

Bruno Schulz and Ukrainian Culture: Historical Contexts and Literary Traces

Stanley Bill
(University of Cambridge)

In an obscure essay published serially in 1937–38, the Polish-Jewish writer and artist Bruno Schulz (1892–1942) laid out his perspectives on the social and collective determinants of artistic creation:

In the face of the finished product, in the face of the crystallized work of art, we do not realize that this limited creation, enclosed within a small space, contains within itself the extraordinarily condensed result of difficult and far-reaching decisions, determinations, hesitations, and breakthroughs taking place in the depths of social consciousness. The artist makes these determinations not just for himself, but in the name of the collective, and by the strength and means of this collective. In art there is no subjectivism. The artist always operates in an objective medium, making shifts in an existing mass of content and cultural tensions. The more he is subjective and true to himself, the more he is representative.¹

For a writer and artist often associated with a unique, even hermetic private mythology, these statements of the social determinants of artistic creation may seem surprising. Schulz's writings are not primarily engaged with the representation of social realities, but rather with the creation of a highly individualized imaginative vision of an archetypized family and a town based on his native Drohobycz (today Drohobych in Ukraine).² Admittedly, he made these theoretical assertions not about his own work, but in an essay about Ephraim Moses Lilien (1874–1925), another Polish-Jewish artist from Drohobycz, who—unlike Schulz—was closely associated with the Zionist movement and thus more explicitly interested in social

‘collectives’. Nevertheless, Schulz’s arguments potentially have wider application and give further legitimacy to a gathering turn in the scholarship toward social and historical readings of his work.³ As archival research in Poland and Ukraine has uncovered ever more material about Schulz’s life and its social, cultural, and political background—including the rediscovery of the Lilien essay in 2015—scholars have situated Schulz and his work more deeply in these contexts. But what exactly were the ‘social consciousness’, the ‘collective’, the ‘cultural tensions’, and the ‘objective medium’ that Schulz himself represented and in which he made his own creative ‘decisions’, ‘determinations’, and ‘shifts’?

Schulz was born, lived, and worked his entire life in the multicultural, multiethnic, multilingual, multiconfessional milieu of a region that today forms the southwestern part of Ukraine. In Schulz’s lifetime, the area belonged to the eastern part of the crownland of Galicia in the Austro-Hungarian Empire until November 1918, very briefly to the short-lived West Ukrainian People’s Republic until early 1919, and then to the Second Polish Republic until the German and Soviet invasions of September 1939. The population of the area was diverse. By far the majority were Ukrainians, or Ruthenians, mostly concentrated in the countryside and constituting as much as 71 per cent of eastern Galicia’s population in 1910, when Schulz was eighteen years old.⁴ Poles and Jews formed the majority in cities and towns, where there were also smaller populations of Germans, Armenians, and other minorities. Politically, the region was the subject of multiple competing claims, from Austrian imperialism to Polish and Ukrainian national statehood projects, while also being a centre of Zionist activism.

Schulz’s own position within the main Polish-Jewish-Ukrainian ethnic triangle was complex. His Jewish family did not place a heavy emphasis on religion and had gone through processes of acculturation that made Polish and German its main languages, with little place for Yiddish. Nevertheless, Schulz remained formally a member of the Jewish religious

community until he withdrew in 1936. He was educated in Polish at the imperial gymnasium school in Drohobycz; he had brief stints of study in Polish in Lwów and in German in Vienna; his professional life as a schoolteacher and his literary work in independent Poland were in Polish. Many of his friends and acquaintances belonged to Polish-speaking Jewish intelligentsia milieux, though he also had connections in Zionist circles and among intellectuals creating literature in Yiddish. After the publication of his first volume of stories in 1933, he was well received in parts of Poland's literary establishment. However, especially by the late 1930s, he feared discrimination as a Jew by the Polish authorities. He would later be murdered as a Jew by a Gestapo officer under the German occupation in the Drohobycz Ghetto in 1942. All these circumstances have provided evidence for a variety of competing claims regarding Schulz's identity and the key cultural influences on his work.

In broad terms, these claims can be divided into symbolic-political and scholarly-interpretive groups. The first category includes the various battles over 'who Schulz belongs to'. Was he primarily a 'Polish' writer, a 'Jewish' artist and victim of the Holocaust, or a figure of the 'Ukrainian' lands? Perhaps the most illustrative version of this conflict was the controversy over the clandestine removal of rediscovered frescoes, originally made by Schulz for a Nazi persecutor under the occupation, from the walls of a Drohobych apartment to Yad Vashem in Jerusalem in 2001. Israeli officials insisted that Yad Vashem was the best place for them as products of the forced labour of a Holocaust victim; Polish intellectuals criticized the crude methods and implicit appropriation of a Polish-language writer; the Ukrainian government complained about the illegal removal of items of cultural heritage from Ukraine.⁵ The strictly interpretive debates over Schulz have been subtler, exploring various Polish, Jewish, European, Galician, and other contexts in rigorous detail on the pages of scholarly journals. Yet, in all these diverse discussions, Ukrainian contexts have been the least prominent. Schulz lived in a region inhabited by a large Ukrainian majority, but—according

to most interpretations—contact with Ukrainians and Ukrainian culture did not substantially influence his life or creative work.

This chapter interrogates this apparent absence of influence and its significance, while also situating Schulz as comprehensively as possible within the Ukrainian contexts of his time and place. It does so both through examination of historical evidence—including archival collections of Drohobycz newspapers from the 1920s and -30s—and through interpretations of his literary works. The Ukrainian strand—or its absence—takes on particular importance today, with Schulz’s native town and region now located in the western part of independent Ukraine, a state whose culture and very existence are under threat from the ongoing Russian war of aggression. The marginalization and repression of Ukrainian culture and claims to self-determination in the region were already key political questions in Schulz’s time, and they remain so today.

The chapter begins with an assessment of various interpretive contextualizations of Schulz and his work, including recent scholarship positing new Ukrainian connections. It then examines in detail the complex background of Polish-Jewish-Ukrainian relations in Schulz’s region and the town of Drohobycz as well as the writer’s own personal contact with Ukrainian dimensions of its cultural mix. Against this background, it lays out the modest evidence for Ukrainian contexts, subtexts, and traces in his literary works. The chapter shows that the relative absence of Ukrainian culture from Schulz’s creative horizon was not just an individual characteristic of his work, but also partly reflected the broader cultural and political relations of his time and his position within them. In this sense, Schulz’s work was indeed ‘representative’ of a wider ‘social consciousness’—as he put it himself in his essay on Lilien—and a product of a historical situation in which Ukrainians were a marginalized group often subject to political and cultural repression.

Conflicting Interpretations of Schulz's Cultural Contexts

The Polish-Jewish writer Marian Hemar (1901–72) retrospectively characterized interwar Drohobycz as ‘one and a half cities—half-Polish, half-Jewish, half-Ukrainian’.⁶ Yet in most interpretations of Schulz’s literary, artistic, and epistolary output of the same period this imaginative arithmetic never seems to add up. Scholars have found a great number of Polish, Jewish, and even German contexts and influences in Schulz’s life and work, while largely viewing the Ukrainian ‘half’ of the city’s cultural composition as absent or unrepresented.⁷ Admittedly, Schulz’s fictional recreation of Drohobycz—which remains unnamed in his stories—contains very few specific references to any cultural group. Indeed, Karen Underhill argues that Schulz seemed intentionally to ‘de-ethnicize and de-contextualize his writing’.⁸ Nevertheless, even taking this strategy into account, Ukrainian contexts are clearly less prevalent in Schulz’s works, influences, and biographical connections than the other key cultural contexts. Ukrainian scholar Oksana Weretiuk even asserts polemically that ‘although [Schulz] lived next to Ukrainians, he obviously fenced himself off from them’.⁹

In the absence of a strong Ukrainian strand, the debates over Schulz’s key cultural influences and identity have largely unfolded between scholars emphasizing, respectively, either his Polish or Jewish connections. Forming the majority view in Poland, scholars have underlined Schulz’s creative expansion of the Polish literary language; the prevalence of Polish toponyms and cultural markers in his writing; his embeddedness in Polish literary life; and the apparent lack of evidence to suggest that he saw himself explicitly as a ‘Jewish writer’.¹⁰ Conversely, a growing body of scholarship has focused on the network of Jewish references and symbolism in his writing, including theories that Schulz’s work draws on the mystical Kabbalah tradition of Jewish religiosity or belongs to a wider movement of Jewish Galician modernism.¹¹

Another set of interpretations has emphasized the international, intercultural, cosmopolitan, or universal dimensions of Schulz's work and creative influences. Jerzy Jarzębski suggests that Schulz's European literary and philosophical influences were predominantly a mixture of German and Polish, with his key early readings including Arthur Schopenhauer, Friedrich Nietzsche, Henri Bergson, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Rainer Maria Rilke, Miriam (Zenon Przesmycki), Stanisław Przybyszewski, Bolesław Leśmian, and Hugo von Hoffmansthal.¹² He also observes that Schulz's visual art plays with motifs and styles borrowed from European surrealism, expressionism, and secessionism, while also representing Jewish figures and themes.¹³ In fact, these diverse artistic influences had already been noticed by reviewers in Schulz's own time, who pointed both to Jewish threads and to commonalities with other European artists like Félicien Rops (1833–98), Alfred Kubin (1877–1959), Aubrey Beardsley (1872–98), and George Grosz (1893–1959).¹⁴

Other scholars and readers have emphasized Schulz's 'Galician' context, arguing that his work should be understood as a product of this Austro-Hungarian 'melting pot' of multiple cultural influences.¹⁵ Some have preferred the term 'borderland' (*pogranicze*) to capture this diverse cultural context.¹⁶ Even more expansively, various readers have viewed Schulz as fundamentally 'universal' in the mythologizing aspirations and resonance of his work.¹⁷ According to some interpretations, this 'universalism' appears as a highly intentional choice, as Schulz actively avoided Jewish or any other ethnic associations—perhaps in part to escape easy categorization, marginalization, or discrimination of his work—while still retaining specific cultural references as key substrata. As Underhill argues, Schulz sought the entry of his work into 'a non-marked community of European letters that shares a broadly modern, cosmopolitan sensibility'.¹⁸

In all these dominant interpretations of Schulz's primary cultural contexts and influences, Ukrainian dimensions appear only as a minor part of the wider Galician or

‘universal’ background—or in connection with Schulz’s local associations with Drohobycz. However, in recent years, some Ukrainian scholars and intellectuals have sought to link Schulz more closely with Ukrainian culture. These efforts have included scholarly articles positing the influence of a Ukrainian ‘folk atmosphere’ on Schulz’s works;¹⁹ new literary translations;²⁰ and endeavours to use the figure of Schulz as part of a broader social movement in support of an open and tolerant Ukrainian society. Among the main motors for this movement has been the International Bruno Schulz Festival in Drohobych, led by Vira Men’ok and her collaborators at the Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University of Drohobych, along with circles of Ukrainian and especially ‘Galician’ intellectuals mostly based in the western part of the country. Taras Voznyak, the founder of the Lviv-based cultural journal *Ї* argues that ‘the story of the return of Schulz to Galicia has become a pretext both for political discussions and for the creation of the foundations for tolerance in contemporary Ukrainian society’.²¹ More recently, Natalia Matorina has contended that Schulz’s writing resonates with Ukraine’s current situation defending itself against Russia’s ongoing war of aggression, pointing to apparently prescient themes of alienation in his work and parallels in his historical position as a member of a persecuted group under attack.²²

In these interpretations, Schulz is sometimes described as a partially ‘Ukrainian’ writer—at least in a limited, geographical sense. Since Schulz was born and lived all his life in a region that now belongs to the independent Ukrainian state, and that was significantly Ukrainian in its demographics in his own time, he is thus a writer of Ukraine and belongs in some part to Ukraine’s cultural heritage. This perspective has also been promoted by Ukrainian state institutions as part of political projects of reconciliation and cultural diplomacy. In 2012, the Supreme Council of Ukraine adopted a resolution to celebrate the 120th anniversary of Schulz’s birth and 70th anniversary of his death. The text of the resolution expressed the conviction that these celebrations would ‘foster the strengthening of

friendly relations between Poland and Ukraine'. The Polish Senate then responded by making November 2012 'Bruno Schulz Month' in a resolution proposing that 'the figure of Schulz and his oeuvre may stand as a point of departure for conversations about Polish-Jewish-Ukrainian relations'.²³ In this context, celebration of the figure of Schulz has provided an opportunity for practical Polish-Ukrainian cooperation in the cultural sphere as well as for positive framings of a 'multicultural' past often darkened by debates over Holocaust collaboration, Ukrainian nationalist massacres of Poles in Volhynia and eastern Galicia in 1943–44, and Polish communist state retribution against Ukrainians in the forced resettlements of Operation Vistula in 1947.

In general, these initiatives and interpretations do not propose new evidence of Ukrainian connections in Schulz's life or of Ukrainian themes, characters, or references in his stories, essays, letters, and drawings. The notable exception here are the stunning archival discoveries made by both Ukrainian and Polish researchers of a series of illustrations done by Schulz in 1940–41 under the Soviet occupation of Drohobycz for the Ukrainian-language propaganda newspaper Bil'shovits'ka Pravda (Bolshevik Truth). Some of these images represent prominent figures of Ukrainian culture, including the writers Taras Shevchenko (1814–61) and Ivan Franko (1856–1916). The Ukrainian researchers have thus argued that the new materials demonstrate once and for all Schulz's engagement with Ukrainian culture, invalidating earlier assertions of its absence from his creative field of reference.²⁴

The published illustrations do indeed offer irrefutable evidence of Schulz's treatment of Ukrainian themes in his artistic work. However, as I have argued elsewhere, the compelled nature of this wage work—with its subjects dictated by the short-lived official Soviet 'Ukrainization' campaign during a repressive occupation—makes this episode more of an exception proving the rule than evidence of authentic engagement with Ukrainian culture.²⁵ The subject and style of the illustrations were most likely chosen by the Soviet Ukrainian

editorial team, specifically to support official anniversary celebrations. There are no references to Shevchenko or Franko in any of Schulz's pre-occupation essays or letters—in marked contrast to his numerous discussions of various Polish, Jewish, and German writers and artists. Just as his commissioned representations of Lenin, Stalin, and the Red Army in the same Soviet propaganda newspaper tell us little about his real political convictions, Schulz's Ukrainian illustrations are a politicized appendix to his artistic career.

The absence of the Ukrainian strand in Schulz's free creative work thus remains a fact in need of historical contextualization. Indeed, his lack of engagement with Ukrainian culture was not an idiosyncrasy, but rather reflected certain wider conditions and attitudes of the Polish and Polish-Jewish intelligentsia milieux to which he belonged, against a background of Polish state oppression of Ukrainian claims to autonomous political and cultural existence.

Ukrainians in the Ethnic Triangle of Schulz's Drohobycz

Relations between Poles, Jews, and Ukrainians in Schulz's region during his lifetime were characterized at various moments by conflict, inequality, repression, and violence, but also by a certain measure of cooperation and constructive coexistence. While Jews regularly faced discrimination and physical threats from both the two larger groups, relations between Poles and Ukrainians were underpinned by a fundamental contest for political dominance in the region and by various attempts to manage this rivalry, especially under the independent Polish state. The Ukrainian threads of this broader background of interethnic conflict and cooperation intersected in multiple ways with Schulz's life and work.

Schulz's native region had been a bone of contention between Poles and Ukrainians from early in his life. The collapse of the Austro-Hungarian and Russian empires at the end of the First World War precipitated a fierce struggle for eastern Galicia from late 1918 to mid-1919 between forces loyal to the newly resurrected Polish state and the short-lived West

Ukrainian People's Republic. The oil fields of nearby Borysław made the Drohobycz area an important strategic prize. Ukrainian forces occupied Drohobycz on 1 November 1918, and maintained control until 18 May 1919, when advancing Polish divisions brought the area under the authority of the nascent Polish state.²⁶ According to both Ukrainian historians and the recollections of Polish residents of Drohobycz, life continued 'relatively peacefully' during the period of the West Ukrainian People's Republic, with only 'sporadic arrests of Poles',²⁷ though this 'peace' was broken in April 1919 by a failed two-day communist revolution.²⁸ Schulz spent part of the war in Vienna, but was probably in Drohobycz during this tumultuous period, which ended when the reestablishment of the Polish state finally crushed Ukrainian hopes.²⁹ He must also have been aware of the widely-reported anti-Jewish pogrom of November 1918 in Lwów/Lviv, perpetrated by Polish soldiers and civilians after they took the city from Ukrainian forces—with the 'alleged pro-Ukrainian behaviour of the Jewish population' providing one of the pretexts.³⁰

The external perspective of the German-Jewish writer Alfred Döblin (1878–1957) offers a strong sense of the poisonous atmosphere between Poles and Ukrainians that resulted from this interethnic warfare and the frustrated Ukrainian aspirations to statehood—with Jews sometimes caught in between. Döblin travelled through Poland in 1924, and then published an account of the journey. His descriptions of grinding poverty in Drohobycz and Borysław almost seem to anticipate Schulz's phantasmagorical rendering of the very same streets, lined with ramshackle houses crumbling under the assault of burgeoning vegetation. At the same time, Döblin's analysis of Polish-Ukrainian relations suggests interethnic tensions ripening to explode into conflict:

Many Ukrainians disgorge a terrible, blind, dumb hatred, an entirely animal hatred of the Poles . . . The surrounding province, Eastern Galicia, has few Poles; the officialdom and the military are Polish, the people Ukrainian, villages and towns also

Jewish. The government is settling Polish colonizers in the countryside, soldiers, invalids. Their job is to Polonize . . . The Ukrainians are only just starting to awaken their national consciousness in the struggle, and the Polish are trying to weaken or even negate it, thus provoking the rage and pain of the Ukrainians.³¹

These tensions would later find their most brutal expression in the campaign of ethnic cleansing conducted against Poles by Ukrainian nationalists in Volhynia and eastern Galicia under the German occupation in 1943–44.³² Yet, even well before the Second World War, it was evident to an outsider like Döblin that eastern Galicia was a tinderbox. The Polish state mixed direct repression of Ukrainian cultural and political institutions with a ‘divide and rule’ strategy of support for selected Ukrainian organizations.³³ These approaches only exacerbated Ukrainian resentment, as internationally proclaimed guarantees of minority rights were ignored, educational institutions were restricted, and Polish military colonists moved into majority Ukrainian areas.³⁴

From the late 1920s, these growing frustrations further radicalized a campaign of Ukrainian nationalist attacks on representatives of the Polish state and moderate Ukrainian leaders, which in turn brought increasingly repressive anti-Ukrainian policies from the government. In 1930, Marshal Józef Piłsudski—the Polish leader later eulogized and mythologized by Schulz on his death in 1935—launched a ‘pacification campaign’, which involved beatings and arrests of Ukrainians by the Polish army and gendarmerie as well as the ‘sacking and closing of Ukrainian reading rooms, cultural centres, newspaper offices, and cooperatives’ across eastern Galicia.³⁵ These actions also undermined the Ukrainian ‘cooperative movement’ and the conciliatory political currents seeking to develop Ukrainian culture under the auspices of the Polish state.³⁶ The authorities found weapons and explosives stored by Ukrainian nationalist organisations, but the wider political interpretation of these

events severely weakened moderates on both sides as well as the earlier movement within Piłsudski's own camp to find accommodations with Poland's national minorities.³⁷

The broad cultural consequences of these political repressions are evident in the fact that—in 1931, for example—not a single book was published in translation from Ukrainian into Polish (or vice versa) in Poland.³⁸ As part of the same campaign, the authorities closed the Ukrainian gymnasium school in Drohobycz.³⁹ The harshest clampdown period was followed by a superficial and short-lived 'normalization' of relations in 1935, but the society in which Schulz lived during the period of his greatest creative activity remained ethnically and culturally divided.⁴⁰ The Polish authorities repressed precisely those sections of Ukrainian society that might have produced autonomous interlocutors for the Polish intelligentsia, effectively limiting the possibility of contact with an independent Ukrainian culture, already restricted by earlier pressures on schools and cultural organizations. As a member of the Polish-Jewish intelligentsia, Schulz's apparent indifference to Ukrainian culture cannot be separated from this historical reality.

By the 1930s, even Schulz's own liberal intellectual milieu was wary of the threat of radical Ukrainian nationalism. In 1936, when Schulz published an essay on Maria Kuncewiczowa's novel The Stranger (Cudzoziemka) in Tygodnik Ilustrowany (Illustrated Weekly), his review appeared directly alongside a richly-illustrated three-page article on the alleged menace of Poland's national minorities—in particular, of Ukrainians. The author opens the article with a reference to the murders of prominent moderate Polish politicians by Ukrainian nationalists, including the assassination of MP Tadeusz Hołówko in 1931 in Truskawiec, the resort town near Drohobycz often visited by Schulz and his family: 'First Hołówko, then [interior minister Bronisław] Pieracki. Nationalist Ukrainian radicalism wishes to be in ceaseless war with Poland and is making every effort to ensure that neither Ukraine nor Poland can forget it'.⁴¹

Schulz left no evidence of his own thoughts on the events in Truskawiec, Piłsudski's 'pacification campaign', or the issue of ethnic conflict more generally, though his letters and essays suggest he was tolerant and liberal in his outlook. In fact, only two weeks after the publication of the piece on ethnic minorities, another article in Tygodnik Ilustrowany discussed Schulz's participation in a joint exhibition at the Lwów Professional Association of Visual Artists (Lwowski Zawodowy Związek Artystów Plastyków) with the Polish painter Andrzej Pronaszko and the Ukrainian painter Yaroslava Muzyka. The author, Karol Kuryluk, concludes the article with a note of surprise: 'The Association of Visual Artists has done an extraordinary thing: it has managed to bring together artists of three nationalities—Poles, Ukrainians, and Jews'.⁴² Kuryluk's astonished tone suggests how isolated the three communities appeared to be from one another in cultural life. Yet he also implies that Schulz belonged to an exceptional group of artists willing to cross the boundaries, as Kuryluk himself did in his own publishing and journalism.

At the same time, other evidence from Schulz's social context reveals a more nuanced picture of wider cooperation, perhaps especially in Drohobycz. From 1927 to 1939, local newspapers referred repeatedly to a 'pact' or 'agreement' between representatives of the 'three nationalities' in the local politics of the City Council (Rada Miejska).⁴³ The essence of the pact—often praised in these local media—was to put aside national disputes to focus on economic questions and development of the town to the benefit of all. This type of cooperation was not entirely unique, with a 'Three-Nationality Bloc' (Blok Trzech Narodowości) also functioning in local politics in nearby Przemyśl.⁴⁴ Yet the advocates of cooperation in Drohobycz expressed particular pride in their practical achievements. According to one local newspaper: 'The fruits of these joint efforts—apart from the attainment of a kind of "treuga Dei" in nationality issues and a whole range of minor issues—have included the completion of the construction of our magnificent town hall and the

realization of the age-old dream of our forefathers to build a municipal waterworks'.⁴⁵ This pragmatic cooperation was supported and cultivated from the top, with the long-serving Polish mayor Rajmund Jarosz (1875–1937) renowned for his even-handed treatment of the various nationalities in Drohobycz. Indeed, such was his reputation for neutrality that the Ukrainian national council during the short-lived West Ukrainian People's Republic (1918–19) had supposedly asked him to stay on as mayor.⁴⁶

Apart from this political cooperation, Drohobycz also hosted various joint civil society organizations, including the Polish-Ukrainian Christian Union (Związek Chrześcijańskiego Polsko-Ukraińskiego), which organized a 'Polish-Ukrainian Academy' bringing together over 300 participants for lectures and cultural activities in 1937.⁴⁷ Some Drohobycz Ukrainian organizations connected to the Greek Catholic Church were sufficiently attached to the Polish state to contribute to fundraising initiatives to support anti-aircraft defence a few months before the German invasion in 1939.⁴⁸ Overall, the level of cooperation in Drohobycz inspired the head of the Jewish community, Leon Tannenbaum, to declare in 1931 that 'relations in the Drohobycz district are different today than in other districts of Eastern Małopolska, and perhaps even in the whole of Poland'. He praised the lack of radical movements in the area and the general atmosphere of 'concord and harmony' between groups.⁴⁹ Doubtless this was an idealizing view, but the evidence for constructive collaboration shows that relations between groups were by no means exclusively negative. Admittedly, these initiatives also reflected wider attempts by the Polish state to foster 'dialogue' through sponsored institutions under its own control, including the publication of the Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński (Polish-Ukrainian Bulletin) between 1932 and 1938.⁵⁰

Yet even amidst the positive propaganda of good relations between national groups in supportive local media, signs of discord, contestation, and oppression were also evident. Only a few months after publishing a detailed report on the ceremonial consecration of the

Ukrainian gymnasium school in Drohobycz in 1930, the Głos Drohobycko-Borysławsko-Samborsko-Stryjski (Drohobycz-Borysław-Sambor-Stryj Voice) newspaper published a laconic, one-line announcement of the school's closure, following other reports on 'mass searches and arrests' of individuals from among the Ukrainian community, including 'very important' figures.⁵¹ Other reports from across the 1930s reveal disagreements over taxation, criticism of Ukrainians for allegedly using social welfare systems without contributing to them, Ukrainian protests over political exclusion, and the related threat of riots in Borysław.⁵² Several of these reports appeared in the same editions of Podgląd Podkarpacia (Subcarpathian Review) in which the instalments of Schulz's essay on Lilien appeared. Language politics were another source of disagreement, as Ukrainian city councillors introduced a controversial and ultimately failed motion to accord equal rights to the Ukrainian language with Polish in administrative matters.⁵³

In this mixed environment of Polish-Ukrainian cooperation and division, Schulz's status as an assimilated Jew also brought specific challenges and opportunities. On the one hand, as a Polish-speaking schoolteacher and member of the intelligentsia, he belonged to an inherently privileged social group. Through his elder brother Izydor, who had an important position in the 'Galicja' refinery, Schulz was also an indirect beneficiary of the oil industry that underpinned the local economy—until Izydor's unexpected death brought financial hardship to the family in 1935.⁵⁴ On the other hand, the belonging of assimilated Jews to the dominant classes was always tenuous in a political and social environment that was becoming increasingly antisemitic, especially in the latter half of the 1930s. A turning point came in 1935 with the death of Marshal Piłsudski, generally viewed as a protector of Jewish communities, after which Schulz's situation became more precarious as the political mood of the country deteriorated. Nationalist literary critics attacked his works, and Schulz expressed

fears about his teaching future against a background of popular agitation to limit the number of Jews in public life and their access to certain professions.⁵⁵

Schulz's assimilated Polish-Jewish identity also put him in an ambivalent position with respect to Ukrainians. From at least the beginning of the twentieth century, there had been significant political cooperation between Jews and Ukrainians in Galicia, as the two groups strategically combined forces in the face of a Polish dominance that extended from the administrative arrangements of the post-1867 Austro-Hungarian Empire through to the reestablishment of a Polish state.⁵⁶ Drohobycz saw the bloody repression of this solidarity during the 1911 Austro-Hungarian elections, when troops opened fire on a mixed crowd of Jews and Ukrainians protesting against attempts by the authorities to prevent them from voting. Twenty-six people died, with many more wounded.⁵⁷ According to Andrzej Chciuk, in an account that some scholars have questioned, Schulz himself witnessed these events from the window of the family home on Drohobycz's main square, where he supposedly sketched the terrible scenes as documentary evidence.⁵⁸

Jewish-Ukrainian electoral solidarity would continue on some level into the period of the Second Polish Republic, in which Ukrainians and Jews shared certain interests as large minority groups within an ethnically-Polish-dominated state. This alliance took parliamentary form in the Bloc of National Minorities (Blok Mniejszości Narodowych), a loose coalition of Jews, Ukrainians, Belarusians, and Germans that became the second largest grouping in the Sejm after the elections of 1922.⁵⁹ However, this cooperation would prove fragile, and there was always a negative side to Jewish-Ukrainian relations, as some Ukrainians continued to perceive Jews as economic exploiters or 'tools' of Polish oppression.⁶⁰

To some extent, these contradictions sprang from a basic division between the Jewish assimilationist upper classes, who tended to support the Polish establishment, and Jewish nationalists more inclined to ally themselves with Ukrainians. This conflict within the

broader Jewish community existed from the late-nineteenth century into the period of the interwar Polish state. Indeed, it was the assimilationist Jewish deputy-mayor of Drohobycz Jacob Feuerstein who reputedly ordered the massacre of Jewish Zionists and Ukrainian workers during the Austro-Hungarian elections of 1911 (though there is no direct evidence linking him to this order).⁶¹ Tensions between ethnic groups were further exacerbated in the Drohobycz area by the exploitative conditions of the Borysław oil fields. Ukrainians were especially disadvantaged, and they sometimes directed their anger against the easy targets of Jewish owners, overseers, innkeepers, and even fellow labourers.⁶² The German occupation during the Second World War brought the nadir of Ukrainian violence against Jews, with Ukrainian nationalists participating in pogroms and assisting the Germans in the Holocaust, including in Drohobycz and Borysław.⁶³ Schulz's close friends Anna Płockier and Marek Zwillich were murdered by Ukrainian militiamen in a forest near Truskawiec.

Before the war, Schulz himself—as a schoolteacher and acclaimed writer and artist—had excellent relations with many ethnic Poles in Drohobycz and beyond. However, his contact with Ukrainians remained extremely limited. In the interwar period, Ukrainians were the smallest of the three main ethnic groups in the ‘one and a half cities’. According to the Polish census of 1939, 25 per cent of the population was Greek Catholic (usually a marker of Ukrainian or Ruthenian identity), while 33 per cent was Roman Catholic, and 40 per cent Jewish. At the same time, only 16 per cent of Drohobycz's inhabitants were Ukrainian speakers, while 25 per cent spoke Yiddish and 58 per cent spoke Polish as first languages.⁶⁴ Moreover, the majority of the town's Ukrainians were spatially separated from Schulz's Drohobycz. Schulz spent most of his life in a very small area in the centre of town, while Ukrainians largely lived on the outskirts, reflecting their marginalized status within the society. According to Ukrainian historians Mikhailo Sen'kiv and Leonid Tymoshenko, interwar Drohobycz saw a basic opposition between ‘Ukrainian suburbs and the Polish-

Jewish town'.⁶⁵ Beyond the suburbs, the countryside around Drohobycz was also overwhelmingly Ukrainian.

This spatial separation of Schulz from Ukrainians was echoed by social or class separation. Schulz belonged to the intelligentsia class; his letters and other evidence of his social associations—for instance, his membership of the Polish-Jewish 'Kalleia' artistic society in Drohobycz—show that most of his acquaintances were educated, liberal, and secular Jews or Poles. These social circles included very few Ukrainians, whose communities were generally more traditional, rural, and less educated. Sen'kiv and Tymoshenko assert that the 'Ukrainian intelligentsia' of interwar Drohobycz numbered as few as fifty individuals.⁶⁶ At least in his hometown, these were the only Ukrainians with whom Schulz could conceivably have socialized, and from whom he might have received any sense of Ukrainian culture or concerns.

Schulz had meaningful contact with at least two individuals from this group. Above all, he had very friendly relations with Aleksy Kuszczak, a Ukrainian fellow teacher at the state gymnasium school and—according to Jerzy Ficowski—a 'cryptonationalist', who visited Schulz at his home, where Schulz read early versions of his stories aloud.⁶⁷ Kuszczak's accounts of his father's work as a firefighter supposedly even served as a partial inspiration for Schulz's story 'My Father Joins the Fire Brigade' (Mój ojciec wstępuje do strażaków) in Sanatorium Under the Sign of the Hourglass (Sanatorium pod klepsydrą, 1937).⁶⁸ In 1933, Kuszczak introduced Schulz to Józefina Szelińska, to whom he would later be engaged, though never to marry.⁶⁹ In 1938, the two colleagues were awarded bronze medals together for long service to the gymnasium school.⁷⁰ Apart from Kuszczak, Schulz also had contact with a certain 'Miss Kuziw' (Kuziv), who appeared in some of his erotic drawings, characterized by Ficowski as 'a young Ukrainian woman with a turned-up nose and a face marked by the stain of titillating vulgarity'.⁷¹ Notwithstanding this reductive

description, Ficowski also notes that ‘Miss Kuziw’ was the daughter of a local lawyer, and indeed Sen’kiv and Tymoshenko include a lawyer named Grin’ Kuziv on their list of members of the interwar Ukrainian intelligentsia in Drohobych.⁷²

The very small number of Ukrainians in Schulz’s intellectual milieu is also confirmed by the records of his primary employer, the King Władysław Jagiełło State Gymnasium. In 1924–25, in Schulz’s first year as a teacher at the school, only one of his thirty-eight students was listed as ‘Greek Catholic’, with twenty-four ‘Jewish’ and thirteen ‘Roman Catholic’ students.⁷³ The pedagogical staff was slightly more representative, with six Greek Catholic teachers out of thirty, alongside fifteen Roman Catholic, one Evangelical, and eight Jewish instructors.⁷⁴ Apart from these few colleagues and some visits with students to the historic wooden Greek Catholic Church of St George, Schulz had little opportunity for contact with Ukrainian culture in Drohobycz.⁷⁵ Instead, the historical evidence shows that Schulz was spatially, socially, culturally, and professionally separated from Ukrainians against a background of ethnic tensions and Polish state repression.

Ukrainian Traces in Schulz’s Literary Works

This historical background opens a broader perspective on the limited resonance of Ukrainian themes in Schulz’s creative work. His collected stories arguably contain only three direct references to specific aspects of Ukrainian culture, all of them to religious institutions. One is the obscure appearance of the ‘Staupigia’, an Orthodox ‘charitable organization’, as Stefan Chwin describes it, whose hall is the setting for a banquet in ‘My Father Joins the Fire Brigade’.⁷⁶ The ‘Staupigia’ was an Orthodox church brotherhood under the direct authority of the patriarch, rather than of the local bishop. One was established in Drohobych in the sixteenth century, though the research for this article found no surviving reference to its existence in Schulz’s time.⁷⁷ The story may thus be imaginatively transposing into its

fictionalized Drohobycz the more famous Stauropegion Institute of nearby Lviv—a cultural and educational institution with a historic role in the propagation of Ukrainian culture, but which in practice had been largely controlled by the so-called Russophiles since the second half of the nineteenth century, with the support of the Polish state after 1922. In this sense, this ‘Stauropegia’ might be understood not entirely as a Ukrainian institution, but rather as one dominated by forces hostile to the Ukrainian movement and to Ukrainian language and culture.⁷⁸ Either way, its significance in Schulz’s story remains unclear.

Apart from this recondite allusion, we also find a ‘Ukrainian’ reference to the art collection of the (Greek Catholic) Basilian Fathers, which plays an important part in the metaphorical argumentation of ‘A Second Autumn’ (*Druga jesień*).⁷⁹ Locked away in the city museum, this collection of second-rate baroque works festers and radiates a decaying ‘mirage’ of autumnal colours into the sky. The monk collectors of the Basilian monastery, which still existed in Schulz’s time, are ironically described as having a taste for military scenes, while the wider metaphorical framework includes the exotic climate of ‘warm winds from [Moldavia]’ and an ‘Alexandrian [epoch]’, loosely suggesting imaginative influences from the cultural and religious ‘east’.⁸⁰

Finally, the ‘large baroque façade’ of the (Greek Catholic) Holy Trinity Church, located on the corner of Drohobycz’s main square, right next to the Basilian monastery, is the subject of a brief architectural description in ‘The Age of Genius’ (*Genialna epoka*).⁸¹ None of these passages explicitly mentions a Ukrainian or Ruthenian connection, which is only revealed by prior knowledge of Drohobycz’s institutions and social composition.

Nevertheless, these Orthodox and Greek Catholic religious institutions are ultimately no less prominent in Schulz’s fiction overall than Roman Catholic churches, which also only feature a few times, or even than Drohobycz’s spectacular choral synagogue, which does not appear

at all. In the purely architectural sense, the city's Ukrainian dimension is therefore not underrepresented.

Apart from these direct references, the historical evidence also suggests several places in Schulz's works where Ukrainian echoes could be speculatively inferred. Firstly, a literalist approach to his representations of the unnamed Drohobycz might cast various references to peasants from the surrounding countryside as Ukrainian allusions. Perhaps the most memorable of these scenes involves a 'bumpkin from the country' (kmiotek ze wsi), who finds himself exposed to the cruel ridicule of the clerks in father's shop in 'The Dead Season' (Martwy sezon). The invasion of this incongruous outsider into the urban world of the shop provokes father's furious metamorphosis into a buzzing fly. The interloper then remains as an uncanny presence that the family tries unsuccessfully to repress:

It became ever more difficult to forget the compromising presence of the poor peasant. It is well known how stubbornly such unfinished business becomes rooted in certain minds. We ignored him on purpose during these empty weeks, leaving him to stamp on the counter in the dark corner, daily becoming smaller and grayer. Almost unnoticeable now, he was still stamping away on the same spot, smiling benevolently, hunched over the counter, indefatigable, chattering softly to himself.⁸²

The humiliation of a (Ukrainian/Ruthenian) peasant from the rural peripheries disturbs the relative (Polish-Jewish) affluence of the bourgeois centre, which then seeks to further marginalize or erase him. At the same time, the father's world of small Jewish commerce is under threat from the greater social and economic forces of modernity—to draw on an interpretation first proposed by Artur Sandauer—so that the scene potentially reveals the failed attempts of an endangered social milieu in its last phase of tenuous ascendancy to repress the underlying presence of other inequalities.⁸³ In the Drohobycz area, these inequalities were partly linked with ethnic identity. Yet Schulz's story elides any specific

cultural or political markers. The putative sociohistorical context of the author's own town suggests that the peasant might well be Ukrainian, but the decontextualized narrative itself pays no attention to such categories.⁸⁴ At a stretch, this episode could be interpreted as a metaphorical critique of power relations in Schulz's region, but only through what Dorota Wojda calls a 'mimesis of process'—a non-realist, non-referential, ironically imitative deconstruction of dominant cultural mechanisms and hierarchies.⁸⁵

Another reference to a ragged local peasant appears in an imaginative metaphor for the architectural transition from the centre of town to the outskirts in 'August' (Sierpień):

After we passed a few more houses, the street ceased to maintain any pretense of urbanity, like a man returning to his little village who, piece by piece, strips off his Sunday best, slowly changing back into a peasant as he gets closer to his home. The suburban houses were sinking, windows and all, into the exuberant tangle of blossom in their little gardens.⁸⁶

Once again, there is nothing specifically Ukrainian about this description, though a literal-minded application of Drohobycz's sociocultural topography could easily suggest this conclusion. The anthropologized metaphor leads from the (Polish-Jewish) urban core to the (Ukrainian) periphery, from architectural culture to botanical nature, from the cultivated city, where the peasant is a stranger, to the wild margins, where he is at home. Like the 'bumpkin' in 'The Dead Season', this metaphorical peasant does not belong to the world of the centre, but rather to a liminal periphery closer to nature than to human culture. In both stories, Schulz thus gives indirect and partial expression to the social divisions of his native region—and perhaps in the former case to an ironically critical deconstruction of them—but without any specific cultural detail or hint of explicit political engagement.

Finally, a group of 'discontented townspeople' who stalk through the town during an unexpected siege by an enemy army in 'Sanatorium Under the Sign of the Hourglass'

(Sanatorium pod klepsydrą) might be interpreted to bear a loose historical relation to events connected with the establishment of the West Ukrainian People's Republic in Drohobycz at the end of the First World War, or perhaps to the subsequent communist uprising of April 1919:

We were told that the enemy incursion gave heart to a group of discontented townspeople, who have come out in the open, armed, to terrorize the peaceful inhabitants. We noticed, in fact, a group of these activists, in black civilian clothing with white straps across their breasts, advancing in silence, their guns at the ready.⁸⁷

This description may represent a point where the specific political history of local ethnic and social tensions imprints itself in distorted form on Schulz's generally ahistorical narrative. In a similar fashion, the novella Spring (Wiosna) includes in its fantastical plot a rebellion against established powers symbolized by Emperor Franz Joseph I, thus potentially delivering a mythologization of the history of the national revolutions that contributed to the end of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.⁸⁸ As Schulz himself implies in his essay on Lilien, sociopolitical history is present in his stories, but always filtered through the distorting lens of a distinctive mythological frame.

Overall, hypotheses of Ukrainian themes in Schulz's works are tenuous and reliant on extrapolative interpretations. This paucity is a result both of the wider marginalization of Ukrainian culture of his time and of Schulz's own specific strategies of 'de-historicization' and 'de-ethnicization'. These latter approaches were admittedly not characteristic of all other Polish-language writers of his time or region. Though they probably remained in a minority, some prominent figures, like Mieczysław Jastrun (1903–83), Józef Łobodowski (1909–88), and Andrzej Kuśniewicz (1904–93), took an interest in Ukrainian questions. Others, like Józef Rogosz (1846–96), Stanisław Antoni Mueller (1877–1944), and Artur Gruszecki (1852–1929), depicted specific ethnic relations and conflicts in the Drohobycz region,

including—especially in the case of Rogosz—a distorted world of relations in which ruthless Jewish capitalists supposedly exploited both Polish and Ukrainian workers in the oil fields.⁸⁹

Another contrasting example is Sydor Rey (1908–79), a Polish-Jewish writer, whose novel Kropiwniki (1937) also represented interethnic relations in a small Galician town. Rey and Schulz briefly belonged to the same Przedmieście (Suburbs) literary group, a collective with a political programme devoted to representing socially marginalized groups and ethnic minorities. Critics have observed that Schulz’s apolitical approach was never a natural fit for this group, and he later withdrew from it, perhaps only having joined through his friendship with another one of its members, the distinguished writer Zofia Nałkowska (1884–1954).⁹⁰

A different local comparison with Schulz is the Ukrainian writer, socialist, and national activist Ivan Franko, who was born near Drohobych, went to school there, and was later to be celebrated by Schulz in the wartime propaganda illustrations commissioned by a Soviet Ukrainian editorial team for the anniversaries of his birth and death. While Schulz mythologizes or ‘universalizes’ the social realities of the Drohobycz region in his literary works, Franko’s stories are located in concrete sociopolitical contexts, often embodying a politically engaged stance against the inequalities, injustices, and abuses of the oil industry, in which many of the most cruelly exploited workers were Ukrainians.⁹¹ Franko’s suffering victims have ethnic or national identities—though their class status is arguably more significant—while Schulz’s characters of the margins are archetypized ‘bumpkins’ and ‘tramps’ without ethnic or social qualities. Comparing the two writers, the contemporary Ukrainian critic Yaroslav Hrytsak has even suggested that Franko was limited by the politicized frame forced upon him by his ‘[nation-building]’ responsibilities, while Schulz enjoyed greater creative freedom as a writer with mixed cultural affiliations.⁹² Consequently, Schulz could become a ‘universal’ writer, who belonged not to Polish or Yiddish literature, but ‘to the world’, as his friend Rachela Auerbach had foretold in a letter in 1938.⁹³

As the comparisons above suggest, the lack of an explicit Ukrainian thread in Schulz's writings was partly a corollary of his individual style as a writer for whom social and political issues only found expression in attenuated form. However, there is still a clear distinction to be drawn between his many Polish, Jewish, and German influences and acquaintances, on the one hand, and the absence of any significant Ukrainian connections in his life or work, on the other. Accordingly, the substratum of his imaginative framework did have social, political, and ethnic content, subject to an implicit cultural hierarchy. This substratum was shaped by the political situation of ethnic segregation and repression under Polish domination in his region, which limited meaningful contact with an autonomous Ukrainian culture and its representatives—even if his town of Drohobycz had also seen examples of successful cooperation. Whatever the reasons, Schulz evinced no interest in Ukrainian culture or the political plight of Ukrainians. Only the violent Soviet and German occupations would force him to do so shortly before his own murder in the Holocaust.

Conclusion: Ukraine and Schulz's 'Little Homeland'

In his essay on Lilien, Schulz acknowledges the collective origins of even the most idiosyncratic individual imagination in a wider 'social consciousness', referring to the 'mythical depths', where art, the collective imagination, and political nationalism find their common roots.⁹⁴ The soil of Schulz's own literary and artistic imagination was predominantly Jewish, Polish, and German in composition. The structure of his society partly closed off the rich resource of Ukrainian culture, so that his creative syncretism united Polish literary culture, certain elements of Jewish culture and mythology, and influences from wider European—especially German-language—modernism. As Schulz wrote of Lilien, 'he embodied the myth that could be sustained by the era and society from which he emerged'.⁹⁵ The Ukrainian thread was almost entirely absent from the mythology embodied by Schulz's

work, until the Soviet occupation of his homeland forcibly introduced it into his creative vision along with other ideologized subjects in his illustrations for the Ukrainian-language propaganda newspaper Bil'shovits'ka Pravda.

Today, the places of Schulz's life lie in an independent Ukraine fighting for its territorial integrity and self-determination against Russian aggression. Schulz's Drohobycz would become Soviet, German, Soviet again, and now Ukrainian, while the town's Polish and Jewish dimensions largely perished together with the writer himself. But the memory of Schulz and these communities is kept alive there now by a growing group of Ukrainian activists, intellectuals, artists, and writers committed to a capacious vision of Ukrainian culture with space for both past and present diversity. These efforts have been led by Ukrainian intellectuals from Schulz's native region and by the organizers of the Bruno Schulz Festival in Drohobych itself. But they have also attracted the wider interest of some of Ukraine's most prominent cultural figures. The Kharkiv-based poet and novelist Serhiy Zhadan, after several visits to the festival, published a volume of poems in Polish translation entitled Drohobycz (2018), in which he mixes meditations on Schulz and his town with painful reflections on the present-day Russian-waged war in the east of Ukraine.⁹⁶ In Schulz's prose and biographical fate, Zhadan finds—among other things—premonitions and analogies for connection with Ukraine's struggle from the Russian annexation of Crimea in 2014.

Schulz himself may have had limited contact with the native Ukrainian culture of his region in his own lifetime, but leading representatives of Ukrainian culture today are deeply engaged with his work as part of the wider cultural heritage of the Ukrainian lands. As another preeminent contemporary Ukrainian writer, Yurii Andrukhovych, explains, Schulz can be placed within the field of Ukrainian culture, because Ukrainians have 'inherited Schulz's little homeland . . . It is part of Ukraine, so we bear a serious responsibility for

Schulz and his legacy'.⁹⁷ As Andrukhovych frames it, Schulz's connection with Ukraine does not imply ownership or control, but rather an ethical obligation. In this hospitable understanding, Schulz and his work have undoubtedly come to belong—at least in part—to Ukraine and Ukrainians.

¹ B. Schulz, 'E. M. Lilien', Schulz / Forum, 2015, no. 6, 84–6. This and all other translations from Polish and Ukrainian are my own unless otherwise indicated.

² Note on place names: Since I will be referring to Drohobycz/דרֹהֹבִיטש/Drohobych from Polish, Jewish, and Ukrainian perspectives, I will use the form of the name most relevant to the political situation of the time under discussion. In general, I will prefer Schulz's own Polish spelling of 'Drohobycz', though in explicitly Ukrainian contexts I will use the transliterated Ukrainian 'Drohobych'. In the same way, I will use both Polish 'Lwów' and Ukrainian 'Lviv'. Ukrainian words are transliterated using British Standard 2979:1958, without diacritics.

³ S. Bill, 'History and Myth: Bruno Schulz's Spring', in T. Bilczewski, S. Bill, and M. Popiel (eds.), The Routledge World Companion to Polish Literature (London, 2021), 238–50: 241.

⁴ M. Klimecki, Polsko-ukraińska wojna o Lwów i Galicję Wschodnią, 1918–1919 (Warsaw, 2000), 16.

⁵ B. Balint, Bruno Schulz: An Artist, a Murder, and the Hijacking of History (New York, 2023), 171–206; D. V. Powers, 'Fresco Fiasco: Narratives of National Identity and the Bruno Schulz Murals of Drohobych', East European Politics and Societies: and Cultures 17/4 (November 2003), 622–53.

⁶ M. Hemar, 'Atlantyda Anadiomene', Wiadomości, 1 March 1970), p. 1.

⁷ For example, see J. Jarzębski, Prowincja, centrum: Przypisy do Schulza (Kraków, 2005), 154.

⁸ K. Underhill, 'Ecstasy and Heresy: Martin Buber, Bruno Schulz and Jewish Modernity', in D. de Bruyn and K. Van Heuckelom (eds.), (Un)masking Bruno Schulz: New Combinations, Further Fragmentations, Ultimate Reintegrations (Amsterdam, 2009), 27–40: 30.

⁹ O. Weretiuk, 'The Ukrainian Reception of Bruno Schulz's Writings: Paradox or Norm?', in D. de Bruyn and K. Van Heuckelom (eds.), (Un)masking Bruno Schulz: "New Combinations, Further Fragmentations, Ultimate Reintegrations" (Amsterdam, 2009), 419–33: 424.

¹⁰ S. Chwin, 'Dlaczego Bruno Schulz nie chciał być pisarzem żydowskim (o "wymazywaniu" żydowskości w Sanatorium pod klepsydrą i Skleпах cynamonowych)', Schulz / Forum, 2014, no. 4, 15; M. P. Markowski, 'Schulz: Dom i świat', Tygodnik Powszechny 50 (2012), website visited 20 August 2022.

¹¹ S. Lindenbaum, 'Wizja mesjanistyczna Schulza i jej podłoże mistyczne', in J. Jarzębski (ed.), Czytanie Schulza (Kraków, 1994), 33–67; W. Panas, Księga blasku: Traktat o kabale w prozie Brunona Schulza (Lublin, 1997); B. Shallcross, "'Fragments of a Broken Mirror": Bruno Schulz's Retextualization of the Kabbalah', East European Politics and Societies, 11/2 (1997), 270–81; Underhill, 'Ecstasy and Heresy: Martin Buber, Bruno Schulz and Jewish Modernity'; K. Underhill, Bruno Schulz and Galician Jewish Modernity (Bloomington, 2024).

¹² J. Jarzębski, Schulz (Wrocław, 1999), 33. Also see M. P. Markowski Powszechna rozwiążłość: Schulz, egzystencja, literatura (Kraków, 2012); W. Bolecki, 'Principium individuationis: Motywy nietzscheańskie w twórczości Brunona Schulza', Teksty Drugie, 2003, no. 5, 17–33.

¹³ Jarzębski, Schulz, 198.

¹⁴ See P. Sitkiewicz (ed.), Bruno Schulz w oczach współczesnych: Antologia tekstów krytycznych i publicystycznych lat 1920–1939 (Gdańsk, 2021), 69, 82, 90.

-
- ¹⁵ B. Budurowycz, 'Galicia in the Work of Bruno Schulz', Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes, 28/4 (December 1986), 359–68; E. Prokop-Janiec, 'Schulz a galicyjski tygiel kultur', in J. Jarzębski (ed.), Czytanie Schulza (Kraków, 1994), 94–107; J. Święch, 'Schulz—pisarz galicyjski', Akcent, 107/1 (2007), 8–20.
- ¹⁶ W. Meniok (ed.), Bruno Schulz a kultura pogranicza: Materiały dwóch pierwszych edycji Międzynarodowego Festiwalu Brunona Schulza w Drohobyczu (Drohobycz, 2007); D. Wojda, 'Schulzowskie reprezentacje pogranicza kulturowego w perspektywie postkolonialnej', Teksty Drugie, 2007, no. 4, 233–47.
- ¹⁷ See Balint, Bruno Schulz: An Artist, a Murder, and the Hijacking of History, 208–11; J. Jarzębski, 'Schulz uniwersalny', Schulz / Forum, 2015, no. 6, 5–16.
- ¹⁸ Underhill, 'Ecstasy and Heresy: Martin Buber, Bruno Schulz and Jewish Modernity', 30, 42–5.
- ¹⁹ Y. Pokal'chuk, 'Bruno Shul'ts u svitli riznikh kul'tur, in Vira Men'ok (ed.), Bruno Shul'ts i kul'tura pohranichchya: Materiali dvokh pershikh edytsii Mizhnarodnoho Festivalyu Bruno Shul'tsa v Drohobychi (Drohobych, 2007), 330.
- ²⁰ Perhaps most notably, a well-received translation by one of Ukraine's best-known writers, Yurii Andrukhovych. See B. Shul'ts, Tsynamonovi kramnytsi ta vsi inshi opovidannya, trans. Y. Andrukhovych (Kyiv, 2012).
- ²¹ See T. Voznyak, Bruno Shul'ts: Povernennya (Lviv, 2012).
- ²² N. Matorina, 'Fenomen suholosnosti Bruno Schul'tsa ukrainskomu sohodenniu', Vcheni Zapysky Tavriiskoho Natsionalnoho Universytetu imeni V. I. Vernadskoho 33(72)/6 (2022), 25–32.

-
- ²³ ‘120th Anniversary of the Birth and 70th Anniversary of the Death of Bruno Schulz’, BrunoSchulz.eu, website visited 20 August 2018; ‘Senators to honor Schulz’, BrunoSchulz.eu, website visited 20 August 2018.
- ²⁴ B. Lazorak, L. Tymoshenko, L. Khomych, and I. Chava, Vidomyi i nevidomyi Bruno Shul’ts: Sotsiokul’turnyi portret Drohobycha (Drohobych, 2016), 327.
- ²⁵ S. Bill, ‘Propaganda on the Margins: Bruno Schulz’s Soviet Illustrations, 1940–41’, Slavonic and East European Review, 96/3 (July 2018), 432–68.
- ²⁶ Klimecki, Polsko-ukraińska wojna, 111, 217. Also see C. Mick, Lemberg, Lwów, L’viv, 1914–1947: Violence and Ethnicity in a Contested City (West Lafayette, 2016).
- ²⁷ W. Budzyński, Miasto Schulza (Warsaw, 2005), 40.
- ²⁸ Klimecki, Polsko-ukraińska wojna, 202.
- ²⁹ P. Caneppele, ‘Bruno Schulz w Wiedniu’, in M. Kitowska-Łysiak and W. Panas W ułamkach zwierciadła... Bruno Schulz w 110 rocznicę urodzin i 60 rocznicę śmierci (Lublin, 2003), 547–56.
- ³⁰ Mick, Lemberg, Lwów, L’viv, 1914–1947, 158.
- ³¹ A. Döblin, Journey to Poland, trans. J. Neugroschel (New York, 1991), 145–6.
- ³² See G. Motyka, Od rzezi wołyńskiej do Akcji ‘Wisła’: Konflikt polsko-ukraiński, 1943–1947 (Kraków, 2011); T. Snyder, The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569–1999 (New Haven, 2003), 154–216.
- ³³ D. Fedorowycz, ‘Quelling Ukrainian Opposition in Interwar Poland: The Ministry of Interior’s Divide and Rule Strategy’, East European Politics and Societies, 34/2 (2020), 351–74.
- ³⁴ B. Budurowycz, ‘Poland and the Ukrainian Problem, 1921–1939’, Canadian Slavonic Papers 25/4 (1983), 473–500; J. P. Himka, ‘Western Ukraine between the Wars’, Canadian

Slavonic Papers, 34/4 (1992), 391–412; A. Portnov, Poland and Ukraine: Entangled Histories, Asymmetric Memories (Berlin, 2020), 28–35.

³⁵ P. R. Magocsi, The Roots of Ukrainian Nationalism: Galicia as Ukraine's Piedmont (Toronto, 2002), 31.

³⁶ P. R. Magocsi, A History of Ukraine: The Land and Its Peoples (Toronto, 2010), 632–9.

³⁷ T. Snyder, Sketches from a Secret War: A Polish Artist's Mission to Liberate Soviet Ukraine (New Haven, 2005), 75–6.

³⁸ J. T. Gross, Revolution from Abroad: The Soviet Conquest of Poland's Western Ukraine and Western Belorussia. Expanded Edition (Princeton, 2002), 8.

³⁹ Motyka, Od rzezi wołyńskiej do Akcji 'Wisła'. Konflikt polsko-ukraiński, 1943–1947, 30.

⁴⁰ Budurowycz, 'Poland and the Ukrainian Problem, 1921–1939', 491.

⁴¹ S. Szczutowski, 'Ciernie dokoła Polski', Tygodnik Ilustrowany, 19 January 1936, p. 45.

⁴² K. Kuryluk, 'Życie kulturalne we Lwowie', Tygodnik Ilustrowany, 2 February 1936, p. 96.

⁴³ 'Niebezpieczna gra', Głos Drohobycko-Borysławsko-Samborsko-Stryjski, 28 June 1931, p.

4; 'Dr. Michał Piechowicz prezydentem m. Drohobycza', Nowy Głos Zagłębia Naftowego, 7

Nov. 1937, p. 2; 'Przemówienie prezesa Klubu radnych żydowskich dr Pawła Adlersberga',

Przegląd Podkarpacia, 6 March 1938, pp. 1–2. Also see G. Józefczuk, 'Bruno

zmystyfikowany, Drohobycz zmanipulowany: Nowe perspektywy badań,' in W. Meniok

(ed.), Bruno Schulz jako filozof i teoretyk literatury: Materiały V Międzynarodowego

Festiwalu Brunona Schulza w Drohobyczu (Drohobycz, 2014), 685–704.

⁴⁴ A. Krochmal, 'Historyczny zasób Archiwum Państwowego w Przemyślu i jego znaczenie dla badań naukowych', Archeion, 2016, no. CXVII, 321.

⁴⁵ 'Niebezpieczna gra', p. 4.

⁴⁶ 'Rajmund Jarosz', Przegląd Podkarpacia, 25 July 1937, p. 2.

⁴⁷ 'Akademia polsko-ukraińska w Drohobyczu', Przegląd Podkarpacia, 14 Nov. 1937, p. 7.

-
- ⁴⁸ ‘Ukraińcy w pow. Drohobyckim subskrybują pożyczkę przeciwlotniczą’, Przegląd Podkarpacia, 16 April. 1939, p. 3.
- ⁴⁹ ‘Przemówienie wiceburmistrza Dra Tannenbauma’, Głos Drohobycko-Borysławsko-Samborsko-Stryjski, 22 November 1931, p. 2.
- ⁵⁰ Portnov, Poland and Ukraine, 34.
- ⁵¹ ‘Uroczyste poświęcenie gmachu ukr. gimnazjum w Drohobyczu’, Głos Drohobycko-Borysławsko-Samborsko-Stryjski, 15 June 1930, p. 6; ‘Masowe rewizje i aresztowania’, Głos Drohobycko-Borysławsko-Samborsko-Stryjski, 9 September 1930, p. 4; ‘Ukraińskie gimnazjum’, Głos Drohobycko-Borysławsko-Samborsko-Stryjski, 7 November 1930, p. 7.
- ⁵² H. Springer, ‘Rozwój stosunków gospodarczych powiatu drohobyckiego w oświeceniu starosty mgr. Wehrsteina’, Przegląd Podkarpacia, 24 April 1938, pp. 1–2; ‘Sprawozdanie z działalności Powiatowego Obywatelskiego Komitetu Zimowej Pomocy Bezrobotnym w Drohobyczu za okres od 15. XI. 1937 r. do 25. VI. 1938 r.’, Przegląd Podkarpacia, 31 July 1938, pp. 2-3; ‘Senzacyjny przebieg zebrania wyborczego ławników miejskich w Borysławiu’, Przegląd Podkarpacia, 28 May 1939, p. 3; ‘Z działalności Związku Strzeleckiego w Borysławiu’, Przegląd Podkarpacia, 28 May 1939, p. 1.
- ⁵³ Pod adresem Rady Miejskiej’, Głos Drohobycko-Borysławsko-Samborsko-Stryjski, 11 January 1929, p. 2.
- ⁵⁴ B. Lazorak, ‘Wpływowy brat Izydor (Baruch, Izrael) Schulz’, Schulz / Forum, 2013, no. 3, 89–104.
- ⁵⁵ B. Schulz, Księga listów, ed. J. Ficowski (Gdańsk, 2008), 157–8, 164.
- ⁵⁶ For example, see J. Shanes, Diaspora Nationalism and Jewish Identity in Habsburg Galicia (Cambridge, 2012), 264, 225; R. Manekin, ‘Politics, Religion, and National Identity: The Galician Jewish Vote in the 1873 Parliamentary Elections’, Polin Studies in Polish Jewry 12 (1999), 100–19.

⁵⁷ Shanes, Diaspora Nationalism and Jewish Identity in Habsburg Galicia, 279. Also see J. Shanes, 'The "Bloody Election" in Drohobycz: Violence, Urban Politics, and National Memory in an Imperial Borderland', Austrian History Yearbook 53 (2022), 121–49.

⁵⁸ A. Chciuk, Ziemia księżycowa: Druga opowieść o Wielkim Księstwie Bałaku (Warsaw, 2002), 69. For a summary of some scholarly doubts, see '19 czerwca 1911, poniedziałek', Schulz / forum website, visited 1 June 2024.

⁵⁹ A. Prażmowska, Poland: A Modern History (London, 2010), 117.

⁶⁰ See Shanes, Diaspora Nationalism and Jewish Identity in Habsburg Galicia, 259–60.

⁶¹ Shanes, 'The "Bloody Election" in Drohobycz: Violence, Urban Politics, and National Memory in an Imperial Borderland', 139.

⁶² A. F. Frank, Oil Empire: Visions of Prosperity in Austrian Galicia (Cambridge, 2005), 127–33.

⁶³ K. Thomas, 'O pogromie w Drohobycz w 1941 roku w świetle materiałów z Archiwum Yad Vashem', Studia Żydowskie: Almanach 5/5 (2015), 119–31; K. Struve, 'Pogrom w Borysławiu 3–4 lipca 1941 r.', in A. Grabski (ed.), Pogromy Żydów na ziemiach polskich w XIX i XX wieku, T. 4: Holokaust i Powojnie (1939–1946) (Warsaw, 2019), 137–58.

⁶⁴ L. Tymoshenko (ed.), Narysy z istoriyi Drohobycha: vid naidavnishykh chasiv do pochatku XXI stolittya (Drohobych, 2009), 154.

⁶⁵ Tymoshenko, Narysy z istoriyi Drohobycha, 155.

⁶⁶ Tymoshenko, Narysy z istoriyi Drohobycha, 156.

⁶⁷ Ficowski, Regiony wielkiej herezji, 156; B. Schulz, Listy, fragmenty, wspomnienia o pisarzu, ed. J. Ficowski (Kraków, 1984), 63.

⁶⁸ Ficowski, Regiony wielkiej herezji, 108–9.

⁶⁹ J. Ficowski, Regiony wielkiej herezji i okolice: Bruno Schulz i jego mitologia (Sejny, 2002), 324.

-
- ⁷⁰ ‘Ostatnio odznaczeni’, Nowy Głos Zagłębia Naftowego, 16 May 1938, p. 2.
- ⁷¹ Ficowski, Regiony wielkiej herezji, 141.
- ⁷² Tymoshenko, Narysy z istoriyi Drohobycha, 156.
- ⁷³ Lazorak et al, Vidomyi i nevidomyi Bruno Shul’ts, 64–5.
- ⁷⁴ Lazorak et al, Vidomyi i nevidomyi Bruno Shul’ts, 42–5.
- ⁷⁵ Ficowski, Regiony wielkiej herezji, 116.
- ⁷⁶ Chwin, ‘Dlaczego Bruno Schulz nie chciał być pisarzem żydowskim’, 14.
- ⁷⁷ F. Sulimierski, B. Chlebowski, and W. Walewski (eds.), Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich, vol. 2 (Warsaw, 1881), 152.
- ⁷⁸ ‘Stauropegion Institute’, Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine website, visited 10 April 2024; O. Subtelny, Ukraine: A History, 4th edition (Toronto, 2009), 319.
- ⁷⁹ Świąch, ‘Schulz—pisarz galicyjski’.
- ⁸⁰ B. Schulz, ‘A Second Fall’, in The Fictions of Bruno Schulz: The Street of Crocodiles and Sanatorium under the Sign of the Hourglass, trans. C. Wieniewska (London, 1988), 219–22. Quotations slightly edited.
- ⁸¹ B. Schulz, ‘The Age of Genius’, in The Fictions of Bruno Schulz: The Street of Crocodiles and Sanatorium under the Sign of the Hourglass, trans. C. Wieniewska (London, 1988), 147.
- ⁸² B. Schulz, ‘The Dead Season’, in The Fictions of Bruno Schulz: The Street of Crocodiles and Sanatorium under the Sign of the Hourglass, trans. C. Wieniewska (London, 1988), 230–1.
- ⁸³ A. Sandauer, ‘Rzeczywistość zdegradowana (Rzecz o Brunonie Schulzu)’, in Zebrane pisma krytyczne, vol. 1 (Warsaw, 1981), 557–80.
- ⁸⁴ Chwin, ‘Dlaczego Bruno Schulz nie chciał być pisarzem żydowskim’, 14.

⁸⁵ Wojda, 'Schulzowskie reprezentacje pogranicza kulturowego w perspektywie postkolonialnej'.

⁸⁶ B. Schulz, 'August' in The Fictions of Bruno Schulz: The Street of Crocodiles and Sanatorium under the Sign of the Hourglass, trans. C. Wieniewska (London, 1988), 17.

⁸⁷ B. Schulz, 'Sanatorium under the Sign of the Hourglass', in The Fictions of Bruno Schulz: The Street of Crocodiles and Sanatorium under the Sign of the Hourglass, trans. C. Wieniewska (London, 1988), 258.

⁸⁸ Bill, 'History and Myth: Bruno Schulz's Spring'.

⁸⁹ J. Rogosz, W piekle galicyjskim: obraz z życia (1896); S. A. Mueller, Henryk Flis: powieść (1908); A. Gruszecki, Tuzy (1893); Dla miliona (1899). See M. Antosik-Piela, 'Galicyjski trójkąt etniczny w polskiej prozie naftowej', Ruch Literacki, LVII/4 (2016), 439–46.

⁹⁰ O. R., 'Kilka słów o „Przedmieściu”', in P. Sitkiewicz (ed.), Bruno Schulz w oczach współczesnych: Antologia tekstów krytycznych i publicystycznych lat 1920–1939 (Gdańsk, 2021), 301; M. Cwalina, 'Świat ludzki w twórczości Brunona Schulza', Schulz / Forum, 2019, no. 14, 97.

⁹¹ R. Mnikh, Drohobychanin Bruno Shul'ts (Drohobych, 2006), 99; J. Hrycak, Prorok we własnym kraju: Iwan Franko i jego Ukraina (1856–1886), trans. A. Korzeniowska-Bihun and A. Wylegała (Warsaw, 2010), 300.

⁹² J. Hrycak, Nowa Ukraina: Nowe interpretacje (Wrocław, 2009), 39.

⁹³ R. Auerbach, 'List', in B. Schulz, Księga listów, ed. J. Ficowski (Gdańsk, 2008), 272.

⁹⁴ Schulz, 'E. M. Lilien', 84.

⁹⁵ Schulz, 'E. M. Lilien', 96.

⁹⁶ S. Żadan, Drohobycz, trans. J. Podsiadło (Warsaw, 2018).

⁹⁷ 'Yurii Andrukhovych: Ya b trymavsia vid Shul'tsa podali', Nova Pol'sha website, visited 5 July 2024.