

IP 6557

10023 укр.

# Shevchenko and Censorship

VICTOR SWOBODA

10023 укр

Reprinted from

The Ukrainian Review

Vol. VIII, No. 1 and Vol. IX, No. 1-2, 1961-1962

Дар.  
з ап.  
з ап.  
з ап.



V. Swoboda

University of London

# SHEVCHENKO AND CENSORSHIP

## I

Among the great poets in modern literature, hardly any attracted the unwelcome attentions of a censor's pencil more readily and extensively than did Shevchenko. Various articles have been written on the subject, but they remain in the obscurity of inaccessible publications, often deal with only one facet or one period of the matter, and, having been published many years ago, are no longer up to date.<sup>1</sup>

Within the limits of the space of the present article, an attempt will be made to establish the chief facts of the case and to trace the factors, trends and causations discernible behind the vagaries of the censor's hand. This survey will not be concerned with Shevchenko's works published outside Russia, since they have not been touched there by censorship proper. It will also leave aside everything except his poetry; in other words, it will deal with the vicissitudes of *Kobzar*, as Shevchenko's collected poetry is traditionally called.

The first edition of *Kobzar* (St. Petersburg, 1840) comprised eight poems, three of which had censor's cuts. It would be difficult, for reasons of space, to quote in full all the passages cut out, so numerous

1. P. Stebnyts'ky, 'Povnyy "Kobzar" v Rosiyi,' *Literaturno-Naukovyy Vistnyk*, 1914, 2, pp. 277-9; eiusd., '"Kobzar" pid sudom,' *VUAN, Zapysky Istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu*, IV (1923), Kiev, 1923, pp. 36-48; O. Lotots'ky, 'Yak poyavylosya povne vydannya "Kobzarya,"' *Tryzub*, 1926, 23, pp. 4-12; M. Voznyak, 'Z pryvodu dvadtsyatylittya "Kobzarya" v redaktsiyi V. Domanyts'koho,' *Za sto lit*, V, Kharkiv-Kiev, 1930, pp. 272-304; V. Danilov, 'Tsenzurnaya istoriya "Kobzarya",' *Nachala*, 1922, 2; I. Ayzenshtok, 'Sud'ba literaturnogo nasledstva T. H. Shevchenko,' *Literaturnoye nasledstvo, XIX-XXI*, Moscow, 1935, pp. 419-84; M. Novyts'ky, 'Shevchenko v protsesi 1847 r. i Shevchenkovi papery,' *Ukrayina*, 1925, 1-2, Kiev, pp. 51-99; P. Zaytsev, 'Redaguvannya tekstu Shevchenkovykh poeziy,' 'Pershi try "Kobzari",' *Zhandayms'ka otsinka politychnoho znachynnya pershoho "Kobzaria,"* T. Shevchenko, *Povne vydannya tvoriv*, II, Warsaw, 1934, pp. 211-8, 229-49; eiusd., 'Tekst poeziy Shevchenka vid 1843 r. do zaslannya,' op. cit., III, Warsaw, 1935, pp. 265-9; eiusd., 'Tekst poeziy, napysanykh Shevchenkom na zaslanni,' op. cit., IV, Warsaw, 1937, pp. 341-8; O. Lotots'ky, 'Poeziyi T. Shevchenka pid rosiys'koyu tsenzuroyu,' vol. cit., pp. 370-90; Ye. Krotevych, 'Pershe povne vydannya "Kobzarya" v Rosiyi,' *Literaturna hazeta*, Kiev, 21 February 1961, No. 15, p. 2.

are they, as will be seen later; instead, their chief ideas will be briefly indicated, with line references which will enable the reader to locate the passages in a full edition.<sup>2</sup>

In "Do Osnov'yanenka," in the first cut passage (ll. 26-44) the poet laments that "freedom will not return, nor will the Zaporozhians; the Hetmans will not rise again... [Ukraine], an orphan, in rags, weeps by the Dnieper... The enemy alone rejoices..." Then he complains about his surroundings: "What is more, it's Muscovy, strangers are around me" (ll. 62-3); "[It is hard] to live with enemies! I, too, perhaps, [would struggle if I had the strength]" (ll. 69-70).<sup>3</sup> Similar sentiments were found to be objectionable in "Tarasova nich": "We shall never forget the Cossack glory! O Ukraine, my dear mother! when I think of your fate my heart weeps!... Where are freedom, banners, Hetmans?... Heathens rule the Cossack children... Weep, O Cossack children, such is your fate!" (ll. 15-40); "the Cossack recalls the Hetmanate, recalls it and weeps!" (ll. 139-40).<sup>4</sup>

The cuts in "Kateryna"<sup>5</sup> are of a different character. The story is of a girl seduced and abandoned by a Russian officer, and here the censor suppressed the poet's digressions consisting of warnings to his readers against a similar fate (ll. 460-7) and an indication that such unfortunate happenings are not infrequent (ll. 533-43). The cause of the cut of ll. 544-54 was apparently in the two lines mentioning "the oak trees from the Hetmanate" and "a pond, captive under ice" (!). The ban of ll. 97-8 was obviously due to a misunderstanding: the lines apply to the heroine of the poem and her son, while the censor must have misconstrued them as alluding to Jesus and Mary.

A number of Shevchenko's other poems appeared in print up to 1844; among these, the cut in "Utoplena" is noteworthy where the poet apostrophizes the evil mother who cruelly ill-treats her child (ll. 90-93): apparently the censor applied it to the Tsar's ill-treatment of Ukraine!

2. Line references are given after the Academy edition: T. Shevchenko, *Povne zibrannya tvoriv v desyaty tomakh*, I, II, Kiev, 1939. An identical reference system is adopted in T. Shevchenko, *Song out of Darkness. Selected poems. Translated from Ukrainian by Vera Rich*, London, 1961. This system does not always coincide with the one found in T. Shevchenko, *Povne vydannya tvoriv*, II-IV, Warsaw, 1934-7.

3. In the above quotation, the phrases within square brackets were not cut by the censor, but are quoted in order to indicate the context of the cuts. An English version of this poem can be found in: T. Shevchenko, *The Poet of Ukraine. Selected Poems. Translated with an Introduction by C. A. Manning*, Jersey City, N.J., 1945, pp. 78-81 ("To Osnovyanenko").

4. A third cut of several lines (conventionally placed as ll. 69-72) has never been restored. An English translation of this poem ("The Night of Taras") is in Vera Rich's selection *Song out of Darkness* (cf. footnote 2 supra).

5. Cf. Manning's translation, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-108.

## II

Most of the poems written between 1843 and 1847 were not meant for publication under the censorship conditions prevailing under Nicholas I; they circulated, however, in manuscript copies among Shevchenko's friends and a wider public. When Shevchenko was arrested in 1847 as a member of the secret Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius, it was those poems and not his membership of the Brotherhood which provided the chief grounds for the indictment. He was accused of having incited in his poems dissatisfaction with the enslavement of Ukraine and of having suggested that Ukraine's happiness could be achieved only through independence. Shevchenko was sentenced on 30 May 1847<sup>5a</sup> to punitive military service of no fixed term in the Central Asian deserts, with a ban on writing and sketching imposed personally by Nicholas.

On 19 June 1847, the Minister for Internal Affairs, Count Perovsky, issued a directive that by special decree **Kobzar** was banned and withdrawn from sale. At the same time, the Minister of Education ordered the Censorship Department not to permit any future re-printing of the book.<sup>6</sup>

Thus the Russian authorities summarily disposed of Shevchenko's poetry which, although previously passed by the censorship, was now known to them to have great popularity amongst, and influence upon, all Ukrainians. The ban lasted during the whole of Shevchenko's long exile. Even after the death of Nicholas I in 1855, he was excluded from the general accession amnesty; undaunted, the poet's friends continued their untiring efforts to obtain his pardon, which they finally secured after another two years' perseverance.

On his arrival in St. Petersburg in March 1858, a free man again after ten long years of silence, Shevchenko immediately started his attempts to get the censorship's permission to re-publish his **Kobzar** and **Haydamaky** as Volume I of his collected poetry. Since the new reign of Alexander II was supposed to be more liberal than that of Nicholas I, Shevchenko hoped that the new censorship would at least be no harsher to him than that of the preceding reign which permitted the publication of his poetry, though with some cuts, in 1840-44. After lengthy formalities, permission was granted in November 1859; the title **Poetry, Vol. I** was banned (the original title, **Kobzar**, had to stay), and some previously published poems suffered further cuts. Thus, "Dumy moyi,"<sup>7</sup> complete in the 1840 and 1844 editions of **Kobzar**, had to be printed in the 1860 edition without ll. 28-100 (leaving only two-fifths of the original length!). The censor apparently

---

5a. Unless otherwise stated, all dates are in the old style.

6. *Russkaya Starina*, Vol. 64, St. Petersburg, 1889, pp. 367-8 (the date quoted in this periodical, 19 June 1846, is obviously due to a slip).

7. "O my thoughts, my heartfelt thoughts" in V. Rich's translation.

found inadmissible the references to "the Cossack freedom" "which has passed away," in place of which now "hovers the Black Eagle" of Imperial Russia, a "foreign country" to the poet. "Haydamaky," which had suffered only a little in the 1841 separate edition, was now heavily curtailed: the dedication<sup>7a</sup> (ll. 1-268) and the prose parts (footnotes and two postscripts) were removed. The poetic dedication outlines Shevchenko's attitude to history, gives his *profession de foi* as a Ukrainian poet, and vividly depicts his creative processes. Pan-Slavist sentiments in the first prose postscript, reminiscent of the ideas of the Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius, may have caused the suppression of the prose parts. Several poems appeared for the first time in this edition; among these, the group "Davydovi psalmy" lost a number of lines (75-7, 81-4, 104, 141-2, 233-4). Most of these lines could be interpreted as anti-tsarist, though the poems are paraphrases of several Psalms; e.g. "It is hard to live in fetters! Rise, O God, and help us to rise once more against the tormentor" (ll. 82-4); "The tsars, the slaves are equal sons before God" (ll. 141-2).

This edition was the last one to appear before the poet's death a year later, on 10 March 1861 (new style). The unpublished heritage (far larger than his published poetry) left by Shevchenko was gradually finding its way into print; among the first was "Stoyit' v seli Subotovi" in the journal *Osnova* (which in 1861-2 published a number of Shevchenko's poems). This short poem of 48 lines lost six (ll. 11-12, 19-20, 27-8); it contains a scathing condemnation of the 1654 treaty of union between Ukraine and Russia, and of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'ky who concluded it on behalf of Ukraine. The result of the treaty, says Shevchenko in the banned lines, was that "The Muscovites stripped [Ukraine] of everything they saw"; "You have ruined the poor orphan Ukraine!" — the poet addresses Bohdan; and now "Catherine's bastards have swarmed upon Ukraine like locusts."

### III

The forty-five years between Shevchenko's death and 1906 saw a gradual introduction into print of most of his extant poems. The editors often used only imperfect copies which, in order to forestall the censor, they sometimes disfigured or cut, more or less severely, but they did not always succeed in their purpose. Several editions of *Kobzar* of various sizes appeared, as well as many separate editions of one or more poems. It is difficult to establish the full extent of the censorship's close interest in the poet, for many editions, as well as the archives of the former Department of Censorship, are virtually inaccessible.

Fortunately, however, some comments on Shevchenko's poems made by officials of that Department which relate to the period in

7a. Translated by Manning, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-16.

question have been published by Jeremiah Ayzenshtok,<sup>8</sup> and they show clearly what was regarded by them as subversive and dangerous to the safety and integrity of the empire. Extremely characteristic of these comments is the report of a censor, Smirnov, to the St. Petersburg Censorship Committee with reference to the 1867 *Kobzar* (Kozhan-chikov's edition):

The subject of Shevchenko's songs is exclusively his native Ukraine. He recalls with particular sympathy the past times of Cossack freedom, he laments the fall of this freedom, the burdens of serfdom (all his poems refer to the times before 19 February 1861) and curses the tyranny of the Polish landowners. The poet dwells exclusively upon the gloomy side of the life of Little Russia. Therefore, as regards censorship, the passages to be disapproved of are those apparently arousing a striving towards separatism by the comparison of the pitiful later condition of Little Russia with her former one, before the fusion with Russia; likewise, the passages which speak with bitterness of the cruelty of the landowners together with the sufferings of the serfs caused by that cruelty. But all these passages do not constitute a sufficient cause for instituting proceedings against the book, both because Shevchenko's songs are only sad recollections without any tendentiousness, and because since 19 February 1861 the condition of the peasants in the South-Western Region has changed completely, and Shevchenko's elegies can only create the impression of traditions. At its price (1 rouble 25 copecks) the book can be accessible only to the wealthy who know perhaps more about Little Russia's fate than can be learnt from Shevchenko's elegies.<sup>9</sup>

From among the numerous instances of censorship interference of this period, only a few typical ones will be mentioned here. Thus, in 1891 Shevchenko's poem "Ivan Pidkova"<sup>10</sup> was banned, the Censorship Committee having decided that the publication of this poem, "all permeated by regret for Ukraine's loss of independence, is extremely undesirable." Because of its small size and low price (perhaps a copeck or two), the poem published as a small booklet would "undoubtedly have had the widest circulation and could arouse the most dangerous memories in the masses of the people."<sup>11</sup> At the same time, banning "Kateryna" as a separate booklet, the Committee added a general rider: "Shevchenko's Ukrainophile trends are only too well known, as also is his influence on the Little Russians in the separatist sense, wherefore, in the Committee's opinion, it is more advisable not to permit any new publications of small booklets, similar to the one under consideration, containing tendentious works by this writer."<sup>12</sup>

8. *Op. cit.* (cf. footnote 1 *supra*).

9. The minutes of the St. Petersburg Censorship Committee of 4 January 1867, p. 1, as quoted by Ayzenshtok, *op. cit.*, p. 438.

10. Cf. Manning's translation, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-3.

11. "Delo Glavnogo upravleniya po delam pechati 1890-1891 gg., No. 28, ch. IV, l. 302," as quoted by Ayzenshtok, *op. cit.*, p. 444.

12. "Delo..., ll. 320-321," *loc. cit.*

In 1896, a censor, Kossovich, reported on a new cheap edition of *Kobzar*:

After tens of thousands of copies of *Kobzar* have succeeded in finding their way to the readership of the Little Russian public, it would of course not be very convenient at present to treat with suitable severity the contents of the whole collection under consideration, if only because Shevchenko's name has become too well known far beyond the borders of the Empire. But everything has its limits. It is not allowable that malicious sallies, openly insulting to the honour of Russia, should be camouflaged by the cult of a famous writer, for, after all, no one, whoever he may be, can be permitted to state boldly in print that a time will come when Ukraine will arise, will come to life again.

Suggesting the banning of fifteen passages, he continues:

The most compelling reason for the urgently necessary exclusion of the above-indicated passages may be said to be chiefly the unusual cheapness (35 copecks) and the rapid spread of Shevchenko's collection of poems, the reprinting of which is proposed, for it is hardly convenient to encourage a wide distribution of *Kobzar* in its original form.

The St. Petersburg Committee added to this:

The speedy distribution alone of the cheap edition of *Kobzar*, sold out within two years although the circle of those reading Little Russian works is relatively limited, speaks for the fact that Shevchenko's ideas about the free Ukraine, about her oppression, find ready acceptance.<sup>13</sup>

Two booklets: one with "Nevol'nyk," another containing several poems ("Ivan Pidkova," "Tarasova nych," "Hamaliya,"<sup>14</sup> "Chernets'" etc.) were banned in 1900 because "(1) the poems contained in the manuscript are of a tendentious Ukrainophile tone and (2) the small size of the manuscript and its apparent cheapness give rise to the assumption that it is meant for wide circulation among the Little Russian common people."<sup>15</sup>

#### IV

The revolution of 1905 brought with it a great relaxation of the censorship, and its permission to publish Shevchenko's complete poetical works without any cuts was obtained by the November of that year. The same revolution opened to research the doors of the archives of the Third Department (secret police) in which Shevchenko's poetry, both clandestine and otherwise, all carefully written down in albums<sup>16</sup> in full and definitive versions, had been concealed for nearly sixty years since his arrest in 1847.

13. "Delo... 1896-1898 gg., No. 31, ll. 20-26, 70-71," *ibid.*, pp. 444-5.

14. Cf. V. Rich's translation, *op. cit.*

15. "Delo... 1900-1902 gg., No. 6, ll. 158, 232-3, 258," as quoted by Ayzenshtok, *op. cit.*, p. 445.

16. The most important of these albums had the title "Three years."

For the first time, forty-five years after the poet's death, a complete edition of his poems, without any cuts or omissions whatsoever, became at long last possible. Such an edition, including practically the whole of Shevchenko's extant poetry, was prepared by V. M. Domanyts'ky and published by two Ukrainian societies late in 1906.<sup>17</sup> Its 10,000 copies were sold out within three months,<sup>18</sup> and another two improved editions followed in 1908 and 1910.<sup>19</sup> Late in 1910, a reprint of the last edition appeared, but its new publisher, V. I. Yakovenko, anticipating trouble with the censorship, cautiously substituted in it the appropriate number of dots for the word "tsar" in many poems.<sup>20</sup> Hardly had the distribution of this reprint begun when, in January 1911, the Censorship Committee seized it (or declared it seized), together with the two previous full editions of 1908-10, and proceedings were instituted against both publishers under the provisions of the Articles 73, 74, and 127 of the Penal Code,<sup>21</sup> the fact that the original 1907 edition had the censorship's permission of 25 November 1905 being disregarded. The reaction had set in.

The censorship banned 104 pages, and the publishers soon re-issued the heavily cut *Kobzar* in 1911, and then in 1913.<sup>22</sup>

17. T. Shevchenko, *Kobzar*, publ. by Obshchestvo imeni T. H. Shevchenka dlya vspomoshchestvovaniya nuzhdayushchimsya vospitannikam vysshikh uchebnykh zavedeniy S. Peterburga, urozhentsam Yuzhnoy Rossii, and Blagotvoritel'noye obshchestvo izdaniya obshchepoleznykh i deshevykh knig, St. Petersburg, 1907, XVI+636 pp.
18. P. Stebnyts'ky, "Kobzar" pid sudom' (cf. footnote 1 *supra*), p. 37.
19. *Kobzar*,<sup>2</sup> by the same publishers (footnote 17 *supra*), St. Petersburg, 1908, XXXII+613 pp.; another version of the same edition published in the same year, XX+635 pp.; *Kobzar*,<sup>3</sup> publ. by V. I. Yakovenko, [St. Petersburg,] 1910, XXIX+600 pp. (cf. T. Shevchenko, *Povne vydannya tvoriv*, XVI, Warsaw, 1939, pp. 158ff., Nos. 378-9, 385). This edition was reprinted without the poem "Mariya" by another publisher under the title *Kobzar, Sobraniye sochineniy*, I, II, [St. Petersburg, 1911,] (5)+128 pp., (5)+134-303 pp. (cf. *loc. cit.*, Nos. 407-8).
20. *Tvory v dvokh tomakh*. I, *Kobzar*, St. Petersburg, 1911, XXXI+600 pp.; see pp. 244, 519, 572-4 etc.
21. Stebnyts'ky, *op. cit.*, p. 40. Ye. Krotevych (*op. cit.*) mentions the Articles 73 (blasphemy), 74 (contempt of the tsar), and 128 (call to insurrection).
22. *Tvory...* (as in footnote 20 *supra*), XXXI+600 pp., but there are large gaps in the pagination; another issue of the same edition as *Kobzar*, St. Petersburg, 1911, XXVIII+600 pp.; pagination amended in *Tvory*, I, *Kobzar*, St. Petersburg, 1913, XXVI+560 pp. In 1914, it was reprinted by L. N. Rotenberg with the same cuts as in Yakovenko's 1911 and 1913 editions (*Povnyy zbirnyk tvoriv*, Katerynoslav, 1914, XXIII+703 pp.) The same seems to be true of the reprints by the publishing company "Krynytsya": *Kobzar*, Kiev, 1914, VIII+644 pp. and another issue with XXXVI+652 pp. No information has been obtained concerning the make-up of the editions published by Kholmushin (*Kobzar*, St. Petersburg, 1911, 602+VI pp.; another issue, 570+VI pp.; reprinted in 1912 and 1914) (cf. *Povne vydannya tvoriv*, *loc. cit.*, Nos. 429, 406, 445, 489, 459-60, 404-5, 430, 467).

Six poems were removed altogether; among them were the anti-monastic "Himn chernychyy," the anti-clerical "Svite yasnyy" and the deeply religious (although it departs from the accepted Christian doctrine) "Mariya";<sup>23</sup> the other three poems: "I Arkhimed i Galiley," "Saul," "Yurodyvyy" are strongly anti-monarchic and anti-tsarist. Another fifteen poems were cut more or less drastically. The longest of the partial cuts were those in the poem "Son" (1844),<sup>24</sup> the same poem which in 1847 had been the chief cause for Nicholas's wrath, and for which Shevchenko paid such a heavy price. The two cuts of 235 lines (ll. 286-488, 540-71) contain a satirical description of the court of Nicholas I and of the royal couple, as well as a violent invective against Peter I and Catherine II whom Shevchenko accuses of destroying Ukraine. The souls of a Hetman (Polubotok) and of the Cossacks on whose bones Peter built his capital are made to express similar feelings in the first of these passages. The cuts largely coincide with the parts which attracted the particular attention of the Third Department in 1847 (ll. 312-87, 412-88 and 517-79 are scored off by them in the manuscript confiscated at the time of Shevchenko's arrest).

Another poem with considerable cuts was "Velykyy l'okh,"<sup>25</sup> which lost 89 lines (ll. 70-133, 154-66, 204-6, 275-6, 293-300).<sup>26</sup> The first passage (the speech of the Second Soul) shows the poet's sympathy with Mazeppa's cause against Peter I; in the second banned passage Catherine II is called "Ukraine's fierce enemy, a hungry she-wolf." In the last one, the present policy of the Russian government towards Ukraine is concisely outlined: "Soon they'll print an ukase: 'By God's mercy, both you and everything else belong to Us, whether usable or not!'"

It would take too long to quote or describe in detail the contents of all the cuts in the other thirteen poems; therefore little more than a list of banned lines is given below, while for details the reader is referred to full editions of the poems themselves. Most of these banned passages are anti-tsarist and anti-monarchical ("Staren'ka sestro Apollona [Tsari]," ll. 13-20, 214-30; "Slava," ll. 18-23; "Ya ne nezduzhayu, nivroku," ll. 9-21; "Vo ludeyi, vo dni ony," ll. 35-45; "Osiyi,

23. "Mary" in Manning's translation, *op. cit.*, pp. 190-211.

24. "The Dream" in the translation of V. Rich, *op. cit.*

25. "The Great Vault" *ibid.*

26. These cuts are found in Yakovenko's 1913 and Rotenberg's 1914 editions (cf. footnote 22 *supra*). The decision of the Senate (cf. p. 21 and footnote 32 *infra*) did not, however, require the cut of ll. 275-6.

hlava XIV,"<sup>27</sup> ll. 54-70; "Molytva," ll. 1-3, 10-12, 34-5, 52-3; "Khocha lezhachoho y ne byut'," ll. 10-15; "O lyudy, lyudy neboraky," l. 23; "Yakos' to yduchy unochi,"<sup>28</sup> ll. 4-11; "Buvaly voyny," ll. 9-24). The passage in "Kholodnyy yar"<sup>29</sup> (ll. 41-52) is anti-imperialist, and an even stronger indictment of Russian imperialism is found in "Kavkaz"<sup>30</sup> (ll. 38-56, 156-60), where anti-monarchical and anti-clerical sentiments are voiced as well (ll. 97-101), the latter also being strong in the banned passage of "Neofity"<sup>31</sup> (ll. 56-60).

In the summer of 1912, the Law Court stopped the proceedings against the publishers, but upheld the decision of the Censorship Committee of January 1911. The publishers appealed to the Senate, but their appeal was disallowed on 18 December 1912, and the verdict of the Court confirmed. Seven months later, on 30 July 1913, the Censorship Committee ordered the seizure of the first full edition of 1907, that very edition the printing of which had been permitted by the same Committee on 25 November 1905. Finally, the Press Department on 9 September 1913 circularized the complete list of the titles of the banned poems with the first and last lines of the passages which were to be excluded.<sup>32</sup>

All the editions of *Kobzar* referred to above, published after the Censorship Committee's decision of January 1911, have cuts in full compliance with this decision and with the list just mentioned;<sup>33</sup> there is, however, at least one edition which is radically different in this respect, but the history of this edition seems so far to have attracted no particular attention. The edition in question was published by F. A. Iohanson late in 1911<sup>34</sup> when the full editions were either sold out

27. "Hosea, Chapter XIV (Imitation)" in Manning's translation, *op. cit.*, pp. 211-13, reprinted in J. Bojko, T. Shevchenko and West European Literature, London, 1956, pp. 63-4.

28. "Once I was walking" in the translation of V. Rich, *op. cit.*

29. "The Cold Ravine" *ibid.*

30. "The Caucasus" *ibid.*

31. "The Neophytes" *ibid.*

32. "Kopiya s tsirkulyara Glavnogo Upravleniya po delam pechati ot 9 sentyabrya 1913 g. No. 12,395," Sanktpeterburgskiye Gubernskiye Vedomosti, 30 October 1913; reprinted in P. Stebnyts'ky, "Kobzar" pid sudom, VUAN, Zapysky Istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu, IV, Kiev, 1923, pp. 42-3, and also in O. Lotots'ky, 'Poeziyi T. Shevchenka pid rosiys'koyu tsenzuroyu,' in T. Shevchenko, Povne vydannya tvoriv, IV, Warsaw, 1937, pp. 388-90.

33. There is, however, no information on Kholmushin's edition (cf. footnote 22 *supra*).

34. *Kobzar. Tvory*, Kiev — St. Petersburg — Odesa, 1912, 622 cols.; another edition by the same publisher (St. Petersburg, 1912, III+628 pp.; cf. *Povne vydannya tvoriv*, XVI, *loc. cit.*, Nos. 440-1) has not been accessible.

(1907) or seized (1908, 1910, 1911),<sup>35</sup> while Yakovenko's first edition with censorship cuts (1911)<sup>36</sup> was the only one available in bookshops. The publishers of Iohanson's edition explained their decision to publish it by the fact that Yakovenko's edition was too expensive for a wide circle of readers. Due to the censorship conditions, fourteen poems were deleted originally,<sup>37</sup> while some poems were cut.<sup>38</sup> But unfortunately, the preface continues, due to the same conditions it has become necessary to delete ten more poems.<sup>39</sup> Thus, in fact, all the twenty-one poems which by its decision of January 1911 the Censorship Committee banned either completely or in part, even if only one line, disappeared completely in Iohanson's edition; moreover, another three poems, untouched by the Committee's decision, suffered as well: "Stoyit' v seli Subotovi" (cf. p. 16 *supra*) and "Rozryta mohyla"<sup>40</sup> in full, and the second and third stanzas of "Zapovit"<sup>41</sup> (ll. 9-24).

It is difficult to say whether the original removal of the fourteen poems was done in compliance with the demand of the censor<sup>42</sup> or in order to anticipate his demand; but it is obvious that it was he who demanded the cut of the next ten poems, and it is also obvious that he would have demanded the cut of the first fourteen had they been presented to him. The censor's motive for mutilating *Kobzar*, on this occasion much more drastically than the St. Petersburg Censorship Committee treated all the other editions, may have been preserved in his official records, but so far these have remained unpublished. However, if one recalls the apparent liberality of pre-1905 censors towards an expensive *Kobzar* for the wealthy, contrasted with their uncompromising hostility to a cheaply produced version, and particularly to small booklets with only a poem or two which the masses of the people could easily afford (cf. section III *supra*), then the censor's severity towards Iohanson's cheap edition for the Ukrainian masses becomes understandable.

(To be continued)

35. Cf. footnotes 17, 19, 20 *supra*.

36. Cf. footnote 22.

37. They include the six poems enumerated above as removed altogether from the Yakovenko edition (p. 20 *supra*), and also "Staren'ka sestro Apollona [Tsari]," "Ya ne nezduzhayu, nivroku," "Osiyi, hlava XIV," "Molytva," "Khocha lezhachoho y ne b'yut'," "O lyudy lyudy neboraky," "Yakos' to yduchy unochi," "Buvaly voyny."

38. "Son" (1847), ll. 44, 59, 85, 88-90; "Podrazhaniye lyezekiyilu" l. 50; and possibly some of the ten poems mentioned next.

39. Edition quoted first in footnote 34, "Publishers' Preface."

40. "The Plundered Grave" in V. Rich's translation, *op. cit.*

41. "Testament" *ibid.*

42. Possibly in Kiev, since the book was printed in that city.

Victor Swoboda

*University of London*

## Shevchenko and Censorship

(Conclusion\*)

### V

The outbreak of World War I brought a new ban on printing in Ukrainian, and it was only on 20 January 1917 that the Military Censorship gave permission for a censored version of **Kobzar** to be printed.<sup>43</sup>

With the fall of tsarism in Russia, the ardent anti-tsarist Shevchenko regained his freedom, and his poetry again appeared complete and un mutilated. The year 1917 saw another full edition of **Kobzar**,<sup>44</sup> while no less than twelve editions came out under the independent Ukrainian governments of 1918-19.<sup>45</sup>

The subsequent Communist governments in Ukraine, installed with the aid of the Red Russian armies, did not suppress Shevchenko openly, nor did they attempt to interfere with the full texts of his works. There were various and obvious factors which made the Communist government in Ukraine permit the full Shevchenko. Firstly, he was an ardent anti-tsarist revolutionary and a victim of tsarism, and thus ideologically had a point of contact with the anti-tsarism of the later Communists. Secondly, because of his immense popularity, the Ukrainian masses

---

\* ) See *The Ukrainian Review*, VIII, 1, 1961, pp. 13-22.

As a recent discovery has shown, the supposed third cut in the poem "The Night of Taras," mentioned in footnote 4 to p. 14 of the first part of the present article, has in fact never existed (cf. T. Shevchenko, *Song out of Darkness. Selected Poems*, London, 1961, p. 117).

43. T. Shevchenko, *Kobzar*, Petrograd, 1917, XXVIII+344 pp.; with it was bound a 15-page supplement, printed after the fall of tsarism and containing the poems originally banned by the censorship in January (cf. T. Shevchenko, *Povne vydannya tvoriv*, XVI, Warsaw, 1939, p. 190, No. 519).

44. *Kobzar*, Poltava, 1917, 616 pp. (cf. vol. cit., p. 191, No. 522).

45. Cf. vol. cit., pp. 191ff., Nos. 521, 546ff.

would have been antagonized towards any government which tried to tamper with his texts. Thirdly, a return to practices similar to those of the late Censorship Committee, to those practices which were still fresh in everybody's mind, would have seemed very "reactionary" and discreditable in the new regime. Therefore only two ways of dealing with Shevchenko's anti-Russian poems seemed to remain possible: firstly, their re-interpretation sociologically and historically, by explaining them away as invectives against tsarism or even against Ukrainian nationalism; secondly, a restriction on the flow of new **Kobzar** editions. Thus, only two editions appeared in 1920-21, while 1922-24 saw no full editions at all, this being in sharp contrast to the twelve editions published in 1918-19 during independence. The period of cultural renaissance was accompanied by a new upsurge of publishing activity in 1925-32 when no less than twenty-five editions of **Kobzar** came out, then followed a sharp drop after the violent suppression of this renaissance, four new editions only appearing in 1933-37. The 125th anniversary of Shevchenko's birth produced another increase in publishing activity with six editions in 1938-40.

Ever since the appearance of the first Domanyts'ky edition of **Kobzar** in 1906,<sup>46</sup> the title **Kobzar** was always synonymous with "Shevchenko's complete poetry,"<sup>47</sup> unless qualified as "selected works" either on the title-page or in the preface. The editions cut by the censorship (1911-14) always had footnotes informing the reader of the exact number of lines banned, while the edition which suffered the most severe losses gave in its preface a full list of all the poems which had been cut out.<sup>48</sup> After 1917, Domanyts'ky's most complete edition was reprinted at first (until 1926), while subsequent editions incorporated the latest discoveries and results of textological research. The culmination of this scholarly work is embodied in the 1939 Academy edition of Shevchenko's poetry.<sup>49</sup> This edition includes all the poetry in its authentic form, as established by meticulous comparison with the most reliable manuscripts and early editions, followed by all the significant variants and differing versions. Here one finds, for the first time in a complete edition of Shevchenko's poetry, the four-line fragment "Za shcho my lyubymo Bohdana" which has an interesting history. These lines had been jotted down by Shevchenko on the last blank page of the manuscript prepared by Ya. de Balmen and M. Bashilov which was confiscated by the police at the time of Shevchenko's arrest in 1847. It stayed, unknown to publishers and scholars, in the

46. Cf. section IV *supra*.

47. "Traditionally we apply the title **Kobzar** to Taras Hryhorovych Shevchenko's whole poetry" (M. Ryl's'ky, 'Knyha narodu,' in Shevchenko, **Kobzar**, Kiev, 1956; also in all subsequent Kiev editions).

48. Cf. footnotes 34, 39 *supra*.

49. Shevchenko, *Povne zibrannya tvoriv v desyaty tomakh*, I, II, Poeziyi, Kiev, 1939.

archives of the Third Department until the October revolution 1917, when it disappeared for seven years, to reappear only in 1924. These four lines were first published in 1925, and then again, more accurately, in 1928.<sup>50</sup> It is remarkable, however, that in spite of its being incorporated in the Academy's canon of Shevchenko's poetry, this fragment has never been published again in any *Kobzar* or any other complete edition.<sup>51</sup>

After World War II, the full *Kobzar* appeared again in 1947,<sup>52</sup> followed in 1949 by collected works<sup>53</sup> (the fragment just mentioned above being, of course, excluded). But there was a completely new departure in 1950: in this year, for the first time since the first complete edition of 1906, a *Kobzar* was published by the State Literary Publishing House of the Ukrainian S.S.R.<sup>54</sup> with cuts which were not acknowledged either in the title, preface, or footnotes, nor justified in any other way. Thus this was the first cut *Kobzar* which purported by its title and make-up to be complete, but from which, in fact, twenty-nine poems (i.e. one-eighth of the total number) were excluded.<sup>55</sup>

In 1951 and 1953 the Academy published the second edition of the first two volumes of the 1939 standard edition of collected works. This new edition is described as "augmented and corrected."<sup>56</sup> But

50. K. Studyns'ky, 'Ilyustrovannyi "Kobzar" T. Shevchenka z 1844 r.', *Stara Ukrayina*, L'viv, 1925, III-IV, p. 59; S. Yefremov, 'Nevidomi ryadky Shevchenka', Instytut Tarasa Shevchenka, *Shevchenko*, I, [Kharkiv], 1928, p. 6. It is noteworthy that the Academy edition fails to mention either of these sources, although in all other cases it quotes in the textological notes the first appearance in print of every poem (cf. *Povne zibrannya tvoriv v desyaty tomakh*, I, Kiev, 1939, p. 577).

51. Incidentally, "Za shcho my lyubymo Bohdana" is still absent from *Kobzar* editions published outside the Soviet Union.

52. *Kobzar. Povna zbirka poeziy*, Kiev, 1947, 298 pp. It is possible that another edition published in Kiev in the same year (*Kobzar*, 398 pp.) is similar in content.

53. *Povna zbirka tvoriv v tr'okh tomakh*, Kiev, 1949.

54. *Kobzar*, Kiev, 1950, 435 pp.

55. Their titles are: "Na nezabud' Shternbergovi," "Pesnya karaul'nogo u tyur'my," "Slepaya," "Rozryta mohyla," "Chyhryne, Chyhryne," "Divy-chiyi nochi," "Za shcho my lyubymo Bohdana," "Velykyy L'okh," "Stoyit' v seli Subotovi," "Davydovi psalmy," "Ne spalosya, — a nich yak more," "Irzhavets'," "Moskaleva krynytsya (1847)," "Dobro u koho ye hospoda," "Kolo hayu, v chystim poli," "Oy vyostryu tovarysha," "Shvachka," "U nedilen'ku u svyatuyu," "Ne vernuvsia iz pokhodu," "U Vil'ni, horodi preslawnim," "Zastupyla chorna khmara," "Lichu v nevoli dni i nochi (1850-1858)," "Yakby to ty, Bohdane p'yanny," "Vo ludeyi vo dni ony," "Umre muzh veliy v vlasnyanitse," "Saul," "Tytarivna-Nemyrivna," "N. T. (Velykomuchenytse kumo!)," "Kuma moy a i ya."

56. T. Shevchenko, *Povne zibrannya tvoriv v desyaty tomakh, vydannya druhe, dopovnene i vypravlene*, I, II, Kiev, 1951, 1953.

the chief difference between the two editions consists, in fact, in the banning from the second (vol. II) of the poem "Yakby to ty, Bohdane p'yanyy."

The remaining non-academic editions (issued by the State Literary Publishing House) of the first half of the 'fifties consistently suppressed seven poems; such is the 1954 **Kobzar** which omits them without any indication of this fact on the title-page (there are neither preface nor source references in the book),<sup>57</sup> and apparently also the 1952 edition.<sup>58</sup> Lastly, the same publishers' 1955 edition of Shevchenko's **Works in Three Volumes**<sup>59</sup> is rather striking. The title is somewhat vague: it is neither "Collected" nor "Selected" works. The titles of each volume are: "I. Poetry," "II. Stories," and "III. Dramatic Works; Diary; Selected Correspondence." They seem to suggest that, apart from the correspondence, all the other sections are complete. The note on p. 4 (vol. I) also inspires confidence: "The texts are printed after the edition: Taras Shevchenko, **Full Collection of Works in Three Volumes**, vol. I, State Literary Publishing House, 1949, compared with the edition: Taras Shevchenko, **Full Collection of Works in Ten Volumes**, vols. I, II, The Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian S.S.R., 1951, 1953."<sup>60</sup> Nevertheless, an inspection of the contents of the first volume shows the absence of the same seven poems which have been found to be missing from the 1954 edition mentioned above. These poems are the following: "Rozryta mohyla," "Chyhryne, Chyhryne," "Velykyy L'okh," "Stoyit' v seli Subotovi" (all four from the manuscript "Three Years,"<sup>61</sup> written in 1843-45), "Za shcho my lyubymo Bohdana" (written about 1845), "Zastupyla chorna khmara" (1848, in exile), and "Yakby to ty, Bohdane p'yanyy" (1859, in Pereyaslav).<sup>62</sup> It is a remarkable fact that nearly all of these poems, excluded from several recent Soviet editions, used also to attract the unwelcome attentions of the tsarist censors and gendarmes. Thus, in "Rozryta mohyla" the Third Department marked ll. 3-4, 17-20, 25-32, 35-46 as noteworthy and incriminating in

57. **Kobzar**, Kiev, 1954, 492 pp.

58. **Kobzar**, Kiev, 1952, 494 pp.; this edition has not been available for inspection.

59. T. H. Shevchenko, *Tvory v tr'okh tomakh*, Kiev, 1955; I, *Poeziyi*, 687 pp., II, *Povisti*, 795 pp., III, *Dramatychni tvory, Zhurnal, Vybrani lysty*, 645 pp.

60. This is the actual wording of the note:

Тексти друкуються за виданням:

Тарас Шевченко, Повна збірка творів в трьох томах, т. I, Держлітвидав, 1949, звіренім з виданням:

Тарас Шевченко, Повне зібрання творів в десяти томах, тт. 1, 2. Видавництво Академії наук УРСР, 1951, 1953.

61. Cf. section IV, footnote 16 *supra*.

62. These seven poems are also among the twenty-nine absent from the 1950 **Kobzar** (cf. footnote 55 *supra*).

1847,<sup>63</sup> while a 1911 censor banned the poem altogether.<sup>64</sup> In "Chyhryne, Chyhryne," too, the Third Department's attention was attracted by ll. 17-25, 27-30, 45-6, 63-4;<sup>65</sup> the censor of the 1867 *Kobzar*<sup>66</sup> deleted ll. 45-6 and 83-6, while l. 20 survived obviously only because, being based on a variant manuscript, it had "Tartar" instead of "Muscovite," the latter being the word used in the album "Three Years." The mystery play "Velykyy L'okh" was severely cut in 1911 and banned altogether in the 1912 edition, while "Stoyit' v seli Subotovi" was cut in 1862 and banned in the same 1912 edition.<sup>67</sup> Lastly, only the first four lines of the poem "Yakby to ty, Bohdane p'yanyy" could be published in the 1867 *Kobzar*.<sup>68</sup> The only poem left untouched by the tsarist regime but which fell foul of the Soviet censor is "Zastupyla chorna khmara."

As can be seen from the above, the cuts in the 1950-55 Soviet editions mostly follow in the footsteps (or, rather, pencil marks) of Nicholas's gendarmes and the tsarist censors. It is as yet impossible to say who ordered or initiated these 1950-55 cuts, since they are never mentioned in a preface or footnotes, nor in any separately published articles or official pronouncements,<sup>69</sup> and the investigation of the archives for material for the full history of the censorship of Shevchenko in the 1950's remains a challenge for Kiev Shevchenkologists.

Meanwhile, however, one or two observations can be made on the available facts. The omitted poems have one theme in common: an unconditional condemnation both of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'ky for the part he played in the conclusion of the treaty of union with Moscow in 1654, and of this continued union itself.<sup>70</sup> It will be remembered that 1954 was lavishly celebrated in the Soviet Union as the tercentenary of Ukraine's union with Moscow, and therefore it would have been embarrassing to allow Shevchenko's dissenting voice to be heard; however, any overt suppression of his poetry was impossible.<sup>71</sup> An unacknowledged omission of the offending poems (in the hope that it might remain unnoticed by the general reading public) perhaps seemed to the authorities the only way out of this difficulty. At the same time, by this action they admitted that Shevchenko's dangerous "separatist" influence<sup>72</sup> was still strong among the Ukrainian masses

63. Shevchenko, *Povne zibrannya tvoriv v desyaty tomakh*, I, Kiev, 1939, p. 571.

64. See the end of section IV *supra*.

65. Vol. cit., p. 572.

66. Kozhanchikov's edition, St. Petersburg, pp. 667-9.

67. Cf. section IV and end of section II *supra*.

68. Ed. cit., p. 636.

69. Cf. the 1911 censorship cuts, officially announced in 1913 (see footnote 32 *supra*).

70. Cf. end of section II and *passim supra*.

71. Cf. beginning of section V *supra*.

72. Using the words of an 1891 censor (see footnote 12 *supra*).

after over thirty years of Soviet rule. That it was from the masses that those seven poems were to be kept is evident from the comparison of the number of copies printed of the almost complete 1951-53 edition<sup>73</sup> which was 10 000, with that of three of the "expurgated" editions, of 1952, 1954 and 1955,<sup>74</sup> which together totalled 350 000 copies.<sup>75</sup> Here one is reminded on the one hand of the censor Smirnov who in 1867 found it unnecessary to suppress **Kobzar** in an edition which was expensive, and therefore had a small circulation, although he was fully aware of its "separatist" trends,<sup>76</sup> and, on the other hand, of other censors banning cheap editions of Shevchenko precisely because they would have reached a much greater section of the Ukrainian people.<sup>77</sup> One cannot help surmising that similar considerations guided those in power when they permitted the printing of a mere ten thousand copies of a nearly complete edition for the few, but found it imperative to remove the poems which were particularly dangerous for the regime from the publications running to more than a third of a million.

## VI

Just as in the first half of the 'fifties the six poems were removed silently, so five of them re-appeared just as silently in the second half of the same decade, and here again one can only speculate as to the reasons for their re-introduction. Each edition in this series of the second half of the 'fifties bears the title **Kobzar**,<sup>78</sup> and begins with Maksym Ryl's'ky's foreword entitled "Knyha narodu," the first words of which (quoted above in footnote 47) emphasize that **Kobzar** means

73. Cf. footnote 56 *supra*.

74) Cf. footnotes 57-59 *supra*.

75. Moreover, the 1950 edition must be taken into consideration (footnote 54 *supra*). The number of its copies is not known, but it might be assumed to have been of a similar order.

76. See section III, footnote 9 *supra*.

77. See footnotes 11-13 and 15 *supra*.

78. Published by the State Literary Publishing House (Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury), Kiev, in 1956, 1957, 1958, 1960 (two editions: 538 pp. and 608 pp.), and 1961 (three editions: 607 pp., 627 pp., and 615 pp.), and also one edition published by the Books and Periodicals Publishing House (Knyzhkovo-zhurnal'ne vydavnytstvo), L'viv, 1961. The edition published by "Radyans'kyy pys'mennyk," *Poeziyi v dvokh tomakh*, Kiev, 1955, is similar in content but has a different introduction (M. Ryl's'ky, 'Poeziya Tarasa Shevchenka'). The 1961 editions of **Kobzar** have remained inaccessible, but there is no reason to believe that they differ in any respect from the 1956-60 editions. In *Tvory v tryokh tomakh* (Kiev, 1961), still the same two poems are absent (cf. B. Kravtsiv, "'Kobzar" dali pid tsenzuroyu,' *Suchasnist'*, Munich, November, 1961, p. 113). (Thanks are due to the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Sarcelles, France, for kindly supplying information concerning some of the above editions.)

Shevchenko's **whole** poetry.<sup>79</sup> Nevertheless, in these editions also two poems are still suppressed. One of them is the comparatively recently discovered fragment "Za shcho my lyubymo Bohdana," which, as is shown above (section V and footnote 50), has never been included in a **Kobzar**, although incorporated into both the 1939 and 1951 standard Academy editions (vol. I).

The second of the two poems still denied a rehabilitation is "Yakby to ty, Bohdane p'yanyy." Its absence can be traced to its unjustifiable suppression in the second Academy edition (vol. II, 1953; cf. section V and footnote 56 *supra*). This poem, known to the Ukrainian reading public since the 1876 Prague **Kobzar**, contains the bitterest and most direct outburst in condemnation of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'ky; it was written in Pereyaslav, the very town where Bohdan concluded his treaty with the Russians. What is more, it was written towards the end of Shevchenko's life, demonstrating that his views on this subject had never changed.<sup>80</sup> What is the reason behind the surreptitious attempt to conceal this poem from the Ukrainian reader? Can it really be the old fear that Shevchenko's uncompromising attitude towards that Prison of Peoples, the Russian Empire, and his condemnation of Bohdan whose deed contributed so much to its creation, may still, a century later, inspire a revolution which might spell its end?

---

79. Likewise, Ye. Kyrylyuk emphatically declared in *Radyans'ka Ukrayina* (in his article 'Knyha zhyttya narodnoho,' 9 March 1960) about the Soviet publications of **Kobzar**: "we do not conceal a single line from the people" (as quoted by Kravtsiv, *op. cit.*, p. 112).

80. Of the five poems re-admitted into **Kobzar** in 1956, four are furnished with editors' notes, at the end of the book, pointing out Shevchenko's "mistaken" opinions; thus, in the note to "Velykyy L'okh" it is asserted that "there are certain contradictions in the treatment of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'ky's image." But this belongs to the problems of interpretation, and thus lies outside the scope of the present article. Similarly, no reference has been made here to the numerous Soviet editions of Shevchenko's poetry clearly described as selected, although the ways of selecting, or rather excluding, various items in such editions are of course no less revealing than those of excluding poems from editions which purport to be complete.

## APPENDIX

Here are the two banned poems, reproduced from the 1939 Academy edition (cf. footnote 49 *supra*), I, p. 292, II, p. 283. They are placed there between "Slippy" / "Velykyy L'okh" and "Kolys' durnoyu holovoyu" / "Vo ludeyi vo dni ony" respectively.

\*        \*

\*

За що ми любимо Богдана?  
За те, що москалі його забули,  
У дурні німчики обули  
Великомудрого гетьмана.

[1845 р. (?)]

\*        \*

\*

Якби то ти, Богдане п'яний,  
Тепер на Переяслав глянув!  
Та на замчище подив[ив]сь!  
Упився б! здорово упивсь!  
5 І, препрославлений козачий  
Розумний батьку!.. і в смердячій  
Жидівській хаті б похмеливсь.  
Або б в калюжі утопивсь,  
В багні свинячім.  
10 Амінь тобі, великий муже!  
Великий, славний! та не дуже...  
Якби ти на світ не родивсь  
Або в колисці ще упивсь...  
То не купав би я в калюжі  
15 Тебе, преславного. Амінь.

18 Августа [1859]  
В Перея[с]лаві



Національна бібліотека України  
імені В.І. Вернадського  
Акт № \_\_\_\_\_

2000 265mm - 4

p