

IVAN DRACH AND HIS CRITICS

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of Graduate Studies

and Research

The University of Manitoba

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirement for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

ALEXANDRA PAWLOWSKY

August 1982

IVAN DRACH AND HIS CRITICS

BY

ALEXANDRA PAWLOWSKY

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1982

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ABSTRACT

The revival that occurred in Soviet Ukrainian literature during the period of de-Stalinization in the late 1950's and early 1960's was primarily due to the efforts of a group of young poets known as the shestydesiatnyky (Writers of the Sixties). The group's aims and existence were highly controversial and for this reason shortlived. One of the most noteworthy of the shestydesiatnyky was the poet Ivan Fedorovych Drach.

Ivan Drach's poetry published in the decade between 1960 and 1970 exhibited a profound commitment to the ideology of the shestydesiatnyky. Thus its primary stress was on purely aesthetic principles rather than on the principles dictated by socialist realism. Drach's poetic endeavour was aimed at defining the role of poetry and the poet in society. This role centered around solving the essential problems that confronted modern man, by seeking out and revealing the truth in all instances. The poet was able to successfully accomplish his poetic assignment through the use of complex stylistic means, that proved to be a synthesis of the traditional with the innovatively original. However, because Drach chose to comply with the dictates of socialist realism when they were once again stringently applied, the latter half of the 1960's belied a progressive waning in the calibre of his work.

The nature of Ivan Drach's poetry caused it to come under intense critical scrutiny. From the outset, Soviet critics divided themselves into two opposing factions, with the Party liners and the conservative wing pitted against the more progressive, liberal wing. Early critical discussions were heated and although their intensity weakened, critical controversy continued to characterize this entire phase of Ivan Drach's poetic career.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
INTRODUCTION	ii
Chapter I WRITERS OF THE SIXTIES	1
Chapter II THEMES, MOTIFS AND IDEAS	35
Chapter III STYLISTIC TRADITIONALISM AND ORIGINALITY	70
CONCLUSION	113
Table I TRANSLITERATION TABLE	117
Table II TRANSLATION OF POETRY TITLES	118
BIBLIOGRAPHY	121

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Jaroslav Rozumnyj, for his guidance and valuable assistance in the preparation and writing of this thesis; to Myron Pawlowsky for his valuable editorial assistance; and to my husband and family for their continual support and encouragement.

INTRODUCTION

Among the more prominent names in modern Ukrainian literature is that of the poet, Ivan Fedorovych Drach.

Although Ivan Drach remains actively involved in literary endeavour today, it can be successfully argued that his poetic career definitively culminated in the decade from 1960 to 1970. His poetic debut was an exceptionally dynamic one, for he entered into prominence with his first and most controversial work, "Knife in the Sun." This stormy debut heralded an early career filled with intense critical scrutiny.

This thesis will examine the thematic and stylistic aspects of Drach's poetry published in the decade between 1960 and 1970, by confronting both Soviet and Western literary criticism published during this period. Aside from the poem, "Knife in the Sun," this period encompasses the collections: Sunflower, Solar Prominences of the Heart, Workday Ballads and Poetry, and other poems which also appeared in print but were not included in these collections.

This topic was chosen because as yet no one has published a comprehensive study of Drach's works of the period. Critics have been more inclined to analyze individual poems, cycles and collections. Furthermore, there has been no confrontation of the views of Soviet and Western critics concerning Drach's early poetry.

In researching the sources it became evident that the most comprehensive critical contributions were made by Soviet authors, particularly: Leonid Novychenko ("Ivan Drach, a newcomer to poetry"), Viktor Ivanysenko ("By the measure of the heart", "After the decree of truth and beauty"), Anatolii Makarov ("A poet searches for the present", "Seriously perceiving the world") and Mykola Il'nyts'kyi ("Polyphony of the poetic word", "Lada prepares herbs"). The bulk of these sources were either articles or critical reviews that appeared in the newspaper Literaturna Ukraina and various periodicals. Most were available locally and those that were not, were generally accessible through inter-library loan. An obstacle was encountered in requesting materials from the Soviet Union, for a number of loan requests were denied. The sources that were requested are known to have dealt with the controversy that surrounded the shestydesiatnyky as a group, and their absence is considered negligible.

Western critics, such as Bohdan Kravtsiv (Sixty poets of the sixties), Ivan Koshelivets' (The Ukrainian literature of to-day) and George Luckyj ("Literary Ferment in the Ukraine", "The Ukrainians") primarily concerned themselves with the shestydesiatnyky as a group. Kravtsiv was the only one among them to single out Drach and deal with him in depth ("Solar Prominences of the Heart and the credo of Ivan Drach").

The aim of this dissertation is to analyze the articles and critical reviews authored by foremost Soviet and Western critics in order to reveal Drach's literary stature and the reasons behind often divergent and in some cases completely opposing critical views concerning Ivan Drach's early poetry.

This work will be divided into three main chapters and a bibliography. The first chapter will deal with the group known as the shestydesiatnyky (Writers of the Sixties), of which Ivan Drach was a leading representative, the critical controversy that surrounded it, and the politics that shaped its destiny. Special emphasis will be placed upon the role of Ivan Drach in the events of this decade and the influence of those events on his poetry.

The second chapter will deal with the themes, ideas and motifs that Drach incorporated into his works, as defined by his critics. It will examine and juxtapose critical discussions and differing viewpoints of both Soviet and Western critics.

The third chapter will deal with the stylistic qualities of Drach's works, particularly as they stemmed from a synthesis of the traditional with the uniquely original. As in the preceding chapter all relevant discussions and viewpoints will be examined.

The bibliography will include all sources referred to in researching this topic. Not all of these sources will be cited within this dissertation for its scope is not broad enough to include them. They may, however, be useful to other researchers interested in this field.

CHAPTER I

WRITERS OF THE SIXTIES

The literary group known as the shestydesiatnyky (Writers of the Sixties) was comprised of Soviet Ukrainian poets, writers and critics. It came into existence in the late 1950's and early 1960's and continued to make its presence felt in Soviet Ukrainian literature throughout most of the decade. This chapter is concerned with tracing its process of evolution and characterizing its most outstanding qualities and achievements. The political atmosphere of the time and the literary discussion that surrounded the poets of this group will be examined, as both of these were integral to the development of the shestydesiatnyky.

In order to gain deeper insight into how and why the shestydesiatnyky came into being it is necessary to first examine the Soviet literary and political milieu of the 1950's.

The death of Joseph Stalin in 1953, brought about far-reaching changes in many aspects of Soviet life, especially in literature. For the most part these were positive changes, that resulted from the slow but progressive process of de-Stalinization, at first unofficially and later officially sanctioned in the decade spanning 1953 - 1963. As Marc Slonim states: "Although the Russian Communists are reluctant to admit it, in these years, between 1953 and 1963, Soviet social, economic,

political, and cultural life underwent a thorough revision."¹ In literary life there occurred a steady steering away from the personality cult propagated by Stalinism, which had required all writers to praise the Party, its leaders and ideals, and the general relaxation of the stringencies inherent to the Stalinized concept of socialist realism. Because Stalinist fundamentals were very deeply entrenched, some years elapsed, however, before the de-Stalinization process was overtly visible in literature.

This period in Soviet history, often termed the "thaw," made itself felt throughout all of the Soviet Republics. In literature it is most renowned for its occurrence in the Russian Federation although it also revealed itself in other non-Russian Soviet literatures. The term "thaw" is not always applied to the phenomenon that occurred in Ukrainian literature at this time, rather it is more often termed a "revival." This is because the circumstances surrounding it and its general flavour in Ukraine differed from those in Russia:

There are obvious similarities between this Ukrainian revival and the Russian "thaw" of the same period. Soviet poets of the late 1950's and early 1960's shared a feeling of revulsion against Stalinism, coupled with attempts to re-evaluate Soviet realities and pleas for greater personal liberties. Yet the tone of these protests and declarations were different in Russia and in the Ukraine.²

The basis for this difference lay in the fact that while Russian literature was both stringently controlled and creatively stifled under Stalinism, it was nonetheless, allowed to exist as an artistic entity. Ukrainian literature, however, from the time of the literary purges of the 1930's onward, essentially ceased to exist as a creative entity.

The Soviets, whose elite was formed principally of Russians, between 1930 and 1938 either murdered or deported to Siberia over 200 Ukrainian writers. Almost 80% of the Ukraine's intellectual elite was affected by Stalin's arbitrary measures. All Ukrainian universities and literary magazines were abolished. The Soviets left alive only four of the outstanding Ukrainian authors. Naturally they had to compose hymns of praise to Stalin and conform to "socialist realism" and the idea of "Great Russia".³

With the onset of de-Stalinization, Russian literature basked in a thawing of restraints, while Ukrainian literature grasped this opportunity to bridge the span of the creative wasteland of the past several decades. It concentrated on reviving its creative resources, primarily those forgotten since the dynamic literary era of the 1920's.

Most critics agree that the first outward sign of something new stirring in Soviet Ukrainian literature occurred in the mid-fifties with a landmark article that appeared in a Soviet Russian newspaper:

On June 25, 1955, ... the Moscow Literaturnaya Gazeta published an article by the Ukrainian writer Oleksander Dovzhenko which ended with the following remark: "I am not calling on artists to promote abstractionism or individual aestheticism but I am deeply concerned that the creative limits of socialist realism should be extended."⁴

This view began to spread throughout the literary community and was soon condoned by Nikita Khrushchev himself. Khrushchev's "secret" speech at the Twentieth Communist Party Congress in 1956, is often cited as the pivotal point in the official stance toward Stalinism. The position adopted by this speech led to the further relaxation of the formerly very strict regulations limiting literary creativity. The easing of restraints quickly spread to all of the Republics, where it was eagerly taken advantage of.

The Party soon realized that perhaps it had been too lenient and decided to curb what it sensed might become an overpowering movement. Thus, in late 1957-58, it took upon itself the task of once again

tightening controls. As a result the new found freedom in Ukrainian literary expression was effectively suppressed.

Following the enlivenment that took place in the field of poetry during the period of the so-called "thaw" of 1956-57 which was evidenced, on one side, by the escape from declarative verse to intimate lyric and, on the other side, in some of the attempts by more daring individuals of both the older and younger generations of poets to broaden the diapason of poetic expression both in content and form - Soviet Ukrainian poetry was once again enveloped by declarative rhetoric, monotony and a dullness in themes.⁵

The return of controls was not to be longlasting, however, for the Twenty-First Communist Party Congress and the Third Congress of Soviet Writers, both in 1959, were instrumental in once again relaxing literary constraints. The Twenty-Second Communist Party Congress held in October, 1961, was even more lenient in its stance toward literature. Between these two Congresses, at a time when, "... there was a stir in literature: more freedom in themes and techniques, more independence, more spirit in the rebuttal of Stalinists, ..." ⁶ the *shestydesiatnyky* were born.

This group was originally composed of a number of young Ukrainian poets, the most noteworthy of which were Ivan Drach, Lina Kostenko, Vitalii Korotych, Vasyl' Symonenko, Yevhen Hutsalo and Mykola Vinhranovs'kyi. As a group, however, they did not comprise a single school of thought in the traditional sense for their styles varied. The bond that united them was a common desire to rediscover the true and solely aesthetic function of poetry.

They vigorously objected to the simplistic Soviet view of life and rediscovered human anguish and suffering as well as the fragility of human relationships. Their disenchantment with society rarely led to a feeling of alientation. The forcefulness of their protests betrayed their engagement.⁷

Their fascination with humanity and human existence often leaned to the philosophical, their viewpoints arose out of intellectual thought, yet they tended to display intensely passionate lyrical feeling.

Bohdan Kravtsiv⁸ and Yurii Lavrinenko⁹ believe that there exists a general misconception as to the number of poets who actually belonged to this group: "The small cluster of poets of the Milky Way," states Kravtsiv, "grew into a large community over the space of five years."¹⁰ He goes on to cite figures¹¹ presented by Volodymyr Briuhnen that provide evidence to prove that during the first half of the 1960's, some 500 new names appeared in Soviet Ukrainian poetry alone. Thus, although the original members of this group may have been few and perhaps they remained the most well known, their actual number multiplied quickly. It seems doubtless that those poets, who were not part of the original number were, in effect, generated by the same factors that generated its original members. As in the words of Lavrinenko: "From their nature and character it is easily apparent that they are a wave of the same broad tide of that era".¹²

This group elicited much interest and influenced other writers, particularly those of the younger generations. Among the younger poets, who looked up to the leading members of the shestydesiatnyky as models for their own poetry, George Luckyj includes Mykola Vorobiov, Vasyl' Holoborod'ko, Iryna Zhylenko, Ihor Kalynets', Roman Kudlyk, Roman Lubkivs'kyi, Oles' Lupii, Volodymyr Luchuk, Borys Mamaisur, Volodymyr Mordan', Borys Necherda, Mykola Synhaivs'kyi, Vasyl' Stus, Stanislav Tel'niuk, Robert Tretiakov and Mykola Kholodnyi.¹³

It would be rather presumptuous to state, as some critics do, that a

number of representatives of the older generation, particularly Mykola Bazhan and Leonid Pervomais'kyi, were "... coaxed into returning to the artistic positions and pathways of their youth"¹⁴ as the result of the influence of the shestydesiatnyky. The reason for the similarities in their styles lies in the fact that all generations of writers were influenced by the changes that were taking place in literature at the time. Consequently some of the older poets revived creative tendencies that they had put aside for several decades.

All of the shestydesiatnyky were born and raised during the Stalinist era, however, most did not reach adulthood nor enter literary life until the late 1950's or early 1960's. For this reason they had little understanding of the older generation of poets, whose creativity they viewed as a mindless but faithful adherence to the stipulations and political cliches of the personality cult. The psychological make-up of the two generations was what set them apart so drastically. The older generation was content with the easing of restraints, for having experienced the rigors of past restrictions, this was the ultimate realization of their dreams. For the young, however, this was only the first step toward further and, ultimately, complete creative freedom. Their differences led to an open conflict between them, with the young,

... accus[ing] their literary "Fathers" of sharing the responsibility for Stalin's crimes for it was they who glorified him and wrote odes in his honour. They could understand that terror forced the older writers to comply to these demands. What they could not forgive, however, was the hypocrisy with which this generation maintained, even after Stalin's death, that works created during that period still possessed literary value.¹⁵

This conflict was one of the most important issues in the literary discussion that surrounded the shestydesiatnyky and is commonly termed

the conflict between "fathers and sons."

Koshelivets' equates the shestydesiatnyky with groups that were simultaneously making their presence felt in the West:

If it is possible to overcome the Iron Curtain and borrow narrow pants ... and the ponytail from the West, then it is not surprising, that the appearance of the Shestydesiatnyky in Ukrainian literature is synchronized with an analogous process in the West: the appearance of the "new wave" in French cinematography, the so-called "angry young men" in all countries of Europe and America.¹⁶

He and other critics believe that this phenomenon, so strongly felt in the West, could not but also pervade the Soviet Union, where the circumstances at that time were optimally receptive to just this type of influence.

Two critics, often closely associated with the shestydesiatnyky, Ivan Dziuba and Ivan Svitlychnyi, proved to be not only among the group's foremost backers, but were also instrumental in paving the way for the publication of their first works. This was achieved through the publication of articles that convinced the literary community that important changes were taking place in Ukrainian literature.

They created the impression, that a significant break had occurred in Ukrainian literary circles, a type of revolution in the manner of thinking about and reacting to given phenomena.¹⁷

The appearance of works authored by the shestydesiatnyky on the pages of the Literaturna hazeta was heralded as a glorious victory over the remaining vestiges of Stalinism. Ivan Dziuba, in particular, was so absorbed with this new trend in literature that he took it upon himself to introduce Ivan Drach's first major poem, "Knife in the Sun," to the readers of this newspaper. His introduction was brimming with praise for the poet's capabilities and with eager anticipation for future Ukrainian literary development:

I heard the voice of a new, contemporary Ukrainian poet - truly contemporary, truly Ukrainian, truly a poet. And I realized, that only this type of a person could, in the future, convey through the vehicle of our Ukrainian literature (is this not a worthy expectation?) the essential, contemporary word, which all readers in the Union are thirsting for, - would this not be fortunate for all of us?¹⁸

Most Soviet critics, however, were prone to accuse the shestydesiatnyky of Western abstractionist and formalist tendencies. They based their criticism on the fact that they were attempting to view literature as a pure art form, rather than a political vehicle, that they were outspoken in their themes, and that they generally leaned toward a modernistic style.

It cannot be denied that the shestydesiatnyky were, in fact, influenced by Western creative endeavour. Kravtsiv, in citing the names of those whose works influenced them, presents a mixture of both Western and Ukrainian artists and writers.

They are well acquainted with the creativity of Whitman and Verharn, the early Tychyna, Bazhan and Ryl's'kyi. In some things their poetry is closely tied to the searchings of Ukrainian Futurists and Symbolists, especially to the "New Generation" of the 1920's, which is a minus for them in the eyes of their opposers. Their poetry has been greatly influenced by modern art: the works of Van Gogh, Vrubel, Sar'ian, Picasso and the Ukrainian artist Krychevs'kyi.¹⁹

Thematically, Lavrinenko believes that they were influenced by both the Westernized concept of man " - as a juridicial individual and as an object of supreme significance with a sacred right to dignity and freedom", and the traditional Ukrainian concept of man " - as a uniquely alive loving being".²⁰

While the works of the shestydesiatnyky provide evidence of Western influences, it is important not to overestimate the influence of the West upon them. One must be careful to gauge what exactly they may have borrowed from the West and what, although similar to tendencies exhibited

in the West, evolved as part of the natural literary process within Soviet Ukraine itself. Many critics, for example, believe that this group "... demonstrate[d] a return to the mainsprings of modern Ukrainian poetry."²¹ In other words, these poets reached back into Ukrainian literary history to the progressive era of the 1920's and attempted to use the maxims of this era as a basis for their creativity. This theory is contained in Luckyj's argument that:

A literature can be truly influenced and nourished only by itself and by what it willingly absorbs from outside. Whatever is imposed upon it, will, after a time, fall away, and old trends will be picked up again. This is particularly true of a culturally underdeveloped country, where the energy necessary to assert a national identity has been stifled. Ukrainian poets may quote Tvardovsky (as Drach does) and invoke Mayakovsky (although now they also turn to Walt Whitman), but they make their verses out of the language perfected by its earlier masters, and continue the intellectual search of their compatriots.²²

They were also fortunate enough to be able to familiarize themselves with the representatives and aims of the literature of the 1920's. This occurred not only through underground channels, but also legitimately, since with the process of de-Stalinization a large number of formerly proscribed works, banned from the time of the literary purges of the early 1930's, were slowly being rehabilitated. Although only selected authors and works were able to share in this fate, those that were, influenced the creativity of the shestydesiatnyky profoundly:

... what was recovered from oblivion conveyed a great deal of the rich literature that had enjoyed such a flowering in the 1920's. Some of the leading writers of the era, notably Mykola Khvyl'ovyi, the author of the slogan "away from Moscow," were not rehabilitated. But those who were, must in some measure have provided the spark for the upsurge in literature of the sixties.²³

All of these factors were significant in contributing to the cause of the conflict between the shestydesiatnyky and the Party. The Party

liners based their opposition to them on the premise that they were attempting to deviate from the norms of socialist realism. Many Western critics agree with this premise and view it as one of the main factors that bound the various members of this group into a cohesive unit.

All of the shestydesiatnyky were self-professed Komsomol or Communist Party members. Hence, it would have been uncharacteristic of them to have taken part in any ideological misconduct. Their fundamental error, in light of Communist principles, lay in striving to disassociate literature and politics, two realms of thought that they felt should not be forced into an unnatural union. Their deviation from the Party line was thus based upon aesthetic principles:

Of course, they write poems dealing with Lenin, cosmonauts, or the struggle for peace, but they also emphasize free creativity, truthful description of life, imaginative observation of nature, ...²⁴

They were striving to attain the right to approach literature as an entity independent of restrictions therefore freeing themselves for solely creative concerns:

The protest of the young poets is, politically, very mild. They issue no slogans and their patriotism is tempered by Communist internationalism. Yet their protest after decades of un-poetry is both effective and lasting because it avoids the touchy national issue and instead produces solid poetic achievement, revealing rich native resources of language and thought.²⁵

Some Western critics laud the shestydesiatnyky for their patriotism and nationalism, while Soviet critics derisively accuse them of "destructive" or "bourgeois" nationalism. It is interesting to note that two critics, J. Pelenski and G. Luckyj, disagree with anyone classifying this group as a nationalistic one. Pelenski believes that although they are concerned with the fate of their homeland and interested in its historical background, "they are not nationalists but good patriots who are con-

cerned about the future of their country."²⁶ Luckyj explains more concisely as to why he believes it is wrong to classify them this way. He delves into the literary environment of the decade between 1922-32 to point out that some of the writers of this period could be objectively called nationalists, while others were totally apolitical in their orientation, although all of them were accused of being nationalists by the Soviet authorities. In the same way he feels that the *shestydesiatnyky* should not all be misnamed as nationalists, when in effect they are not:

The emergence of the "modernist" poets of the sixties cannot be explained as a purely national phenomenon because they are concerned with the restoration of freedom not only for Ukraine but for all men. National sentiments are prominent in some poets (Drach, Vinhranovs'kyi), but greater concern is voiced for social justice and individual freedom.²⁷

The literary discussion surrounding the young poets is generally viewed as beginning with the publication of their first works. Koshelivets' states that it is officially noted as beginning with the discussion of their published works at the joint meeting of the Critics' and Poets' Branches of the Ukrainian Writers' Union on November 10, 1961.

At this meeting two important speeches were made by leading Union members. The first, by Stepan Kryzhanivs'kyi,²⁸ praised the young poets as a new generation of Communists, and defended their right to reflect not only Soviet but also Western creative thought. Although basically speaking in defense of this movement, Kryzhanivs'kyi's words seemed carefully chosen to remain safely within the boundaries of socialist realism. The reason for this lies in the fact that

the official position of the Presidium of the Ukrainian Writers' Union at that time, in order to refrain from exhibiting any tendency toward promoting complete creative freedom, was one of limited praise.²⁹

The second major speech was presented by Mykola Sheremet, who is noted for being one of the most vocal opponents of the shestydesiatnyky. In the guise of welcoming these young writers to the fold of Soviet Ukrainian literature, he vehemently attacked their literary endeavours.³⁰ His attack was mainly aimed at three representatives of the group: Drach, Vinhranovs'kyi and Korotych. By far most of his attention was focused upon Drach and his premier work "Knife in the Sun," which he harshly berated and termed a "poem-rebus." Sheremet accused the young poets of dealing with falsehoods, far-fetchedness, and overcomplexities instead of striving for the kind of simplicity that would bring their works closer to the understanding of the people. He backed up his argument by quoting the Russian writer Leo Tolstoy: "The simple and not artificial may not always be beautiful, but the complex and artificial cannot ever be beautiful."³¹

From the discussion³² that ensued it is obvious that the majority of the elder generation had taken a very paternalistic attitude toward the young poets. For example, one of the concluding statements of the report on this discussion stated: "The young do not require over-enthusiastic, pointless praise, instead they require sincere, reasonable, parental guidance."³³ Thus at the outset, the established literary community firmly believed that their expertise should be the guiding force of the young.

Luckyj, on the other hand, believed that officially the discussion began shortly after this meeting, at the Third Plenum of the Ukrainian

Writers' Union held in January, 1962.³⁴ At this Plenum, Oles' Honchar, Soviet Ukrainian poet-laureate and president of the Union, presented the major address.³⁵ In it he attacked the policies practised under the personality cult, praised the freedom of the new more liberal literary atmosphere, and stressed the importance of the principles of Soviet internationalism and socialist realism. As to the young poets specifically, he stated his belief that the discussion surrounding their creativity was a healthy phenomena, for its scope had grown so wide that it even involved the generally silent reading public. Furthermore, he praised the poetry of the shestydesiatnyky and welcomed them to literary life. However, he was especially careful to point out to them the importance of not ignoring their poetic forebears, saying:

... by respecting yourselves, comrades, respect also the poetry that was created before your time and is still worthy of respect today, the poetry that fought against the enemy in the front lines, ... learn it without any prejudice - for here there is much for you to learn.³⁶

He also warned them to be objectively critical of their own works, especially when subjected to negative criticism, and to treat such criticism as an essential learning vehicle.

Present at this Plenum were several representatives of the shestydesiatnyky, among them Ivan Drach and Ivan Dziuba. From the accounts³⁷ of the discussion that ensued after Honchar's speech, it appears that Drach took it upon himself to act as a representative for the entire group of young poets. In his speech he made the following points:

... that new poets will "create the art of communism, of which Soviet Ukrainian will form a part"; that young intellectuals are enthusiastic about foreign (Western European) art - especially Picasso, Van Gogh, Gauguin, Monet and Cezanne; and that several "forgotten" Ukrainian writers and artists of the past ought to be remembered and treated "with dignity."³⁸

Dziuba, characteristically, defended the shestydesiatnyky's right to incorporate new and unusual motifs into their poetry and opposed terming this tendency a type of formal experimentation. He and Drach agreed that young writers should be given every opportunity to freely publish their collections.

Regardless of when this literary discussion officially began, it soon took on immense proportions in the press. The most lively debates took place in the pages of the newspaper Literaturna Ukraina (renamed from Literaturna hazeta in February, 1962) and the journals Vitchyzna, Prapor and Dnipro. The majority of critics were quick to divide themselves into two opposing camps. The supporters included the writers and critics: Stepan Kryzhanivskyi, Maksym Ryl'skyi, Oles' Honchar, Leonid Novychenko, Andrii Malyshko, Ivan Svitlychnyi, Ivan Dziuba, Mykhailo Ostryk and Ivan Boichak, although Koshelivets' points out that the first five of these "... all guardedly supported the young (even though not always agreeing with them), ..."39 The opponents included Petro Morhaienko, Mykhailo Chabanivskyi, Platon Voronko and the aforementioned Mykola Sheremet. Koshelivets' cites a number of other prominent literary figures, such as O. Kornichuk, Mykola Bazhan, Leonid Pervomaiskyi and M. Stelmakh, as being silent throughout this discussion, not even rallying "... after the very obvious signal of a pogrom was issued from Moscow".40

The supporters of this movement were kept busy defending the shestydesiatnyky against the derisive criticism of their opponents. The critic Ivan Svitlychnyi, for example, defended them, especially Drach, point by point against the accusations made by Mykola Sheremet.41 He

evaluated the level of poetic creativity in Ukraine prior to the emergence of this group as being qualitatively very low and stated that their type of poetry arose from a very real literary need:

... we should not forget that their searching has emanated from a distinct literary crisis, from an overly wide distance between literature and its readers, therefore from a mutual source of necessity, and not from some sort of personal eccentricities.⁴²

Mykhailo Ostryk also polemicized with Sheremet and other opponents of the shestydesiatnyky.⁴³ Although he agreed that definite shortcomings could be found within their works, he defended their poetry and was not hesitant to attack, above all, Sheremet's seeming poetic naivete. He felt that all critics should at least be in agreement on the following major points concerning the creativity of the young poets:

... its depth of content, the fact that it touches upon the significant problems of society, and that it attempts to rethink its own position in the struggle for Communism.⁴⁴

Ivan Boichak agreed with Svitlychnyi's analysis of the overall state of Ukrainian poetry prior to the emergence of the shestydesiatnyky.⁴⁵ He further postulated that if this had not been the case, then there would not be so much interest centered around their poems. He attributed their accomplishments to their ability to view the world's essential unity and constant state of flux in a thoroughly contemporary manner:

Viewing the world in its organic unity, in the unity of the past, present and future, their poetry is able to judge itself and its epoch from the position of the future, approaches the present by measuring it from the standpoint of what is should be (and must be!) tomorrow.⁴⁶

As well, he was firm in his insistence that the basis of the discussion lay in the conflict between the young and talented and the old and the inert, with the old being extremely resentful of the talent possessed by the young.

Supporting this argument are the words of Ivan Drach, spoken at a "round table" meeting of young writers held in Kiev and sponsored by the Russian newspaper Literaturnaia gazeta. Leonid Novychenko stated that at this meeting Drach placed the blame for the lack of understanding of the works of the shestydesiatnyky upon "... all Ukrainian literature of the last decades that preceded them ..."⁴⁷

The opposition to the shestydesiatnyky, as previously stated, was led by Mykola Sheremet, and one of his foremost backers was Petro Morhaienko. Morhaienko most ardently argued against the points made by Ivan Svitlychnyi.⁴⁸ He seemed quite taken aback by Svitlychnyi's statement that the level of modern Ukrainian poetry prior to the emergence of the shestydesiatnyky was scandalously low, stating: " And even if he presented tens of times more examples - the basis for such a low evaluation of our level of poetry would still be groundless."⁴⁹ Morhaienko, like Sheremet, was also especially critical of the works of Ivan Drach, and stepped out in defence of all of Sheremet's arguments concerning them.

Another critic, Mykhailo Chabanivs'kyi, also underlined the many shortcomings of the young.⁵⁰ His solution to the problem they created lay in their co-operation with the older generation of writers, so that their elders might influence them into rectifying their many errors:

We should all fraternize - the old and the young, the experienced and the inexperienced, patiently and professionally discuss the important factors, in order to teach some to distinguish a cockle from a grain, and others to distinguish gilt from a true gem.⁵¹

He also warned against formalistic tendencies, egotism, innovation in the guise of trickery, and disassociation from the real needs of the people, and stressed the importance of adherence to Communist ideals.

In the midst of this discussion, on March 20, 1962, four members of the shestydesiatnyky, Ivan Drach, Yevhen Hutsalo, Mykola Vinhranovs'kyi and Mykola Synhaivs'kyi, were granted membership in the Ukrainian Writers' Union. The majority of this meeting was devoted to the question of the young, although the general consensus of those present still seemed to be that the young were only in need of some constructive guidance.⁵² An interesting comment is credited as having been made at this meeting by the president of the Union's Presidium, Yurii Zbanats'kyi: "Lately a number of discussions have been centred around the so-called problem of the young ... of course no such problem exists, but the Union perhaps is not working with them enough."⁵³ The important point here was that Zbanats'kyi and other members of the Union did not yet view the shestydesiatnyky as a problematic group but were still inclined to assess their shortcomings as characteristic of inexperienced youth.

Shortly afterward Drach, Vinhranovs'kyi and Dziuba spoke before a large gathering of writers, students and young people in the city of L'viv. Their appearance at this gathering spurred heated discussions in the press, urging for more creative freedom. These discussions may have been the cause of the sudden and dramatic change in the official stance toward the shestydesiatnyky.

The meeting of the Presidium of the Ukrainian Writers' Union on June 23, 1962, signalled the end of the rather broadminded stance that the Union had taken up to this point. At this meeting the editors of the journals Vitchyzna, Prapor and Dnipro and the newspaper Literaturna Ukraina were condemned for being lax in allowing works that did not

adhere to the tenets of socialist realism to be printed in their editions. They were further chastised for condoning the schism between the old and young generations of writers. More significantly, at this meeting, the Presidium accepted a resolution to curb literary freedom and, when necessary, censor the works of the young.⁵⁴

The harsh line adopted by the Presidium forewarned of further official recriminations that soon followed. In August, 1962, at the plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, Party Secretary Skaba is quoted as being extremely critical of the shestydesiatnyky, for creating, in his view, an almost anarchical situation in literature:

Among the creative intelligentsia, there are occasionally people who, under the guise of the struggle against administration, are trying to compromise the very idea of Party leadership in literature and art ... They demand a "freedom" of creation which would be completely free of Communist ideology.⁵⁵

It is important to note that although official pressure had increased significantly the shestydesiatnyky were still managing to have their works appear in print. Also, these admonitions had not seemed to chastise them measurably, for, as noted by Luckyj: "Not only have poets like Drach and Vinhranovs'kyi not been silenced or 're-educated'; in their latest poems there is a note of defiance."⁵⁶

Nor did the discussion surrounding this group decrease as a result of the new resolutions although, perhaps now, its tone was more wary and less forthright. Maksym Ryl's'kyi, who had previously not spoken out, now voiced his opinion. In a mainly observational article⁵⁷ he showed himself to be a wary but insightful supporter of the young. In this article he warned of a "battle" with harsh consequences that might

ensue if the young did not start complying with the demands that were being made of them.

The first attempts to curb this movement were rather ineffectual, but the situation soon changed. The central Party organ, appalled by the direction that creative endeavour had taken within the past several years, forcefully stepped in.

During the winter of 1962 - 1963, the leaders of the Communist Party launched an enormous public campaign to bring writers and artists more closely to heel. The campaign, waged on a vaster and more threatening scale than anything of its kind since the Stalin era, brought the Party into collision not with all the creative artists in the Soviet Union but with virtually all in every generation who were possessed of genuine talent.⁵⁸

On December 17, 1962, at a meeting of the Party and government leaders with representatives of literature and the arts, Central Party Secretary, L.F. Il'ichov, harshly condemned abstractionism, modernistic innovation and formalism in all forms of art. He termed it "... a deviation from the basic line of development of Soviet literature".⁵⁹ His arguments were based on the fact that this type of creativity could not be readily understood by the general public. However, this again was not a strong enough move to significantly stem the tide of creativity in the Soviet Union as a whole or in Ukraine in particular.

As a result, three months later Khrushchev himself, was forced to speak out forcefully. He did so at another meeting of the Party and government leaders with representatives of literature and the arts held March 7-8, 1963. In his speech, which proved to be catastrophic for the *shestydesiatnyky*, he reiterated the previous condemnation of abstractionism and formalism and forbade any deviation from the tenets of socialist realism.⁶⁰ In doing so, he realized that "... it was impossible

to save the cause of socialism while condemning its creator,"⁶¹ and was thus forced into once again rehabilitating Stalin. Having done this, he candidly implied that Stalinistic punitive measures might also be resurrected to deal with those who deviate from the "will of the collective."⁶²

Although these official attacks seemed aimed at abstractionism and formalism, the critics tend to believe that the Party was more particularly opposed to "... the individualistic manner of thought and feelings, that lead to abstractionism and formalism."⁶³ If one is to agree with this opinion, then it might be conjectured that the Party may have feared that independent thinking might eventually lead to anarchy among the creative intelligentsia.

The Fourth Plenary Session of the Soviet Writers' Union, held March 26-28, 1963, concentrated on the discussion of questions of ideology and artistic craftsmanship and accepted the official Party position without reservation. At this session the Ukrainian critic Leonid Novychenko is quoted as degrading the Ukrainian poets Drach and Vinhranovs'kyi by comparing them to the Russian poet (although of Ukrainian origin) Yevhen Yevtushenko whom he characterized as "... a very uneducated man, both generally and in the sense of Marxist education, the Marxist world view."⁶⁴

At the meeting of the Kievan Writers' Organization held in April, 1963, total support of the new Party policy was evident.⁶⁵ The members were quick to criticize the works of a number of the shestydesiatnyky, among them Drach, Vinhranovs'kyi and Korotych. The works of Drach and Vinhranovs'kyi were singled out as "confused" and condemned for being

published by Ukrainian "bourgeois nationalists" in the West. It was at this meeting that Mykola Vinhranovs'kyi, undoubtedly realizing the difficult position he and his colleagues were now in, sought to redeem himself by publically renouncing his earlier creative position.

With all Party and associated organs resolutely stepping out against the shestydesiatnyky, individual critics and writers, even some who had previously not taken any part in the literary discussion, were now quick to voice their adamant disapproval in the printed media. Among the most noteworthy of them was Pavlo Tychyna. In his article "Being faithful to an important idea to the end,"⁶⁶ he derisively attacked the young and stated that they were under the direct influence "... of the soulless and mindless Western artists, who have long ago fallen over the ideological precipice."⁶⁷ Here, he reiterated the statements concerning the importance of common ideology as a defence against succumbing to the enemy that he also voiced in another article⁶⁸ that appeared at about the same time in the newspaper Literaturna Ukraina. Koshelivets', for one, was extremely critical of Tychyna's reaction:

With a now characteristic tactlessness, he took advantage of an official directive and, in a completely indecorous manner which did not at all suit a poet of his stature, attacked the young.⁶⁹

Another harshly outspoken attack against the shestydesiatnyky, one that was directly unavailable to this study, although it is cited by both Soviet and Western critics, was that of a village schoolteacher named Stepanenko.⁷⁰ Stepanenko criticized the young poets for the incomprehensibility of their works. He backed up his argument by stating that, having acquainted

the village intelligentsia, the workers of the livestock farm, the collective farm machinists, the specialists in village husbandry, the more renowned in the collective - the heroes of socialist labour, ... they could not understand it either, and were surprised at this sort of innovation, and wondered toward whom it could possibly be directed ...⁷¹

Amidst this furor, the literary creativity of the shestydesiatnyky was not halted. In fact, some of the members of this group did not hesitate to voice their objections to the Party directives in print. One of the most fervent objections was that made by Ivan Drach in the poem "Ode to the Virtuous Coward", which critics believe was addressed directly to Tychyna. In this poem, Drach boldly denounced everything the older generation represented, characterizing them in part, in the following manner:

You have many sides that you are round like a snake,
You are a white-headed master with a black palate,
You always sing the same song,
That my generation is decadent.⁷²

The critics were quick to condemn Drach's outspokenness and Novychenko took it upon himself to issue Drach a stern warning, saying, "... a poet who sinks so low must seriously think about his future endeavours in Soviet literature."⁷³ The warning was clear, he must either recant his position or suffer the consequences of creative oblivion.

If the official measures did not halt the literary creativity of the shestydesiatnyky they did make themselves strongly felt. Within a relatively short period of time the character of creative endeavour was forcibly altered to once again suit the demands of socialist realism. March 8, 1963, the date of Krushchev's now historic speech, is marked as the date when the literary "thaw" officially ended:

... March, 1963 was the date of the beginning of the pogrom against the shortlived revival of literature that occurred within the wake of the Stalinist era and began not directly after the death of Stalin, but only in 1956; thus, it barely lasted seven years.⁷⁴

With Khrushchev's downfall in 1964, Soviet literature began to experience even more stringent controls. The new Party leadership soon showed itself to be less "open-minded" than the previous and refused to tolerate, from the outset, any literary deviations.

Even in the face of stricter regulation, not all of the shestydesiatnyky were willing to conform and dissent could still be felt within their ranks. To these dissenters, whom he does not name, Luckyj attributes:

... the organiz[ation of] informal literary gatherings, sometimes in commemoration of nineteenth century poets like Taras Shevchenko or Lesia Ukrainka. Some of them may have been instrumental in smuggling out the diary and some unpublished poems of Vasyi Symonenko, an idol of Ukrainian youth at that time.⁷⁵

The majority of the shestydesiatnyky did, however, alter the nature of their poetry, so as not to risk recrimination. As noted previously, one of the first of this group to admit to an error in judgment was Mykola Vinhranovs'kyi, although the character of his works changed slowly. As well, a visible alteration in the creative direction of Ivan Drach's poetry was soon positively noted by Soviet critics, especially in regard to his second collection of poetry Solar Prominences of the Heart:⁷⁶

In the following years the poets (I. Drach, M. Vinhranovs'kyi) relieved their works (although slowly and not totally effectively) of the unnecessary juggling of words and superfluous complexities of figurative language, and concentrated themselves upon searching for means which facilitated the transmission of important social ideas to the wide circle of readers.⁷⁷

Other prominent shestydesiatnyky who followed suit were Vitalii Korotych, Yevhen Hutsalo, and Borys Oliinyk. Among those who refused to follow the Party directives and consequently were stifled or simply disappeared from the literary scene were Lina Kostenko, Roman Kudlyk,

Vasyl' Holoborod'ko, Hryhorii Kyrychenko and Borys Mamaisur.

In 1965-66 the Soviet government instigated a new wave of repression and carried out a series of arrests to rid the literary community of its troublemakers. At this time, however, the poets and writers were not the ones being persecuted. This new wave of oppression, Timothy McClure terms the "crisis of the intellectuals," and he juxtaposes it to the earlier oppression of "poets and the liberal wing of the official intelligentsia."⁷⁸ Correspondingly those arrested in Soviet Ukraine at this time were

... the literary critics Ivan Svitlychny, Ivan Dziuba, the historian Valentyn Moroz and the writer Mykhailo Osadchy as well as scores of journalists, artists, young scholars and students.⁷⁹

These arrests and subsequent trials elicited an extremely fervent reaction from the populace. Among those who voiced their disapproval of this action, especially in relation to the arrests of the two critics Svitlychnyi and Dziuba, was Ivan Drach. In November, 1966, while in New York City as part of the Soviet delegation to the United Nations, Drach is cited as

... not confirm[ing] or deny[ing] these accusations [the official accusations directed by the Party against Svitlychnyi and Dziuba - A.P.], but ... say[ing] that he felt there was no need to arrest the accused or bring them to trial.⁸⁰

From this it might be inferred that although he had succeeded in achieving a relative degree of political favour, at least some of his previous convictions were still intact. Therefore, it is not surprising that some Western critics feel that Drach's conformity stemmed solely from a desire to actively survive in the Soviet literary arena.

The Fifth Congress of the Ukrainian Writers' Union, held in November, 1966, was illuminating on several points, particularly as to

the status of the Ukrainian language on Ukrainian territory and as to the further fate of the shestydesiatnyky.

As to the first point, there was a definite steering away from the previous tendency toward Russifying the Ukrainian language. Petro Shelest, Ukrainian Communist Party leader, in his opening address to the Congress unprecedentedly stated that the development of Ukrainian culture and language depends to a great extent on Ukrainian writers whose task it is to promote and defend them. This line of thought was further developed by almost all of the Congress's other speakers. Oles' Honchar, President of the Union at this time, stressed the importance of designating the Ukrainian language as the primary language of instruction in secondary schools and institutions of higher learning, thus releasing it from the stigma attached to a language of secondary stature. He, like other speakers, emphasized the importance of defending the independent existence of the language in its pure and unpolluted form.⁸¹

As to the second point, Western reports concerning this Congress stress the significance of the fact that "... for the first time the group of the so-called '60ers' participated."⁸² It was also noted that a number of the newly appointed members of the Presidium of the Directorate of the Union were also original members of this group, among them Drach, Korotych, Hutsalo and Oliinyk. In fact, the overall evaluation of the shestydesiatnyky as a group was at this point in time quite positive:

At the Congress there occurred no outward condemnation of any young literarians for "ideological errors" or "formalistic twists." No one was accused of allowing "vague and ambiguous content into their poetry, prose, or critical essays" ...⁸³

The staid Soviet Ukrainian literary community, as well, showed acceptance and recognition of at least some of the contributions made to Ukrainian literature by the shestydesiatnyky. In relation to this point, Karl Siehs concluded that the broadminded approach to the nationality problem exhibited at this Congress came about as the result of "... the preparatory work of the '60ers' in this direction ..."84 An early supporter of this group, the critic Stepan Kryzhaniv's'kyi in his speech at this Congress displayed a great deal of insight in assessing the literary achievements of the period between this and the last Writers' Union Congress held in 1959. In his opinion, the majority of positive contributions came about as the direct result of their efforts:

... the three most important aspects of this period were the elevation of humanistic problematics, humanistic and high-minded resonance, the elevation of poetic, aesthetical culture which reflected itself in the area of innovation, and the appearance of a new generation, conventionally called the shestydesiatnyky.⁸⁵

Thus by the latter half of the 1960's, attitudes toward the shestydesiatnyky had altered dramatically. It was officially conceded that their achievements in the literary field were of immeasurable significance to Ukrainian literature. Although harsh repression was still being exercised against individual members, the poets in this group seemed to be making a comfortable niche for themselves within Soviet literary society. The once heated literary discussion that had plagued them relentlessly was now relegated to very low stature. In fact, Shelest went so far as to characterize it as having been either "non-existent" or "contrived."⁸⁶

The cause for this change in attitude can be attributed to the fact that as their works adopted more and more traits that were consistent

with socialist realism, their creative endeavours became more accepted. This is not to say that by doing so the poets had necessarily betrayed all of their earlier literary convictions. Due to their seeming ideological conformity, however, many aspects of their innovative style, which had been frowned upon earlier, were now acceptable to the standards of Soviet literature. Whether the ideological complicity of those poets of this group who were willing to comply was sincere or feigned cannot be determined in this overview. What may be determined is that by doing so, they compromised their further creativity and Ukrainian poetry suffered a great loss. In the ensuing years poetic endeavour consistently declined. In characterizing the general state of Soviet Ukrainian poetry at a plenum of the Directorate of the Writers' Union, held in March, 1973, the Union head Vasyl' Kozachenko attested to this fact when he stated: "... our poetry seems to be lacking in sapidity and impassioned expression."⁸⁷ Koshelivets' agreed with this evaluation and singled out Ivan Drach's works as an example of the low literary level some of the former shestydesiatnyky had reduced their poetry to, by stating that, "... in contemporary Drach, one cannot find any traces of what he was before."⁸⁸

With their arrival onto the Soviet Ukrainian literary arena in the early 1960's, the shestydesiatnyky sparked a controversy in both literary and official circles so intense that it seemed to rival the literary discussion of the 1920's. The efforts of this group were instrumental in reviving a literary culture whose history from the early 1930's onward had seemed doomed to extinction. In fact, they were able to effectively bridge the span of thirty years that divided them from the literary

flourishing of the 1920's and at least equal, if not surpass, the creative genius of that era.

This literary movement was an ideologically cohesive one, even though its members exhibited strong, individualistic creative traits. Their common goal centered on the redefinition of Soviet Ukrainian poetics with a concentration on purely aesthetic values, detached from political connotation and political control. Their poetry was characterized by a deep concern for the philosophical, moral and psychological aspects of human existence and the overall well-being of mankind.

Their relative creative independence lasted only a very short time, from 1960-61 to 1963, when literary creativity once again fell under the strict regimentation of Party controls. Regardless of the imposition of these controls, however, for the better part of the 1960's, the poets of this group were able to produce works which,

... although Soviet in ideological content and subject matter, in the artistic sense, that is, in their attempts to enrich the poetic language and poetic techniques, remained the same as they had at their inception in 1961: new, fresh and original.⁸⁹

For reasons of personal conviction, individually, the shestydesiatnyky did not share common creative destinies. What they did, however, share was an immense contribution to the development of modern Ukrainian literature.

FOOTNOTES

¹Marc Slonim, "The Thaw," Soviet Russian Literature, Writers and Problems, 1917-1977 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 320.

²George S.N. Luckyj, "Introduction," Four Ukrainian Poets (New York: Quixote, 1969), n.p.

³Joachim G. Gorlich, "Ukrainian Literature Between Persecution and the Thaw," The Ukrainian Review 13 (Summer 1966): 49.

⁴Ivan Koshelivets' (Koshelivets), "A Decade of Ukrainian Literature," Studies on the Soviet Union 3 (No. 2 1963): 105-106.

⁵Bohdan Kravtsiv, "'Velyka vedmedytsia' i 'Honchi psy'" ('The Great Bear' and 'The Chasing Dogs'), Suchasnist' (February 1962): 24.

⁶Slonim, p. 347.

⁷Luckyj, "Ukrainian Literature", Discordant Voices, The Non-Russian Soviet Literatures, 1953-1973, ed. George S.N. Luckyj (Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic Press, 1975), p. 128.

⁸Kravtsiv (Krawciw), Shistdesiat poetiv shistdesiatykh rokiv (Sixty poets of the sixties) (New York: Prolog, 1967), pp. v-xxi.

⁹Yurii Lavrinenko, "Z poetychnoi vesny na Radians'kii Ukraini 60-ykh rokiv" (From the poetic spring in the Soviet Ukraine of the 1960's), Zrub i parosty (Stumps and sprouts) (Munich: Suchasnist', 1971), pp. 308-324.

¹⁰Kravtsiv, p. vii.

¹¹Volodymyr Briuhhen, "Manera i manirnist'" (Manner and pretentiousness), Literaturna Ukraina, 22 October 1965.

¹²Lavrinenko, p. 316.

¹³Luckyj, p. 130.

¹⁴Kravtsiv, p. vii.

¹⁵Koshelivets', p. 106.

¹⁶Ivan Koshelivets' (Iwan Koszeliwec), "Shestydesiatnyky" (Writers of the sixties), Suchasna literatura v URSR (The Ukrainian literature of to-day) (Munich: Prolog, 1964), pp. 276-277.

17Osy Zinkewych, "Z generatsii novatoriv" (From the generation of innovators), Z generatsii novatoriv, Svitlychnyi i Dziuba (From the generation of innovators, Svitlychnyi and Dziuba) (Baltimore: Smoloskyp, 1967), p. 90.

18Ivan Dziuba, Introduction to "Nizh u sontsi" (Knife in the Sun), Literatura hazeta, 18 July 1961.

19Kravtsiv, "'The Great Bear' and 'The Chasing Dogs'," pp. 47-48.

20Lavrinenko, p. 319.

21Luckyj, "Literary Ferment in the Ukraine," Problems of Communism 11 (November-December 1962): 53.

22Ibid.

23Luckyj, "Introduction," Clandestine Essays, by Yevhen Sverstiuk, ed. & transl. George S.N. Luckyj (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1976), p. 8.

24Jaroslav Pelenski, "Recent Ukrainian Writing," Survey (no. 59 1966): 104.

25Luckyj, "Literary Ferment in the Ukraine," p. 54.

26Pelenski, p. 106.

27Luckyj, "Introduction," Clandestine Essays, p. 9.

28Stepan Kryzhanivskyi, "Buiannia molodykh syl" (The flourishing of young talents), Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo (January 1962); 3-15.

29Koshelivets', p. 328.

30Mykola Sheremet, "Neproste i shtuchne buty harnym ne mozhe" (The complex and artificial cannot ever be beautiful), Literaturna hazeta, 14 November 1961.

31Ibid.

32"Za hlyboku dumku, za yaskrave slovo!" (For insightful thought, for the illuminated word!), Literaturna hazeta, 17 November 1961.

33Ibid.

34Luckyj, "Literary Ferment in the Ukraine," p. 51.

35"Za pravdyve i vysokodushne vidtvorennia zhyttia narodu!" (For the truthful and highminded depiction of the life of the people!) Literaturna hazeta, 12 January 1962. Speech by Union Head, Oles' Honchar, at the Third Plenum of the Ukrainian Writers' Union, January 10, 1962.

36Ibid.

37"Vsi syly tvorchosti - budivnytstvu komunizmu!" (All creative talents - to the building of Communism!), Literaturna hazeta, 16 January 1962.

38Ibid, cited by Luckyj, "Literary Ferment in the Ukraine," p. 52.

39Koshelivets', p. 332.

40Ibid, pp. 332-333.

41Ivan Svitlychnyi, "U poetychnim kosmosi" (In the poetic cosmos), Dnipro (April 1962): 144-152.

42Ibid, p. 145.

43Mykhailo Ostryk, "V im'ia choho vony, hromy i blyskavytsi?" (In the name of what are they, the thunder and lightning?), Prapor (March 1962): 63-68.

44Ibid, p. 68.

45Ivan Boichak, "Na pul'si epokhy" (On the pulse of the epoch), Dnipro (May 1962): 134-152.

46Ibid, p. 140.

47Leonid Novychenko, "Zvidky berut'sia zabobony?" (Where do superstitions originate?), Literaturna Ukraina, 4 April 1963.

48Petro Morhaienko, "Slovo v polemitsi" (A word in the polemics) Dnipro (May 1962): 152-156.

49Ibid, p. 153.

50Mykhailo Chabanivs'kyi, "Uvaha: rozmova pro naiholovnishe" (Attention: a discussion about the most important), Literaturna Ukraina, 8 January 1963.

51Ibid.

52L. Kopylenko, "Shche vchora chytachi - s'ohodni pys'mennyky" (Yesterday still readers - today writers), Literaturna Ukraina, 23 March 1962.

53Ibid.

54"U presidii SPU" (In the presidium of the Ukrainian Writers' Union), Literaturna Ukraina, 29 June 1982.

55"Report on the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party", Radians'ka Ukraina, 11 August 1962, cited by Luckyj, "Literary Ferment in the Ukraine," p. 54.

56Luckyj, "Literary Ferment in the Ukraine," p. 55.

57Maksym Ryl's'kyi, "Bat'ky i dity" (Parents and children), Literaturna Ukraina, 10 August 1962.

58Priscilla Johnson, Khrushchev and the Arts, The Politics of Soviet Culture, 1962-1964 (Cambridge, Massachussetts: The M.I.T. Press, 1965), p. 1.

59"Tvoryty dlia narodu, v im'ia komunizmu" (Creating for the people, in the name of Communism), Literaturna Ukraina 25 December 1962. Speech by First Secretary of the CPSU, L.F. Il'ichov, at meeting of the Party and government leaders with representatives of literature and the arts, December 17, 1962.

60"Vysoka ideinist' i khudozhnia maisternist' - velyka syla radians'koi literatury i mystetstva" (Lofty ideals and artistic craftsmanship - the great force of Soviet literature and art), Literaturna Ukraina, 12 March 1963. Speech by N.S. Khrushchev at meeting of the Party and government leaders with representatives of literature and the arts, March 8, 1963.

61Ivan Koshelivets' (Iwan Koszeliwec), "Z peredmovy do pershoho vydannia" (From the foreword to the first edition), Panorama nainovishoi literatury v URSR (Panorama of the new Ukrainian literature) (Munich: Suchasnist', 1974), p. 9.

62"Lofty ideals and artistic craftsmanship - the great forces of Soviet literature and art."

63Koshelivets', "From the foreword to the first edition," pp. 9-10.

64Cited in Johnson, p. 197. Ukrainian language original in Leonid Novychenko, "Where do superstitions originate?"

65"Berehty chest' i slavu radians'koi literatury, zbory orhanyzatsii kyivs'kykh psy'mennykiv" (Protecting the virtue and glory of Soviet literature: meeting of the Organization of Kievan writers), Literaturna Ukraina, 23 April 1963.

66Pavlo Tychyna, "Buty virnym velyki idei do kintsia" (Being faithful to a great idea to the end), Dnipro (August 1963): 145-148.

67Ibid, p. 145.

68Tychyna, "Vchytys' na istorii revoliutsii" (Learning from the history of the Revolution), Literaturna Ukraina, 19 March 1963.

69Koshelivets', "Writers of the Sixties," p. 333.

700. Stepanenko, "Poety, pyshit' dlia narodu" (Poets, write for the people), Radians'ka Ukraina, 23 December 1963, cited by Koshelivets', "Writers of the Sixties," p. 333.

71Ibid.

72Cited in Pelenski, p. 105.

73Novychenko, "Velyka vidpovidal'nist' khudozhnyka pered narodom" (The artist's great responsibility to the people), Komunist Ukrainy (January 1963): 70.

74Ivan Koshelivets', "Deshcho pro suchasnyi stan ukrains'koi radians'koi literatury" (Concerning the current state of Soviet Ukrainian literature), Suchasnist' (July 1975): 20.

75Luckyj, "Ukrainian Literature," p. 134.

76Ivan Drach, Protuberantsi sertsia (Solar Prominences of the Heart) (Kiev: Molod', 1965) 143 pp.

77Novychenko, gen. ed., Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury (History of Ukrainian literature), 8 vols. (Kiev: n.p., 1971) vol. 8: "Poeziia" (Poetry), Literatura pisliavoiennoho chasu (1946-1967) (Literature of the post-war period), p. 254.

78Timothy McClure (pseud.), "The Politics of Soviet Culture, 1964-1967," Problems of Communism 16 (March-April 1967): 27.

79Luckyj, p. 134.

80Prolog, 16 November 1966, cited by Robert S. Sullivan, "Voices From the Ukraine ... the 'Shestidesiatnyky'," Problems of Communism (September-October 1967): 51.

81"Ukrains'ka radians'ka literatura na peredodni velykoho p'iatdesiatyrichchia" (Soviet Ukrainian literature on the threshold of the great fiftieth anniversary), Literaturna Ukraina, 17 November 1966. Speech by Oles' Honchar, President of the Ukrainian Writers' Union, at the Fifth Congress of the Union, November 16, 1966.

82K. Siehs, "The Fifth Writers' Congress in Kyiv," The Ukrainian Review 14 (Spring 1967): 50.

83Kravtsiv, "P'iatyi z'izd pys'mennykiv Ukrainy, Stattia persha: Try richyshcha z'izdovoi rozmovy" (The fifth Ukrainian writer's congress, Article one: Three points of discussion), Suchasnist' (March, 1967): 89.

84Siehs, p. 51.

85"Promova Stepana Kryzhanivs'koho" (Speech by Stepan Kryzhanivs'kyi), Literaturna Ukraina, 20 November 1966. At the Fifth Congress of the Ukrainian Writers' Union, November 17, 1966.

86"Boiovi zavdannia ukrains'koi radians'koi literatury" (Militant aims of Soviet Ukrainian literature), Literaturna Ukraina, 17 November 1966. Speech by Petro Shelest, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine, at the Fifth Congress of the Ukrainian Writers' Union, November 16, 1966.

87Koshelivets', p. 25.

88Ibid, p. 22.

89Kravtsiv, Sixty poets of the sixties, p. viii.

CHAPTER II

THEMES, MOTIFS AND IDEAS

The first decade of Ivan Drach's poetic career is widely considered his best. The reason for this assessment is due at least partially to the thematic concerns of his poems published during this period. Beginning with his inaugural poem, "Knife in the Sun," and continuing in his subsequent works, Drach exhibited profound expertise in rethinking questions of a very broad nature.

The poem "Knife in the Sun" elicited much controversy in Soviet literary circles. The controversy caused it to become a fundamental point of contention in the literary discussion that enveloped the entire shestydesiatnyky movement. This poem's thematic concerns played a significant role in the discussion and will, therefore, be examined separately.

The remainder of the chapter will examine the varied aspects of the poet's thematic interests as presented in the works published during the first decade of his career, particularly those that entered into the collections: Sunflower¹, Solar Prominences of the Heart², Workday Ballads³ and Poetry⁴.

Ivan Drach's creative talent came to the forefront through the explosive force of his first noteworthy poem, "Knife in the Sun." The

broad scope of themes encompassed by this work, themes unusual to Soviet Ukrainian poetry, lent it to incisive critical inspection.

The poem is divided into four major parts: "The Prologue," "Wide Open Heart," "Knife in the Sun" and "The Epilogue." "Wide Open Heart" and "Knife in the Sun" are further sub-divided into a series of shorter poems.

Western critics were in agreement concerning the poem's main theme, particularly as it related to the sub-poem "Wide Open Heart." In their opinion, this theme was a historiosophic one. It was variously thought to present either "... a poetic vision of the ruin and social stagnation rampant in Ukraine during the 1930's and 1940's"⁵ or the injustices that incessantly plagued the nation throughout its history.⁶

Soviet critics generally do not mention the historiosophism of this poem as such. They refer to what they term a form of historic thought⁷ and do not relate it to atrocities against the Ukrainian nation in the same sense as Western critics do. Some of them believe that the main theme of this work is the conflict between the eternal forces of good and evil, with goodness being necessarily equated with Communism and evil with Western Imperialism:

... the conflict between good and evil, between man's inherent goodness and black malice, between truth and wrongdoing, specifically the conflict between Communism and Imperialism.⁸

Viktor Ivanysenko characterized the main theme of the work another way, as that of fundamental universal unity. In this respect he highly praised Drach for possessing

... the ability to "open his heart" and grasp the essence of the world in its harmony and contradictions, in the unity of the great and small, "wisdom and witlessness," joy and tragedy.⁹

Critics agreed, however, that "The Prologue" was deeply concerned with the meaning of human existence.

His cosmonaut meditates on topical and vital questions concerning life, "Navishcho ya? Kudy moia doroha?" - he asks, and we understand that he is not speaking about his cosmic journey, but about the fate of mankind, the nature of his being.¹⁰

Mykhailo Ostryk, basing his reasoning on an interpretation of poetic symbols, believed that the cosmonaut's questions were well answered in the poem. The rocket was said to be a symbol of man's attainments, attainments that would ensure societal victories en route to its ultimate goal of total equality, and the hero's journey to save the sun was a symbol of "... the struggle for truth, beauty and fairmindedness against the advances of the Imperialistic spawn."¹¹

The same critic postulated the popular theory that this work reflected an extremely broad time perspective, encompassing the past, the present and the future in one organic entity. This trait was associated with the poet's successful discovery of the essence of the human thought process:

In human consciousness, in memory, in imagination, the past, present and future coexist in one time dimension - engulfing that which was in reality, with that created by fantasy.¹²

The poem "The Madwoman, Vrubel' and Honey," created much controversy among the critics. Mykola Sheremet characterized it as a "poem-rebus" and assaulted it vehemently. Equating the hero of the poem with the poet himself, he adamantly disagreed with the statements he thus attributed to the poet:

Towards whom is the young and talented poet Ivan Drach directing his youthful ardour, against whom are his lightning and thunderbolts aimed, what shocking events has he endured, that he can so Byronically say of himself: "Ya syvity pochav u dvadtsiat' p'iat' ..." "Ya - perekliaty vorohom ne trychi (Rubtsiamy ran zakutana dusha)..." "Ya-oholenyi nerv..."¹³

Sheremet did not understand how Drach could take it upon himself to write about events that he had experienced only peripherally, specifically, the Second World War and its aftermath. It was this critic's conviction that this type of thematic innovation did not attest to poetic skill, but only to poetic immaturity.

Ostryk, a loyal supporter of Drach and the shestydesiatnyky, accused Sheremet of not being able to comprehend the true nature of poetic endeavour:

Do you seriously think that it is forbidden for a poet to recreate that which he has not personally experienced? It is a worthless poet who transmits only small personal sufferings and joys, whose soul is deaf to the fears of a whole nation and perhaps of the whole world, ...¹⁴

He viewed this poem not as an attempt at assessing this period in literary history in a negative light, but, rather as an attempt at presenting the tragic losses incurred in the nation's struggle for the attainment of a better way of life.

Ivan Svitlychnyi, like Ostryk, tried to discredit Sheremet and attacked the logic of his arguments. He concluded that Sheremet's line of reasoning lead to a dearth of themes and a very low qualitative level of poetry and if followed to its logical conclusion would result in a stifling of poetic expression, "What is left to write about?" he asked, "About a daisy, one that you saw - saw with your own eyes, about an insect, one that you heard - heard with your own ears...?"¹⁵

Svitlychnyi emphasized what he termed the poem's prevalent "cosmic" themes. The word "cosmic," however, was not used to refer to heavenly bodies. It stood for a very broad thematic range, one continually expanding its store of materials. He believed that it was false to assess the poem as being concerned with abstractionist themes, for abstractionism is equated with stylistic variables rather than thematic ones. He further theorized that since there is usually no other means for a poet to adequately convey his thoughts and feelings to his reader, Sheremet's belief that "... the complex and artificial cannot ever be beautiful"¹⁶ must be erroneous.

Svitlychnyi was adamant in stating that Drach's creative force, like that of the other shestydesiatnyky, was not encumbered by "common modesty." In other words, the poet was not intimidated by "... the greatest phenomena of the world, the most complex themes, [or] the highest authorities."¹⁷ Consequently, he was believed to approach all subject matter boldly, not hesitating to delve even into the cosmos in his quest for thematic material.

Another vocal protagonist of the shestydesiatnyky, Petro Morhaienko, understood Svitychnyi to imply that "common modesty" should be distinguished from "creative modesty." Thus he accused Svitychnyi of creating two moral standards: one for poets and writers and another one for the rest of society. This type of theory was considered to be in opposition to the principles that Soviet society was based upon and, therefore, an unviable one.

Morhaienko defended Sheremet's position but in doing so did not rely on literary arguments. He relied solely on the reasoning that it was not

proper for Svitlychnyi to have intentionally poked fun at such a deserving Soviet citizen as Sheremet:

Does an older comrade, who lived through immeasurably more, than today's Ivan Drach, one who was a prisoner of war, an escapee, a partisan of O. Fedorov's detachment, ... have the right to ask such questions? I think he does.¹⁸

Ivan Boichak spoke out in defence of Svitlychnyi, particularly concerning the question of "creative modesty." He postulated that literature should only concern itself with those factors that pertain to it directly and need not bother itself with any others. Therefore, "creative modesty" has the right to exist separately from "common modesty." Furthermore, he believed that if poets were to apply the kind of criteria to their works that Sheremet and Morhaienko recommended they would strip themselves of their right to poetic personification. Moreover, this right to personification was crucial to each and every poet for it enriched his poetry by allowing him to relive the experiences of countless others:

A true artist - is a bared nerve, a heart wide open to human suffering and joy, a heart able to live the lives of many hundreds, thousands and millions, able to encompass within itself the joys and sorrows of those hundreds, thousands and millions. And not only contemporary individuals but also past and future generations.¹⁹

Furthermore, Boichak stipulated that Svitlychnyi was not attempting to create a double standard for Soviet society, for creative individuality was an essential right of their moral code.

In his previously cited article, Sheremet also made an observation as to the theme of the poem "Funeral of a Kolkhoz Chairman." Basing his argument on the following excerpt from the poem:

A ty, Betkhovene, prosty meni za te,
 Shcho ya ne mav chasu pryity do tebe,
 Shcho znaiu ya symfonii poliv,
 Ale tvoiei zhodnoi ne znaiu,
 Prosty meni, Betkhovene, za tse.
 I vy Rodeny, Motsarty i Einshteiny.

he theorized that the solely practical aspects of the chairman's life and not any other more aesthetic ones were stressed here.

Most other critics once again radically opposed Sheremet's theory. Boichak, for example, found the theme of this work to indeed be an aesthetic one. He saw it as dealing with the injustices that are inherent in contemporary life. As well, he likened the image of the chairman to that of the poem's hero for he believed that they both represented the need for positive change within the existing social system.²⁰

The Western critic Anna Horbatch asserted that this poem was making a definite anti-Soviet pronouncement. She believed Drach to be voicing a profound statement concerning the great wrongs inherent in Soviet society, wrongs that are usually not discussed in Soviet literature:

The poet exposes the mendacity of the system: whereas it is supposed to satisfy every need of the working class, it becomes quite plain - through the relationship of the Kolkhoz Chairman with the poorest representative of that class, a war widow - what the conditions presented in the literature of socialist realism look like in actual fact.²¹

Also, she associated the kolkhoz (collective farm) chairman with the philosopher Skovoroda. Like Skovoroda he appeared to have realized the need for man to strive toward the perfection of his inner self, although the harsh circumstances of his life had not allowed him to practice this personally.

The theme of the poem "The Invisible Tears of the Wedding" was not dealt with in any depth by the critics. It was said to concern itself mainly with the depiction of essential femininity, of the type that conveys "... gentleness, humanity, lyricism, dreaminess and art, ..."22 as a soothing cure for all of the world's evils.

The final poem of the first section, entitled "Ukrainian Horses Over Paris," was concerned with the limitless and timeless nature of creative endeavour. It provided an historical synthesis that stretched from the dawn of time to the far distant future. However, it was not felt to be without shortcomings. Horbatch criticized it for "... an inadmissible 'narrowing' of the historic view",23 which she attributed to the poet's seemingly regressive manner of "... expressing his emotional relationship with the history of his Ukrainian homeland ..."24 Boichak, on the other hand, thought it failed to add to the continuity of the work, since it was more closely related to the poem's basic idea than to its internal plot structure.

The second half of the poem, which like the title carries the heading "Knife in the Sun," seems fragmentary and incomplete and is generally considered less successful than the first. Western critics were inclined to believe that it was incorporated into the larger work solely to appease the requirements of socialist realism. Soviet critics did not make mention of this reason; however, they agreed that it showed a lack of poetic expertise.

I. Boichak and M. Ostryk reacted unfavourably to what they felt to be the blunt and unconvincing explanation of what the sun symbolically represented:

It is funny to read, for example, "The Communique From the Institute of the Wounded Sun," where the image of the Sun is straightforwardly deciphered: "... it is the embodiment of mankind's desire for truth, beauty, forthrightness, justice, tenderness, etc."²⁵

Sheremet had found it impossible to comprehend the underlying premise of this poem:

I cannot understand Drach's panic inspiring "vision" of the future of our planet and about the fact that the Americans, by launching a rocket from Cape Canaveral, in this way thrust a knife into the sun!²⁶

This caused Ostryk to scornfully reproach him for not being able to grasp the meaning of the image of the sun, even with the aid of such an extremely straightforward explanation.

The theme of the demon who accompanies the hero on his journey was very widely discussed by the critics, particularly the Soviet ones. Although Western critics discussed it as well, their tendency seemed to be mainly one of astonishment at the incorporation of this theme, one so alien to Soviet literature, into the poem. Soviet critics generally did not attach any significance to the devil other than the personification of an evil and destructive force, totally lacking in religious connotation. In this way, his only function was to act as an adversary of the hero and eventually be defeated by him.

M. Ostryk saw the devil as "... the personification of all of the dark sides of life, ..." ²⁷ and as a symbol of what he termed the "old world" that opposes everything that Soviet reality represents. Svitlychnyi emphasized that the function of the devil in this poem should not be misunderstood. In his opinion the devil's role arose from a Faustian concept and, therefore, it was the devil's innate nature to reveal to the hero only the most sordid aspects of life.³⁰ Both

of these critics agreed that this was neither a negative nor a tragic theme, but, rather, an optimistic one, for it permitted the hero to reaffirm his ideals through enduring struggle and eventual victory over the forces of evil.

Ivan Boichak, however, did not agree that the devil was a Faustian concept. He assessed this as a completely original thematic variable that had little in common with any predecessors.³¹ He praised the overall depiction of this theme as an illuminating example to other poets and writers about the way negative aspects of life should be portrayed in literature.

Among the critics surveyed only one, Petro Morhaienko, alluded to the unacceptability of the devil on the basis of religious connotation. It was his belief that the devil was a force that Communist society need no longer believe in.

The devil cannot change his nature but the people have changed theirs and they need no longer entrust their souls to the forces of evil, in order to attain truth.³⁰

The attainment of truth that Morhaienko referred to is one most critics felt the hero was actively striving toward throughout the entire poem. Moreover, they believed that it was the hero's sacred duty to enter into conflict with the devil, for the devil symbolized the greatest obstacle in the way of the attainment of truth.

Regardless of their other opinions, the critics agreed that, on the whole, the poem's thematic scope exceeded both time and space. Furthermore, the themes dealt with against this background of limitless scope were always relevant to contemporary man. The poet was not intimidated by established poetic norms, thus, he dared to broach so vast a

thematic expanse in his inaugural work. They were also unanimous on the point that, in successfully mastering such a formidable poetic assignment, Ivan Drach had proven himself to possess genuine poetic talent.

From the sound basis of this poetic venture, Drach's poetry increasingly expanded in thematic scope. The gradual evolution of his poetic skills and the continued broadening of his thematic range evoked progressively less harsh criticism and more critical acclaim.

Drach's first published collection of poetry, entitled Sunflower, met with much praise from the highly regarded Soviet Ukrainian critic Leonid Novychenko. Novychenko particularly praised the poet for his individualistic manner of rethinking a very broad spectrum of themes and his intense personal sensitivity to each and every theme he dealt with.³¹ This critic, like other Soviet critics, focused a great deal of his attention on the poem "Thirst." He believed it characterized the poet's creativity, for it dealt with trepidation over the destiny of mankind and reflected intense intellectual concerns. At least one Soviet critic, Yu. Ivakin, however, did not share the opinion of the majority. He characterized this as a rather weak poem that had been significantly overrated.³²

As to Drach's intellectualism, Novychenko felt that it was reflected both in his manner of thinking out varied thematic problems and in the nature of those problems themselves. The poet's intellectualism was seen as essentially arising out of his creative individuality and his seemingly inherent ability to rethink the impractical aspects of life with a truly philosophical depth of thought.

Mykola Il'nyts'kyi believed that modern Ukrainian poetry of the time

exhibited a strong tendency toward poetic intellectualism, coupled with a desire to poeticize all aspects of contemporary life. This was said to be reflected in Drach's works, for they included among their themes modern music, painting and architecture.³³ These themes were thought to be well dealt with in the poems "Picasso's Tear," "The Word" and "Architectural Diptych."

Drach perceived the human mind as the source of the most intense lyrical experience. Its chief concern, he felt, should always be the modern era, "... an era of not only social but also intellectual revolution."³⁴ Thus he attempted to modernize the content of Ukrainian poetry in order to keep it in step with the present.³⁵ In the poem "Ballad of the Island of Antorage," for example, he stressed the fact that the intellectual scope of contemporary Ukraine had been vastly enriched and made significantly more complex as a result of the advances constantly taking place in all spheres of human endeavour.

A number of the critics discussed the question of the interrelationship between art and scholarship or intellectualism in Drach's poetry. However, there was some divergence of opinion concerning the nature of this relationship.

M. Il'nyts'kyi cited Drach's free translation of Oiar Vatsientis's "Einsteiniana" as successfully dealing with this question. The poet was said to have realized that although art and scholarship deal with completely differing sets of values they share a common psychological basis. Therefore, he concluded that the poet's aim lay in "... defining the relationship and distinctions between these two methods of perceiving and mastering the world: both the scholarly and the artistic."³⁶

The poem, "Ballad of DNA - Dioxynribonucleic Acid" was also an attempt at dealing with the same problem, but the critics assessed it as being an unsuccessful one. Anatolii Makarov thought that the intellectual aspect of this poem did not reflect the true level of the poet's skills, for it provided only "... a simple repetition of elementary truths [and] generally accessible academic information."³⁷ This poem was consequently felt to be neither an example of poetry nor scholarship, for these aspects of the poem interfered with each other, both in nature and function. Ihor Muratov³⁸ and Mykola Il'nyts'kyi³⁹ agreed with Makarov. They added the example of the poem "Ballad of the Pail" as another unsuccessful attempt in this vein. Their argument stressed the creative artificiality that resulted from the poet's failed attempts at mastering this theme.

Ivan Drach was often said to be "entwined in kilometres of philosophy." This statement was qualified by reasoning that he was essentially striving "... to realistically recreate, through images, the spiritual world of modern man, to provide solutions for truly contemporary and actual conflicts."⁴⁰ He did so because of his deep conviction that it was man's foremost aim and duty to search for truth and

establish the essence of life:

Idesh tak do pravdy, do suti zhyttia,
Obpletenyi kilometrany filosofii,
Raiduhamy symfonii i misiachnykh intehraliv.
Inodi til'ky buvaiesh na vidstani sertsia
Vid tiiei, yedyno ozonnoi Pravdy.

("Ballad about Hordii")

The poet was acutely aware of what he perceived to be his life's mission, a mission that centered around creating talented, introspective individuals and ridding man's soul of all degrading qualities.⁴¹ Apart from the poem "Ballad about Hordii," these thematic concerns were also evident in the poems "Wings," "Ballad of Three Belts," "Guelder-Rose Ballad" and "Ballad With a Question Mark," among others. Furthermore, Drach was deeply concerned about the sources that gave rise to creativity. His more successful works in this vein were thought to be "Ballad about Karmeliuk," "The Appeal of Ivan Honta" and "The Grey Bird From the Nest of Kurbas," while his less successful ones were "To the Sources," "Ballad of Geneology" and "Two Among the Wheat."

A rather sharp discussion, arising in part over the question of the philosophical themes contained in the cycle "Trees," erupted in Soviet literary journals. Makarov was instrumental in sparking this discussion. In his analysis, the cycle conveyed "-- the dramatic feeling of the new, the feeling of the sharpness and force of life's stream ..."⁴² These traits were most visible in the last stanza of the poem "The Forest Sonnet":

Shchytiv shchetynu sprodaly yalyny,
I mudruvaly mudrai modryny,
I z liaku sosny, voi zhovtoshkiri,
Svystily neprystoino, yak v kino,
Bo zh, skynuvshy ostannie kimono,
Kryvavylas' shypshyna v kharakiri.

Makarov concluded that Drach had evolved creatively to the point where he was able to perceive the many-faceted sides of life:

Today I. Drach is able to peer through the window that displays all spheres of life, the heavens, the trees and the sun and summoning up his inherent strength, throw it open.⁴³

Two students from the Chernivtsi Institute, in a letter to the editors of the journal Ranok, reacted negatively to both Drach's philosophical tendencies and Makarov's high appraisal of them. In their opinion, this cycle was nothing more than "... 'versified philosophy with a double bottom' that lowers man's dignity and espouses vulgarity, and which is not capable of withstanding any criticism."⁴⁴ They were strongly convinced that the kind of philosophical "weightiness" that was exhibited in his poetry could not possibly be easily understood by the reading public without some sort of expert assistance. For this reason they compared this cycle to the classics in abstractionist literature.

The editorial reply⁴⁵ to this letter accused the students of complete ignorance on this subject matter. In another article, Lazar Sanov, who otherwise defended the students' position, was also forced to concede that on this point they exercised nothing more than "polemical inertia."⁴⁶

Drach utilized the concept of the union of opposites to reveal artistic beauty: "... the humble and the mighty, the dignified and the trivial, the wise and the witless."⁴⁷ The universe is filled with contradictions, at the centre of which stand two "indivisible brothers," two immortal forces, the forces of good and evil. The critics agreed that Drach utilized this concept to expose both sides of humanity: men of honour and men of dark thought and inhumane deed. It was incorporated

as the basis of many of his better works and may even have served as the impetus for his creative endeavour:

Rady choho vy dumaiete, ya berus' za pero?
Shchob pohanyt' zlo? Shchob uslavyt' dobro?

("For What Reason, Do You Think ...")

The collection Workday Ballads was thought to encompass both conflict and creative endeavour in one cohesive unit.⁴⁸ Internally it derided evil and praised goodness, while externally it presented a discourse on the need for creative expression in life. Primarily the type of creativity that was stressed was that which would improve the quality of human existence by working at moulding man into an ideal form of being. From the main theme of the ballad "Wings," it is evident that Drach was convinced that "... the wings of creative impulse, the wings of thought, elevate man above the world and make him master of his own existence."⁴⁹ Man's creative possibilities were considered limitless and hindered only by his indifference or inability to properly utilize them.

One of the poet's favourite philosophical themes was that of the victory of life over death. This was a theme that Drach related to both mankind and art, specifically poetry. It was a humane theme that revealed a loathing of death and of all phenomena that deform human existence.⁵⁰ It grieved the poet that the deceased were always remembered in light of their positive deeds and their negative ones forgotten. In this way, should remembrance be man's only means of immortality, it would regrettably be a dishonest one.

V pam'iaty zavzhdy shchos' vid obludy.

Neiu my vidkupuemos' vid mertvykh.

("The Grey Bird From the Nest of Kurbas")

Closely associated with this theme was the theme of the eternal union between man and nature. This union symbolized subconscious human protest against the invincibility of death and bitterness over the irony of not being able to correct the savage laws of nature:

Slava smerti -- sluzhnytsi zhyttia,
Chornorukii, zadastii, nevtomnii,
Scho travu nasivaie! Nema vorottia
Liuds'kii doli -- pisnii chy skromnii!

Yak bezsmertia zovet'sia? Trava!
Yak trava ozovet'sia? Lunoiu
Pro liuds'ki bezberehi dyva,
Hei, uvinchani pospil' travoiu.

Kruhoobihu, syvyi dyvache,
Mchysh sobi po tuneliakh travy
Z holovy -- azh istoriia plache --
Do ameby -- ne do holovy.

("What is Grass?")

A contemporary poet, who has borne witness to the many great intellectual advances of his era is correct in displaying strong dissatisfaction with "biological" immortality and could not but be moved by nature's indifference in destroying both good and evil indiscriminately. The merit of this manner of thought is a creatively positive one for it leads

... contemporary man to a progressively greater understanding of the true cost of human deeds and teaches him to weigh them on the scales of conscience and to appreciate pure, earthly and sometimes difficultly attained spirituality.⁵²

As to the immortality of poets and poetry, the poems "Fodder-crops" and "Death of Shevchenko" provided the most insight into this theme. In these works one is able to discern not only the pain and suffering of death, but also the affirmation of immortality. The attainment of immortality is possible for poets through their poetry for poetry is insurmountable by death.

Ivan Drach consistently exhibited deep concern for the fate of his fellow man, the fate of his nation and, on a planetary level, the fate of all mankind. This trait, termed the poet's "... cosmic gauge of world perception ...,"⁵³ was integrally tied to his contemporary outlook on life:

A vitry dvadtsiatoho stolittia.
Moie sertse trudne pidiimaiut'.

("Two Sisters")

Drach consistently sought to be a worthy representative of his time. His mission proved successful, and he is often acclaimed for embodying "the spirit of his era."⁵⁴

This tendency, particularly as it pertained to rethinking the most disturbing and complex issues of the time, permeated all of Drach's poetry. Ivanysenko postulated that it was a poet's primary duty to inform man of the real and threatening aspects of present-day life, "... in which man's high intellectual and cultural achievements coexist with moral savageness, obscurantism and the threat of total annihilation and atomic ruin."⁵⁵ The poems "Knife in the Sun," "Einsteiniana," "The Cemetary Skyscraper" and "Prokofiev's Sonata," among others, were thought to be written with the aim of focusing the reader's attention primarily upon the paradoxical realities inherent in Western society.

Soviet critics closely associated the poet's choice of contemporary themes with the Communist doctrine that requires poetry to concentrate upon questions of vital importance to modern society. Most cited such poems as "Breathing with Lenin" and "The Incomprehensible" as evidence that Drach was fully cognizant of the weightiness of this doctrine. Thus,

in their opinion, he conscientiously and realistically approached the problems of the present-day:

For I. Drach and his generation the ideals of the revolution and Lenin's immortal commandments are too dear for the poet not to realize the anxieties and sorrows of today's turbulent world.⁵⁶

Prisovskyi, alone, postulated that Drach was not always successful in carrying out this ideological assignment. He believed that "... the voices of real life with its urgent needs ..." ⁵⁷ were silent too often in the poet's works.

From Drach's works it was also interpreted that he was deeply absorbed with the idea that the future of the world depends upon the global dominance of Communism and that this goal could only be achieved through dynamic social struggle between the East and West. The poem "Ballad of the Island of Antorage" was said to voice this concern the best. The hero of the poem symbolized the moral betrayal of the modern age. He was depicted as an escapee from the moral obligation that requires each and every individual to take an active part in the social struggle.⁵⁸

It was further believed that the understanding of contemporary themes could not be gained through established means. The poet was obliged to approach them with a different set of criteria from the traditional. It was, therefore, his duty to investigate the present through "... new norms of humanity and goodness, 'to search out and discover everything possible,' to establish the essential and grasp time in the organic union of its conflicting beginnings and endings: ..." ⁵⁹ Drach, so deeply absorbed with contemporary life, realized this and fully utilized this modern criteria in his poetry.

Drach is never overly confident of himself or others. He is a poet who doubts, one who does not believe that he has yet attained the truth and consequently refuses to pay homage to generally accepted truths. In order to attain truth the poet must be an active participant in every sphere of life, for only an earnest student of life will gain access to truth. His goal in this respect was to develop the ability to approach both mankind and truth "... 'by the measure of the heart,' that is, by personally becoming the personification of both spiritual sincerity and breadth ..."⁶⁰

Running concurrently to the poet's feeling of participation in all essential aspects of life is his deeply ingrained sense of moral responsibility, a moral responsibility that concerns itself with all humanity, each and every individual, regardless of social stature. This was considered a positive poetic trait for it led Drach to the exultation of the ordinary individual. He did not, however, present an idealized image of man for that would have been atypical of his nature. Instead he concentrated his efforts on exposing the essence of man's inner being, "the inner strength, the strongest moral foundation, on which man relies in his struggle against unfavourable circumstances."⁶¹

A deeply ingrained sense of moral responsibility combined with equally deep humanitarianism led Drach to develop a type of moral duty toward individuals of harsh destiny. The critics felt that this sense of duty should not be misconceived as the "... 'sentimentality' or emotion of a 'repentant intellectual,' but rather should be viewed as the feelings of an ordinary individual, searching inside himself for the answers to man's destiny."⁶² This concept was illustrated in the

poems "Funeral of a Kolkhoz Chairman," "Two Sisters," "Ballad about Hordii" and "Ballad about Father." However, it was not thought to hinder the poet's portrayal of the heroic nature of contemporary man in any way. Several critics cited the kolkhoz chairman in the poem "Funeral of a Kolkhoz Chairman" as an example of a well-depicted heroic figure, "... who without reservation gave his health and life for the people, a man of his generation, who carried the weight of the war and the difficult post-war years on his shoulders, ..."63

V. Briuhhen felt that the poem "Two Sisters" embodied Drach's desire for human righteousness and exhibited sincere poetic passion for the subject matter being dealt with. He thought that the poet had successfully mastered the secret of poetic creativity for through this work he was able to capture the reader's emotions and elicit from him a sense of moral responsibility.⁶⁴ Briuhhen further assessed him as ably mastering the related themes of empathy ("Ballad-Song"), goodness ("Ballad of the Knots"), fairness ("The Incomprehensible") and emotion ("The Gypsy Ballad," "Wings" and "Do Not be Self-Destructive").

Drach was convinced that in the name of earthly happiness it was each artist's primary duty to attempt to create a new individual, one unencumbered by feelings of inequality or deficiency, and in this way mould a true and worthy "citizen."⁶⁵ This conviction was clearly evident in the poem "Ballad of Creativity":

Zanuriui kulaky v ii yaduchu dushu,
Yii poperek lamai, prasui yii khrebta,
Khai chuie tvii ekstaz, tvoiu zakhlannist' duzhu,
Tvii motsartivs'kyi dym khai smalyt' samota.

Drach was also fascinated by the tragedies that spiritually maim the individual. Bohdan Kravtsiv attributed this fascination with the tragic

to his close association with his homeland and to his growing up amidst the hardships of the war and post-war years in Soviet Ukraine. These were thought to have combined to cause him, as they had other poets, to be more acutely "... aware of his monumental but tragic fate."⁶⁶ Evidence of this trait was contained in the poem "Pen" which Kravtsiv also felt espoused the poet's creative credo:

Nam roztynaty dni tsi kari
Do sertsevyny, do zori,
Kudy ne diidut' yanychary
V obludnii, slovobludnii hri,...

In an article published some years later, Drach admitted that his poetry found its origins in his childhood. His childhood, he reflected, had been a time that was sad as well as happy for the anguish and suffering of the very trying war years left him with harsh and dramatic memories.⁶⁷

Ivakin believed that critics were often too hasty in accusing Drach of an overly-pessimistic or overly-tragic orientation.⁶⁸ He found the poet exhibiting a boundless interest in all aspects of life. Moreover, like other poets, he possessed the inherent right to deal with the tragic aspects of being, as well as the joyous.

Makarov pointed out a serious drawback that modern poetry encounters when attempting to deal with themes relevant to the present. The drawback lies within the fact, that unlike other phenomena that mutually enrich many cultures, "... contemporariness does not mutually enrich all cultures, but creates, ... only unnational forms,"⁶⁹ particularly in art. Drach was believed to be fully cognizant of this hazard and, therefore, not to distance his poetry from his fellow countrymen, he turned to

the rich resources of his national art forms. As he confesses in his "Ballad of Genealogy,"

Ya v svoiemu pomisti. Kniahyni i hrafy
Z vidramy bosy bizhat' po vodu ...
Chy buv u nas khoch odyń literator,
Yakyi ne honyv by kurei z horodu?!

Ya v bilomu zamku z herbom kalyny.
Kosy revut', yak vozdobni tury.
Pokhmillia vikiv nastoiem polynnym
Likui vsiliaki kosmichni tortury.

Being deeply concerned with his nation, Drach's themes reflect his deep association with its past, present and future. Ivakin termed the poet's gravitation toward his nation his "national pride."⁷⁰ He believed that it arose to a great extent from Drach's uniquely Ukrainian manner of thought and feeling and from his thorough knowledge of Ukrainian folklore, history and culture.

Drach is not hesitant to associate many diverse themes with his native land. He readily turns his sight to the far distant historical past, as far back as Scythian times, in his quest for subject matter. The cycles "The Kozak Rode Beyond the Danube" and "Trees" both attest to his knowledge of the Kozak era. Other works such as "Ballad of the Pipe," "Guelder-Rose Ballad" and "Through the Linden Escort" also reflect historical events.

When dealing with these themes the figures of prominent individuals both past and present are often incorporated, including, among others, those of Skovoroda, Shevchenko, Lesia Ukrainka, Tychyna, Ryl's'kyi, Bilets'kyi and Zalizniak. The poem "Death of Shevchenko" stands out prominently in this regard. It deals with several national and historical themes. The foremost, according to Pelenski, is the interpretation

of the "Ukrainian national tragedies."⁷¹ He believed this poem belied a definite sense of bitterness concerning the role that some of Drach's fellow countrymen played in the course of Ukrainian history:

My -- ukrains'ki horobtsi,
 Yak oseledtsi, v nas chuby,
 Vkrains'kyi usmikh na lytsi,
 Vkrains'ki pysky i loby,
 Shcho nam sypnut', te my kliuiem,
 Cholom za lasku viddaiem.
 Tsar nas shuhnuv, i my -- o strakh! --
 Vsi purkhnuly po smitnykakh.
 To sluzhymo v svoikh paniv,
 Yak boh veliv i tsar veliv,
 To mostymosia do chuzhykh
 I v urnakh poriadkuem v nykh,
 A te shcho Ukraina hola, --
 Nam soromno za nashi vola,
 My obmynaem nash smitnyk --
 Vzhe odbuiav kozats'kyi vik, --
 I my ne vytvory lokal'ni,
 My navit' internatsional'ni, ...

Soviet critics, however, did not consider this the work's foremost theme, instead, they focused their attention on the contemporary portrayal of the tragic greatness of Taras Shevchenko.

Drach poeticizes both folklore and the folk. In his understanding of the folk one cannot say that he "... equates the "folk" with the peasantry, as many of his contemporaries have often done. The folk, understood as nation, is representative of everyone, both burgher and villager."⁷² Folk "types" abound in his poems and their characterization is vivid. This is evident in the poem "The Madwoman, Vrubel' and Honey," where a simple peasant woman goes mad after the tragic loss of three sons in contemporary Ukrainian holocausts, in the image of the unfortunate peasant Hordii, in the ballad of the same name, in the hardworking peasant in "Ballad about Father," and in the poem "Wings,"

where the peasant Kyrylo symbolizes the typical folk mentality. All of these depictions are aimed at revealing the rich and varied nature of the Ukrainian people:

... their courage, gallantry and modesty, their inclination to hide the greatness of their exploits, in return for a gracious smile, instead of pathetically gloating over them ... their intelligence which unites the wide range of lessons learned through past, grey centuries, with the rapid-paced intellectualism of the modern era ... [and] their virtuous rigidity that is coupled with virtuous tenderness.⁷³

Drach's poetry, as already noted, evidenced an intentional modernization of folk themes. This quality was a part of his innovative style, a style that strove toward a synthesis between contemporary innovation and the folk tradition. The modernization of folk themes was classified as his "earthward gravitation" and stood in sharp contrast to poetic innovation or "galactic gravitation." It was postulated that early in his career Drach realized that his constant search for a new poetic direction might end in disaster if he could not temper this tendency by more closely linking it to the traditional.⁷⁴ The question of the relationship between these two creative directions was dealt with in the poem "The Guilder-Rose":

Spishu do nei cherez hony lit,
Moia ruka,
 hariacha i tremtka,
Torka
Yii kholodni polum'iani persa,
Ta b'ie mene desnytseiu po sertsiu
I syzyi stan hordlyvo odkhylaie
Arystokratka z repnym korinniam,
Bo zh nohy moi v modnykh cherevykakh
Svii bosyi slid ne mozhut' vidnaity.

There was generally little critical discussion concerning the nature of the folk themes found in Drach's poems for most critical attention

was aimed at questions of folkloric style. Several relevant observations,⁷⁵ however, were made in reference to the collection Workday Ballads. As to the heroines of this collection, it was believed that they spent too much time pondering the fatal question: "Oi chy to ya Leda, oi chy to ya Lada" ("Ballad about Two Swans"). This is an ancient theme in Ukrainian literature, but it was thought that Drach should have been capable of having his heroines concentrate upon problems of a more profound nature. There was also criticism of his restoration of the theme of animal transformation, as in the poems "Ballad of Two Horses" and "The Strange Chronicle of One White Day." However, this was not considered a very popular theme among contemporary readers, whose lives were already filled with an overabundance of inconsistencies and who did not want to read about inconsistencies of the human form.

The poet's inclination toward the traditional was instrumental in the evolution of new national elements in Soviet Ukrainian literature. Ivakin waylaid the argument that socialist realism frowns upon nationalistic distinctions in all forms of art, by arguing that Drach was a proud Soviet citizen, a patriot and an internationalist, not in the least bit hindered by national limitations. His visible tendency toward national individualism was explained as being characteristic of all Socialist nations at a definite stage in their development and, therefore, ideologically admissable.⁷⁶

Drach's creative world is a rich and complex one. It is a world seen through the eyes of a poet who possesses the seemingly innate ability to "unsquintingly look at the sun."⁷⁷ The theme of the sun is one that transgresses all of the poet's works, for he is completely

fascinated by the solar body. Although this theme has been widely utilized in Ukrainian poetry, Drach is thought to have mastered it more thoroughly than any of his contemporaries. His interpretation is fresh and original for it is derived from his creative imagination alone and not borrowed or re-worked from other sources.

The sun stands at the centre of the poet's universe, as a dynamic aesthetic force. Drach, himself, defined its meaning in the following manner:

When speaking of the sun I do not treat it merely decoratively. I have in mind a deeper, philosophical understanding of this term, which represents that which is bright, beautiful, flaming and Promethean - a force which must always guide man.⁷⁸

With this definition in mind, one can understand Briuhhen's notion of the theme of the conquering sun.⁷⁹ This theme was believed to be a prevalent one in a number of the poet's works, but was exceptionally well depicted in the poem "Knife in the Sun." Here, as noted previously, the concept of the sun is not only formatively defined: "The sun is the embodiment of mankind's desire for truth, beauty, forthrightness, justice, tenderness, etc.," but it is also directly related to the forces of goodness and light, whose duty it is to eradicate evil and baseness.

There is little doubt that Ivan Drach was a loyal Communist Party member. Among Western critics, however, questions did arise as to whether he, like many others of his generation, would have been more broadminded in his ideological stance, if given the opportunity.⁸⁰ Ivan Koshelivets', for example, argued that "pseudo-political measures" should not be applied to Drach's poetry. In his opinion, Drach was by no means a political reactionary, but simply a human being whose own emotions

elicit reactions within him.⁸¹

Bohdan Kravtsiv seriously doubted the poet's ideological steadfastness.⁸² This was evident in his intense scrutiny of the significant number of changes that occurred in many of Drach's poems before they were allowed to enter into the collection Solar Prominences of the Heart. Among other works, he noted the example of the poem "Architectural Diptych." In its earlier redaction⁸³ this poem was said to voice "... sharp criticism in reference to, in most probability, modern Soviet architecture ...,"⁸⁴ but in the redaction⁸⁵ that appeared in this collection the offensive stanza was deleted, thus placating the censors, but altering the poem's thematic direction. Thus Kravtsiv concluded that in order to ensure that his works appeared in print, Drach was forced into altering them to meet ideological standards.

Furthermore, Kravtsiv and other Western critics believed that such poems as "Breathing with Lenin" and "The Heaven of My Hopes," which were mainly concerned with the glorification of the Party, were not sincere poetic expressions, but, rather, routinely required patriotic proclamations. Soviet critics, however, praised them for their understanding of the programs implemented by the Party and praised the poet for his respect for the Soviet way of life. Conversely to Western opinion, the poem "Heaven of My Hopes" was an echo of Drach's sincere sentiments: "through exact and forceful wording the young poet transmits the feeling of the significant advances made in the life of our society: ..."⁸⁶

Kravtsiv found it impossible to reconcile himself to the notion that Drach had placidly conformed to Party lines. He felt evidence still existed to prove that the poet was not afraid to doubt certain dogmatic

principles, had not given up his quest for truth, and was courageous enough to declare that he would continue to walk as before:

Tym shliakhom, shcho vybyla znevira,
Skepsys i boliuchy chornyi sumniv ...

("Secrets")

Kravtsiv's opinions may have caused Drach to suffer some negative repercussions from the Soviet authorities. This is deduced from the fact that shortly thereafter the Soviet press carried an article⁸⁷ in which Drach sharply replied to Kravtsiv's critique. In this article Drach professed himself to be an ideologically faithful Communist, whose poetry had been ignominiously misconstrued by a "malicious enemy" of Communism. He accused Kravtsiv of "... thoughtlessly ignoring those poems which belie the political inclinations of their author and about his Communist loyalty, and with typical 'directness' manipulating the desired with the factual in others."⁸⁸

Kravtsiv's article examined the poems that had entered into the collection Solar Prominences of the Heart. It made many observations that could, and perhaps did result in official recriminations and might even have led to an abrupt curtailment of his literary career. The severity of these consequences can only be surmised from the vehemence of Drach's attack against Kravtsiv. This leads one to speculate on the reasons why Kravtsiv, who was undoubtedly aware of the possibility of such consequences beforehand, would have disregarded them and voiced the observations that he did.

The first decade of Ivan Drach's poetic career proved him to be a master in rethinking problems that affected all of mankind. The breadth

and nature of his thematic range elicited a great deal of interest among literary critics. Soviet critics involved themselves in a heated discussion concerning Drach's poetic debut, but with the publication of successive works, abandoned their often harsh stance for one of general acclaim. Among Western critics, however, there never existed any doubt as to the extent of the poet's thematic expertise and their overall positive reactions remained fairly consistent.

Ivan Drach focused his attention primarily upon the complexities of life, upon his era and modern man, all of which were thoughtfully positioned against the backdrop of past, present and future worlds.

Essentially Drach was a humanitarian, an intellectual and a philosopher. He sought to be as one with the universe and humanity, in general, and with his nation and fellow man, in particular. In order to accomplish this he strove to be an active participant in life, not only in its superficial aspects, but also in its deeper, spiritual ones. The need to relive and ultimately to share responsibility for all of life's joys and sorrows, no matter how significant or how trivial remained his constant driving force.

Most of Drach's efforts were aimed at revealing truth to his reader. In attempting to do so, he managed to grasp the true sense of the role of poetry and the poet in life and through the kaleidoscope of his own creative perception convey this sense to others.

FOOTNOTES

¹Ivan Drach, Soniashyk (Sunflower) (Kiev: Khudozhnia literatura, 1962), 138 pp.

²Drach, Protuberantsi sertsia (Solar Prominences of the Heart) (Kiev: Molod', 1965), 143 pp.

³Drach, Balady budniv (Workday Ballads) (Kiev: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1967), 151 pp.

⁴Drach, Poezii (Poetry) (Kiev: Molod', 1967), 183 pp.

⁵Bohdan Kravtsiv, "Narodzhennia novoho" (The birth of the new), Slovo (The word) Almanac I (New York: Ukrainian Writers' Association in Exile, 1962), p. 347.

⁶Anna-Halya Horbatch, "The Young Generation of Ukrainian Poets," The Ukrainian Review 12 (Winter 1965): 28.

⁷Ivan Dziuba, Introduction to "Nizh u sontsi" (Knife in the Sun), Literaturna hazeta, 18 July 1961.

⁸Ivan Boichak, "Na pul'si epokhy" (On the pulse of the era), Dnipro (May 1962): 137.

⁹Viktor Ivanysenko, "V poshukakh radosti i krasny" (In search of happiness and beauty), Vitchyzna (October 1961): 192.

¹⁰Ivan Svitlychnyi, "U poetychnim kosmosi" (In the poetic cosmos), Dnipro (April 1982): 149.

¹¹Mykhailo Ostryk, "V im'ia choho vony - hromy i blyskavytsi?" (In the name of what are they, the thunder and lightning?), Prapor (March 1962): 67.

¹²Ibid., p. 66.

¹³Mykola Sheremet, "Neproste i shtuchne buty harnym ne mozhe" (The complex and artificial cannot ever be beautiful), Literaturna hazeta, 14 November 1961.

¹⁴Ostryk, p. 65.

¹⁵Svitlychnyi, p. 146.

¹⁶Sheremet.

- 17Svitlychnyi, p. 147.
- 18Petro Morhaienko, "Slovo v polemitsi" (A word in the polemics), Dnipro (May 1962): 155.
- 19Boichak, p. 143.
- 20Ibid., p. 138.
- 21Horbach, p. 30.
- 22Bohdan Boichuk, "Dva poetry" (Two poets), Suchasnist' (April 1965): 52.
- 23Horbach, p. 31.
- 24Ibid.
- 25Ostryk, p. 67.
- 26Sheremet.
- 27Ostryk, p. 66.
- 28Svitlychnyi, p. 152.
- 29Boichak, p. 139.
- 30Morhaienko, p. 155.
- 31Leonid Novychenko, "Ivan Drach, novobranets' poezii" (Ivan Drach, a newcomer to poetry), Introduction to Sunflower, p. 7.
- 32Yu. Ivakin, "V puti" (In journey), Voprosy literatury (February 1966): 94.
- 33Mykola Il'nyts'kyi, "Barvy i tony slova" (The colours and tones of the word), Zhovten' (December 1963): 140-141.
- 34Ivakin, p. 99.
- 35Stepan Kryzhanivs'kyi, "Intelektualizm suchasnoi poezii" (The intellectualism of contemporary poetry), Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo (July 1967): 23.
- 36Il'nyts'kyi, Barvy i tony poetychnoho slova (The colours and tones of the poetic word) (Kiev: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1967), p. 88.
- 37Anatolii Makarov, "Nauka prykhodyt' u poeziu" (Academics enter poetry), Rozmaittia tendentsii, literaturnokrytychni narysy (Varied tendencies, literary sketches) (Kiev: Radianskyi pys'mennyk, 1969), pp. 104-105.

38Ihor Muratov, "Skukannia i vidkryttia" (Search and discovery), Literaturna Ukraina, 3 December 1965.

39Il'nyts'kyi', "Polifoniia poetychnoho slova" (Polyphony of the poetic word), Dnipro (June 1966): 141.

40Makarov, "Poet shukaie suchasnist'" (A poet searches for the present), Dnipro (March 1966): 148.

41Yevhen Prisovs'kyi, "Nespokii shukan'" (The unrest of search), Vitchyzna (January 1968): 195.

42Makarov, "Chuiu dub spivaie" (I hear the oak tree singing), Literaturna Ukraina, 9 February 1965.

43Ibid.

44"Ditiam do 16 rokiv chytaty virshi zaboroneno" (Children under 16 years of age are forbidden to read poems), Ranok (August 1965): 12. Letter to the editor by V. Churko and M. Paliichuk.

45Ibid. Reply by I. Ya. Boichak, pp. 12-13.

46Lazar Sanov, "Pro krytychni alehorii i pokvaplyvi vysnovky" (About critical allegories and hasty conclusions), Vitchyzna (October 1965): 176-181.

47Jaroslav Rozumnyj, "Drach, Ivan Fedorovych," in The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet Literatures (Including Non-Russian and Emigre Literatures) Vol. 6, Harry Weber ed. [to be published in 1982].

48Ol'ena Nykanorova, "Piznannia sebe" (Knowing oneself), Vitchyzna (March 1970): 164.

49Prisovs'kyi, p. 194.

50Ibid., p. 195.

51Nykanorova, p. 165.

52 Ibid.

53Ivanysenko, "Na vidstani sertsia" (By the measure of the heart), Introduction to Poetry, pp. 5-18.

54Prisovs'kyi, p. 191.

55Ivanysenko, p. 10.

56Ivanysenko, "Za velinniam pravdy i krasy" (After the decree of truth and beauty), Dnipro (January 1966): 145.

57Prisovs'kyi, p. 194.

58Ivakin, p. 97.

59Ivanysenko, p. 146.

60Ivanysenko, "By the measure of the heart," p. 8.

61Ibid., p. 12.

62Ivakin, p. 98.

63Ibid.

64V. Briuhhen, "Sontse i khmary" (The sun and the clouds), Dnipro (July 1967): 157.

65Prisovs'kyi, p. 196.

66Bohdan Kravtsiv, "Protuberantsi sertsia i kredo Ivana Dracha" (Solar Prominences of the Heart and the credo of Ivan Drach), Suchasnist' (January 1966): 24.

67"Ivan Drach pro svoiu poeziiu" (Ivan Drach on his own poetry), My i svit (February 1979): 44.

68Ivakin, p. 104.

69Makarov, "Dvi Avtokatastrofy" (Two auto catastrophes), Varied tendencies, literary sketches, p. 129.

70Ivakin, p. 108.

71Jaroslav Pelenski, "Recent Ukrainian Writing," Survey (No. 59 1966): 106.

72Rozumnyj.

73Muratov.

74Makarov, "A poet searches for the present," p. 154.

75Makarov, "Sprymaty svit vserioz" (Seriously perceiving the world), Suchasnist' (June 1970): 60-61.

76Ivakin, p. 108.

77Ibid., p. 95.

78"Ivan Drach on his own poetry," p. 43.

79Briuhhen, pp. 156-157.

80Pelenski, p. 111.

⁸¹Ivan Koshelivets' (Iwan Koszeliwec), "Shestydesiatnyky" (Writers of the sixties), Suchasna literatura v URSR (The Ukrainian literature of to-day) (Munich: Prolog, 1964), p. 299).

⁸²Kravtsiv, pp. 6-11.

⁸³Drach, "Arkhitekturnyi dyptykh" (Architectural Diptych), Zmina (August 1962): n.p., cited by Kravtsiv, p. 7.

⁸⁴Kravtsiv, p. 7.

⁸⁵Drach, "Architectural Diptych", Solar Prominences of the Heart, pp. 14-15.

⁸⁶Makarov, "A poet searches for the present," p. 147.

⁸⁷Drach, "O, bud'te prokliati vy shche raz!" (Oh, once again be damned!), Literaturna Ukraina, 22 July 1966.

⁸⁸Ibid.

CHAPTER III

STYLISTIC TRADITIONALISM AND ORIGINALITY

Ivan Drach was a highly individualistic poet, one not afraid to innovate and experiment in order to achieve desired results. Although he shared certain stylistic traits with his literary forebears and contemporaries, essentially his poetic style proved to be uniquely original. This chapter will attempt to reveal the most significant stylistic traits of Ivan Drach's poetry, in the light of critical opinion.

The focus will again be on the same published collections of poems as in the preceding chapter. Also, for the same reasons, the poem "Knife in the Sun" will be examined separately.

Ivan Drach was widely acknowledged as a predominantly lyrical poet. His poems tended to display an almost seething depth of passion, intensity and emotion. Because of this depth of lyrical emotion he was generally considered to be essentially a romantic. "Today's Drach," states Yu. Ivakin, "is a typical romantic with the elevated subjectivity, emotionality and all of the other excesses innate to romantics."¹ Drach wanted to depict the world in the way it ideally should be. This is not to say, that by doing so, he digressed from the realities of the contemporary world. Rather, to reality he added the idealized creations of his own fantasy, a trait common to all romantics. Soviet critics did not

not consider this a positive creative tendency because it did not comply with the demands of socialist realism. However, it continued to characterize his poetry throughout the entire period in question.

A tendency toward philosophical lyricism was evident in Soviet Ukrainian poetic endeavour of the time. Drach's works, as well, with their tendency toward reflective and intellectual thought revealed a current of philosophical lyricism running through them. This tendency toward the philosophical was integrally tied to the poet's quest for truth. It was believed that only as the result of a truly philosophical orientation could he delve into "... the secrets of the macro- and microcosm, society and nature - and, on the basis of the achievements of contemporary scientific and social studies, go forth to discover truth."² The essence of Drach's creative endeavour was aimed at searching out and revealing truth, the attainment and knowledge of which, to him, were as crucial as life itself.

Drach's poetic structures consist of images called into motion by the force of lyrical experience, integrally combined with the poet's lyrical "I." The lyricism of his works was thought to be evident not only from the manner in which the images were created, but also from their spirit. These two factors blended together to produce "... a complete philosophical, historical, conceptual category."³

Viktor Ivanysenko believed it was necessary for the poet to resort to self-analysis, that is, to the exposure of his literary "I." This was an essential trait of each and every poet who possessed "... a rich ... soul, a sharp mind and honourable intentions,"⁴ such as Ivan Drach did. This was observed in the poem "Ballad With a Question Mark" where the

poet expressed his personally deeprooted conviction that one must search for truth through personal suffering:

Ya stukaiu, vperto stukaiu,
Cholom b'ius', b'ius' sertsem kryvavo,
Ya khochu namatsaty mukoïu
De spravdi nalivo, a de napravo.

Furthermore, Ivanysenko saw Drach as realizing the need to always be honest with his reader, particularly in poetic self-analysis, for without honesty the lyrical contact between them would suffer irreparable damage.

Olena Nykanorova, on the other hand, did not consider Drach particularly inclined toward self-analysis. She assessed his lyrical "I" as being rather introverted and reticent to speak out directly from its own standpoint.⁵ In her opinion the poet allowed his own personality to peer through only when he incorporated epic elements into his works. The collection Workday Ballads,⁶ however, proved that he had successfully undergone an intense process of self-recognition and, furthermore, that this process was congruent with the direction of his creative flow.⁷ This was illustrated, to an extent, in the poem "To Mother From Her Prodigal Son" where the poet allowed his reader a glimpse at his true self. It was especially well illustrated in the poem "The Heart Occasionally Looks Back" where the poet was said to have made a first, blatant attempt at summing up his own life:

Strashno koly sered vyru
Prystrastei, vdiachnostei, zryviv
Zadaremnykh tryvoh i dorechnykh spodivanok
Sertse inkoly ozyraïet'sia --
Vono musyt' zapliushchyty ochi,
Koly dyvyt'sia cherez pleche,
Sertse musyt' zliakatysia shliakhy
Toho, davn'oho, odshumiloho,
Bo za spynoiu lysh solonchak,
Bo za spynoiu syza nikchemnist'
I rozstriliana skrypka v krovì,
Ta i ne skrypka -- nadiia na skrypku.
Sertse, bud'mo zhorstokymy,
Ne ozyraïmosia v dushu mynuloïho,
Vona mozhe tebe zamorozhyty ...

Anatolii Makarov defined Drach's lyricism as containing the bravura and assaultiveness of polemics.⁸ This was characteristic of the poem "To Vasyl' Symonenko":

Syn muzhyts'kyi. Zolote korinnia.
Odchaidushna blyskavka brovy,
Spalakh - i kholuis'ke pavutynnia
Zapalyv pozharom holovy.

Na pozhezhi -- stil'ky tykh pozhezhnykiv,
Stil'ky oberezhnykh oberezhnykiv,
Stil'ky bezholosoi vody,
Smerte, chornu ruku odvedy!

Pakhne sontsem nashe hrishne nebo,
V sontsi -- tvoie polum'ia rude.
Vsi my pryidem na toi svit, do tebe,
Til'ky Ukraina khai ne ide!

His polemical voice is never argumentative or shrill, but always filled with self-dignant and even-tempered righteousness:

I, Drach does not argue, he wants to write, to create, to convince not only by negation, but also by creation, by the force and subtlety of personal expression, by the unhindered flow of his imagination, by the imperturbable poeticization of lyrical fantasy, which is not hampered by even the stifling and "futile" atmosphere of satire.⁹

Thus, for example, in the lyrically-satirical poem "Ballad about Modesty," the poet does not enter into enraged moralizing rhetorics concerning his right as a poet to adhere only to the boundaries set by creative modesty. Instead, with complete composure he merely reaffirms this as a basic poetic right.

In comparison to the poet's earlier works, Makarov considered the poems in the collection Workday Ballads as displaying a markedly negative change in poetic temperament and style. The "Ballad of Creativity," for example, although a polemical work, was not compared to the type of work conceived by true poetic thought. Here, the polemics seemed greatly

distanced from the creative impulse. By comparing the poems "Idea Fix" and "Sarcastic" to the poems "Ballad about Modesty," "Wings" and "Ballad of the Island of Antorage," Makarov also inferred that Drach's polemical sarcasm now seemed to be quite banal in quality.

Whereas at one time all of Drach's poems were filled with lyrical emotion, in this collection the dullness of a monotonous and perhaps even an apathetic voice was distinctly audible:

Ya shche ne znaiu, yaka na zapakh Chesnota,
Ya shche ne znaiu, yaka na smak Pidlist',
Yakoho kol'oru Zazdrist', yakoho vymiru Smuta.
Yaka zasolena Tuha, yaka nezhlybyma Liubov,
Yaka syn'ooka Shchyryst', yaka merekhtlyva Pidstupnist',
Ya shche vse rozkladu po polytsiakh,
Ta vse zh, poky ya vyrostu, zrobit' shchos' take na sviti,
Shchob nikoly ne zapliushchuvaty ochei vid Strakhu, ...

("Ballad about a Child's Open Eyes")

Makarov explained the reason for this change in poetic voice as arising out of Drach's increased absorption with form and decreased emotional attachment to his poetry. He, therefore, concluded that "... in many places in his new collection Ivan Drach substantially digressed from those principles that made his lyricism a notable phenomenon in contemporary Ukrainian poetry."¹⁰

While the attributes of lyrical poetry dominate Ivan Drach's poetic style, intermixed with lyricism is a sharp sense of the dramatic. Often it is difficult to distinguish where one ends and the other begins, so finely are they interwoven. The qualities of drama in its pure form, that is, the delineation of dramatic persona, action and counteraction are visible in many of the poems. Drama seems to have evolved out of Drach's almost innate ability to view the world in the light of its internal tensions, inherent contradictions and eternal conflicts, the most significant of which was the conflict between the forces of good and evil.

Leonid Novychenko was among the first critics to draw attention to the dramatic in Ivan Drach's poetry. He saw it as stemming from "... the intensity of [Drach's] poetic experience, [from] his inordinately high, almost feverish state, ...,"¹¹ that belied the poet's intimate proximity to his thematic concerns. Novychenko provided the examples of the poems "Thirst" and "Prokofiev's Sonata" as demonstrating the poet's understanding of acute internal tension. He feared, however, that Drach's inability to "... halfheartedly love, anger, delight or worry,"¹² regardless of how endearing this trait might be to the sensitive reader, could lead him to substitute simply impassioned thought for depth and exactness of thought.

It was popularly maintained that the poet's ability to attain maximum dramatic effect in his works resulted from the tendency of his emotions to dominate over reason. Ivanysenko explained this hypothesis by stating that poetic thought is conditioned by human emotion, by the need for spiritual equilibrium, and by the needs of the soul and the heart. He found it impossible to either locate or delineate "pure" thought from "pure" emotion in Drach's poems:

The poet's thoughts race forward, incited by love or hate, joy or sorrow - and this is not only a general principle, but a quality, innate to each poem or image, or at least to those that correspond to the calibre of Drach's talent.¹³

Klavdiia Frolova saw the drama of these poems arising out of the metaphorical union of dialectical distinctions.¹⁴ This was reflected in the poem "The Incomprehensible":

Dumnyi viter, dumna hroza
Rve kolysky moiei tryvohy.
Talan mii viter pidperezav,
V urahan moi vzuti nohy.

Furthermore, the dramatic understanding of poetry was a dynamic force that grasped every facet of a poem: its rhythm, its sound register and its inner tension.

Frolova characterized Drach as also displaying a constant longing for the tragic, as in the poem "The Lion Etude." Here, each image, each allegory and each metaphor work together to present a tragic depiction of the circumstances leading to the death of Ernest Hemingway. She distinguished the tragic from the dramatic in his works, using the criteria, that through the dramatic, one uncovers "... a chain of images that concentrate upon the 'ordinary' individual, who reveals himself through dramatic exploits in life, ..."15 while through the tragic one uncovers "... images and symbols of worldwide scope, images of gigantic philosophical generalization ..."16 Using this criteria, the dramatic was thus depicted in the poems "Two Sisters," "Ballad about Father" and "Ballad about Hordii," while the tragic was depicted in "Picasso's Tear," "Einsteiniana" and "The Madwoman, Vrubel' and Honey."

The pathos of Drach's poeticization of the ordinary individual was said to have been achieved through dialectical contrast between the real object and its inner essence. The poem "Two Sisters" for example, initially appears to deal with the contentment of old age. As the action unfolds, however, the incorporation of dramatic contrasts and an inner explosive force make it evident that the poet is concerned with revealing the inner tragedy of human existence. The inverted dramatic structure of this poem, where the first and positive half is in contrast to the second, negative one, was deemed to be not only characteristic of Drach's works, but also of other Soviet Ukrainian poets' of the 1960's.¹⁷

Bohdan Boichuk assessed drama as arising out of the weightiness of Drach's poetic word, and among others, also drew on the example of the "Ballad about Hordii" as possessing this trait. He found the dramatic to be further enhanced by the use of a heavy rhythmical pattern, the absence of rhyme scheme and stanza delineation, and in the sound structure itself:¹⁸

Shkira spada na dzvinke krutorizhzhia hofrovane.
 Bombyt' cholovik kulakamy po rebrakh
 I chornymy kudlamy hrizno kyvaie meni.
 Spyt' vahitna yoho dochka,
 Rozkynuvshy zmoreni ruky do Kazakhstanu,
 Rozkynuvshy chorni kosy i chorni mrii.

Ivan Drach, however, should not, in all instances, be considered a darkly dramatic poet. He is also capable of transmitting the bright and cheerful through his works and often does so. He is, in fact, noted for easily transversing from the dramatic to the light and even humorous.¹⁹ This displays not only stylistic flexibility but also a well-rounded creative mood.

The ballad genre was often incorporated into Drach's poetry. The ballad can be defined as

... a short, subjective, lyro-epical work with fabled and fantastic, legendary and historical or heroic content. The tense and sometimes tragic nature of the subject matter is combined with an acutely lyrical narrative tone.²⁰

While his ballads do not always reflect this classic type, they are always fresh and original. Essentially they are concerned with conveying the depth of the poet's lyrical feeling.

The balladic qualities in Drach's works appear in the acute sensitivity of the poet, in his tragic world perception, in the severe and courageous music of conflict that is always resonant in his works. His ballads lack sharpness and tension in subject matter, but always reflect impassioned thought through which runs an undercurrent of extreme tension.²¹

The critics believed that Drach extended the parameters of this genre by introducing new avenues for its further creative development. This was first evident in the collection Solar Prominences of the Heart²² and further developed in the later collection Workday Ballads. Elements of the fantastic were reincorporated in the ballads "Wings," "Ballad of Two Horses" and "A Contemporary Ballad-Fairy Tale for Adults"; humourous irony was incorporated in "Ballad of the Washed Pants," "The Joking Ballad about the Theory of Relativity" and "Ballad of the Golden Onion"; naturalism, in "The Naturalistic Ballad" and "Ballad about Genes"; philosophical tendencies in "Ballad of the Pail," "Ballad of Creativity" and "Cineballad"; and psychological analysis in "The Gypsy Ballad."

The ballads are characterized by marked associational qualities. Often the dynamics of thought combine with action and mood to create a highly emotional stream of thought. However, in the instances where a psychological rather than an emotional reaction is elicited, the dynamics of action supersede the dynamics of thought. The figures and devices are also so forceful that they cannot help but affect the imagination of the reader. Drach was accused of narrowing the ballad's thematic range, but, in the end, his otherwise successful renewal of this genre more than adequately compensated for this shortcoming.²³

The discussion that surrounded the stylistic aspects of the poem "Knife in the Sun" concerned itself mainly with questions of poetic innovation, particularly as they applied to its complex system of images and associations.

Ivanysenko was among the first of the critics to analytically

assess the poem and his assessment was mainly a positive one. He attributed Ivan Drach's talent, at least partially, to his ability to think in terms of complex images, associations and symbols. Accordingly, the poems "The Madwoman, Vrubel' and Honey" and "The Funeral of a Kolkhoz Chairman" were considered exceptionally well executed, the latter for the following reasons:

... here thought and feeling exhibit themselves as essential, because they are basic and because they are backed by real phenomena. Here expressive epithets, associatively deep metaphors, and a unique verse form, in which weighty thought repeats itself through images, gains progressively more significance ...²⁴

Mykola Sheremet, as previously noted, was among Drach's most harsh opponents. As an advocator of poetic simplicity he found this poem overly complex and even brash, written in a manner unbecoming to true innovation, a manner, that in this case, was not felt to arise from "... raging intensity or knowledge but from immaturity."²⁵ Although critical of the entire poem, he considered its second half to be by far the worse, calling it "... a crackling poetic game, and not any kind of innovation."²⁶

Mykhailo Ostryk argued that Sheremet's opposition to Drach's innovative style resulted from his inability to grasp the essence of the poet's system of images. These images were not thought to be in any way contrived. They seemed to organically flow from the poet's desire to artistically portray the experiences and attainments of contemporary man, in the perspective of both the past and the future. Thus the breadth of the thematic plan was said to be suitably complemented by its stylistic components:

... the selection of images is completely appropriate - the real and the imagined, the concrete and the symbolic, the natural and the conditional, it is appropriate to the unfolding of the action - the real life and the fantastical, the action of both direct and transposed thought, appropriate as well is the sometimes publicistic, sometimes "pictorial," sometimes dramatized style.²⁷

He, like all critics, also found the second half of the poem to be creatively lacking, characterizing it as unclear, strained and poetically naive.²⁸

Ivan Svitlychnyi conjectured that the principles of creative simplicity as put forth by Sheremet could never be realistically adhered to unless they were implemented as the sole criteria for artistic endeavour:

When a poet feels the need to introduce new ideas and concepts, complex thought and emotions, to transmit a rich and refined world outlook, he could not take one step if he were adhering to simplicity and only simplicity.²⁹

Svitlychnyi found the second half of the poem to be overly contrived, complex and conditional. He also assessed the first half as being no less conditional than the second. The first half, however, achieved such a high level of explicitness that its conditionality could not be questioned. Although Svitlychnyi characterized all of Drach's poetry as being complex and conditional, he found it nevertheless, to display an overall cohesion of thought and feeling. As an example of this cohesion he presented the epithets: "chornobryvyi sum", "chornyi sum" and "nutro blakytne". He agreed that these were neither simple nor ordinary examples of innovative thought, but he did not evaluate them, or others similar to them, as deserving the harsh criticism that Sheremet doled out.

Petro Morhaienko, in an attempt to defend Sheremet's position, assailed Svitlychnyi's arguments. He, for example, did not feel that the

first half of the poem was very explicit and he viewed it as reflecting the poet's spiritual weaknesses. He found this to be most visible in the words spoken by the devil, when he said:

Ty peretrusysh kistochky didiv,
Chervonyi stiah rozirvesh na onuchi,...

In these words, the critic could not grasp which generation was being addressed. He surmised that it could not possibly be the contemporary one, for contemporary society had evolved beyond this type of thought.³⁰ As to the question of the general comprehension of modern poetry, he contended that this was not a question of simplicity, but one of talent, for a true and talented poet need not be wary of being either misunderstood or incomprehensible.

Ivan Boichak delved into the stylistics of this work more deeply than any of the other critics taking part in this discussion. He praised Drach for adding to the enrichment of Ukrainian poetry by renewing the genre of the fairy-tragedy and further lauded him for displaying the manner in which literature should reveal the negative aspects of contemporary life. Furthermore, he believed that the unexpectedly broad scope of time and space captured within this poem was presented in a completely organic manner. Also, the language utilized in the poem attested to an intellectual, thoroughly modern poet, who had managed to effectively master his native language.³¹ This was evidenced by the use of such terms as "foton", "raketa", "chorny rak vodnykh vakkhanalii", "n'iutonove tiazhinnia", etc.

Boichak readily admitted that the poem did indeed contain many stylistic shortcomings. The major of these was its fragmentary nature, which caused it to appear as a series of separate poems, lacking in

contextual continuity. As a foremost example of this quality he referred to the poem "Ukrainian Horses Over Paris," which although of excellent poetic quality in itself, failed to cohesively relate to the images presented in the other poems of this work, stating "... it based itself more on the fundamental problematics of the poem than on its inner subjectively-compositional and rhythmically-melodic structure."³² He also agreed with the other critics as to the overall lack of success of the second half of the poem. He felt that it required a considerable amount of rewording, since as it stood, it lacked the necessary artistic material to broaden its limited scope of scenes and images.

Boichak accused Morhaienko of not being able to comprehend the creative style of the poem:

One cannot ascertain what predominates here: vulgar - straight forward simplification or plain refusal to read the work correctly and without bias, to penetrate its conception, images, ideas, and composition, to gain an understanding of it only for oneself, if not for the reader.³³

He believed that Morhaienko and other critics like him were attempting to transform originality, innovation and individuality into fakery and a denial of tradition. Boichak himself was an ardent believer in creative individuality tempered with literary tradition, as exemplified in Ivan Drach's poetry. Drach was said to be carrying on the literary traditions of Shevchenko, Dovzhenko and Tychyna, and the images presented in this poem, although reworked and innovatively presented, were largely similar to those created by Dovzhenko.

Sheremet's arguments as to a need for poetic simplicity were considered fallacious, since Boichak felt that Sheremet had not examined the poem's tropes in context and, therefore, was unable to correctly grasp them:

... outside of a creative work, it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine whether a given epithet or metaphor is successful or not. Similarly, it is difficult to determine the subjective content of certain tropes, as for example, "oranzheve sheptannia", "chornobryvyi spiv", "synii zhal'", etc.³⁴

Examining it in context, Boichak explained the meaning of the epithet "oranzheve sheptannia". In a setting of fear and anxiety the hero realizes that he must take upon himself a galactic mission to save the sun from annihilation. At the moment of this realization, as he looks "zoriem v merekhtlyvi vichi", all of his senses are concentrated in his eyes. Thus whispering is transformed into a visual phenomenon. Its orange colour symbolizes the colour of the emission produced by an atomic blast and is a logical incorporation for the poem expresses anxiety over atomic ruin.

The discussion concerning the stylistic aspects of the poem "Knife in the Sun" displayed the same protagonists as the discussion surrounding its thematics. Although the heat of the discussion died down with the publication of serial works and collections, the varied aspects of the poet's innovative style continued to come under the close scrutiny of his critics.

Although seemingly inherent in the poet's manner of thought, his associationally conditional imagery proved to be a major target for critical examination. The reason for this examination lay in its complex and unusual nature, a nature purposely designed to make the reader stop and think in order to fully grasp the significance of the images depicted.

Often the deliberate complexity of Drach's images serves to evoke the complexity of life, and, thus, they serve not only a stylistic function, but a philosophical one as well.³⁵

In analyzing the collection Sunflower,³⁶ Novychenko positively assessed the poet's associational tendencies particularly as exemplified in the poem "Solar Etude." He put the blame for all associational shortcomings on the poet's inability to properly edit his poetry, to rid it of often unduly complex associational images that made it difficult to understand.³⁷ An example of such an instance was thought to be found in the poem "Prokofiev's Sonata," where the scene with the football players was difficult to understand because it lacked the poetic explanation that further editing would likely have provided:

Futbolisty zmoreni,
 I futbolky chorni.
 A lobamy kutsymy,
 A tupymy butsamy
 Rozbihaiut'sia kruto
 i ne m'iachem z rozvorota,
 A holovoiu Sokrata
 probyvaiut' vorota.
 Vorotar prudkyi, yak mukha,
 Khap filosofa za vukha,
 Prykladaiet'sia v rozhonu --
 Priamo v pel'ku stadionu
 Vybyvaie.
 Vsiudy shal.
 Oratoriia. Khoral.

Several critical discussions centred around Drach's constant searching and experimentation that resulted in this uniquely original system of images. Anatolii Makarov initiated the discussion by categorizing Drach's constant search for new creative avenues as "...movement of the new through the old,"³⁸ whereby the poet attempted to build upon past creative experience with new discoveries. His search, however, was thought not only to reveal the new, but also to incorporate the findings of others. This was inferred from the metaphors "dezheavy zelenoi demokratii" borrowed from Dolengo, or, "krony korony" and "kniazi duby"

reminiscent of Lina Kostenko. He found innovative stagnation to set in, in those instances where the poet began to repeat himself, as in the phrases "Koronni het'many dzvinkoho prostoru" and "het'many prostoriv".

Continuing this discussion, Ivan Boichak defended the poet's right to search and experimentation, which he equated with the modern era and Soviet progress. He postulated that complex poetics were the driving force in setting the reader's mind in motion, whereas simple poetics could only appeal to individuals of low intellectual and emotional levels.³⁹

Lazar Sanov, replying to Boichak, left no doubt as to his position on this question. It was his opinion that Boichak had "resurrected" long outdated theories and attempted to set them in opposition to the proven tradition of Soviet Ukrainian literature. He claimed not to be opposed to creative experimentation, search and association, as such, but rather to the fact that they did not rely upon the "... solid foundation of artistic truth, ..."40

Ivanysenko, although not a participant in the above discussion, was also critical of Ivan Drach's tendency toward experimentation, which he felt was not always successful. He did, however, acknowledge that dissatisfaction with staid poetic form and construction led the poet to effectively search out and ultimately reveal new and original poetic types. The poems "Mothers," "The Rose Coloured Apron," "The Gray Bird From the Nest of Kurbas," "Somewhere at the Bottom of My Nights," "Two Among the Wheat" and "Caravel," for example, were presented as works in which "... style and individualism were alike, but form was very different."⁴¹

The need for experimentation was explained by another critic, Klavdiia Frolova, as the need to test a creative idea. She linked this need to the poet's constant searching and his desire to personally experience each and every one of life's phenomena. She termed Drach's experimentation, as being a "moral" type, for the end result of his experiments lay in the discovery of moral truths.⁴² She found this type of experimentation to be an integral part of the poems "Knife in the Sun," "Thirst" and "Death of Shevchenko," particularly in the last, where the image of Shevchenko appears to be that of an individual whose very life has personified the testing of an idea.

Another notable discussion developed on the pages of the journal Prapor. It began with an article⁴³ by Viktor Romanenko which harshly criticized Drach's poetry for an overabundance of poetic associations. Due to their unusual nature and the almost polarized distance between them they were said to lend a sense of obscurity to his works. Romanenko was mainly concerned with Drach's philosophical stream of thought and considered his "... kaleidoscopic, impressionistic manner of thinking, ...,"⁴⁴ although perhaps a requirement of overly associational poetics, as "... not being a positive factor in the sphere of philosophical lyricism."⁴⁵

In his response to this article Liubomyr Senyk criticized Romanenko's conclusions, feeling that they were not supported by poetic analysis. He stated that even if he were in agreement that Drach's "impressionistic" manner of thinking gives rise to the associative quality of his lyricism, it would still not be correct to categorize it as a negative aspect of his creative style. He, in turn, characterized the

poet's associational style as

... least evinced by his "impressionistic" manner of thinking, arising not as much from the poet's life's sensations, as from the union of the rational "base" with the emotional ...⁴⁶

Senyk viewed the associational qualities of Drach's poetry as positively influencing his philosophical orientation. He believed it to be a part of the poet's nature to attempt to rethink the realities of the world through poetic images that possess a philosophical accent. The poem "Knife in the Sun" was seen as an attempt in this vein. However, it was not a complete success, for it often failed to provide a broad enough medium for the wide range of problems it sought to deal with.

Although a backer of the poet's tendency to be in constant search, Senyk believed that this trait often led to the discovery of the new at the expense of other significant poetic factors. For example, modernization and complexity of tropes could not always be considered justified. This was because complex thought, although influenced by it, does not necessarily rely upon complex imagery, and complex imagery can make comprehension difficult.⁴⁷ Thus, by revealing the new through complex means a poem can alienate part of its audience.

An unnamed engineer from Kharkiv, in a letter to the editors of this journal defended Romanenko and assailed Senyk. He theorized that Drach's poetry fell under the category of "engineered."⁴⁸ He classified it as such because its poetic associations were often difficult for the average reader to understand. Because of this he likened the following stanza from the poem "The Colonel's Last Bridge" to a crossword puzzle:

Rizkyi atseton kovtala imla,
Hoidalysia bloky na sparenykh shynakh,
Kaval'kada metalu hurkit tiahla,
Nebo vyhoiduvala na pruzhynakh.

Furthermore, the associations in the poem "Picasso's Tear" were thought to be abstractly absurd and the metaphors in "Prokofiev's Sonata" incomprehensible.

In his rebuttal to this letter Ihor Muratov was particularly critical of categorizing Drach's poetry as "engineered," since such a category was non-existent in Soviet Ukrainian literature.⁴⁹ As to the engineer's inability to comprehend complex poetic associations, he advised him to learn to think in poetic terms, that is, through emotion and not always through reason.

Yu. Ivakin felt that the comprehension of complex imagery could be compared to that of a musical composition; it should never have only one set of criteria applied to it. He illustrated this point with the example of the poem "Ballad-Song" where the images, although externally quite simple, are associationally complex and, therefore, lend themselves to several interpretations. However, he, like other critics, considered Drach to be displaying a strong tendency toward overcomplexity. He also believed that this tendency could no longer be justified as an exercise in polemics, whereby Drach was defending his right to poetic experimentation, as it had been in the past. He blamed it upon his lack of selfdiscipline, on his inability to deviate from the highly associational stream of his creative intuition and creative fantasy.⁵⁰

Viktor Ivanysenko attributed the complexity of Drach's poetic form to its content. He believed that complex themes could only be transmitted through a complex poetic vehicle.⁵¹ He did not consider the poet to be toying with words and images; rather, he considered him to be conveying a wealth of information concerning the spiritual self. In the

instances where the poet did indeed seem to lose himself among his complex images the reader was said to have two options open to him. He could either "... console himself with an overly approximate idea about the content or convince himself that the poet has essentially overcomplicated a relatively simple thought ..."52 As examples of works where the poet had not been able to effectively deal with his highly associational stream of thought he put forward the poems "Secrets," "Girls' Fingers," "We Sat Over There" and "The Appeal of Ivan Honta."

Ivakin theorized that some of Drach's better poems, including "The Lion Etude," "Ballad of the Sunflower," "Funeral of a Kolkhoz Chairman," "Ballad of the Pail" and "Ballad-Song," did, in fact, evince those traits of simplicity that Drach's poetry was generally felt to be lacking. "In these works," states Ivakin, "he does not lose the richness of his lyrical 'I,' he does not err in overcomplexity and formal 'excesses.'"53 To the poems in which the poet succeeded in achieving simplicity, Novychenko included the poem "Ballad of a Soldier's Dream." He also hoped this trait would prove to be "a stylistic possibility in the poet's further evolution."54 Makarov, however, did not feel that this hope was realized in the poet's later works. He assessed Drach's poetry as ultimately taking an essentially different direction, one that fell somewhere between the descriptive and the expressive, which he termed a direction of synthetic association.⁵⁵ This new direction was seen as arising out of the poet's ability to synthetically associate a poem's external sensations (i.e., its visual and aural ones) with its internal ones (i.e., with those processes of the human mind that elicit thought and feeling). This type of association resulted in "... the

blending of sensory perception with categories of contemporary philosophy."⁵⁶

Frolova also found the poet to have mastered the art of synthetic association. She explained this association as being based upon the union of diametrically opposed concepts, through a system that involved the omission of intermediary lines, an intense force of poetic concentration and, finally, synthesis.⁵⁷ This was felt to apply most to those poems that dealt with the phenomena of nature. An example of this type of association was found in the poem "The Guelder-Rose" where the action to the poem's core, that is, to its moral truth, was said to travel through a chain of synthesis. This was particularly evident in the first half of the poem, where the poet seeks to uncover the poetic subject:

Spyvaiu sik hustyi z terpkyykh moroznykh hron,
 Spyvaiu sik zharkyykh zhovtnevykh rozkoshei,
 Spyvaiu shurkhotlyvyi padolyst,
 Spyvaiu zolotu oskomu oseni,
 Smetanu vohnianu spyvaiu i zakhlynaius' --
 Spyvaiu hirkotu kokhanykh vust,
 Spyvaiu materyns'kyi dykyi trunok.

Externally this poem appears as a synthesis of varied associations. For example "hustyi sik" is associated with "sik zhovtnevykh rozkoshei" and later this rather positive image is further associated with the negative images of "hirkota kokhanykh vust" and "oskoma oseni". As the characteristics of the guelder-rose become more profound, emphasis shifts to the portrayal of an actual state of being, which is built upon a series of contrasts. The metaphors characterizing the state of being are created in such a way that intermediary links are unnecessary, for the associative pattern can be readily followed without them. In the end,

the poet successfully synthesizes the concept he is presenting into the metaphoric image:

Khrumtyt' mii smutok.
Tsukryt'sia mii smak.

This image thus synthetically represents "the bitterness and sweetness of the guelder-rose, [and] the grief and joy experienced at encountering it"⁵⁸ This method of synthesis bases itself upon the extraction of the most important qualities from a number of different images. It results not only in an alteration of form but also of content, and, finally, in the creation, through synthesis, of one cohesive state of being. The further route to the discovery of the poem's moral truth relies upon a similarly synthetic process. The end result of this process is also a positive one:

Thus through the recognition of the "character" of the guelder-rose the poet attains the moral truth that centres around patriotism to one's homeland, to the discovery of the guelder-rose's beauty, as a symbol of one's native land, and the beauty of devotion to one's nation ...⁵⁹

Western critics often observed both historiosophic themes and a historiosophic style in Drach's works. Historiosophic conceptualization is what was said to enable the poet to associate seemingly dissimilar and distant historic events with current events in a logically plausible manner. This trait was most obvious in the poem "Knife in the Sun" but was also evident in such poems as "The Marble Pile." In the latter poem, for example, the poet associates the fact that Durando Grilli, a leader of the Florentine Communist movement, born of ancient peasant stock and dead at the hands of the Fascists, with the tormented past of his own Ukrainian homeland:

Povela

mene duma u syvu kozats'ku ridniu
Shcho na horlo pokarana tezh zukhvalo prosylas' na paliu.

This stylistic trait was not generally dwelt upon by Soviet critics. However, this particular association was negatively characterized by Muratov. Although he did not term it as specifically a historiosophic one, he rejected it on the basis of the argument that it evolved from "... pseudo-philosophical equilibristics ... constructed from arbitrary passages, ..."60 Kravtsiv disagreed with his view for he, like other Western critics, found this trait to be completely natural to a Ukrainian poet so closely tied to his homeland. He believed that "... it was caused by both the poet's socio-political beliefs and by the direction and content of poetic endeavour."61

A small discussion centred around the image presented in the metaphor "Hroza ekstazu, bila, azh hirka" ("The Word"). Briuhnen postulated that since it was impossible to envision such an image, Drach must simply be creating images at whim, without any basis in reality.⁶² Muratov agreed with Briuhnen that, regardless of creative impulse, all imagery should be dependent upon reality in order to be justified. However, concerning this particular metaphor, Muratov accused Briuhnen of not being able to comprehend the interrelationship between the senses of taste and smell when presented in a highly associational image.⁶³

Olena Nykanorova warned against contrived metaphoric means of conveying poetic thought. She found this to be true of the poem "A Contemporary Ballad-Fairy Tale for Adults." This poem was said to utilize the painful theme of the atomic bomb for the sake of engaging in simple word play. Nykanorova considered Drach's absorption with metaphoric images to, at times, detract from the actual sense of the poem. At other

times it could be compared to a type of elaborate poetic decoration used to enliven often simple content. She termed it a type of "masquarade ball" which one attends in order "... to forget, if only for an hour, life's tedious prose, ...⁶⁴ This "masquarade ball" effect was the essential lifegiving source for the otherwise traditionally banal "Garden Ballad." The highly metaphorized image of the cucumber patch vividly displayed this effect:

Ohirky lezhat' sered hudynnia,
 Pup'ianky v brunatnykh, v chornykh plavkakh,
 Toi vyvernuvsia navznak, toi nabik,
 Zhovtak perehliada "Vechirni Kyiv",
 Toi lih na spynu i tsyharku palyt',
 A toi lystom napnuvsia, mov hazetoiu, --
 A vsi boiat'sia Khymynykh kurei
 Z hostriushchymy chervonymy dziobamy.

The poem's factual basis is contained in the few short lines spoken by the eldest cucumber in reference to the tomatoes that have fallen into their patch:

"Pohljan'te os' na tsykh chervonobokykh,
 Shcho zainialys' od soromu na sontsi.
 Ne doroha yim nasha tykha hriadka,
 Yim ne mynuty Khymynykh kurei.
 My zh lezhymo u zatinku pid lystiam
 I v lastsi bozhii dizhdemos' zasolu,
 A dekhto navit' v zhovtiaka dozriie."

The factual basis is so simple that it seems to have been called into existence solely to provide the poet with a core to build around.⁶⁵ The true aim and essence of this poem is vivid metaphorization.

Frolova viewed Drach's poetic system as one primarily reliant upon unusual images. She related this to the hyperbolically-fantastic side of his creative endeavour and not to the modernistically-innovative one. The perception of these unusual images was based upon "... the utiliza-

Critically, however, there was a divergence of opinion as to the value of musically pictorial depiction. Novychenko, for one, considered the poet to rely too heavily on what he termed "musically-pictorial suggestions."⁶⁸ He believed that musical tone was often incorporated into Drach's poems at the expense of precision and depth of thought. For example, the image "A misiats' u bilykh spodniakh z bat'kom u shakhy

hrav" ("Ballad of the Washed Pants") was a logical and realistic incorporation while that of the image "Mamo! Ya vashi dumy terebliu," ("Ballad of Sar'ians and Van Goghs") was vague and unrealistic and therefore, only suggestive.

Mykola Il'nyts'kyi agreed with Novychenko that Drach's musical images were not always motivated by realism but he praised their expressive qualities. He even theorized that the poet had successfully established a new means of implementing these types of images.⁶⁹ Of particular interest to Il'nyts'kyi was the unusual association in the image "Violonchel' pohasla" from the poem "The Word":

Violonchel' pohasla. I vidrazu
Vmer kontrabas - khaplyvo,
nashvydku, ...

At first glance the association between the "violoncello" and its "extinguishing" is not obvious. However, after reading the following line one realizes that the contrabass is silenced by death. Consequently, the first association becomes evident: by extinguishing itself the violoncello is also silenced. He concluded that the interrelationship of colour and sound in many of Drach's poems created a type of "colourful-music"⁷⁰ and added a relief-like quality to these works.

Pavlo Serdiuk, like Il'nyts'kyi, positively assessed this trait and Drach's ability to capture and transmit both the content and melody of his poetic thought. He found this quality to be reminiscent of the early style of both Tychna and Bazhan, particularly in the poem "Solar Prominences of the Heart":

My chuiem trav zelenyi kryk,
 Doshchiv zadumani refreny,
 Tse traven', vichnyi yeretyk, --
 Tak z-pid zemli bombyt' zeleno
 Na rivni vichnykh partytur!
 My chorni hory perehornem,
 My vdarym sertsem v mur zazhur,
 My rozkvytaemosia z horem
 Na rivni vichnykh partytur!

This resemblance was said to be particularly explicit in:

... its melodies and images, in its lyrical mastering of musical terms and rhythm, in the phonics of its alliteration and assonance, in the temperamentness of its anaphors and sonority of its inner rhythm.⁷¹

The critics agreed that, above all else, Drach's vibrant palette of poetic expression evolved from the analytical processes of his mind and both thematically and stylistically reflected a highly developed intellect. He was inclined to view the world through the scope of his personal intellectual interests and this enriched his poetry immeasurably.

Drach's early poetry was often predisposed to mentioning the names of renowned individuals, both past and present. This was particularly evident in the poem "Thirst," where the names of such notables as Ptolemy, Raphael, Goya, Voltaire, Picasso, Dovzhenko, Shostakovich, Amburtsumian and Mayakovsky abound. Novychenko warned the poet against this tendency toward name-dropping, implying that it was an example of pseudo-intellectualism rather than true intellectualism. Ivakin saw this as a passing phase in Drach's creative development. He characterized it as "... the naive joy of a neophyte, taking his first drink from the cup of recognition and becoming intoxicated from its contents."⁷² Later poetic efforts were said to concentrate less on such forms of superficial intellectualism and more on the inner, spiritual type.

Viktor Romanenko, while admitting that Drach did exhibit traits of "serious erudition," characterized the attempt at intellectualism in the poem "Thirst" as nothing more than mere child's play. This and all similar ventures into intellectualism were characterized as examples of "audacious erudition that can sometimes turn into boldfaced speculation, ..."73

Replying to Romanenko, L. Senyk argued that if Drach were interested in revealing the essence of life, then it was completely natural for him to address the great artists and thinkers of the past. He found this stylistic attribute not only to be "... poetic in character, ...," but also as "... reconfirming existence as dynamic action, whose goal is the perception of life."74 The poet's tendency to incorporate both academic terminology and the names of great personages was concluded to be testimony to his "... serious philosophical penetration into the socio-psychological factors that characterize the present."75

This discussion begun by Romanenko and Senyk was carried further in the aforementioned letter from an anonymous engineer to the editors of the journal Prapor. Basically agreeing with Romanenko, he found the mode toward the usage of academically technical terms in poetry to be yet another negative aspect of what he termed "engineered poetry." He went further than Romanenko, however, in arguing that the end result of such tendencies is the creation of poetic chaos of an irrational form and is strictly the product of the human mind rather than of human emotion.76 Muratov, although otherwise opposed to the engineer's arguments, agreed with the assertion that overusage of technical terms could be more harmful than beneficial to poetry.77

words by endowing them with exotic or unusual meanings. It was thought that by releasing the word from its mundane meaning he enlivened it with an artistic meaning that provided the impulse for creating the poetic image.⁸⁰

Drach was often acclaimed for a keen stylistic feeling for the Ukrainian language. His in-depth knowledge of his mother tongue, combined with his stylistic feeling for it, enabled him to make a significant contribution to the ongoing development of the Ukrainian language. This occurred not only through his incessant use of highly technical and academic terminology, but also through his creation of neologisms that are essential to the dynamics of language evolution.

The poet was also thought to be successful in incorporating into his poetry a means of "decorative" working. This is particularly evident in the poem "Grandmother." Here he seemingly tests the flexibility and tone of each of his chosen words:

A divulia, divchynyna, divuval'nytsia
Do kozhukha, kozhushenka tak i hornet'sia,
A babusia, babulynia, babusentsiia
Do divchys'ka, divchynys'ka tak i tulyt'sia --
Syrotyna zh, syrotulia, syroptashechka,
Babumantsia, babutatko, babusoniachko ...

In doing so, Drach was said to be unveiling before his reader "... the process of word creation, an usually joyous process for him ..." ⁸¹ However, not all of his attempts at word creation, in this sense, were considered original. This was due to the fact that he tended to repeat himself in an often uninspired manner and the resulting effect seemed contrived rather than created.

Although noted as an innovator, Drach's roots were in Ukrainian literary tradition. His poetic style like his thematic concerns

reflected a synthesis of the modern and the traditional. Stylistically this synthesis enabled him to unite,

... a sharply contemporary world outlook with some unusually appealing traits of the ancient national world outlook, primarily its free-spirited rational elements of poetic fantasy and its sharp and expressive emotionality.⁸²

The poem "Ballad about Father," for example, linked the traditional with the contemporary through a process of complex association. In this way it was able to present a distinct picture of life in the mid-twentieth century:

De hramy vysadkiv hoidaiut' tonny tsukru,
De na hubakh v hychky - moloko,
De tsukrovarnia prostiahaie ruku,
Holodno zakhlynaiuchys' hudkom,
Tam bat'ko khodyt' z soniachnym cholom,
Bo sontse chub na promeni pozychylo,
I khmary osypaiut'sia hurtom
V tu kruhlu liustru, bilo i dobrozychlyvo.
U bat'ka paroplavy plynut' venamy,
Ob rebra truchys', yak ob stiny portu.
Hudkamy dykymy, od holodu shalenymy,
Khryplinniam rvut'sia kriz' yoho aortu,
I rafinad vezut' od sertsia azh do Indii, ...

His images, symbols and metaphors clearly seem to arise out of traditional sources as well, although their character is undeniably modern. The ancient symbol of the sun reappears frequently and its nature proves highly adaptable. The sun most frequently symbolizes poetry:

Poeziie, sontse moie oranzheve!
Shchomyti yakys' khlopchys'ko
Vidkryvaie tebe dlia sebe,
Shchob staty naviky soniashnykom.

("Ballad of the Sunflower")

Here not only is the sun a symbol of poetry, but the sunflower symbolizes the individual who has managed to grasp the essence of poetry. The poet at times depicts himself as being "... a fairy purveyor of suns,..."⁸³

De kotyt'sia mizh holubykh luhiv
 Khmaryna nizhna z bilymy plechyma,
 Ya prodaiu sontsia - oranzhevi, tuhi,
 Z tryvozhnymy, muzychnymy ochyma.

("Solar Etude")

The suns that he is selling are symbols of human thoughts and emotions, the essential wares of a poet.

The metaphoric association between the heart and the sun is a very common one in his works.⁸⁴ It is not only obvious in the title Solar Prominences of the Heart, but is also well illustrated in the poem "Deaf to Their Brother - Trees." In the latter, this association is visible in several instances: firstly, in the metaphorized image of the trees as "akumulatory zhakhnykh protuberantsiv", and secondly, in the poetic association between poets and trees:

V poetiv i derev sertsia bezzakhysni,
 Lyshe zhoraiuchy, vony sluhuiut' sontsiu ...

This "solar ecstasy"⁸⁵ is characteristic of many of Drach's works. It originated in the poem "Knife in the Sun" and was consistently being developed throughout all of his poems.

Folkloric tradition is often stylistically incorporated into Drach's poems as well. It is considered an essential component of his intellectualism for "a poet cannot exist without relying on the elemental cognition of the folk (the past), just as poetry cannot exist solely on barren intellectualism."⁸⁶ Like other traditional forms, folklore is modernized to keep pace with the contemporary world. This is at least partially evident in the union of differing poetic tones, specifically that of the epic-folkloric with the lyrical, as in the poem "Ballad of the Couple":

Na vokhkim zilli ruky bili
 (I somny dum i dumni sny ...)
 Tak dykhaly, tax tykho vmily
 Pryspaty tini tyshyny.

Ya chuv kriz' son, yak tykho plache
 Tvoia zoria v moikh ochakh,
 Tak vystyhla pekel'na vdacha
 Svidoma slova, yak mecha.

Drach, however, was by no means the first poet to successfully achieve this union. The same was said to be true of the early Tychyna, Bazhan, Voronyi, Zerov, Polishchuk and Vlyz'ko.

Much critical attention was directed at the cycle "Ballads From the Well of Folklore." Il'nyts'kyi characterized the poems in this cycle as "... imitations of Epiphany carols and ritual songs."⁸⁷ Both he and Makarov believed that, generally speaking, the cycle failed to master its poetic assignment. This was because the folkloric elements were isolated from the poetic instead of existing as part of the cycle's heterogeneous character. Furthermore, more of the national element existed in the following two lines from the poem "Ballad of the Nightingales" than in the entire cycle in question:

Kozhen letiuchy prorok u sirii kufaiitsi
 Morduvavsia v spivi ...

This excerpt was characterized in the following manner:

Here the folk element is natural, that is, there is as much here, as in the poet himself, in his memory, his way of life, his habits and his manner of thought, here the folk element has left its traces, its faith in "prophets in gray jackets" and its passion for exact, fresh and unusual wording: "killing himself in song."⁸⁸

The folk character of this work arose as much out of its action as it did out of its wording. The cycle in question, however, seemed only capable of presenting the folkloric

... in the form of an interesting archaic phenomenon, a megalosaur, who by some miracle escaped the influence of the new climate, the new way of life.⁸⁹

This was thought to be especially true of the poem "Ballad about Spring":

-- Hospodare, hospodaron'ku, vidtvory voriton'ka!
 -- Khto vorit klyche? -- Yaron'ka Vesnon'ka!
 -- Oi zelena Vesnon'ko v rutianim vinon'ku,
 U kozhnii kviton'tsi -- po zolotii bdzhilon'tsi,
 A na chim zhe ty sydysh? -- Na zolotim krislechku,
 V nebesi posadzhena, khmaron'kamy obhorodzhena.
 -- A chym zhe ty hraiesh? -- Zolotym yabluchkom,
 Oi ne zolotym yabluchkom -- zolotym sonechkom.

In fact, as far as Makarov was concerned, the cycle's folkloric qualities were so dense that it was often difficult to grasp any deeper meaning that the poet may have intended to convey.

At this point, however, the opinions of these two critics diverged. Unlike Makarov, Il'nyts'kyi believed that several of the cycle's poems did in fact possess some redeeming qualities. These qualities were found to exist in those poems where folklorism served as a tool that "... aided the poet in condensing into a single given moment, the historicism of fixed tokens of the rational character."⁹⁰ Conversely to Makarov, he found this to be a characteristic of the "Ballad about Spring":

-- Oi vesna krasna, shcho zh nam vynesla?
 Yak ty zvisyla po nebeson'kakh doliu-raiduhu,
 Vidtvorym voroton'ka, pustym raden'ko:

Malym ditochkam pobihanniachko,
 Starym babon'kam posidnniachko,
 Krasnym divon'kam na spivanniachko,
 A hospodariam na robittiachko.

-- Oi vesna-krasna, schcho zh nam vynesla?
 Yak nam vynesla sontse v khmarontsi, krov na ratyshchi,
 Zatvorym vorotyshcha, Vtopyly radoshchi:

Malym ditochkam -- syrotiannochko,
 Starym babon'kam -- holosinniachko,
 Krasnym divon'kam -- sliozy-nyton'ky,
 Hospodaron'kam -- krivtsiu lyton'ky.

Here the poet was said to be attempting to assess the extent to which such motifs could assist him in dealing with contemporary conflicts. For this reason, he did not deal with specific events, but rather, in the style of the ancient Epiphany carols, consciously attempted to generalize and symbolize the phenomena of nature. Thus, once again in contrast to Makarov, Il'nyts'kyi concluded that the folkloric in this cycle was something greater than "an interesting archaic phenomenon."

B. Kravtsiv closely examined the colour system of the collection Solar Prominences of the Heart and concluded that the colours blue, black and gold predominated.⁹¹ His examination was so detailed that he even noted how many times each given colour (predominant or otherwise) appeared in the collection. From this he then concluded that the tone of the collection was primarily a dark and sombre one and that the poet was predisposed "... to dark and sombre epithets, names and objects."⁹² Kravtsiv also examined the nature of the epithets almost as closely as he did the colour system. From this extremely thorough examination he then concluded that "... Drach's dominant epithets are characteristic of fire, heat, sombreness and savagery, cold-frost and hunger, pride and stubbornness."⁹³ Drach was also praised for the incorporation of biblical motifs into his poems. From this Kravtsiv deduced that he was not afraid to search for truth and the essence of life in religion. He pointed out, as well, that related to these motifs was the incorporation of such archaic terms as "vichnyi yeretyk" and "blahoprystoinyi".

In his barbed reply to Kravtsiv's article Ivan Drach sarcastically referred to Kravtsiv's "... electric adding machine ..." ⁹⁴ method of calculating the number of times each epithet, colour, etc., appeared in

his poems. Drach also derided the petty nature of this critique and the absurd allusions he thought it made, by stating: "even the image system is supposed to reflect rebellion against the political system ..."95

By constantly striving for perfection of form and a strengthening of its national basis, Drach's poetry was becoming increasingly more universal in nature. He consciously promoted this trend by never hesitating to incorporate into his poetry those elements which he found to be better in foreign works. This was said to belie his belief that the national poetic form was indeed a dynamic one, consistently working toward the revival of its creative resources through any means available to it.⁹⁶ Toward this end he was said to have been influenced by Ukrainian poetic tradition, once again dating back to Shevchenko, by the Ukrainian poet of the early twenties, particularly Tychyna, Bazhan and Dovzhenko, by such foreign poets as Eluard, Vatsietis, Lorca, Rytsos and Whitman, and the modern Russian poets Blok, Pasternak and Mayakovsky.

Of all the critics surveyed only Bohdan Boichuk entered into a discourse concerning the rhythm, verse and rhyme schemes utilized in Drach's poetry.⁹⁷ The rhythmical structure, when not utilizing the folksong form, consisted of common foot measurements: the iamb, trochee, amphibrach and anapest, although occasionally a second or third paeon was incorporated at the end of a line. The verse structure was also a common one, usually a four line stanza with an AABB or ABAB rhyme scheme. When required by the nature of the poem stanza delineation was eliminated altogether.

If, as postulated, the themes that Ivan Drach incorporated into his works were concerned with revealing the role of poetry and the poet, then

his poetic style was concerned with implementing the appropriate means to reveal them.

Individuality and innovation arose from his conviction that poetry need not be subservient to widely accepted truths and the generally banal, but rather must undergo constant search and experimentation to establish and consequently reaffirm all discerned truths. Creative impulse stemmed from the union of emotion and intellect. This resulted in the transmittal of poetic thought through a combination of the real with the product of fantasy. All of these factors combined in an inherently complex manner of poetic expression that often required profound introspective thought in order to be fully understood and appreciated.

His manner of thought and the nature of his concerns proved Drach to be a thoroughly contemporary poet. Although primarily a lyrical poet, the weightiness and underlying tension of his concerns caused a sharp dramatic undercurrent to transverse all of his works. His contemporary side, however, was tempered by the distinct influence of the traditional. This foothold in the rich resources of his Ukrainian heritage added the necessary dimension of form and depth to his creative endeavour. His stylistic flexibility, depth of expression and polyphony of tone were limitlessly enhanced by his complete command of the Ukrainian language, its very nuance and inflection.

The declaration made in one of his early poems proved to be his stylistic motto:

An artist does not have constraining norms,
He is the norm himself, he is in his own style.

("Death of Shevchenko")

Consistently adhering to this motto Ivan Drach proved himself to be a highly evolved individualist and innovator, almost without equal in the realm of modern Ukrainian poetry.

FOOTNOTES

¹Yu. Ivakin, "V puti" (In journey), Voprosy literatury (February 1966): 110.

²Stepan Kryzhaniv's'kyi, "Rozvytok i onovlennia zhanriv u suchasni ukrains'kii poezii" (The evolution and renewal of genres in contemporary Ukrainian poetry), Literatura i suchasnist' (Literature and the present) (Kiev: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1970), p.165.

³Klavdiia P. Frolova, Rozvytok obraznoi svidomosti v ukrains'kii radians'kii lirytsi (1917-1967) (The evolution of image consciousness in Soviet Ukrainian lyric (1917-1967)) (Dnipropetrovs'k: n.p., 1970), p. 189.

⁴Viktor Ivanysenko, "Za velinniam pravdy i krasy" (After the decree of truth and beauty), Dnipro (January 1966): 145.

⁵Olena Nykanorova, "Piznannia sebe" (Knowing oneself), Vitchyzna (March 1970): 162.

⁶Ivan Drach, Balady budniv (Workday Ballads) (Kiev: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1967), 151 pp.

⁷Nykanorova, p. 164.

⁸Anatolii Makarov, "Sprymaty svit vserioz" (Seriously perceiving the world), Suchasnist' (June 1970): 54.

⁹Ibid., p. 53.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 62.

¹¹Leonid Novychenko, "Ivan Drach, novobranets' poezii" (Ivan Drach, a newcomer to poetry), Introduction to Soniashnyk (Sunflower) (Kiev: Khudozhnia literatura, 1962), p. 7.

¹²Ibid., p. 8.

¹³Ivanysenko, "Na vidstani sertsia" (By the measure of the heart), Introduction to Poezii (Poetry) (Kiev: Molod', 1967), p. 9.

¹⁴Frolova, "Dramatychne v suchasni lirytsi" (The dramatic in contemporary lyric), Radians'ke literaturoznavtsvo (October 1968): 16.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 20.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 26.

18Bohdan Boichuk, "Dva poety" (Two poets), Suchasnist' (April 1965): 54.

19Ivanysenko, p. 17.

20V.M. Lesyn and O.S. Pulynets', Slovnyk literaturoznavchykh terminiv (Dictionary of literary terms) (Kiev: Radians'ka Shkola, 1965), p. 38.

21Yevhen Prisovs'kyi, "Nespokii shukan'" (The unrest of search), Vitchyzna (January 1968): 194.

22Drach, Protuberantsi sertsia (Solar Prominences of the Heart) (Kiev: Molod', 1965), 143 pp.

23H.A. Nud'ha, Ukrains'ka balada (The Ukrainian ballad) (Kiev: Dnipro, 1970), p. 250.

24Ivanysenko, "V posukakh radosti i krasny" (In search of happiness and beauty), Vitchyzna (October 1961): 192.

25Mykola Sheremet, "Ne proste i shtuchne buty harnym ne mozhe" (The complex and artificial cannot ever be beautiful), Literaturna hazeta, 14 November 1961.

26Ibid.

27Mykhailo Ostryk, "V im'ia choho vony - hromy i blyskavytsi?" (In the name of what are they, the thunder and lightning?), Prapor (March 1962): 67.

28Ibid., p. 68.

29Ivan Svitlychnyi, "U poetychnim kosmosi" (In the poetic cosmos), Dnipro (April 1962): 150.

30Petro Morhaienko, "Slovo v polemitsi" (A word in the polemic), Dnipro (May 1962): 155.

31Ivan Boichak, "Na pul'si epokhy" (On the pulse of the era), Dnipro (May 1962): 140.

32Ibid.

33Ibid., pp. 139-140.

34Ibid., p. 150.

35Jaroslav Rozumnyj, "Drach, Ivan Fedorovych," in The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet Literatures (Including Non-Russian and Emigre Literatures) Vol. 6, Harry Weber ed. [to be published in 1982].

36Drach, Sunflower, 138 pp.

37Novychenko, p. 13.

38Makarov, "Chuiu dub spivaie" (I hear the oak tree singing), Literaturna Ukraina, 9 February 1965.

39"Ditiam do 16 rokiv chytaty virshi zaboroneno" (Children under 16 years of age are forbidden to read poetry), Ranok (August 1965):13. I. Ya. Boichuk's reply to a letter to the editors of this journal, written by V. Churko and M. Paliichuk.

40Lazar Sanov, "Pro krytychni alehorii ta pokvaplyvi vysnovky" (About critical allegories and hasty conclusions), Vitchyzna (October 1965): 178.

41Ivanysenko, p. 17.

42Frolova, p. 190.

43Viktor Romanenko, "Poeziia dumky" (Poetry of thought), Prapor (June 1967): 90-96.

44Ibid., p. 95.

45Ibid.

46Liubomyr Senyk, "Pravdyva iskra z hranitu zhyttia" (A truthful spark from the granite of life), Prapor (July 1967): 81.

47Ibid., p. 82.

48"Dialoh pro poeziiu" (Dialogue on poetry), Prapor (May 1968): 60-61. Anonymous letter to the editors.

49Ibid., p. 62. Reply by Ihor Muratov.

50Ivakin, p. 101.

51Ivanysenko, pp. 14-15.

52Ibid., p. 15.

53Ivakin, p. 102.

54Novychenko, p. 16.

55Makarov, "Poet shukaie suchasnist'" (A poet searches for the present), Dnipro (March 1966): 149.

56Ibid.

57Frolova, The evolution of image consciousness in Soviet Ukrainian lyric (1917-1967), p. 301.

58Ibid., p. 302.

59Ibid.

60Ihor Muratov, "Shukannia i vidkryttia" (Search and discovery), Literaturna Ukraina, 3 December 1965.

61Bohdan Kravtsiv, "Protuberantsi sertsia i kredo Ivana Dracha" (Solar Prominences of the Heart and the credo of Ivan Drach), Suchasnist' (January 1966): 12.

62Volodymyr Briuhhen, "Manera i manirnist" (Manner and pretentiousness), Literaturna Ukraina, 22 October 1965.

63Muratov, "Search and Discovery."

64Nykanorova, p. 160.

65Ibid., p. 161.

66Frolova, p. 194.

67Ibid., p. 196.

68Novychenko, p. 14.

69Mykola Il'nyts'kyi, Barvy i tony poetychnoho slova (The colours and tones of the poetic word) (Kiev: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1967), p. 53.

70Ibid.

71Pavlo Serdiuk, "Baiduzhist' protypokazana" (Indifference contraindicated), Dnipro (March 1965); 137.

72Ivakin, p. 99.

73Romanenko, p. 95.

74Senyk, p. 82.

75Ibid., p. 83.

76"Dialogue on poetry," p. 60. Anonymous letter to the editors.

77Ibid., p. 62. Reply by Ihor Muratov.

78Il'nyts'kyi, "Polifoniia poetychnoho slova" (The polyphony of the poetic word), Dnipro (June 1966): 139.

79Makarov, p. 151.

80Volodymyr Yavorivs'kyi, "Enerhiia poetychnoho obrazu" (The energy of the poetic image), Zhovten' (April 1966): 101.

81Nykanorova, p. 158.

82Makarov, "Dvi avtokatastrofy" (Two autocatastrophes), Rozmaittia tendentsii, literaturnokrytychni narysy (Varied tendencies, literary sketches) (Kiev: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1969), p.125.

83Novychenko, p. 11.

84Kravtsiv, p. 23.

85Rozumnyj.

86Ibid.

87Il'nyts'kyi, "Lada varyt' zillia" (Lada prepares herbs), Dnipro (September 1968): 138.

88Makarov, "Seriously perceiving the world," p. 58.

89Ibid., p. 58-59.

90Il'nyts'kyi, p. 139.

91Kravtsiv, p. 18.

92Ibid., p. 21.

93Ibid.

94Drach, "O, bud'te prokliati vy shche raz!" (Oh, once again be damned!), Literaturna Ukraina, 22 July 1966.

95Ibid.

96Ivakin, p. 109.

97Boichuk, p. 53.

CONCLUSION

The shortlived creative independence of the shestydesiatnyky was instrumental in reviving a literary activity that had been forcibly controlled for several decades. The group's ideology revolved around strictly aesthetic principles and was the common bond that united its members. The initial, extremely favourable reaction from the literary community and the general populace to the poetry of the shestydesiatnyky led to its ultimate destruction. The Party and its backers feared the dangerous implications of independent creative thought. Having accused its members of abstractionist and formalist tendencies, a sweeping series of arrests, imprisonments and forcible banishments succeeded in restoring the faithful adherence to socialist realism by those shestydesiatnyky still active in the literary field.

Ivan Drach was one of the most vocal and most talented representatives of this group. His poetry reflected a deep commitment to its ideals. When official restraints were re-implemented he chose to comply with the tenets of socialist realism rather than risk an uncertain fate. His choice, however, led to a progressive decline in the quality of his poetry, a fact that by the 1970's was noted by the majority of his critics.

During the decade in question Drach's poetry concerned itself with an extremely broad thematic diapason. The themes he chose to deal with were ones he considered to be of primary importance to the contemporary individual. He was mainly concerned with searching out and establishing the truth in all spheres of existence. This, in his opinion, was the only and true role of the poet and poetry in society. Moreover, the nature of these concerns reflected a highly intellectual, philosophical and humanitarian poet and set him apart from both his predecessors and contemporaries.

The stylistic means that Drach utilized to convey his poetic thought proved to be a synthesis of the traditional with the innovatively original. Drach freely drew upon the resources of his Ukrainian literary and cultural heritage. This was strongly reflected in his often romanticized worldview, in his wide incorporation of the ballad genre and in his deep absorption in Ukrainian folklore. However, he was not content with the simple poetic form dictated by socialist realism. If the reader were to discover the complex realities of life through his poetry, then its only suitable vehicle was a complex one.

The content and the form of Drach's poetry complemented each implicitly. Their successful union resulted in poetry that was both thought provoking and highly individualistic.

Soviet critics involved themselves in a heated discussion concerning Drach's first major work "Knife in the Sun." The literary community divided itself into two opposing camps over the issues raised by the discussion. The initial critical reaction to the poem was a positive one. As such Party liners as Mykola Sheremet and Petro Morhaienko, however,

began to criticize the works of the shestydesiatnyky and Drach's works in particular, the tone of the general reaction, in all probability evinced by fear of reprisals, altered dramatically. This was perhaps best exhibited by the reaction of the noted poet Pavlo Tychyna, himself a leading representative of the progressive literary era of the 1920's. One would have expected him to share a spiritual bond with the young generation whose creative sentiments so closely reflected those of the writers and poets of the 1920's. Overtly, however, this did not prove to be the case for his criticisms were completely derisive. Another example was that of the critic Leonid Novychenko. During the heat of the critical discussion he took it upon himself to write an objectively positive introduction to Sunflower, Ivan Drach's first published collection of poetry. Shortly thereafter, however, he shifted his allegiance to the ranks of the opposition.

The intensity of the discussion surrounding Drach's works abated as they progressively conformed to ideological standards. However, a significant difference of opinion continued to exist concerning certain aspects of his poetry, particularly those considered crucial to the requirements of socialist realism. As in the earlier discussions the questions raised set the Party backers and the more conservative critics apart from those critics with more liberal views.

The reasons for the critical opposition to Drach's poetry varied. It has been contended that the first discussion was initiated by individuals who were jealous of the talents that Drach and other members of the young generation so obviously possessed. Perhaps some of Drach's critics were simply incapable of grasping the complex essence of his poetic

thought. While the staunch Party liners and others too wary to prove otherwise may have been critical of his poetry because it so often refused to fit the bland and simplistic stereotype dictated by socialist realism.

Regardless of the reasons why Drach's works elicited so much critical concern, the fact remains that by striving toward ideological conformity Drach's poetry suffered a sharp decline and has never regained its former stature. The contribution that Ivan Drach made to modern Ukrainian literature, however, is a significant one, that continues to be an influential force in its further evolution.

Table I

Transliteration Table

А а	a	Н н	n
Б б	b	О о	o
В в	v	П п	p
Г г	h	Р р	r
Г г	g	С с	s
Д д	d	Т т	t
Е е	e	У у	u
Є є	ie, but ye/Ye in initial position	Ф ф	f
Ж ж	zh	Х х	kh
З з	z	Ц ц	ts
И и	y	Ч ч	ch
І і	i	Ш ш	sh
Ї ї	i, but yi/Yi in initial position	Щ щ	shch
Й й	i	Ю ю	iu, but yu/Yu in initial position
К к	k	Я я	ia, but ya/Ya in initial position
Л л	l	Ь	(м'який знак) '
М м	m		

Table II

Translation of Poetry Titles

A Contemporary Ballad-Fairy Tale for Adults - Сучасна балада-казочка
для дорослих
Architectural Diptych - Архітектурний диптих
Ballad about a Child's Open Eyes - Балада про дитячих розплющених очей
Ballad about Father - Балада про батька
Ballad about Genes - Балада про гени
Ballad about Hordii - Балада про дядька Гордія
Ballad about Karmeliuk - Балада про Кармелюка
Ballad about Modesty - Балада про скромність
Ballad about Spring - Балада про Весноньку
Ballad about Two Swans - Балада про двох лебедів
Ballad of a Soldier's Dream - Балада про солдатський сон
Ballad of Creativity - Балада про творчість
Ballad of DNA--Dioxyribonucleic Acid - Балада ДНК-- Дезоксирибонуклеїно-
вої кислоти
Ballad of Genealogy - Балада про генеалогію
Ballad of Sar'ians and Van Goghs - Балада про Сар'янів і Ван-Гогів
Ballad of the Couple - Балада двох
Ballad of the Golden Onion - Балада золотої цибулі
Ballad of the Island of Antorage - Балада про острів Антораж
Ballad of the Knots - Балада про вузлики
Ballad of the Nightingales - Балада про жайворонків
Ballad of the Pail - Балада про відро
Ballad of the Pipe - Балада про лютку
Ballad of the Sunflower - Балада про соняшник
Ballad of the Washed Pants - Балада про витрані штани
Ballad of Three Belts - Балада про три пояси
Ballad of Two Horses - Балада двох коней
Ballads From the Well of Folklore - Балади з криниці фольклору
Ballad-Song - Балада-пісня
Ballad With a Question Mark - Балада зі знаком запитання

Breathing with Lenin - Дихаю Леніним
 Caravel - Каравелла
 Cineballad - Кінобалада
 Deaf to Their Brother--Trees - Німі братове--дерева
 Death of Shevchenko - Смерть Шевченка
 Do Not Be Self-Destructive - Не будьте самовбивцями
 Einsteiniana - Ейнштейніана
 Fodder-crops - Стоколос
 For What Reason, Do You Think... - Ради чого, ви думаєте...
 Garden Ballad - Городня балада
 Girls' Fingers - Дівочі пальці
 Grandmother - Бабусенція
 Guelder-Rose Ballad - Калинова балада
 Heaven of My Hopes - Небо моїх надій
 Idea Fix - Ідея фікс
 Knife in the Sun - Ніж у сонці
 Mothers - Матері
 Ode to the Virtuous Coward - Ода чесному боягузові
 Pen - Перо
 Picasso's Tear - Сльоза Пікассо
 Prokofiev's Sonata - Соната Прокоф'єва
 Sarcastic - Саркастичне
 Secrets - Таємниці
 Solar Etude - Сонячний етюд
 Solar Prominences of the Heart - Протуберанці серця
 Somewhere at the Bottom of My Nights - Деся на дні моїх ночей
 Strange Chronicle of One White Day - Дивна хроніка одного білого дня
 The Appeal of Ivan Honta - Оскарження Івана Гонти
 The Cemetary Skyscraper - Цвинтар хмарочос
 The Colonel's Last Bridge - Останній міст полковника
 The Forest Sonnet - Лісовий сонет
 The Grey Bird From the Nest of Kurbas - Сизий птах із гніздов'я Курбаса
 The Guelder-Rose - Калинова балада
 The Gypsy Ballad - Циганська балада
 The Heart Occasionally Looks Back - Серце інколи озирається

The Incomprehensible - Незбагнуте
 The Joking Ballad about the Theory of Relativity - Жартівлива балада
 про теорію відносності
 The Kozak Rode Beyond the Danube - Їхав козак за Дунай
 The Lion Etude - Левиний етюд
 The Marble Pile - Мармурова паля
 The Naturalistic Ballad - Натуралістична балада
 The Rose Coloured Apron - Фартух ружовий
 The Word - Слово
 Thirst - Спрага
 Through the Linden Escort - Крізь липовий ескорт
 To Mother From Her Prodigal Son - Матері від блудного сина
 To the Sources - До джерел
 To Vasyly Symonenko - Василю Симоненкові
 Trees - Дерева
 Two Among the Wheat - Двоє в пшениці
 Two Sisters - Дві сестри
 We Sat Over There - Там ми сиділи, отам
 What is Grass? - Що таке трава?
 Wings - Крила

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Primary Sources

Drach, Ivan. Balady Budniv (Workday Ballads). Kiev: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1967, 151 pp.

_____. "Nizh u sontsi" (Knife in the Sun). Literaturna hazeta, 18 July 1961.

_____. Poezii (Poetry). Kiev: Molod', 1967, 183 pp.

_____. Protuberantsi sertsia (Solar Prominences of the Heart). Kiev: Molod' 1966, 143 pp.

_____. Soniashnyk (Sunflower). Kiev: Khudozhnia literatura, 1962, 138 pp.

2. Secondary Sources

A. Books

Adamovich, Anthony. "The Non-Russians." In Soviet Literature of the Sixties, an International Symposium, pp. 100-129. Edited by Max Hayward and Edward L. Cowley. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1964.

Dziuba, Ivan. "'Seks', 'seks ... i trokhy 'antyseksu'" ('Sex', 'sex ... and a bit of 'antisex'). In Shyroke more Ukrainy, dokumenty samvydav z Ukrainy (Wide sea of Ukraine, reprint of samvydav ("samizdat") documents from Soviet Ukraine), Documents 7, pp. 133-148. Paris: P.I.U.F., 1972.

Frolova, Klavdiia P. Rozvytok obraznoi svidomosti v ukrains'kii radians'kii lirytsi (1917-1967) (The evolution of image consciousness in Soviet Ukrainian lyric (1917-1967)). Dnipropetrovs'k: n.p., 1970.

- Il'nyts'kyi, Mykola. Barvy i tony poetychnoho slova (The colours and tones of the poetic word). Kiev: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1967.
- Ivanysenko, Viktor. "Na vidstani sertsia" (By the measure of the heart). Introduction to Poezii (Poetry) by Ivan Drach, pp. 133-148. Kiev: Zhovten', 1967.
- Johnson, Priscilla. Khrushchev and the Arts, The Politics of Soviet Culture, 1962-1964. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1965.
- Koshelivets', Ivan (Koszeliwec, Iwan). "Shestydesiatnyky" (Writers of the sixties), "Vysnovky" (Conclusions). In Suchasna literatura v URSR (The Ukrainian literature of to-day), pp. 275-368. New York: Prolog, 1964.
- _____. "Z peredmovy do pershoho vydannia" (From the foreword to the first edition). In Panorama nainovishoi literatury v URSR (Panorama of the new Ukrainian literature), pp. 5-18. Munich: Suchasnist', 1974.
- Kravtsiv, Bohdan. "Narodzhennia novoho" (The birth of the new). In Slovo (The word), Almanac I, pp. 342-356. New York: Ukrainian Writers' Association in Exile, 1962.
- _____, ed. Shistdesiat poetiv shistdesiatykh rokiv (Sixty poets of the sixties). New York: Prolog, 1967.
- Kryzhanivs'kyi, Stepan. "Rozvytok i onovlennia zhanriv u suchasni ukrains'kii poezii" (The evolution and renewal of genres in contemporary Ukrainian poetry). In Literatura i suchasnist' (Literature and the present), pp. 153-171. Kiev: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1970.
- Lavrinenko, Yurii. "Z poetychnoi vesny na Radians'kii Ukraini 60-ykh rokiv" (From the poetic spring in the Soviet Ukraine of the 1960's). In Zrub i parosty (Stumps and sprouts), pp. 308-324. Munich: Suchasnist', 1971.
- Luckyj, George S.N. "Ukrainian Literature." In Discordant Voices, The Non-Russian Soviet Literatures, 1953-1973, pp. 127-138. Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic Press, 1975.
- _____. "Introduction." In Clandestine Essays by Ievhen Sverstiuk, pp. 7-15. Translated by George S.N. Luckyj. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1976.
- _____. "Introduction." In Four Ukrainian Poets, Drach, Korotych, Kostenko, Symonenko, n.p. Edited by George S.N. Luckyj. New York: Quixote, 1969.

- Makarov, Anatolii. "Nauka prykhodyt' u poeziiu" (Academics enter poetry). Rozmaittia tendentsii, literaturnokrytychni narysy (Varied tendencies, critical sketches), pp. 83-107. Kiev: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1969.
- _____. "Dvi avtokatastrofy" (Two autocatastrophes). Rozmaittia tendentsii, literaturnokrytychni narysy (Varied tendencies, critical sketches), pp. 124-144. Kiev: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1969.
- Novychenko, Leonid. "Ivan Drach, novobranets' poezii" (Ivan Drach, a newcomer to poetry). Introduction to Soniashnyk (Sunflower) by Ivan Drach, pp. 3-18. Kiev: Khudozhnia Literatūra, 1962.
- Nud'ha, H.A. Ukrains'ka balada (The Ukrainian ballad). Kiev: Dnipro, 1970.
- Slonim, Marc. "The Thaw." In Soviet Russian Literature, Writers and Problems, 1917-1977, pp. 320-351. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Zinkevych, Osyp (Zinkewych). "Z generatsii novatoriv" (From the generation of innovators). In Z generatsii novatoriv, Svitlychnyi i Dziuba (From the generation of innovators, Svitlychnyi and Dziuba), pp. 7-147. Baltimore: Smoloskyp, 1967.

B. Periodicals

- Andreev, Mikhail. "The Party and the Literature of the Non-Russian People." Studies on the Soviet Union 3 (January 1963): 109-118.
- Bobak, Milan. "Z Ivanom Drachem" (With Ivan Drach). Duklia (April 1969): 55-57.
- Boichak, Ivan. "Nu pul'si epokhy" (On the pulse of the era). Dnipro (December 1962): 134-154.
- Boichuk, Bohdan. "Dva poety" (Two poets). Suchasnist' (April 1965): 49-61.
- Briuhhen, Voldynmyr. "Sontse i khmary" (The sun and the clouds). Dnipro (July 1968): 155-159.
- Chalmaev, V. "Samye nusushchnye zaboty" (The most vital concerns). Druzhba narodov (September 1962): 254-273.

"Dialoh pro poeziiu" (Dialogue on poetry). Prapor (May 1968): 60-65.
Anonymous letter to the editors and editorial reply by Ihor Muratov.

"Ditiam do 16 rokiv chytaty virshi zaboroneno" (Children under 16 years of age are forbidden to read poems). Ranok (August 1965): 12-13.
Letter to the editors by V. Churko and M. Paliichuk and editorial reply by I. Ya. Boichuk.

Frolova, Klavdiia P. "Dramatychne v suchasni lirytsi" (The dramatic in contemporary lyric). Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo (December 1968): 12-27.

_____. "Holovnyi kalibr" (The main calibre). Vitchyzna (March 1968): 146-154.

Gorlich, Joachim. "Ukrainian Literature Between Persecution and the Thaw." The Ukrainian Review 13 (Summer 1966): 49-50.

Horbach, Anna-Halya. "The Young Generation of Ukrainian Poets." The Ukrainian Review 12 (Winter 1965): 23-34.

Il'nyts'kyi, Mykola. "Alhebroiu zviryvshy harmoniiu" (Algebraically defining harmony). Zhovten' (July 1965): 115-123.

_____. "Barvy i tony slova" (The colours and tones of the word). Zhovten' (December 1964): 134-143.

_____. "Lada varyt' zillia" (Lada prepare herbs). Dnipro (September 1968): 136-144.

_____. "Polifoniia poetychnoho slova" (The polyphony of the poetic word). Dnipro (June 1966): 136-146.

_____. "Svit i svitohliad" (The world and world outlook). Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo (September 1966): 13-23.

Ivakin, Yu. "V puti" (In journey). Voprosy literaty (February 1966): 93-110.

"Ivan Drach pro svoiu poeziiu" (Ivan Drach on his own poetry). My i svit (February 1979): 43-45.

Ivanysenko, Viktor. "V poshukakh radosti i krasny" (In search of happiness and beauty). Vitchyzna (October 1961): 186-193.

_____. "Za velinniam pravdy i krasny" (After the decree of truth and beauty). Dnipro (January 1966): 141-150.

Katsnel'son, Abram. "Na mahistral'ni shliakhy" (On the highways). Dnipro (June 1962): 131-138.

Koshelivets', Ivan (Koshelivets). "A Decade of Ukrainian Literature." Studies on the Soviet Union 3 (February 1963): 105-111.

_____. "Deshcho pro suchasnyi stan ukrains'koi radians'koi literatury" (Concerning the current state of Soviet Ukrainian literature). Suchasnist' (June, 1975): 20-36.

Kravtsiv, Bohdan. "P'iaty z'izd pys'mennykiv Ukrainy" (The fifth congress of the Ukrainian writers' union).

"Stattia persha: Try richyshcha z'izdovoi rozmovy" (Article one: Three points of discussion). Suchasnist' (March 1967): 75-91.

"Stattia druha: Literaturna nyva i chortopolokhy" (Article two: The literary field and the thistles). Suchasnist' (April 1967): 54-64.

_____. "Protuberantsi sertsia i kredo Ivana Dracha" (Solar Prominences of the Heart and the credo of Ivan Drach). Suchasnist' (January, 1966): 5-25.

_____. "'Velyka vedmedytsia' i 'Honchi psy'" ('The great bear' and 'The chasing dogs'). Suchasnist' (February 1966): 24-49.

_____. "Z novoobriinykh mahistral' na stari reiky" (From new highways to old battens). Suchasnist' (July-August 1971): 54-67.

Kryzhanivs'kyi, Stepan A. "Buiannia molodykh syl" (The flourishing of young talents). Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo (January 1962): 3-15.

Kysel'ov, Iosyp. "Poeziia dumky" (Poetry of thought). Vitchyzna (November 1961): 188-196.

Lubkivs'kyi, Roman. "Svidomist' slova yak mecha" (Perceiving the word as the sword). Zhovten' (June 1968): 113-121.

Luckyj, George S.N. "Literary Ferment in the Ukraine." Problems of Communism 11 (November-December 1962): 61-55.

Makarov, Anatolii. "Poet shukaie suchasnist'" (The poet searches for the present). Dnipro (March 1966): 147-155.

_____. "Spryimaty svit vserioz" (Seriously perceiving the world). Suchasnist' (June 1970): 53-62.

Malyshko, Andrii. "Liubliu nashu molodu literaturu" (I like our young literature). Dnipro (March 1963): 148-151.

McClure, Timothy (pseud.). "The Cultural Scene." Problems of Communism 16 (March-April 1967): 26-43.

"Molodye - o sebe" (The young - about themselves). Voprosy literatury (September 1962): 130-131.

Morhaienko, Petro. "Slovo v polemitsi" (A word in the polemics). Dnipro (May 1962): 152-156.

Novychenko, Leonid. "Smelee v zhizn'!" (Boldly into life!). Druzhba narodov (August 1962): 94-95.

_____. "Velyka vidpovidal'nist' khudozhnyka pered narodom" (An artist's great responsibility to the people). Komunist Ukrainy (April 1963): 65-70.

Nykanorova, Olena. "Piznannia sebe" (Knowing oneself). Vitchyzna (March 1970): 158-165.

Ostryk, Mykhailo. "V im'ia choho vony - hromy i blyskavytsi?" (In the name of are they, the thunder and lightning?). Prapor. (March 1962): 63-68.

Pelenski, Jaroslav. "Recent Ukrainian Writing." Survey (no. 59 1966): 102-112.

Prisovs'kyi, Yevhen. "Nespokii shukan'" (The unrest of search). Vitchyzna (January 1968): 190-196.

Romanenko, Viktor. "Poeziia dumky" (Poetry of thought). Prapor (June 1967); 90-96.

Sanov, Lazar. "Pro krytychni alehorii ta pokvaplyvi vysnovky" (About critical allegories and hasty conclusions). Vitchyzna (October 1965): 176-181.

Senyk, Liubomyr. "Buttia yak diannia" (Existence as action). Zhovten' (January 1963): 144-151.

_____. "Pravdyva iskra z hranitu zhyttia" (A true spark from the granite of life). Prapor (July 1967): 78-84.

Serdiuk, Pavlo. "Baiduzhist' protypokazana" (Indifference contra-indicated). Dnipro (March 1965): 133-141.

Sheremet, Mykola. "A chy potribna molodi slava na 'vyrist'?" (Do the young need glory in order to 'grow up?'). Dnipro (March 1963): 50-57.

Siehs, Karl. "The Fifth Writers' Congress in Kyiv." The Ukrainian Review 14 (Spring 1967): 50-57.

Styranka, Myroslav. "The 'Crimes' of the Younger Generation." The Ukrainian Review 10 (Winter 1963): 5-7.

- _____. "The Cultural Resurgence in Ukraine." The Ukrainian Review 10 (Summer 1963): 3-9.
- Sullivant, Robert S. "Voices from the Ukraine ... The 'Shestydesiatnyky'." Problems of Communism 16 (September-October 1967): 50-51.
- Svitlychnyi, Ivan. "U poetychnin kosmosi" (In the poetic cosmos). Dnipro (April 1962): 144-152.
- Turbin, V. "A vot solntsa! Solntsa! Komu solntsa!" (Here is the sun! The sun! Who wants the sun!). Molodaia gvardiia (April 1965); 303-312.
- Tychyna, Pavlo. "Buty virnym velyki idei do kintsia" (Being faithful to a great idea to the end). Dnipro (March 1963): 145-148.
- Vincenz, Andrzej (de Vincenz) "Nowa literatura na Ukrainie" (New literature in Ukraine). Kultura (no. 211 1965): 106-122.
- Vincenz, A. de (Andrzej Vincenz). "Recent Ukrainian Writing." Survey (No. 46 1963): 143-150.

C. Newspapers

- "Berehty chest' i slavu radians'koi literatury, zbory partiinoi orhanizatsii kyivs'kykh pys'mennykiv" (Protecting the virtue and glory of Soviet literature, meeting of the Organization of Kievan Writers). Literaturna Ukraina, 23 April 1963.
- "Boiovi zavdannia ukrains'koi radians'koi literatury" (Militant aims of Soviet Ukrainian literature). Literaturna Ukraina, 17 November 1966. Speech by Petro Shelest, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine, at the Fifth Congress of the Ukrainian Writers' Union, November 16, 1966.
- Briuhhen, Volodymyr. "Manera i manirnist'" (Manner and pretentiousness). Literaturna Ukraina, 22 October 1965.
- _____. "Sim poezii i odyh frahment" (Seven poems and one fragment). Literaturna Ukraina, 25 July 1969.
- Chabanivs'kyi, Mykhailo. "Uvaha: roznova pro naiholovnishe" (Attention: a discussion about the most important). Literaturna Ukraina, 8 January 1963.

Dmyterko, Liubomyr. "Revoliutsiiei mobilizovani i poklykani" (Mobilized and called to arms by the revolution). Literaturna Ukraina, 2 April 1962.

Drach, Ivan. "O, bud'te prokliati vy shche raz!" (Oh, once again be damned!). Literaturna Ukraina, 22 July 1966.

_____. "Pravda, masterstvo, gorizonty" (Truth, expertise, horizons). Literaturnaia gazeta, 1 December 1966.

Dziuba, Ivan. Introduction to "Nizh u sontsi" (Knife in the Sun). Literaturna hazeta, 18 July 1961.

"Ideolohichnu robotu - na riven' velychnykh zavdan' komunistychnoho budivnytstva, narada aktyvu tvorchoi intelihtentsii ta ideolohichnykh pratsivnykiv Ukrainy" (Ideological tasks - at the level of the great responsibility of building Communism, the council of the active members of the creative intelligentsia and ideological workers of Ukraine). Literaturna Ukraina, 9 April 1963.

Kopylenko, L. "Shche vchora chytachi - s'ohodni pys'mennyky" (Yesterday still readers - today writers). Literaturna Ukraina, 23 March

Korniichuk, Oleksandr. "My pidemo vpered" (We will go forward). Literaturna Ukraina, 2 April 1963.

"Kurs-lenins'kyi! Meta-komunizm!" (The pathway - Lenin's! The goal - Communism!). Literaturna Ukraina, 19 March 1963.

Makarov, Anatolii. "Chuiu dub spivaie" (I hear the oak tree singing). Literaturna Ukraina, 19 February 1965.

Muraton, Ihor. "Shukannia i vidkryttia" (Search and discovery). Literaturna Ukraina, 3 December 1965.

Novychenko, Leonid. "Zvidky berut'sia zabobony?" (Where do superstitions originate?) Literaturna Ukraina, 5 April 1962.

"Promova Stepana Kryzhanivs'koho" (Speech by Stepan Kryzhanivs'kyi). Literaturna Ukraina, 20 November 1966. At the Fifth Congress of the Ukrainian Writers Union, November 17, 1966.

Ryl's'kyi, Maksym. "Bat'ky i dity" (Parents and children). Literaturna Ukraina, 10 August 1962.

_____. "Seriozna rich mystetstvo" (Art is a serious matter). Literaturna Ukraina, 29 January 1963.

Sheremet, Mykola. "Neproste i shtuchne buty harnym ne mozhe" (The complex and artificial cannot ever be beautiful). Literaturna hazeta, 14 November 1961.

Sverstiuk, Yevhen. "I navishcho pkhaty solom'ianoho dida?" Literaturna hazeta, 28 November 1961.

_____. "Shevchenko kriz' velyku i malen'ku pryzmu" (Shevchenko through a broad and narrow prism). Literaturna Ukraina, 11 May 1962.

"Tvoryty dlia narodu v im'ia komunizmu" (Creating for the people in the name of Communism). Literaturna Ukraina, 25 December 1962. Speech by First Secretary of the CPSU, L.F. Il'ichov, at meeting of the Party and government leaders with representatives of literature and the arts, December 17, 1962.

Tychyna, Pavlo. "Vchytys' na istorii revoliutsii" (Learning from the history of the Revolution). Literaturna Ukraina, 17 March 1963.

"Ukrains'ka radians'ka literatura na peredodni velykoho p'iatdesiaty-richchia" (Soviet Ukrainian literature on the threshold of the great fiftieth anniversary). Literaturna Ukraina, 17 November 1966. Speech by Oles' Honchar, President of the Ukrainian Writers' Union, at the Fifth Congress of the Union, November 16, 1966.

"U prezidii SPU" (In the presidium of the Ukrainian Writers' Union) Literaturna Ukraina, 27 June 1962.

Ushakov, Mykola. "Novatorstvo i tradytsia" (Innovation and tradition). Literaturna Ukraina, 25 September 1962.

V'iazovs'kyi, Hryhorii. "Khudozhnii obraz i osobystist' poeta" (The artistic image and the poet's individuality). Literaturna Ukraina, 18 September 1966.

Voron'ko, Platon. "Vidpovid'" (Reply). Literaturna hazeta, 6 February 1962.

"Vsi syly tvorchosti - budivnytstvu komunizmu!" (All creative talents - to the building of Communism!) Literaturna hazeta, 16 January 1962.

"Vysoka ideinist' i khudozhnia maisternist' - velyka syla radians'koi literatury i mystetstva" (Lofty ideals and artistic craftsmanship - the great force of Soviet literature and art). Literaturna Ukraina, 12, 15 March 1963. Speech by N.S. Khrushchev at meeting of the Party and government leaders with representatives of literature and the arts, March 8, 1963.

"Za hlyboku dumku, za yaskrave slovo!" (For insightful thought, for the illuminated word!). Literaturna hazeta, 17 November 1961.

"Za pravdyve i vysokodushne vidtvorennia zhyttia narodu!" (For the truthful and highminded depiction of the life of the people!). Literaturna hazeta, 12 January 1962. Speech by Oles' Honchar, President of the Ukrainian Writers' Union, at the Third Plenum of the Union, January 10, 1962.

"Za vysoku ideinist' i khudozhniu maisternist'" (For lofty ideals and artistic craftsmanship). Literaturna Ukraina, 29 March 1962. Speech by First Secretary of the Presidium of the Writers' Union of the U.S.S.R., K.O. Fedin, at the Fourth Plenum of the Presidium, March 26, 1963.

D. Other Sources

Novychenko, Leonid, ed. Istoria ukrains'koi literatury (History of Ukrainian literature) 8 vols. Kiev: n.p., 1971. Vol. 8: "Poeziia" (Poetry), Literature pisliavoiennoho chasu" (Literature of the post-war period), pp. 235-327.

Prolog, 16 November 1966. Cited by Robert S. Sullivant, "Voices From the Ukraine ... The 'Shestydesiatnyky'." Problems of Communism 16 (September - October 1962): 50.

"Report on the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party." Radians'ka Ukraina, 11 August 1962. Cited by George S.N. Luckyj, "Literary Ferment in the Ukraine." Problems of Communism 11 (November - December 1962): 54.

Rozumnyj, Jaroslav. "Drach, Ivan Fedorovych." In The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet Literatures (Including Non-Russian and Emigre Literatures) Vol. 6. Edited by Harry Weber [to be published in 1982].

Stepanenko, O. "Poety, pyshit' dlia narodu" (Poets, write for the people). Radians'ka Ukraina, 23 December 1962. Cited by Ivan Koshelivets' (Iwan Koszeliwec), "Shestydesiatnyky" (Writers of the Sixties). Suchasna literatura v URSR (The Ukrainian literature of to-day), p. 333. Munich: Prolog, 1964.