

Emigration Model of the Ukrainian-Georgian Literary Ties of the Early 20th Century

Processes of the “dialogical penetration” (M. Bakhtin) of literatures in different periods cause a keen interest of researchers. Theoretical and methodological basis of modern literary studies allows their exploring on a new plane. “Other” / Someone else’s perceived as Other, allowing to know Someone better. Dialogic model is, according to A. Wall, the model which “comes through the hierarchy, communicating across boundaries separating both sides ... and showing us that the sides are dialogically associated with similar phenomena and consist of similar components”. Study of the material traditionally unified by the concept of “interliterature communication” is of scientific interest in some aspects: It allows us to reflect on the characteristics of “two-track” (continental and diasporic) development of Ukrainian literature, the value of the Other in it. European emigration model, the place of the Other / Somebody else’s show that it is close (by the direction, material) to the model formed in Ukrainian cultural centres of St. Petersburg, Dorpat etc. Interliterature contacts acquired different forms, inspired the “Renaissance” development of national literature, gave rise to new cultural discourses, expanded genre field of literature. Non-European emigration model was somewhat different, diasporical, according to I. Dzyuba. In this context of great importance are writers-emigrants’ dicta on the theoretical problems of literary interconnections, pluralistic diversity of cultures, their “methodology of understanding” and attempts to transfer observations from prevailing at that time contact-genetic sphere (ideological and thematic) into typological, aesthetic. Thus the material for comparison of the poetics, the dialogue that goes beyond the narration and the dichotomy of comparisons was accumulated (“Sketches of the Typology of Cultures” by Y. Malanyuk (1935), “East and West in the Problem of Ukrainian Literature” (1939), “The National Literature as an Art” by V. Derzhavin (1949). Georgian literature (we reveal it using the materials of an unpublished anthology “Eastern Poetry”, which we can find in the archive of Ukrainian Committee library in Prague, the State Scientific archive library in Kyiv) is actively cut in collections, anthologies, Ukrainian emigration periodicals (Prague, Podiebrady, London, Hanover), suggesting that “the two wings of Ukrainian literature” were not isolated in their desire for national revival, “winning of its say and authority in the world art”. The most active form of literary ties in this period is the artistic translation (translations from Georgian by O. Lototsky, V. Derzhavin, O. Oles, M. Bazhan), and the Georgian theme in the original works of Ukrainian immigrants (“Sakartvelo” by V. Lashchenko etc.).

Key Words: emigratory models, diversity of cultures, Ukrainian-Georgian literary relations.

Globalizational processes which provoke critical discussions especially on the literary and cultural ground, on the one hand, multicultural phenomena, transcultural and transnational changes in the system of artistic thinking, on the other hand, defined a number of vulnerable questions that without solution forbade to speak about “logic and dynamics of globalization” and “tendency to new intellectual project of global ... literature”.

Ukrainian researches don’t share the opinion of national literatures local narrow-mindedness, not disclaiming the processes of mutual enrichment/cognition, peculiar to globalizational epoch. Yet in 1927 E. Malanyuk flung out a remark: “Real culture is always organic, always grows from national essence, rising to universal achievements”. In the other work he added: “poet can become international, but he is always born by nation”; creative personality should be not “hieroglyph of antinational general

humanism”, but national. Significant factor of dialogical model development, in I. Dzyuba’s judgment, “in modern pressing globalized world ... is situation of interaction ... with many world cultures”.

Dialogism/polylogue (phenomena which accompanied literatures entry in the other worlds by means of foreign literatures, foremost Polish, Russian, German) favoured the cognition of Ukrainian literature, “advanced” literature, destroyed inferiority and unoriginality stereotypes, and, in the light of the circumstances, created new/diverse models in which foreign/different word made it possible to learn own better, to become creativity guideline.

Conception of Ukrainian culture development, generated by modern scientific thought, is concentrated on the idea that “none of the cultures can exist outside the defined international space...”; “until thinking by categories of Ukrainian culture ... will not be supplemented with the spectrum of the world cultures heritage, we are continuing to remain in semi-colonial society”. Dialogical model, generated in the early 20th century, nevertheless had its own variants: development and study of interliterary relations in “two ruts” (G.Kostyuk) of Ukrainian literature. First one, already deformed in the early 20s by ideological press and basically concentrated around Ukrainian-Russian relations. Lines of investigation, problems, defined in them, were actively developed by all former Soviet Union literatures. Contactology, genetic relations were dominating; ascertained typological convergences «de facto» submitted to ideological tasks, depersonalized national literatures for the sake of the phantom – unified multinational literature. Second emigratory “variant” had its own peculiarities, induced not only by literary and cultural life features, but also by economical and other factors. I. Dzyuba regards American, Canadian, Australian emigration creation as “purely emigratory on the whole”, considering it “special diaspora model”. While European emigration “continued to identify themselves with the homeland life and culture”. Not denying the fact that diaspora’s activity (its creative wing) was closer connected with search and aspirations of continental Ukrainian literature, we remember that such differentiation was rather conditional, which is confirmed by live and creative fates of many writers, the ways/possibilities to know Different/foreign and to show oneself as Different.

Literary life of writers-emigrants went on in the centers of Prague, Warsaw, Vienna, Berlin, Paris, forming one of the Ukrainian literature “separations” (I. Dzyuba), which together with continental one offered “the spectrum of ideological and aesthetic tendencies, writers’ viewpoints, ... artistic platforms”, pictures of origination of such phenomena as Prague, Warsaw schools, Ukrainian comradeships, institutions, periodical publications, etc. Interliterary relations generally develop along the line of personal contacts and realise in the most favourable forms under the emigratory circumstances: journalistic, critical statements in periodicals, correspondence, rarely in translations. In the late 20s on the territory of Ukraine they lost high-level mission to promote the real entry of Ukrainian literature in the space of intellectual and aesthetic world literature.

Among the series of literary and critical materials we’ll draw attention to some of those, which throw light on interliterary relations. “Time mood” laid stress upon literary and cultural emigratory life, having an effect on built models of interliterary relations – “deep occidentalism”, Ukrainian literature

deprovincialization were determinative. D.Dontsov's thought "Perhaps we were distant east of Occident, but not distant west of Orient" repeatedly pass through the works of A. Lototsky, Y. Lypa, E. Malanyuk.

Changes connected with the eastern (Russian) vector are better seen in the model of interliterary relations in the early 20th century. It happened that political events superimposed on literary ones, leading to distortion, excessive emotional assessments ("The end of "Russian literature" (1926); E. Malanyuk's Soviet literary affairs // Bulletin. – 1935. – № 1; "Our time and literature" by D. Dontsov, 1937). E. Malanyuk's reflections on Soviet literature as "mentally and ethnic mutant", "assimilative", "empire restoration in literature", etc. are expressive. Being in abnormal conditions, poet tried to find "panacea", guided by own tradition and western examples. However, there was no question of imitation, copying. "Influence amateurs", wrote Y.Lobodovsky, "should remember concerning strong personality, it is necessary to implement the notion "analogy from choice", and it can never be the consequence of... imitation" or "submission" of one culture to another.

Thereby significant is E. Malanyuk's publication "Sketches to cultures typology" in Polish magazine «Marcholt» (1935), in which the author raised important issues of intercultural literary relations, synthesis of eastern and western traditions. Though Malanyuk's east perception, while based on views of V. Rozanov, V. Ivanov, J. Konrad, isn't irrefutable not only in the part, where author reflects on "cultures types"; diffusion effects, cultures mixing, their blending, cultural pseudomorphosis – views, assessments of regional, zonal cultural and literary relations, efficiency and synthesis possibility of eastern and western cultural traditions on the territory of Eurasia draw attention in this publication. The author abandons himself to the idea of organicity and more productive cultural and literary synthesis, "where synthetical and fermentation cultural processes continue for centuries". Artificial "races and cultures ... mixture"; "abstractions of imperial unanimity assume "the nature of turbid mixing". From E. Malanyuk's point of view Ukrainian literature interest in western literatures indicates intensified interest in own traditions: Ukraine is a part of Europe.

Relations between Ukrainian and Georgian literatures are long-standing and thoroughly examined by both historians and philologists. They were developing in space, specified in E. Malanyuk's "Sketches..." in this way: "In the east which interests us, so-called "Eurasian" east, there are two significant "east" – southern – Black Sea and Iranian, substantially educated by Asia Minor Hellenism and saturated by Mediterranean impacts, that is why it is "not east", and northern – Mongolian and Altaic ...". These are the space and the way, which still draw scientists' attention. "Caucasian bridge" problem, on which different cultures of Christian and Muslim east faced, were traced by M. Dragomanov, M. Grushevsky, A. Krymsky, O. Lordkipanidze, S. Meshia, Y. Tsintsadze, etc.

This problem and consequently the material repeatedly came in sight of Hv.Vovk – anthropologist of world reputation. Thus, in work "Caucasus and Carpathians (Some problems of ethnological approaching)" (1906) scientist underlines the necessity to study "eastern side", depth comprehension, processed factual material, "insufficient science level" of which yet hasn't "reached European level". On the basis of many typologically similar moments (parallels) between different Ukrainian and Georgian life sides, author initiates the work in a certain direction. It is attested by his

reflections found out in “Studios of Ukrainian ethnography and anthropology” (Prague, 1928). Collaboration with many Ukrainian scientists: M. Dragomanov, V. Antonovich, M. Grushevsky, I. Franko, attention to the works of N. Gulak, I. Franko, N. Sumtsov, V. Gnatyuk, A. Krymsky, minutely reviewed by M. Grushevsky N. Gilchenko’s “Materials for Caucasus anthropology”, Kiev, Tiflis archeological congresses, infringing on Georgian material, extended Georgian “field of vision” and perception. Moreover, Hv. Vovk stayed in close contact with those figures of Ukrainian culture who lived/studied in Georgia (M. Grushevsky, Lev Lopatinsky, D. Nazarenko, B. Grinchenko, G. Namoradze, V. Samiylenko). In 1905 Hv. Vovk published in Paris, where he lived almost 20 years (till 1906), review on “National medicine” by Yashvili, printed in Tiflis in 1904 (131 p.), which enriched the scientist with factual material and, contrariwise, activated translating. At the turn of the 19th century a whole anthology of Georgian poetry was introduced by P. Grabovsky, and suitably appreciated by A. Krymsky (“Kiev Antiquity”, 1901, pp. 46-47) and A. Hahanashvili in the columns of “Caucasus” newspaper. Under the most unfavourable conditions in 1910-20s, the model of Ukrainian and Georgian cultural and literary relations preserves gained forms and supplements with Georgian community activity in Kiev and Kharkov (for instance, S. Chitadze’s activity), Lesya Ukrainka’s and P. Tychyna’s Georgian enthusiasm.

Striking personality in the scope of Ukrainian and Georgian literary relations was A. Lototsky – writer, scientist, diplomat, author of the famous work “East and West in the question of Ukrainian literature”, translator E. Eristavi, N. Baratashvili, I. Chavchavadze. Emigrating to Vienna, eventually in Prague, he continued to work on translations. Symbolic in emigratory model of Ukrainian and Georgian relations were M. Kintsurashvili – Yasamani and O. Oles private contacts. Thus, kartvelolog A. Mushkudiani, on the basis of poets’ correspondence, asserts that Yasamani in 1908 sent to O. Oles word-for-word translation of Georgian works, which he used in emigration. Basing on his observations, from 1909 to 1921 in practice of Ukrainian translation from Georgian (for different reasons) there was a gap: “not a work was translated to Ukrainian”. New wave of translations – M. Dgebuadze-Pulariya, M. Javahishvili, K. Lordkipanidze, K. Gamsahurdia, N. Mitsishvili, K. Nadiradze, Sh. Rustaveli – starts in the 30s. At the same time Georgian topic (in translations, original works, and critics) actively developed in emigration. O. Oles, for example, build in emigration his own eastern world (“Kazbek i Mashuka”, “Kings and people”). In creation of emigratory model of Ukrainian and Georgian relations, as archival materials convince, personal contacts played an important role. It also concerned the translations from the other languages. “First of all we translated those, to whom we were felt drawn”, writes I. Kachurovsky. Translations from European languages formed its considerable part. I. Kachurovsky ascribes M. Fisbeyn’s translations from Georgian in “Untitled collection” to “exotic” translations with “plus” sign. Analysing emigratory translations, author considered them “closer to the original than national”, which was caused by continental tradition to use word-for-word translation. These observations once again suggest the advantages of word-for-word translation, or translations completed with the help of native speakers. B. Grinchenko’s letters to Hv. Vovk in Paris, in which he consulted about the selection of works for translation, new issues catalogue, are demonstrative. On the basis of emigratory Ukrainian “Georginiana” it can be said that M. Semenko’s thesis “we should learn from Europe – that is true”

defined the principle of choice for translations, aesthetic search of Ukrainian literature in emigration. “Oriental poetry” anthology, found in the library of Ukrainian public committee in Prague and prepared for publishing in Ukrainian translation, confirm this. The majority of works (233 pages), written by hand, were exclusively twentieth century translations, taken from continental Ukrainian periodicals. Among six Georgian writers were Rustaveli, Guramishvili, N. Baratashvili, Vazha Pshavela. As we can see, in sight of anthology compiler (on the basis of textual analysis we can suggest that this person was V. Domanitsky, professor of Ukrainian economic Academy in Podebrady, Czech) came the first variant of translation “Knight in the Panther’s skin” by N. Bazhan. Another expressive and almost unexplored fact in emigratory model of Ukrainian and Georgian relations is scientific translation activity of orientalist, literary theorist, translator V. Derzhavin, who lived in emigration, mainly in German, from 1944 to 1964. Sanskritist, Egyptologist, Hebraist, Georgian and Armenian language expert (it was a result of his study in Petersburg university), he, according to I. Kachurovsky, “combined fantastical erudition and refined virtu ... touching upon others works”. Published in majority of Ukrainian emigratory editions, his heritage is dispersed and until now isn’t fully printed. But what is left in translations from Georgian – G. Orbeliani, D. Megreli, A. Shanshiashvili, O. Abasheli, K. Makashvili, I. Chavchavadze, A. Tsereteli, R. Eristavi, Vazha Pshavela – enables to draw a conclusion about the purpose (to introduce Georgian classics and new poetry) and tasks (to realise own principles of translation, including the choice for translation; to proceed from the major criterion – aesthetic value, “national strength” of work).

Thereby we can sum up: emigratory model of Ukrainian and Georgian relations in the early 20th century is inseparable from continental, as well as Ukrainian literature emigratory “separation”. In terms of genre – this is mainly poetry; in themes – Georgian past history, its golden age; aspiration to poetics precise representation, poem peculiarities (V. Derzhavin) is discerned. Difference in choice of texts and authors is noticeable: ideological press absence allows realising own aesthetic tastes, making own choice in translations.

New materials, which undoubtedly exist, can amend the situation, but the essence, to my mind, will remain the same.