

## “MULTIPLE LINKING CORDS”: CORRELATION OF FOLKLORE AND LITERATURE IN IVAN FRANKO’S SCHOLARLY ARGUMENTATION

**Svyatoslav PYLYPCHUK**

- I. Introduction
- II. Background of the equibalanced approach to folklore and literature
  - 2.1. Differentiation principles
  - 2.2. Parallel existence of folklore and literature
  - 2.3. Variability in folklore
  - 2.4. The collective and the individual
- III. Conclusions

<Abstract>

The article considers Ivan Franko’s contribution to the scholarly reception of correlation between folklore and literature. It is emphasized that the scholar was one of the first to substantiate parallel existence of these two branches and clear-cut principles for their differentiation. Among the characteristic features of folklore, Franko listed variability, anonymity, impersonality, collectivity and syncretism; whereas literature tends to be individual, unique, and as a rule is invariable. Franko paid special attention to the research of variation clusters, and not infrequently relied on them to reproduce the fullest possible original text. The famous Ukrainian researcher noticed that written literature can experience stagnation periods caused by various sociopolitical reasons, but folklore is an incessant tradition. The author holds Franko’s remarks on “folklorism” and “literaturisation” as an obvious manifestation of “multiple linking cords” between folklore and literature. The phenomenon of folklorism exists on different levels: images, motifs, plots, genres, and melodic patterns.

*Keywords:* folklore, literature, folklorism, anonymity, impersonality, variability, syncretism.

### **I. Introduction**

Relying on the analytical overview of Ivan Franko’s writings on folklore we can ascertain that he was systematic in defining a clear range of problems, which he researched at different times with different intensity and hence arranged into a holistic system, where each issue was conceptually assessed in terms of it being important and far-reaching in tackling the minutest “internal stirrings” of the traditional folk literature. In “the thicket of folkloristic issues” Franko among others set priority to the correlation of oral lore and written literature. The scholar maintained that “this problem will have to receive scrupulous attention” [5, Vol. 41, 16], because “multiple linking cords and interdependence can be traced between these two realms” [5, Vol. 41, 48]. Franko’s interest in interaction between these two types of literature was

instigated in the course of observing the tendencies in the Ukrainian literature development. The researcher made a substantiated statement that “the contemporary national literature begins to evolve directly out of the vivacious source of folk traditions”, thus assigning an essential role of oral lore in the process of shaping “the spiritual core” of the Ukrainian belles-lettres. While elaborating his “Plan of lectures on the history of Ruthenian literature”, Franko systematically referred to the folkloristic element in literature and more than once emphasized an “absolute necessity” of “coequal treatment of both genera of literature” [5, Vol. 41, 24] and “accentuated an organic correlation between the two” [4, 339]. The researcher carried out a profound parallel analysis of these “sectors of literature” and thereby endeavored to “deeply penetrate in the spiritual nature” of each epoch, and provide its complete and multidimensional “spiritual image”. Any investigation limited to belles-lettres would be insufficient and unilateral for this purpose, therefore oral lore quite naturally completes all the lacunae in scientific perception of the cultural atmosphere at each separate stage of the historical development of the nation. Moreover, following a brilliant example of his precursors (Mykhailo Maksymovych, Mykola Kostomarov, Mykhailo Drahomanov and others), Franko realized that a profound scrutiny of folklore tradition makes it possible to reveal the spiritual world of those periods from the Ukrainian past which were represented in belles-lettres rather insignificantly if at all. The researcher was, to put it mildly, surprised at the lack of attention to the national treasure of oral lore on behalf of a number of literary historians. He reasonably rebuked those men of letters who “left out of consideration” folklore texts, “disregarded these nuggets of folk literature as wild field flowers which haven’t cleansed their beauty to artificially nurtured garden and potted plants” [5, Vol. 41, 39].

## **II. Background of the equibalanced approach to folklore and literature**

### **2.1. Differentiation principles**

The introduction to Franko’s draft project of a thesis on religious songs, namely on different redactions of “Bohohlasnyk” collection of religious songs, contained among others the following key statement: “Folklore, its difference from and relationships with artistic and individual literature” [4, 343]. The dialectics of what is in common and what is different was always in the focus of the scholar’s research and was not infrequently the object of argumentation in his profound studies. The author eventually elaborated the topic of complicated “family” relationships between these two branches of literature.

Despite a highly developed scholarly feel and ability to formulate and investigate the whole range of topical folkloristic problems without anybody’s assistance, Franko in many aspects was a follower of his teacher Mykhailo Drahomanov. The “thunderer from Geneva” put forward a holistic system of the most urgent folklore issues, greatly contributed to their research, and encouraged young Ukrainian adepts of arts to be active in these fields. Drahomanov voiced the idea of equal treatment of oral lore and written literature in a letter to Franko dated 23 November 1883, where he presented his views on writing a history of Ukrainian literature. He, however, admitted that the suggested paradigm is insufficiently justified and regretted having “no time to explain and develop it” [4, 62]. And still he emphasized the core idea: any presentation of a holistic picture of literary development needs

a systematic account of a folklore element, which more than often fully reflects the "essence" of such a process<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, Drahomanov's conception served as a basis for fundamental "History of Ukrainian literature" by Mykhailo Hrushevskiyi, where a rich factual material (both widely-known and unrenowned folklore records) was consistently employed to justify parallel existence of folklore and literature and their multiple overlaps. A closer analysis of Hrushevskiyi's and Franko's works proves that the folkloristic programme of the author of "The Studies on the Ukrainian Folk Songs" in a number of aspects forestalled his colleague, in particular, in tackling the issue of mutual relationships between folklore and literature. The only difference consists in Franko's failure to furnish a complete analytical overview, which would be focused exclusively on the comprehensive research of this topic, similar to what is presented in the first volume of Hrushevskiyi's corpus. Nevertheless, Franko's fundamental statements are distinct enough to be shaped in a rounded scholarly conception. It should be mentioned that Hrushevskiyi did not attach due value to Franko's contribution to the theory of equibalanced investigation of both folklore and literature. The experienced head of the Shevchenko Scientific Society while writing the introduction to his six-volume edition indicated that "in our country none of the histories of literature which have been published so far allotted reasonable space for oral lore" [2, Vol. I, 43]. In the footnotes, however, the author did refer to Drahomanov's programme, however, not a single word was mentioned about Franko's essential contribution to the research of this complicated problem<sup>2</sup>. Hence, against the background of a seemingly complete vacuum, Hrushevskiyi's views of the principles of writing a history of literature appeared absolutely innovational and a way better than the previous tradition, which tended to evaluate oral lore phenomena too one-sidedly.

Franko approached folklore and literature as two parallel manifestations of verbal art, demonstrated their common features and at the same time tried to draw a distinct borderline between the two. He focused particularly on acknowledging characteristic features of oral lore. He was determined to single out those traits which make the innate essence of folk poetic art. Among the differential criteria indicating the folklore basis Franko listed impersonality and anonymity. He maintained that impersonality is revealed in the lack of any "individual colouring", in creating a new text according to the already elaborated schemata, which have gone through a long way of permanent polishing and selection in compliance with the most common preferences and requirements of the existing traditions. Anonymity as a determining feature of oral lore texts can hardly be questioned, as no one would "even try to think of

---

<sup>1</sup> Drahomanov provided a detailed outline of the procedure and stages of analyzing the rich treasury of the folk art products (in particular, its prose segment) yet in the foreword to 1876 edition of "Malorossiyskiye narodniye predaniya i rasskazy" ("Maloruthenian folk stories"). The principles of scholarly analysis of oral lore texts as suggested therein did not appeal to Franko, who regarded them as too complicated, therefore proposing his own "much more modest and on the whole simpler division by literary forms" [6, Vol. 53, 490].

<sup>2</sup> Franko submitted his "History of the Ukrainian Literature" which explicitly promoted the idea of an equibalanced consideration of oral lore and written literature to one of the SSS journals, however, the "Zapysky" published only the first chapter entitled "Theory and Development of the History of Literature".

looking for an author of each separate song” [5, Vol. 27, 62]. While emphasizing the anonymity of folk texts and similarly of numerous literary texts (particularly those dating back to the Middle Ages), Franko argued, “even though the antiquity took plenty of efforts to share with us the picture of their public life and their fine aesthetic taste, it did very little to perpetuate the images of their most prominent leaders in the ideological sphere” [5, Vol. 40, 11].

The list of folklore characteristic features, according to the researcher, also includes a relative lack of dynamics. In literature he observed an opposite tendency – all processes are accelerated and excessively intense. The scholar indicates that “whatever takes centuries and hundreds of minds in anonymous traditional works is concentrated” [5, Vol. 28, 77] in *belles-lettres*.

Ivan Franko did not leave out one more fundamental element of characteristics of oral lore texts – their syncretism. The archaic genres which date back to ancient times obviously demonstrate integrity, in other words fusion of various elements (word, mimics, dance, music etc.). These features are particularly conspicuous in ritual poetry, inasmuch “the relics of this primeval poetry... are performed to the dancing rhythm accompanied by characteristic movements” [5, Vol. 27, 63]; “poetry in general was originally... a singing, a recital, a story, a game” [5, Vol. 31, 86].

The equibalanced analysis of folklore and literature became a conceptual basis of Franko’s “History of the Ukrainian Literature”. The scholar, however, never provided a detailed justification or extended argumentation to support the efficiency of writing a history of literature starting with folklore, as he believed this fact to be obvious or axiomatic. He emphasized the importance of scholarly assessment of folk poetic texts only occasionally but still in compelling statements. In particular he proved the priority of this problem in the list of top objectives of his work by allotting a special place to “the overview of oral tradition, the wealth and versatility of which can hardly be equaled by any European people” [5, Vol. 40, 18].

Franko quite thoroughly scrutinized the theory of parallel existence of oral and written literature as two interrelated branches. He remarked their intensified interaction at each next stage of literary development. The scholar believed that the “diffusion” process is an organic means of mutual enrichment. The penetration of folklore elements into literature (the so-called “folklorism” phenomenon) and, vice versa, of *belles-lettres* elements into folk tradition stimulates, boosts the development of each of the mentioned systems, reveals new perspectives for development and facilitates the search for “fresh material” for further profound perception. Parallel coexistence of two forms of literature in no way implied the termination of contacts. Conversely, it invigorated an incessant mutual exchange, a dynamic circulation of motifs, plots, images etc. Once in a new literary environment, they were affected by new regulations, norms or rules, thus acquiring a new verbalization. Without delving into details, the scholar outlined a scheme to describe this closed cycle of permanent contacts or this fruitful circulation: “plots migrated from the written collections to oral lore, then, even though altered, back to literary texts, from whence again to folk tradition etc.” [5, Vol. 28, 76].

Ivan Franko quite reasonably assigned an unequivocal chronological priority to the influence of folklore on literature, however, he more than once emphasized the importance of the reverse process, inasmuch any poet’s creative legacy can be so significant that “its

consequences penetrate the life of all people... and affect the customs, memory, beliefs, preferences etc.; they produce an impact on the whole spiritual atmosphere of entire generations” [5, Vol. 28, 73]. The scholar justified the fact of substantial pressure of individual creativity on general tendencies of oral lore development by resorting to numerous examples, in particular he maintained that Bürger’s romantic ballad “Lenore” “partially became part of oral lore and underlay numerous versions of folk songs and fairy tales, which were a way different from the previous tradition” [5, Vol. 28, 82]. In ascertaining ideological shifts, partial modification of spiritual aspirations, psychological guidelines of the people under the influence of outstanding literary works Franko was by no means precarious or “meaninglessly trifling with general phrases”, but offered a well-substantiated argumentation relying on synchronic and diachronic analysis of an extensive literary corpus.

Talking about temporary parameters of such parallel cooperation, Franko never limited its chronology merely to the period of Romanticism, where literarization and folklorization were “fashionable tendencies”. He frequently emphasized that permanent contacts between these two branches date back to the primeval times and have been active ever since.

The researcher scrutinizes the principles of folklore elements penetration into literature, analyzes the criteria of selection of relevant materials, and differentiates between the details and elements which “are the product of the author’s spirit and which are his borrowings from the tradition” [5, Vol. 40, 16]. A substantiated division of the text components according to the mentioned scheme demonstrates not only the scholar’s profound penetration into the author’s “internal studio”, but also his considerate, deliberate analytical work aimed at identifying the most productive elements which influence the development of both types of literature and give an impetus to active transformational processes leading to the invigoration and renewal of existing paradigms.

## **2.2. Parallel existence of folklore and literature**

By absorbing the oral lore elements literature more than often relies on the firm basement of the tradition verified by time. Hence, through the new interpretation of widely known images, motifs and plots, which is based on the individual art of its adepts, literature finds powerful incentives for a confident progress. In Ukraine this cooperation of two branches of literature appears hardly unexpected. Due to numerous social and political factors, primarily lack of statehood, loss of independence, being part of foreign hostile empires, the national literature did not have sufficient preconditions for full-fledged development, therefore, oral lore deriving from “the folk necessity of free play of fantasy and poetic emotions” [5, Vol. 41, 103] and being less sensitive to external censorship and bans, for a long time replenished this gap, thus performing a twofold function. It was natural that in the period of establishment of new Ukrainian literature, folklore became the main source of its resilience, self-assertion and competitiveness. Franko frequently emphasized that folklore never experiences “entractes” as it is an incessant process, a permanent continuity of tradition. The scholar maintained that literature, unfortunately, does not always demonstrate such continuity. Those “entractes” or a certain stagnation or expectation of better times occur quite often, even though they are mostly caused artificially. The second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century faced the beginning of the

decline in literature and, as Franko indicated, “an absolute lacuna in the spiritual life, a 300-year regress in all kinds of spiritual work, in all kinds of literary creativity” settled in [5, Vol. 40, 216]. As the Ukrainian writers were then in a kind of lethargic period, the scholar suggested setting about a comprehensive outline of spiritual aspirations of that age by way of “looking around for other memorabilia pertaining to that time”, namely by referring to the memorabilia of oral folk tradition, which were developing quite dynamically and demonstrated not “a mechanical work” deprived of any living emotion, but the only then existing “spark of a living thought”. Franko, however, remarked that folklore texts and above all “their oldest stratum, namely ritual songs, spring, harvest and wedding songs, carols” [5, Vol. 40, 216] offer more information on everyday life<sup>1</sup> and not on the history of the country. Only in some samples, primarily in carols did the researcher find “vague reminiscences” of the heroic epoch which shed a fresh light on the perception of cultural-historical preconditions of literary development. These Franko’s ideas were in tune with a rather bold attempt of Volodymyr Antonovych and Mykhailo Drahomanov to consider carols and Epiphany songs in the context of historical song tradition of the Ukrainian people. In the first volume of “Historical songs of the Ukrainian people” the compilers maintained that these texts retain the living reverberation of the Kyivan Rus’ epoch and an expert analysis thereof can disclose the ways of understanding “the spirit of that time”.

Among the starting points in the history of the Ukrainian folklore tradition was the 16<sup>th</sup> century. It was then that the folk poetic word acquired outstanding authority and began to develop dynamically in various genres, in particular in nationally unique ones. Therefore, while acknowledging the “dawn of our literature in the last 20 years of the 16<sup>th</sup> century”, Franko also pointed out that numerous “new texts of folk songs” appeared at that time and “the Ukrainian song was already famous not only locally but also among Lithuanian, Polish and other Slavonic people” [5, Vol. 40, 246]. To prove the authoritativeness and popularity of the Ukrainian folklore, the researcher mentioned the record of “Shtefan the waywode” song in Jan Blahoslav’s grammar of 1570, remarking that this rather “new text” “was composed in the form of a carol” and obviously continued the old tradition elaborated in ritual songs. Franko as an author of the history of the national literature was not greatly interested in the rich ritual poetry of Ukrainians, because it contained very few obviously historical facts and provided a merely general overview of folk life without a profound conceptualization of significant social and political events. Most of his attention was focused on the further stratum of folk poetic texts, in particular on historic songs, which at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century appeared in the foreground of the folklore tradition. They were direct, objective (only with minor touch of imagination) evidence of the immediate participants of the events. The folklorist observed that the 16<sup>th</sup> century was marked by a dynamic dissemination of ballad motifs with a historic entourage.

The researcher tried stage-by-stage to introduce the most outstanding “spiritual manifestations” from the folklore field into the general course of literary transformations,

---

<sup>1</sup> “Old-Ruthenian everyday life, so sorrowless, patriarchal, satiated and drunk is still fully retained in them without any conflicts, apart from valiant tournaments and desirable campaigns into hostile lands” [5, Vol. 40, 220].

and along with that analyzed which folklore product exerted a crucial influence on the literary progress and ascertained its “major character”. In terms of his conception of history of national literature, Franko proved that folklore is actually a firm ground, on which no matter how unfavorable the conditions might be any professional literature can rely, find a lot of fresh material in its inexhaustible treasuries, and deepen its own reflections about certain complex issues considering the ideas, thoughts and beliefs verified by folk experience and time. The implementation of the folklore element at different times was often a forced step aimed at ensuring the process continuity. It was in such periods that, as Franko figuratively asserted, the folklore element “flooded the whole literature”. As a matter of fact, irrespective of its obvious continuity and lack of conspicuous lacunae, even the folklore tradition demonstrates periods of certain stagnation and unusual surges or striking development. Speaking about the Ukrainian context, the latter statement applies primarily to the 16-17<sup>th</sup> centuries, so-called “golden period” of our folklore, when the formal content of already existing genologic units expanded and along with that there arose an authentic genre rooted exclusively in the national ground – dumas, among the characteristic features of which are explicit historic reference, unique performer’s charm, specific set of expressive tools, etc.

Franko believed that in order to perceive the innate difference between oral and written literature in the minutest detail it is important to consider the process of arising or “the natural environment” of the appearance of folklore and literary texts. The researcher clearly differentiated between the individual writer’s microcosm, which is mainly aimed at “filling in the framework of his work” with “the materialized content of his own ego” [5, Vol. 27, 62] and the folk macrocosm, where the cornerstone of any creative act is “an emotional and ideological material appealing to all people...” [5, Vol. 27, 62]. Elaborating the argument about the so-called “constraint of tradition” permanently experienced (either externally or internally) by every creative unit from among the folk milieu, Franko claims, “when creating a song he (the folk poet – S. P.) does not and cannot surpass others; from the treasury of his individual soul he can draw practically no other content and no other form, but for those constituting the life of the whole society” [5, Vol. 27, 62] and continues, “folk poets, those who are fully rooted in the ground of tradition, seem to sink in it and hardly create on their own behalf. They pick ready motifs ... and choose for them a certain traditionally established form or at most combine them in a more or less unsophisticated way with other similar traditional elements” [5, Vol. 28, 76]. According to the scholar, the law of tradition is an essential factor affecting the establishment of a relatively stable folklore system, whose statics is reinforced by the “eradiating power” of the genre norms. It is evident that folk creative legacy is characterized by the dialectics of statics and dynamics, where the innovational component, although not so conspicuous as in literature, is still systematically realized, which can be reasonably proved by the rise of folklore novelties. These novelties actually demonstrate the tendencies of oral lore development, its response to the challenges of the epoch. While analyzing the songs in the “most recent stage of development”, Franko observed that they are not infrequently a mere “improvisation on the existing motif and simultaneously a new refinement and evolution of the text” [5, Vol. 27, 63].

In the course of stage-by-stage modeling of the process of elaborating traditional elements, so-called loci communes, in folklore, Franko partially tackles the issue of variability,

specifically voicing one of its essential reasons. The researcher held that “passing from mouth to mouth a piece ... is subject to thousands of minor speech and formal alterations: someone dabs on a psychological feature, another comes up with a better motivation of behaviour, finds a better expression for the feelings, still another one shapes up a new form, all in all the text is polished, loses those few individual traits it could originally bear, it becomes folklore, becomes traditional (my italics – *S.P.*) in the full sense of the word” [5, Vol. 28, 76]. This tendency, this long-lasting process of establishment of the piece which is traditional “in the full sense of the word” prevailed in a certain period in written literature as well (the times of “symbol-authors”, like Homer), however, eventually the authorship, the author’s “individual colouring” comes to the foreground, the writer overrides the set norms, wrests out of the knot of tradition, “breaks out of its oppressive restraints”, searches for the original expression, refuses to pursue the well-trodden path, and sets out on the road of refining literature with the power of his creative genius, and “his dominant individuality is revealed in its elementary incommensurable power everywhere” [5, Vol. 28, 78] in his works.

“There are no explicit and enduring boundaries between oral lore and literature, because once set down in writing anything can pass back to the oral tradition, into the memory and life of new generations; and vice versa, anything existing forever in the oral lore and in the memory of people at any moment can be set down in writing” [5, Vol. 40, 7]. A rigid consolidating core is hidden in the sameness of spiritual emotions stimulating the creative process. An insatiable intention “to satisfy the needs of the feelings and mind, of memory and imagination” is a determining guiding factor on the way of creative perception of the world both in folklore and in literature. The oral tradition, however, materializes “the feelings, mind, memory and imagination” of the public, whereas in belles-lettres an individual spirituality is revealed demonstrating personal considerations or proclaiming the ideas of a certain (often limited) group of people. Only ingenious writers manage to advance their works far beyond the limits of a small target readership without losing the charm of an individual creative manner.

For Franko the key matter in the perception of the mentioned folkloristic problem was “a conception of folklore as an impersonal literature, wherein the author’s individuality cannot be felt, and written literature as a literature shaped up by the “individual principle” [1, 192]. No doubt, it was this aspect of two literatures’ correlation that Franko referred to most often and viewed from different angles, delving into the depths of creativity laws. Regarding the opposition of “impersonal – individual” as fundamental, the scholar, however, never restricted himself thereto. Conversely, he suggested a complex comparative overview of folklore and literature, highlighting the issues of variability, poetic, functioning etc.

### **2.3. Variability in folklore**

The researcher was also original in tackling the problem of variability. Polyvariability as an innate feature of a folklore text was of interest to the author of the “Studies on Ukrainian folk songs” primarily from a scholarly point of view, because he was sure that each new variant can offer a lot of valuable information about the development of the piece and its regional specificity, and highlight the culturally and historically significant details. Hence, the folklorist took a lot of effort to give the fullest possible presentation of variation clusters,

considered the most recent records and unrenowned archive materials, carried out a scrupulous research and assured that "not a grain of a really valuable record will be wasted" [5, Vol. 42, 16]. Systematically compiling the most comprehensive possible collections (including all available variants) of popular songs, Franko prepared a basis for their systematic analysis. The researcher proposed using such collections to reconstruct the fullest texts (in Franko's terminology "attempts at a consolidated text"). The scholar searched for "an opportunity to find even if not a prototype, but at least the oldest and the fullest form... of the folk song" [5, Vol. 43, 278] by way of comparing different variants, which arose and were recorded in different times. He tried to draw "conclusions on the character and essence of folk creativity and evolution of its forms" [5, Vol. 43, 278].

The scholar was subjected to multiple criticizing for applying the mentioned methodology (to mention but a few rather disapproving, not to say critical, remarks by F. Kolessa in his "History of Ukrainian Ethnography"<sup>1</sup>). The idea of reconstruction, however, should not be viewed so categorically, because this principle of tackling the multifaceted paradigm had been used by authoritative European researchers long before Franko. The Ukrainian scholar obviously relied on the experience of his doctoral supervisor Vatroslav Jagić, who studied the apocrypha and "involved all previously published texts as well as some old manuscripts in order to use them as a basis for compiling a new correct text of the memorabilia, the closest possible to the original" [5, Vol. 29, 440]. That is why Franko was so resolute in his foreword to the "Studies..." "...to take the songs which have already been published as collections or kept as manuscripts text by text and bring together all their known and so far unrenowned variants, and scrutinize them in all detail..." [5, Vol. 42, 16]. Following this "bring-together" method, the researcher carried out 25 reconstructions "of correct texts of some songs" in the first volume of the corpus. The more variants of a song preserve a certain motif, the higher is a probability that it is older and belonged to the original; such was Franko's basic principle when he was reconstructing a song. While restoring the text to make it as close to the original as possible, the scholar focused primarily on "the establishment of the logical and psychological link" which is frequently ruined in the course of a folk song's long-lasting journey from "mouth to mouth". Franko's innovation consisted in the first application of the reconstruction method to the abundant national folklore material.

Franko tackled the problem of polyvariability by way of "studying the interrelations between the variants" [5, Vol. 43, 282]. Among the key objectives of scrutinizing the variation clusters was ascertaining the following: "Are they offsprings of different variants of the

---

<sup>1</sup> F. Kolessa held that "... striving to reconstruct the original text of each song, Franko makes a serious methodological blunder drawing together variants of one song and hence creating a new really complete variant which has never existed in real life, because it's a summary of all variants arising in dozens or maybe even hundreds of years. Therefore, this method is faulty and inexpedient" [3, 319]. As a matter of fact, progressing from the theoretical consideration of general methodological approaches to their practical implementation, the first head of the Department of Folklore and Ethnography at Lviv University eventually to a certain degree justified Franko's reconstructions regarding them as "bold and very successful attempts at coming nearer to their original texts" [3, 331].

original, or maybe some newer rehashes of one variant” [5, Vol. 43, 282]. Franko was certain that by neglecting this approach his fellow-folklorists prevented them from full and objective presentation of the text development and demonstration of the reasons of all transformations which took place in the song’s lifetime. The researcher also considered diachronic variants of one song, trying to evidentially identify the changes which occurred in “newer fabrications” and trace their influence on the further fate of the text.

Realizing the necessity of scholarship, Franko worked systematically on compiling a corpus of available variants of the text as a basis for restituting (restoring) its fullness and “correctness”.

#### **2.4. The collective and the individual**

In terms of the general problem of “folklore and literature”, the issue of the collective and the individual in a creative process is particularly acute. Despite being seemingly obvious, a platitudinal statement about the collective element dominating in oral lore and the individual component prevailing in belles-lettres gains a profound argumentation in Franko’s scientific discourse with due consideration of all pros and cons. The scholar was more than scrupulous in ascertaining the collective constituent of folklore. Explaining the rise of the oldest layers of folk poetry by the theory of “collective explosion of feelings”, Franko often came across overwhelming evidence refuting one of the fundamental principles of the classical folkloristic programme. Hence, the studies relying on the genetic analysis of a text are interspersed with the statements like the following, “all in all, it seems as if we had descended from a higher poetic level to a lower one or as if some text created by a talented person eventually changed hands becoming battered and losing the original clear contours” [5, Vol. 43, 279] or “we can understand the lack in creativity in this mystic force, the folk memory, to which our ethnographers often assigned polishing and improvement of songs, as if they were originally underdeveloped and dull. Whenever any refinement or polishing takes place in the folk memory, it is like on a coin changing hands: the image wears off, fades out and the coin shrinks in size, names and everyday and historical details are lost or corrupted, language peculiarities are worn off, the picture becomes trite and conventional, sometimes becoming a caricature, and not vice versa. And it may happen vice versa only in exceptional cases, when a colourless and well-polished song again falls into talented hands and this person is capable of adorning it in individually painted attire”.

Franko supported his considerations about the positive influence of one creative person from among the people on the development of a piece of folklore in the conclusions to the analysis of the song about Cossack Plakhta. Analyzing “a complete and exhaustive” variant in Żegota Pauli’s collection “Pieśni ludu ruskiego w Galicji” (Lviv, 1839. – Vol. II. – P. 26–28), he offers an absolutely substantiated assumption that in view of its “correctness” the piece is apparently “an individual conscious rehash of the original text, a rehash carried out by a professional singer” [5, Vol. 43, 279]. Later Hrushevskyi also assured that only “an individual can find a felicitous, or in other words artistic form for a collective mood” [2, Vol. I. 56], providing a theoretical substantiation to the role a personality plays in the development of a song.

While handling the problem of “the collective – the individual” in folklore, the researcher clearly divided the analyzed material, separately considering the ritual and non-ritual poetry. The presence of the collective in the folk ritual poetry can hardly be argued; actually, this fact is rather axiomatic. Therefore, if any proof had to be found, there would be ample obvious evidence to support this fundamental truth. As for the non-ritual poetry, which Franko frequently referred to as “individual” [5, Vol. 43, 148], the “collective colouring” is not always present. “The history of poetic art development, says Franko, proves that purely individual lyrics, no matter how unusual it may seem, marks not the beginning but the end of the evolution, similarly to the way the human individuality is becoming independent, acquires a certain value and feels this value irrespective of the overwhelming connection to the public, kin and family” [5, Vol. 43, 248]. This statement may be regarded as an extension to the ideas suggested in the fundamental study “On the Rise of Folk Songs”, in which the scholar reasonably argues that primeval poetry (primarily ritual poetry is implied) stems exceptionally out of the collective creativity. That is why, the genres representing the oldest layers of folk poetry (carols, Epiphany songs, spring songs (vesniankas and hayivkas) etc.) bear so few “individual traits”. The folk poetic word tends to sound absolutely different at later stages of appearance (like dumas and historic songs), inasmuch the ideological principles had changed and people had begun to identify themselves with a sustainable social unit, or, according to Franko, “feel their value”. Pieces of folklore eventually lose some details persisting through age-long tradition and assume still not very distinct but already individual colouring. Eventually more and more often we can talk about one creative personality out of the people, who “restores” the songs which have “faded” due to the lasting journey from mouth to mouth, adds new vibrations to them and being open-hearted does not claim the authorship, but lets it travel on, so that they “again could fall into the hands of someone talented who will be able to make it at least partially new and individualized”. Franko believed that the mentioned tendency of “gradual reduction of the power of tradition” [4, 343] was reasonable enough, as it supported the conception of gradual narrowing of the collective and simultaneous expansion of individual elements in recent folklore. This approach was largely shared also by other researchers who thoroughly studied broad layers of folk traditional literature at different stages of its development. This idea was more than once supported, in particular, by Oleksandr Veselovskyi.

### **III. Conclusions**

Pursuing a stereometric analysis of a text through all the stages of its cultural evolution, Franko systematically observed numerous amplifications and reductions in the song structure, and searched for their reasons. During these investigations, the researcher focused on the way one image or motif may “all of a sudden pull the cord of a deep feeling” [5, Vol. 43, 286], once interweaved with the canvas of a song. Folk performers “endowed with considerable flair” are “eager to promote” such successful insertions, even though they may divert from the initially elaborated plan of the song. Conscious emphasis on significant or, in other words, “effective places” may eventually cause their emancipation and shaping into an accomplished piece of folklore, and, finally, launch their own independent existence. New

variants which arose out of expansion of “effective places” this way or another still preserve some details referring to the original genetic link with the “initial model”. Amplifications of emotionally outstanding motifs, those which “pull the cord of a deep feeling” may vary in nature. Some text expansions, as mentioned above, exert quite a positive influence on its functional potential, others, conversely, are not organic enough to “liven up” the text. Further accumulation of “satellites” to initially explicit moment of a song often appears too artificial, not to say redundant, aggravating its perception and hence adversely affecting its existence. Franko remarked that when it comes to oral usage, the further a story moves from the original source and the longer it is preserved, the more the trifles sprout. The scholar also searched for the various impacts which brought about the development of certain plot lines, change of the image system and reshaping of the ideological background of a text in view of changes in the ideological principles.

Ivan Franko developed the conception of the interrelations between folklore and literature not only theoretically; he was also consequential in implementing it in his own writings. The problem of “folklorism of Franko’s literary works” calls for a lot of separate and quite extensive research.

#### LITERATURE

1. Harasym, Yaroslav (2009). *Narysy do istoriyi ukrayinskoyi folklorystyky: Navchalnyi posibnyk* (Essays on the history of Ukrainian folkloristics: Manual). Kyiv: Znannya.
2. Hrushevskiy, Mykhaylo (1993). *Istoriya ukrayinskoyi literatury* (History of Ukrainian literature). Kyiv: Lybid. Vol. I.
3. Kolessa, Filaret (2005). *Istoriya ukrayinskoyi etnografii* (History of Ukrainian ethnography). Kyiv.
4. *Lystuvannia Ivana Franka ta Mykhayla Drahomanova* (Correspondence between Ivan Franko and Mykhaylo Drahomanov) (2006). Lviv: the Ivan Franko National University Publishing centre.
5. Franko, Ivan (1976–1986). *Zibrannya tvoriv: u 50 tomakh* (Collected works: in 50 volumes). Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
6. Franko, Ivan (2008). *Dodatkovy tomy to Zibrannya tvoriv u pyatdesiaty tomakh* (Additional volumes to Collected works in fifty volumes). Kyiv: Naukova dumka. Vol. 53.

---

Svyatoslav Pylypchuk, Docent; Director of the Franko Studies Institute; the Filaret Kolessa Department of the Ukrainian Folkloristics; the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukraine. History of Ukrainian folkloristics, Ivan Franko’s scholarly legacy, methodology of modern literature studies and folkloristics. E-mail: [s.pylypchuk@online.ua](mailto:s.pylypchuk@online.ua)