

Australian Slavonic and East European Studies

(Formerly *Melbourne Slavonic Studies*)

Journal of the
Australia and New Zealand Slavists' Association
and of the
Australian Association of Communist and Post-Communist Studies

Volume 36

2022

Australian Slavonic and East European Studies

Editor:	Assoc. Prof. Robert Lagerberg, University of Melbourne
Deputy Editor:	Assoc. Prof. Stefan Auer, University of Hong Kong
Reviews Editor:	Dr John Cook, University of Melbourne
Editorial Board	Assoc. Prof. Judith Armstrong, University of Melbourne
	Dr John Cook, University of Melbourne
	Dr Julie Fedor, University of Melbourne
	Dr Marika Kalyuga, Macquarie University
	Dr Lyndall Morgan, University of Queensland
	Prof. Marko Pavlyshyn, Monash University
	Dr Alexandra Smith, University of Edinburgh
	Dr Ludmila Stern, University of New South Wales
	Dr David N. Wells, Curtin University
	Assoc. Prof. Kevin Windle, Australian National University

ASEES is a refereed journal which publishes scholarly articles, review articles and short reviews on all aspects of Slavonic and East European studies, in particular language and literature. Articles should have a maximum length of 8,500 words and review articles 4,000; they should be submitted to the editor electronically, preferably in .doc (Microsoft Word) format. All articles submitted for consideration should conform to the style guidelines set out in the *ASEES* web page.

ASEES replaces *Melbourne Slavonic Studies*, founded in 1967 by the late Nina Christesen, which ceased publication with Volume 19, 1985.

Back issues of most volumes are available for A\$20.00 per issue plus GST.

Recent volumes of *ASEES* are available online at:

<http://arts.unimelb.edu.au/soll/research/research-publications/european-studies/asees-journal> and <http://miskinhill.com.au/journals/asees/>

ASEES is published once per year: the current subscription price is A\$35.

ISSN-0818 8149

Published by the School of Languages and Linguistics,
The University of Melbourne, Australia.

Telephone: +61 3 8354 5187

E-mail: robertjl@unimelb.edu.au

Web: <http://arts.unimelb.edu.au/soll/research/research-publications/european-studies/asees-journal>

ASEES © The Publishers and each contributor, 2022

We are currently accepting articles for Volume 37 (2023). An electronic copy (in Microsoft Word format) should be sent to the editor by the 31st of July 2023. Papers received after this time will not be considered for publication in Volume 37. *ASEES* Volume 37 (2023) will appear towards the end of 2023.

ANZSA

Office bearers of the Australia and New Zealand Slavists' Association are:

President: Dr Marika Kalyuga, Macquarie University
Vice-Presidents: (Australia) Dr David N. Wells, Curtin University
(New Zealand) Dr Evgeny Pavlov, University of Canterbury
Secretary-Treasurer Dr John Cook, University of Melbourne

AACPCS

Office bearers of the Australian Association of Communist and Post-Communist
Studies are:

President: Dr Alexandr Akimov, Griffith University
Vice President: Dr Milenko Petrovic, University of Canterbury
Treasurer: Dr Anna Taitlin, ANU/University of Canberra
Secretary: Professor Roger Markwick, University of Newcastle
Information Officer: Dr Nina Markovic Khaze, Macquarie University

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

NORBERT MORAWIEC

- ‘Ducunt volentem fata, nolentem trahunt’: Yakov Treshchenok’s
Two Ideas and the Mutation of ‘West Russianism’ 1

MARAT ZAKIROV AND SVITLANA ZAKIROVA

- Украинская диаспора Урала и Сибири: научная преемственность
и новые аспекты исследований в постсоветский период 33

RAFI TSIRKIN-SADAN

- Adaptation as Dissent: *The Master and Margarita* in the
Retellings of Andrzej Wajda and Aleksandar Petrović 75

DAMIAN HERDA AND ROBERT LAGERBERG

- The Productivity of the Russian Suffixal Attenuator *-оват(ый)*:
A Corpus-Based Analysis 103

KEVIN WINDLE

- Ukraine under the Soviets: The Memoirs of Vasyl´ Sokil.
Translated Excerpts with an Introduction 123

REVIEWS

Marlene Laruelle, <i>Central Peripheries: Nationhood in Central Asia</i> (Freddie Hamilton)	151
Daria Khitrova, <i>Lyric Complicity: Poetry and Readers in the Golden Age of Russian Literature</i> (David Wells)	154
Sarah J. Young, <i>Writing Resistance: Revolutionary Memoirs of Shlissel'burg Prison 1884-1906</i> (John Cook)	156
J.A.E. Curtis (ed.), <i>New Drama in Russian: Performance, Politics and Protest in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus</i> (Alessandro Achilli)	160
Zaleska Onyshkevych, Larissa M. L. (ed.), <i>An Anthology of Modern Ukrainian Drama</i> (Marko Pavlyshyn)	163
Urs Heftrich, <i>Gogol's Crime and Punishment: An Essay in the Interpretation of Nikolai Gogol's 'Dead Souls'</i> (Anna Arkatova)	166
Hryhory Skovoroda, <i>The Garden of Divine Songs and Collected Poetry of Hryhory Skovoroda</i> (Marko Pavlyshyn)	169
Irina Reyfman, <i>How Russia Learned to Write: Literature and the Imperial Table of Ranks</i> (David Wells)	173
Tim Harte, <i>Faster, Higher, Stronger, Comrades: Sports, Art, and Ideology in Late Russian and Early Soviet Culture</i> (Alexander Grishin)	176
Emil Draitser, <i>In the Jaws of the Crocodile: A Soviet Memoir</i> (John Cook)	179
Kevin M. F. Platt (ed.), <i>Global Russian Cultures</i> (Alessandro Achilli)	183

OBITUARIES

In Memoriam: Peter Manners Hill	187
In Memoriam: Nonna Ryan	191
Notes on Contributors	193

ANZSA STATEMENT ON UKRAINE

The Committee of the Australia and New Zealand Slavists' Association condemns the unjustifiable invasion of Ukraine by the armed forces of the Russian Federation. We express our support for the people of Ukraine and deplore the destruction of life, property and cultural capital caused by the war. As scholars of eastern and central Europe we declare our commitment to the values of collaboration and the honest exchange of information in the region which is currently under grave threat.

NORBERT MORAWIEC

‘DUCUNT VOLENTEM FATA, NOLENTEM TRAHUNT’:

YAKOV TRESHCHENOK’S *TWO IDEAS* AND THE MUTATION OF ‘WEST RUSSIANISM’

Abstract: This paper analyses the article entitled *Two Ideas* by Yakov Treshchenok (1931-2011) in the perspective of mnemohistory, while posing the question of the ‘West-Russian’ ideology and the extent to which it is incorporated in the discourse of history and memory in present-day Belarus. Treshchenok’s meditations were founded on the historiography of Mikhail Koyalovich, a West-Russian ideologue and the inspirer of the policy of memory of the Russian state in the so-called ‘Western territories’. During the Soviet period, the memory of Koyalovich and his heritage was largely forgotten, but has gained a particular popularity in Belarus in recent years. His West-Russian views were given a new interpretation, fertilising both academic and political meditations. Their aim, however, was not purely academic: they transformed into the ‘neo-West-Russia’ ideology, which was, for a time, a crucial part of President Lukashenko’s policies.

Keywords: West Russianism, West-Russian, neo-West Russianism, neo-West-Russian, Yakov Treshchenok, Alexander Lukashenko, history, memory, mnemohistory.

1. Introduction

By referring to mnemohistorical studies, present-day researchers show the cultural or transcultural determinants that are responsible for the perception of history and memory by contemporary communities (Tamm 2013, Gibson 2015, Pogossian 2019, Forsberg 2020). According to Jan Assmann, culturally fixed memory (cultural

NORBERT MORAWIEC

memory) retains a store of knowledge from which a group's awareness of its peculiarity, but also unity, is derived, and to which historical writing is inseparably linked (Assmann 1995, 130). It defines the general framework within which the past acquires meaning and history is made possible. At the same time, cultural memory determines events and dictates how they are recorded and passed on.

There is one more issue to which we shall return in the course of our analysis: 'cultural memory has its fixed point; its horizon does not change with the passing of time. These fixed points are fateful events of the past, whose memory is maintained through cultural formation (texts, rites, monuments) and institutional communication' (Assmann 1995, 129). Analysing the workings of cultural memory in the context of group identities produced by various reconstructions of the past led Assmann to propose the idea of mnemohistory. He states: 'unlike history proper, mnemohistory is concerned not with the past as such, but only with the past as it is remembered.' Moreover, mnemohistory was to abandon the positivistic study of the past for the study of its actuality. 'Mnemohistory is reception theory applied to history', Assmann explains (Assmann 1997, 9).

The study of the politics of history and memory is an important component of mnemohistorical reflection. Historians are neither its chief engineers, nor even agents. It is usually the state decision-makers who seek or even initiate the creation of certain historical constructs, then adjust political activities to match them, affecting the building of a society's historical consciousness. These constructs – depending on the extent of academic democratisation and the autonomy of researcher circles – are the subject of scholarly discourse, usually led in the context of other, alternative constructs. They do not necessarily originate in the present: created by former historians, 'masters', they are often copied by subsequent generations of 'disciples', then blend into society, serving as an important part of its cultural memory, to finally become the narrative

YAKOV TRESHCHENOK AND WEST RUSSIANISM

templates which ensure a coherent view of that society's past (Tamm 2008, 510-511). Most of them fall into oblivion or 'hibernate'. Then, influenced by political and social change, they come back into existence and, used in political and ideological disputes, assume new meaning, gaining followers and also bitter antagonists (see: Лінднэр 2003). An instance of such hibernation is the focus of this paper. Mikhail Koyalovich, a well-known Russian historian, political and Church activist, and the author of numerous research works of historiosophical merit based on West Russian ideology, not only became the founder of the 'School of Koyalovich' in historiography, but also inspired the memory policy of the Russian state in the so-called 'Western territories' during its final 25 years. In the Soviet period, the memory of Koyalovich and his heritage became largely forgotten. In recent years, however, there has been a certain renewal of interest in his work. Koyalovich gained a special popularity in Belarus, where his 'West-Russian' idea received a new interpretation, fuelling academic and political debates. Of particular interest are the analyses of Koyalovich's intellectual heritage in the deliberations of the Belarusian historian Yakov Treshchenok (1931-2011). Their aim was not purely academic: they transformed into the neo-West-Russian ideology, which was a crucial part of the Belarusian President Alexander Lukashenko's policy for a time. Even though recently this ideology has undergone changes, it is a fixed component in the Belarusian intellectual discourse about the past. In this paper I will focus on Treshchenok's article – written in the tone of opinion journalism – entitled *Two Ideas*, using it as an opportunity to ask questions about the current transformations of the West-Russian concept and the extent of its presence in the discourse of history and memory in present-day Belarus (see: Łatyszonek 1999, 35-39).

2. Biography of Treshchenok

Yakov Treshchenok was born in Minsk, the son of a professional Soviet army soldier (see: Бондаренко, Дмитрачков, 2011). In 1947 he entered the Rostov Preparatory Artillery School, then the Guards Artillery School in Kaliningrad in 1949. After graduating, he served as an officer in the armed forces of the USSR (also abroad), but lost his job in 1956, when the number of officers in the army was reduced. He then began his studies at the Department of History and Geography of the Maxim Gorky Pedagogical Institute in Minsk, which he graduated with Honours (1963). In 1971 he wrote his doctoral thesis entitled *Documentary material of the TsGAOR (Central State Archive of the October Revolution) of the BSSR as a source for the history of the working class of Belarus during the first five-year-plan 1928-1932* (Трещенок 1971), which he did not defend, however. He was a lecturer (from 1967) and a docent at the Chair of East-Slavic and Russian History of the Mogilev State Arkady Kuleshov University (from 1996). He wrote academic textbooks on the methodology of history, the history of historiography, and source studies (Вишнеvский, Костенич, Трещенок, 1997; Трещенок 1999). At the university, he lectured to Alexander Lukashenko. Upon graduating, the future president was trained as a teacher of history and social studies. Years later, Treshchenok became his trusted adviser and expert on historical education and science, and an adviser in the Belarusian historical policy sector. It was in this context that he drafted a reform of historical education (2002) and worked as part of a committee to adapt teaching aids to the political direction of the state authorities. He also wrote history textbooks for lower education levels (Трещенок 2004; Волженков, Трещенок, Воробьев 2008) and engaged in political science regarding the Belarusian state and national idea (Трещенок 2003; Трещенок 2006). Above all, however, he was a 'reviver' of West-Russian thought and launched a study of Koyalovich's intellectual heritage. An important item among Treshchenok's publica-

tions is the journalistic article entitled *Two Ideas*. The questions relating to Koyalovich and the West-Russian ideology did not simply result from his historical meditations, but emerged soon after Belarus gained independence.

3. Origins of West Russianism

Mikhail Koyalovich (1828-1891) was the son of a Uniate priest who converted to Orthodoxy during the Polotsk Synod of 1839 (see: Черепица 1998). He graduated from the Orthodox theological seminary in Vilnius, then from the Theological Academy of St. Petersburg, where for many years he was a professor in the history of the Church and the Russian state. From 1869 until his death, he was the head of the newly founded Chair of Russian History. Mainly known as a historian of the Union of Brest and the Uniate Church, he also published treatises on a variety of subjects and issued collections of documents devoted to the so-called 'Western governorates'. His best known work, entitled 'A history of Russian national consciousness', attempted to analyse historiographic literature with special emphasis on the subjective dimension of historians' research. Perceiving that it resulted from the socio-political conditions affecting historians, he recognised his studies as being created under the influence of 'Slavophile subjectivism'. By founding the so-called 'School of Koyalovich', he contributed to the formation of a circle of researchers who, after graduating from the Theological Academy of St. Petersburg, served in the western territories of Russia of that time, cultivating the West-Russian ideology.

The West-Russian idea of Koyalovich was founded on the following beliefs: 1) the historical unity of the Slavic territories of Belarus/White Russia, Great Rus'/Great Russia, and Little Rus'/Little Russia; 2) the difference in time between 'West Russia' and 'Great Russia', generated by civilisation, cultural and geographic factors; 3) the supra-historical political and confessional threat from the Polish-Catholic side; 4) the

economic threat from the Jewish community; 5) the historical pursuit of the Papacy to subjugate Rus' (spiritually and territorially) through direct Latinisation or unionisation (which was merely Latinisation in disguise); 6) the double mindset of 'West Russians', vulnerable to Polonisation and Latinisation (unionisation), while preserving Slavic-Ruthenian and Orthodox cultural elements (see: Morawiec 2012).

It was in the context of this mindset that the fondness of 'West Russians' for everything Russian and Orthodox had to be explained, but also their participation in Polish national uprisings, love for Polonisms, Polish history, and the existence of Uniate 'recalcitrants'. This reasoning was of practical importance. As Russian decision-makers of the time constantly sought methods to Russify the territories of present-day Poland, Lithuania, Belarus and Ukraine, Koyalovich came forward with them. In his earliest treatises on the Union of Brest and history of the Uniate Church, Koyalovich put forth a specific historical interpretation – based on archival queries – of the 'unification' of Uniates with the Orthodoxy (the Polotsk Act of 1839). He argued that the Union of Brest was imposed on the Orthodox party by the Catholic rulers of Poland and the Jesuits. However, the Uniate community – despite two centuries of Latinisation – remained Ruthenian (i.e., Russian) and Orthodox. Suffering from national and religious persecution by the Catholic Polish nobility, and economic by the Jews, it could free itself from bondage only after the fall of the Commonwealth. The 'unification', started by Catherine the Great and withheld by her successors, was advanced by Nicholas I together with bishop Iosif Semashko. Since an interpretation of this kind redefined the previous Uniate-Orthodox antagonism as Catholic-Orthodox, it had a pragmatic aim: to transform the Uniates, previously accused of having a Catholic and Polish mindset, into Orthodox Russians. Subsequent events showed, however, that not all Uniates felt that they were Russian and Orthodox. Many of them sympathised with Polish Catholics, particularly during the Polish January Uprising. Russian

prosecution in the post-uprising period affected large masses of people inhabiting the western territories of the ‘empire’, including the former Uniates. Koyalovich wanted to explain their pro-Polish fixation, compare the communities inhabiting the western territories of Russia, i.e., Ukrainians, Belarusians and Lithuanians to Russians, while contrasting them with Poles, and explain that any observed ‘otherness’ in their self-consciousness was due to the impact of Polish culture on their customs, beliefs, language etc. Interestingly, these efforts had a pragmatic objective: to show the state decision-makers that they should not punish the ‘West Russians’ fixated on ‘Polishness’ and Uniates celebrating their ‘old customs’ in hiding, but rather understand them, accept their distinctiveness, and spare their peculiarities. Only the consistent de-Polonisation and de-Latinisation, supported by the historical policy of the ‘empire’ found in science, education and Orthodox sermons would eventually bring about centralisation, Russification and Orthodoxisation. Koyalovich and his disciples were convinced that neglecting such efforts would lead to the victory of Polonism and Latinism, reactivation of the church union, prevalence of the ‘nobility idea’, the take-over of the economy by the Jews, and, worse still, the fixation of society on socialist utopias (see: Morawiec 2019). It is worth noting that in Russia, West Russianism actually became the ideology which – virtually until the Bolshevik revolution – defined the national and religious policy in the western territories of Russia, as well as its historical policy. Until his death Koyalovich hoped to explain the correctness of the ‘idea’ by confronting it with specific historical processes, whereas his disciples continued his studies by performing archive queries in the territories of Lithuania, Belarus, Ukraine and Poland. Moreover, this ideology was included in the cultural memory of the Western population of Russia. Scholars studying this memory observed that it was constructed in the context of the ‘current and present situation’, as well as being ‘ritualistic’ and ‘performative’. Therefore, its strength came not only from constantly being ‘constructed’

and ‘invented’, but also from repeating certain cultural practices (Tamm 2008, 508-509). For this reason, members of the ‘School of Koyalovich’ edited scientific and popular periodicals, founded scientific societies, libraries and museums, but also organised state and church celebrations (reinforced by their peculiar rituals and liturgy), thus cultivating West-Russian ‘sites of memory’ (Pierre Nora) or ‘figures of memory’ (Jan Assmann), both positive (baptism of Vladimir, Kostiantyn Vasyl Ostrozky, the Polotsk Act of 1839) and negative (Union of Brest, Josafat Kuntsevych, Polish national uprisings) (see: Morawiec, 2015). So, did history gain its West-Russian narrative template which, however, did not construct solely West-Russian narrations? Some researchers believe it had an unexpected impact on Belarus society. Constant reminders of the historical ‘otherness’ between West Russians and Great Russians led to the emergence of a Belarusian national identity and the establishment of the Belarusian People’s Republic (1918) (Bernardi 2017, 33).

In the Soviet period, little was written about West Russianism (Б.а. 1895, 481). A negative attitude to Koyalovich’s West-Russian legacy is seen in the works of Al-yaksandr Tsvikevich, an active player in the Belarusian People’s Republic (Цвікевіч 1929). A negative evaluation of the historian was also predominant in the writings of Soviet researchers who – albeit without citing works – eagerly used his historical visions (Каштанов 1965; Иллерицкий 1960). For them Koyalovich was a ‘clerical-nobility-monarchist’ scholar (Перцев 1955, 612-613). The works of Koyalovich and his disciples were removed from the official history textbooks of the Belarusian Soviet Socialist Republic (for instance, such information is missing from: *История Белорусской ССР*, 1961).

4. Neo-West Russianism

The turning point came after Belarus gained its independence in 1991. Belarusians sought a certain – recreated rather than newly created – identity, and the problem of Belarusian memory and history became highly important. In the atmosphere of the general enthusiasm for Belarusian state independence, Prime-Minister Vyacheslav Kebich (Viačaslaŭ Kiebič) talked about giving form to the new historical and national consciousness of Belarusians (Bekus 2008, 267). Changes to state symbols quickly followed (a white-red-white flag and the ‘Pahonia’ coat of arms), a calendar of holidays, then the sovereign Republic of Belarus was established in 1991 (Смоленчук 2018, 61). De-Sovietisation began, which was particularly evident in academic institutions, including the Institute of History of the Belarusian Academy of Sciences. The publication market became democratised, with bookstore shelves filling up with works of authors previously unwelcome to the authorities. In many cases Belarusians hoped to (re)construct academic findings, as well as to restore Belarusian historiography. They began analysing the biographies of ‘national intellectuals’, publishing their scholarly heritage. Among others, they recalled the research activities of Vaclaŭ Łastoŭski (1883-1938), murdered by the NKVD in 1938, as well as Usiewaład Ihnatoŭski (1881-1931), accused of nationalist deviation, removed from the party in 1931, and forced to commit suicide, and Adam Stankievič (1892-1949), sentenced for 25 years in a prison camp on charges of conducting ‘anti-Soviet propaganda’ and spying for Japan. Stankievič was not just a Catholic priest: he introduced a vision of a national Belarus in the context of Christian Democracy and Belarusian history in its ‘Latin’ aspect (Дедурин 2013, 248-251).

Clearly, the restoration of Belarusian history, delving deep into the ‘glorious’ past and seeking national ‘roots’, was of key importance (Lastouski 2014, 119). Scholars sought the origins of Belarusian statehood in the Principality of Polotsk (the

first Ruthenian appanage principality with its capital in Polotsk, separated from Kievan Rus' at the end of the 10th century, which existed intermittently as an independent state until ca. 1392), calling the Grand Duchy of Lithuania the Great Belarusian Power. They called the period of its existence a 'golden age' in the development of the Belarusian nation (Смоленчук 2018, 61; Ластовский 2009, 90-91), claiming that, even though the Lithuanians usurped the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, it was ruled by 'forms of Belarusian nationality', and described the language used there as Old Belarusian. The external 'forces of evil' were Poles and Russians, of whom the latter were the 'worse evil', which was a backwards projection of the current threats perceived by the pro-Western political camp (Ioffe 2003, 1264). In such a historical perspective they did not fail to ask questions about the attitudes of Belarusians towards the East and West, Catholicism and Orthodoxy, Russia and Russians, Poland and Poles, the 'Jewish question', etc. (Браточкин 2016). It was also significant that they engaged in a dialogue with Lithuanian historians (in 1992) and developed rules for studying the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which were meant to apply to both sides (Krawcewicz 2014, 82).

However, this 'nationalist renewal' in the presentation of history changed in the second half of the 1990s as a result of the historical policy of the Belarusian president, Lukashenko. State symbols and the national holiday calendar changed again, and the denationalisation process was launched (Смоленчук 2018, 61-62); in history, Soviet historical myths were reactivated (e.g., 'BSSR as the first Belarusian state'), with 'soft' Stalinism (as suggested by Aleksandr Feduta) adopted as the state ideology (Федута 2018, 53). Adam Zalesskiy (1912-2002) became both the main expert and censor of historical topics. In his publications he combatted any Belarusian national ambitions, defended the Soviet heritage, and rebuked the 'perfidy' of Stalin's oppo-

nents (Залесский, Кобринец 1992; Залесский, Кобринец 1999; Залесский, Кобринец 2002).

The Belarusian leader realised that the ‘new’ Belarusian identity could not be built and based solely on Soviet and Stalinist models (Браточкин, 2016). First, it was necessary to construct a ‘new’ – based on a certain historical policy – Belarusian identity, to show Belarus as a political entity, and to offer a ‘new’ political and social ‘programme’ to Belarusian society. In this context it is worth focusing on the activities of the intellectual circles close to President Lukashenko, in particular on his former lecturer and adviser, Treshchenok. In 1997, the latter edited and published the re-edition of Koyalovich’s treatise ‘A history of Russian national consciousness’ (Коялович, 1997). The introduction to the work consisted of original material written by Ivan Palmov (1855-1920) (Пальмов, 1997; see: Лаптева 2007), while Treshchenok wrote the afterword. Palmov’s deliberations included a historiographic analysis of Koyalovich’s treatise, whereas Treshchenok wanted to draw readers’ attention to other interpretations resulting from a reading of the work (Трещенок 1997). He suggested that Koyalovich’s treatise should not be considered merely as a source for the history of historiography. The concepts within were meant to improve the understanding of Belarusian identity, while separating West Russianism from the so-called ‘national separatism’ (ibid., 674). Treshchenok decided to penetrate the socio-cultural context of Koyalovich’s works: Russian culture was mainly of Orthodox and peasant orientation, while Polish culture was eminently Catholic and nobiliary (thus rejecting anything Orthodox and peasant). This affected the expression of the Belarusian national movement, created by refugees belonging to the polonised Catholic nobility circles, who isolated themselves from everything Russian and Orthodox. It drove the ‘separatists’ apart from the Belarusian ‘nation’ (ibid., 675-676), since Orthodoxy inextricably linked Belarus to Russia as the foundation of a pan-Russian ‘ethnos’. While ana-

lysing Koyalovich, Treshchenok noticed one more issue, namely the former's 'Slavo-philic subjectivism' (ibid., 677-678). He wittingly allowed the West-Russian ideology both to define the academic quality it adopted and to choose the methods of political struggle to transform 'West Russia' into Russia (Евровский 2005, 57).

Nonetheless, having read Treshchenok's deliberations, a reader may get the impression that the author did not merely seek to understand the socio-cultural context of Koyalovich's works. His conclusions could also be applied to the Belarusian community of the 1990s, where the 'separatists' closely resembled Belarusian 'nationalists'. It seems that Treshchenok had a specific goal in mind: he wanted to point out to the state decision-makers (i.e., his former student and now president) a certain political and historical interpretation, which they could use in both the internal and external policy of the Belarusian state. It can also be seen that in trying to influence the construction of Belarusian national identity, he referred to the forgotten West-Russian memory. The West-Russian explanation accommodates perfectly both the Russian-ness of Belarus and its socio-cultural distinctness within 'Orthodox and Russian civilisation'. Even more so, it sums up 'separatism' (or 'national movement') as a 'Polonism', simultaneously teaching the perception of 'subjectivism' as a key component of adapting knowledge, and policy as well, to 'external transformations' and 'internal needs', while preserving the 'ideological foundations' of the Belarusian state. The publication suggested that, to achieve the final goal, one should freely choose the methods of political activities, prevaricate, and switch alliances.

Interestingly, the publication of Koyalovich's book and the analyses of its editor did not go unnoticed. Valeriy Cherepitsa (Черепица 1998, see: Нечухрин 2010, 91), Valentina Teplova (Теплова 1999), Aleksey Khoteyev (Хотеев 2012), and Aleksandr Bendin (Бендин 2012) presented their own analyses of Koyalovich's heritage and the West-Russian idea. Treshchenok became a forerunner, and for many even a

‘master’ of ‘Koyalovich studies’. What is more, scholars wanted to prove that the West-Russian ideology had a broad chronological scope and was an element of a wider process, an articulation of a fixed tendency. As such, it could not come into being in the mind of a single intellectual: rather, it was a constant meditation articulated in the works of the Orthodox Russian historiographic school. According to Teplova, the forerunner of this ‘school’ was Grigori Konisski (1717-1795), an Orthodox Archbishop of Mogilev, Mstislav and Orsha, and a historian, and also its advocates – a collector of manuscripts, Count Mikhail Rumyantsev (1751-1811) and the historian–archaeologist Ivan Grigorovich (1792-1852). In this way Koyalovich was included in a broader chronological sequence and shown to be a continuer of the anti-Polish and anti-Catholic movement present in the Eastern reaches of the Commonwealth already before its partition (Теплова 2010; Теплова, 2013). The problems of present-day Belarusians were explained by referring to his heritage, analysing the allegedly ‘national’ dimension of their identity in the context of historical transformations. As the Orthodox heirs of the Slavs, the progeny of ancient Ruthenians (divided into three branches: Belarusians, Ukrainians and Russians), they were tainted with ‘Western’ cultural components. Only overcoming this taint and demonstrating the ethnic, not the national, dimension of Belarusians could lead them to unity with Russia.

The neo-West-Russian view of history was adopted by many other historians as well. Alaksei Łastoŭski included them – besides notably Russophile-oriented scholars – in the so-called Russocentrism (Ластоўскі 2010). Russocentrism understood the need to support the Belarusian president’s historical policy. Therefore, Lukashenko gave neo-West-Russian speeches during organised state celebrations. At the same time, he took care to fill academic institutions with Russocentric researchers and supported the campaign to establish academic societies and launch both scholarly and popular periodicals (Рудлінг 2010, 100; Lastouski 2014; Ластоўскі 2012).

Browsing their online editions allows one to see that they cultivate certain sites of memory, both old (the baptism of Vladimir, prince Ostrogsko, the Polotsk Act of 1839) and new (Mikhail Muravev). In this case, too, there was an attempt to include West-Russian elements in the cultural memory of Belarusian society. Its new interpretation became an important element of the ‘programme’ to reconstruct the face of the Belarusian state, while President Lukashenko ordered his officials to base ‘ideological work’ at all levels of government on it (Лукашенко 2003, 19-20).

A certain highlight in creating this ‘ideological work’ was the publication of a history textbook – recommended by state universities – prepared by a group of researchers led by Treshchenok. The textbook praised Stalin and the outstanding achievements of the Soviet nation, while interpreting the Stalinist period of repressions as tragic but justified (Zadora 2017, 268). However, it contained new elements as well, unknown to Stalin and Zaleski, which considered Belarus as ‘West Russia’ and included it in the context of Russian-Orthodox civilisation. Other textbooks by Treshchenok also showed ‘West-Russian’ Belarus in the context of a civilisation struggle between East and West waged within its borders, a struggle of this ‘nation’ against Western aggressors, i.e., False Dmitry’s Poles, Napoleon’s French, Hitler’s Germans etc., as well as everyone else who wished to separate the Belarusians from their Orthodox and Russian heritage (Дулов, Юрчак 2012, 221-223). The West-Russian concept was absorbed and even mutated in a certain way. Intellectuals became its new ‘neo-West-Russian’ faction. Its formation was summarised in Treshchenok’s article – written in the tone of opinion journalism – entitled *Two Ideas* (Трещенок 2002, no pagination). In this article he attempted to use Koyalovich’s ‘West-Russian’ idea to explain how present-day Belarus was culturally ‘different’ from both the ‘East’ and the ‘West’ and, primarily, to define new methods of political activities (not only those touching upon history).

5. *Two Ideas*

According to Treshchenok, the nation-building process was finally completed in the mid-nineteenth century. At the same time, he stressed that two systems had evolved within European civilisation: one from the Western Christians, the successors of the Western (Latin) Roman Empire, and the other from the Eastern Christians, who saw themselves in the context of the heritage of the Eastern (Hellenistic) Byzantine Empire. The centre of material development lay in the West, while the East was the spiritual centre. In the West, there were several separate nation states, while in the East there was one statehood: Russia. It spread across the entire continent (Eurasia), surpassing the entire territory of Western Europe and developing a powerful multi-ethnic culture, 'potentially able to balance Western Europe'. Treshchenok admitted that there was no alternative to the two-system division of European culture. He wrote: 'Siamese twins have two brains, sometimes two hearts, but one circulatory system: the death of one means the death of the other. We are Siamese twins...' (ibid.).

His deliberations, however, had further consequences. Since two civilisation systems had already emerged, each with certain national divisions, there was no need to form more nationalities. In his view, all the cultural and spiritual achievements of 'small' nations had been accomplished in the cultural spaces of 'great' ones. In fact, in the existing geopolitical system, authentic national 'revivals' never take place. They are – while often presented as part of historical necessity – a 'historical mirage, the fruit of ideological writing, existing only in the imaginations of ideologues' (ibid.). In fact, the leaders of these 'new' movements 'are not so naive as to take all these fantasies of national romanticists on faith': they want to assume power, attain privileges, take hold of government. To achieve it, they use all means available: political provocations and the falsification of history, including the use of bloody terror; they are ready to serve any external political force. As Treshchenok claimed, 'nationalist

movements in small nations are always inspired by external forces to achieve unseemly goals: this is an indisputable lesson in history' (ibid.).

Mutual relations occurring between civilisations affected Belarus and its history as well. Two Belarusian 'ideas' formed here: one close to the Catholic nobility, detached from its nation, the other Orthodox and 'West-Russian'. Even though the latter believes in the fraternity of the communities of Great, Little and White Rus', through centuries of development the Belarusian nation gained its own ethnic and cultural identity, which it has preserved in the most unfavourable historical circumstances and is not going to renounce it. Russia does not question the existence of this identity (ibid.).

The 'West-Russian' idea arose in the circle of Orthodox Belarusian intellectuals. It had long pre-dated the 'Catholic idea' since, as Treshchenok stressed, 'its roots date back to the times of the Commonwealth, to the so-called "dissident" question.' The basic set of concepts was presented by the Belarusian bishop Grigori Konisski in the second half of the eighteenth century. The 'idea' was then advanced by the Uniate Bishop Iosif Semashko, the initiator of the 'unification of Uniates with the Orthodoxy' in Polotsk in 1839. Finally, the West-Russian idea was crystallised in its full form by the writings of Koyalovich and the members of his historical 'school' (ibid.).

The construction of the West Russian idea was carried out against the background of the Polish national movement, which strove to restore the Commonwealth to its 1772 borders, more than half of which were non-Polish, East Slavic and Lithuanian territories. The Poles never considered the ethno-linguistic self-determination of these areas. Treshchenok contrasted the activities of Poles in the eastern territories of the former Commonwealth with what they did in the West. In spite of the official Germanisation policy, the Poles did not even think of fighting for the liberation of their nation. The question of reunification of ethnically Polish territories only arose

during World War II and, in fact, Poles owe their statehood to the efforts of the government of the [...] USSR (ibid.).

The author argues that the Union of Brest led to the collapse of the Orthodox town. As a result, the ousting of Belarusian craftsmen by Jewish merchants caused the demise of the natural demographic and cultural structure of urban settlements of the region. The town became Jewish and Polish. Polish was replaced by Russian, which in fact became the main language of Belarusian urban culture in the early twentieth century. On moving to a town, speakers of Belarusian dialects also switched to literary Russian. Thus, irrevocably, Belarusians adopted Russian as their second mother tongue besides their ethnic Belarusian. The nation itself did not reject its ethnic language, which it preserved as a symbol of identity, its 'language of the soul' (ibid.).

A particular component of Western culture was its supra-historical intent to subjugate the East. According to the author, 'European forces' have historically aimed to destroy, or at least weaken, the Russian Empire: such is the purpose of the activities of 'separatist-nationalists' initiated by the West. Moreover, romantic 'idealists' have been replaced by different kinds of activists, national separatists who – though lacking social support – want to acquire power and monetary gain. The Revolution was followed by a period of activity of national 'separatist' supporters, who 'quickly changed into Socialist clothes', assumed leadership in 'phantom councils' and 'people's republics'; they stayed in the 'offices of German commanders' during the occupation, gained the Entente's protection, 'opposed the violation of the right to self-determination of Russia's nations' at the Versailles Conference, then – finally – took control of Belarus from the Bolsheviks (ibid.). Even though the latter never gave up power, the cultural policy in the new BSSR was seized by overt and covert national separatists. The Catholic national idea was considered as the sole national idea of Belarus, though filled with 'Socialist content'. After the fall of Communism and the proc-

lamation of Lukashenko's presidency, the Belarusian Orthodox national idea prevailed, and the concept of Belarusian identity in unity with Russia and Ukraine was fostered. Nevertheless, the problem of dualism within the Belarusian 'idea' remained valid (ibid.). This situation defines the status of Belarusian historiography. Social groups oriented towards different civilisational values cannot share the same evaluation of the past. In Treshchenok's opinion, the future lies in the Orthodox Belarusian idea, not in Catholic national separatism. Since the Orthodox national idea is genetically based on the original mental foundation of the Belarusian ethnic group, this historiography is a theoretical expression of national mentality preserved through the ages. Conversely, Catholic separatism is an attempt to destroy this mentality, to replace 'a living being with a synthetic structure based on foreign models'. Therefore, the two existing Belarusian national ideas are not two alternative orientations in the future development of the nation ('it is a historical highway and a historical dead-end'). As the passage of time cannot be stopped, it forces Belarusians to choose their future direction, and since, even 'if they passively follow the river' of history, they 'will be brought into the mainstream'. Here the author adds a quotation from Seneca: 'Ducunt volentem fata, nolentem trahunt' ('The fates lead the willing and drag the unwilling') (ibid.).

6. From neo-West Russianism to the 'imperialist historiosophy of a small state'

What was the mutation of the 'West-Russian' idea in Treshchenok's reflections? Like Koyalovich, he saw in history an eternal competition of two civilisations: Orthodox (Eastern) and Catholic (Western). Nationally divided European states on the one side, Great, Little and White Russia on the other. The civilisational conflict was particularly pronounced in Belarus, where the West had always supported national separatists to weaken Russia. Belarus, however, belongs genetically to Eastern civilisation as part

of a broader Russian cultural structure, even though the Belarusians gained, through their historical experience, a certain cultural resource distinguishing them from the remaining Ruthenian/Russian community. Nevertheless, Orthodoxy still remains the key element of Belarusianness. Although for Koyalovich the subject of history was the Uniates – suspended between the East and the West –, for Treshchenok it was the Belarusian nation. The author's anti-Semitism and anti-Polonism are also salient. While Koyalovich mainly attacked the Polish 'nobiliary' quality, Treshchenok viewed the entire Polish nation in hostile terms. The most characteristic passages are those focusing on the national 'separatists'. 'Romantic dreamers' turned into devious political instigators, who wanted to create an independent Belarusian state in order to take over the government and all state structures, and also to gain wealth. Koyalovich assumed that, once the Commonwealth was partitioned, the Uniates – now free from their Catholic-noble protectors – would return to Russia and Orthodoxy. In Treshchenok we can find the belief that, during Lukashenko's presidency, the Belarusian nation would reject 'separatism' and return to Russian-Orthodox civilisation. This mutation preserves the inner core of 'West-Russian' ideology, adding new elements resulting from contemporary political and social relations.

Nonetheless, in the first decade of the twenty-first century, the neo-West-Russian idea in Belarus was undermined. It was not just due to the death of Treshchenok, its chief 'ideologue', but rather to the changes in the geopolitical interpretations of Lukashenko's presidency. Being a pragmatist, Lukashenko saw the benefits of economic and political connections with Russia. Russia, however – having an equally pragmatic leader – increasingly showed its intent to subjugate Belarus completely. Once Vladimir Putin assumed the presidency in Russia, Lukashenko had to abandon any thought of leadership in the planned Russian-Belarusian state. What is more, in June 2002 President Putin proposed the incorporation of six Belarusian regions into

the Russian Federation, which essentially meant depriving Belarus of its statehood (Ioffe 2003, 1266). Lukashenko did not find this proposal acceptable. When in 2006-2007 there was a conflict between Belarus and Russia over crude oil and gas prices, Belarus began to tighten its political and economic relations with Latin American countries and China. Additionally, in 2006 the USA and other Western countries imposed sanctions on Belarusian companies, forcing it to seek rapprochement with Russia (Behrends 2016, 20). Belarus became a state suspended between the European Union and the Russian Federation. Lukashenko eagerly drew on the visions of the pan-Russian community, expecting economic and military protection from Russia. He also craved to reap the benefits of dealing with Western Europe and to be the arbiter in the conflict of the 'West' and the 'East'. Thus, while he did not necessarily push for all-Russian 'unification' and losing – even limited – independence, he thought even less of promoting the national form of the Belarusian state. For this reason the manoeuvring between geopolitical concepts seen in the Belarusian leader's activities is not surprising. Studying the political system currently promoted by Lukashenko, Matthew Frear sees 'apparent paradoxes' in it: general support and denial of political freedoms, pursuit of economic growth and avoidance of market reforms, defence of sovereignty and attacks on Belarusian nationalism, international isolation and openness to foreign trade and travel, integration with Russia and being European. Indubitably, the actions of Belarusian authorities could be perceived as inconsistent and irrational, if seen through the lens of simple dichotomies (Frear 2019). It can also be argued that the Belarusian president pursues a 'deceptive policy' (Radziun 2020, 36). Frear, however, presenting a model of 'adaptive authoritarianism', notes that these 'inconsistencies' are one of the methods Lukashenko uses to consolidate his authoritarian power (Frear 2019). According to Marharyta Fabrykant and Renee Buhr, by fulfilling this goal, the President reveals growing power ambitions and is moving towards 'small state impe-

rialism' (Belarus as 'Russia with a quality mark') (Fabrykant, Buhr 2016, 105). The same applies to history. As noted by Dmitriy Gamezo, the historical policy observed in Belarus in the last ten years has been opportunistic and has changed according to the variable directives of foreign policy or other ideological needs of the Belarusian state. Faced with uncertainty, the authorities have tried to adapt to inconstant trends (Гамезо 2013, 419), believing that all policy, and thus historical policy as well, can be freely transformed in the name of the current needs of the state and the future of the nation. During the 'energy crisis' period, Lukashenko based all of his activities on the Sovietisation of history, while strengthening its Belarusian facet. He frequently referred to the Second World War: in Lukashenko's view, the Belarusians were not only its greatest victims, but also its heroes, the 'guerilla nation', chief defenders of Russia, Europe and the entire world against fascism. Faced with the Russian invasion of Georgia (2008) and annexation of Crimea (2014), he began moving towards rehabilitating Belarusian national history (Astapova 2015, 19). As a result, Lukashenko departed from the understanding of a West-Russian view of history as the only legitimate one by freely combining Belarusian nationalism, neo-Stalinism, Russo-centrism and neo-West Russianism (termed a 'Creole' view of history by some scholars) to create an 'imperialist historiosophy of a small state' (Ioffe 2007, 367).

7. Conclusion

Mnemohistorical studies demonstrate that human representations of the past are linked to the existence of a broader mnemonic mechanism, culturally constructed and based on social communication. As Tamm states (Tamm 2013, 464), 'The past is not simply 'received' by the present. The present is 'haunted' by the past and the past is modelled, invented, reinvented and reconstructed by the present. In the perspective of mnemohistory, then, the key question of historical research is not about the original

significance of past events, but rather about how these events emerge in specific instances and are then translated over time, and about their everyday actualisation and propagation. More precisely, mnemohistory asks questions such as: 'What is known of the past in the present?' This article has shown how the Belarusian present is 'haunted' by the past, how this past was invented, or rather recast, reinvented and reconstructed by the Belarusian president and his historians. Scholars stress that the contemporary socio-political situation in Belarus cannot be understood without referring to the political activities of President Lukashenko. At the same time, they observe a relationship: while the interpretative freedom through which he sees the national aspect of Belarusians contributes to constant changes in political strategies, these actions affect how Belarusians themselves perceive their nationality (Behrends 2016, 9).

Mnemohistorical research tells us that cultural memory 'has its fixed point', 'its horizon does not change with the passing of time', and 'fixed points are fateful events of the past, whose memory is maintained through cultural formation (texts, rites, monuments) and institutional communication' (Assmann 1995, 129). These 'fixed points' may be 'remodelled'. This is usually linked to cultural transformations occurring in reaction to a new socio-political reality (such as the fall of the Soviet Bloc) and often can be found in cultural (not necessarily geographical) borderlands as well. The Belarusian example is a perfect illustration of how the makers of historical policy were able to (de)construct mnemonic structures consciously in order to create 'fixed points' and to build upon them (and reconstruct) the political and national identity of Belarusians.

In this context, the emergence of 'neo-West Russianism' should not be seen simply as a 'mutation' of a newly discovered, or rather 'de-hibernated', West Russianism. Most interestingly, even though this ideology will most likely never again be the main catalyst of the narrative template of Belarusian history, it still functions, of-

fering alternative concepts in constructing the President's geopolitical projects and historiosophical interpretations, which define the 'imperialist' policy of the history/memory of the 'small state' of Belarus.

For Treshchenok, the history of the East and the West, Polonisation/Latinisation and Russianness/Orthodoxy are causally connected (determinism); he was convinced that the nature of all civilisational, political, religious and cultural relations occurring in Belarus remain the same (monism), but that at the same time they follow a certain plan determined by a 'civilisational struggle' (teleologism), and that history pursues a pre-determined goal: unification with Russia and the Orthodox Church (finalism). Why, however, Koyalovich's 'West Russianism' was so quickly accepted by both researchers and state decision-makers is not entirely clear, but, perhaps, because it aligned with Soviet Marxism. Neo-West-Russian thinkers, as former 'Marxists', changed its content and slightly modified its form. In Marxism, the subject of history is the 'working people of towns and villages'; in West Russianism it is the Belarusian (or rather Orthodox-Russian) nation. The Marxian matter of history, the eternal 'class struggle' within the socio-economic formation, was turned into the 'civilisational struggle' of the East and the West which determines all aspects of the socio-economic existence of the Belarusian nation. The Party was replaced by the collective, Stalin (as the nation's leader) by Lukashenko; ideologues (Marx, Engels, Lenin) by Koniski, Rumiantsev, Grigorovich, Semashko, Koyalovich; the external enemy, i.e., the capitalist West, by the non-Orthodox and non-Russian West; internal enemies, i.e. apostates from Communism, by national separatists (Łastoŭski, Tsvikevich, Ihnatoŭski, Stankievič). The 'History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union' (Bolsheviks) was replaced with the 'History of Russian national consciousness' (Koyalovich). The 'Marxist' pedigree was not free from the problem of subjectivism in constructing its historical images either. They were relativised to fit the expecta-

NORBERT MORAWIEC

tions of the Soviet decision-makers. What became most important in Treshchenok was the conviction that by understanding the mechanisms underlying history, one will be able to examine the present and control the future as well. Only through the understanding of these mechanisms can the fate of Belarus be controlled and lead to its unification with Russia (or, depending on political shuffles, with Russian civilisation as an independent entity) and the Orthodox Church. All other activities will be in spite of and against the stream of the 'historical process'. Resistance is futile:

Ducunt volentem fata, nolentem trahunt.

REFERENCES

- Assmann, Jan, 1995: 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity', *New German Critique*, 65, 125-133.
- Assmann, Jan, 1997: *Moses the Egyptian. The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*, Cambridge-London: Harvard University Press.
- Astapova, Anastasiya, 2015: *Negotiating Belarusianness: Political Folklore Betwixt and Between*, Tartu: University of Tartu Press.
- Behrends, Haylee, 2016: *Multi-Vectorism in Belarusian Foreign Policy*, Masters Thesis, Prague: IMS FSV UK.
- Bekus, Nelly, 2008 : 'European Belarus versus State Ideology: Construction of the Nation in the Belarusian Political Discourses', *Polish Sociological Review*, 163, 263-284.
- Bernardi, Martina, 2017: *L'identità bielorusa. Etnia, lingua, religione*, Tesi di Laurea, Venezia: Università Ca' Foscari.

- Fabrykant, Marharyta, Buhr, Renee, 2016: 'Small state imperialism: the place of empire in contemporary nationalist discourse', *Nations and Nationalism*, 22, 1, 103-122.
- Forsberg, Henrik, 2020: *Famines in Mnemohistory and National Narratives in Finland and Ireland, c. 1850-1970*, Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto.
- Frear, Matthew, 2019: *Belarus under Lukashenka. Adaptive Authoritarianism*, London-New York: Taylor & Francis Books.
- Gibson, Catherine, 2015: *Borderlands between History and Memory. Latgalia in Mnemohistory*, IMESS Masters Thesis, Tartu: University of Tartu.
- Ioffe, Grigory, 2003, 'Understanding Belarus: Belarusian Identity', *Europe-Asia Studies*, 55/8, 1241-1272.
- Ioffe, Grigory, 2007: 'Culture Wars, Soul-Searching, and Belarusian identity', *East European Politics and Societies*, 21/2, 348-381.
- Krawcewicz, Aliaksandr, 2014: 'Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie – wizja litewsko-białoruska?', in: Nikžentaitis, Alvydas, Kopczyński, Michał (eds.), *Dialog kultur pamięci w regionie ULB*, Warszawa: Muzeum Historii Polski w Warszawie, pp. 82-87.
- Lastouski, Aliaksei, 2014: 'Creating National Community and History: Official Speeches on Independence Day in Belarus (2001-2012)', in: Egidijus Aleksandravičius (ed.), *The Construction of National Narratives and Politics of Memory in the Central and Eastern European Region after 1989*, Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, pp. 119-128.
- Łatyszonek, Oleg, 1999: 'Krajowość i "zapadnorusism". Tutejsześć ideologizowana', in: Jan Jurkiewicz (ed.), *Krajowość – tradycje zgody narodów w dobie nacjonalizmu*, Poznań: Instytut Historii UAM, pp. 35-39.

NORBERT MORAWIEC

- Morawiec, Norbert, 2012: 'Dekonstrukcja ruskości? "Litewska cerkiewna unia". Michaił Kojałowicz a metafora zjednoczenia', in: Cyran, Grzegorz, Skorupska-Raczyńska, Elżbieta (eds.), *W poszukiwaniu tożsamości. Język. Religia. Tożsamość*, Gorzów Wielkopolski: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWSZ w Gorzowie Wielkopolskim, pp. 143-165.
- Morawiec, Norbert, 2015: 'Dogmatization of Ruthenianism/Russicism. The metaphor of union in the historiography of the so-called "school of Mikhail Koyalovich"', in: Dymczyk, Rafał, Krywoszeja, Igor, Morawiec Norbert (eds.), *Crossroads. From Rus' to...*, Częstochowa-Humań-Poznań, pp. 103-123.
- Morawiec, Norbert, 2019: "'Pany", "chachły" i "kołtuny". "Polskość" a "zachodnioruskość" w "Wykładach z historii Zachodniej Rosji" Michaiła Kojałowicza', in: Тельвак, Віталій, Лазурко, Лідія, Серженга, Павел (eds.), *Спільна спадщина. Річ Посполита обох народів в польській і українській історичній думці XIX і XX ст.: колективна монографія*, Херсон: Видавничий дім «Гельветика», pp. 147-166.
- Pogossian, Zaroui, 2019: 'Methodological and Source-Critical Reflections on History, Mnemohistory and Narratives Inspired by Nikoloz Aleksidze "The Narrative of the Caucasian Schism"', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 85/2, 513-546.
- Radziun, Krystsina, 2020: *Political Regime and Institutionalization of Political Science as an Academic Discipline: Analysis of Belarus and Georgia*, Bachelor Thesis, Kaunas: Vytautas Magnus University.
- Tamm, Marek, 2008: 'History as Cultural Memory: Mnemohistory and the Construction of the Estonian Nation', *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 39/4, 499-516.
- Tamm, Marek, 2013: 'Beyond History and Memory: New Perspectives in Memory Studies', *History Compass* 1/6, 458-473.

Zadora, Anna, 2017: 'Textbook Narratives and Patriotism in Belarus', in: Psaltis, Charis, Carretero, Mario, Čehajić-Clancy Sabina (eds), *History Education and Conflict Transformation. Social Psychological Theories, History Teaching and Reconciliation*, Madrid: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 257-273.

[Б.а.], 1895: 'Коялович', in : Андреевский, Иван (ed.), *Энциклопедический словарь, в 81 т., т. 32 (XVIa): Коялович – Кулон*, СПб.: Ф. Брокгауз –И. Ефрон, р. 481.

Бендин, Александр, 2012: 'К вопросу о формировании этнической идентичности белорусов в Российской империи (вторая половина XIX – начало XX вв.)', *Проблемы национальной стратегии*, 2/11, 170-185.

Бондаренко, Константин, Дмитрачков, Петр, 2011: 'Личность и история', *Белорусская думка*, 9, 84-97.

Браточкин, Алексей, 2016: 'Культура памяти в Беларуси (1988-2016): от раскола к консервативному консенсусу? Советское наследие в политическом и историческом воображении белорусов: тенденции отталкивания и апроприации', *Гефтер*, 25.11.2016, <http://gefter.ru/archive/20174> [last accessed 1/9/2021].

Вишневский, Михаил, Костенич, Владимир, Трещенок, Яков, 1997: *Философия образования и проблема человека: Учебное пособие*, Могилев: МГУ имени А. Кулешова.

Волженков, Валерий, Трещенок, Яков, Воробьев, Александр, 2008: *История Беларуси с древнейших времён до октября 1917 года: Учебное пособие для 10-го класса общеобразовательных школ с русским языком обучения*, Минск: Адукацыя і выхаванне.

- Гамезо, Дмитрий, 2013: 'Проблема политической идентификации в контексте Беларуси', in: Миненков, Григорий (ed.), *Европа-2012: Перспективы и вызовы европеизации: сб. науч. тр.*, Вильнюс: ЕГУ, pp. 409-420.
- Дедурин, Геннадий, 2013: "'Беларускі хрысьціянскі рух" Адама Станкевича как источник по истории становления национального движения белорусов', in: Дулов, Анатолий (ed.), *Актуальные проблемы источниковедения: Материалы междунар. науч.-практ. конф. к 135-летию со дня рождения В. И. Пичеты, Минск-Витебск, 9-11 октября 2013 г.*, Витебск: ВГУ имени П.М. Машерова, pp. 248-251.
- Дулов, Анатолий, Юрчак, Денис, 2012: 'Репрезентации войны 1812 г. в современных учебниках по истории Беларуси для школы и вуза', in: Косов, Александр (ed.), *Война 1812 года: события, судьбы, память: материалы международной научно-практической конференции, Витебск, 17-18 мая 2012 г.*. Витебск: УО «ВГУ им. П.М. Машерова», pp. 220-223.
- Еворовский, Валерий, 2005: 'Польско-российское интеллектуальное соперничество в Беларуси и становление ее национального самосознания (век девятнадцатый): Опыт историко-антропологической реконструкции', *Slavica Lundensia*, 22, 47-63.
- Залесский, Адам, Кобринец, Пётр, 1992: *О национальных отношениях в Советской Белоруссии: Исторические очерки*, Гродно: ГрГУ.
- Залесский, Адам, Кобринец, Пётр, 1999: *И.В. Сталин и коварство его политических противников: в 2 кн., кн. 1: Поражение оппозиционных группировок*, Минск: Историческое знание.

- Залесский, Адам, Кобринец, Пётр, 2002: *И.В. Сталин и коварство его политических противников: в 2 кн, кн. 2: Правовая защита безопасности Советского государства*, Минск: Хата.
- Иллерицкий, Владимир, 1960: 'Историография', in: Нечкина, Милица (ed.) *Очерки истории исторической науки в СССР: В 4 т., т. 2*, гл. X, Москва: АН СССР. Ин-т истории, pp. 571-574.
- История Белорусской ССР*, 1961: Абецедарский, Лаврентий (ed.), т. 1, Минск: Академия наук Белорусской ССР.
- Каштанов, Сергей, 1965: 'Коялович', in: Е.М. Жуков (ed.), *Советская историческая энциклопедия*, т. 8, Москва, p. 17.
- Коялович, Михаил, 1997: *История русского самосознания по историческим памятникам и научным сочинениям*, Минск: Лучи Софии.
- Лаптева, Людмила, 2007: 'Профессор И.С. Пальмов и его исследования по церковной истории зарубежных славян', *Вестник церковной истории*, 3/7, 196-220.
- Ластовский, Алексей, 2009: 'Специфика исторической памяти в Беларуси: между советским прошлым и национальной перспективой', *Вестник общественного мнения*, 4/102 (октябрь-декабрь), 88-99.
- Ластоўскі, Аляксей, 2010: 'Русацэнтрызм як ідэалагічны праект беларускай ідэнтычнасці', *Палітычная сфера*, 14, 58-79.
- Ластоўскі, Аляксей, 2012: 'Кароткая генеалогія: гістарычнае мінулае ў публічных прамовах беларускіх афіцыйных асобаў', *Палітычная сфера*, 18-19/1-2, 137-155.
- Лінднэр, Райнэр, 2003: *Гісторыкі і ўлада. Нацыятворчы працэс і гістарычная палітыка ў Беларусі XIX–XX ст.*, Мінск: Беларускі Гістарычны Агляд.

- Лукашенко, Александр, 2003: 'О состоянии идеологической работы и мерах по ее совершенствованию. Доклад Президента Республики Беларусь А.Г. Лукашенко на постоянно действующем семинаре руководящих работников республиканских и местных государственных органов 27 марта 2003 г.', in: 'О состоянии идеологической работы и мерах по ее совершенствованию. Материалы постоянно действующего семинара руководящих работников республиканских и местных государственных органов', Минск: Академия управления при Президенте РБ, pp. 2-67.
- Нечухрин, Александр, 2010: 'В.Н. Черепица как историограф', in: Ярмусик Эдмунд (ed.), *Через прошлое – к настоящему и будущему: сб. науч. ст. (к 65-летию проф. В.Н. Черепицы)*, Гродно: ГрГУ, pp. 88-93.
- Пальмов, Иван, 1997: 'Памяти М.О. Кояловича', in: Коялович, Михаил (ed.), *История русского самосознания по историческим памятникам и научным сочинениям*, Минск: Лучи Софии, pp. 5-28.
- Перцев, Владимир, 1955: 'Историография Белоруссии', in: Тихомиров, Михаил, Алпатов, Михаил А.Л. Сидоров, Аркадий (eds.), *Очерки истории исторической науки в СССР. В 5 т, т. 1*, Москва: Издательство АН СССР.
- Смоленчук, Александр, 2018: 'Культура памяти и историческая политика в республике Беларусь', in: *Історичні і політологічні дослідження: Спеціальний випуск: доповіді на міжнародній науково-практичній конференції «Трансформації історичної пам'яті» Вінниця, Донецький національний університет імені Василя Стуса*, pp. 58-67.

- Рудлінг Пэр Андэрс, 2010: ‘Лукашэнка і «чырвона-карычневыя»: дзяржаўная ідэалогія, ушанаванне мінулага і палітычная прыналежнасць’, *Палітычная сфера*, 4, 90-113.
- Теплова, Валентина, 1999: М.О. ‘Коялович и русская православная историография’, in: Коялович, Михаил (ed.), *История воссоединения западно-русских униатов старых времён*, Минск: Лучи Софии, pp. 385-395.
- Теплова, Валентина, 2010: М.О. *Коялович и православная историческая школа Белоруссии*, *Sobor.by*, <http://www.sobor.by/kojal.htm> [last accessed 17/8/2022].
- Теплова, Валентина, 2013: ‘Православная церковно-историческая школа Беларуси XIX–XX в.: генезис и традиции’, in: Караў, Дзмітрый, Масненка, Віталій (eds.), *Беларусь, Расія, Украіна: дыялог народаў і культур*, Серыя ‘Гістарыяграфічныя даследванні’, Гродна: ЮрсаПрынт, pp. 205-213.
- Трещенок, Яков, 1971: *Документальные материалы ЦГАОР (Центральный государственный архив Октябрьской революции) БССР как источник по истории рабочего класса Белоруссии в период первой пятилетки, 1928-1932 гг.* (unpublished).
- Трещенок, Яков, 1997: ‘М.О. Коялович и его время: послесловие’, in: Коялович, Михаил (ed.), *История русского самосознания по историческим памятникам и научным сочинениям*, Минск: Лучи Софии, pp. 674-678.
- Трещенок, Яков, 1999: *Введение в методологию исторического познания*, Могилев: МГУ имени А. Кулешова.
- Трещенок, Яков, 2002: ‘Две белорусские национальные идеи (католический национал-сепаратизм и православная национальная идея)’, in: Бендин, Александр (ed.), *VII Международные Кирилло-Мефодиевские*

- чтения, посвященные Дням славянской письменности и культуры: Материалы чтений (Минск, 22-24 мая, 2001 г.). В 2 ч. Ч. 1, кн. 2, Европейский гуманитарный ун-т, Бел. гос. ун-т культуры, Минск: ООО 'Ковчег', <http://www.sobor.by/zametki.php> [last accessed 17/8/2022].*
- Трещенок, Яков, 2003: *О сущностных характеристиках советского общества*, Могилев: МГУ имени А. Кулешова.
- Трещенок, Яков, 2004: *История Беларуси. В 2-х ч. Ч. 1: Досоветский период*, Могилев: МГУ имени А. Кулешова.
- Трещенок, Яков, 2006: *Государственная идеология и национальная идея Республики Беларусь*, Могилев: МГУ имени А. Кулешова.
- Федута, Александр, 2018: '«Недосталинизм», или «Лукашенко на фоне Сталина». О неудавшейся попытке реабилитации сталинизма в современной Беларуси', in: Elżbieta Tomasi-Kapral, Dorota Utracka (eds.), *Między nostalgią a ironią - Pamięć reżimu komunistycznego w dialogu międzykulturowym*, Łódź: Ibidem, pp. 49-57.
- Хотеев, Алексей, 2012: 'Основы концепции западнорусизма в творчестве М.О. Кояловича', in *Белорусская православная церковь. Минская Духовная семинария*, <https://minds.by/news/osnovy-kontseptsii-zapadnorusizma-v-tvo-rchestve-m-o-koyalovicha#.Xc7bwLhYDTA> [last accessed 17/8/2022].
- Цвікевіч, Аляксандр, 1929: *Западноруссізм: Нарысы з гісторыі грамадзкай мыслі на Беларусі ў XIX і пачатку XX в.*, Мінск: Беларускае дзяржаўнае выдавецтва.
- Черепица, Валерый, 1998: *Михаил Осипович Коялович. История жизни и творчества*, Гродно: ГрГУ.

MARAT ZAKIROV AND SVITLANA ZAKIROVA

УКРАИНСКАЯ ДИАСПОРА УРАЛА И СИБИРИ: НАУЧНАЯ ПРЕЕМСТВЕННОСТЬ И НОВЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ В ПОСТСОВЕТСКИЙ ПЕРИОД

Целью работы является характеристика трудов украинской эмиграции, украинских и российских исследователей 1991–2010-х годов, посвященных изучению истории формирования и этнокультурного развития украинской диаспоры Урала и Сибири. В работе использованы методы ретроспективного, сравнительного и системного анализа для определения ключевых характеристик, описания и классификации историографических источников. Применение метода комплексного подхода позволило соединить разные средства исторического исследования, не нарушая принципы объективного познания. Научная новизна заключается в попытке заполнения имеющегося пробела исследований историографии украинской диаспоры Урала и Сибири, что, невзирая на длительную историю изучения миграций населения за пределы Украины и накопленный значительный массив разноплановых трудов, остается малоисследованной.

Выводы. До начала 90-х годов XX века исследования украинского населения в регионах Российской Федерации как этнокультурного феномена были представлены, в основном, в трудах западных исследователей. Они существенно углубили изучение теоретических проблем определения украинской диаспоры в постсоветских странах, как отдельного историко-культурного явления. Региональная история и современность украинцев Урала и Сибири, по большей части, представлена работами украинских и российских авторов. В новейших исследованиях украинских ученых детально освещаются процессы формирования укра-

инского населения региона, выделяется их роль в хозяйственном освоении края, мелиорации земель, внедрении новых культур и агротехнических приемов. Российские исследователи отмечают, что ключевым признаком национальных процессов в среде украинской диаспоры Урала и Сибири является трансформация этнической идентичности, которая происходит под воздействием межэтнической интеграции и культурной унификации. Анализ результатов полевых исследований свидетельствует, что ключевым фактором эффективной компенсации влияния ассимиляционных факторов является развитие организованной национально-культурной жизни.

Ключевые слова: украинская диаспора, Урал, Сибирь, этнонациональное развитие, идентичность, историография.

Введение

Решающим фактором активизации изучения истории украинской диаспоры стало провозглашение независимости Украины. Снятие идеологических ограничений способствовало существенному улучшению состояния научной разработки истории украинской эмиграции в целом и переселения украинцев на Урал и в Сибирь, в частности. Вместе с тем, изменения в настроениях в среде украинского населения региона и эволюция в отношении к организованному национально-культурному движению, которое происходит под воздействием внутренней и внешней политики государства проживания, актуализирует избранную тему. Кроме того, накопленный значительный объем научных исследований, создававшихся в социально-политических и идеологических условиях постсоветского периода, нуждается в целенаправленном изучении и осмыслении. В то же время, имеющиеся исследования украинской диаспоры Урала и Сибири исто-

риографического характера по большей части представлены в форме анализа литературы к квалификационным историческим работам.

Целью данной работы является характеристика трудов украинской эмиграции, современных украинских и российских исследователей, опубликованных в 1990-х – 2010-х годах и посвященных изучению истории формирования и этнокультурного развития украинской диаспоры Урала и Сибири. Для достижения поставленных целей необходимо выполнить следующие задачи: определить степень изученности проблемы; проанализировать труды, отражающие традиции исследований украинской диаспоры региона; выявить характерные черты и особенности работ разных авторов.

Первые попытки объективного анализа научных работ, посвященных изучению украинского населения России, были предприняты еще в конце 1980-х годов. В частности, дореволюционная и советская историография проблемы представлена в работе украинского исследователя диаспоры М. Якименко (1989). Несмотря на идеологическую тенденциозность тогдашней исторической науки, автору удалось провести обстоятельный анализ исследований, освещавших масштабные миграции украинского крестьянства в Российской империи. Однако кардинальные позитивные сдвиги в научных подходах к проблеме национальных меньшинств произошли уже после распада СССР. Декларирование и практическое претворение в начале 1990-х годов руководством постсоветских стран демократических принципов государственной политики открыли возможность существенно расширить спектр научных исследований.

Наряду с традиционным исследованием миграций населения активизируются исследования украинскими и российскими учеными этнокультурных процессов в среде национальных меньшинств. В частности, в работе Т. Крамарчук освещается историография проблемы существования украинского

национального меньшинства в иноэтнической среде Башкортостана (2000). Отражение жизни украинской диаспоры Российской Федерации в 20-30-х годах XX века в украинской историографии анализирует А. Сушко (2001). Историографические традиции изучения истории и культуры украинского населения Южного Урала и Приуралья в научной литературе второй половины XVIII – начала XX веков исследует в своей работе российский историк Д. Черниенко (2012). Автор освещает вклад уральских краеведов в накопление, систематизацию и анализ сведений об условиях жизни, быте переселенцев, политике местных администраций.

Некоторые аспекты современной историографии украинского населения освещает в своей работе В. Амелин (2012). Исследователь отмечает возросший в постсоветский период интерес к изучению истории переселений и проблемам этнокультурного развития украинцев на Южном Урале. Большая часть рассматриваемых В. Амелиным работ представляют собой доклады на тематических конференциях, посвященных пребыванию в Оренбуржье Т.Г. Шевченко.

Более полная картина историографии создания украинских поселений в регионе, политики государства и национально-культурных трансформациях в среде украинских переселенцев с середины XVIII до начала XXI века представлена в диссертации А. Молощенкова (2010). На детальное исследование историографии украинских поселений на Южном Урале опирается и работа В. Амелина и А. Молощенкова (2012). Авторы монографии анализируют широкий спектр работ украиноведческой тематики, охватывающий разные исторические периоды. Исследование показало, что большая часть современных работ представляет собой научные публикации в периодических изданиях или материалы разного рода конференций, а имеющиеся монографические работы, в ос-

новном, посвящены этнокультурному развитию украинцев Башкирии и периоду ссылки Т.Г. Шевченко на Южный Урал.

Одним из первых примеров библиографических изданий, посвященных истории украинцев в Сибири является книга «История и этнография славянских диаспор Томской области» (2017). В указателе представлены библиографические сведения о работах современных российских исследователей истории и этнокультурного развития белорусской, украинской и польской диаспор Томской области. Разноплановые работы российских исследователей, изданные в период с 1990 по 2016 годы, распределены по десяти тематическим разделам, охватывающим широкий спектр проблем прошлого и современности самых больших славянских диаспор Сибири.

Традиции исследований украинской диаспоры Урала и Сибири в работах украинских эмигрантов

Проблема миграции населения в Российской империи и Советском Союзе, учитывая ее перманентную актуальность, относится к наиболее исследуемым проблемам истории Украины и России. Вместе с тем, историография формирования украинского меньшинства в странах бывшего СССР в целом и отдельных регионах Российской Федерации в частности, представлена относительно небольшим количеством работ. Причем исследования и дореволюционного, и советского периода в большинстве своем не выходили за рамки статистического анализа переселенческого движения, освещения направлений миграции и описания материально-бытовых условий жизни переселенцев. Целенаправленных исследований этнокультурного развития украинской диаспоры в России до конца 80-х годов XX века практически не было. Более того, некоторые советские ученые говорили об украинских поселенцах, не отделяя их в своих работах от мигран-

тов других национальностей, что отвечало известным историко-идеологическим постулатам и снимало с повестки дня исследования их самобытности.

Традиции объективного анализа истории формирования, типологизации отдельных поселений, изучения регионов компактного расселения украинцев в СССР и этнокультурного развития закладывали ученые из среды западной украинской диаспоры В. Кубийович (1977; 1979), М. Марунчак (1974), И. Стебельский (1984) и др.

Так, в работе исследователя истории украинской диаспоры в Канаде М. Марунчака (1974) представлена история возникновения украинских поселений за пределами Украины как на территории Российской империи, так и в СССР в целом. Безусловный интерес вызывает попытка автора провести анализ особенностей формирования и условий жизни украинского населения в различных регионах СССР, опираясь на накопленный опыт изучения украинской диаспоры в Канаде.

Украинский историк, географ и общественный деятель В. Кубийович исследует влияние миграционных процессов на динамику численности украинского населения в СССР. Значительный фактический материал об украинской диаспоре в мире в целом и в СССР в частности, содержится в справочнике *Украинские поселения* (1980).

Профессор географии Виндзорского университета (Онтарио, Канада) И. Стебельский (1984) анализирует причины и масштабы переселений украинских крестьян в 1896–1914 годах из девяти губерний в восточные регионы Российской империи. Исследователь подчеркивает, что крестьянские хозяйства, стремившиеся решить острые экономические проблемы, при помощи правительства мигрировали на Урал и в Сибирь. На основе изучения районов выхода и количественных характеристик миграции И. Стебельский установил, что из

UKRAINIAN DIASPORA IN THE URALS AND SIBERIA

1 982 000 украинских переселенцев, пересекших Урал в 1891–1914 годах, 20 % составляли выходцы из Правобережной Украины.

Отличительной чертой работ представителей украинской эмиграции является стремление выйти за рамки статистических и демографических исследований миграции украинского населения на территории Российской империи и СССР и представить эти процессы как неотъемлемую часть общей истории формирования украинской диаспоры в мире.

В то же время следует признать, что, справедливо акцентируя внимание на проблемах сохранения национальной культуры переселенцев в условиях полиэтнического окружения, исследователи не всегда в достаточной мере учитывали специфику советского общества и степень влияния государственной национальной политики и пропаганды на массовое сознание и эволюцию этнической идентичности национальных меньшинств.

Ситуация в значительной степени изменилась с восстановлением независимости Украины. Ученые эмигранты получили доступ к широкому кругу архивных материалов, проблемы диаспор вошли в публичный и научный дискурс республик бывшего СССР. Как следствие, начинается качественно новый этап теоретического осмысления исторических, политико-правовых, культурных и мировоззренческих проблем украинской диаспоры в постсоветских странах.

Среди исследований ученых украинской эмиграции, подготовленных на новой источниковедческой базе, можно назвать работы Ю. Левицкого, В. Маркуся, П. Потичного. Вопросу утверждения в историко-политическом дискурсе понятия украинская диаспора посвятил свою работу профессор университета имени Лойолы в Чикаго В. Маркусь. Исследователь подчеркивал, что главным признаком диаспоры является нахождение части этнического сообщества за пределами территории его ядра (Маркусь 1992, 6). Таким образом, уже в

рамках Российской империи и Советского Союза украинское население, проживавшее за пределами украинских этнических территорий, можно рассматривать как полноправную составляющую часть украинской диаспоры в мире.

Продолжает исследования украинского переселенческого движения в Российской империи до 1917 года И. Стебельский (1993). На основе изучения условий миграции и заселения новых земель исследователь оценивает потери и масштабы выживания переселенцев за Уралом. Автор приходит к выводу, что несоответствие между ожидаемой численностью украинского населения к востоку от Урала и фактическими показателями переписи 1926 года объясняются высокой смертностью среди украинских переселенцев, вызванной тяжелейшими испытаниями в дороге, трудностями обустройства на новых землях, враждебным отношением официальных лиц и русских мигрантов (Stebelsky 1993, 55–56).

Важным источником библиографической и статистической информации является справочник, подготовленный канадским исследователем С. Ципко (1994). В разделах «Избранная библиография» и «Газетные статьи» материалы по истории украинской диаспоры в Российской Федерации и насущных проблемах украинцев в России 1989–1993 годах распределены по географическому принципу. В третьем разделе представлен список украинских периодических изданий, издававшихся в Харбине и Шанхае в 1917–1944 годах, а также в Европе, США и Австралии в 1922–1980-х годах. Так же отмечены и украинские периодические издания, издававшиеся в Российской империи с 1861 по 1817 годы и в СССР в 1920–1930-х годах, а также в начале 1990-х годов. Значительный интерес представляют представленные в работе детальные данные о численности украинцев в регионах Российской Федерации по переписям 1926 и 1989 годов, а также списки украинских добровольных и принудительных мигрантов, упоминавшихся в справочной литературе, как и имена общественных деятелей укра-

инской эмиграции. Завершается справочник списком адресов украинских организаций в России на начало 1992 года.

Некоторые исследователи сосредотачивают внимание на важных проблемах общего характера, помогающих определить роль и место украинской диаспоры как историко-культурного явления. В частности, вопросы диаспоры как фактора в международных отношениях исследует в своей работе научный сотрудник Центра российских и восточноевропейских студий Университета Торонто П. Потычный (1997). Характеристику украинских общественно-культурных объединений в России, оценку эффективности их деятельности, а также анализ государственной политики российского правительства по поддержке национально-культурного возрождения национальных меньшинств в России представляет Ю. Левицкий (1999). Отдавая должное плодотворной работе исследователей эмигрантов, следует отметить, что проблемы региональной специфики в значительной степени остались за рамками их исследований. Представители украинской эмиграции в основном акцентировали внимание на анализе общих проблем украинской диаспоры в Российской Федерации в целом.

История и демография украинского населения Урала и Сибири в трудах украинских и российских исследователей

Среди наиболее известных современных исследователей украинских поселений в отдельных регионах Российской Федерации следует отметить российского ученого, потомка украинских переселенцев В. Бабенко. Он был в числе первых историков, сосредоточивших свое внимание на изучении истории и этнографии украинцев Башкирии. В. Бабенко в своих работах (1992, 2010) освещает процессы формирования и особенности жизни украинского населения башкирских земель Приуралья и Южного Урала, изучает быт, прикладное искусство и фольк-

лор украинцев, сохраняющих самобытность и национальные традиции вдали от этнической территории.

Исследователь на основе изучения статистических данных анализирует динамику численности украинского населения в отдельных районах Башкирии, изучает проблемы обустройства переселенцев, прослеживает трансформацию хозяйственной деятельности переселенцев в новых природно-климатических условиях и влияние межэтнического взаимодействия на быт и обычаи украинцев Башкирии.

Детальный анализ статистических материалов по районам выхода украинских переселенцев и регионам их расселения в Западной Сибири во второй половине XIX – начале XX веков проводит в своей работе российский исследователь А. Липин (1999). Автор подчеркивает, что до 80-х годов XIX века переселение украинских крестьян в Западную Сибирь сдерживалась местной и центральной властью, а также наличием свободных земель в европейской части России. В первые годы массовой миграции за Урал основной поток украинских переселенцев направлялся в Томскую и Тобольскую губернии. С начала XX века, по мере исчерпания пригодных для ведения сельского хозяйства земель, все больше переселенцев направляются в богатую степными просторами Акмолинскую область (Липин 1999, 28). В то же время следует отметить проявление характерной для миграций инертности, стремления переселенцев селиться в уже обжитых своими соотечественниками местах. В частности, старые районы колонизации и в дальнейшем продолжали сохранять лидерство в общей статистике украинского населения Западной Сибири.

Обстоятельный анализ теоретико-методологических основ и влияния геополитических процессов на миграции украинского населения проводит профессор Жешувского технологического университета (Польша) Ю. Билан (2017).

UKRAINIAN DIASPORA IN THE URALS AND SIBERIA

Среди факторов, определяющих внешнюю миграцию, автор предлагает различать выталкивающие и притягивающие. Их анализ позволяет с высокой долей вероятности определять причины и направление эмиграции. Исследователь предлагает разделять эти факторы на четыре группы (макроэкономические, микроэкономические, институциональные и социальные). Ю. Билан подчеркивает, что их взаимодействие фактически определяет миграцию и миграционное поведение (Bilan 2017, 230). В работе также представлена статистическая модель влияния экономического и социокультурного факторов на современную внешнюю трудовую миграцию из Украины.

Комплексное исследование истории и настоящего украинцев Урала и Сибири представлено в работе М. Закирова (2006). В исследовании на основе материалов украинских и российских архивов, законодательных актов Российской империи и СССР, переписей населения, трудов дореволюционных, советских и современных исследователей подробно освещается процесс формирования украинской диаспоры Урала и Сибири, участие украинского населения в заселении и освоении края. Значительную часть исследования составляет анализ современной ситуации в среде украинских переселенцев. Автор дает подробную характеристику ведущих направлений самоорганизации самого многочисленного украинского меньшинства на постсоветском пространстве в 1990-х – первой половине 2000-х годов.

Собственный вариант периодизации переселенческого движения в контексте реализации имперской политики России XIX – начала XX века предлагает В. Шандра (2011). В работе анализируются экономические и социальные предпосылки переселенческого движения, а также статистические данные миграции украинских крестьян из отдельных губерний, их расселения по сибирским регионам. Автор подчеркивает, что переселенческая политика государства

наряду с решением социально-экономических проблем преследовала цель военно-политического закрепления в отдаленных регионах страны путем существенного увеличения славянского населения. Колонизация становится важным компонентом имперской политики, а крестьяне должны были стать надежными проводниками идеи «единой и неделимой России» (Шандра 2011, 238).

Примером целенаправленного исследования государственной переселенческой политики царского правительства России является работа А. Овдина (2013). Автор отмечает, что, несмотря на многочисленные проблемы, правительству П. Столыпина удалось решить важную геополитическую задачу и существенно увеличить славянское население азиатской части страны. По мнению А. Овдина, это имело стратегические последствия для мировой истории, ведь именно благодаря массовой колонизации Сибири регион остался в составе России после событий революции 1917 года и гражданской войны, и сегодня помогает поддерживать статус страны в мире (Овдін 2013, 18).

Процессы формирования украинской диаспоры России во второй половине XIX – начала XX века изучает Ю. Подрез (2014). Автор отмечает, что единичные случаи миграции украинцев в составе казацких отрядов за Урал фиксировались уже в XVI веке. Массовый характер миграция украинцев на восток приобретает лишь в XIX веке. Первоначально переселение происходило в первую очередь на более близкие территории в Донскую область, на Кубань и в Поволжье. Активное освоение Сибири и Дальнего Востока украинскими переселенцами главным образом начинается после сооружения Транссибирской железной дороги. Значительная часть переселенцев выбирала плодородные земли юга Западной Сибири, где со временем сформировался регион компактного проживания украинцев – Серый Клин (Подрез 2014, 23).

UKRAINIAN DIASPORA IN THE URALS AND SIBERIA

Масштабы и динамику выхода переселенцев из разных губерний Украины в пореформенный период развития капитализма в Российской империи исследуют современные украинские авторы В. Грузин и А. Крыськов (2016). В работе анализируются количественные и качественные параметры миграции крестьян Волынской, Киевской и Подольской губерний во второй половине XIX века на восток и сдерживающие факторы, влиявшие на масштабы переселений.

Результаты и последствия переселений для крестьянства Киевской губернии в годы Столыпинской аграрной реформы анализирует З. Священко (2017). Автор анализирует статистические данные по масштабам переселений из отдельных уездов губернии в 1906-1912 годах. Несмотря на сложности и лишения, связанные с дальней дорогой и обустройством на новом месте, подавляющему большинству переселенцев удавалось успешно прижиться на новом месте и наладить хозяйство. Во многом этому способствовала целенаправленная государственная поддержка, которая проводилась в период проведения Столыпинской аграрной реформы. Результатом активной крестьянской колонизации Сибири, весомую долю которой составляли украинские переселенцы, произошло существенное расширение посевных площадей и рост товарного производства зерна и молочной продукции в Зауралье и Сибири.

Удачную попытку расширить проблематику исследований миграций украинского населения в 1860-1917 годах предпринял Д. Розовик (2011). Наряду с традиционным анализом динамики переселений автор акцентирует внимание на отдельных аспектах взаимодействия переселенцев с местным населением. В частности, исследователь пришел к выводу, что украинцы, активно создававшие культурно-просветительские центры как центры сохранения своего языка, традиций и культуры, одновременно способствовали подъему культурно-образовательного уровня местного населения (Розовик 2011, 39-40).

Отмеченные украинским ученым тенденции открывали благоприятные перспективы демографического развития украинцев и способствовали сохранению позитивной динамики численности украинского населения Урала и Сибири. Следует подчеркнуть, что в определенной степени схожие благоприятные условия складывались и в годы становления советской власти. В частности, подробную картину успешного внедрения политики коренизации среди украинского населения Российской Федерации в 1920-х годах представляет в своей работе А. Сушко (2001). Вместе с тем автор отмечает, что на практике проведение украинизации сталкивалось с двойными подходами со стороны политических и государственных структур, которые сознательно тормозили открытие национальных школ, газет, подготовку кадров и создание национальных сельсоветов и районов, украинских культурных организаций (Сушко 2001, 130). Начиная с 1930-х годов, отмеченная в работе А. Сушко практика приобретает характер замалчивания проблем национальных меньшинств, а в последующем трансформируется в государственную политику борьбы с буржуазным национализмом, что в комплексе с социально-экономическими и политическими проблемами определило негативную динамику численности украинского населения Российской Федерации, начиная с 1926 года и до сегодняшнего дня.

Именно такая картина фиксируется в исследовании демографических процессов и эволюции языковой ситуации в среде украинской диаспоры России украинского ученого А. Зубика (2017). На основе анализа материалов Всероссийских переписей населения 2002 и 2010 годов автор констатирует снижение численности украинцев в Российской Федерации на 34,54 %. В Уральском федеральном округе снижение численности украинцев составило 29,62 %, в Сибирском федеральном округе – 39,22 %. Исследователь отмечает, что в большинстве административных единиц Российской Федерации доля украинцев,

UKRAINIAN DIASPORA IN THE URALS AND SIBERIA

указывающих как родной украинский язык, составляет от 20 до 30 %. Учитывая указанные тенденции, А. Зубик делает обоснованный вывод, что следующая перепись населения может показать значительное уменьшение численности украинской диаспоры. В последнее время наряду с природными ассимиляционными процессами существенное негативное влияние на эволюцию идентичности украинского населения оказывает внешняя политика и политика государства проживания относительно деятельности национально-культурных организаций (Зубик 2017, 82).

В то же время следует отметить возросший за последние десятилетия интерес к проблеме национальных меньшинств в Российской Федерации, который способствовал подготовке и публикации ряда глубоких и содержательных работ по истории украинских переселенцев. В монографии российских исследователей Е. Фурсовой и Л. Васехи (2004) на основе анализа статистики переселенческого движения 1896 и 1911 годов, данных Всероссийской сельскохозяйственной переписи 1920 года и Всесоюзной переписи 1926 года исследуются масштабы переселений украинских крестьян в Сибирь во второй половине XIX – первой трети XX века. Авторы приводят данные о семьях украинских переселенцев с указанием фамилий и населенных пунктов их расселения в Приобье, а также в Барабинской и Кулундинской степях (Фурсова, Васеха 2004, 8-11).

Историко-статистический очерк Д. Коровушкина (2007) основан на материалах всеобщих и локальных переписей населения и сведениях территориальных органов государственной статистики. Автор прослеживает динамику численности украинских этнических массивов по районам в лесостепной и степной зонах Западной Сибири. Важнейшую часть работы Д. Коровушкина составляют карты-схемы численности украинского населения по результатам переписей 1926 и 2002 годов, таблицы численности этнических групп и украинцев

по районам и отдельным населенным пунктам, карты-схемы административно-территориального деления регионов расселения украинских переселенцев в конце XIX – начале XXI вв. Собранные и систематизированные автором сведения создают целостную картину формирования украинского населения Западной Сибири и служат ценным источником для дальнейших исследований.

Результаты многолетних исследований истории украинского населения региона представлены в монографии Д. Черниенко (2013b). Автор в хронологической последовательности раскрывает основные этапы и особенности формирования научного интереса к истории и культуре украинцев Южного Приуралья на материалах Башкортостана и Оренбургской области. Исследователь заложил основы историографического анализа развития украинистики как самостоятельного научного направления современной российской науки.

Следующую свою работу Д. Черниенко (2013a) посвятил изучению динамики социально-языковой контактной деятельности украинского населения полиэтнического региона Приуралья. Автор попытался выяснить уровень сохранности украинского языка в регионе, выявить ведущие факторы, оказывающие влияние на его структуру и социальный статус. На основе проведенного анализа исследователь пришел к выводу, что межэтническое сближение украинцев с русскими и другими народами Приуралья играет основную роль в определении перспективы функционирования украинского языка. В будущем речь идет о необратимом переходе от двуязычия к русскоязычному монолингвизму украинцев Приуралья (Черниенко 2013a, 103). Естественные процессы ассимиляции ускоряются в отсутствии возможностей для развития национального образования, полноценного информационно-культурного пространства, перманентного усложнения украино-российских отношений и более высокого социально-политического и экономического статуса русского языка. Таким образом,

учитывая приведенные данные и очерченные тенденции, можно прогнозировать, что самая многочисленная в мире восточная ветвь украинской диаспоры может исчезнуть в ближайшей перспективе.

Хозяйственно–экономическая жизнь украинцев Урала и Сибири в работах современных исследователей

Достаточное внимание в работах украинских и российских авторов уделено детальным исследованиям формирования хозяйственного уклада и особенностям социально-экономического развития украинской диаспоры в отдельных регионах России и, в частности, Урала и Сибири.

Вопросы изменений в агротехнической культуре украинских переселенцев и хозяйственно-бытового межэтнического обмена освещает в своей статье украинская исследовательница В. Шандра. Автор отмечает, что украинцы в Сибири сохраняли традиционную бытовую и сельскохозяйственную культуру еще и во втором поколении: в частности, использовали для обработки земли деревянные плуги и волов в качестве тягла. В то же время украинские переселенцы в числе первых стали использовать фабричные плуги, а затем и молотилки, жатки и веялки (Шандра 2011, 237). Позитивные примеры активного использования сельскохозяйственной техники украинцами способствовали развитию и старожильческих хозяйств. Например, казахи переняли машинный способ косьбы и приемы заготовки кормов на зиму. В свою очередь переселенцы заимствовали новые для себя сорта и виды сельскохозяйственных культур, переходили к разведению местных пород лошадей, коров и овец.

Труды украинской исследовательницы О. Розовик (2015a; 2015b) отличаются детальным анализом процесса подготовки организованного переселения украинских крестьян в Сибирь и вклада переселенцев в хозяйственное освоение

края в 1920–30-х годах. Автор освещает вопросы проведения украинскими переселенцами масштабных мелиоративных работ, широкое применение передовых агротехнических приемов. Благодаря украинским крестьянам, владевшим наиболее совершенными для того периода методами выращивания зерновых, технических и огородных культур, сельское хозяйство региона не только обогатилось новыми культурами, но и начало переходить на интенсивные формы производства (Розовик 2015а, 65). Освещением работы колонизационных комиссий УССР исследовательница открыла новую страницу истории переселений. Работа О. Розовик доказывает, что колонизационно-мелиоративные комиссии-экспедиции, проводившие оценку пригодности территорий для переселений, в значительной степени способствовали адаптации переселенцев и эффективному хозяйственному освоению края.

Особенности хозяйственной деятельности украинских переселенцев в новых природно-климатических и социальных условиях Сибири и Дальнего Востока во второй половине XIX – начале XX веков изучает украинская исследовательница Ю. Подрез (2014). Автор подчеркивает традиционно значительную роль украинцев в социально-экономической жизни регионов России. Неисчерпаемые природные ресурсы, богатый производственный опыт переселенцев в условиях слабого развития местного производства и удаленности от промышленных центров способствовали активному развитию кустарного производства в украинских поселениях. Кроме того, Ю. Подрез отмечает, что довольно часто земледелие не удовлетворяло все потребности переселенцев, и они активно развивали уже существующие промыслы или открывали новые производства, существенно влияя на развитие производственной культуры Сибири и Дальнего Востока (Подрез 2014, 28).

UKRAINIAN DIASPORA IN THE URALS AND SIBERIA

Содержательные исследования хозяйственно-экономической жизни украинских переселенцев представлены в работах российских авторов Сибири и Урала, по объективным причинам имеющих более свободный доступ к местным архивным материалам и результатам полевых изысканий.

В частности, на основе данных обследований, проводившихся в Томской области, А. Воропаева анализирует развитие строительных традиций украинских переселенцев Сибири (2018). Автор подчеркивает, что первоначально они пытались сохранить традиционные методы строительства и использовать привычные материалы. Однако иные природно-климатические условия со временем обусловили отказ от применения в кладке стен жилищ сырцового кирпича и повсеместный переход к использованию древесины хвойных пород. Определенной данью строительной традиции, вывезенной с Украины, вплоть до конца 1920-х годов оставалось широкое применение соломы в качестве кровельного материала. Во внутреннем убранстве жилищ украинские переселенцы сохраняли традицию украшения стен, но при этом заменяли красочную роспись широким использованием вышивки на предметах быта и вышитых картин в рамках (Воропаева 2018, 112; 115).

На причудливое переплетение традиций в строительных приемах украинцев в Сибири указывает в своей работе Т. Гончарова (2010). Исследовательница отмечает, что потомки украинских переселенцев продолжали обмазывать деревянные срубы снаружи глиной и белить их, придавая им вид традиционных украинских хат-мазанок. Причем в отдельных районах региона такой прием внешней отделки домов сохранялся вплоть до 1950-х годов.

Результаты полевых исследований свидетельствуют, что одним из наиболее устойчивых элементов хозяйственно-экономического комплекса является национальная кухня и пищевые привычки. Как отмечает Т. Гончарова, ра-

цион питания украинских переселенцев Сибири, включающий традиционные украинские блюда и продукты – борщ, вареники, галушки, пампушки, маковые начинки и свиное сало – стал основным этническим маркером (Гончарова 2010, 76-77).

В книге Е. Фурсовой и Л. Васехи (2004) традиционная пища украинских переселенцев Сибири рассматривается в комплексе с заимствованиями престижных элементов старожильческой культуры. В частности, усвоение культуры чаепития старожиллов с широким использованием самоваров и плиточного чая. Дополнением к традиционным для национальной кухни галушкам, вареникам и борщу у украинских переселенцев становятся и заимствованные у старожиллов пельмени. В то же время исследователи отмечают значительную консервативность традиций питания, которую они связывают с потребностью групповой идентификации (Фурсова, Васеха 2004, 70).

Значительное внимание в указанной монографии уделено изучению трансформации одежды украинских переселенцев Сибири в зависимости от районов выхода. Авторы отмечают, что переселенцы уже в 1920-х годах переходят от традиционного домотканого полотна из конопли к льняному или фабричному, однако полтавские переселенцы продолжали сеять коноплю вплоть до коллективизации. В новых природно-климатических условиях украинцы перенимают у старожиллов и местные виды одежды и обуви, такие как валенки и тулупы. Украинцы в Сибири продолжали традиции отделки одежды вышивкой и использования большого количества украшений, а украинские переселенки в отличие от основной массы сибирских крестьянок имели нижнее белье (Фурсова, Васеха 2004, 24).

В качестве примера межэтнического культурного обмена в книге отмечается распространение в сибирских селах меховых головных уборов «папах»,

«кубанок», а также широких штанов «шаровар». Однако последующие социально-экономические и политические потрясения в СССР привели к резкому прерыванию естественных процессов этнокультурного развития и существенно ускорили процессы унификации и нивелирования традиций народного костюма и украинских переселенцев, и населения Сибири в целом.

Среди современных исследований традиций питания украинского населения Сибири одной из наиболее полных является работа О. Рындиной и А. Воропаевой (2018). На основе результатов полевых исследований 2009–2010 годов в Томской области авторы провели детальную реконструкцию системы питания украинских переселенцев начала XX века и проследили динамику пищевых традиций во времени. Воссоздав привычный хозяйственный комплекс, основанный на земледелии и животноводстве, украинцы в Сибири сумели сохранить большую часть национальной кухни.

В то же время исследователи приходят к выводу, что новые природно-климатические условия способствовали отказу от характерной для Украины однокомпонентной системы питания, основанной на преобладании растительной пищи в пользу существенного расширения мясного компонента. (Рындина, Воропаева 2018, 152). Сложившаяся к началу XX века пищевая система украинских переселенцев в Сибири серьезно пострадала в результате социальных преобразований 1930-х годов и военного лихолетья. В современных условиях сохранившиеся элементы украинской кухни в большей степени являются маркером сохранения национальной идентичности.

Проблемы хозяйственной адаптации украинских переселенцев в Западной Сибири в конце XIX – начале XX веков на основе опубликованных и архивных материалов анализирует В. Шайдуров (2017). Автор подчеркивает, что большая часть украинских переселенцев на новом месте стремились сохранить

традиционное занятие земледелием. Из-за нехватки тягла и инструментов для обработки земли многие переселенцы на начальном этапе обустройства вынуждены были брать кредиты у торговцев, идти на поденную работу к старожилам, а незначительная часть мигрантов переходила в разряд наемных рабочих и ремесленников.

Более благоприятные условия для организации эффективного хозяйства были созданы в годы проведения столыпинской аграрной реформы. Переселенцы получали льготы на проезд к новому месту жительства, беспроцентные ссуды и существенно большие наделы земли. Результатом агрокультурного диалога украинских переселенцев и старожилов в южных степных регионах Западной Сибири появились бахчевые культуры. Переселенцы перенимали традиции подворного землевладения и активно включались в производство товарной продукции. Практически в каждой украинской деревне Сибири действовала маслодельческая артель (Шайдуров 2017, 16–19).

Таким образом, украинские переселенцы, сохраняя и развивая в новых природно-климатических условиях накопленные многовековым опытом земледелия навыки, способствовали экономическим преобразованиям заселяемых регионов. В результате межэтнического обмена в хозяйственно-бытовой сфере переселенцев и старожильского населения стало взаимное обогащение традиций питания и развитие культуры изготовления одежды.

Исследования этнокультурного развития украинцев Урала и Сибири

Продолжая заложенные учеными западной ветви украинской диаспоры традиции объективных и всесторонних исследований украинского населения России, над изучением этнокультурных проблем диаспоры плодотворно работают современные украинские исследователи. Так, на основе информационно-

UKRAINIAN DIASPORA IN THE URALS AND SIBERIA

статистических и аналитических материалов региональных украинских организаций Западной Сибири и Урала, интервью действующих лиц организаций украинской диаспоры в России В. Иваненко и М. Кавун (2010) анализируют пути сохранения национального самосознания украинцев России.

Распад СССР и создание независимых национальных государств стали ведущим фактором пробуждения национальной самоидентификации национальных меньшинств на постсоветском пространстве. Результатом консолидации украинской диаспоры России стало создание многочисленных национально-культурных организаций, фольклорных коллективов, организация печатных изданий, открытие воскресных школ. Наиболее активно эти процессы происходили в регионах исторически активной украинской колонизации Урала и Западной Сибири. Авторы исследования отмечают, что украинское национально-культурное возрождение, несмотря на существенную активизацию в 1990-х годах, не приобрело массовых масштабов, о чем свидетельствует относительно небольшая численность общин в общей пропорции ко всему украинскому населению регионов. Среди основных проблем исследователи выделяют недостаточное финансирование и материальное обеспечение общин, проблемы с информационным обеспечением украинских организаций и все большие ассимиляционные тенденции (Иваненко, Кавун 2010, 49).

Результаты полевых исследований традиционной культуры украинского населения Башкортостана представляет в своей работе М. Пилипак (2017). На основе анализа этнографического и диалектологического материала, собранного в ходе обследования сельских населенных пунктов в исторических местах компактного расселения украинцев, автор констатирует, что длительное взаимодействие с другими народами приводит к заимствованию элементов их культуры, например, свадебной обрядности. Основными носителями исторической памяти

является сельское население старшего возраста, а лучше всего элементы традиционной культуры сохраняются в таких бытовых формах, как пища, орудия труда, декоративно-прикладное искусство (Пилипак 2017, 240).

Детально проблемы сохранения национальной идентичности украинцев России освещены в аналитическом докладе, подготовленном сотрудницей Национального института стратегических исследований Украины Л. Мазука (2013). Автор подчеркивает изменение политики Российской Федерации в отношении украинских национальных организаций. С начала 2010-х годов развивается кампания давления на Библиотеку украинской литературы, Украинский образовательный центр при средней школе №124 в Москве, ликвидация решением Верховного суда РФ от 18 мая 2012 года Федеральной национально-культурной автономии украинцев России. Взамен ликвидированной организации Министерство юстиции России 22 мая 2012 г. зарегистрировало новую Федеральную национально-культурную автономию «Украинцы России», на учредительный съезд которой не были допущены украинские журналисты, а украинская диаспора заявляла, что организация создается без ее ведома (Мазука 2013, 17).

Весомый вклад в исследования процессов этнокультурного развития украинского населения Урала и Сибири вносят и российские ученые. Важным источником исследовательского интереса научного сообщества является неразрывная связь региона с именем известного украинского поэта Т. Шевченко. Кроме периодических публикаций в изданиях, ученые презентуют свою работу на тематических конференциях. Одним из первых свидетельств возросшего внимания к истории и современности украинского населения края явился сборник материалов научно-практической конференции, посвященной 150-летию пребывания Т. Шевченко в Оренбургском крае *Украинцы в Оренбургском крае*

(1997). В сообщениях, вошедших в сборник, представлены результаты многолетних исследований по истории заселения региона, отражена роль украинцев в экономике, общественной и политической жизни края, проведен анализ процессов становления организованной национально-культурной жизни украинских объединений.

Проведение подобных мероприятий стало доброй традицией, и научно-практические конференции, посвященные исследованиям украинцев Урала и Сибири, с участием широкого круга специалистов проводятся в Оренбуржье регулярно. Например, статьи, раскрывающие творческий и жизненный путь Т. Шевченко, а также будущее и настоящее украинцев региона, вошли в сборник, посвященный 200-летию со дня рождения поэта – *Дорогами Кобзаря. Украинцы в Южно-Уральском регионе* (2014). Исследователи сосредоточили внимание на изучении наследия Т. Шевченко, влиянии его произведений на становление и развитие разных форм украинского искусства. В публикациях ученых наряду с традиционными вопросами истории формирования и культуры украинского населения на Южном Урале раскрываются проблемы сохранения национальной идентичности, языка и традиций в диаспоре, вопросы российско-украинских отношений.

Особенно пристальное внимание российских исследователей привлекает проблематика этнокультурного развития украинского населения Урала и Сибири. Национальную государственную политику в отношении украинского этноса на Южном Урале в 1990-х – начале 2000-х годов исследует И. Москвин (2011). На момент подготовки исследования автор оценивает ее как положительную, конструктивную и направленную на сохранение и развитие украинской национальной культуры на Южном Урале. Вместе с тем исследователь отмечает, что в результате межэтнических браков и распространенным в среде диаспоры

представлением, что в России более успешным будет позиционировать себя русскими, многие украинцы во время переписи определяют себя русскими (Москвин 2011, 529).

Накопленный за десятилетие изучения проблемы значительный исследовательский материал побудил уральских украиноведов В. Амелина и А. Молощенкова (2012) к подготовке обобщающего труда по истории украинцев Южного Урала. Авторы исследуют проблемы формирования украинской диаспоры и этнокультурного развития украинцев в пределах всего региона с одновременным учетом специфики Приуралья и Зауралья. Значительный интерес представляет освещение исследователями современного состояния этнической группы в регионе и эволюции самосознания украинцев Южного Урала, которая происходила под влиянием активных ассимиляционных и интеграционных процессов первой половины XVIII и до начала XXI в.

Российская исследовательница А. Воропаева анализирует процесс смены этнической идентичности пореформенных переселенцев Молчановского района Томской области (2016). Автор на основе изучения похозяйственных книг прослеживает динамику этнической идентичности украинцев в одном из регионов массовой украинской колонизации Западной Сибири. Проведенный анализ пофамильных списков подтвердил выявленный предыдущими исследователями дрейф этнической идентичности, происходивший наиболее интенсивно в 1940-1960-х годах и обусловленный в основном процессами укрупнения деревень, сокращением сферы использования родного языка, что в итоге привело к насильственному прерыванию развития национальной культуры (Воропаева 2016, 47).

Выявлению круга научных проблем в работах сибирских ученых по изучению этнической идентичности украинцев и потомков украинских переселен-

UKRAINIAN DIASPORA IN THE URALS AND SIBERIA

цев с учетом региональных особенностей в полиэтническом пространстве Сибири посвятила свою работу Н. Люля (2020). Автор отмечает, что решающее значение для этнического самоопределения переселенцев и их потомков имеют условия, в которых они оказались. По мнению исследовательницы, в условиях совместного проживания русских и украинцев в одном населенном пункте сохранить традиционную культуру, язык, а значит, и этническую идентичность, в сибирских условиях украинцам было невозможно. В местах же компактного расселения переселенцев уровень сохранения этнического самосознания значительно выше. Среди наиболее важных исследовательница отмечает выводы А. Прохоровой и Т. Гончаровой о том, что с 2010-х годов активное развитие и поддержка национальных культурных объединений и центров привели к консолидации украинцев и увеличению украинской диаспоры в регионах за счет изменения этнической идентичности с россиян на украинцев (Люля 2020, 105). Следовательно, наряду с региональной спецификой идентичности, важным фактором сохранения украинской диаспоры является развитие национально-культурной жизни.

Динамику этнической самоидентификации украинцев Томской области на локальном уровне отдельных поселений изучает Т. Гончарова (2006). На основе анализа похозяйственных книг села Ново-Рождественского и бесед с местными жителями автор приходит к выводу, что зафиксированная в документах смена этнической самоидентификации не отражает реальный уровень. Часть населения продолжает считать себя украинцами, и окружающее население воспринимает село как украинское (Гончарова 2006, 137). Судьбу поселений пришлого нерусского населения Сибири автор рассматривает на примере украинской деревни Крыловка Томской области. Небольшая, как и большинство этнически однородных поселений переселенцев, деревня исчезла в середине 1970-х

годов в результате укрупнения населенных пунктов, а жители переселились в города или другие села. Результаты исследования Т. Гончаровой свидетельствуют о двойственности ситуации в сфере этнического самосознания украинцев. На фоне формальной смены их этнической идентичности фиксируются выраженные свидетельства сохранения многочисленных маркеров украинской национальной идентичности.

Важный вопрос влияния внешнеполитических факторов на этнонациональные процессы в среде украинской диаспоры освещает А. Свидовская (2020). Автор приводит данные полевых исследований о возрождении самосознания у некоторых респондентов под влиянием событий 2014 года. На основе анализа активизации работы центров украинской культуры в городах Барнауле, Омске, поселке Родино Родинского района Алтайского края А. Свидовская отмечает, что, погружаясь в украинизированную языковую среду, респонденты начинают чувствовать свою принадлежность к украинской культуре. По мнению исследовательницы (Свидовская 2020, 126), для сохранения языка как части украинской культуры на территории Западной Сибири следует принимать меры, ориентированные на молодежь и школьников, создавать условия для популяризации среди них родной культуры.

Сложные процессы этнокультурной трансформации украинского населения степной зоны Западной Сибири в XX – начале XXI веков изучают специалисты отдела этнографии Института археологии и этнографии Сибирского отделения Российской Академии наук. В конце XX – начале XXI ст. украинцы Сибири демонстрировали высокие темпы этнической динамики, отмечают в своей работе Е. Антропов, Л. Крикау и И. Октябрьская (2015). Авторы подчеркивают, что в контексте активных процессов межэтнической интеграции и культурной унификации главным фактором сокращения украинского населения

UKRAINIAN DIASPORA IN THE URALS AND SIBERIA

стало изменение этнической идентичности. Вместе с тем, констатируют исследователи, называя себя русскими, потомки украинских переселенцев не забывают о своем происхождении и сохраняют на уровне семейных практик элементы украинской культуры и фольклора (Антропов, Крикау, Октябрьская 2015, 226).

Исследователи подчеркивают, что масштабная миграция украинских крестьян в Западную Сибирь в конце XIX и начале XX веков обусловила формирование значительного массива сибирских украинцев. Украинцы в отдельных районах, в том числе Кулундинской степи, составляли до 50 % населения и являлись доминирующим этносом. Существенная коррекция этнической картины в регионе произошла в результате коллективизации, депортаций населения, эвакуации и репрессий. Последующие этнические процессы протекали в условиях исчезновения моноэтнических сел, выравнивания численности русского и украинского населения и значительного роста межнациональных браков (Антропов, Крикау, Октябрьская 2015, 223).

Современные этносоциальные процессы в Сибири представляют собой совокупность дифференциации и интеграции, что обуславливает сложный, многоуровневый характер идентичности украинцев Западной Сибири. Важное значение для сохранения национальной идентичности переселенцев имеет сохранение традиционного образа жизни, существенной составляющей которого является обрядовость. Неслучайно многие исследователи концентрируют внимание на исследованиях динамики обрядовой культуры.

Попытку воссоздания зимнего праздничного цикла обрядности пореформенных украинских переселенцев, характерного для первой половины XX века, предприняла старший научный сотрудник Томского государственного университета О. Рындина (2012). Автор детально описывает традиции святочной об-

рядности украинцев Томского края, проводя параллели и сравнения с проведением аналогичных обрядов в Украине и соседних регионах Сибири. Анализ материалов полевых исследований показал сохранение украинскими переселенцами традиций колядования, щедрования и посева в качестве ключевых элементов святочного цикла. В то же время локальная специфика трансформации обрядовости переселенцев проявилась в утрате некоторых ключевых действий – ряжение козой, колядование со звездой, Меланку (Рындина 2012, 158).

Наиболее полная картина календарных обычаев и обрядов украинских переселенцев Сибири представлена в работе российского этнографа Е. Фурсовой (2004), совместной монографии Е. Фурсовой и организатора этноэстетического воспитания Новосибирской области Л. Васехи *Очерки традиционной культуры украинских переселенцев Сибири XIX первой трети XX века (по материалам Новосибирской области)* (2004), а также в исследовании специалиста по этнографии восточных славян Сибири Т. Золотовой (2017).

В работе Е. Фурсовой на фоне детального анализа календарных обрядов русского, белорусского и украинского населения Приобья и Кулундинской и Барабинской степей Юга Западной Сибири изучаются процессы межкультурного взаимодействия переселенцев и старожильского населения в первой трети XX века. Автор отмечает явление «культурной интерференции», выражающееся в усилении схожих традиций и ослабление традиций резко выделяющихся, не вписывающихся в общую этнокультурную среду (Фурсова 2004, 38).

Белорусские и украинские переселенцы несли с собой архаичную славянскую обрядовость, во многом уже утраченную старожилами. В последующем, в результате межкультурного обмена происходила трансформация традиций, сопровождавшаяся утратой некоторых символов и элементов, но в то же время общая обрядовая культура восточнославянского населения Сибири при-

обрела более выразительный славянский характер. В монографии Е. Фурсовой и Л. Васехи детально описываются традиции и обряды украинских переселенцев Сибири, связанные с празднованием Рождества, Масленицы, Пасхи, Троицы и других религиозных праздников. Значительное внимание в работе уделяется описанию праздничных блюд, колядок, поговорок и пожеланий, сценариев различных обрядов и гаданий.

Авторы выделяют различия в традициях в зависимости от региона выхода переселенцев в Украине и особенности обрядовости в разных районах поселения украинцев в Сибири, а также приводят отдельные примеры сохранения традиционных названий праздников и обычаев в современной культуре.

Книга Т. Золотовой основана на фольклорно-этнографических материалах, собранных автором в экспедициях по восьми регионам Зауралья и Западной Сибири. Исследовательница представляет реконструкцию традиционных календарных праздников и обрядов русских, украинцев и белорусов и анализирует трансформацию празднично-обрядовой сферы восточнославянского населения на протяжении XX – начала XXI веков. Автор отмечает, что для украинских переселенцев характерна более выраженная связь религии, традиций и обрядов, лучшее знание идеологического обоснования праздника, более яркая эстетическая и вербальная составляющая (Золотова 2017, 206). О масштабах проделанной автором полевой работы свидетельствует список обследованных более 150 населенных пунктов в 43 районах 7 областей Западной Сибири и Зауралья.

Таким образом, оценивая характер этнокультурных процессов в среде украинского населения Урала и Сибири, исследователи отмечают тенденцию к постепенной утрате украинской идентичности. В то же время организация и активное развитие национально-культурной жизни в районах сохранившегося относительно компактного расселения способно не только замедлить отмеченную

тенденцию, но и способствовать пробуждению национального самосознания. Однако, в сложившихся за последние годы общественно-политических условиях сокращение украинского населения региона вследствие смены этнической идентичности демонстрирует устойчивый характер, а национальная культура и фольклор сохраняются преимущественно на уровне семейных традиций.

Заключение

Таким образом, проведенный анализ позволяет констатировать, что проблема истории и настоящего украинской диаспоры на Урале и в Сибири остается в фокусе научного интереса как представителей эмиграции, так и украинских и российских авторов. Выявленные недостатки работ, опубликованных до 90-х годов прошлого века, вызваны в основном господством определенных стереотипов, ставших результатом давления и ограничений со стороны государства. Традиции исследования украинского населения России как неотъемлемой части украинской диаспоры закладывались украинскими учеными эмигрантами. Они стремились выйти за рамки историко-статистических исследований и акцентировали внимание на проблемах этнокультурного развития украинских переселенцев. Преодоление идеологической тенденциозности постсоветской наукой открыло возможности для существенного расширения исследовательского поля и количественного роста масштабных исследований проблем интеграции украинцев в иную социально-культурную среду, процессов их этнонационального развития и самовыражения в разные исторические периоды.

Объем использованных источников и литературы, степень проведенного анализа и аргументированность выводов у разных авторов существенно отличаются, но в целом отвечают современным требованиям к научным исследованиям. Обращение в работах ученых к одним и тем же периодам и вопросам не

UKRAINIAN DIASPORA IN THE URALS AND SIBERIA

является признаком исчерпанности проблемы, а выступает проявлением научной традиции. Возвращение авторов к изучению отдельных аспектов проблемы с использованием новейших достижений исторической науки и методологии, введение в научное обращение новых архивных материалов свидетельствует о научной преемственности, позволяет расширить и углубить понимание исторических процессов в разные периоды формирования украинской диаспоры.

К началу 90-х годов прошлого века исследования украинского населения в регионах Российской Федерации как этнокультурного феномена были представлены только в трудах западных исследователей. Слабым местом работ ученых в эмиграции наряду с недостаточным использованием местного материала было определенное искаженное представление о сущности национальных процессов, происходивших в стране на уровне массового сознания.

Качественно новый этап исследований украинских диаспор на постсоветском пространстве открывается с распадом советской системы и восстановлением независимости Украины. Труды западных ученых существенно углубили изучение теоретических проблем определения украинской диаспоры в постсоветских странах как отдельного историко-культурного явления.

История и современность украинцев в отдельных регионах Российской Федерации и, в частности, Урала и Сибири, нашла широкое отражение в трудах украинских и российских авторов. В комплексных исследованиях ученых Украины подробно освещаются не только процессы формирования украинского населения региона, но и выделяется их роль в хозяйственном освоении края, мелиорации земель, внедрении новых культур и агротехнических приемов. Важной частью этих работ является анализ эволюции национальной политики государства и взаимодействия с местным населением, изучение влияния укра-

инских переселенцев на культурно-образовательное развитие в районах компактного заселения, создание и деятельность национально-культурных центров.

Анализ истории российской науки об украинской диаспоре Урала и Сибири, обобщающие труды и результаты полевых исследований представлены в работах российских авторов. Динамика строительных традиций, эволюция календарной обрядовости, оформления жилищ и национального костюма украинских переселенцев, рост товарного производства и расширение агрокультурного разнообразия отражают процессы межэтнического хозяйственно-культурного обмена и свидетельствуют о вкладе украинцев в освоение и развитие региона. Исследователи отмечают, что ключевым признаком в национальных процессах в среде украинской диаспоры Урала и Сибири является изменение этнической идентичности, что происходит под влиянием межэтнической интеграции и культурной унификации. В обозримом будущем указанные трансформации могут привести к окончательной ассимиляции украинского населения России с сохранением отдельных элементов национальной культуры на уровне семейно-бытовых традиций. Эффективно противодействовать этим процессам на современном этапе существования украинской диаспоры в Российской Федерации может всестороннее развитие организованной национально-культурной жизни, популяризация украинского языка и расширение информационного обмена в диаспоре. Соответственно, среди наиболее перспективных направлений дальнейшего научного поиска можно выделить исследования современного состояния этнокультурного развития украинской диаспоры Урала и Сибири в контексте эволюции национальной политики страны проживания.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

- Амелин, Веналий, Молощенков, Антон, 2012: *Украинцы на Южном Урале*, Оренбург: Издательский центр ОГАУ.
- Амелин, Веналий, 2012: 'История этнических общностей Оренбуржья: проблемы современной историографии', *Вестник ОГУ*, 5/141, 86-93.
- Антропов, Евгений, Крикау, Людмила, Октябрьская, Ирина, 2015: '«Мы украинцы, хотя пишемся русские...»: этнические процессы в среде украинцев степной зоны Западной Сибири XX – начала XXI в.', *Проблемы истории, филологии, культуры*, 4, 221-227.
- Бабенко, Василий, 1992: *Украинцы Башкирской ССР: поведение малой этнической группы в полиэтнической среде*, Уфа: БНЦ УрО РАН.
- Бабенко, Василь, Бабенко, Сергій, 2010: 'Українці Башкортостану: основні тенденції етнокультурного розвитку (кінець XIX – початок XXI століття)', *Народна творчість та етнографія*, 4, 39-47.
- Воропаева, Анна, 2016: 'Динамика этнической идентичности украинцев Молчановского района Томской области. В 1950 – 1970-е гг. (По данным похозяйственных книг)', *Вестник Томского государственного университета. Культурология и искусствоведение*, 2, 45-53.
- Воропаева, Анна, 2018: 'Украинское село в Сибири: динамика строительных традиций', *Вестник Томского государственного университета. Культурология и искусствоведение*, 32, 109-118.
- Гончарова, Татьяна, 2010: 'Историческая динамика этнической культуры (на примере украинцев Томской области)', *Вестник Томского государственного университета. Культурология и искусствоведение*, 336, 76-78.

- Гончарова, Татьяна, 2006: 'К вопросу об этнической самоидентификации украинцев Томской области', *Вестник ТГПУ. Серия: Гуманитарные науки. История*, 1/52, 135-139.
- Грузин, Володимир, Криськов, Андрій, 2016: 'Селянські переселення з губерній правобережної України до Сибіру у другій половині XIX ст.', *Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка: Сер. Історія*, 1/4, 37-41.
- Дорогами Кобзаря. Українці в Южно-Уральском регионе. Материалы Международной научно-практической конференции, посвящённой 200-летию со дня рождения Т. Г. Шевченко, 2014*, Оренбург: ООО ИПК «Университет».
- Закіров, Марат, 2006: *Урало-Сибірський регіон Російської Федерації в умовах трансформації суспільства: участь українського населення*: дис. канд. іст. наук, Луганськ: Сідноукраїнський національний університет імені Володимира Даля.
- Золотова, Татьяна, 2017: *Традиционный праздничный календарь восточнославянского населения Зауралья и Западной Сибири*, Москва: Институт наследия.
- Зубик, Андрій, 2017: 'Динаміка чисельності та етномовні процеси в українській діаспорі Російської Федерації за переписами населення 2002 та 2010 рр.', *Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка. Серія: географія*, 1/42, 74-85.
- История и этнография славянских диаспор Томской области: библиографический указатель (1990–2016 гг.): справочное пособие*, (ред. Татаьяна, Гончарова, Галина, Грошева), 2017, Томск: Изд-во ТГПУ.

UKRAINIAN DIASPORA IN THE URALS AND SIBERIA

- Іваненко, Валентин, Кавун, Максим, 2010: 'Проблеми збереження національної свідомості української діаспори в сучасній Росії. (За матеріалами Сибіру та Уралу)', *Чорноморський літопис*, 1, 46-50.
- Коровушкин, Дмитрий, 2007: *Украинцы в Западной Сибири: Расселение и численность в конце XIX – начале XXI века*. Новосибирск: Издательство Ин-та археологии и этнографии СО РАН.
- Крамарчук, Тетяна, 2000: *Українська діаспора Республіки Башкортостан: історія формування та особливості існування в іншоетнічному середовищі*: дис. канд. іст. наук, Черкаси: Черкаський інженерно-технологічний інститут.
- Кубійович, Володимир, 1977: *Міграційні процеси в Українській ССР за переписом 1970 року. Збірник на пошану проф. д-ра Олександра Оглоблина*, pp. 290-304, Нью-Йорк: Видання Української Вільної Академії Наук у США.
- Кубійович, Володимир, 1979: 'Українська діаспора в СРСР в світлі переписів населення', *Сучасність*, Мюнхен, 6/210, 60-74.
- Левицький, Юрій-Мирослав, 1999: 'Українці в Російській Федерації', *Визвольний шлях*, Лондон, 01/610, 35-41.
- Липин, Алексей, 1999: 'Украинские переселенцы в Западной Сибири: районы выхода (вторая половина XIX–начало XX в.)', *Известия Алтайского государственного университета.*, 4, 24-29.
- Люля, Наталя, 2020: 'Этническая идентичность украинцев и потомков украинских переселенцев Сибири в работах исследователей в 1990-2010-е годы', *Манускрипт*, 12, 103-108. <https://doi.org/10.30853/mns200547> [last accessed 23/8/2022]

- Мазука, Людмила. *Українська держава та світове українство: актуальні питання, потенціал і перспективи взаємодії*, Київ: НІСД.
- Маркусь, Василь, 1992: 'Чому діаспора: спроба ідентифікувати поняття', *Українська діаспора*, Київ; Чикаго, Ч. 1, 4-13.
- Марунчак, Михайло, 1974: *Українці в ССРСР поза кордонами УРСР*, Вінніпег: Накладом УВАН в Канаді.
- Молощенков, Антон, 2010: *Переселение украинцев на Южный Урал и проблемы их этнокультурного развития*: дис. канд. ист. наук, Москва: Российский государственный университет туризма и сервиса.
- Москвин, Илья, 2011: 'Национальная политика в отношении украинского этноса на Южном Урале в начале XXI века', *Вестник Оренбургского государственного университета*, 16/135, 527-529.
- Овдін, Олександр, 2013: 'Державне регулювання міграційного руху з України до Сибіру, Середньої Азії та Далекого Сходу на початку XX століття', *Державне управління та місцеве самоврядування*, 1, 12-19.
- Пилипак, Максим, 2017: 'Традиційна культура українців Республіки Башкортостан (За матеріалами експедиції 2016 р.)', *Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського. Серія: Історія*, 25, 238-241.
- Подрез, Юлія, 2014: 'Формування та розвиток української діаспори Росії в другій половині XIX – на початку XX століття', *Збірник наукових праць. Серія «Історія та географія»*, 50, 21-26.
- Потичний, Петро, 1997: 'Діаспори і міжнародні відносини', *Сучасність*, 11, 79-85.

UKRAINIAN DIASPORA IN THE URALS AND SIBERIA

- Розовик, Дмитро, 2011: 'Міграція українського населення на Поволжя, Урал і Сибір у 1860-1917 рр.', *Вісник Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. Історія*, 107, 38-41.
- Розовик, Олеся, 2015а: 'Господарське освоєння земель Сибіру, Казахстану і Далекого Сходу переселенцями з УСРР у 1920–1930-х роках', *Гілея: науковий вісник*, 95, 64-68.
- Розовик, Олеся, 2015: 'Природно-кліматичні умови території поселення українських переселенців у Всесоюзному колонізаційному фонді'. *Гілея: науковий вісник*, 96, 100-103.
- Рындина, Ольга, 2012: 'Святочная обрядовость украинцев Томского края', *Культурология и искусствоведение*, 4/8, 152-159.
- Рындина Ольга, Воропаева Анна, 2018: 'Традиционная пища украинцев Томской области: динамика во времени и пространстве', *Вестник Томского государственного университета. История*, 55, 148-156.
- Свидовская А. 'Языковая ситуация среди населения с биэтничной русско-украинской идентичностью на юге Западной Сибири', *Общество: социология, психология, педагогика*. Краснодар, 2020. №12. <https://doi.org/10.24158/spp.2020.12.23> [last accessed 23/8/2022]
- Священко, Зінаїда, 2017: 'Переселення селян Київської губернії до Сибіру у роки Столипінської аграрної реформи', *Східноєвропейській історичний вісник*, 3, 53-59. <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058x.3.101057> [last accessed 23/8/2022]
- Сушко, Олександр, 2001: 'Проблема функціонування української діаспори Російської Федерації у 20-х–30-х рр. ХХ століття у вітчизняній історіографії', *Краєзнавство*, 1/4, 126-131.

- Украинцы в Оренбургском крае: Материалы научно-практической конференции, посвященной 150 – летию со дня пребывания Т.Г. Шевченко в Оренбургском крае*, 1997, Оренбург: Печатный Дом «Димур».
- Українські поселення: довідник* (ред. А. Міляннич), 1980, Нью-Йорк: Український соціологічний інститут.
- Фурсова, Елена, Васеха, Лілія, 2004: *Очерки традиционной культуры украинских переселенцев Сибири XIX века – первой трети XX века (по материалам Новосибирской области)*, Ч. 1. Новосибирск: АГРО-СИБИРЬ.
- Фурсова, Елена, 2004: *Календарная обрядность восточнославянских народов в Приобье, Барабе и Кулунде: межкультурные взаимодействия и трансформации первой трети XX в.:* дис. д-ра ист. наук, Новосибирск: Издательство Института археологии и этнографии СО РАН.
- Черниенко, Денис, 2013б: *Украинистика Южного Приуралья*, Ижевск: Издательство «Удмуртский университет».
- Черниенко, Денис, 2012: ‘Украинцы Южного Приуралья в научной литературе второй половины XVIII – начала XX века’, *Вестник Удмуртского университета*, 3, 39-46.
- Черниенко, Денис, 2013а: ‘Этноязыковые процессы в среде украинского населения Приуралья’, *Вестник Удмуртского университета. История и филология*, 3, 99-104.
- Шайдулов, Владимир, 2017: ‘Особенности экономической жизни украинских крестьян в Западной Сибири в конце XIX – начале XX в.’, *История повседневности*, 1, 9-22.

UKRAINIAN DIASPORA IN THE URALS AND SIBERIA

- Шандра, Валентина, 2011: 'Переселення українських селян до Сибіру у 1861–1917: чинники та наслідки', *Проблеми історії України XIX початку XX століття*, XIX, 228-242, Київ.
- Якименко, Николай, 1989: *Переселение крестьян Украины на окраины России в период капитализма (1861 – 1917)*: дис. д-ра ист. наук, Киев: КГУ им. Т. Шевченко.
- Bilan, Yuriy, 2017. *Migration of the Ukrainian Population: Economic, Institutional and Sociocultural Factors*, London: Ubiquity Press. <https://doi.org/10.5334/bbg> [last accessed 23/8/2022]
- Сірко, Serge, 1994: *Ukrainians in Russia: A Bibliographic and Statistical Guide*, Volume 55, Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, University of Alberta.
- Stebelsky, Ihor, 1993: 'Ukrainian Migration to Siberia before 1917: The Process and Problems of Losses and Survival Rates', in: Krawchenko, B. (eds), *Ukrainian Past, Ukrainian Present*, Harrowgate, Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-22671-9_4 [last accessed 23/8/2022]
- Stebelsky, Ihor, 1984: 'Ukrainian Peasant Colonisation East of the Urals 1896-1914', *Soviet Geography*, 25/9, 681-694.

RAFI TSIRKIN-SADAN

ADAPTATION AS DISSENT: *THE MASTER AND MARGARITA* IN THE
RETELLINGS OF ANDRZEJ WAJDA AND ALEKSANDAR PETROVIĆ*

Introduction

Like many other classics of Russian literature, *The Master and Margarita* by Mikhail Bulgakov has engendered numerous cinematic adaptations over time. The present article will consider two early feature-length adaptations of the novel, made shortly after its publication in 1967 by two of Eastern Europe's greatest auteurs: *Pilate and Others*, by the Polish director Andrzej Wajda; and *The Master and Margaret*, by the Yugoslav director Aleksandar Petrović. These films were both released in 1972, just a few years after the Prague Spring and Paris student protests of 1968. Not only do the films engage in intense dialogue with Bulgakov's novel, but they also address specific cultural and political issues of their own days – especially the relationship between dissident intellectuals and the communist establishment with respect to questions of ethics, government, and artistic freedom.

Wajda (born 1926) and Petrović (born 1929) underwent their artistic formation as film directors after the establishment of totalitarian regimes in Eastern Europe in the wake of World War II. Since the time of Lenin, who defined film as the most important of the arts, communist society had assigned great significance to – and, therefore, placed especially strict controls on – all cinematic art. According to Stephen Hutchings and Anat Vernitski, not only did the communist system make the state into the dominant force in film production, but it also caused every cinematic expression to

* I would like to thank Dr. Yeshaya Gruber for editing this article and for his helpful comments.

be regarded as either reinforcing the regime or subverting it (Hutchings and Vernitski 2005, 1-24). It must be noted, however, that such tight supervision and control of film production did not endure inflexibly for long. Adherence to the norms of Socialist Realism, the official aesthetic ideology, became in many cases mere lip service. Moreover, what could not be stated verbally could sometimes (though not always) be expressed by means of ambivalent images that withstood censorship (Dobrenko and Jonsson-Skradol 2018, 17-24). The ‘Thaw’ which followed Nikita Khrushchev’s address to the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956 reinforced such attempts to evade ideological controls. As will be shown, Wajda’s and Petrović’s adaptations of *The Master and Margarita* fully realised the possibilities of artistic liberalisation that existed during the 1960s, even though both films were made in response to the resurgence of conservative forces in the governments of Poland and Yugoslavia.

Bulgakov’s *The Master and Margarita* draws from a long list of literary traditions. The Jerusalem chapters incorporate apocryphal literature, philosophical dialogue, and historical novels, whilst the Moscow chapters feature satire, carnivalesque, fantasy and romantic literature. This colourful variety, which encompasses almost all existing literary genres, fits well with Bulgakov’s attempt to portray a synoptic view of the human story as ‘sacred history’. At the end of the novel the Moscow and Jerusalem chapters fuse, as it were: Woland peers out over Moscow, and Matthew-Levi comes before him to deliver a request from Yeshua – to grant peace to the Muscovite master, who has been persecuted by the establishment. This scene assimilates an aspect of Russian history into global sacred history and the divine plan of redemption as presented in the New Testament.

Bulgakov himself termed *The Master and Margarita* a novel of ‘sunset’. As the son of a theology professor, he must have been well acquainted with Biblical de-

FILM ADAPTATIONS OF *THE MASTER AND MARGARITA*

scriptions of the 'end times' and the Jewish and Christian apocalyptic visions of a heavenly 'new' Jerusalem – a symbol of the ideal kingdom of ultimate truth and justice. He was undoubtedly conscious that apocalyptic sentiments had swept through Russia following the October Revolution and certainly aware of the regime's attempts – which only intensified in the Stalinist period – to portray the establishment of an ideal communist society as the culmination and end goal of all of history (Chudakova 1988; Lesskis 1999). By fusing the Moscow and Jerusalem chapters at the end of his novel, Bulgakov evidently intended to underline the eschatological significance of the October Revolution, and even to imply an intertwining of the destinies of the two cities with respect to reifying the kingdom of truth and justice in actual historical time (Bethea 1982, 373-399; Ericson 1974, 20-36).

In his book *Pilate and Jesus* Giorgio Agamben remarked that the Christian plan of redemption or, to use the theological term, 'economy of salvation' is prone to crises by its very nature, as a result of grave shortcomings in the legal trial of Jesus as described in the gospels. Indeed, according to the gospel accounts, Pilate yielded to pressure from the high priest and his supporters and ordered the crucifixion of Yeshua without even issuing any official sentence, thus rendering the whole trial fundamentally flawed. According to Agamben, this hesitant and improper conduct on the part of Pilate, a representative of human law, undermines his encounter with Yeshua, who represents divine law. In the end, the earthly city remains disconnected forever from the heavenly city of God. Agamben believes that the flawed trial of Jesus – in Greek, *krisis* – turns history into, literally, an ongoing crisis (Agamben 2014, 48-51, 84-86). Needless to say, such a disconnect furnishes no theological justification for political rule, let alone for the incorporation of human history into sacred history. This leads to the formation of radical messianic movements, including secular ones such as communism that seek to hasten an alternative final redemption.

Bulgakov, it would seem, correctly understood these defects inherent in the script of the economy of salvation, or more specifically Pilate's role in the eschatological drama as one who delays salvation and transforms all of history into crisis. In the opinion of this writer, he presents the novel as a genuine attempt to repair the script of the economy of salvation, through the Jerusalem chapters on the origins of Christianity and the Moscow chapters that treat social realities under a messianic communist regime. The task he undertook required the presence of a Muscovite author who could compose a new version of the encounter between Pilate and Yeshua.

It is not surprising, then, that the 'gospel according to Bulgakov's Moscow writer' deals with Yeshua's trial. In contrast to the canonical gospel accounts, however, this version depicts the execution of Yeshua as taking place after a mostly transparent trial, including a thorough investigation and a proper pronouncement of the verdict. During the trial Pilate conducts himself as a decisive and resolute statesman. Whilst no doubt enthralled with Yeshua's personality and ideas, clearly the Roman procurator cannot tolerate the challenge presented by his anarchistic way of thinking. In Pilate's worldview, only a strong political regime is capable of restraining the evil impulses of mankind. Hence, he has no choice but to approve the death sentence. Bulgakov was by no means oblivious to Pilate's 'tragic' role in this eschatological drama (El'baum 1981; Zerkalov 1984).

Thus, the new script of the economy of salvation inherent in Bulgakov's novel incorporates a new version of Yeshua's trial. To my mind, it also contains a solution for Pilate's internal struggle, torn as he is between admiration for Yeshua, on the one hand, and his responsibilities as a representative of the Roman empire, on the other. In the final chapter of the novel the Master (with Woland's approval) absolves Pilate of the pangs of conscience which have afflicted him for two thousand years in consequence of his role in Yeshua's death (Amert 2002, 599-617). This incident should be

FILM ADAPTATIONS OF *THE MASTER AND MARGARITA*

viewed as a revised finale to the Passion, one which leads to the end of history and an automatic cancellation of the *raison d'être* of any messianic totalitarian ideology.

It seems that Bulgakov's literary strategy leaves out of history the issue of the final redemption of humanity. His alter ego, the Muscovite author in the world of the novel, not only fundamentally rewrites the story of the trial of Jesus, but also connects this rewriting to neutralising the messianic force of Russian communism and its own attempt to revise the Western political idea fundamentally. In this sense, the extensive use of the satirical genre in the Moscow chapters is designed to show that the communist regime's attempt to present the possibility of redemption within history is but an empty promise. The very script of the economy of redemption has inherent flaws, and the communist regime itself lacks any 'theological' justification. Needless to say, Bulgakov was not a political theologian who wrote a treatise on the philosophy of history in the guise of a novel. Yet it would also not be too much to propose that he harnessed the storyteller's art to the task of pointing out the theological impulses driving history since the time of Jesus's trial. In his view, these emerged only more clearly *after* the establishment of an ostensibly anti-religious communist regime.

The film adaptations of *The Master and Margarita* also relate to the gospels and the economy of salvation (Wajda's to a greater, and Petrović's to a lesser extent). Nonetheless, the two films do not present any synoptic view of human history, let alone seek to diminish messianic tension by rewriting the divine plan. Rather, they examine particular historical situations stemming from the events of 1968 in Europe. Much as Bulgakov altered cardinal functions of the gospel narratives in order to present his own modified script of the economy of salvation, these two East European film directors in turn exploit the protagonists, motifs and plot lines of *The Master and Margarita* in order both to caution against the temptation of unlimited political power

and to emphasise the importance of freedom of creativity and conscience. In contrast to the novel, neither film seeks to present an all-encompassing mixture of genres.

Wajda's *Pilate and Others* incorporates aspects of historical drama, philosophical dialogue and cinematic documentary. His adaptation is based on the Jerusalem chapters of *The Master and Margarita*, which deal with the interaction between Yeshua Ha-Notsri and Pontius Pilate, the governor of Judea. However, despite being based on such material, the images, settings and characters of the film refer explicitly to the overall condition of totalitarianism in twentieth-century Europe. The film responds directly to the struggle of liberal students and professors for freedom of speech in Warsaw in the late 1960s, as well as to the antisemitic campaign initiated by the general secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party, Władysław Gomułka. It also mentions National Socialism and the rise of the New Left in Western Europe. In following this approach, Wajda necessarily modified the content of the Jerusalem chapters of *The Master and Margarita* to a significant degree. Besides the trial of Yeshua, his adaptation deals extensively with the relationship between Pontius Pilate and Matthew-Levi – a topic described in the novel only very briefly. As will be shown, this choice was made with the intention of reflecting the nature of the relationship between intellectuals and totalitarian authorities.

The relationship between intellectuals and the government similarly figures as a focal point of Aleksandar Petrović's film *The Master and Margaret*, even if this adaptation concentrates more on artistic freedom under communist rule than on the allurements of political power or the endurance of totalitarianism and antisemitism. Petrović's version combines elements of political drama, social satire and romantic melodrama. The film encompasses all the different plot lines of the novel (Woland's visit to Moscow, the Jerusalem chapters and the love story between the Master and Margarita), but arranges them around the Master's struggle for artistic autonomy. Not coin-

FILM ADAPTATIONS OF *THE MASTER AND MARGARITA*

cidentally, this is the very issue that had become such a stumbling block for Yugoslav artists and intellectuals once the government decided to put an end to the freedom that had followed the 'Second Yugoslav Revolution' in the second half of the 1960s. As discussed below, Petrović's retelling significantly alters the sequence of events in the novel, greatly moderates the fantastic aspect of the original, assigns central roles to supporting characters, and even interweaves motifs, themes and characters from other works by Bulgakov such as *The Theatrical Novel*.

Both films provide new retellings of *The Master and Margarita*. Needless to say, these should not be viewed as mere commentary, but rather as works of art in their own right. Moreover, each film conceives and designs the cultural, linguistic and historical milieus very differently. These differences between the films call for explanation. The purpose of this article, then, is to examine the themes and forms of artistic arrangement in Wajda's and Petrović's films in the historical contexts of both directors. In addition, I intend to examine how each of the films relates to the motif of the economy of salvation in Bulgakov's novel. The focus of the discussion will be on modifications of *cardinal* functions of the novel's original narrative (such as the main characters and basic information about them), as produced by both film's *catalysers* (the conflicts, actions and inciting incidents that set the plot in motion). In this sense, the article aims to present a kind of 'close viewing' of the two films, in order to reveal aesthetic and thematic differences between the book and its adaptations.

Even at this early stage, an argument can be made that the directors' artistic choices fit closely into Robert Stam's definition of cinematic adaptation as *intertextual dialogism*. This term refers to textual intersections, expressions, and representations that quote and distort each other, both intentionally and unintentionally. Following Mikhail Bakhtin, Stam argues that dialogism is a multidimensional phenomenon that connects multiple layers of culture and the various arts, and thus the intersections of

literature and cinema must be considered as a single sequence of expression. Stam also employs the term *transtextuality* – coined by the French literary theorist Gérard Genette – in order to underline interactions between a literary work and its cinematic adaptation (Genette 1992). In his view, the transformation of a hypotext (the original source) into a hypertext (the reworking or adaptation) entails a process of selecting components from the narrative, as well as actualising and analogising them. Factors including aesthetic norms, the director's artistic vision, the actors' personalities, economic considerations, technological means, and political and ideological constraints all influence this process (Stam 2000, 54-76).

In an introduction to a collection of studies on cinematic adaptations of Russian literature made outside of Russia, Alexander Burry refined Stam's framework by offering a *culturological* approach. According to Burry, studies of the interface between literature and cinema should address not only the transference of verbal images into visual ones, but also the ways in which cultural texts morph as they pass from one temporal, spatial, linguistic and historical context to another (Burry 2016, 1-16). Stam's and Burry's insights are highly relevant for our discussion of the two cinematic adaptations of Bulgakov's novel. Even though Wajda and Petrović both produced their films at about the same time and under the constraints of communist regimes, each adaptation is nonetheless clearly embedded within its own unique historical, cultural and artistic context. Whilst East European governments were all committed to communist ideology during the late 1960s and early 1970s, different states implemented this overarching framework in widely differing manners. Realities in Tito's Yugoslavia, characterised as it was by a constant tension between federalist and centralist trends, differed greatly from those in Poland, where a strict pro-Soviet stance dominated under Władysław Gomułka.

FILM ADAPTATIONS OF *THE MASTER AND MARGARITA*

Both films were produced approximately thirty years after the novel's composition – but this was also shortly after its eventual publication in the late 1960s, an event which made a major impact in Eastern Europe and beyond. The adaptations indisputably helped to bring Bulgakov's novel to life within this historical context. Nonetheless, research on Wajda's oeuvre has not yet bestowed on *Pilate and Others* the attention it deserves. Scholars investigating Yugoslavian cinema and Petrović's work have discussed his adaptation, but with a focus on its political and institutional aspects, rather than the artistic language of the film in relation to its literary source. I am unaware of any treatment of both films from a synchronic perspective, and thus the present article represents the first attempt of its kind.

Andrzej Wajda's *Pilate and Others*

Andrzej Wajda's *Pilate and Others* of 1972 was the first cinematic adaptation of *The Master and Margarita*. Regarded as one of the most important directors in post-World War II Poland, as well as Europe as a whole, by this time Wajda had already become well known for several important masterpieces: *Generation* (1955), *Kanal* (1957), *Ashes and Diamonds* (1958), *All for Sale* (1968) and *Landscape after the Battle* (1970). All his major films – including those produced after *Pilate and Others*, such as *Man of Marble* (1977), *Man of Iron* (1981) and *Katyń* (2007) – deal with Polish history. They usually attempt a synchronisation of cinematic expression with current events. Even films that are apparently concerned with distant events, such as *Pilate and Others*, cannot be isolated from the temporal and cultural context in which they were made and often allude to specific political moments. According to John Orr, Wajda's historical films of the late 1960s and early 1970s conform with the new historical cinema of their time in representing the past as immediacy, as 'the contingent

moment of the present' (Orr 2003, 9). This is true of *Pilate and Others*, where the past echoes in the present, and the present is transfigured into the past.

Pilate and Others was filmed in Germany and funded by ZDF (Michałek 1973, 133-134). The cast included several distinguished Polish actors: Jan Kreczmar as Pontius Pilate, Wojciech Pszoniak as Yeshua, Andrzej Łapicki as Afranius, and Daniel Olbrychski playing Matthew-Levi. Except for a single scene in Polish, the spoken language of the film is German. This choice apparently reflected production constraints, but it also drove the recontextualisation of Bulgakov's work in Wajda's adaptation. The film opens with a surrealistic sequence located at a slaughterhouse next to a railroad track, where a German TV reporter interviews a ram, the leader of a flock of sheep. The ram explains that his willingness to lead his flock to slaughter derives from his desire to justify the trust his superiors have placed in him; he argues that the scale of the mass slaughter annuls its apparent immorality. The viewer hears this explanation as the sounds of Johann Sebastian Bach's *St. Matthew Passion* play in the background and as images of heaps of bone and flesh come into view at the side of the slaughterhouse.

What follows immediately after this opening is a word-for-word depiction of Pontius Pilate's trial of Yeshua from *The Master and Margarita*, occasionally interrupted by scenes depicting Yeshua's encounters with Matthew-Levi and Judas of Kirioth. The trial was filmed in the inner courtyard of Congress Hall at the Nazi party rally grounds near Nuremberg – and yet Pilate and Yeshua appear dressed in ancient Roman clothes. Much like Bulgakov's novel, in *Pilate and Others* the plot of the gospels is transferred onto modern history. However, the film depicts Pilate as a resolute and peerless statesman who suffers no pangs of conscience during the trial. In fact, this portrayal of Pilate in Wajda's adaptation eliminates all the fundamental tragic aspects of his character in *The Master and Margarita*. Unlike in the novel, where Pilate

FILM ADAPTATIONS OF *THE MASTER AND MARGARITA*

is presented as a tormented soul in need of spiritual revelation who becomes a secret follower of Yeshua, in the film he appears as a cynical politician.

Pilate's later encounter with Kaifa, the high priest, unambiguously reveals his antisemitism. He is outraged by Kaifa's insistence on Yeshua's execution. Kaifa's attempt to object to Pilate's flow of threats by suggesting that they are inappropriate for a Roman statesman is cut short: a new surrealistic scene shows a group of blind men, dressed in modern clothing and wearing yellow armbands, being led off to their death in the gallery of Congress Hall. This scene clearly references the extermination of European Jewry. In this scene the European past is depicted as a phantasmagoria, a day-dream that blends the costume drama of the distant past with a representation of recent history. After his conversation with Kaifa, Pilate ascends the main stage of the Zeppelinfeld at the Nazi party rally grounds, in order to pronounce sentence. The procurator's resemblance to Nazi leaders is highlighted by a Nazi salute and the raising of a boy wearing traditional Bavarian costume. The shot of the roaring crowd is taken from actual footage of a large gathering in a European city in the 1960s or 1970s, almost as if Nazism had not been eradicated some thirty years earlier.

According to Paul Coates, the use of surrealistic and allegorical images in the representation of World War II and the Jewish Holocaust relates to a search for aesthetic adequacy in representing violent episodes of Polish history, and, in particular, those pertaining to Jewish-Polish relations (Coates 2003, 15-23). An argument can be made that, in addition to the depiction of Nazi imagery, Pilate's antisemitism also represents a reference to the persecution of Jews during Gomułka's last years in office (Prazmowska 2015, 241-263). In this sense, the figure of Yeshua represents the persecuted Jew. Surrealistic scenes, such as the interview of the ram leader at the slaughterhouse, or the blind men with yellow armbands who appear at the Nazi Congress

Hall during Yeshua's trial, can accordingly be understood as a sublimation of personal and collective guilt.

Seen from this perspective, Wajda's cinematic adaptation of *The Master and Margarita* not only unambiguously denounces European (including Polish) antisemitism, but also identifies with the '1968 movement' and the New Left. The latter promoted aggressive denazification of the political establishment, blaming it for anti-democratic and fascistic tendencies (Jut 2005, 417-421). Considering this context, the film also presents the encounter between Yeshua and Pilate as an inter-generational conflict between 'fathers', whose world took shape under the influence of the totalitarianism of the 1930s and 1940s, and 'sons' born after the war who possess longings for a more democratic world. We may, therefore, reject Bolesław Michałek's argument that Wajda's Pilate symbolises the point of view of the contemporary man who is torn between his conscience and his practical needs, between collective responsibility and the allure of power (Michałek 1973, 146).

Not only does Wajda's Pilate not 'wash his hands' to clear his conscience, but he is depicted as a thoroughly evil man who exults in the opportunity to exert absolute power over a young intellectual member of the 1968 movement. This representation comes through most clearly in the crucifixion scene, in which Yeshua wears jeans and sports a typically hippie hairstyle. Besides denouncing fascism and antisemitism, Wajda connects faith in humanity, love of one's fellow humans, and abhorrence of violence – all upheld by Yeshua in his dialogue with Pilate – to the New Left's social criticism of alienation, consumption culture and the urban decadence of the industrial Western world. Wajda's portrayal of the Passion along the Via Dolorosa, which constitutes a documentary-like sequence filmed on the streets of Frankfurt, as well as his crucifixion scene at a municipal garbage dump beside a highway, reflect this connection clearly. The loss of spiritual values in late capitalism is emphasised by a shot of a

FILM ADAPTATIONS OF *THE MASTER AND MARGARITA*

tourist bus as it passes by the crucifixion site at the outskirts of a big city. The night scenes of the city after Yeshua's death on the cross are permeated by kaleidoscopic images of decadence.

Whilst social criticism clearly appears in Bulgakov's novel as well, it is directed mostly at the corrupt Soviet bureaucracy, the lack of artistic freedom and the moral deterioration of the intelligentsia. These topics are not explicitly addressed in *Pilate and Others*, although Wajda himself was greatly troubled by the institutionalisation of revolutionaries who had claimed to advocate high standards of morality. Matthew-Levi's character, played by Daniel Olbrychski, is a good case in point. For whilst Yeshua is presented as a hippie, Matthew-Levi is a New Left intellectual. As he attempts to approach Yeshua on the cross, still dressed in jeans and a T-shirt, he is stopped violently by the Roman soldiers in a manner resembling riot control measures used during the student protests of 1968. His furious monologue against the God who permits Yeshua's suffering is significantly extended in comparison to the original novel – it becomes a stream of blasphemies and accusations against God for allowing the existence of death, murder and injustice on earth.

Matthew-Levi's fulminations parallel the opening sequence, which refers to the mass murders of World War II. Divine indifference to human suffering seems to have caused him to lose his faith both in God and in Yeshua's moral ideals. Interestingly, this monologue is conducted in Polish, whereas the rest of the film is spoken in German. According to Olbrychski, Wajda consciously decided that this monologue should not be performed in German (Wajda 1996, 256). A desire to emphasise the Polish context of the adaptation of Bulgakov's novel may have been the motive behind this decision. In particular, he may have wished to convey the ideological dilemmas of young Polish intellectuals during the 1960s and 1970s, of which the character Matthew-Levi is a collective symbol.

Although Wajda's Matthew-Levi initially emerges as an enthusiastic follower of Yeshua who abandons his earthly occupation as a tax collector, after the latter's death he uses his legacy to gain political power. He has nothing in common with the Matthew-Levi of the novel – an eccentric, marginal, half-mad figure who is totally devoted to Yeshua and justifies God's every judgment and action. In Wajda's film it is Matthew-Levi, not Judas of Kirioth, who betrays Yeshua. This Matthew-Levi of the film carefully plots his every move. Before speaking with Pilate, he draws a portrait of Yeshua on his shirt – an act of appropriation that makes him the first and exclusive propagator of Christianity. During the scene depicting their conversation, moreover, he faces the experienced, unrestrained statesman with great confidence as an equal.

The film version of Matthew-Levi's manuscript detailing Yeshua's teachings differs completely from that of the novel. For instance, when Pilate requests to read his papers, he does not find the original line with the words 'greatest sin... cowardice', which are repeated in the epilogue of the novel and serve as its main moral conclusion. As in the novel, the film depicts Matthew-Levi threatening to kill Judas of Kirioth – but it also adds in a sentence found nowhere in the original text, to the effect that Yeshua's death will be avenged by much additional spilling of blood. Pilate agrees with this sentiment, and it appears that the two form an alliance to spread Christianity by means of warfare.

In contrast to the book, which highlights the relationship between Yeshua and Pilate, the film underscores the deep connection between Pilate and Matthew-Levi. Both are portrayed as unrestrained, power-craving politicians who intentionally deviate from Yeshua's spiritual path. In the film Matthew-Levi accepts Pilate's offer to serve as his court intellectual. The film ends with him seated in front of a typewriter placed on Allen Jones's *Table*, an erotic sculpture consisting of a tabletop resting on the naked figure of a woman in a sexual position. It becomes apparent that Matthew-

FILM ADAPTATIONS OF *THE MASTER AND MARGARITA*

Levi's writing ability has been lost as a result of his connection with political power. He is now unable to write his gospel, let alone present a synoptic perspective on human history. In contrast to Bulgakov's writer, here Matthew-Levi is portrayed as the one primarily responsible for delaying redemption. Clearly, then, any text he might write about the life of Yeshua would have to be considered an unworthy distortion.

Despite the fact that *Pilate and Others* includes all of the cardinal functions found in Bulgakov's Jerusalem chapters, such as the characters and sequence of events, adapting the novel to film necessarily required 'deforming' them to fit Wajda's artistic and political vision. Significantly, the characters who drive the plot of the film and connect its main scenes together are not the ones who seem directly *involved* in the totalitarian regime, but rather those who have chosen to *collaborate* with it. Prime examples of such catalysers are Judas of Kirioth's activities as an informant and Matthew-Levi's attempts to use Yeshua's teachings to gain political power. It is reasonable to view this feature of the film as Wajda's way of issuing a warning to the youth of the '1968 generation' in Poland, lest they follow in the footsteps of their 'fathers'.

Marek Haltof, a Polish historian of cinema, asserts that Wajda's films – despite their tendency toward demythologisation of Polish heroism, actually conform to the Polish romantic tradition (Haltof 2002, 85, 87, 95). With this in mind, the Passion of Yeshua in the film refers to the fate of young Polish patriots of the twentieth century. The similarities between Wajda's Yeshua and Maciek, the Polish freedom fighter in *Ashes and Diamonds*, are conspicuous: both die at a garbage dump, which serves as a synecdoche both for corrupted human society and for the 'garbage bin of history'. Both deaths hold up a mirror to a rotten society. In this context, Matthew-Levi's inability to write at the end of the film is meant to deter those who seek to enhance their political and economic position by making use of ideology. Clearly, the relinquishing of artistic freedom not only takes a personal toll, but also enables the oppressive re-

gime to continue. No wonder, then, that the film was not distributed widely in Poland (Wajda 1996, 258).

Aleksandar Petrović's *The Master and Margaret*

From his initial steps as a film director to his advancing to become a central figure of Yugoslavian Novi Film ('New Film'), Aleksandar Petrović was guided by a sense of social responsibility that only grew stronger with the passage of time. His first prominent film, *Three* (1965), dealt with the loss of humanity during wartime. *I Even Met Happy Gypsies* (1967), which brought him international recognition, depicted the tragic wretchedness of the Roma in Yugoslavia – exiled to remote rural locations and denied the opportunity for an honourable existence. According to the Yugoslav film historian Daniel Goulding, Petrović and other directors associated with Novi Film (such as Dušan Makavejev and Živojin 'Žika' Pavlović) operated on three levels simultaneously. First, they sought to promote artistic freedom and to free the cinematic arts from state supervision. Second, they encouraged experimental filmmaking and study of the artistic language of the medium. Third, they focused on topical questions, exposing social injustice and dark aspects of human existence. In many ways their work embodied in the realm of culture the principles of decentralisation, democratic socialism, and liberalisation which characterised the Second Yugoslav Revolution of the second half of the 1960s (Goulding 1985, 66-67).

However, this atmosphere of artistic freedom in the country would not last long. Tito's government not only had to deal with shock waves from the European student movement, but also with Croatian national aspirations, which enjoyed the support of liberals within the central government in Belgrade. Tito responded by increasing restrictions and by purging the communist party of supporters of Croatian nationalism, as well as liberal Serbs (Lampe 1996, 298-304). His inflexible policy to-

FILM ADAPTATIONS OF *THE MASTER AND MARGARITA*

ward the opposition also entailed increased control of the arts. The regime in Belgrade unleashed its anger particularly on artists and intellectuals, including the Novi Film directors who had sought to challenge the official discourse and had called for a true realisation of the ideals of socialism (Sudar 2013, 201-206).

Petrović's adaptation of *The Master and Margarita* (1972) addressed these developments explicitly. The film was an Italian-Yugoslavian co-production that starred actors from outside Yugoslavia: the Italian Ugo Tognazzi played the Master, the Frenchman Alain Cuny was cast as Woland, and the American Mimsy Farmer acted the role of Margarita. The spoken language of the film is Italian. Yet unlike Wajda's film – a German-Polish co-production that presented a universal message against any totalitarian rule, whether fascist or communist – Petrović's cooperation with Western partners did not supersede his intention of situating his reinterpretation of Bulgakov's novel within a particular local context.

At the time of filming, Petrović held several key positions within the Yugoslavian film industry: executive of the Belgrade studios, lecturer in cinematic studies, and chairman of the cinema workers' union. As a result, he personally enjoyed a significant degree of artistic freedom. Nevertheless, his decision to produce a cinematic adaptation of Bulgakov's provocative novel constituted an affront to Tito's rule. Moreover, making artistic freedom the main theme of the film required a deformation of the narrative sequence and stylistic fabric of the source text. In an interview given at the time of production, Petrović declared that he saw no value in an adaptation that would merely reflect its source without any alteration (Sudar 2013, 217). Indeed, he took full advantage of his artistic freedom in fashioning the adaptation. In his film the Master's last name is Maksudov – the name of the protagonist of Bulgakov's *A Theatrical Novel*, which was written at the same time as *The Master and Margarita*. The film is in fact based on the storylines of both *The Master and Margarita* and *A Theat-*

rical Novel. Petrović merged the two novels as part of his attempt to expose the hypocrisy and subjugation of the Soviet literary establishment. The film's Maksudov is a playwright whose *Pontius Pilate* is about to be performed at a Moscow theatre, directed by the famous Vsevolod Meyerhold. Like the protagonist of *A Theatrical Novel*, he encounters great difficulty in presenting his work before an audience. It is possible that these difficulties also reflect those of artists and intellectuals who resisted Tito's new policy of the early 1970s and were forced to endure orchestrated campaigns against 'pessimism' and nonconformity in art (Goulding 1985, 78-84).

The film informs its viewer of the situation in which the Master finds himself right at the beginning, as he rides the tram through Moscow's snowy streets to a dress rehearsal of his play. Unlike in the novel, the plot of the film takes place entirely in winter, hinting at the protagonist's depressing fate in a totalitarian society. The rehearsal of the first scene of the play, which Woland and his entourage sneak in to watch, represents a précis of Yeshua's trial before Pilate from the novel. The play's text creates great discomfort among the management of the theatre. When Yeshua speaks of the coming of the kingdom of truth and justice, the rehearsal is stopped and the cast told to wait until the Association of Proletarian Writers grants final permission to perform the play. At this point Woland pretends to be an assistant of Berlioz, the head of the association, and grants permission. The rehearsal is resumed but is soon cut short again when Berlioz himself enters the theatre and declares the premiere cancelled. In the novel the Master has no connection to Berlioz, but in the film they seem like old chums. Berlioz clearly appreciates Maksudov's work, but is forced to cancel the play in order to appease the communist authorities. After his play on Pilate is rejected, Maksudov meets Margarita and starts writing a novel on Satan's visit to Moscow.

FILM ADAPTATIONS OF *THE MASTER AND MARGARITA*

This sequence emphasises the analogy between Yeshua's trial and the persecution of writers and intellectuals in a totalitarian society. The same analogy also appears in Bulgakov's novel. Yet, in contrast to the novel, Petrović's film does not attempt to present its own version of the economy of salvation, and perhaps for this reason he chose not to incorporate the character of a resolute ruler like Pilate. Berlioz as representative of the government is portrayed as a dull clerk who serves only to carry out the orders of powerful political forces that remain shrouded throughout the film. His encounter with Maksudov does not create any eschatological drama, which aligns with Petrović's decision to emphasise the local political context in which the film was made. Thus, it is not surprising that he also chose to remove the focus from Yeshua's trial, despite the fact that it plays such a central role in Bulgakov's novel. The Jerusalem chapters and the novel on Satan are presented in the film as a story within a story. The encounter between Pilate and Yeshua takes place only within the play, but Satan's story penetrates the frame story, as Woland and his entourage become allies of the persecuted writer.

One striking occurrence takes place after the secretary of the Association of Proletarian Writers – Oskar Danilović, a character not taken from the novel – tries to force Maksudov to give up his *Pilate* play. He even threatens that if Maksudov refuses, then his anti-Soviet behaviour will be reported to the general assembly of the Association. However, Koroviev and Azazello, members of Woland's entourage, instead expel him to Yalta. Danilović's removal, of course, brings to mind Woland's encounter in the novel with Styopa Likhodeev, the artistic director of the Variety Theatre and Berlioz's roommate. Yet, whilst Likhodeev receives gentle treatment at the hands of Woland, who makes no secret of his fondness for him, Danilović experiences a string of abuses. At the height of these events, he is chased stark naked along the beach on a rainy day by Koroviev, who is dressed as a Soviet policeman.

Yet the Woland of the film, unlike his counterpart in the book, has quite limited powers. He is unable, in fact, to save Maksudov, who falls under severe attack at the general assembly of the Association of Proletarian Writers for the alleged promotion of religious myths, regarded as antithetical to the principles of atheism and Socialist Realism, in his play *Pontius Pilate*. This entire general assembly scene does not appear at all in the novel. In response to these accusations, Maksudov declares that he will never relinquish his artistic freedom. To his mind, free thought and expression, as well as civil rights in general, are not only consistent with true socialism, but even a necessary condition for its realisation. Maksudov's words concur with the critique advanced by the Yugoslavian 'New Left' regarding the deviation from original Marxism of both Stalinism and the socialist bureaucracy.

According to Jasna Dragović-Soso, this critique did not seek to undermine the communist system as such. Its aim was rather to deepen the commitment of the Yugoslavian central government to the ideals of socialism and, more particularly, to secure the preservation of civil rights and the rule of the people by means of direct democracy. The exposure of social injustice and the shortcomings of the bureaucracy were thus viewed as expressions of socialist humanism (Dragović-Soso 2002, 22-28). In Petrović's vision, Maksudov, like the Yugoslavian New Left, was in effect offering a left-wing critique of the official socialist ideology. Bulgakov's novel, by contrast, never mentions – or even hints – that the Master supports socialism.

Following the assembly scene and official denunciation of Maksudov, the film has the Soviet press delegitimise him in a manner resembling the persecution of the Master in the novel. Whilst Maksudov, like the novel's Master, finds refuge from his despair and loneliness in the arms of Margarita, in the film this romantic relationship is but a secondary theme. Moreover, the film omits the novel's satirical scenes that pertain to Moscow's housing problems of the 1930s. Instead, it focuses more directly

FILM ADAPTATIONS OF *THE MASTER AND MARGARITA*

on questions of writing and freedom of thought, topics that lie at the heart of the novel as well.

Bulgakov's novel opens with a conversation between Woland and two literary figures, Berlioz and Ivan Bezdomny. As authorities on atheist theory and Socialist Realism, these characters deny the historical existence of Jesus. Such views, if expressed officially, clearly impinge on freedom of imagination. Indeed, the novel ends with the Master's escape from the communist capital after his persecution by the literary establishment for writing a novel that allegedly affirms the historical reality of Jesus's existence. Significantly, Woland not only confirms the Master's intuition concerning the birth of Christianity in Jerusalem, but also severely punishes anyone who would threaten the freedom of expression.

In the film Woland clarifies his attitude toward the dominant perspectives in Soviet literature during a conversation with Berlioz and Maksudov, which replaces his conversation with Berlioz and Ivan Bezdomny at the beginning of the novel. The film's Woland spitefully mocks the atheist doctrine that praises free will, and he even prophesies Berlioz's death in a tram accident. Vlastimir Sudar argues that such statements, which are not uncommon in the film, represent a challenge to the dogmatic positions of Marxist ideology (Sudar 2013, 213). Yet it seems that Petrović, unlike Bulgakov, did not seek to delve into the internal contradictions between atheism and materialism. Rather, he dealt with the artist's position in a totalitarian society, a condition determined by the individual's level of cooperation with the regime. This is clear from Woland's hostility toward Berlioz, who represents all the artists and intellectuals who have 'sold out' to the communist regime in exchange for gratification of their material needs (Milne 1990, 242).

In a very graphic scene, a tram accident severs Berlioz's head from his body – for all intents and purposes, a beheading. His death serves as a realisation of the fanta-

sy of all dissident intellectuals and artists. Maksudov is convinced that Berlioz was murdered by Satan. As in the novel, Margarita makes a deal with Satan in order to save her beloved, who has been shipped off to a madhouse represented as a Soviet prison. However, instead of appearing as queen of his annual ball, she is to model at his fashion show at the Variety Theatre – the opening act for the premiere of *Pontius Pilate*.

In adapting the chapters that treat Margarita's relationship with Satan and his entourage, Petrović thus omits the fantastic scenes of Satan's ball and Margarita's flight. These would blatantly defy the conventions of Socialist Realism. However, Petrović does make use of the fantastic in connection with members of the Soviet literary and theatrical establishment. In addition to the scene of Danilovich's supernatural expulsion to Yalta, the film also incorporates scenes portraying vengeance on the writer Bobov and the critic Lavrovich, two of the Master's enemies who do not appear in the original. These scenes merge most of the mischievous activities of Koroviev, Behemoth and Azazello in the Moscow of the novel.

During Satan's own show another decapitation occurs – that of Rimsky, the treasurer of the Variety Theatre in the novel, but its artistic director in the film. As in the novel, the Master is mysteriously released from the insane asylum. Yet instead of setting out on a journey toward eternity after his pardon of Pilate and fulfilment of the divine plan, he finds himself seated in the theatre next to Margarita, watching the premiere of his own play. Woland serves them wine from Pilate's table – a scene that resembles the death of the Master and Margarita in the novel. The film ends with a scene from the play, in which Yeshua hurls at Pilate, 'All power over people is a form of violence!' This statement is immediately followed by a shot of Maksudov's dead body in the madhouse, and the sequence gives tangible expression to the resemblance between Yeshua and the Master.

FILM ADAPTATIONS OF *THE MASTER AND MARGARITA*

It is no coincidence that the film opens with the Master's ride through the snowy streets of Moscow and ends with his death in the madhouse. In both scenes the setting illustrates the artist's loneliness within a subjugated society. Bulgakov's novel had presented a similar situation. In this respect we cannot accept the argument of Mira and Antonin Liehm to the effect that Petrović simply failed to find a cinematic equivalent for the novel's style (Liehm and Liehm 1977, 412-432). Admittedly, he did greatly reduce the fantastic and carnivalesque elements of the original text. However, he also refined its relevant realistic elements, which dealt with the suppression of freedom of thought and the subjugation of artistic creativity to the perceived needs of the regime. The fantastic scenes of the novel, especially those in which Woland and his entourage abuse members of the literary and theatrical establishment – amusing as they may seem – are intended first and foremost as a critique of those who have sold themselves to the god of the regime.

The end of the film can only be interpreted as a cry against the fate of humanity inside the communist bloc. Even though the film did not openly attack the communist system *per se*, its critical message greatly disturbed the regime in Belgrade. The film was screened at several international festivals (e.g., Venice, Chicago) – but not in Yugoslavia itself. Petrović left the country shortly after the completion of this film, fearing accusations of fostering a subversive atmosphere within the Belgrade film school. In this sense his own biography, so typical of dissident artists and intellectuals in Eastern Europe, resembles that of the Master's in Bulgakov's novel. The adaptation of *The Master and Margarita* was the last film Petrović ever made in Yugoslavia.

Conclusion

As mentioned earlier, Wajda and Petrović shot their films almost simultaneously, and only a few years after the initial publication of *The Master and Margarita*. Their use of the novel as a sort of preliminary script possibly stems from their deep identification with the author, who was forced to shelve his *magnum opus* out of fear for his personal safety and the danger that the manuscript would be confiscated by the authorities. Even though the novel was first published in an official Soviet journal at the end of the Thaw, cinematic adaptation remained impossible within the Soviet Union itself. In the early 1970s Leonid Brezhnev's conservative regime put an end to liberalisation in literature and the arts, isolating writers suspected of opposing the government. Only their distance from Moscow and eminent positions in the European film industry allowed Wajda and Petrović to produce their respective adaptations of a novel that had quickly attracted a cult following worldwide (which may help explain why they succeeded in securing funding for their productions).

In the thirty years that separated the completion of the novel from its first cinematic adaptations, the peoples of Eastern Europe lived through a world war, a genocide, and the establishment of communist regimes that dealt harshly with opponents and aimed to control every aspect of their citizens' lives. During these times reality often exceeded the faculties of imagination. People disappeared and then reappeared in different places by mysterious and almost omnipotent forces. The fantastic parts of *The Master and Margarita*, which are permeated with the use of imagination, may defy the strict conventions of Socialist Realism. Ironically, however, they serve to reflect actual reality under totalitarian rule.

The first two film adaptations of the novel follow suit, addressing the persecution of intellectuals and writers who refused to abandon their moral and artistic visions, as well as the institutionalisation of other intellectuals with worldly interests. In

FILM ADAPTATIONS OF *THE MASTER AND MARGARITA*

these two serious works of artistic expression, the directors intentionally omitted Bulgakov's attempt to present a revised version of the economy of salvation, as well as various fantastic, comic and amusing layers of the novel. Yet such alterations, far from diminishing the faithfulness of the adaptations, actually increased the cogency of Bulgakov's ethical and aesthetic statement in *The Master and Margarita* against violating freedom of thought and expression in the name of seeking to establish the kingdom of heaven on earth. Seen in this light, Wajda and Petrović contributed in a significant way to the canonisation of the novel, which has lost none of its relevance even in the twenty-first century.

WORKS CITED

- Amert, Susan, 2002: 'The Dialectics of Closure in Bulgakov's *Master and Margarita*', *The Russian Review*, 61/4, 599-617.
- Agamben, Giorgio, 2014: *Pilat i Iesus*, perevod Maria Lepilova, Moskva: Grundrisse.
- Bethea, David, 1982: 'History as Hippodrome: The Apocalyptical Horse and Rider in *The Master and Margarita*', *The Russian Review*, 41/4, 373-399.
- Burry, Alexander, 2016: 'Introduction: Filming Russian Classics – Challenges and Opportunities', in: Alexander Burry and Frederick H. White (eds.), *Border Crossing: Russian Literature into Film*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 1-16.
- Chudakova, Marietta, 1988: *Zhizneopisanie Mikhaila Bulgakova*, Moscow: Kniga.
- Coates, Paul, 2003: 'Wajda's Imagination of Disaster: War Trauma, Surrealism and Kitsch', in: John Orr and Elżbieta Ostrowska (eds.), *The Cinema of Andrzej Wajda: The Art of Irony and Defiance*, London: Wallflower, pp. 15-23.

- Genette, Gérard, 1992: *The Architext: An Introduction*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dragović-Soso, Jasna, 2002: *Saviours of the Nation: Serbia's Intellectual Opposition and the Revival of Nationalism*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- El'baum, Genrikh, 1981: *Analiz iudeiskikh glav 'Mastera i Margarity' M. Bulgakova*, Ann Arbor: Ardis.
- Ericson, Edward, 1974: 'The Satanic Incarnation: Parody in Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*', *The Russian Review*, 33/1, 20-36.
- Goulding, Daniel J., 1985: *Liberated Cinema: The Yugoslav Experience*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Gunter, Hans, 2018: 'How Socialist Realism was Exported to Eastern European Countries and How they Got Rid of it', in: Evgeny Dobrenko and Natalia Jonsson-Skradol (eds.), *Socialist Realism in Central and Eastern European Literatures under Stalin: Institutions, Dynamics, Discourses*, New York: Anthem, pp. 17-24.
- Haltof, Marek, 2002: *Polish National Cinema*, Oxford: Berghahn.
- Hutchings, Stephen, and Anat Vernitski, 2005: 'Introduction: The "Ekranizatsiia" in Russian Culture', in: Stephen Hutchings and Anat Vernitski (eds.), *Russian and Soviet Film Adaptations of Literature, 1900–2001: Screening the Word*, London: Routledge Curzon, pp. 1-24.
- Judt, Tony, 2005: *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945*, New York: Penguin.
- Lampe, John R., 1996: *Yugoslavia as History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lesskis, Georgii, 1999: *Triptikh M.A. Bulgakova o russkoi revoliutsii*, Moscow: OGI.

FILM ADAPTATIONS OF *THE MASTER AND MARGARITA*

- Liehm, Mira, and Antonin J. Liehm, 1977: *The Most Important Art: Eastern European Film after 1945*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Michałek, Bolesław, 1973: *The Cinema of Andrzej Wajda*, London: Tantivy.
- Milne, Lesley, 1990: *Mikhail Bulgakov: A Critical Biography*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Prazmowska, Anita, 2015: *Władysław Gomułka: A Biography*, New York: Tauris.
- Orr, John, 2003: 'At the Crossroads: Irony and Defiance in the Films of Andrzej Wajda', in: John Orr and Elżbieta Ostrowska (eds.), *The Cinema of Andrzej Wajda: The Art of Irony and Defiance*, London: Wallflower, pp. 1-14.
- Stam, Robert, 2000: 'Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation', in: James Naromore (ed.), *Film Adaptation*, New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, pp. 54-76.
- Sudar, Vlastimir, 2013: *A Portrait of the Artist as a Political Dissident: The Life and Work of Aleksandar Petrovich*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Wajda, Andrzej, 1996: *Wajda Films*, ed. Barbara Kosińska, Warsaw: Wydawnictwa artystyczne i filmowe.
- Zerkalov, Aleksander, 1984: *Evangelie Mikhaila Bulgakova*, Ann Arbor: Ardis.

DAMIAN HERDA AND ROBERT LAGERBERG

THE PRODUCTIVITY OF THE RUSSIAN SUFFIXAL ATTENUATOR *-ОВАТ(ЫЙ)*:
A CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS

1. Introduction

Although typically realised by free morphemes, degree modification in Russian may also be expressed by bound elements, among which is the adjectival suffix *-оват(ый)* (and its soft variant *-еват(ый)*). Similarly to diminutive and augmentative formatives in general, *-оват(ый)* belongs to the group of so-called secondary affixes, in that rather than changing the word class of its derivatives, it is used to form new adjectives from existing adjectival bases, thus ‘expand[ing] the semantics of the derived adjective’ (Gronemeyer 1994, 15).¹ More specifically, the formative in question serves to attenuate the property denoted by the base adjective (cf. Bratus 1969, 46), which is why its semantic contribution bears resemblance to that of Polish *-aw(y)* (cf. Herda 2021, 95), as exemplified below:

Russian	Polish	English translation
<i>черн-оват-ый</i>	<i>czarn-aw-y</i>	‘blackish’
<i>пуст-оват-ый</i>	<i>pust-aw-y</i>	‘a bit empty’
<i>тверд-оват-ый</i>	<i>tward-aw-y</i>	‘a bit hard’
<i>стар-оват-ый</i>	<i>star-aw-y</i>	‘a bit old’
<i>лыс-оват-ый</i>	<i>łys-aw-y</i>	‘baldish’

¹ In fact, as will be explained below, it is also possible to encounter denominal and deverbal *-оват(ый)* adjectives, such as *хамоватый* ‘boorish’ (< *хам* ‘boor’) and *сиповатый* ‘a bit hoarse’ (< *сипеть* ‘to speak in a hoarse voice’), respectively (cf. Bottineau 2012), but the present study focuses only on deadjectival formations.

Despite the fact that the semantics of the suffix *-оват(ьй)* have already received a fair share of attention in the literature (cf., among others, Gronemeyer 1994; Bottineau 2012; Kagan & Alexeyenko 2011; Fangfang & Kosova 2019), little has hitherto been written about its actual productivity in language use, i.e. the exact extent to which it is capable of deriving new adjectives. For instance, Gronemeyer (1994), while explicitly referring to the concept of productivity, only relies on a reference grammar of Russian and Zaliznjak's (1973) grammatical dictionary, together with the linguistic intuitions of fourteen native-speaker informants. The main pertinent observation here is that, although the latter work includes 110 *-оват(ьй)* adjectives, 'some informants can understand and use forms created by analogy [...], none of which is listed in Zaliznjak or considered standard by some other informants' (Gronemeyer 1994, 26-27), which leads her to the conclusion that the suffix under scrutiny is 'partially productive' (ibid., 31).

In view of the above, this study, utilising naturally occurring data extracted from the Russian National Corpus, seeks to fill in the aforementioned gap by providing two relevant measures reflective of the productivity of the analysed formative, namely type-token ratio (TTR) and hapax-token ratio (HTR), i.e. the number of, respectively, adjective types and hapax adjectives divided by that of all pertinent tokens. For a broader context, the values will be juxtaposed with those determined in Herda's (2021) analogous investigation related to the productivity of the Polish attenuative adjectival suffix *-aw(y)*, which, as already mentioned, can be regarded as a functional equivalent of Russian *-оват(ьй)*.

The remainder of the text is organised in the following way: Section 2 provides an overview of the previous research devoted to the suffix *-оват(ьй)*, with a focus on its semantics and distribution; Section 3 describes the methodology of the

analysis, while Section 4 offers an account of the obtained results; finally, Section 5 summarises the main findings of the corpus-based enquiry.

2. Previous research

The Russian Academy grammar (*Russkaia grammatika*, 1980) distinguishes between four types of derivations with the suffix *-оват(ый)*, three of which are beyond the scope of the present article. Firstly (ibid., 288) it deals with denominal derivations which are either characterised by what the base word denotes (e.g. *щёголь* ‘fop’ > *щеголеватый* ‘foppish’) or have the feature denoted by the base word (*прыщ* ‘spot’ > *прыщеватый* ‘spotty’). The second type (ibid., 298-299), in turn, comprises deverbal derivations which encode the sense of being characterised by the action of the base verb (e.g. *сипеть* ‘to speak in a hoarse voice’ > *сиповатый* ‘a bit hoarse’, which carries a weakened degree of the property implied by the verb). The third type, by contrast, encompasses isolated derivations formed by simultaneous prefixation and suffixation, e.g. *про-...-оват(ый)*, as in *продолговатый* ‘oblong’. Finally, the fourth type (ibid., 299) concerns adjectival attenuation and is precisely the focus of this article.

Drawing on Kennedy and McNally’s (2005) influential study concerned with the semantics of gradable predicates, Kagan and Alexeyenko (2011, 323) take the suffix *-оват(ый)* to constitute a bound degree modifier which conveys that the degree to which a property holds of the referent of the adjective’s argument slightly exceeds a specific standard of comparison. It goes without saying, therefore, that the formative under discussion is only compatible with gradable adjectives (Gronemeyer 1994, 28; Kagan & Alexeyenko 2011, 322), i.e. those ‘involv[ing] a feature which we perceive as variable in intensity or extent’ (Paradis 1997, 43), hence the unacceptability of formations such as **живоватый* (< *живой* ‘alive’) or **мертвоватый* (< *мёртвый*

‘dead’). As Kagan and Alexeyenko (2011, 322) further observe, in the case of a pair of antonymous adjectives, which represent one and the same dimension of measurement, *-оват(ый)* normally attaches to the item with a conventionally negative connotation, e.g. *грязноватый* ‘a bit dirty’ (< *грязный* ‘dirty’) vs. **чистоватый* (< *чистый* ‘clean’), *плоховатый* ‘a bit bad’ (< *плохой* ‘bad’) vs. **хорошеватый* (< *хороший* ‘good’), and *слабоватый* ‘weakish’ (< *слабый* ‘weak’) vs. **сильноватый* (< *сильный* ‘strong’).² Its function here, then, is to mitigate the sense of the base adjective or to create euphemisms from it. As for adjectives which do not have a clearly evaluative character, by contrast, the suffix may combine with both members, e.g. *длинноватый* ‘longish’ (< *длинный* ‘long’) and *коротковатый* ‘shortish’ (< *короткий* ‘short’).³ However, rather than being conditioned by semantics alone, the distribution of *-оват(ый)* is also partly guided by morpho-phonological factors. For instance, the analysed suffixal attenuator typically rejects adjectival bases consisting of stems with more than two syllables, which may explain the ill-formedness of adjectives such as **агрессивноватый* (< *агрессивный* ‘aggressive’) or **простодушноватый* (< *простодушный* ‘simple-minded’). This is borne out by the data collected in this analysis which contain only derivations in *-оват(ый)* from adjectival bases with stems of one or two syllables. It is also worth noting here that base adjectives with a stem ending in *-ов-* (*-ев-*) fuse this morpheme with the first syllable of the suffix, e.g. *лиловый* ‘lilac’ > *лиловатый* ‘lilacish’ (vs. **лилововатый*).

² Nevertheless, if an adjective whose basic sense reveals a positive colouring exhibits polysemy and one of its subsenses invites negative connotations, the item is likely to be compatible with *-оват(ый)* when used in this specific meaning. A case in point is the adjective *простой* ‘simple, easy’, which, when employed with reference to a human, receives the interpretation of ‘simple-minded’, and thus the formation *простоватый* ‘slightly simple-minded’ is considered acceptable (cf. Kagan & Alexeyenko 2011, 334).

³ Nonetheless, as will be shown in the discussion of open-scale adjectives combining with *-оват(ый)*, the suffix itself tends to impose a slightly negative colouring on an otherwise neutral predicate of this kind.

Another important distributional characteristic of the suffix *-оват(ый)* manifests itself in its compatibility with both lower-closed-scale and upper-closed-scale adjectives. In the former case, it communicates that the relevant property slightly exceeds the minimal value on a scale (Kagan & Alexeyenko 2011, 328), as in *кривоватый* ‘slightly crooked’ (< *кривой* ‘crooked’), *странноватый* ‘a bit strange’ (< *странный* ‘strange’), or *грустноватый* ‘a bit sad’ (< *грустный* ‘sad’). In the latter case, on the other hand, the suffixal degree modifier takes as a point of departure a context-dependent functional standard associated with the meaning of the adjectival base rather than the upper boundary encoded in the semantics of the adjective itself, for the obvious reason that ‘no degree can be higher than the maximal element on the scale’ (Kagan & Alexeyenko 2011, 329). For example, the formation *суховатый* ‘a bit dry’, derived from the upper-closed-scale adjective *сухой* ‘dry’, indicates that the degree of dryness which holds of its argument’s referent is slightly too high for the present purposes (Kagan & Alexeyenko 2011, 332).

The contextual standard likewise applies to open-scale adjectives combining with *-оват(ый)*, in which case the bound attenuator points to the degree of a property possessed by the referent of the adjective’s argument slightly surpassing that required by a particular situation, thus imposing a somewhat negative tinge on the resulting adjectival formation (Tribushinina 2008, 224; Kagan & Alexeyenko 2011, 331-332), as exemplified by *великоватый* ‘a bit large’ (< *великий* ‘large’) or *высоковатый* ‘a bit tall’ (< *высокий* ‘tall’). In fact, even when employed in relation to some lower-closed-scale adjectives, *-оват(ый)* may rely on a functional standard instead of the lower bound, which leads to occasional ambiguities. To illustrate this point, Kagan and Alexeyenko (2011, 332-333) invoke the derivative *островатый* ‘a bit spicy’ (< *острый* ‘spicy’), which allows two interpretations depending on the assumed stand-

ard of comparison, namely (i) ‘possessing at least a minimal detectable degree of spiciness’ and (ii) ‘slightly too spicy than desirable’.

Although small in scale, Gronemeyer’s (1994) study suggests that with stage-level predicates, *-оват(ый)* may additionally acquire a temporal sense of frequency. Taking the formation *скучноватый* ‘a bit boring’ (< *скучный* ‘boring’) as an example, she argues, based on insights obtained from her informants, that the phrase *скучноватая лекция* ‘a slightly boring lecture’ may be interpreted as referring not only to a lecture which is generally a bit boring, but also to one which is sometimes boring, i.e. that the property of being boring can only be assigned to some of its instances (Gronemeyer 1994, 21).

Fangfang and Kosova (2019) also provide a useful survey of research into the semantics, though not the productivity, of *-оват(ый)*, going back as far as Lomonosov’s Russian grammar of 1755. Using the Russian National Corpus, they found that there were 16,696 tokens of deadjectival derivations with this suffix in the corpus. Proceeding from this dataset, they established 11 semantic groups, something which previous studies had not provided in such a systematic way. The 11 groups, which will be used in the following analysis, are as follows: 1) physical features or states of an object (28 types found by Fangfang and Kosova (2019, 64 ff.)); 2) inner states, qualities, character traits (22 types); 3) colour terms (18 types); 4) external appearances (of people) (14 types); 5) physiological characteristics or states (of people) (10 types); 6) spatial features or parameters (10 types); 7) evaluative terms (9 types); 8) taste terms (6 types); 9) adjectives denoting form (5 types); 10) features denoting intensity (or lack of) (3 types); 11) temporal features (2 types). It should also be said at this point that there are occasions when adjectives in *-оват(ый)* may be used both in a literal and also secondary or metaphorical sense. Thus, *мрачный* may be used both literally as a term to denote the visual sense of semi-darkness (‘gloomy’), as well as

the emotional state of a person ('sombre, dreary'). In some cases, there may be more subtle distinctions, e.g. *дикий* which can be used literally for 'wild, untamed', as in *дикие племена* 'wild tribes', or more loosely to denote human behaviour, as in *дикий ребёнок* 'a wild child'. There also grey areas which can be interpreted in different ways: thus, *подлый* 'base' can be interpreted both as an evaluative term (e.g. for an action) or as a character trait. The approach of the present article is to use the more literal meaning as the basis for classification. In the list of derivations in Section 4 below, when there are different meanings, the first is the more literal and the second or last (if there are more than two) – the more figurative. It is important to note that this approach does not have any impact on the overall statistical findings of the analysis regarding productivity.

As can be inferred from the foregoing discussion, the semantic and distributional qualities of *-оват(ый)* have already attracted a considerable amount of attention in the literature, even though its actual level of productivity has not yet been established empirically. The subsequent parts of the article, therefore, offer a corpus-based analysis of this suffixal attenuator, the primary aim of which is to measure the extent to which the bound element is currently capable of deriving new adjectives from existing adjectival bases in Russian.

3. Methodology

As stated above, this study seeks to determine the productivity level of the bound attenuator *-оват(ый)* in contemporary Russian. To this end, a random sample of deadjectival formations with *-оват(ый)* was extracted from the balanced, 283-million-word main subcorpus of the Russian National Corpus by means of the built-in corpus search engine. The search command required that the hits must include attenuative adjectives whose basic forms end in *-оватый*, while at the same time allowing all of

their possible inflectional variants. The search, performed in May 2022, revealed as many as 33,035 contexts where the analysed suffix occurs, of which 2,484 were included in the downloadable Excel file encompassing ‘top search results’. The examples were then randomised using the RAND function in MS Excel, and the dataset was reduced to 1,000 relevant instances, which involved a filtering out of sporadic irrelevant tokens, especially denominal adjectives, e.g., *хамоватый* ‘boorish’ (< *хам* ‘boor’), *франтоватый* ‘dapper’ (< *франт* ‘dandy’), *трусоватый* ‘cowardly’ (< *трус* ‘coward’) and *дураковатый* ‘oafish’ (< *дурак* ‘idiot, simpleton’). In the next step, two common measures of morphological productivity were calculated, namely type-token ratio (TTR) and hapax-token ratio (HTR), i.e. the number of, respectively, types of adjectival bases and hapax adjectives divided by that of all tokens in the sample (1,000). In the absence of any universal criteria for describing productivity as either low, moderate or high, we decided to follow the conventions used in correlation measurement. Thus, any value lower than 0.3 was taken to reflect low productivity, values falling within the range between 0.3 and 0.7 were thought of as indicative of moderate productivity, while any value higher than 0.7 was regarded as evidence for high productivity. To obtain a better picture of the productivity of the analysed formative, the quantitative results were then compared with those established in an analogous investigation devoted to the Polish attenuative adjectival suffix *-aw(y)* (Herda 2021). Finally, the base adjectives were ranked in descending order of type-frequency with accompanying qualitative comments on their semantic classes.

4. Results

The random sample comprising 1,000 deadjectival *-оват(ый)* formations was shown to contain 91 adjective types, of which 15 are hapax legomena. Accordingly, the TTR is 0.091, while the HTR value stands at 0.015, which indicates that the probability of

RUSSIAN ADJECTIVAL SUFFIX *-ОВАТ(ЫЙ)*

an *-оват(ый)* adjective encountered by a language user being unique amounts to 1.5%. By way of comparison, the TTR for Polish *-aw(y)* is 0.058, with the corresponding HTR value standing at 0.009 (Herda 2021, 98). Thus, even though both the Russian and Polish suffixes display a generally low productivity level, *-оват(ый)* turned out to be almost twice as prolific as *-aw(y)*. A striking affinity between the two formatives, nevertheless, manifests itself in their tendency to cluster around similar semantic classes of adjectives, such as colour terms, adjectives denoting physical features, and evaluative items.

In what follows, the 91 adjectival bases detected in the dataset are ranked in descending order with respect to the frequency of their occurrences in the sample:

1. зелёный (68) ‘green’
2. жёлтый (67) ‘yellow’
3. красный (56) ‘red’
4. голубой (39) ‘(pale) blue’
5. сладкий (33) ‘sweet’
6. грубый (32) ‘rough, rude’
7. жуткий (30) ‘awful’
8. розовый (27) ‘pink’
9. страшный (25) ‘terrible’
10. глупый (23) ‘stupid’
11. дорогой (22) ‘expensive, dear’
12. слабый (22) ‘weak’
13. дикий (21) ‘wild’
14. тяжёлый (21) ‘heavy, difficult’
15. горький (20) ‘bitter’

16. грязный (19) 'dirty'
17. мрачный (19) 'gloomy, dreary'
18. глухой (18) 'deaf'
19. серый (18) 'grey'
20. хриплый (18) 'hoarse'
21. полный (16) 'full, plump'
22. кривой (15) 'curved'
23. поздний (15) 'late'
24. тупой (15) 'blunt, stupid'
25. лысый (14) 'bald'
26. холодный (14) 'cold'
27. простой (13) 'easy, simple(-minded)'
28. солёный (13) 'salty'
29. сухой (13) 'dry'
30. сырой (13) 'raw, damp'
31. длинный (11) 'long'
32. кислый (11) 'sour'
33. мелкий (11) 'small, shallow'
34. скучный (11) 'boring'
35. тёмный (11) 'dark'
36. белый (10) 'white'
37. наглый (10) 'impudent'
38. седой (10) 'grey-haired'
39. тесный (10) 'cramped, tight, intimate'
40. трудный (10) 'difficult'
41. жёсткий (9) 'hard, rigid, strict'

RUSSIAN ADJECTIVAL SUFFIX *-ОВАТ(ЫЙ)*

42. мутный (9) 'turbid'
43. странный (9) 'strange'
44. великий (8) 'great'
45. белёсый (6) 'whitish'
46. лиловый (6) 'lilac'
47. хитрый (6) 'sly'
48. грузный (5) 'heavy, bulky, corpulent'
49. низкий (5) 'low, short'
50. плохой (5) 'bad'
51. пьяный (5) 'drunk'
52. высокий (4) 'high, tall'
53. короткий (4) 'short'
54. резкий (4) 'sharp, harsh'
55. рябой (4) 'rock-marked'
56. скупой (4) 'stingy'
57. тугой (4) 'tight'
58. бедный (3) 'poor'
59. вялый (3) 'flabby, languid'
60. жидкий (3) 'liquid, watery, scanty'
61. пустой (3) 'empty, superficial, vain'
62. сутулый (3) 'stooping'
63. чёрный (3) 'black'
64. душный (2) 'stuffy'
65. крупный (2) 'large(-scale), major'
66. мокрый (2) 'wet'
67. пошлый (2) 'vulgar'

68. сизый (2) 'blue-grey'
69. си́пый (2) 'hoarse'
70. смуглый (2) 'swarthy'
71. старый (2) 'old'
72. твёрдый (2) 'hard, firm'
73. тёплый (2) 'warm, cordial'
74. тусклый (2) 'dim, dreary'
75. угрюмый (2) 'sullen'
76. узкий (2) 'narrow'
77. бледный (1) 'pale'
78. гнилой (1) 'rotten'
79. грустный (1) 'sad'
80. густой (1) 'thick'
81. долгий (1) 'long'
82. едкий (1) 'caustic'
83. жадный (1) 'greedy, eager'
84. круглый (1) 'round'
85. крутой (1) 'steep'
86. малый (1) 'small'
87. мягкий (1) 'soft'
88. подлый (1) 'base'
89. редкий (1) 'rare, sparse'
90. толстый (1) 'thick, fat'
91. хмурый (1) 'sullen, overcast'

RUSSIAN ADJECTIVAL SUFFIX -ОВАТ(ЫЙ)

It is immediately evident that a significant proportion of the sample, especially in terms of tokens, is made up of colour (or shade) adjectives. More precisely, there are as many as 16 relevant types, among them 11 adjectives denoting colours and shades thereof, namely *зеленоватый, желтоватый, красноватый, голубоватый, розоватый, сероватый, беловатый, белесоватый, лиловатый, черноватый* and *сизоватый*, and 5 adjectives denoting visual sensations, namely *мрачноватый, темноватый, смугловатый, тускловатый* and *бледноватый*.⁴ The sum of the token frequency of these 19 types is 337, thus 33.7% of all the *-оват(ый)* tokens in the sample.⁵

What deserves special attention in the context of the colour terms found in the dataset is the fact that, in addition to combining with adjectives denoting basic colours, *-оват(ый)* occurs in a number of formations encoding derived, i.e. non-basic, colours, such as *серый, голубой, розовый* and *лиловый*. Given this observation, coupled with the considerable size of the semantic class at issue, it seems that, despite generally not being productive, the analysed formative exhibits a somewhat higher degree of prolificness in relation to colour adjectives. This finding agrees with that of Fangfang and

⁴ English translations of forms in *-оватый* (e.g. *желтоватый*) are not given, but can be assumed to be either produced by the corresponding base adjective (e.g. *жёлтый* ‘yellow’) suffixed with ‘-ish’ (‘yellowish’) or the base adjective preceded by ‘a bit/rather’ etc. (‘a bit yellow/rather yellow’).

⁵ In the analysis of Polish adjectives in *-aw(y)* (Herda 2021) there were 24 adjective types related to colours (and shades thereof), eight more than those found in Russian. However, their token frequency value stood at 693, which amounts to as much as 69.3% of all the *-aw(y)* tokens in the sample, basically double the amount found for Russian. The actual adjectives found in the Polish analysis correspond in many instances to their semantic equivalents in Russian: *zielon(k)awy* ‘greenish’, *żółtawy* ‘yellowish’, *niebieskawy* ‘blueish’, *czerwonawy* ‘reddish’, *białawy* ‘whiteish’, *szarawy* ‘grayish’, *złotawy* ‘goldish’, *rudawy* ‘gingerish’, *czarn(i)awy/czerniawy* ‘blackish’, *sinawy* ‘a bit livid/blue-grayish’, *błękitnawy* ‘sky-blueish’, *różowawy* ‘pinkish’, *siwawy* ‘grayish’, *brązowawy* ‘brownish’, *burawy* ‘dark grayish’, *ryżawy* ‘gingerish’, *fielotowawy* ‘violetish’, *srebrnawy* ‘silverish’, *brunatnawy* ‘russetish’, and *modrawy* ‘cerulean blueish’, together with four adjectives encoding visual sensations, namely *ciemnawy* ‘darkish’, *bladawy* ‘a bit pale’, *mrocznawy* ‘a bit gloomy’ and *mętnawy* ‘a bit murky’.

Kosova (2019, 65) who observe that this group of adjectives displays the highest level of activity in terms of occurrences in the corpus.

Proceeding through the other 11 categories listed above, 21 types in *-оват(ый)* denoting physical features or states of an object were identified with a total token count of 165, 16.5% of all the tokens found. Most of these adjectives can be labelled as the exponents of parameters such as age, weight, consistency, temperature, length, size, etc. Notwithstanding the fact that in this category there are slightly more types than there are colour types (21 to 16), their token frequency is much lower than that of colour terms (165 compared to 334, basically half the number).⁶ Adjectives denoting physical features and states are represented by the following 21 types: *грубоватый, грязноватый, полноватый, туповатый, холодноватый, суховатый, сыроватый, жестковатый, мутноватый, туповатый, вяловатый, жидковатый, пустоватый, душиноватый, мокроватый, твердоватый, тепловатый, гниловатый, густоватый, едковатый* and *мягковатый*.⁷

The second group in Fangfang and Kosova's (2019) classification, i.e. inner states and (negative) character traits, is represented here by 9 types: *грустноватый, диковатый, жадноватый, нагловатый, подловатый, скуповатый, угрюмоватый, хитроватый* and *хмуроватый*. The total token count of these types stands at just 47 (4.7% of all tokens found). As seen below with evaluative adjectives, the role of the suffix in this semantic category is to mitigate the meaning of the base adjective or to create euphemisms.

⁶ In the Polish analysis (Herda 2021) there were 187 such tokens, which is 18.7% of all the *-aw(y)* tokens under analysis.

⁷ Some of the adjectives belonging to this group may be used in relation to humans and objects alike, e.g. *староватый* 'oldish', while others are restricted to either animate (e.g. *глуховатый* 'a bit deaf') or inanimate referents (e.g. *душиноватый* 'a bit stuffy').

RUSSIAN ADJECTIVAL SUFFIX *-ОВАТ(ЫЙ)*

For the fourth group (external appearances), only 4 types occur in the dataset, namely *лысоватый, рябоватый, седоватый* and *сутуловатый*. The total token count for these adjectives stands at 31 (3.1% of all tokens). As with the second and seventh categories, these adjectives essentially play a mitigating or euphemistic role, insofar as the base adjectives are most likely to be perceived as unfavourable. The fifth group (physiological features) is not dissimilar, with 4 types also and a total token count of 43 (4.3% of all tokens), all of which denote what are generally perceived as unfavourable features, namely *глуховатый, пьяноватый, силоватый* and *хриповатый*.

The sixth category (spatial features) is represented by 11 adjectives, namely *великоватый, высоковатый, длиноватый, коротковатый, крупноватый, мало-ватый, мелковатый, низковатый, тесноватый, толстоватый* and *узковатый*. The total number of tokens is only 59 (5.9% of all tokens). By contrast, evaluative terms in *-оват(ый)*, the seventh group, are represented by 13 types with a token count of 179 (17.9% of all tokens). This is, therefore, one of the largest of the 11 categories: several of these types appear to be relatively frequent with token counts in double figures. All these adjectives have negative connotations, the role of the suffix *-оват(ый)* here clearly being one of mitigation or creating euphemisms. This is similar to what pertains to the second and fourth categories (see above), and, indeed, it is important to state that some of these adjectives occupy a somewhat grey area between the two categories: for example, *глуповатый* can be viewed as both an evaluative adjective and a description of a person's character trait. The list of these adjectives is as follows: *бедноватый, глуповатый, грузноватый, дороговатый, жутковатый, плоховатый, пошловатый, простоватый, скучноватый, странноватый, страшиноватый, трудноватый* and *тяжеловатый*.

The final four groups are all relatively small in terms of types. The eighth group (taste terms) has only four types: *горьковатый*, *кисловатый*, *сладковатый* and *соленоватый*. However, it appears that these types display considerable activity, all of them in double digits in terms of their tokens which amount to 77 in total (7.7%). In the ninth group there are three formations which denote forms, namely *кривоватый*, *кругловатый* and *крутоватый*. The latter two types have only one token each (i.e. these are hapax legomena), whereas *кривоватый* has 15 tokens. The total count of tokens, therefore, is just 17 (1.7%). The tenth group, which denotes what Fangfang and Kosova (2019) describe as ‘интенсивно проявляемый признак’, i.e. features of intensity, is represented in the dataset by just three types, namely *редковатый*, *резковатый* and *слабоватый*. Their total token count is a mere 27 (2.7% of all tokens). The final group contains three types denoting temporal features, namely *долговатый*, *поздноватый* and *староватый*. Of these three, the first is a hapax legomenon, the second has 15 tokens and the third – two tokens, giving a total of 18 tokens (1.8%).

5. Conclusion

The Russian adjectival suffix *-оват(ый)* is noteworthy for two main reasons. Firstly, it belongs to the rare group of morphological degree modifiers, more specifically, attenuators. Secondly, it is claimed to be capable of deriving new adjectives from existing adjectival bases in contemporary Russian. Nevertheless, all of the previous observations made in the literature with reference to the discussed formative are grounded primarily in lexicographic data. Drawing on a random sample of adjectives suffixed by the attenuative element *-оват(ый)* extracted from the Russian National Corpus (N = 1,000), this paper has, therefore, aimed to establish the formative’s current level of productivity by providing two pertinent measures, namely TTR and HTR, as well as

by offering generalisations on the semantic classes of adjectives detected in the empirical data.

The calculations carried out suggest that the current productivity level of the adjectival suffix *-оват(ый)* is conspicuously low. More precisely, among the 1,000 tokens included in the dataset, there are only 91 adjective types, of which as few as 15 are hapax legomena. Within the latter group it is not possible to discern any clearly marked tendencies: there are four types from semantic category 1 (physical features), four from category 2 (inner states and character traits), one from category 3 (colour and shade terms), two from category 6 (spatial features), two from category 9 (form), one from category 10 (intensity) and one from category 11 (temporal features).

Accordingly, the relevant TTR value stands at 0.091, while the HTR is 0.015, which means that the probability of encountering new *-оват(ый)* types in language practice is 1.5%. As for the semantic categories represented by the adjectives suffixed by *-оват(ый)* identified in the corpus material, the obtained results largely concur with those of previously conducted studies. On the whole, the formative under scrutiny attaches predominantly to adjectives encoding qualities available to the senses, particularly sight, taste and touch. It exhibits a very strong predilection to combine with adjectives denoting colours (and shades thereof). This semantic category is represented by 16 types and 337 (33.7%, approximately a third of the total) tokens. Notably, the analysed suffix has been shown to attach not only to the names of basic colours, but also to those of derived colours, as in *голубоватый* 'pale-blueish' (< *голубой* 'pale blue'), *лиловатый* 'lilacish' (< *лиловый* 'lilac'), or *розоватый* 'pinkish' (< *розовый* 'pink'). It seems, therefore, that, despite its generally low productivity, the formative is somewhat more prolific within the semantic class of colour terms. Another frequent semantic group of formations with *-оват(ый)*, represented by 21 types and 165 tokens, involves adjectival bases encoding physical properties and features.

Although this group has more types than those in the colour category, its token count is about half the size. The next most frequent semantic group is composed of evaluative adjectives with 13 types and 179 tokens (17.9%), thus with a higher token count than the group denoting physical features. Other categories, by contrast, are represented by substantially lower numbers of types and tokens.

Since the conclusions reached in the present study all pertain to the current status of the suffix *-ovat(ыў)* in Russian, future research on the topic should involve a diachronic corpus-based analysis aimed at determining (changes in) its productivity as a bound degree modifier over time. Moreover, the fact that Polish *-aw(y)* and Russian *-ovat(ыў)* exhibit striking distributional parallels, which cannot be explained etymologically, seems to stem from cognitive and cultural commonalities, in particular, the indeterminacy of colour concepts and the general tendency towards euphemisation. To substantiate this claim, a corpus analysis of a functionally analogous suffix in a South Slavonic language should also be conducted, e.g. Slovenian *-kast*, as in *belkast* ‘whitish’. In addition, it would be instructive to juxtapose the said Slavonic formatives with English *-ish* used in a similar function, with the aim of establishing the degree of equivalence between them in terms of semantics and distribution.

REFERENCES

- Bottineau, T. (2012). ‘Les variations sémantiques du suffixe russe *-ovat-*’, *Slavica Occitania*, 34, 211-227.
- Bratus, D. V. (1969). *The Formation and Expressive Use of Diminutives*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

RUSSIAN ADJECTIVAL SUFFIX -ОВАТ(ЫЙ)

- Fangfang, L. & Kosova, L. (2019). 'Особенности деривационной семантики русских прилагательных на -оватый/-еватый', *Филология и культура*, 2, 62-68.
- Gronemeyer, C. (1994). 'Productivity in derivational morphology – a case study of Russian secondary suffixes', *Working Papers. Lund University, Dept. of Linguistics*, 42, 15-33.
- Herda, D. (2021). 'On the productivity of the attenuative adjectival suffix -aw(y) in contemporary Polish: A corpus-based study', *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies*, 35, 91-107.
- Kagan, O. & Alexeyenko, S. (2011). 'Degree modification in Russian morphology: the case of the suffix -ovat', in: Reich, I., Horch, E. & Pauly, D. (eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn and Bedeutung*, 15, Saarbrücken: Saarland University Press, pp. 321-335.
- Kennedy, Ch. & McNally, L. (2005). 'Scale structure, degree modification and the semantics of gradable predicates', *Language*, 81, 345-381.
- Paradis, C. (1997). *Degree Modifiers of Adjectives in Spoken British English*, Lund: Lund University.
- Russian National Corpus*, <https://ruscorpora.ru/> [Last accessed 12/7/2022]
- Russkaia grammatika* (1980). *Vol. 1: Fonetika. Fonologija. Udarenie. Intonatsiia. Slovoobrazovanie. Morfologija*, N. Iu. Shvedova (ed.), Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences.
- Tribushinina, E. (2008). *Cognitive Reference Points: Semantics beyond the Prototypes in Adjectives of Space and Colour*, Utrecht: LOT.
- Zaliznjak, A. (1973). *Grammaticheskij slovar' russkogo iazyka*, Moskva: Russkii iazyk.

KEVIN WINDLE

**UKRAINE UNDER THE SOVIETS: THE MEMOIRS OF VASYL´ SOKIL
TRANSLATED EXCERPTS WITH AN INTRODUCTION**

Vasyl´ Sokil (1905-2001) had a varied career in the USSR. At various times he was a journalist, a schoolteacher, a newspaper proofreader, a soldier, a translator, a playwright and member of a musical comedy troupe. He was thus exposed to many aspects of Ukrainian life under the Soviets, while retaining childhood memories of pre-Soviet times in Husarka, where he was born, and later in Katerynoslav (Dnipropetrovsk, now Dnipro). In his memoir, *Zdaleka do blyz´koho (From Far Away to Close at Hand)*, published eight years after his emigration in 1979 (Sokil 1987; Windle 2013), his exceptional powers of retention and recall of detail are on full display.

On leaving the USSR, Sokil and his wife went first to the USA, where some close relatives were firmly established, then in 1987 to Australia, where their son Yuri had settled. His last years were spent in Sydney, where he died in 2001. He continued to write throughout his last years; in fact, as he states in these memoirs, he published many times more in six years in the USA than in ten in the USSR, and a second volume of memoirs appeared in the year of his death (Sukhina 2020).

Sokil became politically engaged in earliest youth. His involvement with a Ukrainian Youth Union (UKRIUS), in Katerynoslav at the age of twelve in 1917, is described in the chapter entitled ‘Straight into Politics!’, translated below. The following year, with his elder brother Mykola, he narrowly escaped execution by Makhno’s anarchists. At eighteen he joined the Ukrainian Communist Party (UCP), whose platform differed from that of the All-Union Communist Party, the Bolsheviks, and in 1925 found himself in prison along with the UCP’s senior members. His account of

this episode, his remarkable release and the absorption of the UCP into the CPSU is the subject of a chapter (Sokil 1987, 44-48). For the next fifty-four years, spent mostly in Kharkiv, he kept his distance, as far as that was possible, from any active role in political life, while doing his best to keep alive the traditions of Ukrainian culture.

The child of Ukrainian patriots, Sokil in these memoirs maintains a steady focus on Ukrainian affairs. He travelled widely in the Soviet Union, and was completely bilingual in Russian and Ukrainian, but the latter remained his preferred medium, and the fate of Ukraine was his primary concern. At the time of writing, the mid-1980s, his country was to a large extent invisible to the outside world – one of fifteen Soviet republics ruled from Moscow, and Moscow allowed foreign observers little opportunity to cover their internal affairs. Only ten years earlier, Ivan Koshelivets had written that although Kyiv was geographically closer than Moscow to the West, it was politically much more remote, indeed almost out of reach (Koshelivets 1975, 173). Sokil has much light to shed on the life of the Ukrainian SSR during that long period.

The early chapters provide a vivid narrative of events in Ukraine in the chaotic years of revolution and Ukraine's brief independence. Those pages invite comparison with the picture presented by Mikhail Bulgakov in his novel *Belaia gvardiia* (*The White Guard*) and by Konstantin Paustovskii in his memoirs. Sokil differs, as might be expected, by offering us a firmly Ukrainian perspective, and he presents a view from Katerynoslav rather than Kyiv.

In a career spanning eight decades, Sokil published numerous minor works, including many feuilletons and humorous pieces in the press under the pseudonyms Andriy Shpichka and Makar Duda, beginning in the early 1920s. However, as time went on and Soviet rule became more inflexible, most of his longer works of fiction or for the stage ran into difficulties. Much later, with his film-making son Yuri, he would write a successful film scenario which went into production in 1972: 'The Red Pop-

VASYL' SOKIL'S MEMOIRS

pies of Issyk Kul''. Others were blocked and he kept his more serious prose fiction hidden from view. In the 1970s, when he sensed a possible change in the cultural air, he offered his novella *Zapysky Barzuma (Barzum's Notes)*, written in 1967, for publication. The story provoked such fury in the first reviewer that he hurriedly retrieved it and kept all copies well hidden (Sokil 1987, 314). Seventeen years later it was published in Munich under a new title, *Taka dovha nich: spohady staroho sobaky (A Night So Long: Memoirs of an Elderly Dog)* (Sokil 1984), and awarded First Prize in the Ivan Franko competition in 1986.

Svetlana Sukhina has described Sokil's memoirs as 'a chronicle of a whole epoch' (Sukhina 2020). Beginning in late Tsarist days, they cover the flowering of Ukrainian culture and literature in the early 1920s, the tightening of control from Moscow, the famines of 1921, 1932 and 1947, the Terror, World War II, the clamp-down which followed it, Stalin's death, Khrushchev's thaw, the rise of dissent and its suppression under Brezhnev, and increased Russification throughout the Soviet period. Sokil witnessed all of this at first hand and his family did not escape unscathed. His father, who lived and worked under German occupation, was arrested when the Wehrmacht withdrew and died in prison. His brother Mykola served a prison sentence in Kolyma. His sister, Maria Sokil (1902-1999), a gifted opera singer, left the USSR in 1939 and went on to a long and successful career in the USA.

Sokil himself was exposed to risk more than once, but escaped the most serious dangers. When in need of gainful employment in the mid-1930s, having been declared an 'alien element', he took a job as proofreader for a Kharkiv newspaper. At the time this was not a low-risk occupation: the ever-vigilant security organs were on the look-out for ideological subversion on the proofreading front. Another proofreader was reputed to have gone to prison for overlooking a misprint: Pistyshev for

Postyshev (Sokil 1987, 105), the name of a candidate member of Stalin's Politburo. (That was before Pavel Postyshev was arrested and shot.)

The author presents us with a broad spectrum of Ukrainian cultural life, and Soviet life more broadly, as seen from the inside. He was well connected in the world of the arts, not in the sense of patronage or protection – those he conspicuously lacked – but for many years was part of the cultural information network, mainly its dissident fringe. The list of poets, novelists, journalists, translators and other cultural figures who are featured appears to omit few, and with many he was personally acquainted. They include Mykola Bazhan, Pavlo Tychyna, Mykola Kulish, Mykola Khvylovyy, Vasyl' Mysyk, Geli Snegirev and many others. An index of names, if one were supplied, would fill many pages. They are not only Ukrainian. The Soviet overseers of cultural policy and the arts also occupy some space, as do writers from other Soviet republics. Yanka Kupala, the Belorussian poet, is warmly remembered, along with Mikhas' Zaretsky (here called 'Ales') and Mikhas' Charot, both shot in 1937 (Sokil 1987, 82-83). The literary achievement of Chingiz Aitmatov is deeply admired, though his role in the persecution of Andrei Sakharov draws censure (Sokil 1987, 288ff.). Maxim Gorky is remembered less warmly than some others: he resisted a proposal to have his novel *Mat'* (*The Mother*) translated into Ukrainian because in his view that language was a 'dialect' of Russian (Sokil 1987, 73). A page is devoted to the authorship of *Tikhii Don* (*The Quiet Don*) (Sokil 1987, 198): like Solzhenitsyn and many others (to whom Sokil does not refer, e.g. D* 1974), Sokil is firmly of the belief that Mikhail Sholokhov appropriated the work of Fedor Kriukov.

Throughout these memoirs, as in his fiction, whether Sokil is presenting characters, recounting situations, or painting landscapes or cityscapes, his gift for colourful descriptive prose is clearly apparent. He is hardly a dispassionate onlooker; his polemical or narrative position is never in doubt, be it in irony directed at his coun-

VASYL´ SOKIL´S MEMOIRS

try's rulers or sadness at the passing of a way of life. Deep feeling resonates in many places, never more so than in the first and final chapters, where he sets out his earliest memories of rural Ukraine before World War I, and the homesickness he experiences after emigration.

Though well known to readers of Ukrainian, Sokil's work has not been widely translated into other languages. His masterpiece, *Taka dovha nich*, has appeared in Russian (Sokil 1985). It has also been published in English, in the same volume as *Vikna vykhodiat' na zakhid (Windows Facing Westward)* (Sokil 1990), and two chapters from his memoirs – Chapter 29 'Soldier of the Reserve' and Chapter 33 'Never to Be Forgotten' – have appeared in *The AALITRA Review* (Windle 2013). Ruf' Zernova commends his work to Russian readers (Zernova 1988). It deserves a wider audience and wider recognition than it has enjoyed to date.

While reading *Zdaleka do blyz'koho*, one needs to bear in mind that it was written in the USA in the mid-1980s, while Ukraine was still firmly under Soviet rule and independence seemed a distant dream. It pre-dates Sokil's last intercontinental relocation, to Australia in 1987.

The excerpts presented here include passages from the first and last chapters, Chapter 4 'Straight into Politics!' (in full), Chapter 34 '5 March 1953' (also in full), and a short linking passage from Chapter 45 'A Dream No Longer'.

KEVIN WINDLE

REFERENCES

- D*, 1974: *Stremia Tikhogo Dona (Zagadki romana)*, with foreword by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, Paris: YMCA-Press.
- Ivan Koshelivets, 1975: 'Khronika ukrainskogo soprotivleniia', *Kontinent*, No. 5, 173-199.
- Vasyl' Sokil, 1984: *Taka dovha nich: spohady staroho sobaky*, Munich: Suchasnist'.
- Vasyl' Sokil, 1985: *Sobach'i radosti*, Englewood, N.J.: Perspektiva.
- Vasyl' Sokil, 1987: *Zdaleka do blyz'koho (spohady, rozdumy)*, Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.
- Vasyl Sokil, 1990: *And Then There Was Glasnost*, two novellas translated from the Ukrainian by Kevin Windle, Canberra: Leros Press.
- Kevin Windle, 2013: 'Vasyl Sokil's *Recollections and Reflections*' (excerpts with translator's introduction and commentary), *The AALITRA Review: A Journal of Literary Translation*, No. 7, November, 38-60.
- Svetlana Sukhina, 2020: https://www.dnipro.lib.dp.ua/Vasyl_Sokil [last accessed 18/8/2022]
- Zernova, Ruf', 1988: 'Ukrainskii pisatel' i ego sud'ba', *Novoe russkoe slovo*, 14 October 1988.

VASYL´ SOKIL´S MEMOIRS

CHAPTER 1
CHILDHOOD DREAMS

Recalling the far-off years of my childhood, I study my father's yellowed photographs, and in the clouded weft of the past I see a round-faced boy with serious, curious eyes.

For as long as I can remember, my most earnest wish was to find out about everything in the world as quickly as possible. I was drawn by an irrepressible hunger for everything unknown and alluringly out of reach. I dreamed avidly of distant lands shown on the globe and world maps, and so much wanted to travel everywhere, fly everywhere and marvel at the world about me. Tales of unknown lands set off in my imagination the kind of travels and improbable wondrous adventures that can appear only in dreams.

And, believe me, I actually saw all those wonders, because I was flying there myself. In my dreams. I flew slowly over enchanted regions, over mountains, valleys and rivers; in one moment I could fly from the frozen North (because I had recently looked at the illustrations in a book with a blue cover entitled *Amidst the Ice in the Dark of Night* by Roald Amundsen)¹ to the hot tropics (books by James Fenimore Cooper and Miklouho-Maclay), where I had interesting encounters with primitive peoples.

Oh, how I could fly! Almost every night! And not only in childhood, but later too, and sometimes even now in my old age. And it always surprises me that others do not understand and don't avail themselves of such an easy and accessible means of seeing everything one wants to see. And even today, when my aging legs don't always fully obey me, my wonderful ability to fly – and see everything in colour as if

¹ *Sredi l'dov vo mrake nochi*, the title given here, is actually the Russian translation of a work by another Norwegian explorer, Fridtjof Nansen. [KW]

KEVIN WINDLE

alive – has not left me for a moment. I was even prepared to share my experience and demonstrate how easy it was. Before the eyes of my astonished friends, I would raise my arms like wings, with hands outstretched, and lightly spring up by my toes and take flight.

That's how easy it was to defy the laws of gravity. I would demonstrate how, by a slight turn of my head, arm or torso, I could change direction and vary my speed.

The sensation was truly marvellous. For example, passing over the Amazon in flood, I would make a gradual descent to the water, settle on it for a moment and float freely along. It turned out that no effort was required in water either – I had only to steer, even against the current, by my two hands clasped together. Then I would take wing from the surface of the river, rise up and soar over meadows, villages, towns and mountain forests, revelling in my flight and in no fear of colliding with anything. Like a cruise missile, that fantastic invention of the 1970s, I could evade any obstacles in the path of my unstoppable flight. I could fly wherever I wanted.

And where did my flights take me?

In my childhood and youth, of course, my imagination alone could lift me so high. But the older I grew, the more I wanted to actually fly to another real and unknown world.

And fly I did. But my flights began way back then, in the village of Husarka ... In my happy dreams.

Those flights would become reality, I regret to say, only many decades later. But more of that another time.

A childish curiosity revealed before my eyes the hugely rich world of nature, not only on the vast open expanses of the Tauride Steppes, but on a small patch of land, amid the grass of the untilled steppe. What mighty trees I saw there, and impenetrable thickets, secret hideaways and fabulous tangled plants, through which fab-

VASYL´ SOKIL´S MEMOIRS

ulous creatures crawled! I could lie for hours in the virgin grass, my chin propped on my elbows, endlessly watching thin stalks becoming mighty trees, and bugs, grasshoppers and moths metamorphosing into fantastic beasts.

And how delightful it was to survey the far horizon from a height! I had two observation points: a tall tree next to our cottage and a small wooden structure two or three metres high with a flat roof. From the tree it was difficult to see all round, so I preferred the wooden structure built to house pigs, the piggery. From the roof of it you could easily see all the surrounding country on all sides. From this weather station I only needed to glance at the horizon to declare authoritatively if it would rain today or not. My forecasts were hardly ever wrong. As a result, everybody predicted a career in weather-forecasting for me.

Much to my regret, in later years I was never able to foretell when or from where storms would come or when lightning would strike. [...]

The steppe lay boundless, primeval, unclaimed, with wild feather-grass and a dense forest of other vegetation, in which huge bustards, as big as ostriches, could nest undisturbed. In my childhood, there were such splendid birds there, three or four times the size of turkeys. For centuries the bustard had ruled the wide open steppe, before the coming of civilisation. My memory held onto the bustards, the silvery feather-grass, and even the wild boar of the steppe which frequented the small clumps of bushes beside the spring freshets in packs. [...]

The village of Husarka, where I was born at the beginning of the twentieth century, in no way stood out: it was an ordinary, plain village, but to me it has remained dear and unforgettable.

Villages like it had been established in the time of Catherine II, who set out to found Novorossiia and first of all started settling the lands she had seized in southern Ukraine with Russians, Belorussians and Lithuanians. Those peoples had come to the

KEVIN WINDLE

lands of the future Katerynoslav, occupied the fertile Black Earth and started farming there. That was how Husarka, Belmanka, Tsarekostyantynivka and other villages arose, where the villagers spoke a mixture of Belorussian and Russian. For my father, Husarka was in a way a place of exile. Previously he had been a schoolteacher in Ukrainian villages [...]. For remaining true to his convictions he was deemed ‘unreliable’ by the Tsarist authorities and banished to a Russified village for his ‘Ukrainophile’ views, as they said in those days. But that did nothing to make him change his beliefs.

I remember my parents with the deepest respect, mostly because they raised their children well, in loving devotion to their Ukrainian homeland. In our family Ukrainian was always spoken, there were many Ukrainian books, and the atmosphere of our childhood was one of folk songs and tales.

As we know, in the upbringing of a child the first five years are critical. Clearly, the child’s physical, mental and emotional development is mostly determined in that period. Our parents, of course, had access to no special handbooks like Doctor Spock’s, so well known today. They relied on their own experience and a healthy intuition to instil in us, their five children, some basic unshakable principles to live by. Our father, the son of a serf-blacksmith sentenced to death by Count Kankrin for his recalcitrant character,² by his own determination rose from being a semi-literate peasant to a rural schoolteacher, instructed us and unobtrusively steered us towards goodness. Our mother, a well-trained teacher, undoubtedly had even more influence on our upbringing, but we never noticed that. It was all done without the slightest pressure, without insistence, and the atmosphere in the home was so sensibly conducive to

² Count Egor Kankrin (Georg Cancrin), 1774-1845: imperial minister of finance, remembered for his financial reforms in the reign of Nicholas I. His son Viktor was a professor and pioneer of forestry in the Ukrainian steppes, where the family owned an estate. Sokil does not explain the death sentence. The dates suggest the reference is to Viktor Kankrin, rather than his father. [KW]

VASYL´ SOKIL´S MEMOIRS

learning that the process of raising and rearing took place in a completely relaxed and natural way. [...]

Our village was not large: it stretched along a small nameless stream and had four parallel streets and, I think, the same number perpendicular to them. In the middle of the central square stood quite a handsome church, surrounded by the local council offices, the school, the library, the priest's house, a shop and a communal barn known as 'the silo'. Later another smaller school was built on the other side of the village. Those buildings were brick-built. Many of the more prosperous villagers also had brick-built houses. On the whole the villagers lived quite well, being capable farmers: they had several acres of fertile land and even some machinery: reapers, threshing and winnowing machines, and twin-bladed ploughs. Some German colonists farmed nearby, setting a good example to others. At the time the Elworthy factory in Yelysavethrad [later Zinovievsk, Kirov, Kirovohrad; since 2016, Kropyvnytskyi] was already producing farm machinery.

Our house, built of brick, had four rooms with a kitchen on each side. It had been intended for two teachers, but my parents had both halves at their disposal. It had a spacious loft under a tin roof, as well as schoolrooms for two large classes. In the yard was a long earthen cowshed, in which we kept two cows; we had our own milk, butter and cheese. The cowshed also had a loft; it was home to many feral pigeons, which we also ate. There was a large barn, where Father kept his beehives, among other things, in winter, and a cellar, a well, and the piggery mentioned above. In the orchard there were many cherry trees (Father made a tasty liqueur with honey), apricots, plums, apples and pears. There was also a mysterious grave, of much interest to us. We even planned to dig it up, but Father forbade that. Outside the windows lilac bushes flourished and walnut trees grew, and an alley lined with yellow acacia ran all the way through the orchard from our yard to the pastures.

KEVIN WINDLE

Around us, of course, there was so much land that in my childhood that part of the steppe remained uncultivated, and completely carpeted with assorted grasses from early spring. The dominant colour was yellow. From mid-summer, sweet clover added its honeyed hue to that picturesque riot of colour. In spring the yellow carpet was dotted with squills, and later blue cornflowers appeared.

That is how my steppeland spring has remained forever in my heart, bathed in two colours: yellow and blue. [...]

CHAPTER 4

STRAIGHT INTO POLITICS!

The revolution in February 1917 was greeted by mass demonstrations in Katerynoslav [Dnipropetrovsk, now Dnipro]. Having no understanding of the events, I was spell-bound by the spectacle: columns of demonstrators with banners filled both sides of the boulevard. Red banners predominated, but occasional blue-and-yellow ones could also be seen. Revolutionary songs rang out everywhere and one sensed the general excitement. There was no sign of trouble: all were united by the news – the Tsar had been deposed, and the war would soon be over!

At school, classes were suspended for a few days, but everything quickly returned to normal. Order was not at all disrupted and normal discipline was maintained. Our class teachers made sure that we prepared thoroughly for the end-of-year examinations. My third year of high school was coming to an end.

As usual, we spent the summer in Husarka and Preobrazhenka. My cousin Grisha was now eighteen and did his best – probably in order to impress me – to voice his views on events in the country. I remember his words: ‘There’s a big war coming.’

VASYL´ SOKIL´S MEMOIRS

‘With Germany?’ I asked.

‘No. We’ll be fighting each other,’ came the incomprehensible reply from my far-sighted cousin.

In autumn the situation in Katerynoslav changed. My parents moved us into another flat in Kazanskaya Street. Mykola, having completed his studies at the trade college, had entered the Mining Institute. He lived on his own. My sister and I took up residence in a shabby, sparsely furnished little room on the ground floor, with windows opening straight on to the footpath. After our previous splendid home, this was disagreeable, but one can get used to anything, and later on we even came to like it, most likely because of the freedom it gave us.

That autumn I learned that a Ukrainian youth organisation existed in the town and was inviting people to come and get to know each other. I first heard of it from a classmate, whose name I do not recall as we had not been friends, but he certainly knew that I was from a Ukrainian family and told me the address and the time to go there. The address wasn’t quite right – it was not easy to find the place or the entrance. It was in a street not far away, opposite the park. The small building stood in the depths of a yard, but on the door was a handwritten sign saying, ‘Polish Club, “Ognisko”’. That came as a surprise, and I was on the point of leaving when I noticed a girl walking round the building to the left and entering a side door. I followed her. The door was not locked, and I timidly opened it and entered a very small room, in which some ten youths and girls were seated on benches by the walls. At a small table by the wall an older boy was standing. Without stopping speaking, he motioned me to a seat.

Either from surprise at this entrance, or from feeling lost, the meaning of his speech was lost on me, but eventually it became clear. He proclaimed loudly and solemnly: ‘From now on, all Ukrainian young people must join UKRIUS.’ I wasn’t

KEVIN WINDLE

brave enough to ask what that meant – I feared appearing ignorant. Next time, however, it was explained to me: it stood for three words, Ukrainian Youth Union.

Thus I became a member of UKRIUS. Formally speaking, I should have lodged an application of some kind. I wrote that I wished to join because the organisation stood up for Ukraine. I don't remember being issued any kind of membership card or certificate. The boy who was in charge knew us personally; besides there were not many of us, so no doubt we would never be asked for any documents. We were asked to attend every Saturday, I believe. At every meeting I saw new people, and the little room grew more crowded and uncomfortable. Nothing stayed in my mind from the talks I heard. They were too general: I heard calls for unity in the struggle for a free Ukraine, but nobody proposed anything definite. After a while I started attending only irregularly, and once when I went there, I saw a sign on the door saying that the Youth Union had moved to new premises. The new address would be announced later.

I did not discover the new address, and on one occasion the door which had a sign advertising the Polish club showed a different one: Komsomol District Committee.

Those changing signs were very typical of a fast-changing period. In Katerynoslav, as everywhere throughout Ukraine, governing bodies changed frequently. In their struggle for power, the Central Rada, the Hetman and the Directorate – in Katerynoslav at least – did not resort to armed conflict. Outwardly they differed little in their forms of governance. Any deeper analysis was quite beyond a lad like me, and in practical terms, from the viewpoint of our family, for example, one could see that, for the most part, the same officials held onto their posts whoever held power. My father, for instance, worked in various sections and committees of the department of education, with some interruptions, from 1918 until Ukraine was finally taken over by the Bolsheviks.

VASYL´ SOKIL´S MEMOIRS

In their organisational and practical work, the political parties – the Ukrainian Social Democrats (SDs) and Social Revolutionaries (SRs) – in our town deferred to the Russian parties, in particular the Bolsheviks, who had much influence even before the revolution on the local factory workers. At that time the better-qualified workers were predominantly Russian. The Ukrainian peasants would encounter the revolution only in the factories, but, having little technical education, more often remained in unskilled labour, and moreover in temporary or seasonal employment. Until collectivisation forced them into the proletariat, they feared abandoning the business of grain-growing. In spring, summer and autumn they would farm the land round the nearby villages of Diivtsi, Kamyantsi, Sukhachivtsi and Pidhorodni, and in winter seek work at the metallurgical works or the numerous factories of Nizhnedniprovsk.

Given that situation, it was difficult for the Ukrainian parties to gain influence among the workers. A few years later, in the early 1920s, the ethnic composition in those factories would change markedly. From that time on, the Ukrainian SDs and especially the Ukrainian Communist Party, whose Katerynoslav organisation competed energetically with the pro-Moscow Ukrainian Bolshevik Party, began turning their attention to the Ukrainian working class. In 1918-1920, events followed one another with lightning speed, and to a naively impressionable boy like me it was all one huge show, in which even a child could have a part.

To be sure, the ‘Komsomols’ and ‘Young Socialists’ did not attract me in the slightest. Brought up in a patriotic family, I was drawn to the ethnic organisation in which I felt most at home. In Katerynoslav, youth groups arose spontaneously, often without any leadership, united by the idea of the ‘Ukrainian cause’. I recollect that about ten of us would meet in the home of an elderly lady, listen to Shevchenko’s verse, read romantic stories by Kashchenko,³ sing Ukrainian songs and drink tea.

³ Adrian Kashchenko, 1858-1921: writer and historian whose work focussed on Ukraine and the Cossacks. [KW]

KEVIN WINDLE

Now we can be critical and regret that we were on the wrong track, but nobody would venture to write off the importance of that vigorous upsurge of national consciousness among Ukraine's young people, who, at that time, armed with romantic slogans and singing patriotic songs, often came out bravely against the Muscovite invaders, risking their lives.

Being very young in those days, I was not prepared for any such determined measures. But some older girls and boys (only three or four years older) did not confine themselves to stirring slogans; they actively resisted the hostile forces.

Towards the end of 1918, in a brief period of Bolshevik rule in Katerynoslav, my sister Maria, who had just reached the age of sixteen, was suddenly arrested by the Cheka. I recall that for some reason her arrest did not give rise to much alarm in the family. When the Chekists came for Maria, my mother, with her usual belief that everything that happened must be for the best, did not appear upset. She merely took care to give Maria something to take with her to eat, but couldn't find anything except a water-melon, which she gave her to quench her thirst during questioning.

I don't remember whether she ate it, or whether her interrogator confiscated it, but after a few days they let her go, although the case for which they had summoned her was anything but trivial.

On the bank of the Dnipro, on the Nizhnedniprovsk side, two girls from the district had been found murdered. One of them was known to my sister, and the Cheka investigator questioned Maria closely about her connections with the girls, who had been shot. One was Maryna Kryvoshiya, her friend, whom I did not know, but I knew the other one slightly. She was Olena Shpota, a gifted poet. From an official announcement in the newspapers it emerged that in Nizhnedniprovsk the Cheka had exposed a Ukrainian nationalist youth organisation which sought to 'return power to the capitalists and landowners'.

VASYL' SOKIL'S MEMOIRS

It needs to be pointed out that, not so much in Katerynoslav itself as on the other side of the river in Nizhnedniprovsk, where there was a mixed population of peasants and workers, the Ukrainian patriotic movement was at its most active, especially in the outlying settlements of Amur and Baraf. Even before the revolution, there had been workers' educational organisations there, one of them led by the well-known Yemets (unfortunately I remember neither his first name nor his trade, but that surname was still renowned in the district). The group of which Maryna Kryvoshiya and Olena Shpota were members came from the same locality. Their death was the more tragic because they were shot just before the town was liberated by troops of the Directorate. The funeral of the two brave patriots was a solemn occasion.

Some earlier memories come to mind:

Against a background of 'victorious' reports from the Bolshevik administration in Kharkiv, which spoke of consolidating Soviet-Muscovite rule, in early spring 1918 the 'Fourth Universal' was proclaimed in Kyiv. It stated: 'Henceforward the Ukrainian People's Republic is a Free Sovereign State of the Ukrainian People, dependent on no one.'

In holiday mood, a huge mass demonstration made its way downhill from Cathedral Square, taking up the full width of the boulevard. In its ranks marched a thirteen-year-old schoolboy, maintaining a lively step, in order to keep up. He did his best to stay at the head of the column, beside a stocky man in a soldier's greatcoat with a banner in his hands. And on the demonstrators' chests the colours of spring blazed brightly, as on their banners. And on the schoolboy's unbuttoned grey greatcoat that same blue-and-yellow spark blazed.

KEVIN WINDLE

The waves of that spring awakening surged along the length of Katerynoslav's long, broad boulevard. Songs were sung, and the words of Oles's poem rang out: 'What splendour! The rebirth of a nation!'⁴

The awakening of nature! The rebirth of Ukraine!

But the flowering of spring soon faded and a harsh winter came on. The warm memory of those joyful colours, yellow and blue, lingered forever only in the heart of that boy.

The yellow is the colour of my country, the place where I was born, carpeted in spring with the honey colour of sticklewort, charlock, buttercups and sweet yellow clover. And the blue is the breadth of our sea and the depth of the boundless Ukrainian sky. To our great misfortune, the chill north winds from Moscow extinguished the flowers of that brief spring of Ukrainian national rebirth, and those gentle, caressing hues, the yellow and the blue, were declared mortal enemies of the harsh, bloody red.

At that time, the eager schoolboy was still unaware of the danger, and for long years kept the state flag – that sweet-scented flower – hidden at home.

He was lucky that, when the GPU arrested him seven years later, they did not search his home. And when they put him in a cell in the local prison, which brazenly towered over the boulevard where not long ago he had proudly marched in that joyful column of demonstrators with a blue-and-yellow ribbon on his breast, he was glad to meet several of his older like-minded comrades, whose ranks he had so gladly joined. For he deeply and perhaps naively believed that thanks to their efforts it would again be possible to raise aloft the flag of a free Ukrainian State. Perhaps, he thought then, there would be a red stain on it. Bloodshed was probably unavoidable.

But rather than hurry on to the bloodshed and prison, we should look back to the year 1918.

⁴ Oleksandr Oles, 1878-1944: writer and poet whose verse imitated Ukrainian folk songs. [KW]

VASYL´ SOKIL´S MEMOIRS

When the years of revolution set in, my parents firmly decided to leave the village. Three of their children were living almost permanently in town, and their paths would take them far from Husarka. For that reason Father searched hard for an opportunity to acquire some kind of accommodation of his own in Katerynoslav. In the autumn of 1918 he came upon a well-to-do businessman who had the foresight to decide to leave our troubled country for the Promised Land, Palestine. From him Father bought a fully furnished four-room apartment, with all domestic and kitchen utensils, on favourable terms. So we moved into the building on quiet Borodinsky Street, into a spacious first-floor flat with a large balcony. To me it seemed a truly grand home, with solid furniture, carpets on the parquet floors and hangings on the walls, a big mirror, a chandelier suspended by weights, with five lamps, and – wonder of wonders – a concert grand piano made of mahogany. I immediately decided that I would be a pianist, although I had to give priority to my sister, who already knew how to play a little.

CHAPTER 34

5 MARCH 1953

In the early 1950s there was not the slightest hint of any change to come in any area of life in the Soviet Union. Everything followed the old routine: ‘Our locomotive steams ahead – next stop communism.’ But on the path of that communist locomotive, obstacles kept arising and preventing it from getting there on time. The more time passed, the harder it became to reach that ‘next stop’.

From the very first to the most recent years of Soviet rule, the blame for the failures of the ‘victorious’ movement was declared to lie with the counter-

revolutionary forces which constantly caused the engine to break down on the main lines of Bolshevik policy. The minds of ordinary people were clouded by trumped-up trials of imperialist agents, saboteurs and bourgeois nationalists. There were so many sworn enemies of Soviet rule! Where were they not lurking? What professions and areas of life were unaffected? Industrial engineers, agricultural specialists, scientists, cultural figures, writers, artists, transport workers, specialists in commerce and education, and military men – were there no reliable elements, true to the Soviet system. Even in the bosom of the ‘mighty and united Party of Lenin’! Spies and saboteurs turned up everywhere.

In the late 1940s, in their search for new nests of saboteurs in other trades, the organs of terror turned their attention to a field they had overlooked: it had not previously occurred to them to arrange a trial of doctor-saboteurs. And what a fruitful field it was! What a splendid range of criminal activity! The sudden death on the operating table of the ‘outstanding army commander’ [Mikhail] Frunze. The unexplained death of [Sergo] Ordzhonikidze, Stalin’s true comrade-in-arms. The mysterious death of [Maxim] Gorky, ‘the stormy petrel of the revolution’. Those cases alone were enough to weave an elaborate web of charges against health workers and accuse them of arranging to poison or throttle key figures in the Party and government or cut their throats. Why should a doctors’ plot against Stalin, Voroshilov and Molotov seem improbable?

No sooner had a furious ‘struggle against rootless cosmopolitans’ been launched than it became clear that its logical conclusion was to be a sinister trial of the doctor-poisoners, which would be clearly anti-Semitic in nature. Nobody could be surprised by this. Soviet Jews were now being castigated and treated as agents of Zionism. But quite recently, in 1948, the Soviet Union had been among the first to welcome the foundation of Israel, proclaiming itself a true friend of the newly established

VASYL´ SOKIL´S MEMOIRS

state in the Middle East. Comrade [Shmuel] Mikunis, then a technical specialist at the Kharkiv Tractor Works, was even sent to Israel as secretary of the Communist Party's Central Committee. Somebody in the Kremlin must have miscalculated. Israel realised that Moscow wished to make it a pawn in its aggressive policy in that part of the world, and at once staked out its independent position. Furthermore, Israel began accusing Moscow of anti-Semitism by restricting Jewish emigration from the USSR. In response, a pogrom was launched against 'rootless cosmopolitans', marked by the execution of Jewish writers and the preparation of a trial of the 'doctor-poisoners'.

The sudden demise of the organiser of all such trials cut short the implementation of that bloody project.

There exist several narratives concerning the question of whether the despot died a natural death or was murdered. No-one knew anything about his state of health, as until March no medical bulletins were issued about the illness of the 'leader of the peoples'. The first of them were soothing reports of an indisposition. Only in his last days did notes of alarm appear. And finally came the official announcement.

I do not know about other cities, but in Kharkiv on 5 March nobody knew of Stalin's death. It was not announced in the press until the next day.

I will not rehearse the wild consternation which gripped the broad mass of the population. That is well known. Hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of 'true sons of the great Father' flooded madly into Moscow, 'my homeland's capital', from all sides for the obsequies of the wretched father. Such a frenzy might be understandable if people were in haste to be first in the home of the departed, in order to grab a share of his inheritance. As it was, the death of the 'leader' led to panic among the great majority of the population: 'Oh, what are we to do without you? And who will take your place?'

KEVIN WINDLE

I recall that later a friend visiting from Leningrad said that on the day of the death announcement the mood in the streets was one of joy.

For me personally, that day, 5 March, was truly a red-letter day.

In our family we held fast to a fine tradition of celebrating significant family dates, especially birthdays. Our friends knew of it and always came to our home, never waiting to be invited. And on my birthday many friends came with birthday wishes and to mark the occasion fittingly at a well-stocked table. That year, as luck would have it, 5 March was a Monday, a day off at the theatre, where I had many friends, so some fifteen people came, and quite early, intending to make it a long celebration.

At some point, while we were at the table, some problem arose. I no longer recall what it was. Perhaps something was missing, or perhaps we simply wished to take a stroll in town, as it was a fine, still, sunny day.

So we went out for a walk, and half a dozen of us went as far as the theatre. Among us was the secretary of the theatre's Party organisation, with the title of People's Artiste, who wanted to go in. Why I don't know; that was none of our non-Party business. He looked in and quite soon re-emerged. He was beaming broadly and happily, delighted about something and winking at us. Again, it was no business of ours; he had probably dealt with some important Party matter, we thought. He came up to us and said mysteriously, 'In we go! Klava's here!' 'Hooray!' somebody exclaimed foolishly. Someone else shut him up: it was important to remain calm and enter one by one, not in a noisy throng. People might think we were drunk. And the building was a temple to the arts.

We passed in orderly fashion through the wide theatre doors, which for some reason were unlocked and nobody was minding them. Clearly because of Klava.

But enough of this mystification. Who was Klava? The manager? The Director-in-Chief? No, but a figure of no less importance and esteem. She was the barmaid

VASYL´ SOKIL´S MEMOIRS

whose task it was during intervals to sell sandwiches, cakes, sweets, mineral water, apples and cigarettes. And wine. But to members of the collective (especially friends and the management) she was no ordinary purveyor of food products. One could count on her for all manner of things in short supply; sausages, eggs, butter, even chickens and meat, from under the counter or from the canteen stores, for a small bonus payment for the service. That day she was at work because for her own records she was conducting an inventory, to avoid any unpleasantness that might arise in the case of an audit. No doubt that day everything was in good order, because when she heard from the People's Artiste and Party secretary (she too was a Party member) that it was my birthday, she was delighted and immediately invited us all to take a seat at the table. With an expansive gesture she produced several bottles of wine, some snacks and delicacies. A red-letter day! The birthday of our renowned illustrious comrade (people started calling out various titles and honours I had never held)!

Klava the barmaid was a treasure! We spent the time most agreeably and happily in the buffet of the State Theatre! I believe some even took to dancing; we all felt completely at ease among friends and acquaintances. We dispersed at nightfall, with hugs and kisses, while arranging our next meeting. The People's Artiste and I agreed to meet the next day to cure our hangovers.

As it turned out, he would find himself curing his hangover in the office of the District Party Secretary, with his Party membership card on the Secretary's desk.

Did anybody know what had happened the day before? Was there any announcement on the radio? And was there anything in the papers? True, we hadn't been listening to the radio or reading the papers that day.

But we should have been. If we had, we (including the Party secretary and People's Artiste) would have known that on 5 March 'our dearly beloved ... brilliant ... General Secretary' had died. And we had spent that day drinking and carous-

KEVIN WINDLE

ing from morning till night, and even shouting ‘Hooray!’ in the street, feasting on the premises of the State Theatre and singing and dancing. Filled with alarm, the People’s Artiste firmly denied before the District Committee that there’d been any singing or that he’d seen any dancing. Nobody had drunk a drop; they could ask Klava. Klava, of course, was one of us; we could absolutely count on her, and she did not let us down, asserting that we had indeed dropped in, but nobody had eaten or drunk anything. They might have had a glass of mineral water, then they just sat for a while and went home.

To our surprise, they believed Klava. She, I repeat, enjoyed considerable authority with the District Committee secretary. And it seemed we were lucky in having no informer in our midst. Or perhaps the situation had rapidly changed, because the District Committee started to back-pedal. Party members who’d been dancing on the day of Stalin’s death got off scot-free.

At first I was fearful that such counter-revolutionary acts might be rewarded with at least ten years. And when that danger passed (the drunkards received their Party cards back!), I thought sadly that henceforth 5 March would be declared a national day of mourning forever, and no friends would ever visit me on my birthday again. I would have to celebrate it quietly with my family. That, I thought, was what the miserable despot had thought up in his last moments to spite me!

It didn’t work! For my friends and me, 5 March remained a holiday, even a double one. Because soon we came to see that day as a liberation of the spirit. Perhaps not for long, and perhaps not to the extent we wished for.

After Stalin’s death and the Party congresses that followed, at which for the first time there was talk of a ‘cult of personality’ and of the hideous crimes of the ‘leader and Father of the Peoples’ among ordinary folk, for some time it really was possible to breathe more easily. Above all, after Khrushchev’s speech, the weight of

VASYL´ SOKIL´S MEMOIRS

fear under which a terrorised society had lived for long decades, was lifted. We believed that henceforth it would be possible to utter a word of truth. It was not merely a matter of belief; people started speaking out openly and honestly, not only among friends, but also before masses of people, whose delight in listening was unprecedented.

Those were extraordinary times of free thought and free speech. Perhaps only a matter of months, or even weeks. But just imagine a writer addressing a workers' club or hostel, or speaking directly to an audience of hundreds in a workshop. Such meetings as a form of official propaganda, of communication between writers and readers, had always been common practice. But previously they had been permitted only to members of the Writers' Union, and the content of the presentation had to be approved by the Union's so-called bureau of literary propaganda. That did not mean that a writer was bound to read 'from his notes, like Brezhnev', but in any public forum nobody could forget for an instant the limits beyond which one could not venture with impunity. That was the way writers had always spoken in public, disseminating Party directives rather than literature.

After the aforementioned Party congresses, even I, a non-member of the Union, was permitted to address readers. Until then, I had had to be accompanied and supervised by a Union member, but now I was accorded the right to address people on my own. I remember how, in a large club or on an open-air stage in the grounds of a factory, I spoke to an audience of hundreds of workers, unafraid to say: 'Comrades! A time of free thought has arrived. Now it is possible to say a word of truth. Writers can breathe freely. The obstacles and barriers along the creative path are falling. Up to now we were obliged to walk a narrow corridor lined by strict barbed-wire limits. From now on, by the will of the Party, those wire fences have been torn down. New horizons have opened before us ...'

KEVIN WINDLE

What grand words I was capable of! They rang out like slogans, like a call to action! And that was how the audience received them. I could hardly believe it myself! My every sentence was drowned by thunderous applause and cries of acclamation. How easy it was to lead the crowd to storm the Smolny!

But, as the Odessa song has it, 'The music didn't play for long, the dancing didn't last.' The 'thaw' proved short-lived. Before long we felt the breath of another harsh winter to come.

Chapter 45

A Dream No Longer

[...] On 22 October 1979 the big Pan American airliner took off from Rome's Leonardo da Vinci airport and set course for New York. Among the passengers, in a window seat, was the boy who had once gazed dreamily at shimmering horizons. As it turned out, it had taken seventy years and more to make his dream a reality. To be sure, the boy had changed a little and grown older. But not so old that he couldn't feel the same delight as the boy who had then been able to fly as freely as a bird.

Now he was flying over the Mediterranean Sea, the Pyrenees and the Atlantic Ocean.

The airliner touched down gently on the concrete runway of Kennedy Airport.

All our transatlantic clan, old and young, and numerous friends were there to meet us. Many of them we had never seen before. Many had not seen us. But the meeting was so touching that from the baggage belt I picked up two suitcases belonging to somebody else instead of my own. [...]

VASYL' SOKIL'S MEMOIRS

Back in the Old World they soon remembered me. Friends sent me a disgusting little book published by 'Prapor' in Kharkiv under the title 'The Path into the Abyss'. Its authors were anonymous, but I knew who they were, because so much space (two full pages) was devoted to a 'non-entity' and 'traitor and turncoat', with cries of 'How could he sell out such a wonderful country? And what awaits him there? The abyss!' [...]

CHAPTER 46 SIX YEARS LATER

[...] In these few years along my 'path into the abyss' I have written and published several times more than in ten years in the USSR. And my son and I are still travelling and working creatively. I see the present book of memoirs as a sort of step along that path.

Now I can look back completely freely from afar, with eyes wide open, at everything that is close to my heart. From afar, as from a mountain peak, a broader panorama unfolds. And from the summit of those years events stand out more clearly. And the homeland I had to leave becomes all the closer. It is with me, and I continue to live for it, wishing by my modest toil to serve its people.

But what is one to do about homesickness?

I miss the wide open Tauride Steppes, the cherry orchards, the nightingale groves, the grey Dnipro, the Carpathian peaks, the boundless skies over those beloved steppes, the dells and valleys. And most of all I miss the people, the working people of my native land. And as soon as they come to mind, I want to cry out: 'Why, in whose name, for what misdeeds should the people of my country be forced to live for

KEVIN WINDLE

so many years in meek submission, in servitude, deprived of human rights in their own sovereign state!? What has become of my homeland?’

I miss it. I miss my free homeland. Because, in truth, freedom is where one’s homeland is. And freedom is also my homeland.

My longing for my native land is filled with a bitter ache for all the humiliations that its people, cowed and at their wits’ end, have patiently endured. Worse than that, they have even come to accept a prison regime as a normal condition of life.

My enslaved homeland has no need of any sentimental homesickness. It seeks salvation because it is in bondage. Sad sympathies will not save it; they will not deliver freedom. Freedom is not to be won by begging for it; it must be fought for.

And that requires great strength. To gain that strength, one must first shed that most terrible of weaknesses: the failure to grasp one’s situation in servitude, and meek acceptance of it. To shed that fatal weakness is to acquire invincible strength.

REVIEWS

Marlene Laruelle, *Central Peripheries: Nationhood in Central Asia*. London, UK: UCL Press, 2021. ISBN 978-1-80008-014-0. x + 252 pages.

Nationhood defines cultural normality, creating boundaries that determine who belongs and who does not. Tracing the emergence of Central Asia's modern nations through Russian imperialism and the Soviet Union's collapse is useful for understanding how and why modern nationhood is constructed and maintained.

Marlene Laruelle, Research Professor and Director of the Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies (IERES) at George Washington University, is an expert in post-Soviet nationalism and politics. *Central Peripheries: Nationhood in Central Asia* is her attempt to unpack nation-building in post-Soviet Central Asia. A post-postmodernist framework, she affirms, is the best means for doing this.

Postmodernist deconstructivism champions the death of the nation, the abolition of national boundaries and unbridled cosmopolitanism. Post-postmodernism, on the other hand, rejects these notions in favour of embracing nationalism. For modern Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan (Turkmenistan is omitted from the analysis), Laruelle argues, their nationalist agendas represent textbook ethno-symbolism. What this means is that, despite these nations being modern constructs initiated by state elites, their origins remain rooted in a classical vision of the nation state, itself based upon complex cultural and ethnic histories. These histories, Laruelle maintains, are reinterpreted by elites (who excel in 'symbolic politics') to suit their nation-building agendas – a process that requires 'cultural, religious, historical and geographical myth-making'. As Ernest Renan — the French scholar who penned *What is a Nation* — famously said, in order to exist, a nation must not only remember,

REVIEWS

but also forget – together. This is apt in post-Soviet Central Asia; selective memory with a flourish of artistic license employed on a grand scale.

For instance, the current Central Asian regimes tend to omit their Soviet pasts selectively, while embracing narratives that emphasise grandiose historical significance. Laruelle supports this with numerous examples: Uzbekistan emphasises its sedentary roots and lays claim to Tamerlane as father of the Uzbek state; Tajikistan embellishes its Aryan/Indo-European roots to capture the prestige of the great empires of Asia Minor, the Achaemenids, Alexander the Great and the Sassanids as precursors to their modern state, thus providing pre-eminence over their regional Turkic brethren. As might be expected, these new narratives are propagated through academic research, school textbooks, museums, mass communication, national holidays and the built environment.

If this sounds like a lot of effort, why is nationalism employed in this way? Laruelle's position is that Central Asian elites view nationalism as a tool for promoting inclusivity, providing cohesion and legitimising the existence of their regimes. Ultimately, these outcomes promote peace, ensuring the longevity of those in power. Central Asia has long held a great contradiction: geographical centrality but political and economic peripherality. Having an inclusive identity is an important step in attempting to overcome this, aligning aspirations and informing interactions with other regions, such as the Middle East, Europe and East Asia.

Laruelle's compelling argument goes a long way to distilling the overlapping complexity of Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan, supported by chapter case studies on each nation. However, because each chapter represents a separate journal article or edited book contribution published over a period of twelve years, *Central Peripheries* struggles to maintain a refined and cohesive theme. Instead, the book relies heavily upon the introductory and concluding chapters to pull the argu-

REVIEWS

ment together. A chapter on Tengrism is a case in point, providing disproportionate representation to an otherwise fringe movement (followers number in the tens of thousands) and adding little to the debate.

On the reverse side, essential analysis of the Soviet state's role in providing the necessary preconditions for the region's post-Soviet regimes to 'pick-'n-mix' bits of the past to build up their national narratives is limited. Similarly, while Laruelle claims in the conclusion that '[t]he need to fully reintegrate Islam into efforts to craft nationhood will become increasingly apparent in the coming years and decades', the book falls short on its exploration of Islam's role in modern nationhood narratives. Replacing the chapter on Tengrism with one on this subject in future editions would be a valuable amendment.

Other niggles persist. A controversial statement that 'the revival of ethnic faith [in Central Asia] remains deeply anchored in racist and anti-Semitic clichés, with an ideological genealogy sometimes descended directly from the Nazi Rassenkunde' is carelessly unsupported and its relevance not unpacked. A claim that 'linguistic habits do not change via top-down decisions' is rebutted on numerous occasions. While it might seem petty, this is significant because language is a core theme in Laruelle's analysis. Further, while the influence of Russia, the West and even Mongolia are explored, China, the sharp-elbowed superpower neighbour, is barely touched upon.

The value of retrospective analysis is its ability to provide a foundation for further research, while helping to understand future trends. Consequently, the most informative insight from *Central Peripheries* is the need to observe the region's shifting demographic currents, such as ethnicity, education, employment, language, religious affiliation, and even attitudes to the market economy. Exploring these trends further, Laruelle maintains, will assist Central Asian nations to create unique and inclusive national identities that best prepare them for the future, enabling their post-colonial,

REVIEWS

post-Soviet potential to be fully unlocked, demographically, economically and geopolitically.

Freddie Hamilton

Wolfson College, University of Oxford.

Daria Khitrova, *Lyric Complicity: Poetry and Readers in the Golden Age of Russian Literature*, Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 2019. X, 296 pp. ISBN 978-0-299-32214-4

This is a book about literary pragmatics – the way in which literature functions as a communication system within the practical context of interactions between writers and readers. The particular focus – the poetry of the Russian Golden Age (that is to say, the verse written by the St Petersburg elite in the early part of the nineteenth century) provides a particularly clear case study for a pragmatic approach. As Daria Khitrova explains in lively and compelling prose, its conventions were markedly different from uses of poetry in other eras. Golden Age verse, eschewing the odic tradition of the eighteenth century, was to a large extent aimed at communication on a personal level: it was distributed at least as much through private letters, shared hand-written compilations and albums as through publication. It was also very much a collaborative undertaking: writers would seek and take their friends' advice on drafts; poems would be deliberately constructed to contain *pointes* which could be extracted and used by others in circumstances remote from the original context. Khitrova's account is grounded in a thorough knowledge of the Golden Age poets from Pushkin to Ryleev and the Russian and European models on which they drew, and is informed by a close reading of later scholarship from the Russian formalists to the present, in which she

REVIEWS

does not shy back from disagreeing with, for example, such luminaries as Jonathan Culler and Mikhail Bakhtin where their theories do not fit the evidence.

The book falls into three main parts. The first, 'Functions and Uses', considers the function of Golden Age poetry as both speech act and literary fact, outlining the circumstances in which verse was composed and used, and the particular relationship which developed between written forms, oral performances and song, in both public and private contexts. The second part looks in detail at the actual and implied audiences of Golden Age poetry, distinguishing between reflective verse in which the addressee is the lyric 'I', verse addressed to a specific group including the author and/or to the world at large, and love poetry which exploits the relationship between 'I' and 'You'.

In establishing the pragmatics of Golden Age verse, Khitrova draws frequently on the extensive correspondence between writers of the day, and comments on the reception and purpose of numerous individual poems. Notable are her analyses of Vizemskii's 'Poslanie k Turgenevu s pirogom', written to accompany a gift sent in 1819, but exploring the dynamics of friendship at both a private and a more public level; of Zhukovsky's appropriation of Gray's 'Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard' to his own personal mythology in the two translations that he made of the English poem; and of the role played by Baratynsky's elegy 'Razuverenie' in the development of a romance between Sofiia Del'vig and Aleksei Vul'f as documented through Vul'f's diary. Pushkin, of course, features prominently, and not only in a purely literary context: in noting, for example, the ways in which comments in albums could recontextualise a poet's lines to fit the personality and situation of a specific hostess, Khitrova cites the example of the words 'This is my life' included by an anonymous contributor as an annotation to Pushkin's elegy 'Ia perezhil svoi zhelaniia'.

REVIEWS

The final section examines the critique of Golden Age aesthetics implicit in some of Pushkin's work. The cult of 'amateurism' implicit in much Golden Age writing was ultimately at odds both with Pushkin's aspirations to achieve literary fame through a large-scale work and with the necessity of seeing literature as a source of income. Khitrova explores Pushkin's attempts to create new forms by linking different genres together in a form of poetic sequence. Notable here is his ode 'Volnost', which in some manuscripts is accompanied by a madrigal to Princess Golitsyna, thus undermining or at least complicating the serious message of the ode. Khitrova also examines in detail the parodic treatment of the character of the poet Lensky in *Evgenii Onegin*.

If *Lyric Complicity* has a fault, it lies in not balancing the essentially synchronic approach to Golden Age verse adopted in most of the book with the diachronic view put forward in the final section, and in not providing a conclusion which would bring these together. Nevertheless, this is an important and highly stimulating piece of scholarship which will help modern readers grasp the full complexity and subtlety of Golden Age writing, and provide a model for pragmatic studies of verse in different cultures and periods.

David Wells
Curtin University

Young, Sarah J. *Writing Resistance: Revolutionary Memoirs of Shlissel'burg Prison 1884-1906*. London, UK: UCL Press, 2021. 251 + xix pp., ISBN 978-1-78735-992-5.

UCL Press is the publishing arm of University College London. As stated in the series preface:

REVIEWS

The UCL Press FRINGE series presents work related to the themes of the UCL FRINGE Centre for the Study of Social and Cultural Complexity. [It is] a platform for cross-disciplinary analysis and the development of ‘area studies without borders’. ‘FRINGE’ is an acronym ... for **F**luidity, **R**esistance, **I**nvisibility, **N**eutrality, **G**rey zones, and **E**lusiveness – categories fundamental to the themes that the Centre supports (p. xiii).

Sarah Young’s research focuses on two complementary areas: narratives of incarceration and the novels of Dostoevsky (most relevant in this context his fictionalised memoir, *Notes from the House of the Dead*). She has published a series of articles and book chapters on carceral narratives, and *Writing Resistance* is her most recent work on this area.

The structure of this title involves a comprehensive introduction, the memoirs of three prisoners, an appendix covering ‘Shlissel’burg’s Inmates’, a brief but informative glossary, a detailed bibliography and an index. Endnotes appear after each chapter.

The introduction provides an essential context for all three memoirs. It is divided into five sections, each focussing on a particular aspect of the memoirs: the prisoners, the fortress, the new prison, the unity and resistance of the prisoners, and the process of politicising the prisoners’ memoirs. The importance of prisoners’ carceral memoirs to Russian revolutionary mythology is underscored in the first section, not least because sixty percent of the thirty long-term prisoners in Shlissel’burg wrote accounts of their incarceration (p. 1). Of those eighteen accounts, Young has chosen three memoirs that draw contrasting vectors over the experience of imprisonment in this fortress, those of Liudmila Volkenshtein (1857-1906), Mikhail Ashenbrenner (1842-1926) and Vasilii Pankratov (1864-1925).

REVIEWS

Between 1711 and The February Revolution of 1917, Shlissel'burg Fortress — located on an island in Lake Ladoga — was mostly used to house political prisoners. Young's coverage of the history and conditions of the prison up to 1870 appears to be concise but comprehensive. Circumstances in prisons changed in the 1880s after the assassination of Alexander II. The foment associated with this event caused a demand for high security institutions, compounded by incidences of escapes from establishments like the Peter and Paul Fortress in St Petersburg. This required a new prison at Shlissel'burg, in addition to the existing fourteen-cell prison. This two-storey 40-cell building was opened in 1884 and immediately populated. Its principal aim was 'absolute isolation' (p. 7). The harsh regime imposed was described by the prisoners as a 'living death'. This metaphor had a literal aspect:

As a result, of the 38 prisoners who arrived at the fortress in 1884, 16 died, 11 within two years, with tuberculosis and scurvy being the main killers. A further two died by suicide, and two were executed for assaulting the prison doctor and the superintendent of the guards (p. 9).

However, as Young observes, this harsh regime bore the seeds of its own erosion. This attrition rate was unsustainable because eventually there would be no prisoners to guard, which would deprive the local guards and administration of their jobs, as well as causing a scandal.

As a consequence, the resistance of the prisoners — well documented in the three memoirs — was only sporadically suppressed, leading to a gradual improvement in conditions. This is well analysed in the section of the introduction on the unity and resistance of the prisoners. Young characterises this as 'open and determinedly collective defiance' (p. 13). Later in this section, she explores the importance of 'shared identity' and how this manifests itself in the three memoirs through 'self-effacement

REVIEWS

and de-personalization' (pp. 14-16). Young extends that to an examination of language as an instrument of power (by the authorities) and resistance, as expressed in the memoirs (pp. 16-18). She also explores other collocations of words in the memoirs that implicitly express the attitudes and states of mind of the prisoners (pp. 18-23). The final part of this section is devoted to an exploration of the prisoners as a 'writerly community' (p. 23). Thus, the aim of the memoirists was to connect with a public who were already familiar with the carceral writing of Dostoevsky, Chekhov and Doroshevich.

This aim is explored in the last section of the introduction, devoted to politicising prison writing. As Young expresses it:

The vision of the prisoners' collective regaining its voice in the fortress not only becomes a central theme of the texts, but extends beyond the fortress as a motivation for the memoirs (p. 24).

She attributes the shape of the genre conventions to four factors: the scope of the memoirs is restricted to what occurred within the prison walls; the opposition of prisoners and authorities; the transition from solitary to communal life as constraints relaxed; and, finally, a guide to revolutionary conduct (pp. 25-26). Commenting on the differing approaches of the three memoirists, Young articulates the range from a focus on human tragedy, through a more technical emphasis, to a more psychological approach (pp. 28-30). However, all memoirs in this volume 'share the anger and urgency of political writing that has an immediate objective' (p. 30). In selecting and translating these memoirs, Sarah Young has certainly achieved her aim of '[restoring] the collective voice of the Shlissel'burg prisoners' (p. 28).

The memoirs themselves are unable to be summarised in this review, but are an absorbing read. The appendix on the 'Inmates' is a useful guide to the lives of all

REVIEWS

who passed through the Fortress, and there is a comprehensive bibliography and index. In conclusion, this book represents an excellent piece of research on Tsarist carceral literature. It is not only relevant to both the Gulag that succeeded it, but also post-Soviet Russian conditions of imprisonment (p. 31).

John Cook
University of Melbourne

New Drama in Russian: Performance, Politics and Protest in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus, edited by J.A.E. Curtis, London, Bloomsbury Academic, 2020. Paperback. ISBN: 978-1-3502-5318-6. 276 pages.

Having become acquainted with this interesting and diverse edited collection, readers are likely to ask themselves if its title truly reflects the object and the scope of the book. There seems to be a contrast between the title, the one printed more prominently on the cover, and the subtitle, which explains which countries and national cultures are involved in the volume. The title can be read as postulating the predominance of Russian as the supposed language par excellence of drama in the whole of the East Slavic space, which for a book published in 2020 is sure to sound outdated. However, those who read the book will be reassured that Curtis and her team of contributors are fully aware that Russian is not the only and definitely not the privileged language for drama and culture in the East Slavic area outside of the Russian Federation.

The book includes three parts, preceded by an informative introduction and followed by a conclusion, both penned by Curtis. The titles of the three parts are simply the names of the three East Slavic countries, with eight chapters dedicated to Russia, six to Ukraine and four to Belarus. The introduction itself is made up of a

REVIEWS

general part and of an individual section for each of the three countries. In it, Curtis illustrates the double aim of her work: to reflect upon ‘the significance of the roles which theatre can play in the political cultures of the post-Soviet world, and specifically in the East Slavic region constituted by the modern-day states of Russia, Ukraine and Belarus’ (p. 2), and to ‘trace some of the ways in which a turn away from the Russian language in the region has become apparent’ (ibid.). After giving a definition of ‘New Drama’, which she sees mainly as making use of verbatim and documentary texts and tackling contemporary themes through vernacular language, Curtis points out that in the late 1990s and in the 2000s “playwrights, directors and theatre critics in the newly independent post-Soviet states of Russia, Ukraine and Belarus actively collaborated with one another’ (p. 3). This is the starting point for the authors, who then focus on analysing similarities, differences and changes in interaction platforms between the three national cultures in the following years. By doing so, *New Drama in Russian* offers a successful example of what scholars can do in comparative East Slavic literary and cultural studies, an area of Slavic Studies that has suffered from disaffection in recent years.

All three sections include both research articles and interviews with such leading practitioners as Ivan Vyrypaev, Natalia Vorozhbyt, and Natalia Koliada. The Russian section opens with an overview of Russian-language drama since 2000. While emphasising the fundamental role of such figures as the late Mikhail Ugarov and Elena Gremina of the Moscow-based Teatr.doc, Marie-Christine Autant-Mathieu’s chapter also transcends the boundaries of Russian culture, as do Lucie Kempf’s pages on Teatr.doc, the KnAM theatre from Komsomol’sk-na-Amure and the Belarus Free Theatre, and Maria Kroupnik’s chapter on ‘Class Act’ in Russia and Ukraine.

The Ukrainian section focusses on the development of an independent theatre scene between the late 2000s and the 2010s. Its protagonists are Natalia Vorozhbyt

REVIEWS

and Maksym Kurochkin. While Noah Birksted-Breen claims that the Ukrainian New Drama was born in 2014 thanks to the country's cultural regeneration after the Revolution of Dignity, Jack Clover shares his experience as a director and playwright in Ukraine to explain why he sees 2018 as the year in which Ukrainian theatre became truly autonomous. Jessica Hinds-Bond's reflections on Vorozhbyt's *Viy* provide fascinating insights into the interaction of text and context in drama. Asking herself what happens to a Ukrainian play when it is performed in Russia vs. when it is performed in Ukraine, and drawing on the scholarly work that has been done in recent years to deconstruct Gogol's Russianness, Hinds-Bond offers a fascinating insight into the Ukrainisation of contemporary Ukrainian drama.

The Belarusian section includes materials on the Belarus Free Theatre, Pavel Priazhko, and Dmitrii Bogoslavskii. In her essay, Tania Arcimovich stresses the growth of the Belarusian language in recent Belarusian drama, identifying the beginning of the Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2014 as a 'trigger' for young Belarusian playwrights.

While most contributions originate from a workshop held at the University of Oxford in 2017, the conclusion was written in 2019 with the aim of updating the book in the light of the then most recent tendencies. The current full-scale invasion of Ukraine has accelerated such cultural processes as the already ongoing detachment of Ukrainian culture from the Russian sphere and the strengthening of cultural repression in the Russian Federation, which Curtis herself acknowledges in her closing remarks as a 'broad movement transcending national borders' (p. 262).

New Drama in Russian shows that comparative studies involving the three East Slavic countries are not only possible, but also important. Although the book tends to focus on Russian-Ukrainian and Russian-Belarusian matters, with only sporadic glimpses into the Ukrainian-Belarusian encounter, one is left hoping that other

REVIEWS

scholars will be willing and able to produce similarly balanced and stimulating comparative accounts of cultural developments in an area of the world that is nowadays extremely sensitive and fast-changing.

Alessandro Achilli
University of Cagliari

Zaleska Onyshkevych, Larissa M. L. (ed.), *An Anthology of Modern Ukrainian Drama*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2012, 521 pp. ISBN 978-1-894865-27-2

An Anthology of Modern Ukrainian Drama is surely among the most valuable of Larissa Zaleska Onyshkevych's many contributions to critical and editorial scholarship concerning Ukrainian drama and theatre. This splendid anthology offers English-speaking readers ten Ukrainian twentieth-century dramatic works by nine authors, capably rendered by eleven translators.

These ten plays exemplify different nuances of the meaning of the term 'modern'. Lesia Ukrainka's verse drama 'In the Wilderness' reflects in the spirit of turn-of-the-century aestheticism on the conflict between creative imagination, on the one hand and, on the other, philistinism and ideological stricture. 'The Prophet', a topical problem-play from Volodymyr Vynnychenko's inter-war émigré period, dramatises capitalism's wily co-optation of the technology of mass communication. Four plays exemplify the risk-taking flirtations of Soviet playwrights with formal experimentation: from the decade preceding the tyranny of Socialist Realism, Mykola Kulish's masterpieces 'The People's Malachi' and 'Sonata Pathétique', both of which recklessly questioned the plausibility of communist utopianism, and Ivan Kocherha's 'Masters

REVIEWS

of Time'; and, from the 'Thaw' of the 1960s, Oleksii Kolomiets's 'Planet Speranta'. Three plays by post-Second World War émigrés variously refract the formal non-realism and some of the philosophical preoccupations (pre-eminently existentialism) of Western modernisms, while obliquely or directly allegorising and condemning totalitarianism: Liudmyla Kovalenko's 'The Heroine Dies in the First Act', Eaghor G. Kostetzky's 'A Play about a Great Man' and Bohdan Boychuk's 'Hunger – 1933'. The one play dating from the period of Ukraine's renewed independence is the dystopian historical fantasy 'Birds from an Invisible Island' by Valerii Shevchuk.

Each of the texts is accompanied by a brief biography of its author, select bibliographies of editions (especially in English) of the dramatist's work and of relevant scholarship, and short essays by Larissa Zaleska Onyshkevych containing contextual, interpretive and critical observations. Alternative versions of sections of the two plays by Kulish offer insight into what was (or was not) sayable at different times and even at the same time but in different places in the Soviet Union. An appendix to 'Hunger – 1933' presents several pages of poetry which, though part of Boychuk's Ukrainian-language original, were omitted from the English translation at his request; highlighting their removal raises interesting questions about the authoritativeness of various versions of a literary work and the meaning of the differences between them.

As was even more explicitly the case in the collection of scholarly articles that Zaleska Onyshkevych co-edited with Maria Rewakowicz, *Contemporary Ukraine on the Cultural Map of Europe* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 2009), the editor's concern in her *Anthology of Modern Ukrainian Drama* is to foreground works of Ukrainian culture which manifest an affinity with Western thought and Western stylistic paradigms. Zaleska Onyshkevych draws attention to qualities of the plays that, for example, align Lesia Ukrainka's 'In the Wilderness' with neoromanticism and Kostetzky's 'Play About a Great Man' with expressionism (p. xiii), although elsewhere she jus-

REVIEWS

tifiably remarks that the intertextual, self-referential and parodic playfulness of this work qualifies it as an exponent of ‘the early postmodernist style’ (p. 331). In contrast to Ukrainian nineteenth-century drama, whose popularity rested on ethnographism and local reference, and to the drama of mainstream Socialist Realism with its narrowly circumscribed propagandist content, Zaleska Onyshkevych emphasises the ‘broader themes and universal concerns’ (p. xiii) that her selection of plays addresses even as they take note of contemporary social and political realities. The existentialist conception of the individual human being as essentially free, even though that freedom is threatened by uncomprehending social environments or tyrannical states; the affirmation of steadfast commitment to ethical principles; preoccupation with time as the medium which makes possible judgment of the past and present, and hope for a better future – these are some of the features which, in her Introduction, Zaleska Onyshkevych identifies as spanning many, if not all, of the plays in her selection.

A notable and admirable feature of the *Anthology* is the consistently high quality – the fluency combined with accuracy – of the translations that it contains. Two were previously published: Kulish’s ‘Sonata Pathetique’ in the 1975 rendering of George and Moira Luckyj, and Kocherha’s ‘Masters of Time’ in John Wixley’s translation of 1934. The English-language version of Boychuk’s ‘Hunger – 1933’ was created by the distinguished translator Vera Rich in collaboration with the author himself and Zaleska Onyshkevych, who also translated Shevchuk’s ‘Birds from an Invisible Island’. The remaining texts were produced by translators who – unfortunately, given the excellence of their work – have not elsewhere figured in that role: John Prasko (‘The People’s Malachi’ and ‘A Play about a Great Man’) and four of Zaleska Onyshkevych’s students at Rutgers University: Christine Oshchudlak Stawnychy (‘The Prophet’), Roxolana Stojko-Lozynskyj (‘In the Wilderness’), Charles A. Steck (or

REVIEWS

Stek? – his surname appears in different forms in the Preface and on p. 329 – ‘The Heroine Dies in the First Act’) and Don Boychuk (‘Planet Speranta’).

An Anthology of Modern Ukrainian Drama is a book as valuable in English as it was when it first appeared in Ukrainian as *Antolohiia modernoi ukrains'koi dramy* in 1998. For most recipients in both audiences, it introduced an unfamiliar picture of recent Ukrainian drama as the work in equal measure of playwrights in Ukraine and in emigration, and as challenging both formally and intellectually. The book should have enduring interest for students as well as general readers – and, one hopes, theatre professionals looking to expand their ensembles’ repertoires in novel directions.

Marko Pavlyshyn
Monash University

Urs Heftrich, *Gogol's Crime and Punishment: An Essay in the Interpretation of Nikolai Gogol's 'Dead Souls'*; translated by Joseph Swann. *Studies in Slavic Literatures, Cultures, and History*. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2022. ISBN 9781644697627 (hardback) 265 pages. Illustrations, bibliography, index.

The basic argument of this book is that Chichikov’s journey across the spaces of Russia is not merely outward, that is, centering around his visits to the estates of the five landowners and the city of N., but also an inward one, involving the meandering or halting progress of his corrupted soul toward redemption. According to Heftrich, such a reading ‘from a psychological point of view’ (p. 24), where the protagonist’s soul becomes the focus of the analysis, explains the logic of the poem’s composition.

The order of Chichikov’s meetings with each landowner ‘follows a strict plan that allows neither insertions nor omissions’ (p. 29). In other words, the ‘inner spaces’

REVIEWS

(p. 31) of the landowners' flawed souls are only reflections of his own soul at certain stages of his biography: 'what he faces are the moral skeletons from his own cupboard, allegorical personifications of his earlier life's crimes and misdemeanors. [...] As revenants of Chichikov's former self they appear [...] in exact counterflow to the phases of his career' (p. 171). To give an example, the oldest of the landowners, Pliushkin, is designated as Chichikov – 'the youthful Scrooge' (p. 97). This miser's behaviour mirrors Chichikov's early years and the mercenary, in terms of money and friends, 'educational doctrine' of the latter's father. The loneliness of Chichikov the child and the self-imposed 'isolation' of Pliushkin are expressed through the parallel images of the darkened windows, 'the windows of their souls' (p. 42).

Dead Souls (1842), therefore, is subtly divided by Heftrich into two 'cross-referenced' (p. 125) narratives: a *prehistory* (Chichikov's past) and a *chronicle* (the actual unfolding of the poem's action based on Chichikov's *present-day* interactions with the landowners). The 'biographical details' and 'expressive structures' (p. 42), metaphors and allusions of the *chronicle* and the *prehistory* constantly intertwine or 'touch' by forming a 'circle' (p. 98), uniting into a single circular narrative. The reader is supposed to rotate through this textual circle by being assigned the proactive role of 'experiencing' a range of Chichikov's '*déjà-vus*' (p. 47): as a morally passive protagonist, he fails to reflect on his past sins or to connect them to the present, and, as a result, he 'completes the entire multilayered cycle without progressing an iota in his personal development' (p. 99).

The second part of the book is devoted to investigations of Chichikov's fundamental sin or 'crime', the Lie, that is, his approach towards language, described by the author as 'semantic recklessness – the delusion that words can be arbitrarily manipulated' (pp. 201-202). On the way of realising his rooted-in-the-Lie 'capital-raising project' (p. 172) – the buying of dead souls – Chichikov is confronted with 'the five

REVIEWS

faces of lying', each 'face' attributed to a particular landowner. The protagonist encounters five distorted attitudes towards the 'word', five stylistic and semantic violations of the Eighth Commandment ('Thou shalt not lie'), and, therefore, five deviations from the word of God or from what it means to be a 'genuine Christian' (p. 168). For instance, Manilov's highly 'rhetorical understanding of language', his manner of expressing himself 'for the sake of the style' and intoxication with the 'mere sound of words' make him 'lose sight of their referent' (pp. 121, 123, 127, 147). Consequently, the words 'end in themselves', lose their ties to the 'things' they signify and overshadow or outweigh reality ('word > thing') (pp. 127, 173). During Chichikov's meeting with Manilov the fantastic project of acquiring dead souls is shown to be similarly 'based on the primacy of word over thing' (p. 172); or the dominance of the poetic style over the divine truth; or, more simply put, the Lie.

The basic element of the argument, though, resides in the third part of the study that stresses the impossibility of 'the victory of the lie'. *Dead Souls* is shown as a 'theological universe of truth and lies' (p. 171) where truth will eventually triumph and Chichikov, instead of being allowed to bask in his popularity and celebrate the realisation of his project, receives condign punishment. The punishment appears in the face of the ancient goddess Fama, the personification of popular rumour. She 'splits along gender lines' (p. 203) by acting through the female and male residents of City N. By means of excessive talk or gossip the townspeople destroy Chichikov's enjoyment of success and make the protagonist flee or 'fly' from the city.

According to Heftrich, while Gogol sends Chichikov, who is often compared to a poet (pp. 125-126, 199), on his journey and examines his soul, his creator simultaneously puts himself on a moral quest and investigates the depths of his own soul as a writer. Gogol poses the question whether 'lying as an art-form' (p. 119) is permissible and whether he, as a poet, is faithful to the truth in the process of creating his po-

REVIEWS

em: ‘Chichikov is not exactly a Gogol, but he does possess a classical feature of the poet: he is a great liar. Gogol, we know, loved to compile lists of names to which he might one day give fictive existence – and what else does Chichikov do?’ (p. 235) As the title of the book indicates, Chichikov’s ‘Crime and Punishment’ extend to Gogol himself.

It should be mentioned that Heftrich’s study is illustrated with reproductions of paintings and drawings by a variety of international artists. These facilitate and enrich one’s reading experience. Thus, the city of N. as well as the sinful ‘world’s senselessly rotating cycle’, mediated through the poem’s recurrent image of ‘the flawed wheel’ (pp. 99, 100), are symbolised via a hand-drawn illustration by Johann Amos Comenius, *The Labyrinth of The World* (1631; p. 96).

This book, which offers a reading of *Dead Souls* not as a ‘social satire’, but as ‘covert theology’, is a vital addition to the existing body of criticism on Gogol. It is intended for an academic audience as well as the general reader with an interest in Russian literature and Slavic culture.

Anna Arkatova

Hong Kong Baptist University, UIC College

Skovoroda, Hryhory. *The Garden of Divine Songs and Collected Poetry of Hryhory Skovoroda*. Transl. Michael M. Naydan with an Introduction by Valery Shevchuk. London: Glagoslav, 2015. 134 pp.

On 7 May 2022 a missile strike destroyed the eighteenth-century country house just over 50 kilometres from Kharkiv that housed the museum dedicated to the Ukrainian philosopher and mystic Hryhorii Skovoroda (1722-1794). The outrage was emblematic

REVIEWS

ic of the fact that, in Russia's war on Ukraine, cultural monuments and repositories of national memory — symbols of national identity that they are — find themselves as much under threat as population centres and military targets.

Skovoroda holds a special place in the popular Ukrainian cultural imagination where he figures as a seeker of freedom, a teacher of wisdom for ordinary folk and aristocrats alike, and a man who chose ascetic self-limitation over convenient compromise with state or church. But Skovoroda was also the author of a remarkable corpus of poetry, didactic fables and, above all, complex philosophical dialogues in the spirit of the European pietism of his day, replete with esoteric symbolism and steeped in Biblical and classical heritage.

In 2015 Michel Naydan, a veteran literary translator from Ukrainian and Russian into English, launched a project to present Skovoroda to the English-speaking reader in three volumes, of which the verse anthology *The Garden of Divine Songs* was the first. A second volume, *The Complete Correspondence of Hryhory Skovoroda: Philosopher and Poet*, also with Glagoslav, appeared in 2016. *The Garden* contains all of Skovoroda's extant poems, including the thirty originally grouped as *Sad bozhestvennykh pesnei*, and has an introduction by Valerii Shevchuk, the distinguished Ukrainian prose writer who did much in the 1980s and 1990s to animate public interest in the Baroque period of Ukraine's literature.

From numerous angles and in a variety of verse forms Skovoroda's poetry sets forth a single, characteristically Baroque, argument: that, amidst the distractions and temptations of the world, the sole object of value is the salvation, through Christ, of the individual human soul. The poems, for all their charms, are not framed as a *hortus deliciarum*, a garden of delights, but as a garden of *divine songs*. The garden is cultivated and ordered so as to guide the reader through a life of temporal virtue and spiritual attentiveness into a blessed eternity. The structures of evaluative contrast charac-

REVIEWS

teristic of Skovoroda's verse amplify this central thesis. Urban civilisation is set against pastoral landscape, secular power and pomp against self-abnegating poverty, flesh against spirit, passion against tranquillity, intellectual prowess against simple faith. The first element in each of these binaries impedes salvation, the second draws it nearer.

Skovoroda's poems – like his *Basny khar'kovskiiia* (Kharkiv Fables) and unlike his later mystical dialogues – are accessibly expressed, notwithstanding their display of Biblical and Græco-Roman erudition. The thirty poems that constitute the 'garden' proper are in all but a few cases introduced by an epigraph that takes as its 'seed' or 'virtue' a quotation or a combination of quotations from Scripture or liturgy. Naydan helpfully identifies the sources in footnotes. The scriptural theme is elaborated in the 'song' itself. Shevchuk points out that, in addition to setting forth an aspect of Skovoroda's religious world-view, each poem showcases one of the different patterns of syllabic versification in use in the Ukrainian poetry of his day. The collection, according to Shevchuk, is an implicit handbook of poetics such as Skovoroda may have been expected to produce in the course of his pedagogical work. Also on display, inscribed in the metaphors and allegories that abound in these poems, is Skovoroda's alertness to contemporary modernity – to the natural sciences, geometry, the military arts, modern agriculture and economics, and contemporary social realia. He was as much a child of the Enlightenment as were other European religious poets and thinkers of his day.

The translator of Skovoroda is confronted with the task of deciding what aspects of this wealth of intellectual and aesthetic material to retain in translation, and what to abandon. Naydan privileges content over form, aiming for as much line-by-line literal correspondence as possible. He does not make a point of imitating the syllabic structure of the verse, judging (no doubt correctly) that the number of syllables

REVIEWS

in a line, even if it did carry an aesthetic charge in eighteenth-century Eastern Europe, has little aesthetic resonance for today's reader. On the other hand, Naydan does try to replicate the effect of Skovoroda's rhymes, enclosing in square brackets words not in the original that he has inserted for this euphonic purpose. Unusual though the technique is, in lines like the following it may well communicate something of what Naydan calls the text's 'poeticity' (p. 10):

Seeing the sadness of this life,
Seething like the Red Sea[']s strife],
With a whirlwind of sorrows, illness and woes,
I grow weak, terrified, pale, [indisposed]. ('Seventeenth Song', p. 70)

On the other hand, one would not necessarily assent to all of the translator's decisions. Skovoroda's explanatory footnotes, which give insight into the author's assumptions about his audience's cultural knowledge, are omitted. Most text in Latin is translated, but not all (e.g., pp. 123-124). Occasionally the translation appears to modify somewhat too radically the meaning of the original. For example, the lines 'Тот непрестанно стягает грунта, / Сей иностранны заводит скота' ('That one unceasingly amasses land, / This one introduces foreign breeds of cattle'; Skovoroda, *Povne zibrannia tvoriv* [Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1973], I, 67), which identify worldly activities that the poetic subject condemns as vain, are rendered as 'One constantly strikes the ground. / A stranger pastures cattle' (p. 57).

What seriously detracts from the impression made by this nicely designed and printed book is the negligent copy-editing. A Roman character set has inadvertently replaced the letters of the Greek epigraph to the 'Thirtieth Song' (p. 100). Relics of the translator's quest for the best equivalent of a word with multiple meanings proliferate: 'ridiculedkepkualy' (p. 17), 'the storyistorija' (p. 19), 'Cleave the Serpent's

REVIEWS

head.tear off’ for ‘Змію сотри главу’ (p. 50), ‘Can I grow weary of this mystical flame?strange, eerie’ for ‘Может ли мнѣ наскучить дивный пламень сей?’ (p. 51), ‘Each head has its own reason.cognizance?’ for ‘Голова всяка свой имѣет смысл’ (p. 55), and ‘It fears no sly sneers either,grimaces, expressions’ for ‘И хитрых мин не страшится’ (p. 75).

These flaws, regrettable though they are, can easily be removed in a revised edition; what matters is that the poetic legacy of a remarkable human being – a legacy which is also a significant monument of the Ukrainian thought and writing predating Ivan Kotliarevs’kyi’s inauguration of literature in vernacular Ukrainian – is now available to the student and the general reader in English.

Marko Pavlyshyn
Monash University

Irina Reyfman, *How Russia Learned to Write: Literature and the Imperial Table of Ranks*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2016. ISBN 978-0-299-30834-6. xi, 237 pp.

When Peter I promulgated the ‘Table of Ranks’ in 1722, his intention was to codify and align the numerous roles that existed across the army, navy, court and civil administration in order to improve the efficiency of government business. The fourteen ranks and the opportunity to progress through them on the basis of service experience and merit also quickly came to provide an alternative social hierarchy which existed in tandem with the traditional class structure and, to a significant degree, superseded it. Nobility was automatically acquired by reaching a certain rank; conversely there was also an expectation that the nobility should earn its place in society through service, and that rank was the measure of such service. Although the rank system underwent

REVIEWS

numerous changes over time, it remained essentially in place until 1917 and was a defining feature of Russian society for nearly two hundred years.

Notwithstanding the rather broader implications of its title, *How Russia Learned to Write* focuses on the neglected topic of how expectations about state service influenced the lives and works of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century writers. One thing that is immediately apparent is that Russian writers responded to the hierarchy of ranks in widely different ways depending both on their personalities and on their specific social and economic circumstances. The book begins by looking at selected writers from the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Literary writers in this period were overwhelmingly from the nobility and tended to see their writing more as a hobby than a profession. Service, moreover, was mandatory for nobles until 1762 and, thus, rank frequently formed an important part of their identity. Reyfman proceeds by outlining writers' service careers and exploring their attitude to their writing within this context. Aleksandr Sumarokov, for example, who served both in the army and as director of the Russian Imperial Theatre, retiring with the rank of actual state councillor (4th class), viewed his literary activities as an element of his service. On the other hand, Andrei Bolotov, though he served in both the military and civil branches, saw service as rather a hindrance to both his literary pursuits and his duties as a landowner. Aleksei Rzhevskii took the opposite track and subordinated his literary career to his service ambitions, eventually reaching the rank of actual privy councillor (2nd class).

The greater part of the book is devoted to three major writers: Pushkin, Gogol and Dostoevsky and the role of the service hierarchy in their life and work. Reyfman works through the contradictions and resentments of Pushkin's rather unsuccessful service career in some detail, from his early postings in St Petersburg and Kishinev, through the unfortunate posting to Odessa which led to his dismissal, to Pushkin's reinstatement in 1831 and the grant of access to the imperial archives for his work on

REVIEWS

Peter I. Pushkin never advanced beyond the rank of titular councillor (9th class), though he was also granted the court title of *kammeriunker* (rather than that of *kammerger*, to which he believed he was entitled) in 1833. Pushkin's uneasiness about rank and social status is reflected in several of his late prose works, notably his *Tales of Belkin*.

Tracing Gogol's passage through two government departments and his appointments as a teacher and later professor of history, Reyfman notes that reconstructing Gogol's service career in detail is problematic because of inconsistencies in the record and apparent attempts by Gogol himself to obfuscate it. His treatment of the service hierarchy in his writing is no less problematic and highly mythologised, particularly in his *Petersburg Stories*, a world in which, for example, Kovalev's Nose, in the story of the same name, acquires an independent rank two grades above Kovalev's own. Reyfman points out, moreover, that the menial duties and abject poverty of Akakii Akakievich in *The Overcoat* are hardly consistent with the relatively senior rank of titular councillor. Dostoevsky, whose limited service was in the military, draws heavily on Gogol's mythologised version of the civilian service, and Reyfman examines the portrayal of dysfunctional and delusional officials in a string of early works including *The Double*, *The Village of Stepanchikovo*, and *Notes from the Underground*.

A number of other authors are examined at shorter length including three early nineteenth-century military poets: Denis Davydov, who created a poetic persona as a frivolous 'hussar-poet' rather at odds with his highly professional approach to his career in real life; Aleksandr Polezhaev, who found himself trapped in military service after being punished by Nicholas I for a scurrilous student composition, but nevertheless found a vocation in his poetry about Russian campaigns in the Caucasus; and Mikhail Lermontov, whose military and personal careers are finely intertwined in his

REVIEWS

own poems of the Caucasus and in *A Hero of Our Time*. A final chapter considers writers in the second half of the nineteenth century, by which time the centrality of rank as measure of social worth had begun to diminish. The last author discussed is Afanasii Fet, whose great fame as a poet, especially from 1870 onwards, never fully consoled him for his lack of success in achieving through service promotion the hereditary nobility which he believed to be his birthright.

Reyfman's sometimes rather encyclopaedic approach to her topic makes it hard for her to come to overall conclusions about the relationship between rank and literary creativity in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literature. Nevertheless, her book is well worth reading for its numerous valuable insights and its fresh perspective on the creative process in Russia.

David Wells
Curtin University

Tim Harte, *Faster, Higher, Stronger, Comrades: Sports, Art, and Ideology in Late Russian and Early Soviet culture*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2020. ISBN 978-0-299-32770-5. xv + 297 pages

In the famous final paragraph of *Literature and Revolution* (1924), Leon Trotsky wrote:

It is difficult to predict the extent of self-government which the man of the future may reach or the heights to which he may carry his technique. Social construction and psycho-physical self-education will become two aspects of one and the same process. All the arts – literature,

REVIEWS

drama, painting, music and architecture will lend this process beautiful form. More correctly, the shell in which the cultural construction and self-education of Communist man will be enclosed, will develop all the vital elements of contemporary art to the highest point. Man will become immeasurably stronger, wiser and subtler; his body will become more harmonised, his movements more rhythmic, his voice more musical. The forms of life will become dynamically dramatic. The average human type will rise to the heights of an Aristotle, a Goethe, or a Marx. And above this ridge new peaks will rise.

The ‘psycho-physical’ development of the individual and of society as a whole became an entrenched characteristic of the *novyi chelovek*, or Soviet New Person, who was meant to blossom under the communist regime. Cults of the sportsman and the sportswoman were enshrined in Soviet propaganda, and success at the Olympics and other international sporting competitions was presented as proof of the triumph of the Soviet system. It was not so much a celebration of ‘sport’ as it was a celebration of ‘physical culture’ (*fizkul'tura*) that was championed or, in Trotsky’s terminology, the ‘psycho-physical’ development that would lead to an overall development of a fully rounded new person.

John Bowlt’s article, ‘Body beautiful: The artistic search for the perfect physique’ published in *Laboratory of Dreams: the Russian Avant-Garde and Cultural Experiment* (1996), set the agenda for many of the subsequent studies of the new Soviet super sportsman in art in western academic literature. Mike O’Mahony’s well-illustrated *Sport in the USSR: Physical Culture - Visual Culture* (2006) became the pioneering study on sport in Soviet art with a detailed examination of the visual expression of *fizkul'tura* in Soviet art through key images. In 2014, in conjunction with the 22nd Winter Olympics in Sochi, the significant exhibition *Russian Avant-Garde*

REVIEWS

and Sport opened at The Olympic Museum in Lausanne. It brought together a considerable body of visual evidence, including the work of Varvara Stepanova, Aleksandr Rodchenko, Nikolai Kubeev and Gustav Klucis. This exhibition was accompanied by a substantial monographic catalogue containing several essays.

Tim Harte's *Faster, Higher, Stronger, Comrades: Sports, Art, and Ideology in Late Russian and Early Soviet Culture* builds on much of this early literature, but also explores a number of new avenues. Whereas many of the earlier studies concentrated only on the Soviet period and the immediate preceding avant-garde developments, Harte spends a considerable amount of time sifting through the evidence for the cult of wrestlers in late tsarist Russia, as well as the emergence of other sporting codes. He also examines the links between the interest in the body physique and late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century Russian symbolist writers, especially Aleksandr Blok.

Harte argues more for a continuum in Russian and Soviet culture than for an abrupt change in 1917. His analysis also includes a more detailed discussion of silent cinema than in previous studies and generally a more comprehensive analysis of visual culture.

Harte also argues that the early *fizkul'tura* ideals that triumphed in the art of the Soviet avant-garde in the 1920s, 'did not lead straight to the widespread glorification of Soviet sports under Stalin, as might be assumed. The "New" Soviet Person so prominent in Socialist Realism was not a direct descendant of the artistically exalted wrestling champions, artist-athletes, and new sportsmen in art of the revolutionary era.' (pp. 23-24) He adopts Vladimir Paperny's delineation of early Soviet culture into two streams – the first being a revolutionary one in the first two decades of the twentieth century that embraced a youthful orientation and a machine aesthetic with the image of the healthy machine-like artist athlete believing in an achievable

REVIEWS

future. The second stream came into being under Stalin, when the future was pushed forward towards eternity, with the focus changing from the individual to massive displays and pageants. Harte writes, ‘Thus the egalitarian dreams of the 1920s gave way to an ideological rigidity in athletics and in the artistic rendering of everyday sports that highlighted the setting of athletic records by elite athletes and that glorified the Stalinist state’ (p. 24).

Harte’s *Faster, Higher, Stronger, Comrades* is the most detailed examination to date of the role that *fizkul’tura* played in Russian and Soviet visual culture, thought, ideology and propaganda in the first three decades of the twentieth century. Although lengthy digressions – for example the examination of sport in Victorian England – slightly detract from the readability of the book and the limited illustrations make some of arguments on art difficult to follow, this is a beautifully researched and significant contribution to our understanding of part of the DNA of early Soviet culture.

Alexander Grishin

Australian National University, Canberra

Draitser, E. *In the Jaws of the Crocodile: A Soviet Memoir*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2021. 262 + xiii pp., ISBN 978-0-299-32900-6.

Emil Draitser’s memoir is structured into six parts, the last five of which are contiguous chronologically. The first part provides the cultural context of Jewish life in Odessa and the barriers to further education encountered by the prospective memoirist. The memoir then jumps four years to Draitser’s first encounter with the publishing world and the subsequent parts deal with the development of the writer’s craft while navi-

REVIEWS

gating between the Scylla of providing entertaining copy and the Charybdis of official disapproval. The last part of the book culminates with the author's decision in 1974 to leave the Soviet Union. The epilogue finds him in the USA, tying up some loose ends. As mentioned in the preface, this book is chronologically positioned between Draitser's *Shush! Growing up Jewish under Stalin* (University of California Press, 2008) and *Farewell, Mama Odessa* (Northwestern University Press, 2020).

This reader found Part I: *Hopes and Dreams* evocative of the multicultural Odessa of the 1950s. The memoirist's Jewish background and the hurdles it placed on his way to tertiary education are vividly depicted in the first three chapters of the book. This part ends with Draitser's acceptance as a freshman in the Department of Electrical Engineering at the Odessa Polytechnic Institute. The narrative of these chapters is punctuated by short stories, scraps of poetry and pithy aphorisms that revel in Jewish humour (pp. 15, 17-18, 19, 33 and 37). This technique is employed throughout the memoir, sometimes employing snatches of song lyrics or other ephemera (p. 63), but mostly extracts from the author's published work (p. 71).

Some nine years elapse between acceptance at the Polytechnic and Part II: *Serendipity*, which begins four years after Draitser's graduation as an electrical engineer. He is bored in his job in a research laboratory and this ennui combined with his liking for feuilletons has driven him to write in his spare time. A number of chance meetings find him at the office of *Moskovskii komsomolets*, where an editor commissions a satirical piece. The conflict between the lofty aims of belles-lettres and the worldly genre of satire is soon over, although the author explores this conflict in detail throughout Part II.

Part III: *On a Roll* begins with the editor's acceptance of the delivered piece (p. 68). Using the public's letters as grist to his satirical mill, Draitser starts to enjoy 'making candy out of crap' (p. 75). This leads to an introduction (via feuilleton con-

REVIEWS

contributions to *Komsomol Pravda*) to the editor of *Krokodil*'s economics department. The following chapter explores the author's search for a *nom-de-plume*, occasioned by a comment by the then feuilleton editor of *Soviet Russia* implying that Draitser's name was too Jewish:

“Listen, Emil.” He chewed his lips some more. “Your surname ... well, you know ... it's not quite for the newspapers. Change your byline” (p. 77) ... which the author duly did – to Emil Abramov. The remaining chapters in the part explore different aspects of being Jewish in the Soviet Union in the 1960s: one chapter describing the author's holiday trip to Odessa, anguishing over how to show his burgeoning career as a feuilleton writer to his disapproving family; another describing his accidental employment as a book editor (against all odds); and the last chapter in the part centred on his piece about complaints (a serious business in the Soviet Union).

Part IV: *In Hot Water* covers the results of a piece entitled ‘Shut Up, You Scatterbrain! A Tragicomic Sonata in Three Acts’, which leads to Emil Abramov (Draitser) being denounced in the *Literary Gazette*. Several chapters are devoted to covering the ‘wheels within wheels’ that resulted in that denunciation and identifying the person ultimately responsible for it – the then Minister of Culture. Unfortunately, the ‘Scatterbrain’ piece is not the only one of Draitser's feuilletons that have targeted the Ministry of Culture over the past couple of years. The Editor of *Krokodil* responds obliquely in an attempt to defuse the issue, but after a detailed response, appends the following comment:

‘The author of the feuilleton, E. Abramov, is no longer welcome to contribute to our magazine’ (p. 149).

Subsequent chapters indicate that E. Abramov has ruffled other feathers on tourist boards and in regional government, but that he is not the only feuilletonist to be sacrificed on the altar of the *nomenklatura*.

REVIEWS

The author's last few years in the Soviet Union are described in Part V: *Not for Want of Trying*. During this period, Draitser engages with the trend towards Aesopian satire as exemplified by 'The 12 Chairs Club', a humour section of the *Literary Gazette*. However, his 'euphoria at finding a new literary device that makes it possible for [him] to continue writing satire begins to subside' (p. 194). His disenchantment with 'writing between the lines' eventually consigns all his written output to his desk drawer. This is reinforced by the fact that his non-satirical work is perceived as having a 'Jewish' flavour.

The final section, Part VI: *Jumping into the Abyss* and the following *Epilogue*, describe the circumstances that precipitate Draitser's decision to apply to emigrate to the USA. An application such as this was fraught with difficulty (and even danger) in 1974. A viewing of Stanley Kramer's film *Bless the Beasts and Children* finally tips the scales and after some traumatic dealings with the KGB and border control, Draitser makes good his escape. A number of questions that puzzled the author are subsequently resolved in the epilogue.

When I chose this book to review, I imagined that it would expose the inner workings of the Soviet Union's premier satirical journal, *Krokodil*. In this, I was only partly right – the journal's editorial personnel and their actions are certainly discussed. However, the locus of the book's importance lies elsewhere, as a document that exposes the myriad ways in which, in the Soviet Union, a writer could be excluded solely on the basis of their ethnicity. And excluded, what is more, to the point at which they and their family had no other choice but to emigrate. From this perspective, this memoir is a significant social document that is still relevant today.

John Cook
University of Melbourne

REVIEWS

Global Russian Cultures, edited by Kevin M. F. Platt, Madison, The University of Wisconsin Press, 2019. ISBN 9780299319700. 386 pages.

Reading a collection of scholarly essays on ‘global Russian cultures’ after the 24th of February, 2022 may be challenging in many ways. The Russian full-scale aggression towards Ukraine and the growing distance between the Russian Federation and the West are likely to make any book on this subject written before 2022 appear obsolete even if it was published *only* three years ago. The same could be said, for example, of *Transnational Russian Studies*, edited by Andy Byford, Connor Doak, and Stephen Hutchings (Liverpool UP, 2020), which does not mean that the book is not interesting or solid. However, this rich and multifarious volume edited by Kevin Platt – as is the case with Byford, Doak and Hutchings’s – is sure to provide food for thought to anyone interested in a better understanding of what Russian culture is, or what Russian cultures are, today. In a time when some are deploring an alleged cancellation of Russian culture and others call for this cancellation to be implemented, the question about the nature of Russian culture(s) is far from trivial.

The book includes an introduction by Platt and fourteen chapters, divided into two parts, titled respectively ‘The Situation of Russian Cultures’ and ‘Russian Cultures at Large’, although it is not always clear how the chapters are divided between them. The two parts include both more general and methodological chapters, and specific case studies. While in some books the introduction is just a brief anticipation of what the reader will encounter in the following pages, in this case it may be said to be the most important part of the entire volume. Platt’s passion in exposing his vision of a new approach to Russian cultures and Russianness itself goes hand in hand with a thoroughly convincing deconstruction of the traditional view of Russian culture as a more or less monolithic entity. In the context of a culture that has often been fet-

REVIEWS

ished as 'great' and morally challenging, Platt's assertion that 'there is no single fundamental Russian cultural formation, in or outside of Russian territory' (p. 8) is a breath of fresh air. Platt also openly speaks about 'the political commitments of this volume', which has been conceived 'in opposition to the bounded and unitary conceptions of culture and identity that are most often associated with national projects in and around Russia' (p. 9).

At the same time, while most other chapters appear to be intended also for readers with little to no knowledge of Russian/Russophone cultures, Platt's introduction is more demanding, although intellectually satisfying. The introduction is followed by Maria Rubins's historical overview of Russian cultures abroad, which she views as an archipelago. In the light of the current situation, Vitaly Chernetsky's discussion of Russophone writing in Ukraine past and present is one of the crucial parts of the book. Chernetsky describes contemporary Russophone writing in the context of the consolidation of 'a fundamentally new Ukrainian identity, civic and future-oriented' (p. 49), which is supposed to replace 'an ethnically based concept of nationhood' (p. 50). From the vantage point of 2022, one may nevertheless have a feeling that the dynamics of inclusion of 'Russian populations, their language, and their writing' in contemporary Ukrainian identity may have quite significantly changed after the 24th of February, 2022.

In his chapter, 'Russia as Whole and as Fragments', Ilya Kukulkin describes the ways in which Russian writers have imaged the territory of their country between expansionistic and marginalising strategies, showing how 'the question of the unity or diversity of Russian culture within Russian itself' is no less important of that regarding Russian cultures abroad (pp. 151-152). Michael S. Gorham's chapter on the transformation of the Russian-World idea from an instrument of soft power to an openly aggressive one is also of particular importance today. Two chapters (Lisa Ryoko

REVIEWS

Wakamiya and Yelena Furman) focus on Russian-American literature, exploring such successful American authors as Gary Shteyngart and Lara Vapnyar. Others cover such topics as Russian cultures in Central Asia (Natalya Kosmarskaya and Artyom Kosmarski), Latvia (Platt), Russian-Israeli film (Alex Moshkin), 'Russophone Russophobia' in Ukraine (Dirk Uffelmann), Russian-American author Michael Idov (Adrian Wanner), Russian tourism in Scotland (Lara Ryazanova-Clarke), Russian musical lyric abroad (Philip Ross Bullock), and global 'Russian literature' written by non-Russians (Miriam Finkelstein).

After 2020, one is likely to feel that a chapter on Russophone writing and/or the Russian language in Belarus is missing, and Platt's chapter on Latvia makes one want to know more about Russophone culture in Estonia. In addition, an analysis of cultural bilingualism in those areas of the Russian Federation in which Russian is not the only language currently used would have been interesting in this context. Although published in 2019, the book constantly, and correctly, refers to 2014 as a watershed of recent history, thus reminding readers that the ongoing full-scale war in Ukraine is just the continuation of a long process that has its roots in the 2014 annexation of Crimea and the war in Donbas. Going back even further, it is based on the aggressive ideology of the whole of the Putin age since its beginnings, marked by the second Chechnya war and the attack on Georgia in 2008, as Gorham's chapter on the Russian World aptly notes.

Alessandro Achilli
University of Cagliari

IN MEMORIAM: PETER MANNERS HILL (16/10/1945 – 19/6/2022)

Professor Peter Hill, who died on 19 June 2022, was an outstanding scholar in the field of Slavonic languages, especially those of the Balkan region. Born in Perth, WA, he attended Christ Church Grammar School, where he first showed his rare gift for language-learning. He proceeded to take his first degree, First Class Honours in German and Russian, at the University of Melbourne (Ormond College) in 1967. This was followed by an MA from Melbourne University in 1970. He continued his studies in Germany, at the University of Hamburg, where he received a PhD in Slavonic Studies in 1972, and was then appointed Assistant Professor (*wissenschaftlicher Assistent*), teaching linguistics for students of Russian and other Slavonic languages, and in 1980 – Professor. There he did much to encourage and support the study of lesser-known Slavonic languages, while devoting much time to administrative matters and a range of committees. He also found finance to support dialect-study expeditions to Bulgaria and other parts of South-Eastern Europe.

Peter returned to Australia in 1983, when Macquarie University expanded its offerings in community languages, in line with the Galbally Report, by establishing a program of Slavonic Studies. With Dr John Besemeres, another Melbourne University graduate and specialist in the field, he undertook to develop the new program. Peter would have charge of the South Slavonic area. This was no simple task, since the fractious politics of the Balkans were bound to intrude, but Peter was able to handle the inter-ethnic tensions adroitly. One of his major research interests, the Macedonian language, posed its own serious problems. Intractable political considerations attended its recognition and codification, which was achieved only at the conclusion of World War II. With the passage of time and the seismic changes in the Balkan region, those factors have changed, but the difficulties remain. The Greek government refuses to accept the existence of a state named Macedonia beyond its own borders, and Bulgar-

OBITUARIES

ians continue to regard the language as merely a dialect of their own. At a time when the situation was fluid and the Yugoslav state was nearing its final collapse, Peter was not to be deterred, and the credit for establishing the study of Macedonian in Australia is rightly his. He was also responsible for courses in Serbian and Croatian and taught an introduction to Slavonic philology.

When the program of Slavonic Studies at Macquarie fell victim to funding cuts and increasing casualisation in 1986, Peter returned to his previous post at the University of Hamburg, where he remained until he took early retirement in 2001. For the next two decades he would live in Canberra or on the NSW coast, holding the post of Visiting Fellow in what is now the School of Literature, Languages and Linguistics at the Australian National University. There he was a regular contributor to the lecture program in that School's courses in European Studies, presented numerous conference papers and continued to publish articles and book reviews. In September 2009 he chaired the Inaugural Forum for Advancing Australia-Macedonia Relations at Parliament House. In 2010 he gave guest lectures in Hamburg and at the Humboldt University in Berlin on the language of Bosnia, and in 2011 lectured on general and Macedonian linguistics at the University of Skopje in Macedonia.

In his seventies, Peter took an increasing interest in matters of theology and the study of the Bible in various languages. He played a very active and competent role in Professor Anna Wierzbicka's theology group at the ANU. In 2017 he officiated at the launch of her book *What Christians Believe*, written in Polish, displaying an impressive command of the subject matter. At a conference on semantics at the ANU in 2018, he presented a paper on ways of addressing God in German.

In retirement Peter taught Italian at the University of the Third Age in Bateman's Bay, took up environmental causes with great determination, and made use of a fine singing voice by singing in a choir.

OBITUARIES

Peter was the author of many scholarly publications. His major works included: *Die Farbwörter der russischen und bulgarischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart. Versuch einer Klassifikation und einer strukturell-semantischen Analyse* [Words for Colour in Contemporary Standard Russian and Bulgarian. An Attempt at a Classification and a Structural-Semantic Analysis], Amsterdam, 1972; *The Macedonians in Australia*, Carlisle, WA, 1989; *The Dialect of Gorno Kalenik*, Columbus, Ohio, 1991; and *The Routledge Macedonian-English Dictionary*, London, 1998. The last-named was a long-term collaborative project begun by the late Professor Reginald de Bray, based on the large *Rečnik na makedonskiot jazik* [Dictionary of the Macedonian Language] compiled by Todor Dimitrovski, Blagoja Korubin and Trajko Stamoski, and brought to completion by Peter, Sunčica Mirčevska and the present author.

Peter will be warmly remembered by his many former students, friends and colleagues in Hamburg, Canberra, Sydney, Melbourne and Macedonia. He is survived by his wife Alexandra and her two sons and their families (three grandchildren and two great grandchildren), as well as his two elder brothers and a sister in Western Australia.

Kevin Windle
Australian National University

With thanks to Alexandra Hill, Bettina Strewe, John Besemeres and
Anna Wierzbicka

IN MEMORIAM: NONNA RYAN (1938 – 2022)

It is with a sense of profound sadness that we report the death of Associate Professor Nonna Ryan. Nonna Ryan died in Sydney on June 17, 2022. The Russian ethnic community in Sydney and numerous people who have studied Russian knew Nonna well. Her name is associated with the very beginning of teaching of the Russian language at Macquarie University, where she was the Russian course authority for 16 years, from 1991 to 2007.

Nonna was born in 1938 in China, into a family of Russian immigrants and in 1958 immigrated to Sydney. In 1991, she was appointed as Lecturer at Macquarie University in the recently created section of Russian Studies. Nonna had a passion for Russian literature, culture, and the Russian language. In 2003, she was awarded the honorary Russian Pushkin medal for her work by the International Association of Teachers of Russian Language and Literature.

At Macquarie University, Associate Professor Ryan introduced various courses on Russian and taught students how to read and analyse literature, from Pushkin to Akhmatova and Solzhenitsyn, among others. She was also an active member of the Russian community and an organiser of many festivals, seminars and exhibitions. She will be sorely missed by her family, colleagues, students and friends.

Marika Kalyuga
Macquarie University

Notes on Contributors

Damian Herda is a PhD candidate in Linguistics at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, Poland. He is the principal investigator of a project concerned with the cross-linguistic development of measure nouns into degree modifiers, funded by the Polish National Science Centre (Grant No. 2019/33/N/HS2/01695). His research interests revolve around lexical semantics, grammaticalisation theory, and corpus approaches to language analysis.

Robert Lagerberg is the convenor of the Russian Program in the School of Languages and Linguistics at the University of Melbourne. His research interests are mainly in Russian linguistics, in particular the study of word stress.

Norbert Morawiec, PhD, is a researcher at the Institute of History of the Jan Długosz University in Częstochowa. His research interests lie in the history of East Central European historiography, mnemohistory and anthropology of historiography.

Rafi Tsirkin-Sadan received his PhD from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. His research interests include: Russian Literature, Modern Jewish literature, comparative literature in East European context. Currently he serves as senior lecturer at the Department of Literature, Language, and the Arts at The Open University of Israel. Selected publications: ‘The Hebrew Text of Gomel: Space, Genre, Modernity’, *Jewish Quarterly Review* (together with Natasha Gordinsky, forthcoming spring 2023); ‘Genre and Politics. The Concept of Empire in Joseph Brodsky’s Work’, *Partial Answers. Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas* 19 (2021), no. 1, 119–143; ‘Tolstoy, Zionism and the Hebrew Culture’, *Tolstoy Studies Journal*, volume 24 (2012), 26-35.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Kevin Windle is an Emeritus Professor in the School of Literature, Languages and Linguistics at the Australian National University. His major publications include *From St Petersburg to Port Jackson: Russian Travellers' Tales of Australia 1807-1912* (co-edited with Elena Govor and Alexander Massov); *A New Rival State: Australia in Tsarist Diplomatic Communications 1857-1917* (co-edited with Alexander Massov and Marina Pollard); and a biography of Alexander Zuzenko. For his translations from various languages he has been awarded several prizes, including the Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs (FIT) Aurora Borealis Prize for the translation of non-fiction.

Marat Zakirov (Doctor of Political Sciences, Associate Professor) is the head of the Political Science Analysis at the V. I. Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine, Kyiv. He is the editor-in-chief of the journal *Ukraine: Events, Facts, Comments*. He is the author and co-author of several monographs, textbooks and more than 150 articles in Ukrainian and international publications. Research interests: history of political thought, political institutions, political analysis of national and international conflicts, the Ukrainian diaspora, the role and significance of strategic communications. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4897-4325>

Svitlana Zakirova (Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor) since 2015 has worked as a Senior Research Associate at the National Law Library, V. I. Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine (NBUV), Kyiv. She is the author and co-author of several monographs, textbooks and numerous articles. Research interests: the history of the state and law, post-conflict settlement policy, social communications, communication between authorities and civil society. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5396-7210>