kultura* in the popularization of Ukrainian literature and culture, primarily formed in exile. **The research methodology** is based on the comparative methodology and hermeneutic methodology, which allow to present and explain different approaches to culture and literature. But they also teach respect for the Other. **The Scientific Novelty** lies in the fact that, for the first time in Polish literary studies, a deep reflection was undertaken on the forms of implementation by the “*Kultura*” program of cooperation between Poles and Ukrainians (postulated by Jerzy Giedroyc, the editor of emigration monthly). **The Conclusions:** Undoubtedly Lobodowski fulfilled the most important role in the process of evaluation of Ukrainian identity in conjunction with simultaneous reassessment of Polish identity. He stared at the Ukrainian literature, especially poetry, almost exclusively through the prism of its artistic value. In all essays Lobodowski commanded ‘dignity’ of Ukrainian literature, he also drew attention to the attainment of its independence, to the liberation from the chains of national duty.

Keywords: “*Kultura*”, Polish-Ukrainian relations, Polish emigrant literature, Ukrainian emigrant literature, Polish identity, Ukrainian identity, reassessment of Polish identity, evaluation of Ukrainian identity

The Relevance of the Topic. At the end of the 20th century, undoubtedly the most difficult in the centuries – long history of common life and neighborly relations between Poles and Ukrainians, George Grabovych, a Ukrainian

professor at Harvard University, stated without hesitation that the Parisian monthly “within a few years became the main factor in the process not so much of renewal as of fundamental rethinking and reformulation of Polish-Ukrainian cultural, political and intellectual ties” (Grabovych, 2005, p. 42; Berdychowska, 2004). The ‘revaluation’ of Ukraine was included by the researcher in the process of reorientation of Polish relations with other neighboring nations, carried out by *Kultura*, although he rightly attributed the fundamental place to relations with Ukrainians. At the same time, he astutely noticed that this fundamental change in the relationship formula was and is possible only through “a revaluation of the Polish side and Polishness as such” (Grabovych, 2005, p. 43). It is difficult to find words of greater appreciation, probably not only from the perspective of a Ukrainian emigrant, for the half-century activity of the monthly magazine Jerzy Giedroyc. Historians of both nations return to this statement now and will return to it many times.

The Formulation of the Problem. Jerzy Giedroyc, editor of the monthly magazine, put emphasis on the need of normalization of Polish-Ukrainian relations. In his opinion, focusing on the moral and cultural issues gave the best results in the reformulating of Polish thinking about Ukraine and overcoming animosity between our nations. The problem lies in the lack of a comprehensive study of the activities of the Polish emigrant magazine *Kultura*.

The Purpose of the article is the theoretical justification of the role and significance of the *Kultura* magazine in the formation of Polish-Ukrainian relations.

The Presentation of the topic. It should be emphasized that in appreciating the effects of *Kultura*’s efforts, Grabovych does not unambiguously link the evaluation of Ukraine with the reassessment of Poland, but implicitly conditions them. It’s a sort of establishing a proper hierarchy in this process. He emphasizes that it took place in the first two decades of the existence of the Parisian monthly, but only after overcoming the “polonocentrism” of *Kultura* from the earliest three years of the magazine. He attributes the main role in the revaluation of Polishness to Witold Gombrowicz, who “consistently, programmatically and with incredibly explosive power destroyed, parodied, deconstructed the national myth, national form, ‘sacred’, collective hypocrisy, falling in love with illusion and false pose” (Grabovych, 2005, p. 45). According to the Ukrainian researcher, ‘the relay baton’ was taken over by Czeslaw Milosz. However, before both artists began the process of disillusionment and deconstruction of Polishness, Polish eyes on the culture of our neighbors from across the Buh River were directed by Joseph Lobodowski, who at the same time fought against the disrespectful and condescending attitude of Poles towards Ukrainians. His contribution to the acknowledgement of Ukrainian culture and making his compatriots aware of its importance is as huge

as it is underestimated (Hnatiuk, 1997/1998, pp. 54–56). Bogumila Berdychowska made a very valid point that “this part of the achievements of the *Kultura’s* milieu is probably the least known today” (Berdychowska, 2004, pp. 50).

In the introduction to the Golden Hramota published in Paris in 1954, a volume of poems entirely devoted to Polish-Ukrainian theme, Lobodowski recalled the critic’s words that his poetry “is one of the last remaining spans of the bridge suspended over the abyss between the two nations” (Lobodowski, 1954, p. 8). But much more important, much more durable and artistically perfect spans of this bridge are his Ukrainian essays. He wrote over a dozen of them, among which the superb essay “Against the Ghosts of the Past” undoubtedly has a pioneering and programmatic role. It was published in *Kultura* at the beginning of 1952 (Lobodowski, 1952). It should be seen as the fullest record of the effort to re-evaluate Ukrainianness, noticed by Grabovych, in conjunction with the simultaneous re-evaluation of Polishness.

Jerzy Giedroyc, in his letters to Ukrainian emigrants, emphasized that with this ‘fundamental’ programmatic essay he began “a systematic discussion of Polish-Ukrainian relations” in *Kultura* (Giedroyc, 2004, pp. 375, 549). Less than a half a year after Lobodowski’s essay, an article by Włodzimierz Baczkowski *Sprawa ukraińska (The Ukrainian Matter)* was published in a Parisian monthly with a declaration of the necessity of “cooperation in the subsoil, aiming at future historical decisions” (Baczkowski, 1952, pp. 84). What is interesting, but also puzzling, is that the symbolic ‘subsoil’ in this sentence carries a range of potential meanings. It significantly exceeds the issue of the borders of future independent states neighboring each other, disregarding the problem of ‘bills of injustice’, issued too generously by both sides. Since the process of revaluation does not take place on a visible, eye-catching, concrete plane, it goes on slowly and subcutaneously.

Giedroyc’s words from letters to Ukrainian emigrants do not mean that *Kultura* in its earlier issues did not deal with Ukrainian matters. Nor do they mean that Giedroyc began to show interest in Ukraine only since 1952. Finally, they do not mean that Lobodowski started publishing Ukrainians in the monthly with this essay. Both Lobodowski and Giedroyc were unequivocal in their sympathies during the inter-war period, speaking out against the almost universal Polish neglect of the needs and culture of a nation that propaganda called Ruthenians (Sojak-Masztalerz, 2004). They had numerous ‘connections’ with the Ukrainian world. Already at that time, Lobodowski, in the pages of the *Polish-Ukrainian Bulletin*, ruthlessly fought for full political, cultural and social rights of Ukrainian fellow citizens. He also edited, in cooperation with Henryk Jozewski, the voivode of Volhynia and an opponent of the Polonization policy, the magazine *Wolyn’*

open to all wishing authors (Szypowska, 2001, pp. 75-81; Siryk, 2002, pp. 18-21).

Both writers not only continued their inter-war activities, but also intensified them considerably during their exile wanderings. Giedroyc in his letter to Ivan Kedryn-Rudnytsky mentions that being the head of publishing houses and military magazines in the Propaganda and Culture Department of the 2nd Corps in 1944, he let the publication of a "Prayer Book" in Ukrainian for Greek Catholic soldiers (Giedroyc 2004: 797). Together with Herling-Grudziński, they edited the first issue of *Kultura* in Rome, where they created a Ukrainian section which became one of the editor's main designs. In his letter to Bohdan Osadczyk Giedroyc claimed that "the most effective method [of normalizing Polish-Ukrainian relations] is to look after both moral and cultural matters in the first place" (Giedroyc, 2004, pp. 367). Here his paths crossed with Lobodowski, in whom he found undoubtedly the best connoisseur and translator of Ukrainian literature. In London's *Wiadomosci*, the poet and essayist at the same time gave a major outlet to his temperament. He fought for the recognition of the Ukrainian nation, he argued that it was entitled to the same rights as other nations, and that Poles, guided by both emotional and rational considerations, should maintain the closest possible relations with it. He repeated these important theses in *Kultura* in the quoted essay "Against the Phantom of the Past" (Lobodowski, 1952), but basically in the Parisian monthly (since early 1950s until his death in the late 1980s). He was primarily concerned with the popularization of Ukrainian literature as its translator, historian, critic and interpreter.

However, before Giedroyc entrusted Lobodowski with the duties of guiding Polish readers around areas of Ukrainian culture, he gave the floor to the Ukrainians themselves. The editor wanted, first, for Ukrainian culture and literature to be discussed by its creators themselves. Thanks to this, he pursued two goals – he received the best experts on Ukrainian literature, and at the same time he broke down Polish-Ukrainian barriers, aversions, prejudices, which were very strong also in emigration. And, from the very moment of founding *Kultura*, he was looking for writers who would agree to publish the "Ukrainian Chronicle" in his monthly, which may slightly weaken the thesis about the initial Polish-centric attitude of the monthly. The editor's correspondence with distinguished essayist Jerzy Stempovsky, who encouraged writers (Yuri Klen (pseudonym Oswald Burkhardt), Leonid Mosendz and Jewhen MaLaniuk), acquaintances and other people very close to *Kultura*, clearly demonstrates this. He also managed to get Yuri Shevelov (Szerekh), an outstanding Ukrainian linguist in emigration, later the editor of the *Suczastnist* monthly. A few months after the publication of the first issue of the Parisian monthly, in the summer of 1948, Mosendz (under the pseudonym of Leonid Korzon) published an essay "Ukrainian Neoclassicists-

Parnassians” where he presented the profiles and poetry of five Kyiv classics: Mykola Zerow, Pavlo Fylypowycz, Mykhailo Draj-Chmary, Maksym Rylski and Yuriy Klen (Korzon, 1948). Of the five, the first three died in Stalinist labor camps, Rylskiy repented, Klen found himself in exile and died of exhaustion shortly after the war, thus prematurely sharing the fate of the first three. Much more important was Jewhen Malaniuk’s essay “Narod wedrowce” (Kardosz, 1949, pp. 18–26), published a year later also under a pseudonym (Julian Kardosz), which was intended to be a panorama of the cultural life of the Ukrainian emigration. One should also recall Yuri Sherekh’s excellent essay on the younger generation “The Fourth Kharkiv” (Szerekh, 1951, pp. 6–12). In those earliest years of presenting Ukrainian literature, essays and narratives were accompanied by publications of poems by poets, emigrants, but also authors doomed to non-existence in Soviet Ukraine. These were lyrics by Zerow and Fylypowycz, excerpts from Klen’s poem “Ukraine”, poems and excerpts from Malaniuk’s notebook.

The essential significance of Mosendz (Korzon) publication was perfectly captured by Grabovych, quoted at the beginning, who emphasized that reading the essay for the Polish reader “must have been surprisingly strong, at least calculated to change paradigms” (Grabovych, 2005, pp. 44). In the opinion of the researcher, Ukrainian literature for the first time “was presented in a way which, implicitly, was reserved exclusively for Polish (or other equally ‘worthy’) literature, that is, not only in the spirit of martyrdom, but in the spirit of ‘high’, aesthetically sublime literature [...] which was persecuted and destroyed by ruthless ‘Asian despotism’ (Grabovych, 2005, pp. 44). And in this we can see an important stage in the process of reevaluation of Ukrainianness by *Kultura*, which, however, was done by a Ukrainian writer. But I would like to attribute Grabovych’ thesis with fundamental meaning, because it perfectly characterizes Lobodowski critical attitude as a reader and popularizer of the literature of our neighbors across Zakhidnyy Buh River. And it certainly does not result from his ‘submission’ to the opinions of Mosendz about the high artistic value of Ukrainian poetry of Mosendz, whose study he translated. Based on reading Lobodowski other essays, it can be said that he looked at Ukrainian literature, especially poetry, almost exclusively through the prism of its artistic values. He applied the same criteria as in the case of Polish and general literature. The consequence, perhaps negative, of such an attitude is a kind of ‘revision’ of the greatness of Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine’s most appreciated poet. Todos Osmaczko saw in the creator of the Haidamaks “the first poet of humanity” (Lobodowski, 1964, pp. 202), which for the Polish essayist proved “to what extremes blind, uncritical admiration can lead” (Lobodowski, 1964, pp. 202). Hamalija, appreciated the ‘historical role’ of Shevchenko in shaping and strengthening the Ukrainian identity, but he

emphasized that it overshadowed the "artistic values of his works" (Lobodowski, 1964, pp. 206) and concluded that "a work of art must not be measured only by its social usefulness" or national, because it is a passing value" (Lobodowski, 1964, pp. 205). In a similar form, he repeated his thesis in the essay for the 100th anniversary of the birth of Lesia Ukrainka, whom he appreciated for her significant contribution to liberating "the literature of her nation [...] from parochialism, folk ethnographicism and provincialism" (Lobodowski, 1971, pp. 120). On the other hand, he did not see her as an outstanding poet (rather a playwright), as he believed that "the intellectual and cultural influence in literature does not always coincide with the artistic level" (Lobodowski, 1971, pp. 120).

Such a perspective is revealed in all of Lobodowski's essays, which paid close attention to the literary culture of Ukrainian authors, because "in a country like Ukraine, where national life has been systematically and for years destroyed, where deliberate lowering of the intellectual and artistic level is the main point of the implemented program, the importance of literary baggage takes on completely different proportions" (Lobodowski, 1954, p. 39). For the Polish essayist, this testifies to the strength of resistance, to the effective opposition of Ukrainian writers to Russification first, then to Sovietization, but also to cultural degradation.

Mentioned above Malaniuk's essay "Nation wandering" was undoubtedly the most important text on Ukrainian emigration published in the first years of *Kultura's* existence. It is necessary to devote a little more attention to it, because Lobodowski would refer to his findings later. Malaniuk searches for the sources of the weakness of contemporary Ukrainian emigration and its literature in the essay. The poet begins without hesitation with the thesis that 'the Iron Curtain' hung over the Zbrucz line as early as 1921, dividing Europe and dividing Ukrainians. The seemingly trivial remark that the eastern Ukrainians were subjected to a brutal vivisection leads the author to the conclusion that almost physical changes have taken place in them. However, Malaniuk pays more attention to internal changes. Without questioning the level of intelligence of eastern Ukrainians, the poet captures and points out the fundamental differences in national consciousness between them and their compatriots from the western lands. For those from the East, "the relatively few certainties that make up the catechism of the so-called consciousness of every human being [...] is usually a series of theses that still need to be proven" (Kardosz, 1949, p. 19). After this critical diagnosis, Malaniuk puts forward an extremely interesting thesis that the Ukrainians are a 'cordocentric' nation (Kardosz, 1949, p. 21) and the Soviets, despite various successes in the field of 'forging' of the Ukrainian soul, failed to destroy the 'Ukrainian heart' (Kardosz, 1949, p. 21). In 1948, this very heart became the greatest treasure for emigration, two waves of which slowly began to

merge. The first was created by writers who left Ukraine after 1921, and the second by refugees from Ukrainian lands completely controlled by the Soviet Union. The largest part of them were prisoners and POWs left in the West. Malaniuk's assessment of the artistic and scientific achievements of the diaspora was extremely critical, the poet appreciated primarily the fine arts, with Oleksandr Archypenko from the first wave at the forefront. He did not notice interesting, important and new phenomena in literature and music. But Malaniuk did not stop at evaluation, he tried to indicate the causes of the crisis of Ukrainian émigré literature. In his opinion, the literature of "a nation without a state" (Kardosz, 1949, p. 24) was burdened with too much responsibility, which it was unable to bear. He also emphasized the effects of ruthless sovietization and cruel terror, which led to complete destruction in the eastern lands of the generations of the 1920s and 1930s. The defeat was completed by Nazi crimes, the murder of two outstanding poets: Olena Teliha and Oleh Olzycz.

The cooperation of the Parisian monthly with the first Ukrainian emigrants did not last long, Yuri Klen died first, Leonid Mosendz shared his fate shortly after the publication of the essay in *Kultura*, and Malaniuk left for America and stopped sending essays to Giedroyc. However, in the early years of *Kultura*, he was the most frequently published Ukrainian writer.

However, their place was taken by artists from the milieu of the young emigration, recruited to cooperation thanks to the help of Bohdan Osadczyk. He met the editor at the Congress of Cultural Freedom in West Berlin in 1950. In his memoirs, Osadczyk revealed the backstage of the first meeting with *Kultura* represented by Giedroyc and Józef Czapski. "The conversations with Giedroyc made a breakthrough impression on me. I felt that I had finally found what I was looking for and dreaming about: the path to dialogue and partnership" (Osadczyk, 2001, pp. 159). Giedroyc was primarily interested in contacting the representatives of emigration from Ukraine from across the Zbrucz River, i. e. the so-called 'Easterners' from the Ukrainian Revolutionary-Democratic Party led by the writer Ivan Bahriany. This did not meet with the expected response, because – as Osadczyk regretfully emphasizes – "few people in these circles realized the importance of establishing a dialogue with the Poles. To some extent, they were weighed down by the old Soviet propaganda about the anti-Ukrainian role of 'white Poles'" (Osadczyk 2001: 150). Nevertheless, with his help, Giedroyc managed to get Borys Lewyćke, Lubomyr Ortynski, Iwan Koszeliwiec, and Iwan Lysiak-Rudnyćki to work with him. Thanks to this, Ukrainian literature has found its place in the pages of *Kultura* for good. Levytkyj and Koszelivets were not only published in a Parisian monthly, they also published books at the Literary Institute headed by the editor. The first of them published "Terror and Revolution" in 1965,

a year later, "The Nationality Policy of the USSR in the Era of Khrushchev", while the second prepared the documents "Ukraine 1956-1968" published in 1969.

The undeniable importance of Ukrainian literature in the early days of *Kultura* is eloquently demonstrated by the number of publications which included texts by Ukrainian writers, as well as Polish essays on the subject. In the first decade, it exceeded eighty items. For comparison, Russian literature in the mid-sixties, after the rise of the dissident movement in the USSR and appearance of the 'third wave' of emigrants in the West – only sixteen, though it managed to take over the role of sovereign later. Later, these relations changed fundamentally, nevertheless, in the first decade of the Parisian monthly, Ukrainian literature, along with Polish, occupied the most space in its pages. Almost all the texts were translated by Lobodowski, with poetry predominating.

The double issue from the summer of 1950, presenting 20th-century Ukrainian poetry, included poems by émigré poets Yuri Klen, Yevhen Malaniuk, Bohdan Krawciw, Ivan Bahriany, Swiatoslaw Hordynski, and also by Pavlo Tyczyna, Mykola Zerow, Maksym Rylskyi, Pavlo Fylypowycz, Olena Teliha. The intention of the translator, who was familiar with this poetry since pre-war times, was to select the "main formal and ideological tendencies of the authors [...] over the last thirty years". The adopted chronological order of authors served this purpose, "according to the years in which they appeared in literature" (Lobodowski, 1950, p. 93). The intention of a full presentation of 20th-century Ukrainian poetry was not fully successful because, as the translator emphasized in the introduction, there were no poems by eminent authors such as Oleh Olżycz, Mykhailo Draj-Chmary, Yuriy Kosach, Leonid Mosendz, Mykola Bazhan. In later years, Parisian monthly also published poems by new emigrants, Swiatoslaw Karawanski, and Vasyl Stus, Hryhor Tiutiunyk, Yuri Szerbak, Vasyl Symonenko, who lived in Ukraine.

Kultura has not limited itself to publishing the works of established poets, it has also noticed young writers. This is evidenced by the names mentioned above. The most spectacular proof of this interest was the presentation of debut poets from the *New Poetry almanac*, later called the "New York Group". They were: Emma Andijewska, Zhenya Wasylkiwska, Bohdan Bojczuk, Bohdan Rubczak, Patrycja Kalyna, Yuri Tarnawky. Lobodowski presented them in *Kultura* as "a young forest in exile".

The essays of Ukrainian emigrants were presented in the Paris monthly by Ivan Koshelivets and Yuriy Lavrinenko. The first of them focused on Polish literature (Koszewanec, 1971, p. 64–74; Koszeliwac, 1984, pp. 136–142), while the second one in "Literature of Borderline Situations" undertook a polemical discussion with Milosz – "The Captive Mind" (Lawrynenko, 1959, pp. 5–17). He was supported in this polemic by Gustaw Herling-Grudzinski, a translator of the

text from Ukrainian, who had already had an ambivalent attitude towards Miłosz famous book. Apart from Lobodowski, who, in addition to translations, published nearly thirty essays, articles and reviews on Ukrainian topics in *Kultura*, few Polish writers were interested in this problem. A beautiful memoir after Malaniuk's death was written by Stempowski (Hostowiec, 1968, pp. 30–132), several important studies were published by Andrzej Vincenz (Vincenz, 1956, 137–143; Vincenz, 1958, pp. 148–151; Vincenz, 1959, pp. 142–147; Vincenz, 1965, pp. 106–122; Vincenz, 1977, 150–153; Vincenz, 1978, pp. 83–92), which were accompanied by regular discussions of Ukrainian books and periodicals. Walerian Rewucki was interested in Polish motifs in the works of Maksym Rylski (Rewucki, 1965, pp. 130–133), Zygmunt Markiewicz briefly reviewed Mykola Zerow's book "Nowe ukraińskie pysmenstwo" (Markiewicz, 1962, pp. 120–121) and the publication of Vladimir Djakow "Taras Shevchenko's Polish Friends" (Markiewicz, 1965, pp. 147–150). The 1970s were much more modest in terms of "Ukrainian" publications for *Kultura*, which, in addition to Lobodowski studies and translations, brought Benedykt Heydenkorn review of the two-volume anthology "Estafeta" edited by Bohdan Stebelski and Wiaczeslaw Dawydenko (Heydenkorn, 1976, pp. 144–146). They gathered the fruits of emigration, works of writers and artists.

Lobodowski translated not only poetry; while in exile, he translated into Polish Iwan Koszeliwc's book "Ukraine 1956–1968" (Paris, 1969), in which, apart from artistic literature (works by Ivan Dziuba, Ivan Dracz, Wasyl Symonenka, Oleksandr Dowżenka), there were documentary texts, descriptions of processes (Ivan Hela, Mychajly Horynia, Mychajly Masiutka, Opanas Zalywachi, SwiatosLaw Karawanski), letters from prisons and labor camps. In Koszeliwiec's book, Lobodowski found the fullest "image of the nation, crushed and quartered so many times, which does not want to give up and still shows an amazing will to fight, with faith in an uneasy victory" (Lobodowski, 1969, pp. 14).

Panoramic essay by Lobodowski "Ukrainian émigré literature", published in one of the spring issues of *Kultura* in 1952 (Lobodowski, 1952) has a crucial meaning for understanding the place and significance of Ukrainian literature in *Kultura*. "Panoramic" does not exhaust the value (and importance) of this essay, it is also important that it contained issues to which the Polish essayist would return many times. He would systematically supplement his reflections on poetry, especially in the two-part essay "Scylle and Charybdy of Ukrainian poetry" (Lobodowski, 1954; Lobodowski, 1954). In it he also recalls the poets of the first emigration, concentrated in Czech, Prague, partly in Warsaw. Lobodowski would also regularly refer to the theme of emigration and the emigrant condition raised in the essay, especially in his reflections on Malaniuk's work. After 1921, the Polish poet looked at Ukrainian literature almost exclusively through the prism of

emigration. The physical emigration to the West was accompanied by the internal emigration of writers who remained in Soviet Ukraine. But at the same time, all the studies are dominated by the same thesis: "Ukrainian emigration literature is moving forward and, despite everything, it creates serious values" (Lobodowski, 1952, pp. 59). You may ask – why "in spite of everything"? The answer is provided by Yuri Klen, cited by Lobodowski: "We find ourselves in uncultured conditions [...], in cramped quarters, often without a corner of our own. [...] We are people without a name and state, without a specific citizenship. And yet we stubbornly stick to our itinerant trail and do not want to deviate from it... And in these difficult living conditions, at the mercy of foreign nations, we continue to create our culture" (Lobodowski, 1952, pp. 59).

Referring to these words, as well as to the title of Malaniuk's essay, Lobodowski emphasizes that "no nation, apart from Poland, has experienced wandering on such a scale and in such dimensions in modern history" (Lobodowski, 1952, pp. 59). The poet notes the lack of centralization of the Ukrainian emigration, which formed in two waves after World War II. He is critical of the attitudes of much of the first wave, who showed no deep interest in artistic literature, concentrating rather on providing readers. The Polish poet decided that all valuable Ukrainian literature was in exile, but lacked the centralisation that could serve as a compass. He meant the lack of a literary magazine which, like the Polish *Wiadomosci* in London or *Kultura* in Paris, would gather all important writers. However, he is in no hurry to blame the creators, seeing the painful consequences for Ukrainians of the previous lack of state institutions. He also emphasises internal quarrels and political divisions in emigrant circles, as well as the difficulties of life in the DP camps. The Polish essayist lists the tragic losses of Ukrainian literature during the war and post-war period, and especially he cannot get over the deaths of two poets – Olena Teliha, whom he admired, and who he probably met in Poland, and Oleg Olzycz. However, the most important reason seems to be the lack of authority that Yuri Klen could have become, but this was prevented by his untimely death.

Lobodowski tries to reconstruct the history of the stratification of the Ukrainian emigration, he points out attempts to organise writers' problems and publishing issues. Such an effort was undertaken by the organization MUR – Mystetskyi Ukrainskij Ruch (Ukrainian art movement), established in 1945. For the literary life in exile, the most important thing was the establishment of a magazine in which writers could publish their works. The effect of the first attempts proved to be ephemeral, but the essayist picks up on such phenomena and initiatives that he thinks have a chance of filling a painful void. From a fairly wide range of literary and academic journals, he chooses above all the Philadelphia-based *Kyiv*, comparing it to the Polish inter-war *Skamander*, where

Swiatoslaw Hordynski (a poet, artist and translator of Lobodowski's poems) and Bogdan Krawczyk were active. The second magazine appreciated by the Polish essayist was the New York-based *Obriji* (Horizons), a magazine of young militant writers, which set itself the goal of following “the line of greatest resistance” (Lobodowski, 1952, pp. 51). He admired their energy and the desire to raise the level of Ukrainian émigré literature, but he also noticed the emphasized need to cross the borders of artistry.

At this point, their searches certainly coincided with the convictions of the Polish poet, who believed that leaving one's own region and entering the world can only be successful if one bravely joins the world-shaking currents of thought, takes up universal human problems in the broadest perspective, and finally – even if there are strong objections – a revision of ‘Ukrainism’, if one can say so, on a geographical and historical scale, definitely exceeding the magic circle of one's own fatherland (Lobodowski, 1952, pp. 59).

Lobodowski cites a fragment of an editorial written by Yuri Sherekh, with an absolutely basic question: what emigration has brought so far and what will it bring, if it manages to successfully return to the Dnieper, to a nation that is not interested in polemics and literary discussions. Aware of the duty of writers to the nation, Lobodowski, himself living poorly on the pavements of Madrid, reverses the question and accuses the nation of having done nothing to save its great writers, Klen and Mosendz, from starvation.

The following part of the essay is the first such comprehensive overview of contemporary Ukrainian poetry in Polish. It can and should be seen as a historical and literary supplement to the selection of poems presented in *Kultura* less than two years earlier. Lobodowski accused Ukrainian émigré poetry of excessive subordination to the tradition of “Kiev neoclassicism”, in the orbit of which even the poets of the younger generation (Yur Slavutych and Leonid Poltavsky) were placed. In the tyranny of classicism, he not only saw a real threat to the development of free verse, but also prophesied, being an experimenter himself, that poetry would almost wither away. In the opinion of the Polish essayist, only Wasył Barko and Ivan Bahriany did not submit to it among the emigre poets. However, Lobodowski notices the timid attempts to look for other traditions, the catastrophic patterns of Malaniuk were continued by Hordynsky and Oleksy Stefanycz. The essayist saw a common feature of all Ukrainian émigré poetry in “longing for the great epic form” (Lobodowski, 1952, pp. 55). Out of many attempts, he appreciated the poem “Ashes of Empires” (1947) by Yuri Klen. “The Volhynia Year” (1948) by Mosendz, written in ottava Rima, was also important. In Oksana Laturyńska, the Polish poet saw the heiress of Lessia Ukrainka, “the most masculine of Ukrainian writers of the time” (Lobodowski, 1952, pp. 55). Until her martyrdom at the hands of the Gestapo, this type of poetry was also

performed by Olena Teliha. Lobodovsky was not limited to established poets; he was a regular reader of Ukrainian magazines, thanks to which he caught the debut of the now highly regarded poetess and artist Emma Andijevska. And he was the first to translate her poems into Polish. The essayist's premonitions were confirmed by the poems from the already mentioned New York almanac *New Poetry*.

Lobodowski wrote much less about Ukrainian émigré prose and drama. He did not hide his weaker orientation in this field. Thus, unlike in the case of poetry, in the essay he focused only on individual prose works. He referred to the previously reviewed "Garden of Gethsemane" (1950) by Bahriany as the most important work in prose of the Ukrainian emigration. He saw in this novel, which he juxtaposed with "Darkness at Noon" (1940) by Arthur Koestler, "a shocking document of a fighting man", but also found, despite "all the overgrowth and swelling of form and content [...] pages and chapters on a high narrative and psychological level" (Lobodowski, 1952, pp. 58). To Bahriany's work he added "Khmelnysky's Rubikon" (1943) created during the war by Yuri Kosach, nephew of Lessia Ukrainka. Lobodowski did not know the novel, but he noticed the struggle of Ukrainian prose writers "to get out of the circle of ethnographic, parochial and social genres, for the effort of nationwide synthesis, for universal issues" (Lobodowski, 1952, pp. 57).

Lobodowski returned to the importance of classicism in the aforementioned essay "Scylla and Charybdis of Ukrainian poetry". The author intended it to be a study showing the main currents of lyric poetry, also proving the individual understanding of the process of its development. Nevertheless, the essayist began his reflections with Mykola Zerow's declaration that classicism is the path of Ukraine. And he made a great explication of this thesis, emphasizing both the artistic and non-artistic significance of classicism for Zerow. The Polish author says that "the compact, economical form of the sonnet was for him the entire national and political program" (Lobodowski, 1954, pp. 33). And he explains it as expressively as convincingly. In his understanding, "classical order" is contrasted with 'steppe anarchy', organised architecture with the melting Bolshevik 'Malorussian land', "the traditions of ancient artistry with the collective utility of 'social order'". (Lobodowski, 1954, pp. 37). Thus, the essayist saw the 'self-defense' senses of classicism, a counterbalance to both the native negative tradition and the pressures of the Soviet concept of art and literature, which have little in common with art and literature. According to Lobodowski, this current of poetry meant not so much a submission to the influence of literary fashions, but much more broadly – a logical consequence of the development of "tendencies clearly marked throughout Ukrainian history" (Lobodowski, 1954, pp. 43). Unfortunately, the poet did not develop this extremely intriguing reflection. An

undoubted achievement of the essayist was the emphasis on the independence of Ukrainian poetry, its inclusion in the bloodstream of European culture.

The essay in question, which certainly deserves a study of its own, consists of excellent 'portrait sketches' of the most important Ukrainian poets, complete with their poems (usually sonnets) translated by the author of the essay. Lobodowski inscribes these portraits, so to speak, into the historical-literary process of the development of poetry. He begins with the Kyiv classics, from Zerow, to the poetry of Rylski, through the poems of Tyczyna (the most outstanding, "from a strictly artistic point of view" (Lobodowski, 1954, pp. 39) Ukrainian poet), through Malaniuk to the works of Mykhailo Orest, Zerow's younger brother, "the most consistent a continuator of Kyiv's 'neoclassicism' (Lobodowski, 1954, pp. 29). However, the essayist does not stop at drawing this line of development, in the poems of Wasyl Barka, the continuator of Bazan's poetry, he finds 'Ukrainian Baroque', which, as he argues, "not only does not contradict the poetry of the Kyiv 'neoclassicism', but also organically complements it" (Lobodowski, 1954, pp. 36). Thus, Lobodowski beautifully concludes the development of Ukrainian poetry in the first half of the twentieth century. One might ask, why this classicism, why the baroque? Why such 'ordering' efforts in a poet who was not a supporter of 'classification' in principle. Well, with this large essay, Lobodowski, in a way, joined the émigré dispute over the 'organic national style' (Lobodowski, 1954, pp. 45) of Ukrainian poetry, in which Yuri Szerekh and Vladimir Derzhavin took part, the former as a representative of 'national organics', and the latter as "Europeanists" (Lobodowski, 1954, pp. 33). Emphasizing the classicism and baroque character of the poems of Ukrainian poets, Lobodowski wanted to attract attention to their universalism. He not only proved its importance, but also postulated that "one should be able to find the right relationship between national and universal issues, cultivating those variants of the national style that suit each individual best, looking for connections with the traditions of Western European writing" (Lobodowski, 1954, pp. 43–44). Thus, he in fact indicated a compromise solution to the dispute, at the same time realizing that "condemning oneself to double emigration – forced from one's own homeland, voluntary from the country of exile, is equivalent to a death sentence" (Lobodowski, 1954, pp. 43–44).

Five years later, Lobodowski could welcome the poets from the "New York group" with satisfaction and joy. He noticed generational similarities between them, and young Polish poets gathered around the London magazine *Kontynenty*, but he also emphasized the rapprochement of Ukrainian thirty-year-olds with contemporary Western trends. Again, he advises keeping the right distance, sticking to the 'golden mean': respect for the best traditions of Ukrainian poetry should be accompanied by its 'universal study' (Lobodowski, 1960, pp. 54). In

this attitude, he saw a chance for young writers to protect themselves from the danger of being locked in a backwater, but also to break away from the subsoil. The essayist emphasized the ambitious promises of taking over the initiative in émigré literature and giving it a completely different character. "For the first time in the history of Ukrainian literature", young writers looked at poetry only as art, they wanted to "shed off the duty of serving the nation", which in the conditions of emigration, as the Polish translator emphasized, "meant a real revolution" (Lobodowski, 1960, pp. 50). Appreciating their achievements, he also pointed out shortcomings. Andijewska's "extraordinary poetic individuality" (Lobodowski, 1960, pp. 55), whom he promised a beautiful future, was slightly accused of excessive metaphors resulting from unbridled imagination. He appreciated the language culture of Wasylykivska but pointed out moments of 'cheesy' in her poems. Despite such critical remarks, he could happily write that "a young forest has grown up before our eyes in exile, giving the lie to all those who claim that emigration literature is doomed and will not survive beyond the lifetime of one or two generations" (Lobodowski, 1960, pp. 57).

After this essay, Lobodowski published several more studies, including a beautiful and important memoir "After Malaniuk's Death" (Lobodowski, 1968, pp. 116-126). But basically, reflections on the place of Ukrainian emigration literature in *Kultura*, and especially in Lobodowski's works, can be closed with this optimistic observation. The Polish poet began by proving that writing in the Ukrainian diaspora was developing in spite of everything. He constantly monitored this development and introduced it to the Polish reader, so that after a dozen or so years he could state that a new generation open to the world and to artistic achievements had been born. In practically all his essays, Lobodovsky defended the 'dignity' of Ukrainian literature, and in an essay on the "New York Group" he additionally drew attention to its achievement of independence, its liberation from the shackles of national duty and fidelity to art. At the end of his life, at the end of his last 'Ukrainian' essay, Lobodowski wrote: "Happy are those writers who can [...] realize that they have fully used their abilities and deserved immortality" (Lobodowski, 1987, pp. 81). With these words, he summed up the work of Ulas Samchuk. One can also implicitly hear in them a timid request to notice the meaning of his own work. He probably wouldn't be entirely happy with the highest essay grade. But they prove his right calling.

The Conclusion. Jerzy Giedroyc, editor of the monthly magazine, put emphasis on the need of normalization of Polish-Ukrainian relations. In his opinion, focusing on the moral and cultural issues gave the best results in the reformulating of Polish thinking about Ukraine and overcoming animosity between our nations. The author of most texts on Ukrainian literature was Joseph Lobodowski, Polish poet in exile, excellent translator of the Ukrainian language,

a great expert and admirer of Ukrainian culture. His contribution to the evaluating of the Ukrainian culture, to the raising of awareness of the importance of Ukrainian literature is as huge as underrated.

He created a stable foundation for Polish-Ukrainian mutual understanding, to unite the two peoples by ‘the rainbow of a new union’. And he contributes in no small way to this great work.

References

Baczkowski, W. (1952). *Sprawa ukraińska* [Ukrainian case]. *Pro domu sua*, „Kultura”, 7–8 (57–58), p. 64–85. [in Polish]

Berdychowska, B. (2004). *Giedroyc i Ukraińcy* [Giedroyc and the Ukrainians]. Introduction to J. Giedroyc, *Emigracja ukraińska, Listy 1950–1982* [Ukrainian Emigration, Letters 1950–1982], wybrała, wstępem i przypisami opatrzyla B. Berdychowska, listy autorów ukraińskich przełożyła O. Hnatiuk, Warszawa. [ed. B. Berdychowska, letters of Ukrainian authors translated by O. Hnatiuk] [in Polish]

Berdychowska, B. (2004), *Ukraiński krag “Kultury”* [Ukrainian circle of “Kultura”], *Wież*, 8–9, p. 104–114. [in Polish]

Giedroyc, J. (1994). *Autobiografia na cztery rece* [Four Hands Autobiography] oprac. i posłowiem opatrzyl K. Pomian [ed. and gave an afterword K. Pomian]. Warszawa. [in Polish]

Giedroyc, J. (2004). *Emigracja ukraińska, Listy 1950–1982* [Ukrainian Emigration, Letters 1950–1982], wybrała, wstępem i przypisami opatrzyla B. Berdychowska, listy autorow ukraińskich przełożyła O. Hnatiuk, Warszawa. [ed. B. Berdychowska, letters of Ukrainian authors translated by O. Hnatiuk]. [in Polish]

Grabovych, H. (2005). *Mezhi dopustymoho: natsionalna pereotsinka v “Kulturi” ta pytannya polsko-ukrayinskykh zvyazkiv* [Limits of what is permissible: national reassessment in “Kultura” and the issue of Polish-Ukrainian relations]. *Krytyka*, 2. [in Ukrainian]

Heydenkorn, B. (1976). *Reprezentacyjna publikacja* [A representative publication]. *Kultura*, 10, p. 144–146. [in Polish]

Hnatiuk, O. (1997/1998). *Pozorna obecność. O recepcji literatury ukraińskiej w Polsce w ostatnim półwieczu* [Apparent presence. On the reception of Ukrainian literature in Poland in the last half-century]. *Pamiętnik Słowiański*. XLVII/XLVIII, p. 54–56. [in Polish]

Hostowiec, P. (1968). *Wspomnienie o przyjacielu* [A memory of a friend]. *Kultura*, 4, p. 130–132. [in Polish]

Kardosz, J. [J. Malaniuk]. (1949). *Narod w wedrowce* [A nation in a migration]. *Kultura*, 15, p. 18–26. [in Polish]

Korniejenko, A. (1997). *Ukraiński modernizm. Proba periodyzacji procesu historycznoliterackiego* [Ukrainian modernism. An attempt to periodize the historical-literary process]. Kraków. [in Polish]

Korzon, L. [L. Mosendz]. (1948). Ukraińscy neoklasyści-parnasiści [Ukrainian neoclassicals-Parnassians]. Tłum. J. Lobodowski [trans. J. Lobodowski]. *Kultura*, 7, p. 37–54. [in Polish]

Koszeliwec, I. (1971). Pieciolatki literatury ukraińskiej [Five-year plans of Ukrainian literature]. Tłum. J. Lobodowski [trans. J. Lobodowski]. *Kultura*, 9, p. 64–74. [in Polish]

Koszeliwec, I. (1984). Tragedia Mykoly Bazana [The tragedy of Mykola Bazan]. Tłum. B.O. [Trans. B. O]. *Kultura*, 8, p. 136–142. [in Polish]

Lawrynenko, J. (1959). Literatura sytuacji pogranicznych [Literature of borderline situations]. Tłum. G. Herling-Grudzinski [Trans. G. Herling-Grudzinski]. *Kultura*, 3, p. 5–17. [in Polish]

Lobodowski, J. (1950). Współczesni poeci ukraińscy [Contemporary Ukrainian poets]. *Kultura*, 7–8, p. 93–111. [in Polish]

Lobodowski, J. (1951). *Ogrody Getsemanski* [Gethsemane Garden]. *Kultura*, 1, p. 135–143. [in Polish]

Lobodowski, J. (1952a). Przeciw upiorom przeszłości [Against the ghosts of the past]. *Kultura*, 2–3, p. 14–67. [in Polish]

Lobodowski, J. (1952b). Ukraińska literatura emigracyjna [Ukrainian emigre literature]. *Kultura*, 4, p. 46–60. [in Polish]

Lobodowski, J. (1954a). *Od Autora – Złota hramota* [From the author – The Golden Hramota]. Paris. [in Polish]

Lobodowski, J. (1954b). Scylle i Charybdis ukraińskiej poezji [Scylla and Charybdis of Ukrainian poetry]. *Kultura*, 5, p. 35–50. [in Polish]

Lobodowski, J. (1954c). Scylle i Charybdis ukraińskiej poezji (dokonczenie) [Scylla and Charybdis of Ukrainian poetry – (completion)]. *Kultura*, 6, p. 29–47. [in Polish]

Lobodowski, J. (1959). Ostatnia wiosna [The Last Spring]. *Kultura*, 7–8, p. 41–49. [in Polish]

Lobodowski, J. (1960). Młody las na obczyźnie [Young Forest in exile]. *Kultura*, 10, p. 4–57. [in Polish]

Lobodowski, J. (1964). *Taras Szewczenko 1814–1861* [Taras Shevchenko 1814–1861]. *Kultura*, 7–8, p. 201–207. [in Polish]

Lobodowski, J. (1968). *Po śmierci Malaniuka* [After Malaniuk's death]. *Kultura*, 10, p. 11–126. [in Polish]

Lobodowski, J. (1969). *Od tłumacza* [From the translator]. I. Koszeliwec, *Ukraina 1956–1968*, Paris. [in Polish]

Lobodowski, J. (1971). *W stulecie Lesi Ukrainki* [On the centenary of Lesia Ukrainka]. *Kultura*, 6, p. 114–122. [in Polish]

Lobodowski, J. (1987). *60-lecie twórczości Ulasa Samczuka* [60th anniversary of Ulas Samchuk's work]. *Kultura*, 6, p. 79–81. [in Polish]

Markiewicz, Z. (1962). *Początki literatury ukraińskiej* [The beginnings of Ukrainian literature]. *Kultura*, 5, p. 120–121. [in Polish]

Markiewicz, Z. (1965). *Polscy przyjaciele Tarasa Szewczenki* [Polish friends of Taras Shevchenko]. *Kultura*, 11, p. 147–150. [in Polish]

Osadczuk, B. (2001). *Rola Jerzego Giedroycia w stosunkach polsko-ukraińskich* [The role of Jerzy Giedroyc in Polish-Ukrainian relations] – *Jerzy Giedroyc. Redaktor*.

Polityk. Człowiek [Jerzy Giedroyc. Editor. Politician. Man]. Zebral, do druku przyg. i wstępem poprzedził K. Pomian [ed. K. Pomian]. Lublin. [in Polish]

Rewucki, M. (1965). *Motywy polskie w twórczości M[aksyma] Rylskiego* [Polish motifs in the works of Maksym Rylski]. *Kultura*, 9, p. 130–133. [in Polish]

Siryk, L. (2002). *Naznaczony Ukraina. O twórczości Józefa Lobodowskiego* [Marked by Ukraine. About the work of Joseph Lobodowski]. Lublin. [in Polish]

Sojak-Masztalerz, H. (2004). *Rusini czy Ukraińcy? Językowy obraz nacji ukraińskiej w prasie polskiej (1918–1939)* [Ruthenians or Ukrainians? The linguistic image of the Ukrainian nation in the Polish press (1918–1939)]. Wrocław. [in Polish]

Szerech, J. (1951). *Młodzież czwartego Charkowa* [Youth of the fourth Kharkov]. Tłum. J. Lobodowski [Trans. J. Lobodowski]. [in Polish]

Sydorenko, N. (2012). *Yuzef Lobodovs'kyi ta ukraïns'kie mihratsiyni perekhrestya* [Joseph Lobodovsky and Ukrainian emigration crossroads] In : *Miedzy literatura a polityka. O Jozefie Lobodowskim* [Between literature and politics. About Joseph Lobodowski]. Pod red. L. Siryk i E. Los [ed. L. Siryk and E. Los]. Lublin, s. 133–144. [in Ukrainian]

Szypowska, I. (2001). *Lobodowski. Od "Atamana Łobody" do "Seniora Lobo"* [Lobodowski. From "Ataman Loboda" to "Senior Lobo"]. Warszawa. [in Polish]

Vincenz, A. (1956). *Lwow oczami Ukraińców* [Lviv through the eyes of Ukrainians]. *Kultura*, 9, p. 137–143. [in Polish]

Vincenz, A. (1958). *Rus Zakarpacka* [Carpathian Ruthenia]. *Kultura*, 4, p. 148–151. [in Polish]

Vincenz, A. (1959). *Aktualność Szeptyckiego* [Sheptytsky's topicality]. *Kultura*, 12, p. 142–147. [in Polish]

Vincenz, A. (1965). *Nowa literatura na Ukrainie* [New literature in Ukraine]. *Kultura*, 5, p. 106–122. [in Polish]

Vincenz, A. (1977). *Ukraiński Wolny Uniwersytet* [Ukrainian Free University]. *Kultura*, 1, p. 150–153. [in Polish]

Vincenz, A. (1978). *Dmytro Czyzewski* [Dmytro Czyzewski]. *Kultura*, 5, p. 83–92. [in Polish]

Voznyuk, O. (2012). *Kulturno-polityczny dyskurs pro Ukraiynu Yuzefa Lobodovskoho na materialu misyachnyka "Kultura"* [Cultural and political discourse about Ukraine by Jozef Lobodovsky based on the material of the monthly "Kultura"]. In : *Miedzy literatura a polityka*. [in Polish]

The article was received 12/09/2022.

Article recommended for publishing 10/02/2023.