

JOURNAL

OF UKRAINIAN STUDIES

John-Paul Himka: Serfdom in Galicia

Іван С. Коропецький: Український економіст Іван Вернадський

Iurii Badzo: An Open Letter to the Presidium of the Supreme
Soviet of the USSR and the Central Committee of
the CPSU

Юрій Перфецький: Українські мовні риси в білоруській
хроніці Биховця

Вероніка Шувар: Українські мистецькі об'єднання в кінці
XIX - початку XX століття

Jaroslav Zurowsky: Ievhen Deslav: A Forgotten Ukrainian
Filmmaker

Guide to Research

Reviews

17
WINTER 1984

ЖУРНАЛ
УКРАЇНОЗНАВЧИХ СТУДІЙ

MANAGING EDITOR

Roman Senkus

EDITORIAL BOARD

Bohdan Bociurkiw, *Carleton University* • Yury Boshyk, *University of Toronto* • Oleh Ilnytskyj, *University of Alberta* • Wsevolod W. Isajiw, *University of Toronto* • Bohdan Krawchenko, *University of Alberta* • Manoly R. Lupul, *University of Alberta* • Peter J. Potichnyj, *McMaster University* • Bohdan Rubchak, *University of Illinois at Chicago Circle* • Roman Serbyn, *Université du Québec à Montréal* • Myroslav Shkandrij, *University of Manitoba* • Danylo H. Struk, *University of Toronto* • Orest Subtelny, *York University*.

The *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* is published semiannually, in the summer and winter, by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. Annual subscription rates are \$9.00 for individuals and \$13.00 for libraries and institutions. Cheques and money orders are payable in Canadian or American funds only to Journal of Ukrainian Studies. Please do not send cash. Subscribers outside Canada: please pay in U.S. funds.

The *Journal* publishes articles on Ukrainian-related subjects in the humanities and social sciences. The criterion for acceptance of submissions is their scholarly contribution to the field of Ukrainian studies. The *Journal* also publishes translations, documents, information, book reviews, letters and journalistic articles of a problem-oriented, controversial nature. Those wishing to submit manuscripts should observe the guidelines on the inside back cover.

Manuscripts, books for review, and all correspondence regarding subscriptions, changes of address, and editorial matters should be sent to: *Journal of Ukrainian Studies, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, M5S 1A1.*

© 1984 by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.

Typesetting by Harmony Printing Limited, Toronto, Canada.

Printed by the University of Toronto Press.

ISSN 0228-1635

Articles

<i>John-Paul Himka. Serfdom in Galicia</i>	3
<i>Іван С. Коронецький. Український економіст Іван Вернадський</i>	29
<i>Iurii Badzo. An Open Letter to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Central Committee of the CPSU</i>	47
<i>Юрій Перфецький. Українські мовні риси в білоруській хроніці Биховця</i>	71
<i>Вероніка Шувар. Українські мистецькі об'єднання в кінці XIX—початку XX століття</i>	79
<i>Jaroslav Zurowsky: Ievhen Deslav: A Forgotten Ukrainian Filmmaker</i>	87

Guide to Research

<i>The Archival and Manuscript Collection of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, New York City (Yury Boshyk, Roman Waschuk, and Andriy Wynnyckyj)</i>	93
--	----

Reviews

<i>Maurycy Horn. Walka chłopow czerwonoruskich z wyzyskiem feudalnym w latach 1600-1648, part 3: Opór chłopski w dobrach szlacheckich wystapienia włościan przeciw obcym panom (Stepan Velychenko)</i>	105
<i>George Luckyj. Panteleimon Kulish: A Sketch of His Life and Times (Romana Bahrij-Pikulyk)</i>	107
<i>Paul R. Magocsi. The Rusyn-Ukrainians of Czechoslovakia: An Historical Survey (Павло Мурашко)</i>	112
<i>Vasyl Veryha. Dorohamy druhoi svitovoi viiny: Legendy pro uchast ukrainsiv u Varshavskomu povstanni 1944 r. ta pro Ukrainsku Dyviziïu "Halychyna" (Lubomyr Y. Luciuk)</i>	115
<i>Hryhorii Kostiuik. U sviti idei i obraziv. Vybrane: Krytychni ta istoryko-literaturni rozдумы (Myroslav Shkandrij)</i>	116
<i>Heroes of Their Day: The Reminiscences of Bohdan Panchuk (Stanley W. Frolick)</i>	118
<i>Antin Hlynka, posol Federalnoho Parlamentu Kanady (Stanley W. Frolick)</i>	122
Books Received	124
Letter to the Editor	126

Contributors

JOHN-PAUL HIMKA is an assistant professor of East European history at the University of Alberta. He is the author of *Socialism in Galicia: The Emergence of Polish Social Democracy and Ukrainian Radicalism (1860-1890)* (1983).

IWAN S. KOROPECKYJ is a professor of economics at Temple University in Philadelphia. An expert on Soviet economics, he is the author of numerous articles and the editor of *The Ukraine within the USSR: An Economic Balance Sheet* (1977), *Soviet Regional Economics: Selected Works of Vsevolod Holubnychy* (1982), and *Selected Contributions of Ukrainian Scholars to Economics* (1984).

GEORGE A. PERFECKY is an associate professor of Slavic linguistics at La Salle University in Philadelphia. A specialist on Ukrainian medieval and cossack chronicles, he is the author of numerous articles and *The Hypatian Codex, II: The Galician-Volynian Chronicle* (1973).

VERONIKA SHUVAR is an art historian living in Eastern Europe.

JAROSLAW ZUROWSKY is a Ph.D. candidate in Ukrainian literature at the University of Ottawa.

John-Paul Himka

SERFDOM IN GALICIA

In working on a study of the Ukrainian national movement's penetration into the Galician village in the late nineteenth century,¹ I found that my story made little sense without a description of the socioeconomic relations that really forged the Ukrainian peasantry in Galicia, namely the relations of serfdom. Therefore I composed this descriptive essay. It is based largely on the important work on Galician serfdom by the Ukrainian Marxist historian Roman Rozdolsky and on an excellent collection of source materials published in Soviet Ukraine.² I have supplemented these materials with documents I found in the archives in Lviv as well as with other sources I had at hand. This is not an exhaustive treatment of the subject, but it should serve to introduce English-language readers to a topic unjustly neglected in Ukrainian studies in North America.

¹ The study, from a preliminary draft of which this article is extracted, will be published by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies under the title "The Awakening Village."

² Roman Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze w dawnej Galicji*, 2 vols. (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1962); *Klasova borotba selianstva Shhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849): Dokumenty i materialy* (Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1974).

The Nature of Serfdom

Ta iak tiazhko na tu horu kamin vykotyty—
Oi tak davno bulo tiazhko panshchynu robyty.

Ukrainian folk song³

Under serfdom, Galician peasants paid rents in labour, nature, and money to the lord of the manor, the state, and the church. According to the land cadastre of 1810-20, peasants paid out 84.7 percent of their annual income in rents. The lion's share of rents went to the landlords (80.0 percent), the rest to the state (16.1 percent) and church (2.8 percent). The greater part of feudal rents was paid in labour (83.2 percent in 1845), and much less in nature (10.8 percent) and money (6.0 percent).⁴

The primary labour rent was the *corvée*, unpaid labour on the lord's estate. The *corvée* was reminiscent of slavery, but the serf was no slave. The slave was nothing more than an instrument of production for his master; the serf, however, was a self-sustaining producer who worked a certain number of days on the lord's estate and a certain number of days on his own farm, which produced his means of subsistence. All the slave's labour belonged to his master, while the serf's labour was divided in two, with a clear separation in time and space.⁵

Under old Poland, serfs could be forced to perform *corvée* labour for as much as four, five, or even six days a week. The Austrian government, however, prohibited imposing more than three days a week on any peasant.⁶ The number of days of *corvée* required annually varied from village to village and was recorded in a document known as the inventory. The number of days of *corvée* required of individual serfs in a particular village depended

³ "As hard as it is to roll a stone up a hill, that's how hard it used to be to do *corvée* labour." "Na panskii roboti," in *Khodyly opryshky: Zbirnyk*, ed. I. M. Senko (Uzhhorod: Karpaty, 1983), 45.

⁴ F. I. Steblii, "Peredmovi," *Klasova borotba*, 10. See also Rozdolski, 1:262-3, and R. Rosdolski, "The Distribution of the Agrarian Product in Feudalism," *Journal of Economic History* 11 (summer 1951): 247-65.

⁵ Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:121, 129-30. Labour rent "is not only directly unpaid surplus-labour, but also appears as such." Karl Marx, *Capital*, 3 vols. (New York: International Publishers, New World Paperbacks, 1967), 3:790.

⁶ Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:174-75.

on the stratum to which they belonged, which in turn was determined by the size of their farm. Thus the inventory for Mechyshchiv, Berezhany circle,⁷ compiled in 1773, established that serfs with more than 12 *Joch*⁸ of land would be considered half peasants; serfs with less than 9 *Joch* would be considered gardeners.⁹ So-called full peasants were obliged to perform the maximum corvée in the village. For example, full peasants in Ivachiv Dolishnii, Ternopil circle, performed 133 days of corvée a year, while half peasants performed 81, and quarter peasants, as well as gardeners, performed 52.¹⁰ The corvée was rendered either with draught animals provided by the peasant or without draught animals ("pedestrian corvée"). Generally, full peasants did corvée labour with two draught animals, half peasants with one, and the lower strata of the peasantry with none. For this reason, full, half, and quarter peasants were also known respectively as "paired" peasants, "single" peasants, and "pedestrians."¹¹

Galician landlords did not reconcile themselves easily to the imperial government's limitation on the number of weekly corvée days, that is, three for a full peasant. Some landlords demanded that their serfs compensate them in money for the abolished labour days, threatening to confiscate land or cattle from serfs who did not pay. The Austrian government, however, prohibited such compensation.¹² More frequently, landlords resorted to imposing piece-work on the serfs to increase the number of labour days. A serf would be assigned a certain task, such as ploughing a specified area of field, and no matter how long the task took, it would be counted as one day of corvée. Thus the manor of Kunashiv, Berezhany circle, in the 1840s managed to extract 5,688 pedestrian

⁷ A circle (German: *Kreis*, Ukrainian: *okruh*) was a territorial-administrative unit in use in Galicia until 1867.

⁸ A *Joch* (Ukrainian: *morg*) equals 0.575 hectares.

⁹ Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv URSR u m. Lvovi [TsDIAL], 168/1/228, p. 81v.

¹⁰ TsDIAL, 488/1/613, pp. 50v-53v.

¹¹ There were also other, less popular, designations for the same system of stratification. In Vynnyky, Zhovkva circle, the serfs were divided into strata according to the number of days of corvée they owed each week. Thus there were three-day peasants, two-and-a-half-day peasants, etc. TsDIAL, 168/1/571. In Volytsia, Stryi circle, the serfs were simply divided into first-class and second-class peasants. TsDIAL, 488/1/62, p. 1v.

¹² Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:177-78.

and 3,600 draught corvée days beyond what was legally required of the serfs.¹³

The manor's most important mechanism for multiplying labour days was the institution of the so-called "auxiliary days." In 1786, amidst the clamour of Galician nobles protesting that the three-day limitation on corvée would bring them to ruin, Emperor Joseph II decreed that serfs who were not obliged to work three days a week for free on the estate could be required to work up to the full three days for wages. Thus, for example, a quarter peasant with the inventory obligation of one day of corvée a week could also be made to work for pay on the estate another two days. Since compulsion was still involved and the wages were fixed and very low,¹⁴ the auxiliary days differed little from serfdom, from the point of view of either the landlord or the peasant. Joseph II's intention and the letter of the law were that the auxiliary days could only be demanded during haymaking and the harvest. Hence they were also known as the "summer auxiliary days." In practice, however, the seasonal character of the auxiliary days was ignored. An official of Ternopil circle in March 1846 complained to the governor of Galicia that the auxiliary days were being used "to keep [peasants] on corvée day after day throughout the entire year—and not only during haymaking and harvests." In Chortkiv circle in 1838 peasants were compelled to work in distilleries in fulfillment of their auxiliary days. As low as the wages were, some landlords depressed them even further, either by luring peasants into debt and having them work off usurious interest as auxiliary days or by paying the serfs not in money, but in tokens that could only be redeemed at the landlord's tavern.¹⁵ The auxiliary days, so hateful to the peasantry, were only abolished by the imperial patent of 13 April 1846, in the wake of a bloody peasant uprising in western Galicia.¹⁶

¹³ The illiterate serfs kept track of the illegal days by putting notches in their rafters. The circle authorities recognized the legitimacy of their grievances *after* serfdom was abolished in 1848 and imposed a hefty fine on the manor. But in 1852 the peasant commune had still not been able to collect any of the money it was owed. TsDIAL, 146/64b/3213, pp. 114-15v; 146/64b/3214, pp. 109-10v.

¹⁴ A day's work with a scythe was remunerated at fifteen kreuzers; with a sickle at twelve; less demanding work, at eight. Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:201-2.

¹⁵ *Klasova borotba*, 217-21, 291.

¹⁶ *Istoriia selianstva URSR*, 2 vols. (Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1967), 1:344.

Landlords could raise labour rents not only by increasing the number of labour days but also by expanding the number of hours in the workday. In some districts there had been the custom of working only half a day on *corvée* or of starting the workday at eight or nine o'clock in the morning. In response to the three-day limit, landlords universally replaced these shorter workdays with days that lasted from dawn to dusk. An imperial patent of 16 June 1786 limited the *corvée* workday to twelve hours in summer (from 1 April through 30 September) and to eight hours during the rest of the year (winter). These workdays included a rest period of two hours in summer and one hour in winter. Only during the harvest could the workday be extended legally for one or two hours.¹⁷ However, the legal situation did not correspond to the reality. In Chortkiv circle, as gubernial councillor F. Hannsmann reported to the crownland presidium in 1838, landlords were making serfs work twenty-four hours in the demesnal distilleries and counting the twenty-four hours as one day of pedestrian *corvée*.¹⁸ When in April 1846 an imperial patent reiterated the limits to the length of the workday, it came as news to the peasantry. Serfs, reported a Przemyśl circle authority to Lviv, had been working on estates from early morning until late evening, and sometimes late into the night. Awareness of the limits awakened an interest in timekeeping among the peasantry, since "no one now wants to be on *corvée* one minute longer than the labour time established by the patent." For the first time, peasant communities began investing in clocks.¹⁹

Landlords also collected lesser labour rents in addition to the *corvée*. Frequently serf women were obliged to spin a certain quantity of thread for the manor.²⁰ Serfs could also be required to make roofs for manorial buildings and to gather mushrooms and nuts for the lord's kitchen. The imperial patent of 16 June 1786 abolished a number of forms of rent then existing in Galicia, such as transporting the manor's grain to Gdańsk (without this being counted as *corvée*) and netting all the fish in the lord's ponds, cleaning out the silt, and stocking them again with fish.²¹

Labour dues to the state included road work (Polish: *szarwarek*) and transport obligations. In 1821 Galician peasants worked

¹⁷ Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:177-78, 191.

¹⁸ *Klasova borotba*, 221.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 322.

²⁰ TsDIAL, 168/1/1222, p. 2v; 488/1/613, pp. 50v-53v.

²¹ Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:195-200.

1.6 million days on road construction and repair for the state; in that same year they worked 31.5 million days of corvée on the estates.²² Labour dues to the church were not sanctioned by law, but in some parishes serfs were expected to work for free on the priest's land.²³ Peasants donated their labour to construct and repair churches and parish buildings.

Rents in nature to the manor usually included grain and poultry. In Plove, Zolochiv circle, full peasants gave the manor 4.5 "bushels" (Ukrainian: *kortsi*, Polish: *korcy*; 553.5 litres) of fodder oats, a capon, and six chickens.²⁴ In Ivachiv Dolishnii full peasants gave one "bushel" (123 litres) of wheat and two "bushels" of oats; half peasants gave half that amount, and quarter peasants a quarter. Full peasants also gave two capons, two hens, and twenty eggs, while half and quarter peasants gave proportional quantities.²⁵ In some villages peasants also paid a tithe in sheep.²⁶ Rents in nature to the state consisted of irregular deliveries of provisions for soldiers. Rents in nature to the church, when they existed, were established by local custom or the imposition of the pastor. In Dubno, Rzeszów circle, the Greek Catholic pastor demanded 1,800 sheaves of grain annually from his parishioners in the 1840s.²⁷

Collection of money rents by the manor was irregular. In some villages, such as Ivachiv Dolishnii, all peasants paid the manor a tax on their farms, with full peasants paying 6 gulden, half peasants 3, and quarter peasants 1.5. In other villages no taxes were paid on farms. Some serfs, especially craftsmen and peasants in state-owned villages, paid all of their rents in money. It was the custom in nearly all villages for beekeeping serfs to pay a money tax on their hives to the manor.²⁸ The state, of course, was the largest collector of money dues, in the form of taxes. In fact the principal aim of Joseph II's agrarian reform legislation was to increase the taxability of the countryside by alleviating the lot of the peasantry.²⁹ However, since the landlords did everything in their considerable power to nullify the effect of the Austrian reforms, the increased state taxes were a great burden

²² Ibid., 1:262.

²³ See *Klasova borotba*, 515.

²⁴ TsDIAL, 168/1/1222, pp. 1v-2v.

²⁵ TsDIAL, 488/1/613, pp. 50v-53v.

²⁶ Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:200.

²⁷ *Klasova borotba*, 515.

²⁸ See TsDIAL, 168/1/1222, p. 3v; 488/1/613, pp. 50v-53v.

²⁹ Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:12-15, 28.

on the peasantry.³⁰ The main form of money rent to the church were the fees collected by priests for performing baptisms, marriages, and funerals. These sacramental fees were deeply resented by the peasants, who felt they were paying taxes on their very births and deaths.³¹

What did the peasant receive in return for all the feudal rents he paid? From the church he received certain civilizational benefits, and from the state some protection against his landlord. But what did the landlord, who collected 80 percent of the rents, give to the peasant? After serfdom was abolished in 1848, the Austrian government made a list of all feudal obligations in every Galician village. For the village of Plove we have seen what the peasants owed the landlord. In the list of obligations there was also a rubric for the landlord's obligations vis-à-vis the peasants. In the Plove list, which was typical, the landlord's obligations were described with a single German word: "Keine," that is, none.³²

Actually, by Austrian law landlords did have one obligation vis-à-vis their subjects: to lend them seed grain and food in times of distress. This obligation, legally imposed from 1772 to 1848, proved extremely difficult for the government to enforce, and great pressure had to be brought to bear on landlords before they fed starving serfs.³³ In 1847, while the great potato famine raged in Galicia, the senior police commissioner in Przemyśl was worried that the widespread hunger would lead to unrest; he felt this could be avoided "if every landlord were humane enough to help his suffering serfs as his means allowed; but such humanity, unfortunately, is lacking."³⁴ Even when landlords did provide grain subsidies to their peasants, this was hardly out of humanitarian motives. In Chortkiv circle, in the late 1830s landlords were lending

³⁰ See the moving case of Havrylo Neporadny of Kunashiv, Berezhany district, who was unable to sow his land, let alone pay his taxes in 1825. He fled from the village, but found no refuge elsewhere and eventually returned. He was arrested and lost his land and horses. TsDIAL, 146/64b/3212, pp. 46-47.

³¹ A folk song from 1846 lamented: "Popy takzhe nas derut, / Z pokhoron hrosh berut, / Urodytsia—tra, platyty, / Uzhe trudno v sviti zhyty." ("The priests also fleece us. They take money for funerals. If someone's born, we have to pay. It's getting difficult to live in the world.") *Klasova borotba*, 345.

³² TsDIAL, 168/1/1222, pp. 17v-42v.

³³ Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:38, 233-24.

³⁴ *Klasova borotba*, 357.

grain to poverty- or disaster-stricken peasants so that they could later demand repayment in labour, in the form of extra auxiliary days.³⁵

In addition to appropriating the peasants' surplus through feudal rents, landlords in the early nineteenth century also expropriated peasant land, both the so-called rustical land, which the peasants tilled as their individual farms, and the communal land, largely forest and pasture, which the peasants used collectively. Landlords throughout Galicia took 342,659 *Joch* of rustical land away from their serfs from 1789 to 1847; this was almost 6 percent of all rustical land registered in 1789. Most (over 80 percent) was taken before the land survey of 1820.³⁶ Landlords used the survey to claim empty rustical plots as their own. They may themselves have emptied the plots in the first place. By illegally denying a peasant in need the loan of seed grain, the manor could force the peasant to abandon his land. By encouraging a peasant to drink liquor on credit or through usurious lending, the manor could also eventually remove him from his land.³⁷ Landlords also used various pretexts to exchange demesnal land for rustical land, giving their serfs plots of a smaller size and inferior quality.³⁸ From 1819 until 1847-59, the average size of a demesnal holding increased from 783 to 1,054 *Joch*, while the average size of a peasant holding decreased from almost 11 to 7.3 *Joch*.³⁹

No survey of the feudal system in Galicia, however brief, can dispense with an account of the extra-economic aspects of the landlord-peasant relationship. In old Poland the relations of personal dependence between landlord and serf were similar to those existing elsewhere between master and slave. Landlords could kill serfs on their own authority and could sell them without the land to which they were, in theory, attached.⁴⁰ Austrian legislation

³⁵ Ibid., 218.

³⁶ Roman Rozdolski, *Wspólnota gminna w b. Galicji Wschodniej i jej zanik*, *Badania z dziejów społecznych i gospodarczych*, 27 (Lviv: Instytut Popierania Polskiej Twórczości Naukowej, 1936), 49-50.

³⁷ These methods were used by landlords in the mid-1840s in Ternopil circle. *Klasova borotba*, 291-92.

³⁸ Peasants of the Komarno region, Sambir circle, complained to the emperor in 1822: "... the lords have taken good land from us and given us in exchange absolutely bad and small plots." Ibid., 133.

³⁹ Steblii, "Peredmova," *Klasova borotba*, 9.

⁴⁰ Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:127-32.

made the Galician peasant a subject of the law and not, as formerly, beyond any law,⁴¹ but the landlord's power over him remained great. Manorial officials could punish disobedient serfs. If peasants had complaints against the manor, they had first to bring them to the manor itself. In spite of Joseph II's prohibition of such displays of servility, Galician peasants doffed their caps within three hundred paces of the manor.⁴²

The feudal system, with the landlord's unbridled or barely bridled domination of the peasant, even affected the most intimate spheres of life. Until 1782 Galician serfs had to receive the lord's permission to marry. Serfs had also been required to pay a marriage tax to the lords, but Joseph II, who wanted to increase the population by removing all obstacles to marriage and procreation, abolished this ancient custom in 1777.⁴³ In spite of this legislation, some manors refused to allow peasant lads to marry until they had paid a tax.⁴⁴ By his patent of 5 April 1782, Joseph II prohibited the landlords' practice of taking serf children to work in the manor, but the prohibition was not entirely effective. As late as 1847 Count Bąkowski, lord of Ustia, took serfs' daughters to serve in the manor. A gubernial document of May 1847 reported that Bąkowski forced the daughters "in a manner grossly offensive to public morality and enraging to human feeling to satisfy his lusts." Bąkowski also dumped the dead body of one of his male servants, Fed Kostiv, into the Dniester River before an autopsy could be performed. The gubernial acts speak of forty rapes perpetrated by Bąkowski on serfs. But in the end, the severe justice of feudal Galicia caught up with him and, blind to his exalted position, banished him from his estate for six-years (1847-52).⁴⁵

⁴¹ Ibid., 1:260.

⁴² *Klasova borotba*, 418.

⁴³ Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:94-95, 138-39.

⁴⁴ In villages belonging to the Bohorodchany manor, Stanyslaviv circle, peasants who wanted to marry were required to pay 61.5 liters of wheat or a money equivalent (1799). *Klasova borotba*, 61.

⁴⁵ Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:137-38. The situation was much the same in Russia. Even Richard Pipes, who feels that "it is particularly important to be disabused concerning alleged landlord brutality toward serfs," admits "Sexual license was not uncommon; there are enough authenticated stories of landlords who staffed regular harems with serf girls." *Russia under the Old Regime* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1979), 152-53. See also *Istoriia selianstva URSR*, 1:318.

The Enforcement of Serfdom

The peasantry . . . delights in violence and dreams about it.

A Galician official, 1847.⁴⁶

The feudal system rested on violence—not the violence of the peasantry, but violence *against* the peasantry. The manorial authorities, particularly the mandator and steward, made peasants compliant by beating them and locking them up in manorial prisons. Joseph II had limited the right of the manor to inflict corporal punishment on serfs in 1775 and abolished it completely in 1788; but Francis I renewed that right in 1793.⁴⁷

Some insight into the punitive measures applied to enforce serfdom can be gained by looking at the individual case of Hrynko Liush, a peasant from Kunashiv, Berezhany circle, who brought his complaints against the manor to the circle authorities in 1848. Liush's grievances dated back to Easter 1835, when he spent eight days in the manorial prison. At that time the manor had expropriated some bush-covered land from the peasant commune (*hromada*) and the commune was protesting this. The commune eventually won its land back, but Liush—simply for carrying the commune's grievance to the circle authorities—was imprisoned by the manor. In August 1836 Liush was made to work two days of corvée in one week instead of the one-and-a-half days he was actually obliged by the inventory. In protest he refused to work a third, auxiliary day. For this insubordination he spent two days in chains in the manorial prison and received twenty blows with a cudgel. He spent only two days in prison then because his labour was needed during the harvest. When the exact same conflict between Liush and the manor was repeated after the harvest in 1836, he was chained and imprisoned for eight days. In the winter of 1837 the leaseholder of the estate, Suchodolski, tried to make Liush do corvée on a Ukrainian holy day. For his refusal, Liush spent another eight days in prison. In April 1837 Liush harnessed four oxen to a plough and ploughed the estate for a day and a half. Considering how many animals he used, he thought his labour should be counted for more than two days of corvée. For this he spent another four days in chains in prison. Later that same year Liush wanted to rent some pasture from the manor but was re-

⁴⁶ *Klasova borotba*, 373.

⁴⁷ Steblii, "Peredmov," *Klasova borotba*, 7, 10; *Istoriia selianstva URSR*, 1:339.

fused. He therefore put his four oxen out to pasture in a neighbouring village. But soon thereafter the leaseholder demanded that Liush perform draught corvée. Liush pleaded for pedestrian work, since his oxen would die in the fields if he took them so soon from their grazing. His pleas cost him eight more days in chains in prison. After the harvest in 1837 Liush was ordered to make a two-day trip. Since he had no bread just then and no fodder for his horses, Liush requested that the order be postponed for one day. The leaseholder struck Liush several times in the face, neck, and other parts of his body, and then put him in prison for eight days. Liush's trials did not end here. He was punished again in 1838, 1839, 1840, 1842, 1846, and 1847. Altogether in 1835-47, Liush spent eighty-eight days in the manorial prison, many of them in chains. In 1846 he was beaten until he could no longer stand.⁴⁸

Liush was obviously a stubborn individual. There were also stubborn communes. In 1780 the peasants of the small town of Stoianiv, Belz circle, refused to perform corvée labour beyond what was specified in the inventory. The manorial officials responded brutally. "Wherever they catch us," complained the peasants to the circle authorities, "they beat us, cripple us, murder us, attack our houses, and frighten our children. They beat our women, causing miscarriages and endangering life." One day a serf, Demko Huliuk, was conscripted by soldiers to transport wood to Komarno and was unable to show up for corvée labour. For failing to appear, the demesnal authorities "twisted his neck, ripped the hair from his head and gave him 28 or 30 lashes without his shirt." He showed up for corvée labour the next day, but "as soon as . . . the steward saw him there, he instantly, like some fury, pounced on him, grabbed him by the forelock, and tossed the man back and forth; and then he ordered him to be laid out and flayed as the greatest felon."⁴⁹

When the violence of the demesnal authorities did not suffice to enforce serfdom, the manor appealed to the circle officials for aid. The circle officials were not cruel. Before they beat a particular peasant, a doctor would estimate how many blows that peasant could endure without crippling or killing him. For example, in Dorozhiv, Sambir circle, in 1846, the doctor told the circle commissioner that two peasants could each endure fifty blows with a cudgel. After the fifty blows were administered, the two peasants

⁴⁸ TsDIAL, 146/64b/3214, pp. 27-28.

⁴⁹ *Klasova borotba*, 41-42.

still refused to make up the auxiliary days they owed the manor. The commissioner ordered that the recalcitrants only be imprisoned, because—to use his own words—“it would have been cruel to punish them further on that same day.”⁵⁰

In documents emanating from the circle authorities themselves, there is never a description of the cudgel that they used on serfs. But a peasant document from 1848 (Turie, Zolochiv circle) describes the cudgel as “an oak stick covered with lead.”⁵¹

When the violence of the circle authorities proved insufficient, they called in the military. The serfs were made to quarter and pay the soldiers who were sent in to quell them. From mid-October 1847 until January 1848, 250 infantrymen and 65 cavalrymen were stationed in several communes in Zolochiv circle that refused to fulfill what they considered excessive corvée obligations. We have a peasant description of how the soldiers behaved.

Urged on by the manor, these soldiers bullied us as much as they wished. They ordered us to catch flies and fry them in butter. Then they threw [the flies? the peasants?] on dung-heaps. They forced the women to make prostrations in the roads. One woman was beaten to death, another had a miscarriage as a result of a beating. Even officers brought in several skinny horses, fattened them up on oats they took from people, and then sold the horses.⁵²

Violence against peasants, particularly beatings, was an absolutely indispensable component of the feudal system. This was eloquently argued by a Przemyśl circle commissioner, Mikołaj Pobóg-Rutkowski. In a letter dated 18 December 1783 (N.S.), the noble Rutkowski pleaded with the higher circle authorities to allow him to beat every tenth peasant in the village of Vyshatychi.

For the local peasant, who lives in gross ignorance and has no concept of honour, there is no better threat than the threat of corporal punishment. The local peasant is as stupid as he is stubborn, and the cudgel will instruct him more quickly than hunger or im-

⁵⁰ Ibid., 328.

⁵¹ Ibid., 407. Whips were favoured by the manorial authorities. A Russian traveller to Galicia in the 1860s heard a description of a manorial whip from a peasant who drove him in a cart: “like my horsewhip, only the handle was very, very short, and the strap was long, about the length of a man’s body, plaited, with a knot at the end.” Vasilii Kelsiev, *Galitsiia i Moldaviia: Putevyia pisma* (St. Petersburg: Pechatnia V. Golovina, 1868), 106.

⁵² *Klasova borotba*, 488-89.

prisonment. I was born on this land and I have observed the local peasants since I was a child. It is not without foundation that I can affirm that the local peasant can be corrected more quickly with ten blows than with ten days in prison Nothing but corporal punishment can make the local peasant obedient. Any other punishment will make the peasant still more stubborn and fresh.⁵³

Noblemen like Rutkowski were convinced that the peasants were little better than beasts and that, as other beasts of burden, they needed to be beaten.⁵⁴ The image of peasants as beasts is explicit in a letter from an official of Stanyslaviv circle to the crownland presidium (September 1846): "in the hill peasants of this circle those features that distinguish people from animals are but little developed."⁵⁵ In this case, the official was not interested in beating the peasants; he just wanted to emphasize how ignorant they were.

In fact, the peasants' ignorance was almost as important as violence in maintaining the feudal system. Rutkowski, for example, in the same letter where he justifies beating peasants because they are "stupid" and denizens of "gross ignorance," also asks the circle authorities to think of some "special form of punishment" for one of the peasants of Vyshatychi, the mayor Ivan Beheka. Rutkowski felt that Beheka was the leader of the commune's resistance to corvée and road-work. Not only was Beheka "importunate and stubborn," but "he can read and write and knows some Latin."⁵⁶ As Rutkowski implies, an educated peasant was a dangerous peasant.

Landlords frequently had educated peasants sent to the army⁵⁷ and did what they could to prevent the peasants from becoming educated. In 1825 the priest Stefan Hryhorovych founded a parish school in Zaluche, Kolomyia circle. At first he himself instructed the village youth in the school, teaching them to read and write in Ukrainian as well as basic arithmetic. Eventually he

⁵³ Ibid., 52.

⁵⁴ "The beating of enserfed peasants by landlords and manorial officials was in essence an inseparable attribute of the system of serfdom, without which it did not at all seem possible to maintain the discipline of corvée labour. The psychological counterpart of this fact was . . . the conviction of the nobility that it was necessary to beat the peasant just like a draught animal" Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:77.

⁵⁵ *Klasova borotba*, 348.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 52-53.

⁵⁷ Stefan Kachala, *Shcho nas hubyt a shcho nam pomochy mozhe* (Lviv: Prosvita, 1869).

turned the task over to a cantor, but the landlord had the cantor drafted into the army. (Military service then lasted fourteen years.) The same story repeated itself with a second cantor, and with a third. In 1840 the peasants of Zaluche appealed to the Greek Catholic school inspector in Horodenka: "We hear that they teach the deaf and dumb to read, but we are neither deaf nor dumb and we pay for the school ourselves. We do not understand what it means that our school is so disliked." In the end, Hryhorovych himself had to return to teaching and persisted in this work, despite persecution by the manor, until his death in 1845.⁵⁸ The landlord of Kunysivtsi, Kolomyia circle, expropriated the lumber that peasants had set aside to build a school in the mid-1840s.⁵⁹

Landlord opposition to peasant education was not confined to placing obstacles in the way of individual peasants and individual village schools. The entire political influence of the Galician nobility was used to hinder the development of popular education. In 1840 the Greek Catholic bishop of Przemyśl, Ivan Snihursky, proposed in the Galician estates diet that more elementary schools be founded in the countryside. He was almost unanimously voted down.⁶⁰ In 1842 only 15 percent of Galician school-age children attended school, while in Bohemia 94 percent attended and in all of Austria, excluding Galicia, 75 percent attended.⁶¹ When Galician peasants finally gained a political representation, during the revolution of 1848-49, the peasant deputies in the Austrian parliament made the expansion of education one of their foremost demands. Their programmatic statement of 3 September 1848 (N.S.) affirmed: "We consider it of the utmost necessity that schooling begin in every commune so that many persons of the lower estate can leave the darkness for the light."⁶²

The lack of education put the peasantry at a great disadvantage during the feudal conflict with the landlord. When the nobility voted down Snihursky's proposal to found more schools in 1848, they derisively asked: Should we establish more schools so that the peasants can write more complaints against us to the circle

⁵⁸ Mykhailo Pavlyk, "Pro rusko-ukrainski narodni chytalni," *Tvory* (Kiev: Derzhlitvydav, 1959), 429. *Klasova borotba*, 229.

⁵⁹ *Klasova borotba*, 474.

⁶⁰ S. B., "O prawach włościan w Gallicyi," *Biblioteka Warszawska*, 1843, no. 4, 143.

⁶¹ *Tafeln zur Statistik der österreichischen Monarchie für das Jahr 1842* (Vienna, 1846), unpaginated.

⁶² *Klasova borotba*, 427.

authorities?⁶³ They were right, of course. An illiterate peasantry could not itself formulate any of the documents necessary to prevent landlords from extracting extra days of corvée, closing off pastures and forests, and conscripting peasant girls for service in the manor. Ignorance also meant that the peasants had difficulty understanding the work of government commissions to resolve disputes between them and the manor; this was especially true if the commission's proceedings were deliberately conducted in German, as was the case in Horoshova, Chortkiv circle, in the 1840s. The peasants of Horoshova complained to the Supreme Ruthenian Council in 1849 that "at such investigations everything is carried on in German, and we can neither understand it nor read it; therefore we generally end up cheated."⁶⁴

The Resistance to Serfdom

Oi ne budu, khlop molodyi, panshchynu robyty,
Ia utechu v Voloshchynu i tam budu zhyty.
Oi ne pidu na panshchynu, ne pidu, ne pidu,
Koly bude temna nichka zroblu panu bidu.
Ne boiusia ia ni viita, ani ekonomia,
Ia ne pidu na panshchynu, budu sydiv doma.

Ukrainian folk song⁶⁵

In spite of all the force used against them, in spite of the servility inculcated by the frequent beatings,⁶⁶ and in spite of their

⁶³ S. B., "O prawach włóścian," 143.

⁶⁴ *Klasova borotba*, 500.

⁶⁵ "I, a young man, will not do corvée labour. I'll flee to Wallachia and live there. I will not do corvée labour. I will not, I will not. In the dark of night I will do the lord harm. I am not afraid of the mayor or the steward. I will not do corvée labour. I will sit at home." "Na panskii roboti," in *Khodyly opryshky*, 45.

⁶⁶ The psychological effect of beating on the peasants was "the view, full of slavish submissiveness and resignation, held by the peasants themselves, that one must endure without murmur the lashings and floggings administered by the landlords, stewards, and manorial bailiffs simply because one had the misfortune to be born a peasant. And none of the negative aspects of the system of serfdom—with the one exception, perhaps, of the promotion of drunkenness by manorial tavern-keepers—had such a fatal, destructive influence on the peasant psychology, as well as on the entire 'character' of that class, as the continual corporal punishment meted out by the manorial authorities." There was even a Ukrainian proverb to the effect that sparing the rod spoils the peasant ("Khlopa ne byi, khlop bude hnylyi"). Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:77.

great ignorance, Galician peasants waged an impressive struggle against serfdom and the landlords throughout the period of Austrian rule and eventually succeeded in forcing the abolition of serfdom in 1848.

The resistance to serfdom took many forms. By far the most common was the submission of complaints against the manor. The complaints did not bring into question the institution of serfdom itself, but only abuses, such as the augmentation of *corvée* and auxiliary days and rents in nature and money beyond what was specified in the inventory or by Austrian law, the seizure of rustical or communal land by the manor, and excessive or cruel physical punishment of serfs (and *any* corporal punishment from 1788 to 1793).

The submission of complaints demanded literacy. Not only did grievances have to be presented in written form, but the peasants had to know what constituted an abuse; that is, they had to know what was written in the inventory and what was written in imperial patents regulating serfdom. Because literacy was so rare among the peasantry, the peasants largely relied on non-peasants to formulate their grievances. These nonpeasants were the so-called corner-scribes (Ukrainian: *pokutni pysari*, Polish: *pisarzy pokatni*, German: *Winkelschreiber*).

Corner-scribes were the outlaw intelligentsia of feudal Galicia. They were a diverse group that included the educated dissenters that every oppressive society produces, the marginal elements that had received an education but no corresponding position in society, and unscrupulous hucksters out to take advantage of the peasants' ignorance. They were renegade petty officials, such as "the notorious" Adalbert Giżejewski, who lost his post in connection with a suit against Count Komorowski of Nestanychi, Zolochiv circle, and thereafter made his miserable living writing complaints for peasants. They were the sons of such officials, like the younger Giżejewski, who carried on the profession of corner-scribe after his father was arrested and imprisoned in 1846.⁶⁷ They were young burghers like Piotr Majbek, "without parents, without profession," who ran his business from a tavern in Ternopil and paid for his formulation of grievances by being conscripted into the military.⁶⁸ They were teachers, tavern-keepers, former manorial officials, and, more rarely, petty leaseholders.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ *Klasova borotba*, 339, 356, 536 n. 64.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 204-6.

⁶⁹ Roman Rozdolski, review of Hipolit Grynwaser, *Przywódcy i burzyciele włościan: Szkice z dziejów włościan skarbowych w Królestwie*

Government and manorial officials, as well as the landlords themselves, considered them the cause of all unrest in the Galician village.⁷⁰ According to nobles, like Count Jan Kanty Stadnicki, Kazimierz Badeni, and Ignacy Poniatowski, who "well know the character of the peasants," only "restless heads" could provoke the serfs to "erroneous actions." Therefore, the presidium of the Galician estates diet begged the gubernium in 1822 to apply the sternest measures against corner-scribes.⁷¹ Numerous laws prohibited the existence of corner-scribes, and men who risked engaging in that profession faced unremitting persecution. Where it proved possible to eradicate corner-scribes, it became difficult, if not impossible, for peasants to register any formal, legal protest against feudal abuses.⁷²

When grievances involved not individual peasants but the entire commune, as was most frequently the case,⁷³ the commune elected one or more of its members to represent it. These plenipotentiaries were often singled out for persecution by the manor, as was Hrynko Liush, whose repeated imprisonment and occasional thrashings have already been described. Ivan Smytsniuk, plenipotentiary of Iamnytsia, Stanyslaviv circle, was so importunate that the circle authorities decreed in 1835 that he could no longer represent the commune; but he continued in this role into the early 1840s. In 1836, to discourage Smytsniuk further, his son was conscripted into the army. Smytsniuk travelled to Vienna twice to bring his commune's grievances to the emperor; when he set off for a third time, in 1843, he was murdered by hirelings of the manor.⁷⁴ The plenipotentiaries of Smarzawa, Tarnów circle,

Polskim (1815-30), Odbitka z "Przeglądu Współczesnego" (Warsaw, 1937), in *Roczniki Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych* 6 (1937): 356-61.

⁷⁰ *Klasova borotba*, 73, 82, 91, 121-22, 139-40, 187, 192, 196-98, 313, 321, 330, 360, 367. There is also an exceptional report by gubernial councillor Hannsmann that contains the truth about corner-scribes. Sent to investigate widespread unrest in Chortkiv circle in 1838, Hannsmann reported back to Lviv: "Nowhere did I notice that so-called corner-scribes influence the peasants seditiously. The complaints that have been submitted are formulated without passion and contain nothing but a simple description of the oppression that the communes, in their view, experience." *Ibid.*, 213.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 136.

⁷² Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:152.

⁷³ "It was the rare peasant who dared to fight the manor 'in a duel.'" *Ibid.*, 1:146.

⁷⁴ *Klasova borotba*, 181-85, 228, 533 n. 35.

western Galicia, suffered diverse persecutions at the hands of their landlord: imprisonment, confiscation of produce, expropriation of land, and numerous beatings. One of the Smarzawa plenipotentiaries was Jakub Szela, who later led the savage peasant revolt in western Galicia in 1846.⁷⁵ Plenipotentiaries also led the less violent peasant unrest that encompassed eastern Galicia in that same year.⁷⁶ The primary function of these peasant leaders, however, was to carry the commune's grievances through the various levels of government until the commune had achieved satisfaction.

Grievances first had to be brought to the manor for consideration, unless they involved expulsion from rustical land or corporal punishment. After the manor had made its decision, the peasants could appeal to the circle authorities. Appeals could later be made by both sides to the gubernium and to the imperial court chancery.⁷⁷

The circle and gubernial authorities, especially during the reign of Joseph II, were sometimes known to side with the peasants if the legitimacy of their grievance was convincingly documented or if the grievance concerned an abuse of unusual enormity. Some Austrian civil servants, especially in the period nearer 1772, distrusted the Polish nobility and sought to alleviate the plight of the peasantry. From the landlords' point of view, the Austrian bureaucracy "took the side of the peasants," "provoked them to [submit] unending, unfounded grievances against the manor" and "incited serfs who were hitherto peaceful and obedient."⁷⁸ From the peasants' point of view, however, government officials were not so favourably disposed to them. In 1822 the peasants of the Komarno region, Sambir circle, complained to the emperor that circle officials sent to investigate their grievances "appeared at night and quietly settled their affairs with the lords If there even was any investigation of the injustice against us, this was only done superficially, for appearances' sake, and always in favour of the lords."⁷⁹ The peasants of Horoshova, Chortkiv circle, were not surprised that the circle authorities always sided with their landlord, since the head of the circle was a good friend of the mandator and enjoyed hunting on the Horoshova estate.⁸⁰ A Ukrai-

⁷⁵ Roman Rozdolski, "Do historii 'krwawego roku' 1846," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 65, no. 2 (1958): 410.

⁷⁶ *Klasova borotba*, 323-24, 330-31.

⁷⁷ Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddâncze*, 1:144-47.

⁷⁸ *Klasova borotba*, 111-12, 145.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 133.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 499.

nian folk song from 1846 summed up the peasants' attitude: "The circle sides with the lords/ And does not care about our injuries./ Complain—it doesn't help./ O God, grant us patience."⁸¹

Failing to find justice among the lords and officials, peasants took their grievances to the emperor, whom they regarded as their protector. Like many other peasantries, the Galician peasantry viewed the monarch as a stern but just and benign ruler who curbed the nobility and officials whenever he became aware of the injustices they perpetrated and tolerated. This view of the emperor was not only an ideological consequence of the isolation and dispersal of the small peasant proprietors,⁸² but also a reflection of the historical experience of the Galician peasants, of the improvement in their lives when Emperor Joseph II reformed Galician serfdom.⁸³ The naive monarchists of rural Galicia sent plenipotentiary after plenipotentiary on the long journey to Vienna, certain that only the local officials were blind to the justice of their grievances. And some plenipotentiaries returned with the false good news that, yes, they had spoken with the emperor and,

⁸¹ "Tsyrykul z panamy trymaie, / O kryvdy nashi ne dbaie. / Uskarzhysia—ne pomozhe. / Terpelyvosti dai nam, Bozhe." Ibid., 345.

⁸² "Insofar as millions of families live under economic conditions of existence that separate their mode of life, their interests and their cultural formation from those of other classes and bring them into conflict with those classes, they form a class. They are therefore incapable of asserting their class interest in their own name, whether through a parliament or through a convention. They cannot represent themselves; they must be represented. Their representative must appear simultaneously as their master, as an authority over them, an unrestricted governmental power that protects them from other classes and sends them rain and sunshine from above." Karl Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte," in *Surveys from Exile*, ed. and trans. David Fernbach, The Pelican Marx Library, Political Writings, 2 (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books in association with New Left Review, 1973), 239.

⁸³ "It was the agrarian and peasant reforms carried out by the enlightened absolute rulers that spread royalist feelings among the populace, especially among peasants In time, the stereotyped presentation of Joseph II as a benign, severe but just monarch gave way to a myth of the peasants' emperor, a myth which was handed down from generation to generation in an increasingly idealized form. During the following decades this myth exerted a strong influence on the attitudes and social behaviour of the peasantry throughout the entire monarchy." Józef Chlebowczyk, *On Small and Young Nations in Europe: Nation-Forming Processes in Ethnic Borderlands in East-Central Europe*, Polish Historical Library, 1 (Wrocław-Warsaw-Cracow-Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1980), 64.

yes, the emperor had seen that the manor and local government were in the wrong.⁸⁴ It is difficult to pinpoint the motivation of such false reports by the plenipotentiaries. They may have been deluded, by themselves or others; they may have lacked the heart to confess to the commune that they had not received an audience with the emperor or that he had given them a noncommittal answer; or they may have lied in order to bolster the resistance of the commune to the manor. In any case, the naive monarchism of the peasants was an important component of their ideology of resistance throughout the late eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century. When in January 1784 Przemyśl circle commissioner Rutkowski read peasants the imperial patent of 1 October 1781 reforming serfdom, they told him that part of the patent was indeed composed by the emperor but the part that obliged them to do *corvée* and road-work was written by the landlords.⁸⁵ In 1819 the peasants of Komarno refused to give fodder, chickens, and capons to the lord until they heard from the emperor. "When the emperor writes to us in response to our petition, then will we do and give whatever he tells us."⁸⁶ In 1847 the peasants of Turie, Zolochiv circle, also refused to give rents in nature to their lord, falsely believing that the emperor had abolished them and that only "the circle authorities in league with the manor" demanded them.⁸⁷ The truth of the matter was, however, that the emperor—as the gubernial and circle authorities—protected the institution of serfdom, and necessarily many of its abuses, until constrained to abolish it in 1848.

Justice for the peasantry was not only uncertain, but slow. The manor had a month to respond to a grievance before the commune was entitled to appeal to the circle authorities. Once the grievance reached the circle level, the commune would be fortunate if its grievance was reviewed within months and not years.⁸⁸ Franz Stadion, the governor of Galicia, took circle authorities to task on the eve of the 1848 revolution: "While the government is always willing to give the manors indispensable [military] assistance to

⁸⁴ For example, Fedir Chubei was sent to Vienna by the commune of Babyntsi, Chortkiv circle, in 1838. Here is how the circle authorities described his activities after returning: "He is deceiving the peasants that he spoke with his majesty the emperor, that he received money and a written order that frees them from *corvée* labour." *Klasova borotba*, 193.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 50.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 90; see also p. 110.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 355.

⁸⁸ Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:144-47.

collect rents from the serfs or, in the event of a refusal, to perform corvée labour, the serf, often only after many years, can gain satisfaction in connection with the oppression against which he registers a complaint. This exasperating circumstance makes him, and not without reason, distrustful of the government.⁸⁹ If the circle authorities decided in the end that the peasant commune was in the right, the landlord could, and usually did, appeal to the gubernial authorities. At this level of appeal, as well as at the highest, the imperial court chancery, the case could also rest for a long time. During the entire process, peasants were obliged to be obedient to their landlord until their grievance was proven legitimate in the final instance.⁹⁰ Thus, the landlord could impose an extra day of corvée on the peasants and extract that day for years while the peasants, with the aid of a hounded corner-scribe, pursued their complaint down legal channels. If the peasants refused at any time to perform the extra day of corvée, the military would be sent in to beat and bleed them into submission. And if in the end the peasants were found to be right in their protest and the lord had to reimburse them in money for the extra days of labour, it could prove very difficult to extract from him the required payment.⁹¹

In this situation it is hardly surprising that peasants also resorted to illegal measures in their struggle against feudal oppression. Most frequently these took the form of refusing to fulfill feudal obligations. On an individual level this generally meant flight, often to Bukovyna or Moldavia, where feudal dues were less burdensome than in Galicia. (Serf, of course, were prohibited by law from fleeing their villages.)⁹² On a communal level this meant a strike. These feudal strikes were often sparked by the authorities' delay in investigating a specific communal grievance, but also by false rumours that the emperor had abolished or severely curtailed serfdom. In the course of such a strike, communal solidarity played a key role. In Vyshatycki, Przemyśl circle, the peasants told the circle commissioner in the winter of 1783-84: "We have all unanimously made a compact that even if they lock us all in chains, as well as our plenipotentiaries, and even if they drive us off our farms as they are threatening, even then we will

⁸⁹ *Klasova borotba*, 379.

⁹⁰ Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 1:147.

⁹¹ See n. 9 above.

⁹² See the order of Count Anton Pergen, governor of Galicia, issued on 16 November 1772 (N.S.), in *Klasova borotba*, 39; the same text, in the original, is in Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*, 2:65-66.

not perform [feudal] obligations or road-work.”⁹³ In Perehinsko, Stryi circle, in 1817 a peasant threatened a potential strike-breaker with these words: “If you do not stand up for the commune and do not join with the commune, then the commune will hang you. The commune is a higher authority than the lord.”⁹⁴ In Chortkiv circle in 1838 the commune of Melnytsia took an oath in the church to maintain their solidarity. With candles burning and the gospel book raised above them, the peasants knelt down and swore that “one would not allow injury to another and one would stand up for the other completely.”⁹⁵ In 1847 the peasants of Turie, Zolochiv circle, refused to give rents in nature to the manor. Their resistance was extremely difficult to break, as the circle commissioner reported, “because of the collectivity of their erroneous idea, which is manifested in the response that rose simultaneously from hundreds of throats: ‘If the commune will give [the rents], then so will I.’” The commissioner chose twenty of “the loudest and most arrogant shouters” and had them flogged to the limit suggested by an attending surgeon. “The stubbornness of those punished grew into fanaticism; supported, on the one hand, by entreaties and demands to stand firm, and frightened, on the other hand, by threats from . . . the crowd in the event of a binding declaration [to give rents], the majority bore their punishment with stoic resignation. They considered themselves martyrs for the happiness of the entire commune . . .”⁹⁶ But no matter how much solidarity the individual commune or several communes displayed, until the refusal to render feudal dues threatened to encompass all of Galicia in 1848 the use of military force always succeeded ultimately in crushing the peasants’ resistance.

Given the violent context of the enforcement of serfdom, it is understandable that the peasants also resorted at times to violent forms of struggle in their resistance to serfdom. Arson, directed against manorial property (for example, the manorial prisons) and sometimes against strike-breaking peasants, was fairly common,⁹⁷ in spite of the dangers it posed for the entirely wood structures of the commune itself. Social banditry (*opryshkivstvo*) was also prevalent, especially in the Carpathian mountains in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.⁹⁸ Other manifestations

⁹³ *Klasova borotba*, 49-50.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 76-77.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 187, 199-201.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 355-56.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 136, 141, 143, 269, 281, 292-93, 295, 335, 358.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 91-93. There is a large body of literature on Ukrainian and

of violence emerged only sporadically in eastern Galicia under Austrian rule. Here there were no counterparts to the Ukrainian cossack and Haidamaka uprisings of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries or to the Galician Polish peasant revolt of 1846.

This is not to say that there were not isolated instances of large-scale or particularly intensive peasant unrest. In 1819 several thousand peasants in the Komarno region of Sambir circle were in open revolt. They occupied a tavern at an important crossroad, thus interrupting communications for the ludicrously undermanned government commission sent to pacify them. They also captured circle officials and held them hostage in the tavern. In a moment very characteristic of the serf mentality, they took away all the documents from the circle commissioner and forced him to write new documents guaranteeing that they would never be forced to do *corvée* labour again.⁹⁹ In 1838 a great wave of unrest swept Chortkiv circle.

The slaughter of the landlords that took place in western Galicia in 1846¹⁰⁰ also had repercussions in the east. In 1846 in Horozhanna, Sambir circle, where the military had put down peasant unrest in 1833,¹⁰¹ the hated mandator and other manorial representatives and nobles tried to win the serfs over to the Polish insurrection against Austria. Instead of joining the noble insurgents, however, the peasants killed them.¹⁰² In that same "bloody year," the peasants of Bilka, Lviv circle, were heard to be singing a song that started with a description of the evils of serfdom and ended with a summons to butcher the landlords.¹⁰³

Carpathian social banditry. See Paul Robert Magocsi, *Galicia: A Historical Survey and Bibliographic Guide* (Toronto-Buffalo-London: University of Toronto Press, 1983), 91; *Khodyly opryshky*; E. J. Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (New York: The Norton Library, 1965), 13-29. See also the story "Magass der Rauber" in [Leopold von] Sacher-Masoch, *Galizische Geschichten* (Leipzig: Ernst Julius Günther, 1875), 1-53.

⁹⁹ *Klasova borotba*, 101, 104, 106, 110.

¹⁰⁰ Galician, mainly Polish, peasants killed 728 noblemen and destroyed 474 manors in 1846. *Istoriia selianstva URSR*, 1:344.

¹⁰¹ *Klasova borotba*, 178-80.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 279-81. Rozdolski, "Do historii 'krwawego roku,'" 411-16.

¹⁰³ "[1] Pany kazhut, zhe my svyni, / Zhe ne znaiem, shcho to nyni, / Tilky panshchynu robyty, / I tym maiem v sviti zhyty. / [2] Pan nas kazhe vyhaniaty, / a okonom daie baty, / A iak vyidesh na panshchynu, / 'Roby,—krychyt—sukyi synu!' / . . . [10] Ale to vsio ne pomozhe, / Boronim zhe sia, nebozhe. / A zheby iuzh spokii maty, / Treba paniv vyryzaty." *Klasova borotba*, 344-46.

More peaceful, but also more ominous for the future of feudal relations, were other repercussions of 1846. The ill-starred Polish noble insurgents had hoped to win the peasants to their side by proclaiming the abolition of serfdom. This was the first time that peasants heard the nobles themselves speak of such a thing. Even though the peasants distrusted the insurgents and their promises, they realized that the end of the feudal system was at hand. For their loyalty to the Austrian state during the insurrection, the serfs expected to receive from the emperor what the rebel nobles had promised them: the end of the *corvée* and other feudal dues. When the emperor abolished the auxiliary days to alleviate peasant unrest in the spring of 1846, he only exacerbated the situation. The peasants were convinced that the emperor had abolished the *corvée*, and not just the auxiliary days as the manorial and circle officials informed them. The refusal to do *corvée* spread throughout eastern Galicia, and the villages had to be placed under military siege.¹⁰⁴

Peasant resistance to serfdom spanned the entire period from 1772 to 1848, but it was particularly acute in the aftermath of the Napoleonic wars and, much more so, in the decade preceding emancipation.¹⁰⁵ The latter period marked by an intensification of opposition to serfdom not only in Ukrainian Galicia, but also in Polish Galicia (the 1846 uprising) and in Ukrainian Bukovyna (the uprising led by Lukiian Kobylitsia). The accumulation of resistance made it impossible not to abolish serfdom after revolution broke out in Austria in March 1848.

Instead of a Summary: The Memory of Serfdom in the Late Nineteenth Century

The memory of serfdom was still fresh in the late nineteenth century when the national movement was penetrating the Galician Ukrainian village. Numerous villages erected crosses in commemoration of serfdom's abolition. The crosses stood as a reminder of the past oppression until the Soviet authorities tore them down, as religious symbols, after the Second World War.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 287-349.

¹⁰⁵ A very rough gauge of the intensity of peasant resistance is the number of documents from various decades in the collection *Klasova borotba*. For the decades between 1778 and 1817 there are from 3 to 6 documents each; for 1818-27 there are 44 documents; for 1828-37 there are 7; and for 1838-47 there are 128.

In the late nineteenth century the Ukrainian national movement initiated the custom of celebrating the abolition of serfdom every year on its anniversary, 3 (15) May. The peasants, dressed in their festive clothes, would gather in the village church. If several villages celebrated together, the peasants from the peripheral villages would march in procession to the designated church. Here they would celebrate a solemn liturgy and a memorial prayer service for Emperor Ferdinand I, who emancipated them. After the service, the peasants would march in procession to the cross commemorating the abolition of serfdom. The cross would be decorated with garlands and ribbons, and the procession would be accompanied by religious songs, the ringing of the church bells, and shots from mortars. At the cross another prayer service would be held to commemorate those who died under serfdom, and water would be blessed. The priest would then speak on the significance of emancipation. This would be followed by more singing and a picnic at the cemetery.¹⁰⁶

A particularly revealing account of the commemorative ceremony and the emotions it evoked has been left by a *latynnyk*, that is, a Ukrainian-speaking peasant of the Latin rite. He had first heard of the existence of the commemoration from his pastor, who denounced it as a "schismatic holy day." But by chance he travelled to the nearby village of Roznoshyntsi, Zbarazh district,¹⁰⁷ on the very day of the celebration. He arrived to the roar of mortars being set off near the church "so that the village was shaking." He looked for the weaver he had come to see and found him bustling about a mortar.

I went into the cemetery and asked someone what was going on. I was answered by an old, grey-haired man: "Aren't you a peasant just like us? Didn't the landlords beat you with cudgels and whips as they did us Ruthenians? Didn't you go out every day at dawn for corvée labour as we Ruthenians did? Didn't you spend every Sunday and holy day in the mandator's prison as we Ruthenians did? Didn't

¹⁰⁶ This composite picture of the ritual of commemorating the abolition of serfdom is based on Tam[oshnii], "...vid Rozhnitova," *Batvivshchyna* 6, no. 23 (6 June [30 (sic) May] 1884: 140; M[ykhailo] S[yvy], "Pysmo z Peremyslianskoho," *ibid.* 6, no. 28 (11 July [29 June] 1884): 172; "Pysmo zi Zbarazhskoho," *ibid.* 6, no. 33 (15 [3] August 1884): 204; and Vasyl Iakubiv et al., "Pysmo z Brodskoho," *ibid.* 10, no. 22 (1 June [20 May] 1888): 135.

¹⁰⁷ The district (German: *Bezirk*, Ukrainian: *povit*) replaced the circle as the chief territorial-administrative unit in Galicia in 1867.

Journal

your livestock perish beneath the landlord's burden as our Ruthenian livestock did? Didn't your wives spin thread, bleach linen, grind millet, give capons, eggs, fodder, hens, and chickens [to the lord] as our Ruthenian wives did? Or maybe they didn't take your children by force to the manor, as if into Egyptian slavery under King Pharaoh, as they did our Ruthenian children? Don't you know what day this is?"

By then I had already guessed myself that on this very day serfdom had been abolished. The words of that old man sent a chill and a fire through my body. And then they once again rang all the bells and set off the mortars, and my body for some reason just shook with joy.¹⁰⁸

One could hardly hope to summarize the situation better than this old peasant has done.

¹⁰⁸ "Pysmo zi Zbarazhskoho," 204.

Іван С. Коропецький

УКРАЇНСЬКИЙ ЕКОНОМІСТ ІВАН ВЕРНАДСЬКИЙ

До великої кількості вчених неросійського походження, що внесла значний вклад у розвиток науки і культури на російській мові, належить український економіст Іван Вернадський, сторіччя смерти якого припадає на цей рік.

Помимо його значних наукових і публіцистичних досягнень, життя та творчість Вернадського ще не належно досліджені. В українській літературі можна знайти про нього тільки коротенькі згадки.¹ Причиною цього є довголітнє перебування Вернадського в Москві та Петербурзі, що ставить його автоматично поза межі дослідів у Радянській Україні. В російській літературі можна знайти численні згадки про Вернадського

¹ О. З. Жмудський, впор., Історія Київського університету, 1834—1959 (Київ, 1959), стор. 247-48, 629; Українська радянська енциклопедія, т. 2 (Київ, 1960), стор. 316; т. 17, стор. 434; друге видання, т. 2 (Київ, 1978), стор. 190; Український радянський енциклопедичний словник, т. 1 (Київ, 1966), стор. 304; Д. Ф. Вірник, упор., Нариси з історії економічної думки на Україні (Київ, 1956), стор. 188, 190, 191, також вибрана бібліографія творів Вернадського на стор. 373; С. В. Сороковська, Історія економічної думки на Україні (IX — початок XX ст.): Бібліографічний покажчик видань за 1917—1966 рр. (Київ, 1967), стор. 3, 29-31, 41-43, 88.

як економіста² і як статистика.³ Але тільки один історик російської економічної думки, Ніколай Цаголов, вивчав його творчість докладніше.⁴ Одначе, з праць Цаголова не можна повністю уявити собі про творчість Вернадського; Цаголова цікавить тільки одне, а саме: до якої міри погляди вченого збігаються і до якої міри вони розходяться з радянською ідеологією. Вкінці, до сьогодні Іван Вернадський майже невідомий на Заході.⁵

Ця стаття має на меті три завдання: подати життєпис Вернадського; висвітлити його громадську та публіцистичну діяльність (аналізі деяких його наукових творів буде присвячена окрема стаття); і старатися визначити його національно-політичний світогляд.

² *Энциклопедический словарь*, т. 6 (С.-Петербург: Брокгауз і Ефронъ, 1892), стор. 38-39; М. Ф. Владимирский-Буданов, *История Императорского университета св. Владимира*, т. 1 (Київ, 1884), стор. 372-74; В. В. Святловский, *История экономических идей в России* (Петроград, 1923), стор. 168-69; И. Г. Блюмин, *Очерки экономической мысли в России в первой половине XIX века* (Москва, 1940), стор. 80; П. И. Лященко, *История народного хозяйства СССР*, т. 1 (Москва, 1947), стор. 496; (1950), стор. 492-93; (1956), стор. 484-85; Н. К. Каратаев, *Экономические науки в Московском университете (1755-1955)* (Москва, 1956), стор. 80-93; Н. К. Каратаев, *Русская экономическая мысль в период кризиса феодального хозяйства* (Москва, 1957), стор. 139-41; Н. Каратаев і И. Степанов, *История экономических учений Западной Европы и России* (Москва, 1959), стор. 400-403; В. Н. Розенталь, "Общественно-политическая программа русского либерализма в середине 50-ых годов XIX в.", *Исторические записки*, т. 70 (1961), стор. 212-13; В. Н. Замятин, *История экономических учений* (Москва, 1964), стор. 201-202, 237, 240, 325; *Большая советская энциклопедия*, всі видання.

³ Каратаев, *Экономические науки*, стор. 86-89; Н. К. Дружинин, *Хрестоматия по истории русской статистики* (Москва, 1963), стор. 220-21 і передрук статті Вернадського, "Задача статистики"; Н. К. Дружинин, "Русские статистики первой половины XIX в. о содержании статистики как науки", стор. 12, 14; також Д. В. Савинский, "Московский университет и статистическая наука", стор. 53, в Академия Наук СССР, *Очерки по истории статистики СССР* (Москва, 1957).

⁴ Н. Цаголов, *Очерки русской экономической мысли периода падения крепостного права* (Москва, 1956), розділ 10, "Экономические воззрения буржуазно-либерального экономиста И. В. Вернадского"; його ж "Буржуазная критика крепостничества в работах Д. Н. Струкова и И. В. Вернадского," в А. И. Пашков, упор., *История русской экономической мысли*, т. 1, част. 2 (Москва, 1955).

⁵ Мені відомі лише дві згадки про Вернадського в Західній літературі: Achille Loria, "Italian School of Economists," в R. H. I. Palgrave, ed., *Dictionary of Political Economy*, II (London: Macmillan & Co., 1917), стор. 464, 470, у відношенні до монографії Вернадського про італійських економістів; та в гаслі Івана Миклашевського в тій же збірці, "Russian School of Political Economy," Palgrave, III (London, 1918), стор. 339-40. Деякі погляди Вернадського є дискутовані в моїй статті, "Academic Economics in the 19th Century Ukraine," в редактованій мною збірці, *Selected Contributions of Ukrainian Scholars to Economics* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press for Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies, 1984), стор. xi, прим. 18, 165, 189-84.

I

Вернадський походив з сім'ї, предки якої прийшли на Запоріжжя або з Литви або з Італії, і пізніше, в середині 18-го століття, поселилися на Чернігівщині.⁶ Перший Вернадський (так родина тоді писала своє прізвище), про якого є докладніші відомості, на ім'я Іван, був священиком в селі Церковщина Чернігівської губернії. Він мав бути яскравою індивідуальністю, і через це він часто попадав в конфлікти з своїми прихожанами. Іван мав трьох синів і хотів їх всіх вивести в священики. Однак, середущий Василь рішуче відмовився від цього і, залишивши батьківську хату, подався до Москви на студії. За цей непослух батько викляв Василя і всіх Василевих нащадків. Василь однак дістав тайне благословення від своєї матері, яка походила із знаної козацької сім'ї Забілло і була нащадком відомого полковника Крижанівського, правдоподібно єврейського походження. Василеві не вдалося поступити в університет у Москві, але за те він закінчив там Медично-хірургічну академію і став військовим лікарем. Як начальник польових шпиталів. Василь брав участь в багатьох походах Суворова і Кутузова і в часі Наполеонської кампанії попав разом з своїм шпиталем у французький полон у Швейцарії. Французький уряд відзначив Василя за його попередню людяну поведінку з французькими раненими в російському полоні медалею *Légion d'honneur*.

Василь був масоном і, проживаючи в Києві по відході на пенсію, належав до кружка містиків під проводом Пилецького (разом з Бунге, правдоподібно лікарем і батьком визначного економіста та міністра фінансів Миколи Бунге). Василь Вернадський (він перший почав так писати своє прізвище) був жонатий з Катериною Короленко, яка походила з козацької сім'ї, з якої також пізніше вийшов відомий російський письменник Владімір Короленко. У Василя і Катерини народилося багато дітей, але всі вони вмерли або в дитинстві або в дуже

⁶ Ця біографія є написана на підставі чотирьох джерел: Владимирский-Буданов, цит. праця; *Энциклопедический словарь*, цит. праця; В. И. Вернадский, "Из воспоминаний," копія яких знаходиться в Vernadsky Papers, Bakhtmeteff Archive, Columbia University (англомовний переклад споминів появився в *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.*, т. 11 [1964-68], стор. 3-31. [під споминами є дата 18/V/1943 і місце Боровое Курорт Акмолинской обл., а під додатком дата 10/VI/1943]); і Георгія Вернадського історія своєї родини (дві течки) в тім же архіві (ця історія була написана 29 і 30 липня 1936 року в Нью Гейвені на підставі оповідань його батька Володимира під час їхньої зустрічі в Парижі в серпні 1923 року).

молодому віці. Можна було думати, що Іванове прокляття діє. Щоби запобігти цьому лихові, батьки вирішили назвати наймолодшого сина, народженого 1821 року, Іваном. І він пережив, але втратив батька вже на п'ятнадцятому році життя.

Василь Вернадський не залишив жодного майна, так що його вдова з сином була вимушена отримувати допомогу зі сторони своєї родини Короленків. Іван дуже близько жив з Короленками, що відзначалися ліберальними поглядами. Ці погляди передалися Іванові на все життя. Він вчився в Київський гімназії і вже по шостій класі здав державний іспит і був прийнятий до Київського університету. Але потім він вирішив поступити в Московський університет і туди виїхав. Вернадського там не прийняли і він, не маючи жодних засобів до існування, дуже бідував під час свого перебування в Москві. Внаслідок цього він хронічно захворів на серце. Остаточно він повернувся до Києва і там блискуче закінчив університет. За працю "Про душу," написану під впливом Платонівської філософії, Вернадський був нагороджений золотою медалею. Зразу ж по закінченні університету він став учителем російської мови і літератури в Кам'янець-Подільській гімназії. Тоді він головню цікавився слов'янським літературознавством, зокрема українською літературою.

В той час царський уряд почав давати стипендії найздібнішим випускникам університетів на два або три роки студій за границею. Так мали бути доповнені кадри власними університетськими викладачами. Іван Вернадський подав прохання на таку стипендію для студій славістики. Але цю стипендію було приділено іншому кандидатові. Тому що була вільна стипендія для студій політичної економії, Вернадський її прийняв. (Пізніше його син Володимир вважав цей вибір помилковим.) Вернадський студіював в Німеччині, Австрії, Швейцарії, Франції та Англії. Він слухав виклади відомих науковців К. Рау, М. Шеваліє та Ж. Блянкі. Наслідком його студій була магістерська праця "Очерк теории потребностей," яку він захистив в Петербурзькому університеті в 1847 році. Але студії політичної економії не заповнювали всієї уваги Вернадського під час його побуту закордоном. Він продовжував цікавитися славістикою і мав тоді нагоду познайомитися особисто з такими світочами цієї дисципліни як П. Шафарік і В. Ганка.⁷ Між

⁷ Молодечі зацікавлення славістикою не залишили Вернадського коли він став економістом. І так в листі з 1846 року до П. Куліша він пише про подібності між етіопською і глаголицькою азбуками (остання — це одна з двох найстарших слов'янських азбук.) Гляди Володимир Міяковський, "Лю-

1846 і 1849 роками Вернадський викладав різні курси економіки і статистики в Київському університеті зі ступенем адюнкта.

В 1849 році Вернадський захистив в Московському університеті докторську працю “Критико-историческое исследование об итальянской политико-экономической литературе до начала XIX века.”⁸ В тому ж році його підвищено в посаді до надзвичайного професора, а в наступному році вже він був переведений до Московського університету, де викладав до 1856 року. Від 1851 року Вернадський був звичайним професором політичної економії. В 1857 році він переїхав до Петербургу і до 1867 року працював урядником спеціальних доручень у Міністерстві внутрішніх справ. Одночасно Вернадський не покидав свої педагогічної праці; між 1857 і 1859 роками він викладав в Головному педагогічному інституті, а між 1861 і 1868 роками в Олександрівському ліцеї. З огляду на серцеву недугу Вернадський був змушений в 1868 році залишити Петербург і всю тогочасну там діяльність і перенестися до Харкова, де він став керівником відділу державного банку. В 1876 році він пішов на пенсію і повернувся до Петербургу, де і помер в 1884 році.

Вернадський був одружений двічі. Першою його дружиною була Марія Шігаєва, народжена в 1831 році.⁹ Під впливом свого чоловіка вона зацікавилася політичною економією і стала першою відомою економісткою в Царській імперії. За своє коротке життя (вона померла в 1860 році в Гайдельберзі) вона встигнула багато написати. Її цікавили проблеми емансипації жіноцтва, жіночої праці, виховання, тощо. Також вона перекладала економічні твори з чужих мов. Свої

ди сорокових років (кирило-методіївці в їх листуванні),” *За сто літ* (Київ, 1928), стор. 68-69. (Я вдячний Юрієві Луцькому, що звернув мені увагу на це джерело.) Свої зацікавлення Іван Вернадський передав своєму синові Володимирові. Гляди Олена Апанович, “Академік Володимир Вернадський і слов'янський світ,” *Всесвіт*, червень 1984, стор. 151-52.

⁸ Ця праця вийшла книжкою під таким же заголовком в Москві в тім самім році.

⁹ Виглядає, що Марія принесла Вернадському значне придане. Каратаєв (*Экономические науки*, стор. 91) пише, що Вернадський володів двома селами, Шігаєвка і Пластиково, коли, як відомо, батько не залишив йому жодного майна і на університетській праці він також не міг розбагатіти. На жаль, інформації про приватне життя Вернадського, як також про його перебування в Харкові та передсмертні роки в Петербурзі, є дуже скупі в джерелах наведених в прим. 6. Напевно багато докладніше про ці справи можна було б довідатися з архіву Івана Вернадського — який включає його дневник і різні записки, — що переховується в Академії наук СРСР в Москві. Гляди Цаголов, *Очерки русской*, стор. 387, прим. 1; Каратаєв, *Экономические науки*, стор. 81, прим. 1.

праці вона друкувала переважно в журналах, які видавав її чоловік, правдоподібно з її заохоченням. Після смерті своєї дружини, Вернадський видав її твори окремою книжкою.¹⁰ Вони мали сина Миколу, вихованням якого Вернадська інтенсивно займалася. Син помер у молодому віці, зразу ж по закінченні Харківського університету.

Вдруге Вернадський був одружений з Анною, дочкою Петра Константиновича і Вікторії Красницької. Константиновичі походили з греків, які давно поселилися в Україні і пізніше стали козацькими старшинами. З цього подружжя Вернадський мав сина Володимира (1863-1945), славнозвісного вченого-біохіміка та першого президента Української академії наук, та дві дочки — Ольгу, якої чоловіком був Кіріл Алексєєв, та Катерину, дружину Сергея Короленка. Володимир та його жінка Наталія Старицька мали сина Георгія (1887-1973), відомого історика Росії та довголітнього професора Єйльського університету, та дочку Ніну (1897-?), по професії психіатр, чоловіком якої був Ніколай Толль.

Іван Вернадський був незвичайно здібною і всесторонньою людиною. Він був ознайомлений майже з всіма економічними творами на різних мовах, опублікованих до його часу. Крім політичної економії і статистики, предмети які були його професією, все своє життя він жваво цікавився слов'янськими літературами. Володів англійською, німецькою, французькою, італійською та всіма слов'янськими мовами. Зокрема добре знав польську мову і мав “пропольські” політичні симпатії. Коли дивитися на його велику наукову і публіцистичну спадщину, не може бути сумніву, що він був дуже працьовитою людиною. Він мав талант легкого стилю, скорого писання і доброго публічного промовця та був завзятим полемістом. В приватному житті він був товариським; за словами свого внука, він любив випити та мав багато “романсів.”¹¹

II

Доказом незвичайної працьовитості Вернадського є його громадська та публіцистична діяльність. (Нижче подаємо список його важливіших творів включно з деякими статтями, вміщених у видаваних ним журналах. Як можна бачити із заголовків, Вернадський не був вузьким спеціалістом якоїсь ді-

¹⁰ Собрание сочинений покойной М. Н. Вернадской, урожденной Шигаевой (Петербург, 1862).

¹¹ Георгій Вернадський, стор. 31.

лянки економії.) Його цікавив цілий ряд економічних і статистичних проблем: історія розвитку економічної думки, методологія політичної економії, теоретична і практична статистика, міжнародні економічні відносини, теорія зовнішньої торгівлі, теорія потреб споживачів, питання реформи 1861 року, проблеми сільського господарства, економічно-соціологічні проблеми. Деякі його твори зберегли і до сьогодні свою наукову вартість. Тут маємо на увазі його дослідження з історії економічної думки та аналізи проблем економічного розвитку Царської імперії (вигоди “общинного” і приватного володіння землею, відношення між економічним розвитком і зовнішньою торгівлею, тощо). Інші його твори були відгуками на важливі тогочасні проблеми. Слід заважити, що Вернадський написав це все за відносно короткий проміжок часу, між 1849 і 1865 роками, коли не брати до уваги його перекладу і передмови до книжки Г. Шторха, яка появилася вже по відході Вернадського на емеритуру.

В додатку до праці університетського викладача та державного службовця, наукових дослідів і, як побачимо нижче, інтенсивної публіцистичної діяльності, Вернадський брав живу участь у громадському житті. Будучи професором Київського університету, він був членом “Комиссии для обследования Киевского учебного округа,”¹² діяльність та публікації якої мали важливий вплив на розвиток новітнього українства. Проживаючи вже в Петербурзі, Вернадський був активний в “Политико-экономическом комитете при Императорском вольном экономическом обществе” і його першим предсідником.¹⁴ Переглядаючи звіти про діяльність цього комітету у видаванім ним тижневику, бачимо, що Вернадський відвідував регулярно всі засідання, виступав в дискусіях і часто давав доповіді на тому форумі. Там він теж заснував друкарню “Слов’янська печатня”, в якій видавалися книжки слов’янськими мовами.¹⁴ В 1860 році Вернадський приймав участь у роботах Міжнародного статистичного конгресу в Лондоні і був вибраний до президії однієї із сесій, присвяченої проблемам перепису населення та військової статистики.¹⁵ Варто відзначити, що при цій нагоді Вернадський відвідав багато західноєвропейських наукових центрів, де познайомився з визначними на той час

¹² В. П. Теплицький, “Суспільно-економічна думка на Україні в період підготовки реформи 1861 р.,” в Вірник, цит. праця, стор. 188, прим. 5.

¹³ *Экономический указатель* (дальше *ЭУ*), 1861, но. 309.

¹⁴ Апанович, цит. праця, стор. 151.

¹⁵ *ЭУ*, 1860, но. 182. Вражіння з цієї поїздки є предметом цілого циклу статей Вернадського в *ЭУ* за 1860 рік.

економістами та статистиками. Працюючи вже в Харкові, Вернадський знайшов час бути президентом Товариства взаємного кредиту та заступником президента Статистичного комітету.¹⁶ З відходом на емеритуру, Вернадський мав намір видавати газету в ліберальному дусі в Петербурзі. Після кількох намагань, він не одержав на це дозволу від уряду. Розчарований цією невдачею, Вернадський хотів емігрувати з цілою сім'єю до Праги, але його дружина, яка полюбила петербурзьке життя, супротивилася цьому.¹⁷

Здається, що під час свого побуту в Петербурзі Вернадський присвячував найбільше уваги, і правдоподібно часу, публіцистичній праці. Його великим досягненням в той час було видавання газети присвяченої економічним, політичним та соціальним проблемам та економічного журналу. Газета, яка мала назву *Экономический указатель* в 1857-58 роках і *Указатель политико-экономический. Статистический и промышленный журнал* (далше *ЭУ*) в 1859-61 роках, була тижневиком великого об'єму, яка мала понад 2 000 передплатників. В 1858 році Вернадський почав видавати журнал *Приложение к Экономическому указателю*, який він в 1859 році перейменував на *Экономист*. Цей журнал спочатку виходив неперіодично, а від 1862 року мав стати регулярним місячником. Однак, правдоподібно внаслідок недуги Вернадського, журнал перестав виходити в 1865 році.

Існування *ЭУ* можна поділити на два періоди. За перших два роки, 1857-58, тижневик поміщав регулярно статті істотного характеру таких відомих тоді економістів імперії як А. Скальковський, М. Бунге і А. Ходнєв і також відомих заграничних авторів, як наприклад, М. Шеваліє. *ЭУ* подавав інформації про політичні й економічні події дома та за границею. Там також можна було знайти дописи власних кореспондентів з різних частин імперії та із закордону. Багато уваги присвячував тижневик публікаціям різноманітних статистичних даних та рецензіям книжок на російській та інших мовах. Найбільш матеріалу для тижневика постачав його видавець і редактор, сам Вернадський. Він підписував свої статті або повним прізвищем, або ініціалами *И. В.* або *И. В-ий*. Можливо багато непідписаних матеріалів також належать йому. Активною співробітницею газети була перша дружина Вернадського, яка звичайно підписувала свої речі ініціалами *М. В.* В другому періоді свого існування, газета обмежувалась в

¹⁶ *Энциклопедический словарь*, цит. праця.

¹⁷ Володимир Вернадський, цит. праця, стор. 4.

більшості до публікацій статистичної інформації, репортажів, оглядів та рецензій. Більші статті, свої і других авторів, Вернадський поміщував тоді в журналі *Економист*.

Економист мав бути повноцінним економічним журналом, спочатку кварталником, а від 1862 року місячником. Але як можна судити на підставі примірників, що знаходяться в бібліотеці Гельсінкського університету, журнал не виходив з такою точністю як *ЭУ*. В журналі можна знайти статті Вернадського на економічні та статистичні теми, переклади його дружиною творів з англійської і французької мов про методологічні проблеми політичної економії та статті інших авторів. Також на сторінках журналу були поміщені важливі повідомлення; наприклад, цілий том за 1861 рік був присвячений публікації розпорядків у зв'язку з емансипацією кріпаків. Журнал і, в багато більшій мірі, тижневик були великим успіхом в діяльності Вернадського. Без сумніву, в цьому є заслуга його самого як видавця, редактора і автора. Але також не треба забувати, що час появи цих періодиків був сприятливий їхньому видаванню. Початок другої половини минулого століття відзначався важливими структуральними перемінами в економіці імперії. Вистачить згадати знесення кріпацтва, бурхливий ріст індустріалізації та урбанізації, а також побудову залізничної мережі. Всі ці проблеми вимагали професійної економічної інформації та аналізи. І власне *ЭУ* і *Економист* служили форумом для цієї дискусії.

Як згадано вище, *ЭУ* поміщував статті на теоретичні теми політичної економії, як також реагував на біжучі економічні та політичні події. В теоретичних питаннях Вернадський був безкомпромісовим прихильником англійської економічної школи, з її постулатом невмішування держави до економічних справ. Недармо радянські автори називають Вернадського “відомий ліберальний економіст”¹⁸ або навіть “вождь петербурзьких лібералів-економістів,”¹⁹ для якого “охорона і піднесення до недоторкаемости буржуазних економічних відносин були характерними... при розв'язці кожної проблеми політичної економії.”²⁰ Його статті на біжучі теми відзначалися застосуванням доктрини *laissez faire* в економічних справах і питомих Західній Європі в 19-ому віці лібералізмом в соціально-політичних проблемах. Тут неможливо проаналізувати всі проблеми, які були дискутовані на сторінках видань Вернад-

¹⁸ Розенталь, цит. праця, стор. 212.

¹⁹ Каратаев, *Русская экономическая мысль*, стор. 139.

²⁰ Цаголов, *Очерки русской*, стор. 366.

ського. Одначе, віримо, що наступні приклади повинні в достатній мірі ілюструвати його погляди.

При кінці 1850-их років розгорнулася палка дискусія між публіцистами імперії на теми пов'язані з неминучою емансипацією кріпаків. Вернадський був в самому центрі цієї дискусії.²¹ В циклі його статей²² і статей його прихильників,²³ *ЭУ* заступав найбільш ліберальну розв'язку цього питання, а саме, повну приватну власність у сільському господарстві і повну свободу для сільського населення. На думку цих авторів, такі умови довгожданої реформи призведуть до збільшення інвестицій не тільки в сільському господарстві але також в індустрії, стимулюватимуть приватну ініціативу та відкриють дорогу для вільного перепливу робочої сили з хліборобства до зростаючих інших народногосподарських секторів. Вернадський гостро полемізував з такими відомими російськими публіцистами, як В. А. Панаєв, Н. Г. Чернишевський та Н. А. Добролюбов, які на сторінках журналу *Современник* заступали позиції індивідуального звільнення кріпаків при захованні "общинної" власності на землю. Вернадський давав на сторінках своїх видань можливість висловлювати свої погляди людям, з якими він не погоджувався. Наприклад, Д. Н. Струков в циклі статей в *ЭУ* бачив перевагу "общини" над приватною власністю на землю з огляду на більшу можливість соціальної справедливості на селі.²⁴ Вернадський критикував цей погляд з точки економічної ефективності.²⁵

Видання Вернадського були, без сумніву, не без впливу його дружини Марії, піонерами в обороні прав жінок та жіночої праці. Застосовуючи принцип поділу праці та релятивних

²¹ У своїй компетенції як службовець Міністерства внутрішніх справ, Вернадський приготував свій власний проект емансипації кріпаків, який знаходиться тепер в архівах Академії наук СРСР. Як пише Цаголов (*Очерки русской*, стор. 387-88), Вернадський нічого не згадує у своєму проекті про земельну власність після звільнення селян. Знову Каратаєв (*Экономические науки*, стор. 92, прим. 2) пише, що цей проект мав пропонувати залишити всю землю поміщикам, а селянам дати лише свободу покинути поміщиків. Цей проект мав так подобатися цареві Олександрові II, що він подарував Вернадському брильянтовий перстень зі своїм монограмом.

²² Наприклад, статті в *ЭУ*, "Об условиях благосостояния," 1857, no. 3; "Современный вопрос," 1857, no. 7; "О поземельной собственности," 1857, no. 22, 25, 27; "Туман и миллиард," 1859, no. 108; "Логика общинного владения," 1859, no. 111; "Крестьянское дело с научной точки зрения," 1859, no. 129; "Туман в крестьянском деле," 1859, no. 131; та багато інших.

²³ Наприклад, статті підписані Ї. Кор-о, "Крестьянский вопрос," *ЭУ*, 1858, no. 63, 65, 67, 68; 1859, no. 128; Н. П. Данилов, "О повинностях срочнообязанных крестьян к помещикам," *Экономист*, 1859, т. II, кн. 3.

²⁴ "Опыт изложения главнейших условий успешного сельского хозяйства," *ЭУ*, 1857, no. 5, 7, 9, 10.

²⁵ *ЭУ*, 1857, no. 21, стор. 119, 126-27.

користей, Вернадський закликав жінок старатися займати такі місця праці, в яких вони найбільш продуктивні і в яких вони повинні бути платні на рівні з мужчинами. Вони не обов'язково мусять бути домашніми господарями.²⁶ Щоб звільнити жінок від домашньої праці, для тих, що її не люблять, він пропонував спеціальну побудову мешкальних домів з широкою сіткою ресторанів і інших підприємств побутового обслуговування поблизу. Такі умови допомогли б жінкам працювати в інших економічних галузях.²⁷ При цьому він не забував ставати в обороні домашньої прислуги.²⁸ Вернадський не уникав і контроверсійних проблем. На сторінках *ЭУ* ішла широка дискусія про трактування проституток (їх делікатно називали "жінками відомої професії" або гетерами).²⁹ Вернадський (І.-ський хіба він), покликуючись на авторитет Ж. Б. Сея, мав найбільш вільнодумний погляд на ці справи; він твердив, що коли така потреба існує, ці жінки виконують позитивну функцію і тому заслуговують на гуманну з ними поведінку, медичну опіку, власну організацію, тощо.³⁰

Живучи в столиці звісного антисемітського уряду, газета Вернадського стала відкрито в обороні євреїв. Дописувач Іван Кретович пропонував у своїй статті дати всім євреям права, якими користуються росіяни, зокрема для комерційної і промислової діяльності. Таке рішення, на його думку, буде не лише справедливе, але також корисне для держави і всього суспільства.³¹ Хоч імперія щойно починала індустріялізуватися і ставати більш урбанізованою, Вернадський відразу ж зрозумів шкідливий вплив цих явищ на довкілля. Він помістив статтю А. І. Ходнева, в якій автор описував різні випадки заневищення повітря та пропонував різні протизаходи.³²

Цих декілька прикладів повинні вистачити для оцінення широкого діяпазону зацікавлень публікацій Вернадського та ліберального підходу їх видавця та редактора до розв'язки біжучих проблем. Без сумніву, поява *ЭУ* була унікальним

²⁶ Наприклад, "Об улучшении быта женщин," *ЭУ*, 1859, no. 152.

²⁷ Наприклад, "Нечто об устройстве квартир и домов," *ЭУ*, 1859, no. 111; "Общественная жизнь и трактирные заведения," *ЭУ*, 1859, no. 153. В цих проектах, без сумніву, відчувається вплив ідей Ш. Фур'є.

²⁸ Наприклад, лист до редакції підписаний "Петербургская кухарка," *ЭУ*, 1859, no. 107.

²⁹ Гляди статті різних авторів, які, правдоподібно зі соромливості, не подавали своїх прізвищ: *ЭУ*, 1859, no. 153; 1861, no. 226; 1861, no. 278; 1861, no. 305.

³⁰ "Еще о гетерах," *Экономист*, 1862, кн. 3.

³¹ *ЭУ*, 1858, no. 102.

³² "О средствах очищения воздуха," *ЭУ*, 1857, no. 33.

явищем в ті часи. Одначе, можна запитати, чи потрібно присвячувати увагу журналові, який виходив російською мовою і до того ж в столиці імперії, якої Україна була провінцією? І взагалі, чи потрібно присвячувати стільки місця вченому, який писав свої твори російською мовою та жив більшу частину свого трудового життя поза Україною? У відповідь, треба мати на увазі й те, що в ті часи — половина XIX століття — українська мова ще не була мовою наукового спілкування та не було й попиту на наукові праці в цій мові. Також, не входячи в причини, не було відповідних наукових та громадських інституцій в Україні. Але діяльність Вернадського все таки заслуговує на увагу в цьому контексті, бо була діяльністю української людини.

III

Але що розуміти під поняттям “української людини” у випадку Івана Вернадського? Це питання постараємося розглянути в цій частині нашої статті. На жаль, наша відповідь буде неповною і пробною, бо вона спирається на уривкові свідчення його сина Володимира та внука Георгія та на деякі завваження самого Івана Вернадського в його творах. Повніший образ його поглядів правдоподібно можна б було собі виробити на підставі матеріялів у його вищезгадуванім архіві. Можна також думати, що існують матеріяли в цій справі в архіві Володимира Вернадського, який, на жаль, є недоступний Західнім дослідникам.³³

Перш за все, як трактовано національність Вернадського перед революцією і після неї? В передвоєнному *Энциклопедическом словаре национальности Вернадского* не подається, хоча про його дружину Марію написано там виразно, що вона була першою російською економічною авторкою.³⁴ Всі видання *Большой советской энциклопедии* називають Вернадського “русским” економістом. Також всі російські історики економічної думки вважають його “русским.” Наприклад, дослідник Вернадського Цаголов починає свій розділ: “И. В. Вернадский был одним из видных русских буржуазных экономистов второй половины XIX в.”³⁵ В українській радянській

³³ Гляди Kendall E. Bailes, “Science, Philosophy and Politics in Soviet History: The Case of Vladimir Vernadskii, *The Russian Review*, липень 1981, стор. 298, прим. 85.

³⁴ Цит. праця.

³⁵ *Очерки русской*, стор. 365.

літературі зайшла останньо “зміна” національності Вернадського. Включення його бібліографій в збірники про розвиток української економічної думки сугерує, що Вернадського вважали українцем. Також у загально-інформаційних виданнях 1960-их років він фігурував як російський і український економіст. Тепер, одначе, наприклад в другому виданні *Української радянської енциклопедії*, його вже просто звать російським економістом.³⁶

Отже не має сумніву, що Вернадський був українського роду по батькові і матері. Він добре володів українською мовою і в його хаті панував український дух. Наприклад, за словами сина Володимира, дома часто співали українських пісень, бо мати відзначалася гарним меццо-сопраном. Мав він, як на ті часи, велику збірку українських книжок, включно зі збірниками *Основи*. Він був особисто знайомий з Тарасом Шевченком, Пантелеймоном Кулішем, Михайлом Максимовичем і Григорієм Квіткою-Основ'яненком та був під впливом Миколи Гулака, рідного дядька своєї другої дружини. Анна була шкільною подругою Аліни Крагельської, нареченої Миколи Костомарова, шлюб яких був перешкоджений арештом Кирило-Методіївських братчиків. Будучи зі своїм сином на вакаціях в Міляно в 1873 році, Іван Вернадський довідався про Емський розпорядок. Це його дуже схвилювало, і він тоді оповідав синові правдиву історію України, а не таку яку вчили в школах. Він говорив, що Петербург є побудований на костях українців-козаків, яких використано для цієї цілі після “зради” Мазепи.³⁷ За словами свого внука Георгія, Вернадський вважав Мазепу одним з останніх борців за волю України і відносився негативно до політики та особи Петра І. Дальше внук згадує, що Вернадський був незадоволений своїм батьком Василем, що той забув матірню мову. Сам він прищепив українські (політичні) симпатії своєму синові Володимирові.³⁸ Прив'язання Вернадського до Росії мусіло бути не дуже сильним, коли, як було сказано вище, вже на схилі життя він хотів емігрувати до Чехії.

Переглядаючи публікації Івана Вернадського, можна там знайти різні зауваження, які вказують на його живе зацікавлення Україною та її проблемами. Вже під час свого побуту в Москві, Вернадський написав дуже сумлінну рецензію на пропозицію Журавського, як описати статистично Київську

³⁶ Гляди прим. 1 вище.

³⁷ Володимир Вернадський, цит. праця, стор. 4.

³⁸ Георгій Вернадський, стор. 30.

шкільну округу.³⁹ Роблячи оцінку населення світу в половині минулого століття, він звернув окрему увагу на українців, яких число він оцінював на 10 мільйонів (7.5 млн. малоросів в Царській імперії, 0.25 млн. в Польському королівстві, та решта — руснаки, рутенці, русини — під Австро-Угорщиною).⁴⁰ В одному з чисел свого журналу, Вернадський надрукував статтю Пантелеймона Куліша про долю одного спільного знайомого, земляка з Чернігівщини, життєві невдачі якого під час перебування в Москві довели до самогубства.⁴¹ Хоч цей невдаха і мав бути колись співробітником видань Вернадського, здається публікація такої статті в економічному журналі мала за ціль дати Кулішеві змогу друкуватися. Варто згадати, що Вернадський друкував *ЕУ* якийсь час у петербурзькій друкарні, власником якої був Куліш.⁴² Під рубрикою відкритих питань, Вернадський одного разу питає так: “Чому зі сторони великоросів і, в загальному, столиці не було або було дуже мало висловлено симпатії до Т. Г. Шевченка, незвичайної особистості з огляду на його життя, діяльність і передовсім з огляду на теперішні течії?”⁴³ Також доказом його постійного зацікавлення Україною було поміщування частих дописів про соціально-економічний розвиток різних українських регіонів таких кореспондентів як О. Чужбинський, А. Скальковський, О. Гейсман, О. Біломорський, В. Ліновський, М. Бунге і А. Рославський-Петровський.

З другої сторони, Вернадський в своїх писаннях постійно вживає фрази “наше русское государство,” “наш русский народ,” “наш величайший русский император” та подібне. Отже, коли іде мова про імперію, він не розрізняє між росіянами і українцями. Характерними в цьому контексті є його міркування про держави з етнічно мішаним населенням.⁴⁴ Він вва-

³⁹ “План статистического описания губерний Киевского учебного округа, состав. Дм. Журавский,” *Отечественные записки*, 1853, т. 88, кн. 5.

⁴⁰ “О населении земного шара,” *Экономист*, 1859, кн. 1, стор. 3-4.

⁴¹ “Как у нас гибнут горячие люди,” *Экономист*, 1862, кн. 5/6.

⁴² Вернадський запізнався з Кулішем ще в Києві перед його першим виїздом за кордон. По повероті, вони заприятимилися. Опісля приязнь трохи охолонула, як це можна бачити з одного з Кулішевих листів з 1848 року: Вернадський “гарний хлопець, якби не дуже пофранцузивсь. Та це, може, з літами похолодніє до всього іноземного, німецького, до того вразького прогресу, що тільки руйнує старовину, а нового нічого не здобував віковішнього.” Гляди Міяковський, цит. праця, стор. 93, прим. 156. Як можна судити з його пізніших писань, Вернадський своїх ліберальних і прогресивних поглядів та західноєвропейських симпатій не змінив. Все таки, на підставі наведених в тексті фактів, можна гадати, що якісь зносини між ним і Кулішем залишилися.

⁴³ *ЕУ*, 1861, но. 273.

⁴⁴ *ЕУ*, 1860, но. 182.

жає, що з огляду на смаки споживачів, які є пов'язані з їх етнічним походженням, було б побажаним мати національно однорідні держави. Перешкодою до цього є династичні амбіції різних урядів. Але коли вже і є держава з кількома національностями, всі вони повинні бути однаково трактовані. Вернадський подає Австро-Угорщину як приклад неефективної розв'язки національного питання. Одним з народів цієї імперії є, як їх Вернадський називає, "малороси." Він думає, що було б Галичині краще належати до Царської імперії, бо, з огляду на специфічний смак галичанів, їх попит, наприклад, на книжки, рибу, ікру, текстильні продукти, тощо, можна було б тоді задовольнити дешевшим коштом. Вернадський писав ці міркування в 1860 році. Правдоподібно, він не пропонував би такої розв'язки після сумнозвісних Валуєвського (1863) та Емського (1873) розпорядків.

На підставі попереднього, можна запропонувати такі висновки. Немає сумніву, що Вернадський вважав себе етнічно і територіально українцем, або, як тоді звалось, "малоросом," інакшим від етнічних росіян. Одночасно, як громадянин імперії, він вважав себе "руським" і в цьому державно-політичному контексті думав імперськими категоріями. Виглядає, що помимо Вернадського знайомства з Шевченком і його творами, Шевченкове слово не проникнуло політичного світогляду Вернадського, зрештою як величезної більшості його земляків по обидвох берегах Дніпра. Ця проблема подвійного характеру — лояльності до етнічного українства і браку аспірацій до політичної сепарації від росіян — на жаль, і дотепер не вповні розв'язана в Україні.

Накінець, історія сім'ї Вернадських може служити добрим прикладом зигзагуватого і також часом сумного розвитку національно-політичної свідомості серед української інтелігенції 19-го століття. Священик Іван напевно добре пам'ятав козацькі традиції, винесені його батьком або дідом зі Запоріжжя. З певністю, його проповіді були на українській мові. Але син Василь, студіючи і проживаючи довший час поза межами батьківщини, навіть забув матірню мову. Його син Іван віднайшов своє національне коріння. Перебуваючи, як і батько, довго поза Україною, українство Івана було політично незрілим. Яким би воно не було, він все таки старався передати ці погляди своєму синові Володимирові. Але цей останній вважав, що бути українцем значило бути політиком; а він постановив посвятити себе всеціло науці. Живучи в Росії, Іванові дочки повиходили заміж за росіян і цілком зрусифікувались. Володимир і його дружина, також українського

роду, мимо того, що щорічно літом перебували на Полтавщині, не зуміли передати своїм дітям, синові Георгію та дочці Ніні, не то що політичної, але навіть етнічної української свідомості. Обидвоє були політично активними росіянами,⁴⁵ а син під час революції працював коротко в уряді ген. Врангеля.

ВИБРАНА БІБЛІОГРАФІЯ

Критико-историческое исследование об итальянской политико-экономической литературе до начала XIX века. Москва, 1849.

“Теория кредита, соч. Н. Бунге,” **Отечественные записки**, 1852, кн. 11-12, част. 5.

“Исследования производительных сил России, соч. Л. Тенгоборского,” **Отечественные записки**, 1852, кн. 2, част. 5.

“Задача статистики,” **Журнал Министерства народного просвещения**, 1852, но. 5.

“План статистического описания губерний Киевского учебного округа, состав. Дм. Журавский,” **Отечественные записки**, 1853, т. 88, кн. 5.

“Несколько слов о железных дорогах в России, по поводу речи г. Рославского,” **Московские ведомости**, 1853, но. 55.

Романское начало и Наполеониды. С.-Петербург, 1855.

Политическое равновесие в Англии. Москва, 1855, 1877.

“Предмет политической экономии,” **Журнал Министерства народного просвещения**, 1856, част. II.

“О внешней торговле,” **Русский вестник**, 1856, т. II.

“Еще о внешней торговле,” **Русский вестник**, 1856, т. III, кн. 2.

Понятия Гопкинса о народном хозяйстве, пер. з англійського і передмова Івана Вернадського. Москва, 1856.

“Исследования у бурлаках,” **Журнал Министерства внутренних дел**, 1857, но. 23, кн. 5, від. 2; но. 24, кн. 4, від. 2.

Очерк теории потребностей. С.-Петербург, 1857.

Исторический очерк практической статистики (без місця і року видання).

“Значение природы в государственном хозяйстве,” **ЭУ**, 1857, но. 1.

“Об условиях благосостояния,” **ЭУ**, 1857, но. 3.

“Прибыль народонаселения в России,” **ЭУ**, 1857, но. 3.

“Кредит и монета,” **ЭУ**, 1857, но. 7.

⁴⁵ Під час Другої світової війни, Георгій Вернадський підтримував кореспонденцію зі своїм батьком Володимиром через амбасадора СРСР у Вашингтоні, яким тоді був Максим Літвінов. В одному з листів, Георгій просить амбасадора передати вістку батькові, що він та його сестра Ніна є активні в Російському военному допомоговому комітеті і запевнює, що батько дуже втішиться цією вісткою. (Копія листа в архіві Георгія Вернадського.)

- “Современный вопрос,” **ЭУ**, 1857, но. 7.
- “Политико-экономическое обозрение,” **ЭУ**, 1857, но. 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 29, 34, 40.
- “Финансовое обозрение,” **ЭУ**, 1857, но. 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 30, 37, 43.
- “Статистическое обозрение,” **ЭУ**, 1857, но. 11, 15, 19, 23, 35, 41.
- “Очерк теории потребностей,” **ЭУ**, 1857, но. 21, 22, 23, 26, 28, 30.
- “О поземельной собственности (Критику ‘Современника’),” **ЭУ**, 1857, но. 22. 25, 27.
- “Нечто о тарифе,” **ЭУ**, 1857, но. 24.
- “Средства сообщения,” **ЭУ**, 1857, но. 25.
- “Ответ на 134 но. ‘Северной пчелы’,” **ЭУ**, 1857, но. 25.
- “Политико-экономическое обозрение,” **ЭУ**, 1858, но. 57.
- “Обозрение новых политико-экономических сочинений,” **ЭУ**, 1858, но. 58.
- “Против чего мы вооружаемся и чего желаем? (Автору ‘Общины’ В. А. Панаеву),” **ЭУ**, 1858, но. 66.
- “Политико-экономическое значение некоторых общественных фактов,” **ЭУ**, 1858, но. 70.
- “Библиографический очерк истории систематической статистики,” **Экономист**, 1858, том. 1, кн. 1.
- Очерк истории политической экономии.** С.-Петербург, 1858.
- Проспект политической экономии.** С.-Петербург, 1858.
- “Туман и миллиард,” **ЭУ**, 1859, но. 108.
- “Логика общинного владения,” **ЭУ**, 1859, но. 111.
- “Нечто об устройстве квартир и домов,” **ЭУ**, 1859, но. 111.
- “Крестьянское дело с научной точки зрения,” **ЭУ**, 1859, но. 129.
- “Туман в крестьянском деле,” **ЭУ**, 1859, но. 131.
- “К монетному вопросу,” **ЭУ**, 1859, но. 133.
- “Мелкие денги,” **ЭУ**, 1859, но. 150.
- “Об улучшении быта женщин,” **ЭУ**, 1859, но. 152.
- “Общественная жизнь и трактирные заведения,” **ЭУ**, 1859, но. 153.
- “Политико-экономические вопросы во Франции,” **ЭУ**, 1859, но. 155.
- “Экономические вопросы на Западе,” **ЭУ**, 1859, но. 156.
- “О населении земного шара,” **Экономист**, 1859, кн. 1.
- “Вопрос дня,” **ЭУ**, 1860, но. 158.
- “Экономические вопросы на Западе,” **ЭУ**, 1860, но. 158.
- “Можно ли оглашать действия акционерных компаний,” **ЭУ**, 1860, но. 160.
- “Экономические общества за границей,” **ЭУ**, 1860, но. 164.
- “Завоевания без издержек,” **ЭУ**, 1860, но. 168.
- “По поводу полемики г. Ходнева,” **ЭУ**, 1860, но. 168.
- “Начало разделения труда,” **Экономист**, 1862, кн. 2.
- “Еще о гетерах,” **Экономист**, 1862, кн. 3.
- “Значение политической экономии как науки,” **Экономист**, 1862, кн. 9.
- “По поводу статистических конгрессов и административной статистики вообще,” **Экономист**, 1863, кн. 1.
- О мене и торговле.** С.-Петербург, 1865.

Journal

Замечания к книге Г. Шторха, 'Курс политической экономии,' т. 1, Ст. Петербург, 1861, переклад з примітками І. В. Вернадського. С.-Петербург, 1881.

При складанні цієї бібліографії допоміжною була бібліографія в книжці А. И. Пашков, упор., *История русской экономической мысли*, т. I, част. 2 (Москва, 1955), стор. 842-44.

Скорочення:

ЭУ — Экономический указатель, 1857-58; Указатель политико-экономический. Статистический и промышленный журнал, 1859-61.

Экономист — Приложение к Экономическому указателю, 1858; Экономист, 1859-65.

Iurii Badzo

**AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDIUM OF THE SUPREME
SOVIET OF THE USSR AND THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE CPSU***

For the peoples of the Soviet federation, who have long endured national oppression by the Russian state—particularly and primarily for the Ukrainians and Belorussians, whose national persecution resulted in their official non-recognition as separate nations in prerevolutionary Russia—there is in the above-mentioned situation a very important historical aspect: an ideological obstacle to liquidating the assimilationist achievements of Russian tsarism and Stalinism. The ideology of the “internationalization” of the peoples of the USSR, that is, the extinction of the Soviet nations, not only contradicts the ideology of national equality and freedom: it negates the concept and policies of national rebirth, has interrupted the national renaissance of the non-Russian peoples after the October Revolution, and exploits today the assimilationist achievements of tsarism and Stalinism as the basis for creating a “single Soviet nation.” This ideology today sanctifies Russification—both linguistic and physical—of the party-state apparatus of the Ukrainian republic (if one speaks only of Ukraine), Russification of the educational system, the film industry, radio, and television.

As a result of historical circumstances, the status of the republics is unequal as it pertains to Russification. In Ukraine and Belorussia, however, the situation is very grave.

From prerevolutionary Russia the eastern Ukrainians and the Belorussians inherited the cities, which were Russified to such a great extent that by national consciousness and language the Ukrainian and Belorus-

* The first part of this document appeared in the summer 1984 issue of this journal.

sian peoples truly consisted mostly of the rural, peasant population. In the 1920s the party conducted a policy of Ukrainizing the party-state apparatus and the educational and cultural cadres; it demanded that employees of the party-state and cultural institutions be proficient in the Ukrainian language and use it in their official work. A course favorable to the development of Ukrainian culture was taken. Actually, here one should speak not of some beneficent policy of the new order. The non-Russian peoples were undergoing a historical renaissance and political and cultural consolidation. Our own national political and cultural cadres were being born; public life, especially a state and party life, that was Ukrainian in content and in form came into being. The Ukrainian language assumed an increasingly significant place in the scholarly and cultural activity of Ukrainian society. In these conditions, the language, of course, would certainly have been used by the urban population more and more on a daily basis. During the course of industrial development, the ranks of the working class would have been filled primarily by those leaving the villages, who, in an atmosphere of attention to and respect for Ukrainian culture, would not have become Russified, but would themselves have created a Ukrainian milieu. In essence, what was taking place was the process of equalizing the social structure of the Ukrainian nation. This was the result and an important agent of the national renaissance of our people.

The Stalinist repressions interrupted this process. The major and most valuable political and cultural cadres were physically destroyed. The terrible, artificially created famine of 1933 in Ukraine, which took several million Ukrainian lives; the Second World War; the new repressions that followed; and a new psychological war against the Ukrainians in the form of the struggle with so-called Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism; all this physically and mentally exhausted the nation and hurled it back to the political and psychological threshold of 1905. Ukraine ceased being, to a decisive degree, a political entity. It was again transformed into a borderland of the Russian state. The first consequence of this was and remains the Russification of the party-state apparatus and of the cultural cadres. In western Ukraine the situation has been saved to a certain extent by the elemental pressure of the milieu, but in eastern Ukraine the cities have again become Russian-speaking. The Russian language dominates in institutions, except perhaps for specific isolated centers, for example, the literary-artistic publishers and the Union of Writers. In the eastern Ukrainian cities Ukrainian-speaking persons—nationally conscious Ukrainians—feel as if they are in the emigration.

In such conditions, and this is not surprising, the rural Ukrainian population pouring into the eastern Ukrainian cities becomes Russified. Within it there develops a feeling of national inferiority, even a feeling of enmity towards the Ukrainian language, culture, and often Ukrainian nationality in general. The demagogic chauvinists love to argue with

Ukrainian patriots, saying "And who forbids you to speak in Ukrainian?" As if it were only a matter of language and of a juridical interdiction! Nevertheless, there is a juridical component in the formal aspect of language, for the party-state agents are directly responsible for the situation of the national language in the republic's party-state institutions. National equality is proclaimed, but how can there be equality when conditions are such that in the eastern Ukrainian cities Ukrainians cannot use their native language outside their immediate family freely because they are hindered by psychological factors and, in most cases, by the local officials' usual lack of knowledge of the language?

The politics of "internationalization" have also resulted in the substantial forcing-out of the use of Ukrainian in all spheres of life. The belief that no single state language exists in the USSR is widespread. In Ukraine and, perhaps, in Belorussia, however, the situation is quite different! In our republic, Russian functions as the state language to a decisive degree, while the Ukrainians, by this criterion, are transformed into a national minority, even though they physically constitute, according to the 1970 census, 74.9 percent of Ukraine's population. (The Russians constitute 19.4 percent.) In the 1960s the CPU leadership under Petro Shelest tried to correct the situation and to give the Ukrainian language state support so that it could function in the public sphere, but today the republic's top party-state authorities, primarily V. V. Shcherbytsky, the current first secretary of the CC CPU, overtly and demonstratively differentiate themselves from the Ukrainian people by their [use of Russian as the] official language. This symbolizes the renewal of Russian state rule on the territory of the Ukrainian SSR.

The marked practice of using Russian in [public] appearances is in itself unconstitutional, anti-Ukrainian, and insulting to the national dignity of the Ukrainian people. When one considers the domination of Russian and Russified forces in the party-state, cultural, and civic institutions, one has to qualify this practice as the direct encouragement of a great-power offensive against the Ukrainians, as a call for even more actively forcing the Ukrainian language out of daily use. The consequences did not take long to emerge. The number of scholarly publications in Ukraine has been drastically reduced; correspondingly, even Ukrainian publishing houses publish foreign classics for school use in Russian. The Ukrainian evening television program "Just before You Go to Bed, Children" has also started being broadcast in Russian; the latter language even predominates. The Kiev operetta theater and the newspaper *Vechirne Dnipro* in Dnipropetrovsk have changed over to using Russian. Even the Znannia [educational] society now publishes part of its output in Russian. Even more Russified are the agitational posters in the streets of Kiev. We have no Ukrainian-language cinema at all, and this, after the Russification of the party-state apparatus, is one of the most important means of pressuring

Ukrainians to assimilate. The same must be said about television and radio, which are also [broadcast] mostly in Russian.

The Russification of preschool establishments and the educational system is advanced. For example, in Kiev, where Ukrainians constitute the majority, there is a small number of Ukrainian kindergartens and schools, but they, especially the kindergartens, are Ukrainian in name only. The teachers in Kiev's Ukrainian schools, as a rule, converse with each other and with their pupils in Russian, simultaneously inculcating in the children a disdainful attitude towards Ukrainian language and culture. Extramural activities in the Ukrainian schools are conducted mostly in Russian. The educational authorities do not look after the program of language teaching in the Ukrainian schools. Many teachers in the Ukrainian schools, even those who teach Ukrainian language and literature, speak Ukrainian badly. This is primarily a consequence of the fact that our institutions of higher learning are predominantly Russified; consequently, there is no one to prepare Ukrainian educational cadres. Of course, here one would need statistics about the number of Ukrainian schools in the republic's cities, about the number of pupils in the Russian and Ukrainian schools and, more precisely, in Russian and Ukrainian classes, since now many Ukrainian schools are, in fact, bilingual. Half and even more of the classes in them are conducted in Russian, which also results in lectures in a number of subjects in the Ukrainian classes being taught in Russian. But such data are not published anywhere; they, of course, are a state secret in the "sovereign" Ukrainian SSR. At the moment it is not possible for me to go around searching for them. Besides, the state of affairs is obvious at first glance to decent people.

After all, even statistics cannot reflect the real Russification of the party, of that state when the Ukrainian language also in the educational sphere—from elementary to higher education—plays the role of a temporary environment. What is most important and most terrible is that such a situation is viewed officially as normal, as a tendency of development. Consequently it is possible to boast of the Russification of the education of the non-Russian peoples. Take, for example, the book by K. Kh. Khanazarov, *Reshenie natsionalno-iazikovoi problemy v SSSR* [The Solution of the National-Language Problem in the USSR] (Moscow, 1977), in which the author writes the following about Belorussia:

In the Belorussian SSR, Russians constitute, according to the 1970 census, 10.4 percent of the population; but schools that teach in Russian, in the 1972-73 school year, had 51.4 percent of all pupils, and in the urban settlements of the republic, 97.6 percent of the children. (p. 137)

This is what the "flowering" of Belorussian elementary education looks like!

Interesting data about the national inequality of Ukrainians in Ukraine's higher and secondary-special education can be found in the speech of the former minister of higher education, Iurii Dadenkov, to a conference of administrators of Ukrainian higher educational institutions that took place in the late 1960s under the auspices of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine. Its aim was to discuss the situation of the Ukrainian language in higher education. (The speech became known publicly through *samvydav*.) I should point out that according to the 1970 census Ukrainians constituted 74.9 percent of the population of the Ukrainian SSR; but only 55 percent of VUZ* students and students at institutions of secondary-special education were Ukrainian and only 50 percent of staff lecturers were Ukrainian. In the universities Ukrainians constituted 61 percent of the students and 56 percent of the regular professors and lecturers. University lectures were read in Ukrainian by only 34 percent of the lecturers. The exceptions were Kharkiv University and Odessa University, where only 13 and 10 percent of the lectures were delivered in Ukrainian. (Ukrainians there constituted 55 percent of the students.)

Dadenkov emphasized in his speech that even at Uzhhorod University, where Ukrainians comprise 71 percent of the student body, only 43 percent of the lecturers conducted classes in Ukrainian. The Kiev Agriculture Institute and the Kharkiv Jurisprudence Institute, according to the speech, "are the only VUZy in Ukraine that prepare specialists in their [respective] fields to work in the state-planning and legal organs whose activity, in accordance with the constitution of the Ukrainian SSR, is being conducted in Ukrainian." At the Kiev Agriculture Institute, 78 percent of the students are Ukrainian; in the last five years, 90 percent of all graduates have been assigned jobs in the Ukrainian SSR, but only 5 percent of them lecture in Ukrainian. Eighty-five percent of the graduates of the Kharkiv Jurisprudence Institute remain in Ukraine to work; at the institute, however, "the entire teaching process is conducted in the Russian language." Of the thirty-six technical institutes subordinated to the Ministry of Higher and Secondary-Special Education of the Ukrainian SSR, lectures are read in both languages—Russian and Ukrainian—in six institutes; in thirty institutes teaching is conducted only in Russian. At the Lviv Forestry-Technical Institute, 50 percent of the students are Ukrainian; classes are conducted in Ukrainian by 70 percent of the lecturers. At the Poltava Civic Engineering Institute, 91 percent of the students are Ukrainian, but no classes are conducted in Ukrainian. At the Kiev Polytechnical Institute, 65 percent of the students and almost 60 percent of the lecturers

* VUZ (plural: VUZy) is the acronym for "institution of higher learning"—Trans.

are Ukrainian; but not one lecturer conducts his classes in Ukrainian. At the Lviv Polytechnical Institute, the percentage of Ukrainian students and lecturers is about the same as at the Kiev Polytechnical Institute; 30 percent of the lecturers lecture in Ukrainian. Almost 70 percent of courses in all disciplines taught at all eight universities in the republic do not have textbooks in the Ukrainian language available to them.

"In many VUZy, ideological training among the students is conducted solely or predominantly in Russian." "In our country," stated the speaker, "for some unexplainable reason a rule that is unwritten, although maintained in practice, has been introduced: that meetings of the scholarly councils and defenses of candidate and doctoral dissertations take place in Russian, as if the Ukrainian language is little suited for this. It should be said that the same applies to the organization of various student gatherings and the holding of classes, discussions, lectures, and meetings with prominent and interesting individuals. In daily life, in the course of work, every lecturer, graduate student, and student uses the language of his choice: this is his right and privilege. As for official and mass transactions, the conducting of documentation of correspondence, then we," emphasized the speaker, "should strictly apply the use of the language of the Ukrainian people: it is our state's and constitutional duty."

One can also judge the level of Russification of the Ukrainian higher schools by the publication of educational literature for the VUZy, which is documented in the statistical handbook *Presia Ukrainskoi RSR 1918-1975* (Kharkiv, 1976). In 1975, in Ukraine 112 publications in the Ukrainian language appeared, with a total number of 348,000 copies, whereas the number of publications in the Russian language was 502, with a total number of 1,308,000 copies.

This is how the external, linguistic side of Ukrainian cultural activity looks. It is the result of our national-political dependence and the absence of freedom, of conditions that negatively affect first and foremost the Ukrainian sociocultural atmosphere and create an even more serious means of pressuring Ukrainians to assimilate. Just as before the revolution, the Russian great-power advocates have been increasingly directing Ukrainian culture onto the road of unilateral development, predominantly in the arts and literature, ethnography, and publicism. According to data in the above-mentioned handbook, *Presia Ukrainskoi RSR*, 454 scholarly books in the Ukrainian language were published in 1975 in Ukraine, with a total number of 3,249,000 copies; 1,829 books in the Russian language were published, with a total number of 4,859,000 copies. The smaller difference in printings is explained by the fact that a significant part of the Ukrainian output is comprised of popular-science publications, which obviously appear in larger printings. The handbook reflected the evolution of scholarly publishing in Ukrainian and Russian in the Ukrainian SSR as follows:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Books in the Ukrainian language</i>	<i>Books in the Russian language</i>
1946	128	86
1950	200	216
1960	326	388
1970	472	947
1975	454	1,829

Under separate categories, the handbook presents the following picture:

Books in the Natural Sciences and Mathematics

	<i>Ukrainian</i>	<i>Russian</i>
1950	211	41
1959	213	155
1960	182	239
1970	228	427
1972	284	585
1974	224	742
1975	189	773

*Books on
Technology, Industry, Transport, Communications, and Medicine*

	<i>Ukrainian</i>	<i>Russian</i>
1975	64	319

Books on Physical Education and Sport

	<i>Ukrainian</i>	<i>Russian</i>
1975	17	25

One would think that there does not exist even a speculative ideological excuse for Russifying publications on agriculture, but Russian-language output dominates here. It is interesting that the turning point occurred after 1972:

	<i>Ukrainian</i>	<i>Russian</i>
1970	367	255
1971	397	322
1972	500	493
1973	386	387
1974	363	400
1975	356	516

Meanwhile, publications in the Ukrainian language predominate only in linguistics, literary scholarship, and art, and only in a proportion that does not correspond to the number of Ukrainians living in the Ukrainian SSR.

Thus, a policy of restricting Ukrainian spiritual life within the framework of specific ethnic material is being pursued; this means nothing else but the policy of transforming our nation into an ethnographic mass, more amenable, of course, to total Russification. The facts are much too obvious and unambiguous to be able to avoid mentioning them, demagogically declaring [instead] a national and cultural "flowering." This is why party propaganda tries theoretically to justify the Russification of publishing by the "all-Union division of language work," "the voluntary [?] division of functional obligations between the international and national languages" (Khanazarov, pp. 21 and 121).

Let this statement about the "voluntary" nature of such a division rest on Prof. Khanazarov's conscience; I shall raise here only one of the latest examples of the "good will" of the non-Russian peoples: the severe reduction of the quantity of publications in the Ukrainian language after 1972, when, because of false accusations of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda, many representatives of the Ukrainian cultural intelligentsia were imprisoned, the CC CPU first secretary, Petro Shelest, was (administratively) repressed, a purge of party-state and scientific cadres took place, a blow was struck against Ukrainian historical scholarship, a whole series of important national-cultural initiatives was abolished, and so on.

The division of "functional obligations" between the Russian and Ukrainian languages reflects in reality the division of the sphere of influence between the Russian and Ukrainian cultures in general, the destruction of the vital structure of the spiritual life of the nation, and the debasement of the cultural prestige of our people. It pursues the goal of destroying the self-sufficiency of the Ukrainian cultural process, of reducing it to the role of serving as the propagandizer of "internationalization," to the role of a billboard that can at any moment be taken down and replaced. I am referring to the fact that the Ukrainian-language cultural atmosphere forcibly created by state policy does not guarantee Ukrainians a full-blooded spiritual life and cannot in all ways satisfy their spiritual needs. Conditions are forcibly created so that the Ukrainian language would simply be unnecessary and, on the other hand, so that without the Russian language it would be impossible to take a step: so that every person, from the one in the capital to the one in the most remote mountain village, constantly feels surrounded by the atmosphere of Russian culture. Current Ukrainian-language news and information, both political and cultural, is considerably poorer in quality than [its] Russian [counterpart]. (Compare, for example, the programs of the central, that is, Russian, and Ukrainian television networks.)

Of course, not every ethnic community in a multinational state, including the USSR, has the practical possibility of equaling the large nations in terms of the (proportional) amount of publications produced or the variety of scholarly and cultural activity. Actually, the very needs of scholarly life have already been determined by the physical size of the nation. What matters is that these needs be allowed to be formed freely, in the conditions of national liberty and independence, first and foremost of independence from "objective laws" hatched in the great-power cabinets of the dominant nation. As for my homeland, Ukraine, there no demagoguery can excuse the present division of labor either in the branch of "the functional obligations of language" or in the sphere of spiritual activity in general. The large population of our people and the economic power of the republic make it objectively possible for us (using our own forces in our own forms, especially Ukrainian-language ones) to create a complete and fully developed structure for the spiritual life of the nation and, in this regard, to be on par with Russian society and not to lag behind the large peoples with independent states.

The above-mentioned "division of labor" has an especially ruinous effect on the state of the humanities and social sciences: Russian academics pursue truly scholarly problems, while Ukrainian scholars are assigned publicistic themes and are given the secondary role of political propagandists. I am speaking, of course, not of particular instances, but about the general atmosphere, the dominant tendency in the cultural development of Ukrainian society. Compare, for example, [the Russian journal] *Voprosy istorii* with [the Ukrainian journal] *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, [the Russian journal] *Voprosy filosofii* with [the Ukrainian journal] *Filosofska dumka*; or [the Russian journal] *Voprosy literatury* with [the Ukrainian journal] *Radianske literaturoznavstvo*.

In a federated state, a certain coordination of scholarly activity is possible and purposeful, but never at the cost of the spiritual independence of the non-Russian peoples or at the cost of the completeness and self-sufficiency of their sociocultural life. After all, the size of the nation, natural-geographic conditions, historical traditions, and national needs would themselves regulate the necessary division of inter-republican scholarly research in the natural sciences and economics; whereas the humanities and social sciences cannot be "divided," for this is one of the basic spheres of activity, in which the historical activity of the nation, its ability to exist independently, and the organic nature of its development are expressed. The crux of the matter is precisely that the nationality policies of the CPSU lack this. The CPSU wants to destroy this ability to exist independently and to create a "new historical commonness."

The great-power, colonialist purpose of the concept and politics of the division of labor in scholarship and culture is most evident in the state of affairs in historical science, in the study of the Ukrainian people's

past, and in our nation's familiarity with its historical, particularly cultural, heritage; in other words, where there can be no "division," no replacement of the subject of independent spiritual existence. Ukraine was the political and cultural center of East Slavic life in the epoch of Kievan Rus', but the study and spiritual assimilation of this period of East Slavic, and particularly of Ukrainian, history is conducted mostly by Russians, recently especially actively and in all its dimensions, but in such a way that absolutely no room in this epoch remains for the Ukrainians and Belorussians. Research that is objective and covers all the aspects of Ukraine's history is simply impossible within the framework of the present historiographic concept of "reunification" and the struggle with "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism."

But even beyond this our historical heritage is studied unsatisfactorily and is popularized even less. Soviet courses in Ukrainian history focus mostly on the socioeconomic development of our country, while Ukrainian sociopolitical and cultural developments are illuminated much too superficially, primitively, and tendentiously. Suffice it to say that in tsarist Russia the political and cultural history of Ukraine was written about much more extensively and substantially than in the present-day "sovereign" Ukrainian SSR. In the late eighteenth and the nineteenth century, the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Ukrainian cossack chronicles of Samovydet, Hryhorii Hrabianka, and Samiilo Velychko appeared in print. In 1927 the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR published the first volume of Velychko's chronicle. Stalin's "internationalization" arrested this project. Only in 1970 did the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences renew publication of the chronicles. Two books managed to appear—*Litopys Samovydtzia* [Samovydet's Chronicle] and *Lvivskyi litopys i Ostrozkyi litopysets* [the Lviv Chronicle and the Ostrih Chronicle]. There were plans to publish two parallel editions of the chronicles—one academic and one scholarly-popular—translated into contemporary literary Ukrainian. But the next wave of "internationalization" again interrupted this work. After its first issue in 1972, the publication of the annual *Kyivska starovyna* [Kievan Antiquity] was halted; it was intended to renew the work of the prerevolutionary [journal] *Kievskaiia starina*. The works of Dmytro Iavornytsky and the three-volume collection of documents of the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood also did not appear, although advance orders for both publications had been solicited. It's strange but true: the anti-serfdom program of a Ukrainian political organization of the mid-nineteenth century, which in the sphere of national relations proclaimed a federation of Slavic republics based on equality, turned out to be too frightening for the "sovereign" Ukrainian SSR.

As far back as 1959, the publication of an ethnographic historical survey titled "The Ukrainians" had been announced. To date it has not appeared.

Mykhailo Hrushevsky's works were published in tsarist Russia. Today they are kept in special repositories and confiscated from private libraries during [police] searches. In the 1950s and 1960s there appeared multi-volume publications of the works of Vasili Kliuchevsky and Sergei Solov'ev, prerevolutionary Russian historians who did not recognize the Ukrainians and Belorussians as separate nations. Yet Hrushevsky, who corrected the Russian great-power concept of East Slavic history, has been labelled by Soviet historiography as an "enemy" and "traitor" of the Ukrainian people.

These are only a few examples of the situation regarding the education of the Ukrainian people about its history. An in-depth expert analysis of this situation would expose this glaring national-cultural inequality of Ukrainians within the USSR.

Official propaganda enjoys citing statistics about Ukrainian-language publications under Soviet rule, especially the works of the Ukrainian classics. The figures are not small, but their significance, as of every fact, is revealed only in the context of a phenomenon, in this case, in the context of a sociopolitical and cultural atmosphere, of a national-political process. First, the bulk of Ukrainian-language publications about current cultural matters consists of propagandistic literature, especially about so-called Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism: in other words, [it consists] of publications that in reality play an anti-Ukrainian role. Second, present-day Russian great-power advocates cannot simply proclaim to the world that "It [Ukraine] never existed, does not exist, and cannot exist" or, in today's language, "It's doubtful whether it existed; it exists a bit, but should not exist." They must deal with the fact that a Ukrainian nation of fifty million exists and has an age-old culture.

As for the legacy left by Ukrainian writers, it—and this is the crux of the matter—is published selectively and interpreted tendentiously, according to the ideological needs of Russian great-power nationalism. In all the years of Soviet rule, an academic edition of only one Ukrainian writer—Taras Shevchenko—has appeared. Characteristically, in the editions of the *Kobzar* after 1972, those works by Shevchenko that were directed against the great-power politics of Russia have been expunged. In its struggle with "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism," party propaganda actively exploits the names of Ivan Franko, Lesia Ukrainka, Pavlo Hrabovsky, and other revolutionary-democratic Ukrainian writers. Nevertheless, many of their works on the national theme are not published. Lesser figures who were not as close to the revolutionary viewpoint are not even mentioned. The literary and generally social processes of the Soviet 1920s period are expurgated with particular thoroughness. Such literary giants as Volodymyr Vynnychenko and Mykola Khvylovy in particular are completely expunged from this period.

As we can see, Ukraine's national-political past, from Kievan Rus'

to the period of Stalinist repression, and the national-political positions of Ukrainian leaders of this time retain their political relevance and are thus subject to severe censorship. This most convincingly testifies to the fact that today our national reality is not created organically, not by way of free internal development, but under the pressure of external forces, of Russian great-power nationalism. It is no accident that in documenting their historical and cultural past the Russians have been governed by different methodological principles: by the criteria of national patriotism, the political independence of their homeland, the "criterion of historicism," and a multidimensional intellectual approach to the cultural process. They do not exclude from their national culture the archpriest Avakum, nor the Slavophiles, nor Ivan Bunin, nor Mikhail Bulgakov. Today, for example, Bulgakov's *White Guard* is not only freely published, but television series based on this work are broadcast throughout the Soviet Union, even though the work has an openly anti-Ukrainian purpose.

The political conditions that have brought about the isolation of the Ukrainian people from its historical, cultural, and especially national-political inheritance have not allowed Ukrainian society to actualize the process of self-awareness and, in the framework of the contemporary movement of history, to research the present conditions of life in society, at least not on such a scale or in such depth as this has been done in Russian society. It is permissible to write and say less, and in a more superficial way, about all aspects of life—the economy, culture, the sphere of governing of society, the natural environment, the life-style and folk-ways, moral-ethical relations, and so on—in Ukraine than in Russia. This is best illustrated by comparing [the Russian newspaper] *Literaturnaia gazeta* with [the Ukrainian] *Literaturna Ukraina*. The Russian publication needs no introduction. Actually, neither does *Literaturna Ukraina* to knowledgeable people, because it is too openly and "demonstratively" primitive, vulgar, barely cultured, uninteresting, minimally informative, and narrowly propagandistic and, by its sociocultural nature, essentially serves the apparat; in other words, it is such that it is perceived as the organ not of the cultural intelligentsia, but mainly of the administrative apparat outside the Writers' Union. I call it the instruction sheet of a certain institution for hounding the Ukrainian intelligentsia. *Literaturna Ukraina* is our national disgrace. It also reflects the level of creativity of that part of our intelligentsia that has been allowed to remain publicly active.

I say "allowed" because the situation is created not only by the pernicious influence of the general ideological and political conditions on the quality of the national cultural cadres, not only by the "division of labor" in scholarly and cultural work, which has resulted in the numerical decline of the Ukrainian humanistic intelligentsia, but also by a strict selection of cadres according to criteria that, to put it mildly, are not

favorable to people who are creative and show initiative, let alone to individuals with a developed social consciousness and a feeling of national patriotism, without which culture in general cannot be created.

Thus, we have what an outsider would consider to be a truly unbelievable "flowering" of Ukrainian culture, when, for example, in the capital's Ivan Franko Ukrainian Academic Theater, rehearsals are conducted in Russian; that is, the text of the work is declaimed in Ukrainian, but beyond this the director and the actors converse in Russian. For the theatre collective, it appears, Ukrainian culture is simply a functionary's job, a source of income. This is why it is not strange that the Ukrainian language issuing from the Franko Theater's actors' mouths sounds artificial and false, that in it coarse Russianisms and errors [based on Russian syntax] inadvertently crop up. Obviously in such conditions one cannot even consider the possibility that the plays might be artistically successful.

There are almost no Ukrainian-speaking actors at the Dovzhenko Film Studio or at the Kiev Opera and Ballet Theater. At the Kiev Operetta Theater no one speaks Ukrainian off stage. (Now in this theater only certain operettas, those based on the works of certain Ukrainian authors, are staged in Ukrainian.) Enter the offices of Ukrainian radio and television [stations] and you will have entered the Russian-speaking world. The language of Ukrainian radio broadcasts, like the language of the press and books, is replete with gross mistakes. As a matter of fact, in Dadenkov's above-mentioned speech the following was stressed about the education of Ukrainian journalists:

There are, however, specializations whose very essence, nature, and purpose demand the preparation of a future expert precisely on the basis of the Ukrainian language. Unfortunately, even here we come across facts that cannot be explained in any way except as the indifference of the heads of faculties and higher institutions. For example, at Kiev University and the Ukrainian Polygraphic Institute, cadres have for many years been trained to specialize in "journalism." It is well known that the press, radio, television, and book publishing in the republic are produced mostly in Ukrainian. But for the future journalists and editors in both of the above institutions, the majority of the enumerated disciplines—especially the social sciences, foreign literature, logic, and introduction to literary studies—are taught in Russian. Moreover, at Kiev University, in the department of Ukrainian philology, certain social disciplines, for example, the foundations of scientific communism, are also taught in Russian. This is, to put it mildly, ineffective and foolish.

Yes, according to the criterion of national equality, this is, to put it mildly, ineffective and foolish. But from the perspective of the ideology of the rapprochement and fusion of nations, from the perspective of the

great-power aim of Russian nationalism, such a policy is logical and natural. *For the purpose is precisely to educate and select people for cultural and scholarly work in Ukraine who are indifferent to Ukrainian culture and the national fate of the Ukrainian people.* There have been great successes in this regard. I shall add a few more examples to the above-mentioned facts. The Ukrainian party-state leadership headed by Petro Shelest did not feel itself to be, and was not, sovereign in deciding even local cultural questions. But it is also well known that [those pursuing] the goal of Ukrainianizing the VUZy ran into the united opposition of those very professors and lecturers who are indifferent to Ukrainian culture. At the humanistic scholarly-research institutes of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, there are many people who are devoid not only of Ukrainian patriotic feelings but also of a true interest in scholarship. It is they who primarily create that community and scholarly atmosphere in the creative collectives, where, even in the institutes of linguistics and literature, Russian-speaking employees predominate. In the Institute of History there are almost no people for whom Ukrainian could be considered to be the language in which they think and communicate daily. The director of the institute, Iurii Kondufor, does not even know how to speak Ukrainian. His predecessor, Arnold Shevelev, spoke only in Russian. He created in the institute an atmosphere that forced even those few people who until then still communicated in Ukrainian to switch to Russian. Directing the institute are not learned specialists, but party functionaries.

The situation is no better among the leading cadres in other institutes. The director of the Institute of Fine Arts, Folklore, and Ethnography, after Maksym Rylsky, was the literary scholar Mykola Syvachenko. He was succeeded by a nonspecialist, Serhii Zubkov, a person who is, to put it mildly, little known in the scholarly world. Heading the Institute of Literature for a long time after Oleksander Biletsky was the well-known Stalinist, vulgar sociologist, and hounder of Ukrainian writers, Mykola Shamota, an odious figure in Ukrainian society and politics in the postwar period. Shamota's successor, Ihor Dzeverin, is a person who has occupied himself academically with narrow propagandistic topics (the "party-mindedness" of literature). The Institute of Archeology was headed by a non-archeologist, Fedir Shevchenko; he was replaced by a person sent from Leningrad, a second-rate archeologist. The editor of *Literaturna Ukraina* is the journalist Vitalii Vynohradsky, who is not known to anyone as a creative individual and is not even a member of the Writers' Union; he was "imported" after 1972 all the way from Ternopil.

Volodymyr Shcherbytsky has admitted that "among the top employees of our republic, 70.4 percent are Ukrainian, 27.1 percent are Russian, and 2.5 percent are representatives of other nationalities" (*Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 1979, no. 2, p. 9). In other words, Ukrainians con-

stitute a proportionally smaller number there than they do in the composition of Ukraine's entire population (74.9 percent), while there are considerably more Russians (who comprise 19.4 percent of the Ukrainian SSR's population). I am speaking of the republic as a whole. But if one takes the leading political sector of the republic—the cities, especially the leading cultural and political centers—then there is no doubt: the dominance of Russians among the leading cadres would be even greater there, especially in scholarship, culture, and education.

This tendency clearly reveals itself in situations of political crisis. Thus, after [the purge of] 1972, personnel changes took place among the directors of social-scientific institutes of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. In the Institute of History, Andrii Skaba was replaced by Arnold Shevelev. In the Institute of Fine Arts, Mykola Syvachenko was replaced by Serhii Zubkov. In the Institute of Literature, Mykola Shamota was replaced by Ihor Dzeverin. (The journal *Radianske literaturoznavstvo* is headed by V. Bieliaiev, who was for many years the secretary of a party organization. The sector of pre-Soviet literature is headed by B. Derkach, who studied in the faculty of Russian philology and wrote his candidate's dissertation on Russian literature, and whose contribution to the development of Ukrainian literary scholarship is, to put it mildly, small. He, according to the editors, has devoted a great deal of effort to thoroughly expurgating the fifty-volume edition of Ivan Franko's works.) In the Institute of Archeology, Fedir Shevchenko was replaced by I. Artemenko (who, although his name ends in “-enko” [a Ukrainian ending], was invited down from Leningrad and speaks only Russian). In the Institute of Economics, Petro Bahrii was replaced by Ivan Lukinov. The Institute of Social Research and the Agricultural Academy are also headed by Russians. After 1972 the Ukrainian directors of a number of Kiev's schools were replaced by Russians. Elected as leaders of the oblast branches of the Writers' Union of Ukraine, [in those branches] where conditions for this are conducive, especially in the organizations of southern Ukraine, were people who write in Russian.

After all, in the conditions of the party's ideological and political absolutism, the political leadership of the Russian center decides matters. The problem here is not only the general national ideology and policies of the CPSU, but also direct control by the ruling party-state agencies in Moscow. Through unofficial channels it became publicly known that at a meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU in December 1971, during a discussion of the work of the Lviv oblast party organization, the oblast's leadership was reproached for the small number of Russian schools (!) in Lviv oblast. In the last few years, by order of the Ministry of Higher Education of the USSR, publishers in Ukraine have been forbidden to publish their own original school textbooks, except for courses in Ukrainian language and literature. Similarly, the publication of schol-

arly monographs in Ukrainian has been restricted to essentially ethnic subjects. Since 1973 the Higher Attestation Commission has not accepted for consideration any dissertations written in Ukrainian. It is clear that this places Ukrainian dissertation writers in an unequal position vis-à-vis the Russians, makes them do twice the work, or forces them to write their dissertations in Russian. The subject classification of specialization has also been changed in dissertation abstracts. Previously, the annotation would have been, for example, simply "Ukrainian literature." Now this specialization is given a more "international" term—"literature of the peoples of the USSR"—while the more precise [term] "Ukrainian" is put in parentheses.

From these facts about the expunging in official language of symbols of the national distinctiveness and activity of the non-Russian peoples, one can conclude that the Russian-language public speeches by representatives of supreme political power in the Ukrainian SSR and their avoidance of the term "the Ukrainian people" are also a result not of their own initiative.

Returning to the question about the place of Ukrainians in the intellectual output of the Ukrainian SSR and the quality of Ukrainian national-cultural cadres, we are forced to make the unpleasant conclusion that the Ukrainian people today, in the sixtieth year of its supposed sovereignty as a state, does not have its own fully developed intelligentsia, its own nationally conscious cadres in science, culture, and education. National-political conditions and the artificial restriction of Ukrainian scholarship in the humanities and social sciences to second-rate subjects have hindered the formation in Ukraine of highly qualified scholars, the creation of an atmosphere of high scholarly standards, civic integrity, and the assumption of historical responsibility for the spiritual climate of society and the future of the nation. In this regard, the situation in Ukraine cannot in any way be compared with prerevolutionary times: here we have clearly regressed because of national-political circumstances.

The moral standard of the leading cadres is a very telling reflection of the political conditions of our national-cultural life. M. Ishchenko, the director of the cultural section of the Central Committee of the CPSU, I. Soldatenko, the secretary of the Writers' Union of Ukraine, and A. Stas, the director of the publishing house Radianskyi Pysmennyk, were all fired from their positions for financial misuse. Rumors are circulating that the editor of *Literaturna Ukraina*, V. Vynohradsky, will also be dismissed from his job for the same transgression.

The system of awards for cultural achievements, especially in literature, has been increasingly discredited in the republic. Particularly disgraceful is the way that the Taras Shevchenko State Prize has been awarded. [Authors of] works with a mainly ideological and official purpose, and not the true achievements of our culture, have received the award. Here are

some examples from the last few years. The Shevchenko prize was awarded to Tymofii Levchuk's film *The Kotsiubynsky Family*, which was not even the event of the season and in which primitivism reigns supreme. For political reasons the Shevchenko prize was given to Pavlo Zahrebelny for his artistically poor and ideologically tendentious novel *Smert u Kyievi* [Death in Kiev]; this work has a clearly anti-Ukrainian purpose: its "common Rus'" patriotism reaches the level of open "Suzdalian," that is, Russian, nationalism. Borys Ten was nominated twice for the Shevchenko prize; his translations of classical Greek literature are a great achievement of Ukrainian culture. But both times the judges were incapable of giving the translator's merits the evaluation they deserved. This year they ruled in favor of the poetry of Liubomyr Dmyterko, whose place in Ukrainian literature, I think, requires no comment. In the field of journalism the award was given to M. Podoliak for his vulgar, primitive, and dishonest newspaper feuilletons on "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism." The film *The Reapers* was awarded the Shevchenko prize even before its appearance on the film screens of the republic—also for its politically useful material. It is important to point out that the committee awarding the Shevchenko prizes is headed by Mykola Shamota.

In conditions of ideological ethnocide and in an atmosphere of official and professional irresponsibility, which has been created by a conducive human environment, events that are tragic for our culture have occurred. In 1964 a fire broke out in the Public Library of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. It began for some reason right in the Ukrainian section. A great number of valuable works, many of them rare books from the prerevolutionary period, were destroyed in the fire. A few months later, a fire broke out in the Vydubychi Monastery, which houses the library of the Kiev Academy and contains European literary treasures of the seventeenth and eighteenth century. In the early 1970s, in the library of Kiev University, the Cabinet of Rare Books, founded by Prof. Serhii Maslov, was closed down. The literature was taken down to the basement of a student residence, where it was submerged by water leaking from broken pipes. In late 1974, the department of old Ukrainian literature in the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences burned down. Many valuable books perished, as did the huge scholarly card file of the researcher V. Kolosova. In the mid-1970s, on the first floor of the building of the Academy of Social Sciences, the library of the Institute of Linguistics was flooded. A large amount of literature was destroyed. Because the roof leaks, Ukrainica in the library of Kharkiv University is perishing.

In July 1977, the Ivan Franko Ukrainian School in Kiev burned down. Two children died, the caretaker's and the chambermaid's. This accident was preceded by a lengthy struggle on the part of the Ukrainian public to keep the school open despite the intentions of the city authorities to close it down. In the eyes of Kiev's Ukrainophobic philistines, the

school was known for being a "nationalist nest": in it a Ukrainian atmosphere prevailed, the children of Ukrainian writers were pupils there, and nationally conscious Ukrainians tended to send their children there. In early March 1979, in the village of Prokhorivtsi near Kaniv, the Memorial Museum dedicated to the famous nineteenth-century scholar Mykhailo Maksymovych burned to the ground. In January 1978, an attempt was made to rob the section of rare books in the History Library. *Ucrainica* has disappeared from the library of the Museum of Ukrainian Art. Priceless works of art were stolen from the Kiev Cave Monastery. The necessary environmental conditions for preserving ancient artifacts in the Republican Museum of Folk Architecture and Culture have not been provided. The clothing is moth-eaten; the churches and peasant houses are mold-infested; some of the ancient icons on glass have been smashed. The museum's director is indifferent to his job; casual people [without any qualifications] predominate on the staff; [qualified] workers who are honest and enthusiastic about their work are deliberately harassed by the administration.

A junior associate of the Institute of History of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Vadim Kriukov, succeeded for the longest time in combining his participation in the "development" of Ukrainian culture with robbing the institute's library. Because of the conducive atmosphere, created in particular by Arnold Shevelev, the director of the institute at the time, Kriukov was able to sell almost the entire Ukrainian library (even [books] from the special collection) on the black market: all the periodicals from the prerevolutionary period and the 1920s, Cossack chronicles of the sixteenth to eighteenth century, the works of Dmytro Bantysh-Kamensky, Mykola Markevych, Panteleimon Kulish, Mykola Kostomarov, Oleksandra Iefymenko, Orest Levytsky, Volodymyr Antonovych, Mykhailo Maksymovych, Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Dmytro Bahalii, Ahatanhel Krymsky, Oleksander Kistiakovsky, Dmytro Iavornytsky, and many others. The Kiev oblast court put an end to Kriukov's "cultural" activity by sentencing the "scholar" to ten years; unfortunately, however, it did not (nor did it try to!) expose or condemn those general political and local social conditions that allowed such a crime to be committed. It did not condemn the unbelievable and bizarre statement made by Arnold Shevelev, the director of the Institute of History, that the stolen literature was "nationalist trash" and "waste paper." Was it not because of such "internationalism" that Shevelev, having made, to put it mildly, a very modest contribution to scholarship, became a doctor of historical sciences, a corresponding member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, a professor, and director of an academic institute? (In addition, he directed the chair of the history of the CPSU and scientific communism at the Kiev Civil Engineering Institute and was the secretary and member of the bureau of the Kiev City Committee of the CPU.)

In any case, the national-cultural atmosphere in Ukraine, especially in the area of historical scholarship, has been created according to Shevelev's criteria. To the above I shall add a few more facts. Since the end of 1977 the works of Mykhailo Hrushevsky have been removed from libraries and even library catalogues to give the impression that this scholar never existed! A person who produced ten thick volumes on the history of Ukraine, who until the revolution was a scholarly authority for the Saint Petersburg Academy of Sciences, and who, after all, became a Soviet academic! Imagine what would happen if such figures as Sergei Solovov and Vasilii Kliuchevsky were expunged from Russian historiography! In Russia a person would be called insane for making the very suggestion. In Ukraine the similar criterion of "historicism" is applied to Hrushevsky on the level of state policy. And not to Hrushevsky alone, but to the entire national-political and cultural history of the Ukrainian people. In the scholarly libraries Ukrainica catalogues have been thoroughly weeded out. For example, in the Central Scientific Library, there were at one time seven drawers of bibliographic cards about Taras Shevchenko; now they take up only a third of one drawer. (By subject matter they have been restricted to literature about the friendship of peoples, atheism, and "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism.") All Ukrainica, especially scholarly publications, in the Central Library has been removed to the Podil district, to a branch of the library that is closed on Saturday and Sunday, and is open only until 6 P.M. on weekdays. Previously the Central Library was open on Saturday and Sunday until 11:30 P.M. Now it is open only until 5:45 P.M. Thus measures have been taken to restrict altogether readers' access to Ukrainian publications of the past, to prevent those who do not work in the approved institutions from having these publications available to them.

The facts stated above are only a few examples of the abnormality of conditions for the cultural development of a Ukrainian socialist nation, of the oppressed state of the Ukrainians within the USSR, and of the political dependence of the Ukrainian SSR on Russia, which today is realizing its great-power chauvinist policies under the guise and in the form of a federation of Soviet republics.

This situation is crowned by endless repressions of those Ukrainians who oppose Russification and refuse to follow quietly the "natural" road to national extinction. Even passive opposition does not escape punishment. For a person who is uninvolved and has learned about contemporary Ukraine only from the picture painted by official propaganda, it is difficult, perhaps, to believe that in the capital of the Ukrainian SSR, a person who merely speaks Ukrainian outside a few specific spheres automatically becomes politically suspect in the eyes of the authorities and that consequently this person has fewer chances of achieving a professional career or holding a more prestigious position. Moreover, the way out of

this situation takes completely unexpected forms. For example, I myself was more than once the victim of national discrimination by salespeople while shopping for daily provisions: say one sentence in Ukrainian, and you'll receive the inferior product or your order will not be filled as well as it could be. They'll say: "That's good enough for the hick."

The prewar and postwar Stalinist repressions dealt the Ukrainian people such a physical and psychological blow that the nation has not recovered to this day. This blow signalled a cardinal transformation of the political and cultural status of the republic. The revelation of the Stalin cult did not result in a radical improvement in the situation. But owing to the temporary political thaw in Ukrainian society, an elemental process of national revival [nevertheless] began. People who spoke out in a fresh and talented way about the real needs of society appeared in the cultural sphere. The professional and cultural level of social activity in Kiev grew perceptibly; there appeared a prestigious Ukrainian-speaking milieu, to which both the non-Ukrainian and Russified public began listening. The Club of Creative Youth was created. It attracted large audiences to its evenings. On New Year's Eve, Ukrainian carols echoed in the streets of Kiev: literary Ukrainian rang out not from the stage, but from the mouths of the living street element. People were amazed; there was no lack of openly hostile reactions; but a friendly attitude prevailed. Against the background of an official Ukrainian paper facade there arose a thriving Ukrainian life; Ukrainians began discovering their Ukrainianness.

The Russian great-power chauvinists had not expected this to happen. It was precisely this rebirth of the people that contradicted their ideology of "internationalization," "rapprochement," and the fusion of nations. In 1965 the Ukrainian rebirth of the post-Stalin period received its first blow. Of course, the blow was to its head: in a number of Ukrainian cities, including Kiev, many representatives of the Ukrainian cultural intelligentsia were arrested and charged formally with reading samvydav literature and with "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda." Nevertheless, the 1965 arrests still fitted within the framework of the all-Union policies directed at silencing the critics of Stalinism. They circumscribed permissible national-cultural activity but did not stop the process of Ukraine's national rebirth. Moreover, at precisely this time, in the second half of the 1960s, the republic's top party leadership, owing to a significant degree to the influence of Ivan Dziuba's book *Internationalism or Russification?*, found within itself the courage to turn its attention to the real state of affairs and tried to do something to correct the situation. In particular, the above-mentioned conference of directors of higher educational institutions was organized; the Vyshecha Shkola publishing house was created to provide the VUZy with educational literature in Ukrainian; the study of Ukrainian history was revived in the Academy of Sciences;

a government resolution was passed about building the Zaporozhian Sich historical preserve on Khortytsia Island. As we can see, the national-political and cultural situation in Ukraine was also confirmed officially and documented. This is very significant considering the later course of events.

The next great-power blow against Ukraine already had a different character: the mass arrests of the Ukrainian intelligentsia in January 1972 signalled a radical change in the national policies of the Ukrainian party-state authorities. They were intended precisely to show that Ukraine did not have its own regional policies, so that in this respect it would revert to Stalin's time and in no way violate its provincial character; in other words, so that it would not become a visibly separate entity of political activity. The point that should be made is that the party leadership under Petro Shelest laid claim to occupying a *responsible* position in the republic, to being the ruling organ representing the Ukrainian people, the population of Ukraine. Of course, this could not but disturb the great-power advocates, who did everything to drive Ukraine again onto the road of "objective" and "natural" national extinction.

The 1972 political arrests in Ukraine were loudly publicized in the press, on the radio, and on television as an action related to the affair of Iaroslav Dobosh, a Belgian citizen of Ukrainian origin, and supposedly directed against, to cite an official statement, "activity hostile to the socialist order" of those arrested. The connection between the arrests and Dobosh was not proven by the court; such charges did not figure in the sentencing of any of those accused. This "hostile activity" consisted of critical statements about civic life, of the reading of samvydav literature, of writing letters to the organs of power in which attention was focussed on the situation in this or that area of national life, and, finally, of publishing the uncensored typewritten journal *Ukrainskyi visnyk*, which, as far as I know, had an informational purpose. I know many of those imprisoned and have associated with some of them for years. Therefore I can testify, with full awareness of the consequences, that in the world view and sentiments of the Ukrainian intelligentsia that was publicly active in the 1960s there were neither anti-Soviet nor antisocialist motives, meaning that there could not be any antisocialist propaganda and agitation on their part. There existed only a civic consciousness of their rights in society and obligations to their country, the need to lead a free, independent spiritual life, and, of course, dissatisfaction with the state of the people as a nation, a critical attitude toward the ideological and political bureaucratization of society.

The civic behavior of the arrested was an expression of, and a factor in, the development of Ukraine's self-awareness, and this undeniably became the principal reason for the arrests and the brutal punishment meted out to the most active participants in the Ukrainian national move-

ment. As for the evidence collected during the days of imprisonment and the objectivity of the court, it is enough to state this fact: the lawyer demanded the release of one of the accused, Oleksander Serhiienko, because of the absence of *corpora delicti*, but the court sentenced Serhiienko to seven years of strict-regime camps and five years of exile. Vasyl Lisovy, a communist, a candidate of philosophical sciences, and an employee of the Institute of Philosophy of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, expressed his alarm as a citizen about what was happening in a letter to the Central Committee of the CPU on 5 July 1972. The next day he "received his reply": Lisovy was arrested and subsequently sentenced to seven years of strict-regime camps and three years of exile. Those sentenced were usually given maximum terms; this is additional proof that the purpose was not to punish them for concrete criminal acts but to exclude people from Ukrainian public life for as long as possible, if not permanently.

That the 1972 trials in Ukraine had the character of a political action against all of society and were directed against the national rebirth of Ukraine is demonstrated by the subsequent unfolding of events. First, in advance, in preparation for the planned action, the chief of the KGB in the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR was removed; later, after the arrests, which, according to widespread rumors, were opposed by the Ukrainian party leadership, Petro Shelest was removed from the post of First Secretary of the CC CPU and sent to Moscow so that subsequently he could be accused unjustifiably of Ukrainian nationalism and to put an end to his political career. All of this signalled, in fact, a coup d'état in Ukraine, which was reminiscent in miniature of the political changes in Ukrainian society after Mykola Skrypnyk's suicide in 1933. Moscow's appointment of Valentyn Malanchuk as a secretary of the CC CPU has a particularly interesting history: it was completely unexpected, even for the anti-Ukrainian groups in the higher party circles of the republic.

As a result of these personnel changes, the general national-political and cultural atmosphere greatly deteriorated. The concept of "the Ukrainian people" disappeared for a long time from the official speeches of the representatives of the ruling authorities and is used now only very rarely and cautiously; later the public appearances themselves were in Russian. The propaganda war against "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism," which long ago had become synonymous with the concepts of "nationally conscious Ukrainians" and "Ukrainian patriots," increased. Even the leadership under Shelest had been unable to transform the VUZy and technical schools into institutions that teach in Ukrainian. After 1972, this situation deteriorated further. Work on the creation of the Zaporozhian Sich preserve was halted. The Ukrainian language's functional sphere in society was constricted. The press began hounding writers for ideological transgressions, particularly for so-called idealization of the

past, that is, for attempting to say something more concrete and objective about Ukrainian history. The vulgarization of Ukrainian history reverted to the level that existed in Stalin's time. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal* did not come out for over a year. As a matter of fact, from precisely this time Kiev's kiosks have been stuffed with the [Russian] journal *Otechestvo*, which is aimed at the Russian emigration and which also wages a struggle with—you guessed it—"Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism."

The publication of Ukrainian-language journals in the natural sciences has been halted. The number of classes in Ukrainian language and literature in the high schools has been reduced; classes in Ukrainian language and literature have been removed from the curricula of technical schools. Matters have reached such a state that in 1973 and 1974 editors in the publishing houses deleted the word "Ukrainian" from books. For example, the phrase "Ukrainian activists" was changed to "activists of the fatherland," "the Ukrainian people" to "the toiling masses," and so on. The words "cossack," "Zaporozhian Sich," and similar concepts were subjected to the same censorship. Facts of such editing were in my possession, but unfortunately I am unable to provide them at this time because my card file was confiscated during a search.

School programs in Ukrainian language and literature have been shifted in the direction of even greater "internationalization," that is, in the direction of an even greater evisceration of their Ukrainian content. I have heard of cases where Shevchenko's portrait was taken down from the walls of libraries and classrooms, where tape-recordings of readings of Shevchenko's works have been removed from the cabinet of Ukrainian literature, and so on.

Beginning in the 1960s, the beautiful old march "Bohdan Khmelnytsky" was performed. Now it is officially called "The March Dedicated to the Unification of Ukraine with Russia."

A detailed analysis of the national-political and cultural situation in Ukraine in the 1970s would reveal a picture of the real defeat of a modern Ukrainian national renaissance that had begun in the atmosphere of the revelation of Stalinism. In one or another form, everyone who in the 1960s had revealed his or her national patriotism and had participated in unsanctioned social activities was subjected to repression. Many people became victims of "the prohibition to work in one's profession." For over ten years Lina Kostenko, one of the finest poets in Ukraine today, was unable to publish her works. Mykola Lukash, whose translations were a unique phenomenon in Ukrainian culture, is still not allowed to publish. Mykhailo Braichevsky lost his position as a historian for his scholarly article "Annexation or Unification?" His well-known name could not be mentioned for a number of years. Only recently, because of the precautions taken before the conference on questions of the Helsinki Accords, was Braichevsky again made a member of the staff of scholarly workers

of the Institute of Archeology. Iaroslav Dzyra, a candidate of philosophical sciences who had been doing fundamental work in the preparation of a scholarly edition of the cossack chronicles at the Institute of History, cannot to this day find work in his field. It was a great loss for Ukrainian literary scholarship when Mykhailyna Kotsiubynska, a candidate of philological sciences, was forbidden to work in her profession. V. Skrypka, a folklorist and candidate of philological sciences, has been forced to work for Statystyka publishers. Leopold Iashchenko was dismissed from his job in the Institute of Fine Arts, Folklore, and Ethnography and expelled from the Union of Composers for forming an independent folk choir. The choir was forced to disband, and its members were administratively persecuted.

I have named only a small part of the repressed representatives of the Ukrainian cultural intelligentsia. But I hope, and there is enough evidence to see, that my description of the present national predicament of the Ukrainian people as a state of siege possesses not only a metaphorical and ideological import, but also a practical one. The official ideology of the "internationalization," "rapprochement," and fusion of nations and the historiographic concept of the history of Ukraine leave the Ukrainian people virtually no room for free movement either forward or backward. They block our access to the future and to the past; and the practical creators of this predicament beat over the head anyone who rises above the level of planned national extinction, anyone who tries to tell the truth about the reality of the Ukrainian nation, or, God forbid, tries to evaluate the overall picture on an all-national, historical scale according to political criteria.

Translated from the Ukrainian by Roman Senkus

Юрій Перфецький

УКРАЇНСЬКІ МОВНІ РИСИ В БІЛОРУСЬКІЙ ХРОНІЦІ БИХОВЦЯ

У 1979-ому році, під час четвертої зустрічі Постійної конференції українських студій (ПКУС), я виголосив доповідь під заголовком “Галицько-Волинський літопис як джерело хроніки Биховця”, історичної пам’ятки про Велике Литовсько-Руське Князівство, яка кінчиться 1506-им роком. Ця хроніка була написана кирилицею перед 1565-им роком та переписана останній раз латинськими буквами в 1570-их роках, за даними білоруського дослідника Улашкіка.¹ У своїй доповіді я зосередився над мовою лише тих частин хроніки Биховця, що були майже дослівно запозичені з Галицько-Волинського літопису. Я показав, що автор хроніки Биховця не переписував свій текст механічно, а радше модернізував мову свого моделю, хоча не послідовно, та іноді робив нейтральні зміни, які позбавили запозичені частини хроніки Биховця тої яскравості та жвавості викладу, що є ознакою Галицько-Волинського літопису. На кінець своєї доповіді я старався визначити, якою мовою ці запозичення були оригінально написані. Однак, тут я допустив помилки, бо до специфічно українських мовних рис, як наприклад, перехід *е* (ятя) в *і* (наприклад, у слові “wira”² замість “wёra”), я зачислив і такі, що є спільними для української та білоруської мов — як, наприклад, чергування літери *у* з літерою *в* (у хроніці латинкою: *u ~ w*), які

¹ Н. Н. Улашкік, *Хроника Быховца* (Москва, 1966) стор. 29.

² Полное собрание русских летописей (дальше ПСРЛ), том 32 (Москва, 1975), стор. 135.

виступають як префікс та як прийменник в обидвох мовах (наприклад, у хроніці Биховця дієслова “ukusił i “wkusi” — останнє — це форма аориста у значенні “вкусив”³ та чергування у формі прийменника: наприклад, “w Witebsku” i “u Witebsku”⁴). Усе ж таки, тому що я натякнув й на те, що дотепер неідентифікована копія Галицько-Волинського літопису, що з неї переписував літописець хроніки Биховця була відмінною від Іпатієвського та Хлебніковського текстів Галицько-Волинського літопису та мала “українське забарвлення”, моя доповідь вийшла друком у зміненій формі завдяки Професорові О. Прицакові як коротке звітження. Недоліком доповіді було й те, що, хоча я відчував “дух української мови” у запозичених сторінках із Галицько-Волинського літопису, на що й натякнув у звітженні,⁵ я, на жаль, не міг тоді судити про мову цілого літопису.

Сьогодні я можу більше сказати про цю мову, бо я переклав цілу хроніку Биховця на англійську мову й, працюючи над своїм перекладом, звернув спеціальну увагу на виключно українські мовні риси у цій пам’ятці. Простудіювавши цілий літопис, я не думаю, що можна твердити, як я це зробив у звітженні, цитуючи Улащіка, що — мовляв — “останній автор хроніки Биховця... писав по суті білоруською мовою з домішкою таких же церковно-слов’янських, українських і польських елементів, що їх знаходимо в ріжній кількості в інших “литовських” чи “західньо-російських” історичних працях”.⁶ До речі, правильно повинно було бути “західньо-руських” (West Rus’ian), але форма “West Russian” у знаках наведення чомусь попала у кінцеву версію статті, за яку відповідала редакція. У своєму перекладі цілої хроніки на англійську мову та у передмові до цього перекладу я вживаю послідовно правильний термін “West Rus’ian.”

Я правді не дмаю, що можна мову хроніки Биховця назвати білоруською, бо — крім переходу *ѣ* (ятя) в *е*, прикладів якого є дуже багато, дуже малого числа форм з правдоподібним білоруським аканням,⁷ наприклад, “*rárabcy*” (стор. 133),

³ Там же, стор. 159.

⁴ Там же, стор. 155.

⁵ “A Note on the Relationship of the Byxovec Chronicle to the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, т. 5, ч. 3 (вересень 1981), стор. 353, прим. 7.

⁶ Там же, стор. 351.

⁷ Що на перший погляд виглядає як приклад так званого білоруського “дзекання” на стор. 162 у слові “*widziacz*” правдоподібно ним таки не є, а є радше впливом польського “*widzieć*”, бо білоруська мова, хіба що в діалектах, що межують з західньо-українськими, дієслова “видіти” не має.

“kali” (стор. 138) і “attóle” (стор. 167), і одного прикладу білоруського місцевого відмінку від слова “wóseń,” себто “u woseni” (стор. 133) — інших виключно білоруських рис у хроніці є відносно мало. Переважно це спільні риси з українською мовою, як наприклад, чергування *u:w*, про яке я вже згадував, та інші. До речі, “u woseni” могло бути “uw oseni” в недійшовшому до нас оригіналі, а така форма znana й в українській мові. Зрештою, навіть протетичне “восінь” знане в українських говорах, на що звернув мені увагу Проф. Богдан Струмінський. Щодо церковнослов'янізмів, то, крім запозичень з Галицько-Волинського літопису, звідки взято також конструкцію так званого “давального самостійного”, їх в інших частинах літопису також відносно мало. Переважно це аористи і один приклад “давального самостійного”: “iduszczym bo im dorohoіu у pereszedszym im reku Dnestr” (стор. 166), що значить “бо коли вони йшли дорогою та перейшли ріку Дністер”. А знов щодо полонізмів, то їх аж так багато немає і знаходяться вони переважно у лексиці — наприклад, такі слова як “aczkolwiek”, себто “хоча” (стор. 134); “marszałek” (стор. 136); “koruna” (стор. 145); “dufane”, що по-сучасному є “dufnie”, себто “упевнено” (стор. 162); “papeż (od papeża”, стор. 153) — та іноді у синтаксі, наприклад, у вживанні знахідного відмінка з прийменником *o*, як наприклад, “rocza” (себто “почав”) “prosit’ o lasku” (стор. 157), “prosiaczy o pomocz” (стор. 161, 162) та інші. Натомість, виключно українських мовних рис — як на білоруський літопис — є тут поважне число і тому я хочу їх вичислити.

Поперше, крім двох сторінок та одного і чверть рядка,⁸ з якої складається остання сторінка хроніки видання 1975-го року (що я вживав для мого перекладу), немає сторінки, на якій не було б певних прикладів української заміни “ятя” на *i : ё > i*. Найчастіше це *i* виступає в особово-зворотному займеннику “sobi”⁹ (я начислив 41 приклад та один раз форму “sebi”¹⁰); тоді у слові “wira” — раз у називному,¹¹ два рази в родовому (“wiry”),¹² тринадцять разів у знахідному (“wiru”),¹³

⁸ Це стор. 142, 153, 173 (один і чверть рядка).

⁹ Стор. 129, 130 (3 рази), 131, 132 (2 рази), 133 (3 рази), 134 (3 рази), 135-36, 139 (2 рази), 141, 144, 150, 152, 154-55, 156 (2 рази), 157, 158 (2 рази), 159-60, 161 (2 рази), 162, 163 (4 рази), 164 (2 рази), 166, 171.

¹⁰ Стор. 133.

¹¹ Стор. 135.

¹² Стор. 139.

¹³ Стор. 130, 133-34, 139 (2 рази), 140 (2 рази), 141, 144 (2 рази), 145 (3 рази).

два рази у дієслові “wiryli”,¹⁴ і по одному разі у словах “błahowirnaja”,¹⁵ “błahowirny”,¹⁶ і чотири рази “dostowirno”¹⁷ з тим же самим коренем. В порівнянні із словом “sobi” я запримітив особовий займенник “tobi”¹⁸ лише п’ять разів. Після тих прикладів найчастіше вживаними словами з літерою і на місці етимологічного “ятя” (ѣ) є: (1) форма аориста “bi”, себто “був” (десять разів)¹⁹; (2) форми “swit” та “swita” (п’ять разів, три з них у фразеологічному звороті “od poczatka swita”)²⁰; (3) слово “czelownik” (три рази), до того раз у родовому (“czelownika”), раз у давальному відмінку (“czelowiku”), і крім цього раз у сполонізованій формі “czlowik” та раз у прикметнику “czelowiczeskij”²¹; (4) форми “lit” (три рази) та “lita” (один раз)²²; (5) дієслово “mili” (від інфінітива “mēti”, паралельного до “imēti”), що вживалося чотири рази в значенні “мали”, три рази у формі чоловічого роду “mil”, себто “мав”, та два рази у формі інфінітива “mity”, себто “мати”²³; (6) форми “ditey” та “dity” (по два рази кожна)²⁴; (7) форми “misto”, “miste” (“u tom miste”), та “mista” (по одному разі)²⁵; (8) п’ять разів форма “misiaca” та раз “misiacy”²⁶; та (9) іменник “hniw” (три рази) і похідне від нього дієслово “hniwatysia”, що два рази виступали в реченнях, що віддзеркалюють живу мову на 149-ій стор. хроніки: “dla toho na mene ne hniwaysia” та “hniwu na mene ne mey” (себто “май”).²⁷ Окрім щойно наведених прикладів, по одному разі я запримітив такі форми: “hrobi” (“u odnom hrobi”)²⁸; “obicala” та “sia obical”²⁹; “k papi”, себто “до папи”³⁰; “tila” і “tilo”³¹; “wbih” та “pobih”³²; “terpity”³³; “widaty” і “widuszczē” (по сучасному “знати” і “знаючи”)³⁴; “otwit”

¹⁴ Стор. 134 (2 рази).

¹⁵ Стор. 162.

¹⁶ Стор. 170.

¹⁷ Стор. 156-57, 160, 165.

¹⁸ Стор. 139, 143, 152 (2 рази), 158.

¹⁹ Стор. 132, 133 (3 рази), 146-47, 157 (3 рази), 162.

²⁰ Стор. 135-36, 165-65, 168.

²¹ Стор. 133, 136, 145, 149, 152 (2 рази), 170.

²² Стор. 129-31, 136.

²³ Стор. 129 (3 рази), 134, 150 (2 рази), 151, 158-59.

²⁴ Стор. 129, 151 (2 рази), 159.

²⁵ Стор. 128, 138, 169.

²⁶ Стор. 150, 154 (2 рази), 162-63, 170.

²⁷ Стор. 149 (2 рази), 159 (2 рази).

²⁸ Стор. 131.

²⁹ Стор. 131, 161.

³⁰ Стор. 132.

³¹ Стор. 133-34.

³² Стор. 137, 167.

³³ Стор. 137.

³⁴ Стор. 140, 160.

і “otwita” (себто “відповідь” і “відповіді”)³⁵; “o ráhubi”;³⁶; “powidáuczy”³⁷; “wicznoho”³⁸; “uwidaw” (себто “довідавшись”)³⁹; “po zwizdach”⁴⁰; “nit” (себто “немає”)⁴¹; “bidno”⁴²; “obid”⁴³; “w ... powite i ko powitu”⁴⁴; “sowit” (у значенні “договір”)⁴⁵; та “na trupi”.⁴⁶ Вийком є слово “mni” (себто “мені”),⁴⁷ що засвідчено у хроніці два рази. Однак, тут треба зазначити, що напевно всіх слів з тим “українським” і я не виловив, бо на першому пляні моєї праці був переклад цілої хроніки на англійську мову і я міг переочити деякі форми.

Наступною українською мовною рисою у хроніці Биховця це перехід ненаголошеного *е в о* (*е > о*) після шиплячих приголосних та перед здавна твердим приголосним. Цей перехід був колись також у середньобілоруській мові, але сьогодні ця риса затерта аканням. Однак, я все ж таки зачислив її до українських рис, тому що коли в даному літописі є вже приклади акання, наприклад, згадане вже слово “kalí” (себто акання на цей час уже встановлено), то перехід ненаголошеного *е в о* (*е > о*) після шиплячих можна зачислити вже до виключно українських рис, бо через появу та від появи акання ця зміна відбувається у білорусів лише під наголосом.⁴⁸ Отже, до українських прикладів я зачислив такі форми як “czohó” (стор. 146, 153), “derżaczohó” (стор. 136), “stárszohó” (стор. 154), “nászomu” (стор. 158) і “koroléwiczom” (стор. 164), бо *о* після шиплячих у тих прикладах ненаголошене. Однак, частіше я запримітив це українське ненаголошене *о* в інших словах, як наприклад, у числівнику “czotýry”, що вживається у хроніці дев'ять разів. Уже на самому початку хроніки появляється воно у другому реченні, що говорить про походження литовців від римлян і згадує “czotýry rożaj”⁴⁹ (стор. 128), себто “чотири роди” римської шляхти що покинули свою батьківщину, вті-

³⁵ Стор. 148, 165.

³⁶ Стор. 160.

³⁷ Стор. 160.

³⁸ Стор. 165.

³⁹ Стор. 165.

⁴⁰ Стор. 128.

⁴¹ Стор. 129.

⁴² Стор. 146.

⁴³ Стор. 134.

⁴⁴ Стор. 130, 135.

⁴⁵ Стор. 145.

⁴⁶ Стор. 172.

⁴⁷ Стор. 148, 149.

⁴⁸ Букатевич, Н. И. та інші, *Очерки по сравнительной грамматике восточнославянских языков* (Одеса, 1958), стор. 48.

⁴⁹ У цьому випадку читай *j* як [ji].

каючи під проводом князя Палеймона від гунського полководця Аттіли. Потім форму “czotyry” запримічено в частинах запозичених з Галицько-Волинського літопису, де говориться про те, що литовський князь Войшелк вбивав денно людей “po czotyry” (стор. 133) і згадується “czotyry párabcy” (стор. 133) і обставини, при яких вони вбили литовського князя Троняту. Усі інші приклади з числівником “czotyry” запримічені були в менш значних контекстах, де слово “czotyry” виступає в таких фразах як: “w czotyrech milach” (стор. 130), “czotyry mili” (стор. 137), “za czotyry strylenia” (стор. 143), тобто “на віддалі чотирьох пострілів”, “czotyry dni” (два рази, стор. 154), та у реченні з розмовним кольоритом “w neho byli czotyry syny” (стор. 139).

Другим частішим прикладом ненаголошеного *о* це слово “czoło” у фразеологічному звороті “biti” або “wdaryti czołóm” (себто “низько вклонятися комунебудь”), що виступає в хроніці одинадцять разів, переважно у минулому часі,⁵⁰ а третім таким прикладом це слово “czotyrysta”, що виступає тут шість разів виключно у літочисленні, як ось, наприклад: “W leto . . . po bożym narożeniju”⁵¹ “tysiacza czotyrysta dewiatdesiat semoho” (стор. 165).⁵² Четвертий, п’ятий і останній приклади цього українського *о* це дієслово “noczowáli” (стор. 154, 172); числівник “czotyrynadcaty”, що виступає у фразі “w czotyrynadcaty nedelach” (стор. 162); та іменник “żoná”, що, крім двох разів у називному відмінку (стор. 135, 149), виступає раз у родовому (“żoný”, стор. 135), чотири рази в знахідному (“żonu”, стор. 135, 139, 142, 152), та раз в орудному відмінку (“so swojeiu żonóiu”, стор. 152).

Черговою виключно українською мовною рисою у хроніці Биховця — це вживання закінчення першої особи множини на -мо, яке — за словами авторів найновішої радянської історичної граматики української мови — вже від першої половини 15-го століття “безперечно . . . відображає структуру народної мови”.⁵³ Мені відомо, що полуднево-західні говірки бі-

⁵⁰ Стор. 137: “bili czołóm” (2 рази), “y wdaryli iemu czołóm”; стор. 140: “bił czołóm”; стор. 147: “czołóm wdaryty”; стор. 157: “wdaryli czołóm”, “wdary czołóm”; стор. 158: “wdaryli czołóm”, “bity czołóm”; стор. 160: “bili czołóm”, “czołóm bijuczy”.

⁵¹ У виданні з 1907 року (ПСРЛ, т. 17 [С.-Петербург, 1907], стор. 554) слова “bożym narożeniju” пишуться з великої букви, як і в інших прикладах із словом “Бог”.

⁵² Інші приклади на стор. 153, 164 (3 рази), 166.

⁵³ С. П. Бевзенко та інші, Історія української мови: Морфологія (Київ, 1978), стор. 314.

лоруської мови також знають закінчення - *мо*⁵⁴ і під їх впливом це закінчення проникло в дуже мале число поодиноких дієслівних форм білоруської літературної мови, як наприклад, “*дамо*”, паралельна форма до більш вживаної “*дадзім*”,⁵⁵ але тому, що ці говірки межують якраз з територією української мови, я вважаю це явище поширенням українського закінчення на сусідню білоруську територію. Отже, закінчення - *мо* перш за все зазначено у формах наказового способу, як наприклад, у зверненні Короля Ягайла до свого брата Великого Литовського Князя Витовта у справі наслідства, в якому він каже, вживаючи форму наказового способу аж два рази у тому реченні: “*A tak mežu soboіu zmoўto u prysiahu wczynіmo*” (стор. 151), себто “Зробімо договір між собою та й заприсягнімо”. І тут мушу зазначити, що у всіх прикладах це закінчення виступає у прямій мові, як ось у словах Князя Льва Даниловича до литовського князя Войшелка, перед тим як він його забив (стор. 134): “*Napijmosia icszcze, kume*” (“Напиймося ще, куме”); або в менш значному реченні (стор. 143): “*Poіedmo do Wilna*” (себто “Поїдьмо до Вільна”). Також знаходимо його у зверненні Пана Олехна Судимонтовича, який, бажаючи врятувати від загибелі сина Ягайла — Короля Казимира — щоб змилити чехів, які оточили короля під час битви під Вроцлавом, назвав його звичайним лицарем, звертаючись до своїх товаришів словами (стор. 161): “*Bratia miłaiа, ratuymo toho rycera*” (себто “Дорогі побратими, рятуймо цього лицаря”).

Більш складним явищем є поява українського закінчення - *мо* у формах “*bychmo*” та “*abychmo*”, що їх знаходимо у хроніці також у прямій мові. У згаданій вже найновішій історичній граматиці ця поява пояснюється “впливом частки умовного часу *byxomz* (колишньої форми аориста) на особові афікси минулого часу: *byxomz* (*abyxomz*) > *byxmy* (*abyxmy*) > *xmy*... Наступним етапом була морфологічна адаптація цього афікса на українському ґрунті... На поширення цієї форми, очевидно, певний вплив справила польська мова. Проте вважати її запозиченням з польської... немає достатніх підстав, бо вона може бути і результатом прямого розвитку давньоруських форм аориста.”⁵⁶ Приклади цього закінчення - *мо* у частці умовного часу виступають у підрядних ре-

⁵⁴ Букатевич, стор. 197.

⁵⁵ R.G.A. de Bray, *Guide to the East Slavonic Languages* (Columbus, Ohio, 1980), стор. 243.

⁵⁶ Бєвзенко, стор. 326.

ченнях, як ось, наприклад: (1) "... szto bychmo pohoworyli s nim" (себто "щоб ми поговорили з ним"), (2) "... abychmo derżali swoje ..." ("щоб ми своє держали"), та (3) "dali bychmo otcu swojemu prawdu" (щоб ми батькові своєму присягнули") — усі виключно на стор. 143 хроніки. Однак, мені пощастило запримітити ще один приклад на самому кінці хроніки (стор. 171), в якому віленський єпископ Табар звертається до Короля Александра в обороні прав та привілеїв литовської шляхти на сеймі в Радомі в 1505 році словами "... my boronili praw u prywilejow naszych, szto bychmo pro nich zostali ..." ("ми боронили своїх прав та привілеїв, щоб ми могли їх задержати"). Слова єпископа мали такий потрясаючий вплив на короля, що зараз після єпископської промови, за хронікою Биховця, король захворів на параліч.

Зі сказаного вище я прийшов до висновку, що дійсно дуже тяжко місцями встановити, чи у даній хроніці масмо до діла з білоруською мовою з українською домішкою, чи навпаки, з українською мовою з білоруською домішкою, тому що так тісно переплітається одна мова з другою у цій хроніці. Не знати також в чию користь зачислити спільні риси. Натомість, бодай в одному можна бути до деякої міри впевненому. Той літописець, що переписував 145-у сторінку хроніки, правдоподібно був українцем,⁵⁷ чи точніше на той час — українським русином, бо на цій сторінці є одне речення, написане напів кирилицею з правильно вжитими "ятями" — "нюже мѣру мѣрите" (що значить "в яку міру", або більш сучасно "якою мірою мірите") — і напів латинкою — "otmiritsia im" (що значить "відміряться", себто "відплатиться їм" замість біблійного "вам").⁵⁸ У цьому реченні явно бачимо заміну кириличного "ятя" (ѣ) латинським і у слові "otmiritsia". У всякому разі є над чим замислитися.

⁵⁷ Хоча менш правдоподібно, коли взяти під увагу цілу хроніку, він міг бути також поляком, що читав церковно-слов'янські тексти з українською вимовою, що була поширена вже в 16-ому столітті у давній Речі Посполитій. Точніше про це явище, гляди: Я. Ісаєвич, *Першодрукар Іван Федоров і виникнення друкарства на Україні* (Львів, 1975), стор. 99—100. До речі, Ісаєвич згадує польського письменника Л. Гурніцького (Górnicki), який в опублікованій ним транскрипції латинкою уривка церковно-слов'янської Острозької Біблії в Кракові в 1594 році дотримувався української вимови.

⁵⁸ Євангеліє від Св. Матвія, VII, 2.

Вероніка Шувар

УКРАЇНСЬКІ МИСТЕЦЬКІ ОБ'ЄДНАННЯ В КІНЦІ XIX — ПОЧАТКУ XX СТОЛІТТЯ

Наприкінці XIX ст. в Україні виникали численні товариства й об'єднання художників (Товариство південно-руських художників в Одесі, Київське товариство художніх виставок, Товариство харківських художників). Ці об'єднання допомагали консолідації мистецьких сил, їх суспільному й естетичному визначенню.

Ряд товариств діяло у Львові. Так, у 1896 р. в місті було засновано з ініціативи відомих художників Івана Труша й Юліяна Панкевича Товариство для розвою руської штуки, що ставило собі за мету популяризувати українське мистецтво. Архів цього товариства не дійшов до нашого часу, а його матеріяли розпорошилися. Однак збереглися матеріяли пізнішого мистецького об'єднання — Товариства прихильників української літератури, науки і мистецтва, яке виникло в 1904 р.¹ Одним з засновників його і активним членом був також І. Труш.

В списках членів товариства знаходимо такі імена, як Іван Франко, Михайло Грушевський, Іван Нечуй-Левицький, Михайло Коцюбинський, Леся Українка, Микола Аркас, Микола Лисенко, Олександр Мишуга, Олександр Олесь, Володимир Гнатюк, Павло Житецький.

Про діяльність товариства розповідають протоколи засідань, які деякий час (від 15 лютого 1904 р. до 9 лютого 1908 р.) вів І. Труш як секретар. З них довідуємося, що, на-

¹ Львівський обласний державний архів (ЛОДА), ф. 298, оп. 1, спр. 1—8.

приклад, на засіданні 4 вересня 1904 р. І. Труш доповідав про організацію виставки картин, плахт, килимів, гуцульської різьби; тоді ж було й обрано й журі в складі І. Труша, М. Грушевського, актора Ст. Дембіцького й художника Модеста Сосенка. Виставка відкрилася в 1905 р.

13 січня 1905 р. було записано, що І. Франка, І. Труша і В. Гнатюка обрали до укладання практичного підручника української мови.

Товариство сприяло розвитку української науки, літератури і мистецтва. З цією метою виник намір видати університетський курс лекцій з історії України Володимира Антоновича, працю Степана Томашівського „Народні рухи”, працю І. Франка про Данте, його ж курс української літератури, двотомники оповідань Володимира Леонтовича, полтавських оповідань І. Нечуя-Левицького, поезій Грицька Чупринки та інше. Більшість намірів товариства була здійснена.

На одному з засідань вирішили звернутися до Лесі Українки, щоб вона дозволила видати на кошти товариства ті її твори, що не увійшли у збірку Видавничої спілки, ухвалили також видати посмертну збірку творів Марка Вовчка.

Товариство проявляло великий інтерес до розвитку українського народного мистецтва. Оголошувалися конкурси, призначалися грошові нагороди. В одному з протоколів читаємо, що після довгої дискусії було признано золоті медалі за кращі роботи Миколі і Василеві Шкріблякам, срібну Маркові Мегединюкові, похвальний диплом — Федорові Шкріблякові.

Серед документів зберігся лист Г. Калитовського з Борщова від 22 жовтня 1904 р. до І. Труша з проханням допомогти художникові-початківцеві І. Юрківському — учневі вчительської семінарії в Заліщиках. Товариство взяло активну участь у святкуванні 35-річчя літературної діяльності І. Нечуя-Левицького (1905 р.), ювілеїв Миколи Садовського (1907 р.) і Марії Заньковецької (1908 р.). На пропозицію І. Труша корифеїв українського театру прийняли в члени товариства. Також на його пропозицію в члени прийнято художника М. Сосенка. Одногolosно було обрано членом товариства директора Київського етнографічного музею Миколу Біляшівського.

Збереглися рахунки і розписки 1904—1906 рр. підписані І. Трушем про одержання грошей на придбання експонатів і транспортні витрати, пов'язані з перевозкою картин на виставки і т. п.

Документи висвітлюють діяльність товариства від його заснування (1904 р.) і до 1914 р.

В 1921 р. у Львові виник Гурток діячів українського мистецтва (ГДУМ), який проіснував вісім років.² Матеріали цього об'єднання також збереглися в архіві. В списку членів ГДУМ згадується сорок осіб. Серед них — Олекса Новаківський, Петро Холодний (старший), Микола Бутович, сестри Олена і Ольга Кульчицькі, Олександр Архипенко і Антін Манастирський. Збереглися об'яви виставок, а також текст протесту ГДУМ (опублікованого в газеті „Свобода” за 26 листопада 1922 р. проти ув'язнення голови ГДУМ, відомого художника проф. П. Холодного).

За час своєї діяльності ГДУМ влаштував чотири виставки, що відіграли значну роль в історії західноукраїнського (галицького) мистецтва.

Не дивлячись на несприятливі умови в яких доводилося працювати українським митцям (вимушений виїзд за кордон багатьох членів), ГДУМ чимало зробив як для пропаганди українського мистецтва, так і для самого об'єднання митців.

Під час організації третьої виставки (1924 р.) з членів гуртка виділилася окрема група „Треті півні” близька до західноєвропейського модернізму. Ця група з часом перетворилася в Союз діячів українського мистецтва (1931 р.), який прийняв назву Асоціація українських незалежних митців (АНУМ). Головою асоціації було обрано Ярослава Музику, секретарем Павла Ковжуна. Матеріали цього об'єднання також зберігаються в архіві.³

Статут АНУМ проголошував, що її метою є піднесення культурного рівня своїх членів шляхом видання журналів, книжок та мистецьких репродукцій, влаштування виставок, читання лекцій на мистецькі теми, організації мистецьких гуртків, школи, майстерень.

Необхідність об'єднання прогресивних мистецьких сил диктувалася життям. „Потрібна конче жива мистецька організація, яка б взяла все мистецьке життя в енергійні руки, організувала б митців... для взаємної допомоги, для пов'язання контактів з широким мистецьким життям в Україні. Може це бути союз українських митців або союз українських незалежних митців... Щось таке, щоб мало характер всеукраїнської мистецької організації, щоб усі ми на всіх землях мали якусь

² ЛОДА, ф. 291, оп. 1, спр. 1, спр. 1, с. 1.

³ Там же, с. 3.

спільну ідею і один шлях до праці...” — читаємо в одному з протоколів.⁴

До товариства потягнулися митці. Багато колишніх членів ГДУМ стали активними членами АНУМ. Серед документів збереглися заяви окремих митців з проханням прийняти їх в члени товариства. Українські художники, члени АНУМ, працювали в різних містах Західної Європи, наприклад, Федір Смець-Нечитайло в Берліні, Михайло Андрієнко в Парижі, Данило Антонович в Празі, Северин Борачек в Кракові, Марія Дольницька у Відні, Мирослава Чапельська в Мюнхені і Оксана Лятуринська в Празі.

АНУМ встановила широкі зв'язки з закордонними мистецькими організаціями майже цілого світу, а результатом цього була перша інформативна виставка організована спільно з Українським національним музеєм в 1931 р. Влаштуваючи її АНУМ заявила, що Львів “надалі на захід висунений український культурний центр, хоч би по природі свого положення мусить відіграти роль мосту між східною і західною культурою. Метою виставки було зібрати перш за все твори чужинних майстрів, що належать до того самого покоління і що змагає з тими самими проблемами. Українське малярство... змагає великими кроками висловити свою індивідуальність, а одночасно дух доби і зловити ту нитку, що єднає його з велетенською скарбницею народного мистецтва”.⁵

Українські митці часто виставляли свої твори в салонах Парижу. О. Рубісова виставляла там графіку, дереворити, літографії; Василь Перебийніс-Нечитайло — пейзажі з Підкарпаття. Він же виконав цікаву серію марок для авіапошти Афганістану, працював над проєктами костюмів для відомого хору Олександра Кошиця. На зарубіжних виставках великою увагою користувалися емалі члена АНУМ художниці Марії Дольницької. Відомий мистецтвознавець Ганс Тіце вважав її першорядним майстром емалі; творчість художниці сформувалася на ґрунті традицій модерної віденської академії та українського мистецтва.⁶

АНУМ цікавилася життям художників в Радянській Україні і знайомила радянського глядача з творчістю західноукраїнських митців. Твори останніх були добре представлені на ювілейній виставці — „Десять років Жовтня”.

⁴ Там же.

⁵ ЛЮДА, ф. 291, оп. 1, спр. 2, с. 3.

⁶ „Мистецтво”, 1932, № 1.

Учасниками великої виставки української книжкової графіки у Харкові (1929 р.) були О. Кульчицька, П. Ковжун, Володимир Січинський, М. Бутович, Роберт Лісовський та інші.

На IV-й Всеукраїнській виставці (1932 р.), яка експонувалася в багатьох великих містах Радянської України, вперше були представлені роботи окремих українських митців-членів АНУМ, які проживали в Парижі.

Товариство культурного зв'язку з закордоном у Києві і Харкові влаштувало виставку робіт художника Миколи Глуценка, що прославився зокрема своїми ілюстраціями до роману Миколи Гоголя „Мертві душі”. Як одноголосно стверджувала тогочасна критика, він виявив тонке розуміння творчості великого письменника. Ці твори виставлені в паризьких салонах користувалися великою увагою.⁷

У відповідь на запрошення радянського консульства у Львові, західноукраїнські митці вирішили 18 січня 1930 р. влаштувати в Радянській Україні виставку творів західноукраїнських художників і в цей спосіб започаткувати постійний обмін культурними здобутками між роз'єднаними частинами українських земель. Для переговорів і здійснення технічних заходів була обрана спеціальна делегація в складі Михайла Осінчука, Я. Музики і П. Ковжуна.

Виставка відкрилася у 1933 р. в Харкові. Члени АНУМ приймали також участь в міжнародних виставках. У 1932 р. в Лос-Анджелесі, на Міжнародній виставці книжкових знаків небувалим успіхом користувався відділ українського екслібрису.

Західноукраїнські графіки, як і радянські майстри, багато уваги приділяли книжковому знаку, який таме тоді став самостійним і добре розвинутим жанром графічного мистецтва. Екслібриси Олени Кульчицької, П. Ковжуна, М. Бутовича, Я. Музики, Льва Геца, Р. Лісовського, П. Холодного (молодшого), Стефанії Гебус-Баранецької та інших здобули визнання як на українських, так і на багатьох зарубіжних виставках.

Цікаві виставки українського екслібрису були також на Всеслов'янській виставці в Празі (1933 р.), на виставках в Берліні (1933 р.) та Римі (1938 р.)

У Львові Асоціація влаштувала одну з найцікавіших виставок килимів, виготовлених за проєктами художників М. Бу-

⁷ ЛОДА, ф. 291, оп. 1, спр. 3, с. 2.

товича, Святослава Гординського, П. Ковжуна, Р. Лісовського, Я. Музики, М. Осінчука і П. Холодного (молодшого) на основі народних зразків, виставку художників-самоуків, п'ять великих періодичних виставок і велику ретроспективну виставку „Українське мистецтво за останні 30 років” (1935 р.).

У 1932 р. АНУМ розпочала видавати журнал „Мистецтво”. До редакції журналу входили М. Бутович, мистецтвознавець П. Ковжун, В. Січинський і М. Осінчук. Журнал інформував про український мистецький рух, вмщував статті з історії та теорії мистецтва, а також публікував хроніку подій мистецького життя в Радянській Україні і в Європі. „Мистецтво” фактично було єдиним на цю пору західньоукраїнським мистецьким журналом (виходив протягом 1932-37 рр.). АНУМ вмщувала також у закордонній пресі публікації про окремі ділянки мистецького життя в Західній Україні, а також видала серію окремих мистецтвознавчих і мистецьких видань. У 1932 р. було видано збірник про український книжковий знак „Екслібрис” (під редакцією П. Ковжуна), де було вмщено понад 80 книжкових знаків, з коротким змістом англійською, французькою й німецькою мовами; видано монографію про Леонтія Тарасевича — одного з кращих європейських граверів XVII ст., що деякий час працював в Москві і праці якого прирівнювалися до неперевершених робіт тогочасних голландських майстрів.

Під редакцією Дмитра Антоновича у серії „Майстри українського мистецтва” вийшла монографія, присвячена П. Холодному (старшому). АНУМ видала також цінні монографії про Олену Сахновську, М. Андрієнка-Нечитайла, О. Кульчицьку, Олексу Грищенка, М. Глуценка і Л. Геца.

Цікаві розвідки Вадима Щербаківського про українські килими і мальовану кераміку та В. Січинського про пам'ятки дерев'яної архітектури було опубліковано в двотомнику „Art populaire” (праці I-го Міжнародного конгресу народного мистецтва, який відбувся в Празі в 1932 р.). АНУМ пропагувала також творчість тих талановитих українських митців, які працювали в різних містах Західної Європи, а також Америки. Одним з них був О. Архипенко. Журнал „Мистецтво” (№ 1 за 1935 р.) підкреслював, що Архипенко творчість розпочала новий етап у розвитку сучасної різьби. Серед майстрів пластики, які працювали за межами України, жоден не міг зрівнятися з О. Архипенком, ні талантом, ні інтенсивністю творчих шукань, ні мистецькою вартістю свого доробку. Як відомо, в 20-30 роках Архипенко брав участь у художніх ви-

ставках в Радянській Україні, працював над пам'ятниками Т. Шевченкові, І. Франкові, князеві Володимиру. В Америці він влаштував біля 30 виставок, які стали підсумком усієї багаторічної творчості митця.

АНУМ активно співпрацювала з прогресивними західно-українськими громадськими організаціями. Спільно з товариством „Рідна школа” Асоціація виробила навчальну програму для мистецько-промислової школи.

Своєрідна філія АНУМ — „група молодих” — працювала у Варшаві. Між нею і АНУМ підтримувались тісні зв'язки. На одному з спільних засідань обговорювалися справи діяльності „Товариства опіки над старовиною і мистецькими пам'ятками” і питання організації пересувних мистецьких виставок в головних містах краю.

В протоколі спільного засідання АНУМ і українського мистецького гуртка у Варшаві від 18 червня 1933 р. записана постанова про необхідність скликання з'їзду митців західноукраїнських земель.

Члени АНУМ проводили серію публічних читань про мистецтво Львова, про мистецтво і археологію. З доповідями виступали Іван Крип'якевич, Ярослав Пастернак, Микола Голубець та ін.

На запрошення скульптора Сергія Литвиненка члени АНУМ оглянули проєкт виконаного ним пам'ятника для могили І. Франка і після проведеної широкої і всебічної дискусії внесли резолюцію: „Одноголосно стверджуємо, що проєкт пам'ятника Сергія Литвиненка є цікавий і по мистецькій концепції і по творчій замислі. Цей шкіцовий проєкт зробив на присутніх членів Асоціації щире враження через його настрійовість і експресію, як ілюстрація до одного з сильних слів Франка. Хоча АНУМ вважає таку розв'язку завдання пам'ятника не цілком достатньою.”⁸

Влаштовуючи свою чергову виставку (1934 р.) АНУМ заявила, що йде далі своїм наміченим шляхом. Іде всупереч усім гадкам, що в сучасних наших обставинах ніякого місця для мистецтва нема. Йде всупереч усім песимістам, що єдину радість знаходять тоді, коли їм удається доказати, що власне ніякої радості нема. Говорячи про завдання мистецтва АНУМ заявила, що сучасне українське мистецтво має бути „озброєне всіма здобутками минулого і сучасного, та це нам,

⁸ Там же, спр. 2, с. 6.

митцям таке самозрозуміле, що без цього годі собі уявити сучасного українського митця”.

В конкретній політичній обстановці 30-х років, коли по всій Західній Україні прокотилася хвиля так званої пацифікації та жорстокого розгрому майже всіх прогресивних і революційних організацій, існування АНУМ якоюсь мірою протистояло наступові польських великодержавників, та й на-вряд чи за таких умов існування іншого легального об'єднання українських митців було б можливе.⁹

⁹ Г. С. Островський, Мистецтво західних областей України та Північної Буковини. 1917-1941. „Історія українського мистецтва”, т. V, (Київ, 1967), с. 394.

Jaroslav Zurowsky

IEVHEN DESLAV: A FORGOTTEN UKRAINIAN FILMMAKER

On the pages of the Ukrainian futurist journal *Nova generatsiia* (1930) Ievhen Deslav is listed as being one of its cinema correspondents. Besides this accreditation, not much is known about him in the Ukrainian world. Probably because of his involvement in the Ukrainian Revolution and his subsequent emigration to France, he is not mentioned in Soviet sources. And unfortunately, there is little mention of him in Ukrainian sources in the West.¹ Yet, it appears that Deslav was quite an interesting figure who was active in French avant-garde cinema between the two world wars.²

¹ The only readily available Ukrainian sources are a short entry about Deslav in *Entsyklopediia ukrainoznavstva*, vol. II/2 (Paris—New York, 1955-57), 504, which lists five of his films; and Borys Berest, *Istoriia ukrainskoho kina* (New York: Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1962), 184-86, which lists ten films.

² "Apart from the films of Buñuel and Cocteau and the experiments of Dulac . . . and Clair . . . the best work of the avant-garde is the series of short rhythmic exercises in 'pure' cinema by men like Man Ray, Fernand Léger, Eugène Deslav and Henri Chomette." "France," *The International Encyclopedia of Film*, gen. ed. Roger Manvell (London: Rainbird Reference Books Ltd., 1972), 204.

Details of Deslav's life are not readily available. Even the date of his birth is uncertain. Most Ukrainian and French sources state he was born in Kiev in 1900.³ According to materials found in the Evhen Batchinsky Archive, however, Deslav was born on 8 December 1898 in Kiev. His real name is Ievhen Slabchenko, and he was married for many years to a Frenchwoman named Denise, with whom he had no children. Deslav and Batchinsky corresponded for twenty years, and their correspondence is the best source of information about Deslav. Most of the details in this article come from this invaluable source.⁴

It appears that Deslav was almost always active in Ukrainian life. He was one of the founding members of the Ukrainian scouting organization Plast in Dnieper Ukraine after the revolution.⁵ In 1918 and 1919 he was an officer in the Ukrainian national army and went to France as a member of a Central Rada delegation. He returned to Ukraine for a few years, but in the mid-1920s he was back in France as a student at the Sorbonne in Paris. Deslav never again returned to Ukraine, although he maintained ties with Mykhail Semenko and the Ukrainian futurists, as well as the All-Ukrainian Photo-Cinema Administration (VUFKU).

It is fortunate that he did not return to Ukraine. A distant relative, the historian Mykhailo Slabchenko, was repressed in 1930 as a member of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine,⁶ and

³ The best French source is the entry "Deslav, Eugene" in Maurice Bessy and Jean-Louis Chardans, *Dictionnaire du cinéma et de la télévision*, vol. 2 (Paris: Jean-Jacques Pauvert, 1966), 74. This source lists thirteen of Deslav's films: *La Marche des machines* (1928); *La Nuit électrique* (1930); *Montparnasse* (1931); *Robots, Négatifs* (1932); *La Cité universitaire* (1934); *Revue du rail* (editor, 1935); *La Guerre des gosses* (co-director, 1936); *A nous la jeunesse* (1938); *Les Pyrénées sont là* (scenario, Spain) and *Meurtre à Monte-Nera* (Spain, 1952); *Images en négatif* (1955); and *Vision fantastique* (1956). This is far from being a complete list.

⁴ There are two packets of material about Deslav in the Evhen Batchinsky Archive at Carleton University in Ottawa; another packet is at the Ukrainian Cultural and Educational Centre in Winnipeg.

⁵ In 1917 Ievhen Slabchenko organized "troops of Ukrainian boy scouts in Bila Tserkva and later in Kaniv, Kiev, Katerynoslav, Vinnytsia, and other cities." "Plast," *Entsyklopediia ukraïnoznavstva*, vol. II/6 (Paris—New York, 1970), 2103.

⁶ See Janusz Radziejowski, "The Last Years of Mykhailo Slabchenko," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 8, no. 2 (winter 1983), 81-84.

other members of Deslav's family also fell victim to the Stalinist terror. A similar fate probably would have befallen Deslav.

In France Deslav, now known as Eugène Deslaw, became involved in filmmaking. Thereafter it seems he was never idle. Deslav began his cinematic career by making short experimental films, which were greeted quite positively. For example, in a review of his film *La Marche des machines*, the *New York Herald* stated that it "gives an impression of strength and blind force which could occasionally be used with benefit by symbolists of the motion pictures. The pictures are of rare beauty and . . . striking effects, revealing an expert cameraman, with knowledge of the technical possibilities of the cinema."⁷

This evaluation of the camera work is not surprising, for Deslav's cameraman on a number of his early projects was another former Kievite, Boris Kaufman, the younger brother of two famous early Soviet experimental filmmakers, Denis (Dziga Vertov) and Mikhail Kaufman. Boris Kaufman later emigrated to the United States and worked in Hollywood. In 1954 he won an Oscar for best black-and-white cinematography for *On the Waterfront*.

Like Dziga Vertov, Deslav was associated in the 1920s with the futurist movement and shared the avant-garde's idea of the role of cinema: to create an ultrarealistic picture of the world in motion. Deslav lost no time in experimenting with sound film after it was invented. Already in 1931 he wrote that he wanted "to obtain a synthesis of noise and to change sound, which until now had been a simple matter of curiosity, into a lyrical or psychological factor" by arranging "sounds around images, not upon any realistic basis . . . but in prolongations or complete change of the spectacle of life."⁸ The futurist composer Luigi Russolo worked with Deslav on the soundtrack of *Robots*. Deslav's sound-film experiments preceded Vertov's by some two years. It is not known whether one influenced the other. But it is a fact that Boris Kaufman wrote to his brother for advice and that VUFKU screened Deslav's films in Ukraine in 1930. Whether any of Deslav's sound films were screened is uncertain, and only a comparison of Deslav's films with the Kaufman brothers' will reveal any similarities.

Deslav maintained extensive contacts with the Soviet Ukrainian film industry throughout the 1920s as an official VUFKU

⁷ *New York Herald*, 21 October 1928.

⁸ Eugene Deslaw, "My First Sound Film," *Close Up* (London) 8, no. 1 (March 1931): 61-62.

representative in France. In 1927 he established a group of Friends of Ukrainian Cinema to help promote Ukrainian films in France.

In the 1930s Deslav's film career was in full swing. He completed many projects and began many others. He also worked with famous filmmakers. In 1930, for example, he worked on the sound of Abel Gance's *La Fin du monde*. He was involved in adapting American films for the French screen. The high point of his work in the 1930s, and perhaps of his entire career, came in 1939, when he received the best-European-film award at a New York film festival for his film *La Guerre des gosses*, which he codirected with Jacques Daroy in 1936.

Deslav quickly acquired a reputation, and it seems his services were constantly in demand, not only in France, but elsewhere. He was even invited to go to work in Egypt (he did not accept the offer). His reputation led to an invitation to work on several film projects in Spain, and Deslav was thus lucky enough to be able to leave Nazi-occupied France. While he was in Spain, he became the first Slav elected to the Spanish Society of Authors. This may sound like an important achievement, but one must remember that under Franco's dictatorship, the writers' association was not a very respectable body. It is ironic that Deslav agreed to become a member, for in his letters he is quite critical of the Right, especially the Nazis.

During the war Deslav also lived in Switzerland and worked on several films there. In 1948 he worked on the Abel Gance-Walter Wagner film *La divina tragedia*. His reputation continued to grow; by 1953 he had been officially invited to the Cannes Film Festival four times and to the Venice Film Festival twice as a "Ukrainian cinema technician of world renown." In 1956 he received an honorable mention at Venice for his film *Vision fantastique*. This film is a landmark: it was the first to use solarized images.

In the 1950s Deslav began working in French television and ended his career there as an archivist.

Unfortunately, a list of all the films Deslav made or worked on does not exist. Nor do the films that he made circulate, at least not in North America. Consequently, it is not possible to gain an understanding of his significance as a filmmaker aside from a few, scanty references in books on experimental or avant-garde cinema.

Deslav's accomplishments extend beyond the sphere of filmmaking however. He was very active in Western Europe as a propagandizer of things Ukrainian. His creation of the Friends of

Ukrainian Cinema has already been mentioned. During the war he became involved in the Ukrainian Red Cross that Batchinsky organized to help Ukrainian refugees. Deslav personally aided Ukrainians with forged passports who were in France. After the war he continued helping Ukrainians in the DP camps by getting them jobs so that they could avoid deportation to the USSR. Unfortunately, however, Deslav's good deeds did not gain him much favor among the postwar Ukrainian émigrés in Europe. He considered emigrating to Canada in 1949, but was discouraged by the underdevelopment of the Canadian film industry. Disgruntled, he remained in Europe.

In the 1950s, alarmed at the state of Ukrainian studies and libraries in Europe, Deslav began collecting Ukrainian materials and archives. What apparently impelled him to do this was the acquisition by Hryhory Kostyuk of Volodymyr Vynnychenko's archives for, claimed Deslav, fifty dollars and a promise to build a Vynnychenko museum. It appears that Deslav mistrusted Kostyuk and most prominent Ukrainians in North America. His mistrust was not allayed by a campaign of slander and ridicule that was, for some reason, begun against him by the Bandera faction of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, and it was compounded by the fact that the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences in Europe did not support his projects. This left Deslav very disillusioned and alienated from the Ukrainian community.

Nevertheless, he continued with his projects. He tried to keep Batchinsky's archives and library from being broken up and sold off. He tried to initiate the gathering of all Central Rada archives that had been taken into exile. In 1954 he started a Ukrainian film archive in Nice. In that same year he organized a display of Ukrainian ceramics in Cannes. Deslav also began researching Ukrainian-European relations from the eighteenth century on. He uncovered obscure facts; for example, he discovered that a Mykhailo Kochubei lived in Nice at the end of the nineteenth century, where he built himself a palace and proclaimed himself hetman of Ukraine. The result of Deslav's research was to have been a book about Ukrainians in Western Europe; he claimed that it was 80-percent complete in 1957.

Deslav was fascinated by the figure of Ivan Mazepa and tried several times to begin a film about him. His failure to do so was ridiculed in the Banderite press. In 1958 he also initiated a project to make a film about Ievhen Konovalets. It was also never completed.

Deslav is the author not only of film scripts and scenarios, which he wrote in French or Spanish, but also of short stories and

novels, which appeared in the Ukrainian press.⁹ But most of his prose—which, unlike his films, dealt with émigré life and the revolution in a quiet, impressionistic manner—was never published.

Unlike most Ukrainians who lived in the West after the revolution, Ievhen Deslav was one of the few who made a name for themselves outside Ukrainian circles. Yet his life and achievements, both in and outside the Ukrainian sphere, remain virtually unknown. Whether or not he is still alive, for example, cannot be ascertained. Yet his involvement, both cinematic and otherwise, merits closer scrutiny. From his letters to Batchinsky one gets the impression that Deslav's personal archive was quite extensive. It would be a boon to discover that it still exists and that it could be made available to students of Ukrainian history and film history alike.

⁹ A list of Deslav's Ukrainian stories is found in the Batchinsky archive: "Ivas z chuzhynetskoho legionu"; "Khata na kolesakh"; "Dyvna paryzhanka"; "Polkovnytska Sich"; "Monparnaska diisnist," *Ukrainskyi visnyk* (Berlin), 2 May 1943; "Try O" ("Olena—Oksana—Odarka"), *Ukrainskyi visnyk*, 19 September 1943; "Pan Serzh"; "Domivka volotsiuh," *Ukrainskyi visnyk*, 2 May 1943; "Khrestnyk"; "Kapitan Les," *Proboiem* (Prague), 1942, no. 12; "Liudyna bez 'bulo kolys,'" *Holos* (Berlin), 1942, no. 22; "Monparnaski sandvichi mrii," *Holos*, 1943, no. 4; "Vchenyi piven," *Holos*, 1942, no. 38; "Sohodnishnia Espaniia," *Holos*, 1942, no. 30; "Ukrainske v zakordonnykh filmakh," *Holos*, 1942, no. 23; "Sadok vyshnevyyi kolo khaty . . .," *Krakovski visti*, 24 July 1942; "Mista Italii," *Krakovski visti*, 11 August 1942; and "Moia zustrich iz Makhnom," *Krakovski visti*, 17 September 1942.

GUIDE TO RESEARCH

THE ARCHIVAL AND MANUSCRIPT COLLECTION OF THE SHEVCHENKO SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY, NEW YORK CITY

Shevchenko Scientific Society, Inc.,
63 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10003.
Tel.: (212) 254-5130/5239.

Curator: Professor Vasyl Lev; Administrative staff: Mykola Haliv,
Dr. Koval.

Hours: 9-5 Monday-Friday. Permission required to use the collection. Arrangements can be made to photocopy materials.

The Naukove Tovarystvo im. Tarasa Shevchenka (NTSh) or Shevchenko Scientific Society is the oldest Ukrainian scholarly organization. Since its formation in Lviv in 1873, it has played a leading role in supporting scholarly research, publications, and conferences. In Galicia, the society was disbanded by the Soviet authorities during the first occupation of Western Ukraine in 1939. It was revived after the war by Ukrainian refugee scholars in the West. The American branch was formed in 1948 and has its headquarters in New York City. In 1983 it celebrated its thirty-fifth anniversary in the United States and one hundred and ten years since its founding.

Since its establishment in the United States, archival and manuscript collections have been deposited with the society. Several published guides to archival and manuscript materials mention the society's collection, but not in any detail.² As far as we are aware, this is the first time a more detailed listing of the individual collections has been made.

² See Steve A. Grant and John H. Brown, *The Russian Empire and Soviet Union: A Guide to Manuscripts and Archival Materials in the United States* (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1981); Lubomyr Wynar and Pat Kleeberger, eds., *Slavic Ethnic Libraries, Museums and Archives in the United States: A Guide and Directory* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1980); Lubomyr Wynar and Lois Buttler, *Guide to Ethnic Museums, Libraries, and Archives in the United States*. Program for the Study of Ethnic Publications (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University, School of Library Science, 1978); Yuri Boshyk and Borys Balan, *Political Refugees and "Displaced Persons," 1945-1954: A Selected Bibliography and Guide to Research with Special Reference to the Ukrainians*. Research Report No. 2 (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1982). On the fate of the archives housed before 1939, see Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, "The Stefanyk Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences: A Treasury of Manuscript Collections in Lviv," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 5, no. 2 (June 1981): 200-204.

The society is now undertaking to complete its cataloging and acquisition of several collections, namely: the Nicholas Chubaty papers; the correspondence of the Detriot bookseller S. Faryniak (primarily with the historian Mykhailo Hrushevsky from the 1920s); the Bohdan Lepky papers; the Andrii Iakovliv papers; the Voliansky family papers (mostly materials relating to the family's history); the papers of Stepan Smal-Stotsky; and the society's own records. The society also has in its possession a very valuable manuscript from 1685—a eulogy for Innokentii Gizel with a brief evaluation by the late Roman Jakobson of Columbia University. Finally, the Bakhmeteff Archive at Columbia University has a microfilm copy of the society's materials on the collectivization of agriculture in Soviet Ukraine (1929-1933).

**
*

Holovna uprava Bratstva Ukrainskykh Sichovykh Striltsiv

Source: Stepan Ripetsky

Archive of the Ukrainian Sich Riflemen 1914-18 and its veterans' association, 1914-74. 332.5 cm., unarranged in four small and two large crates in sub-basement. No restrictions.

The Ukrainian Sich Riflemen (USS) were a distinct national legion within the Austrian Army in the First World War. Formed at the outbreak of the war in August 1914, the unit's size was limited to just over 2,000 men. Nevertheless, skilful propaganda in print, photography, and song made them a symbol of national pride, the importance of which far exceeded their military significance. After the creation of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic in November 1918, the USS became the nucleus of the Ukrainian Galician Army (UHA) and shared its fate until the ultimate dissolution of the latter in 1921-22. USS veterans then took up many of the leading positions in West Ukrainian political and cultural life, establishing the Chervona Kalyna publishing cooperative to preserve their traditions. A formal veterans' association, the Brotherhood of Ukrainian Sich Riflemen (BUSS), was only established in Germany after the Second World War. It soon transferred its headquarters to New York. Its current president is Stepan Ripetsky.

Description. Combined archives of the civilian administration (Ukrainska Boieva Uprava) of the USS, the business office of the newspapers *Dilo* and *Svoboda* (published in Vienna as weeklies during the Russian occupation of Galicia, 1914-15), the Chervona Kalyna publishing cooperative (New York), and the USS veterans' association (1948-). Of particular interest is the extensive collection of photographs and postcards. This

archive is apparently one of three in the New York area dealing with the USS.¹

Crate 1: Correspondence of Ukrainska Boieva Uprava (UBU), 1915-18. Archives of the business offices of *Dilo* and *Svoboda*, 31 cm. Records of Intendantura USS in Lviv, 1914. Various financial records of UBU for 1915-17. Catalog and administrative record of sale of USS postcards (includes samples). Memo pad of UBU, 1917-18. 54 cm.

Crate 2: Collection of commemorative badges, 20 November 1917, 1964. Various Russian and Austrian banknotes (1898-1905). Ukrainian-German dictionary of military terminology. Card file of USS casualties (to no. 1399); card file of those killed in the battle of Potutory-Lysonia. Multiple copies of "Pravylnyk sotnyka" and "Pravylnyk chetaria". Pamphlet entitled *Sichovi Striltsi, ikh istoriia i kharakter* by V.K., 1920, 27 cm.

Crate 3: Two copies of USS satirical magazine *Samokhotnyk*, 1915-16. Map of Ukraine by Freitag & Berndt, 1919. Collection of photographs, postcards of USS troops, officers, campaigns, etc., approximately 2,600 items. 65.5 cm.

Crate 4: Camera-ready typeset copy of USS songbook, 1918. Personal archive of Mykola Tsymbryna, USS officer, 1914-55. Fragment of typed manuscript of Kyrylo Trylovsky's memoirs. Photographs from the collection of V. Hirniak. Miscellaneous items, publications from the archives of BUSS and Chervona Kalyna publishing cooperative, 1955-73. 36 cm.

Crate 5: Various financial records of the UBU; address book; Ukrainian diplomatic post envelope; visitors' book for the USS display at the War Exhibition in Vienna, 1916 (two vols). Literary works by front-line USS troops; correspondence of Semen Goruk; proofreader's galleys of brochures and proclamations; handwritten manuscripts for training manuals. USS reserve records (medical and other); original officers' insignia; card file of casualties for 1917 (to no. 1993). Eight mm. film of reunion in 1954. Miscellaneous 50th and 60th anniversary publications. Two unbound copies and manuscripts of *Za voliu Ukrainy*, a historical almanac with photos and extensive bibliography, 1967. Approximately fifty 18 x 25 cm. photo enlargements. Miscellaneous press and publications. 85 cm.

Crate 6: A collection of Austrian newspapers, especially extra editions regarding battles in Galicia, 1915-16 (25 cm.). Folder containing written and typed memoirs of General Kraus of the UHA; also memoirs of Captain Holovinsky. Two fragmentary copies of *Vistnyk Derzhavnoho sekretariatu viiskovykh sprav* published in Stanyslaviv, March-April 1919. Article by Nykyfor Hirniak, "Ukrainski Sichovi Striltsi." Paper (title page missing, author unknown) about USS. Financial reports, ledger,

¹ The others are in the Archive-Museum of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences and in the private possession of Mr. Stepan Ripetsky.

Journal

and various correspondence of UBU for 1916-17. Collection of twenty wartime aerial photographs of localities in Galicia. Correspondence (1947-56), minutes, financial reports, constitution of the supreme executive of BUSS. Materials pertaining to Chota plastuniv imeny Fedora Chernyka, 1950. Miscellaneous financial records of BUSS, 1961-65. Large photo (25 x 40 cm.) of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (SVU) presidium. Twelve enlargements (40 x 65 cm.) of USS troops and refugees. Total: 65 cm.

Lysiuk-Kalenyk (pseud.), Hryhorii [Lepkash]

Source: Hryhorii Lysiuk-Kalenyk [Lepkash]

Community and political affairs, 1920-50. 3 cm., unarranged in one folder in library-archives room. No restrictions.

Lysiuk-Kalenyk was born in 1889 in Podillia. He was arrested by tsarist authorities in 1909, escaped, and returned to play an active role in the revolutionary period. He was one of the organizers of the Free Cossacks. He emigrated to the US in 1923, returned to Carpatho-Ukraine with a film crew in 1939-40, and then went back to America. He is the founder of the Ukrainian National Museum in Ontario, California.

Description. Extremely varied fragments of the collection of a Ukrainian revolutionary and community activist in the United States: a photocopy of his Ukrainian diplomatic passport; two letters from Ievhen Konovalets; some letters from the Ukrainian Military Organization (UVO) to Ukrainian leaders in North America; a letter from Ievhen Petrushevykh (1920); a photocopy of minutes of negotiations between the Hetman government and the Bolsheviks, 30 May 1918; photographs of Carpatho-Ukrainian leaders in Czechoslovakia in the 1930s; a folder containing a fragment of a manuscript by Volodymyr Vynnychenko (work unascertainable).

Lutsiv, Luka

Source: Luka Lutsiv

Archives of a Ukrainian journalist and literary critic, 1929-82. 28 cm., unarranged in one box in the library-archives room. No restrictions.

Lutsiv was born on 30 October 1895 in Hrushiv, Drohobych region. He joined the USS in 1914, was active until general internment by the Poles, and then escaped to Czechoslovakia and studied in Prague (1921-26). He returned to Galicia and taught in schools in Sambir, Sokal, and Krosno. During the Second World War he went to Germany and lived in Bamberg before emigrating to the US. From 1952 he was a coeditor of *Svoboda*.

Description. Materials arranged in folders (with misleading markings) or loose: a January 1948 issue of *Arka*; a folder of typescripts; clippings of various reviews written by Lutsiv; an article by A. Kliuchko about Ivan Franko; miscellaneous correspondence, 1974; a photocopy of Bohdan Kravtsiv's article in *Obrii* (1936) about Moloda Muza entitled "Dva pokolinnia"; miscellaneous press clippings; miscellaneous correspondence, 1972-73; a photocopy of B. Levytsky's article from *Pravnychi visnyk*, vol. 2 (1963) about a coup in Drohobych in 1918; photocopies of B. Kravtsiv's articles in *Litopys Chervonoi Kalyny* (1929) about Lutsiv's book on Ivan Franko; a folder of miscellaneous clippings on Ukrainian literature, 1949-50; a folder of photocopies of articles by Lutsiv published in 1930-39 in *Visnyk* and *Literaturno-naukovi visnyk*; a listed group of photocopied items on various topics (from Gogol to USS); a short typed memoir; a typescript of an essay by John Brand, "Filosofii Kosachevoi povisty pro Eneii—Nimetskyi ekzystensiiializm"; a folder of varied items, including an address list of former Drohobych residents, press clippings, typescripts of articles, bills, and so on; miscellaneous correspondence, 1967-77; unorganized press clippings.

Mudry, Vasyl

Source: Olena Mudra

Archive of a journalist, politician, and community activist, 1927-49. 44.5 cm., arranged in one box in the library-archives room. No restrictions.

Mudry was born on 19 March 1893 in Vikno. In 1927-35 he was the editor of *Dilo*, in 1926-35 the vice-president of the Ukrainian National Democratic Alliance (UNDO), and then its president until 1939. He emigrated to Germany in 1945 and was the president of the Central Representation of the Ukrainian Emigration (TsPUE) in 1945-1949. He emigrated in 1949 to the US, where he became the executive director of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. He died in 1966.

Description

Folder 1: "Ukrainska natsionalna polityka v Polshchi"; copy of *Iskra*, organ of the Ukrainian National Communist Army, 1941; personal documents—certificates of baptism, of membership in the Polish Sejm; correspondence of Ukrainske Vydavnytstvo publishers in Cracow, 1941; minutes of a meeting with Roman Sushko and Iaroslav Orshan; declaration of the Ukrainian National Council (UNR), 22 June 1941; Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) directive, issued in April 1941; documents and correspondence relating to the activities of the UNR in 1941; plans for the organization of the Greek Orthodox church in Lublin district; a report on the condition of the Prosvita trade school in Mylo-

Journal

vannia in 1941; minutes of the Lviv Committee to commemorate Ivan Franko, 1921-33; a copy of the Report on the Polish Ukrainian Conflict in Eastern Galicia by James Barr and Rhys Davies, presented to the British House of Commons in September 1931.

Folder 2: Miscellaneous maps; a caricature and silhouette of Mudry; an issue of *Narodnia polityka*, 3 September 1939; documents relating to Mudry's activities as a deputy to the Polish Sejm, 1927-39; proofreader's galleys of articles for *Krakivski visti* in 1941; a memo in German for use by German authorities, "Die Politik der UNDO-Partei in der West-ukraine".

Folder 3: Manuscripts of a collection of essays entitled "Dvadtsiat lit pid Polshcheiu". Authors: Stepan Shukhevych, Ivan Rakovsky, Dmytro Doroshenko, Pavlo Horodetsky, Mykola Tvorydlo, Ivan Dubovy, Volodymyr Ostrovsky, Bohdan Lepky, B. Olkhivsky, S. Truvor, Iuliian Tarnovych, and Ievhen Tsehelsky.

Folder 4: Miscellaneous maps of Central Europe and issues 1-3 of the gazette of the Control Council for Germany.

Folder 5: Mudry's correspondence in his capacity as head of TsPUE; constitutions and resolutions of various DP organizations, 1947-48.

Folder 6: Additional correspondence relating to TsPUE, including a report entitled "Ukrainska emigratsiia v Evropi," 1947-49.

Folder 7: Additional correspondence as TsPUE president with charitable organizations outside Germany, especially with the Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain, containing reports of community organizations in the Netherlands, Great Britain, Belgium, and France.

Folder 8: A fourteen-page report of the TsPUE branch in Frankfurt; statistics on Ukrainian refugees in the American zone of Germany, by district, for 1949; miscellaneous reports.

Folder 9: Confidential memos to the British War Office concerning Ukrainian prisoners of war in Great Britain by G. R. B. Panchuk, 1947; documents pertaining to the Second General Congress of the Ukrainian Emigration in 1947; correspondence with Allied authorities on behalf of DPs in general and concerning specific cases.

Folder 10: Further interventions on behalf of DPs in 1947; a memo on DPs to the International Refugee Organization; miscellaneous correspondence, 1947.

Folder 11: Correspondence with the United Ukrainian American Relief Committee and individuals in the US, 1947-49.

Folder 12: Miscellaneous memos and correspondence, including minutes of a meeting between Ukrainian and Allied representatives about repatriation and emigration, marked "strictly confidential"; various statistical tables about DPs in the various zones of Austria and Germany; publications—two copies of *Ukrainske maliarstvo* published in Munich (1947),

negatives and fragments of *Dilo* from 1938, Beauplan's description of Ukraine in English, translated and published in New York, and assorted émigré periodicals.

Folder 13: Miscellaneous official TsPUE correspondence, 1947-48; two copies of an article entitled "Causes of Ukrainian Emigration and Its Character".

Folder 14: Statistics of Ukrainian emigration from the American zone of Germany in 1948.

Onatsky, Ievhen

Source: unknown

Archive of a journalist and political activist, 1935-57. 14 cm., unarranged in one box in the library-archives room. No restrictions.

Onatsky was born in 1894 in Hlukhiv. He was a member and secretary of the Central Rada in 1917-18, a member of the Ukrainian Peoples' Republic (UNR) delegation to the Paris peace conference in 1919, and head of the Ukrainian Diplomatic Mission in Italy. He represented the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) in Rome in 1929-43 and was a foreign correspondent for *Dilo*, *Novyi chas*, and *Svoboda*. He emigrated to Argentina in 1947. He was editor of *Dzvin*, *Nash klych*, *Ukrainska mala entsyklopediia*, and other publications. He died in 1979.

Description. A scrapbook of press clippings from the French and Italian press concerning Ukraine and Carpatho-Ukraine, 1937-41; "Zapysky zhurnalista" (a diary later published) for the years 1935-38; the archive of Elena Vda de Paduchak—mostly correspondence about Ukrainian life in South America (1947-57).

NOTE: Another part of Onatsky's archive is housed with the Museum-Archive of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US in New York. For a recent view of Onatsky's work and life, see Liubomyr Vynar, *Ievhen Onatsky—chesnist z natsiieiu (1894-1979)* (New York—Munich—Toronto: Ukrainian Historical Association, 1981).

Ostroverkha, Mykhailo

Source: Mykhailo and Olena Ostroverkha

Archive of a Ukrainian army officer, editor, journalist, and community activist, 1926-78. 58 cm., unarranged in one box in the library-archives room. No restrictions.

Ostroverkha was born on 7 October 1887 in Buchach. He joined the USS in September 1915. He was chief educational and cultural-affairs officer in the UNR Army in 1921. He contributed to *Veselka* in Kalisz, which

Journal

he coedited with Ievhen Malaniuk and Iurii Darahan. In 1926-39 he was a foreign correspondent in Italy for *Dilo*, *Novyi chas*, *Dzvony*, and other periodicals (pseudonyms: N. Maievsky and M. Podoliak). In 1943 he returned to Cracow and Lviv and edited *Do peremohy* and contributed to *Krakovski visti*. He emigrated to Germany in 1945 and was an editor of UNRRA and IRO publications until 1949. He emigrated to the US in 1949 and contributed to major Ukrainian dailies and weeklies. He has an extensive number of publications to his credit, including a work on Mykola Khvylovy, *Chornoknyzhnyk iz Zubivky*, and a translation of Machiavelli's *The Prince*.

Description. A collection of Ostroverkha's articles printed in the Ukrainian press and mounted on cardboard, 1955-73; an envelope of typescripts of articles, 1974; a bibliography of his works, 1920-74; a journal, 1976-78; a journal of his impressions of Italy; some memoirs about the 1930s and 1940s; miscellaneous news clippings, 1971-74; a typescript of a memoir, 1926-31; a curriculum vitae; miscellaneous press clippings; a typescript of his translation of Machiavelli's *The Prince*; six folders of published and unpublished articles about Renaissance art and literature and various Ukrainian press clippings, 1955-78.

Parfanovych, Sofiia

Source: Sofiia Parfanovych

Archive of a physician and writer, 1915-67. 119.35 cm., unarranged in three boxes in the library-archives room. Restrictions: probably for letters from 1924-25 (see description).

Parfanovych was born on 7 June 1898 in Lviv, obtained her medical degree from Lviv University in 1926, and specialized in gynecology and obstetrics. She was a staff doctor and assistant professor of gynecology and obstetrics at Lviv University Hospital. She emigrated in 1945 to Germany, where she was chief of the obstetrics-gynecology department in the IRO General Hospital for refugees in Augsburg until 1949, when she emigrated to the US and continued her practice in Detroit. Throughout her life she was active in the Ukrainian Women's Association and the Ukrainian Medical Association. In 1929-36 she directed the Vidrodzhennia temperance society. She is the author of numerous publications about hygiene, short stories, and six novels.

Description

Box 1: Typed manuscript of an unfinished prose work, "Olia"; a register of correspondence, 1972-73; financial records and program regarding the NTSh centennial; diary from 1916-19 and 1927-35; a 1946 publication of the 350th anniversary of the Union of Brest; notes for a book about Kiev in 1940; drafts of short stories. 30 cm.

Box 2: Various typed drafts of articles and short stories; a typescript of "Popid kycheramy ta nad potokom"; personal correspondence, 1950-54; short stories on Jewish themes; correspondence with NTSh; fragments of the novel "Shukatymu"; "On Crossroads", an incomplete English translation of her novel; the libretto, performance notes, and advertising for the opera *Anna Iaroslavna* put on in Carnegie Hall; sealed personal correspondence, 1924-25. 22 cm.

Box 3: A bound scrapbook entitled "Nauka—Higiiena—Literatura" containing various reviews and articles by her and about her books; two editions of her sex-education booklet *Cholovik ta zhinka* (Lviv, 1935; Augsburg, 1946); materials about the Vidrodzhennia temperance society; a diary from 1924-26, 1938-39, and 1946-50; drafts of short stories; articles on health; correspondence and a register of correspondence; travel notes; a scrapbook of correspondence notes and press clippings for the years 1961-66. 67.35 cm.

Shandruk, Pavlo

Source: unknown

Archive of a former Ukrainian army officer, 1924-79. 47.5 cm., unarranged in two boxes in the library-archives room. No restrictions.

Shandruk was born on 28 February 1889 in Borsuky, Volhynia gubernia. He graduated from the Historico-Philosophical Institute in Nizhen in 1911 and served in the Imperial Russian Army until 1917, when he joined the Ukrainian military units then being formed. He commanded parts of the Zaporozhian Corps and the Third (Iron) Division and achieved the rank of brigadier-general in 1919. He was interned in Polish POW camps in 1920-23, after which he studied at the Polish General Staff officer training school and was seconded to the Polish Army until 1939. Interned once more by the Germans, he was released and permitted to organize the Ukrainian National Committee (UNC) in early 1945. In addition to heading the UNC, which strove to represent Ukrainian interests before the warring powers, Gen. Shandruk was also commander-in-chief of the Ukrainian National Army, which consisted largely of the former 14th Waffen SS Grenadier Division Galizien. Following Germany's surrender in May 1945, Shandruk lived briefly in Bavaria before emigrating to the US, where he died on 15 February 1979. Throughout his émigré career, Shandruk was closely aligned with the government of the UNR in exile and took an active interest in the Ukrainian veterans' organization.

Description. Materials pertaining mostly to organizational matters of post-war veterans' associations.

Box 1: Miscellaneous correspondence and personal documents, 1924-79. 15.5 cm.

Journal

Box 2: Miscellaneous postwar typescripts of articles about preparations for future conflicts with the Soviet Union and memoirs; press clippings; correspondence concerning the Ukrainian veterans' association, Ukrainian government in exile, and Polish veterans' association; documents of the Ukrainian War Historical Institute, 1945-79. 32 cm.

Shtefan, Avhustyn

Source: same

Archive of the former premier of the Carpatho-Ukrainian Republic, 1923-79. 48 cm., unarranged in two boxes in the library-archives room. No restrictions.

Shtefan was born on 11 January 1893. He participated in the Khust National Council (January 1919) and the Uzhhorod National Council (May 1919), and was the associate editor of the first Transcarpathian daily, *Rusyn* (1920-22), and of *Uchytelskyi holos* (1929-38). He was a leading member of the Agrarian party (1929-38) and a member of the Carpatho-Ukrainian government in 1939, premier of the Carpatho-Ukrainian Republic, and president of the diet. He was also the director of the Ukrainian Academy of Commerce in Bratislava (1939-40). Later he served as the director of the Ukrainian gymnasium in Prague (1940-45) and Augsburg (1945-49). He emigrated to the US in 1949.

Description

Box 1: Photocopy of N. Beskyd's *Dukhnovych* (in Russian, Philadelphia, 1934) and *Karpatoruskaia pravda* (in Rusyn, Philadelphia, 1932); typescript copies of Shtefan's biography of Avhustyn Voloshyn; a collection of the *Greek Catholic Union Weekly*, 1964; a collection of photocopied maps, mainly of Carpatho-Ukraine; a photocopied collection of Galician heraldry and studies of the Carpatho-Ukrainian coat of arms; photocopies of articles from a 1936 Uzhhorod calendar; a copy of V. Pachovsky's *Istoriia Zakarpattia* (Munich, 1946); a typescript of materials for biographies of Avhustyn Voloshyn and Hryhorii Zhatkovych; a photocopy of *Otkrytoe expose* by H. Zhatkovych; photocopies of some pages from A. Albanque's *Les Rutenes* (1948); a photocopy of a schematism of clergy in Transcarpathia in 1908; a photocopy of Ievhen Onatsky's study of Carpatho-Ukraine; photographs of lecturers at the Uzhhorod teacher's college in 1923 and 1925; a photograph of Voloshyn at a Prosvita rally in October 1937. 32 cm.

Box 2: A collection of press clippings from 1967-79; fragments of a typescript; proofreader's galleys of Shtefan's biography of Voloshyn; miscellaneous items. 16 cm.

NOTE: Another part of Shtefan's archives is housed at the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.

Tokarzhevsky-Karashevych, Ian.

Source: Borys Weligos-Lotockyj

Archive of a Ukrainian nobleman and diplomat, 1919-48. 30 cm., arranged in one box in the library-archives room. No restrictions.

Tokarzhevsky-Karashevych was born in 1885 in Chabanivtsi, Podillia. He studied in Freiburg, Switzerland. He returned to his village and was active in zemstvos. In 1918-21 he was in the Ukrainian diplomatic corps, serving in Vienna and Constantinople. He was chief foreign officer for the UNR from 1922. He moved in 1924 to Paris, where he founded the Society for Ukrainian Studies and was president of the International Heraldic Institute. He moved to Rome in 1936, and to London in 1948. He died in 1954.

Description

Box 1: Miscellaneous correspondence, clippings, and copies of the Galician and émigré press of the 1920s and 1930s, notably *Hromadskyi holos* and *Vpered*; an autographed portrait of Wilhelm von Habsburg; a copy of M. Lozynsky's *Mizhnarodne pravo*, pt. 1 (Prague, 1922).

Box 2: Correspondence, notes, and publications mostly in French and Italian (1930s-40s; a copy of the constitution of Societa di San Giorgio Cavaliere e Martire a Roma; a copy of "Orden Sviatoho Velykomuchenika i Pobidonostsia Iuriia" (and analogous Russian, Polish, German and French "orders"), established 25 November 1917 in Kiev to promote Greek Catholicism.

Box 3: Albums of drawings of Ukrainian noble coats of arms; notes on the trident; genealogies of Ukrainian noble families; copies of Polish, French, and German publications on heraldry and genealogy from the 1920s; press clippings on the Ukrainian peasant nobility (*khodachkova shliakhta*).

Box 4: Three small boxes, each with a list of contents, concerning Ukrainian diplomacy and propaganda, 1920-21, including "Zbirnyk zakoniv i postanov Ukrainskoho Pravytelstva vidnosno zakordonnykh instytutsii" (guide for diplomats, Vienna, 1919); biographical data about Hryhor Orlyk; five envelopes of Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations publications, topics marked.

Box 5: Two small boxes of materials concerning his activities in France and articles in French; printed ephemera, especially calling cards of various aristocrats; envelopes containing postcards, mostly from pre-First World War Ukraine.

Box 6: Three small boxes of materials concerning his activities in Britain and Italy; miscellaneous Mazepiana, including Dmytro Doroshenko's notes sent to B. Lototsky in Rome; eight envelopes of Ukrainian, Russian, Polish, and Austrian bank notes.

Journal

Box 7: His manuscript, "Dyplomatiia"; files on the assassination of Symon Petliura (European press clippings and Tokarzhevsky-Karasevych's own brochure on the subject), on Makohin, the Ukrainian aristocratic "imposter" ("Mazepa," "Rasumovsky"), and on Carpatho-Ukraine, including issues of *Nova svoboda*; a copy M. O. Skrypnyk's *Rekonstruktsiia krainy i perebudova shkoly* (Kharkiv, 1932); miscellaneous photos and engravings (some dating from the 1830s) of cossacks and Ukrainian noblemen.

Box 8: Miscellaneous historical notes.

Box 9: A collection of press clippings.

**Prepared by Yury Boshyk, Roman Waschuk, and
Andriy Wynnyckyj***

* We would like to thank the following individuals for their assistance and encouragement: Professor Vasyl Lev, Dr. Koval, Mr. Mykola Haliv, Mr. Mykhailo Pezhansky, Professors Danylo Husar Struk and Frank Sysyn, and Ms. Daria Horodecka. We would also like to acknowledge the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies research grant that made this study possible.

REVIEWS

MAURYCY HORN, *WALKA CHŁOPÓW CZERWONORUSKICH Z WYZYSKIEM FEUDALNYM W LATACH 1600-1648, PART 3: OPÓR CHŁOPSKI W DOBRACH SZLACHECKICH, WYSTĄPIENIA WŁOŚCIAN PRZECIW OBCYM PANOM*. Wrocław and Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1982. 108 pp.

Peasant riots and rebellions are as characteristic of agrarian societies as strikes are of industrial societies. For this reason they should not be interpreted as signs of revolution and manifestations of a coming and inevitable better order. Vulgar Marxist historiography and populist-inspired historiography have been especially guilty of describing preindustrial agrarian discontent and disturbances in such terms. By drawing a disproportionate amount of attention to a relatively common phenomenon, these two traditional approaches to rural socioeconomic history have only blurred the reality of lord-peasant relations for later generations. During the last two decades or so, however, Western European historians, most notably Alfred Cobban and Rodney Hilton, have shown how the image of the past that depicts lord-peasant relations in terms of a merciless and horrendous class struggle is unfounded, inasmuch as it ignores the mediation of such factors as law, custom, self-interest, and Christian morality. Consequently there has occurred a major revision of our image of just what "feudal" society was in western Europe and how socioeconomic events influenced political happenings there.

Insofar as Ukrainian history is concerned, the beginnings of a similar revision in the interpretation of popular riots and rebellions can be found in the early twentieth-century works of Mytrofan Dovnar-Zapolsky, Ivan Novytsky, and Andrei Iakovlev. These beginnings, however, never fully developed, and the conclusions of those men and others carrying out similar investigations were never incorporated into the general histories of Ukraine, which continued to depict the situation of Ukrainian peasants as particularly horrible and presented the national history in terms of a struggle for liberty and against oppression. For all too many historians of Ukraine the practice has been—and in some instances still is—to examine socioeconomic history by selecting facts illustrating oppression, deprivation, class division, and poverty, and then to weave them into a unilinear progressivist-revolutionary picture of the national past. Ukrainian history emerges thereby as a series of violent climaxes in a

struggle for ever more perfect forms of liberty, with, as official Soviet historians claim, the great moment arriving in 1917. Those opposed to the present ruling group in Moscow, of course, claim the great moment awaits the next turn of the historical wheel.

Within this broader context the excellent work of Maurycy Horn takes on special significance in Ukrainian historiography. Continuing the critical examination of lord-peasant relations that began in the early twentieth century, this Polish historian has made a major contribution to a more realistic understanding of the Ukrainian historical process by illuminating agrarian social relations in western Ukraine between 1600 and 1648. Working on this subject for over ten years, Horn has probably examined almost all of the available documentary evidence dealing with it, and he has succeeded in providing historians with an indispensable monograph on peasant unrest, disturbances, riots, and rebellions in early seventeenth-century western Ukraine.

The book under review is the third volume of his study, and like the others contains a wealth of detail concerning specific instances and cases of peasant protest and unrest. One of the most important points that emerges from the study concerns why people acted as they did. Specifically, Horn explains that violence appeared only as a last resort and that the usual recourse was to seek legal redress of grievance either at the royal courts or, for serfs on private estates, at the lord's manor. He also draws the reader's attention to the frequently overlooked fact that leaseholders were particularly responsible for raising the levels of exploitation. The truly "feudal" lord, a paternalistic owner, was more interested in the continued productivity of his serfs at a traditionally accepted rate than in the windfall profits to be obtained from rapacious rents and duties, which had to be implemented in disregard of customs and charters, and which, by progressively impoverishing the peasants, threatened at some point to ruin the landowner himself.

Horn points out that the ultimate purpose of the peasants' struggles was to maintain what they regarded as the "just" customary duties, and that it was usually the wealthier members of the village who were most vociferous in defending them. Among some of the interesting statistics mentioned by the author is that at least 1,000 persons fled annually from western Ukrainian villages during the period in question, and that roughly forty percent of them went to the larger towns rather than further east to cossack Ukraine. He also notes that almost eighty percent of the fugitives he could identify came from private rather than royal estates, and that inasmuch as the Orthodox clergy in the area was as poor as its flock, they incurred no hostility—whereas the wealthier Catholic and Uniate clergy did, from both Poles and Ukrainians. It emerges clearly from Horn's study that the peasants never contested the principle of rent, which would indeed have been revolutionary, but only the amount, and that

this was not done in the name of abstract principles, but on the basis of what they felt had been customary practice. In some instances villages had charters or contracts specifying what rents and duties were to be given, in which case the peasants defended their interests on the basis of these documents.

Unfortunately, Horn almost totally ignores the national-religious aspect of lord-peasant relations in the region. Admittedly, this aspect of the past may not have been as well recorded in the existing documents. But if so, the historian should have explained this. A second, more important shortcoming of the book lies in its failure to treat the international market forces at work at the time, which would explain why rents, duties, and taxes increased, especially during the period in question. The late sixteenth century saw the emergence of the world capitalist economy, whose tentacles definitely embraced Poland's western Ukrainian territories. Many gentry, as is known, sought to make the greatest profits possible on the international market in order to meet rising costs and to increase their own buying power, which, in turn, led the more ambitious and/or greedy to squeeze their bondsmen regardless of the consequences. One of the ways of doing this was by introducing new capitalist techniques, among which was the leaseholding or *orenda* system of land exploitation. In short, mercantile-capitalist techniques and market forces stood in direct relationship to the rise in levels of land and labor exploitation in western Ukraine. But if this was so, to what extent can peasant resistance be called "antifeudal"?

Stepan Velychenko
University of Toronto

GEORGE LUCKYJ, *PANTELEIMON KULISH: A SKETCH OF HIS LIFE AND TIMES*. Boulder, Colo.: European Monographs, 1983. viii, 229 pp. Distributed by Columbia University Press.

This is not only the first biography of Panteleimon Kulish in English, but the most comprehensive, objective, and scholarly biography of Kulish in existence. It bears no comparison with the earlier biographies by Borys Hrinchenko (1898), Osyp Makovei (1900), Vladimir Shenrok (1901), Dmytro Doroshenko (1923), and Viktor Petrov (1929). Professor Luckyj points out in his introduction that a full study of Kulish will have to await a time when Kulish is completely rehabilitated and archival material, consisting of Kulish's many unpublished diaries and notes, becomes available. He has, nevertheless, succeeded in amassing an impressive quantity of materials, all available memoirs, and a particularly voluminous correspondence.

The unavailability of Kulish's diaries is probably one of the reasons why Luckyj chose not to use a psychological approach. (A study utilizing the theory of role-playing and analyzing the different personae or masks of a complex personality such as Kulish will yield particularly fruitful results.) He opted, instead, for the historical-cultural approach, of which he is an erudite master and which is best suited to his goal: to portray the times of Kulish as well as his life and to evaluate Kulish's works rather than presenting a detailed analysis of them. This biography is in many ways a continuation of Luckyj's previous monograph, *Between Gogol and Ševčenko: Polarity in the Literary Ukraine, 1798-1847* (Munich, 1971), parts of which overlap with, and have therefore been utilized in, the present study—a fact acknowledged by the author. Like his previous study, the present one, while focussing on the life of a particular individual, outlines the whole panorama of Ukrainian intellectual history of the nineteenth century.

The biography is divided into five chapters, which correspond to five distinct periods in Kulish's life (1819-97). The first chapter, entitled "The Promise," traces Kulish's formative years—his childhood on a *khutir* (homestead) in Voronezh gubernia, where he was born into a cossack family of no rank, and his life as a young intellectual, teacher, and writer in Kiev, Lutsik, and St. Petersburg—up to 1847, the year of his marriage to Oleksandra Bilozerska and his arrest for participation in the activities of the Saints Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood. In addition to describing Kulish's friendship with such well-known figures as Mykola Kostomarov, Taras Shevchenko, and Mykhailo Maksymovych, Luckyj highlights other people who played a role in Kulish's life and influenced his views: his childhood benefactress Uliana Muzhylovska, whom Kulish called his "second mother" (his own having died when he was five); his benefactor Mykhailo Iuzefovych, a Russified Ukrainian who was a trustee in the imperial educational system and who thirty years later was instrumental in the implementation of the Ems ukase; Professor Vasilii Krasov, a specialist of English and German poetry at Kiev University; Petr Pletnev, rector of St. Petersburg University; and the Russophile Polish Walter-Scottist Michał Grabowski, whose views on the cossacks and Ukraine, as the author points out, exerted an enormous influence on Kulish for many years.

Luckyj dispels any notions about animosity between Shevchenko and Kulish in these years. But he does underline the difference between Shevchenko's "bohemian temperament" (p. 20) and Kulish's conservative one and stresses that Kulish, already in these early years, liked to play the role of mentor—not only in his relationship with Shevchenko but with others as well. Also notable in this chapter is the emphasis placed on the influence on Kulish of Polish culture, in addition to the obvious influence of the Ukrainian and Russian cultures. The significance of the Christianity

of the brotherhood is acknowledged, but its eschatological and evangelical nature is not sufficiently stressed and the influence of Petr Avsenev (later Archimandrite Teofan), professor at the Kiev Academy and Kiev University, is not mentioned.¹

In chapter two, "The Suspension," Luckyj describes the spiritual crisis experienced by Kulish during the trauma of his arrest, interrogation, imprisonment, and exile. While not hesitating to bring to light Kulish's faults, such as his recantation after sentencing, the biographer explains Kulish's crisis in terms of his conservative, law-abiding temperament. He points to his virtues as well: Kulish's dignified conduct during his interrogation, and his extraordinary perseverance and diligence in exile, during which he used his time profitably for extensive study and reading. Of particular interest in this chapter are the descriptions of interpersonal Ukrainian-Russian tensions, from the mild ones between Kulish and the Slavophile Aksakov family to the open "racist" comments of Belinsky on Ukrainian matters.

Chapter three, appropriately entitled "The Fulfillment," describes a very productive period (1856-63) in Kulish's life, during which he directed all his energies toward Ukrainian culture. This is the time when he published some of his best-known works (*The Life of Gogol*, *Notes on Southern Rus'*, *The Black Council*), developed a Ukrainian orthography, was the main contributor to the first Ukrainian journal, *Osnova*, and established a printing press in St. Petersburg. This was also the period when his philosophy of *kulturnist* (culturalism) crystallized. It consisted of the fostering of nonpolitical cultural nationalism and of *khutorianstvo* (homestead philosophy)—advocacy of returning to the *khutir* (homestead), which for Kulish was simultaneously the source, or "heart," of individual morality and of national culture.

With considerable narrative skill, Luckyj describes Kulish's first trip abroad with his wife, his attempts at homesteading, his cultivation of contacts with such Ukrainian landowners as Hryhorii Halahan and Vasyl Tarnovsky, his continuing warm relationship with Shevchenko and Kostomarov, the strained relationship with Vasyl Bilozersky, his marital tensions, and his liaisons—ranging from platonic and literary to intimate—with such women as Mania de Balmen, Oleksandra Myloradovych, Marko Vovchok, Paraska Hlibova, and Hanna Rentel. Other lesser known aspects of Kulish's life are also brought to light, such as his pedagogical activities and his authorship of a letter, printed in *Russkii vestnik* and signed by Shevchenko, Kostomarov, Marko Vovchok and Nomys, protesting an anti-Semitic article that had appeared in the St. Petersburg weekly, *Illiu-stratsiia*.

¹ See Dmytro Chyzhevsky, *Narysy z istorii filosofii na Ukraini* (Prague, 1931), 79, 107-12.

The years 1863-82 described in chapter four, "The Decline," reveal an alienated Kulish working in Warsaw for the Russian government, publishing in Galician journals, attempting to live on a *khutir*, going on trips abroad, and returning to St. Petersburg disenchanted, full of bitterness, and critical of Ukrainian cossack history, Kostomarov, and Shevchenko, whose cult he himself had created after the poet's death. Luckyj explains Kulish's accommodation to the regime in these years by the trauma of arrest experienced earlier, the "Stockholm syndrome," and the circumstances in which a Ukrainian writer had to work after the Valuev circular of 1863 and the Ems ukase of 1876. In spite of these draconian repressions and even though at one point he renounced his Russian citizenship (only to change his mind soon after), Kulish consistently rejected not only political separatism, but any political nationalism whatsoever. He clung tenaciously to his belief in *kulturnist* and moral rather than political reform, fervently believing in the idea of the harmonious co-existence of the Russian and Ukrainian cultures.

An undertaking of this period was the translation of the Bible into Ukrainian, a task that Kulish began with Ivan Puliui and at which he worked steadfastly for thirty years until his death. It is to Luckyj's credit that he has brought to the fore Kulish's phenomenal achievement and all the difficulties associated with it, though, as he states, "the story of this translation and publication has still to be written" (p. 151).

In the final chapter, "The Recovery," Luckyj demonstrates how in the last fifteen years of his life Kulish succeeded in coming to terms with himself and with society by finally settling and living on the *khutir* Motronivka in semireclusion. He describes a materially poor but happy Kulish, living harmoniously with his wife, writing original poetry, translating the Bible, Shakespeare's plays, and the poetry of Byron, Schiller, Goethe, and Heine, corresponding with Mykhailo Drahomanov, Mykhailo Pavlyk, and others, and ploughing, sowing, and doing carpentry.

Luckyj is the first biographer of Kulish to have developed extensively the idea, stated by Dmytro Chyzhevsky, that there was a constant factor in Kulish's life: his Christian beliefs.² The author thus invalidates the commonly held view of Kulish as a man "without synthesis," a view most succinctly formulated by Serhii Iefremov.³ It was deep Christian

² Ibid. This point was also made by the author of this review in her Ph.D. dissertation, "*Taras Bulba* and the *Black Council*, the adherence to and divergence from Walter Scott's historical novel pattern" (University of Toronto, 1978), 340-54, where a parallel is made between Kulish's views and those of St. Augustin in *The City of God*.

³ S. Iefremov, "Bez syntezy. Do zhyttovoi dramy Kulisha," *Zapysky Istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu VUAN* 4 (1923): 58-78.

faith, according to Luckyj, that sustained Kulish in his years of crisis and, in fact, lead to his recovery. The Islamic themes in Kulish's poetry must be seen in this Christian context, for Kulish, "the idealist Christian, saw in Islam the virtues of early Christianity" (p. 175). Moreover, Kulish's cultural nationalism was based on Christianity, and the *khutir*—besides being a country home, a romantic escape, and a family demesne—was a Christian retreat.

The picture of Kulish that emerges from reading this study is that of a stubborn and egotistic loner who was a highly disciplined, well-organized, and hardworking scholar and writer possessing exceptional linguistic and writing talents, a phenomenal memory, and wide-ranging interests; a man who, in spite of all the roles he assumed and was forced to assume, was basically a rational conservative and a Christian. Kulish held a fervent conviction in the existence of Ukrainian culture and was dedicated to its development on the basis of universal humanist values. It was, however, his misfortune to live at an inopportune time. A hostile social environment, opposed to the development of Ukrainian culture, was at the root of the incessant change in Kulish's life and drove him from job to job, from journal to journal, from city to city, from benefactor to benefactor.

In keeping with the goal stated in his introduction, Luckyj has outlined the principal phases of Kulish's life lucidly and concisely. Of course, more detailed study remains to be done, particularly of the influence on Kulish of the Bible, of such people as M. Grabowski, and of the works of Spinoza and the writings of the American John W. Draper, but it is precisely such research that the book was meant to inspire.

This is also a well-written biography. The author uses the right amount of detail, anecdote, and quotation to make this work interesting to the nonspecialist as well as the specialist. Some pictures of Kulish and his contemporaries could, however, have made the book more visually attractive. There are some typographical errors, but these are minor drawbacks that do not detract from the overall excellence of the biography; they are compensated for by extensive notes, a selected bibliography, and the summary at the end, subtitled "The Legacy."

George Luckyj has successfully shown that Kulish was a central intellectual figure in modern Ukrainian history. The biography provides us with many valuable facts and perceptive insights about Kulish and his era. Aa important contribution to Ukrainian scholarship, it sets a good precedent for more biographies of Ukrainian writers.

Romana Bahrij-Pikulyk
York University

PAUL R. MAGOSCI, *THE RUSYN-UKRAINIANS OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA: AN HISTORICAL SURVEY*. Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller Universitäts-Verlagsbuchhandlung GmbH, 1983, 94 pp.

З точки зору загальноукраїнського історичного розвитку часто до себе привертала увагу діяльність і доля українських національних меншостей, що знаходяться на території інших держав.

В порівнянні з українцями Польщі та Румунії, чехословацькі українці мали, принаймні в деяких періодах свого існування, дещо кращі умови для власного розвитку. Помітні тут були публікаційні можливості і з цим пов'язані деякі досягнення в цій ділянці, зокрема в 1960-их роках. Тим більше дивує, що досі не було навіть короткого історичного огляду, який хоча би в основних рисах показував розвиток українського населення Чехословаччини. Існує, правда, кілька спеціальних досліджень (напр., І. Ванат, *Нариси новітньої історії українців Східної Словаччини, т. I: 1918-1938*, Пряшів, 1979; L. Haraksim, *K sociálnym a kultúrnym dejinám Ukrajincov na Slovensku do roku 1867*, Bratislava, 1961), але загального огляду цього розвитку в окремій публікації донині не було.

Тому вже з цієї причини слід належно відмітити згадану коротку працю П. Р. Магосчі на цю тему. І хоч автор у дрібній передмові попереджає, що його праця не претендує бути вичерпною, проте вона, як він сам каже, може бути вступом до вивчення політичної, суспільно-економічної та культурної історії русинів-українців Чехословаччини.

Попробуємо з'ясувати наскільки ця публікація виконала дане завдання.

Наведена праця справді коротка. Коли відрахувати передмову, примітки, бібліографію, реєстр, тощо, то залишається лише 46 повних сторінок тексту. Цих 46 сторінок розподілено на 11 розділів (найкоротший має неповні дві сторінки).

Проте, незважаючи на цю стислість праці, авторові тут вдалося зосередити незвичайно багато цікавих і цінних інформацій. Позитивно слід оцінити також вміщену тут бібліографію.

Одначе, історичний розвиток українців Чехословаччини настільки складний, що будь-яка його інтерпретація викликає ряд різних проблем. Наведемо лише деякі з них, які можна вважати відносно важливими.

Передусім слід сказати, що книжка повинна б мати назву "Русини-українці Пряшівщини" (а не "Русини-українці Чехословаччини"). Адже українці живуть в Чехословаччині також поза Пряшівщиною, і, хоч українська етнічна територія тут знаходиться тільки на Пряшівщині, однак в деяких чеських і словацьких містах (напр., Прага, Подебради, Братіслава) було в різних періодах незвичайно інтенсивне українське культурне і суспільне життя. Про це тут ніде не згадано. Лише в примітках наведено, що на території Словаччини зголосилося до української національності під час останнього перепису населення (1980 року) 39 800 людей, а в Чехії 18 400 людей.

Багато українців із Пряшівщини живе також в інших частинах Чехословаччини. Тому розвиток українського населення Пряшівщини не слід розглядати окремо від інших частин Чехословаччини, як це саме й робить автор.

Знову при цій нагоді виникає ненове питання як зрештою це населення називати. На стор. 11 автор наводить, що він вживає історичний термін “русини” у зв’язку з подіями до 1945 року, а для пізнішого періоду використовує термін “русини-українці”. Сучасна загальна публікаційна практика в Чехословаччині (і не лише тут) однозначно вже довгий час означає це населення українцями (а не русинами-українцями, карпато-українцями і т. д.). До такого самого означення дійшла також більшість нашого населення в цій державі, яка донині не захотіла асимілюватися (це тут означає офіційно перейти на словацьку чи чеську національність). Уже з цих причин було б більш доречним вживати терміни “українці”, “український”, навіть коли йде мова про давніші періоди розвитку нашого населення Пряшівщини.

При цій нагоді слід відмітити також те, що автор рецензованої праці тут в різних місцях виразно виступає проти української орієнтації цього населення Пряшівщини. Наприклад, на стор. 42, він наводить, що на Пряшівщині існували лише дві мовні орієнтації (йдеться про період до 1938 року): російська або русофільська і місцева — русинська. Автор пише, що представники обох напрямів називали себе карпаторосіянами (“карпаторусские”) і що вони виступали проти введення на Пряшівщині “штучного українського жаргону” з Галичини. Значить, треба було виступати на Пряшівщині проти української течії вже тоді! Значить, вже тоді вона там мусила існувати!

Сьогодні ми вже знаємо, що як русофільський, так і місцево-русинський напрями в розвитку мови і культури на Пряшівщині були лише певними етапами в історичному розвитку нашого населення на цій території. До цього ж, ці етапи мали лише обмежену тривалість і сьогодні їх слід вважати в основному пройденими.

У зв’язку з цим особливо цікавим міг би бути останній розділ цієї праці, де на кількох сторінках зроблено спробу аналізувати найновіший розвиток (від 1948 року) і сучасну суспільно-політичну і культурну ситуацію нашого населення Пряшівщини.

Тут наведено (на стор. 49) три основні зміни в житті українців Пряшівщини, які відбулися в перших роках комуністичного ладу в Чехословаччині (автор пише, що вони проходили більш-менш паралельно в 1949-1953 роках): колективізація, ліквідація греко-католицької церкви (тут названо це декатолізацією) і українізація.

На Пряшівщині досить поширена версія, яку П. Р. Магочі інтепретує на наступних сторінках (ст. 49-52): коли люди втратили землю (більшість нашого населення жила в селах) і релігію, то це викликало також негативне ставлення до так званої українізації Пряшівщини (головним проявом цього було адміністративне введення літературної української мови до шкіл нашого населення). І автор пише: “...коли вони не могли бути русинами і

мати свої русинські школи, то вони здогадалися, що краще стати словаками ніж українцями” (стор. 52).

Саме в цьому я вбачаю глибоке незрозуміння суті словакізації українського населення Пряшівщини (або ж навмисне перекручування справжнього стану речей).

Колективізація і ліквідація греко-католицької церкви (вона була в Чехословаччині відновлена 1968 року) на Пряшівщині є подіями давно пройденими і з точки зору теперішньої політичної актуальності їх можна вважати справами призабутими.

Правда, при так званій українізації Пряшівщини, яка відбулася більш ніж тридцять років тому, були застосовані методи, які важко могли допомогти плекати у народних мас любов до української культури і мови. Але, незважаючи на це, люди все-таки розібралися у складних обставинах історично-політичного розвитку і протягом останніх десятиріч на Пряшівщині закінчився той процес, який на більшості інших земель заселених українцями відбувся вже раніше. Тут завершився процес національного усвідомлення значної частини українського (або, якщо сьогодні ще хтось хоче дати перевагу цій назві, русинського) населення і його кращі представники стали на основі власного рішення свідомими українцями. Почуття приналежності нашого населення Пряшівщини до українського народу тут сьогодні вже глибоке і стійке. Так званий русинський період, коли тут були помітні тенденції, які ставили під сумнів спорідненість цього населення з українським народом — це вже справа минулого. Це саме можна сказати також про русофільський напрям на Пряшівщині.

Щодо суті словакізації українців Пряшівщини, то, за моїми переконаннями, її головні стимули є такі: систематична словацька асиміляційна політика щодо українців і населення інших національностей, які на Словаччині знаходяться, і брак помітніших зв'язків з українцями поза Чехословаччиною. Результатом цього є повна ліквідація українських шкіл на Пряшівщині (їх уже майже нема) і прискорена асиміляція нашого населення на цій території. Реакційну протиукраїнську ролю в цьому процесі відіграють також органи, які повинні б передусім протистояти словакізаційним тенденціям на Пряшівщині. Йдеться головню про КСУТ (Культурний союз українських трудящих), який має свій центр в Пряшеві. Ця установа в кінцевому рахунку сприяє словакізації українського населення Пряшівщини. Адже за цілий час її існування там не було проявів серйозного опору добре організованим протиукраїнським акціям на Словаччині (див., напр., статтю М. Мушинки “Чиї це ікони?”, *Журнал українознавчих студій*, но. 10, 1981).

Недалеко міста Бардієва знаходиться сканзен (музей народної архітектури в природі), де зосереджено майже виключно перенесені споруди з українських сіл Пряшівщини. І все це представлено як досягнення словацького населення. А протестів проти такого скандального зухвальства словацьких чинників нема. Перелік подібних явищ можна б продовжувати дуже довго.

П. Р. Магочі трактує по суті цю проблему так, що коли б не було на Пряшівщині українізаційних тенденцій, населення і надалі було б русинським і проблеми із словакізацією або не були б, або були би набагато меншими. І, якщо йти далі, то можна це зрозуміти й так, що ніби найбільше нещастя в історичному розвитку русинів Пряшівщини була українізація в 1949-1953 роках або ж прямо наявність українського народу. Якби ніби цього всього не було, то русини на Пряшівщині досьгодні спокійно собі існували б і користалися б своїми русинськими (не українськими) школами.

Положення автора рецензованої праці про ніби добровільну словакізацію нашого населення Пряшівщини вважаю основним недоліком цієї книжки. Довготривалі і старанно організовані протиукраїнські акції словацьких чинників надто помітні, щоб їх замовчувати. Зрештою, ставлення чеських органів до українців, які живуть на території Чехії (а їх немало), також не є кращим.

В книжці є також деякі неточності і помилки в наведених даних. Напр., на стор. 10 наводить автор, що Чехословаччина (мається на увазі створення самостійної держави) виникла 1919 року. В цілій публікації не наведено не лише правильну дату виникнення Чехословаччини (28 жовтня 1918), але навіть 1918 рік у зв'язку з цією подією.

Вже давно відчувається пекуча потреба публікації на подібні теми, одну з яких обрав у цій праці П. Р. Магочі. Шкода, що наведені недоліки до значної міри знижують вартість цінного зібрання інформацій у цій книжці.

Павло Мурашко
Прага

VASYL VERYHA, *DOROHAMY DRUHOI SVITOVOI VIINY: LEGENDY PRO UCHAST UKRAINTSIV U VARSHAVSKOMU POVSTANNI 1944 R. TA PRO UKRAINSKU DYVIZIU "HALYCHYNA"*. Toronto: New Pathway Publishers, 1980. 259 pp.

Vasyl Veryha's study of various allegations regarding the behavior of the Ukrainian Division Galicia during the Second World War is certainly welcome. Utilizing little explored sources, he has carefully reviewed claims that this military formation helped suppress the Polish uprising in Warsaw and has shown such tendentious assertions to be false. Quite correctly he has demonstrated that much of what has been written about this group is Soviet propaganda or inspired by such sources. For this effort Veryha should be congratulated.

Regrettably, however, the book has several critical faults that will not make it easy for its important message to get through the seemingly omnipresent fog that beclouds serious discussions of Ukrainian nationalism and its role during the war. The book is written primarily in Ukrainian, and its thrust tends to be polemical. While this may suit its dominantly

Journal

Ukrainian émigré readership, such contentiousness does little to recommend the book to non-Ukrainian scholars. The English summary that accompanies the book, while underscoring the main message that the Division did not take part in actions that would besmirch its reputation, is replete with caustic references to the factional infighting that so debilitated the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists after 1940. Such polemics have absolutely no role to play in serious scholarly writings. Veryha has done something of a disservice to his fellow veterans by including such opinions in his work.

Equally lamentable is that the work seems doomed to being ignored by the larger public. While this cannot be seen as entirely the author's fault, it is surprising that, to date, there has been no adequate English-language portrayal of the Division's history or postwar experiences. Readers of the *Journal* are undoubtedly aware of the sporadic references to "Ukrainian SS men" that appear in the Canadian press, and even on CBC television. Attempts at correcting such errors of fact or interpretation are frequently given short shrift by those responsible, if they are answered at all. Clearly there is a distinct need for the Ukrainian community to respond to defamation aimed at such an important constituency as that represented by former soldiers of the Division residing in Canada. Very often all Ukrainians are tarred with the same brush. The need for clarification and explanation remains crucial. However satisfying Veryha's book may be for veterans of this military unit, it has not been able to reach the wider Canadian public or even to educate the younger Ukrainian-Canadian generation about who these people were. It is likely that the entire Ukrainian-Canadian community, and indeed Ukrainians in the diaspora, will continue to be accused of harboring in their midst persons involved in the annihilation of Jews and Poles, even if such an accusation is untrue.

Lubomyr Y. Luciuk
University of Toronto

HRYPHORII KOSTIUK, *U SVITI IDEI I OBRAZIV. VYBRANE: KRYTYCHNI TA ISTORYKO-LITERATURNI ROZDUMY, 1930-1980*. Suchasnist, 1983. 537 pp.

This book spans fifty years of Hryhorii Kostiuk's work as a literary critic. The earliest article is a spirited defence of impressionism against monumental realism, written in 1930 for the Kharkiv journal *Proletfront*, and the latest—dating from 1982—is a plea for renewed interest in Volodymyr Vynnychenko. The twenty-nine essays, in fact, constitute a history of Ukrainian literature in our century, a record of the parallel development of the Soviet and émigré literary communities, and a chronicle of the DP generation's meeting with the West.

Readable, balanced in its judgements, generous in its assessments, and wide-ranging in scope, the collection could be recommended as an introductory textbook. And yet the reader who expects detachment will be disappointed. Kostiuk never belonged to the academic ghetto to which other postwar critics may have aspired or been consigned. He takes a moral position: political evil must be combated. He sees a social role for the critic: literary reality must be tested against historical and subjective reality. The end goal must be social: the education and edification of the next generation.

Another plank in Kostiuk's critical platform is the refusal to trivialize the achievements of Soviet writers. He argues that the 1920s in Soviet Ukraine produced the highest literary achievements and the most enduring critiques of the political and cultural complex erected by the Stalinists. He is quick to applaud the brave new voices raised in defence of the new during the post-1957 thaw.

If a criticism is to be made of Kostiuk's approach, it has to begin with his unquestioning faithfulness to early, formative influences, in particular to the teachings of the charismatic Mykola Khvylovy. In article after article Kostiuk pushes the idea of "active romanticism" as the definition of the style of our century; he sees echoes of the "Asiatic renaissance" theme in the writings of contemporaries; and he warns against the formalist tinkering of futurists, past and present. However, without some more detailed analysis of these evocative but enigmatic terms, their invocation sounds like a hollow refrain.

The author does, however, bear witness to the affirmative culture of the twenties, to the fact that this decade forced a profound and irreversible shift in ways of seeing, feeling, and perceiving, and to its radical role in delegitimizing the norms and values of the prevailing order, both in Ukraine and Russia. His thoughtful articles on Khvylovy, Mykola Kulish, Oles Dosvitnii, Iurii Ianovsky, and Valerian Pidmohylny in the Soviet context, and on Ivan Bahriany, Ulas Samchuk, Dokiia Humenna, Emma Andiiivska, Vadym Lesych, and other émigrés document the move in the last fifty years toward a new vision of Ukraine as a modern nation and the idea of literature as a demanding form of artistry.

To be sure, the moral stance sometimes seems to fit uncomfortably with the latter idea, and this leads to some interesting debates with the New York Group of poets on the limits of experimentation (pp. 480-83). It also leads to a tension in the critic's work: ideas such as the artist's "individual voice," his "originality," or his "deformation of linguistic norms" jostle for position with the concept of literature as a transparent record of the time (*vahovytyi dokument doby*) and praise for the artist as a manly son of his people (*muzhnii syn svoho narodu*)

Somewhere around the time of the Second World War, Hryhorii Kostiuk, the survivor of Stalin's camps and one of the few eyewitnesses

Journal

of the literary renaissance of the twenties, began to see himself as one of the last Mohicans to fight a rearguard action, casting himself in the role of a critic rescuing from obscurity and preserving as much as possible of a proscribed culture. In this he succeeded admirably. While this book may not succeed in alerting the formalists at our universities to the primacy of politics, it does marshal a great many facts about Ukrainian literature that deserve to be better known. It is a valuable guide to contemporary Ukrainian writing.

Myroslav Shkandrij
University of Manitoba

HEROES OF THEIR DAY: THE REMINISCENCES OF BOHDAN PANCHUK, edited and with an introduction by Lubomyr Y. Luciuk. Toronto: The Multicultural History Society and the Ontario Heritage Foundation, 1983. 168 pp.

Recollection of the exact nature of events, when and how they occurred, and whom they involved may become faulty with the passage of time. But there are ways of checking the facts. One of the simplest methods of verification is asking other persons who were directly involved. When an author, in this case Panchuk, fails to ensure the veracity of his statements and proceeds to publish factually incorrect accounts, then the entire contents of his book and his credibility must necessarily suffer as a result.

In his reminiscences, Bohdan Panchuk has played havoc with time sequences. He states, for example, that the "master plan" of his Canadian Relief Mission, which arrived in London in late October 1946, called for the formation of central Ukrainian relief committees in each Allied occupation zone, with an umbrella committee for the whole of Austria and Germany. Dr. Myron (sic) Roslak headed the committee for Austria, and Wasył Mudryj, the one for Germany. In fact, these committees, were formed at least a year earlier, and without any external prompting or assistance. On pp. 79-80 we read that "the Allies established the CCG, the Central Commission for Germany. After the armies relinquished control, the CCG took over. This was taking place towards the end of 1946." Here again Panchuk is late by more than a year.

Distortions and inaccuracies about in *Heroes of Their Day*. The Romanow-Smylski flight to Rome as described by Panchuk (pp. 75-76) is largely fictional. He could very easily have refreshed his memory as to the reason for the flight and what had actually happened by simply asking the persons involved. Roman Spolsky was never in the UPA, nor was there an UPA field hospital in the Carpathian Mountains. Furthermore, the description of the alleged black market operation in cigarettes put into effect by Panchuk and Spolsky to supply the UPA (p. 88) belongs more to the cops-and-robbers genre of adventure stories than to

an autobiography. Similarly, not only the participants in the "Spanish caper" (pp. 86-87) so vividly reproduced by Panchuk, but anyone in Toronto, if asked, could have informed the author that neither Karmanin nor his colleague, Luciwi, were "UPA and UHVR emissaries"; nor had Karmanin been "one of those UPA soldiers who was sent out of Ukraine to establish contact with the West." Not only has Panchuk put them in the wrong pew, but in the wrong church as well.

The author of this review was not paid "a small salary" as alleged on p. 81, nor could he have been regarded as "holding the position at the Bureau—to all intents and purposes a civil service job so far as UCC was concerned" (p. 97) for the simple reason that he was being paid by His Majesty's Government almost to the middle of 1946 and during that period and thereafter worked voluntarily as Secretary General and later as Director of the Central Ukrainian Relief Bureau, without any remuneration and with considerable personal sacrifice of a financial nature—for example, giving up government-paid transportation back to Canada following demobilization in the United Kingdom. Consequently, Panchuk is also mistaken when he writes that the UCC paid Frolick's "way back to Canada" (p. 99). Frolick was not persuaded by the author "to abandon his CCG work and to work for us [?] full-time He became the general secretary for CURB." The fact of the matter is that Panchuk and Frolick were appointed director and secretary-general at the same time and were informed by the same cablegram from the the UCC in Winnipeg, followed by a confirming letter.

The story of the mysterious "package of correspondence" alleged to have been for Frolick but received by Panchuk by mistake, its contents, as well as the alleged confrontation between the two as a result, are all figments of the author's imagination.

Panchuk quotes parts of a letter he wrote to Dr. Kaye about Frolick "setting up political propaganda," but he fails to cite the real reason for the letter: to inform Dr. Kaye of Frolick's departure from the UK that day and urging Kaye to abandon any plan he may have to recommend or facilitate Frolick's return to the continent in the role of a Canadian immigration official.

The Ukrainian Information Service, which Panchuk states was "deeply political or partisan" and "founded" by Frolick unbeknownst to Panchuk after Frolick became director on Panchuk's return to Canada, was, in fact, set up in early 1946, when not Frolick, but Panchuk was Director of CURB. In a report to the relief committees in Canada and the USA dated 5 March 1946, we read:

At the C.U.R.B. Conference it was decided to divorce information from relief work and to set up a "Ukrainian Information Service," the task of which would be to inform the British press and influen-

tial people about matters pertaining to Ukraine on one hand, and on the other to give similar information out to the Ukrainian press in North and South America. Last week we sent out the first letters containing such information to the Ukrainian press and to the committees. We trust that our parcels containing this information and copies of our correspondence have been arriving safely, and that you are making good use of them.

In the minutes of a meeting held on 13 April 1946 with Rev. V. Kushnir, decision no. 9 is recorded as follows: "The Information Service is to be considered as a secondary matter and only done without cost or expense to the relief work." As a matter of record, Panchuk sent parcels on 27 September 1945 to the UCC and to the newspapers *New Pathway*, *Ukrainian Voice*, *Ukrainian News*, and *Svoboda* containing the following material as listed in his covering letter: press release of the Press Service of the UHVR, *Visnyk* of the UPS of UHVR, UPA songs, an article on UPA, and an English translation of it.

Panchuk makes contradictory statements. On p. 99 he (correctly) affirms that Frolick refused the invitation to join the mission as a member, feeling that it "would be a demotion." But on the next page he states Frolick "believed that our decision to remove him was superimposed on us by Rev. Kushnir and company in UCC." Another example: "George Kluchevsky was CURB treasurer while we were gone and kept Frolick's books" (p. 100). Contrast that with this passage on p. 96: "Stan Frolick was still holding the fort in London, waiting to see what would happen. Either someone was going to come as director of the bureau, or someone was going to send him money [to run the bureau] and make him director" (which eventually happened). Panchuk continues: "He was the only executive member left there with his two secretaries and George Kluchevsky as treasurer Before we had left England for Canada, we had found . . . George (Finlay) Kluchevsky, who became CURB's treasurer when Ann Crapleve was discharged and returned to Canada." In the latter statement he confuses UCSA with CURB, as Miss Crapleve was never the treasurer of CURB.

Vladimir de Korostovetz was not "one-time Minister of External Affairs for Hetman Pavlo Skoropadsky" (p. 55). The first and only commissioned officer present at the founding of the Ukrainian Canadian Servicemen's Association (UCSA) was not Lt. John Swystun as Panchuk states (p. 50), but Lt. Wally Kupchenko. Panchuk had only to look at the first issue of the *UCSA Newsletter* to ascertain who in fact were the founding members and the first executive.

Concerning the errors and distortions in this book, some of which were pointed out above, the author may be partially excused for not getting his facts right and resorting to guesswork or fiction on the grounds

that, as he himself admits, "from that time on" (i.e., the Allied landing in Normandy in 1944) "I was on active duty in Europe up until the middle of 1946, except for my leaves." Several months later he returned to Canada. However, these circumstances do not seem to have inhibited him from claiming personal credit for much of the work and accomplishments of others at the bureau in London in his absence.

There is much in the book that tends to exaggerate the author's role.

Panchuk was one of the initiators of CURB, which was born spontaneously and grew and developed in response to the pressing problem of saving Ukrainian DPs from being repatriated by force to the territories of the USSR and, secondly, from material want and a culturally and spiritually dehumanizing process. For Panchuk and many others, however, the only Ukrainian reality was the Ukrainian-Canadian experience with which they were familiar. The war had effectively cut off Ukraine from the diaspora and had completely shrouded all the political developments and social changes that took place throughout the war years and changing occupational regimes, making these processes even more incomprehensible to the young men from the farms of western Canada. They failed to see that their insistence that DPs abandon their institutions, organizations, political philosophies, and different values and outlook and embrace the forms and values of the Ukrainian-Canadian community is the way of the tyrant. It was ironic that democratic principles were invoked to achieve essentially undemocratic results: the preservation of the status quo, assuring the domination of the reigning Ukrainian-Canadian elite atop a non-elective, rigid, and largely ineffective and inefficient superstructure imposed from above.

Hence there were attempts to impose a surrogate UCC on Ukrainians on the continent by Kushnir, Galan, and, later, Panchuk, to the extent that even the same initials (KYK) were used for the proposed umbrella body. Hence Panchuk endeavoured to place the growing Ukrainian presence in the U.K. into an organizational mold taken from the Ukrainian-Canadian example, totally disregarding entirely different circumstances and needs. Hence also there runs through Panchuk's book the argument that there was no need for the postwar immigrants to "transplant" their own organizational forms onto Canadian soil, because the existing organizational structure could have met all the needs of the newcomers. For instance, he suggests that all nationalists could have, and ought to have, found a home in the UNF; that the émigré youth organizations Plast, SUM, and ODUM should have joined the existing youth organizations in Canada and in the UK (which were modelled on the Canadian pattern); and that the Orthodox DPs could have joined the USRL and its youth affiliate, CUYA. If this was the case, why did Panchuk himself find it necessary to form a new organization, the UCVA, back home, when a veterans' organization already existed within the UNF framework?

Journal

Like so many other Ukrainian Canadians of the time, Panchuk had difficulty in resolving the conflict between being Ukrainian and being Canadian. His book shows clearly that he failed to come to terms with this dichotomy. For example, on one hand he asserts that Konovalets and Skoropadsky "were patriotic Ukrainians, just as good as I was" (p. 42), while on the other hand he confesses that "the average Ukrainian Canadian in my generation just didn't care about what was happening in Europe that much. We accepted the British Empire... we accepted the fact that our flag was the Union Jack, that our mother country was Britain and the empire." It is not surprising, therefore, that he confided to a British official that he would best of all like to see Ukraine a British dominion.

Though being sycophantic to the British and harbouring an inferiority complex and a feeling of insecurity in respect to them, vis-à-vis the DPs Panchuk's feeling is one of superiority. And yet he is totally bewildered as to why veterans of the Division Galicia turned against him when "in 1947-48 the Division was totally pro-Panchuk. If you'd found one person who criticized me, the majority would have lynched him" (p. 119). He is bitter because he cannot understand why "It's as if I never existed for them" and why it is still not recognized "that I was once president of AUGB." Yet, in another place he concedes that by 1952 "I was no longer indispensable. These people whom we had shepherded for the first few years after World War Two could now take care of themselves" (p. 114).

Out of the bitterness of rejection, a new and a very unflattering side of the author's character emerges. This is reflected in the material he chose to include in his book, such as his letter of denunciation sent to the British Ministry of Labour, which appears in truncated form on p. 114.

A definitive, objective, and scholarly history of the Ukrainian relief effort, and particularly of the genesis, role, and achievements of CURB has yet to be written.

Stanley W. Frolick
Toronto

ANTIN HLYNKA, POSOL FEDERALNOHO PARLAMENTU KANADY, 1940-1949 (Anthony Hlynka, Member of the Canadian House of Commons, 1940-1949). Published and with an introduction by Stephanie Hlynka. Toronto, 1982. 172 pp.

The book consists of two parts. The first appears to be the unfinished memoirs of Anthony Hlynka, covering mainly the period during which he represented the Vegreville constituency as a Social Credit member of

the Canadian parliament. The second part consists of six speeches on various topics delivered by him during his term in parliament.

Hlynka's term covered the crucial war years and the immediate post-war period, so important in many ways to Ukrainian Canadians. The question of Ukrainian political independence was raised in several of the speeches reproduced here from Hansard.

Mr. Hlynka went in 1947 to Europe with his wife, Stephanie, to see for himself the plight of Ukrainian refugees and displaced persons and the conditions in which they lived. He visited a number of Ukrainian displaced persons camps in Germany and met with a number of their leaders. On his return, he delivered a speech on the displaced persons problem in the House of Commons on 31 May 1948, thus helping to lay the groundwork for the eventual admission to Canada of large numbers of Ukrainian war refugees.

It must be remembered that Hlynka was only the second federal M.P. of Ukrainian origin to be sent to Ottawa. The first was Michael Luchkovich, who, by coincidence, had been elected in the same riding as Hlynka fourteen years earlier. Hlynka devotes a separate chapter to this pioneer parliamentarian.

The book contains much interesting material on the Vegreville constituency, on the manner of choosing candidates to run in elections in those times, and on how election campaigns were conducted in that particular area. Several chapters convey the author's conception of the role of a Canadian member of parliament and how that role differs for one of Ukrainian origin, as well as his personal impressions and observations about Ottawa and the Parliament of Canada.

Despite linguistic shortcomings and at times a somewhat preachy tone, this book is a valuable contribution to Ukrainian-Canadian studies. There is a great paucity of published material dealing with political participation in the Canadian electoral process by persons of Ukrainian background. Hlynka's book, which includes a collection of his speeches in a separate appendix to the memoirs, is a welcome addition to the library of every student of Canadian politics and the contributions by our kinsmen in that field.

A hardcover edition is reasonably priced at \$12.50 and may be ordered directly from Mrs. S. Hlynka, 19 Kingswood Rd., Toronto, Ontario, M4E 3N4.

Stanley W. Frolick
Toronto

BOOKS RECEIVED

- AMMENDE, Ewald. *Human Life in Russia*, reprint edn. Cleveland: John T. Zupal Inc. with the Foundation to Commemorate the 1933 Ukrainian Famine (Montreal), 1984. ix, 319 pp.
- BALAN, Jars. *Salt and Braided Bread: Ukrainian Life in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1984. 152 pp.
- BERDNYK, Oles. *Apostle of Immortality*. Trans. by Yuri Tkach. Toronto, Chicago, and Melbourne: Bayda Books, 1984. 129 pp.
- CARSTENSEN, Fred V. *American Enterprise in Foreign Markets: Studies of Singer and International Harvester in Imperial Russia*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1984. x, 289 pp.
- CHAPLENKO, Vasyl. *Z istorii ukrainskoho pysmenstva: Doslidy i retsenzii*. New York and Greeley, Col.: Ukrapress, 1984. 132 pp.
- CONNOR, Walker. *The National Question in Marxist-Leninist Theory and Strategy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984. xvii, 614 pp.
- DRAHAN, Antin. *Shevchenko u Vashingtoni: Do istorii pamiatnyka Kobzarevi Ukrainy u stolytsi Ameryky*. Jersey City and New York: Svoboda Ukrainian National Association, 1984. 138 pp.
- FISHBEIN, Moisei. *Zbirka bez nazvy. Poezii. Pereklady*. N.p.: Suchasnist, 1984. 112 pp.
- KALUZNY, Antoine Eugène. *La Philosophie du coeur de Grégoire Skovoroda*. Montreal: Editions Fides, 1983. 128 pp.
- KASINEC, Edward and Bohdan STRUMINSKYJ. *The Millenium Collection of Old Ukrainian Books at the University of Toronto Library: A Catalogue*. Toronto: Chair of Ukrainian Studies, University of Toronto, 1984. 36 pp.
- KHEIFETS, Mykhailo. *Ukrainski syliueti*. N.p.: Suchasnist, 1984. 239 pp.
- LUTSKY, Iurii, ed. *Vybrani lysty Panteleimona Kulisha ukrainskoiu movoiu pysani*. New York and Toronto: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., 1984. 326 pp.
- MAGOCSI, Paul Robert. *Our People: Carpatho-Rusyns and Their Descendants in North America*. Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1984. xii, 161 pp.

- MOROZIUK, Russel P. *Politicized Ecumenism: Rome, Moscow and the Ukrainian Catholic Church*. Montreal: the author, 1984. 24 pp.
- . *Politics of a Church Union: Information Regarding the Relations between... the Ukrainian Catholic Church... and the Church of Rome*. Chicago: Church Herald, 1983. 141 pp.
- Narysy z istorii ukrainskoi kultury/ Essays from the History of Ukrainian Culture*, vols. 1-3. Edmonton: Ukrainian Women's Association of Canada Natalia Kobrynska Foundation, 1984. 174, 140, 233 pp.
- New Soil—Old Roots: The Ukrainian Experience in Canada*. Ed. by Jaroslav Rozumnyj with the assistance of Oleh W. Gerus and Mykhailo H. Marunchak. Winnipeg: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Canada, 1983. 334 pp.
- Pershyi vinok: Zhinochy almanakh*, 2d rev. edn. Ed. by Natalia Kobrynska and Olena Pchilka; introd. and notes by Larysa M. L. Zaleska Onyshkevych. New York: Ukrainian Women's League of America, 1984. xix, 486 pp.
- PINKUS, Benjamin. *The Soviet Government and the Jews 1948-1967: A Documented Study*. Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, and Syney: Cambridge University Press in association with the Hebrew University of Jerusalem—Institute of Contemporary Jewry and the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1984. xvi, 612 pp.
- ROSS, Graham. *The Foreign Office and the Kremlin: British Documents on Anglo-Soviet Relations, 1941-1945*. Cambridge, London, and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984. xi, 303 pp.
- RUBCHAK, Bohdan. *Krylo ikarove: Novi i vybrani poezii*. N.p.: Suchasnist, 1983. 183 pp.
- SMITH, R. E. F. and David CHRISTIAN. *Bread and Salt: A Social and Economic History of Food and Drink in Russia*. Cambridge, London, and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984. xvi, 391 pp.
- SOKIL, Vasyl. *Taka dovha nich: Spohady staroho sobaky*. N.p.: Suchasnist, 1984. 96 pp.
- Studia Ucrainica 2*, University of Ottawa Ukrainian Studies, no. 5. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1984. 278 pp.
- WYNAR, Lubomyr R. *Dmytro Doroshenko 1882-1951*. Munich, New York, and Toronto: Ukrainian Historical Association, 1983. 41 pp.
- . *Mychajlo Hruševs'kyj: Biobibliographische quelle 1886-1934*. Munich: Ukrainian Free University, 1984. 68 pp.
- Zapisy 17: Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Symposium, February 1977*. Ed. by Thomas E. Bird. New York: Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences, 1983. 248 pp.

Лист до редакції

Монреаль, 8 листопада 1984 р.

Прошу виправити в наступному випуску “Журналу” помилку, на яку я натрапив, читаючи цінну статтю професора Степана Козака п. з. “Михайло Максимович і формування романтичної думки в Україні” (“Журнал” No. 16, літо 1984).

В кінці 26-ої сторінки “Журналу” автор статті критикує “літання думкою по дереву” в Максимовичевому перекладі “Заспіву” **Слова** й каже: “Думається, що переклад цього найбільш загадкового місця в тексті **Слова** найбільш вдало передав Олексій Коваленко”. На підтвердження своїх слів він цитує Коваленків переклад зовсім іншого місця в тексті **Слова**, а саме уривка з тієї частини, якій Коваленко дав заголовок “Погоня”.

Насправді, “найбільш загадкове місце в тексті **Слова**” Коваленко переклав так:

Боян віщий тільки здума
Кому пісню заспівати,
А вже думка по деревах
Шуга білкою в гіллі,
Сірим вовком по землі,
То орлом вона полине
Сизокрилим аж під хмари.

З пошаною

Адольф Гладилевич

NEW

from the

CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF UKRAINIAN STUDIES

LIFE SENTENCE: MEMOIRS OF A UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PRISONER

LIFE SENTENCE
Memoirs of a Ukrainian Political Prisoner



DANYLO SHUMUK

Danylo Shumuk is Amnesty International's most "senior" political prisoner. *Life Sentence* is his autobiography.

It describes the author's early life and his involvement with the communist movement under Polish rule. Disillusioned with communism, he joined the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, which was engaged in a struggle against both German and Soviet occupiers. In 1945, he was captured by Soviet troops and sentenced to death (a sentence that was later commuted to life imprisonment).

xxiii, 401 pp., maps Paper \$14.95, Cloth \$19.95

Order from:

Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies
352 Athabasca Hall
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta Canada T6G 2E8

TO THOSE WISHING TO SUBMIT MANUSCRIPTS

All contributions must be submitted in three copies and double-spaced throughout. Footnotes should be placed at the end of the manuscript. The modified Library of Congress system of Cyrillic transliteration should be used (with the exception of linguistic articles).

In general, articles should not exceed 25 double-spaced pages, except where especially justified by extensive documentation, tables, or charts. For purposes of style and footnoting, the University of Chicago Press *Manual of Style* should be consulted. Authors should send a short academic biography with their submissions. Manuscripts will not be returned unless specifically requested and postage provided. The policy of the *Journal* is not to consider articles that have been published or are being considered for publication elsewhere. The editors reserve the right to edit all submissions.

A TABLE OF TRANSLITERATION

(Modified Library of Congress)

а — a	ĩ — i	ф — f
б — b	й̣ — i	х — kh
в — v	к — k	ц — ts
г — h	л — l	ч — ch
г̣ — g	м — m	ш — sh
д — d	н — n	щ — shch
е — e	о — o	ю — iu
є — ie	п — p	я — ia
ж — zh	р — r	ь — -
з — z	с — s	-ий̣ — y in endings
и — y	т — t	of personal
і — i	у — u	names only

POLITICS AND SOCIETY IN SOVIET UKRAINE

1953-1980

By Borys Lewytskyj

Perhaps the most authoritative English-language work on the period to date. Encompasses Soviet Ukraine from the death of Stalin to Shcherbytsky's rule as first party secretary. A final chapter on Society examines the economy, religion and the continuing Russification of Ukrainian society by the Soviet regime.

219 pages, cloth \$14.95 paper \$6.95

Order from:
University of Toronto Press,
5201 Dufferin Street, Downsview, Ontario,
Canada M3H 5T8

Published by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies,
University of Alberta

VISIBLE SYMBOLS

CULTURAL EXPRESSION AMONG CANADA'S UKRAINIANS

Edited by Manoly R. Lupul

What are the *visible symbols* through which Ukrainians in Canada express their identity in the North American milieu? The volume answers this question in six parts: Ukrainian Material Culture in Canada; Ukrainian Art in Canada; Ukrainian Music in Canada; Ukrainian Dance in Canada; In Search of Ukrainian Canadian Symbols; and the Politics of Ukrainian Culture in Canada. The papers are taken from the fifth annual conference on Ukrainians in Canada (University of Manitoba, 1981).

204 pages, cloth \$19.95

Order from:

University of Toronto Press,
5201 Dufferin Street, Downsview, Ontario
Canada M3H 5T8

Published by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies,
University of Alberta