

JOURNAL

OF UKRAINIAN STUDIES

Bohdan R. Bociurkiw: The Soviet Destruction of the
Ukrainian Orthodox Church, 1929–36

Virlana Tkacz: The Birth of a Director:
The Early Development of Les Kurbas
and His First Season with the
Young Theatre

Mary Halloran: Ethnicity, the State and War:
Canada and its Ethnic Minorities, 1939–45

Marta Tarnawsky: Ukrainian Literature in English
Published Since 1980: Part 3

Book Reviews

22
SUMMER 1987

ЖУРНАЛ

УКРАЇНОЗНАВЧИХ СТУДІЙ

EDITOR

Myroslav Yurkevich

EDITORIAL BOARD

John-Paul Himka, *University of Alberta* • Andrij Hornjatkevych, *University of Alberta* • Oleh Ilnytzkyj, *University of Alberta* • Bohdan Kordan, *Arizona State University* • Bohdan Krawchenko, *University of Alberta* • Manoly R. Lupul, *University of Alberta* • David Marples, *University of Alberta* • Bohdan Medwidsky, *University of Alberta* • Natalia Pylypiuk, *Harvard University* • Peter A. Rolland, *University of Alberta* • Frances A. Swyripa, *University of Alberta*

The *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* is published semiannually, in the summer and winter, by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. Annual subscription rates are \$10.00 for individuals and \$15.00 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*, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 352 Athabasca Hall, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2E8.

© 1987 by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.
ISSN 0228-1635

Typesetting by Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.
Printed by Printing Services, University of Alberta.

JOURNAL OF UKRAINIAN STUDIES

Volume 12, Number 1

Summer 1987

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>Bohdan R. Bociurkiw</i> , The Soviet Destruction of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, 1929–36 | 3 |
| <i>Virlana Tkacz</i> , The Birth of a Director: The Early Development of Les Kurbas and His First Season with the Young Theatre | 22 |
| <i>Mary Halloran</i> , Ethnicity, the State and War: Canada and its Ethnic Minorities, 1939–45 | 55 |

Guide to Research

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>Marta Tarnawsky</i> , Ukrainian Literature in English Published Since 1980: Part 3 | 67 |
|---|----|

Book Reviews

| | |
|--|-----|
| David J. Goa, <i>Seasons of Celebration: Ritual in Eastern Christian Culture/Temps de Célébration: Les Rites dans la culture chrétienne de l'Orient</i> (Daniel Sahas) | 87 |
| Dimitry Pospelovsky, <i>The Russian Church Under the Soviet Regime, 1917–1982</i> (Andrew Sorokowski) | 92 |
| Sophia Senyk, <i>Women's Monasteries in Ukraine and Belorussia to the Period of Suppressions</i> (John-Paul Himka) | 96 |
| Volodymyr Maruniak, <i>Ukrainska emigratsiia v Nimechchyni i Avstrii po Druhii svitovii viini</i> (Ihor V. Zielyk) | 97 |
| Paul R. Magocsi, <i>Ukraine: A Historical Atlas</i> (Ihor Stebelsky) | 101 |
| Paul R. Magocsi, <i>Ucrainica at the University of Toronto Library: A Catalogue of Holdings</i> (Alan Rutkowski) | 105 |

Contributors

BOHDAN R. BOCIURKIW is professor of political science at Carleton University, Ottawa. His many publications include studies on church-state relations, religion and atheism, nationality policy and political dissent in the USSR.

MARY HALLORAN is a director of the Canadian Committee for the History of the Second World War, Directorate of History, National Defence Headquarters. She is completing a doctoral dissertation on post-war Canadian external relations.

MARTA TARNAWSKY is a librarian at the University of Pennsylvania and the compiler of several bibliographies. She is also the author of two books of poetry in Ukrainian, a library manual, and numerous articles and reviews.

VIRLANA TKACZ has directed plays at LaMaMa Theatre and other theatres in New York City. She delivered a paper on Les Kurbas at the Mid-America Theater History Conference in Nebraska earlier this year.

Editor's Note

Because of a misunderstanding for which the *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* was not responsible, Oleh W. Gerus's article, "Ukrainians in Argentina: A Canadian Perspective," which appeared in the Winter 1986 issue (no. 21), was also printed in *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, vol. XLII, no. 1-2 (Spring-Summer 1986).

Our apologies to Oleh Leszczyszyn, whose name was given incorrectly in the Contributors column of the Winter 1986 issue.

THE SOVIET DESTRUCTION OF THE UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH, 1929–36

Viewed from the distance of half a century, Stalin's so-called "revolution from above," unleashed by the end of the 1920s, was more than just a radical restructuring of the Soviet political, economic and social system into a modernized totalitarian state. It also marked a fundamental shift from the early internationalist concept of the Soviet polity to a refurbished imperial model which, when stripped of its semantic trappings, reaffirmed the continuity between tsarist Russia and the USSR and opted for the integration of the non-Russian peoples with the dominant Russian nation. The cultural, linguistic, and eventually ethnic "homogenization" of the Soviet population was now perceived as the more reliable guarantee of the territorial integrity, internal security and military might of Stalin's empire.

In this context it is perhaps easier to examine the calamities brought upon Ukraine by Stalinization: the tragedy of the Ukrainian famine of 1933, the liquidation of national-communist cadres in the Communist Party of Ukraine (CP[b]U), the pogrom of the Ukrainian cultural and scientific elite, and the destruction of the only surviving institutional vestige of the Ukrainian revolution—an independent Ukrainian Orthodox Church. It is to this last aspect of the Stalinist assault on the Ukrainian nation that this article is devoted.

Beginning with an examination of the regime's motives and procedures employed in the liquidation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC) in 1929–30, the article will proceed to discuss the lesser-known successor to the UAOC, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. In this successor church, the Autocephalist remnants were allowed to continue their by now much more severely restricted religious activities while being progressively strangled by a combination of confiscatory taxation, administrative harassment and police terror. By 1936, as the so-called Stalin Constitution, "the most

democratic in the world,” was about to be enacted, the last parish of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was closed down by the authorities. Most of the still surviving bishops and clergy in Ukraine, including those of the once favoured Renovatianist and Patriarchal Churches, perished during the *Iezhovshchina* terror of 1937–8. By the end of the 1930s only a handful of churches remained open in all of Soviet Ukraine.

The Liquidation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church

The regime’s decision to liquidate the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church was apparently connected with important changes in Soviet ecclesiastical and nationality policies at the end of the 1920s. The Russian (Patriarchal) Orthodox Church had been purged of anti-Soviet leaders, and since 1927 the Patriarchal *Locum Tenens*, Metropolitan Sergii (Stragorodskii), had committed it to the positive and unconditional support of Soviet policies. While this did not save the Russian Church from the devastating anti-religious campaign that swept the Soviet Union in the subsequent decade, it is likely that the 1927 *quid pro quo* involved the regime’s promise to restore the Patriarchate’s jurisdiction over those elements of the Orthodox Church which had seceded from the Russian Church.¹

More important in this respect, however, were developments in Soviet nationality policy that could not but fundamentally affect the fate of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. By 1927, with the stabilization of the domestic and international position of the USSR and with Stalin in effective control of the party, the regime came to regard concessions to the nationalities and peasantry as an obstacle to the realization of its larger political and economic objectives. Beginning in the late 1920s, Russian nationalism, once condemned as “great-power chauvinism” but now implicit in the doctrine of “socialism in one country,” began to be quietly rehabilitated in the USSR. This development reflected both the now familiar process of the penetration of Soviet communism by elements of Russian nationalism and the official recognition of the latter as an important centralizing and stabilizing force in the Soviet state. Conversely, then, centrifugal “bourgeois nationalism” in the non-Russian borderlands came to be regarded as the “main danger” to the regime.²

In Ukraine this was reflected in the accelerated purge of national communists by the party, the slowing down and eventual discontinuance of “Ukrainization,” and increasingly severe attacks on Ukrainian

literary and artistic circles, scientific institutions, and other such cultural centres which, while professing loyalty to the established regime, pursued a line supporting the independent cultural and intellectual development of the Ukrainian people.³ By 1929–30 the witch-hunt of the Ukrainian cultural and intellectual elite assumed the proportions of systematic police terror, with the GPU arresting many hundreds of leading Ukrainian writers, scholars, and cultural and social leaders. The principal pretext for this succession of pogroms against the Ukrainian elite, which by the end of the thirties had crippled the intellectual and cultural life of Ukraine, was the charge of “counter-revolutionary” and “terrorist” activities.⁴ To “substantiate” these charges, the GPU hastened to “uncover” a number of underground nationalist organizations, many of them evidently fathered by the police themselves, which were supposedly working toward the overthrow of the Soviet regime or the separation of Ukraine from the USSR and had allegedly “sold out” to foreign powers.⁵

The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was one of the first national institutions to be liquidated in this chauvinistic campaign. Dedicated to the ideal of the ecclesiastical and spiritual independence of Ukraine from Moscow, the UAOC had gathered together in its ranks some of the most nationally conscious elements of the population, including many of those once associated with the Ukrainian People’s Republic. Its influence reaching deeper and affecting wider strata of the population than that of any other national institution, this church contributed to the rise of national consciousness in the peasant and worker masses. Despite the increasing limitations imposed upon it by the regime, even regardless of the weaknesses and servility of some of its leaders, at its base the UAOC had remained a formidable obstacle to the Sovietization of the Ukrainian countryside.

The 1927 purge of Metropolitan Lypkivsky and some other uncompromising leaders from the UAOC and the imposition of internal Soviet controls upon the church evidently did not satisfy the regime; of no avail were the far-reaching concessions offered by the Third All-Ukrainian Council (*Rada*), its “self-criticism,” and its collaboration with the authorities. As early as 1928, the GPU arrested two autocephalist bishops (Stepan Orlyk and Konon Bei),⁶ and a number of priests.⁷ In 1929, in the midst of mass arrests of the Ukrainian intelligentsia, more bishops and hundreds of autocephalist priests and lay leaders were imprisoned, among them the church’s principal ideologist, Volodymyr Chekhivsky. Finally, in the second half of that

year, the GPU ordered the All-Ukrainian Council and its local agencies to discontinue their activities.⁸ The official “explanation” of these repressions was not long in coming. On 22 November 1929, the Moscow *Izvestiia* carried a communique signed by the head of the Ukrainian GPU, Vsevolod Balytsky:

The organs of the GPU of the Ukr. SSR have uncovered and liquidated a counter-revolutionary organization which called itself the “League for the Liberation of Ukraine” (*Spilka vyzvolennia Ukrainy*) and pursued the aims of restoring the capitalist system, returning the landowners, and enslaving the workers and peasants of Ukraine... [Among its leaders were] the former prime minister of the Petliurite government in the “Ukrainian People’s Republic” and the present leader of the Autocephalous Church, V.M. Chekhivsky. For its counter-revolutionary ends, the SVU also used the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church, where it gathered, in the capacity of bishops, priests, and other servants [of the cult], former officers—members of the Petliurite bands and insurgent organizations...

Lumped together in the sweeping accusations that now filled the Soviet press were the UAOC (the “propagandist apparatus” and “military reserves” of the SVU), the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (“the centre of the counter-revolutionary organization”), the Institute of the Ukrainian Scientific Language, the Medical Section of the Academy (preparing “medical terror” against the Soviet leaders), philologists, linguists, university professors, writers, leaders of the co-operative movement, and others.

Significantly, most of the accused were former leading members of the Ukrainian socialist parties and had taken an active part in the Ukrainian revolution of 1917–19; some had returned from emigration upon Soviet assurances that they would be free to engage in apolitical scientific and cultural work. Their *past, before* the establishment of the Bolshevik regime in Ukraine, appeared to be their principal “crime.” As the subsequent “show trial” of the SVU demonstrated, the regime tried in their persons the ideas of the Ukrainian revolution; their extorted “confessions” were designed to caricaturize these ideas and thus debase and ridicule them for the benefit of Soviet propaganda.⁹

The deadly implications of the Soviet charges against the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church were sufficient to throw its leadership into a state of panic. The grotesque nature of these accusations did not matter: while the party and the Godless League agitators were busy explaining the role of the UAOC to the populace as an “instrument of the national counter-revolution,”¹⁰ the GPU proceeded with the

liquidation of the church. To compromise the UAOC in the eyes of its believers, the GPU staged a humiliating mockery of the church's "self-liquidation" at the so-called "Extraordinary Church Sobor," which met on 28–9 January 1930 in Kiev. Hastily convoked to "solve the question of the church's status in connection with the discovery of the counter-revolutionary activity of autocephaly and, in particular, of its role in the organization of the SVU,"¹¹ the "Sobor" supplied the GPU with a collective "confession" of guilt and duly "voted" to dissolve the UAOC.¹² The regime could thus be protected against charges of "religious persecution" and absolved of responsibility for the church's liquidation.

A full week elapsed before the resolution of the "Extraordinary Sobor" was released by the official press agency.¹³ As it actually represented the regime's final verdict on the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church, it deserves to be quoted extensively. The resolution began, as could be expected, with "self-criticism" and a condemnation of the principal "culprits" (by then already imprisoned by the GPU):

The Extraordinary Sobor must acknowledge that the UAOC, as has now been fully [*sic*]¹⁴ determined, has, during its ten years of existence, been a clearly revealed anti-Soviet, counter-revolutionary organization. One cannot deny that it has included and still includes people who joined the church only to satisfy their religious needs. But this essentially church-oriented mass, without being aware of it, has lived and acted under the leadership and instructions of those individuals for whom the UAOC was not an end, but a means for the realization of their counter-revolutionary intentions. The weak efforts of this, however large, part of the believing church members to liberate themselves from these extra-church aims and influences have not, as we have seen from the report,¹⁵ achieved positive results. And in the process of time, the UAOC has deviated more and more toward a non-ecclesiastical orientation...¹⁶

Having acknowledged the "liberating" influence of Soviet ecclesiastical legislation, the resolution continued:

But after liberating itself from political-monarchical oppression, [the UAOC was not destined to become a true Christian Church, free and removed from peculiar nationalistic chauvinist politics (*politykanstvo*).¹⁷] This is a fact, because the UAOC was reborn during the political struggle, and it was revived and later led by people who had suffered defeat on the open political front and, having joined the church, intended to, and actually did, exploit it as an instrument for further struggle against the Soviet regime and hence also against the justice of the social revolution.

It was natural that the leading organs of the UAOC, from the VPTsR [All-Ukrainian Church Council] to the PTsR [parish church council], revealed themselves through clearly non-ecclesiastical actions of a nationalist-political, anti-Soviet, counter-revolutionary nature. The same can also be said of the clergy of all ranks, beginning with Metropolitan Lypkivsky. They preached from the church pulpit nationalistic political ideas that sharply disagreed with the ideology of the church and which, with respect to the Soviet regime, were counter-revolutionary and subversive (*antyderzhavni*).

“All this, accordingly, made the UAOC a synonym of counter-revolution in Ukraine . . . Under the circumstances, it was

completely logical that *autocephaly should become a symbol of Petliurite independence, that Ukrainization should be exploited as a means of inciting national enmity, and that conciliarism should transform itself into a demagogical means of political influence in order to reach the appointed end.*¹⁸

The “investigation of the personal composition of the clergy of the UAOC,” stated the resolution, revealed “quite a few men who had once taken an active part in the Petliurite military detachment” or “had simply been compromised in the past,” as well as “completely irreligious people, whose political, anti-Soviet intentions [*sic*] cannot raise any doubt . . . and all these people were largely in leading positions (*aktyv*).”

The Sobor finds with sorrow that Metropolitan V[asyl] Lypkivsky, [and Mykola] Pyvovariv, the All-Ukrainian *blahovisnyk*, V[olodymyr] Chekhivsky, and others took the path of nationalistic-political, counter-revolutionary, anti-Soviet activities [perpetrated] through the church.

Nor can one conceal the fact that the citizens of the Republic—in connection with the uncovering by the organs of the regime of the counter-revolutionary political organization “SVU,” which used the UAOC for its ends—consider our church a counter-revolutionary organization.

Hence, taking all this into account, the Extraordinary Sobor of the UAOC recognizes that, for the reasons stated above, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was a nationalist-political, counter-revolutionary organization of the “League for the Liberation of Ukraine.” *Therefore, the Extraordinary Sobor finds purposeless the further existence of the UAOC and regards it as liquidated. Accordingly the Sobor discontinues the activities of the directing organs: the VPTs, OTsR, RTsR, and PTsR,*¹⁹ *the Metropolitan ceases his spiritual*

*leadership over the UAOC, while the bishops of the UAPTs discontinue their spiritual leadership over the regional churches and remain as parochial servants of the cult (sviashchenodiiachi), along with the priests, in the registered parishes, which remain without being united in any church organization.*²⁰

A careful reading of the "Sobor's" resolution suggests the lack of any firm conviction on the part of its authors that the official charges (repeated in the resolution in much milder form) were *actually* true, hence the reference to the *past* and *intentions* of the leaders of the church, the public *impression*, and the attempt to differentiate between the "essentially church-oriented mass" and the "non-ecclesiastical *aktyv*" (cadres). Indeed, neither the resolution nor the official charges and their repetition in the obviously fake "confessions" at the SVU trial produced any objective evidence of the "counter-revolutionary and anti-Soviet *activities*" of the UAOC. As was demonstrated, however, by the long succession of Soviet "show trials" against the "wreckers," the party opposition, and other "enemies of the people," the absence of objective proof of guilt never restrained "revolutionary justice" from doing away with the suspected, potential, or simply imagined opponents of the regime.

The concluding passage of the "Sobor's" resolution, while declaring the dissolution of the All-Ukrainian Council and its intermediate and local counterparts, as well as the cessation of episcopal activities, significantly *leaves intact the individual parishes and their clergy* (now also including the bishops). It is likely that this was the concession offered by the authorities to the "Sobor" in exchange for its condemnation of the leadership of the UAOC and of the autocephalous ideology. Such condemnation *before* the SVU trial, coming from the church itself, "strengthened" the position of the prosecution; furthermore, it could be used in the future as a pretext for the liquidation of the surviving Ukrainian parishes and clergy.

"It was not Christ or the church that spoke through this Sobor, but the GPU," commented Lypkivsky. "Perhaps those bishops and clergy hoped, by insinuations against their church and its leaders, . . . to save the UAOC and themselves from the Bolshevik danger. But a lie is never a means to salvation, and a lie about the church is but an open betrayal of Christ (*khrystoprodavstvo*)."²¹

At the show trial of the "League for the Liberation of Ukraine," held from 9 March to 19 April 1930 in the Kharkiv Opera House, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church was assigned an essential role. Since the accused scholars and writers, by themselves, could hardly be presented as a dangerous group threatening the very existence of the regime, it had to be "shown" that they had at their disposal an organized

mass following and “military cadres” whom they planned to lead in armed rebellion against the Soviet regime. It was here that the UAOC was brought into the picture as the “link” between the SVU and the masses, “the main centre of the insurgent movement,” “the most reliable organizational backbone . . . and the mightiest agitation and propaganda apparatus of the SVU,” its “legal cover for maintaining military reserves.”²²

Among the forty-five defendants at the trial, the Autocephalous Church was “represented” by only three persons—Volodymyr Chekhivsky, introduced as the “leader of the so-called Ukrainian Autocephalous Church”; his brother, the priest Mykola Chekhivsky (a former officer in the Ukrainian Army); and another priest, Kostiantyn Tovkach, the head of the Poltava church council. The two first chairmen of the All-Ukrainian Council, Mykhailo Moroz and Vasyl Potiienko, appeared as witnesses for the prosecution.

Probably because of his past eminence as a socialist leader and premier of the Ukrainian Government, Volodymyr Chekhivsky was cast in the role of the evil spirit of the UAOC, through whom the SVU (as well as its predecessor, the BUD²³) allegedly had directed every move of the church. In what could have been a projection of its own *modus operandi*, the GPU alleged that Volodymyr Chekhivsky had headed a special secret five-member cell (*piatiorka*) “for church affairs” including his brother, Metropolitan Lypkivsky,²⁴ later “replaced” by Metropolitan Mykola Boretsky,²⁵ Archbishop Nestor Sharaivsky,²⁶ “and others.”²⁷ Accordingly, sinister and subversive motives were ascribed to all forms of the church’s activity. Especially singled out was the “harmful” activity of the church in the countryside, where the autocephalist clergy “disseminated national-political seed [consciousness], united national elements openly hostile to the Soviet regime around the church, and turned these elements against [the regime] and its measures.”²⁸ Indeed, as was pointed out by a contemporary Polish observer, it was the “unmasking” of the UAOC that climaxed the SVU trial. The “proven charges” against the church leadership could now be extended to include a broad stratum of the Ukrainian intelligentsia who, while not incriminated in any anti-Soviet activities, could be attacked for their past association with the UAOC.²⁹

The forty-one-day-long trial ended with seemingly mild sentences; none of the “repentant” defendants was condemned to execution (neither did any of them survive Soviet imprisonment).³⁰ But at the same time, during the years 1929–30, the GPU arrested and condemned thousands of prominent Ukrainians to deportation, imprisonment or death without even the doubtful benefit of a trial. Among them were several bishops of the UAOC (including Metropolitan Boretsky, Archbishops Iurii Zhevchenko and Kostiantyn Krotevych, and Bishops Mykola Pyvovaryv

and Volodymyr Dakhivnyk-Dakhivsky) and approximately one-half of the church's clergy,³¹ not to mention a large number of autocephalist laymen. While some bishops and priests sought to escape the repressions by renouncing the church and even the faith,³² more than three-quarters of the autocephalist parishes had been liquidated in one way or another by the second half of 1930.³³

A Substitute for the UAOC: The Ukrainian Orthodox Church

Nevertheless, despite such "successes" in liquidating the "ecclesiastical counter-revolution," the Soviet authorities apparently developed some second thoughts about the wisdom of the "Extraordinary Sobor's" decision (or rather, their own decision) to abolish all central organization and leadership in the Ukrainian Church. Immediately after the conclusion of the January "Sobor," an "All-Ukrainian Provisional Organization Church Committee" (VUTsTOK) was organized in Kharkiv under the leadership of Archbishop Ivan Pavlovsky.³⁴ Obviously with official blessing, the committee addressed a circular letter to some three hundred surviving Ukrainian parishes on 9 June 1930, "inviting" them to unite in a single church organization to participate in the planned "Second Extraordinary Church Sobor."³⁵ During November, the committee arranged a series of diocesan conferences which "elected" their bishops and clergy; the latter were requested to sign a declaration pledging unconditional loyalty to the regime and renouncing all political activity.³⁶

The "Second Extraordinary Sobor" of the UAOC met in Kiev on 9–12 December 1930, with the GPU, reportedly, again providing both "initiative" and "guidance."³⁷ The Sobor once again condemned the past activities and leadership of the UAOC and confirmed its "dissolution"; it then declared itself the Sobor of the "Ukrainian Orthodox Church," pointedly dropping the politically suspect term "Autocephalous" from the name of the "new" church.³⁸ The gathering "revised" the canons of the 1921 All-Ukrainian Sobor, removing those provisions that had been assailed by the regime as containing or "concealing" political significance. The conciliar principle (*sobornopravnist*) became one of the principal victims of this revision, which appears have been officially inspired. It seems that the regime's distrust of lay influence in church government outweighed its dislike of clericalism: indeed, the GPU had had less trouble in managing (and, if need be, corrupting) the autocephalist clergy than in dealing with the less vulnerable lay element, which had hitherto dominated the councils (*rad*y) of the church.³⁹ Accordingly, the new organizational scheme adopted by the December Sobor removed laymen from direct participation in ecclesiastical government, which was now centred in the episcopate; at the head of the

church now stood the Metropolitan of Kharkiv and All Ukraine,⁴⁰ who also headed the “new” All-Ukrainian Church Council, with its membership, however, limited to three priests.⁴¹ The surviving Ukrainian parishes were now gathered together in seven dioceses, each to be governed by a bishop assisted by two priests; together, they formed the diocesan council.⁴²

Archbishop Ivan Pavlovsky of Kharkiv was elevated to the post of Metropolitan, while Archbishop Kostiantyn Maliushkevych of Kiev was elected his deputy. The Sobor decided to resume association with the American diocese of the UAOC⁴³ and confirmed Ievhen Bachynsky as the official representative of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Western Europe.⁴⁴ It warned all members of the church, however, that “should anyone express in [his] ecclesiastical activities views hostile to the Soviet regime, he would harm the cause of the church and shall be subjected to ecclesiastical punishment.”⁴⁵ The same warning appeared in the new Metropolitan’s message to the American Ukrainian Orthodox Church, in which he urged: “Be faithful pupils of Christ and Apostles in your attitude toward the Soviet regime. Show it your good will and conscientiously carry out its directives.”⁴⁶ Needless to say, such an appeal provoked an indignant reaction on this side of the Atlantic and was rejected by the American church as unacceptable; indeed, the latter did not recognize the new “Ukrainian Orthodox Church,” viewing its new leaders as captives of the regime.⁴⁷

It is, of course, impossible to determine the precise reasons that led the Soviet authorities in Ukraine to stage, or at least to permit, the restoration of the “purified” and “loyal” Ukrainian Orthodox Church. The January 1930 “Extraordinary Sobor” might have been promised this concession to sway those participants who could not be intimidated to vote for the “self-liquidation” of the UAOC. Lypkivsky, on the other hand, suggested that the GPU found it difficult to scrutinize and control those isolated Ukrainian parishes which had survived the liquidation campaign of 1929–30:

Indeed, while the Bolshevik regime has subjected all its institutions to the strictest centralization, introduces the principle of a “single command” in all other establishments and most fears any particularism (*hrupovist*), the Ukrainian parishes found themselves in an anarchic state and became separate independent groups of population; moreover, this happened in a field most suspect from the Bolshevik point of view—the field of religion.... The GPU convokes [therefore] the second “Extraordinary Sobor” and there corrects its mistake, ... it posts a guard beside the grave of the UAOC in order to have in its hands certain organs and certain people who would be responsible for dead calm in the Ukrainian church.⁴⁸

The reversal on the question of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church coincided with the abatement of the general anti-religious campaign in the Soviet Union (which reached its peak in the winter of 1929–30, when thousands of churches of all denominations were closed), and with the slowing down of the forcible collectivization drive. Excesses on both the anti-religious and collectivization “fronts,” which had provoked widespread resentment among the masses and adverse public reaction outside the USSR, were now criticized by Stalin in his “Dizziness from Success” article⁴⁹ and were duly rehashed on the lower levels of the party and government hierarchy. It may be that the Soviet decision to “resurrect” the Ukrainian church was a by-product of this monumental, though rather short-lived, collective breast-beating. After all, the attacks on religion and individual agriculture were not criticized as such, but only the unreasonable speed and tactical errors in combating them.

The Slow Agony of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church

The tactical nature of Soviet “concessions” to the “new” Ukrainian Orthodox Church soon became apparent. The short lease on life granted it by the GPU proved only a prolonged agony for the church. The surviving Ukrainian parishes were burdened with extremely high taxes which impoverished and demoralized the faithful.⁵⁰ With more and more parishes finding it impossible to meet this exorbitant taxation, the total number of Ukrainian parishes fell to two hundred by 1933.⁵¹ Not long after the “Second Extraordinary Sobor,” the police resumed their arrests of Ukrainian bishops and clergy, driving some of them to repudiate the priesthood and even religion.

The few letters written abroad between 1933 and 1936 by the aging Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky (then living in abject poverty in a suburb of Kiev⁵² under constant police supervision) convey the anguish of the persecuted church. Writing on 5 June 1933, Lypkivsky reported:

... In the summer of 1930, Metropolitan Mykola Boretsky was deported to a Iaroslavl concentration camp, where he is still confined. Earlier, Archpriests L. Karpov and M. Khomichevsky were exiled to Vladivostok, while Archpriests Iu. Krasysky and D. Khodzitsky ... [were deported] to the North. ... In Kiev, Archbishop Maliushkevych [is] now in prison. ... Not more than two hundred parishes reportedly remain in [all] Ukraine. In Kiev seven parishes still exist. ... Bishops Stepan Orlyk, Iurii Zhevchenko, and Mykola Pyvovariv are in exile. Bishops Krotevych, Oksiuk, Dakhivnyk, Hrushevsky, Chulaivsky, Romodaniv, [and] Teslenko renounced their sacerdotal ranks and the church, and took government jobs. Many priests (including Moroz and Hoviadovsky ...) have also defrocked themselves. Only seven bishops continue their work and several

[bishops] (Mikhnovsky, Shyriai, [and] Samborsky) [serve] as parish priests;...the position of the Ukrainian church in Ukraine is very difficult....⁵³

On 13 December 1933, the Metropolitan wrote that

... [Archbishop] Maliushkevych has already renounced our church in the press as "counter-revolutionary" and received a state position.... Bishop Kalishevsky also resigned in the same way. Our church in Ukraine comes to nought;...only two parishes have remained [in Kiev],...but they are probably scheduled to be closed too. In general, only two bishops have retained their episcopal sees,...Karabinevych in Uman and Chervinsky in Vinnytsia, as well as [Metropolitan] Pavlovsky in Kharkiv; there are several bishops [serving as ordinary priests] in parishes (Samborsky, Maliarevsky, Bei, Serhiiv), but their turn, too, is coming....⁵⁴

By August 1934, only two Ukrainian parishes were still functioning in Kiev,⁵⁵ and in the autumn of that year only one remained intact, served by Metropolitan Pavlovsky, who moved to Kiev following the transfer of the Soviet Ukrainian capital there.⁵⁶ In the spring of 1936, even this single parish was closed by the authorities.⁵⁷

In one of his last letters (dated 7 September 1937) to reach a correspondent abroad, Metropolitan Lypkivsky reported on his conversation with the now retired Bishop Mikhnovsky.⁵⁸

Metropolitan Pavlovsky and Bishop Brzhosniovsky (lately he was in Kharkiv)—the last two diocesan bishops—were banished from Ukraine; it seems that no parishes have remained in Kiev or Kharkiv or any other city. He [Mikhnovsky] does not know, either, whether any [parishes] still exist in the villages, but one hears that all village churches have already been closed. An attempt is being made, with Bolshevik ruthlessness, to establish an areligious society in Ukraine....⁵⁹

The last Ukrainian parish was apparently liquidated sometime in 1936,⁶⁰ although as late as April 1939 the Ukrainian Godless claimed that some isolated or "disguised" autocephalist parishes still existed in Ukraine.⁶¹

In February 1938, the NKVD arrested Metropolitan Lypkivsky, who had been living in forced retirement since 1927.⁶² Taken to Kiev, he was either shot in prison or deported from Ukraine and met his death in exile, as he was never heard from again.⁶³ The man who had led the Ukrainian church movement, who had founded, headed, and personified the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church, was not spared the anguish of

witnessing the gradual destruction of his church. Symbolically, his departure from the scene brought to a close the last act in the tragedy of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church.⁶⁴

* * *

The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was a religious manifestation of a great surge of Ukrainian national consciousness which had begun with the nineteenth-century cultural revival and reached its political culmination in the revolution of 1917 and the subsequent struggle for an independent state. The revolutionary energies released by the events of 1917–19, although frustrated politically, were channelled into the cultural and spiritual renaissance of the 1920s until the latter was abruptly and brutally stopped by the massive terror applied against the Ukrainian cultural elite after 1929.

Throughout the 1920s, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church was perhaps the most important organized expression of the new urge of the Ukrainian people to reaffirm their own identity, to emancipate themselves from the forced status of a spiritual and cultural colony of Moscow, and freely to follow their own unique path of national development. This should not be taken to mean, however, that the UAOC was a predominantly secular phenomenon, alien to true religiousness. Although strongly affected by the national and social ideas of the Ukrainian Revolution, the Autocephalous Church was above all an outgrowth of and answer to the genuine religious needs of a large and important segment of the Ukrainian people. Lacking the canonical status enjoyed by the Russian Orthodox Church, the UAOC probably came closer to the Orthodox ideal of the Christianization of popular life. To its faithful, it offered a profound religious experience intensified by the use of a familiar language, national rites and the symbolism that was part of folk tradition. It was a popular church, free of rigid distinctions between priesthood and laity and drawing the latter into almost every phase of ecclesiastical functions and activities. The servants of this church knew apostolic poverty and encountered ridicule, calumnies, and persecution from both the atheist regime and the former established church. In common with other religious communities in the USSR, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church had its share of weaklings and defectors, but nevertheless contributed a disproportionately large number of martyrs during the years of anti-religious terror.

As a religious body, the UAOC was subjected to the same legal and administrative limitations and repressions as the other churches in the Soviet Union, but, unlike the others, was completely destroyed by the regime, which never again, even with the arrival of the wartime "religious NEP," allowed the restoration of the Ukrainian Autocephalous

Church. The reason evidently lies in the other facet of the UAOC—the fact that it was also a national institution embodying Ukrainian aspirations toward ecclesiastical and spiritual independence from Moscow.

Religious nationalism has not been the exclusive preserve of the Ukrainian church. An integral feature of national Orthodox churches, such nationalism has been an important element for centuries in Russian Orthodoxy, especially in its attitude toward the Russian state and the minority nationalities of the Empire. Indeed, the passionate identification of the Moscow church with the Russian national interest was not only accepted but came to be explicitly praised by the Soviet leadership after the late 1930s. In the final analysis, it was primarily Russian nationalism that provided the common ground for the paradoxical alliance between the Orthodox church and the Soviet state during and after World War II. Thus what was condemned as the chief vice of the Ukrainian church became, in the eyes of the Kremlin, the principal virtue of the Russian church—a double standard that became characteristic of Soviet nationality and religious policy in Ukraine.

Notes

¹ Thus the U.S. autocephalist journal *Dnipro* (1 May 1930, p. 3) reported, citing the Russian émigré newspaper *Za svobodu*: “An agreement has been signed between the Soviet Government and Metropolitan Sergii in connection with the re-establishment of a single authority over the Orthodox Church in all non-Russian Soviet republics.... According to this agreement (concordat), the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church will be completely liquidated and incorporated into the jurisdiction of Metropolitan Sergii.” Even if this had not been one of the provisions of the 1927 “concordat,” considerations of efficiency and the characteristic Soviet distrust of particularism could have suggested to the Kremlin the advisability of centralizing various Orthodox groups under a single state-controlled ecclesiastical centre.

² While it was only in January 1934 that Stalin officially declared “national deviation” to be the “main danger” in Ukraine, the new line in Soviet nationality policy in Ukraine had become apparent as early as 1926–7. See James E. Mace, *Communism and the Dilemmas of National Liberation: National Communism in Soviet Ukraine, 1918–1933* (Cambridge, Mass., 1983), 103–19.

³ Perhaps the chief exponent of this orientation was the Ukrainian writer Mykola Khvylovy (1893–1933), a national communist who urged that Ukrainian culture “run away from Moscow as quickly as possible” and orient

itself toward “ever-changing Europe” as symbolized by its Faustian “questioning spirit” (*Dumky proty techii* [Kharkiv, 1926], 123). On Stalin’s angry reaction to “Khvylovism,” see his 1926 letter to Lazar Kaganovich, published in I.V. Stalin, *Sochineniia* (Moscow, 1948), 8: 149–54.

⁴ On the Soviet attack upon the Ukrainian cultural and scientific elite from the late 1920s, see S. Nykolyshyn, *Kulturna polityka bolshevykiv i ukrainskyi kulturnyi protses* (n.p., 1947); George S. N. Luckyj, *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917–1934* (New York, 1956); N. Polonska-Vasylenko, *Ukrainska Akademiia Nauk*, 2 vols. (Munich, 1955–8); and Mace, 264–307.

⁵ See Luckyj, 154–6, 183–202; Polonska-Vasylenko, 2: 9–52; and F. Pigido, *Ukraina pid bolshevytskoiu okupatsiieiu* (Munich, 1956), 86–9.

⁶ M. Iavdas, *Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church* (Munich and Ingolstadt, 1956), 67, 86.

⁷ Among them was Mykola Chekhivsky, brother of the “All-Ukrainian *blahovisnyk*,” with whom he was destined to “represent” the UAOC among the defendants of the SVU trial in 1930 (*ibid.*, 177).

⁸ Iurii Samoilovich, *Tserkov ukrainskogo sotsial-fashizma* (Moscow, 1932), 121.

⁹ See “*Spilka Vyzvolennia Ukrainy*”: *Stenohrafichniy zvit sudovoho protsesu* (Kharkiv, 1931), 1: 168–9, 362, 419–20.

¹⁰ *Proletarska pravda*, 22 December 1929, cited in *Tryzub* 6, no. 5 (2 February 1930): 1–2.

¹¹ *Kommunist*, 6 February 1930, cited in Ihnatiuk, *Ukrainska avtokefalna tserkva i Soiuz Vyzvolennia Ukrainy* (Kharkiv and Kiev, 1930), 27.

¹² The lack of other than official Soviet data about this “Sobor” and the writer’s inability to locate even one surviving participant of this gathering (most of them were later deported or executed) make it extremely difficult to verify the relevant official accounts. All autocephalist writers as well as the writer’s informants from the circles of the UAOC agree that the “Sobor” was arbitrarily chosen and lacked representative character and that this gathering’s resolutions were dictated by the GPU, which terrorized the “delegates” into acceptance. On the other hand, allowance must, obviously, be made for opportunist and servile elements among those attending, including some members of the last All-Ukrainian Council and individual bishops, who involuntarily collaborated with the GPU in liquidating the church.

¹³ Although the “Sobor” ended on 29 January, the RATAU released its resolution only on 5 February, a delay that may have been associated with GPU attempts to “persuade” some of the autocephalist leaders to draw “logical” conclusions from the “Sobor’s” resolution. It does not seem coincidental that, simultaneously with the resolution, the Soviet press published Bishop Hrushevsky’s alleged renunciation of his episcopal office, church, and faith:

"The church has been only a tool in the hands of the counter-revolutionaries in their struggle against the Soviet revolution, and religion a means of reaction and counter-revolution. Any honest man should struggle against religion in the interests of the socialist society (*hromadianstvo*). I renounce the episcopal dignity and relinquish the leadership of the church [Hrushevsky was the last secretary of the All-Ukrainian Council], and forever break with religion" (*Proletarska pravda*, 5 February 1930, cited in *Visti VUTsVK*, 6 February 1930, 2). According to Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky's *Istoriia Ukrainskoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy, Rozdil VII: Vidrozhennia Tserkvy v Ukraini* (Winnipeg, 1961), 173, other members of the last Council, such as Bishops Romodaniv and Chulaivsky, and the priests Hoviadovsky and Koliada, also published similar renunciations after the "Sobor."

¹⁴ Thus the GPU's case had been "proven" even *before* the trial of the SVU took place.

¹⁵ A reference to the self-damning report of the last Council read to the "Sobor" by the former's chairman, Leontii Iunakiv.

¹⁶ *Visti VUTsVK*, 6 February 1930, 2.

¹⁷ A typical example of the standard Soviet argument that no truly religious organizations have ever been persecuted in the USSR.

¹⁸ *Visti VUTsVK*, 6 February 1930, 2. Emphasis added. The last sentence points to the principal Soviet motives for the liquidation of the UAOC.

¹⁹ Initials of the All-Ukrainian, regional, district, and parish church councils, respectively.

²⁰ *Visti VUTsVK*, 6 February 1930, 2. Emphasis added.

²¹ Lypkivsky, *Istoriia*, 170–71.

²² *Visti VUTsVK*, 2 March 1930, 2, and *Pravda*, 11 and 19 March 1930.

²³ The initials stand for the *Bratstvo ukrainskoi derzhavnosti* (Brotherhood of Ukrainian Statehood), a nationalist underground organization allegedly in existence from 1920 to 1924.

²⁴ Paradoxically, Metropolitan Lypkivsky, so much abused in the accusations against the UAOC, was not arrested at this time or brought in as a witness at the SVU trial. It might be that his popularity among the believers or his remarkable capacity to withstand the "conditioning" of the GPU was the reason for this "omission"; at no time was the GPU able to extract any "confession" from the old Metropolitan. This is what Lypkivsky wrote in 1930 about the SVU trial: "The GPU itself invented or perhaps indeed found some political circle—SVU. . . . With this SVU, the GPU aimed at the liquidation of 'Petliurism' and in general it also attached to this case the UAOC, in order to liquidate the latter."

²⁵ Charges against Metropolitan Boretsky, who "presided" over the "Extraordinary Sobor" and was spared in its resolution, appeared only at the trial. Shortly afterward, he was arrested by the GPU and deported to the

Iaroslavl *politizoliator* and later to the Solovetskii Islands concentration camp. He has not been heard from since 1935. Iavdas, *Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church*, 58.

²⁶ Sharaivsky, removed from his diocese by the 1927 Sobor, died in poverty in 1929.

²⁷ According to his wife, V. Chekhivsky was never a member of the SVU and was brought to trial only to "justify" the liquidation of the UAOC. *Pravoslavnyi Ukrainets*, no. 19 (February 1954): 3–5.

²⁸ *Pravda*, 28 February 1930.

²⁹ Jerzy S. Langrod, *O autokefalii prawosławnej w Polsce* (Warsaw, 1931), 124.

³⁰ V. Chekhivsky was sentenced to ten years of "strict isolation," while his brother and Tovkach were given terms of three and five years respectively.

³¹ Lypkivsky, 169.

³² *Dnipro*, 1 July 1930, 1.

³³ According to Lypkivsky (*Istoriia*, 173), some 300 autocephalist parishes survived the 1930 "liquidation" (out of approximately 1,100 in 1928).

³⁴ Metropolitan Pavlovsky's letter to Ievhen Bachynsky of 25 February 1931 (Bachynsky's archive, Bulle, Switzerland). VUTsTOK was formally "legalized" only in June 1930 (Samoilovich, 123).

³⁵ *Dnipro*, 1 August 1930.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 15 June 1931, 2.

³⁷ Lypkivsky, *Istoriia*, 173. In his letter of 5 June 1933, Lypkivsky observes that the "Ukrainian Orthodox Church is in fact the very same 'Active' [Church]" which existed during the mid-twenties. He was not a member of the new church's clergy. *Lysty Mytropolyta Vasylia Lypkivskoho do o. Petra Maievskoho... vid 1933 do 1937* (Los Angeles, 1953), 3.

³⁸ Samoilovich, 123.

³⁹ This, incidentally, has been a consistent Soviet policy since the late 1920s. Witness, for example, the autocratic character of the Patriarchal administration after Metropolitan Sergii's compromise with the regime in 1927, the narrowing of the membership of the 1943 Sobor of the Russian Orthodox Church to bishops only, as well as the curtailment of lay influence in parish administration under the new statute (*polozhenie*) of the Russian church, adopted, obviously with prior Soviet approval, by the Local Sobor of 1945.

⁴⁰ Significantly, the Sobor "voted" to transfer the Metropolitan see and the centre of the church to Kharkiv, then the capital of the Ukrainian SSR. Only in 1934, when the latter was transferred to Kiev, did the centre of the church move back to this historical, religious, and cultural capital of Ukraine.

⁴¹ It seems that the All-Ukrainian Council had now been reduced to a subordinate status.

⁴² *Dnipro*, 15 January 1934; Lypkivsky, *Istoriia*, 174.

⁴³ Contacts between the All-Ukrainian Council and the American branch of the UAOC, somewhat strained since the 1927 Sobor, were interrupted in the summer of 1929 when the GPU suppressed the council's activities. Attempts on the part of VUTsTOK and Metropolitan Pavlovsky to bring the American diocese back into the UOC were eventually rebuffed by Archbishop Ioann Teodorovych, who would not accept the validity of the January 1930 "Sobor" (Pavlovsky's letters to Teodorovych of 13 June 1930 and 24 March 1931; Teodorovych's letter to Bachynsky of 24 June 1931; Bachinsky Archive, Special Collections, Carleton University Library).

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, Pavlovsky's letter to Bachynsky of 25 February 1931.

⁴⁵ *Dnipro*, 15 June 1931, 2.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ Similar requests, including signed declarations of *loyalty* to the Soviet regime, had been addressed by the Moscow Patriarchate to those Russian émigré bishops who recognized the Patriarchate's jurisdiction while remaining *outside* the USSR.

⁴⁸ Lypkivsky, *Istoriia*, 173–4.

⁴⁹ *Pravda*, 2 March 1930.

⁵⁰ For example, to quote Archpriest Demyd Burko, "by the end of 1932 the parish [of St. Sophia in Kiev] was burdened with a tax of 10,000 rubles, and when it had paid this sum with difficulty, it was taxed three months later to the extent of 20,000 rubles" ("Z knyhy buttia Ukrainskoi Tserkvy," *Ridna Tserkva*, no. 21 [1956]: 5).

⁵¹ Lypkivsky's letter of 5 June 1933 to Rev. P. Maievsky in *Lysty Mytropolyta*.

⁵² In the autumn of 1934, apparently in connection with the "passportization" action, Metropolitan Lypkivsky and his two sisters, who then supported him, were expelled from Kiev to the nearby village of Aleksandrivska Sloboda (*Lysty Mytropolyta*, 20–21).

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 3. Hrushevsky actually died in February 1930, about the time "his" renunciation was published.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁵⁵ Letter of 28 August 1934, *ibid.*, 20.

⁵⁶ Letter of 14 December 1934, *ibid.*, 14.

⁵⁷ Letter of 15 June 1936, *ibid.*, 30.

⁵⁸ Shot in 1939. Earlier, the NKVD executed the following bishops: Karabinevych (1934), Chulaivsky (1936), Samborsky (1936), and P. Tarnavsky (1938) ("Informatsiina zapyska pro Pravoslavnu Tserkvu na Ukraini," 14 August 1945 [Mimeographed]).

⁵⁹ *Lysty Mytropolyta*, 35–6.

⁶⁰ One of the last Ukrainian parishes to be closed was that in Kharkiv. On 23 January 1936, its priest, Mykyta Kokhno, was tried in Kharkiv together with three other autocephalist leaders. All defendants were sentenced to long terms in exile (Iavdas, *Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church*, 93).

⁶¹ Speaking at the All-Union Conference convoked by the Central Council of the League of the Militant Godless on 22 April 1939, the representative of the League's Ukrainian Organization, G. Motuzko, declared that "the Autocephalous Church nevertheless continues to exist up to the present time. We cannot say that this is a mass phenomenon, but the Ukrainian autocephalist priests do exist and there are not a few churches where mass is being celebrated largely in Ukrainian. Not a few Ukrainian churches, where masses were previously celebrated in the Ukrainian language, have now adopted [Church] Slavonic and joined the Synodical [Renovationist] or the Tikhonite Church; but this is only external camouflage for the Petliurite clergy..." (G. Motuzko, "O religioznykh organizatsiakh," *Antireligioznik*, 5 [1939]: 21). It is remotely possible that in 1939 some isolated Ukrainian parishes were still in existence in Ukraine, but more likely these could have been the parishes which, having joined one of the other two Orthodox factions, retained some elements of the Ukrainian language in the church service and sermons. On the other hand, Motuzko could have been paying lip service to the current line of "not underestimating the tenacity of religious survivals." Some factual errors appearing in his report throw even more doubt on his reliability. At any rate, not a single Ukrainian parish was found to be in existence when the Germans invaded Ukraine in 1941. Ukrainian writers on the whole accept 1936 as the date of the closing of the last Ukrainian Orthodox parish.

⁶² Until 1930, the Metropolitan worked on a history of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, the manuscript of which (with a brief postscript written in 1932 or 1933) was saved from the police by his sister. Only Chapter VII of this work, dealing with the Ukrainian autocephalist movement and the UAOC from 1917 to 1930, has reached Ukrainians abroad and was first published in 1959. Between 1933 and 1937, the Metropolitan was engaged in correspondence with Father P. Maievsky of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Canada, to whom he had sent in 1934 a series of sermons which appeared (in mimeographed form) in 1934–5 in Winnipeg under the title "Slovo Khrystove do Ukrainskoho Narodu. Propovidi na nedili i sviata tsiloho roku."

⁶³ *Materiialy do Pateryka Ukrainskoi Avtokefalnoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy* (Munich, 1951), 22–3.

⁶⁴ In 1941 only 270 autocephalist priests and two bishops could be located in Ukraine (Iavdas, *Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church*, 179).

THE BIRTH OF A DIRECTOR: THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF LES KURBAS AND HIS FIRST SEASON WITH THE YOUNG THEATRE

Les Kurbas was the Ukrainian theatre director who created the Berezhil, one of the most exciting, innovative and revolutionary theatres in Europe in the 1920s. This article concerns itself with Kurbas's early career and explores his development into a director. It traces his background, the theatrical environment in Ukraine and the new European theories of theatre which shaped his ideas. The article also examines his earliest theatrical involvement, culminating with his work during the first season at the Young Theatre, which he established in 1917.

Kurbas's Childhood and the Ruska Besida

Oleksander Stepanovych (Les) Kurbas was born on 25 February 1887 in Sambir in Western Ukraine.¹ He came from a theatrical family. His father, Stepan Kurbas (1862–1908), was a popular actor of the 1890s, playing under the stage name Stepan Ianovych. His mother, an actress, played under the name Vanda Ianovycheva. Both parents worked at the Ruska Besida, the leading Ukrainian theatrical troupe in Western Ukraine.

The Ruska Besida, formed in 1864, was the first professional Ukrainian theatre troupe. Like all Ukrainian troupes of the nineteenth century, it did not have its own theatre, but rather toured throughout Western Ukraine. Its repertoire consisted of a variety of Western and Eastern Ukrainian plays, melodramas and operettas, along with Ukrainian translations or adaptations of European plays, operettas and operas.² The sets and costumes at the Ruska Besida, as in other provincial touring troupes, were relatively meagre. The success of the production depended mainly on individual performances. The actors

rarely had any formal theatrical training and led a rather poor nomadic life, but the variety of the repertoire helped them develop a very flexible style.³ The troupe also often crossed paths with German and Polish touring troupes and, therefore, had some contact with trends in European theatre as they were interpreted by these provincial troupes.

Stepan Ianovych, Les Kurbas's father, was one of the leading actors of the Ruska Besida. In 1891 the theatre sent him for a month to Eastern Ukraine to observe Marko Kropyvnytsky's theatre troupe and study his method of production.⁴ In the mid-1890s Ianovych staged a number of plays at the Ruska Besida, including several premières of the plays of Ivan Franko, the leading writer of Western Ukraine. Ianovych also staged Franko's translation of Calderón's *The Mayor of Zalamea*.⁵ As an actor, Stepan Ivanovych was best remembered for his portrayal of Mykhailo Hurman in Franko's *Ukradene shchastia* (Stolen Happiness).

When Les was still a child, his father was forced to retire from the stage because of ill health. The family moved in with Les's paternal grandfather, who supported them. The grandfather, a clergyman, did not look kindly on his son's theatrical career. He considered Les's education a priority, seeing it as insurance against the grandchild's interest in the theatre. Initially, Les was educated at home, then at a gymnasium in Ternopil. Les had a gift for languages: he spoke Ukrainian, Russian, Polish, and German, and had a reading knowledge of English, French, Italian, and Norwegian.⁶ Because of this he was able to read most of the European literary and dramatic classics in the original.

As an adolescent Les also tried his hand at writing. In 1906, *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk* (Literary-Scientific Herald), the leading journal of Western Ukraine, published his short story "V horiachtsi" (In a Fever) under the pen name Zenon Myslevych.⁷ Les also played the piano, sang and recited poetry at school concerts, and drew cartoons for the school newspaper.⁸

Theatre was Les's real passion, but he had to hide the fact from his family. In 1907, after graduating from the gymnasium, Les secretly applied to the Ruska Besida for financial assistance to pay for studies in a theatrical school. His appeal was rejected for lack of funds.⁹

Vienna and the New European Theatre Movement

In the autumn of 1907 the family sent Les to study at the University of Vienna. He enrolled in classes of German and Slavic literature and linguistics and also studied Sanskrit. Away from home Kurbas was free to pursue his theatrical interests, and Vienna opened a new world of theatre for him.

At the pinnacle of Viennese theatrical life stood the Imperial Burgtheater and its leading actor, Josef Kainz (1858–1910). He had been a member of the Meiningen Players, the most respected theatre company in the world in the 1870s and 80s. In 1883 Kainz led the company of the Deutsches Theater when it became the first theatre in Germany to adopt a more realistic manner of theatrical presentation.¹⁰ In the first decade of the twentieth century Kainz was one of Vienna's most venerated actors, famous for his portrayals of Mark Antony and Hamlet.¹¹ Kurbas often watched Kainz's performances in Shakespeare and Schiller tragedies at the Burgtheater, and also attended his lectures at the Dramatic Academy.¹²

Valerii Inkizhinov, Meyerhold's long-time assistant, who directed several shows at Kurbas's theatre in the 1920s, claims that:

It was from [Kainz] that [Kurbas] acquired a very important wellspring of creativity which is characteristic of the Western spiritual world: precision and a logical path into the unknown. [Easterners] usually get intoxicated with just the seed of a role and only later, in the process of the work, arrive at rational moments. The German school differs in that the direction is exactly opposite. Only having perceived the logic of an image did the masters of the great era of German theatre allow themselves to express their temperament bravely.¹³

While Kurbas absorbed important lessons about the art of acting as he watched Kainz's productions, it was the writings of such major twentieth-century theatre artists and theoreticians as Gordon Craig and Georg Fuchs and the work of the director Max Reinhardt that planted the artistic and intellectual seeds which would enable Kurbas to become one of the most innovative directors of his time.

In order to understand Kurbas's development as a director and to situate his ideas within the framework of modern theatrical thought, we need a basic grasp of the seminal ideas that revolutionized stage practice and gave birth to modernism in the theatre.

The general trend in the nineteenth century had been toward ever greater realism in theatrical production. In the earlier part of the century, the major focus of the production was the star's performance in

the play. Stars staged productions and often cut or rewrote scripts to meet their demands. Toward the end of the century the independent theatre movement in Europe, led by such theatres as Antoine's Théâtre Libre (1887) in Paris and Brahm's Freie Bühne (1889) in Berlin, pushed realism to an extreme. They introduced naturalistic drama to European audiences and established the dominance of the text in the theatre.¹⁴

In the first years of the twentieth century, a new movement arose which rejected naturalism, historical realism, the rational spirit and the dominance of literature in theatre, and instead embraced theatricality—a heightened sense of the formal aspects of theatre. The major proponents of this new art movement were Adolphe Appia, Georg Fuchs, and Gordon Craig. The theoretical writings of these three men, rather than their actual practice, gave shape to the theatre as we know it today and helped establish the idea that the theatre production is an independent work of art, the product of a single vision—that of the director.

The Swiss designer Adolphe Appia (1862–1928) was enchanted by Wagner's music and concept of "total theatre," but disappointed in the actual standard stagings of the operas. He opposed the use of painted realistic scenery and felt that "giving the illusion of reality is the negation of art."¹⁵ Instead, he designed three-dimensional architectural sets intended to convey the "rhythmic geometry" of space, rather than literal representation. His sets were "monumental designs of walls and steps sculpted in light and shadows."¹⁶ Appia reminded directors that the living, mobile body of the actor on stage had to be a primary consideration, and explained his famous formulation "actor—space—light" in the following way:

There are two primordial conditions for any artistic presence of the human body on stage: lighting that will enhance the body's plasticity, and a plastic configuration of the setting such that will enhance the body's posture and movements.¹⁷

Appia believed that one person, the director, should have control over all the elements of a production if it was to be a work of art. His work with Emile Jacques Dalcroze (1865–1960), who created a system of training based on movement to music called "eurythmics," convinced Appia that rhythm was the primary force of theatre. Although Appia started publishing his revolutionary ideas in 1895, general recognition of his work did not come until he began to stage Wagner's operas in the 1920s.

Georg Fuchs (1868–1949), a German director, critic and theorist, was the author of numerous articles and the books *The Theatre of the Future* (1905) and *Revolution in the Theatre* (1909). His motto was "*Rethéâtraliser le théâtre!*" and he called for a theatre "freed from the

yoke of literature.”¹⁸ Fuchs believed that “the written drama is no more than a score” and that the essence of drama is “rhythmic movement of the body in space.” He opposed naturalistic detail and felt that “every artistic solution of a theatre problem should lead to a drastic reduction of scenic paraphernalia and make use of the minimum of representation.”¹⁹ In 1907 Fuchs founded the Munich Art Theatre, where he tried to put his theories into practice.

Gordon Craig (1872–1966) was an English director, designer and theatre theorist. Although he completed only seven mature productions, he was the first director to realize the importance of publication to promote new trends.²⁰ His books, *The Art of the Theatre* (1905), *On the Art of the Theatre* (1911), *Towards a New Theatre* (1913), and *The Theatre Advancing* (1919), which were widely translated and read all over Europe, established Craig as the major proponent of the new art theatre movement.

Craig opposed realism as “the blunt statement of life, something everybody misunderstands, while recognizing.”²¹ He felt that “Realism is only Exposure, whereas Art is Revelation.”²² Realistic acting had turned the actor into an artless imitator:

The best [today’s actor] can do when he wants to catch and convey the poetry of a kiss, the heat of a fight, or the calm of death, is to copy slavishly, photographically—he kisses—he fights—he lies back and mimics death—and, when you think of it, is not all this dreadfully stupid? Is it not a poor art and a poor cleverness which cannot convey the spirit and essence of an idea to the audience, but can only show an artless copy, a facsimile of the thing itself? This is to be an imitator, not an artist.

[Actors] must create for themselves a new form of acting, consisting for the main part of symbolic gesture. Today they *impersonate* and interpret; tomorrow they must *represent* and interpret; and the third day they must create. By this means style may return.²³

Craig called for a highly stylized approach to acting which would go beyond appearances to the essence of drama. He felt that “to conventionalize life’s movements and sounds is to create a new kind of life, and in [his] opinion, that [was] the whole reason for the existence of the artist.”²⁴

In his most controversial essay, “The Actor and the Über-Marionette,” Craig suggested that theatre can only become an art if actors are replaced by super-puppets or über-marionettes. “The über-marionette will not compete with life—rather it will go beyond it.” Craig also insisted that the director must have total control of the production, since he felt that “it [was] impossible for a work of art ever to be produced where more than one brain is permitted to direct.”²⁵

Craig wanted the director to be more than a mere illustrator of the written text and believed that:

When [the director] interprets the plays of the dramatist by means of his actors, his scene-painters, and his other craftsmen, then he is a craftsman—a master craftsman; when he will have mastered the uses of actions, words, line, color, and rhythm, then he may become an artist. Then we shall no longer need the assistance of the playwright—for our art will then be self-reliant.²⁶

As a designer Craig favoured architectural sets which could suggest various places of action. His set designs were somewhat reminiscent of Appia's in that they usually consisted of monumental walls and steps, but Craig wanted to shift the configuration of the screen walls during the show to suggest changes of location and mood.

Although Craig, Fuchs and Appia are considered the major proponents of the new movement in theatre, they are remembered primarily for their ideas and influence on other artists. Max Reinhardt's productions, however, gave life to the ideas of the new movement in theatre and introduced them to the general public.

Reinhardt (1873–1943) was a native Viennese who worked mostly in Berlin at the beginning of the twentieth century. A prolific director, he embraced stylistic experimentation. "Everything is welcome to me," he wrote, "that is apt to multiply the undreamt-of potentialities of the theatre."²⁷ Believing that every play required its own style, Reinhardt directed everything from small intimate productions of Strindberg to huge extravaganzas with casts of hundreds. He strove to control every element of the production, demanded technical perfection, and "worked with set designers with strong creative imaginations."²⁸

In the first decade of the twentieth century, Reinhardt's most acclaimed production was that of Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream*. A closer look at one aspect of it can probably best illustrate how the new theories affected theatrical productions.

Reinhardt's designer for this show, Gustav Knina, created a three-dimensional forest scene with real-looking trees, grass, hills, and even a pond, which he mounted on a revolve.

As the forest began slowly to turn, ever new perspectives were revealed—of trees, hillocks and a little lake—and leaping through the forest were green-clad elves and sprites, no longer actors set before a backcloth but an integral part of a complete picture.²⁹

The audience was enchanted by the beauty of the production. As the Austrian critic Rudolph Kommer noted:

Full of life, color, music and joy, it had a message that did away in one evening with all the voluptuous pessimism and sordidness of the preceding fifteen or twenty years of naturalism.³⁰

The beauty of the set depended on a tension between the realistic elements of the forest scene and the sense of its artifice created by the fact that it turned.

Reinhardt's use of stage machinery in this production introduced a revolutionary concept into the theatre. Machinery had been used in the theatre for centuries but nearly always to create spectacular illusory effects, remarkable imitations of real events. But a real forest does not turn; by placing his set on a revolve, Reinhardt drew attention to its artificiality. Thus, although part of the delighted response of the spectator was to the realistic illusion of a forest, at the same time the audience derived pleasure from seeing this 'real' forest put on display as a work of art.³¹

Max Reinhardt's innovative use of the set clearly indicated that the theatre director had now joined other modernist artists in exploring how the formal aspects of an art could communicate ideas about life and reveal hidden perspectives of reality, instead of merely illustrating a part of life. By openly manipulating a formal aspect of the theatre the director created a strong visual image that could express his concept of the play.

Les Kurbas was enchanted by the the new world of European theatre revealed to him in Vienna. According to his university roommate, he read the newest plays, theatre books and journals, and spent almost every night in the theatre. Although Kurbas was still dreaming of a career as an actor,³² he was actually acquiring the theoretical base for his growth as a director.

Kurbas was most impressed by the rich diversity of Max Reinhardt's opulent spectacles and stylish classics.³³ The new theories of Gordon Craig and Georg Fuchs, which he read at this point, would prove to be a major influence on his work, although they did not provide him with a ready-made system for practical application. It would take years for their influence to be fully revealed in his productions. This article traces only the early stages of Kurbas's assimilation and first application of these ideas. Eventually, Kurbas would build on these ideas and create his own theories of theatre while working at the Berezil in the 1920s and 30s.

Kurbas's Work in the Western Ukrainian Theatre

After a year abroad, Kurbas returned to Western Ukraine to attend his father's funeral. He enrolled at the University of Lviv, where at first he studied both Ukrainian and German literature, concentrating subsequently on German literature and linguistics. His library from this period, now preserved at the Ternopil Museum of Regional Studies, suggests that at this point Kurbas was also interested in the history of art and the ancient literatures of Babylon, Egypt and the Orient.³⁴

In Lviv Kurbas aggressively pursued his interest in theatre. Early in 1909 he joined one of the most active amateur groups in Western Ukraine, the Sokil Theatre Group.³⁵ The group had a good reputation and provided Kurbas with his first practical experience in theatre. He appeared as an actor in a number of productions, receiving favourable reviews. The theatre, however, lacked a competent director. Iryna Volytska, a young Soviet scholar who has researched Kurbas's earliest work, writes that:

The notices [in the press] about the productions constantly underline the lack of connection between the actors, the lack of a unifying element to the separate scenes or episodes, and the sluggishness of the shows, whose tempo is graphically compared to a ride on an ox team across the Ukrainian steppes.³⁶

Kurbas's experience with the Sokil Theatre probably provoked him to try his own hand at directing.

In the autumn of 1909 Kurbas organized a student theatre group at the university. He directed and played the leading role in the group's first production, Evgenii Chirikov's *The Hebrews*, which was sponsored by the Yad Khalusim Jewish association³⁷ and opened on 23 November 1909 at a Polish hall in Lviv. Kurbas's first directorial effort was well applauded, and the Jewish section of the audience even offered him a laurel wreath.³⁸ Iryna Volytska suggests that the production was a greater success for Kurbas in terms of acting than of direction. However, the student theatre group did not draw such distinctions, and elected Kurbas its director after the opening of the play.³⁹

Kurbas was next planning to stage his own translation of a German play, Max Halbe's *Youth*, but that spring he joined student protesters who were demanding a university with Ukrainian as the language of instruction. In July the protest turned into a riot; one of the students was killed.⁴⁰ Les was among the hundreds of students arrested and expelled from school. The investigation of the incident lasted more than a year, and Kurbas, like the others, was not allowed to study or work. The expulsion not only cut short his formal education, but also eliminated any future in the academy. He now turned his full attention to the

theatre.

At first Kurbas joined the Hutsul Theatre troupe.⁴¹ The Hutsuls, an isolated mountain people dwelling in the westernmost part of Ukraine, had maintained their folk culture well into the twentieth century. In 1909 Hnat Khotkevych, a writer and folklorist who lived with the Hutsuls, staged a play with them about a local outlaw. The production's success led to the formation of the Hutsul Theatre troupe. Unlike many of the ethnographic theatres that peddled stereotypical images of happy peasants, the members of the Hutsul Theatre portrayed their own culture on stage. Khotkevych wrote that his amateur actors "did not separate life from the stage; at no point did they stop being themselves."⁴²

Kurbas was drawn to the company by memories of a hike through the Hutsul area. He had been enthralled by the beauty of the ancient customs he witnessed.⁴³ Now he joined the Hutsul troupe as an administrator and actor. At the time, acting was considered a very unusual career for someone with a university education: most actors had little, if any, formal schooling. At the Hutsul Theatre, most of the actors were illiterate and someone had to read them the script while they memorized it.⁴⁴

In the latter half of 1912, Kurbas was invited to join the Ruska Besida, where he played the romantic leads in a number of Ukrainian plays, including that of Mykhailo Hurman' in Franko's *Stolen Happiness*. He also appeared there in the first Ukrainian productions of Chekhov's *Uncle Vania* (as Astrov), Gorky's *Lower Depths* (Pepel), and Tolstoi's *The Living Corpse* (Karenin).

Even at this early stage of his career Kurbas was showing interest in exploring new directions. Les Taniuk, who has had access to Kurbas's personal correspondence and notes, writes that at the time

[Kurbas] dreams of open-air spectacles in a natural setting. He dreams of staging a cycle of Chekhov's plays using the music of I[gor] Stravinsky, C[laude] Debussy and M[aurice] Ravel. He dreams of Sophocles and Aeschylus, of productions on a grand scale, and with striking pageantry. He thinks of staging the Hindu "Veda," of staging renderings of "The Song of Roland" and "The Tale of Ihor's Campaign."⁴⁵

But such projects were not possible at the Ruska Besida. Iosyp Stadnyk, the troupe's director, did not understand Kurbas's ambitious ideas and felt that Kurbas knew nothing of the realities of running a theatre. "If one listened to Kurbas," Stadnyk would say, "the theatre would soon collapse."⁴⁶

While at the Ruska Besida, Kurbas met several young actors who also were unhappy with current stage practices in Ukrainian theatre. In

1914 Kurbas, together with Hnat Iura, Semen Semdor and Favst Lopatynsky, began planning a new "Europeanized" Ukrainian theatre. The group sent letters to a number of prominent actors they hoped to engage in their endeavour. In one of the letters Kurbas wrote:

A group of the better actors from the Western Ukrainian Theatre in Lviv, together with several artists from Ukrainian and Russian troupes, have been considering and evaluating the situation of the contemporary Ukrainian theatre in Russia and have arrived at the conclusion that the only hope for it is the establishment of a model Ukrainian theatre whose repertoire would not be limited to old-style Ukrainian plays, but which, throwing completely overboard the old "whiskey-hopak" [pseudoethnographic] ballast, would stage a thoroughly artistic repertoire of modern and classical plays, no matter in which language they were originally written. Therefore, we want to play in Ukrainian [the works of] Shakespeare, Ibsen, Schiller, and also [those of] our own Vynnychenko, Oles, Lesia Ukrainka, etc. And almost nothing from the old ethnographic repertoire used by contemporary Ukrainian troupes.⁴⁷

In his letter the new "Europeanized" theatre is defined primarily in terms of repertoire. The group seems to have hoped to form a classic literary repertory theatre, probably along the lines of the Burgtheater in Vienna. However, as we have seen, Kurbas's notebooks reveal that he was already dreaming of even larger changes, of a more conceptual direction to production. It is not clear whether he revealed his dreams to the other actors at the time. Even if he had, they would not necessarily have understood or shared his ideas, as later experience would prove.

In the summer of 1914 Kurbas left the Ruska Besida with his group and started rehearsals, but the plans for a new artistic direction were never realized. Before the group could open its first production, the First World War broke out, and the Russian army soon occupied much of Western Ukraine. Most Ukrainian cultural organizations were abolished, and strict censorship was imposed on all theatrical performances.

Despite its early successes, the Russian army was soon pushed back just west of Ternopil, where the front line remained until 1916. During the summer of 1915, the Russian occupation administration relaxed its harsh treatment of Ukrainians in order not to antagonize the local population any further.⁴⁸ Ukrainian cultural organizations were once again permitted to exist and censorship was somewhat relaxed. In September 1915 Kurbas found himself in Ternopil, which remained under Russian control. Taking advantage of the new cultural policies, he organized a theatre group called the Ternopilski teatralni vechory (Ternopil's Theatrical Evenings), which presented a season of standard

Ukrainian plays. Kurbas was not only artistic director but also director, composer, music director and even choreographer of many of the productions.⁴⁹ The group's first production was Kotliarevsky's *Natalka Poltavka*, which opened on 18 October 1915.

Although the Ternopil Theatrical Evenings staged mostly standard Ukrainian plays, Kurbas continued to dream of forming a truly modern Ukrainian theatre. He often gave lectures on theatre and art to his actors, trying to instill in them the idea that theatre can be more than mere entertainment.

Theatre is the temple of art and it should educate and be a sacred school for the masses.⁵⁰

In this statement Kurbas voiced the populist idea of the educational value of theatre, which was accepted in the better contemporary Ukrainian theatre troupes. At the same time he used the phrase "temple of art," an expression often employed by the proponents of the art theatre movement of Europe. In this single phrase, Kurbas tried to combine the ideas of the new art theatre with the best of the traditional Ukrainian theatre. Teofil Demchuk, one of the actors of the Ternopil troupe, writes that Kurbas often spoke of Reinhardt and the new theatre of Europe:

We too [he would add] have to form a theatre which would [stand on] an equal footing with foreign theatres. However, in our present circumstances we can, and even must, show on stage mostly plays from the ethnographic repertoire, with singing and dancing, to satisfy the cultural hunger of the mass spectator in gray overcoats. Moreover, we have to fit within the limitations of censorship.⁵¹

A natural educator, Kurbas spent much time with the youngest actors of the troupe, advising them on their particular roles and urging them to broaden their cultural horizons. Although he was the troupe's leading actor, he often took part in mass scenes in order to encourage the young actors.

According to Teofil Demchuk, the best production at the Ternopil Theatrical Evenings was Kurbas's staging of Volodymyr Vynnychenko's *Chorna pantera i bilyi vedmid* (The Black Panther and the White Bear), one of the few exceptions to the troupe's standard repertoire of ethnographic plays.⁵² This modern Ukrainian psychological play explored the tensions between a painter's work and his family. The novelty of an urban setting, subtle psychological portrayals, harsh conflict and the famous tango scene helped make this the group's most popular production. Kurbas would stage this play again with even greater success at the Young Theatre in Kiev.

Demchuk also writes that Kurbas spoke of staging such world classics as *Macbeth* and *Oedipus Rex*, but was not able to produce them at this point. However, the troupe managed to present 30 full-length plays during Kurbas's short tenure as artistic director, as well as a large number of one-act plays. The latter were staged between films at the local movie houses and helped supplement the actors' income.⁵³ In the spring of 1916 Kurbas left the Ternopil troupe for Eastern Ukraine.

Les Kurbas and the Eastern Ukrainian Theatre

In March 1916 Kurbas was invited by Mykola Sadovsky to join his company in Kiev. The Sadovsky Theatre, formed in 1906, was the most prestigious Ukrainian company of the time, as well as the first Ukrainian troupe with its own theatre house. Sadovsky was a veteran actor from the Teatr Koryfeiv (Coryphaei Theatre), the most famous ethnographic theatre troupe of the nineteenth century. The Sadovsky Theatre produced the best of the ethnographic repertoire, new Ukrainian plays and, for the first time in Eastern Ukraine, translations of foreign plays. Sadovsky's greatest successes were performances of Ukrainian historical plays, operas and operettas, as well as translations from the Russian. The theatre managed to attract some of the best actors in Ukraine, and the success of the productions depended largely on their individual performances.

Sadovsky was unsuccessful in his attempts to produce the more modern Ukrainian plays. Like the new realistic and symbolist plays of Europe, the works of Lesia Ukrainka, Volodymyr Vynnychenko and Oleksander Oles demanded a new approach to production. The actors of the Sadovsky Theatre, steeped in the ethnographic style, could not handle the new texts. Even the new realistic plays required a shift in theatrical objective from the reproduction of conventionalized external reality to the creation of a specific environment or milieu to support psychological explorations of character. The nuances required in a theatre of conversation, which was based on the life of the intelligentsia, seemed awkward in the hands of actors who had spent their careers portraying peasants. Although the old-style actors still managed in the new realistic plays, Sadovsky's attempts to stage a symbolist play by Oles proved disastrous.

The actors' inability to handle the new texts prompted the formation of a drama section at the Lysenko Musical Institute in Kiev. Although it provided the only formal theatrical training in Ukraine, the school at first had little impact on established theatrical life. The newly trained actors had no choice but to work in the old troupes. The old stars were also very protective of their careers and rarely allowed the younger actors to play major roles in the shows they directed.

In 1912 a group of former drama students of the Lysenko School informed the press that they were going to establish a new theatre which would present modern Ukrainian and European plays. Although the project failed for lack of a director, the group continued to meet several times a week to discuss theatrical matters.⁵⁴

The young generation of Eastern Ukrainian actors were, therefore, as dissatisfied with current practices in Ukrainian theatre as were Kurbas and his friends in Western Ukraine. The difference was that the young Easterners benefited from a systematic actor-training program, while the Westerners had more production experience. The Westerners also inherited a more flexible acting style and varied repertoire, and had access to new European ideas. A new Ukrainian theatre would be born when these two groups joined forces. The war, which had redrawn the frontiers, actually facilitated this meeting, whose immediate cause was Sadovsky's invitation to Kurbas to join his company. Without realizing it, the most prominent actor of the old theatre was actually assisting in the birth of the new theatre.⁵⁵

Kurbas moved to Kiev in March 1916. Appearing in such roles as Khlestakov in Gogol's *Inspector-General* and Mykhailo Hurman in Franko's *Stolen Happiness*, he quickly became one of the company's most popular actors.

However, Kurbas again was more interested in exploring new directions. On 18 May 1916 he met with a group of former Lysenko School drama students and proposed that they establish a studio dedicated to theatrical innovation. As preparation, a study group on new trends in art and theatre was formed. In June 1916 the members of the studio began preparatory work on Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*, studying the culture of ancient Greece. They found rehearsal space in a dilapidated building on the outskirts of Kiev. As Iosyp Hirniak notes:

At the time neither Kurbas nor the talented young group had any clear, concretely drawn creative project or plan. They only possessed the zeal and desire to find at all costs the path to a new form of expression in the theatre. The Revolution of 1917 overtook this work.⁵⁶

After the fall of the tsarist government, a Ukrainian representative body, the Central Rada, was formed in Kiev. All tsarist restrictions on Ukrainian culture were lifted. Kurbas left the Sadovsky Theatre and helped organize a national committee of theatre workers. He also joined the editorial board of the Kiev theatrical journal, *Teatralni visti* (Theatrical News). There he published a series of articles on theatre and his own translations of Lessing's *Tragedy of an Actor*, Rudolf Blimper's "Drama and the Stage," and some maxims by Oscar Wilde.

The revolutionary enthusiasm of the times prodded the members of Kurbas's studio theatre group into action. They decided to postpone their studies and redirected their energies into a theatre production whose proceeds they donated to the National Fund.⁵⁷ In May 1917 Kurbas staged Vynnychenko's play about revolutionaries, *Bazar* (Bazaar), with the members of the studio several times at various locations in Kiev.⁵⁸

In April 1917 the Rada formed a National Theatre Council with the objective of creating a National Theatre for Ukraine. After much wrangling, the council chose an artistically very conservative route, appointing an ethnographic troupe headed by Ivan Marianenko as the National Theatre Company. Its first productions proved very disappointing and left a large deficit.

Meanwhile, Les Kurbas's theatre studio group, working without subsidy or official recognition, became the theatrical talk of Kiev and created the basis for a revolution in Ukrainian theatre.

The Formation of the Young Theatre

Encouraged by the reception of their production of *Bazaar*, Kurbas and his actors organized themselves formally as the Molodyi teatr (Young Theatre) in September 1917.

At its inception the Young Theatre was unlike any other theatre in Ukraine. It was legally an association with by-laws that outlined the artistic rights and duties of its members. Most of the actors were graduates of a theatre institute. The group wrote an artistic manifesto and, on the day before its first production, Kurbas published an article in one of the newspapers introducing the goals of the new group to the general public.⁵⁹

The group saw its genesis in the progressive circles of the Ukrainian intelligentsia.⁶⁰ Its members declared themselves opposed to the ethnographic theatre and provincialism.

The contemporary Ukrainian theatre is the result of an anti-Ukrainian regime—it is [characterized by] an unfinished thought, an uncompleted gesture, and an unformed tone. At its best it is several last Mohicans from the great era of Kropyvnytsky, Tobilevych and their first students, whose traditions run contrary to the requirements, style and quality of repertoire which alone inspires us.⁶¹

They announced that they would bring a new European repertoire to the Ukrainian audience, produce the latest Ukrainian plays, set new standards of production, and create a new Ukrainian theatrical culture.

The goal of the "Young Theatre" Association in Kiev is to create and

bring to life those forms of theatrical art which can express the artistic individuality of the contemporary young generation of Ukrainian actors who are not "Ukrainophiles," but are part of a national form of European culture that breaks completely with the banal traditions of Ukrainian theatre and will create its own values in theatre arts, especially in the art of acting, and will not be just a provincial manifestation of other cultures.⁶²

The Young Theatre wanted to create a revolution in Ukrainian theatre in terms of art, not politics.

Art is not created for external purposes; its purpose exists in itself, in the reason for its creation. Theatre exists because the actor must have a place in which to express his artistic individuality.⁶³

The group agreed that style was primary in art; that in the theatre style determines the form of gesture, voice, tone and rhythm of a production.⁶⁴ At the same time the group did not support any particular stylistic trend.

We want to be free from any preconceptions and seek only our own truths. We will direct our studies, efforts and work toward any form of theatre that interests us and the more questions it answers, the longer we will stay with it.⁶⁵

Unity and purity of style were considered the essential criteria.⁶⁶ While rehearsing a play, the actors would study the history and theories of its particular style, presenting the play only when they felt that they had explored all its possibilities.

The creation of a modern Ukrainian theatre was a monumental undertaking, and the group readily acknowledged that it was less than fully prepared for such a task. Nevertheless, the young actors believed that the sorry state of the contemporary Ukrainian theatre obliged them to start a new and totally different theatre company.⁶⁷

The group's primary objective was to research theatrical forms through study and experimentation conducted in its studio. Productions were seen as subservient to studio work. The repertory theatre, the actors believed, would provide them with funds to hire teachers for their studio, attract other young talented actors to the group, and allow the actors to share their artistic creations with an audience.⁶⁸

The group approached its herculean task with the highest hopes:

We begin our new venture with total agreement among ourselves, faith in victory, and awareness that we are breaking the dam that is holding the stagnant, putrid waters of Ukrainian theatrical art, so that someday on its

purified waves can freely glisten the sunny hundred-coloured rainbow of the liberated creative spirit.⁶⁹

The members of the Young Theatre were to be in charge of the repertoire and all the major decisions in the theatre were to be made collectively. Since at this point all the members, including Kurbas, saw themselves primarily as actors, they agreed to place "strict limitations on the rights of the director and designer in order to allow total freedom of activity for the individual and the collective, to make possible total freedom of initiative."⁷⁰ In practice, however, Kurbas proved to be the leading force and was actually in charge of the selection of plays. He initiated most of the productions during the first season, many of which were projects in which he had shown interest previously.

It was at the Young Theatre that Kurbas grew as an artist and made his first steps toward becoming a modern conceptual director. The theatre provided very special working conditions unhampered by state censorship. During the first season he attempted to introduce new ideas about production into his theatrical practice.

The First Season at the Young Theatre

During its first season the Young Theatre did not have its own theatre house, and presented its productions once a week, on Mondays, at a theatre that housed a Russian company.⁷¹ Most of the work on productions, however, was done at the studio, which was located on the outskirts of Kiev. Kurbas directed four of the five productions that season, each of which was an experiment in a different style.

The season opened on 24 September 1917 with a psychological realistic play, Vynnychenko's *The Black Panther and the White Bear*. There were several reasons for the choice of this play as the premier production. Kurbas had already directed it with great success at his theatre in Ternopil. It made sense to open a new theatre with a play that had already proved successful, but with a new production that the local audience had not seen. Vynnychenko was also a member of the newly formed Central Rada, and it was appropriate to open a new Ukrainian theatre with a modern Ukrainian play. Moreover, certain members of the theatre felt that the production of *Bazaar* could have been stronger and that the ensemble should continue exploring realistic acting techniques.⁷²

Although Kurbas's production of *The Black Panther and the White Bear* was basically realistic, several writers noted that it already had a heightened sense of theatricality. Usually, theatricality is most obviously expressed in sets and costumes, but in this production it must have been projected totally through the direction of actors, since both

costumes and sets had been rented from other theatrical houses.⁷³ Iona Shevchenko attributed the production's success to the intense work on gestures.⁷⁴ Discussing the play several years after the production, Kurbas mentioned that it had been characterized by "torn phrases and irrepressible nervous gestures."⁷⁵ In his article on the Young Theatre, Iurii Blokhyn writes: "There was no clearly visible theatrical experimentation, but from the very beginning one felt a tendency toward a 'theatrical theatre.'"⁷⁶

Press reaction was encouraging. The critic for the Kiev newspaper *Nova rada* (New Council) wrote:

One can see that these youngsters are talented people, young and, therefore, not totally polished. But when they acquire this polish, when the talents and unique gifts of each of them are further delineated, then without doubt they, more than anyone else, will have a chance to break with hackneyed and stereotypical traditions and give Ukraine that which is new, something we do not now have.⁷⁷

Several weeks later, on 15 October 1917, Kurbas directed Max Halbe's *Youth*, a naturalistic German play, in his own translation. Written in 1893, *Youth* was first performed at the Residenztheater in Berlin. Kurbas's interest in the play probably stemmed from the fact that Max Reinhardt had staged it in his earliest days as a director.⁷⁸ Kurbas had translated the play in the spring of 1910, shortly after his university days in Vienna. He had planned to stage it then, but instead became involved in the protests at Lviv University.⁷⁹ Later he also planned to stage the play at his theatre in Ternopil, but left for Kiev before rehearsals could begin.⁸⁰

Although this was a naturalistic drama, "the director's concept was to accent the ideas of the play and let milieu take a secondary position."⁸¹ Rejecting naturalism's usual focus on sordid details, this production stressed "beauty,"⁸² rhythm and musicality. One of the actors, Stepan Bondarchuk, wrote that there was little actual music in the play, but:

...the entire production seemed to be a harmonious quintet. This was due to its rhythmic structure. Accent and relaxation, the widening and narrowing of the backdrop, the plastic and vocal techniques of the actors "sounded" like a well-worked-out musical composition. The image of [Ännchen] and [Hans] appeared as a beautiful duet of young ideas, young aspirations for a new life. The older, dignified parson Hoppe added to this a third voice full of genial sincerity. The theme of the scholastic chaplain [Schigorski] argued in vain with the invincible motif of vital truth. And only the sudden cries of the disturbed soul of the half-witted

[Amandus] ([Ännchen's] brother) disturbed this harmony from time to time.⁸³

The beauty, rhythm and musicality of a production were major concerns of the new art movement. It is interesting that Kurbas chose a naturalistic drama to interpret in this manner. Naturalism usually stressed the importance of environment, but here Kurbas "let milieu take a secondary position." Concern with beauty supplanted the usual raw realism. This shift of focus can be seen as a reinterpretation of the play.

However, Kurbas's attempt to incorporate the ideas of the new movement into this production was apparently confined to acting. Visually, the production did not reflect the new trends or Kurbas's concept of the play. The costumes and sets for the Young Theatre's production of *Youth* had already been built specifically for the show. The production designer was Mykhailo Boichuk, one of the foremost painters of Ukraine, who had created a unique modernist style based on Byzantine art. Yet his work on this production was rather ordinary. The design seems to have consisted of a standard one-room set⁸⁴ whose only truly distinguishing feature was an icon painted on a wall, clearly signalling that Boichuk had created the work. Kurbas, who played the lead, was not able to see the total stage picture, and therefore limited himself to interpreting the internal concerns of the play. The set only illustrated the place of action instead of supporting the director's concept.

The most stylized presentation of the Young Theatre's first season was the lyrical and symbolic *Evening of Etudes* by the Ukrainian poet Oleksander Oles. Kurbas directed the etudes *Autumn*, *The Dance of Life* and *In the Light of the Bonfire*, while Hnat Iura staged *A Quiet Evening*. Kurbas also wrote a prologue to the evening in which he appeared.

Kurbas had been enamoured of Oles's work since his gymnasium days.⁸⁵ In his letter of 1914 to Luchytska, Kurbas mentioned Oles as one of the writers whose work he would like to produce in the new theatre he was then planning. Although Oles's poetry was highly regarded, many felt that his dramatic etudes were impossible to stage. Sadovsky had previously tried to stage *Autumn* and *The Dance of Life*, but the results were disastrous. *The Dance of Life* was removed from the repertoire after a single performance.⁸⁶

The theatre historian Oleksandr Kysil did not appraise Oles's etudes very highly, but neatly summarized the plots:

The basis of the etudes *Autumn* and *In the Light of the Bonfire* was the theme of love between people who are psychologically distant from each other, a love which does not bring them happiness, but death... *The*

Dance of Life is imbued with a deeply pessimistic mood and symbolizes dismay with life, which the author sees as an insane dance of cripples.⁸⁷

In the Soviet Ukrainian theatre history *Ukrainskyi dramatychnyi teatr* (Ukrainian Dramatic Theatre), the etudes are described as somewhat reminiscent of Maeterlinck's plays, although less pretentious and not as concerned with mysticism or supernatural powers. The characters, as in other symbolist plays, are abstract and archetypal: Man, Young Lady, Brothers, Watch-woman, etc. The etudes present moments full of innuendo, fine psychological nuance and half-tones.⁸⁸

Kurbas again stressed musicality and rhythm in his work with the actors. Polina Samiilenko, an actress in the Young Theatre who did not take part in this production, describes her reaction to Kurbas's work on the etudes:

I sat as if listening to an unknown symphony; you cannot yet comprehend it, nor can you tear yourself away. Kurbas built Oles's etudes on a fine sense of inner rhythm, not so much on [the rhythm] of the poetic language (the etudes are laconic) as on the rhythm of the unspoken thoughts and feelings. He demanded from the actors an almost musical harmony of gestures and movements.⁸⁹

For the first time at the Young Theatre the visual design for the *Evening of Etudes* supported the musicality and rhythm of a production. Kurbas had found a designer, Anatol Petrytsky, who understood his conceptual approach to plays. Petrytsky, born in Kiev in 1895, had studied at the Kiev Art Institute. As a painter, he was first influenced by impressionism and post-impressionism⁹⁰ and later by futurism and the Ukrainian baroque fresco style.⁹¹ He first became involved with theatre design in 1915, when he painted the backdrops and posters for a Ukrainian baroque *intermediia* which Sadovsky staged as part of the "Ukrainian Bazaar," a benefit for wounded soldiers at the Kiev Hippodrome.⁹² In 1916–17 Petrytsky designed sets for several small theatres in Kiev, joining the Young Theatre in the autumn of 1917. He designed most of the productions of the Young Theatre's second season⁹³ and was considered the theatre's main designer.⁹⁴ Later Kurbas would write that the designer appeared as a creative force in Ukrainian theatre only when Petrytsky joined the Young Theatre.⁹⁵

Petrytsky's design for the *Evening of Etudes* was unlike anything previously seen on the Ukrainian stage.

For this, his first appearance as a designer at the Young Theatre, he decisively broke with the tradition of the one-room set. For the etude *Autumn* he created a snow-covered window, the outline of its frame

melted into the winter's night haze. And for *The Dance of Life* he used a panel with a linear pattern.⁹⁶

The play of the silhouettes on the window, which the winter's twilight had turned pale blue, the luminous mist in the garden, the beautiful contours of the trees against a background of evening sky—all these well conveyed the mood of the etudes.⁹⁷

The young ensemble was praised in the press. The critic for *Robitnycha hazeta* (Workers' Gazette) wrote:

It is inappropriate to mention individual performances—as such they did not exist—rather this was a unified collaboration [created by] a related group of actors and especially by the director.⁹⁸

The Young Theatre's next production was a dramatization of the short story "Mysl" (Thought) by the Russian writer Leonid Andreev. Hnat Iura wrote the dramatization, known as *Doctor Kerzhentsev*, directed it, and played the leading role in the production.

Iura was born into an Eastern Ukrainian peasant family in 1888. He worked as an actor in one of the minor ethnographic troupes before being invited to join the Ruska Besida, where he met Kurbas and joined him in his efforts to start a new type of theatre. When the Russian army invaded Ternopil in 1914, Iura, a Russian citizen, was drafted.⁹⁹ He arrived in Kiev only in 1917 and joined the Young Theatre.¹⁰⁰

More conservative than Kurbas, Iura wanted a repertory theatre that would stage literary classics. He was enamoured of the psychological approach to acting that he had seen at the Moscow Art Theatre.¹⁰¹ Kurbas, on the other hand, favoured experimentation and stylization. These two separate directions would become obvious in the Young Theatre's second season.

Iura's production of *Doctor Kerzhentsev* was not marked by experimentation but was a psychological portrayal of a man on the verge of a breakdown. Apparently the production was not well received, for it did not play long and was not revived the following season.¹⁰²

Kurbas started rehearsals for the next production, Jerzy Żuławski's *Ijola*, but work on the play was interrupted. The political situation in Kiev during the winter of 1918 was highly volatile. Fighting broke out, and on 22 January the Central Rada proclaimed independence from Russia. In February the Red Army took the city from the Rada, only to be replaced by the German army a month later.

Rehearsals for *Ijola*, a tragic love story set during the time of the Inquisition, resumed in March. Some members of the Young Theatre complained about the play's mysticism and fatalism. Polina Samiilenko, who played the title role, describes Kurbas's preparatory work with her:

Kurbas would go with me to the library, find the paintings of Goya, and show me his portraits from the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth, as well as the series of etchings, "Los Caprichos" [depicting scenes of witchcraft and sorcery intermingled with social satire]. "Take a look and decide, examine your *Ijola*. What forced Goya to draw this devilry? Fatalism, or the powerful genius of this artist-thinker?" said Kurbas. And so, when I became absorbed in Goya's etchings, I forgot my reservations. I was haunted by the atmosphere created by the Inquisition in which the heroine lived. Kurbas knew how to awaken our fantasy so that we could find the seed for the image of the role.¹⁰³

Kurbas translated this mystical, impressionistic Polish verse play and directed it. He spent a long time with the actors working on the rhythm of the verse and the musicality of the poetic language. Samiilenko mentions that during these rehearsals Kurbas also started talking about the need for the actors to create an image based on a certain idea.¹⁰⁴ This was perhaps Kurbas's first and most primitive expression of what he would later call the transformed gesture,¹⁰⁵ which combined Gordon Craig's idea that actors must create "a new form of acting consisting for the main part of symbolic gesture"¹⁰⁶ with Kurbas's own desire to work with thinking actors who would understand the underlying idea of a moment and create a gesture to express it. The transformed gesture would be one of the foundations of Kurbas's method of training actors in the 1920s.

The set for *Ijola* was designed by Mykhailo Boichuk, who again eschewed experimentation. The medieval rooms were painted in a romantic style.

The play opened on 12 April 1918 as the season's last production. It also proved to be the Young Theatre's most popular show with the public that season.¹⁰⁷

The Young Theatre's first season was, on the whole, more ambitious than accomplished, demonstrating the young collective's enthusiasm, potential and nerve. But it also proved the group's ability to achieve goals it had established for itself in its manifesto. As promised, the theatre had presented a new repertoire: three translations of Middle and Eastern European plays (German, Polish and Russian), a modern Ukrainian play and an evening of etudes by a Ukrainian poet. Perhaps most notable was the fact that the repertoire did not include a single

ethnographic play, which the general public assumed to be the entire scope of Ukrainian drama.

Each play of the first season was also the result of experimentation with a particular style of drama, reflecting the group's initial announcement that style was a primary concern and that it would direct its studies toward any form that interested it. Kurbas's personal support for the continual exploration of style was probably influenced by his admiration for Max Reinhardt, who believed that "there is no one form of theatre which is the only true artistic form."¹⁰⁸

Throughout the season the actors continued training in their studio. Aware of their own limitations, they hired outside teachers.

We decided to take on Russian teachers in order to develop our technical skills, common to artists of every nation. But not to hire any outside directors who would tie us to Russian or Ukrainophile traditions. We will learn, but search without assistance.¹⁰⁹

The group worked on movement with two teachers, Lange from the Kiev Opera and Mikhail Mordkin, a choreographer from Moscow's Bolshoi Theatre and a dancer of international acclaim.¹¹⁰ There were classes in esthetics taught by Kuzmin, fencing by Mikhailov and voice by Lund. Acting, however, was taught by Kurbas.¹¹¹

Kurbas insisted that the actors become familiar with the latest European aesthetic and theatrical theories. Unlike the French director Jacques Copeau, who wanted to put all books under lock and key and become the only source for his students,¹¹² Kurbas sent his actors to libraries and museums. They had to learn to think independently and to teach themselves.

In his acting classes Kurbas introduced the actors to the notion of mimetic presentation of a role, stressing the importance of finding the right gesture. He opposed acting based on impulse and emotionalism, insisting that the actors learn to fix a role, that is, be able to repeat their choices exactly.¹¹³

A contemporary article about the Young Theatre mentions that the group was studying the systems of gestures developed by Delsarte and Dalcroze.¹¹⁴ François Delsarte (1811–71) approached acting scientifically, developing an elaborate analysis of how various parts of the body communicate emotions and ideas and thus creating a system that was "the first significant attempt to reduce every aspect of the actor's training to method."¹¹⁵ Emile Jacques Dalcroze (1865–1960), on the other hand, stressed the importance of rhythm. He developed a system called "eurythmics" in which "the students were led to experience music kinesthetically by responding physically to the rhythms of musical compositions."¹¹⁶ These studies paid off quickly, for during the season

critics began to remark on the importance of rhythm, musicality and gesture in Kurbas's productions. Kurbas also used these studies as the basis for his system of training actors, a program he was only beginning to develop. An emerging theatricality was becoming an organic part of his work as a director.

The new ideas soon rang even clearer in Kurbas's declarations. Throughout the first season he was slowly moving the actors away from realism. By October 1918 Kurbas would write in his article "Teatralnyi lyst" (Theatrical Letter):

Realism, even when not practiced fully . . . is the most anti-artistic expression of our time. [It] has gained control of the theatre and is paralyzing its every creative attempt.¹¹⁷

Gesture has died, the word has died, elements through which the actors display their art have died, and what remains is a chaotic deadlly "lifelikeness" for the presentation and illustration of literary sentiments and literary grimaces.¹¹⁸

These passages are very similar in tone and content to Gordon Craig's attacks on realism.

The alternatives to realism that Kurbas proposed are also reminiscent of the new theories. To renew itself, the theatre would have to renounce the dominance of literature and return to the source of its strength: once again it would have to become theatrical. Kurbas declared that "the substance of theatre is not literature, but gesture and sound,"¹¹⁹ and that

actors and directors who discard the tyranny of literature [*literaturshchyna*] and give prominent place to the other arts will freely create the renewal of the theatre out of its own elements.¹²⁰

Kurbas's call for theatricality and his rejection of the dominance of literature in theatre echo Reinhardt's belief that

The theatre is more than an auxiliary to other arts. There is only one objective for theatre: *the theatre*; and I believe in a theatre that belongs to the actor. No longer, as in the previous decades, shall literary points of view be the decisive ones.¹²¹

Kurbas also called for reform in theatre design in his "Theatrical Letter." He harshly criticized contemporary stage decoration practices in

Ukrainian theatre:

...two-dimensional decorations near the three-dimensional actor, stage and props, real yellow leaves falling from the hideous painted "forest" [borders], against the obvious and conspicuously painted perspective of the backdrop... Add to this a production overladen with details, an unintelligible chaos of gestures, at best only typical, "real," moonlight from the footlights—and then you understand the despair.¹²²

Kurbas's point about the clash of conventions between the flat, "realistically" painted elements of the set and the three-dimensional reality of the actor, space and props is also similar to views voiced by the proponents of the new art theatre movement. Adolphe Appia, for instance, had written:

Our modern staging is totally enslaved to painting—the painting of sets—which purports to give us the illusion of reality. Now, this illusion is itself an illusion—the presence of the actor contradicts it. The principle of illusion produced by painting on vertical flats and the principle of illusion produced by the plastic, living body of the actor are, quite simply, in contradiction. Therefore, working out the operation of these two types of illusion separately—as is done on all our stages—will not enable us to obtain a homogeneous and artistic production.¹²³

Kurbas's protest against productions overladen with detail is reminiscent of Georg Fuchs's opposition to naturalism's clutter.

In his "Theatrical Letter" Kurbas also declared that the creation of "the style of our time... is the first and most important postulate that excites contemporary art, or rather its creators."¹²⁴ Kurbas was still searching for this style and was therefore vague about its exact nature. At this point he could only propose two promising avenues for exploration.

The first, Kurbas felt, was symbolism "arising from a purely theatrical phenomenon [which] promises us a future of unprecedented manifestations."¹²⁵ This enthusiasm was probably based on his experience of the first season. His work on Oles's symbolist etudes was really his first step toward experimental direction.

Traditionally, the director had been expected to organize a production and perform its leading role. In the first two productions of the season Kurbas had assumed both these traditional functions. It may be assumed that a large part of his energy was channelled into their actual organization and design,¹²⁶ as well as the formation of the new theatre and the studio. This gave him total control over the interpretation of the leading role and a profound influence on the other

performers, but deprived him of the distance required for conceptual control of the entire stage picture. The first two productions therefore remained well within the frame of literal textual illustration, departing from accepted practice only in rhythm, not in the conceptual interpretation of a play's text.

Oles's etudes could not succeed on these terms. The director had to interpret these pieces theatrically, to create them in visual terms. For the first time, Kurbas found a designer, Anatol Petrytsky, who could work from a director's concept instead of just illustrating the place of action required by the text. Concern with the visual design of a production was an essential aspect of the new theories of theatre. It is no coincidence that the major proponents of modernism in theatre were all themselves designers, director-designers or directors who worked with strong designers. Kurbas's experience in directing an open-ended text such as the etudes and his work with Petrytsky opened a new field of vision for him as a director. It was from this experience that Kurbas developed his enthusiasm for symbolism "arising from a purely theatrical phenomenon."¹²⁷

The second direction Kurbas suggests in his "Theatrical Letter" is a return to the classics:

The movement toward Greece and Shakespeare [filtered] through our own experience is a movement so far unsuccessful because it is understood only in terms of literature. But it is a true movement that eventually will find the correct path.¹²⁸

One of the main reasons for this suggestion was that Kurbas had already begun such exploration himself. The Young Theatre was working on a production of *Oedipus Rex* which would open that autumn, and Kurbas was also planning to stage Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*.¹²⁹ His interest in the classics was probably fuelled by Craig and Reinhardt's famous productions of Shakespeare and Reinhardt's production of *Oedipus Rex*, which had brought him international acclaim.

Although symbolism and a return to the classics were promising directions to explore, Kurbas felt that neither would actually constitute the new style. "Somewhere between these two poles wanders the synthesis, the style of our time, the basis of its forms."¹³⁰ Kurbas did hazard some guesses as to the form that the style of the time might take in the near future:

Maybe there will be almost no words... Maybe what will replace them will be the wealth of primitive sound. Maybe the theatre of improvisation will be reborn. Maybe it will be this, that and another in various new

differentiations of the theatre.¹³¹

In these speculations Kurbas quite accurately predicted his own explorations of the early 1920s.

As we have seen, during the first season at the Young Theatre Kurbas started to take the first steps toward becoming a conceptual director. The resulting shift in his artistic goals became more clearly evident in his work of the second season. Kurbas's revolutionary artistic idea of a unified vision in theatre, which required a strong director, conflicted directly with his revolutionary egalitarian political idea of collective responsibility for artistic vision. This brought about a rift in the collective that tore the Young Theatre apart.

In the next several years Kurbas re-evaluated his self-definition as an artist and abandoned acting in favour of directing. In 1922 he formed a new theatre, the Berezil, creating the conditions in which he would become the leading theatre artist in Ukraine and one of the truly innovative directors of his time.

Notes

¹ Many sources list Kurbas's date and place of birth as 12 September 1887, Stryi Skalat. This information is incorrect. Kurbas's grandfather lived in Stryi Skalat, but his parents settled there only around 1900. The confusion as to the date of birth probably arose because 12 September was his name day (St Alexander's, according to the old calendar). In Western Ukraine people of Kurbas's generation celebrated name days rather than birthdays, and it is easy to see how others unaware of this fact would confuse the dates. Kurbas was born while his parents were on tour with the Ruska Besida in Sambir. He was christened only a year later, on 8 January 1888, in Przemyśl. Raisa Skalii has located Kurbas's baptismal certificate, on which he is identified as Oleksander Zenon Kurbas. At that time, Western Ukrainians gave children middle names and did not use patronymics. Kurbas's patronymic is used here since many sources cited use it. For information on the search for Kurbas's record of birth, see Raisa Skalii, "Zahadka Lesia Kurbas," *Nasha kultura*, no. 2 (214), supplement to *Nashe slovo* (Warsaw), February 1976, 6–7.

² Throughout the nineteenth century, Western Ukraine was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, whose cultural policies were less restrictive than those of the Russian Empire, which ruled Eastern Ukraine. Eastern Ukrainian theatre was severely hampered by tsarist censorship, various restrictions and prohibitions. The tsarist government restricted Ukrainian theatre to ethnographic (*pobutovi*) dramas, which portrayed the customs, rituals and

manners of the village folk. The first Eastern Ukrainian professional troupe was permitted only in 1881, and Ukrainian translations of foreign plays were forbidden in Eastern Ukraine until 1906.

³ Kurbas would later compare favourably the actors of Western Ukraine as a group with those of Eastern Ukraine. He felt that the great diversity of repertoire was a particular advantage: "A repertoire that included Schiller's classical tragedies and French farce, vaudeville, operetta and contemporary opera, ethnographic plays treated as melodrama and naturalistic plays by Tshlynsky created a specific type of actor with unusual stylistic flexibility" (Les Kurbas, "Shliakhy Berezolia," *VAPLITE, Literaturno-khudozhnii zhurnal*, no. 3 (1927): 146).

⁴ M.T. Rytsky, ed., *Ukrainskyi dramatychnyi teatr*, 2 vols. (Kiev, 1959-67), 1:302.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1:308.

⁶ Vasyl Vasylo, "Narodnyi artyst URSR O.S. Kurbas," in *Les Kurbas: spohady suchasnykiv*, ed. Vasyl Vasylo (Kiev, 1969), 5.

⁷ Les Kurbas [Zenon Myslevych], "V horiachtsi," *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk* 9, no. 4 (April 1906): 37-40. Zenon was Kurbas's middle name, while Myslevych means "thinker" in Ukrainian.

⁸ Khoma Vodiany, "Z iunatskykh lit Lesia Kurbas," *Zhovten*, no. 10 (October 1967): 122.

⁹ The text of Kurbas's letter is reprinted in Khoma Vodiany, "Spomyny pro Lesia Kurbas (1901-1913 roky)," in Vasylo, *Les Kurbas*, 349n.

¹⁰ Oscar G. Brockett, *History of the Theatre*, 3rd ed. (Boston, 1977), 472.

¹¹ Iryna Volynska, "Iunist Lesia Kurbas," *Ukrainskyi teatr*, no. 3 (May-June 1982): 23.

¹² Yosyp Hirniak, "Birth and Death of the Modern Ukrainian Theatre," in *Soviet Theatres: 1917-1941*, ed. Martha Bradshaw (New York, 1954), 256.

¹³ V[alerii] Inkizhinov, "Spohady pro Lesia Kurbas," in Natalia Pylypenko, *Zhyttia v teatri* (New York, 1968), 126. Certain Western sources give the author's name as Inkijinoff.

¹⁴ Both Antoine and Brahm felt that their primary task as directors was to illustrate as faithfully as possible the text as written by the author. Otto Brahm (1856-1912) placed total emphasis on the dramatic text. Max Reinhardt, who started as an actor in Brahm's company, wrote: "True, Brahm sat in the stalls and made infallible critical remarks, but on stage there were only technicians who never made any artistic suggestions. The actors had to do everything themselves" (Quoted in Michael Patterson, *The Revolution in German Theatre 1900-1933* [Boston, 1981], 34). André Antoine (1858-1943), on the other hand, was also interested in the visual truth of the production. He developed the "fourth wall" concept in staging. The actors were to behave naturally on the stage and to ignore the presence of the audience, treating the

proscenium opening as the "fourth wall" of the set. The set itself was furnished and arranged in every detail as in real life. Accepting naturalism's belief in the importance of the environment, Antoine "helped establish the principle that each play requires its own setting quite distinct from that of any other work" (Brockett, 471).

¹⁵ Quoted by Denis Bablet, "Appia and Theatrical Space: From Revolt to Utopia," in *Adolphe Appia 1862-1928: Actor—Space—Light* (New York, 1982), 12.

¹⁶ Patterson, 40.

¹⁷ Adolphe Appia, "How to Reform Our Stage-Directing" (1 June 1904), in *Adolphe Appia 1862-1928*, 43.

¹⁸ Georg Fuchs, *Revolution in the Theatre: Conclusions Concerning the Munich Artists' Theatre* (Port Washington, N.Y., 1972), xxviii.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 103, 90 and 88.

²⁰ Christopher Innes, *Edward Gordon Craig* (Cambridge, 1983), 213.

²¹ Edward Gordon Craig, *On the Art of the Theatre* (London, 1911; reprint New York, 1956), 89.

²² Quoted in Edward Craig, *Gordon Craig: The Story of His Life* (New York, 1968), 219-20.

²³ Craig, *On the Art of the Theatre*, 62-3 and 61. Emphasis in the original.

²⁴ Quoted in Innes, 158.

²⁵ Craig, *On the Art of the Theatre*, 84 and 99.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 148.

²⁷ Quoted in Martin Esslin, "Max Reinhardt: High Priest of Theatricality," *The Drama Review* 21 (June 1977): 10.

²⁸ Patterson, 34.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 35.

³⁰ Rudolph Kommer, "The Magician of Leopoldskron," quoted in J.L. Styan, *Max Reinhardt* (Cambridge, 1982), 55.

³¹ Patterson, 35.

³² Khoma Vodiany, Kurbas's roommate in Vienna, described the incident in which he first discovered Kurbas's secret intention of becoming an actor:

I came home when Les was not expecting me and found him in front of the mirror. On the table lay an open book. He became flustered and jumped away from the mirror, and by the time I took off my coat, he had put the book into his suitcase. And to stave off my questions, Les said, "You know, actors must know how to choose their own costumes and must practice their roles in a mirror..." (Vodiany, "Spomyny pro Lesia Kurbasa," in Vasylo, *Les Kurbas*, 65).

³³ It is not clear whether Kurbas saw any of Reinhardt's productions or just read about them at this time. During the 1907-8 season Reinhardt had

productions running only in Berlin and Budapest. For a list of Reinhardt's productions that season, see Styan, 132–3. However, the assessment that Reinhardt's productions were a major influence on Kurbas at this point is generally accepted. For examples, see Les Taniuk, *Mariian Krushelnitskii* (Moscow, 1974), 54–5; and N[elli] N. Kornienko, "Rezhisserskoe iskusstvo Lesia Kurbasa," synopsis of thesis (Moscow: Ministerstvo Kultury SSSR, Institut Istorii Iskusstv, 1970), 6.

³⁴ Volytska, 24.

³⁵ The official title of the Sokil Theatre Group was "Ukrainskyi liudovyi teatr pid pokrovom tovarystva 'Ruskoï besidy' u Lvovi" (The Ukrainian popular theatre under the aegis of the Ruska Besida association in Lviv). Rytsky, 1:434.

³⁶ Volytska, 24.

³⁷ Vodiany ("Spomyny pro Lesia Kurbasa," 67) gives the name of the Jewish organization as "Yad Kharuzim," but Mel Gordon, a theatre historian who writes on Soviet theatre, has suggested to me that "Yad Khalusim" is the proper transliteration from the Hebrew, meaning "Hand of the Pioneers."

³⁸ Vodiany, 67.

³⁹ Volytska, 24.

⁴⁰ The murdered student was Adam Kotsko, who appeared in Kurbas's production of *The Hebrews*. Vodiany, 67.

⁴¹ I have not been able to determine when exactly Kurbas joined the Hutsul Theatre troupe. Iosyp Hirniak remembers seeing Kurbas perform with the troupe in 1910 (Iosyp Hirniak, *Spomyny*, ed. Bohdan Boichuk (New York, 1982), 17–18). However, Soviet sources only mention that Kurbas was both administrator and actor in the troupe in early 1912. Rytsky, 1:437.

⁴² Quoted in Rytsky, 1:438.

⁴³ Vodiany, "Z iunatskykh lit Lesia Kurbasa," 122–3.

⁴⁴ Rytsky, 1:438.

⁴⁵ Taniuk, 55.

⁴⁶ Quoted in Vodiany, 123.

⁴⁷ Quoted in Rytsky, 1:442.

⁴⁸ Nataliia Polonska-Vasylenko, *Istoriia Ukrainy*, 2 vols. (Munich, 1972–6), 2:448.

⁴⁹ Rytsky, 1:432.

⁵⁰ Teofil Demchuk, "Spohady pro Lesia Kurbasa (12.IX.1887–15.X.1942)," *Ukrainskyi kalendar 1972* (Warsaw), 201. The birthdate for Kurbas listed as part of the article's title is incorrect. See note 1 above.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid., 203.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Iurii Blokhyn [Iurii Boiko], "Molodyi teatr," *Zhyttia i revoliutsiia*, no. 6 (1930), reprinted in Iurii Boiko, *Vybrane* (Munich, 1971), 1:3.

⁵⁵ For a satirical comment on this episode, see Pavlo Mykhailovych Hubenko [Ostap Vyshnia], "Les Kurbas (mystetskyi syliet)," *Kultura i pobut* (supplement to *Visty VUTsVK*), no. 7, 18 February 1928, reprinted in Vasylo, *Les Kurbas*, 301.

⁵⁶ Hirniak, "Birth and Death of the Modern Ukrainian Theatre," 258.

⁵⁷ Petro Rulin, "Ukrainskyi dramatychnyi teatr za pnatnadtsiat rokiv zhovtnia," *Zhyttia i revoliutsiia*, no. 11–12 (November–December 1932): 97.

⁵⁸ Rylsky, 1:443.

⁵⁹ Les Kurbas, " 'Molodyi teatr' (Heneza—zavdannia—shliakhy—)," *Robotnycha hazeta*, 23 September 1917. Page numbers given below refer to a typed transcript of the original.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 2–3.

⁶² " 'Molodyi teatr,' " first poster announcing the formation of the theatre, quoted in Vasylo, "Narodnyi artyst," in Vasylo, *Les Kurbas*, 7.

⁶³ Kurbas, " 'Molodyi teatr,' " 5.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁶⁶ Kurbas, "Shliakhy Berezolia," 147.

⁶⁷ Kurbas, " 'Molodyi teatr,' " 2, 6.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 5–6.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁷¹ Pioneer theatrical groups have often had to limit their performances to customarily "dark" days. The German Freie Bühne (1889) and the English Independent Theatre (1891) performed only on Sundays, while today New Yorkers interested in the newest avant-garde often have to venture out to downtown clubs on Monday nights.

⁷² Blokhyn, 6.

⁷³ The set was borrowed from P.M. Myloradovych, the owner of the Bergonie Theatre, and the costumes came from the Leifert Brothers Costume Shop. Stepan Bondarchuk, "Molodist Kurbas," in Vasylo, *Les Kurbas*, 89.

⁷⁴ Iona Shevchenko, quoted in Blokhyn, 6.

⁷⁵ Les Kurbas on 4 August 1920, quoted in Blokhyn, 6.

⁷⁶ Blokhyn, 6.

⁷⁷ *Nova rada*, 26 September 1917, quoted in Rylsky, 1:443.

⁷⁸ Max Reinhardt's production of Halbe's *Youth* opened in May 1903 at the Magyar Színház in Budapest. Styan, 129.

⁷⁹ Vodiany, "Spomyny pro Lesia Kurbas," in Vasylo, *Les Kurbas*, 67.

⁸⁰ M. Labinsky, "Materialy do khronolohii zhyttia i tvorchoi diialnosti O.S. Kurbas," in Vasylo, *Les Kurbas*, 329.

⁸¹ Bondarchuk, "Molodist Kurbas," in Vasylo, *Les Kurbas*, 89.

⁸² Blokhyn, 7.

⁸³ Bondarchuk, "Molodist Kurbasa," in Vasylo, *Les Kurbas*, 89. Original German names of the characters are provided instead of the Ukrainian equivalents that appear in the cited passage.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Vodiany, "Z iunatskykh lit Lesia Kurbasa," 122.

⁸⁶ D[mytro] Antonovych, *Trysta rokiv ukrainskoho teatru (1619-1919)* (Prague, 1925), 205.

⁸⁷ Oleksandr Kysil, *Ukrainskyi teatr (populiarnyi narys istorii ukrainskoho teatru)* (Kiev, 1925), reprinted in Oleksandr Kysil, *Ukrainskyi teatr*, ed. Pavlo Perepelytsia and Rostyslav Pylypchuk (Kiev, 1968), 138.

⁸⁸ Rytsky, 1:443.

⁸⁹ Polina Samiilenko, *Nezabutni dni horin* (Kiev, 1970), 40.

⁹⁰ John E. Bowlt, *Stage Designs and the Russian Avant-Garde (1911-1929)* (New Haven, 1976), 81.

⁹¹ V[asy]l Khmury, *Anatol Petrytsky: Teatralni stroi* ([Kharkiv?], 1929), 9.

⁹² Ivan Ivanovych Vrona, *Anatol Petrytsky: Albom* (Kiev, 1968), 10.

⁹³ During the Young Theatre's second season Petrytsky designed six shows, Stepan Hrechany designed two shows, and the designer for the two other shows has not been identified.

⁹⁴ Statutes of the Young Theatre (Kiev, 1918); list of members and titles reprinted in Labinsky, "Materialy," in Vasylo, *Les Kurbas*, 331.

⁹⁵ Kurbas, "Shliakhy Berezolia," 151. While working with the Young Theatre, Petrytsky became closely associated with Aleksandra Exter, who then lived in Kiev. Exter was the designer of a number of sets for Aleksandr Tairov's Kamerny Theatre in Moscow and was known for her "lyrical adaptations of Cubism and Constructivism" (Bowlt, 8-9). Exter's influence is evident in Petrytsky's later work, an excellent discussion of which appears in Myroslava M. Mudrak, "Modern Expression and Folk Tradition in the Theatrical Art of Anatol' Petrytsky," *Cross Currents: A Yearbook of Central European Culture*, 3 (Ann Arbor, 1984): 385-95. Petrytsky also designed sets for opera and ballet, including the set for Mikhail Mordkin's *Nur and Anitra*, which travelled to New York in 1923. See designs for *Nur and Anitra* in Bowlt, 49-50.

⁹⁶ Samiilenko, 40.

⁹⁷ Rytsky, 1:444.

⁹⁸ L.A., "Molodyi teatr," *Robitnycha hazeta*, 20 November 1917, quoted in Rytsky, 1:444.

⁹⁹ Iurii Boboshko, *Hnat Iura* (Kiev, 1980), 4-11.

¹⁰⁰ Samiilenko, 22.

¹⁰¹ Boboshko, 10.

¹⁰² Blokhyn, 7.

¹⁰³ Samiilenko, 23-4. The bracketed description of "Los Caprichos" in the cited passage is mine.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 25.

¹⁰⁵ Vasyly Vasylo, Kurbas's assistant, believes that the earliest examples of Kurbas's transformed gestures are to be found in his work on Shevchenko's lyrical poems performed in the spring of 1919 at the Young Theatre. Vasylo, "Narodnyi artyst," in Vasylo, *Les Kurbas*, 20.

¹⁰⁶ E.G. Craig, *On the Art of the Theatre*, 61.

¹⁰⁷ Dmytro Hrudyna, "Dekliaratsii i manifesty: pro 'Shliakhy Berezolia' [1]," *Krytyka*, no. 37 (February 1931): 96. Hrudyna, a proponent of socialist realism, derisively calls *Ijola* "the height of eclecticism, a mixture of symbolism, raw naturalism and romanticism brightly colored by estheticism" (Ibid., 25). The opposite opinion was expressed in a letter to the press that urged workers to see the play for the good of socialism. *Robitnycha hazeta*, 16 April 1918, excerpts reprinted in Labinsky, "Materialy" in Vasylo, *Les Kurbas*, 331.

¹⁰⁸ Quoted in Helen Krich Chinoy, "The Emergence of the Director," in *Directors on Directing: A Source Book of Modern Theatre*, ed. Toby Cole and Helen Krich Chinoy, rev. ed. (New York, 1963), 49.

¹⁰⁹ Kurbas, " 'Molodyi teatr,' " 4.

¹¹⁰ Mikhail Mordkin (1881–1944) had toured America with Pavlova in 1910 and returned to the U.S. in 1923 with his own ballet, *Nur and Anitra*.

¹¹¹ Vasylo, "Narodnyi artyst," in Vasylo, *Les Kurbas*, 7.

¹¹² Jacques Copeau quoted by Chinoy, in Cole and Chinoy, 46.

¹¹³ Vasylo, "Narodnyi artyst," in Vasylo, *Les Kurbas*, 8.

¹¹⁴ "Molodyi teatr," *Volia*, no. 4 (26 July 1919): 16.

¹¹⁵ Brockett, 422.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 482.

¹¹⁷ Les Kurbas, "Teatralnyi lyst," *Literaturno-krytychnyi almanakh*, no. 1 (1918), quoted in Yosyp Hirniak, "Birth and Death of the Modern Ukrainian Theatre," 262.

¹¹⁸ Kurbas, "Teatralnyi lyst," quoted in *Shliakhy i problemy rozvytku ukrainskoho radianskoho teatru*, ed. M.K. Iosypenko (Kiev, 1970), 38–9.

¹¹⁹ Kurbas, "Teatralnyi lyst," quoted in Rytsky, 2:52.

¹²⁰ Kurbas, "Teatralnyi lyst," quoted in Iosypenko, 38.

¹²¹ Quoted in Esslin, 9. Emphasis in the original.

¹²² Kurbas, "Teatralnyi lyst," quoted in Iosypenko, 39.

¹²³ Appia, "How to Reform Our Stage-Directing," *Adolphe Appia 1862–1928*, 42.

¹²⁴ Kurbas, "Teatralnyi lyst," quoted in Rulin, "Ukrainskyi dramatychnyi teatr za piatnadtsiat rokiv zhovtnia," 98.

¹²⁵ Kurbas, "Teatralnyi lyst," quoted in Blokhyn, 10.

¹²⁶ For *Youth*, the second production, Kurbas found a designer, Mykhailo Boichuk, but because this was the first production design created specifically for the new theatre, the organization of the process of realizing this design probably again consumed much of Kurbas's energy.

¹²⁷ Kurbas, "Teatralnyi lyst," quoted in Blokhyn, 10.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 14.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 10.

¹³¹ Ibid., 11.

**ETHNICITY, THE STATE AND WAR:
CANADA AND ITS ETHNIC MINORITIES, 1939-45**

From 25 to 27 September 1986, a conference on "Ethnicity, the State and War: Canada and its Ethnic Minorities, 1939-45" was held at the Donald Gordon Centre of Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario. Organized by the Canadian Committee for the History of the Second World War, the symposium attracted scholars from across the country and of diverse academic interests. Specialists in political, ethnic, immigration and military history met to discuss the wartime relationship between Canada's ethnic minorities and the government.

The first session focused on "Bureaucratic Approaches to Ethnic Loyalty." It began on a positive note with a paper by N.F. Dreisziger (Royal Military College of Canada) on the origins and work of the Nationalities Branch of the Department of National War Services. Drawing on the conclusion of the English historian Arthur Marwick that war creates a national mood which makes possible "the wide circulation of ideas confined in peacetime only to a tiny minority," Dreisziger set out to show that the acceptance in Canada of a new concept of Canadian nationalism was reflected in the establishment during the war of bureaucratic machinery to deal with the country's ethnic minorities. Established in October 1941, the Nationalities Branch survived the apathy of bureaucrats in the Department of National War Services and the misguided zeal of one Tracy Philipps to become the Citizenship Division. It was eventually absorbed into the new Department of Citizenship and Immigration in the post-war years.

Was Marwick's dictum about war acting as a catalyst in the dissemination of ideas borne out by the Canadian experience? Had Canadians come to share the vision of Robert England and a few others of a new Canadian nationality embracing those of non-French and non-English background? Dreisziger admitted that they had not. Still, he did not see the war as "entirely or even mainly detrimental to

Canadian ethnic groups." The official encouragement given to Canadian multiculturalism today may be seen as a legacy of the war.

It is that conclusion which William Young (McGill University) appeared to contradict in the second paper of the session, "Chauvinism and Canadianism: Canadian Ethnic Groups and the Failure of Wartime Information." According to Young, the government adopted an "official view of Canadian nationhood" which included those whose origin was neither French nor English. Through the Bureau of Public Information and its successor, the Wartime Information Board, the government tried to promote acceptance of ethnic minorities, particularly those with origins in enemy countries. But it soon became apparent that the government's information agencies "could not penetrate either the latent xenophobia of the French and English Canadians nor could [they] escape being caught in the rivalries which split ethnic groups unwilling to leave behind the feuds which had riven their European homelands."

Wartime attitudes toward Japanese Canadians underscore the most telling failure of the government's wartime information programmes. Far from trying to allay suspicions of that ethnic group, the information agencies appeared to mirror the anti-Oriental prejudice of many Canadians. At war's end, half the Canadians surveyed indicated reluctance to live beside a Japanese family. Another survey reported an increase in the number of those who advocated a "closed-door policy" on immigration. As Young concluded, "the age of the cultural mosaic and multiculturalism lay far in the future."

In the discussions following the presentation of the papers some pertinent points were raised. John English (University of Waterloo) pointed out that Robert England, Tracy Philipps, John Grierson and other figures at the centre were British-born. If these people did not reflect the "accent of the majority," how did they come to wield the influence they did in the government's relations with the ethnic communities?

J.L. Granatstein (York University) suggested that the war demonstrated the failure of assimilation. That is, the government during the course of the war hoped to create a common feeling of Canadian identity among people of different origins so as to minimize the distinctiveness of individual ethnic groups. He asked why the end of the war did not give rise to a renewed push for assimilation.

Seizing on this point, Howard Palmer (University of Calgary) expressed the widely held sentiment that multiculturalism was not born during the war. The thrust of the government's policy during the forties

and fifties was assimilative. The redefinition of Canada as a multicultural society did not come about until the sixties and seventies.

The second session broached the topic of "Loyalties in Question." In his paper entitled "Breaking the Nazi Plot: Canadian Government Attitudes Towards German Canadians, 1939-1945," Robert Keyserlingk (University of Ottawa) concluded that there was very little reason to question the loyalty of Canada's German population. Keyserlingk addressed himself to the "generally accepted version" of the government's actions against German Canadians in the Second World War. Noting that even the government's critics accept in this instance that the swift work of the RCMP was laudable in smashing a very real subversive plot, Keyserlingk argued that the evidence supports no such conclusion. The RCMP could not have uncovered any such plot even if one had existed, because it was woefully unprepared to do so. Rather, the police responded to pressure from their political masters in the wake of widespread public panic about Nazi subversives, and, in lieu of hard evidence, rounded up more than 800 German Canadians on the basis of membership in suspected pro-Nazi organizations.

Far from condemning the RCMP, Keyserlingk argued that they were deprived of the necessary staff, intelligence capability and knowledge of the German Canadians to perform more effectively. Nonetheless, he could not point to a shred of evidence that any subversive Nazi plot existed in the country. The review process quickly released the majority of interned German Canadians. Keyserlingk argued that the internments were carried out largely in response to public pressure for action. Noting that the government's move against Canadians of German origin served as a foretaste of similar action against communists, Italians and Japanese in Canada, he concluded that the episode "does not give an observer much confidence that security or intelligence work is any more rigorously restrained in a crisis if it is controlled by politicians rather than policemen."

Bruno Ramirez (Université de Montréal) approached his subject differently in "The Italians of Montreal and the Second World War: Ethnicity on Trial." Whereas Keyserlingk concentrated on the inadequacy of the RCMP to assess a genuine security threat, Ramirez focused on the devastating effect of the arrest and internment of Italians in the Montreal area on the individuals and on the community. The arrests began on 10 June 1940. In addition to arresting suspects who had been denounced to police by Italian-Canadian informers, the government also required enemy aliens—all those born on territory

under Italian sovereignty and not naturalized British subjects before 1 September 1929—to register immediately with local authorities and to report periodically to the police.

Drawing on the testimony of individuals involved, Ramirez described the humiliation of the internees and their families. Of more significance to the Italian community of Montreal, however, was the blow dealt by the government's actions to "the very essence of Italian-Canadian ethnicity and to some of the most visible ways in which it had manifested itself."

Ramirez argued that by the thirties the Italians in Montreal, individually and in their associational life, had achieved "ethnic respectability." The government in its security measures and, more importantly, in its encouragement to anti-fascist members of the Italian community to denounce those with real or imagined loyalty to the fascist cause, "transformed bitter dissension and rivalries into hatred and profound divisions" that were not healed until the arrival of new Italian immigrants in the fifties and beyond.

These papers sparked lively discussion. Several speakers drew attention to the inadequacy of the review procedures for those who found themselves interned. Often the internees, both German and Italian, had difficulty finding lawyers to represent them. Still others pointed out that there were those in authority who disliked the way in which the Defence of Canada Regulations were being implemented, among them Norman Robertson and J.W. Pickersgill. Another issue was the state's role in the "Canadianization" of the immigrants. As J.L. Granatstein pointed out, no one warned the Germans that association with the Bund could prove dangerous.

The most obvious differences of opinion centred on the question of the state's right to take the measures it did during wartime. As Terry Copp mentioned, June 1940 marked the surrender of France and signified nothing less than the fall of the Western world. In desperate times, the government has not only a right but a duty to take action, even to the extent of banning potentially subversive organizations and interning people. Granatstein defended the notion of "guilty until proven innocent" when a nation is at war. Harold Troper (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education) insisted that one must distinguish between genuine threats and innocent people.

The papers presented at the third session looked at the special problems the government encountered when ethnic identity was also "a matter of faith." Paula Draper (Ontario Institute for Studies in

Education) examined "Fragmented Loyalties: Canadian Jewry, the King Government and the Refugee Dilemma." She chronicled the sad fate of the refugees from Germany, Austria and Italy who had been temporarily interned in Britain after the fall of France and placed on ships bound for Canada and Australia. Although the British quickly determined the innocence of the refugees, the Canadian government did not release the last of them until December 1943. The chief reason for the government's failure to act was that more than 200 of the interned men were Jews, and it was not deemed politically expedient to welcome them to the country. Despite lobbying from the Canadian Jewish Congress and the Canadian National Committee for Refugees, and despite the apparent conviction of Under-Secretary of State Norman Robertson that the internment of the refugees was plainly wrong, no one had either the political will or the power to overrule F.C. Blair, the Director of Immigration. Only when C.D. Howe (then Minister of Munitions and Supply) insisted on the release of some of the interned skilled workers for the war effort were some of them freed. The trickle of releases turned into a steady stream when aroused public opinion forced Mackenzie King's hand.

The fate of the interned refugees illustrated the wartime dilemma of Canadian Jews. Unable to move the government toward a pro-Jewish Palestine policy or to open Canada's doors to Jewish refugees, unable to win the release of those wrongly interned, "Canadian Jewry found that indeed its loyalty was fragmented—between Canadian nationalism, a budding Jewish nationalism and the survival of world Jewry."

Not all religious minorities suffered at the government's hands, as David Fransen (Directorate of History, Department of National Defence) illustrated in "Breaking Down the Barriers: Mennonites in Canada during the Second World War." The government's accommodation during wartime of Canada's 100,000 Mennonites, rural, isolationist, German-speaking and pacifist, makes a remarkable success story. At the outbreak of war the Mennonites were riven by internal disputes. The earliest immigrants to Canada, the Swiss and Kanadier Mennonites, resented the Russlaenders who had arrived since the 1920s because they were believed to have made a mockery of the faith in taking up arms to defend themselves in the wake of the Russian revolution. Unable to agree among themselves, the two groups nonetheless went together to Ottawa in November 1940 to negotiate some form of non-military contribution to the war effort. The result was the setting up of Alternative Service Work camps in Ontario, British

Columbia, and the prairies. The camps were eventually superseded by a more diversified programme of alternative service administered by the Department of Labour.

This notable success at accommodation came about largely because the Mennonites proved themselves ready to compromise. In this they compared favourably to those more intractable conscientious objectors, the Doukhobors and the Jehovah's Witnesses. To the chagrin of the Mennonites, officials also noticed—and appreciated—the significant number of Mennonite men who did enlist in the army. Finally, bureaucrats reacted with singular flexibility to the Mennonites' offer of alternative service. These factors account for an unusually happy chapter in the state's wartime relations with the ethnic community.

In the general discussion at the third session, attention came to rest on the roles of three individuals: Mackenzie King, F.C. Blair and Norman Robertson. The Prime Minister was shown to be somewhat remote from the decision-making process that sealed the fate of both the Jewish refugees and the Mennonites. In the case of the former, he took no active role until requested to do so by an acquaintance, although he must have been aware of the refugee dilemma in the summer of 1940. As for his reputation as a great friend and benefactor of the Mennonites, there is no evidence that he busied himself in the search for a compromise.

No satisfactory answer emerged in answer to William Young's question about the source of Blair's power. Equally unfathomable was the inaction of Norman Robertson, despite his supposed concern for the interned refugees. John English challenged Paula Draper's contention that the Liberal government did not bother to act because it took the Jewish vote for granted. The discussion ended with a vague agreement that the refugees remained interned because no one in authority had the political will to act.

The fourth session generated the most debate. Lubomyr Luciuk (University of Toronto) presented the first paper, co-written with Bohdan Kordan (Arizona State University), on "Ethnicity and the State at War: Canada and Ukrainian Canadians during the Second World War." Their conclusions were damning. In 1940, the Canadian government established the Ukrainian Canadian Committee to bring under a single organization all the separate Ukrainian factions, except the left. It was set up for the twofold purpose of ensuring that the government's war aims were clearly understood by the Ukrainian population and of checking possible pro-Soviet activity in the months

before the Soviets joined the Allied cause. Luciuk and Kordan argued that the Ukrainians, concentrated in agriculture and heavy industry, gave the government their unstinting support in the war effort and enlisted in substantial numbers because they believed that they were fighting for the principles of the Atlantic Charter. In return the Ukrainians believed that the government would adhere to the "liberal-democratic" principles of the charter and support the cause of an independent Ukraine.

The end of the war brought disillusionment and the widespread conviction among Ukrainians that the government had failed to adhere to the principles it claimed to be defending. The other "crippling legacy" of the war was the Ukrainian Canadian Committee itself, which survives to the present and remains an unrepresentative and artificial body.

The most contentious paper of the conference was that on "The Evacuation of the Japanese-Canadians, 1942: A Realist Critique of the Received Version," by J.L. Granatstein. The author began with the accepted version of events as presented in the work of Ken Adachi, Hugh Keenleyside, Ann Gomer Sunahara and the brief of the National Association of Japanese Canadians, namely that the removal from the West Coast of all Japanese nationals into the interior, the confiscation of their property and the move to deport them were prompted by the desire of politicians to "pander to the bigotry" of some constituents or by other political motives, and that the RCMP and the top military brass considered this measure unnecessary, "there being no credible military or security threat."

Granatstein turned a questioning eye on various aspects of the received version, notably the resources and manpower of the intelligence services on the West Coast, the role of the Japanese consulate, the actions of Japanese Canadians before the attack on Pearl Harbor, the role of the military representatives in British Columbia, and the potential military threat to the West Coast. What his paper added to the received version was the assertion that "there were military and intelligence concerns that, in the face of the sudden attack at Pearl Harbor, could have provided Ottawa with a justification for the evacuation of the Japanese-Canadians from the coast." It was admitted, however, that in December 1941 the government lacked much of the evidence to indicate the existence of such a threat and the expertise to assess it. The paper echoed the work of Keyserlingk in pointing out the weakness of the RCMP's intelligence network. It also showed that the

Japanese foreign ministry had ordered the Japanese consulate in Vancouver to use Japanese nationals as spies, and noted that their support for the Imperial Japanese in the war against China prior to 7 December 1941 understandably worried Canadians. Perhaps most contentious of all was his suggestion that some of the scanty information available seems to indicate a predisposition on the part of first-generation Japanese in British Columbia, like their counterparts in Hawaii, to favour the success of the Japanese after December 1941. His conclusions did not question that "the Japanese-Canadians were victims of the racism of the society in which they lived and an uncaring government that failed to defend the ideals for which its leaders claimed to have taken Canada and Canadians to war."

In the discussion Granatstein's work was contested on a number of points. His most outspoken critic, Howard Palmer, did not believe that there was any new evidence to suggest a genuine military threat. Further, if security was the motivation for the evacuation, why were orphans and the blind removed along with the more plausible subversives?

Granatstein conceded that the evacuation was indeed motivated by racism. But as to the existence of a threat, it is the perception of the authorities at the time that matters, and those authorities did see a threat. He repeated his assertion that in wartime the attitude is and must be "guilty until proven innocent." One poignant contribution was made by a student of Japanese descent from Carleton University, who pointed out that Japanese Canadians had demonstrated their loyalty in their generous donations to Victory Loan drives, and had done little to merit the treatment to which they were subjected.

As in earlier sessions, the participants concluded that the government was poorly equipped to deal with its immigrant population, especially those from enemy countries.

"Sanctuary and Security" featured the final papers of the symposium. Donald Avery (University of Western Ontario) offered remarks on "Canada's Response to Refugees, Enemy Aliens and Displaced Persons, 1939-1945: The Security Dimension." He showed that although Canada did not have a refugee policy as such, about 3,000 European refugees "slipped through the immigration gates." The fact that so many of the refugees were Jews was the chief reason for the restrictive policy. But it must be pointed out that Blair, the Director of the Immigration Branch, opposed the admission of all refugees. In this he reflected not only the views of his American counterpart, but also

those of the security agencies of Canada, the United States and Great Britain. The governments of all three countries were warned by their security experts that a more liberal refugee policy heightened the risk of admitting Nazi or Soviet agents. Concern about the latter seems not to have been dulled by the Soviets' change of heart in June 1941. "In Canada, the leadership of the RCMP and the Immigration Branch assumed that in the national interest it would be better to reject all refugees rather than to allow a single Nazi or Soviet agent into the country." Once more, it seems, the circumstances of war dictated the government's response.

Robert Bothwell (University of Toronto) traced the fortunes of Hans von Halban, the Austrian-born pioneer of Canada's nuclear programme, in his presentation on "Weird Science: Scientific Refugees and the Montreal Laboratory." Apprentice of Joliot-Curie in his heavy water atomic research at the Collège de France, co-creator of the uranium reactor, it was Halban who first suggested to his British research team that they move their laboratory to Canada so as to be closer to sources of heavy water and uranium. In 1942 the Canadian and British governments struck the deal, and the Montreal laboratory came into existence with Halban as director. The research was administered by C.J. Mackenzie's National Research Council, although it is clear that Mackenzie himself had an imperfect understanding of its significance.

For some time the fate of Canada's budding nuclear project hung in the balance. With much humour, Bothwell showed that "difficulties in the laboratory, between the laboratory and the Canadians, and between the British and the Americans seemed inextricably bound up with Halban's personality." A solution was eventually found in the removal of Halban as director and the decision to proceed with a large reactor of heavy water and uranium. These measures ensured American co-operation with the Canadian laboratory and precluded its demise.

Bothwell's paper shed light on the role of wartime refugees in the early days of Canada's nuclear program. The Montreal laboratory was multinational in character, staffed by refugees from several European countries who brought with them the technical expertise crucial to the laboratory's work. Their story, particularly that of Hans von Halban, underlines the contribution of wartime refugees to Canadian life.

The importance of that contribution emerged in the course of the discussion. According to Bothwell, C.J. Mackenzie lacked confidence in the Canadian scientists on the staff of the National Research Council.

In 1945 that body was still very "colonial" in character. Because of the influx of foreign talent, the laboratory was able to retain a pool of scientific knowledge, train and develop it. The impact of Halban and his team was immeasurable. Owing to the expertise of the refugee scientists, the origins of the CANDU reactor may be said to lie in Paris.

It was left to the concluding panel to offer general remarks on the proceedings. John English noted that the war had been some distance away from the conference. The only events of the war to have received mention were the arrests of June 1940. In emphasizing the circumstances of the war, English stressed that the question of ethnicity was on the periphery of the country's interest in the early forties, not at the centre. The war not only provides the context in which all the issues raised in the papers must be examined, but was also responsible for recasting the international political system. Canada reflects this. In 1939, Canada was a very different country from the one that emerged six years later. She had been unprepared for the outbreak of war, and unconcerned about matters of security. Small wonder that the security services so vividly demonstrate that lack of preparation.

English also questioned the validity of some assumptions underlying the earlier discussions. Canada went to war because the majority of its citizens had emotional ties with Great Britain, not in defence of the principles of the Atlantic Charter. It was that sentimental attachment to the mother country which made the majority look with suspicion on the emotional ties of other ethnic groups. Furthermore, one must be careful in speaking of "civil liberties" in the context of the war. In the pre-war years civil liberties were perceived as an issue that concerned university professors, not ethnic groups.

Finally, English noted some omissions among the subjects treated at the conference. Among these was the impact on ethnic groups of the economic transformations wrought by the war. To touch on that topic is to underscore his earlier point that we are further away from the world of 1939 than some of the papers at the conference would have us believe.

Howard Palmer remarked that the conference had brought together scholars whose interests did not often give them opportunities to meet. In blending the fields of ethnic and political history the conference had raised issues that have seldom been considered.

The papers showed that war brought out the best and the worst in people. The worst, to Palmer's mind, was the large-scale denial of civil liberties to the Japanese Canadians. He questioned whether the

government action was justified even if a percentage of Japanese did support the Imperial Japanese cause. It is the wartime fusion of those two powerful emotions, racism and nationalism, that helps explain the action against the Japanese. Palmer argued that it is our duty to make moral judgements about the case of the Japanese Canadians and to learn lessons from it. The issue of redress to the Japanese Canadians is no more a "Japanese-Canadian issue" than the Holocaust is a "Jewish issue." It is a matter that concerns us all.

Harold Troper said that what was missing from the conference was not the war but ethnicity. None of the discussions focused on what war signified for ethnicity and survival. Ethnicity is not just a matter of organization, but has to do with learned behaviour traits which dictate how a person lives.

Troper addressed the problem of defining ethnicity, describing it as something more visceral than what had been conveyed at the conference. In his view, ethnicity defies time, has its own dynamic and is an indigenous Canadian phenomenon. Time changes but does not diminish a group's ethnic identity.

After some discussion, it became apparent that the participants had not reached a consensus on all or even most of the major issues. What the conference did was to provide the opportunity for an exchange of opinion, and a sharing of research, on a vital question in Canadian history.

Chernobyl and Nuclear Power in the USSR

David R. Marples

Analyzes the April 1986 nuclear accident at the Chernobyl plant in the context of the development of nuclear power in the USSR and Eastern Europe. Examines the nature and consequences of the disaster and comments on the economic and political repercussions of the event for Soviet society.

This edition available in Canada only.

xii, 228pp, cloth \$19.95, paper \$14.95

ISBN 920862-48-9 (cloth), 920862-50-0 (paper)

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

Published by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies in association with the Macmillan Press, London.

GUIDE TO RESEARCH

Marta Tarnawsky

UKRAINIAN LITERATURE IN ENGLISH PUBLISHED SINCE 1980: PART 3*

I. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- A18. *Anthology of Soviet Ukrainian Poetry*. Compiled by Zakhar Honcharuk. Translated from the Ukrainian. Kiev: Dnipro, 1982. 462 p. ports.

Contents: Pavlo Tychina: Harps ringing, harps ringing. — Enharmoniques: The Sun (Birds of paradise somewhere feed on). Wind (Bird — a river — greening legumes). Rain (The serpents writhe in someone's hand). Fog (Over swampland like spun milk fog goes). — Pastels: I (Runs by a bunny). II (It has supped on hearty wine). III. (Trills like flutes rang on horizons). IV (Oh, wrap me up well. Oh, wrap me). Tr. by Gladys Evans. — The plough (Wind). Tr. by Walter May. — On the square (In front of the church on the square). Tr. by

* An attempt will be made to provide an ongoing, comprehensive coverage of books and pamphlets, as well as articles, book reviews, and translations of poetry, prose and drama published in monthly and quarterly journals and collections. Persons wishing to bring additional material to my attention are requested to write to me at the University of Pennsylvania Law Library, 3400 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104. Inclusion of a title will be postponed, however, until the item is personally examined and the bibliographical information is verified.

Gladys Evans. — Wind from the Ukraine (Nothing do I love so fine). — La bella fornarina (By Tiber's side strolled Rafael). — We live and toil communally (I. VI. X). Tr. by Walter May. — From *In the cosmic orchestra*: I. (Blessed are). II. (I am a spirit, the spirit of eternity, of matter — the muscles that move the dawn). III. (In the great cosmic orchestra). V. (Along eternity's steep bank). VI. (The earth goes circling round the sun). VIII. (Humanity proclaims its creed). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg. — Tractor girl's song (Smoke and dust fly by from machines). — One family feeling (My soul is deep, resilient, rich). — Song of John Ball (They may be kings and courtiers). Tr. by Walter May. — Funeral of a friend (The hues of eve had changed to wistful tones). Tr. by Gladys Evans. — I grow strong (I am the folk, the Truth's my crown). — Sword dance (We were received in Aberdeen). Tr. by Walter May.

Maxim Rylsky: *** (Swallows now are flying, fly to try their wings). — *** (Sign of Libra — sign of the new age). — The competition (In sunny Florence once upon a time). — Friendship (He made his scenic exit — mad King Lear). — Chant of my native land (Blest be the wondrous day and time). — Cup of friendship (Rings through lullabies when dusk has fallen). — Fidelity (All was reflected in the placid stream). 2 (She touched with soft and gentle hand, so pleading). 3 (The joys of eventide are faint bells ringing). — Pigeons over Moscow (The growth of Moscow gladdens the eye). — Late nightingales (The spring has finished its wassailing). — Wild carnations in the wood (In the wood near wild carnations). — Grapes and roses (A tired girl came home from fieldwork: then with hoe). — The bells of Avignon (Chimes rise and fall in Avignon). — Rio de Janeiro: I. (The screech of yellow birds, long-beaked). II. (Mulatto! Dressed in rags and tatters). — Thirst: From the poem *A vision* (excerpt) (We thirst). — Fairy tale (A kindly fairy threw a golden ball). Tr. by Gladys Evans.

Vasil Chumak: Spring hubbub (Little lily-cups clinked, dashed with rain). — May (Keep silent. Just stroll. Why the path? Take the gully. The thicket.) — The call (Wake, no grouses). — Boundary (Daybreak. Dewdrops. Dreaming. Silence). — Asters (What faded splendour). — Cornflowers (Yesterday for amusement). — Tempered poetry (Hammer). Tr. by Walter May.

Vasil Ellan-Blakitny: Forward (Not a word that we're tired! Not a word about rest). — Hammer blows (Beating hammers, beating hearts). — Letter (I have come to say to you goodbye). — Forgive me (Forgive me love, little girl, I ask your grace). Tr. by Walter May.

Volodimir Sosyura: Oh no, 'twas not in vain ('Twas not in vain, oh no, the steppe with gunfire shuddered). Tr. by John Weir. — The red winter (O Lisichansk! Donetsk! My smoky factory). — *** (No one loved so before. In a thousand years once). — *** (As a night train goes rumbling afar). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg. — *** (I recall the cherries ripening, swinging). Tr. by Gladys Evans. — To Maria (If all the loves on earth were blended into one). Tr. by John Weir. — Cornflowers (All over the field, you see blue cornflowers growing). Tr. by Gladys Evans. — A letter to my fellow-countrymen (In our cities and villages, forests and valleys, where once). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg. — *** (Joy of victory and making a right-about). Tr. by Gladys Evans. — Love your Ukraine (As you love the bright sun, Ukraine you must love). Tr. by John Weir. — My Donbas (The long night's done, my Donbas... Love is in its heyday). — *** (Sunflower past the fence there, heavy head drooped long). — *** (Hear the nightingale — it's my land of nightingales). — *** (I love the ancient world of trees). — *** (What are trees whispering of within the evening darkness). Tr. by Gladys Evans.

Dmitro Zahul: I gaze afar (I gaze afar on stormy seas). — Changing motifs (No poet is formed where rules tranquillity). — The trumpeter (It's not the archangel's Last Trump blasting). — The sun and the heart (O Sun on high! Such golden flaming light). Tr. by Gladys Evans.

Valerian Polishchuk: First snow (A yellow leaf on the ground). — The Colossus of Memnon (When the sun emerged and bounded). — To my father (For glory and freedom and honour we die). Tr. by Walter May.

Mikola Tarnowsky: To our brothers overseas (As spilled our people's woes across the planet). — My beautiful Ternopil (Ternopil! City of militant glory). — Let seed be sown ("Let seed be sown and grain be grown!" we say today). — Under my country's skies (Land of my birth, Ukraine, my motherland). Tr. by John Weir.

Ivan Kulik: Sowing (Eyes flashing lightning we'll sow the horizon with stars). — Fifth letter (My son said yesterday: "You're old now, daddy). — Sixth letter (Well no, from ancient Balaklava). Tr. by Walter May.

Mikola Tereshchenko: Light from the east (Down from beyond the meadows). — A girl from the Ukraine (I met a girl from the Ukraine). — Harvest (Clouds vanish beyond the horizon). — Kibalchich's testament (This night will be my last. Will I have time). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

Pavlo Usenko: Spring song (And today it is spring, just as then). — Letter (Our dear secretary-girl). — For our Ukraine (Our flasks of water). — I'll bind, embrace, and close entwine. — *** (Snowdrops all are gone). — My spring (My own perennial enchantress). — *** (From this earth I'll not be parted). Tr. by Walter May.

Mikhailo Yohansen: *** (A new Atlantis arose from blue abyss). — The Commune (Do you really think that's a Commune). — The Red Army (No White-Guard heroism here). — Spring (On a winter poem where no word was seen). — September (A September day is like a sword). Tr. by Gladys Evans.

Mikola Bazhan: The trooper's song (The troop cavalcade moved out, horses neighed). Tr. by Gladys Evans. — Hoffmann's night (Into a dark abyss, down steps worn-down, rough-carven). — The wind from the East (From *A Stalingrad Notebook*) (O turbulent east wind, you breathe and you smell). — The break-through (From *A Stalingrad Notebook*) (In houses knocked askew, shot through, bashed in). — The Cliffs of Dover (From *English Impressions*) (So here it is, that chalk so widely famous). — Before Michelangelo's statues (From *Italian Encounters*) (The rabid boiling of magma, eruptions of ore primeval), 2. (On great blocks of marble he chiselled the features), 3. Pieta (All alien here to me: these towering vaults). — On Sardinia (From *Italian Encounters*) (Where heat-waves choke, where rusty grassblades poke), 2. (Peopleless wastes without end). — Second variation (From *Stories of Hope*. Variations on a theme from R.M. Rilke) (Through the worm-eaten pineboard partition, through rag-plugged crannies and cracks). — The gods of Greece (From *Memories of Uman*) (Clashing, sparkling, glistening). — Shostakovich: Seventh

symphony (Ashes lay red. Ruins remained of homes). — Leontovich's well (He stopped short in the steppe and he listened, intent, to the groan and the moan). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

Yevhen Pluzhnik: Lenin (Decades pass, in time's day-measured paces). — *** (I know that ploughshares are beaten out of swords). — *** (To learn wisdom — others don't employ). — *** (Night world in beauty wrought). — *** (Oh, when September-golden comes to pass). — *** (Just a small town. But climb up the bell-tower). — *** (Night... a boat — like a silver bird). — *** (Blue madness yonder! With the sea beneath me). — *** (Evenfall. And seaward fog is rising). Tr. by Gladys Evans.

Olexa Vlizko: *** (Rich red blood, and my strength, open-handed). — Ninth symphony (Fire! Fire of superhuman love). — I speak for all: I (From towers tall we view the world), II (We shall not cry! To no pot-house fly), III (Oh yes! We'll grow! We'll grow and grow). — Ironie overture (With the stiff north wind from the mountains). — Roadstead (Beyond the silo — the lighthouse tower). — Ballad of "The Flying Dutchman" (The heavy cruiser goes out on her course). Tr. by Walter May.

Teren Masenko: To my mother's memory (Where the boundless Black Sea lies). — Premonition (I dreamt there was a heavy shower). — Meditation (I've lived half a century now). Tr. by Peter Tempest.

Vasil Misik: The spirit of today (Thus in Boyan's age too, no doubt). — Wormwood (Wormwood, I'm longing to know). — Cranes of Hiroshima (If you yourself were a physician). — The path (Who was the first with wary gait). — The planet (Our planet we must care for, doing). — *** (The twenties... Long those autumns were). — The heart of Burns (To singing his beloved's praises). — Chornotrop (A rare good fortune is yours). — The drop (It's dark in the room here from shelves overburdened). — Conscience (A man came along who said). Tr. by Peter Tempest.

Sava Holovanivsky: Maples (I would like to turn into a roadside maple). — Meeting sunrise on Chernecha hill (For a while on the hilltop we stood without whisper or murmur). — A song about my Ukraine (Where wide-spreading poplars bow

low in a wind-storm). — Harkusha (That selfsame Harkusha who just came from battle back home). — Lady Godiva (I have travelled a lot and seen many a wonder). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

Yevhen Fomin: Shchors (I see bold Shchors upon his horse). — Ocean etude (Ocean, for long you've not gladdened my vision). — Landscapes: I (There's a landscape — a slender pine), II (Above the cliff stand oaks, their heads like clouds), III (Above Taurian steppe the storm struck out). Tr. by Walter May. — The Dnieper (I know not how the Seine flows on with blueing waters). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath. — Golden Slavic soul (O golden Slavic heart and soul). Tr. by Walter May.

Leonid Pervomaisky: *** (Ah, for a taste of bitter apples). — Earth (An autumn road... A muddy autumn road). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg. — Song (From the Syan to the banks of the Don the road lies). — Master (Rules may forbid it, but look — he's taking). Tr. by Peter Tempest. — The two giants (They are coming back from a walk, both in the prime of their might). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg. — *** (When a fir tree falls in the forest). Tr. by Peter Tempest. — The tree of life (Beaten by thunderstorms unbending tree). — Francois Villon (Dig into rags, curl up and close your eyes). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg. — *** (The past brooks no denial). — Lessons of poetry (For drinking and eating I've lost the knack). Tr. by Peter Tempest.

Vasil Bobinsky: Song of the winged centaurs (We break into gallop with a song). — Black earth: I (You are brimful of sweat poured off hands of the farmer), II (Hey, black-earth there! Hey, black-earth there), III (Black of night, you go into the steppe lone and bare). — Sunlight against show-windows (Sunlight crackles to splinters against the show-windows). — To far lands (O remote distant seas where the billows are tossed green and silver). Tr. by Gladys Evans.

Ivan Honcharenko: That was not your daughter stood there (Once a mother was conversing). — Obelisks (On all roads from the Volga to Elbe). — Now the ploughland revives. Tr. by Walter May.

Yuri Yanovsky: *** (Hail to you, sea! A steamer's course). — Son ("What's a sail like — a big wide shawl"). — In port (Let happy day sleep sound and fast). — Dedication

(High in the sky swift falcons veered). — Ten years (With sharp steel swords, and not with tears). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

Lyubomir Dmiterko: Arkan (Like the Prut cascading free). — Dance above crossed swords (Not on crossed swords, but on a deadly mine-field). — Olvia (Most ancient city, thrusting from the earth). Tr. by Walter May. — Prelude (In the nighttime of March). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath. — The singer (Upon the Vosges Square there lies). — Porik's grave (A stone is not unfeeling rock). Tr. by Walter May.

Serhiy Voskrekasenko: Double-faced (We hear him speaking very often). — A thief at confession (The priest said strictly to the thief). Tr. by Walter May.

Petro Doroshko: *** (I drink water from the clear pure spring). — *** (Way beyond some gay horizon there). — Upon the Kola Peninsula (The strung-out track runs on unspanned). — Girl from Polissya (Maiden, o maiden). — Aerodromes (The aerodromes are just like nervous centres). — Orioles in my orchard (Orioles in my orchard here). — 'Mid the pines in the forest dark is the night. Tr. by Walter May.

Mikola Nahnibida: Out at sea (By my hand my Grandad led me). — The shirt (My mother once sewed me a shirt). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg. — Montenegro (This took place in far Montenegro). — Bonfires (The bonfires smoke above the water). — The bells of Khatyn (excerpt) (The singing rain). Tr. by Walter May. — To veterans of the war (Tell all the truth about it to your sons). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg. — To Katerina (Don't lose yourself within the human sea). Tr. by Mary Skrypnyk.

Kost Herasimenko: Ditty (Ah, I've tramped the pathway). — Story about a song (All flooded in spingtime sunshine). — Affirmation (Already the roads are drying). — Just a yarn (I don't know: the truth, or a tale invented). Tr. by Walter May.

Mikola Shpak: Happiness (Daughter on one arm). — *** (Above the village an aeroplane). — My native land (The whole earth steams). — The wish (You so desired a son). Tr. by Walter May.

Ihor Muratov: Bread (A captive wounded soldier lay). — My love and my hate (Oh, nothing could make me deviate). — Eyes (Peoples' eyes may differ — dark or blue). — Autumn

trumpets (The blazing leaf-fall lifts its voice). — Orioles (Orioles, orioles, birds that nest — out my way). — *** (Have you the knack of reading people's eyes). Tr. by Gladys Evans.

Ivan Virhan: Warrior's glory (A mortal wound beneath his breast). Tr. by Walter May. — To Olenka (Walking again through fields rolling). — Girl with a balloon (Through pale blue streets amidst the crowd thick milling). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath. — End of summer (No longer combines rumble on the steppe-lands). — The red guelder-rose tree (How fine here for me, the red guelder-rose tree). — Poplar down (One white ball of poplar down). Tr. by Walter May. — *** (When yesterday I came to you in darkness). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath.

Abram Katsnelson: Confession (I'm getting greedier and greedier for beauty). — *** (In our villages steep obelisks). — A ballad about a globe (The school was closed. In classrooms horses whinnied). — I'm earth (Fair curls peeped from beneath the saucy beret). — A maple leaf on the asphalt (A fancy-shaped, five-fingered maple leaf). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

Andriy Malishko: Motherland (You have raised me up since childhood's day). — The stork (He comes here flying from a distant strand). — Trumpeter (A cherry-red glow foretells a fine dawn of day). — The carpenters (The carpenters spanned with their bridges the Dnieper). — Katya (She went out quite early, before the sun-rising). — The Grey (A horse, called "The Grey", an old battery nag). — The word (At times above the crowd it sounded out). — *** (I lived not those years stuck behind a stone-deaf solid wall). — Of desert heat and dust I don't complain. Tr. by Walter May.

Valentina Tkachenko: Forests (A pine drips needles on the trail). — Story of a dove (When parting from you hurt in painful measure). — Mountain profiles (These mountains pictures call to mind). — Autumn's just beginning (From the clouds with rich donations). — Snowfall (Heavy the snowfall last night that came falling). Tr. by Gladys Evans.

Oleksandr Levada: The appointed hour (The appointed hour strikes plain). — Cosmonaut's monologue before Lenin's mausoleum (Again dawn calls, with impetuous pitch). — Four Yaroslavnas (Out of the trembling darkness). Tr. by Walter

May.

Platon Voronko: In the name of your sweet freedom. — Partisan ballad (Devilish night). — I am he who burst the dams. — Rain has passed. — "Beloved field" (In Albert Hall they sang "Beloved Field"). — Sleepless nights (All the words I've sorted long ago). Tr. by Walter May. — Swan-flight (I know not if a swan sings, as they say). Tr. by Gladys Evans. — *** (Here sat Boyan. He must have sat just here). Tr. by Walter May.

Vasil Shvets: The wind gone grey (And there is silence, soundless still). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath. — A girl from Moscow (The girl from Moscow sleeps — my darling Lida). — *** (The immortelle protects the marjoram). Tr. by Walter May. — Snow (Over fields midst the wheat of cold winter). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath. — The moon is rocking (To you in legend or tale I am calling). — Demeter (In its own time the cruel course of seasons). Tr. by Walter May.

Stepan Oliynik: The "emperor" ("Last autumn, so well my old tractor I'd driven"). — A bit too crafty (Late one night a puffing train). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg. — Our mothers (Let's remember, dearest children). Tr. by Mary Skrypnyk.

Oleksandr Pidsukha: Mother rocked me in my cradle. — One in age (Father, you and I are one in age). — *** (Blessed is he, who the silver line). — *** (Specially for me, and on my birthday too). — Early spring (The sky is clear, and pure as a tear). Tr. by Walter May.

Yaroslav Shporta: Zaporizhya (Greetings to you, Zaporizhya, steel-clad). — Ballad about light (To his motherland Gurgun came back). — Ballad about a small seed (Upon our fire-swept soil's dry crust). — The book with steel pages (Each word in that book I should like now to properly know). Tr. by Walter May.

Rostislav Bratun: Volyn song to the accordion (Wherever I have travelled). — Remember (No, the blood-stained secret can't be hidden). — *** (Should you go out and leave the city). — Lilies-of-the-valley make a landing (Do not trample). — Fairy tale about my town (Out of the night sailed Castle High). Tr. by Walter May.

Viktor Kochevsky: Landing night (Pale-blue Gelendzik came to see off the Black Sea squadron). — In your name

there are seven letters (In the quiet fire-glow of morning). — Conversation with the sky (Upon two birches). — Barev, my Armenia (Like some wide rainbow, which supports the sky). Tr. by Walter May.

Anatoliy Kosmatenko: Philoxenes and Dionysus (In those past days, when crowds of flattering lackeys). Tr. by Walter May. — The Golden Gates (A scrounger suddenly found out). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath. — Essence and effervescence (In order to study human natures). Tr. by Walter May.

Zakhar Honcharuk: Pigeon dawn (In the window). — Zaporozhian oratorio (From the poem *Titan*): (I'll play the organ). — Adriatic aquarelles (The sun comes up behind the hills), II (Thin and sharp-pointed as a spear), III (In hospitable Cetinje). — Pastoral (My thoughts are browsing). — Newton's binomial equation (My memory singles out your voice). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

Dmitro Pavlichko: Mount Ararat (How Mt. Ararat calls with its sails), II (I flew up to that mountain of ice). — *** (From what source is this web due). — Nostalgia (That woman haunts me. Always standing there). Tr. by Gladys Evans. — Hands (Look closely at your hands. Look near). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath. — Oswiecim (From Oswiecim I will not return). Tr. by Walter May. — In Hemingway's house near Havana (I went in and my spirit stood still). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath. — Lighthouse (Whose heart is that). Tr. by Walter May. — The heart of the matter (And for my coffin wood shall never want). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath. — Ernesto Che Guevara: I (Like smoke upon the earth Guevara fell), II (Well, burn him then, or give him to the ants). Tr. by Walter May. — The sea (The frosty rime is laid on seas autumnal). Tr. by Gladys Evans.

Vasil Bondar: The first from the left in the line (Came the hiss of barbed wire and clanking of iron). — *** (Oh, how I'd like to have two hearts... Look you). — The Italian (We were walking phantoms or their shadows). Tr. by Gladys Evans.

Mikhailo Klimenko: My orchard (This orchard). — Awakening (How fine to wander where the snow is thawing). — Polissya. Tr. by Walter May.

Mikhailo Tkach: Son, the ducks are flying (At daybreak a mother). — Mirage (I gazed into the mirror of Baikal). Tr. by

Mary Skrypnyk. — Living earth (It's war). Tr. by Walter May. — O beautiful ash trees. Tr. by Mary Skrypnyk. — Taras' dream (O blessed dreamlet, thought-child so long lying). Tr. by Gladys Evans.

Tamara Kolomiyets: The cranes' sorrow (Two broad wings has a crane and a nest in the marsh). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg. — The girl white-washed the cottage. — *** (Morning comes on grey steeds prancing). — To a mother (When you rock your children without rest). Tr. by Mary Skrypnyk. — On the hill of Batu Khan (As fair Kiev golden lay). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath.

Volodimir Brovchenko: The veterans were returning from the war (When the veterans returned from the war). — *** (Again the steppe arises from the depths). — *** (Beneath the plum-tree "Uhorka"). Tr. by Mary Skrypnyk. —

Yevhen Letyuk: Who's stirring the stars around up there (Who's stirring the stars around up there with a hand as big as a shovel). — *** (I've seen high wires trailing, torn loose by Big Gun battle spells). Tr. by Gladys Evans.

Stanislav Strizhenyuk: The sunflower (Once a lad and a sunflower grew up). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg. — Odessa (A dry lagoon). Tr. by Walter May. — White gull seagull (The wind is weeping at our parting). — Mamayev mound (Some dreams more bitter far than wormwood bite). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath. — The field (An AN-2). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

Volodimir Luchuk: Dawn (I ran to darkness cold and chilling deep). — Ballad of the hands outstretching (And I bless all the hands held outstretching). — In sun encircled (So full of life and love in sun encircled). — The sun (Scooping, palms cupping, deep waters). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath.

Volodimir Kolomiyets: Vernal dowry (Fill the vernal cup a-brimming). Tr. by Gladys Evans. — The arms of Venus de Milo (In the statue hides the centuries' secret). — A soldier's medals (Beneath the glass, in their green frame). Tr. by Walter May. — *** (The sun is now my visitor). — Spiky thoughts or heart of a hedgehog (And fingers brushed keyboard, a woodland seeking). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath.

Mikola Sinhayivsky: My native land (If not for you, my woods and fields). — Daily bread (The sun in the window — an omen gay). — *** (Underneath the Polissian sky). Tr. by

Dorian Rottenberg.

Mikola Karpenko: *** (The weight of years' upon my back I feel). — *** (Like water, minute after minute). — *** (You remember how we loved to listen). — Once I dreamed (Once I dreamed that the earth was all rubble and smoke). — While Vesuvius sleeps (Vesuvius awakes — Pompeii's gone). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

Vitaliy Korotich: Flight No. S-957, May 26, 1976 (Upon my fortieth birthday a YAK-40). — Eternity (A person's age can't be defined). — Traces (It's you who passed here. Melting snow). — Autumn geese in Koncha Ozerna (Leaving the imprints of their feet upon the barren sands). — The old minstrel (Ah, people, lead me there, across the square). — Summer in Kutaisi (How early blooms this year the linden tree). — The painter Pirosmanni's self-portrait (I hear quite well — stop shouting at me, stop). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

Robert Tretyakov: Pull of the heart (What marvels grand and glorious rose). — *** (Oh no, no infant cradles then). — *** (My father has a wound that's old). — Portraits (For scientist or poet comes a time). — *** (Carpathian beech, steppeland Lombardy poplar). Tr. by Gladys Evans.

Vasil Simonenko: Millstones (Those everstraining hands). Tr. by Gladys Evans. — *** (Native land of mine! My mind is brighter). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath. — A mother's entreaty (Out of dreamy mist arise wings of rosy swans). Tr. by Mary Skrypyk. — *** (Ever shall I bless despite the sorrow). — *** (Awake your new Magellan, fine Columbus). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath.

Boris Oliynik: *** (On jagged rocks they bound him in duress). Tr. by Gladys Evans. — Bachelor's ballad (I flew off like a handsome devil). Tr. by Walter May. — *** (From where the ages sleep in tombs along the Nile). Tr. by Gladys Evans. — *** (The years now no longer speed by as wild horses swift run). — Song about mother (She richly sowed cornfields of life with the years of her living). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath. — *** (I'd have always lain peaceful as ages passed by). Tr. by Gladys Evans. — My debt (I am in debt, that I was born Ukrainian). — The lesson (excerpt from the poem) (All around just as it should be). Tr. by Walter May.

Ivan Drach: The ballad of the sunflower (The sunflower once was all arms and legs). — Women and storks (Women in August differ. They're different women). — The ballad of Karmelyuk (They bound him tightly, with ropes they secured him). — The mystery (A funeral there was, and speeches). — Maria of the Ukraine — No. 62276 from Oswiecim to the Chornobil Nuclear Power Station (Maria Yaremivna leads us beyond Yaniv station). — In the society of the bumble-bee (The bee that bumbled yesterday now quiet lies). — The Korolis-welders (This wonderful double family fascinated me). — A girl's fingers (Heavens, how many groans in fingers). Tr. by Peter Tempest.

Hanna Svitlichna: Father (Father walks among beds in the garden). — Joy (Out in the yard on a snowladen twig). — Red blizzard (Again October's blizzard blows). — The colour print (I lay awake and in the quiet of home). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

Mikola Vinhranovsky: Sistine Madonna (Mined by Hitler, below in the black cellar's water piled). — To my sea (The time has come to meet again). — On the golden table (The crimson cliff o'er the world's abyss). Tr. by Walter May. — The first lullaby (Sleep, my little baby, lulla-bye). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg. — Star prelude (Evening hay filled the sea scent spray). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath.

Roman Lubkivsky: Golden sowing (The Hammer and Sickle — a Star which won't dim). Tr. by Walter May. — The sweetbriar (The girls and boys run off to school). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg. — The parable of passing time (A boy's young hands try hard to capture passing time). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath. — *** (And when in the last attack he fell). Tr. by Walter May.

Viktor Korzh: Land of my fathers (The window in the shadow burns with roses). — Wild thyme (How resounds the height). — Flowers of memory (Children of post-war years don't forget). Tr. by Walter May. — Faith (Blackest leaves of trees in slumber deep). Tr. by Michelle MacGrath.

Petro Skunts: Birthtime (Ah, that we never should have known such times). — A ballad in a trench-coat (A common night. Just night. No special date). — Hoverla (Oh, help me to retrace your destiny). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

Irina Zhilenko: Speak to me of fields (The break of dawn... The cool of morning tethers). — Spring (The spring is here. On breathing in bark moisture). — Self portrait (This moment now is mine. And no one ever); 2 (Around my brow streams out a violet aura). Tr. by Gladys Evans.

Petro Osadchuk: *** (My Ukraine begins and extends). — *** (I awoke from the nightingales' song at dawn). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

Volodimir Zabashtansky: Faith in man (Men need metal and clothing and bread). — The stone-hewer (Uncle Ivan, if you'll kindly permit me). — Sonny (In this world he hasn't yet a worry). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

Leonid Talalai: Song (The branches dripped). — Girl with buckets (Girl with buckets). — Eluard's word (To find one word out of millions). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

Svitlana Yovenko: On translating poetry (Are not our human cares identical). — Woman (Men I have never envied). — In defence of Goethe's late love (Who was it said love's light will perish). Tr. by Peter Tempest.

Petro Perebiynis: My heirlooms (I try for size). Tr. by Gladys Evans. — A master-craftsman's love (I bow to you). — The earth's palette (If your spirit is dead, nought will save you). — Glazed horses (A grey-haired potter at the market offers). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

Volodimir Zatulyviter: Birth debt (The bird-cherry rejoices, meeting May Day). — A theory of wings (Arise, O Father! Ploughs fly back to fields). — Rodin: a sonnet (I learn from stone. It's only now at last). — The stellar message (Constellations illumine the heavens). Tr. by Dorian Rottenberg.

With bio-bibliographical notes and black and white portraits for each poet in the anthology.

- A19. Antonenko-Davydovych, Borys. *Duel*. Tr. from the Ukrainian by Yuri Tkach. Melbourne: Lastivka Press, 1986. 136 p. [Translation of the novel *Smert'*. Introduction (p. 5-7) by Dmytro Chub].
- A20. *Before the Storm: Soviet Ukrainian Fiction of the 1920's*. Ed. by George Luckyj. Tr. by Yuri Tkacz. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1986. 266 p.

Contents: Introduction. — The woodcocks [excerpt]/Mykola Khvylovy. — The radio ham/Hryhoriy Epik. — The provocateur/Geo Shkurupiy. — Kostryha/Arkadiy Liubchenko. — The sailor [excerpt]/Yuriy Yanovsky. — Black lake [excerpt]/Volodymyr Gzhytsky. — In the infirmary/Valerian Pidmohylny. — Stone grapes/ Oleksa Slisarenko. — Politics/Hryhoriy Kosynka. — Notes of a flunky/Ivan Senchenko. — The journey of the learned doctor Leonardo and his future mistress, the beautiful Alceste, into Slobodian Switzerland [excerpt]/Mike Yohansen. — Doctor Seraficus [excerpt]/Viktor Domontovych. — Sirko/Oles Dosvitny. — Along the broken road/Mykhailo Ivchenko. — The life and deeds of Fedko Huska/Yukhym Vukhnal. — My autobiography/Ostap Vyshnia. — Shadows of forgotten days/Borys Antonenko-Davydovych. — Notes on the authors.

- A21. Berdnyk, Oles'. *Apostle of Immortality*: Ukrainian science fiction. /Tr. from the Ukrainian by Yuri Tkach. Toronto, Chicago, Melbourne: Bayda Books, 1984. 129 p. Port.

Contents: Oles Berdnyk's science fiction/Walter Smyrniw. — A journey to the antiworld. — The alien secret (an excerpt). — Two abysses. — The Constellation of Green Fish. — A chorus of elements. — The apostle of immortality. With the author's black and white portrait on p. 6.

- A22. Bodnarchuk, Ivan. *The Generations Will Get Together*: novel. Editing and introduction: Yuriy Klynovy. Edmonton: Ukrainian Canadian Writers' Association "Slovo," 1986. 132 p. Illus., port. [Translation of *Pokolinnia ziidut'sia*. Tr. by Yuriy Tkach. Translator indicated on book jacket only. "Introduction" consists of three sentences excerpted from a foreword to the Ukrainian edition.]

- A23. Franko, Ivan. *When the Animals Could Talk*; fables/Tr. from the Ukrainian by Mary Skrypnyk. "The painted fox" tr. by Wilfred Szczesny. Ill. by Yuli Kryha. Kiev: Dnipro, 1984. 86 p. col. ill.

Contents: The Donkey and the Lion. — How past favors are forgotten. — The Vixen and the Crane. — The Vixen and the Crab. — The Fox and the Blackbird. — The Hedgehog and the Rabbit. — The Kingbird and the Bear. — The Wolf as a reeve. — The Rabbit and the Bear. — Three sacks of cunning.

— The war between the Dog and the Wolf. — Godmother Vixen. — The Crow and the Snake. — The painted Fox. — The Wolf, the Vixen, and the Donkey. — How the animals brought the people to court. — A fable about fables.

- A24. *On the Fence*: an anthology of Ukrainian prose in Australia. Tr. from Ukrainian by Yuri Tkach. Assembled, with an introd. by Dmytro Chub. Melbourne: Lastivka Press, 1985. 151 p. The great race/Lesia Bohuslavets. — In the whirlpool of combat (an excerpt)/Yurij Borets. — They liked us from the start/Opanas Brytva. — An unexpected visitor/Dmytro Chub. — Castle on the Voday (an excerpt)/Serhij Domazar. — 1933/Klavdiya Folts. — The twilight of this world/Yevhen Haran. — Look after your health/Nevan Hrushetsky. — Son of a kulak (An excerpt)/Kuzma Kazdoba. — Christmas Eve/Zoya Kohut. — The young Judas/Liuba Kutsenko. — Hetman Rozumovsky (An excerpt)/Mykola Lazorsky. — From the other world/Yaroslav Lishchynsky. — The ballad of an overcoat/Olha Lytvyn. — A letter from the past/Fedir Mykolayenko. — Nightmare years/Nadia Petrenko. — My Bulgaria/Bohdan Podolianko. — The strange boss/Stepan Radion. — The idiot/Volodymyr Rusalsky. — The promise/Ivanna Sirko. — Farmsteads aflame/Ivan Stotsky. — Rain/Pylyp Vakulenko. — The gift of love/Hrytsko Volokyta. — The power of beauty/Vadym Zhuk. — Biographical notes. [Includes also a story by A. Liakhovych originally written in English].
- A25. *On Taras Mount*. Picture book on the Shevchenko Museum complex in Kanev, Cherkassy region, Ukrainian SSR. Kiev: Mistetstvo, 1981. unpagged [i.e., 96 p.] illus., part col. [Title, text and captions in Ukrainian, Russian and English. Edited by T.F. Bazylevych and L.M. Iefymenko. Photographs by B.O. Mindel et al. The first stanza of Shevchenko's *Zapovit* (When I am dead, then bury me) in three languages on first page of text. Mostly illustrations. English text = 4 p. Title in Ukrainian: *Na Tarasovii hori*].
- A26. Slavutych, Yar. *The Conquerors of the Prairies*. Tr. by R.H. Morrison, Zoria Orionna, Roman Orest Tatchyn and Rene C. du Gard. Edmonton: Slavuta Publishers, 1984. 128 p. [Poems. Parallel Ukrainian-English ed. One translation in French].

Contents of English translations: The conquerors of the prairies (Not Corteses from some long-bygone day). — Sorrow (No cuckoo's heard, no nightingale is found). — Atavistic (Smoke from the black roots drifts towards the skies). — Ploughmen (The axes and the spades, the ploughs and hoes). — Palms to the handles of the plough. — Boat upon water, plough in field. — Here headless skeletons, bleached white. — The stallion (What heartbreak, frenzied and insane). — The three (The haze has fallen on the glen)/Tr. by Zoria Orionna. — The inheritance (The grain's and tilled earth's songs ascend). — The west's brown hue. — The keen scythe hunts, athirst for prey. — The old men (They sit there lost in thought, omniscient). — The cottage (I stopped the auto and I went inside). — This land that has been conquered by the plough. — Saskatchewan girl (I met you there among blue-flowering trees). — Not these will be forgotten soon. — With sight of the Ukrainian folk made strong. — Stand on the firm black soil — Alberta (The greenish prairies black blood moves firm ground). — Jubilee (The ceaseless flame of my self-immolation). — Polar sonnets (Thus was Cree prophecy fulfilled). — Shevchenko in Winnipeg (His forehead's like the sun!). — In memory of Wadym Dobrolige (Art's dedicated one, Wadym, goodbye). — Like schools of bluish whales in onward rush. — Primeval forest, like totemic bird. — Winter's a sculptor. — The house I live in is concealed in snow. — Northern lights (White serpents on the slopes). — Low, leafless, dead are the surrounding trees. — Hungry coyotes' whining. — Like brontosaurus egg discovered in. — A yellowish sun was shining. — Embracing with ill-boding greed. — Falling snow (Falling and falling of snow, I, II, III). — To bondage goes the storm of snow. — White distance — like a coffin. — White whirl (I. O white whirlwind, O tempest of whiteness. — II. Strong wind from unconcerned skies. — III. With the whip of Alaska). — Beyond far Athabasca snow mounds rise. — Where heavy snows'. — Wild lamentation. — The green-clad distances of Yukon. — Northern lights (Oh how I love to stand admiring you). — In their abundance others came and went. — The girl's held in the ocean's embrace. — I dreamt of polar bears that in their lair. — Deeper each year the wrinkles grow. — Complaint (Revered Agapiy's long-lost trails I shadow), I, II, III,

IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, Epilogue/Tr. by Roman Orest Tatchyn.

- A27. *Ukrainian Folk Tales*./Tr. from the Ukrainian by Irina Zheleznova. Ill. by Yuli Kryha. Kiev: Dnipro, 1985. [c1981, 2d printing 1985]. 388 p. col. ill.

Contents: Nibbly-Quibbly the Goat. — The magic mitten. — The little round bun. — Sister Fox and brother Wolf. — The Little Straw Bull with the Tarred Back. — The Cat and the Cock. — Sir Cat-o-Puss. — The Fox and the Bear. — How the Dog found himself a master. — The Fox and the Crane. — Why the Stork eats frogs and the Wolf hunts sheep. — The Fox and her children and Nekhailo the loafer. — The Crow and the Snake. — Why geese bathe in water, cats wash on the top of a stove, and chickens take dust baths. — The mice and the cock. — The Lion and the mosquitoes. — The Bear and the Bees. — How a Squirrel helped a Bear. — The Ox, the Ram and the Cock. — The Wolf who wanted to be the village head. — The Goat and the Ram. — Sister Fox. — The Wolf and the kids. — Sirko. — The Lion who drowned in a well. — The Fox and the Crayfish. — The Heron, the Fish and the Crayfish. — The fly that ploughed a field. — The Swan, the Pike and the Crayfish. — The little Fish and the big fat bean. — Danilo-Burmilo the bear. — The bee and the pigeon. — The Lion who was made tsar. — Little Grey Wolf True-Beaten Black and Blue. — Telesik-Little Stick. — The frog princess. — The magic egg. — The seven brothers — seven ravens and their sister. — The brother, the sister and the Devil-Dragon. — Kirilo the Tanner. — Illya of Murom and Solovei the Whistler-Robber. — Ivan the Bohatyr. — The magic pumpkins. — The princess's ring. — Pea-roll along. — The pipe and the whip. — The soldier and the tsar. — Ivan the peasant's son. — How a Hutzul taught a princess to keep house. — Oh. — Ivan the Dragon Killer. — The fire-bird and the wolf. — The shepherd. — The flying ship. — Ivan-not-a-stitch-on and his brother. — The youth and the eagle. — Ivanko and Duliana the Wise. — Ivanko, tsar of the beasts. — The poor man and his sons. — The iron wolf. — The twelve brothers. — The blacksmith and the devil. — How a farmwife outwitted the devil. — The pipe, the fiddle and the dulcimer. — The old man's daughter and the old woman's daughter. — The greedy old woman and the lime tree. — The

foster father. — The rich miser. — Death and the soldier. — The tsar's goats. — The serf and the devil. — Mistress death and the cossacks. — How a peasant got the better of a devil. — The clever maid. — The honest nephew and the dishonest uncle. — The man who ransomed an enemy of the king. — Sad songs and gay. — Ivan the fool.

- A28. Vasyl'chenko, Stepan. *Stories*/Stepan Vasilchenko. Tr. from the Ukrainian by Oles Kovalenko. Ill. by Vasil Yevdokimenko. Kiev: Dnipro, 1984. 214 p. ill. (part col.).

Contents: Peasant 'rithmetic. — Vova. — At the manor. — Off for a strange land. — In the hamlet. — In the very beginning. — On the river Ros. — Father-in-law. — The rain. — The gull. — Talent. — The boy who came to stay. — Junior aviators' club. ["About the author" note on verso of title page].

(To be continued)

THE HARVEST OF SORROW

Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine

Robert Conquest

At long last the whole story of what has been called "the worst human disaster in living memory" has been told.

"Anyone who has had difficulty understanding Ukrainian nationalism will find an explanation here." *The Observer*, London

\$24.95 cloth

Order from:
The University of Alberta Press
141 Athabasca Hall
Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2E8

BOOK REVIEWS

DAVID J. GOA, *SEASONS OF CELEBRATION: RITUAL IN EASTERN CHRISTIAN CULTURE/TEMPS DE CÉLÉBRATION: LES RITES DANS LA CULTURE CHRÉTIENNE DE L'ORIENT*. Edmonton: Alberta Culture and Provincial Museum of Alberta, 1986. vi, 57 pp.

This book is the accompanying bilingual volume of a splendid exhibition, under the same title, which opened on 13 November 1986 in Edmonton, Alberta, and which is scheduled to close on 29 April 1989 following a national tour. As the "Introduction to the Exhibition" (p. vi) states:

Seasons of Celebration provides a glimpse into the marvelous world of Eastern Christian culture. This world is present in Canadian society and the materials in the exhibition are drawn from its numerous communities across the country. The ethnographic photographs of the various rituals and the material culture of the tradition all speak of the culture's genius.

The inherent spirit of both the exhibition and the book is that of recognition and celebration of the sacred in the midst of creation within the annual cycle, something that Eastern Christendom has made its characteristic "abiding message," hence the title of the exhibition and of this volume. The time is ripe for Christians from Eastern churches to share with pride their sacred culture with the rest of Canada—a truly ecumenical endeavour offered with love to the Canadian public for the life of Canada and of the world.

Indeed, the exhibition is scheduled to travel to eleven centres in eight provinces, to present icons, artifacts, vestments, sacred objects, texts and symbols, sounds and colours, and relevant photographs of items from the Greek, Ukrainian, Syriac, Coptic, and Russian communities. These will be presented within their own liturgical and cultural context, in conjunction with the experience of the world and of human beings. "For Eastern Christianity has grasped, far better than has its Western counterpart whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, how it is that sacred history unveils the sacredness of the natural world, of the total cosmos," as Professor Jaroslav Pelikan writes, concisely, in his foreword to this volume.

In displaying objects revered by the faithful as instruments and means of holiness, the exhibition celebrates not only holiness as such, but also beauty—*to kállos*—which is the inherent characteristic and manifestation of sacredness. In spite of the rigidity imposed by the book format, this publication has succeeded in capturing the flavour of the exhibition and "freezing" it into an effective interplay of text and photographs. The book is the artful work of David Goa,

Curator of Folk Life at the Provincial Museum of Alberta, researcher and creator of the exhibition. The publication also includes two short, but most comprehensive and interesting, articles on "Icons and Art: An Icon Painter's View" (pp. 45–8) by Heiko C. Schlieper and "Sacred Music in the Orthodox Church" (pp. 49–55) by Nicolas Schidlovsky.

A publication issued on the occasion and as part of an exhibition cannot be read and reviewed independently from the exhibition itself. And yet this particular publication has a certain autonomy that is worth considering and reviewing. For example, one might be puzzled as to the significance of photographs of bishop's and priest's vestments (p. 6) in the context of discussing Easter. There is, however, a connection between the bright, richly ornamented vestments and the celebration of the life of the Kingdom of God restored on earth, even though this connection is not articulated.

The publication is not meant to be a treatise on the history and culture of the Eastern Church or a theological statement of its doctrine; its purpose rather is to offer an introduction to the flavour of Eastern Christianity and to its characteristic celebration of life. With the book's attractive presentation, it has succeeded greatly in the latter intention; with its empathy and eloquence, it has accomplished much of the former. Yet the upbeat nature of the theme, the shortness of space, the vastness of the subject, and the plasticity and antinomy of language employed to convey spiritual categories are often conducive to a certain theological astigmatism. I shall venture to discuss a few such instances, not by way of unsympathetic criticism of the author, but as a means of confessing how much I value the exhibition and how seriously I take this publication:

- a) On p. 8, the caption for the icon of "The Extreme Humility" states that this icon "is commonly hung over the Altar of Oblation," but the picture next to it correctly shows the bishop preparing the eucharistic gifts at the Altar of Oblation under the icon of the Nativity! The Table of Oblation is not an altar. The gifts on the Table of Oblation are not yet consecrated, but are being prepared for consecration. The niche and the Table of Oblation are representations of the stable and the manger where God-the-Word is born and thus enters into the world in flesh. The service of the *proskomidē*, or offering and preparation, commemorates the Nativity of him who from his birth was destined to be sacrificed and yet be King, hence the performance of the rite by either priest or bishop in full vestments and regalia of his rank and dignity.
- b) One may find it difficult to concur with the assertion that the *Altar* symbolizes "the Kingdom of God" (p. 9). This statement appears to contradict the whole exhibition. The entire church-space in which the Eucharist takes place is a microcosm of the Kingdom, as the liturgical text, the blessings, actions, interactions and symbols

manifestly indicate. A few words could have been added to amplify the notion that although in the Eastern Church the Word of God is loudly chanted, attentively received, meditated upon, revered and venerated (as even the heavily ornamented Gospel Book indicates), it is the *incarnate* Word of God, Christ, who is celebrated as the cause and *raison d'être* of the Gospel Book. Hence the magnificent procession of the gospel before the readings [Small Entrance], starting from the southern door of the iconostasis, proceeding in front of the Table of Oblation (the Nativity spot) through the congregation, and arriving ultimately at the altar, symbolizing the actual ministry of the Logos in flesh.

The causal relationship between the written and the incarnate word is magnificently proclaimed by the icon of Christ Pantocrator, enthroned and holding the Gospel book open at the quotation: "*I am the way and the truth and the life!*" It was very perceptive of the author to illustrate his discussion of the Small Entrance with this icon.

- c) I am not sure that the following statement on p. 12 is a happy one:
In the Eucharistic prayer, heaven and earth are *blended*, past, present and the ages to come, *dark and light*, the cross, the tomb, the Resurrection...all *merge together* in this moment of thanksgiving... (Emphasis added)
The text of the Eucharistic prayer does not support this description. The Eucharistic prayer is above all doxological ("It is proper and right to sing to You, bless You, praise You, thank You and worship You..."), as well as Christological-soteriological: a "flashback" or reminder ("remember, therefore,...") of the divine dispensation.
- d) It is doubtful that the cup of warm water poured into the chalice in preparing the communion symbolizes "the living character of the risen Christ" (p. 13). The wording of the liturgical text that accompanies the blessing of the water ("Blessed is the fervour of your saints, now and forever and to the ages of ages. Amen"), and the pouring of the water into the chalice while mixing it with the wine ("The warmth of the Holy Spirit, Amen"), suggests something concretely ecclesiological in meaning behind this action. John D. Zizioulas's *Being in Communion. Studies in Personhood and the Church* (1985) is now a "must" for eucharistic ecclesiology.
- e) The picture of a baptism on p. 15 does not convey what the caption very rightly states—that the child is *immersed in (baptized)*, not sprinkled with, the baptismal water.
- f) The icon of the Resurrection in the context of the Mystery of Confession (p. 18) is a very appropriate combination. Seeing no

explanation, however, and noting that this icon seems merely to repeat the theme of the one on p. 6, the reader may be left wondering about its significance. This section should have included a brief explanation of what makes confession a mystery or sacrament, a frequent question and objection of Protestants. The mystery is not the confession as such, which is only its external and visible manifestation. What makes this act a mystery and a sacrament is the event of *metanoia*, the capacity to “change one’s mind” or repent; an event that includes, as does every mystery, the *synergeia* or co-operation of the human with the divine. Somehow that “I will return to my Father” of the prodigal son has not been sufficiently stressed in the text as the key to explaining the mystery of confession.

- g) With reference to marriage, the bridal couple are not “led around the altar” (p. 20), but around the wedding table. This table is a figuration of the altar, pointing to the traditional celebration of holy matrimony in conjunction with the Eucharist, as well as to Eastern Christendom’s interpretation of marriage as an eschatological union.
- h) Discussing the rite of monastic tonsuring (pp. 21–2) between holy matrimony and holy orders might easily lead the inexperienced reader to the conclusion that this also is a mystery, a sacrament, in the Eastern Church. The same might be assumed about the “Rites For Those Who Have Fallen Asleep” (pp. 25–6), even though the author has used the word “rites” in both these instances. The puzzle becomes even greater when one considers that in this whole chapter on the sanctification of the person, the word “mystery” is used for baptism, confession and holy matrimony, while the word “sacrament” is applied to holy orders. The inclusion of communion in the chapter on the sanctification of creation rather than in the one on the sanctification of the person makes matters confusing.
- i) No ordination of a bishop can be made by the laying on of hands of *one* celebrant bishop, as the caption on p. 24 implies. Ordination, especially of a bishop, requires the Pentecostal event, the *anamnesis* of the constitution of the Church as a body, i.e., as a synodical and collegial communion. This rite is an essential ecclesiological characteristic of the Eastern, especially of the Orthodox, Church.
- j) The selection of the icon of the ascension of Christ (p. 25) in the context of the “Rites For Those Who Have Fallen Asleep” is rather unfortunate. The icon of the “Dormition of the Theotokos” would have been more appropriate. The ascension of Christ, i.e., bodily translation to heaven, cannot be equated with a human dormition, and thus with the rite for those who have fallen asleep and await the resurrection of the dead. The Orthodox Church never shared the

Catholic teaching on bodily assumption, not even for Mary.

- k) On p. 30 the phrase "In the beginning, all creation was very good, and the Spirit of God moved upon the waters" is particularly erroneous, especially because it is offered as based on Gen. 1:2.
- l) The phrase "Saints embody the divine presence" (p. 34) might justifiably raise objections and intensify misunderstandings among Protestant Christians. In honouring saints the Eastern Church manifests its conviction that holiness—which is inherent in all creation and in all humanity because of the Incarnation—is, indeed, accessible and manifest in the life of ordinary human beings who have lived in space and time. Holiness for Eastern Christianity is not an abstract or ethereal category, but has to do with real people who live or have lived in the real world.
- m) The author contradicts himself, perhaps, when he characterizes Lent as a "joyous time" (p. 36), while in the same paragraph he speaks of forty days' fasting and of a call to discipline the body and spirit. These spiritual exercises do not make Lent a morbid season, but surely they make it a period of self-immersion, introversion, contrition and sober contemplation—hardly a "joyous time" in any sense.

More problematic is the statement that a second type of fast "is to refrain from celebrating the Eucharist on specified days... the Church has set aside the weekday Eucharistic Liturgy." On the contrary, Eucharistic services are multiplied and intensified during Lent, precisely in order to provide the faithful with opportunities to take communion even more often!

- n) It is unclear why the four evangelists depicted in the corners of the Gospel Book are also called prophets (p. 42). The French translation, especially, directs one to look for *des quatre évangélistes et des quatre prophètes*, as if they were two different sets of four personages.

This book is a portable exhibition and should be cherished both by those who have and those who do not have an opportunity to view the exhibition itself. Having woven together texts, pictures, colour, commentaries, and explanations, the volume serves as a useful reminder that books are not only words to be read, but also contain a whole realm of communicable ideas, images, messages, experiences, ideals, realities, and ontologies. Thus "books" are neither the property nor the prerogative of the literate and the intellectuals, but of all human beings. This is precisely why the Orthodox tradition has made such extensive and comprehensive use of material creation in its realistic, symbolic and ontological forms. In this way, Eastern Christianity proclaims and celebrates the participation of all creation in the event of recreation, and makes

every human being, irrespective of literacy, history and culture, a conscious participant in this celebration. To this end the exhibition and the book have already made a great contribution. This publication prepares the viewer to understand and enjoy the exhibition, and gives the non-viewer a glimpse of the ritual of celebration in Eastern Christian culture.

Daniel Sahas
University of Waterloo

DIMITRY POSPIELOVSKY, *THE RUSSIAN CHURCH UNDER THE SOVIET REGIME, 1917–1982*. Preface by John Meyendorff. Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984. 2 vols. 535 pp.

Professor Pospelovsky begins this work by describing the state of the Russian Orthodox Church on the eve of the Revolution. He then traces its history from the restoration of the Moscow Patriarchate in 1917 up to the present decade. His study includes the "leftist" and "rightist" schisms in the 1920s and 1930s, dwelling on the émigré Karlovci Synod in Yugoslavia (Chapters 2 and 4). It is also noteworthy that he devotes a subsequent chapter to the relationship between the Russian Churches in the diaspora and the Moscow Patriarchate (Chapter 8). The author ends his account with a chapter on the Russian Orthodox Church between 1965 and 1982 (Chapter 12); in a brief, impassioned conclusion, he depicts a church whose patriarch tries to serve the state, but which nevertheless remains "genuine, living and vibrant" through the faith and continuous sacrifices of believers and clergy.

The six appendices illustrate certain points emphasized in the book. The excerpts from a manuscript entitled "Political Controls over the Orthodox Church in the Soviet Union" (Appendix 1), by a former Kievan monk and Ukrainian Autonomous Church bishop, accuse the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church of having seized power by force and with Bolshevik support. Excerpts from A.A. Valentinov's *The Black Book* (Appendix 2) detail the savage Bolshevik persecution of the Russian Orthodox Church during the Revolution, including incidents in Ukraine and the Kuban. Appendix 3, an abbreviated version of a letter allegedly written by Archbishop Illarion Troitsky in 1927, contrasts with Illarion's known statements in criticizing the new alliance between church and state. Excerpts from the decisions of the 1937 New York Sobor of the Orthodox Church in America (Appendix 4) give evidence of that church's autonomy in relation to the Karlovci Synod. Appendix 5 contains an English translation of a 1939 address of thanks to Adolf Hitler from Metropolitan Anastasy of the Karlovci Synod for the building of the Berlin Orthodox Cathedral. Appendix 6 sets out the 1975 amendments to the 1929 Soviet laws on religious association alongside the articles affected, and thus

illustrates the increased power of the central Council on Religious Affairs in relation to local authorities. A bibliography of almost 16 pages is followed by an index.

This work is thoroughly documented and well written. Nonetheless—as one can infer from its dedication to the martyrs in Russia and other lands under militant atheist regimes—it is not a disinterested or dispassionate account. In occasionally polemical language that gains intensity in the final chapters, Professor Pospelovsky addresses several contentious issues which centre upon the fundamental conflict of the secular and the spiritual aspects of church life. Thus, he criticizes secularizing trends within the post-revolutionary Russian Orthodox Church, especially those which, like the Ukrainian autocephalist movement, he considers politically inspired. He is wary of nationalism in church affairs, including the Russian monarchist nationalism of the Karlovci Synod, which he attacks mercilessly. Thus, with regard to North America he supports the idea of an American Orthodox Church suited to local conditions as opposed to a politicized Russian church-in-exile. Similarly, he is sensitive to the constant exploitation of the Moscow Patriarchate by the Soviet government for political, especially foreign-policy, purposes, and admires those who struggle for the moral and spiritual purity of their church.

Professor Pospelovsky's analyses evince a dedication to a strong and canonically regular Russian "Mother Church." Indeed, his concern with canonical continuity often leads him to argue in favour of the Moscow Patriarchate despite its allegiance to the state. It also impels him to dismiss uncanonical formations, no matter how genuinely spiritual. In so doing, he appears to overlook the fact that canonical regularity is often the privilege of the powerful.

The author performs a valuable service in depicting the complexity of the Russian church's position vis-à-vis the Soviet regime. He describes the subtle mechanisms of state control as well as the vicious persecutions of the 1930s and early 1960s. He documents instances of independent and courageous action by clergy, hierarchy and faithful, but does not overlook the sycophantic behaviour of some Orthodox leaders. Professor Pospelovsky thus depicts the church as both victim and tool of the state. He does not, however, acknowledge any communality of interest between church and state in, for example, the purported dissolution of the Union of Brest in March 1946.

The author's analysis of the church's position under Soviet law is particularly valuable, as is his untangling of the web of canonical irregularities involving the Moscow Patriarchate, the Karlovci Synod and the North American Metropolia. Also useful are his summaries of recent religious dissent, although his sometimes rhetorical tone illustrates the perils of tackling recent history.

The author expresses strong opinions about the Ukrainian national churches. In his Foreword, he warns that his primary interest is in the "historical-national Church of the Russians and other Slavs of the USSR"—a somewhat inflated description which encapsulates the historical pretensions of

the Russian Orthodox Church. He goes on to point out that he will not deal with the question of "national identities and possible frictions" between the Russians on the one hand and the Ukrainians and Belorussians on the other, nor with the history of "separatist church attempts" in Ukraine and Belorussia, except in brief summaries (p. 16). Yet those brief summaries suffice to convey his views. Even by including his discussion of the birth of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in a chapter entitled "Leftist Schisms within the Russian Orthodox Church," the author leaves little doubt as to his attitude toward the former.

Professor Pospelovsky's primary criticisms are canonical. They centre on Metropolitan Lypkivsky's "self-consecration" of 1921 and, after the Church's canonical reconstitution by Metropolitan Dionisy in 1942, its alleged contamination through acceptance of Lypkivsky's clergy without reordination. He favours the wartime Ukrainian Autonomous Orthodox Church, canonically based on a statute adopted at the All-Ukrainian Church Sobor in July 1918 and confirmed at the All-Russian Church Sobor in September of that year.

The author's fastidious concern with canonical regularity prompts him to mention that, strictly speaking, the structure of the Moscow Patriarchate itself might be seen as canonically questionable, and that, indeed, "the whole Russian Orthodox Church from 1721 to 1917 could be judged uncanonical" (p. 269). Furthermore, he correctly characterizes the Muscovite church's original autocephaly of 1448 as "self-declared," although he considers its "immediate cause" to have been the "forced" Florentine Union with Rome (p. 310, n. 17). Yet none of these irregularities prevents him from regarding the Russian Orthodox Church (Moscow Patriarchate) as the legitimate "Mother Church" to which all Orthodox Ukrainians, among others, owe allegiance. Nor does his rather indulgent attitude toward the Russian Church prevent the author from asserting canonical niceties against the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church.

Professor Pospelovsky's second principal criticism of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church is its political character. He notes that in the 1920s its members indulged in "rabid nationalist propaganda" (p. 76), while during World War II it was simply "a spiritual branch of nationalist politics" (p. 240). Citing Friedrich Heyer, he contrasts the worldliness of this church's "Ukrainian politicians in bishops' robes," such as Mstyslav Skrypnyk, with the "genuine spirituality" of the Autonomous Church's Russophile leadership (p. 240). With his view of both the pre-revolutionary and the Patriarchal Russian Orthodox Church as primarily a victim of the state, the author naturally underemphasizes the political role that this church has played as the state's partner in promoting Russian nationalism. As a result, he fails to explain adequately the genesis of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. In his portrayal, the church appears as a combination of "leftist" tendencies such as those that produced the Renovatianist schism on the one hand, and of national "separatism" on the other. This misses the essential point that the Autocephalous Church was a response to the overtly political, Russifying

activity of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Professor Pospelovsky's faulty characterization of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church leads naturally to his third criticism—that it was not broadly popular. He attributes its temporary survival in the immediate post-revolutionary period in great part to Bolshevik support, and during World War II to Ukrainian nationalist terror and German support—although he does point out that at times the Germans supported the Autonomists, and in general played one church off against the other. Citing rather vague and incomplete statistics on the number of church institutions, parishes and clergy under the occupation, he fails to consider the factor of inertia weighing in favour of any Russian-oriented church, particularly on the institutional level.

Apart from a few tendentious statements and some gingerly apologetic phrasing, Professor Pospelovsky's account of the liquidation of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church by the Soviet authorities and the Russian Orthodox Church in 1945 (pp. 306–9) is accurate. It is curious, however, that a historian so concerned with canonicity should omit the point that the Lviv "sobor" of March 1946 was canonically invalid, not one Catholic bishop being present. One may also object to the author's use of the term "Uniate" instead of the Church's official name; this is rather like referring to the Russian Orthodox Church as the "Disunited Church."

Professor Pospelovsky's conservative approach, emphasizing canonicity and favouring a Moscow-centred, culturally Russian church for all Orthodox Slavs in the USSR, colours his account. It does not, however, detract seriously from its value to the informed and critical reader. Furthermore, the author's sensitivity to the spiritual dimension of his subject, in addition to its political and institutional aspects, deserves emulation.

Although Professor Pospelovsky builds his arguments carefully and substantiates his points thoroughly, the student of Ukrainian church history may find his depiction of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church biased and unfair. While it must be remembered that it was not the author's intention to cover the histories of non-Russian churches, in view of that he might have done well to temper some of his conclusory language. Nevertheless, those wishing to pursue the history of the Ukrainian or Belorussian churches will find much to admire in the passionate concern and scholarly integrity that Professor Pospelovsky brings to his study of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Andrew Sorokowski
Keston College

SOPHIA SENYK, *WOMEN'S MONASTERIES IN UKRAINE AND BELORUSSIA TO THE PERIOD OF SUPPRESSIONS*. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 222. Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1983. 235 pp.

Sister Sophia Senyk, professor at the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, has painstakingly reconstructed from diverse primary sources the history of Ukrainian and Belorussian nuns, both Catholic and Orthodox, up to the turn of the nineteenth century. As the sources say very little about women's monasteries before the Ukrainian religious, cultural and political revival of the late sixteenth century, her book actually concentrates on the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. No women's monasteries existed in "the Carpathian region" even in this period, so neither Transcarpathia nor Bukovyna is considered in her study. Still, a great deal is covered in this book, which in 1985 was awarded the Kovalev prize by the Ukrainian National Women's League of America.

The book opens with a short introduction to the topic and its historiography (pp. 8-10), followed by a catalogue of women's monasteries in Ukraine and Belorussia. Although this is the first reliable catalogue and the product of great assiduity, it may well put off the impatient reader, who should start with Chapter Two, on the founding of monasteries (pp. 55-69). Here Senyk contributes to early modern Ukrainian social history with her discussion of the gentry and Cossacks as founders. The third chapter (pp. 71-99) is a region-by-region analysis of the economic situation of the monasteries. One learns here, for example, of the feudal rents, primarily in kind, that the inhabitants of twenty-six villages owed to the monastery in Polatsk and of the relative impoverishment of the Galician monasteries. Relations with the church hierarchy and with other monasteries are the subject of the fourth chapter (pp. 101-21). The fifth, on "the community" (pp. 123-46), includes a very enlightening section on the social background of the nuns. Except for the Galician nuns, who came from villages and the poorer urban classes, the nuns of Ukraine and Belorussia were largely of gentry and Cossack-officer origin. The sixth chapter (pp. 147-64) concerns the internal organization of the monasteries, including hierarchical structure and administration, while the seventh (pp. 165-93) looks at the life of the nuns. Among the topics discussed here are literacy (less than half the nuns were literate, with Galician nuns the least literate) and the nuns' occupations (ranging from goat-tending to school-teaching). After a brief account (pp. 195-203) of the suppression of women's monasteries, primarily by the enlightened absolutists of Russia and Austria, the book concludes (pp. 205-10) with some generalizations about women's monasticism in Ukraine and Belorussia in comparison with men's monasticism in the same region and with women's monasticism in ethnic Poland and Russia. The book also has several appendices, an annotated bibliography and indexes.

Senyk's book is a solid contribution to Ukrainian women's history as well as church history, although it is clearly the latter that interests her. Her study is obviously informed by the new historical writing on nuns in Western Christendom, although this growing corpus of literature is neither cited in her work nor are themes that it has raised directly engaged. The book is strewn with numerous insights into Ukrainian church history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Senyk seems to delight in recounting, in a fairly low-keyed fashion, little facts that challenge the general stereotypes developed by an overly polarized historiography. Her nuns sometimes do not, or cannot, distinguish between the Union and Orthodoxy, and some of her Orthodox founders, admittedly running against the general trend, deliberately established both Orthodox and Uniate monasteries. This revision of stereotypes can also be found in articles Senyk has written since the book, which was her doctoral dissertation. For example, in an excellent article on "The Sources of the Spirituality of St. Josaphat Kuncevyč" (*Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 51 [1985]: 425-36), Senyk convincingly demonstrates that the arch-Catholic Josaphat was a devotee of the Jesus prayer, i.e., a hesychast. The surprising subtleties of the interplay of the Eastern and Western monastic traditions are fruitfully examined in another article, on "Rutskij's Reform and Orthodox Monasticism" (*Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 48 [1982]: 406-30). Still other articles, like the book, are blends of social and religious history, often with a focus on pious practices (see especially "The Eucharistic Liturgy in Ruthenian Church Practice," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 51 [1985]: 123-55).

Sophia Senyk is doing some very innovative, but sober-minded, interesting and exceptionally well-researched work on Ukrainian church history. The journals in which she mainly publishes, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* and *Analecta OSBM*, should be followed closely by all who have a serious interest in early modern Ukraine and Ukrainian church history.

John-Paul Himka
University of Alberta

VOLODYMYR MARUNIAK, *UKRAINSKA EMIGRATSIIA V NIMECHCHYNI I AVSTRII PO DRUHII SVITOVII VIINI*. Vol. 1, 1945-1951. Munich: Dr. Petro Beley Academic Publishers, 1985. 432 pp.

Those of us who have been waiting for a book-length treatment of the Ukrainian exodus at the end of World War II are rewarded at last by Volodymyr Maruniak's comprehensive survey. Based on the author's dissertation in sociology and foreshadowed by his earlier published work, *Ukrainska emigratsiia* is at least as much a product of long years of participant experience as it is of painstaking research, and obviously a labour of love. Its style of

presentation alternates between stretches of factual description supported by tabular data and interludes of journalistic illustration or comment; it never claims to be exhaustive and apparently is not meant to be scholarly in an analytical sense; and yet the reader takes leave of it not only better informed but with a vivid sense of how the different parts of the emigrants' life fitted together into an intelligible, meaningful whole.

Maruniak quite appropriately uses the term "emigrants" (the distinction between refugees and displaced persons is largely irrelevant for his purposes) and thus avoids needless complications. His aim is to review those aspects of the "emigration process" which assumed collectively organized forms and left a residue of statistical tallies. Thus the value of his work lies primarily in providing future scholars with the "large picture," a general descriptive framework within which to identify topics for more focused research and problems for intensive analysis. He also shows the main turning points in the sequence of events, and subdivides the period into three stages (p. 149), sharpening the reader's awareness of the time dimension, without which it is impossible to understand those extraordinary days when a normal lifetime's experience was telescoped into a few years' time. With all this and, in view of the nature of his work, perhaps unexpectedly, Maruniak's real strength is interpretation. He is sensitive to atmosphere and mood, emphathizes with the subjective experience (cf. his comments on the problems of creative writers under conditions of camp life), and notes subtle shifts in people's attitudes and responses. These are hardly virtues normally found in factual chronologies, and yet it is this that makes the facts themselves meaningful.

The first part of the book sketches in the historical background and offers some general facts and figures, setting the stage for a detailed description of various aspects of the emigrants' life in the post-war years. There are stories of the turbulent months in 1945, before the dust and smoke began to settle. Much of the narration here has a remarkable immediacy, further enhanced by the use of passages from eyewitness accounts and memoirs. Two chapters stand out from the rest: XII, with its incisive analysis of the emigrants' legal status and their relation to the surrounding German and Austrian populations; and VI, because of its grim topic—the period of forced repatriation, tragic because of its senseless suffering and waste of human life, infamous for the part played in it by the Soviets' British and American allies (the author exonerates the French, citing their humane stance). One would be hard put to decide which seems more incredible, even at this distance: the tale of the West's naive acceptance of the USSR's claiming as its citizens people from areas only annexed by it during or after the war, or the sad epic of violence used by Allied troops against freedom-loving civilians who resisted repatriation.

The remainder of the volume focuses on the experiences and problems of Ukrainians in DP camps and on the multifaceted activities of émigré institutions and organizations. There are chapters devoted to education and cultural achievements, political organizations, attempts at centralized coordination,

youth and student life, churches, women's and other status associations, economic enterprise and vocational training. Of special interest in view of their direct relevance to the life outcomes of the emigrants—both those who were to leave Germany or Austria and those who remained—are the chapters on medical and relief services, resettlement, the placing of refugees under German/Austrian jurisdiction, and the relations between the emigrants in Europe and Ukrainians in Canada and the United States. The latter is scarcely more than a sketch, but it can and should serve as a point of departure for much-needed future work on this important topic.

The last chapter, "Summary and Conclusions," once again demonstrates Maruniak's capacity for taking the long view and imposing a coherent interpretation on the wealth of observations brought together in the book. His list of "characteristics of the Ukrainian emigration" is headed, quite rightly, by an emphasis on its politicization, both in the sense of commitment to an uncompromising irredentism (which, among other things, inspired ceaseless efforts at presenting the Ukrainian cause to an uninformed and often indifferent world) and in the sense of intense internal factionalism. According to Maruniak, however, there was also an impressive amount of unanimity and solidarity in the face of external threat, particularly of forcible repatriation. Equally noteworthy is the fact that in the DP camps Ukrainians of both faiths, from all regions, were brought together and learned to tolerate, and eventually to depend on, one another, allowing "the process of organic *sobornist* [to penetrate] in depth."

Above all, one thing is impressed upon the reader by the massive factual evidence and the whole tenor of the book: the energy and initiative (and, one might add, competence) of the emigrants, who succeeded—with minimal outside help and often against formidable obstacles—in building, amid the chaos and uncertainty of post-war Europe, oases of relative stability and order in which they survived as a collectivity and even managed to provide continuity for their children. It seems there was hardly anything they did *not* do: they improved their physical environment, maintained churches and built organizations, practiced elective democracy along with factional politics, provided mass audiences for cultural and athletic events and a mass market for a plethora of publications, established schools for the young and took advantage of educational opportunities for adults. Contrary to stereotype, at least half of them were employed in a wide range of occupational functions, including creativity in the traditional folk crafts, literature, and the arts. Considered from this angle, the transitional DP episode suddenly appears in a different light: not just as an era of troubles and tensions, and certainly not as so much time wasted in historical limbo, but as a period in which much was learned and accomplished, perhaps one of the crucial stages in the forging of modern Ukrainian consciousness.

The volume's deficiencies appear minor compared to its contributions. The many tables are not numbered and frequently not titled, and the sources of statistical data are not indicated systematically. The photographs, though quite

helpful, are not always optimally selected or located. There are inconsistencies in the spelling of foreign words and place names. All these could have been avoided with routine editing and correction. More serious are some of the omissions. The author focuses on life in the DP camps, but provides little information on the experiences and problems of the *pryvatnyky* (those who lived outside the camp), who made up as much as one-third of the Ukrainian population. He concentrates on the communal and the organized, but does not really satisfy our curiosity about such basic things as family life or daily activities in the camps, although it must be said in fairness that this is justified in view of the study's avowed objectives. Many pages are devoted to publishing trends, but the arrival of a unit of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army in Germany—surely one of the most dramatic events for the exile community—is mentioned in just a few sentences.

The thorough reader will be disappointed by the absence of both index and bibliography. Also, it is not clear to this reviewer why the author relies predominantly on Ukrainian sources and does not make more extensive use of materials in the archives of the Allied occupation forces, UNRRA and IRO documents, etc.

Curiously enough, some of the book's strengths also account for some of its weaknesses, and vice versa. The author's determination to give a humanly meaningful account seems to lead him at times to slight the "hard" evidence. Instances range from obvious oversight (putting the circulation of periodicals at 15 million copies, p. 209, n. 50) and inconsistencies in statistical presentation (on p. 295, a table used to illustrate attrition registers two increases in the number of S.Ch.S. units) to some cryptic statements that leave the reader tantalized because a general conclusion is not explained or concretized by reference to fact. Thus we never learn what the author means by the "distortion of . . . theatrical art" (p. 202) or by "grass-roots demands for . . . unification" (p. 260). While Maruniak's proneness to subjectivity—at one point he simply calls Ukrainian emigrants "our people"—results in some debatable judgements (e.g., his evaluation of émigré journalism), at times it pays off, as in his courageous comment on the writer Ihor Kostetsky's having to seek recognition outside the Ukrainian community, or in his ranking of Iurii Kosach among the most noteworthy literary figures. Someone has to record the facts, even unpopular ones.

The text is followed by four appendices, two of which should prove particularly valuable, as they contain possibly exhaustive lists of books and periodicals printed in the period under study. The painterly cover by the late Ivan Kuchmak enhances the attractiveness of the volume, and the quality of the paper contributes to its readability.

Ihor V. Zielyk
Seton Hall University

PAUL R. MAGOCSI, *UKRAINE: A HISTORICAL ATLAS*. Cartography by GEOFFREY J. MATTHEWS. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985. iv, 25, i double pages.

Paul Magocsi should be congratulated for producing the first historical atlas of Ukraine in the English language. His handsome volume fills a void in Ukrainian studies at both the high-school and undergraduate university levels. Twenty-five maps, designed by the best Canadian cartographer, provide information in a clear and aesthetically pleasing manner on the right-hand pages. The explanatory text, placed on the left-hand (facing) pages, is concise, precise and comprehensible. Topics are arranged mostly in chronological order, and the text flows beautifully in a coherent fashion.

The emphasis of this atlas is on political and administrative boundary changes. For the purpose of orientation and continuity, each map shows the present-day outline of the Ukrainian SSR. Furthermore, Magocsi uses this boundary as a criterion for standardizing the language in which place names are rendered. Thus, except for a few names commonly accepted in English (borrowed from Russian or Polish), most names of places now in the Ukrainian SSR are given in Ukrainian, while those beyond its borders, even if they are on Ukrainian ethnolinguistic territory, are usually rendered in the language of the country in which they are currently located.

The first two maps provide a foundation for the remaining chronology. "Geography of the Ukrainian lands" (map 1) is in fact a simple hypsometric map with a skeletal drainage pattern. Only the largest physical features (Carpathian Mountains, East European Upland) are named. Others are aggregated (Northern Lowlands, Central Plateau, Coastal Lowlands) to provide a simple, aesthetically pleasing outline. The explanatory text touches on the size of the country, its uplands and lowlands, the largest bodies of water, their trade-route potential and the rise of the largest urban centres. Nothing is said of climate, soils, or natural vegetation, for which at least another map would be needed. Superimposed on the first two maps are the current international, Union Republic and ASSR boundaries, major cities, and some historic regions.

"Ethnolinguistic setting of the Ukrainian lands" (map 2) provides a clear and simple representation of Ukrainian ethnolinguistic territory in solid green, with lands inhabited in part by Ukrainians indicated by lighter diagonal shading. Three groups of Ukrainian dialects are differentiated. The accompanying text highlights the historic regions, describes the distribution of Ukrainians, and tabulates their estimated numbers.

Map 3, "Greek colonies and the steppe hinterland," begins the historical sequence with territories of the Greek city-states, the Bosporan Kingdom, the Scythians and their successors, the Sarmatians. No attempt is made to differentiate, on the basis of available summarized archeological research, the domain of the sedentary farmers from the nomadic pastoralists in Scythia. By commencing the chronology with the historic Greeks, the need to map the

advanced prehistoric cultures that developed on the territory of Ukraine is avoided.

Subsequent migrations of the Goths and the steppe tribes, as well as the expansion of the Slavs, are summarized in "Eastern Europe, AD 250–800" (map 4). The Roman limes and the northern limit of the steppe provide meaningful lines of orientation. The explanation of the patterns of migration is adequate. However, the Antes federation of the Slavic tribes should be highlighted, for they represent the forebears of Ukrainians and also coincide in territory with the advanced prehistoric Trypillian farmers who preceded the Scythians.

"East Slavic and adjacent tribes in the 9th century" (map 5) is a free-flowing representation with no boundaries defining the areas of either peoples or states. Map 6, "Trade routes in Medieval Europe," provides a similar free-flowing overview with an emphasis on the Saracen route along the Volga (800 AD) and the route "from the Varangians to the Greeks" along the Dnieper (1000 AD). Curiously, although the earlier existence of Kiev is acknowledged, its two major trade routes (800 AD) from the Carpathian salt mines and from Constantinople are not shown.

"Kievan Rus' in the 11th century" (map 7) provides a neat outline that also highlights the original cradle of Rus' (750 AD) around Kiev. Moreover, its explanatory text relates the name Rus' to the branch of the Polianian tribe named after the Ros river. "Southern Rus' circa 1250" (map 8) focuses on Galicia-Volhynia and its shorter-term possessions. It proves a clear outline of the borders of adjacent principalities and kingdoms, but the graphics are complicated by trade routes and Mongol campaigns.

Map 9, "Ukrainian lands circa 1400," depicts the expansion of Lithuania. Colours are well chosen, and the trade routes as well as the Genoese and Venetian colonies harmonize well with the political patterns. Map 10, "Ukrainian lands after 1596," reveals the administrative subdivision of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which absorbed most of the Ukrainian lands. The text provides an exciting narrative concerning the three spheres of influence on Ukraine: Polish, Muscovite, and Crimean Tatar.

"Zaporozhia" (map 11) clearly reveals the details of the multiple locations, over time, of the Cossack Sich below the Dnieper rapids. The map, however, suffers from typographical errors (Tomakivka, not Tomivka; Budylo, not Budilo; Lyshnii, not Lishnyi). Its larger-scale inset, while showing Oleshky (1711–34) near the mouth of the Dnieper, lacks Nova Sich (1775–1828) at the Danube delta. The context of the Zaporozhia also could have been improved by showing, in the inset, the northern limit of the steppe, the southern limit of permanent rural settlement, or both.

Map 12, "Ecclesiastical divisions in the 16th and 17th centuries," appears to be incomplete. It does not distinguish the earlier dioceses from the later ones, those belonging to the metropolitan see of Kiev and Halych from others, and the Uniate dioceses from those that were exclusively Orthodox.

"Cossack state after 1649" (map 13), highlighted in a green tone, shows both international and internal boundaries. It also traces the first Khmelnytsky campaign and the associated and later battles. It is a pity that the text does not explain the significance of the battle of Konotop, which is located on the map.

Map 14, "Ukrainian lands after 1667," identifies, among other things, the Belgorod Line. Unfortunately, nowhere is there an explanation that the latter provided Moscow with military control over the Sloboda Ukraine and its Izium Line, which was erected to face the Crimean Tatars. Although the text mentions Mazepa, campaigns, and the battle of Poltava, the events are not shown.

Map 15, "Ukrainian lands circa 1750," portrays the encroachment of organized settlement onto Zaporozhia from the north. What it fails to show is the establishment of the so-called Ukrainian line of forts along the Orel River, manned by Russian regiments drawn from places north of the Belgorod Line.

"Russian Empire in Europe" (map 16) provides an overview of Russian expansion and administrative consolidation of the acquired lands into *gubernii*. Although the text also mentions the earlier, larger *namestnichestva*, these unfortunately are not shown on the map. A more detailed view, "Dnieper Ukraine, 1850" (map 17), provides the superimposition of the farthest extent of Ukrainian ethnolinguistic territory.

Map 18, "Minority population in 19th century Ukraine," is illogically designed and, for this reason, conveys misleading information. Since the map identifies minorities by colour coding only within the boundaries of the present-day Ukrainian SSR, areas within the republic but outside the ethnolinguistic line (as in Budzhak and Crimea) should not have been left white—for then who inhabits those areas? Similarly, areas beyond the Ukrainian SSR that fall within the ethnolinguistic boundary erroneously appear purely Ukrainian, because colour coding was not extended beyond Ukrainian SSR borders. The only effective method of showing minority populations is to depict them within the limits of the Ukrainian ethnolinguistic boundary.

"Austro-Hungarian Empire" (map 19) elegantly depicts its constituent parts. Names of major cities are given in several languages, including German and/or Hungarian, as used at the time. "Western Ukraine, 1772–1914" (map 20) provides a more detailed view of the areas that changed hands between Austria and Russia.

Map 21, "Ukrainian lands, 1914–1919," graphically defines Ukrainian lands after the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, the additional territories claimed by the Hetmanate (which more closely approached the ethnolinguistic limits) and those claimed by the West Ukrainian Republic (along the ethnolinguistic limits in the southwest).

Map 22, "Ukrainian lands during the interwar years," focuses on the Ukrainian SSR with its boundary changes and administrative subdivisions; internal subdivisions of Poland, Czechoslovakia and the RSFSR are also shown. There is, however, an erroneous reference to northern Chernihiv as

non-Ukrainian-inhabited, although it is correctly shown on the map as located within the ethnolinguistic limits.

Map 23, "Ukrainian lands during World War II," depicts Nazi German, Hungarian and Romanian annexations with effective colour coding and clear labelling. Not all cities (with dates in brackets) should be identified as *recaptured* by the Red Army. In the case of Uzhhorod, the Red Army occupied it in 1944 for the first time.

"Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic since World War II" (map 24) portrays the current international, Union Republic and ASSR borders and oblasts within the Ukrainian SSR. It also shows a redefined Ukrainian ethnolinguistic boundary, but reasons for its contraction in Poland and the RSFSR are not given.

Finally, the "Index map" (p. 25) offers, by means of a grid, a quick means of locating all place names shown on the atlas maps drawn to the same scale and listed alphabetically in the accompanying gazetteer. The listing, however, is not internally consistent. Although some areas, such as the Black Sea coast settlements, bear both old and new names in different languages (but there are omissions of later names: Korsun for Chersonesus, Sudak for Sugdea/Soldaia), in Western Ukraine, where Polish, German, Hungarian and Romanian names were also employed in the past, the nomenclature is kept unilingual. It is unclear why the old Ukrainian renditions of Peremyshl', Iaroslav and Kholm (p. 8) do not also appear on pp. 5-6 and why the index gives only cross-references to Polish equivalents (p. 25). On the other hand, it is odd that Cherven', and not its Polish equivalent, is used throughout, even though the town is now located in Poland. Although Ukrainian renderings should apply to places in the Ukrainian SSR (note the use of L'viv, Kryvyi Rih and Kharkiv), there are exceptions not only for major cities such as Kiev or Zaporozhia (accepted English usage, from Russian), but even for smaller places such as Mukachiv (Ukrainian) or Mukacheve (Soviet Ukrainian), here given as Mukachevo (Russian). The use of soft signs also seems inconsistent, for some appear to be missing (Cherven', Homel', Roden', Tmutorokan').

Although the adoption of the Ukrainian SSR as a reference area has its advantages, it has its deficiencies as well. The advantages consist of expediency: 1) Soviet Ukrainian scholarly literature about Ukraine almost invariably limits its discussion to the territory of the Ukrainian SSR, and the use of the same border facilitates compilation of comparable data, and 2) the adoption of a *de facto* political boundary avoids the risk of arguments over less tangible limits or a potential charge that the atlas promotes irredentism. The deficiency lies in its political and pedagogical value: the abandonment of ethnolinguistic territories beyond the Ukrainian SSR to other countries by means of standard referencing and place-name rendition conveys the message that Ukraine should no longer be considered the land of the Ukrainian people, but is now to be equated with the Ukrainian SSR.

The founders of Ukrainian geography (Stepan Rudnytsky, Volodymyr Kubijovyč) adopted contiguous ethnic territory as the chief criterion for defining Ukrainian lands precisely because Ukraine lacked (and still lacks) independence and its changeable borders were decided by imperial powers, while its ethnic territory has undergone minimal change over time. If political and pedagogical values are to be maximized and the viewpoint of Ukrainian geography is to be maintained, then one must conclude that a comprehensive historical atlas of Ukraine which focuses on the ethnos and its cultural, economic and political evolution has yet to be produced.

Ihor Stebelsky
University of Windsor

UCRAINICA AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY: A CATALOGUE OF HOLDINGS. Compiled by PAUL R. MAGOCSI with the assistance of NADIA ODETTE DIAKUN. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985. 1845 pp.

The two weighty volumes that comprise this work look impressive—a tribute to the size and importance of the University of Toronto's Ukrainian collection. The introduction traces the development of that collection from its modest beginnings in 1949 to its present strength of nearly 13,000 volumes.

Ucrainica was three years in the making, and much of that time was devoted to the daunting task of photocopying thousands of catalogue cards from various libraries in the University of Toronto system. The text is a reproduction of those photocopied cards. This approach has been used before, notably for the New York Public Library's *Dictionary Catalog of the Slavonic Collection* (44 vols.)

Ucrainica is arranged by subject under 31 headings and 80 subheadings. The absence of an index (according to the introduction, one is planned for the future) makes the catalogue difficult to use. It is impossible to tell with any certainty, for example, what works by Mykhailo Drahomanov Toronto has. Since one must guess where a given work might be classified, it is difficult and time-consuming even to determine whether the holdings include a known title. It took an experienced bibliographic searcher almost 45 minutes to find out that Toronto has Drahomanov's *Pro ukrainskykh kozakiv* but apparently does not have his *Vnutrennee rabstvo*. The *Library of Congress Slavic Cyrillic Catalog of Pre-1956 Imprints* reports that the University of Toronto does have the latter work. The criteria for including works given in the introduction to *Ucrainica* would lead one to expect to find all of Drahomanov's works there. This drawback would have been eliminated in a straight dictionary arrangement and presumably will be remedied by an index.

Another feature which makes this catalogue somewhat less than "user friendly" is that the alphabetical arrangement within each subject group does not always include the filing term at the head of each entry. All entries are filed under author, editor, or title when author or editor are lacking. For a good many works whose main entry is either title or corporate body, the actual filing term appears (sometimes underlined, sometimes not) in the body of the entry or even in the tracings. Thus, on a given page, the main entries are predominantly "Akademiia nauk URSR," although the reader has actually reached the middle of the l's in the sequence "Levchenko, Levi," etc. Until one gets used to it, if one does, the impression is often that the arrangement is not alphabetical at all.

Since no items acquired after 1980 are included, the catalogue was out of date by the time of publication, in 1985. Supplements are planned.

Ucrainica will doubtless be of some use to researchers who wish to browse in specific subject areas pertinent to their fields of interest. It is important to note, however, that each card has been photocopied only once. A work that covers more than one subject will therefore be located under only one subject heading. This may account for the relative paucity of materials under "Statistics and Demography." One must also question the principles underlying the subject categorization when one finds under the main subject heading "Sociology" two pages with eleven entries ranging from a work on concentration camps to a United Nations pamphlet on hygiene.

In its present format the catalogue is of little use to librarians, who have quicker access to the information they need via the UTLAS database, Library of Congress catalogues and other bibliographic tools.

Alan Rutkowski
University of Alberta

RETHINKING UKRAINIAN HISTORY

edited by Ivan L. Rudnytsky
with the assistance of John-Paul Himka

A collection of essays covering aspects of Ukrainian history from the period of Kievan Rus' to the present day. The book concludes with a stimulating Round-table discussion on periodization and terminology.

269 pages, paper \$9.95, cloth \$14.95

Order from:

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

Published by the Canadian Institute
of Ukrainian Studies

**Ukraine during World War II:
History and its aftermath.
A symposium.**

Edited by Yury Boshyk

Discusses the Nazi and Soviet occupations of Ukrainian territory; Jewish-Ukrainian relations; Ukrainian participation in German armed forces.

291pp., paper \$9.95.
ISBN 920862-36-5
(paper).

**Famine in Ukraine
1932-1933**

Edited by Roman Serbyn and
Bohdan Krawchenko

Selected essays from a 1983 conference in Montreal discuss the origins and nature of the 1932-33 man-made famine in Ukraine.

192pp., cloth \$19.95.
ISBN 920862-43-8.

**Political Thought of the
Ukrainian Underground,
1943-1951**

Edited by Peter J. Potichnyj and
Yevhen Shtendera

A collection of political writings by publicists of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army. Discusses imperialism in Ukraine; ideology; strategy and tactics; and programmatic documents and appeals.

xxvii, 406 pp., cloth \$24.95.
ISBN 920862-45-4.

*The above books may be ordered from
the University of Toronto Press, Distribution
Department, 5201 Dufferin Street,
Downsview, Ontario M3H 5T8.*

The Cultural Renaissance in Ukraine: Polemical Pamphlets, 1925-1926

By Mykola Khvylovy

Translated, edited and introduced by
Myroslav Shkandrij.

Political writings of the major figure in the Literary Discussion that took place in Soviet Ukraine in the 1920s.

xi, 266pp., cloth \$19.95
ISBN 920862-42-X.

The Ukrainian Impact on Russian Culture 1750-1850

By David Saunders

Based on original research in the archives of Moscow and Leningrad, this study sheds new light on the role played in Russian cultural development by those Ukrainians who chose to identify themselves with the Russian Empire.

x, 415pp., cloth \$19.95, paper \$14.95.
ISBN 920862-32-2 (cloth), 920862-34-9 (paper).

The Ukrainian National Movement in Galicia: 1815-1849

By Jan Kozik

Edited and with an Introduction by
Lawrence D. Orton.

Analyzes the Ukrainian national revival in Galicia in the early nineteenth century, and the revolution of 1848 in eastern Galicia.

xx, 498pp., cloth \$29.95, paper \$19.95.
ISBN 920862-40-3 (cloth), 920862-28-4 (paper).

The above books may be ordered from the University of Toronto Press, Distribution Department, 5201 Dufferin Street, Downsview, Ontario M3H 5T8.

Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Research Reports

- 1 Shirley Zaporzan
Film and the Ukrainians in Canada 1921–1980
1982 xv, 76 pp. \$8.00

- 2 Yury Boshyk and Boris Balan
*Political Refugees and "Displaced Persons,"
1945–1954*
1982 xl, 424 pp. \$27.00

- 3 Alan Rutkowski and Nadia Cyncar
*Ukrainian Serials: A Checklist of Ukrainian Journals,
Periodicals and Newspapers in the University of
Alberta Library*
1983 vi, 62 pp. \$7.00

- 4 W. Roman Petryshyn and Natalia Chomiak
*Political Writings of Post-World War Two Ukrainian
Emigres: Annotated Bibliography and Guide to
Research*
1984 xxvi, 297 pp. \$20.00

- 5 Alan Rutkowski and Nadia Cyncar
*Ukrainica on Microform: A Checklist of Non-serial
Publications in the University of Alberta Library*
1984 91 pp. \$9.00

- 6 John-Paul Himka and Frances A. Swyripa
Sources for Researching Ukrainian Family History
1984 37 pp. \$6.00

- 7 Frances A. Swyripa and Andrij Makuch
*Ukrainian Canadian Content in the Newspaper
Svoboda 1893–1904*
1985 157 pp. \$12.00

- 8 Frances A. Swyripa
*Guide to Ukrainian Canadian Newspapers, Periodicals
and Calendar-Almanacs 1903–1970*
1985 xv, 121 pp. \$11.00

- 9 Bohdan S. Kordan
Ukrainians and the 1981 Canada Census: A Data Handbook
1985 222 pp. \$15.00
- 10 Bohdan S. Kordan
Ukrainian Community Needs-Assessment Study: Prairie Region
1985 33 pp. \$6.00
- 11 Frances A. Swyripa
Oral Sources for Researching Ukrainian Canadians: A Survey of Interviews, Lectures and Programmes Recorded to December 1980
1985 434 pp. \$25.00
- 12 Dennis Sowtis and Myron Momryk
The Olena Kysilewska Collection
1985 36 pp. \$6.00
- 13 Dennis Sowtis and Myron Momryk
The Kateryna Antonovych Collection
1985 28 pp. \$5.00
- 14 Mariia Dytyniak
Ukrainski kompozytory: Bio-bibliohrafichniy dovidnyk
1986 160 pp. \$12.00

Send Orders to:

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

UKRAINSKA USNA SLOVESNIST

(Ukrainian Oral Literature)

By Filiaret Kolessa



First published in 1938, this work has long been out of print. This edition, augmented with an introduction by Mykola Mushynka, a Ukrainian folklorist from eastern Slovakia, presents a summary of the life and works of Kolessa as an ethnomusicologist and folklorist. The volume is an extensive survey—from the pre-Christian era to the mid-1930s—of Ukrainian folklore. Kolessa's comprehensive treatment of genre makes it a classic in its field.

702 pages, paper \$14.95

Send order to:

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

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 | й — i | х — kh |
| в — v | к — k | ц — ts |
| г — h | л — l | ч — ch |
| г — 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 | -ий — y in endings |
| и — y | т — t | of personal |
| і — i | у — u | names only |

