

💼 the UKRAINIAN review

is a quarterly journal devoted to all aspects of Ukrainian studies. All articles, whether commissioned or unsolicited, reflect the views of the author(s).

Editor

Stepan Oleskiw

Deputy Editor Vera Rich

Associate Editors

Volodymyr Mykula Oleh S. Romanyshyn

Editorial Board

Nicholas L. Chirovsky Seton Hall University (emeritus professor) James Dingley University of London Yarema Kelebay McGill University Bohdan Kordan University of Saskatchewan Lubomyr Luciuk Royal Military College of Canada Dmytro M. Shtohryn University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

the UKRAINIAN review

is published by: The Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain, Ltd. Ucrainica Research Institute, Toronto, Ont., Canada

Editorial Office

200 Liverpool Road, London, N1 1LF, United Kingdom Tel: (0171) 607-6266; Fax: (0171) 607-6737; E-mail: uisltd@compuserve.com

Subscriptions

The subscription price, which includes postage, is £20.00 (US \$40.00). The price for a single copy is £5.00 (US \$10.00).

Orders should be sent to

49 Linden Gardens, London, W2 4HG, United Kingdom Tel: (0171) 229-8392; Fax: (0171) 792-2499

ISSN 0041-6029

Printed in the UK by UIS Ltd., London.

Roksolana. A painting by Ivan-Valentyn Zadorozhnyi, see pp. 69–77.



Contents

the ukrainian *review*

Contributors	2
Current Events The Lack of Determinacy in Ukraine's Foreign and Security Policy JENNIFER D. P. MORONEY	;
History	
The First Unified Representation of the Ukrainian People On the 80th Anniversary of the Labour Congress of Ukraine ANDRIY HOSHULYAK	e. 1 :
1100th Anniversary of Halych VOLODYMYR BARAN	2
The Year of Revolutions: 1848 and Ukrainian National Consciousness THEODORE MACKIW	3
Press and Publishing in Kharkiv, 1920s–1930s оLна піznуснелко	4
The Family Archives of Vasyl Tomara MARHARYTA CHERNOBUK	5
Arts and Culture	
Yuriy Shevelov (On the Occasion of his 90th Birthday) ROKSOLIANA ZORIVCHAK	6
Ivan-Valentyn Zadorozhnyi, 1921–1988	6
Kotlyarevskyi's <i>Aeneid</i> and the Ukrainian Baroque Traditie BOHDANA KRYSA	on 7 8
Kotlyarevskyi's Aeneid: The 1898 Celebration	8
Yevhen Pluzhnyk, 1898–1936	9
Judge me then yevhen pluzhnyk Now in the North	9 9
How futile – to deck stanzas lavishly	9
What has not come to pass?	9
Reviews	Q

winter '98 vol. 45 no. 4

Contributors

the ukrainian *review*

JENNIFER D. P. MORONEY

is a PhD candidate at the University of Kent, Canterbury.

ANDRIY HOSHULYAK

is a post-graduate student at the Department of Modern History of Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko Kyiv University.

PROF. VOLODYMYR BARAN

an associate member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, is a prominent Ukrainian archaeologist. He is currently head of archaeological research at the ancient Halych stronghold, Ivano-Frankivsk oblast.

DR. THEODORE MACKIW

is Emeritus Professor of the University of Akron, Ohio.

OLHA RIZNYCHENKO

is head of the Department of Exhibitions, Kharkiv Museum of Literature.

MARHARYTA CHERNOBUK

is a Head of Department at the Museum of the History of Kyiv.

DR. ROKSOLIANA ZORIVCHAK

is head of the Department of Translation Studies and Contrastive Linguistics at the Ivan Franko University in Lviv.

BOHDANA KRYSA

is a Professor of Ukrainian Literature at the Ivan Franko University in Lviv.

Current Events

The Lack of Determinacy in Ukraine's Foreign and Security Policy

Jennifer D. P. Moroney

Introduction

S ince gaining independence in 1991, Ukraine has faced challenges that even the most established of states would have had difficulty in addressing. In terms of foreign and security policy-making, the greatest challenge has been how to facilitate cooperation with the West in the changing security environment of Europe, while maintaining positive, productive, and mutually respectful relations with Russia. This proves no easy task, particularly in the light of Russia's blatant objection to an enlarged NATO that would include any of the former Soviet Republics. Ukraine's room for manoeuvre in its foreign and security orientation is thus currently limited by both economic and geopolitical factors. Until both the economic situation in Ukraine improves drastically, and the Russian government's attitude towards NATO enlargement becomes more positive, this will most likely continue to be the case.

The Ukrainian government is at present dually constrained in its ability to shape its own foreign and security policy. Internally, there are considerable divergences in the ideologies and foreign policy goals of the major political parties in the Rada (parliament). Also, the executive and legislative branches do not on the whole work very well together. Debates are regularly centred on individuals and personal vendettas, such as those between President Kuchma and former Premier Lazarenko. Moreover, old Soviet style bureaucratic structures are still in place, which tends to increase the time involved in reaching decisions. Externally, Ukraine is constrained by the growing tension between the West and Russia, and is finding itself in an ever-more uncomfortable geopolitical position while it simultaneously struggles to alleviate its economic crises at home. Because the Ukrainian government is facing considerable political and economic challenges both internally and externally, its foreign and security policy decisions are constantly changing, responding, and adapting to the external environment in a manner that makes the highest level political decisions appear to lack determinacy¹ and without lasting authority.

This article sets out and discusses various explanations for Ukraine's lack of determinacy in foreign and security policy-making, and attempts to draw certain conclusions from this behaviour. The focus will be on the issue of Ukraine's sovereignty, and we shall attempt to explain how the fact of having achieved only negative sovereignty² can be a significant constraint on a state's manoeuvrability in its

¹ In other words, due to both internal and external limiting factors, there appears to be no overwhelming consensus as to the development of a solidified foreign policy agenda.

² i.e. Freedom from outside interference in its domestic affairs. See below.

international relations. We shall commence with a discussion of 'weak' states in the international system, which is intended to set the context for the following section on Ukraine's negative sovereignty dilemma. These sections will help to provide a partially empirical, partially theoretical explanation of Ukraine's lack of determinacy in its foreign and security policy-making. This discussion provides the foundation for understanding Ukraine's overall policy towards the West and NATO, and also towards Russia and the CIS. The following section will consider to what extent Ukraine's foreign and security policy is becoming more 'determined', by looking at 'established' trends and patterns of its international relations. Finally, we shall examine the extent to which the West's attitude to Ukraine is becoming more favourable, taking into account its partnership treaty with NATO, as well as the support received from international financial organisations. Moreover, taking 'negative sovereignty' into account will help to further Western understanding of the precarious situation that the Ukrainian government is facing, both at home and abroad.

Medium-Sized Power, Weak State

Ukraine's technological advancements and military capabilities give it the potential to be a medium-sized power. Nevertheless, it is currently considered by the international community to be a weak state. Ukraine's 'weakness' is demonstrated by the fact that its government, in most situations, does not have the means to oppose or appease its enemies or woo its friends.³ Weak states, such as Ukraine, are particularly vulnerable to the interference of external actors in their domestic affairs, since they tend to seek the economic and political support of international organisations or of individual state actors. They are likely to sacrifice control of domestic activities in exchange for much-sought-after financial or political support. This course may sometimes enable the state in question eventually to lose its image as a weak state. It may, however, also be a means for external actors to increase their economic and political leverage over the said state.

The protection of the inhabitants of a state from military attack by another state is and always has been universally perceived as one of the major functions of every government. No matter what other functions are legitimate practices, protection of its own population takes priority. Likewise, and just as universally, there has always existed an inequality among countries in their ability to provide this protection. Weak states simply do not have the power to protect themselves from the military or economic onslaught of their stronger neighbours. Sometimes geographic location or topography has been a factor, but given the absence of natural defences, weak or threatened states have traditionally been forced to seek assistance from more powerful states. This in turn has presented another dilemma for weak states: whether to join an alliance with its neighbours or adhere to a policy of neutrality? If the alliance is powerful, might not the stronger members try to take advantage of the weaker state's vulnerable position?⁴

³ Sherman Garnett, 'Reform, Russia, and Europe: The Strategic Context of Ukraine's NATO Policy', in Stephen J. Blank (ed.), *From Madrid to Brussels: Perspectives on NATO Enlargement* (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1997), p. 74.

⁴ Marshall Singer, Weak States in a World of Powers (New York: Collier-Macmillian, 1972), pp. 273-4.

In every period of history, weak states have been faced with this predicament, and have often pleaded neutrality. But as the Belgians learned in 1914 and 1940, and the Cambodians in the early 1970s, neutrality only holds good so long as the more powerful neighbours accept and respect this policy and have no great interest in taking resources from the neutral. In the case of post-1991 Ukraine, its government has adhered to a policy of non-bloc status, seeking a working relationship with the West, including NATO partnership structures (without ruling out future membership in the alliance), and detachment from the Tashkent Collective Security Agreement of the CIS, while still being involved in the economic structures of the CIS. Ukraine seeks a normalisation of relations with Russia, based on bilateral negotiations (indicating a desire to bypass the CIS), while aiming to limit these relations to the economic and political spheres.

Weak states such as Ukraine which are in the process of nation- and statebuilding will normally seek to enlist international support in many forms, even if these are only insubstantial and symbolic. States in the throes of economic and political reform and whose domestic institutions are still relatively unstable will seek to obtain external support for their negative sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity. This is particularly so if the state in question feels threatened by a powerful neighbour.

Immediately after gaining independence, the Ukrainian government pursued two major themes in its foreign and security policy. Firstly, Kyiv sought to obtain security guarantees from the world's great powers and international institutions. In December 1994, Ukraine gained the political support of the world's nuclear powers in return for its ratification of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. In July 1997, Ukraine and NATO signed a partnership treaty largely motivated by the latter's gratitude for Ukraine's support of NATO enlargement. The second major issue for Ukraine since independence has been how to obtain legal recognition of its borders to protect much of what it gained from post-World War II territorial changes. This was finally achieved in May and June 1997, when Russia and Romania signed border treaties with Ukraine, although this was by no means the end of the matter for the Russian Duma (lower house of parliament) proved reluctant to ratify the treaty, while in the case of the Romanian-Ukrainian treaty, the question of the continental shelf off Serpent Island was deferred for further negotiation, and if the two sides do not reach an agreement within two years, it will go to arbitration.⁵ As a weak state with a somewhat precarious sovereignty, Ukraine must continue to seek ties with more influential actors and institutions that share similar economic and political ideologies so as to protect the agreements that have already been reached.

The Negative Sovereignty Dilemma

Negative sovereignty is a condition typical of states which have recently achieved independence and been recognised as sovereign entities by other international actors. It may be defined as freedom from outside interference in a state's internal

⁵ As explained to this author in October 1998 by a member of NATO's Political Affairs Division.

affairs. It is a formal legal condition or entitlement, and is the legal foundation upon which a society of independent and formally equal states fundamentally rests.⁶ States with negative sovereignty are, for the most part, in the throes of economic, political, or social transition, and their precarious domestic situation imposes constraints on their international relations. Nevertheless, they are sovereign as regards their internal affairs, and thus must be accorded due respect in accordance with international law.

One may also think of independence and non-intervention as the 'distinctive and reciprocal rights and duties of an international social contract between states – when it is held it is held absolutely in the sense that it is not dependent on any conditions... and only requires observance and forbearance'.⁷

Positive sovereignty, conversely, can be described as 'freedom to' as opposed to the 'freedom from' (negative sovereignty) - being active and self-directing, choosing, pursuing and realising goals. It also points towards the acquisition and enjoyment of capacities, and not just immunities, because it postulates agents and conditions that are enabling. Positive sovereignty presupposes capabilities that enable governments to be their own masters, and is a substantive rather than a formal condition. A positively sovereign government is one that not only enjoys the rights of non-intervention and other international immunities, but one that is in the position to provide political goods to its citizens. Moreover, it describes a government that can collaborate with other governments in defence of alliances and similar international and regional arrangements, and reciprocate in international commerce and finance. According to Jackson, positive sovereignty is the means which enable states to take advantage of their independence, which is usually indicated by able and responsible rulers and productive and loyal citizens.8 Positive sovereignty is the distinctive, overall feature of a developed state, and is not a legal but a political attribute, if political is understood to include sociological, economic, technological, psychological, and wherewithal to declare, implement, and enforce public policy both domestically and internationally.9

Ukraine can be considered to be a negatively sovereign state, according to the above definition. The Ukrainian state achieved negative sovereignty under international law the moment its independence was recognised by the international community. Ukraine has the right of non-intervention, or 'freedom from' outside encroachment. However, since Ukraine is in the throes of political and serious economic transition, its government is actively seeking the assistance of external actors, and hence voluntarily relinquishing some measure of control over its internal policy-making as a trade-off for the attainment of international assistance. A case in point is the prescriptive approach taken by Western international financial organisations such as the IMF and World Bank when they consider loans to applicant

⁶ See G. Schwarzenberger and E. D. Brown, *A Manual of International Law*, 6th edition (London, 1976), pp. 54–5.

⁷ Robert Jackson, *Quasi States: Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Third World* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 27.

⁸ Jackson, p. 29.

⁹ Schwarzenberger and Brown, op. cit., pp. 52 and 564.

states such as Ukraine. Stringent prerequisites, based on the Western-style approach to dealing with economic crises, are attached to such loans. Moreover, the economic decrees recently initiated by President Kuchma were intended to convince international financial institutions that the government was working towards real economic reforms, although at that time tougher reforms were unpopular.

Another example of Ukraine's negative sovereignty is the decision of the Ukrainian government to halt its negotiations with Iran over the proposed sale of turbines for the building of an Iranian nuclear station. This decision was taken just after the visit of US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright to Kyiv in March 1998 to discuss with President Kuchma Ukraine's pending arrangements with Iran, a country 'unfriendly' to the US.¹⁰ As a result, Ukraine suffered an economic loss by terminating the deal with Iran, but hoped to receive some kind of compensation from Western governments.

But what does this negative sovereignty situation mean for the Ukrainian government and its manoeuvrability in terms of policy-making? What does the discourse reveal about the connection between Ukraine's negative sovereignty dilemma and its lack of determinacy in foreign and security policy. Ukraine is in a particularly difficult situation; it receives much attention from the West both on account of its geopolitical position in the newly emerging security architecture in Europe, and for its potential for economic and political instability. The former may be termed positive attention, and the latter, negative. In terms of its unique geopolitical position. Ukraine has been successful in negotiating several foreign and security policy agreements, ranging from various border settlements with its neighbours to a special Charter with NATO which gives it specific recognition as an important component in future security arrangements in Europe. Yet, Ukraine is often projected in the foreign media as unstable in economic terms (due to the slow progress with reforms aimed at transition to a market economy), and in political terms on account of the Communist majority in the Rada and the inability of the executive and legislative branches to work together to implement the necessary reforms.

These different approaches have contributed to Ukraine's apparent lack of determinacy in its foreign and security policy making, since the Ukrainian government is not always able to ascertain the West's position on key economic and political matters which could affect its ability to defend its sovereignty and independence. For example, during US Vice President Al Gore's recent trip to Kyiv, he declined to endorse an international loan package on the grounds that Ukraine needs to implement further economic reforms. Ukraine was hoping for US political support for the pending loan from the IMF, whose representatives were in Kyiv at that time for negotiations. Kuchma commented to reporters after the meeting saying that Ukraine has done the best it realistically could, and thus deserves the loan.¹¹ Furthermore, he has repeatedly warned of economic catastrophe without international financial support.

¹⁰ RFE/RL Newsline, 6 March 1998.

¹¹ Daniel Williams, 'Gore declines to back Ukrainian loan appeal', *The Washington Post Foreign Service*, 23 July 1998, p. A26.

After much speculation in the media, the IMF finally announced that its team would recommend the approval of a \$2.2 billion low-interest loan to Ukraine. In August, the IMF Board of Directors announced that the initial tranche of \$200–250 million would be released immediately. Yet, as always, the continued release of this loan is subject to Kyiv living up to the terms of the agreement, and Ukraine has a history of falling out of line with IMF conditions. The most recent was in March 1998, when a \$542 million tranche was suspended due to the lack of progress in economic reforms.¹² Ukraine cannot seek to pursue a confident and absolute *Westpolitik* without some definite evidence of Western support for Ukrainian reforms. Any other course simply should not be expected of the Ukrainian government and indeed of a negatively sovereign state.

Other Contributing Factors to Ukraine's Lack of Determinacy

Ukraine's multi-directional approach to foreign and security policy-making

Since independence, and particularly since 1994, the Ukrainian government has pursued a fairly ambitious approach in its external relations. Ukraine has had at least three clear goals in its external relations: to deepen ties with key Western institutions and actors, to normalise relations with Russia, and to establish itself as a Central European state. Yet these goals may well be incompatible, i.e. normalisation of relations with Russia might not be realised if Ukraine is viewed by Moscow as a Central European state, detached from the former Soviet Union. But, nonetheless, Ukraine is compelled to continue with this multi-directional approach, which at times will appear to teeter more in one direction rather than another, depending on both internal and external developments.

Ukraine's partnership with NATO

Ukraine's short-term goals for its partnership with NATO may be summarised in three points: 1) active participation in all Partnership for Peace (PfP) and Euro-Atlantic Cooperation Council (EAPC) activities that do not require membership; 2) implementation of the *Charter on a Distinctive Partnership Between NATO and Ukraine*, which was signed at the Madrid Summit, raising it *de facto* to the level of the Russia-NATO Founding Act; and 3) assurances that membership of NATO at a later date is not ruled out.¹³ It can safely be stated that Kyiv has been successful in achieving these goals on a broad scale. Ukraine's activities within NATO's Partnership for Peace are becoming more numerous and detailed, even in the face of Russian objections. Moreover, Ukraine has successfully concluded its own specific charter with NATO, but only in the course of time will the actual value of this document from a Western perspective be revealed. Whether or not the West

 ¹² Volodomyr Zolotnycky, 'IMF support eases Ukrainian debt crisis', *The Kyiv Post*, 4 August 1998, p. 1.
 ¹³ Tor Bukkvoll, *Ukraine and European Security* (London: The Royal Institute of International Affairs, Chatham House, 1997), p. 365.

truly considers Ukraine to be its 'strategic partner' cannot be said for certain at this time. Moreover, the door to NATO in theory remains open to Ukraine and the other states not included in the first enlargement, but again external developments such as NATO-Russia relations will have a hand in Ukraine's potential membership in the Alliance.

Due to the unpredictability of future regional developments in Eastern and Southern Europe and also in relations between Russia and the West, it is unrealistic to expect that Western policy-makers would state unequivocally that Ukraine will in the future be a welcome member of all European and Transatlantic institutions. But without clear statements of this kind and evidence that NATO partners take seriously the new Charter with Ukraine, and until the Ukrainian economy begins to show considerable improvement, this trend of lack of determinacy is likely to continue.

Relations with Russia/CIS

A major foreign policy priority for Kyiv is the establishment of positive relations with the east – Russia and the Caucasian and Central Asian republics. But major differences are evident between President Kuchma and his predecessor, Leonid Kravchuk, in their dealings with Russia and the CIS. Although both leaders were committed to Ukrainian statehood and independence, Kuchma's 'pragmatism' has replaced the 'romanticism' of Kravchuk. Kuchma has preferred to treat Russia less like an adversary and more like a business partner, in which a partnership built on cooperation, trust, and mutual respect is likely to bring about positive economic (as well as political) changes. But, at the same time, he has refused to bow to Russian pressures, for example, regarding joining the Tashkent Collective Security Agreement, or other suggestions put forward by the Russian government for closer political or military ties within the CIS framework.

Although 'normalisation' is a term used so often to describe the trend in Russian-Ukrainian relations, it should not be forgotten that Russia still exerts a considerable amount of economic and political leverage over the Ukrainian government. For example, Ukraine is dependent on Russia for oil and gas supplies, and by October 1998 had an outstanding debt of almost US \$1 billion to Russia's oil and gas firms. In terms of political leverage, one may cite the example of the Duma's reluctance to ratify the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Partnership, which affirms the 'immunity of existing borders' between the two states. The three intergovernmental agreements on the Black Sea Fleet (BSF), signed on 28 May 1997,¹⁴ are of key importance to the normalisation of relations between these two countries, and the fact that over a year has passed since the signing and the Duma has delayed ratification is significant.

As we have already noted, Ukraine prefers direct bilateral relations with its CIS neighbours. At present there is a CIS working party, drafting proposals for a fundamental reform of CIS structures; the Ukrainian members of this advocate a drastic reduction in areas of cooperation at the supranational level.¹⁵ They propose exclud-

¹⁴ The Verkhovna Rada ratified the agreements on 14 January 1998 by a vote of 317 to 27.

¹⁵ Ukraine is itself not a full member of the CIS organisation, having never signed its Charter.

ing from such cooperation political, military, border protection, military-technical, humanitarian, legal, exchange of information, ecology, and collective security issues. Instead, they want to reduce the CIS to a mechanism for economic cooperation, whose structures would not duplicate those of other European and international bodies, or hinder the integration of CIS member countries into those bodies.¹⁶

The Ukrainian leadership appears to realise that closer economic cooperation with its CIS neighbours is one way of ensuring an increase in Ukrainian trade and exports, and hence helping to overcome the current economic crisis. When economic reforms become more evident, Ukraine will be able to demonstrate to Western states and organisations that it should be considered a stable Central European country, worthy of economic and political support, and possibly resulting in eventual membership in Western institutions.

Relations with key regional actors

Immediately after the declaration of independence, Ukraine began to strive vigorously for international recognition of its geopolitical identity as a Central European state. It still keeps up these efforts, and, in placing great emphasis on its relations with Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Romania, Ukraine has shown itself eager to be seen as a Central European nation within the larger European continent. The Ukrainian government has hoped that this would lead to a recognition of its independence, national borders, and territorial integrity, distancing itself from Russia, and a diversification of its international ties. Moreover, neighbouring states were seen as the 'gateway to the West', and Kyiv has counted on their support in its efforts to establish links with Western Europe. It therefore should come as no surprise that Ukraine has placed and still places great importance on friendly relations with the front-runners for NATO and EU membership.¹⁷

Yet, at the same time, Ukraine's neighbours saw it in their national interests to bolster ties with Kyiv, with the recognition that an independent and stable Ukraine served their larger interests in regional security. This resulted in several treaties of friendship as well as border agreements. During 1992 and 1993, three bilateral political treaties on friendly relations and cooperation between Ukraine and its neighbours were signed: the Ukrainian-Polish Treaty (1992) and the Ukrainian-Hungarian and Ukrainian-Slovak Treaties (1993). These renounced mutual territorial claims, recognised the inviolability of existing borders, and guaranteed the rights of existing minorities. The agreements between Ukraine and Poland, Hungary, and Slovakia have formed the basis for the development of positive political and economic relations in the region.

Ukraine and Russia finally concluded an agreement on friendship and cooperation in May 1997, which recognised Crimea as Ukrainian territory, while leasing the Black Sea port of Sevastopol to Russia for 20 years (open to renewal).

¹⁶ 'Ukrainian reform proposals could scupper CIS', RFE/RL Daily Newsline, 23 July 1998.

¹⁷ Oleksandr Pavliuk, 'Ukraine and regional co-operation in Central and Eastern Europe', *Security Dialogue*, 1997, vol. 28, no. 3, p. 348.

This was an historic achievement for Ukraine, since it finally settled the debate over the control of Crimea. Moreover, in June 1997, Ukraine concluded a border agreement with Romania, the last of the contiguous states which posed a threat to its territorial integrity.

The Ukrainian government appears to recognise the importance of reliable regional partners, yet, at times, Western interference has influenced the foreign policy stance of some of these states. For example, the prospects of NATO and EU enlargement have had a profound impact on regional ties, since certain states are uncertain as to which policies would put them on the 'fast track' to NATO and EU membership. Should they concentrate their efforts on fulfilling the criteria for membership in these organisations, or should they look to their neighbours for support in terms of regional organisations (like CEFTA), or to bilateral agreements aimed at the promotion of stability? Western policies can be obscure, indeterminate, and counter-productive as regards the development of regional ties in East-Central Europe, and can also skew the policies of states such as Ukraine in a manner that makes some government policies appear to lack determinacy.

Is Ukraine's Foreign and Security Policy becoming more Determined?

Former Ukrainian Foreign Minister Hennadiy Udovenko once described Ukrainian foreign policy as coherent and predictable. However, it is precisely the absence of these traits that strikes foreigners attempting to analyse Kyiv's foreign and security policies in the international arena. On the other hand, since the spring of 1997, Kyiv has pursued a steady trend of orienting itself towards integration in European and transatlantic organisations.

In his public speeches, President Kuchma has on numerous occasions made it clear that Ukraine is trying to move closer to Europe, and out of the Russian sphere of influence. Perhaps this shift can be partly attributed to the Foreign Minister, Borys Tarasyuk, who, in April 1998, on receiving word of his nomination, stated that he would do everything he could to help integrate Ukraine into European and transatlantic structures, and to strengthen the country's independence by means of foreign policy.¹⁸ Tarasyuk is clearly pro-Europe, being a former ambassador to the BENELUX countries, as well as the former head of Ukraine's mission to NATO in Brussels.

In July 1998, at a conference in Berlin, Tarasyuk pressed for Ukraine to receive associate membership in the EU, stating that, 'Ukraine still hopes to draw closer to the European Union, with membership the ultimate goal'.¹⁹ Although Ukraine was refused associate status in June and again in November 1998, Kyiv is still pushing for a clear political signal about joining the organisation. Wanting to keep the momentum going, the Foreign Minister made a two-day visit to Washington

¹⁸ 'Ukrainian President appoints new Foreign Minister', *RFE/RL Daily Newsline*, 17 April 1998, taken from ITAR-TASS.

¹⁹ Rostislav Pavlenko and Jaroslav Koshiw, 'Tarasyuk pushes EU associate membership', *The Kytv Post*, 7 July 1998, p. 2.

for talks with US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright about both US-Ukrainian relations and Ukraine's efforts to join the EU.

At the outset, it appeared that Tarasyuk has been equally successful in formulating a basis for the continuance of positive relations with Russia. After his meeting with his Russian counterpart Yevgeniy Primakov in May 1998, it was reported that they had reached a 'complete understanding', and that 'both sides managed to agree even on those issues that had earlier been a stumbling block in [their countries'] relations'. Both sides had shown a constructive approach and good will in discussing bilateral relations.²⁰ However, following NATO Secretary General Solana's visit to Kyiv, the Ukrainian Foreign Ministry's statements once again put relations with Moscow under strain. Tarasyuk stated that NATO poses no threat to Ukraine's national security, and that its eastward enlargement is seen as the expansion of a zone of stability and security, which is in Ukraine's interests.²¹ But why was Tarasyuk appointed in the first place, unless a pro-Western movement was already on the cards? And can we assume that Tarasyuk's presence as a high-ranking official means a lasting movement towards Europe?

Being a strategic partner with all of its neighbours might seem an attractive strategy for Ukraine, but it is inappropriate and unrealistic in the post-Communist era. Ukraine's neighbours to the West have pinned their hopes on integration into NATO and the EU, and the most successful of them are only a few months away from membership in NATO and well on the way to the EU. What this will mean for Kyiv is an added strain on the development of ties, at least along economic lines, with the Central European states, since Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, for example, will be preoccupied with bringing their countries up to Western standards. This will also mean that Ukraine will be faced with trade barriers as a non-member and non-aligned country, putting Kyiv precisely in the position it fears most: behind a new economic and strategic 'iron curtain'.²²

Moreover, on the domestic level the Ukrainian government has yet to develop a coherent policy towards the West, as the legislative and executive branches have in general been unable to work together for the good of the Ukrainian state. With a Communist majority in the Rada, and many powerful forces working against Kuchma in the legislature in the run-up to the 1999 Presidential elections, it is unclear whether this apparent pro-Western trend can and will continue.

Is the West's Attitude to Ukraine Changing?

Western policy-makers and analysts have on frequent occasions made reference to Ukraine as a strategic cornerstone of European security, a keystone in the arch of a secure and stable Europe,²³ an East-West pivot, and a potential bridge to positive East-West relations. Ukraine was the first state from the former Soviet Union

²⁰ 'Tarasyuk, Primakov reach "complete understanding", and 'Russia says "positive dynamics" in relations with Ukraine', *RFE/RL Daily Newsline*, 27 May 1998.

²¹ 'Closer NATO link irks Moscow', The Kyiv Post, 10 July 1998.

²² Rostislav Pavlenko, 'Ukrainian foreign policy setting course', The Kyiv Post, 24 July 1998, p. 8.

²³ See Sherman Garnett, *Keystone in the Arch: Ukraine in the Emerging Security Environment of Central and Eastern Europe* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1997).

to join NATO's Partnership for Peace Programme, and has also participated in joint exercises, including 'The Shield of Peace' (1996), 'Cooperative Neighbour' (1997), and 'Sea Breeze' (1997), which took place on or near Ukrainian soil. But the most significant achievement for Ukraine in its NATO policy has been the signing of the NATO-Ukraine Charter (July 1997). This document encountered virtually no opposition from the participants. Perhaps this is due to the fact that it envisaged that the relationship between NATO and Ukraine would continue to be based on mutual cooperation and respect for each other's roles in European security, and implied no legal or military obligations. The agreement is nonetheless a great psychological achievement, since Ukraine has been given special recognition, similar to that accorded to Russia, which is seemingly proof of NATO's commitment to building a partnership specifically with the Ukrainian government.

President Kuchma, in his opening statement at the NATO Madrid Summit, declared that he was certain that this historic document would demonstrate yet again that a new security architecture, based on openness and partnership, is steadily being constructed on the European continent. Kuchma referred to the importance of developing strong and positive ties between NATO and Russia, saying that he could not refrain from mentioning so important an event in the development of international security as the conclusion of the Russia-NATO Founding Act.²⁴ Furthermore, he stated that 'Ukraine has made its choice and is ready together with the NATO member-countries and the partners of the Alliance to take an active part in the construction of the secure future for Europe... and thus for the whole world'.²⁵

Likewise, during his State-of-the-Union address in January 1998, President Clinton made particular reference to NATO's new partner, Ukraine, and has on various other occasions commented on Ukraine's important strategic position in the emergent security architecture in Europe. Of course, these statements in themselves do not imply any firm security guarantee for Ukraine. Nevertheless, they should not be overlooked, since psychological assurances are of utmost importance during this period of economic and political transition and of state- and nation-building.

During a visit to Kyiv at the beginning of July 1998, NATO Secretary General Javier Solana voiced his support for Ukraine's role in NATO enlargement at a news conference: 'The stability, security, and prosperity [of Europe] is impossible without strong relations between Ukraine and NATO'.²⁶ The Ukrainian Foreign Ministry responded that, 'Ukraine considers NATO an alliance of democratic states which poses no threat to its national security'.²⁷ Solana also praised the opening of the NATO Information and Documentation Centre in Kyiv, the first of its kind in a non-NATO country, which aims to improve Ukrainian understanding of the military alliance.

However, in spite of these noteworthy achievements, Western policy-makers and, in particular, financial institutions have been and remain critical of Ukraine's lack of

27 Ibid.

²⁴ Opening statement by the President of Ukraine, H. E. Leonid Kuchma, at the signing of the NATO-Ukraine Charter, Madrid, 9 July 1997.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Tiffany Carlsen, 'Visiting NATO chief praises Kyiv', The Kyiv Post, 10 July 1998, p. 2.

concrete economic reforms, and the inability of the legislative and executive branches of government to put through the necessary enabling legislation for such reforms. President Kuchma has been very vocal about his difficulties with the Rada, and the lack of support for his economic reform programmes. He has also been adamant about his goal of receiving the pending \$2.5 billion IMF loan, which he believes will help to alleviate the current economic crisis, urging that without it Ukraine is doomed to suffer economic hardships far worse than those currently prevailing. In one interview, he painted a gloomy picture of a stagnant economy hamstrung by fierce internal battles over economic reform. 'Frankly speaking', he said, 'without financial support, we await a catastrophe no less severe than in Russia'.²⁸ He also asked for Ukraine to be compensated for the financial losses incurred when the government cancelled its sale of turbines to Iran, as had been promised at the time.

The West, for the most part, has been unsympathetic to Ukraine's economic hardships, and far too rigid on its criteria for qualifying for the IMF loan. President Kuchma recently claimed that Western aid does not match the rhetoric accorded Ukraine as a hedge against the potential rivalry of Russia, and that too often the role and place of Ukraine has not been fully understood.²⁹ It seems quite clear that the West does not yet fully appreciate the importance of Ukraine; otherwise by now NATO's description of it as a 'strategic partner' would be more than a diplomatic euphemism. However, it will take time to determine exactly how the 'strategic partnership' resulting from the Madrid Summit will take effect. For this reason, the Ukrainian government should not place too much weight on the details of its Charter with NATO, but should rather seek to expand its Western policy with other organisations such as the EU and the OSCE, and also with key individual actors.

Ukraine continues to suffer the constraints associated with negative sovereignty, as has become evident in terms of its lack of determinacy in its external relations. Ukraine is in no position to take full advantage of its independence or to provide much-needed goods to its citizens, since it still has to rely on international support to deal with the economic crises at home. Although the Ukrainian government has exemplified time and again its desire to integrate and work closely with the West, such integration and cooperation seems unlikely to reach the level envisioned by Kyiv for some time. For the immediate future, NATO and the EU will be preoccupied with both internal and enlargement issues. Hence, it will be up to the Ukrainian leadership to deepen ties with key actors in the region, such as Poland, in order to continue normalising relations with Russia, and to demonstrate its worthiness as a key player in the future of European security. Only then will Ukraine be able fully to determine its future foreign and security policy line with confidence and conviction.

History

The First Unified Representation of the Ukrainian People

On the 80th Anniversary of the Labour Congress of Ukraine

Andriy Hoshulyak

I n the history of the national state-building process during the era of the Directory of the Ukrainian National Republic,¹ the Congress of the Working People of Ukraine (to give it its official title) occupies an important place. True, in the works of different historians, one can find diametrically opposed evaluations of it. Several who themselves played an active part in the war for Ukraine's independence were particularly critical, basing their assessments, for the most part, on subjective criteria, first and foremost their own political inclinations. Possibly for this reason, or, more probably, the fact that the Directory lost that war, the history of the Labour Congress and the resolutions it passed have received insufficient attention from historians. This article addresses some little-known aspects of the Congress, focusing particularly on its role in strengthening the sense of Ukrainian national unity.

The successful outcome of the anti-Hetman coup of November-December 1918 faced the Directory with the urgent problem of finding an appropriate form or model for the organisation of state power. On 12–14 December, this issue was discussed at the State Conference in Vinnytsya; participants included, in addition to members of the Directory, representatives of Ukrainian political parties (Socialist Revolutionaries,² Social Democrats,³ Ukrainian Party of Socialists–Independen-

¹ The Directory of the Ukrainian National Republic was a temporary, revolutionary state authority, headed by Volodymyr Vynnychenko (see Note 5), which was set up by the Ukrainian National Union on 14 November 1918, to mastermind the overthrow of Hetman Pavlo Skoropadskyi. The latter, who had been installed as ruler of Ukraine with the help of the Germans, after the armistice of 11 November, could no longer count on their protection. Possibly for this reason, he had, earlier on 14 November, declared a 'federative union' with a future, non-Bolshevik, Russian state. This triggered the uprising against him. As a result, Skoropadskyi abdicated in favour of his council of ministers, which in turn handed over power to the Directory. A new government, the Council of National Ministers of the UNR was established by a decree of the Directory on 26 December 1918, with Volodymyr Che-khivskyi as its chairman.

² Ukrainian Party of Socialist Revolutionaries (UPSR). A national-liberation revolutionary socialist party that played an important role in Ukraine during the revolutionary period of 1917–20.

³ Ukrainian Social Democratic Party (USDP). A socialist workers' party founded in September 1899 by members of the Polish Social Democratic Party of Galicia and Silesia, who had formed a Ukrainian social democratic organisation in Lviv in 1897, and by a minority faction that split away from the Ukrainian Radical Party. tists,⁴ and others). A motion, proposed by Volodymyr Vynnychenko,⁵ was adopted for establishing a system of 'labour councils', consisting of representatives of all elements of society, which did not exploit others' labour. 'In other words', as Vynnychenko pointed out, 'this was to have been a dictatorship not of the proletariat and the prosperous peasantry, but a dictatorship of the working people'.⁶

In the middle of December 1918, a draft declaration was produced, and later published in the Kyiv press, which for the first time set out the Directory's intention to convene a Congress of the Working People of Ukraine. This was to comprise elected representatives of the peasants, the military and working people. After long and bitter discussions in state and party circles, the final text was promulgated on 26 December. By now the projected composition of the future Labour Congress had somewhat changed. Instead of soldiers' representatives, there were to be elected representatives of the 'working intelligentsia', defined as that section of the intellectual community which 'works directly for labouring people, that is: workers in the field of mass education, medical staff, enlightenment, doctors' assistants, organisers of cooperative societies, and persons employed in offices and other institutions'.⁷

The Directory's declaration stressed that the 'Congress of the Working People of Ukraine shall have all the supreme rights and plenipotentiary powers to resolve all the issues of social, economic and political life of the Republic'.⁸ It was regarded as a revolutionary representation of the organised working masses and was viewed as a temporary proto-parliament for Ukraine. The Declaration outlined the basic principles for election to the Labour Congress. It noted that the Congress would not be convened according to 'a full-fledged formula of elections, to which it [wa]s impossible to adhere at this time'. In the future, when peace was restored, it was to have been replaced by representatives of the working masses, elected on the basis of a full-fledged system of election, that is by a Founding Meeting.⁹

On 5 January 1919, an 'Instruction' on the election to the Labour Congress was issued, signed by all the members of the Directory. This stipulated representation, the rules for election of deputies to the Congress, the order of voting. The elections were to have been held on the basis of curias, each of which consisted of the members of a specific social group (workers, peasants, intelligentsia) in a given territory. Suffrage was granted to all citizens of the UNR who had reached

⁹ Ibid.

⁴ Ukrainian Party of Socialists–Independentists (UPSS). A small nationalist party founded in Kyiv on 30 December 1917 by members of the former Ukrainian People's Party and by senior officers of the Army of the UNR.

⁵ Volodymyr Vynnychenko (1880–1951). Writer, statesman and politician. In 1917, while being the leader of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party (USDRP) he was elected one of the two vicepresidents of the Central Rada, and subsequently head of the General Secretariat, the government of Ukraine. Under the Hetman government which followed, he led the opposition Ukrainian National Union, and then (from its inception on 14 November 1918) until February 1919, the Directory of the Ukrainian National Republic.

⁶ V. Vynnychenko, Vidrodzhennya natsiyi (Kyiv, 1990), part 3, p. 141.

⁷ Konstytutsiyni akty Ukrayiny 1917–1920. Nevidomi konstytutsiyi Ukrayiny (Kyiv, 1992), p. 102.

⁸ Ibid.

the age of 21 (with the exception of persons deprived of civil rights by the verdict of a court, and those serving in the army of the UNR). In view of the great services rendered by railway and postal workers during the anti-Hetman coup, they were accorded a special representation. A special representation was also accorded for the Western-Ukrainian National Republic (ZUNR),¹⁰ which was of major significance for reinforcing the sense of unity of the Ukrainian lands. According to the Directory's plans, the Labour Congress was to have opened on 19 January 1919 in Kyiv. This allowed only two weeks to prepare for and hold the elections, which was obviously not enough. But the current course of the war for independence meant that no longer time-span could be allowed.

Territory	Peasants	Workers	Working Intelligentsia	Total
Kyiv region	50	12	5	67
Podillya	47	8	4	59
Kharkiv region	50	11	4	65
Kherson region	37	11	4	52
Volhynia Chernihiv	46	10	4	60
region	42	9	3	54
Poltava region Katerynoslav	46	8	4	58
region	31	12	3	46
Tavriya	14	3	1	18
Kholm region, Pidlyashshya, Polissya district All-Ukrainian	14	4	1	19
Railway				
Congress All-Ukrainian		20	-	20
Postal Congress		10		10
Total	377	118	33	528
ZUNR (Galicia, Bukovyna,				
Hungary)		_	_	65
Total		-	-	593 ¹¹

The representation to the Congress from the territories and curias was as follows:

¹⁰ Western-Ukrainian National Republic (ZUNR). A nation-state established on the Ukrainian ethnic territory of former Austria-Hungary on 19 October 1918 by the Ukrainian National Rada in Lviv.
¹¹ M. Shapoval, *Velyka revolvutsiya i ukrayinska vyzvolna probrama* (Prague, 1928), p. 128.

Thus, it was originally planned to elect 593 delegates, and this is the number always quoted by historians. But it is not correct, since it overlooks a number of amendments which the Directory made a few days later, and the Supplement to the Instruction for the elections to the Labour Congress. The Supplement envisaged adding to the total number of deputies a further 14 from the Khotyn, Akkerman and Sorokskyi districts of the former Bessarabia *guberniya*, settled by Ukrainians. The commissar of the Mohyliv-Podilskyi district of the Bessarabian *guberniya* was made responsible for organising the elections in these districts. Elections were also to be held in other parts of Ukraine not included in the system of districts and *guberniyas*.¹²

The idea of the Labour Congress received wide public support. The press carried regular reports on the progress of the elections in various regions. Nevertheless, the prevailing emergency conditions meant that everything was done in great haste. In some regions there was neither time nor favourable conditions for a proper election campaign. But all the same, as a result of the extreme situation, they were conducted hurriedly. A significant part of Ukraine was under enemy occupation, and no elections could be held there at all. Hence it proved impossible to have the planned amount of over 600 delegates to the Congress. Furthermore, on the very eve of its opening, there was a bitter dispute over what would constitute a quorum. As a result, the opening of the Congress had to be postponed several times, that is from 19 January to 20 January, then to 22, and finally to 23 January.

It is possibly for this reason that different historians give different dates for the opening of the Congress. Some, including such authoritative figures as Mykyta Shapoval,¹³ Matviy Stakhiv,¹⁴ et al state that it opened on 22 January 1919. However, the general consensus is that it began on 23 January – and this would appear to be the correct date. Two contemporary scholars, O. and M. Kopelenko, have tried to reconcile the discrepancy by asserting that: 'In principle, either of these dates can be accepted, since the formal opening of the Congress took place on 23 January, the various inter-factional discussions and meetings of the "Councils of Elders" began earlier'.¹⁵ But it is not easy to accept this explanation. We may note that the inter-factional consultations and meetings of the 'Council of Elders' seem to have begun on 21 January, or even earlier. But none of these dates can be regarded as the proper opening.

Moreover, the capital's newspaper *Nash put* (evening edition on 23 January 1919), citing a source in the government of the UNR, informed its readers that the 'opening of the Labour Congress did not take place on 22 January, solely for technical reasons'. Neither the Directory nor the Council of Ministers exerted any pres-

¹² Narodna volya, 1919, 16 January.

¹³ Mykyta Shapoval (1882–1932). Political and civic leader and publicist. He was the co-organiser of the Ukrainian Party of Socialist Revolutionaries and head of its central committee. He was a member of the Central Rada and Little Rada (1917–18) and became postal and telegraph minister in November 1917. He helped organise the rebellion against Hetman Skoropadskyi in November 1918, and was subsequently minister of lands in the Directory from December 1918 to February 1919.

¹⁴ Matviy Stakhiv (1895–1978). Lawyer, historian, and political leader from Galicia.

¹⁵ O. L. Kopylenko, M. L. Kopylenko, Derzhava i pravo Ukrayiny 1917-1920 (Kyiv, 1997), p. 124.

sure to postpone the Congress. On the contrary, the Directory resolved to grant it full freedom of action. The Congress could freely discuss all aspects of Ukrainian independence. However, the issue of Ukraine's independence itself was a *sine qua non*: the independence of the Ukrainian state, won with the blood of the people, must remain inviolable.¹⁶ This clearly indicates that the leaders of the UNR harboured some doubts about the political direction of the future forum, particularly as the current clash of political ideologies, the course of the civil war, and the escalation of military aggression (first and foremost, Bolshevik Russia and newly re-emergent Poland) made the situation in Ukraine extraordinarily unstable and complex.

It is hardly surprising that in these conditions the UNR leaders placed great hopes on the delegates from the ZUNR, who had come with the aim of a solemn promulgation of an Act of Union of the ZUNR with the UNR. The UNR leaders saw the West Ukrainian delegates as a consolidated and dependable force as regards nation and state. Hence on 19 January, during its first meeting with the presidium of the ZUNR delegation, the Directory proposed that the whole 36-member West Ukrainian delegation, should take part in the Labour Congress with full voting rights. This was in spite of the fact that in Galicia there had been no elections to the Congress, and the delegation from the ZUNR did not have a mandate from the Ukrainian National Rada¹⁷ to take part in it. Following a special discussion of this issue, the ZUNR delegation unanimously resolved to participate fully in the Labour Congress. The 'delegation's decision', wrote Stakhiv, 'raised the Directory's spirits considerably since it was very worried about the way the election of delegates to the Congress had turned out'.¹⁸

To date, the total number of delegates who eventually took part in the Labour Congress has not been definitively established. Pavlo Khrystyuk¹⁹ and several other scholars consider that there were no more than 300 participants. However, many scholars, including the Kopylenkos, put the figure at close to 400. Matviy Stakhiv in his fundamental work wrote that when the Congress opened there were exactly 400 delegates.²⁰ Some authors seem to confuse desideratum and fact, and simply cite the number of delegates laid down in the Instruction of 5 January 1919, namely 593. In our opinion, however, the estimate of nearly 400 delegates

16 Nash put, 1919, 23 January.

¹⁷ Ukrainian National Rada. A council formed in Lviv on 18 October 1918 to represent the Ukrainian ethnic territories within the Austro-Hungarian Empire in their quest for self-determination. Its membership included all Ukrainian deputies in both houses of the Austrian parliament and the diets of Galicia and Bukovyna, 3 representatives from each Ukrainian political party in the two crown lands, a group of non-partisan specialists, and selected deputies from counties and towns. Several seats were also reserved for national minorities.

¹⁸ M. Stakhiv, Ukrayina v dobi Dyrektoriyi UNR, vol. 3 (Scranton, 1963), p. 15.

¹⁹ Pavlo Khrystyuk (1880-?). Cooperative organiser, political figure, and publicist. During the revolutionary period he was a leading member of the central committees of the UPSR and the Peasant Association. He served as a deputy of the Central Rada and a member of the Little Rada, general chancellor in the first UNR government (1917–18), led by Volodymyr Vynnychenko, minister of internal affairs and later state secretary (from the end of February 1918) in Vsevolod Holubovych's UNR government, and deputy minister of internal affairs in Isaak Mazepa's UNR government (1919).

20 Ibid., p. 17

is probably close, although the issue undoubtedly demands further detailed investigation.

As mentioned above, the Labour Congress opened on 23 January 1919 in the Kyiv Opera House. It began, however, not at 2 p.m., as had been originally planned, but at 4.45 p.m., since faction meetings were in progress right up to that time. In his opening speech, Volodymyr Vynnychenko stated that the Directory had done everything in its power to ensure the best possible conditions for the Congress to convene.

We are not responsible for the fact that it was impossible to assemble all the representatives from the whole of Ukraine as should have been. But I think that those assembled here have the fullest possible authority to speak on behalf of the working people of Ukraine and to decide their destiny.²¹

After the head of the Directory had spoken, the delegates proceeded to elect a presidium of the Congress. The bloc of left-wing, destructively-minded representatives boycotted the voting. After failing to elect a chairman of the presidium, the Congress elected three vice-chairmen: Dmytro Odryna (a Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionary from the Peasant Association), Tymofey Starukh (from a bloc of Galician parties), Semen Vityk (a member of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party in Galicia). They also elected V. Zlotchanskyi (Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party), S. Bachynskyi (a Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionary from the Peasant Association), L. Havrylyuk (Russian Party of Socialist Revolutionaries), Mykola Voronyi (Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party [Independentists]), and I. Bisk (Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party) as secretaries. Owing to a split of the largest of the factions – the Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionaries – it proved impossible to elect a chairman of the Congress; hence it was chaired by Semen Vityk, a Galician Social Democrat who possessed a wealth of experience of parliamentary activities in the Austrian parliament, and as vice-president of the Ukrainian National Rada.

The fundamental issue of the first day was the ratification of the Acts of Union of the UNR and ZUNR. After outlining their immense significance, Vityk stressed, with considerable vehemence, the need for consolidation and a united front of the workers of all the lands of Ukraine in the fight for full social and national liberation. After that, the secretary of the ZUNR delegation Stepan Vytytskyi read out the Proclamation of the Ukrainian National Rada of 3 January 1919 on the union of the ZUNR with the UNR, and Labour Congress secretary Zlotchanskyi read the Universal of the Directory of 22 January 1919 on the union of the ZUNR and UNR into a single unified state.

With profound attention, the participants stood to listen to these very significant historical documents. Then the head of the ZUNR delegation Bachynskyi spoke. 'The age-old dreams by which the finest sons of the Ukrainian people lived have now become a reality', he said.

The Directory wrote these words in its solemn Universal, which declares the union of the two Ukrainian Republics. A single Ukrainian National Republic has been created.

We Ukrainians of Galicia, Bukovyna and Hungarian Rus' particularly welcome this moment. We have been waiting for it to come to pass as quickly as possible. The realisation of our dream became possible once those states which had been the prisons of their peoples began to fall apart, but until now in Ukraine the conditions and situation offered no possibility to effect this union. Now, with the Ukrainian National Republic headed by the Directory, which has given its guarantee that Ukraine will be an independent state and that there will be established in it a situation and system in which the working people can have a good life, we have come to ask to be accepted as part of a single United Ukraine. The High Directory has acceded to our request and issued a universal which we shall keep forever in our heart and about which we shall tell our grandchildren and children. We hope that the Congress, too, will accept our petition to be part of it forever.²²

The reply on behalf of Central Ukraine was given by M. Lyubynskyi, who formerly had been foreign minister of the UNR during the Central Rada period (1917–18): 'When brother meets brother after a long separation', he said,

then he is overcome with emotion and cannot speak. But I, in welcoming you on behalf of Central Ukraine, fight down my heartfelt emotions and direct them to the seat of reason. When [brothers] meet, they greet one another. I shall begin by saying: greetings to you [applause].

Neither the sound of cannons, nor the blood of war could numb our feeling so much that we could not appreciate the festal nature of this day. On the contrary, the blood of war and fratricidal conflict has forced us to listen more closely to the voice of brotherly union, and he, who has waited long ages for this day, knows well how long we have dreamed of this, of which and only today can we speak aloud. This dream has been handed down from generation to generation since the moment when we were divided. This dream, however, lived, like a fire, in our hearts and the hearts of our forefathers. But it was not only national sentiment, not only a single ethnography which united us. While we were divided, centuries rolled by, and culture lowered, but our people, divided by a border, remained true to the same culture. We were waiting for the moment of unification.²³

In conclusion, Lyubynskyi expressed his confidence that once Ukraine was established as a united, neutral and working Republic, then no eagles would perch on its trident, whether single- or double-headed, black or white.

The next speaker was Tymofey Starukh, the delegate from the Galician peasants, who was a member of the Congress Presidium.

In your applause, we can see that we have one thought – union must be achieved; that we are all of one mind, that Ukraine united and whole should live and develop, that it will be one body, which no-one will be able to tear apart. ... When we came to union, we were not steered by anything other than the thought of living with you in a single destiny, other than the thought that the Ukrainian people should live united.²⁴

After this, Vityk as Chairman formally asked the participants whether the Congress members agreed with both Acts of Central and Western Ukraine. All those present, save for a handful of Russian Social Democrats, rose to their feet as a sign of

²² Robitnycha bazeta, 1919, 26 January.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid.

consent. Thus the Labour Congress almost unanimously ratified the Act of Union of the ZUNR and the UNR, giving it a legal juridical character.

At this point, the first day of the Congress ended. At 5.50 p.m., the chairman adjourned the meeting.

The principal task of the Labour Congress for the following days was to define the fundamental principles of internal and foreign policy, and the form of the state system of the UNR. All these and other matters of principle provoked bitter conflicts between the various party factions at the Congress. The largest such was the UPSR, but this split into various fragments right at the beginning of the Congress. The next in number of mandates was the USDRP. The UPSS had a sizeable representation, and the UPSF a considerably smaller one. Other parties were very weakly represented. The bloc consisting of social democrats, the group of delegates of the ZUNR, delegates from the Peasant Party and part of the faction of Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionaries commanded a compact constructive majority, which ultimately determined the decisions ratified by the Congress.

On 24 January, the Congress held no plenary sessions, since the entire day was taken up by meetings of the various factions. The next plenary session was on 25 January. This heard reports from the Directory and Government, presented, respectively, by Vynnychenko and Volodymyr Chekhivskyi. These were followed by speeches from the Minister for Military Affairs, Oleksander Hrekov, and other ministers. The following day, various other ministers spoke, as well as Supreme Otaman Symon Petlyura²⁵ and the commander of the Corps of Sich Riflemen Yevhen Konovalets.²⁶ The latter two addresses revealed what a critical situation Ukraine was in, owing to the aggression of Soviet Russia. To constructively-minded faction leaders it became ever-clearer that very little time remained for protracted and, unfortunately, sometimes fruitless discussions. Hence a meeting of heads of factions agreed that the speeches given in plenary sessions should not be discussed, and that these sessions should henceforth be confined to faction's statements of their principles and aims, and proposals for establishing constitutional order for the UNR.

On 26 January, the delegates heard declarations, statements and draft resolutions from various factions, in particular from the UPSP (central tendency), the Bund, Socialists-Federalists, Independentists-Socialists, the professional association of railway and postal workers, the ZUNR delegation, Russian Socialist-Revolutionaries, and Russian Social-Democrats.

The majority of the factions demonstrated a profound concern with the situation in the country, expressed confidence in the Directory, and spoke in favour of a democratic parliamentary model of a state system. For example, Tymofey Starukh, a representative of the Galician peasantry and a member of the Congress presidium, stressed in his speech that 'For six centuries, frontiers separated us. We

²⁵ Symon Petlyura (1879–1926). Statesman and publicist; supreme commander of the UNR army and President of the Directory of the UNR.

²⁶ Colonel Yervhen Konovalets (1891–1938). Military commander in the UNR army, and political leader of the Ukrainian nationalist movement.

suffered in servitude and a whole sea of blood had to be spilt for the dismembered lands to be united with their mother – Ukraine'. Having pointed out that the fight for statehood had not been waged without mistakes, he urged that,

This is not the time for party quarrels, when the enemy is standing on our threshold. The Labour Congress should state that it is prepared to stand forth in solidarity and with force in defence of the working people... Let us leave party quarrels, for we need to defend the country. This is no time to speak of changing the Directory, we should be expressing full confidence in its work. This is no time to be holding meetings – that is a matter for the future. Let us now wind up the Congress, go to the villages, and raise an army that is both disciplined and fearsome...²⁷

In conclusion, Starukh read out a declaration from the peasantry of Western Ukraine. In view of the political importance of the time, and the uncertain military and domestic situation of the UNR, this proposed, in particular, 1) to express full confidence in the Directory of the Ukrainian National Republic, and give it a mandate to continue in the future as the supreme authority in the UNR; 2) to close the Session of the Labour Congress and mandate the Directory to convene, as soon as the statehood, territory and peace of Ukraine are ensured, an All-Ukrainian national assembly on the basis of universal, equal, simple, secret and proportional suffrage; 3) to express support for compulsory military service and the immediate raising of a powerful and disciplined army for the defence of the independent working UNR; 4) to abolish large-scale land-ownership, leave small-holdings in private hands, and, bearing in mind that this is the opinion of the peasantry of Central Ukraine, to put on record a separate resolution on this issue relating to Western Ukraine.³⁸

The bitter factional debates on these propositions continued the following day. There were also interfactional negotiations on joint resolutions; as a result, most of the factions of the Ukrainian Party of Socialist Revolutionaries (central tendency) reached agreement with the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party (USDRP) faction on proposing a joint resolution on the principles of the provisional constitution of the UNR.

On its final day, 28 January, the Congress in an overwhelming majority ratified a Law on the Form of Power in Ukraine, based on the aforesaid joint resolution. In it the Directory was given full confidence and thanks for its liberation of the Ukrainian people from aristocratic-hetmanite rule. In view of the dangerous military situation, authority and the defence of the country was accorded to the Directory, whose membership was to be extended to include a representative from Western Ukraine. The mandates of supreme power in Ukraine were to remain with the Directory until the next session of the Labour Congress. It was noted that all legislation, adopted by the Directory prior to the said next session, was subject to eventual ratification by the Labour Congress. Executive power in the UNR was assigned to the Council of National Ministers, formed by the Directory.

This Law noted that the Congress of the Working People of Ukraine opposes the establishment of a workers' dictatorship, and supports a democratic system in the

28 Ibid.

²⁷ Ukravina, 1919, 29/16 January.

UNR. In order to strengthen the democratic system, the government of the UNR in conjunction with the relevant commissions (see below) was to draft a law for elections to a national parliament of the Great United Ukrainian Republic. On the basis of nation-wide elections, new organs of power should be convened in local areas, and until that time, in the interest of national defence, authority there should rest in the hands of commissars appointed by the government of the UNR. These commissars were to work in contact with and under the control of the local labour councils. For drafting legislation in the interval until the next session of the Labour Congress, six commissions were appointed – defence, agrarian affairs, budget, foreign affairs, food supply, culture, and education. The document further stated that

in relation to the occupation of Ukrainian territory by the forces of the states of the Entente, and the Soviet, Polish, Don, volunteer, and Romanian armies, the Congress of the Working People of Ukraine declares its resolute protest against these infringements of the integrity, sovereignty and independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. The Ukrainian people wishes to be neutral and in friendly relations with all other peoples, but it will not suffer any state to use military force to impose its will on the Ukrainian people.³⁹

After adopting the law on state power, the Congress promulgated a Universal [Decree] to the Ukrainian people. This in effect repeated all the fundamental propositions of the said law. An appeal to the nations of the world was likewise adopted.

The military situation was by now rapidly deteriorating (the Red Army had occupied all Ukraine east of the Dnipro and had reached Kyiv), the work of the Congress was 'temporarily' halted, and its delegates went away intent on implementing its resolutions, first and foremost that calling for the mobilisation of the population in defence of their country. But 'temporarily', in fact, turned out to mean 'permanently', since the Congress was never to convene again.

Nevertheless, the Congress was of major significance for the national statebuilding of that era, and the gathering of state-building experience for the future. Particularly valuable is the fact that in spite of Ukraine's difficult domestic situation and extraordinarily complex external conditions, the Congress represented one of Ukraine's first attempts at truly democratic elections, and wide-ranging and free discussion of various courses of national state-building. Today, scholars rightly note that, 'In comparison with the Central Rada, the Congress has more grounds for being regarded as [Ukraine's] proto-parliament since it was formed on the basis of – albeit incomplete – territorial representation'.³⁰

All serious scholars of the subject likewise particularly stress that the Labour Congress personified united Ukraine, and was the first united representation of the Ukrainian people in history.³¹ As regards its role in the legislative endorsement of the Act of Union, this has already been discussed in sufficient detail above.

 ²⁹ P. Khrystyuk, *Zamitky i materialy do istoriyi ukrayinskoyi revolyutsiyi*, vol. 4 (Prague, 1922), p. 67.
 ³⁰ Kopylenko, Kopylenko, op. cit., p. 126.

³¹ See O. Mytsyuk, *Doba Dyrektoriyi UNR. Spomyny i rozdumy* (Lviv, 1938), p. 40; Stakhiv, op. cit., p. 91; Kopylenko, Kopylenko, op. cit., p. 126, et al.

1100th Anniversary of Halych

Volodymyr Baran

On 18–20 September 1998, Ukraine celebrated the 1100th anniversary of Halych, the capital of the mediaeval principality of that name, which included the lands of Galicia and Volhynia. (The very name 'Galicia' is simply a Latinised form derived from the name 'Halych').

The focal point of the celebrations was the unveiling of a statue of the mediaeval prince Danylo Romanovych of Halych, one of the key figures in the history of the Halych principality. The statue stands in the central square of the modern town of Halych, and the President of Ukraine, Leonid Kuchma, delivered an address at the unveiling ceremony.

The celebrations also included a two-day scholarly conference on 'Halych and the Galician Land in the State-Building Processes of Ukraine'. This paid particular attention to the archaeology of Halych and its environs, an academic discipline which, prior to Ukraine's gaining independence in 1991, had on occasion yielded results which by no means accorded with the political preferences of the ruling powers of the time. Since 1991, there has been a new burst of activity in the excavation of the Old Halych site, which, fortunately for the archaeologists, is at some distance from its modern namesake.

The approach of the anniversary triggered a major effort to put the archaeological remains of Halych into a form readily appreciable by the general public. The interior of the Halych Mound – excavated by an archaeological team in 1991–6 (see, *The Ukrainian Review*, vol. 45, no. 3, autumn 1998) – was made safe for tourist access, lighting was installed, and it was provided with replicas of the original artefacts. The mediaeval Metropolitan's palace (which previously had housed a somewhat dreary Soviet-style museum) was refurbished, and the museum completely reorganised to focus on the archaeological and ethnographic artefacts from the Old Halych site and its surroundings. The twelfth-century Church of St Panteleymon, in the nearby village of Shevchenkove, was thoroughly restored.

The first documentary reference to Halych occurs in the Hungarian chronicle collated by an anonymous notary of King Bela II (1131–41), which records that Almos, a leader of the Magyars, stopped in Halych on the way to Pannonia. At its peak of importance, after Prince Roman Mstsyslavovych had united the Volhynian and Halych principalities in 1141, Halych was a large mediaeval city, made up of several distinct districts, surrounded with multiplelines of defences, and dozens of stone churches, various artisans' workshops, market squares, military barracks, and the palaces and mansions of wealthy notables.

This picture of a well-built, well-defended and prosperous capital has been built up on the basis of careful archaeological research. Below, the leader of the present Permanent Halych Archaeological Expedition, Professor Volodymyr Baran, outlines the history of archaeological research at the site and the controversies it engendered.

* * *

F rom the mid-nineteenth century onwards, mediaeval Halych has attracted the attention of antiquaries and enthusiasts for regional history. The first of these was Fr. Antin Petrushevych, a specialist in ecclesiastical history and amateur archaeologist. In the latter capacity, during the 1850s he made groundlevel surveys of the then still-visible ruins of churches and defensive earthworks from the princely era; he also studied the walls and towers of the palatine's castle. In his report on his observations, which he published in the journal *Zorya haly*-

the ukrainian *review*



Fig. 1. Krylos settlement – the stronghold of Princely Halych, 12th–13th c.
1. Halych Mound; 2. Dormition Cathedral; 3. Zolotyi Tik; 4. Tsarynka site; 5. Church of the Annunciation; 6. Nad stinkoyu site.

tska,¹ Petrushevych raised a vital issue, which later turned out to be extremely complex: which of the ruins still visible at that time in Halych and its vicinity was, in reality, the site of princely Halych and its Metropolitan cathedral. (We must point out, straightaway, that this question has still not received a final and definitive answer). Petrushevych considered that Old Halych stood on the site of the contemporary town, with its castle hill and the palatine's castle; the latter, he thought, was built where once the prince's palace had stood. He likewise thought that the Church of the Nativity in modern Halych occupied the site of the (Old Halych) Cathedral of the Mother of God.² Petrushevych propounded this theory vigorously and consistently to the very end of his life.

His immediate successors in the field, likewise amateurs of archaeology, were Isydor Sharanevych, a professor of history at Lviv University, and Lev Lavretskyi, a priest from Zalukva. Together they undertook the first excavations of the ruins of the mediaeval churches still visible in the vicinity. They took a different view of the site of Old Halych.³ Sharanevych located it on the Zalukva plateau. between the rivers Limnytsya (Chechva) and the Dnister, west of present-day Halvch. In 1882, Fr. Lavretskyi carried out excavations on the Zalukva plateau for a whole season and uncovered the remains of the foundations of three stone structures. One of these, at the 'Karpytsya' site, was identified by Sharanevych as the Church of the Holv Redeemer, the second, beside what Yosvp Pelenskyi called the 'Dibrova' wood, was termed the Church of Sts Cyril and Methodius. The remains of the third building – a rotunda – became known in archaeological literature as the 'Polygon'. In 1884, throughout the summer season, Lavretskyi discovered the remains of a further three small churches. These were, firstly, the monastery Church of St Elijah in the 'Prokaliyiv orchard' site on the right bank of the Mozol Brook, the foundations of which, after repeated excavations, Mikhail Karger and Bohdan Tomenchuk eventually brought to the surface. Secondly, at the 'Old Church' site, Lavretskyi discovered the foundations of the Church of the Annunciation, where there was a well-preserved section of floor made of the beautiful glazed tiles which are now known to be specific to Old Halych. The remains of the third church at the 'Old Church' site, beside the road from Zalukva to Chetverky, have not been definitively identified. Sharanevych at first believed them to be the Church of the Annunciation, and later - the Dominican Church of St Anne. At the end of the 1884 season, at the 'Voskresenskvi' (Resurrection) site on the right bank of the Mozol Brook in the Krylos area, Lavretskyi discovered the remains of the foundations of the small Church of the Resurrection, a rotunda which Prof. Volodymyr Antonovych believed to be a tower. (The excavations of Yaroslav Pasternak in 1941 and Yuriy Lukomskyi in 1989 eventually demonstrated that Lavretskvi's identification had been correct).

³ J. Szaraniewicz, *Trzy opisy historyczne staroksiążęcego grodu Halicza w r. 1860, 1880 i 1882* (Lviv, 1883); J. Szaraniewicz, *Rezultaty badań archeologicznych w okolicy Halicza* (Lviv, 1886).

¹ Zorya halytska, Lviv, 1850, no. 55.

² A. Petrushevych, *Istoricheskoe izvestie o tserkvi sv. Panteleymona* (Lviv, 1881), pp. 73–5. A. Petrushevych, *O sobornoy Bogorodichnoy tserkvi v gorodi Galichi proiskhodyashchey iz pervoy poloviny xu stolitiya* (Lviv, 1899).

During the 1880s and 1890s, Oleksander Cholovskyi also took up the study of Old Halych. One can still make out his excavations around the existing (sixteen-th-century) Church of the Dormition in the village of Krylos, in his search for the cathedral. Cholovskyi maintained that this church was proof that it was the Krylos citadel, not the one on the Dnister, which had been the seat of the Rostyslavychi and Romanovychi dynasties of princes of Halych.⁴

Cholovskyi found no traces of the Dormition Cathedral, the site of which remained an open question. His excavations, which he carried out together with Sharanevych, showed that the materials from the foundations of the Krylos church included individual architectural details from an older church. It is now known that these came from the nearby Cathedral of the Dormition, the ruins of which were quarried by the builders of the newer, late-mediaeval church.

A major contribution to the study of the architectural remains of Old Halych was made in the early years of this century by the art historian Yosyp Pelenskyi. He made the first major survey and study of the one more-or-less well preserved mediaeval church in the area, that of St Panteleymon. (This has now been completely restored due to the dedicated work over many years by Academician Ivan Mohytych and his talented team).

Pelenskyi also surveyed the important area between present-day Halych, Krylos and Zalukva. He pointed to a number of sites with ruins, which had not been noted by previous researchers.⁵ In his search for the cathedral, Pelenskyi dug several more trenches around the present church in Krylos, but these yielded no positive results. Nevertheless, in Pelenskyi's opinion,

 \dots the high, tongue-shaped cliff has since the twelfth century been called Krylos... it was... the capital city of the Rus' chronicles and tales of Dluhosh. On it, there stood,... in the middle the largest stronghold – the cathedral Church of the Dormition of the Holy Virgin built from dressed stone...⁶

This assertion, although based essentially on intuition, was later corroborated by the work of the notable Ukrainian archaeologist Yaroslav Pasternak.

We shall return to Pasternak's findings later. First, though, we have to mention the study of Old Halych by the person whom Pasternak described as the '... ardent, amateur-archaeologist Lev Chachkovskyi and his notable assistant, the local medic and later doctor – Yaroslav Khmilevskyi'.⁷ During the period 1921–32, they made a ground-level survey of the whole territory of Old Halych, its suburbs and close vicinity, mapping the locations of fortifications, churches, and barrows, including the Halych Mound, and giving brief descriptions of them. The two maps they produced thus delineated graphically the historical topography of Old Halych. Their cartographic work was published in 1938 in their joint monograph *Knyazhyi Halych*, which appeared after Chachkovskyi's death. Their maps have been used

⁴ A. Czołowski, O polożeniu starego Halicza (Lviv, 1890).

⁵ J. Pełeński, *Halicz w dziejach sztuki średniowiecznej na podstawie badań archeologicznych i źródeł archiwalnych* (Cracow, 1914).

⁶ Ibid., p. 108.

⁷ Ya. Pasternak, Staryi Halych (Cracow-Lviv, 1944), p. 40.

by all subsequent researchers of Old Halych, particularly Pasternak, and have been reprinted in book after book.

In actual fact, Chachkovskyi and Khmilevskyi, on the basis of their own surveys and previous archaeological work, defined the boundaries of Old Halvch, in the era when it was the capital of the Galician-Volhynian Principality.8 This was, for its time, a large, though somewhat scattered city, with a Lower Town and numerous suburbs, extending from the Dnister in the north to the 'Dibrova' wood outside the village of Sokoly in the south. Its heart - the fortress - is located in the area of the village of Krylos. Between the river Lukva and the Mozol Brook, it was protected in the south by mighty defensive ramparts. Chachkovskyi and Khmilevskyi definitively identified and mapped almost all the defensive systems of Old Halych, including the stone churches and monasteries. The centre of the Krylos citadel – the fortress – was divided, in the opinion of the researchers, into two parts. In the southern part of the fortress stood the Dormition Cathedral (still unlocated), while in the northern area, at the 'Zolotyi Tik' site, they assumed the remains of the princely palace and Volodymyrko's Church of the Holy Redeemer to lie. In the gully between the cathedral and 'Zolotyi Tik' was a square. where merchants and pilgrims stayed. Today it has been built over, but it still retains its mediaeval name - 'Bazar'.

Pasternak, who had a high opinion of the work of Chachkovskyi and Khmilevskyi and made full use of it, continued the study of the Krylos fortress which they had identified, and brought it to fruition. Pasternak, a gifted scholar and professional archaeologist, located and excavated the foundations of the largest church in the area of Old Halych – the Cathedral of the Dormition – bringing to an end a search which had lasted almost a century. However, as regards 'Zolotyi Tik', neither Pasternak nor any subsequent archaeological team up to the present day has ever located any remains of the princely palace or its 'chapel-royal' – the Church of the Holy Redeemer – at this site.

In his monograph *Staryi Halych* – one of the key works in the literature on the subject – Pasternak, following Chachkovskyi and Khmilevskyi, attests that the princely court was located on the 'Zolotyi Tik' site. However, recent archaeological research suggests that there are stronger grounds for assuming that, like the cathedral, it was built during the reign of Yaroslav Osmomysl, the son of Volodymyrko, who ruled in Halych from 1153–87, and was located somewhat higher up and to the north of the Cathedral of the Dormition, somewhere adjacent to, or, possibly, partly below the Metropolitan's palace. In any case, the latest excavations by Bohdan Tomenchuk and Yuriy Lukomskyi give certain indications of this. The residence of Prince Volodymyrko (1104–53), which was connected to the Church of the Holy Redeemer, should most probably be sought at the 'Karpytsya' site, whence, the Chronicle tells us, the road to Bovshiv, along which departed Petro Boryslavych, the envoy of Prince Izyaslav of Kyiv, is clearly visible. All the more so, since our 1960s dig adjacent to Bovshiv revealed settlements from the twelfth–thirteenth centuries.

⁸ L. Chachkovskyi, Ya. Khmilevskyi, Knyazhyi Halych (Stanislav, 1938).

Pasternak's work launched a new stage in the archaeological study of Old Halych; this lasted from 1934 to the outbreak of the Second World War. Pasternak's research was financed by Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytskyi, the head of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church.

Pasternak, who had an expert knowledge of the mediaeval chronicles and who had studied the historical topography of Old Halych, had two aims in his fieldwork. Firstly, to find and investigate the foundations of the Dormition Cathedral, the site of which would determine the location of the princely capital, and so answer the question: which of the Halych citadels had actually been the seat of the Rostyslavychi and Romanovychi dynasties. Secondly, when had the fortification work which turned the Krylos citadel into a town been undertaken. Pasternak began his fieldwork with the second objective.

During his season, in 1934, he began to study the Halych Mound. The Chronicle mentions the Halych Mound, which is situated at the highest point of the Krylos citadel on the 'Kachkiv' site, under the annal for 1206. The name of the Mound itself is eponymous with the town of Halych, and the fact that it was known to the chronicler indicates its historical significance. The chronicler mentions the Mound in connection with an uprising of the citizens of Halych against voyevode Benedict, who was temporarily ruling Halych in the name of King Andrew of Hungary. Prince Mstyslav Yaroslavovych 'the Dumb' brought a small force to the aid of the citizens of Halych from Peresopnytsya but did not succeed in breaking into the town. Before he returned to Peresopnytsya, one of the Halych boyars, Illya Shchepanovych, led him to the Halych Mound and mocked him, saying 'O, Prince, in as much as thou hast seated thyself on the Halych Mound, thou hast ruled in Halych'. The text goes on to promise that the chronicler will say more later about '... the Halych Mound and of the origins of Halych, from whence it arose'.⁹

Although the chronicler did not keep his promise, this remark prompted Mykhaylo Hrushevskyi to postulate that in the Halych Mound may be buried 'some Halych (or Halytsya) – the founder of the eponymous town'.¹⁰ Hrushevskyi likewise thought that the centre of Old Halych was located 'more-or-less along the line between the outfall of the Limnytsya and present-day Halych, where in two places the knolls alongside the Dnister rise more-or-less to the level of the Krylos citadel'. Clarifying this further, he said that 'this is the present-day castle hill and the bank of the Limnytsya'.¹¹ Pasternak quotes this passage in his *Staryi Halych*. By the time he came to write his monograph, Pasternak knew where the cathedral had stood – he had found it himself – and this fixed the site of the capital on Krylos hill, contrary to the theories of Petrushevych and Hrushevskyi. But we should like to quote another passage, from the second volume of Hrushevskyi's *Istoriya Ukrayiny-Rusi*, which is not cited in *Staryi Halych*: which says that 'all in all, the question of this [the location of Halych] still remains open. There is nothing impossible in [assuming] that Halych, together with its suburbs (scattered, surely, not a cramped mass),

⁹ Litopys Rus'kyi. Za Ipatskym spyskom. Translated by L. Makhovets (Kyiv, 1989), p. 381.

¹⁰ M. Hrushevskyi, Istoriya Ukrayiny-Rusy, vol. 11 (Lviv, 1904), p. 466.

[&]quot; Pasternak, op. cit, p. 34.

occupied with some gaps the entire area from the Limnytsya to Krylos and present-day Halych' (p. 468). This view, in the light of present-day archaeological research, is extremely fruitful. The residence of the Halych princes may well have been in different citadels at various times.

First, however, let us return to the Halych Mound, with which Pasternak began his research. By 1934, it was no longer intact; it had twice been partially excavated (by Tadeusz Ziemięcki in 1883 and by Yosyp Pelenskyi in 1911) – but without result. In 1915, during the First World War, two dug-outs and an access trench were cut in the middle of the Mound, which effectively destroyed this ancient monument. Like his predecessors, Pasternak, too, was unable to find any traces of a burial in the Mound. He interpreted the site as a 'Place of enthronement of the first Halych princes long before Volodymyrko, and then, when this custom had become obsolete or was, perhaps, banned by the Church, the Mound remained a historical place'.¹² This interpretation satisfied archaeologists, both Pasternak's predecessors and successors. No further work on the Halych Mound was done until 1991. Then in 1991–2 a joint dig from the Institute of Archaeology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine and the Ivano-Frankivsk Museum of Regional Studies discovered traces of a burial in the Mound. (We shall return to this discovery later).

Pasternak's major achievement was the location and study of the Dormition Cathedral. After making a study of the terrain of Old Halych and a successful reconnaissance dig, he excavated a number of barrows, including one in which Magyars were interred during the ninth-tenth centuries. This latter find corroborated the report by an anonymous chronicle of King Bela II (1131–41) which notes under the annal for 898 that during their migration to Pannonia, a group of Magyars led by one Almos had been guests of the Prince of Halych. This reference – and Pasternak's corroborative discoveries, was the basis for the 1998 celebrations of 1100 years of Halych.

Locating the foundations of the Dormition Cathedral was not easy. Pasternak was successful only at his tenth attempt. However, once he had discovered the foundations and the remains of the alabaster-tiled floor, he was able to announce with confidence that these were, '... the remains of the largest princely building of the Galician-Volhynian state, for which his predecessors had searched for many decades'. He continued digging in 1937, 1938, and 1939. The cathedral was completely unearthed. According to Pasternak, it, '...was one and a half metres shorter and narrower by the same amount than St Sophia's Cathedral in Kyiv. The Dormition Cathedral had three apses, while St Sophia's in Kyiv has five apses'.¹³

The stone Cathedral of the Dormition of the Holy Virgin was built by Yaroslav Osmomysl, in the crypt of which he was buried. A stone sarcophagus with the remains of the prince was discovered by Pasternak during his excavation of the cathedral. During World War II, before the arrival of the Soviet Army in Galicia, Pasternak concealed the remains of the prince in the crypt of the Cathedral of St George in Lviv. Today, there is much discussion about where they should be re-interred. Beside and to the east of the sarcophagus of Yaroslav Osmomysl, another burial was discovered; this was a young woman who was interred in a wooden coffin. Pasternak suggested that this was a daughter of Osmomysl, who is unknown to written history.

Pasternak compiled a detailed description of his excavation, with diagrams and photographs, including extensive analogical material, together with a careful study of the various artefacts and materials unearthed during the dig. This makes it possible to visualise how the Cathedral - the largest shrine in Halych and the Galician-Volhynian land - once looked. In addition, one should note that Pasternak's monograph Starvi Halvch also contains a brief description of all the other churches and chapels, discovered by his predecessors. In 1939–41, the vicinity of the cathedral was also investigated. Some late-mediaeval interments were discovered, which cut across those of the princely era, as well as the remains of dwellings from a much earlier period. One of the latter dwellings contained a stonebuilt oven, which intrigued Pasternak considerably. At that time, such ovens were unknown, and Pasternak interpreted it as a stove in a building which served as the bath-house. Since then, subsequent teams have discovered some fifteen dwellings with stone-built ovens in the Halvch citadel, while in the whole of Ukraine east of the Dnipro several hundred have been found, and there are no longer any doubts about their use. Furthermore, it has now been established that semi-pit dwellings with stone ovens first appeared in the Dnister basin at the end of the fourth century AD, and remained the principal type of dwelling there right up to the first half of the twelfth century. Mapped geographically, they show the migration of Slavs from the Northern Carpathian area to Central and Western Europe. For example, in the ninth-tenth centuries, they were known in Slav settlements between Hamburg and Lübeck.14

Pasternak's work on the 'Zolotvi Tik' site of the Krylos fortress in 1938-9 deserves special mention. There he excavated the ramparts and uncovered a fairly significant area on the plateau. He exposed a series of domestic pits, found numerous ceramics dating from the twelfth-thirteenth centuries, metal products, usually of sacral use, and episcopal seals. But he found no traces of the princely castle, nor the Church of the Holy Redeemer. Nor, subsequently, did any others who excavated the 'Zolotyi Tik' site; neither Mikhail Karger nor Vitold Aulikh, nor Yuriy Lukomskyi, nor Bohdan Tomenchuk and myself. From this one may deduce that they are not to be found there, although Pasternak was convinced that the residence of Volodymyrko Volodarevych and the Church of the Holy Redeemer linked to it were located on the 'Zolotyi Tik'. A careful study of all the discoveries made on the territory of the mediaeval city of Halych tend to make one support the view put forward by Bohdan Tomenchuk that the court of Volodymyrko and the Church of the Holy Redeemer were located in the 'Karpytsya' site, and that it was only in the time of Yaroslav Osmomysl that the capital was moved to the area of the Krylos hill, and that massive defences were raised to protect it on the vulnerable, southern side.

A special section in Pasternak's *Staryi Halych* is devoted to his excavations at the 'St George's monastery' site in 1939 and 1941. Here he discovered a number of artisan's workschops, including bronze-founding, jewellery, glass-making and a two-level potter's kiln. The finds included matrices for casting, bronze shavings, slag and metal blanks. Pasternak went so far as to call this site the 'industrial park' of Old Halych.

When one considers Pasternak's undoubted achievements in the archaeological study of Old Halych, one cannot fail to remark yet again that, in spite of all the difficulties of the war years, he nevertheless was able to make a profound study of all the archaeological material from Old Halych, together with the written sources and documentary evidence. This bore fruit in his monumental monograph *Staryi Halych*, published in 1944. This work is an exemplar for all future archaeological teams working on the territory of Halych.

We would now like to describe the archaeological research carried out by the Halych expedition of the Institute of Archaeology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine and the Ivano-Frankivsk Museum of Regional Studies, which was led by Vitold Aulikh. But before we do so, we should like to mention briefly the occasional digs carried out by Vasyl Dovzhenok and V. Honcharov from Kyiv and Mikhail Karger and O. Ioannisyan from Leningrad in the 1950s-80s in the area of princely Halych. The two Kyiv archaeologists discovered a number of dwellings, workshops and domestic buildings, while the Leningraders studied the remains of ecclesiastical architecture.15 They made a new and more detailed study of several churches: the quadriform church in the village of Poberezhzhya: the Church of St Elijah; the Church of the Holy Redeemer, on Karpytsya hill; the 'Polygon', on the 'Karpiv grove' site; and an unidentified church on the 'Cemetery' site. Their publications significantly increased the amount of archaeological knowledge available about princely Halych. Dovzhenok, a recognised specialist on the feudal structures of the Kyivan state, after studying the historical topography of Halvch, expressed the view that the boyars' palaces as it were blockaded the princely capital, and that the boyars often used their own considerable economic and military power to impose their will on the princes of Halych, thus creating social tension and destabilising the political situation in the state. This idea proved extremely fruitful.

Aulikh began systematic work on Old Halych in 1969. This encompassed the fortress of the Krylos citadel, the Lower Town beside the river Lukva, and a series of suburbs. A large number of dwellings and domestic outbuildings were identified, artisan's workshops, cemeteries, and individual interments were uncovered and excavated, together with a quantity of (archaeologically) valuable materials.¹⁶ Yuriy Lukomskyi's team, which formed part of the Aulikh expedition, excavated a number of relics of monumental architecture. A second team, that of Bohdan Tomenchuk, studied the surroundings of princely Halych. This work is continuing to yield positive results. The detailed appraisal of the results of Au-

¹⁵ V. K. Goncharov, 'Drevniy Galich', *Visnyk AN URSR*, no. 1, Kyiv, 1956; M. K. Karger, 'Osnovnye imogi raskopok drevnego Galicha v 1955 g.', *Kratkie soobsbeniya Instituta arkbeologii AN SSSR*, no. 81, Moscow, 1960, pp. 61–71; O. M. Ioannisyan, 'O rannem etape razvitiya Galitskogo zodchestva', op. cit., no. 164, 1981.

¹⁶ V. Aulikh, 'Istoricheskaya topografiya drevnego Galicha', Slavyanskie drevnosti, Kyiv, 1980.

the UKRAINIAN *review*



Statue of Prince Danylo Romanovych, Halych. Unveiled in September 1998 to mark the 1100th anniversary of the city.
likh's expedition, which they undoubtedly deserve, is, alas, beyond the scope of this short article. Let us pass on then to his 1980–1 dig in the southern part of the Krylos citadel (on the Shevchuk family estate). Here he discovered the best and richest collection of domestic artefacts and tools in the whole history of archaeological research at the Old Halvch site. In the store-room of a Halvch jeweller were found 142 complete and 15 fragmented earthenware crucibles, eight bronze matrices, three stone and two bronze icons, buckles, clasps, plaques, pendants, a complete bronze vessel, an ivory chess-piece (queen), and fragments of a candelabrum, six fragments of crosses, two iron axes, a lock, keys, whetstones, lead weights, 31 fragments of glass bracelets, and fragments of earthenware pots (from the twelfth century). One of the richest dwellings in Krylos was also excavated – a semi-pit building of the twelfth-thirteenth centuries - which had eventually been destroyed by fire. In one corner, the skeleton of a woman was unearthed. The finds included the coulter for a plough, 2 scythes, 2 fragments of a chain-mail, 3 axes, a drill, knives, fragments of a spur, a stirrup, horses' hobbles, nails, metal blanks, beads, 7 whetstones, 91 fragments of glass bracelets, and a bone arrow-head.

Unfortunately, illness prevented Aulikh from writing up his investigations in a definitive monograph, but his extensive and well-substantiated notes have opened up new pages of the archaeology and history of Old Halych.¹⁷

Archaeological work on princely Halych was then continued by Aulikh's younger assistants: Bohdan Tomenchuk and Yuriy Lukomskyi.

Over the next 18 years, their work included the architectural and archaeological study of 15 major objects, 6 of them for the first time. Lukomskyi made surface-level measurements of the churches which had already been discovered, identified their ground plans more precisely, and established the structural and technological features of their construction. He also dated them more precisely, and made graphical reconstructions.

A team working at the 'Tsarynka' site in the area of the Lower Town of Old Halych in 1986–92 also produced significant results. They uncovered four unidentified religious structures which had stood on the same spot at different times, and also investigated part of a cemetery from the princely era. One must mention in particular the wooden cruciform tri-apsidal mausoleum, which was in use from the middle of the twelfth century to the first decades of the thirteenth century. During the first half of the thirteenth century, the construction of a cruciform domed stone church on the same site was begun, for which purpose the foundations were reinforced by timber beams. This, however, was interrupted by the Mongol invasion (1241). In the second half of thirteenth century, a wooden chapel was built on the traditional site of the church, beside which the inhabitants of the Lower Town continued to be interred.

In recent years, important work has also been done on Castle Hill in presentday Halych by Yuriy Lukomskyi's team, and also by the conservation digs of Vasyl Ivanovskyi and Vasyl Oprysko, and, this year, by Mykhaylo Rozhka, too. There

¹⁷ Reports by Vitold Aulikh about the archaeological study of Old Halych are located in the archive of the Institute of Archaeology, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.

materials and artefacts from the eleventh and twelfth-thirteenth centuries were found. Thus the palatine's castle was built in a citadel dating from the princely era.

Another team, led by Bohdan Tomenchuk, which included Ihor Kochkin and students from the Department of History of the University of the Carpathians, began with a conservation dig at the 'Kachkiv' site.¹⁸ In 1991–2, we began a dig at the Halych Mound, which unlike the three previous attempts, proved fruitful.

Our discovery of a buried monoxyla-type boat containing rich war-gear, covered with a gold-embroidered cloth, tended to support Hrushevskyi's theory that the founder of Halych was interred in the Halych Mound. It is probably no coincidence that the building of the Halych Mound, at the end of the tenth century, was simultaneous with the construction of the first defences of the Halych citadel. The Mound has now been reconstructed so that visitors can go into it and view replicas of the finds. The replica monoxyla was made by Professor M. Fihol, author of the monograph *Mystetstvo starodavnyoho Halycha* (The Art of Old Halych), and his students.

For the first time, a thorough study was made of the Krylos citadel. It was established that the triple ramparts and the main ditch, which surrounds the southern part of the fortress, were started in the tenth century. The main, middle phase with wooden defensive cells dates from the twelfth–thirteenth centuries, and was burned by the Tatars in 1241; the final, late phase – to the fifteenth–seventeenth centuries. This year, under the main ditch of the fortress, prehistoric defences, dating from the seventh–sixth centuries BC, were discovered.

In 1995–6, on the western escarpment opposite the Dormition Cathedral, were discovered traces (post-holes) of a large two-storey hall in the central area (length 26 m.; width 15 m.). Judging by the material (spurs, stirrups, a stylus, numerous amphorae shards) it housed the prince's men-at-arms.¹⁹

In addition to dwellings and domestic outbuildings, in 1996–7, adjacent to the Dormition Cathedral, a square, paved with white stone and running up to the Metropolitan's palace was uncovered. In 1998, Yuriy Lukomskyi and his team uncovered the wooden foundation-beams of some large wooden structure. One may postulate that these two discoveries are connected and that these are the first, although not unequivocal, traces of the princely court to have been discovered.

However, even if remains of the princely palaces are found, this will not mean that the whole Rostyslavychi dynasty, from Volodymyrko onwards, had their seat in the citadel in the present-day village of Krylos. Mediaeval Halych consisted of a whole system of citadels. The first residences of the Halych princes, both the Rostyslavychi and the Romanovychi, may have been by the Dnister, in the citadels where the Churches of the Holy Redeemer and St Panteleymon are situated.

Nevertheless, several decades of archaeological investigation have now established beyond doubt that when the power and influence of the Galician-Volhynian principality was at its height (for example, under Yaroslav Osmomysl and Danylo of Halych), the princely residence was located in the Krylos citadel, which had the best defences and strategic advantages.

¹⁸ From 1991, Volodymyr Baran has been the head of the archaeological expedition in Halych.

¹⁹ V. Baran, B. Tomenchuk, 'Pidsumky doslidzhen Halytskoyi arkheolohichnoyi ekspedytsiyi v 1991–1996', *Halych i Halytska zemlya* (Kyiv–Halych, 1998), pp. 10–17.

The Year of Revolutions: 1848 and Ukrainian National Consciousness

Theodore Mackiw

he 'year of revolutions', 1848, is one of the key dates in the nineteenth century history of Central Europe. Although the Ukrainians of Austrian-ruled Galicia, unlike their Polish and Hungarian neighbours, made no direct bid for independence, the events of 1848 played a significant role in the development of Ukrainian national consciousness and political awareness.

The name 'Galicia' is the Latinised form of the Ukrainian Halychyna – which originally designated the principality ruled from Halych, the city founded by Prince Volodymyrko as his capital in 1140. When Galicia was united with neighbouring Volhynia in 1199, it became known as the Principality of Galicia and Lodomeria.¹

The Austrian claim to Galicia goes back to a marriage arranged in 1214 between Kalman, the five-year-old second son of King Andrew II of Hungary (reigned 1205–35) and Salome, the three-year old daughter of Prince Leszek the White (reigned 1202–10 and 1211–27), the senior ruler in Poland, which at that time consisted of a number of feudal principalities. Under the marriage-settlement, it was agreed that Kalman would take the (vacant) throne of Galicia, which, in due course, he did, receiving his crown from the Pope. More than a century later, King Casimir III 'the Great' of Poland (reigned 1333–70), with the aid of the Hungarian King Louis I 'the Great' (reigned 1342–82), annexed Galicia to Poland on the basis of that dynastic marriage.

The kings of Hungary, and later the Habsburgs, who ruled as Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary, retained in their formal list of titles the appellation 'rex... Galiciae et Lodomeriae'. In 1772, under the First Partition of Poland, the then ruler of Austria-Hungary used this title to claim Galicia for her empire. And, together with Galicia (which was populated predominantly by Ukrainians), she also annexed the Principality of Cracow, which had a mainly Polish population, combining the two into a new, artificial, administrative unit, designated the 'Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria, with the Grand Principality of Cracow'. This comprised an area of some 1500 square miles, with a total population (Poles and Ukrainians) of around three million. Shortly afterwards, in 1774, Austria took advantage of the Russo-Turkish war (1768–74) and annexed Ukrainian-populated Bukovyna, placing it first under military governors, and then, in 1867, attaching it (as a separate region) to Galicia.

When Austrian troops occupied Galicia, the officials, mostly of Czech origin, reported to Vienna that only a small minority of nobility was Polish and that most of the people were Ukrainians, or, as they were called at one time or another, 'Rusyny' or 'Ruthenians'.

¹ Lodomeria is the Latin name of the Volodymyr-Volynskyi principality. It appeared in the title of Andrew II of Hungary starting in 1206, and in the title of the Austrian emperors following Austria's annexation of Galicia in 1772.

Galicia at the time of the Austrian annexation was in a most precarious social and economic state. The prolonged and oppressive Polish domination for four hundred years (annexed in 1439) had left deep scars. The Ukrainians had become a politico-economically backward ethnic group, unconscious of their national identity. Yet they survived as a people because they possessed and transmitted a rich cultural heritage: unwritten literature in the form of tales, poetry, and songs, distinct customs, and especially the Greek Catholic Church, all of which set them apart from the Poles.

The Greek Catholic, or Uniate, Church played a very important role in the history of the Galician Ukrainians in the nineteenth century. The Austrian government granted the Greek Catholic Church and clergy equal status with their Roman Catholic counterparts. In 1774, Empress Maria Theresa founded the Barbareum, a Greek Catholic seminary at the Church of St Barbara in Vienna; this provided Galician students not only with systematic theological training, but also with an invigorating exposure to Western culture. In 1783, a larger theological school - the Greek Catholic Theological Seminary - was established in Lviv, which replaced the Barbareum seminary in Vienna, and in 1787 the Studium Ruthenum Greek Catholic seminary was established in Lviv for students who did not speak Latin. The Studium was affiliated with Lviv University, and drew its lecturers from it. These foundations, which were sponsored by the Austrian government, raised the educational level of the Greek Catholic clergy, not only as regards religious matters, but also in public affairs. From 1848, the Greek Catholic clergy provided the political leadership of the Ukrainians in Galicia. Although, later, the leadership gradually passed into the hands of the lay intelligentsia, many of these were the sons of clerical families.

The next step was the formation of a patriotic circle in the Greek Catholic theological seminary in Lviv. Its founders were Markiyan Shashkevych,² Yakiv Holovatskyi³ and Ivan Vahylevych,⁴ known as the Ruska Triytsya (Ruthenian Triad).⁵ These three young, idealistic seminarians, who had become captivated by Herder's

² Fr. Markiyan Shashkevych (1811–43). Poet and leader of the literary revival in Western Ukraine, based on the vernacular.

³ Yakiv Holovatskyi (1814–88). Noted historian, literary scholar, ethnographer, linguist, bibliographer, lexicographer, and poet.

⁴ Ivan Vahylevych (1811–66). Romantic poet, philologist, and ethnographer of the Galician revival.

⁵ The Rus'ka Triytsya (Ruthenian Triad) was a Galician literary group named after the number of the predominant members, Markiyan Shashkevych, Yakiv Holovatskyi, and Ivan Vahylevych, which existed in the late 1830s, while the three were students at the Greek Catholic Theological Seminary in Lviv. Since the group came into being in the period of Romanticism, it retained the predominant interests and features of that movement – an interest in folklore and history, and a striving for Pan-Slavonic unity. The group united around itself other youths who were burning with a desire to work for the good of their people. Most were engaged in collecting oral folk literature, studying the history of Ukraine, translating the works of other Slavonic authors, and writing their own verses and treatises. The group maintained that the 'Ruthenians' of Galicia, Bukovyna and Transcarpathia were all part of one Ukrainian people who had their own language, culture and history. Their first two collections, *Syn Rusi* (The Son of Rus', 1833) and *Zorya* (The Star, 1834) were not published. Their third collection *Rusalka Dnistrovaya* (The Unister Nymph, 1836) was published in Buda, but most of the copies were confiscated. Although the collection was short-lived, its importance was immense, in that it was written in the spoken Ukrainian and initiated the use of vernacular Ukrainian for literature in the Ukrainian lands in the Austrian Empire.

ideas, decided to publish an almanac, entitled *Rusalka Dnistrovaya* (The Dnister Nymph), which would contain folk songs, poems, and historical articles written in the vernacular. After some difficulties with censorship, a small volume appeared in Buda in December 1836. The *Rusalka* was the beginning of modern Ukrainian literature in Galicia, and hence a milestone in the formation of national consciousness.

The Austrian empire was a multinational state, in which the Czechs, for example, achieved various political gains which served as a model for the Ukrainians of Galicia. In fact, the Czechs, Croatians and Ukrainians benefited from what was known as the Austro-Slavonic policy. The celebrated Czech journalist, Karel Hav-liček Borovsky, advised the Austrian government in 1846 to support the Ukrainians in Galicia, in the hope of engendering pro-Austrian attitudes among the Ukrainians of the Russian empire.

In 1846, one member of the 'Ruthenian Triad', Yakiy Holovatskyi, writing under the pseudonym 'Havrylo Rusyn', published an article 'Zustaende der Russinen in Galizien' (The Conditions of the Ruthenians in Galicia), in which he wrote that 'the Ukrainians have sunk very low among all the Slavonic peoples'.⁶ After describing the social plight and cultural stagnation of his people, oppressed by the Polish gentry and neglected by their own conservative senior clergy, Holovatskyi explained why, in spite of these unsatisfactory conditions, the Galician Ukrainians felt no attraction towards Russia. The peasants, he said, knew that in Russia there was no legal protection for the serf against abuse. The Greek Catholic priests had a better life than their Russian Orthodox counterparts. Therefore, the Ukrainians remained faithful to their (Austrian) Emperor, and continued to place their hopes in Austria. Moreover, since the centralising Russian government suppressed the publication of Ukrainian literature, Holovatskyi suggested that by favouring Ukrainian literature in Galicia, Austria could exert influence on (Russian-ruled) Ukraine. He categorically rejected the assertion that the Ukrainians (Ruthenians) were a danger to Austria because of their geographical proximity to Russia. This article may be considered to embody the first political programme of the Ukrainians in Galicia, namely, that they would stay faithful to Austria.

The chain-reaction of revolutionary movements in Europe in 1848, and in particular the Vienna uprising of 13 March 1848, roused the Ukrainians of Galicia to formulate their own national rights. When, on 19 March 1848, news reached Lviv of the riots in Vienna and the resignation of the hated Prince Metternich,⁷ the leaders of the Galician Poles immediately sprang into action. They dispatched a petition to the Emperor calling for greater political rights for the Poles of Galicia, but totally ignoring the Ukrainian presence there, treating Galicia as a purely Polishinhabited province. In support of these demands, a Polish People's Council (Polska Rada Narodowa) was established in Lviv on 13 April 1848. Soon afterwards, a network of local councils was formed, a Polish National Guard organised, and a newspaper *Dziennik narodowy* (People's Daily) founded.

⁶ Jahrbuecher fuer slawische Literatur. Kunst und Wissenschaft (vol. w, nos. 9–10, pp. 261–379). ⁷ Klemens Fürth von Metternich (1773–1859). Austrian statesman, Minister for Foreign Affairs (1809–1848), champion of conservatism.

The Polish leaders demanded self-government for the Poles only, ignoring the question of the Ukrainians' rights. This restricted outlook led to an anti-Polish reaction among the Ukrainians. One Greek Catholic priest, Fr. Ivan Biretskyi (1815–83), wrote a letter to the editor of the Polish newspaper *Postep* in Lviv, in which he categorically rejected the Polish assertion that the Ukrainians were simply of Greek Catholic Rite, and emphatically demanded equal treatment for them. The letter (published on 11 April 1848) is indicative of the democratic character and patriotic thrust of the literary, cultural and educational work of this priest, who, we may note, was very active in the revolutionary year 1848.

Another Ukrainian priest, Fr. Vasyl Podolynskyi (1815–76), published in 1846 a pamphlet in Polish *Slowo przestrogi* (A Word of Warning), which was of great political significance. This ranks as another key document of Ukrainian political thought of the mid-nineteenth century, which categorically rejects the tendentious Polish assertion that the Ukrainians are not a separate nation. Quoting the Polish newspaper *Dziennik narodowy* (no. 39), Fr. Podolynskyi asked rhetorically: '... What is the purpose of denying the name and the language of the Ukrainians, when in history and in Ukrainian hearts it is written that our ancestors called themselves Ukrainians'. Furthermore, he put forward the idea of a united, independent Ukraine ('Yes, we Ruthenians also firmly believe in the resurrection of a free independent Rus'. Whether sooner or later is of no account').

To the great disappointment of the Poles, the Ukrainians – whom the Poles did not consider a separate nation – rejected the invitation to join the Polish efforts. Instead, on the suggestion of the Governor of Galicia, Count Franz Stadion, on 19 April 1848, a group of Greek Catholic clergymen led by the Coadjutor-Bishop of Lviv, Hryhoriy Yakhymovych,⁸ addressed a petition to the Emperor. Unlike the earlier Polish appeal, this was a timorous, loyalist document. The preamble consisted of a historical survey stressing the national distinctiveness of the Ukrainians of Eastern Galicia, the past glories of the mediaeval principality of Halych, and its subsequent subjugation and exploitation by the Poles. The petition itself requested the introduction of the Ukrainian language in schools and the administration, access for Ukrainians to government positions in Galicia, and genuine equality between Greek and Roman Catholic clergy.

Two weeks later, on 2 May 1848, the first modern Ukrainian political organisation, the Supreme Ruthenian Council (Holovna Rus'ka Rada),⁹ was established in Lviv, thereby nullifying the claim of the Polish People's Council to speak for Ga-

⁹ The Holovna Rus'ka Rada (Supreme Ruthenian Council) was the first legal Ukrainian political organisation in modern times, founded in May 1848 in Lviv. It was established in direct response to the revolution of 1848–9 in the Habsburg monarchy, in particular to the formation in Galicia of the Polish National Council (Rada Narodowa), which declared itself the representative political body for the province. The purpose of the Rada was to strengthen the Ukrainian people in Austria by encouraging publications in Ukrainian, introducing the Ukrainian language in schools and the local lay and church administration, and defending the constitutional rights of Ukrainians. It served also the parallel function of upholding the interests of the Greek Catholic clergy. Another primary concern of the Rada was the partition of Galicia into separate Ukrainian and Polish provinces.

⁸ Hryhoriy Yakhymovych (1792–1863). Ukrainian Catholic metropolitan, professor, and civic activist.

licia as a whole. The Supreme Ruthenian Rada, which was headed by Bishop Yakhymovych, consisted of sixty-six members. Its social composition was dominated by the urban clerical and secular intelligentsia, nearly one-third of its members being Greek Catholic priests, one-third civil servants, and the remainder students, teachers, lawyers and townsmen. In the weeks that followed, fifty local and thirteen district branches of the Rada were established throughout Galicia. The first-ever Ukrainian-language newspaper in the world, *Zorya halytska* (The Galician Star), commenced publication on 15 May 1848. Contacts were established with Ukrainians elsewhere in the Habsburg Empire – notably Bukovyna and Transcarpathia.

Since the founding of the Supreme Ruthenian Rada was a direct challenge to the Polish claim that Galicia was an organic part of Poland, the Galician-Polish leaders tried to undermine its credibility by fostering a counter-body which allegedly represented a pro-Polish trend among the Ruthenians. Accordingly, on 23 May 1848, a handful of Polonised nobles and intelligentsia ('gente Rutheni, natione Poloni') met in Lviv and founded a (pro-Polish) Ruthenian Congress (Sobor rus'kyi).¹⁰ The Congress began to publish a newspaper *Dneunyk Ruskij* (Ruthenian Daily) in Ukrainian, but in the Latin alphabet, and using Polish orthographic conventions. They hired as its editor Ivan Vahylevych, a former member of the Rus'ka Triytsya. The Ukrainians who supported the Supreme Ruthenian Rada denounced the Congress as a sham, and both the Congress and its newspaper proved extremely short-lived.

The question of national identity was answered by the Rada in the 'Ukrainian' sense, that is, by asserting the distinctiveness of their people not only from Poland, but from Russia as well. The Rus'ka Rada's manifesto of 10 May 1848 stated that: '... We Galician Ruthenians [Rusyny halytski] belong to the Great Ruthenian (i.e. Ukrainian) nation, who speak one language and number fifteen million, of whom two and one half inhabit the Galician land'.

During the Slavonic Congress in Prague in June 1848,¹¹ the Ukrainian delegates from the Rada demanded that Galicia be divided into separate Polish and Ukrainian provinces, an idea the Poles adamantly opposed. The Czechs, working behind the scenes, mediated a compromise solution: the Ukrainians agreed to postpone the issue of Galicia's division, and the Poles conceded the principle of the equality of the two nations in all administrative and educational matters. This

¹⁰ The Ruthenian Congress (Sobor rus'kyi) was a political committee that was active in Lviv during the 1848 Revolution. It was founded in May by Polish and Polonised nobles and intellectuals as a counterbalance to the Supreme Ruthenian Council. Its 64 members opposed the Polish-Ukrainian administrative partition of Galicia and collaborated with the Polish National Council. Although a number of Polonophile Ukrainians were members of the Congress, it received little Ukrainian support. On 6 October 1848, the Congress was absorbed by the Polish National Council and ceased to exist as a separate organisation.

¹¹ Slavonic Congress in Prague (1–10 June 1848). A congress of representatives of the Slavonic peoples of the Austrian Empire, convened to consolidate the forces of the Slavs in response to calls for the unification of all German lands (including Austria and Czech-inhabited Bohemia) by the German parliament in Frankfurt. The Congress was attended by a number of Galician Ukrainians, including delegates from the Supreme Ruthenian Council. agreement remained a dead letter, since Austrian troops began bombarding Prague, forcing the Congress to disband; nevertheless, the Ukrainians had made a debut on the international political stage.

While the Slavonic Congress in Prague was still in session, elections began in Galicia to the Austrian Reichstag, or lower house of the newly founded imperial parliament. For the Ukrainians, the peasants in particular, these elections were a new and confusing experience. In contrast, the Poles were politically much more sophisticated, and hence managed, by means of rumours and threats, to keep many Ukrainian peasants away from the polls. In the event, Ukrainians won only 25 of the 100 seats allotted to Galicia. In the parliamentary debates that took place in the latter part of 1848, first in Vienna and then in Kromeriz, the Ukrainian deputies concentrated on two issues: compensation to landlords for the abolition of the corvée (serfdom), and the administrative division of Galicia into separate Ukrainian and Polish provinces. Meanwhile, the imperial government was slowly regaining control of the situation, and in December, soon after the new emperor, the 18-year-old Franz Joseph, ascended the throne, parliament was dissolved. Once revolution in the Austrian Empire was suppressed, the Habsburg monarchy returned to absolutism.

The neoabsolutist decade which followed (1850–60) has often been called the 'Bach era', after the Minister of the Interior, Alexander von Bach. In Galicia, it could well be called the 'Goluchowski era', after its governor. As a high aristocrat, Count Agenor Goluchowski¹² won the full confidence of the Emperor and was appointed Viceroy of Galicia. He used his office and the confidence of the Emperor to remove all obstacles to Polish dominance in Galicia, filling the ranks of the civil service, which prior to 1848 had been predominantly Teutonic, with Poles. Moreover, he convinced Vienna that the Ukrainians were Russophiles and hence a dangerous threat to the security of the Austrian Empire. As a result, in 1851 the Rus'ka Rada was forced to disband and its leaders went back to their predominantly ecclesiastical occupations. Nevertheless, they were kept under close surveillance by the authorities.

It must be noted that during the period 1849–1916 all Governors of Galicia were members of the Polish nobility, appointed to office by the Emperor himself. In Galicia, the Governor, as the highest state authority, was simultaneously Chancellor of the Exchequer and Minister of Education. From 1855 onwards, he was also chief of police and the chairman responsible for economic programmes. He had the right, *inter alia*, to censor all publications, to control labour movements and to suppress any organised opposition.

Polish historiography generally puts the blame for this clamp-down on the Supreme Ukrainian Council, since in the word of the eminent Polish historian, Jan Kozik, the Council 'instead of leading [its] people to fight for its rights in alliance with the forces of revolution, it imposed upon it loyalty and support for reaction. It taught people to rely on the Austrian authorities and to expect some change from that side,

¹² Agenor Gołuchowski (1812–75). Polish count and Austrian statesman. Viceroy of Galicia in 1849–59, 1866–7 and 1871–5, Austrian Minister of Internal Affairs in 1859, and Minister of State in 1860.

instead of teaching the Ukrainians that they should rely on themselves and that they should feel their own power'. Hence, the council contributed to the origin of the dishonourable name with which the Ukrainians were called: 'the Tyrolese of the East'.¹³

However, Kozik contradicts himself. He writes that the Poles themselves rejected the Ukrainians, neglecting their national rights and identity.¹⁴ When the Poles revolted against the Habsburgs, they expected to gain support from the Ukrainian serfs, whom they had long oppressed. In fact, it turned out that even the Polish peasants turned against the Polish revolutionaries and then proceeded to massacre the Polish gentry. Similarly, when - a few days after the Austrian uprising the Hungarians rose against Vienna, they too hoped, as had the Poles in Galicia, to obtain the support of the non-Hungarians (Croatians, Ukrainians and others), whom they had exploited and oppressed in the past. The Ukrainians, however, rejected Polish and Hungarian blandishments and pledged their loyalty to the Habsburgs, rather than choosing the brand of 'liberty' offered by the Polish and Hungarian gentry. Had they supported the Poles and/or the Hungarians, the Ukrainians stood to gain nothing. In 1848, the Ukrainians of Galicia were neither politically mature enough nor prepared to fight for independence. Participation in the 1848 uprisings would not have brought the Ukrainians independence, but would have threatened their very survival as a nation.

The greatest achievements of the 227 days of the 1848 Revolution were undoubtedly the abolition of the corvée and the introduction of constitutional government. However, considering the total lack of political experience on the part of Ukrainians, their own achievements were not inconsiderable: the formation of the Supreme Ukrainian Council with its smaller local branches throughout Galicia; the founding of the first Ukrainian newspaper Zorya halytska; participation in the Slavonic Congress in Prague; a campaign for election to the first Austrian Reichstag and participation in parliamentary work; the formation of a Ukrainian National Guard and military detachments, which took part in the war against insurgent Hungary; the holding of a Congress of Ruthenian Scholars (Sobor uchenykh rus'kykh, 19-26 October 1848)15 to determine guidelines for cultural and educational policies; and the organisation of public meetings. Thus, 1848 marked a turning point in the history of Galicia, putting an end to the long inertia, passivity and isolation of the Ukrainians, and launching them on the long and hard struggle for national and social emancipation.

¹³ J. Kozik, Między Reakcją a Rewolucją: Studia z dziejów ukraińskiego ruchu narodowego w Galicji w latach 1848–1849. Zeszyty naukowe uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, cccixxxi: Prace bistoryczne (Warsaw–Cracow, 1975), p. 236.

¹⁴ Kozik, op. cit., pp. 194–5, 216.

¹⁵ The Congress of Ruthenian Scholars (Sobor uchenykh rus'kykh) was the first educational conference in Galicia. It was convened by the Supreme Ruthenian Council. The Congress took place in Lviv on 19–26 October 1848. The participants produced a broad programme for organising Ukrainian scholarly research and public education (including the publication of general-education school text-books), agreed to set up the Society for Public Education, and discussed the question of the Ukrainian literary language.

Press and Publishing in Kharkiv, 1920s–1930s

Olha Riznychenko

ccording to the Handbook of State Institutions and Publishing Houses for 1930,186 titles of various newspapers and journals were published in Kharkiv.² Of these, 26 were newspapers, and 60 magazines. Eighteen newspapers were published in Ukrainian; 3 in Yiddish; 2 in German; 1 in Bulgarian; 1 in Polish; and 1 in Russian. The newspapers Komunist, Visti, Robitnycha hazeta Proletar, Kharkivskyi proletar, Vseukravinskyi proletariy, Komsomolets Ukraviny, Chervona armiva appeared daily in Ukrainian. The Yiddish newspaper Der Stern was likewise a daily. Other newspapers came out thrice-weekly or weekly; this group included the newspapers of various ethnic minority groups of Kharkiv: Sovetsko selo (in Bulgarian), Yunge guardye (in Yiddish), Glos młodzieży (in Polish), Jung Sturm (in German) appeared 8 times a month. Das Neue Dorf (in German), Krasnaya armiya (in Russian), Zay-greyt (in Yiddish) were weekly. Of the journals, 55 titles were published in Ukrainian; 3 in German; 2 in Russian; and one each for the Jews, Poles and Bulgarians. For young people, adolescents and children there were: the newspapers of the 'Pioneer' movement Na zminu and Yunyi leninets; Dytyachyi rukh - a children's monthly; Druh ditey - the monthly organ of the 'Druh ditey' (Children's Friend) society;³ Zhoutenya – a monthly for younger children; Znannya ta pratsya – a monthly for children; Tuk-tuk - a monthly magazine for the under-sevens; and *Chervoni kvity* – a monthly for children. All these were published in Ukrainian. Also for these age groups there were Yunge guardye - a newspaper for the Jewish working and peasant youth; Zay-greyt - a Pioneer newspaper in Yiddish; Glos młodzieży - a newspaper for the Polish peasant youth; Die Trampe - a bi-weekly children's magazine in German; Oktyabrskie vskbody - a bi-weekly illustrated magazine for older children in Russian; Bandź gotów - a bi-weekly Pioneer magazine in Polish; Bădi gotov - a bi-weekly Pioneer magazine in Bulgarian.

Education and teachers' periodicals included: *Radyanska osvita* – a monthly journal of civic education; *Robitnycha osvita* – the organ of the central council of working education of the People's Commissariat of Education of the Ukrainian SSR, a monthly; *Shklyakh osvity* – a pedagogic monthly. These periodicals were published in the Ukrainian language. The teachers' monthly *Erzung und Aufklärung* was published in German.

While dealing with youth and educational periodicals, it is worth mentioning that the 1930 *Handbook* lists the addresses of 80 schools, of which 60 had Ukrainian as the

¹ Dovidnyk derzhavnykh ustanov i vydavnytstv (Kharkiv: Molodyi Robitnyk, 1930).

² Kharkiv was the capital of Soviet Ukraine from 1920-34.

³ Druh ditey, a society in the Ukrainian SSR (1923–35), whose purpose was to help the agencies of the People's Commissariat of Education and the Communist Youth League to combat juvenile delinquency, and to provide elementary education for all children.

language of instruction; 5 taught in Ukrainian and Russian; 13 in Russian; 4 in Yiddish; 2 in German; 2 in Polish; 2 in Bulgarian; 1 in Armenian; and 1 in the Tatar language.

We should also note that the various Ukrainian-language periodicals, both educational and general, published diverse works of *belles-lettres* and scholarship, both by Ukrainians and members of minority-language groups in Kharkiv. These included such writers as Leib Kvitko, Del Nister, Friedkin, Holman, who published their works primarily in Yiddish, for example, in the journal *Di royte welt*, but who also featured regularly in the Ukrainian-language press. Furthermore, when scanning the periodicals of the 1920s, we found nothing to suggest any pressure on the rights of minority language groups. It is obvious that almost all the creative intelligentsia of Kharkiv knew Russian and valued Russian classics, but the policy of Ukrainisation⁴ then in force was based on the principle that the literature of Pushkin and Tolstoy should not outrank that of Shevchenko, Lesya Ukrayinka and Ivan Franko, or of Mickiewicz, Kochanowski, and Norwid. Nevertheless, people had a chance of becoming familiar with Russian and world classics both in the original, and in Ukrainian translation.

However, at the end of the 1920s and the beginning of the 1930s, just as the process of the restructurisation of Ukrainian socio-civic and cultural life was gaining strength, there began a wave of repressions: group after group of writers was disbanded, most Ukrainian newspapers and journals ceased publication, publishing houses were closed. Yet, against a background of arrests, executions, deportations of Ukrainian writers, artists and scholars, the print-runs of the Ukrainian classics increased, as well as all kinds of events and activities which invoked the names of major literary figures: Shevchenko, Franko, Nechuy-Levytskyi,⁵ Panas Myrnyi.⁶ However, their works were applied to serve the formation of vulgar-ideological stereotypes, with which the names of the Ukrainian classics became identified. No such crude experiments were attempted with Russian classics, which were always treated with a serious, scholarly approach. One of the mechanisms of the Russification of Ukrainian cultural life in Kharkiv was the physical elimination of the bearers of that culture, and also the degradation of the public perception of Ukrainian literature and culture as something primitive, inferior and mediocre. Thus throughout the Soviet period works such as *Evgeniy Onegin* or War and Peace were perceived and discussed in schools at the level of such issues as the meaning of life, individual freedom, moral choice; while in contrast

⁴ Ukrainisation, a series of policies pursued by the CP(B)U in 1923–33 to enhance the national profile of state and Party institutions, and thus legitimise Soviet rule in Ukrainian eyes. Ukrainisation was the Ukrainian version of the all-Union policy of indigenisation. This included making state and Party cadres fluent in Ukrainian and familiar with Ukrainian history and culture, recruiting Ukrainians into Party and state apparatuses, establishing separate Red Army units with Ukrainian as the language of command, giving financial support to non-Communist cultural institutions, such as the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, developing a Communist or pro-Communist Ukrainian intelligentsia to play a leading role in the 'Ukrainian cultural process', and greatly expanding education and publishing in Ukraine.

⁵ Ivan Nechuy-Levytskyi (1838–1918). Ukrainian writer. Began writing in 1865, but because of Russian imperial censorship his works appeared only in various Galician periodicals.

⁶ Panas Myrnyi (1849–1920; pseudonym of Atanas Rudchenko). Ukrainian writer and translator. He greatly expanded the lexicon of Ukrainian literary language and with his talent for rhythmic and melodious phrasing enriched Ukrainian syntax. Shevchenko's Kateryna or Franko's Boryslav smiyetsya (Boryslav Laughs) were analysed simply in terms of their class/sociological content. The perception of Ukrainian literature as one-dimensional, tendentious, and obvious, and Russian literature as multi-valued, polyphonic, and paradoxical was actively instilled into the psyche of the masses during eras of repression on the one hand, and Russification - on the other. (This manner of presentation, one may note, may still be encountered today). We must also recall that the Russification of the cultural life of Kharkiv did not consist only of the banning or liquidation of certain Ukrainian socio-literary, artistic, and scholarly societies, periodicals or publishing houses. The authorities also found it expedient to keep members of the creative intelligentsia under control, and this control was best exerted through various associations and groupings. Thus one after another groups with a clear Ukrainian outlook, which had among their members leading Ukrainian literary figures, artists, scholars, were ordered to merge with other organisations, which obeyed instructions from the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Ukraine, and hence, indirectly, from the authorities in Moscow.

This mechanism is illustrated by the history of the literary group VAPLITE, the Vilna Akademiya Proletarskoyi Literatury (Free Academy of Proletarian Literature). This included the most influential Ukrainian writers of the day, including Mykola Khvylovyi,⁷ Pavlo Tychyna,⁸ Mayk Yohansen,⁹ et al. VAPLITE existed in Kharkiv from 1926–28. It published its first booklet, also called *VAPLITE*, in 1926, with an editorial board which included Yohansen, Kulish,¹⁰ Senchenko,¹¹ Slisarenko,¹² and Tychyna, and the Statute of VAPLITE appeared in it. The VAPLITE almanac (1926) published poetry by Tychyna, Sosyura,¹³ Yanovskyi,¹⁴ Bazhan,¹⁵ prose works by Dosvitniy,¹⁶ Slisarenko, Epik,¹⁷ and included new translations of poetry from Turk-

⁷ Mykola Khvylovyi (1893–1933; pseudonym of Mykola Fitilev). Ukrainian writer and publicist of the Ukrainian cultural renaissance of the 1920s.

^s Pavlo Tychyna (1891–1967). Poet; member of the Vseukrayinska Akademiya Nauk (All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences – VUAN), and the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR.

⁹ Mayk Yohansen (1895–1937). Poet, prose writer, screen-writer, translator, literary theorist, and linguist. He began writing in Ukrainian after 1919. Member of the writers' associations Hart and VAPLITE.

¹⁰ Mykola Kulish (1892–1937?). Renowned playwright. Member of Hart and VAPLITE. Repressed during the Stalinist terror.

¹¹ Ivan Senchenko (1901-75). Writer and member of Pluh, Hart, and VAPLITE.

¹² Oleksa Slisarenko (1891–1937). Poet and prose writer. Editor of the Knyhospilka publishing house in Kharkiv. Arrested in 1934 and deported to the Solovets Islands, where he was shot in 1937.

¹⁵ Volodymyr Sosyura (1898–1965). Poet; member of the writers' associations Pluh, Hart, VAPLITE, and the All-Ukrainian Association of Proletarian Writers.

¹⁴ Yuriy Yanovskyi (1902–54). Writer. He began publishing poems in Ukrainian in 1924, and prose after 1927.

¹⁵ Mykola Bazhan (1904–83). Poet, writer, translator, and Soviet Ukrainian cultural and political figure. One of the most prominent representatives of the literary renaissance of the 1920s. Member of the writers' associations VAPLITE and Nova heneratsiya, and the journal *Literaturnyi yarmarok* (Literary Fair), a literary and art almanac in Kharkiv, edited by Mykola Khvylovyi, as the organ of the group of former members of VAPLITE, following its dissolution.

¹⁶ Oles Dosvitniy (1891–1934). Writer and literary critic. From 1925, he was one of Khvylovyi's closest associates, and a leading member of VAPLITE, from which he was expelled in 1927, together with Khvylovyi by order of the CP(B)U central committee. Shot in 1934, during Postyshev's terror in Ukraine.

¹⁷ Hryhoriy Epik (1901–?). Writer and critic; member of Pluh, VAPLITE, and the Prolitfront. Arrested in 1934 and died in the labour camps. The exact date of his death is unknown.

ish, Yiddish, and other languages. Later, a literary-artistic bi-monthly, VAPLITE, was brought out, and ran to five issues. The sixth issue was to have published the second part of Khvylovyi's Wood-cocks, however, this work was confiscated, and the journal itself proscribed. As a result of ideological pressure, on 28 January 1928 VAPLITE formally dissolved itself. Instead, its former members grouped again around the monthly journal Literaturnyi yarmarok (Literary Fair), twelve issues of which appeared from 1928-9. However, following criticism from the Communist Party, this journal ceased publication in 1929. Nevertheless, the same year, the former VAPLITE members formed a new literary association called 'Prolitfront' - Proletarskyi literaturnyi front (Proletarian Literary Front), which in addition to its aesthetic canons adopted a more definite ideological line. In 1929-30, 'Prolitfront' published a literary-civic monthly under the same name. The editors of this journal were Mykola Kulish and Ivan Momot,18 and its secretary was Ivan Senchenko. However, this organisation, too, in spite of its ideological commitment, was also forced to disband, under pressure from the Party. The writers, who had belonged to 'Prolitfront', like Khvylovyi, Kulish, Dniprovskyi,19 were attracted by various means (in particular, the possibility of publishing their works) into the Vseukravinska Spilka Proletarskykh Pysmennykiv (All-Ukrainian Union of Proletarian Writers) - VUSPP, which had been founded at the All-Ukrainian Congress of Proletarian Writers, which was held in Kharkiv in January 1927. The organisation of VUSPP was based on the structure of the Proletkult,20 which had existed in Kharkiv in 1919-20, and which Ukrainian writers had quit in protest at the line enforced by Moscow representatives. that Soviet literature should develop exclusively in the Russian language, since, they argued, this was the language of the victorious proletariat, and would eventually become the language of the world, when the proletariat came to power worldwide. At the All-Russian Congress of Proletarian Writers, in Moscow, in 1929, VUSPP was incorporated into the Vserossiyskava Assotsiatsiya Proletarskikh Pysatelev (All-Russian Association of Proletarian Writers) - VAPP. But, in 1932, this organisation, too, was liquidated. In its place, in 1934, the Spilka Pysmennykiv Ukraviny (Union of Writers of Ukraine - SPU), was established, and this was formally controlled by Moscow. In 1932, the literary, artistic and critical journal Hart - the organ of the VUSPP, was closed down.

All other literary associations suffered a similar fate to that of VAPLITE. The literary association 'Pluh' (1922–32) disappeared together with its periodicals. The last publication of the Ukrainian futurists was the journal *Nova heneratsiya*, which under the editorship of Mykhaylo Semenko²¹ appeared from October 1927 to December 1930.

²¹ Mykhaylo Semenko (1892–1937). Poet, founder and theoretician of Ukrainian futurism. Arrested in 1937 and shot.

¹⁸ Ivan Momot (1905-31). Literary critic.

¹⁹ Ivan Dniprovskyi (1895–1934; pen name of I. Shevchenko). Writer, member of Hart, VAPLITE, and Prolitfront. He was a close associate of Khvylovyi.

²⁰ Proletkult (Proletarska kultura). A leftist mass movement in the immediate post-revolutionary period, which originated in Russia in 1917. It was opposed to classical traditions, regarding them as bourgeois and inimical to the proletariat. The mass orientation and ignorance of the members of this movement was opposed by VAPLITE and the Neoclassicists, which was reflected in the Literary Discussion of 1925–8, a wide-ranging debate which coincided with the policy of Ukrainisation.

In the same way, the 17 Ukrainian publishing houses, which existed in 1930, were all disbanded. These included the publishing house of the newspaper *Komunist* (which produced the newspapers *Komunist, Komsomolets Ukrayiny*, and the journals *Robselkor, Komunarka Ukrayiny*); the publishing house of the newspaper *Robitnycha hazeta Proletar* (which also produced the newspaper *Proletar* and the journals *Dekada, Chervonyi perets, Tekbnika – masam*); and the publishing house Visti VUTsVK (which in addition to the newspapers *Visti, Vseukrayinskyi proletar*, also brought out the journals *Vsesvit, Avto* and *Shlyakby*).

The fate of the most popular newspaper in Kharkiv – Visti, clearly demonstrates how the Ukrainian press was suppressed. Publication of this paper began in Kharkiv in 1918. Originally in Russian, from 1921 it appeared in Ukrainian. Its first editors Vasyl Blakytnyi²² and Yevhen Kasyanenko²³ persuaded many leading writers to publish in it, including Ostap Vyshnya,²⁴ Volodymyr Sosyura, Valeriyan Polishchuk,25 Hryhoriy Kosynka,26 and Ivan Senchenko. Oleksander Dovzhenko27 published his caricatures. In December 1922, this published extracts from Tychyna's poem 'Skovoroda'. It had a weekly supplement (originally 'Literature, Learning and Art', after 1925, 'Culture and Life') in which Mykola Khvylovyi published his essays, and ex-members of VAPLITE and writers of a similar outlook appeared. This supplement triggered a major literary discussion, which took place on its pages. Visti also provided a platform for other issues, particularly the problems of setting the Ukrainian orthography, both prior to the 1927 conference and in 1928–9, when it brought out a special supplement on this issue. At the end of the 1920s/beginning of the 1930s, the editorial board of the newspaper was completely changed, and by 1938 nearly the whole editorial board and the majority of active contributors had fallen victim to Stalin's purges. From January 1938, parallel to Visti, a Russian-language newspaper Sovetskaya Ukraina was launched, which circulated throughout Ukraine. (In 1944, it was renamed Pravda Ukraviny). On 3 May 1941, the newspapers Visti and Komunist closed down, and were replaced by Radyanska Ukrayina.

Let us now turn our attention to the fate of what was in the 1920s–30s the biggest and most-influential publishing house in Ukraine, the State Publishing House of Ukraine (DVU). This was established in Kharkiv, in 1919. In the 1920s, its editors included Mykola Khvylovyi, Arkadiy Lyubchenko,²⁸ Serhiy Pyly-

²² Vasyl Blakytnyi (1894–1925). Ukrainian revolutionary and political figure, writer, poet, and journalist. In 1921, he became director of the State Publishing House of Ukraine and the editor of *Visti VUTsVK*. He was also one of the founding members of the literary associations Borotba and Hart.

²¹ Ostap Vyshnya (1889–1956; pseudonym of Pavlo Hubenko). Writer, humorist, and satirist.

²⁵ Valeriyan Polishchuk (1897–1937). Writer and literary critic. In 1923, he joined Hart and in 1925 in Kharkiv he founded the organisation Avanhard, which put forward a programme of constructivist dynamism and relied on Russian, Western European and American avant-garde literature.

²⁶ Hryhoriy Kosynka (1899–1934; pseudonym of Hryhoriy Strilets). One of the more outstanding Soviet Ukrainian story writers of the 1920s–30s.

²⁷ Oleksander Dovzhenko (1894–1956). Film director. In 1923–6, he drew caricatures for the newspaper *Visti VUTsVK* in Kharkiv, and played an active part in the artistic and literary life of the city.

²⁸ Arkadiy Lyubchenko (1899-1945). Writer, active in the literary movement of the 1920s-30s.

²³ Yevhen Kasyanenko (1889–?). Political leader and journalist. Disappeared in the late 1930s during the purges in Ukraine.

penko,²⁹ and Ivan Dniprovskyi. Its periodicals included the journals *Chervonvi* shlvakh, Zhyttya y Revolvutsiya, Literaturnyi yarmarok, Hart, Pluh, Nova heneratsiva. The DVU played a significant role in the standardisation of the Ukrainian literary language in the spirit of the Vseukravinska Akademiya Nauk (All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences) - VUAN. In 1930, under increasing pressure from the Soviet Ukrainian government, the DVU was reorganised into a network of eleven publishing houses: 'Radyanska shkola'; 'State Technical Publishing House'; 'State Publishing House of Socio-Economic Literature'; 'Proletar'; 'State Publishing House of Artistic Literature': 'State Publishing House of Children's and Adolescent Literature "Molodyi Bolshevyk"'; 'State Publishing House of Professional-Working Literature "Ukravinskyi robitnyk": 'State Medical Publishing House'; 'State Publishing House of Military and Physical Training Literature "Na varti"'; the 'Centre of Book and Journal Distribution "Ukrknyhotsentr"'; 'Administration of Polygraphic Enterprises'. Some years later, in 1934, the DVU was radically restructured; it ceased to be a system of individual publishing houses, and became, in effect, a subsidiary of the State Publishing House in Moscow.

'Knyhospilka' (Ukrainian Cooperative Publishing Union) was founded in 1918 in Kyiv; in 1922, its head office was moved to Kharkiv. This publishing house specialised in the series 'Literaturna biblioteka' (selected works of Ukrainian classics), 'Svitova literatura' (translations from Balzac, Anatole France, de Maupassant, et al), works by Franko, Lesya Ukrayinka, Mykhaylo Kotsyubynskyi,³⁰ school textbooks, 'Muzychna biblioteka' (edited by Lev Revutskyi³¹). 'Knyhospilka' was closed down in 1931, and its editors repressed.

The 'Rukh' Ukrainian cooperative publishing house, founded in 1917 in Vovchansk, was transferred to Kharkiv in December 1921. It mainly published the works of Ukrainian pre-revolutionary writers, in a series intended for mass distribution: 'Biblioteka ukrayinskoyi literatury dlya selyanskykh i robitny-chykh knyhozbiren' (Library of Ukrainian Literature for Peasants' and Workers' Book-cases), 'Illustrated Library for Children', 'Franko Library', a 'Theatre Library', which published over 100 plays, artistic monographs, and complete editions of the Ukrainian classics, including the works of Ivan Franko – in 30 volumes (1924–31); Olha Kobylyanska³² – in 9 volumes (1927–9); Borys Hrinchenko³³ – 10 volumes (1926–30); Mykola Chernyavskyi³⁴ – (10 volumes,

Secretary of Hart, co-founder and permanent secretary of VAPLITE; co-founder of Prolitfront and Literaturnyi yarmarok.

²⁰ Serhiy Pylypenko (1891–1934). Writer and journalist. Founded Pluh and was editor of its publications. He took an active part in the Literary Discussion of 1925–8. In addition, he was a director of the Knyhospilka publishing house and the State Publishing House of Ukraine. In 1933, he was arrested and shot the following year.

³⁰ Mykhaylo Kotsyubynskyi (1864–1913). One of the finest Ukrainian writers of the late nine-teenth-early twentieth centuries.

³¹ Lev Revutskyi (1889–1977). Composer, teacher, music activist.

³² Olha Kobylyanska (1863–1942). A pioneering Ukrainian modernist writer.

³³ Borys Hrinchenko (1863–1910). Prominent public figure, educator, writer, folklorist, and linguist.

³⁴ Mykhaylo Chernyavskyi (1868–1948). Writer and pedagogue. Under the Soviet regime, he suffered political persecution, and his works were prohibited. 1927–31); Hnat Khotkevych³⁵ (8 volumes, 1928–32). In 1933, 'Rukh', as a private cooperative publishing house, was wound up, together with its extensive book-distribution network that included the entire Ukrainian SSR. The staff of 'Rukh' were repressed.

By 1938, the Ukrainian press, periodicals and publishing sector had been effectively unified and brought under the total control of Moscow. In the post-war years, provincial newspapers, as a rule, had a parallel publication in the Ukrainian and Russian languages; for example, in Kharkiv there were *Sotsialistychna Kharkivshchyna* (in Ukrainian) and *Krasnoe znamya* (in Russian). In addition to the provincial papers, there was a local one – *Vechirniy Kharkiv* (in Ukrainian). In 1992, however, this changed to Russian. Today in Kharkiv only one newspaper is printed in Ukrainian – *Slobidskyi kray*, though occasionally materials in Ukrainian appear in the newspapers *Panorama* and *Sloboda*. The telephone directory *Zolotye stranitsy Kharkova* for 1997 listed 49 periodicals, of which only the following are in Ukrainian: the journals *Berezil, Silskyi zhurnal*, and *Selyanska hazeta*; the newspapers *Slobidskyi kray* and *Rayonni visti* (the organ of the council of deputies of the Lenin district); and the children's newspaper *Zhuravlyk*, published by the Kharkiv Prosvita organisation.



The Family Archives of Vasyl Tomara

Marharyta Chernobuk

Mong the archives of the Museum of the History of Kyiv there is a unique collection of documents, acquired in 1989, which once belonged to Vasyl Tomara, a Privy Councillor and Senator of the Russian Empire, and a notable diplomat of the late eighteenth century. Until this collection was acquired, virtually nothing was known of Tomara's biography. This article addresses, for the first time, the problem of reconstructing his curriculum vitae from this archive material.

The scholarly significance of such family archives, first and foremost, lies in the fact that they are chronological collections of documents, which not only throw light on the family concerned but may also contain unique material on the participation of its notable members in the civic, political, and cultural life of their country, and the social development of the state. The Tomara family archive, had it been preserved in full, would have been an invaluable source for scholars researching into the history of Ukraine of the eighteenth–nineteenth centuries. Even the relatively small fragment in the possession of the Museum of the History of Kyiv contains much valuable material.

The Tomara family is fairly notable in the history of what was termed Little Russia (i.e., Left-bank Ukraine, east of the Dnipro, which from the mid-seventeenth century was under the rule of the Russian state). It became connected by marriage with many eminent Cossack families, and a number of members of its branches rose to prominence and won it renown. Representatives of this family fought in the wars against the Turks of the end of the seventeenth–eighteenth centuries and the war of 1812; later scions were involved in the Decembrist movement, becoming distinguished among their contemporaries for their courage, education, and progressive views.

Vasyl Tomara's archive contains 33 documents: these are principally the various Deeds and official papers referring to his service career. These include: a certificate of Attestation from the Collegium of Foreign Affairs, instructions and orders of Field Marshal Grigoriy Potemkin, rescripts of successive Russian monarchs – Catherine II, Paul I, Alexander I, letters to Senator Tomara from Empress Maria Fyodorovna (wife of Emperor Paul I), the draft of a letter from Tomara to Empress Catherine II asking for his discharge, and notes on his 30-year irreproachable service, copies of Decrees of the Senate, and also, of particular interest, the wills of Tomara's father and himself. These documents make it possible to discover something of the family circumstances of Vasyl Tomara, his connections, and views, and to form an impression of this remarkable individual.

The archive includes a letter which reveals what became of these documents after the death of Tomara's widow – Yelyzaveta (née Kalamey, the daughter of a nobleman from the Grand Duchy of Tuscany). The letter, dated 1840, was addressed to the nephew of Vasyl Tomara, the retired cornet Yevhen Tomara, and



The Tomara family coat-of-arms.

sent from St Petersburg. In it the author (signature illegible) announces that finally he has been able to send these important papers. Their further fate – right up to their acquisition by the Museum – remains unknown, and it is evident that much material was lost from the archive during this century and a half. However, even in its present form, the archive is of considerable historical and genealogical importance. In particular, the biography of Vasyl Tomara himself was almost unknown, a fact noted by Petro Bartenev, the collator of the 'Archive of Prince Vorontsev', which includes letters from Vasyl Tomara, written between 1775–1803. 'Unfortunately', he wrote, 'the biography of V. S. Tomara is unknown to me. We only know that he was renowned as an astute diplomat'.'

Some details of Vasyl Tomara's biography, including the identity of his parents and closest relatives, were established by the historians Oleksander Lazarevskyi and Vadym Modzalevskyi. Lazarevskyi's article 'Lyudi Staroy Malorossii' (The People of Old Little Russia), provides some information about the founder of the family (an incomer from Greece) Ivan Tomara, and his two sons – Stepan and Vasyl.² Modzalevskyi collected further detailed data about other members of the family. He intended to include them in the fifth volume of his *Malorossiyskiy rodoslovnik* (Little Russian Genealogy). But this volume never appeared and remained in manuscript form.³

The archive has made it possible to work out one of the branches of the widespread Tomara family tree: from the elder son of Ivan Tomara – Stepan – to the owner of the archive – Vasyl Tomara, whose great-grandfather he was. Stepan Tomara's will, dated 1715, is preserved in the archive.

It appears that under the regime of Hetman Ivan Samoylovych (ruled, 1672–87) Stepan Tomara was Colonel of Domontovsk, later he became Aide-de-Camp of the Pereyaslav Regiment, and in 1707, on the order of Hetman Ivan Mazepa, he was promoted to Colonel of the said Regiment, which he held until his death in 1715.

Stepan Tomara was married twice. This is apparent from his will, which bequeaths his lands with many villages and estates to his wife Pelaheya Yakivna (née Lyzohub, the daughter of the Chernihiv Colonel Yakiv Lyzohub). At the same time, it notes that no bequests are made to the (adult) children of his first marriage (to Varvara Voytivna, maiden name unknown) – a son Ivan and daughter Hapka – since they had already established their own households and, at appropriate times, had received [from their father] substantial moneys.

From his second marriage, Stepan Tomara had a son Vasyl and six daughters. This Vasyl received a good education, and later, like his father, entered upon a military career: he was a Military fellow, and subsequently Colonel of the Pereyaslav Regiment. He was killed during the Crimean campaign of 1735–6, and his remains were interred on the family estate, the village of Kovray (presently in the Zolotoniskyi district, Cherkasy province).⁴

Concerning the family status of Vasyl Tomara, we know that he was married to Elizabeth von Brinken, a close relative of General-en-Chef, Baron Karl Ewald Renne, who commanded a division from Little Russia. From this marriage, two children were born – a son Stepan and a daughter Hanna.

Stepan Tomara the younger was born in 1719, and, like his father and grandfather, served in the Zaporozhian army. In 1737, as a Fellow of the standard, he took part in the Khotyn campaign of 1739.⁵ In 1761, he retired, and from 1784 was

² A. M. Lazarevskiy, 'Lyudi Staroy Malorossii', Kievskaya starina, 1885, no. 5, pp. 14-20.

³ Institute of Manuscripts, V. I. Vernadskyi Central National Library of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, holding 2, 16609–16610.

⁴ i.e., the Russo-Turkish war, 1735–9. This war was preceded by a raid of the Crimean khan (1735), who, on orders of the Turkish government, led a large army through the Russian dominions to attack the territories returned by Russia to Iran (the provinces of Mazendaran, Hylyan, Astrabad, and the towns of Baku and Derbent on the shores of the Caspian Sea). There was a clash between the Crimean Tatars and Russian troops. In the spring of 1736, Russia declared war on Turkey. See, *Istoriya SRSR* (Moscow, 1967), vol. 3, p. 348; *Dnewnye zapiski malorossiyskogo podskarbiya generalnogo Yakova Markovycba* (Moscow, 1859), no. 2, p. 10.

⁵ The Khotyn campaign of 1739 was the concluding act of the Russo-Turkish war (1735–9), when Russian troops under the command of Field Marshal Minikh delivered a devastating blow to the Turks at Stavuchany on 17 August 1739, and on 19 August captured Khotyn, and later Iaşi. A peace treaty was signed on 18 September 1739. See, *Istoriya SRSR* (Moscow, 1967), vol. 3, p. 349.

a deputy from the nobility of Pereyaslav county, Kyiv *gubernia*, and a counsellor of the Little Russian Collegium.

Stepan Tomara was married to the daughter of the Poltava Colonel Vasyl Kochubey – Hanna, by whom he had three sons: Vasyl, Pavlo, Mykhaylo, and five daughters – Ulyana, Yelysaveta, Sofiya, Nadiya, and Marfa.

The eldest son of this marriage – Vasyl the younger – is of particular interest, since he was the owner of the archive. He appears to have been born in ca. 1748. Virtually nothing is known of his childhood and adolescence – apart from one interesting fact. When he turned five, it was decided to employ a resident tutor for him. By a fortunate chance, the choice fell on Hryhoriy Skovoroda, who was recommended to Stepan Tomara by his friends.⁶

Residence in the Tomara home was not easy for Skovoroda. Although the father of his pupil was an intelligent man, he was proud, and took considerable pride in his aristocratic descent. He never spoke to his son's teacher, nor paid any attention to him. This situation was humiliating to Skovoroda. He felt the implied humiliation, but tried not to react to it. For, having lost his membership of the Pereyaslav Collegium on account of his progressive ideas, he decided to endure his one-year contract to the end. Skovoroda immersed himself in his pedagogic work, using the innovative principle that the teacher should seek out the natural abilities of his pupil, and then try to assist their development discreetly, without overburdening the young mind with other fields of study. This method of teaching evoked in the boy a sincere affection for his teacher. However, shortly after, an incident occurred, which caused the departure of Skovoroda from Kovray. One day, during lessons, Skovoroda, growing exasperated with his pupil's answers, called him a 'pig's head'. This came to the knowledge of the boy's parents, and, on the insistence of his wife, Stepan Tomara dismissed Skovoroda – at the same time expressing his sympathy and apologising to the philosopher.

Skovoroda returned to Pereyaslav, where he met a friend from the Kyivan Academy, Kalihraf. Together they travelled to Muscovy, to the Sergeyev-Posad. Skovoroda spent a whole month at the Monastery. Its superior, Kyrylo Lyashchevetskyi, who recognised Skovoroda's eminent scholarship, offered him a post as a lecturer in the seminary there. But love for Ukraine impelled Skovoroda to return to Pereyaslav.

Stepan Tomara heard that he was back, and tried to get Skovoroda to return as Vasyl's resident tutor. However, in spite of the urgings of his friends, Skovoroda was unwilling to accept the invitation. And then a curious incident occurred: during the night, Skovoroda's friends conveyed him in his sleep to the Kovray estate. Next morning, Stepan Tomara pleaded with Skovoroda to resume his duties as tutor, promising never again to interfere in matters of the boy's education. Persuaded, apparently, by little Vasyl's affection for him, Skovoroda remained in Kovray for six years, until it was time for the boy to continue his schooling in official educational institutions.

⁶ Skovoroda was recommended by the Metropolitan of Kyiv, Tymofiy Shcherbatskyi. See, *Narodna tvorchist ta etnohrafiya*, 1972, no. 5, p. 40; 'Skovoroda, ukrainskiy pisatel xviii v.', *Osnova*, 1862, August, pp. 21–3.

When Vasyl turned twelve, Skovoroda wrote his pupil a birthday poem in Latin.⁷

On the Birthday of Basilius Tomara, a boy of Twelve Years

The circle is completed, now a new year is beginning, This is the primal day with which the year must open, On this day thou wast born, thou lad of talent, Basilius, Auspicious were the omens that the fates bestowed on thee. Just as thou didst come first into the light, an infant, First in virtue shalt thou be, and first likewise in honour, First thou art gifts of mind, first in gifts likewise, Which for seemly harmony of the body are needed. Firstly thee did first nature kindly fostering cherish, Though to those born after thee she prove step-dame unkindly. So first did the Creator of all things shape Adam, Later he shaped Eve, yet Eve became the lesser. Hence I congratulate thee, to whom many gifts have been given, Many gifts are thine from Powers good and auspicious. Yet bear in mind! To thee the Creator so much has entrusted, At the Judgement He will ask that to Him much thou rendr'est Strive then in thy studies, meetly perform every duty, And, in deeds as in name, thou shalt be truly 'Basilius'.8

The six years (1753–9) that Skovoroda spent with the Tomara family proved fruitful for him. During this time, he wrote a cycle of poems, which eventually became part of his famous collection *Sad bozhestvennykh pesney* (Garden of Divine Songs). These years likewise had their effect on Vasyl Tomara. He received

⁷ Hryboriy Skovoroda. Literaturnni Tvory (Kyiv, 1983), p. 181. The Latin text reads: Perfecto circo rursum novus incipit annus.

Haec est prima dies, quam caput annus habet Hocce die nasci, puer ingeniose Basili, Omine felici fata dedere tibi, Ut cum primus es in lucem puer editus infans, Primus virtute ac primus honore fies, Primus es ingenio, primus quoque dotibus illis, Consona quas poscit corporis harmonia. Primi prima tibi indulsit natura benigna, Quae post te natis dura noverca fuit Sic prius ille opifex rerum confinxit Adamum, Finxit post et Evam, set minor Eva fuit. Gratulor ergo tibi, quod tam bona multa dedere, Multa dedere tibi numina dextra bona, Sed tamepheu multum tibi credidit ille creator, Ilio in judicio reddita multa volet, Magnam puer, te cura manet toleranda laborque, Ut sis Basilius nomine reque simul.

⁸ The first two lines of the poem imply that Vasyl Tomara was born on 1 January, the date to which Peter I had moved the opening of the civil year in the Russian empire. His name lends credence to this view; in Ukraine at this period children were frequently named after the saint on whose day they were born. 'Vasyl' is the Ukrainian version of the Greek 'Basilios' – meaning 'Kingly', and 1 January, in the Byzantine religious calendar, is the feast of St Basil the Great.

a basic education, and throughout his life retained a warm affection and sincere respect for his first tutor, keeping up a correspondence with him. In one of his letters, dated 1778, he wrote to Skovoroda as follows:

My Dear tutor Hryhoriy Savych! I received your letter with heartfelt affection for you, that amounts to love. You will recall, my dear friend, your Vasyl, who may not appear unfortunate, but who within needs more advice, than when he was with you. O, if only the Lord had inspired you to remain with me! If only you could hear just once and knew, then you would take no joy in the boy you reared. Have I wished for you in vain. If not, then be so kind as to write and tell me how I can see you, my dear Skovoroda. Farewell and do not grudge giving, just once more, at least a little of your time and peace to your old pupil Vasyl Tomara.⁹

The letter is redolent of his affection for Skovoroda, the need to confess his own deeds, and the wish to receive much-needed advice. It shows clearly how deep a mark the exceptional personality of the tutor had left on the soul of his pupil.

From the end of his studies under Skovoroda until the first mention of his activities in the Imperial service, no information is available about what Vasyl Tomara was doing. We may assume, however, that like other bright and ambitious young men from the East-Slavonic world, he studied at the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. This seems likely on two accounts; firstly, his tutor, Skovoroda, was himself an alumnus of the Academy, and secondly, proximity of the family residence to Kyiv, where his parents could rent accommodation for their son and keep an eye on him. We may also assume that, after the Academy, Vasyl Tomara also studied abroad, as did many Kyivan students.

Quite a few young Ukrainians, after graduating from the Academy, went on to take up government posts in Moscow and St Petersburg. Vasyl, too, went to St Petersburg. His education and intellect made it possible for him, while still only 21, to enter the Collegium of Foreign Affairs, where he spent a considerable time occupying various posts. His work there is corroborated by a Certificate of Service, issued on 6 May 1779, that is after ten years of his service. According to this document, Vasyl Tomara took part in a number of important diplomatic activities of the Russian government. He was present at all the negotiations which preceded the signing of the peace treaty of Kuchuk Kainarji (1774) with the Ottoman Porte, which ended the Russo-Turkish War of 1768–74. Thus, in 1772, Tomara was a member of the Russian delegation led by Count Grigoriy Orlov, Director General of Engineers and General-en-Chef, and the Russian ambassador to Turkey, O. M. Obreskov, during the peace negotiations in Focşani, and later to Bucharest.

During the Bucharest Congress, the Turks proposed conditions which could have led to a renewal of hostilities; however, Russia was in no situation to fight. In the autumn of 1773, a peasant rebellion broke out under the leadership of Yemelyan Pugachev, which caused considerable alarm to the Russian nobility, and induced the government to sign an immediate peace treaty.

These mandates were given to the commander of the First Russian Army, the renowned military leader, Pyotr Rumyantsev. In two successful campaigns beyond the Danube, he defeated the Turks, and forced them to sign a peace agreement. Tomara was present during the final stage of negotiations, on 10 July 1774, in the village of Kuchuk Kainarji. Shortly after, he was sent to the capital of the Ottoman empire – Constantinople. Here, as an assistant to the Chargé d'affaires, he conducted important negotiations with representatives of the Turkish government on the various points of the treaty still in contention. As a result of his efforts, on 21 July 1774, the peace treaty was signed.

Years later, Vasyl Tomara wrote to the Empress Catherine II a curriculum vitae, evoked by extraordinary circumstances. In this he gives a fairly coherent account of the main stages of his service. Referring to the ratification of the Kuchuk Kainarji treaty, Tomara states with regret that many officials were given various rewards at that time, but he, who had done much to bring it about, was simply given a Diploma of the Foreign Affairs Collegium.

Tomara spent some time in Constantinople with General-en-Chef Nikolay Repnin, who was Plenipotentiary Ambassador Extraordinary to the Ottoman Empire. For this, he was raised to the grade of titular counsellor (though this was only ninth place in the table of civilian ranks). However, his conscientious performance of his official duties did not go unnoticed. When he returned home, Tomara received a new appointment – he became a counsellor to the embassy in Constantinople. Thus his ascent of the complex hierarchical ladder of ranks progressed.

In the course of Tomara's professional career, a number of changes took place. In 1779, Field Marshal Grigoriy Potemkin had him transferred to the military establishment, and sent to Warsaw, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, under orders to evacuate the Russian armies from Poland.

According to his curriculum vitae, this was quite a difficult diplomatic assignment, since the government of Catherine II was reluctant to withdraw its troops, and tried by various diplomatic ploys to interfere in this matter. Tomara's curriculum vitae reads:

... that year [1779], I was sent to Warsaw under orders to evacuate the troops from Poland, but empowered, if this removal is a cause of great concern to the Polish authorities, to cancel those instructions, and to instruct the Commanding Officer, Lieutenant-General Romanius, to make ready for a campaign, awaiting new orders; I carried out all this, and conveyed to the Imperial Prince [Potemkin] from the King [Stanisław August Poniatowski] and the Polish Government those instructions, according to which Your Majesty desired at that time to leave troops in Poland.¹⁰

Vasyl Tomara carried out this important assignment with honour. In 1783, he was given an even more responsible task, of which he writes as follows:

In 1783, I was sent to Georgia in order to convey to King Erekle [II] a treaty concerning his vassalage to Your Imperial Majesty. This treaty, which I delivered in Tiflis, was accepted by the King and conveyed by me to the Georgievsk fortress to the Georgian plenipotentiary for the signature of this tractate by Lieutenant-General Pavel Serg. Potemkin on behalf of Your Imperial Majesty.

¹⁰ Holdings of the Museum of the History of Kyiv (hereafter MIK), DK-7014. Draft of a curriculum vitae by Vasyl Tomara on his 30 years of service.

For his part in this assignment, Tomara was promoted to full colonel.

That same year, Tomara went to Imeretiya, to persuade its ruler, too, to allow his kingdom to become a Russian protectorate. After some complex manoeuvring, he brought this to a successful conclusion. In 1784, he was also sent on a special mission to Persia, and, on returning, was appointed commander of the Lyuben Regiment of Carabineers, with which, as he wrote in his curriculum vitae,

... during the [Russo-]Turkish war [of 1787–91], which broke out shortly afterwards, I served initially in the Katerynoslav [army] and later in the Ukrainian army, and was present at the defeat of the Turks and Tatars in Hanhuri and Salkutsy, then [the defeat of] Hasan Pasha on the River Salga; at Izmail and at the capture of Bendery.

For his participation in these campaigns, Tomara was promoted to brigadier. According to the table of ranks, this was fifth overall, and the lowest rank of general. Of his subsequent assignments, Tomara writes:

As brigadier I was posted by the late Field Marshal as General-en-Chef and Knight in place of: Prince Yuriy Volodymyr[ovich] Dolgorukiy to the allied Imperial army against the Turks, and then, after my promotion to Major-General [I was posted] to the Austrian army against the Prussians. In the first of these postings, I commanded a regiment during the Campaign against Izmail and Bendery; as regards the second, I was not actually sent, owing to peace negotiations which were just beginning in Reichenbach...

Vasyl Tomara stresses the especial trust, which Field Marshal Potemkin placed in him, and on account of which he was, in May 1791, appointed commander of the Russian flotilla in the Archipelago in the Mediterranean. A few months later, in December 1791, Russia signed a peace treaty with Turkey at Iaşi. This new appointment meant only trouble for Tomara. The flotilla was in a pitiful state. He wrote:

The independent flotilla had by then been almost completely destroyed by the Turks; the small vessels which they had left plied between the islands of the Archipelago, while the commander Lieutenant-Colonel Knight Lambro Kachoni and his officers were far away in German lands. Unserviceable vessels had been disarmed and were ignored by the armourers who served on them, and the regular flotilla was reduced to 3 vessels and 60 sailors with no provisioning.

Tomara took his new responsibilities seriously. He began to refit the flotilla, and within a short time there was a major improvement. 'By now', he wrote, 'the regular flotilla comprised 10 vessels, which had been acquired and armed by me'. The main cause of the chaotic situation of the flotilla was, in his opinion, the fact that there was no proper information about the strength of crews on each vessel. Hence, it was impossible to calculate pay accurately or provide the necessary rations. He therefore introduced rules which laid down the number of sailors in each flotilla under war conditions and in peace-time; this, he believed, would put an end to all abuses. He describes in detail how he restored the pitiful remnants of the flotilla into proper fighting units once again, and how he managed to satisfy the demands of the crews, particularly those of the independent flotilla, whose commanders had received no payroll since the very beginning of the war.

Tomara gives details of the costs incurred in putting the flotilla in order: for the arming of the vessels, provisioning them, refitting them and dispatching them to

the Black Sea with stores for six months. This all added up to 98,000 'red guilders'. '... I will dare to add', he writes, 'that the construction of this flotilla and its longterm maintenance in home waters could not have cost your I[mperial] majesty less'.

Tomara was obliged to go into so much detail about everything connected with his command of the flotilla because complaints about him had reached St Petersburg, and Catherine II had ordered a special commission to be set up to investigate them. Tomara was greatly disturbed by this, particularly since he felt no cause for blame or guilt. He had restored order to the flotilla, defended the state interests, and, as far as circumstances would permit, had tried to satisfy the complaints coming to him from the various vessels.

The commission rejected the charges against Tomara as groundless, however, no formal decree was issued appraising his activities as commander of the flotilla. He felt, therefore, that, in the absence of such a public declaration, he remained discredited in the eyes of society. Accordingly, he wrote to the Empress, tendering his resignation. She, however, considered that his conduct had been irreproachable, and, instead of accepting his resignation, refused to dismiss him, appointed him counsellor to the embassy in Spain. This, it is clear, was in 1796, since the draft of the curriculum vitae is dated January of that year.

Some time later, Tomara received a new assignment: he was sent as Envoy to Constantinople, where he remained from 1798 until 1807. In the years that followed, he received numerous rewards for his meritorious service. Emperor Paul I appointed him a Knight First Class of the Order of St Anne, and soon afterwards a Commander of the Order of St John of Jerusalem (which brought with it an annual honorarium of 1,000 roubles). At the same time, he was granted in perpetuity for himself and his heirs an estate in the Podillya *gubernia*, which the Treasury had acquired from Prince Lyubomirskiy. This comprised six villages and 1,499 male peasants.¹¹

Both orders were established in Russia by Tsar Paul I (1797). At that time, all Russian Orders were recognised as a single Knightly rank or order (individual orders were considered its classes and received a common statute and administration which became known as the Order Chancellery). In 1798, this was renamed the Chapter of the Order of Chivalry. At that time, a number of individual 'officials' were also ratified: Chancellor, Master-in-Chief of Ceremonies, Master of Ceremonies, secretaries, and heralds. Three principal order 'officials' – the Chapter. The Master-in-Chief of Ceremonies and the Treasurer – formed the general core of the Chapter. The secretaries of the Order classes, whose main task was to keep the lists of Order members, were accountable to it.

Every order had a special festival on the feast of its patron saint. In addition, Paul I also established a general festival for all Russian knightly orders – 8 November, the feast of St Michael the Archangel, and also assigned to each class a particular church in St Petersburg.

The members of these orders had the duty of taking part in charitable activities, supervising educational establishments in Moscow and St Petersburg, opening in both capitals refuges for the care of the poor and needy. To pay for the establishment and equipping of such charitable concerns, newly-created members of an order had to make a one-time contribution to the Chapter of the Russian Chivalric Society. Knights of the orders were given an annual pension. See, F. F. Brokgauz and I. A. Efron, *Entsiklopedicheskiy slovar* (St Petersburg, 1897), vol. xxII, pp. 117–20.

¹¹ MIK holdings, DK-7008. Rescript of Paul I creating Privy Councillor Tomara a Knight of the Order of St Anne First Class; DK-7006. Rescript of Tsar Paul I creating Privy Councillor Tomara a Commander of the Order of St John of Jerusalem.

N14 Ротодинь ЭТайный Салатнина Янамара Стазанное вани усердие на Служан нашей во выпоренноми валые постив и тогноез HEROUMENIE, Hpednucerin Hallitate? ofpanyamme na back Malle dialobour rie, Bl use bierin oree oralo nopasoba м Мы вась Каванероми Ордена Свяmbin Auribi nepualo hisacca, nocio Sua ни у село препрованийона возлори. me na ceda. Floredisbacuto de mosterilo? fr lagund Cumuliffe 11.

Decree of Emperor Paul I informing Counsellor Vasyl Tomara of the granting to him of the Order of St Anne First Class, 11 September 1798.

Tomara's career continued to prosper. He became a Privy Councillor – an official of the third rank, above which there remained only two grades: Actual Privy Councillor and Chancellor. In the course of time, he became an Actual Privy Councillor, and towards the end of his career, was granted the honorary title of Senator.¹²

¹² Senator was a civil title and post of honour, introduced at the end of the seventeenth century; it was granted to members of the Council of Ministers and other top-level civil servants (grades 2–4, princi-

Vasyl Tomara's archive, however, has not preserved copies of the decrees of the monarchs he served, granting him these titles and awards. In other words, a number of documents are missing, which would have been invaluable aids to reconstructing his biography and career.

Particularly valuable for such research is Tomara's will, from which one can ascertain his address in St Petersburg and the circle of his friends. The will was drafted three years before his death -15 May 1816. Tomara begins with the following words:

Not knowing how long the Almighty will deign to prolong my life in this world, in the case of the hour of death, I, the undersigned Actual Privy Councillor and Knight, Vasiliy, son of Stepan Tomara, being of sound mind and body make the following spiritual bequests.¹³

According to this will, the stone-built building in St Petersburg, no. 47 in the first quarter of the Admiralty section, which had in its time been acquired from Count Arakcheev, was to pass into the absolute and long-term ownership of his wife – Yelysaveta. Tomara also bequeathed absolutely to his wife five estates in the Simbirsk, Volodymyr, Nizhnyi Novgorod, Kherson, and Poltava *gubernias*. In the case of her predeceasing him, the estates were to pass to Vasyl Tomara's bro-thers – Pavlo and Mykhaylo, and his sister Sofiya.

Tomara ends his will as follows:

in concluding these bequests, I sincerely request to act as witnesses and executors my kinsman Count Viktor Pavlovich Kochubey and my dear friends Count Aleksey Kirillovich Razumovskiy, Count Nikolay Nikolayevich Golovin, Mikhail Ivanovich Danaurov, Prince Aleksandr Nikolayevich Golitsyn, Count Lev Kirillovich Razumovskiy, and Zakhar Nikolayevich Posnikov, and I especially request them to be gracious guardians and protectors of my wife, inasmuch as she is not knowledgeable either in business matters nor in the language, and to execute all these bequests with every precision.¹⁴

The document was endorsed with his personal seal, which replicated the device of his great-grandfather, the Pereyaslav Colonel Stepan Tomara. It was an oval shield, bearing a couped Latin cross standing on a crescent, and surmounted by a helmet and three ostrich feathers. These were the principal elements of the coat-of-arms, which is described as:

Azure a Latin cross *or* issuant from a crescent *or*, above, an estoile of six points argent. Crest a peer's helmet, crowned. Mantling *azure*, countercharged argent. Supporters two storks. Motto: Ducit aut Salvet.¹⁵

The golden cross, placed above a crescent moon and chosen as the central motif, was intended to symbolise victory over the Muslims, and in particular the

pally to the third class) on their retirement. The title of Senator was comparable to the title of Guardian, which was introduced in 1798 to reward members of the Councils of Guardians, which headed charity institutions, or who gave significant donations to charity. See, I. E. Shepelev, *Otmenennye istoriey chiny, zvaniya y tituly v Rossiyskoy imperii* (Leningrad, 1977), p. 98.

¹³ MIK holdings, DK-7004. Will of V. S. Tomara.

¹⁴ Viktor Kochubey (1768–1834). Notable statesman; along his maternal line, he was a relative of Vasyl Tomara.

¹⁵ V. N. Lukomskyi, V. L. Modzalevskyi, *Malorossiyskiy gerbovnik* (St Petersburg, 1914), p. 185; *Obsbchy gerbovnik dvoryanskikb rodov Vserossiyskoy imperii* (St Petersburg, 1799–1840), part vii, p. 13.

the ukrainian review



Silver tea-pot with the Tomara family coat-of-arms. Made ca. 1715 by the Kyivan jeweller Ivan Ravych to the order of the Colonel of Pereyaslav Stepan Tomara. Now in the Museum of Historical Treasures of Ukraine.

participation of Vasyl Tomara in military campaigns against the Crimean khanate and the Russo-Turkish wars of the turn of the seventeenth–eighteenth centuries. The storks, which symbolise sagaciousness, diligence, exuberance, and watchfulness, indicate the predominant traits of the members of this family.

One may deduce from Vasyl Tomara's dispositions concerning his property that his marriage was without issue. Hence there were various bequests to his relatives. The available information about the latter is by no means complete; but even the fragments which we have are not without interest.

It is known that, in the eighteenth century, Vasyl Tomara's sister, Ulyana, lived in Kyiv, at Moskovska Street, 46. She was married to Ivan Vyshnyevskyi, a colonel of the guard and head of the Imperial Palace of Justice. It is noteworthy that in 1787, when Catherine II visited Kyiv, a member of the Empress's entourage, one N. Naryshkina, a relative of Vyshnyevskyi, was accommodated in their home.

During Catherine's visit, life in the city became much livelier. All the notables from the surrounding areas came into town to attend balls and masquerades. Catherine II's favourite pastime was playing cards, and Naryshkina organised cardparties in the Vyshnyevskyis' house, which were attended by a select circle of their acquaintances from the gentry – and the Empress herself.¹⁶

Another of Vasyl's sisters – Sofiya – also lived in Kyiv, though her exact address is unknown. Her husband, Hryhoriy Krasnokutskyi, a member of the nobility of the Kyiv *gubernia*, was a State Councillor, and held the post of the Prosecutor of the Kyiv *gubernia*.

Their son, Semen, had a brilliant but tragic career. He was born around 1788. After training in the First Cadet Corps, he served as an ensign in the Life Guards of the Semeniv Regiment. He took part in the campaign of 1807 (the Russo-Turkish war), displaying conspicuous bravery for which he was awarded a golden sabre of honour. In 1811, he was promoted to Staff Captain. During the war against Napoleon in 1812, he took part in the major battles – Borodino, Tarutin, and Malo-yaroslavets – as well as foreign campaigns. In 1821, Semen Krasnokutskyi retired with the rank of Major-General, and was appointed to the Senate, in the first section of the fifth department, where he held the post of Senior Prosecutor and the rank of Actual State Councillor – the fourth grade in the table of ranks.

Semen Krasnokutskyi was a member of the young generation of officers, scions of the nobility, who after the war against Napoleon wanted reform in Russia. In 1817, he joined the 'Union of Salvation' in St Petersburg, and then gradually became involved with the Southern Society of Decembrists, and helped prepare the uprising on the Senate Square. For his participation in the Decembrist movement, he was arrested and exiled to Siberia for a term of twenty years. There he became seriously ill with rheumatism, and in 1831 became unable to walk. In view of this, his mother was permitted to send a servant to Krasnoyarsk, where he was living.

The fate of Semen Krasnokutskyi was clearly a cause of great concern to Yelisaveta Tomara, Vasyl's widow. In her own will, she bequeathed 50,000 roubles in

¹⁶ Kyivski zbirnyky istoriyi, arkbeolobiyi, pobutu ta mystetstva (Kyiv, 1930), collection 1, pp. 307–14.

securities in the State Bank, for the income to go to the support of her husband's kinsman in Siberia. (Yelyzaveta died on 19 June 1835). However, after a relatively short time, Semen Krasnokutskyi died in Tobolsk in 1838, to which town he had been transferred as a result of the efforts of his sister Nadiya.¹⁷

A great-nephew of Vasyl Tomara, Lev Tomara, the grandson of his brother Mykhaylo, is known to have been living in Kyiv in the 1880s. He was a prominent personality in the city, and for many years (1885–98) held the post of Governor of Kyiv. In 1897, Governor Lev Tomara did much to assist the organisation of the All-Russian Industrial and Agricultural Exhibition in Kyiv, and was given a testimonial of gratitude from the organisers. He resided at Volodymyrska Street, 22.¹⁸

Another member of the Tomara family, Oleksander, the great-grandson of Vasyl's brother Pavlo, is known to us from documents in the Kyiv provincial archives, in the holdings of the Kyiv Assembly of Noble Deputies.

He was born on 9 March 1866 and educated in the Orlov Cadet Corps. In 1885, he entered the Kyiv Assembly of Noble Deputies, where he was assigned to the third rank of officials. He served from 27 June 1885 until 24 March 1886, that is, until his prescribed term of military service. He then asked for his discharge and transferred to the 36 Okhtyr Dragoon Regiment.

After leaving the army, Tomara returned to Kyiv and continued at his previous post (1891). Two years later, he was appointed registrar of the Little Russian Collegium, and after a further three years – secretary of the governor.

Oleksander Tomara was married to Zinayida, the daughter of a titular counsellor – Avhustyn Kryzhanivskyi. In Kyiv, the family lived at various addresses. In 1891, they lived in the Lukyaniv borough, where they owned a house, no. 44. In 1896, they moved to Bezakivska Street, 6.¹⁹

It is further recorded that in 1896 Oleksander Tomara entered the Ministry of the Court of His Imperial Majesty. Later, he served in the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and later still – in the Ministry of Communications.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the family archives of Vasyl Tomara are fairly fragmentary, and that without recourse to other documents the full reconstruction of the family tree would be difficult, if not impossible. Nevertheless, further research will doubtless bring to light additional information about the ramifications of this family, whose members included so many notable people.

¹⁹ State Archive of the Kyiv Oblast, holding 782, file 4, item 180, folios 1-5.

¹⁷ Dekabristy. Biograficheskiy spravochnik (Moscow, 1988), p. 84.

¹⁸ Kalendar. Adresnaya i spravochnaya kniga g. Kieva na 1914 god (Kyiv, 1913), p. 246.

Arts and Culture

Yuriy Shevelov (On the Occasion of his 90th Birthday)

Roksoliana Zorivchak

 \mathbf{Y} uriy Shevelov, one of the leading Ukrainian philologists of this century, celebrates his 90th birthday this December.

Shevelov was born on 17 December 1908 in Łomża in Russian-ruled Poland. where his father was a civil servant. Two years later, however, the family moved to Kharkiv, the city with which Yuriy Shevelov was associated for almost the entire 'Ukrainian' period of his life. Here, in 1931, he graduated from the Institute of Professional Education. Here, too, in 1939 he successfully defended his dissertation for the degree of 'Candidate of Sciences': 'Observations on the Language of Contemporary Poetry'. During the 1930s, he worked as a lecturer and then Associate Professor at the Ukrainian Institute of Journalism (1933-9), and at Kharkiv University (1939-41), becoming, in 1941, head of the Department of Ukrainian Philology. Shevelov began to be published in 1929, his earliest appearances in print being reviews of plays. His first book - Grammar of the Ukrainian Language (in two parts, co-authored with Naum Kahanovych) appeared in 1934. It was reprinted in two subsequent editions, in 1935 and 1936. Kharkiv, to a marked degree, formed Shevelov as a Ukrainian scholar. There he had the opportunity to become acquainted with the most prominent members of the Ukrainian Renaissance of the inter-war period, working alongside such personalities as the linguists Mykola Nakonechnyi and Kostyantyn Nimchynov, whom he regarded as his mentors. And it was in Kharkiv that, as a young man, he came face to face with all the horrors of the Soviet system, during the period which his close friend, the literary scholar Yuriy Lavrinenko, termed the 'Executed Renaissance' - a tragic phrase which became part of the terminology of Ukrainian literary history.

In 1943, Shevelov moved to Lviv, where he became closely acquainted with Professor Vasyl Simovych, who, as Shevelov himself said later, 'was at that time the only exponent in Ukraine of the ideas and methods of the Prague Linguistic Circle', and where he was able to be in touch with Nikolay Trubetskoy 'himself'.¹ The young scholar worked extensively in the library of the Shevchenko Learned Society (NTSh), the director of which, Volodymyr Doroshenko, willingly shared with him his memories of thousands of key events of Ukrainian cultural life stretching back to the turn of the century. From Lviv, Shevelov emigrated to Germany; from 1946–9 he was an Associate Professor at the Ukrainian Free University in Munich (where it had been transferred from Prague in 1945). It was there

¹ Yu. Shevelov, Foreword, *Halychyna v formuvanni novoyi ukrayinskoyi literaturnoyi movy* (Galicia in the Formation of the Modern Ukrainian Literary Language) (Lviv, New York, 1996), p. 8.

that, in 1947, he published (in cyclostyled form) his monograph *Do henezy nazyv-noho rechennya* (On the Genesis of the Nominal Sentence), which he had written in Ukraine in 1941–2. This work formed the core of his doctoral dissertation, which he defended successfully in 1949 at the Ukrainian Free University. This was a topic which had, at that time, never been addressed in Western linguistics.

While in Munich, Shevelov was also the vice-president of the literary association 'MUR' (Mystetskyi ukrayinskyi rukh)² (1945–9). In 1950, he moved to Sweden, where for two years he lectured on the Ukrainian and Russian languages at the University of Lund. Eventually, like so many other Ukrainian displaced persons, he emigrated to the USA, where he arrived on 15 July 1952. There, after mastering the English language and the American scholarly methodology, he became, in due course, one of the best-known Slavists in the USA.

Initially (1952–4) Shevelov taught Russian and Ukrainian at Harvard University; later (1954–77) he was Professor of Slavic Philology at Columbia University. He also gave a series of lectures at various universities in the USA, Canada and Western Europe. He was also, simultaneously, very active in émigré Ukrainian academic institutions. Since 1945, he had been a full member of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences (UVAN),³ and since 1949 of the Shevchenko Learned Society (NTSh). During the years 1959–61 and 1981–6 he served as president of UVAN. He was also a founder-member of the Slovo Association of Ukrainian Writers in Exile⁴ (1954), and a member of the Society for the Development of the Ukrainian Language (from 1964).

Shevelov has made significant contributions to a broad spectrum of Ukrainian studies, in particular, phonology, morphology, syntax, etymology, and onomastics. He developed the conceptual and historiographical principles of Ukrainian linguistics, synthesising in his works the diachronic and synchronic approaches to the study of the Ukrainian language. Shevelov carried out ground-breaking research on the syntax of the simple sentence Syntaksys suchasnoyi ukrayinskoyi literaturnoyi movy. Proste rechennya (The Syntax of Modern Ukrainian Literary Language: The Simple Sentence) (1951; in English in 1963). In his English-language monographs A Prebistory of Slavic: The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic (1964, 1965) and A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language (1979), he demonstrated the development of the phonological system of the Ukrainian language from its proto-Slavonic origins to the present day, using a wide range of historical, dialectical, inter-language and textual evidence, and, by establishing the underlying causative links between individual phonetic changes, gave a panoramic view of the development of the Ukrainian language in a historical cross-section, substantiating its origins in the seventh century and the completion of its formative period in the sixteenth.

² MUR (The Artistic Ukrainian Movement), an artistic-literary organisation of Ukrainian émigrés in Europe.

³ UVAN, the official name of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences (Ukrayinska Vilna Akademiya Nauk). An academy of Ukrainian émigré scholars, founded in Augsburg in November 1945.

⁴ Slovo Association of Ukrainian Writers in Exile, an association initiated in New York in June 1954 to continue and develop the ideology and activities of its European predecessor MUR (see note 2), which comprised all Ukrainian writers outside Ukraine, the USSR, and its satellites.

Rejecting existing views of proto-Slavonic linguistic unity and the three East-Slavonic languages, prior to the beginning of written records with the coming of Christianity at the end of the tenth century, he developed his own original – and controversial – theory of the configuration and re-grouping of dialectic groups (Kyiv-Polisya, Galicia-Podillia, Polotsk-Smolensk, Novgorod-Tver, Murom-Ryazan dialects), which evolved into the Ukrainian, Russian and Belarusian languages.

In addition to his works on historical, contemporary and dialectal Ukrainian linguistics, Shevelov's scholarly publications include monographs on various mediaeval texts, critical appraisals of the works of other Ukrainian linguists, and works on other Slavonic languages. He wrote extensively on the (still controversial) topic of the development of a standard Ukrainian orthography, and also wrote extensively on literary topics, for both scholarly and general audiences.

In honour of his 75th birthday, in 1983, a *festschrift* was compiled, published in 1985 as *Studies in Ukrainian Linguistics in Honor of George Y. Shevelov.* This – as the spelling of the title implies – appeared in the USA. For, throughout Shevelov's whole active career in the West, his work remained virtually unknown in his native Ukraine, and the many academic honours he received came from US or other Western institutions.⁵ Only in the final months of the Soviet Union, after Ukraine had already declared its 'sovereignty', was Shevelov able to return to his native Ukraine, for the First International Congress of Ukrainicists, in August 1990. Since then, he has been a frequent visitor. In 1990, he was elected a Member Abroad of a the National Academy of Arts and Sciences of Ukraine, in 1992 – a member of the editorial board of the journal *Movoznavstvo* (Linguistics), and a number of his most significant articles have been reprinted in this and other scholarly journals in Ukraine.

As his 90th birthday approaches, Yuriy Shevelov may truly be termed, after more than four decades in the diaspora 'wilderness', that rare phenomenon – a prophet honoured in his own country, no less than abroad. \Box

⁵ These include honorary doctorates of the Universities of Alberta (1983) and Lund (1984), and prizes from the Guggenheim Foundation (1959), the American Council of Academic Associations (1964; 1967), and the National Fund of Humanitarian Studies (1974).





ZADOROZHNYI, Ivan-Valentyn. Kyi, tapestry, 1980-2. Hotel Lybid, Kyiv.

Ivan-Valentyn Zadorozhnyi, 1921–1988

his year marks the tenth anniversary of the death of Ivan-Valentyn Zadorozhnyi, one of the most original and innovative Ukrainian artists of his time.

Ivan Zadorozhnyi was born in Rzhyshchiv, Kyiv province, on 7 August 1921, into a working-class family. In 1933, when Ukraine was in the throes of the Great Famine

imposed by the planners in Moscow, his dying father sent him to Kyiv where he found a place in a children's home, and where the supervisor, for some reason, gave him the additional forename of Valentyn. He completed his schooling in Kyiv, simultaneously holding various part-time jobs, including working as a courier for the 'Druh ditey' (Children's Friend) Society, and then as a stoker and 'retoucher' for the newspaper Visti. In 1937, at the age of 16, he became a student at the Shevchenko Art School in Kviv. In 1939, he reached the age of compulsory military service, and entered the Caspian Naval School in Baku (Azerbaijan). During World War II (which for the Soviet Union began with Hitler's 'Operation Barbarossa' against the USSR in June 1941), Zadorozhnyi served as an officer with the 68th Marine



artillery brigade. He was twice wounded (in actions at Rostov and Novorossiysk), and in 1943 was transferred to an artillery reserve brigade based at Vologda in Russia.

By 1945, he was working as an artist on the staff of the White Sea military district in Russia's far north. Here he produced what was, as far as is known, his first 'political' poster, entitled 'Glory to the victorious Soviet warriors'. Later that year, he enrolled in the Kyiv State Art Institute, in the faculty of painting, from which he graduated in 1951.

Zadorozhnyi's artistic education, naturally, followed the canons of Soviet aesthetics of that time, with a strong emphasis on 'socialist realism'. However, even his early paintings showed a marked degree of originality; these included, in particular, 'Bohdan Khmelnytskyi leaving his son, Tymish, as a hostage with the Crimean Khan' (1954) (for which he received his 'Candidate's' degree), 'Sonata' (1957) and 'Apassionata' (1960), for which he was awarded the title of 'Distinguished artistic worker of the Ukrainian SSR'.

His first major change of style came during the literary and artistic 'thaw' of the early 1960s, to which Zadorozhnyi responded by moving away from the naturalism of his earlier works to a stylised, semi-abstract treatment of his subject matter. This

the ukrainian *review*



At the Site of Past Battles (My Fellow-Countrymen). Fragment, 1963-5.
approach was developed over several years of dedicated effort and experiment, which had resulted in bulging portfolios of sketches, rough outlines, mock-ups, and the figure sketches which were to serve as his human raw material. The main features of Zadorozhnyi's new style were already apparent in his triptych 'The Song of Taras' (1962–4). In this, the figure of Ukraine's national poet, Taras Shevchenko, on the centre panel and the side-panels with their characters from his works 'Kate-ryna' and 'The Fettered One' were treated in a fairly stylised and symbolic manner. The head of Shevchenko, the 'apostle of wisdom, truth and right', rose high above his subjugated native land, defiantly touching the low-hung, brooding sky.

The landmark work of Zadorozhnyi's new style, however, was the painting 'At the Site of Past Battles (My Fellow-Countrymen)', on which he worked during 1963–5, and which portrayed stylised and dramatic figures of Ukrainian collective farm workers, standing as if turned to stone. The exhibition of 'My Fellow-Countrymen' evoked a furore of criticism both from less innovative artists and from the then Minister of Culture, Babiychuk, who told Zadorozhnyi curtly to 'Paint like everyone else'. Nevertheless, at an All-Union exhibition in Moscow, 'My Fellow-Countrymen' received a Grade II diploma.



Wedding Party. Bas-relief, 1971-2. Kremenchuk Palace of Culture.

Simultaneously with his mastery of the forms, colours and tones of the new technique came Zadorozhnyi's deliberate decision to go and live in the village of his forebears – Shchuchynka, once known as Chuchyn, a settlement in prehistoric times of the tribe of the Antes (see *The Ukrainian Review*, vol. 45, no. 1, spring 1998). Throughout the 1960s, Zadorozhnyi continued to strive for an idealised technique, based on a limited palette, monumentalised figures, and frieze-like compositions, culminating in his anti-militarist canvas 'That the Orchards may bloom', which portrays a war-blinded soldier and his aged mother. These two figures dominate the entire canvas, and the eponymous orchard is reduced to a semi-abstract pattern of trunks and a few bunches of leaves and fruits. After this, it was clear to everyone that Zadorozhnyi could never return to mere naturalism; indeed, in 1974, in a symbolic autocatharsis from all traces of the past, he destroyed and discarded all his materials from the past 24 years – studies, sketches, paintings, everything.

By then, however, Zadorozhnyi's creativity had undergone another major change of direction, from painting to what may be termed 'civic' art - a development which was greatly deplored by his fellow artist, the Paris-trained landscape painter Mykola Hlushchenko. This new development, which began in 1966, led Zadorozhnyi into significantly broader principles of imagery and composition. His first work in this field (produced in conjunction with F. Hlushchuk and Vasyl Perevalskyi was a stained-glass window, 'Taras Shevchenko and the People', for Kyiv University. This was followed by the mosaic panel 'My Homeland' (1970), the stained glass window 'Our Song is Our Glory' (1971-2) and the bas-relief 'Wedding Party' (1971-2) for the Palace of Culture in Kremenchuk, the stained-glass window 'Necklace', the mosaic 'Tenderness', the murals 'The Well' and 'The Flute of Guelder-rose', the painted ceilings 'The Young Shoot', 'The Winter's Tale', 'Flowers of Memory', produced during 1972-4 for the Palace of Culture in Kalyta village, the stained-glass window 'Ballad of the Cosmos', the mural 'Birth of Technical Thought', the carving 'Workers' Chorale' (1975), and the stained-glass windows of the Kyiv funicular (1984). At the same time, he worked on wood-carvings representing the pagan gods of Old Rus' - Svaroh, Stryboh, Dazhboh, Yarylo, Veles, Duzha, Kupalo, Marena, Troyets, Slava, Lada, Khors, Svitovyd. These, together with his tapestry portraying semi-legendary figures from the mediaeval chronicles - Kyi, Shchek, Khoryv and Lybid, and his encaustic painting: 'Glory in this World to the Sun and Peace on Earth to you, Good People!' established, as it were, a broad-based code for the Ukrainian people, glorifying the wonders of the world, and linking them with Nature and the universal order. His stained-glass window 'Our Song is Our Glory' (the largest in Ukraine) in the Palace of Culture in Kremenchuk portrays the later-mediaeval period of Ukrainian history, after the fall of Kyivan Rus', when the people found within themselves the strength to resist the Tatar horde, and producing their own immortal archetype, the Cossack-Mamay. Zadorozhnyi's window portrays Ukraine's national characteristics as follows: in the foreground, a brachycephalic moustached bardic sage gazes wide-eyed at the hundred-faceted human world, and the prevailing atmosphere of peace. He sits firmly on his steed, wearing a curved sabre, as if to warn off any future foreign



Our Song is our Glory. Stained-glass window, 1970–1. Kremenchuk Palace of Culture.



📰 the ukrainian review



Attila:Military Leader, Statesman, Ruler of the Huns, Scythians, 1979-83.

invader. His hands hold the traditional instrument of the Ukrainian bard, the kobza. The surrounding panels show the themes of his songs: his moustached Cossack brethren, sailing off to attack the Turks, a young couple in love, the bard-enchanter Lelya with his magic reed pipe, the beasts of the field and the birds of the air, two by two according to their kind, apple-trees heavy with fruit, and mother-Dana herself, praying that the world will be kind to her children, and that they may be fruitful and multiply. And, as was said of the legendary bard Boyan, the willows and poplars, the sun and stars listen to the Cossack's song, to which, in Shevchenko's words, 'the dead and the living and the as-yet-unborn' all respond.

Other symbols used here include the Sich Riflemen marching into battle to defend Ukraine against invasion, swearing a knightly oath on their sabres, and planting the eternal Tree of Life in the black earth of Ukraine, so that 'the Cossack Host shall not perish', while above, the bird of freedom soars up to the sun and stars. Similar folklore images, with multiple layers of meaning, are to be found in his other stained-glass windows of this period. His concept of the unity of nature: water, earth, fauna, flora, atmosphere and human beings, became increasingly important in these works, and found their full expression in his window 'People, Protect the Earth' in Bila Tserkva, which he completed in 1980, six years before the nuclear disaster at Chornobyl. This composition – a multi-faceted design focusing on a central figure, Gaia, Mother-Earth, the all-fruitful, who stretches out her hands to the people as if entreating: 'Protect... and you will possess'. The message of the window is clear: only by working in harmony with nature can we preserve Earth as an abode fit for people to live in, and only a peaceful development of civilisation and a just society can protect us from war and a nuclear holocaust.

Another facet of Ukrainian folklore may be seen in Zadorozhnyi's large-scale wood-carvings, which combine stylised, simplified forms with a wealth of allusions and associations. Works in this genre include his stela 'Kotsyubynskyi's well' (1978–83) in the Chernihiv museum devoted to the writer Mykhaylo Kotsyubynskyi, and the 'Scythia' woodcarvings at the Prolisok camp-site on the outskirts of Kyiv. The latter include all the woodwork of the establishment, from the hall and doors right down to the stools and lamps; the artist's 'foray' into the mysterious historico-archaeological world of one of the tribal ancestors of Ukraine. The forms and images, rich in symbolism and perception, are enhanced by the reddish tone of the wood, which gives an aura of great antiquity. Once again, at the centre, we find the all-fruitful Great Mother, with her Son, with her hands (as by now had become typical of Zadorozhnyi's vision) poised as if in prayer. As a halo, she wears the ancient bird of Scythia and the serpent of wisdom which ever renews itself.

According to Zadorozhnyi, the Scythians were a people skilled in all the necessary arts and crafts of life; to fight when necessary, to live in eternal brotherhood, to win themselves a livelihood, and to play sweet music – an intelligent, strong and wise people. His series of carvings use the findings of archaeology to portray scenes from Scythian life; a man scythes hay for the horses, housewives carry their milk-pots, a kneeling lad presents a flower to his sweetheart, an eagle soars into the sun, and the mythical griffin, half-lion half-eagle, rules over all... And, here, too, is a bard, whose song takes wing like a bird... a marching song for his people.

Zadorozhnyi's focus on history was not simply an artistic quirk. Rather it was an appeal to his fellow Ukrainians to consider their past, to be aware of their traditions, and to be reborn into true brotherhood.

But a third stage was to appear in his work. From 1973 onwards, he adopted a new style of symbolic painting, with expressive, deliberately 'distorted' figures and symbolic accessories, presented on a plain background, in clear, unmuddied colours and a limited palette. This is an approach which requires considerable conceptualisation of national and universal motifs. The subjects chosen were historical: 'Attila', 'Yaroslav the Wise', 'Petro Mohyla', or symbolic: 'The Universal Supper', 'We are crucified on the eternal road'. There were portraits, too, of Ukrainian writers (Shevchenko, Volodymyr Sosyura, Lina Kostenko) and world fig-



Mother-Scythia. Carving, fragment, 1976–8. Motel Prolisok, Kyiv.

ures (Gandhi, Paganini), and illustrations to Shevchenko's poetry. He also began work on several other major canvases: 'Dying for the Truth (Socrates)', 'Afghanistan', 'Famine–1933', and 'Chornobyl'. These, however, were still not completed, when he died on 21 October 1988.

In spite of the shock which his work had initially produced among Soviet establishment 'art experts', during his later years Zadorozhnyi received a number of state honours and awards, including a prize from the Council of Ministers of the USSR for his decorative works in Kalyta village, the Order of the Fatherland War (2nd class), and the medal for the 1500th anniversary of Kyiv. These were, however, essentially the 'routine' honours an artist might expect in the Soviet Union. The greater prizes, however, escaped him – and when, in particular, he was proposed for Ukraine's highest artistic award, the Shevchenko Prize, the necessary documents mysteriously went missing in the offices of the Union of Artists of Ukraine. Indeed, although his civic art – carvings, stained glass, tapestries – could be seen in many towns and villages of Ukraine, he never once in his life-time had a one-man show. Only three years after his death, with the Soviet Union collapsing, and Ukraine moving towards full state independence, was such an exhibition put on in Kyiv.

In the course of his creative life, Zadorozhnyi won a well-deserved reputation in a number of artistic fields, including posters, stained glass, art for children, and writings on the theory of art. He several times made sudden changes of theme, genre and style, discovering new forms of imagery, and addressing the burning issue of contemporary life and the history of his country and nation. In particular, he focused on Ukraine's history and pre-history – the Zaporozhian Cossacks, the Middle Ages, Kyivan Rus', the pre-historic Slavs and their tribal forebears and neighbours. At the same time, his work brought into close focus the phenomena and events of contemporary life in Ukraine, portrayed with a yearning for the renaissance of the nation's psyche.

Kotlyarevskyi's *Aeneid* and the Ukrainian Baroque Tradition

Bohdana Krysa

krainian baroque literature is rooted in a phenomenon which developed at the turn of the sixteenth/seventeenth centuries – a perceived need to imitate the forms of antiquity, with, simultaneously, an equally pressing need to create one's own tradition, which in

contrast to the classical heritage, became conventionally termed 'simplicity'.¹

At the same time, the Ukrainian-Renaissance-Baroque paradigm of antiquity developed along its own unique lines, introducing ever more specific borrowings, ranging from the citation of names as *sui generis* cultural *topoi*, and unattributed quotations to imitations, translations and travesties.

A third determinant of the Baroque was the inter-relation between antiquity and Christianity and their somewhat exemplary reconciliation, which has become accepted as a criterion of the development of Baroque.

It may be further observed that this reconciliation persisted as a living and developing trend throughout the entire literary process from the 1630s to the end

of the eighteenth century, introducing a certain movement into the ongoing literary and philosophical discourse. The debate eventually culminated in the dictum of Hryhoriy Skovoroda,² who stressed the absence of any essential antinomies between the thinkers of antiquity and the Christian era.³

Thus, Ivan Kotlyarevskyi's travesty of the *Aeneid*, on the one hand, fits naturally into a literature with a developed Baroque philosophy, and a unity of high and low, which did not exclude even Biblical subjects, and which functioned and

¹ B. Krysa, Peresotvorennya svitu. Ukrayinska poeziya xvv-xvv stolit (Lviv, 1997), pp. 78–99.

² Hryhoriy Skovoroda (1722–94). Philosopher and poet; one of the most outstanding figures in the history of Ukrainian literature and scholarship.

³ H. Skovoroda, Povne zibrannya tvoriv: U2 tomakb (Kyiv, 1973), vol. 2, p. 450.

developed in all artistic registers. Its success, therefore, was due not only to the undoubted talent of the author, but also to the fact that it arose from and fitted into the current artistic tradition.

On the other hand, when one considers Kotlyarevskyi's work against the background of that tradition, it becomes increasingly clear that he was breaking the bounds of the Baroque, bringing to the foreground not the poets or heroes of antiquity, as his predecessors in the tradition had done, but the multitude of the gods of the Graeco-Roman pantheon, thus creating a world which did not depend on the will of a single, omnipotent God. This was a *sui generis* challenge to an existing and long-standing literary tradition, which attributed all good things to God's favour and all that is bad to God's punishment for sin. In this view, the defining trait of man's humanity was trying to win God's favour, and to avoid His punishments. At the same time, shorn of its sacral context, this outlook relates directly to the plot of the *Aeneid:* all events in it are driven by the deeds and actions of the gods.

In the one and three-quarter centuries before Kotlyarevskyi, the acceptance of the ideals of antiquity as the proper basis for the development of one's personal literary culture was a matter for 'serious' literature. The proclaimed cult of 'simplicity' did not go so far as advocating that the living popular language should become the language of literature. Kotlyarevskyi, however, first and foremost, dealt much more simply with antiquity. His travesty, which is permeated with the essential spirit of Ukrainian 'low' Baroque, legitimises and expands the formula of 'simplicity', putting antiquity on the same footing as Ukrainian popular tradition and using a prosody based on the vernacular language.

One could easily be over-critical here, recalling that we are dealing with a derivative work at second or third remove from the original Roman classic. Thus, for example, Aeneas behaves at times like a Christian, having persuaded Neptune 'for half three-score of cash' to give him a calm sea, the first thing he does is 'cross himself five times'. Furthermore, the Aeneid of Kotlyarevskyi is clear evidence of 'how at the turn of the eighteenth century the thousand-year-long European vision of the world as organised around a God-Absolute and His Will finally lost its power. From then on, Europeans changed to a Weltanschauung which has at its centre the category of a sovereign self-sufficient People...'.⁴ For Skovoroda said: 'The people does not want to go to the grave'. This was, therefore, a time of transition outlooks, the Baroque and the Romantic. And thus Kotlyarevskyi cannot avoid looking back at what had been in the past. In his travesty he unintentionally evokes the Ukrainian ideas that were once of pressing importance, old motifs are developed to an absurd degree, the Ukrainian world is seen once more through the mask of foreign toponyms and names. The overall artistic consistency of the Aeneid of Ivan Kotlyarevskyi from this point of view would be difficult to deny, although individual passages may show some ambivalence of motifs and images. Thus, for example, the idea of a 'common good', which at the beginning

⁴ V. Skurativskyi, 'Do dvokhsotrichchya "Eneyidy" Ivana Kotlyarevskoho. Prospekt monohrafiyi', *Suchasnist*, no. 12, 1998, p. 144.

of the seventeenth century must surely have been one of the major (albeit virtually unimplemented) Ukrainian ideas, creates a *sui generis* counter-point, becomes an anthology quotation ('love for the homeland'), which cloaks the profundity of the author's sub-text, which in a striking manner gives to old ideas a hierarchy of layers of meaning arising from the chimerical nature of historical realities, so that it is the 'outsiders' – foreigners and mercenaries – who show themselves to be the most courageous and steadfast. Likewise in Kotlyarevskyi's *Aeneid* the Baroque 'wanderer' motif undergoes striking changes of meaning, because not everyone can feel the temporary nature of his sojourn on Earth, and not everyone will leave his native land and become an exile.

This breathes new life into the uncertainty of the Ukrainian early Baroque chronotope; however, this is no longer a preoccupation with spiritual spheres, nor the light of high culture, but the uncertainty of the future. Apart from the complete absence (for various reasons) of ambivalence in the *Aeneid* of Kotlyarevskyi, the intrinsic motif is the same: Virgil's hero also strives to understand whither he has come. And here we have an interesting paradox. In the development of the Ukrainian Baroque antique toponyms played a particular role: they were used to seek coordinates for one's own, Ukrainian culture, one's own roots. When, later, these coordinates were lost, the eternal rhetorical question 'where?' was expressed through classical analogies.

Finally, the language of Kotlyarevskyi's *Aeneid* also stands in a particular relation to popular tradition. It not only innumerably strengthens that current of the living vernacular, perceptible in the works of the 'lower' Baroque; for Kotlyarevskyi's work, these connections are significantly wider. First and foremost, as has been mentioned above, they have an ideological character, to personify the vision regarding 'simplicity' of language, rhythm, rhyme, which was very clear in the first half of the seventeenth century. From then on, the success of the *Aeneid* occurred at a time when the Baroque exuberance of language was coming under criticism because it touched on high spiritual registers, as it happened, for example, with the young Kyrylo-Tranquillon Stavrovetskyi in his sermons. The linguistic relation of Kotlyarevskyi's *Aeneid* to the previous era was more apparent through its contrast with typical Baroque style: lines rich in synonyms are, as it were, set with their vivifying force against lines of *vanitas*, the emptiness of human existence, stylistically expressed in the long catalogues of ominous phenomena and signs, the very naming of which conveys a warning.

It is difficult to use anything to give a warning to the heroes of the *Aeneid:* having lost everything, they make preparations to win everything. And language becomes here truly the single home of Existence, which cannot be violated by the chaos of the world, nor any ruin of it.

The features of the Baroque character, which at every turn opens up with different facets, the ambivalence of the *Aeneid*, and even more so its artistic profundity are manifested in variant readings, in new versions of the text. The historic sub-text provides, for example, for that reconstruction of the meta-text, which Shevchuk made, on the basis of a consideration of the eternal image of Ukrainian history, 'movement of Cossackdom in time'.⁵ One may find echoes of other events, have doubts about details. But in general such an approach, all-encompassing, and congruent with Baroque practice touches upon very important functional structures, in a word, leads to artistic form.⁶ And in that, the historic sub-text of the *Aeneid* becomes a support for the whole weight of its artistic 'reality', like the piers of a bridge. And the attainment of this artistic reality takes place in various ways, because it is open both to the past and to the future. Thus it is present in both.

⁵ V. Shevchuk, 'Eneyida' Ivana Kotlyarevskoho v systemi kultury ukrayinskoho baroko (Lviv, 1998), p. 50.

⁶ N. Fedorak, 'Na perepravi ukrayinskoho mystetstva', *Dzvin*, no. 4, Lviv, 1998, pp. 115-8.

Kotlyarevskyi's *Aeneid:* The 1898 Celebration

In 1798, Ivan Kotlyarevskyi published the first three books of his *Aeneid*, a travesty in the Baroque tradition, in which Aeneas and his Trojan companions were presented in the guise of Ukrainian Cossacks (see *The Ukrainian Review*, no. 1, 1998, p. 64). This was the first work of Ukrainian literature to be written in the vernacular of the day, rather than formalised language (much influenced by Church Slavonic), which had been used hitherto. Its publication is therefore considered to mark the beginning of modern Ukrainian literature.

In 1898, to celebrate the centenary of this event, a gala performance was staged in Lviv of another of Kotlyarevskyi's works, the operetta *Natalka Poltavka*. To inaugurate the evening, and to stress the importance of Kotlyarevskyi for the survival of the Ukrainian nation and language, the pre-eminent Ukrainian writer of the day, Ivan Franko, wrote a brief 'masque', which, beginning with the opening stanza of Kotlyarevskyi's *Aeneid*, becomes a call for Ukrainian state-building.

CENTENARY MASQUE

The stage is completely dark; in the darkness can be seen the glow of a great conflagration, downstage right is a burial mound.

THE COSSACK-IMMORTAL

an aged grandsire, with a bandura, sits on the mound. At first only a faint outline of his silhouette can be seen in the darkness. He gazes at the fire, and declaims in a dull, ironic voice.

Aeneas, he was lithe and limber, A fine lad, as true Cossacks are! In troubled times, his wits grew nimbler, The boldest wanderer he, by far. So when the Greeks their fire came strewing, And made of Troy an utter ruin, He pulled his pack on with due zeal, Then, calling a few Trojans over, Brown as a berry, all bold rovers, He showed Troy a clean pair of heels.

He rises up, stands erect. The bandura twangs.

And so she burns. Our Troy-Ukraine is lying In flames. She's lost. From her heart the blood flows.



It seems this is her last dread hour of dying. It seems, indeed, that nimble-witted foes Have won. Our warriors, slain in their defying, All dead, the walls all burned, and now there goes Too the last shroud which might the fallen cover, Stolen by the ravening throng that hovers.

And that is not the sum. Within us more Fires raged, and left in us but grieving ashes, We are worm-eaten to the very core, And in the soul all the eternal flashes Of living faith are quenched. Our strength of yore Laid on the pyre. Down, down, still down woe dashes Our brows once lofty to the ground. O Mother! Thou art left poor and naked, childless ever!

Thus are we all! What others would think shame, We take as daily bread to us imparted, What others 'traitor' we 'good fellow' name, Others say 'base', we say 'obeying smartly!' . What others simply and quite clearly claim As 'spinelessness' we denote 'simple-hearted'. There is no shame in us! Quiet and contented, Proud in the base depths to which we descended.

Distant thunder. The glow of the fire becomes nearer. The scene becomes a little lighter.

COSSACK

pointing to the west.

Yes, there he goes, that Cossack lithe and limber, Escaping as his home goes up in flames. Make mistake! His wits were surely nimble, Let ruin come here, death his brother claim, Let the black ravens rend his mother grimly, Let executioners fell the warriors famed... He's well away! Clutching his own Penates, Off now to seek another home he's started.

He showed you a clean pair of heels, sweet Mother! He left you there amid your wounds and blood! Out of his breast his heart he tore and severed, And ran off like a dog – for life is good! Loudly he shouted: 'Come on, lads, for never Will dew fall here, nor grass grow as it should! Our Mother's fallen. So, in this night's gloaming, Let's leave her corpse, into the wide world roaming!

'A better fortune waits us there, where roasted Pigeons come flying straight into your jaw. If you want luxury, Carthage will host you. If as a ruler above men to soar You wish, bags brimming gold and fame far-boasted – To Rome with me! Our shrine forever more! Let us forget Troy! What good is burned wreckage? Now Rome with power, Carthage with pleasure beckons!'

So off they went! A byword among nations! To seek themselves a mother new, somewhere! Quenched in their hearts even that inclination Which drags a dog back to its native lair. Where do you go, Aeneas? Lamentation They do not hear. Vain the cries of despair! Go! And to every nation shown proclaiming, Your beggar's bag, your countenance quite shameless.

During this speech, it has grown a little lighter. The burned-out shells of villages can be seen, and a field strewn with corpses.

Sun, rise no more upon Ukraine! The morrow Would terrify you with a scene so fall. Let me grow blind in such an hour of sorrow. Lest this dread picture, far more grim than hell, Should, like a thorn, pierce through my heart with horror Forever more! But... do I hear a bell? It is an angel tolls a nation's passing, For, should something still live... enough of asking!

A bell tolls in the distance.

Indeed, an angel tolls. With diamond clapper, He strikes the crystal bell-vault of the sky. Ah, what dread agonies at once are racking My old wounds. This blood-crusted mark did I Take at Berestechko. This bone-wound happened At Chudniv. This scab that all cure defies After a century came from Andrusiv's marching, This from Poltava and Tsar Peter's parching!

The bell becomes louder and is mingled with the growling of thunder. It grows dark once more. The Cossack falls to his knees on the gravemound.

O God, is this to be my song's last ending? Ukraine is dead! Let me now rest in peace! Grant that these hands, long tortured in surrender, Lie now unfettered in the grave at least! Blot out our memory, so that our descendants May not know how we came to our surcease, And, Lord, forget us in that hour of evil, When with the earth our gravemounds are made level!

There is a clap of thunder. The Cossack sinks into the earth. Once more, the thunder rolls for a moment, then it gradually grows lighter, a great rosy dawnglow appears in the east. The sun rises. The scene reveals the same landscape, but now with green orchards and neat cottages; far off to the right are the towers of a city with golden domes. Around the gravemound, bushes are flourishing. Guelder-rose and bird-cherry are in flower.

THE COSSACK-IMMORTAL

the same, but now rejuvenated, with a bandura, rises up from the gravemound. At first he moves gloomily and pensively; then slowly his movements become filled with energy, and his voice grows stronger.

> I've had a mighty sleep, I see, In Cossack style, through years five-score, Well, be it gain or loss to me, I'll look upon the world once more, Upon my own dear Ukraina, Which bloomed of old like paradise, Which more than aught else on the earth was Dearest to me, beyond all price. But who there now rules as master, But who there now lives out his days, How do they speak, how do they sing now, The generation of this age? Dear God, my heart is gripped by terror: For, surely, they are all long gone, And none is left to know and cherish Our native language and our song. Kalmyks and Kyrgyz somewhere trample The steppe where we laid down our bones; Yea, Mordvin, Chukhan, Finns have taken The villages which were our homes.

Dear God, why from my sleep eternal Didst thou call me to rise amain? Only that with a heart grief shattered, I might lie in my grave again?

He moves forward. Off-stage a choir is heard singing, at first pianissimo, and then growing stronger, but still muted as if far off:

'Oh see, mother, see, The Cossacks riding free! Fair and fortunate, is the road they follow, As they ride on free.

And when they ride out, Then the meadows shout, And before their onslaught every dastard foeman Shall be put to rout!'

COSSACK

with an expression of supreme joy.

Dear God, it is our native language, Our native song lives yet and thrives, The generation of this age yet Keeps our memory alive! Of Cossackdom they still are singing, And of its wars in olden times, And so it is *not* dead and buried, That nation well-beloved of mine!

He looks around bim.

Ah yes, indeed, the flowering orchards, Ploughlands and villages are there, These are indeed Ukrainian homesteads, These Ukraina's garlands fair! And there rise high the ancient gravemounds Where warriors in last sleep were laid, Adorned with flowers, set there, surely, By fair hands of Ukrainian maids. And some Ukrainian from these ploughlands Garners still his daily bread, And still no stranger tramples over Our graves, and kills our glory dead.

He comes further forward, and catches sight of the audience.

And there, behold, wonder of wonders, Mystery among dread mysteries great! Lo, the descendants of Aeneas! But what today can be their fate? Their grandsires who, a hundred years back, When flames engulfed our own dear home Showed a clean pair of heels, not thinking That ever such a day would come, -That under her maternal wings would Folk nestle lovingly once more, Wishing in their native homeland, A paradise here to restore. And see, behold, their eyes are gazing Afire with that holy flame, Which of old in that night was blazing, When my friend, my sworn brother came, When that famous yet luckless hero, Our Bohdan, our good father, bade His Cossacks, in an hour of trouble, To muster forth in their parade. Like this same day I can recall it, That night, around us Dnipro moaned, And the Insatiate rapid seething, Gnawed gnashing at his ribs of stone. And in the steppeland, the Sich facing, It was not an owl that spread Forth its talons as a raptor But the Kudak fortress dread. Tears in Bohdan's eyes were shining, But fire in his soul and cry: 'Brothers, let us either perish Or raise freedom's banner high! Perish must we, no path other, Or in fetters or in war: But he who hates fetters shall not Find in fight a terror sore! Does our strength, enfeebled, perish? Blunted now our sabres bright? Have your hearts now ceased to cherish The true spirit of a knight?' Louder than the waves of Dnipro, Roared the Cossacks' shout straightway: 'Either we shall fall in battle,

Or the foeman we shall slay!' In the yellow flare of torches, Bright before us in the dark, In the eyes of Cossacks shone then, Full ten thousand gleaming sparks. And, my brothers, those ten thousand Sparks did light the tinder trail, Which raised a dread conflagration To the Buh and to Syan's vale. And, my brothers, those ten thousand Sparks proved a decisive goad That caused Ukraina's history To turn to another road. Yes, I see, I see those sparks now! You say: 'So few of that kind?' What? Out of full thirty million, Are ten thousand hard to find? You say: 'Where to get our Bohdan?' Only you will have the skill, For the great and holy cause to Temper breast and thought and will! If you do but test your wings now, Pluming them for lofty flight. Bohdan will come, culmination Of your striving, of your might. If each one of you is ready For that mighty moment, why – Each of you may be a Bohdan, When the appointed hour draws nigh. You say: 'Now our wars are different!' So, forge weapons which can cope, Steel your will and whet your reason, Only fight, and do not mope! Only strive, no compromising, Fall, but waste strength not, aimlessly, Stand you proudly, never yielding, Perish - but no traitor be! Each of you think, on you depends The way that millions shall live. That for the fate of these millions It is you must answer give. Each of you think: in this place, here, Where I stand amid the fire, All of fate stands in the balance Of a huge and mighty war,

88

Can I aid you, I can say not, I shall hover, like a shade, Blood-stained toil of many, many Generations first must fade. With these thoughts keep up your courage, To your children teach them sure: Easter bread there will be, truly, If there be wheat clean and pure – 'And must we wait long for victory? Must wait long!' No, do not wait! Study victory now - tomorrow Victory will be your fate. Not in vain so long endured the Vigorous Ukrainian kin. Not in vain bright sparks are beaming! These young people's eyes within! Soon new broadswords will be gleaming, In their right hands, bold to win, Long we have endured fate's trying, Enough misery: We cry Forth now: 'She lives on, undying, Lives undying, will not die!'



Yevhen Pluzhnyk, 1898-1936

D ecember 26, 1998 marks the centenary of the birth of Yevhen Pluzhnyk, one of the most gifted Ukrainian writers of the 1920s. However, in spite of his undoubted talents (which have led some critics to compare him to



Rilke). his work came into disfavour with the Soviet literary establishment which found his contemplative and frequently gloomy lyricism and his denunciation of the excesses of the Revolution unpalatable. Although he contributed poems to several leading Soviet Ukrainian journals, Pluzhnyk only published two collections of poems: Dni (Days) in 1926 and Rannya Osin (Early autumn) in 1927. In 1928, he published a novel Neduba (Illness), which was, however, banned shortly after it appeared. The following year, two of his plays Profesor Sukborab and Udvori na peredmisti (In a suburban courtyard) featured in the journal Zhyttya i revolvutsiva (Life and Revolution); however, apart from these plays, which may well have already been accepted before the ban on Neduba, Pluzhnyk published very little more of his original work. What was

to prove his last major literary effort was (1930–2) participation in compiling an anthology of Ukrainian poetry.

In December 1934, during a major campaign against Ukrainians deemed to be 'anti-Soviet', Pluzhnyk was arrested, and, in March 1935, a military tribunal sentenced him to death by firing-squad. This was then commuted to 10 years imprisonment in the Solovetskyi Islands in the White Sea. However, Pluzhnyk, who since 1926 had been suffering from tuberculosis, served less than a year of this sentence; he died in his Arctic prison on 2 February 1936.

Twenty years later, in 1956, during the post-Stalin 'thaw', he was posthumously rehabilitated. Collections of his poems were published in Kyiv in 1966 and 1988, and also in Germany – in Augsburg (1948) and Munich (1979).

> Judge me then with your severest judgement, Man of this age! Posterity unbiased Will pardon me my faults and vacillations, And my late grief and my untimely gladness – To them my quiet sincerity will speak.



Now in the North the snows are all afire... Here in the North the slender elk are running... The sign of northern vigour flares, The lofty chill Aurora, stunning The eyes with its swift flicker... Blow Into the now-cold heart, Aquilo! Thy voice I understand and know, For now the blood flows sluggish, chilly; For lower, ever lower, head is leaning, Like clash of colours, coldly gaze gives greeting And ever oftener I see in dreaming Deserts of snow...

* * *

Hail, desert, on our meeting!

* * *

How futile – to deck stanzas lavishly... The flame of thought endues them, unavailing... The poet's gift (bitter as all gifts be) Is but to understand his poems' failings.

You take the fire – its heat at once grows faint, Let your ink run dry upon some verse... Fire truly quaint!

- so to say nothing worse...

* * *

What has not come to pass? The years are flowing, The heart grows cold... and grief in silence rests... So welcome, welcome

final hopelessness...

I yearned, I learned that you would come! But, see! Save my grey hair, all is as once it was... What has not been?

Long since, it came to pass!

Translations by Vera Rich.

Reviews

Kistiakovsky. The Struggle for National and Constitutional Rights in the Last Years of Tsarism. By Susan Heuman (Harvard University Press for Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, Cambridge, Mass., 1998), xiv+218 pp., illustr.

Bogdan Kistiakovsky – to use the orthography preferred by this author – was one of the most interesting political thinkers in the Russian empire in the early years of this century. Well aware of his Ukrainian heritage, and with a permanent sense of deprivation that the Tsarist ban on the use of the Ukrainian language had prevented him receiving his childhood education in that language, he nevertheless went no further in his political concern for Ukraine's future than to advocate the transformation of the Russian imperium into a constitutional, law-governed, federal state, in which every ethnic entity would enjoy considerable autonomy. Furthermore, while ostensibly embracing socialist principles, he was more interested in establishing what, almost half a century later, would become known as the human and civil rights of the individual than in the 'class struggle' principles of the classical Marxists.



Indeed, in 1903, Kistiakovsky attacked Lenin's concept of a 'vanguard party' with a leading role in the coming Revolution, observing that he did not wish to see the autocracy of the Romanovs replaced by the despotism of Lenin – even if the latter were to go by the name of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'.

How and why Susan Heuman first became interested in this enigmatic figure is unclear. She merely tells us in her preface that her research began back in the days 'before the era of Gorbachev and perestroika, when revolutionary ideas were still in vogue and issues of national autonomy had not yet reached the consciousness of most historians specializing in the [East European] region'. After completing the draft, she left the USA to teach in Zambia and then Zimbabwe, where, in the early 1980s, 'the question of establishing a representative form of government that was based

on human rights and democratic principles was a pressing reality'. In both these countries she lectured to university audiences on Kistiakovsky's ideas of constitutionalism, social justice, and human rights. This experience undoubtedly gave an extra dimension to her work, sharpening the distinctions (which Kistiakovsky himself stressed) between universal general principles, and their applications to a specific historical context.

Professor Heuman addresses her subject in seven main chapters. Only the first – 'A Cosmopolitan in Three Worlds', may be termed biographical, and even this is more concerned with the impact on him of the 'three worlds' – Russia, Ukraine, and Germany (where he completed his education) – than with the minutiae of his life.

His marriage is dealt with in two paragraphs – of which the second focuses on the difficulties he suffered as a result of his wife's arrest and internal exile to Vologda. (A third paragraph, a little later, touches briefly on the fact that, on their return to Kyiv in 1904 'both Kistiakovsky and his wife created the "Banquet Movement" to spread the liberal constitutionalist program of the Union of Liberation'. The fact that this union produced 'offspring' is mentioned only in the 'Usage Note' at the beginning of the book, explaining the choice of spelling of his name.

The other six chapters deal, specifically, with Kistiakovsky's ideas within the context of the intellectual movements, theories and debates of the time: 'Neo-Kantianism and the General Theory of Law', 'Human Rights: a Pre-Revolutionary Model', 'Constitutionalism and the Rule-of-Law State', 'The Role of the Intelligentsia', 'The Ukrainian Movement within the Multinational Russian Empire', and 'The Debate on the Ukrainian National Question: Kistiakovsky vs. Struve'.

A fundamental theme underlying this book is the long debate by legal theorists, in the closing decades of the Russian empire, on the establishment of a state based on the rule of law. For Kistiakovsky, this concept meant not merely a state based on a constitution (Rechtstaat) but, in the author's words, 'a constitutional form based on the inalienable rights of the individual, universal suffrage, and democratic principles'. For him, the question of Ukrainian (and other minority) rights was an integral part of this; accordingly, he denounced the Russification propounded by some Russian advocates of reform no less than that of supporters of autocracy:

Those among Russian progressive people who advocate an ideological struggle against the Ukrainian popular movement should know that there are no devices with which they can relieve themselves of the moral responsibility for that violence to the human spirit which is inherent in compulsory Russification,

he wrote. Yet at the same time, he was, Professor Heuman says, 'wary of the developing Russophobia among Ukrainian nationalists' after 1905, pointing out that Ukrainian nationalists who attacked 'Russian liberals and radicals who did not stress the national rights of Ukrainians... were losing sight of the enemy that Ukrainians shared with Russians and other non-Russians – the autocracy'. However, 'when the Russian attacks on Ukrainian cultural and political activities increased', he resumed the pro-Ukrainian activity of his student years in Germany, publishing articles aimed at raising 'Russian political consciousness about the Ukrainians' and 'build[ing] support for a possible collaboration between Russians and Ukrainians (as well as other non-Russian nationalities) in the building of a federation of nationalities for the Russian Empire'.

Professor Heuman devotes the major part of her work (as the title itself indicates) to the last years of tsarism, tracing Kistiakovsky's contacts (and conflicts) with other political thinkers, not only within the Russian empire, but also in Austria-Hungary. The last months of his life, after the declaration of Ukrainian independence in January 1918, are merely outlined. Professor Heuman tells us that he 'withdrew completely from the Russian intelligentsia and focused his energies on the Ukrainian national cause', becoming a professor of law in Kyiv and a co-author of the first citizenship law of Ukraine. She tells us, too, that his life during this period was 'complicated by his brother Igor's activities as minister of internal affairs for the controversial Skoropads'kyi government'. But the intriguing question of how this former 'federalist' adjusted to the fact of Ukrainian independence is left unanswered. Possibly, no material has survived to show us his evolving views at this key period. A manuscript on the Ukrainian movement on which he was working at the time of his death in 1920 has long disappeared.

Nevertheless, for the period up to 1917, this book provides not only a fascinating study of Kistiakovsky's life and thought, but also some valuable sidelights on other key Ukrainian figures of the period, including Mykhaylo Drahomanov. Moreover, its importance is not simply historical – for Kistiakovsky's views have gained a new lease of life and significance in the on-going discussions of constitutional law and its development in the successor states of the Soviet Union. Scholars wishing to follow and understand that discourse will undoubtedly find this book invaluable background reading.

Professor Heuman's interest in Kistiakovsky focuses, as we have seen, primarily on his constitutionalist ideas, and she appears to have come to Ukrainian studies only as a by-product of that interest. Occasionally, when dealing with Ukrainian matters peripheral to the main theme, she makes some small errors. Thus, she writes that, following the 1905 Revolution, 'the new periodical, Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk [The Literary Scientific Herald], published in Ukrainian was launched in both L'viv and Kyiv'. In fact, this journal had been published by the Naukove Tovarystvo imeni Tarasa Shevchenka (Shevchenko Scholarly Society) in Lviv since 1898, and it was only in 1907 (and not, as Professor Heuman implies, immediately after the October Manifesto of 1905) that the editorial office was moved to Kyiv. Again, she states, that '[i]n 1918 Kistiakovsky was elected professor of law at the newly established Ukrainian State University of Kyiv'. Since there is no reference elsewhere to the existence of any other University in Kyiv, the less-informed reader might well assume that this was the first time that a University had been established in Kyiv. In fact, this university was established by Hetman Skoropadskyi as part of his 'Ukrainisation' programme, as a rival to the existing Russifying 'St Vladimir' University of Kyiv, with which – under Bolshevik rule and with a change of name - it was merged the following year.

These, however, are only minor blemishes on a work that must surely find a well-deserved place in any scholarly library specialising in history, constitutional theory, or human and civil rights.

Transition report 1998. Financial Sector in Transition (European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, London, 1998), viii+234 pp.

This fifth annual report of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) focuses on the financial sector. The EBRD, in fact, reports twice yearly: an annual report in November and an update in April. This is thus the first report since the May 1998 Annual Governors' Meeting of the EBRD, which was held in Kyiv, indicating the importance which the Bank, established to 'foster the transition' of the formerly Communist states 'to an open market-oriented economy and to promote private and entrepreneurial initiative', gives to Ukraine. The report was finalised in the wake of the August 1998 financial crisis in Russia – an event which had a harmful knock-on effect throughout much of the former Communist world. That crisis, writes the EBRD's Chief Economist, Nicholas Stern, in his Foreword, 'arose largely from a failure of the state – its ability to collect taxes, to enforce laws, to manage its employees and to pay them – and constitutes a significant setback in transition'. The lesson to be learned from it, Stern concludes, is

that the way in which markets are liberalised and state enterprises privatised – that is, the nature of the early transition decisions – can have important implications for the capacity of governments to enforce the rule of law, to promote competition and to regulate effectively.



In contrast to the Russian débâcle, he praises the 'strong performance of many transition economies in central Europe': 'Having substantially liberalised markets and privatised state enterprises, they are now responding to the difficult challenges of the next phase of transition, building the necessary institutions and business practices'.

How does Ukraine, geographically sited between these two extremes of exemplary and failed transition, and the second most populous state in the post-Communist world, rate with the experts? The latest values of the EBRD's cumulative transition indicators (covering progress in the whole post-Communist era) give Ukraine the following ratings:

Large-scale privatisation 2+, Small-scale privatisation 3+, Governance and enterprise restructuring 2, Price liberalisation 3, Trade and foreign exchange system 3-, Competition policy 2, Banking reform and Interest rate liberalisation 2, Securities markets and non-bank financial institutions 2.

For comparison, we may note that in Estonia and Slovenia, front-runners for admission to the European Union, the values of these indicators are: 4, 4+, 3, 3, 4+, 3, 3, 3 and 3+, 4+, 3-, 3, 4+, 2, 3, 3 respectively, while Belarus trails in the rear with 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2.

Against this background of generally optimistic long-term progress, the report notes a number of setbacks arising from the Russian crisis. 'The collapse of the Russian rouble', it says, 'led to strong pressures on the hryvnia'. Among other anticrisis measures, 'the currency band was widened to 2.5 to 3.5 hryvnia to the US dollar at the beginning of September, leading to a depreciation of over 50% within a month'. This fall in the currency is pinpointed as a 'key challenge' to reform, which, the report warns, 'will necessitate tight budgetary policies and an acceleration of structural reforms'.

Other constraints on market liberalisation are the increase in import tariffs and trade barriers (particularly for agricultural products), and certain tax exemptions and constraints intended to foster the production of automobiles in Ukraine (in particular from the Daewoo-Avtozaz joint venture), which, the report warns 'appear to

contravene the most-favoured nation rules' of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and hence, presumably, could hinder Ukraine's accession to that body.

Privatisation has made some progress, particularly of large industrial enterprises; by July 1998, over 7,800 of the original 9,500 medium-sized and large enterprises included in the Mass Privatisation Programme had been 'privatised' (i.e., more than 70 per cent of the shares sold). However, the sale by open tender of 200 of the largest enterprises has been slower (only 40 sold by mid-year) and, comments the report, 'Continuing disagreements between the President and parliament have held back the pace of privatisation'. In the agricultural sector, the report says, the pace of privatisation 'lags behind', being 'thwarted by constraints on the sale of land', although the small-scale privatisation programme was 'largely completed at the end of 1997, with over 45,400 enterprises privatised'. Privatisation of infrastructure – in particular, power distribution companies – is now under way, although 'filnitial interest of potential strategic investors was limited'.

The banking sector, the report says, 'remains small and under-capitalised'. Total bank assets were estimated, in early 1998, at almost US\$12 billion. The five sectoral banks, into which the former monobank was broken up, account for over 70 per cent of all assets in the banking sector. (Three of these five have been privatised, leaving only the savings bank and foreign trade bank in state hands). In April 1998, the National Bank of Ukraine abolished the 15 per cent limit on foreign ownership of Ukrainian banks; by mid-year there were 25 banks in Ukraine with foreign ownership. At the same time, Ukraine is listed among the countries where 'extensive state control remains an impediment to the evolution of the banking sector'.

During 1998, the securities market (both via the four stock exchanges and the PFTS over-the-counter electronic trading system) initially performed well, with an average weekly turnover on the PFTS of \$4–6 million, with both membership and the number of listed stocks increasing. The markets were, however, adversely affected by the Asian and Russian financial crises, and the growth which was expected as a result of the large-scale privatisation programme failed to materialise – an indication, yet again, of how closely the health of the Ukrainian economy is dependent on the world climate, and of that of Russia in particular.



A Quarterly Journal of Ukrainiar Studies