

1.2.3 Eastern European traditions

Czech, Hungarian, Polish, Slovak, and Ukrainian literary drafts

Mateusz Antoniuk, Jiří Flaišman, Michal Kosák, Ágnes Major, Martin Navrátil
& Dmytro Yesypenko

This chapter refers to literature in five languages: Czech, Hungarian, Polish, Slovak and Ukrainian. Firstly, it presents the histories of Eastern European literary drafts. In this section answers to the following questions are delivered: from what time do the oldest surviving rough drafts date? How did the culture of archiving evolve? What impact did historical events have on the state of preservation of the documents? The focus then shifts to the issue of the genetic approach in Eastern European scholarship. The aim of this section is to discuss how creative writing processes were dealt with by different philological traditions. Finally, East European reception of *critique génétique* is presented.

Keywords: Czech, Hungarian, Polish, Slovak and Ukrainian literature, genetic criticism, rough draft, archives

Introduction: Defining “Eastern European tradition”

The purpose of this chapter is to explore two closely related problems. The first is the Eastern European history of the literary rough draft, treated as a part of the Eastern European history of literature. The second is Eastern European research on the literary rough draft (and more broadly: on the creative process), which has been an integral part of Eastern European textual scholarship, philology, editorial theory and practice, as well as literary studies. Even this general statement requires immediate critical commentary.

The very notion of “Eastern Europeanness” is an unobvious, disputable construct. There are no strong, unambiguous criteria to distinguish between “Western” and “Central” Europe, or to differentiate the “Central” section of our continent from the “Eastern” one. Neither geography (which, after all, even has difficulty clearly indicating the border between Europe and Asia) nor history, and even less so the history of culture, can provide such criteria. Particularly in the field of culture, the categorisation of any phenomenon as Central/Eastern European is always an act of interpretation, inevitably determined by one or another “interpretive community”. The use of the adjective “Eastern European” is thus conventional and pragmatic – as in the title of our chapter.

The meaning of the term “Eastern European traditions”, assumed for the purposes of our study, includes literatures (and literary studies) in five languages: Czech, Hungarian, Polish, Slovak and Ukrainian. Each of these languages has had a different history, functioned differently as a material for literary creation, as a space for inventing and disseminating ideas and,

finally, as a national and state-forming factor. By putting them together in one picture, we gain the opportunity to observe tendencies that are partly analogical and partly different.

Due to the limit on chapter size, the following comparative presentation of the five “Eastern European traditions” is inevitably short, not without unavoidable simplification. Nonetheless, we try to show as precisely as possible both the unique characteristics of each of the discussed “histories of the literary rough draft” (and the histories of research on the draft) and the similarities and connections between them.

Eastern European histories of the rough draft – in a nutshell

The “manuscript culture” in Eastern Europe began together with Christianity; the oldest documents of writing were made first in Latin (tenth century), then in vernacular languages.¹ The question posed in this section is: what are the oldest extant Eastern European “rough drafts”, understood as working holographs or autographed manuscripts that enable us to track the birth of the text of a literary work?

Some examples of such first drafts can be found in the early modern period and even in medieval times. The history of the Czech language and literature knows short lyrical or gnomic texts written on the margins of Latin or Czech manuscripts.² These notes have a draft character of some kind and date to the start of the fifteenth century; their status, however, is ambiguous, as it is difficult to say whether they are small poetic works or only *probatio pennae*.³ The same holds true in the case of the Slovak language.⁴ In the Polish language, one can identify the working holographs of sermons and a Bible translation as the oldest preserved rough drafts; a small collection of such documents comes from the late medieval and early modern periods (from fourteenth to seventeenth century). Similar documents relating to Ukrainian language and literature are considerably later: one of the oldest preserved rough manuscripts belongs to the most prominent representative of Ukrainian baroque, the writer and philosopher Hryhorii Skovoroda (1722–1794).⁵

However, all examples mentioned above are rare and exceptional. As a general rule, Eastern European rough drafts from the Middle Ages and early modernity are scarce and do not represent the creative process of the most significant authors or the origins of the greatest works

-
1. The oldest Hungarian manuscript is called the *Funeral Speech and Prayer* [*Halotti beszéd és könyörgés*] and records the state of the Hungarian language around 1100. The oldest preserved manuscript of a literary work in Polish goes back to the thirteenth century. The first literary works with distinct features of the Ukrainian language come from the eleventh century.
 2. For example, short Czech written verse on the inside cover of “Sborník vyšehradský” [Vyšehrad manuscript] (Prague, NK, sign. F 9; see also on www.manuscriptorium.com).
 3. As Jakub Sichálek noted, if we know just one text source, we cannot decide whether it is an unfaithful reproduction of an existing text or a small poetic work in progress (2018: 223).
 4. For example, a draft of verses by Leonard of Uničov in the Novohrad tax register from 1457.
 5. We can trace his creative process and learn about its interesting features (like the author’s remarkable illustrations accompanying the literary texts) through his drafts from the 1760s–80s.

of that time. A good case in point is Jan Kochanowski (1530–1584), the greatest poet of the Polish Renaissance, who in his lifetime published in printed form many works in Polish and Latin but left only a few holographs to posterity (none of which can be described as a rough draft). This proportion is significant and representative: neither the Middle Ages nor the early modern era were conducive to the collection and storage of documents of the creative process. This tendency does not distinguish Eastern Europe from the West.

In each Eastern European literary tradition, it is possible to identify a “turning period” – the first to produce and leave for posterity a remarkable collection of rough drafts. We can also point out the concrete authors who can be seen as figures representative for these “turning periods”. Ferenc Kazinczy (1759–1831), writer, poet, organiser of the Hungarian literary life, important figure of the Hungarian Enlightenment movement, and main animator of the Hungarian language reform, was probably the first Hungarian author who left a considerable part of his oeuvre to posterity. Between 1794 and 1801, he was imprisoned due to his involvement in a Jacobin conspiracy against the Habsburg Empire, and to avoid presumed censorship he planned a posthumous publication of his work of seven years’ captivity; to this end, he deliberately conserved his manuscripts and drafts. Consequently, his bequest contains not only vast correspondence, but also manuscripts of his memoirs, poems, translations, and different textual versions of his works (Szilágyi 2017). In the case of Czech, Polish, Slovak, and Ukrainian histories of literature, the beginnings of the “golden era of the draft” seem to appear a bit later: a significant quantity of working holographs of literary works were produced and left by the period of Romanticism (conventionally dated 1820s–1860s in Polish literature and Ukrainian literature, 1830s–1850s in Czech literature, 1836–1875 in Slovak literature).

Why do the first half of the nineteenth century and Romanticism play such an important role in the history (or histories) of the rough draft in Central and Eastern Europe? Two factors seem to be responsible for this.

First of all, it was during this period that each of the literatures considered here was shaped by particularly innovative poets full of creative energy, who left not only the completed, printed texts, but also a vast scriptural trace of their work. Polish Romanticism was dominated by four great individuals: Adam Mickiewicz (1798–1855), Juliusz Słowacki (1809–1849), Zygmunt Krasiński (1812–1859), and Cyprian Kamil Norwid (1821–1883). As for Czech Romanticism, we ought to mention Karel Hynek Mácha (1810–1836), Karel Jaromír Erben (1811–1870), and Karel Sabina (1813–1877). The central figure of the Ukrainian Romantic period – and the entire Ukrainian literary canon – is Taras Shevchenko (1814–1861). The parallel Slovak list of outstanding authors includes Samo Chalupka (1812–1883), Andrej Sládkovič (1820–1872), Janko Kráľ (1822–1876), and Ján Botto (1829–1881).

Secondly, the Romantic period was particularly conducive to a specific cult of outstanding poets. In Polish, Czech, Slovakian, Ukrainian or Hungarian history, the typically Romantic “cult of genius” was additionally supported by political conditions. None of these nations possessed their statehood or independence in the nineteenth century: Czechs and Hungarians had been part of foreign imperial structures since the sixteenth century; Poles ultimately lost their statehood in 1795; Ukrainians were striving for their own state; the modern Slovak nation was

undergoing an intensive process of formation since the eighteenth century and the Enlightenment. Nevertheless, they all had their own political and cultural ambitions. In this situation, the celebration of the works of the great Romantics became a strategy for building national identity, which was under threat. And it was precisely as part of this reverence for “great poets” that their manuscripts – including their working manuscripts – were collected, preserved and metaphorised as national “relics” or “treasures”.

In consequence, the nineteenth century appeared to be crucial for establishing the tradition of preserving the manuscripts of the works central to Polish, Czech, and other Eastern European literatures: in brief, for the foundation of Eastern European “archiving culture”. This culture had, first of all, a non-institutional dimension. Karel Hynek Mácha’s drafts, later preserved in literary museums, were first recognised as part of Mácha’s valuable literary inheritance by his friends, colleagues, and editors of his early collected works. Analogically, Taras Shevchenko’s contemporaries saw the crucial importance of each line in each of the poet’s drafts already in his lifetime and shortly after his death. Despite difficult life circumstances, and the lack of his own housing which would enable keeping a personal archive, a relatively high number of the writer’s manuscripts survived and have been carefully preserved to this day.⁶ Sometimes, the role of curators was taken up by the descendants of the great Romantics: Władysław Mickiewicz (1838–1926), son of the most important Polish poet, devoted his entire life to commemorating his father, for example by collecting his holographs.

This spontaneous and individual model of collecting and preserving naturally inspired and stimulated institutional solutions: the nineteenth century saw the foundation of many Central and Eastern European institutions, whose mission was to archive the documents of national culture, including manuscripts (and drafts!) of both historical and contemporary writers. In 1802, the National Széchényi Library was established in Pest-Buda (currently, it holds the largest manuscript collection of Hungary). The year 1818 saw the founding of the National Museum in Prague, which was tasked with assembling manuscripts and printed books produced on Czech territory.⁷ Since 1863, manuscripts written in the Slovak language have been collected by *Matica slovenská*, a notable cultural institution that played the role of a library, museum and research centre.⁸ The first Polish public library was opened in Warsaw much earlier than the nineteenth century, before the loss of independence, but during Romanticism new institutions started their activities, such as *Bibliothèque Polonaise de Paris* (1838), an institution whose main task was to collect and safeguard historical and contemporary books and documents of national significance.⁹ In 1894 the library of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv

6. Shevchenko’s friends and fans disseminated his texts in their handwritten copies. For some of the poet’s works, the manuscript was the only possible form of existence, since they were banned from publication in the Russian Empire.

7. These materials were located in the National Museum Library, where an independent department gathering the papers of Czech authors was founded in the 1890s; since 1923, this department has borne the name Literary Archive of the National Museum Library (LA NML).

8. Manuscripts are deposited in the Literary Archive of the Slovak National Library in Martin.

9. The Załuski Library, inaugurated in 1732 and officially proclaimed as the National Library in 1780.

was established; among other tasks, it collected manuscripts of Ukrainian authors. Although not limited to the field of literature, all those institutions paid attention to poets' and writers' archives.

To sum up, in the history of Central and Eastern European cultures and literatures, it was the nineteenth century that laid the foundation for the cultural phenomenon which can be named the "golden age of the rough draft". Since the Romantic period, the number of preserved and archived working manuscripts has been rising. The twentieth century brought to this region of Europe (as elsewhere in the world) an intensification of literary production and, in consequence, the proliferation of documents of the creative process (especially holographic rough drafts). On the other hand, the turbulent twentieth-century political history of Eastern Europe has resulted in the material destruction of many libraries, museums and archives, affecting the state of preservation of working holographs in Central and Eastern European countries. The scale of this process was so huge that the metaphorical term "manuscript-clasm" seems to work well here.

The siege of Budapest in 1944 and 1945 exposed the Hungarian capital to a military operation and caused major damage to public and private manuscript collections. Just a few months earlier, during the Warsaw Uprising (August to September 1944), the capital of Poland was changed into a battlefield between Polish insurgents and the German army; this led to the almost total destruction of the material substance of the city. Books and papers shared the fate of people and buildings.¹⁰ In the case of Ukrainian literature, the situation with the preservation of drafts and manuscripts, in general, is much worse for the authors of the 1920s–30s. They went down in history as the generation of the "Executed Renaissance" (*Rozstriliane vidrozhennia*) as most of them were repressed on various charges and sentenced to exile or death by Stalin's totalitarian regime. As a result, their writings were often destroyed or lost. Also, many Ukrainian dissidents of the following decades, in particular representatives of *shistdesiatnyky*, the "sixtiers" movement, repeated the fate of their predecessors repressed in the 1930s. The Eastern European "manuscript-clasm" had also another sorrowful dimension. It was largely on the occupied Polish territory that the Holocaust, organised by the Third Reich, took place. The unimaginable tragedy of the Shoah involved the physical destruction of paper documents, including literary manuscripts (Leociak 2004; Shallcross 2011).¹¹

-
10. Stanisław Wyspiański (1869–1907), Polish Symbolist playwright and painter, was especially fascinated with creativity; for example, he published an essay about *Hamlet*, devoted to Shakespeare's creative process (of course it was rather an act of pure fantasy than scholarship). During the Warsaw Uprising, Wyspiański's archive was burnt, together with numerous versions of his poetic plays. In this way, a poet who can be seen as the historical patron of Polish genetic criticism is at the same time not accessible for genetic research.
 11. Many final and rough-draft texts of Vasyl' Stus (1938–1985), one of the most important Ukrainian poets of the twentieth century, were lost after his convictions and stay in the camps. Those that have been preserved in his autographs and notes by friends often have at least a few versions that can be considered as "main" (Kolodkevych 2015: 23–25).

All in all, Eastern European archives – although deprived of so many important objects – are still full of holographic rough drafts from the nineteenth and twentieth century.¹² And, of course, the history of the draft still goes on. Technical modernisation has changed the construction of the rough draft since the beginning of the twenty-first century, when the computer (with Internet access) became the basic tool in the writer's studio; many poets of the younger generation draft their poems only in this way, without using paper. Consequently, their creative process leaves only digital traces. On the other hand, the potential of paper rough drafts is still not exhausted: the 2018 Nobel Prize winner in literature, the Polish author Olga Tokarczuk (born 1962, so belonging to the generation with predigital writing habits) uses notebooks and papers (apart from a computer) to create her novels and short stories.

Genetic approach in Eastern European textual scholarship: Beginnings and development

Each culture mentioned in this chapter – Hungarian, Czech, Slovak, Polish, Ukrainian – obviously has had a specific tradition of philology and literary criticism, and all those traditions had their specific approaches to the process of text creation.

The foundations of the modern Czech editorial tradition were established at the end of the eighteenth century in the works of the foremost philologist Josef Dobrovský (1753–1829). In the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries it was shaped by impulses coming mostly from German textual criticism and later on – due to political reasons – from the Russian School. In the second half of the last century a systematic theoretical and methodological basis for editorial work was established by the editors of the “Prague School”, namely Felix Vodička, Miroslav Červenka, Břetislav Štorek, and Rudolf Skřeček.

The basic disposition of Czech textual studies in the nineteenth century was centred around the works of the Romantic poet Karel Hynek Mácha, and for the twentieth, primarily around the work of Petr Bezruč, a poet who closed the age of Symbolism. The initial situation surrounding the work of K.H. Mácha provided Czech textual studies with some orientation regarding temporal and authorial attribution (as it had to come to terms with the sheer quantity of manuscript versions and their problematic authenticity), deciphering manuscripts, the issues of the fragmentary nature of texts, and the methodology of processing them for publishing. Bezruč's constantly evolving core collection, in turn, confronts the 1960s' textual studies, above all with the challenge of variants and their importance for text interpretation – a challenge that was successfully faced by the Czech structuralist school. In his seminal study *Variants and Stylistics* (1930), Jan Mukařovský, an outstanding theoretician of literature and one of the eminent figures of the Prague Linguistic Circle, showed that variants can be examined for reasons other than purely editorial: the focus was shifted towards nonprac-

12. From time to time there are also happy turns of action: manuscripts considered lost as a result of the war are found. Holographs and drafts of the Hungarian poet, writer, journalist and translator Dezső Kosztolányi (1885–1936) were believed to have been largely destroyed during the Second World War. However, thanks to András Veres' research, most of the manuscript of *Édes Anna's* (a novel from 1926) was discovered and published (Veres 2004).

tical textual studies and situated within text poetics (variants, also holographic drafts, relevant as evidence of changes in the author's style).¹³ Mukařovský's line of "genetically-oriented" research was creatively continued by Miroslav Červenka (1932–2005), in his 1971 work *Textual Criticism and Semiotics* (Červenka 1971), where rough drafts are regarded as material useful for studying the individual psychology of creation.¹⁴ Czech structuralist textual scholarship (together with Russian textology and Polish editorial theory and practice) stimulated Slovak textual studies, also with regard to genetically oriented research. The representative work of the Slovak research on text genesis and the author's creative process is Marianna Mináriková's (1930–2012) monograph *Textologické a štylistické problémy Kukučínovho diela* [Textological and Stylistic Problems of Kukučín's Work, 1972],¹⁵ while Nora Krausová (1920–2009), stimulated by such focused research, tried to use variability in the analysis of the generative process of the work.¹⁶

Likewise, in Poland the abundance of holographs and holographic rough drafts challenged the theory and practice of the editors, historians of literature, and interpreters of literary works. To visualise this situation, we can zoom in on one example. *Samuel Zborowski* (1844–1845), a hermetic play by Juliusz Słowacki, was never published during the author's lifetime. It was left to posterity in the form of circa 40 loose pages, full of deletions, marginal and interline additions, and alternative versions. Between 1901 and 1963, five different editions of *Samuel Zborowski* were prepared by six editors from three generations of Polish philologists: all of them tried to employ the classical pattern of a critical edition. As a result, some fragments of *Samuel Zborowski* were moved, depending on the individual editor's decision, from the main text to the apparatus – and vice versa. In fact, Polish editors tried to make Słowacki's "rough" text, what it never was: a completed, coherent dramatic text, divided into acts, with a clear assignment of each line to a particular character, with a logically developing action. Finally, it is only in the twenty-first century that the big editorial problem of *Samuel Zborowski* has found a new solution: in 2017, Marek Troszyński proposed the paper "genetic edition", which combines facsimiles of the original manuscript with a system of transcriptions presenting to the reader all parts and fragments of the text in the (reconstructed, hypothetical) order of their notation by the poet (Troszyński 2017).

Having said that, we must add that the creative process was quite widely discussed by Polish literary scholars of the twentieth century. The eminent philologist Stanisław Pigoń (1885–1968) even before the First World War started his systematic research on Adam Mickiewicz's holographs and drafts; in the last years of his life, he summarised this line of scholarly

13. This paper by Mukařovský's was also translated into German (Mukařovský 1968).

14. One of the few Czech works on textual scholarship to have been translated into German and English (see Červenka 1971, 1995).

15. In 1957–1974, she edited 21 volumes of Martin Kukučín's works.

16. Studies *Textológia a poetika* [Textology and Poetics, 1973] and *Literárny text ako proces produkcie* [The Literary Text as a Production Process, 1974] published in the journal *Slovenská literatúra* [Slovak Literature].

activity by publishing an important book entirely devoted to the history of the creation of Adam Mickiewicz's *Dziady* [The Forefathers' Eve] (Pigoń 1967).

“Researchers should study the genesis of work in its embryonic state, and the development of intentions from a vague thought to the finished work (the study of draft sketches, author's plans and assumptions, particular editions of a work); they must study *the psychology of creative process* of an author” – this postulate was formulated in Ukraine as early as in 1922 by Iieremiia Aizenshtok (1900–1980) (Aizenshtok 1922: 157).¹⁷ Ukrainian literary criticism took up this proposal almost immediately: in 1926 Pavlo Fylypovych (1891–1937) wrote a genetically oriented preface to the drama *U pushchi* [In the Forest] by Lesia Ukraïнка (Fylypovych 1926). As usual, genetic research appears where the archival situation enables this approach. The crucial factor in this case is that Lesia Ukraïнка (the pen name of Larysa Kosach, 1871–1913) was aware of the great importance of manuscripts: therefore, she asked her family to store her archive for the future correct editions of her works. Despite all dramatic developments of Ukrainian history and thanks to the efforts of her sister, almost all drafts have been preserved for a number of Ukraïнка's poems. Analogically, the vast collection of Shevchenko's drafts enabled the genetic research on his manuscripts, presented in dozens of articles and several monographs of the late 1930s to 2010s. Among others, researchers highlighted differences in Shevchenko's habits and pace while creating original texts and adaptations, for instance of biblical texts. Shevchenko usually wrote his original short and even longer poems really fast. These manuscripts contain just minor corrections. The autographs of his adaptations, by contrast, are multi-layered because of edits and the variability of certain lines: features that capture the author's uneasy creative attempts and explorations (Borodin 2010).¹⁸

To summarise: there were the home-grown, Eastern European traditions of academic, professional thinking about the dynamics of literary creation, directly determined by local archival situations (the state of preservation of holographic drafts) and inextricably linked to local literary critical landscapes (sets of tendencies in philology, history and theory of literature, editorial theory and practice). Those traditions, although they did not achieve the autonomous position of separate sub-disciplines, undisputedly had their own achievements and impact.

Having said that, one should bear in mind that the Eastern European history (or histories) of genetic studies in the general sense of the term was (or were) influenced by other scholarly traditions (most notably, Russian) and shaped by the process of reception of Western methodological and theoretical impulses. Among them, the French *critique génétique* played a crucial

17. Cf. his “embryonic” figure of speech with Almuth Grésillon's observation regarding the vocabulary of French scholars in the last decades of the twentieth century that “moves to human (pro)creation, which leads to a whole new series of metaphors: gestation, childbearing, begetting, parturition, embryo, offspring” (Grésillon 1997: 108).

18. Among other authors whose creative process has been studied with especially solid results, one may name prose writers of the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: Ivan Nechui-Levyts'kyi, Panas Myrnyi, Vasyli' Stefanyk, and Olha Kobylians'ka (Zubkov 1968; Syvachenko 1974). The whole raft of fascinating genetic studies has been accumulated in Larysa Miroshnychenko's books (Miroshnychenko 2001; Miroshnychenko 2011).

role. To describe the Eastern European reception of genetic criticism, the metaphor of a network seems particularly useful. It allows us to see the international and cross-linguistic connections and relations as a system of circulation, in which ideas, terms and concepts are disseminated, transferred and exchanged.

External inspirations and their internalisation: *Critique génétique* in the Eastern European nexus

“Avant-texte, texte, après-texte” – this title, clearly referring to the French terminology, was given to the international textual studies colloquium in Mátrafüred (Hungary) in 1978 – apparently one of the first appearances of genetic criticism in the Eastern Bloc.¹⁹ Alongside the French guests and Hungarian hosts, conference participants included also scholars from Czechoslovakia, Germany (East and West: Berlin, Hamburg, Mainz, and Münster), USSR, Belgium and Switzerland.²⁰ The impact of this event is, at least to some degree, measurable: the colloquium not only started the Hungarian reception of *critique génétique* – later strengthened by the 1989 *Helikon* thematic issue – but also influenced Czech textual studies.²¹ Pavel Vašák, one of the 1978 colloquium participants, the next year published a Czech-language report on the event’s discussions (Vašák 1979), and then referred in his own studies to the works of Louis Hay, Almuth Grésillon and Jean-Louis Lebrave. The Hungarian conference had virtually no echoes in the Polish textology, which was, in turn, relatively well acquainted with Russian and Soviet studies on the textual creation process.²² The Polish reception of *critique génétique* started with a significant delay in the early 1990s.²³ In 1990, Zofia Mitosek, eminent theoretician of literature, published a journal article (later re-published in Mitosek’s popular academic handbook on the methodologies of literary studies, Mitosek 2004); in 1992 a French-Polish genetic conference (attended by Louis Hay) was organised in Poland by the University of War-

19. The conference proceedings were published in Hay and Nagy 1982.

20. Amongst the French guests were Raymonde Debray-Genette, Jean Bellemin-Noël and Louis Hay. See full list of participants: Hay and Nagy 1982: 7–10.

21. *Helikon* quarterly has been issued since 1955. The journal reports on international research results in literary studies. Its scope of interest covers literary theory, comparative literary studies, the theoretical, historical and methodological questions of modern world literature, and the border areas of cultural history and literature. It has published thematic issues since 1963. The first issue of 2021 deals with genetic criticism in theoretical and workshop studies.

22. In 1964 the Polish translation of Boris Eichenbaum’s 1919 article *Kak sdelana “Shinel” Gogolia* [How Gogol’s “Overcoat” is made] was published. This article, although focused on the construction of the finished work, contains also significant passages devoted to the rough drafts – in this way the classic text of Russian formalism demonstrated to the Polish readers the usefulness of the genetic approach. Another example of welcoming Eastern inspiration is a Polish translation (from 1976) of a book *Tvorcheskaia istoriia “Anny Kareninoi”; materialy i nabliudeniia* [History of creation of “Anna Karenina”; materials and remarks] by Vladimir Zhdanov.

23. By comparison, other French and Romanian tendencies in literary studies, like “critique thématique” or structuralism, were well known in Poland – through discussions and translations – in the 1970s.

saw and Parisian ITEM. From Poland our narrative should now shift back to the Czech Republic, as both Polish acts of reception mentioned above were quickly absorbed by Czech textual scholarship: the proceedings of the 1992 conference became the subject of Miloš Zelenka's methodological deliberations (Zelenka 1995), and Zofia Mitosek's handbook (with its final, genetic chapter) was later translated into Czech (2010). At the same time, the Czech culture of textual scholarship absorbed Western inspirations also via German: a review of the anthology *Literarische Schreibprozesse*, published as the 68th volume in the journal *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft* (1987), offered a look at such methods of genetically oriented criticism as *Produktionsästhetik*, intertextuality scholarship, and Eco's theory of the open work.²⁴ To complete the portrait of this East European "nexus", we should add that in the case of contemporary Ukrainian scholars, the acquaintance with *critique génétique* occurs mostly via Russian mediation and the collection titled *Geneticheskaia kritika vo Frantsii* [Genetic Criticism in France] (Dmitrieva 1999).²⁵

The Eastern European reception of *critique génétique* is still in progress. After several years marked mainly by the discursive presentations of French theory and practice, there finally appeared the long-awaited translations of the entire and representative book: *Génétiq ue des Textes*, the classical "handbook of *critique génétique*" by Pierre-Marc de Biasi, was translated first into Polish (2015) and then into Czech (2018).

Today and tomorrow: Eastern European genetic criticism as work in progress

Provoked by the vast literary archives (in spite of the scale of historical manuscript-clasm), and based on the local, homegrown traditions supplied by the French, Anglophone, German or Russian inspirations, Eastern European genetic criticism can be described as "work in progress", as the project still opens to the future. During the first two decades of the twenty-first century, genetic studies were looking for their space among other tendencies of contemporary literary studies and, to say more broadly, contemporary humanities. This process continues.

One can already risk the thesis that the last dozen or so years, circa 2007–2020, have seen a clear intensification of Polish studies devoted to the text-making process. The evident quantitative growth of Polish genetic research in recent years can be illustrated by the fact that between 2007 and 2020, eight new books devoted (entirely or in significant part) to the text-forming process have been published. In Poland, however, genetic editing is – in spite of a few notable achievements – still deficient in comparison with genetic literature studies. Polish geneticists usually write about the genesis of Polish literary texts, rather than creating comprehensive, editorial representations of their genesis; this disproportion between literary

24. The authors of the review, Alice Jedličková and Dana Svobodová, name the text's processual conception as a constitutive trait of genetic criticism; as regards publishing activities, they note a distancing from the effort to "prepare" a singular "true text" (Jedličková and Svobodová 1989).

25. This collection served as a main source of information and a theoretical basis for Larysa Miroshnychenko (Miroshnychenko 2003), as well as for Myroslava Hnatiuk (Hnatiuk 2011: 18). In the recent articles, however, one can also notice references to the works of Polish "geneticists" (Haleta 2021).

discourse and editorial practice is highly noticeable. A similar situation can be observed in Ukraine, although single digital editions, those pioneering attempts at presenting Ukrainian classics in a new format, paid some attention to draft manuscripts too. The authors of the *Portal Shevchenka* (Shevchenko Portal) project, among other things, set an ambitious goal of displaying each line written by Shevchenko and preserved to this day. It is difficult to overestimate the importance of such easy access to authors' drafts, autographs, notes, and letters for researchers, all in one online resource, on one screen. However, the *Shevchenko Portal* is rather a prominent exception, while most Ukrainian classics have no electronic/digital projects representing the variability and processuality of their works.

Genetic theories are more intensively translated into editing practice in Hungary. Especially after 2000, several scholarly text editions have been produced according to genetic principles. Among numerous examples, particularly worth mentioning is the textological research conducted at the University of Debrecen under the leadership of Attila Debreczeni, which deals with the corpus of classical Hungarian literature, first and foremost the works of Ferenc Kazinczy and Vitéz Mihály Csokonai. The critical edition of Kazinczy's oeuvre started in the late nineties. A large number of variants required the application of the principles of genetic textology in addition to traditional critical text management. The critical edition of Csokonai's works was published in eleven volumes between 1975 and 2002, and the interrelation of the different variants led to the idea of genetic publishing. Both critical editions have their printed versions, but their major innovation lies in the creation of a digital edition. The Csokonai Critical Edition series is an exemplary work because the last volume of the series is Debreczeni's monograph (Debreczeni 2012) on the chronological order of Csokonai's works, which proposes to redefine basic textual concepts (text source, text state, text variant, text identity, authorised copy, archive copy, collector's copy) and to rethink the problem of text genesis (Szénási 2018: 358).

Nowadays, Hungarian textual scholarship is involved in the project of the critical edition of Mihály Babits' poems.²⁶ The large number of autograph fragments, draft texts, handwritten and typed fair copies in Babits' legacy, as well as numerous instances of duplicate publications, often with considerable differences in content in comparison to the manuscript, calls into question the practice of selecting a primary text and the enforceability of "authorial intent" underlain by the principles of *ultima manus* and *ultima editio*. The new critical editions – currently "in the making" – will replace the finality of the published work of art by demonstrating the continuity of its creation (Buda and Major 2019). To achieve this goal, the editors must develop an easily decoded genetic set of characters that can illustrate as many moments of the writing act as possible. In addition to renewing the methodology of text publishing, the project aims to refresh the content of the subject notes, breaking with positivism and biography-centric genetics.²⁷

26. Mihály Babits (1883–1941), Hungarian poet, writer and translator, one of the most important figures in Hungarian modernism.

27. The most important publication related to the preliminary work on the Babits critical edition is Kelevéz 1998.

After 2000, Czech textual critics and editors strived to present textual variants in a digital environment. In the Hybrid Scholarly Edition of the complete writings of František Gellner (2012), “Slezské písně” [Silesian Songs] by Petr Bezruč (2015) and K.H. Mácha’s poem “Máj” [May] (2019) editors concentrate on capturing the dynamic of literary texts and visualising it adequately. Recalling Peter Schillingsburg’s classical division of editorial methods, it can be said that this approach is essentially historically oriented, with traces of sociological orientation. These digital editions bring together and organise all the textual variants, such as drafts, manuscripts, fair copies, all the types of prints (magazine, book) and reviewed prints. Every text is presented to the reader in different ways: (1) as a facsimile, (2) as a transcription (in the case of manuscripts), (3) as a literary (diplomatic) edition of printed texts and (4) as a corrected and commented edition. Textual changes are furthermore registered in the apparatus section in the form of synoptical reading. These tools allow us to introduce new statistical methods into the research on variants. The digital part of the Hybrid Scholarly Edition does not aim to establish authoritative canonical reading, but rather to grasp the substantial fluidity of the text.

Modern, professional studies of the genesis of Eastern European literary works date back to the 1920s (if not earlier); their foundations have been laid circa a hundred years ago. Despite this long and productive history, the idea of the literary work as a multivariant phenomenon and the manuscript as a field for learning the creative process is itself still a “work in progress”. The Eastern European shift from the question “how was this made?” to “how was this being made?” is ongoing.

References

- Aizenshtok, Iieremiia. 1922. “Izuchenie novoi ukrainskoi literatury (Zametki)” [Studies of new Ukrainian literature: Notes]. *Put’ Prosveshcheniia* 6: 135–162.
- Bezruč, Petr. 2015. *Slezské písně* [Silesian Songs]. Prague: Institute of Czech Literature – Akropolis.
- Borodin, Vasyľ. 2010. “Dynamika tvorchoho protsesu Shevchenka-poeta” [Dynamics of creative process in Shevchenko’s poetry]. *Slovo i Chas* 3: 3–29.
- Buda, Attila, and Ágnes Major. 2019. “A Babits-versek kritikai kiadásának átalakulása, avagy a kéziratok hagyatéék változásának következményei” [Changes in the critical editions of the Babits poems, or the consequences of transformations in the manuscript legacy]. *Irodalomtörténet* 100 (4): 435–447.
- Červenka, Miroslav. 1971. “Textologie und Semiotik.” In *Texte und Varianten. Probleme ihrer Edition und Interpretation*, ed. by Gunter Martens and Hans Zeller, 143–63. München: C. H. Beck.
- Červenka, Miroslav. 1995. “Textual Criticism and Semiotics.” In *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*, ed. by H. W. Gabler, G. Bornstein, and G. B. Pierce, 59–77. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Debreczeni, Attila. 2012. *Csokonai költői életművének kronológiai rendje* [The chronological order of Csokonai’s poetic oeuvre]. Csokonai Vitéz Mihály összes művei. Budapest-Debrecen: Akadémiai Kiadó-Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.
- Dmitrieva, Ekaterina (ed.). 1999. *Geneticheskaja kritika vo Frantsii* [Genetic criticism in France]. Moscow: OGI.
- Fylypovych, Pavlo. 1926. “Henezha dramatychnoi poemy Lesi Ukraïny *U pushchi*” [Genesis of Lesia Ukraïna’s dramatic poem *In the Forest*]. In Lesia Ukraïnka, *Tvory*, vol. 9, 7–27. [Kyiv]: Knyhospilka.
- Gellner, František. 2012. *Dílo* [The Complete Writings]. Prague: Institute of Czech Literature – Akropolis.
- Grésillon, Almuth. 1997. “Slow: Work in progress.” *Word & Image* 13 (2): 106–123.

- Haleta, Olena. 2021. "Poet na druhomu berezi: protsesual'nist' pys'ma u prozi Bohdana Ihoria Antonycha" [Poet on the other side: writing as a process in Bohdan Ihor Antonych's prose]. *Slovo i Chas* 1: 56–71.
- Hay, Louis, and Péter Nagy. 1982. *Avant-texte, texte, après-texte*. Colloque International de Textologie à Mátrafüred (Hongrie), 13–16 October 1978. Budapest-Paris: Akadémiai Kiadó-Éditions du CNRS.
- Hnatiuk, Myroslava. 2011. *Tekstolohichni studii [Textological studies]*. Kyiv: VPK Ekspres-Polihraf.
- Jedličková, Alice, and Dana Svobodová. 1989. "Jak v napsaném objevovat psaní" [To find writing in the written]. *Literární Měsíčník* 18 (10): 156–8.
- Kelevéz, Ágnes. 1998. *A keletkező szöveg esztétikája. genetikai közelítés Babits költészetéhez [The aesthetics of a nascent text. A genetic approach to Babits's poetry]*. Budapest: Argumentum.
- Kolodkevych, Halyna. 2015. *Variatyvnyist' khudozhnioho myslennia Vasylya Stusa [Variability of Vasyly's artistic mindset]*. Kyiv: Kyiivs'kyi Mizhnarodnyi Universytet.
- Krausová, Nora. 1973. "Textológia a poetica" [Textology and Poetics]. *Slovenská Literatúra* 20 (3): 132–143.
- Krausová, Nora. 1974. "Literárny text ako proces produkcie" [The Literary Text as a Production Process]. *Slovenská Literatúra* 21 (2): 178–190.
- Leociak, Jacek. 2004. *Text in the Face of Destruction: Accounts from the Warsaw Ghetto Reconsidered*. Warsaw: ŻIH.
- Mináriková, Marianna. 1972. *Textologické a štylistické problémy Kukučínovho diela [Textological and stylistic problems of Kukučín's work]*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej Akadémie Vied.
- Miroshnychenko, Larysa. 2001. *Nad rukopysamy Lesi Ukraïny: Narysy z psykholohii tvorchosti i tekstolohii [On Lesia Ukraïnka's manuscripts: Essays on the psychology of creativity and textology]*. Kyiv: Instytut Literaturny im T. H. Shevchenka NANU.
- Miroshnychenko, Larysa. 2003. "Rukopys yak metod vyvchennia psykholohii tvorchosti [Manuscript as a method for studies on the psychology of creativity]." *Materialy p'iatoho Mizhnarodnoho Konhresu Ukraïnistiv. Literaturoznavstvo*, vol. 1, ed. by Oleksa Myshanych, 72–73. Chernivtsi: Ruta.
- Miroshnychenko, Larysa. 2011. *Lesia Ukraïnka. Zhyttia i teksty [Lesia Ukraïnka, Her life and texts]*. Kyiv: Smoloskyp.
- Mitosek, Zofia. 2004. *Teorie badań literackich [The theories of literary scholarship]*. Warsaw: PWN.
- Mukařovský, Jan. 1968. "Varianten und Stilistik." *Poetica* 2 (3): 399–403.
- Pigoń, Stanisław. 1967. *Formowanie "Dziadów" części II: rekonstrukcja genetyczna [The Forefathers' Eve, part II – the process of text-making, genetic reconstruction]*. Warsaw: PIW.
- Portal Shevchenka [The Shevchenko portal]. <http://kobzar.ua/page/48>
- Shallcross, Bożena. 2011. *The Holocaust Object in Polish and Polish-Jewish Culture*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Sichálek, Jakub. 2018. "Editologická problematika staročeské literatury" [Scholarly Editing in the Context of Old Czech Literature]. In *Editologie: Od náčrtu ke knize*, ed. by Michal Kosák and Jiří Flaišman, 219–62. Prague: Institute of Czech Literature.
- Syvachenko, Mykola. 1974. *Literaturoznavchi ta fol'klorystychni rozvidky [Literary and folklore studies]*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Szénási, Zoltán. 2018. "Teória és praxis. A szövegkiadás elmélete és gyakorlata Magyarországon – az elmúlt harminc év" [Theory and practice. Theory and practice of text publishing in Hungary – the last thirty years]. *Irodalomtörténet* 99 (4): 337–359.
- Szilágyi, Márton. 2017. *Forrásérték és poétika. Kazinczy Ferenc: Fogságom naplója [Source value and poetics. Ferenc Kazinczy: Diary of my captivity]*. Budapest: reciti.
- Troszyński, Marek. 2017. *Alchemia rękopisu. "Samuel Zborowski" Juliusza Słowackiego [The alchemy of the manuscript. "Samuel Zborowski" by Juliusz Słowacki]*. Warsaw: IBL PAN.
- Vašák, Pavel. 1979. "Dědictví klasiků a textologie" [Heritage of classics and textology]. *Tvorba* 3: 14.
- Veres, András. 2004. "Az Édes Anna kritikái kiadásáról" [On the critical edition of Anna Édes]. *Irodalomtörténet* 85 (3): 394–401.

Zelenka, Miloš. 1995. "Genetická kritika a literární dějiny" [Genetic criticism and literary history]. *Slavia* 66 (2): 197–201.

Zubkov, Serhii (ed.). 1968. *Pytannia tekstolohii* [Issues of textology], vol. 1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.