

O. Kharlan,
doctor of philological sciences,
Berdiansk State
Pedagogical University

UKRAINIAN AND POLISH LITERATURE OF INTERWAR TWENTIETH: CATASTROPHIC LANDSCAPES

Ukrainian and Polish literature during the period between two world wars due to the historical situation developed ambiguously. Two literatures, which survived after First World War (which was the awful test and occasion for both countries) blended into circumstances which formed. Thus, Poland gained independence and Ukraine went through numerous battles and rebellions, remained divided and pseudo-independent in frames of USSR. It is impossible, surely, to make a conclusion about more or less state activity of literature process, but certainly this state had its influence on literature, determining its functioning.

At first we have to determine using of definition "interwar literature". In Ukrainian literary scholarship, unlike the Polish one, in which it gets used on the terminological level [look: 15; 20], is referred to from time to time. In 20th literary critics understood that art of the beginning of 20th century became the separate period and before it there are developing new, yet not outlined and comprehended streams; there are coming people with their points of view; different social processes are becoming being the object of cognition. The afterwar Europe received on its territory some camps: winners and losers, besides, transformed into USSR The Russian Empire with its interests and aggressive foreign policy's direction. It is clear that political situation was determining the specific literature process also. Thus, French scientist A. Tiboode considered to be the most important generational factor. That's why as the headlines for each part of his work ("History of French Literature. From French literature till 1930th years") he takes the date of each new generation: 1789, 1820, 1850, 1885, 1914. As the main reasons of appearance of newest generation the author names the democratization of social life, reform of school education, (shortening of lessons of classic languages, break with traditionalism in school curriculum, advantage of exact sciences over humanitarian), development of sport and interest of numerous representatives of all society's layers in this aspect of life, progress of techniques and [19, 468].

Peculiar circumstances imposed imprint on the development of German literature: defeat in First World War, cardinal social changes (revolution, falling of Monarchy, establishment of republic), mechanization of everyday life.

Besides, coming to power of the National Socialists in 1933, became the border of state's life, and, consequently, the artistic life. Separating individual links literature of the interwar period, German literary critics use the names "golden twenties" and "thirties black", so the line between spending relatively liberal and totalitarian period [16].

Determining as the separate link the literature of interwar period, German literature scholars use the term "golden twentieth" and "black thirtieth", making the edge between the liberal and totalitarianism periods [16].

Their own peculiarities (in bordering of literature epoch) have Italian, Spain, Danish literature studies. In general, determining the period between two world wars, they do not

lose the national specific. Thus, the coming of Mussolini in Italy gives the foundation to consider the period 1922–1945 to be the coherent whole. Political events which took place in Spain determine the chronological frames of 1918–1939, because this country did not participate in the world war; proclamation of republic in 1931, citizen war of 1936–1939 resulted in death and emigration of number of writers. The victory of general Franco (1939) became the checking point for the new epoch of historical-literature process: development in conditions of dictatorship from on the one hand and emigration on the other hand. Literature of Denmark, which has been relatively stable, has not felt such a strong impact of the First World War, but of course, it was observed here [14, 101]. “With the explosion of World War I it was radically changed the situation in the Danish literature. However, the war was passed over the territory of Denmark, which remained neutral country, but the effect on her, though not directly. In the case of total disaster in Europe it was necessary reconsider all ethical and aesthetic concepts again”.

Countries of Central and Eastern Europe have lived through the tragedy of the First World War in the worst way, but the consequences of it were the most radical also, because the on the map of this part of the continent instead of Empires there appeared new states, and literature of each of them had its own specific. we can't agree completely with the opinion of A. Vontrovskoho, who considers that two factors made the influence on the character of literary creation of the region: “the decline of modernist art with its decadence and isolation from social life and the creation of independent states, which allowed writers to create without limits from occupation censorship (Austro-Hungarian, German and Russian). Hence – the bold experiments of the 1920s, the development of futurism, neo-classicism, surrealism, etc.” [1, 222].

Following S. Pavlichko we consider that “modernism, is the usual term for literature of the period between the two world wars” [5, 17], so the decline of the language can't take place. Talking about the censorship within the newly formed states, we have to remember that most of them came out of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, where the pressure of the censors were not as strong as in Russia, and there they were, especially in the 30's, went to the open persecution, and physical destruction of artists.

Approaches to problem of division into periods of Ukrainian and Polish literature were often determined by ideological factors. Thus, in spirit of vulgar Marxism it is given the division into periods in the article of J. Z. Jakubovsky [13], there are given names of literature periods which correlates with accepted in USSR terminology: “Literature of first imperialistic period, period of naturalism and Young Poland”, “Literature of interwar years (1918–1939) – second imperialistic period”, and in “History of Ukrainian Literature: in 2 volumes” (1959): “Literature of period of October revolution and civil war (1917–1920)”, “Literature of period of rebuilding of national household and social industrialization of the state (1921–1929)”, “Literature of period of prewar Five-year plans (1930–1941)” [3]. Their points of view on the separation of literature period of interwar twentieth were represented by G. Markevich, [18], T. Bureck [11], E. Baltsezh [10] etc. Thus, T. Bureck as the counting point marked 1905, considering that First world war was the result of social processes which had been beginning at that time; G. Markevich in work “Przekroje I zblizenia” (1967) expresses the idea that the basis argument of determining of period of interwar twentieth

are the historical circumstances and generational principle, and E. Baltsezhan pointed on the exclusivity of era: "Polish interwar twentieth realized its own specific. Or it will be better to say: it has created the myth about its specific" [10, 265].

Idea about the separation of period interwar of interwar twentieth is fixed in "Ukrainian literature of 20th century" [2], but it is limited by the chronological approach: these are 10–30th years. Using of marked above term is possible to be argued, firstly, by the social-historical conditions, which separate this period, cause especially then Ukraine had unrealized opportunity to solve question of its independence and during these two decades almost all ethnic subordinated to Moscow; entering of Ukrainian lands (except of USSR) to different countries (Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania) gave opportunity to artists to be included into the international literature, provided renovation and determining as the separate one. Secondly, by historical literature factors, cause as I. Dziuba states, "during the end of first – beginning of second decade of 20th century in Ukrainian literature takes place the changing of literature generations. Withdrawal from life of M. Kotsyubynskyi, Lesya Ukrainkam, Ivan Franko, emigration of A. Oles, C. Cherkasenko, M. Shapovalov, V. Vynnychenka M. Voronoy, W. Samiilenko (last soon returned) shot of G. Chuprynky (1921) marked the end of an early stage of Ukrainian modernism with its powerful national-cultural myths' creation, with spiritual utopia of harmonious individual, national and social life" [2, 21]. Thus the new generation appears, with moral burden of victories and defeats for national independence, with understanding of Ukraine's way in world's history, independent in their ideas, with diverse ideas about development of Ukrainian literature, when, according to S. Pavlichko, literature "gained wider, than earlier, auditorium. The educational level of this auditorium increased. For the first time in literature there worked a number of writers and intellectuals. For the first time Ukrainian scientists wer etalking from chairs of national universities. For the first time separate art directions, groups and schools were roughly differentiated" [5, 170]. That's why it is possible to speak that new phenomenon in historical life, culture, politics, everyday life determine 1918–1939 years as the separate period in development of writings, which course was interrupted by the beginning of the World War II.

At the same time during this period we have to determine semi-periods which express peculiarities of historical and social-cultural life. Currently in Polish literature studies there are separated such semi-periods: 1918–1932 (in the context of prose there is the division on two parts more: 1918–1926 and 1926–1932) and 1932–1939 years [17], and in Ukrainian, in general, while separating 20th and 30th years [2], sometimes scientists make specification. Thus, Yu. Lavrinenko in famous antilogy speaks about 1917–1933 years, associating this time with symbolic name "Shooteed Renaissance", and the period after 1933 year when "modern fool with some killing consistency, with infallibility of some anti-cultural instinct firstly threw away everything yce artistically best and powerful, leaving for themselves trash and weakness" [6, 12]. Obviously it will be more logical to separate in this semiperiod two periods more (asin Polish prose): 1917–1927 (before the suppression of literature discussion) and 1927–1933 years, after that Ukrainian writings finally separated in two directions: under the USSR and emigrational. S. Pavlichko, characterized these two conditional discourses: Kyiv–Kharkiv and Lviv–Prague. She said: "The second in political sense was the answer and reaction on the first one. Though the Western Ukraine had the free

exit to Europe and certain political freedom, her culture became the victim of those events, which were happening on the East" [5, 171]. It is necessary to remember that discourse of Lviv was also the discourse of Warsaw. Ukrainian and Polish literature had been functioned in one space being close due to the state belonging, but living out through the division caused by the short-sighted policy of Polish government to Ukrainians. It is interesting that number of scientist from both sides had the experience of the World War I in common trenches (Yu. Vittlin and O. Turyanskyu), lived out events of Bolshevik Revolution on the "Foreign" territory, as, for, example, S. I. Vitkevich, which had been certain period in Kyiv orgained knowledge and experience in Polish educational establishments, as Yu. Lipa, who had finished medical of Poznan university (1929) and for some time has been working as the assistant at medical chair of Warsaw university.

Thus, we can speak about almost synchronously of periods of Ukrainian and Polish literatures of interwar twentieth, but their content is a little bit different. While the Polish prose had the opportunity to develop in frames of individual freedom, free choice of topics and styles, independent critics, active familiarization with heritage of world art, at the same time Ukrainian prose was living out through (especially after 1933) in the under-USSR Ukraine, living out through the general unification, leveling of creative specific and transforming into the "only one rightly" social-realistic railway. That literature, which existed in Western Ukraine and in emigration, could not replacing all the layer of physically and moral destroyed authors. "In 1930 year there had been publishing 259 Ukrainian writers. After 1938 only 36 of them had been publishing. We asked: "Where and why have disappeared 223 writers from Ukrainian literature?" – asked in telegram, sent from New-York (20.12.1954). Representatives of Union of Ukrainian writers "Word" participants of II All-USSR meeting in Moscow, were giving such explanation: "Shot 17, made suicide 8, arrested, sent to camps or taken away from literature with the help of other police methods (among them could be shot and dead in concentration camps – 175, disappeared –16, died on natural reasons – 7" [6, 12–13]. That's why the common thought is about hard suppression of literature in Ukraine, result of this was the lose of Ukrainian prose of their best representatives, which did not realize their destination. When in Ukraine (on ruins of social and cultural life) in 30th the pseudo-happy voices social-realistic fulfillment were sounded, in Poland (exactly at that time) were heard loud apocalyptic warnings about the coming catastrophe. We have to poin tout that catastrophic directions characterized all the literature of interwar twentieth, because under the "influence of scientific discoveries, new philosophical hypothesis, and surely, modern's life itself, person consequently lost confidence in values of previous era, sceptis became the term of time, cognition considered to be as the subjective process, and its results were considered to be relative" [5, 17].

It is known that the most expressive spirit of era was revealed in compex of ideas and notions, in which feeling were conceptualized, these feelings were about early unknown strong powers which subordinated the person's life. Person is connected with their help with general space process, person is involved into unbelievable catastrophes. The unknown becomes of great importance for the person, its sphere is limitless, such as knowledge which is always not full, light and fictive by essence. This knowledge only satisfies the utilitarian aim. Life does not reveal the being it just covers it and gives mark about deep

mysteries. Philosophers, writers, artists which proclaimed pessimistic-catastrophic thoughts in the middle of XIX century, on that time were out of attention of social conscious, which was under progressive ideas of positivism, natural optimism and social reformation. The fate of A. Schopenhauer is very indicative, which became the lord of thought only after his death in 70th years of XIX century.

Ukrainian and Polish literature, functioning in the context of worlds cultural tendencies, were developing accordingly to world wide demands of this era, its art and theoretical rhetoric. O. Shengler said that each of great cultures is characterized by the mysterious language of world's feeling, that it is clear only for that, which soul belongs to this culture [9, 340]; P. Sorokin, analyzing the term "great culture" considered that during the megacycles it is composed three special type of culture: 1) in Medieval age the reformed the "ideational", based on the principle of over sensuality and over cleverness of God as the unique real value"; 2) in XIII–XIV centuries – "idealistic", its main principle "was partly over sensor and religious and partly real and material"; 3) modern type of culture (its appearance Sorokin deals with period before the XVI century.) – "sensual, its basis principle is "Material and utilitarian. The philosopher underlined that exactly the changes of different types of culture are the most radical, tectonic changing in history and are the main factors of social dynamics: changes of economical formations or political systems. "For each "great culture", – he says, – there is the typical especial type of mentality, which corresponds to its value principle". Each type of mentality is the complex (or even system) of notions about fundamental phenomena of being (conditions of existing and mechanisms of functioning of universe, essence of human individual, ontological principles of interactions of human and world" [7, 429–432]. It is clear that type of mentality that is in the basis of culture, bears the integrated character – it composed on the crossroad of subcultures, which exist in society. Thus, V. Tyupa separates four types of mentality (modules of conscious): genitive conscious (according to S. Averitsev "pre-reflective traditionalism"), authoritarian conscious ("reflective traditionalism"), separated "I-conscious" and convergent "You-conscious", which consequently ruled in culture megacycles since ancient till our days [8]. In Ukrainian and Polish prose and poetry immanent personalities which were used for circumstances of those times, had found their revealing. In case of Polish literature we have to underline that it was searched as the part of great modern's continent, but Ukrainian one had just some observations. In our days the idea of "non-modern" Ukrainian literature are already in the past (this though was spread by the USSR literature studies). AS the proof of the finding of place of Ukrainian literature on the aesthetical map could be marked works of: S. Pavlichko, T. Gundorova, M. Ilnitskyi, Ya. Polishuk, M. Moklitsa, Yu. Kovaliv etc However as S. Pavlichko stated, "search of modern was the immanent process, the foundation of all the literature movement, but it did not succeed (not in sense of creation of certain masterpieces, but in sense of appreciating b the whole art culture as the leading to modern, legitimization of art styles and creations of modernism" [5, 347].

Talking about Polish literature, researcher L. Yevstahevich stated: "Literature synthesis of interwar twenty years it is possible to construct, using only aesthetical and historical preconditions. But the imprint of phenomena not only on the background of history but philosophy, psychology, sociology, aesthetic also points on the general involving of

intellectual and aesthetical interdependence, which in sum is the style of era" [12, 7]. Thus new era of literature is connects as with the historical events (World War I, social revolutions in Russia and Europe) as, firstly, with the intellectual one.

All the researchers mark the cardinal break which happened on the edge of XIX–XX century. It was revealed in form of great cultural explosion, which reneved the literature, music, art, theatre, choreography. The extra-factors of cultural explosion are marked by Russian researcher N. Leiderman: breaking of notion about the Universe and its laws, which determined the skepticism of science to positivist approach; it determined the doubt in power of almighty causality and search of new explanations of connections between phenomena; historical experience of 19 century which was marked by revolutions, wars, sharing of borders, which revealed in crisis of democratic utopias which grounded on faith in people as the bearer of moral law through the dissolution of personality in people. "it is possible to make an assumption that on the edge on XIX–XX centuries due to numerous factors, which denied or doubted in fundamental notions (which considered to be eternal) there was appeared the critical mass which led to the mental explosion. The result of this was the apocalyptic fracture in human consciousness, about which Nietzsche declared desperately, "God is dead"" [4, 18].

Whatever the chaotic processes that took place in the early twentieth century, they are, according to H. Leiderman, "had their emotional color. In their Brownian movement they were leading to the two polar power centers" [5, 20].

After the Russian literature sciences we determine these two centers as apocalyptic and revolution. We can't agree with the statement that these two centers are polar, because we see as they are projecting on each other, becoming interchangeable, because the consciousness which presented the first center, was provided complete changes after the apocalyptic catastrophe and the second led to this catastrophes. Worldview which had been spread in the end of XIX century (more brightly was revealed the first ten years of 20th century) could be named catastrophic especially during the era between two World wars.

At the same time opposite to the desperation the 20th century gave birth to some utopian projects, which promise "the golden age" in future and had given raw of revolutionary achievements in science and techniques, which led to millions of victims as the result of wars, totalitarian regimes, man-made disasters. Thus, deep mental changes which had happened on the edge of centuries, led to the appearance of new type of culture – modernist, marked by the deep disappointment and doubts in reality and opportunity of achievement of world's harmony. Modernism, avant-and post-modernism gave works which were oriented not on the defeating of Chaos by Space but on the poetizatsiya and cognition of Chaos as the universal and undefeatable form of human life [4].

Modernism the revision of the whole system of mental values, denied all stable notions about the world. But, refusing from hope for the searching harmony in material world, it implemented its intention in light-image of Chaos as the minus-harmony. "The great victory of modernism was that fact that pushing out from low human empiric practice of everyday life, it gave to the human spirit the status of self-esteem high everyday being – it entered in this reality, lived in it, began the conquest of space, its height and lowlands, began looking for a source of inner light and sink into her "black holes". Actually, the variety

of "modernism" demonstrates unbelievable width and depth of the artistic impulse, which was marked by consolidation of the world soul is whole and self-contained Universe" [4].

In 20th century we can speak about the cooperate being of modern, realistic, romantic elements in literature of interwar twentieth, changeability of historical-literature systems. Thus, realistic direction had the crisis period during these 20 years; symbolism which appeared in 90th of 19th century, after twenty years was going away; expressionism had not long intensity also (10–20th of 20th century).

According to researchers point of view, one of the essential peculiarities of literature process of interwar twenty years can be defined in relatively holistic artistic tendencies which were leading to the creation of directions, but did not in historical-literature system. They, creating for some time smth close to the literature directions, became the foundation for aesthetical search of coming literature directions, vectors, schools. One of these directions, on our opinion, became the catastrophism – idea-aesthetic tendency in literature of interwar twenty years, which transformed into separate literature direction but revealed also in different models of art research of that time. The tragic pessimism of writers of interwar twenty years for each of them was the separate case on increasing disquiet which grounded not only on the factors of social and cultural order of life with clear feeling of edge of era but grounding on thoughts which were going away, filling world with new notions about the end of the world, its catastrophic processes and energetic finalism, which did not fit into traditional deterministic schemes of traditional thinking. The answer to this mental cataclysm was the establishing of new forms of cultural-moral identifications and cultural-historical orientations of personality. The catastrophic worldwide, metaphysics of the end and anesthetization of death as the fundamental human and cultural positive value have an importance place among them.

Література

1. Вонтровський А. Бути чи не бути? Методологічні питання міжвоєнного періоду в історії літератури / А. Вонтровський // Вісник Львівського університету : Серія філологічна. – 2004. – Вип. 33. – С. 219–226.
2. Історія української літератури ХХ ст. / [за ред. В. Г. Дончика]. – К. : Либідь, 1993. – 789 с.
3. Історія української літератури : [в 2-х т.]. – К. : Наукова думка, 1959. – Т. 2. – 879 с.
4. Лейдерман Н. Траектории "экспериментирующей эпохи" / Н. Лейдерман // Вопросы литературы. – 2002. – № 4. – С. 3–47.
5. Павличко С. Дискурс модернізму в українській літературі : [монографія] / С. Павличко. – К. : Либідь, 1997. – 360 с.
6. Розстріляне відродження : [антологія 1917–1933 : поезія – проза – драма – есей] / [упоряд., передм., післям. Ю. Лавріненка ; післям. Є. Сверстюка]. – К. : Смолоскип, 2007. – 976 с.
7. Сорокин П. А. Социокультурная динамика / П. А. Сорокин // Человек. Цивилизация. Общество. – М. : Политиздат, 1992. – С. 429–432.
8. Тюпа В. И. Постсимволизм : теоретические очерки русской поэзии XX века / В. И. Тюпа. – Самара : Изд-во СГУ, 1998. – 286 с.
9. Шпенглер О. Закат Европы. Очерки морфологии мировой истории : [в 2-х т.]. – М. : Мысль, 1998. – Т.1 : Гештальт и действительность / [пер. с нем., вступ. ст. и прим К. А. Свасьян]. – 663 с.
10. Balcerzan E. Dialektyka polskiego dwudziestolecia międzywojennego / E. Balcerzan // Prace ofiarowane Henrykowi Markiewiczowi / [pod red. T. Weissa]. – Kraków ; Wrocław, 1984. – S. 265–279.

11. Burek T. 1905, nie 1918 / T. Burek // Problemy literatury polskiej lat 1890–1939. – Wrocław, 1972. – Seria I. – S. 77–105.
12. Eustachiewicz L. Dwudziestolecie 1919–1939 / L. Eustachiewicz. – Warszawa : Wyd-wa szkolne i pedagogiczne, 1983. – 430 s.
13. Jakubowski J. Z. Sprawa periodyzacji historii literatury polskiej XIX i XX wieku (Propozycje do dyskusji) / J. Z. Jakubowski // Polonistyka. – 1950. – №1. – S. 1–7.
14. Kaszyński N., Krzysztofik M. Zarys literatury duńskiej / N. Kaszyński, M. Krzysztofik. – Poznań, 1976. – 145 s.
15. Katastrofizm // Głowiński M., Kostkiewiczowa T., Okopień-Sławińska A., Sławiński J. Słownik terminów literackich / [pod red. J. Sławińskiego]. – Wrocław ; Warszawa ; Kraków : Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 2002. – S. 238.
16. Kurze Geschichte der deutsche Literatur. – Berlin, 1983. – S. 23–39.
17. Kwiatkowski J. Dwudziestolecie międzywojenne / J. Kwiatkowski. – Warszawa : Wydawnictwo naukowe PWN, 2002. – 597 s.
18. Markiewicz H. Przekroje i zbliżenia / H. Markiewicz. – Warszawa : PIW , 1967. – S. 5–19.
19. Thibaudet A. Historia literatury francuskiej : od rewolucji Francuskiej do lat trzydziestych XX wieku / A. Thibaudet. – Warszawa : PWN, 1997. – 526 s.
20. Werner A. Katastrofizm / A. Werner // Słownik literatury polskiej XX wieku. – Wrocław ; Warszawa ; Kraków : Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1996. – S. 445–453.