

Українська література

Oksana Weretiuk, д. філ. н. (Rzeszow University, Poland)

Reflections on Identities in Andrzej Stasiuk's and Juriy Andruhovych's Travel Narratives

Метою даної роботи є порівняльний аналіз відображень національної та європейської ідентифікації поляків і українців в оповідях про подорожі Анджея Стасюка (1960-?) та Юрія Андруховича (в 1960 -?), а саме в *Dojczland* (2007) і *Таємниця (Замість роману)* (2008). Польський та український письменники вивчали складний характер ідентичності в Центрально-Східній Європі, розглядали відносини між ідентичностями та історією, релігією, нацією і мовою, порівнюючи Схід і Захід. Обидва автори є прекрасними оповідачами, вони часто використовують нелінійні нарративи; їх мова жива, точна, жвава у дотепності, іронічна, автоіронічна, парадоксальна і метафорична, повна еротичних зображень і дуже часто повна грубої лайки. Їх знання історії, географії, політики і культури, здається, не суперечить навмисній вульгарності та плебейству. Їх дві книги - подорожні нотатки Стасюка під назвою «*Dojczland*» і «*Таємниця (Замість роману)*» Андруховича являють собою приклад літератури подорожі, яка описує реальність Східної Європи та її відносини із Заходом. Оскільки вони належать до того ж покоління і того самого географічного регіону, Стасюк і Андрухович мають подібне бачення й аналогічну думку про Східну / Центральноєвропейську історію, на європейську інтеграцію і регіоналізм, але їх національні ідентичності, мовна самобутність, стилі оповіді і творчі методи відрізняються.

Ключові слова: ідентичність, література про подорожі, наратор, розповідь.

The aim of the paper is a comparative analysis of reflections on national and European identification of Poles and Ukrainians in Andrzej Stasiuk's (1960-?) and Juriy Andruhovych's (1960 - ?) travel narratives, namely in Dojczland (2007) and Таємниця (Замість роману) (2008, The Secret (Instead of a Novel)). The Polish and Ukrainian writers examine the complex nature of identity in Central-Eastern Europe, look at the relationship between identity and history, religion, nation and language, compare the East and the West. Both authors are perfect story-tellers, they often use non-linear narrative; their language is lively, concrete, enlivened with wit, irony, autoirony, paradox and metaphor, full of erotic images and very often – full of coarse erotic invectives. Their knowledge of history, geography, politics and culture, it seems, does not argue with their intended vulgarity and plebeians. Their two books – Stasiuk's travelogue titled Dojczland and Andrukchovych's 'instead of a novel' titled Secrecy – present an example of travel literature which describes the reality of Eastern Europe and its relationship with the West. Belonging to the same generation, to the same geographical region, Stasiuk and Andruhovych have a similar outlook and similar opinion on the Eastern/Central European history, on the European integration and regionalism, but their national identity, linguistic identity, narrative styles and creative methods differ.

Key words: identity, travel literature, narrator, story.

The aim of the paper is a comparative analysis of reflections on national and European identification of Poles and Ukrainians in Andrzej Stasiuk's (1960 -?) and Juriy Andruhovych's (1960-) travel narratives, namely in *Dojczland* (2007) and *Таємниця (Замість роману)* (2008, *The Secret (Instead of a Novel)*). Stasiuk is one of the most successful and internationally acclaimed contemporary Polish writers, he is best known for his describing the reality of Central-Eastern Europe and its relationship with the West. Andrukchovych for his literary writings and all-European activity as Ukrainian public intellectual has been awarded numerous national and international prizes, including the Herder Prize, the Erich Maria Remark Peace Prize, and the Leipzig Book Fair Prize for European Understanding.

The Polish and Ukrainian writers examine the complex nature of identity in Central-Eastern Europe, look at the relationship between identity and history, religion, nation and language, compare the East and the West. Both authors are perfect story-tellers, they often use non-linear narrative; their language is lively, concrete, enlivened with wit, irony, autoirony, paradox and metaphor, full of erotic images and very often – full of coarse erotic invectives. Their knowledge of history, geography, politics and culture, it seems, does not argue with their intended vulgarity and plebeians. Their two books – Stasiuk's travelogue titled *Dojczland* and Andrukchovych's 'instead of a novel' titled *Secrecy* – present an example of travel literature which describes the reality of Eastern Europe and its relationship with the West. Belonging to the same generation, to the same

geographical region, Stasiuk and Andruhovych have a similar outlook and similar opinion on the Eastern/Central European history, on the European integration and regionalism, but their national identity, linguistic identity, narrative styles and creative methods differ. Let us observe their narration in *Dojczland* and *Secrecy*, where the storytelling plays the universal creative role, emphasizing plot, character, atmosphere and theme as well.

The narrators of *Dojczland* and *Secrecy* used the first person account which suits both fiction and nonfiction stories and these two literature works compound the features of the first and the second one. A reader easily recognizes the real authors in narration, the narrator and the author in these two works share the same persona, since the real world and the world of the story generally are the same. This style of narration is appropriate to their genre function: travel literature typically records the experiences of an author, and an author - telling you the story as it is, becomes a narrator (and the viewpoint character as well) in travel, who tells us the way she (he) saw it happen. Thus, both narrators/authors/ viewpoint characters - usually are talking about their selves and their national context as well, describing a sequence of mostly non-fictional events.

Both authors come from the East (Stasiuk from Poland, Andrukchovych from Ukraine) to Germany, where they are frequenters. Over the time of narration Andrukchovych over and over again mentions about his working visits to the western neighbour¹. Stasiuk not without irony and pathos informs the reader: “I went past sixty German hotels, sixty German cities, sixty German railway stations and seven German airports”². But the way they observe German is entirely different. The Polish author has chosen a form of itinerary, telling in details an account of his journey in Germany, thus German is in the foreground, but very often in comparison with Poland. His story looks like a free reflection and we may begin to read it from any place. His Ukrainian colleague and friend Juri Andrukchovych preferred the form of a real (or may be fictional?) interview with his (real or fictional?) German colleague Egon Alt which took place in Berlin. Although the author/narrator and his interlocutor generally chat about author’s travelling («you are again in travel»[176], his German colleague notes), he mostly travels in spacetime in the limits of his own biography. German surrounding plays the role of a frame for the author’s journey across his native country and more precise – across his own experience and his own life. Travelling in his memory he tries to tell the alternative stories about himself, the story about Ukraine, Ukrainians and the whole Eastern Europe to his very attentive western listener, decoding eastern codes for him and for each reader as well. Answering the questions of the western stranger, he helps himself to understand his nation and to find his European identity.

Stasiuk’s story is fictional and real at the same time. Using Henri Lefebvre’s definition, I may say: his «Representational space is alive: it speaks. It has an affective kernel or center: Ego, bed, bedroom, dwelling, house; or square, church, graveyard. It embraces the loci of passion, of action and of lived situations, and thus immediately implies time»³. An affective kernel of *Dojczland*’s space is locomotion in Germany: German trains and cars, hotels, railway stations and airports. Real author goes on business trips for promotions and meetings with his German reader of his translated books, which are physically present in his narration. He does not need to hide his mercantile interest from the reader of this story: “As usually, I went here for money”[99], he defines the aim of his journey and not without irony identifies himself a ‘nomadic gastarbeiter’, a ‘commercial traveler’[28]. Moreover: his irony and autoirony prompt him a comparable image - he sets himself against another workers from the East, namely, with intelligible Gipsy from Rumania,

¹ Юрій Андрухович, *Таємниця (Замість роману)*, Харків: Фоліо 2008, 278 сс. The following quotations from this edition are given with the page number in brackets.

² Andrzej Stasiuk, *Dojczland*, Wołowiec: Czarne 2007, s. 27. The following quotations from this edition I give with the abbreviation *D* and the page number in brackets. All translations from Polish and Ukrainian of Stasiuk’s and Andrukchovych’s works cited are mine and my doctorate students’.

³ Quoted by: *Post-Theory. New Directions in Criticism*, ed. Martin McQuillan, Graeme MacDonald, Robin Purves, Stephen Thomson. Edinburg University Press 1999, p.204.

earning money playing the accordion and the trumpet for German public [92], an then – on the basis of this comparison – he uses a metaphor of Central-Eastern Europe as “Gipsy of the European Union” [100].

In the whole story Stasiuk reflects on his European, Slavic and Polish identity in comparison, first and foremost with Germany, but with other countries and nations as well. His itinerary, telling in details an account of his trip in Germany, is not a typical travelogue. As he notes himself, he has his own Pascal¹ in Germany [12], which is oriented on observing Germans, but not visiting places of tourist interest. The chronological disorder, non-linearity of narration entirely response to discontinuous, complex, heteronymous and contested world, situated by the author/narrator in post-colonial (post-communist) context. All the time he interrupts his storytelling (e.g. “I have just strayed away from the subject”[54]) with memories of his previous journeys to Germany and other countries, with historical facts of communist and fascist occupation in Central-Eastern Europe:

I keep all this in my memory and make Germany out of these pictures[21]; I want it all mixed up and change into some clear vision: My grandmother, placed before her own house [she was just about to die, shot by a German officer], a silver ICE, Axel with a flask of coffee in the Dresden railway station, Klaus Kinski in *Fitzcarraldo*, Bruno S. in *Stroszek*, bread for fresh, warm milk, five hundred thousand second- hand golfs in Polish roads, the battle of Grunwald...[90]

(Przechowuje to wszystko w pamięci i składam z tych obrazów Niemcy [21]; (...) chcę, żeby to wszystko wymieszało się i zamieniło się w jakiś zrozumiały obraz: Moja babka pod ścianą własnego domu [która już miała umrzeć od pocisku niemieckiego oficera – O.W.], srebrny ICE, Axel z termosem kawy na drezdeńskim dworcu, Klaus Kinski w *Fitzcarraldo*, Bruno S. w *Stroszku*, chleb za ciepłe, świeżo udojone mleko, pięćset tysięcy używanych golfów na polskich drogach, bitwa pod Grunwaldem [90])

As the result of such actions, his visions of “sixty German hotels, sixty German cities, sixty German railway stations and seven German airports»² and his Polish historic experience interfere and a hybrid image of Stasiuk’s Germany comes into being. The author emphasizes a fictional sense of his storytelling, the relative truth of the facts mentioned – human’s memory is fallible [11]; he also with provocative irony notes: “It seems that mistakes are possible, and it is possible that this story consists of mistakes only”[61]. His narration casts doubt on established truth about German and Poles, and other European nations, but his point of view has no claim to priority. Very often does Stasiuk tell about his imagine travels and diaries, using future tense, praesens historicum and conditional mood (e.g. “I imagined that I am sitting opposite the window and writing. I am writing down everything I remembered. Day after day, city after city, hotel after hotel ...”[34]), playing with the reader, being ironic and autoironic, joking and striking a provocative attitude. His story is first of all a peculiar reflection, ‘philosophy of travelling’[72] and ‘psychoanalyses’[27], a propos, according to the author’s definition.

Being a European, a Central-Eastern European, is the widest level of Stasiuk’s identification. The second level is being Slav. He names himself ‘Slav writer’ [63], characterizes his thinking as ‘Slav mind’[81] and tries to specify Slavic race and culture – that’s why, the Polish writer puts in the storytelling a fragment of the second-person narration about his imaginative travel to Russia. Step by step, arguing, dialoguing and reflecting, he with himself (it may be compared with drama’s soliloquy), he questions (very, very emotionally, with a use of expletives!) the well known opinion on Russia as the most Slavic country, the center and a stronghold of Slavs. In his opinion, Slavic tradition, Slavic culture disagree with communist violence, geographical distances and nations motley of Russia:

¹ Pascal Travel Club and Publishing House in Bielsko-Biała, Poland, belonging to ITI (International Trading and Investments Holdings SA Luxembourg) and specializing in edition of tourist guides, maps, illustrated books etc.

² This number all along varies with the development of events, reaching e.g. one hundred and seventeen cities (see pp. 9,12,13,61,77).

What the fuck Slav lands, are you crazy? Ural and Yekaterinburg are right here, where Lenin ordered to murder the tsar and his family; wait a minute, ask me, please, whether I agree to the Slav lands, understood in this way, with Lenin- the unforgettable representative.... One thousand eight hundred from Moscow, and where Ussurijsk... What does it have in common with me, the child of Mazovia, what does it have in common with the gloom of Mazovian lowlands, weeping willows and F. Chopin? It has nothing. Slav lands are Slovakia and Slovenia. GDR is more Slav lands than Omsk on two thousand six hundred seventy- sixth from Moscow or Novosybirsk on three thousand three hundred third.

(«Jaka, kurwa, słowiańszczyzna, czy cię pogięło? Przecież zaraz Urał, zaraz Jekaterynburg, gdzie Lenin kazał zamordować cara z całą rodziną, chwila moment, proszę mnie zapytać, czy ja w ogóle reflektuje na tak pojmowaną słowiańszczyznę z Leninym jako niezapomnianym reprezentantem». Tysiąc osiemset od Moskwy, a gdzie jeszcze Ussurijsk... Co to ma wspólnego ze mną, dzieckiem Mazowsza, co to ma wspólnego ze smętkiem mazowieckich nizin, płaczącymi wierzbami i Fryderykiem Chopinem? Nic nie ma. Słowiańszczyzna to Słowacja i Słowenia. Już NDR to bardziej Słowiańszczyzna, niż Omsk na dwa tysiące sześćset siedemdziesiątym szóstym od Moskwy albo Nowosybirsk na trzy tysiące trzysta trzecim. [75])

Travelling across Germany, Stasiuk observes among this nation an exceptional and exclusive sense of form [79], which is not characteristic of Slavs. After his watching «one hundred and seventy seven German towns and two hundreds and twenty mornings» [77] he is delighted with all-German capability of streamlining but simultaneously he mocks the automatism of their actions:

[Germans] just get up and start a day like they did yesterday, the day before yesterday, a hundred or two hundred days ago. They quietly repeat their fathers' and grandfathers' gestures, they repeat the old German gestures, without which no day can start, without which no morning has sense. While heading for the railway station in Bavarian, Wirtembergian, Rheinland or Brandenburgian remote places, I observed how they form their lives, how they organize chaos, how they try to control the madness of humanity. Waiters and conductors with their sedateness, moustached men in overalls (...), cops finishing their duty (...) pensioners drinking their morning tea and reading a newspaper, children going to school, all they, the whole Germany, in the morning, they are slow, quiet ritual, that protects the world from catastrophe, aberration, extinction.

([Niemcy] Po prostu wstają i zaczynają dzień tak jak wczoraj, przedwczoraj, sto i dwieście lat temu. Powtarzają spokojne gesty swoich ojców, dziadków, powtarzają stare niemieckie gesty, bez których nie może zacząć się żaden dzień, bez których żaden poranek nie ma sensu. Idąc na dworzec w bawarskiej, wirtemberskiej, nadreńskiej albo brandenburskiej pipidówce, przyglądałem się jak nadają formę swojemu życiu, jak porządkują chaos, jak próbują zapanować nad obłędem człowieczeństwa. Kelnerzy i konduktorzy z tą swoją statecznością, wąsaci faceci w kombinezonach (...), gliniarze schodzący ze służby (...) emeryci nad poranną herbatą i gazetą, dzieciarnia wędrująca do szkoły, oni wszyscy, całe Niemcy rano, to jest powolny, spokojny rytuał, który chroni świat przed katastrofą, przed wykojeniem, przed zagładą. [79])

Comparing German and Slavic football fans during and after the match, he especially emphasizes the form of established civil order, so characteristic of Germans. The absence of this quality in the space of *Dojczland* becomes a distinctive feature of the Slavic race [82]. As a matter of fact, the narrator, with great pleasure once notes no-obedience, a rebellion of the form: the Germans smoking under *No smoking* at the railway station. He describes this fact tastefully:

They were standing by “Rauchen verboten” and smoking. In the 90 s. They were smoking and throwing butts on the floor. They were crushing them with their heels on the floor. They were not bums, they were regular citizens in suits with leather briefcases etc.

(Stali pod «Rauchen verboten» i palili. W latach dziewięćdziesiątych. Palili i kiepowali na podłodze. Rozdeptywali obcasami na posadzce. I to wcale nie lumpy, normalni obywatele w garniturach, ze skórzanymi teczkami i w ogóle. [94])

This fact forced him to take up an internal polemics with ethnic stereotypes. Therefore, in order to understand Slavs Stasiuk compares them with German culture, German life style from one side and Russian element – from another. In his anthropological comparisons (‘anthropological

vision of waters'[97], as he determines himself) he does not regret juicy and sharply critical characteristics for European and non-European nations, he even agrees with his real and implied reader, that his 'story is full of prejudice'[44].

With the help of the same second-person narrative technique, a favoured form of various literary works within postmodernism tradition, Stasiuk moves to the next level of identification: he tries to understand the "Polish soul" [74], which cannot be got right without navigation to the East, to Russia, the Polish eastern neighbour and historical oppressor. For Russia Poles are 'everlasting rebels', 'sneaky traitors of Slavs' and the East [74]. On the other side, the West still is holding Poles in contempt. Returning to the first-person narration Stasiuk not without autoirony and cunning provocation presents his presumption:

It can be said that we are Jasio the Fool¹, the Foolish John of Europe, such the Fool from the fairy tale, the youngest of brothers and sisters, for whom the world is a mystery and the land of wonders. What is my German journey then, if not the fool's journey in search of wisdom?

(Można powiedzieć, że jesteśmy Głupim Jasiem Europy, takim Głupim Jasiem z bajki, najmłodszym z rodzeństwa, dla którego świat to zagadka i kraina cudowności. Bo czym jest moja niemiecka podróż, jeśli nie wędrówką Głupiego Jasia w poszukiwaniu mądrości? [77])

Thanks to his strong neighbors, to Russia and Germany, Stasiuk comments slyly, John the Fool enjoys a green old age, is still young, without 'the bored stiff western democracy' and all is before him [77].

When Stasiuk employs a dialogue occasionally, Andrukchovych makes this form of character's speech a type of literature, in which he engages in a discussion with his German biographer. His interlocutor – by putting questions to narrator and interrupting him in the moments of excessively complex digression - fulfills a role of the text organizer. Being in the shade, he tries to discipline the narration about the past. Answering these questions the author/narrator creates a complication story, a mood piece and thematic stories² as well, in a form of alternative stories about his life and "autometacriticism"³ of his writing. Like Stasiuk's author/narrator, he strengthened his storytelling with the help of alcohol.

Generally, Andrukchovych's quasi novel and quasi travelogue, is entirely devoted to the search of European identity of Ukrainians. As I have mentioned, it is made up of interviews in which his very European (German) colleague asked him questions about his previous works about Europe and Ukraine as well as quoted them. Strolling in Berlin, where the narrator temporarily took up residence in 2005, travelling by train in suburban zones, like Stasiuk, observing passengers and walkers, they spoke mainly about Ukrainian experience of Andrukchovych, that is about his native country and its relations with the West.

For a long time the West was enigmatic; hidden for Poles and Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain. For a Ukrainian, who was much longer under the communist regime than the Pole, the West was much more remote, strange and Other, and only the forbidden Western music which for all that was stolen in the life of his Soviet generation became "a kind of parallel world where you can hide from school, from Soviets, from semen poison ('Sovpedia and spermatotoxicosis')[60]. For the Ukrainian narrator the West starts from Poland. In the age of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Poland and Ukraine were in the same unity; but after WWII, from the perspective of Andrukchovych's Ukrainian, Poland becomes the very beginning of the West, although it begins straight away after Lviv. Narrator notes, that it is within walking distance from Przemyśl to Freiburg - where Europe is 'and there would be another correlation between the time and the distance' [353], because in real Europe people get over distances much more quickly and much

¹ Popular Slav fairy tale character, seen as a hopeless fool by others but coming out winner in the end, Russian version - Ivan the Fool.

² I used the terminology of Lewis Turco: "A narrative that emphasizes plot is a *complication story*; one that stresses character is a *character sketch*; one stressing atmosphere is a *mood piece*, relying on *ambience*; and a short narrative that relies primarily on theme is a *thematic story*". Lewis Turco, *The Book of Literary Terms*, Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1999, p.39.

³ I used the term from http://kut.org.ua/books_a0170.php, 12.09.2011.

more easily. Mundane hitchhiking, a means of transportation for strangers, in the Ukrainian consciousness of the narrator grows into a symbol of European freedom and democracy; and borderland Polish Przemyśl - a metaphor of the beginning of Another life:

The rest of the way, it is ten times longer distance, from Przemyśl and Nottingham, he [his English colleague] travelled by hitchhiking and paid nothing for that. I have made this digression for you to understand better what Przemyśl is from our *outlandish* perspective. This is a geographic place that is a starting point for hitchhiking, do you get it? Hitchhiking as a lifestyle and civilized model. [354]

(Усю решту шляху, себто в десяток разів довший відтинок між Перемишлем і Ноттінгамом, він долав автостопом і не платив за це ані цента. Цей відступ я зробив для того, щоб ти краще зрозумів, що таке місто Перемишль з нашої *потоїбічної* перспективи. Це такий географічний пункт, з якого, нарешті, починається автостоп, розумієш? Автостоп як спосіб життя і цивілізаційна модель. [354]).

Getting over distances was very important for Andrukchovych, because travelling in declining years of Soviet empire was a kind of the resistance to authority. «Today it seems me, that all this time, all the 90s plus the first years of the new century I continued returning from somewhere and packing my baggage again» [340], he remembers. Travelling to the West played a role of strengthening his identification, both national and European. In narrator's answers Europe means freedom and democracy, a civilized model of lifestyle. A particularly deep gap was observed by him in the middle of the 1990s, on the very eve of Ukrainian independence when: with every covered kilometre from the Polish border to Lviv, in a bus packed with malicious and tattered tradesmen and tradeswomen, he 'could feel it in [his] bones that the more they went further, the more distant was one of Fata Morganas of the world – so called Europe – all its towns, stones, bridges, smells, mountains and forests' [355]. The Ukrainian author notes that "the gap" makes itself known even now, especially during passport control and customs examination of Ukrainians on the border with the European Union [360], and he wishes for the abolition of this procedure that is so humiliating for his countrymen and makes them un-European, Strange and Other (the worst). The worst thing is that separation of Ukrainians from Europe deforms their identity, Andrukchovych – expressing the sentiments of European-oriented Ukrainian intelligentsia confides his problem with bitterness:

But with an existing partition nowadays my identity can be ragged, cut from its own. You see, a substantial part of me is left there, outside that just painted veil that makes me feel like scraping my nails along it, the nails that – beyond my will – sometimes turn into claws. (...) I am cut off from Prague, Budapest and Krakow; soon I will be detached from the Danube, the Balkans and Transylvania. Such a partition is not what I like, because I feel like I am removed from my own house. To be more specific, I feel like I can't come in to some of my rooms. [399 – 400]

(Тільки от за наявного нині поділу моя ідентичність може бути розшматована, відрізана від себе самої. Розумієш, значну частину мене залишено там, по той бік цієї щойно пофарбованої завіси, об яку я тільки й можу, що люто шкребти нігтями, котрі – поза моєю волею – часом перетворюються в пазурі. (...) Мене відтято від Праги, Будапешта, Кракова, невдовзі мене відітнуть від Дунаю, Балканів і Трансильванії. І такий поділ мене ніяк не влаштовує, бо за такого поділу я наче залишаюся виштовхнутим з власного дому. Точніше, мені заборонено без дозволу заходити до деяких його кімнат [399 – 400]).

On the other hand – he understands well that it is precisely borders that promote national identification of those beyond the borderline. He is Ukrainian, a citizen of – as he determines wittily and ironically – «the largest objective reality in Europe and that is the reason why it cannot be comprised within Europe» [335]. He defines his identity as Central/Eastern European as well, a «true European», with his «tender Centro-European soul» [399], but with another, essentially different from that which is usually defined as European experience, because his «experience is an experience of a *European occupied*» [400], occupied much more, much longer than Prague in 1968, much longer than Stasiuk's Polish experience. The Ukrainian author in the same way as Stasiuk, with a similar irony, autoirony and 'communist experience»joking in addition, calls into question

the geographical and state boundaries of Central Europe. «Central Europe is not here, because it is the first of all a communized Europe», he argues. «It is better to say, it is the Europe which yielded to be dependent on Russia – and what is even more – an imperia with imperial desires. To be large, larger, the largest» [406] – he defines more exactly from the perspective of postcolonial criticism»¹.

In the terms of socio-spatial dialectic, Stasiuk's and Andrukchovych's narratives have «the social function of producing what Frederic Jameson called 'cognitive maps' for social subjects. They mediate dialectically between modes of conception, perception and affection»². Such cognitive map is their being between the East and the West, between Germany and Moscow. Both shift their narrative from the hegemonic privileging of empire to a postcolonial concern with the marginalized perspective of the colonized other, thereby offering a model of these political and artistic transformations.

Both, Stasiuk and Andrukchovych use speech narrative. Segmenting «discourse markers»³ typically associated with spoken modes or oral narrative, occurring in *Dojczland* and *Secrecy* include *ah, oh, all right, now, but now!, mind you, how-how! still, after all, what of it? I men, okay et»* [173]. Incomparably more them in Andrukchovych's narrative, which has a dialogue form and exploit creatively the very staff of everyday conversation. Both narratives – in spite of their colloquial, stressed and premeditated vulgar style, full of untranslatable erotic, copulative curses, used as neutral and even positive vocabulary in their meaning, this youth slang, very far from being scientific – present authentic (from the inside) cognition of differences between the West and the East as well as similarities and analogies which unite them into the whole.

Both narrators are lonely in the strange Germany, especially Stasiuk with his melancholy, both are deep-rooted in their native regions. They are in love with the place they live and where they always return, but also with maps, guide-books and Europe. Travelling is the sense of their life, it agrees with their credo, a propos formulated by Stasiuk in *Dojczland*: «To get to know the other and yourself» [87].

Primary sources

Stasiuk, Andrzej, *Dojczland*, Wołowiec: Czarne 2007.

Андрухович Юрій, Таємниця (Замість роману), Харків: Фоліо 2008.

Secondary sources

McCarthy, Michael, «Spoken Discourse Markers in Written Text» [in:] *Techniques of Description. Spoken and writte discourse*. Ed.by John M. Sinclair, Michael Hoey, Gwyneth Fox. London-New York: Routledge1993, pp. 170 – 182.

Murphet, Julian «Grounding theory. Literary Theory and New Geography»[in:] *Post-Theory. New Directions in Criticism*, ed. Martin McQuillan, Graeme MacDonald, Robin Purves, Stephen Thomson. Edinburg University Press 1999, pp. 200 – 208.

Turco, Lewis, *The Book of Literary Terms*, Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1999.

Целью данной работы является сравнительный анализ отражений национальной и европейской идентификации поляков и украинцев в рассказах о путешествиях Анджея Стасюка (1960?) и Юрия Андруховича (в 1960 -?), А именно в «Dojczland» (2007) и «Тайна (вместо романа)» (2008). Польский и украинский писатели изучали сложный характер идентичности в Центральной и Восточной Европе, рассматривали отношения между идентичностью и историей, религией, нацией и языком, сравнивая Восток и Запад. Оба автора являются прекрасными рассказчиками, они часто используют нелинейные нарративы; их язык жив, точен, оживлен в остроумии, иронический, автоироничный, парадоксальный и метафорический, полон эротических изображений и очень часто грубой брани. Их знания истории, географии, политики и культуры, кажется, не противоречит намеренной вульгарности и плебейству. Их две книги - путевые заметки Стасюка под названием «Dojczland» и «Тайна (вместо романа)» Андруховича являют собой пример

¹In Stasiuk's *Dojczland* we can find another account, Germany is the heart of Europe [70].

² See in: Julian Murphet, 'Grounding theory. Literary Theory and New Geography'[in:] *Post-Theory. New Directions in Criticism*, ed. Martin McQuillan, Graeme MacDonald, Robin Purves, Stephen Thomson. Edinburg University Press 1999, p. 206.

³ Michael McCarthy, 'Spoken Discourse Markers in Written Text' [in:] *Techniques of Description. Spoken and written discourse*. Ed.by John M. Sinclair, Michael Hoey, Gwyneth Fox. London-New York:Routledge1993, p.172.

литературы путешествия, которое описывает реальность Восточной Европы и ее отношения с Западом. Поскольку они принадлежат к тому же поколению и того же географического региона, Стасюк и Андрухович имеют подобное видение и аналогичное мнение о Восточной / Центральноевропейскую истории, на европейскую интеграцию и регионализм, но их национальные идентичности, языковая самобытность, стили повествования и творческие методы отличаются.

Ключевые слова: идентичность, литература о путешествиях, нарратор, рассказ.

ББК 83.(4 УКР)

УДК821. 161. 2

Тадей Карабович, проф. (Люблін)

Єднання розбитого світу в літературній творчості еміграційних поетів Нью-Йоркської групи

Стаття присвячується поверненню літературної творчості еміграційних поетів, об'єднаних у 1959 році у Нью-Йоркську групу, до літературного дискурсу України. У статті розглядається феномен групи з позиції історичного розвитку на тлі її поетичних видань. Завдання статті полягає в тому, щоб дослідити та показати історію Нью-Йоркської групи як авторський творчий феномен, але в контексті часового становлення групи, з перспективи єднання розбитого світу на тлі бурхливих епох та цивілізації. Нью-Йоркська група – це була в українській літературі творча формація, яка живучи в еміграції, у США, Бразилії та Німеччині надихалася Україною та увійшла до канону української літератури другої половини ХХ ст. Це були Емма Андіївська, Роман Бабовал, Богдан Бойчук, Женя Васильківська, Віра Вовк, Патриція Киліна, Олег Коверко, Юрій Коломиєць, Марія Ревакович, Богдан Рубчак, Юрій Тарнавський і Марко Царинник. На прикладі Нью-Йоркської групи протягом цілого творчого феномену видно зв'язок еміграційних творців з материком, їх ностальгію за рідною землею – названу Олександром Астаф'євим феноменом самосвідомості

Ключові слова: Нью-Йоркська група, поезія, еміграція, вигнання, повернення. Висвітлюються художні шукання митців Нью-Йоркської групи, яка творила в річищі модерністського дискурсу.

Reconstruction of a Fragmented World The Literary Work of Émigré Poets of the New York Group

The article presents a return of the literary work of The New York Group to the fold of the Ukrainian culture. The poetic creativity of the Group is examined in its historical aspect. The article aims at presenting the history and achievements of The New York Group as an outstanding creative phenomenon. The Group's activity took place in a world fragmented by historical and political events. The New York Group was the first active group of poets contributing to the Ukrainian culture from their emigration in the USA, Brazil and Germany. Gravitating for a long time towards the mainstream Ukrainian literature, the group was finally admitted among its Twentieth Century classics. The members of the group include Emma Andiyevska, Roman Baboval, Bohdan Boychuk, Zhenia Vasylkivska, Vira Vovk, Patricia Nell Warren, Oleh Koverko, Yury Kolomiyets, Maria Revakovich, Bohdan Tymish Rubchak, Yury Tarnavskiy and Marko Tsarynyk. Emigrants distributed among several countries, they were longing for the return to the fold of the Ukrainian literature. Their creativity was characterised by an acute nostalgia for their homeland, the phenomenon described by Alexander Astafjev as «self-consciousness».

Keywords: The New York Group, poetry, emigration, exile, return.

Постановка проблеми та її значення. Стаття має літературознавчий оглядовий характер й оповідає про історію Нью-Йоркської групи. Присвячується переважно становленню літературної історії групи, розкритому на вибраних прикладах. Українська література загалом та творчість української еміграції зокрема відіграли важливу роль у становленні та розвитку літературної свідомості в Україні. Повернення українських еміграційних поетів та письменників, членів Нью-Йоркської групи до читача після проголошення Україною державної незалежності у 1991 році стало, отже, важливим фактором літературного процесу [5, с. 102 – 110]. Відбулася презентація творчої формації, яка, живучи в еміграції, надихалася Україною та увійшла до канону української літератури другої половини ХХ ст. [3, 373 с.]. Творчість української еміграції стала, візитівкою української літератури ХХ ст., де Нью-Йоркська група розглядається як історичний феномен українського творчого зростання [4, 288 с.].

Аналіз публікацій та досліджень. Творчість української еміграції залишається досі темою не до кінця дослідженою з огляду на її відносно недавнє повернення до літературного