

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 33
2019

Australian Slavonic and East European Studies

Editor:	Dr 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 Julie Fedor, University of Melbourne Dr John McNair, University of Queensland 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, literature, history and political science, and also art and social science. 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 8344 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, 2019

We are currently accepting articles for Volume 34 (2020). An electronic copy (in Microsoft Word format) should be sent to the editor by 31 August 2020. Papers received after this time will not be considered for publication in Volume 34. *ASEES*, Volume 34 (2020) will appear towards the end of 2020.

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: Assoc. Prof. Roderic Pitty, University of Western Australia
Secretary/Treasurer: Dr Anna Taitlin, University of Canberra
Executive members: Prof. Leslie Holmes, University of Melbourne
Mr Tony Phillips, University of Melbourne
Assoc. Prof. Hans Hendrichke, University of New South
Wales
Assoc. Prof. Slobodanka Vladiv-Glover, Monash University
Dr Lynne Alice, Deakin University

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

GEOFFREY HULL AND HALYNA KOSCHARSKY

Characteristics of the Polish Lexical Element in Western Ukrainian 1

KATYA JORDAN

A Crochet Needle versus a Quill Pen: Negotiating Fashion and
Education in the Nineteenth-Century Russian Women's Press 29

JOHN COOK

Performativity and the Scope of Bakhtin's Chronotope 57

PAVEL KREISINGER

To the Czechoslovak or the Australian Army? An Unknown Chapter
of Czechoslovak-Australian Relations during the Second World War 83

REVIEWS

Tatiana Smoliarova, <i>Three Metaphors for Life: Derzhavin's Late Poetry</i> (David Wells)	111
Christina Lodder, ed., <i>Celebrating Suprematism: New Approaches to the Art of Kazimir Malevich</i> (Rosamund Bartlett)	113
Bowers, K., C. Doak, and K. Holland (eds.), <i>A Dostoevskii Companion: Texts and Contexts</i> (John Cook)	116
Neil Robinson, <i>Contemporary Russian Politics: An Introduction</i> (Stephen Fortescue)	120
John Besemeres, <i>A Difficult Neighbourhood: Essays on Russia and East-Central Europe Since World War II</i> (Marko Pavlyshyn)	123
Edin Hajdarpasic, <i>Whose Bosnia? Nationalism and Political Imagination in the Balkans, 1840-1914</i> (Peter M. Hill)	126
Massov, A., M. Pollard, and K. Windle (eds.), <i>A New Rival State? Australia in Tsarist Diplomatic Communications</i> (Natalia Batova)	129
S. Kulchytsky, <i>The Famine of 1932-1933 in Ukraine: An Anatomy of the Holodomor</i> (S. G. Wheatcroft)	131
Zuzanna Bogumił, <i>Gulag Memories: The Rediscovery and Commemoration of Russia's Repressive Past</i> (Elena Mikhailik)	135
Books Received	141
Notes on Contributors	143

Vale, Dr John McNair

It was with great sadness that we learnt about the passing of our former editor, Dr John McNair, earlier this year. John was an eminent Slavist, a gentleman, a loyal colleague and a source of great support to me personally over many years as editor of this journal. He will be greatly missed by us all.

On behalf of the editorial staff and board of *ASEES*, I extend my deepest sympathies to John's family.

A full obituary will be published next year in Volume 34 of *ASEES* (2020).

Robert Lagerberg

GEOFFREY HULL AND HALYNA KOSCHARSKY

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POLISH LEXICAL ELEMENT IN WESTERN UKRAINIAN

Lexical polymorphism, the phenomenon of single concepts being expressed by different lexemes according to dialect within a given language, is particularly pronounced in Ukrainian, far exceeding in quantity the disagreements in vocabulary between such genetic pairs as Croatian and Serbian, British English and American English, European Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese, Hindi and Urdu, and Malay and Indonesian. The numerically impressive differences in vocabulary between Standard Ukrainian and the Western varieties of the language — vernaculars proper to those areas of Ukraine that remained the longest under Polish rule or socio-cultural influence (maximally 1349-1944) — have been explored and described in a series of previous studies by the authors (Hull & Koscharsky 2006, 2009, 2014a).¹ As the main purpose of this research was mainly to identify for language learners and linguistic researchers concepts with differing ‘Eastern Ukrainian’ and ‘Western Ukrainian’ referents, the lexemes in question were simply presented in alphabetical lists, rather than analysed according to the semantic fields to which they belong. The forms under study in these works were not confined to the body of Western Ukrainian lexis directly borrowed from Polish or merely concurring with Polish (a natural development in the broader context of the Slavonic dialectal continuum), but addressed also internal differences within Ukrainian itself that are not attributable to external influences.

¹ Galicia was under Polish rule or cultural hegemony from 1349 to 1944 (almost six centuries), and Volhynia from 1569 to 1795 and again from 1918 to 1944. Central Ukraine (Eastern Polesia and Podolia) was Polish-ruled for most of the period between 1569 and 1793, the Kyiv, Poltava and Zaporozhia regions from 1569 to 1649, and Siveria (Chernihiv, Sumy and Okhtyrka and their districts) only from 1619 to 1649. Sloboda Ukraine (Kharkiv, Donetsk), Priazovia and Crimea were never part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

While some historical background explaining the lexical divide within Ukrainian was provided in these studies, the phonological patterns and semantic fields characterising this diversity were not highlighted or directly examined. As a means of rounding off our general overview of regionally based synonymy in Ukrainian, we concentrate in the present article on Polish borrowings and concordances. In presenting this new data we adopt a more analytical approach, using as illustrative examples the large store of vocabulary that had to be omitted from our monograph of 2014 because of space restrictions, but which had formed part of the questionnaire on which this work was based.² Researchers in Ukrainian linguistics and lexicography and of Polish as a superstratum will thus find in the current study, combined with those that preceded it, a substantial corpus of data for those areas of vocabulary where the Ukrainian varieties of Galicia, Bukovina and Volhynia have — traditionally at least — expressed themselves with different lexemes from those typical of, and standardised by, more easterly forms of the language, including the Middle Dnieprian dialect of the South-Eastern group on which modern literary Ukrainian is based.³ As observed previously (Hull & Koscharsky 2014, 6-11), the historic polonisms of Western Ukrainian are today best preserved in diaspora varieties which perpetuate to a large extent the state of the language as it was in 1944, when Polish-ruled Eastern Galicia, Bukovina and Volhynia were occupied by Soviet forces and became permanently part

² The same Galician informants interviewed by Mrs Oksana Hull for the foregoing studies therefore need to be acknowledged again here, viz Mrs Anna Hull, Mrs Ivanna (Joan) Koscharskyj, the late Mr Mychajlo Cybulka, the late Mrs Olena Cybulka, Mr Lavrentij Ihnativ, the late Mr Ivan Nuinka, Mrs Vera Nuinka, Mr A. Kowalski, the late Mrs Julia Kowalska, the late Mr Ivan Matwisyk, Mrs Maria Matwisyk, Mr Oleh Ostrowsky, the late Mr Roman Rožek, Mrs Justyna Senkowycz and Mr Mychajlo Undulka.

³ The lexical material in the present article is not affected by the minor orthographical changes mandated by the June 2019 amendment to Ukrainian spelling, announced by the Ukrainian Cabinet of Ministers, these new norms superseding the 1992 version of standard orthography.

of Greater Ukraine. The speech of post-war generations of West Ukrainians has, by contrast, been more or less assimilated to the Standard Ukrainian taught in Soviet schools and used in the mass media, the depolonising trends being naturally more marked in urban than in rural varieties.

The remaining lexical agreements between Western Ukrainian and Polish discovered in our research will be examined in two broad sections, (a) near homonyms (lexemes with differing regional forms but the same etymology) and (b) heteronyms (lexemes with distinct etymologies).

1. Near homonyms

Although an imposing element of the language, Polish (P.) loanwords in Ukrainian are well assimilated to Eastern Slavonic phonological patterns, in western as well as central and eastern varieties. The main difference between East and West in the adaptation of polonisms is that Western Ukrainian (WU.) has added to its phonemic inventory an extra consonant and grapheme, ‘r’ (representing Polish /g/), whereas in Eastern Ukrainian (EU.) ‘r’ was substituted in the vast majority of cases, and this substitution became general in the literary language of the Soviet era. The addition to the Ukrainian alphabet of the letter ‘r’ was felt to be unnecessary in the Centre and East, where ‘r’ is articulated as the voiced glottal fricative [ɦ] or even as the voiced velar fricative [ɣ], whereas in Western varieties is commonly pronounced as the voiceless glottal fricative [h], which provides a much greater acoustic contrast to the voiced velar stop [g] of foreign origin. Still very numerous in Western Ukrainian (especially diaspora varieties) are lexemes in which this ‘international’ velar [g] has not been replaced by the more vernacular [h] in words of German, Romance, Latin or Graeco-Latin provenance or inspiration. Such is the case with *гид* ‘guide’ (~ WU. *гид*), *гастроль* ‘tour (artistic)’ (~ WU. *гастроль*), *флігель* ‘wing (of building)’ (~ WU. *флюгель*), *граціозний* ‘graceful’ (~ WU. *граційний*) and *грандіозний* (~

грандіозний), Ukrainian lexemes without counterparts in modern literary Polish.⁴ The more numerous cases where WU. ‘r’ agrees with Polish /g/ against the literary standard include:

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
(army) general	генерал	генерал	general
to ignore	з/ігнорувати ⁵	з/ігнорувати	z/ignorować
immigrant	імігрант	імігрант	imigrant
irrigation	іригація	іригація	irygacja
mango	манго	манго	mango
organist	органіст	органіст	organista
phlegmatic	флегматичний	флєгматичний	flegmatyczny
to react	за/реагувати	за/реагувати	za/reagować
regular	регулярний	регулярний	regularny
religion	релігія	релігія	religia
ring (sporting)	ринг	ринг	ring
shingle	гонт	гонт	gont
spaghetti	спагєт(т)i	спагєтти	spaghetti [spa'getti]
tin foil	фольга	фольга	folia
trick	фігель	фігель	figiel
zigzag	зигзэг	зигзэг	zygzag

Although the phonemes /lʲ/ (alveolar lateral approximant, slightly palatalised) and /l/ (velarised alveolar lateral approximant) are well distributed in all varieties of Ukrainian, when it comes to loanwords, the former is more commonly heard in Western Ukrainian than in Eastern varieties and the standard language. In such instances Western Ukrainian generally follows Polish, whereas Eastern Ukrainian agrees with Russian in presenting ‘dark’ [ɫ], e.g.:

⁴ But most have counterparts in Russian (*гид* < French *guide*, *флігель* < German *Flügel*, *грандіозний* < Fr. *grandiose*, *застріль* < Ger. *Gastrolle*). The Polish equivalents here are *przewodnik*, *skrzydło*, *wspaniały* and *tournée* (a gallicism) respectively.

⁵ The slash separates imperfective from perfective verbs. Where both members of a pair are formally distinct, the imperfect form is given first. Where the perfective counterpart is formed from the imperfective by the addition of a prefix, a slash separates the perfective prefix from the full form of the imperfective verb.

POLISH LEXICAL ELEMENT IN WESTERN UKRAINIAN

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
laboratory	лабораторія	лябораторія	laboratorium
pawnshop	ломбáрд	льомбáрд	lombard
plantation	плантáція	плянтáція	plantacja
platform (dais)	платфóрма	плярфóрма	platforma
sticking plaster	плáстир	плярстер	plaster
recitation	декламáція	деклярáція	deklamacja
declaration	декларáція	деклярáція	deklaracja
flagpole (on ship)	флагштóк	флярштóк	flagsztok
gorilla	горíля	горíля	goryl
elastic (band)	елáстика	елястика	elastik
oval (noun)	овáл	овáль	owal

Less numerous are cases of Eastern/Standard Ukrainian presenting the native Slavonic single or clustered consonants /p/, /kv/ or /xv/ where Western Ukrainian has ‘international’ /f/ as in Polish:

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
potato	картóпля	картóфля	kartofel
saffron	шапрáн	шафрáн	szafran
Stephen	Степáн	Стефáн	Stefan
wave	хвíля	фáля	fala
bean	квасóля	фасóля	fasola

One of the prime distinguishing features of Ukrainian is the progressive palatalisation of Common Slavonic tonic *o* in closed syllables when the vowel in the following or final syllable was either of the two *yers* (*ь = ĭ, ъ = ŭ*), e.g. CS **gostĭ* ‘guest’ > **guist* > *hüst* > *hist*, *dómŭ* ‘house’ > **duim* > *düm* > *dim*, *ókŭno* ‘window’ > **uikno* > *vüknó* > *viknó*.⁶ Cases of Western Ukrainian preferring a form within secondary tonic *i* instead of the tonic *o* usual in the standard language are relatively common, cf. *дохóд* ‘income’ ~ WU. *дохíд* (P. *dochód*), *паровóз* ‘steam engine’ ~

⁶ Shevelov 1965: 411, 443-448. This change occurred between the twelfth and the sixteenth centuries. The phase [ü] (IPA [y]) persists in certain north-western Polesian dialects (Karasyn and Tomašhorod districts in the Rivne oblast of Volhynia, the districts of Lemeševyči, Hlynna, Verxolissja, Pisky, Zapрудy and Vidomlja now located in south-western Belarus, and Dobrowoda across the border in Poland) as well as in central varieties of Ruthenian. See AUM, II, map 52; in these areas the pronunciation of *vin* ‘he’ today is [vün].

WU. *паровіз, бóйня* ‘slaughterhouse’ ~ WU. *бійня, хрóну* (genitive singular of *хрін* ‘horse radish’) ~ WU. *хріну, самотній* ‘single’ ~ WU. *самітній, дрож* ‘shiver’ ~ WU. *дріж*. Such forms frequently (but not always) agree with those of Polish, which has *ó* [u] in such instances, cf. P. *dochód, parowóz*, but *samotny, chrzani*. Other Galician and Volhynian phonetic features coinciding with those of Polish, e.g. palatalisation of sibilants before [i] or yod (*visim* ‘eight’ > *visim, svjatýj* ‘holy’ > *svjatýj, zillja* ‘herb’ > *zillja, zlist* ‘malice’ > *zlist*), are indicated orthographically only in dialect literature (*вісьім, сьвятий, зьілля, зьлість*).

Western Ukrainian dialects are by nature no less polytonic than their Central and Eastern cogeners, and typically paroxytonic borrowings from Polish usually become oxytones, e.g. *обру́с* ‘tablecloth’ < P. *obrús*, *плуто́н* ‘platoon’ < P. *pluton*, *шляфрóк* ‘dressing gown’ < P. *szlafrok*. There is nonetheless a marked tendency for Western Ukrainian to favour a Polonoid paroxytonic stress — at least as an option — in many words, cf. WU. *кале́ндар/календа́р* ‘calendar’ (P. *kalendarz* ~ EU. *календа́р*), *листо́пад* ‘November’ (EU. *листопад* ~ P. *listopad*), *значі́ння* ‘meaning’ (EU. *зна́чення* ~ P. *znaczenie*), *налі́т, на́лет* ‘raid’ (EU. *наліт* ~ P. *nalot*).

In word building the preferred preposition in Western Ukrainian for indicating the purpose of various implements is *до* (= P. *do*) rather than Standard *для* (though both take the genitive case), e.g. WU. *щітка до волóсся* (= P. *szczotka do włosów*) for *щітка для волóсся* ‘hairbrush’, *шпілька до волóсся* (= P. *szpilka do włosów*) for *шпілька для волóсся* ‘hairpin’, *комплéт до шиття́* (= P. *komplet do szycia*) for *набі́р для шиття́* ‘sewing kit’. Occasionally *на* replaces *для* in the West, e.g. WU. *па́стка на ми́ші* (= P. *pułapka na myszy*) for Standard Ukrainian *па́стка для ми́шеї* ‘mouse trap.’

Polish influence in the construction of idiomatic expressions in Western Ukrainian is not only common, but wholly to be expected of a bilingual region where

POLISH LEXICAL ELEMENT IN WESTERN UKRAINIAN

Polish was for centuries either the hegemonic language or the high (acrolectal) variety in a diglossic relationship, cf. *бути правим/правою* ‘to be right’ ~ WU. *мати рацію* (= P. *mieć rację*), *не мати ні найменшого поняття* ‘not to have the faintest idea’ ~ WU. *не мати зеленого поняття* (= P. *nie mieć zielonego pojęcia*, lit. ‘not to have a green notion’), *страждати морською хворобою* ‘to be seasick’ ~ WU. *терпіти на морську хоробу* (= P. *cierpieć na chorobę morską*), *повісити трубку* ‘to hang up the telephone’ ~ WU. *покласти слухавку* (= P. *odłożyć słuchawkę*); *перебивати/перебити промовця візюками* ‘to heckle a speaker’ ~ WU. *закричувати/закричати промовця* (= P. *zakrzyczeć mówiącego*), *глухий, як тетеря*⁷ ‘as deaf as a post’ ~ WU. *глухий, як пень*⁸ (= P. *głuchy jak pień*), *сліпий, як кажан* ‘as deaf as a bat’ ~ WU. *сліпий, як крив*⁹ (= P. *ślepy jak kret*), *Як ти поживаєш?* or *Як тобі йдеться?* ‘how are you?’ ~ WU. *Як ся маєш?* calqued on Polish *jak się masz?* Adjectives following the pronoun *щось* ‘something’ remain in the same neuter case in Standard Ukrainian, while in the West they commonly go into the genitive case, cf. *щось легке* ‘something light’ ~ WU. *щось легкого* (= P. *coś lekkiego*). Such Polonoid constructions are indeed so important a feature of Western Ukrainian that they merit a separate study.

Certain Western Ukrainian agreements with Polish now belong to the realm of strictly dialectal variants, e.g. *якщо* ‘if’ ~ dial. WU. *єсли* (cf. P. *jesły* = Russian *если*), *проти* ‘against’ ~ dial. WU. *протиw* (= P. *przeciw*), *зеть* ‘away’ ~ dial. WU. *преч*, *пріч* (= P. *precz*).

⁷ Literally ‘deaf as a woodcock’.

⁸ Literally ‘deaf as a log’.

⁹ Literally ‘blind as a mole’.

One very characteristic difference between Western Ukrainian and Standard Ukrainian is the abundance of words that share a common Slavonic or exotic stem, but employ different prefixes and/or suffixes. Typical examples are:

a) Nouns

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
avenger	ме́сник	помсти́тель	mściciel
bite	уку́с	уку́шення	ukąszenie
electricity	еле́ктрика	електри́чність	elektryczność
enlightenment	осві́ченість	осві́чення	oświecenie
extrovert	екстрове́рт	екстраве́ртик	ekstrawertyk
fee	пла́та	опла́та	opłata
florist	кві́тникáр	квітя́р	kwiaciarz
frostbite	обморóження	відморóження	odmrozenie
garbage truck	смі́ттево́з	сміття́рка	śmieciarka
importance	важли́вість	ва́жність	ważność
improvement	полі́пшення	улі́пшення	ulepszenie
instant	хви́лін(к)а	хви́ля	chwila
introvert	інтрово́ерт	інтрово́ртик	introwertyk
laziness	ліно́щі	ліні́вство	lenistwo
love affair	ромáн	ромáнс	romans
morals	морáльність	морáля	moralność
mortal	сме́ртний	сме́ртельник	śmiertelnik
non-smoker	некуре́ць	непалу́чий	niepalący
pedestrian	пішохо́д	піши́й	pieszy
recruitment	вербува́ння	вербу́нок	werbunek
remark	заува́ження	заува́га	uwaga
rumour	по́голос	по́голоска	pogłoska
service (e.g. in shop)	обслу́говування	обслу́га	obsługa
show	видóвище	видóвисько	widowisko
smile	у́смішка	у́сміх, у́смішка	uśmiech
warning	застере́ження	остере́ження	ostrzeżenie

b) Adjectives

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
blocked, stuck	блоко́ваний	зabloкóваний	zablokowany
decorative	декоратівний	декораці́йний	dekoracyjny
disciplined	дисципліно́ваний	здисципліно́ваний	zdyscyplinowany
eager	жа́дбний	жа́дний	żądny
hoarse	хрипкі́й, охри́плий	захри́плий	zachrypnięty
incurable	невиліко́вний	невилі́чний, невилі́чимий	nieuleczalny
injured	пора́нений	зра́нений	zraniony
irresponsible	безвідповідáльний	невідповідáльний	nieodpowiedzialny
moderate	помі́рний	умі́ркований	umiarkowany
muggy	паркі́й	парні́й	parny

POLISH LEXICAL ELEMENT IN WESTERN UKRAINIAN

obsolete	застарілий	перестарілий	przestarzały
pensive	задумливий	задуманий	zadumany
rainy	дощовий	дощевий	deszczowy
reasonable	розсудливий	розсудний	rozsądny
repulsive	відразливий	відражаючий	odrażający
return (ticket)	зворотній (квиток)	поворотний (білет)	(bilet) powrotny
rocky	скелястий	скелістий	skalisty
rotten	гнилий	з(і)гнилий	zgniły
second-rate	другосортний	другорядний	drugorzędny
selfish	егоїстичний	егоїстичний, самолюбний ¹⁰	egoistyczny, samolubny
smooth	гладенький	гладкий	gładki
snobbish	снобізний, снобістський	снобістичний	snobistyczny
spiteful	злісний	злісливий	złośliwy
sporting	спортивний	спортівий	sportowy
stained	заплямований	поплямлений	poplamiony
tourist	туристський	туристичний	turystyczny

c) Verbs

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
to brag	хвалітися	перехвалітися	przechwalać się
to contradict	суперечати/суперечити	заперечати/заперечити	zaprzeczać/zaprzeczyc
to encounter	стикатися	спіткатися/спіткнутися	spotykać się/spotkać się
to enjoy	вживати/вжити	заживати/зажити	zażywać/zażyć
to extend	подовжувати/подовжити	передовжувати/передовжити	przedłużać/przedłużyć
to fix (mend)	виправляти/виправити	направляти/направити	naprawiać/naprawić
to improve	поліпшувати/поліпшити	уліпшати/уліпшити	ulepszać/ulepszyć
to learn	навчатися/навчитися	на/вчїтися	na/uczyć się
to maintain	підтримувати/підтримати	утримувати/утримати	utrzymywać/utrzymać
to manage to	йому здатися	здолати ¹¹	zdołać
to pout	надувати/надути губи ¹²	видувати/видути губи	wyduwać/wyduć wargi
to provide	постачати/постачити	достарчати/достарчити	dostarczać/dostarczyć
to push forward (vi.)	просуватися/просунутися	посуватися/посунутися	posuwać/posunąć się
to refund	повертати/повернути	звертати/звернути	zwracać/zwrócić
to reunite	возз'єднувати/возз'єднати	знову з'єднувати/з'єднати	ponownie z/jednoczyć
to shorten	укорочувати/укоротити	скорочувати/скоротити	skracać/skrócić
to sift	просіювати/просіяти	просівати/просіяти	przesiewać/przesiać
to smell (vt.)	відчувати/відчути	по/чути	po/czuć
to smooth (vt.)	пригладжувати/пригладити	вигладжувати/вигладити	wygładzać/wygładzić
to sober up (vi.)	потверезуватися/ потверезитися	витверезуватися/ вітверезитися	wy/trzeźwieć
to soften (vt.)	пом'якшувати/пом'якшити	зм'якшувати/зм'якшити	zmiękczać/zmiękczyć
to spill (vt.)	проливати/проліти	розливати/розліти	rozlewać/rozlać
to stumble	спотикатися/спіткнутися	потикатися/поткнутися	potykać/potkać się
to surrender (vi.)	здаватися/зда́тися	підаватися/підда́тися	poddawać/poddać się

¹⁰ A false friend: in Standard Ukrainian the usual meaning of *самолюбний* is 'ambitious, self-serving'.

¹¹ A false friend: the meaning of this verb in the standard language is 'to overcome, conquer' (= *подолати*).

¹² Literally 'to puff one's lips'.

GEOFFREY HULL AND HALYNA KOSCHARSKY

to teach	навчати/навчити	на/вчити	na/uczyć
to weigh up	звážувати/звážити	розважати ¹³ /розважити	rozważać/rozważyć

A regular formal difference in the area of imperfective forms is the correspondence of the Western Ukrainian infinitive ending *-áti* or *-ýti* with Eastern/Standard *-увати* or *-ювати*. In the examples below both varieties of the language agree on the perfective form (*установити, зменшити, викоринити, наситити*), but the imperfective forms vary:¹⁴

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
to institute	установлювати	установляти	ustanawiać
to lessen	зменшувати	зменшати	zmniejszać
to root out	викоринювати	викориняти	wykorzeniać
to sate, satiate	насічувати	насищати	nasycać/nasycić

Sometimes one encounters regional disparities in the choice of prefixes for perfective verbs (the imperfective forms being prefixless):

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
to believe	повірити	увірити	uwierzyć
to grow numb	затёрпнути	стёрпнути	ścierpnąć
to punish	покарати	укарати	ukarać
to ring up (vt.)	подзвонити до	задзвонити до	zadzwonić do
to shave	поголіти	оголіти	ogolić
to train	потренувати	витренувати	wytrenować

These regional differences can affect nouns derived from verbs, e.g.:

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
breath	пóдих	ві́ддих	oddech
dressing room	убирáльня ¹⁵	перебирáльня	przebieralnia

¹³ The Eastern Ukrainian equivalent, *розва́жувати*, means ‘to weigh out (in measurements)’ not ‘to weigh up, consider’.

¹⁴ Note also EU. *проповідувати* ~ WU. *проповідати* (pf. *проповісти*) ‘to preach’, without equivalents in Polish. With all these verbs the contrast extends to inflected imperfective forms, cf. EU. *я проповідую, ти проповідуєш* ~ WU. *я проповідáю, ти проповідáєш* ‘I am preaching, you are preaching’.

¹⁵ This noun has the secondary, euphemistic meaning of ‘toilet, lavatory’.

POLISH LEXICAL ELEMENT IN WESTERN UKRAINIAN

reprimand	догáна	нагáна	nagana
shot	пóстріл	вістріл	wystrzał
tributary	пріплив	доплив	dopływ

One strongly recurring characteristic of Western Ukrainian is a predilection for lexemes of ‘international’ (Latin or Graeco-Latin) origin established in Polish, whereas Eastern Ukrainian presents native formations or words of some other foreign origin.

a) Nouns

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
awning	навіс, тент	маркіза	markiza
bystander	постерігáч	обсервáтор	obserwator
congratulations	поздорóвлення	гратуляція	gratulacje
copy (of book)	примірни́к	егземпляр	egzemplarz
intermediary	посерéдник	медіáтор	mediator
investor	вкладник	інвéстор	inwestor
layman	мирянíн	ляі́к	laik
leftovers	недої́дки (pl.), зáлишок	рéшткí (pl.)	reszti (f. pl.)
parking lot	(авто)стоянка	пáркінг	parking
refectory	трапéзна	рефектáр	refektarz
refinery	нафтоперерóдний завод	рафіне́рія, рафіна́рня	rafineria
salary	платня́, заробі́тна пла́та	пéнсія	pensja
sodium	на́трій	сод	sod
syllable	склад	сіля́ба	sylaba

b) Adjectives

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
advanced	передóвий	заавансóваний	zaawansowany
honorary	почéсний	гонорóвий	honorowy
illegal	незакóнный	нелегáльний	nielegalny
inspiring	надихáючий	інспіра́ючий	inspirujący
irritating	драгі́вливий	іриту́ючий	irytujący
ostentatious	показни́й	остентаці́йний	ostentacyjny

c) Verbs

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
to bewilder	з/бентéжити	з/дезоріентува́ти	z/dezorientować
to decorate	прикраша́ти/прикраси́ти	у/декорува́ти	u/dekorować

GEOFFREY HULL AND HALYNA KOSCHARSKY

to honour	поважати	у/гону́рвати	u/honorować
to identify	отото́жнювати/отото́жнити	з/іденти́фікувати	z/identyfikować
to ill-treat	погано ста́витися до	зле трактува́ти	złe traktować
to vie	супернича́ти, змага́тися	ривалізува́ти	rywalizować

By contrast, sometimes one encounters the opposite phenomenon, with an internationalism in Eastern and Standard Ukrainian and a Slavonic form in Western Ukrainian:

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
cone	ко́нус	стіжо́к	stożek
costume	костю́м	стри́й	strój
Equator	еква́тор	рівни́к	równik
masterpiece	шеде́вр	архиді́ло	arcydzieło
motion (proposal)	пропози́ція	внесо́к	wniosek
pole (of earth)	полю́с	бігу́н	biegun
resident	резиде́нт ¹⁶	мешка́нець	mieszkaniec
somersault	сальтоморта́ле	переве́рт	przewrót ('roll')
subtitles	субті́три (m. pl.)	на́писи (m. pl.)	napisy (m. pl.)

There are a few noteworthy cases of internationalism used in both varieties of Ukrainian, but disagreeing formally on the choice of Latinate prefix, e.g. 'contraception': *контраце́пція* ~ WU. *антиконтце́пція* (P. *antykoncepcja*); 'immoral': *амора́льний* ~ WU. *немора́льний* (cf. P. *niemoralny*). Especially interesting are contrasts in which Eastern Ukrainian sides with Russian in adopting a French word, whereas Western Ukrainian, like Polish, has chosen its German counterpart, e.g. *жест* 'gesture' (< Fr. *geste*) ~ WU. *гест* (= P. *gest* < Ger. *Geste*).

An important subcategory of loanwords consists of nouns belonging to 'international' Latinate or Graeco-Latin lexical stratum which are typically masculine in Eastern Ukrainian (reflecting Russian usage), but feminine in Western Ukrainian, as in Polish:¹⁷

¹⁶ Less usual than *житель*.

¹⁷ Cf. also *нуль* 'nought, zero' (same form in Russian) ~ WU. *ну́ля*.

POLISH LEXICAL ELEMENT IN WESTERN UKRAINIAN

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
etiquette	етикéт	етикéта	etykieta
policy (document)	пóліс	поліса	polisa
heroin	героїн	героїна	heroína
itinerary	маршрут	маршрута	marszruta
model	макéт	макéта	makieta
paraffin	парафін	парафіна	parafina
prognosis	прогнóз	прогнóза	prognoza
saccharine	сахарїн	сахарїна	sacharyna
streamer	серпантін	серпентїна	serpentina

Indeed, the feminine option is so characteristic of Western Ukrainian that it sometimes disagrees with both Polish and Eastern Ukrainian in avoiding a masculine form, e.g. *сандáл* ‘sandal’ ~ WU. *сандáля* (~ P. *sandal*). On the other hand, one finds cases of Western Ukrainian preferring a masculine form to a feminine one, cf. *яхта* ‘yacht’ ~ WU. *яхт* (= P. *jacht*).

Another formal contrast concerns scientific words of Greek origin in *-ia* which continue to be accented on the suffix in Standard Ukrainian, but Western Ukrainian frequently imitates the Polish habit of stressing such words on the stem, as in Latin pronunciation, e.g. *шизофрeнїя* ‘schizophrenia’ ~ WU. *шизофрeнїя*, *схизофрeнїя* (= P. *schizophrenia*), *терaпїя* ‘therapy’ ~ WU. *терaпїя* (= P. *terapia*).¹⁸

Certain formal differences which emerged in our data do not fall into typological categories large enough to warrant individual treatment here. These are very numerous, and include:

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
book cover	обклáдинка	обкладка	okładka
bureaucracy	бюрократїя	бюрокрація	biurokracja
cigar	сигáра	сигáра, цигáра	cygaro
clergy	духівнїцтво	духовeнство	duchowieństwo
coarse	жорсткий	шорсткий	szorstki
column	колóна	колóмна	kolumna
to cower	шúлитися	скúлитися, скóрчитися	skulić się
crystal	кристáл	криштáль	kryształ
dogma	дóгма	дóгмат	dogmat
eastern	східний	східній	wschodni

¹⁸ Also *пневмонїя* ‘pneumonia’ ~ WU. *пневмóнїя*, not found in Polish.

GEOFFREY HULL AND HALYNA KOSCHARSKY

exam	екза́мен	егза́мін	egzamin
to float	пла́вати	плі́вати	pływać
furrow	борозна́	борозда́	bruzda
glutton	ненаже́ра	обжо́ра, жарло́к	żarłok
headline	заго́ловок	наго́ловок	nagłówek
to lament	жалкува́ти	жалува́ти	żałować
on the left	ліво́руч, з ліво́го бо́ку	по лі́вим бо́ці	po lewej (stronie)
mortgage	іпоте́ка	гіпоте́ка	hipoteka
nausea	нудо́та	ну́дність	nudności (f. pl.)
to paralyse	с/паралізува́ти	с/паралі́жувати	s/paraliżować
payday	платі́жний день	день ви́плати	dzień wypłaty
perfume	парфу́м	перфу́ми (pl.)	perfumy mpl.
phone book ¹⁹	телефо́нна кни́га	телефо́нічна кни́жка	książka telefoniczna
pickpocket	кишене́кóвий злоді́й	кишене́кóвець	kieszonkowiec
press (journalists)	пресе́	праса́	prasa
prize (winnings)	ві́граш	ві́грана	wygrana
producer (cinema)	продю́сер	продуце́нт	producent
prosecutor	прокуро́р	прокура́тор	prokurator
reef	риф	ра́фа	rafa
return trip	пове́рнення	поворо́т	powrót
on the right	право́руч, з пра́вого бо́ку	по пра́вим бо́ці	po prawej (stronie)
roadway	шо́се	шоса́	szosa
roll of film	руло́н фі́льму	ро́лька фі́льму	rolka filmu
round (boxing)	ра́унд	рунда́	runda
to sail	пливті́	плі́сти	po/płynąć
to scrape	скребті́, скребта́ти/скребну́ти	шкря́бати/шкря́бну́ти	skrobać/skrobnąć
seam	шов	шев, шво́	szew
set (noun)	комплéкт	комплéт	komplet
to shiver	дрижа́ти	здріга́тися, здрига́тися	za/drżeć
sketch	ескі́з	шкі́ц	szkic
sled, sleigh	са́ни, санча́та (pl.)	са́нки (pl.)	sanki (pl.)
to snarl, growl	гарча́ти	ворча́ти	warczeć
somewhat	де́що	не́що	nieco
south-eastern	півде́нно-схі́дний	полудне́во-схі́дний	południowo-wschodni
southern	півде́нний	полудне́вий	południowy
south-western	півде́нно-захі́дний	полудне́во-захі́дний	południowo-zachodni
to spark(le)	іскри́тися	іскри́тися	skrzyć się
spark plug	сві́чка запáлювання	запальна́ сві́чка	świeca zapłonowa
to splash (vt.)	плеска́ти/плесну́ти	плю́скати/плю́снути	pluskać
spoke (of wheel)	спи́ця	шпи́ця, шпри́ха	szprycha
spring (metal)	пру́жина	спру́жина	sprężyna
squinting	косоо́кий	зизоо́кий	zezowaty
to sulk	ду́тися	ду́сатися, надува́тися	dąsać się
towel	рушні́к	ручні́к	ręcznik
to trip (stumble)	спіткну́тися	поткну́тися	potykać się/potknąć się
uncontrollable	невгамо́в(а)ний	непомаго́ваний	niepohamowany
to wax	на/вощі́ти	на/воскува́ти	na/woskować
western	захі́дний	захі́дний	zachodni

¹⁹ A colloquial term; 'telephone directory' is *телефо́нний довідник*.

POLISH LEXICAL ELEMENT IN WESTERN UKRAINIAN

West Indies	Вест-Індія	Західні Індії	Indie Zachodnie
whirlpool	водовёрт (f.)	водний вир	wir wodny
windowsill	підвікóння	підвікóнник, підлокітник	podokiennik ('parapet')

2. Heteronyms

The heteronyms that follow in this section — full lexical contrasts where Western Ukrainian agrees with Polish against Eastern/Standard Ukrainian — are arranged according to general semantic fields.

a) Nature terms

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
blizzard	завірюха, хурта, хуртовина	заміття	zamieć (f.)
high tide	прилив	приплив	przyplływ
holly	падуб, гострокіст	вістряк	ostrokrzew
it's hailing	іде град	падає град	pada grad
it's raining	іде дощ	падає дощ	pada (deszcz)
kite (bird)	шуліка	кánя	kania
kitten	кошеня	кóтик	kociak
leap year	високóсний рік	перестúпний рік	rok przestępny
ravine	ущелина	узвіз	wąwóz
river bed	русло річки	коріто річки	koryto rzeki
slug	слизняк	нагий слимак	ślimak nagi
tortoiseshell	панцир черепахи	шільдкрет	szyl(d)kret
turtledove	гóрлиця	тúркавка	turkawka
wasteland	пустіще	невжитки (m. pl.)	nieużytek
weevil	довгонóсик	рийка	ryjkowiec

b) Human body

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
cyst	кіста	ціста	cysta
ear wax	вушна сірка	вушний віск	woskowina, woszczyna
groin	пах	пахвіна	pachwina
hip	стегно	бедро	biodro
molar	кутній зуб	черенний зуб	zab trzonowy
pelvis	таз	мидниця	miednica

c) Foodstuffs

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
currant	сморódина	порічка	porzeczka
dregs	óсад, осáдок	осáд, фúси (pl.)	osad, fusy (pl.)
fruit juice	фруктóвий сік	овочéвий сік	sok owocowy
giblets	потрухі	пóдроби	podroby, podróbki

GEOFFREY HULL AND HALYNA KOSCHARSKY

gin and tonic	джін-тoнік	джін з тoніком	dżin z tonikiem
peanut butter	арахісове мaсло	горіховe мaсло	masło orzechowe
peppermint drop	м'ятна цукерка	м'ятівнік	miętówka, miętus
pickles	соління	маринaтa	marynata
puff pastry	листокoве тiсто	французьке тiсто	ciasto francuskie
smoked ham	кoпчена шінка	вуджeна шінка	szynka wędzona
skim milk	знежирене молоко, худе молоко	збiране молоко	chude mleko
tomato sauce	томaтний соус	помідорoвий сос	sos pomidorowy
tripe	рyбці (m. pl.), тpиппa	флячки (m. pl.)	flaczki
whipped cream	збiтi вeршки (m. pl.)	збита сметaна	bita śmietana

d) Medical terms

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
infection	зараження	закaження	zakażenie
labour (at birth)	рoди, полoги (pl.)	пoрiд	poród
nausea	нудoга	млiсть, млoснiсть	mdłości (f. pl.)
poultice	припiрка	oклад	okład
sleeping pill	снодiйне	насонна таблeтка, таблeтка до спaння	tabletkę nasenna

e) Objects and materials

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
baby's bonnet	чeпчик	шiпoчка	czapeczka
car horn	гудoк	кляксон	klakson
clutch (in car)	мyфта	спряглo	sprzęgło
compartment	вiддiлення	передiл, передiлка	przedział
cork (in bottle)	прoбка	кoрок ²⁰	korek
dent	вм'ятина	вгнiщення	wgniecenie
department	вiддiлення	вiддiл	wydział
dish	блюдо	тарiлка, тaлiрка	talerz
flake	пушинка	платoк	płatek
gas mask	протигаз	газoва мaска	maska (przeciw)gazowa
gear (of car)	передaча	бiг	bieg
gear box	скрiнька передaч	скрiнька бiгiв	skrzynia biegów
handle	держaк	ручка	rączka
handrail	пoручень	пoруччя (pl.)	poręcz
hatchet	сокирка	топiр	topór
heater, radiator	oбiгрiвaч	oгрiвник	grzejnik
heirloom	фaмiльнa цiннiсть	рoдиннa пaм'яткa	pamiątka rodzinna
light globe	(електрична) лямпа	жарiвкa	żarówka
mast (of ship)	щoглa	машт	maszt
pickaxe	кiрка, кaйло	oскaрд	oskard
playing marble	крeм'яx	шклянa кyлькa	szklana kulka
provisions	зaпaси (m. pl.)	прoвiянт	prowiant

²⁰ *Kóрок* in Standard Ukrainian refers to the material alone.

POLISH LEXICAL ELEMENT IN WESTERN UKRAINIAN

rocking chair	крісло-гойдалка	колицьове крісло	krzesło kołyskowe ²¹
roll of film	фотоплівка	фільм	film
scrap	обрівок	скравок	skrawek
sealing wax	сургуч	ляк (до печатки)	lak (do pieczęci)
seat belt	ремінь безпеки	пояс безпеčnosti	pas bezpieczeństwa
shaving brush	помазók, щітка до гоління	пéнзель до голення	pędzel do golenia
shoe horn	ріжók для взуття	лóжка до взуття	łyżka do butów
socket (electrical)	штéпсельна розéтка	оправка	oprawka
spanner, wrench	гайковий ключ	ключ до шруб	klucz do śrub
speaker (machine)	рупор	голоснік	głośnik
steamroller	паровий котók	паровий вáлець	walec parowy
trousseau, dowry	пóсаг, придáne	пóсаг, віно	posag, wiano ('dowry')
visor	козирók	дашók	daszek

f) People

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
bouncer (in club)	вибивáла	викида́йло	wykidajło
boxer	п'ястукáр	боксéр	bokser
caretaker	двірнік	дозóрець	dozorca
chatterbox	бáзіка	па́пля	papla
citizen	громадя́нин	обивáтель ²²	obywatel
conscript	призовнік	поборóвий	poborowy
dandy	фра́нт	мо́дник, елeгáнт	modniś, elegant
dealer, trader	торгóвець	гандля́р	handlarz
doorman	воротáр, швeйцáр	швайцáр	szwajcar ('portier')
employer	наймáч, робо́тода́вець	працеда́вець	pracodawca
foundling	по́кидко, підки́дьок	(з)на́йда, (з)на́йдух ²³	znajda
fraudster	шахра́й	ошу́ста, ²⁴ ошукáнець	oszust, oszukaniec
goalkeeper	воротáр	бра́мкар	bramkarz
greengrocer	овочeвий	зеле́няр	zieleniarz
hotelier	госпо́дар готeлю	готеля́р	hotelarz
hunter	мисли́вець, eгер	мисли́вий, eгер	myśliwy
invader	зага́рбник	на́їздник	najeźdźca
lawyer	ю́рист, адво́кат	меце́нас, адво́кат	mecenas, adwokat
murderer	уби́вця	мордiвни́к, ²⁵ забiйник	morderca, zabójca
official	службо́вець	у́рядник	urzędnik
offender	пору́шник	просту́пник	przestępca

²¹ Standard Polish *fotel bujany/ bujający* or *krzesło bujające*.

²² This noun in Eastern Ukrainian has the meanings 'resident', 'inhabitant', 'man in the street' and 'philistine'.

²³ The feminine forms of these are: *покидька, підкидька; (з)найденя, (з)найдушка*.

²⁴ This word is probably the etymon of the American slang term *shyster*, which seems to have been contributed to the regional English of New York by Polish or Ukrainian Jews.

²⁵ The verb on which this noun is based, *мордувати*, is an intra-Ukrainian false cognate, meaning 'to murder' in the West, but 'to torture' in the East.

GEOFFREY HULL AND HALYNA KOSCHARSKY

philistine	міщанин, обиватель	філістер	filister
receptionist	ресстратор	рецепціоніст (f. -ка)	recepcjonist (f. -ka)
recipient	одержувач	відбирач	odbiorca
sentry	вартовий	вартівник	wartownik
settler	поселенець	осадник	osadnik
shoplifter	крамнічний злодій	склеповий злодій	złodziej sklepowy
sissy	пестунчик	мамин синок	maminsynek
supporter	прибічник	сторонник	stronnik
warrior	воїн	войовник	wojownik

g) Civil life

English

agreement, pact
 conscription
 coup d'état
 curfew
 eaves
 flag at half-mast

front door
 grocery shop
 junior high school
 management
 mint (place)
 nursing home
 petrol station

racing track
 rail (of track)
 (railway) track
 reception (desk)
 right of way

road block
 sawmill
 settlement
 team
 trade
 trademark
 traffic lights

Standard Ukr.

договір
 набір
 (державний) переворот
 комендантська година
 карніз
 припущений прапор

парадні двері
 бакалія
 середня школа
 управління
 монетний двір
 будинок престарілих
 автозаправна станція,
 бензоколонка

бігова доріжка
 рейка
 колія
 ресстратура, приймальня
 право проїзду

доріжний блок
 лісопилька
 оселення
 команда
 торгівля
 фабрична марка
 світлофор

Western Ukr.

уклад
 побір
 замах стану
 поліційна година
 о́кап, карніз
 прапор спущений до
 половини машту
 вхідні двері
 споживчий склеп
 гімназія, гімназія
 дирекція
 минниця
 дім спокійної старости
 бензинова стация

біжня
 шина
 тор
 рецєпція
 першенство (переїзду)

доріжня бльокада
 тартак
 осада
 дружина
 гандель
 фірмовий знак
 світлова сигналізація,
 (coll.) світла (neut. pl.)

Polish

układ
 pobór
 zamach stanu
 godzina policyjna
 okap
 flaga opuszczona do
 połowy masztu
 drzwi wejściowe
 sklep spożywczy
 gimnazjum
 dyrekcja
 mennica
 dom spokojnej starości
 stacja benzynowa

bieżnia
 szyna
 tor
 recepcja
 pierwszeństwo
 (przejazdu)
 blokada drogi
 tartak
 osada
 drużyna
 handel
 znak firmowy
 sygnalizacja świetlna,
 (coll.) światła (neut. pl.)

POLISH LEXICAL ELEMENT IN WESTERN UKRAINIAN

h) Social Terms

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
birthday	день народження	уродіни (pl.)	urodziny (pl.)
bout (match)	зустріч	посідинок	pojedynek
boxing	п'ястукарство, боксування	бокс	boks
burglary	пограбування	айнбрух	ajnbruch ²⁶
caleshop	кондитерська	тісткарня	ciastkarnia
dining room	їдальня	столова	pokój stołowy
enclosure (in letter)	укладка	залучник	załącznik
enrolment	реєстрація	записи (m. pl.)	zapisy (m. pl.)
goal(post)	ворота (pl.)	брамка	bramka
greeting	вітання	поздоровлення	pozdrawienie
handwriting	рукопис	письмо	pismo, charakter pisma
handshake	рукотискання	стискання руки, утиск руки	uścisk dłoni
hint (noun)	на́тяк	алюзія	aluzja
hiding place	схованка, тайник, сховок	криївка	kryjówka
hire (noun)	наймання, прокат	на́єм, вінаєм	wynajem
illegitimate (child)	незаконнороджений	нешлюбний	nieślubny
market stall	я́тка	я́рмарочна буда	buda jarmarczna
menu	меню, стравопіс	карта	karta
room and board	проживання та харчування	кімната з проживанням	pokój z wyżywieniem
scoreboard	табло́	таблиця пунктів	tablica wyników
shipwreck	корабельна аварія	корабельна катастрофа, розбиття корабля	katastrofa morska, rozbicie statku
skating	ковзання, со́вгання	лижва́рство	łyżwiarstwo
sketch (rough)	на́черк	за́рис	zarys
switchboard	телефонний комута́тор	телефонічна центрáля	centrala telefoniczna
traffic jam	дорóжній затóр, прóбка	кóрки (pl.) (на дорóгах)	korek

i) Religious terms

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
denomination	віроіспові́дання	віровизна́ння	wyznanie (wiary)
heresy	єресь	герезія	herezja
heretic	єрє́тик	герє́тик	heretyk
holy water	свята́ вода́, агіасма	свя́чена вода́	woda święcona
hymn	гі́мн	гимн	hymn
Palm Sunday	Вє́рбна Неді́ля	Кві́тна Неді́ля	Kwietna Niedziela, ²⁷ Niedziela Palmowa
sacristan	рі́зник	захри́стіян	zakrystian, kościelny
sermon	про́повідь	про́повідь, каза́ння, каза́нь	kazanie
Whitsunday	Зелє́на Неді́ля	Зелє́ні Св'я́та (pl.)	Zielone Świątki (pl.)

²⁶ Polish Galician dialect form from German *Einbruch*; the standard Polish term is *włamanie*.

²⁷ Also *Wierzbna Niedziela*, as in Eastern Ukrainian.

j) Abstract nouns

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
anxiety	турбота	обава, непокій	obawa, niepokój
breeding	розведення	годівля	hodowla
contempt	презирство	погорда	pogarda
co-operation	співробітництво	співпраця	współpraca
emphasis	наголос	натиск, притиск	nacisk, przycisk
error	помилка	блуд	błąd
form	форма	кшталт, форма	kształt, forma
humiliation	приниження	упокорення	upokorzenie
imagination	уява	виображення	wyobraźnia
impoverishment	збіднення	зубожіння	zubożenie
impudence	нахабність	безчельність	bezczelność
inclination	схильність, прихильність	склонність	skłonność
inconvenience	незручність	невигода, недогода	niewygoda
invasion	вто́ргнення	інва́зія	inwazja
kick	удар ногою	копняк	kopniak
leap	стрибок	скок	skok
level	рівень	позем	poziom
memory (recollection)	зга́дка, спога́д	спомин	wspomnienie
objection	заперечення	спротив	sprzeciw
oblivion	забуття	запо́мин	zapomnienie
occupation	заняття	завід	zawód
pattern	зразок	взір	wzór
pollution	забруднення	занечіщення	zanieczyszczenie
population	населення	людність	ludność
possession	володіння	посідання	posiadanie
pretence	удавання	позори (m. pl.)	pozory (m. pl.)
refund	оплата	зворот (коштів)	zwrot (pienędzy)
relief	полéгшення	пільга, фольга	ulga ²⁸
ridicule	висміювання	посміховисько	pośmiewisko
security	безпе́ка	безпечність	bezpieczeństwo
subsidy	субсидія	дота́ція	dotacja
surplus	зайві́на	на́двшка ²⁹	nadwyżka
surveillance	на́гляд	на́дзір	nadzór
trot	ри́сь (f.)	клу́с, ри́сь (f.)	kłus
violence	насі́льство, наси́лля	гвалт ³⁰	gwałt, przemoc

²⁸ The Polish cognate *folga* means ‘indulgence’.

²⁹ A false friend of EU. *надвшка* ‘increase, rise’, ‘surcharge’.

³⁰ Eastern Ukrainian *гвалт* means ‘uproar, hubbub’.

POLISH LEXICAL ELEMENT IN WESTERN UKRAINIAN

k) Adjectives and adverbs

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
bearable	стерпний	зно́сний	znośny
check(er)ed	карта́тий	в кра́ти, в гра́ти	w kratę
contemptuous	презі́рливий	пого́рдливий	pogardliwy
exemplary	зразко́вий, взірце́вий	при́кладний	przykładowy
foreign	закордо́нний	загра́нїчний	zagraniczny
grouchy	сварлі́вий	гди́рлівий	gderliwy
handmade	ручно́ї робо́ти	зро́блений ру́чно	wykonany ręcznie
humiliating	прини́жуючий, прини́зливий	упоко́ряючий	upokarzający
imaginary	уя́вний	уро́сний	urojony
immune	неспри́нятливий	відпо́рний	odporny
imperceptible	непо́мітний	незава́жливий	nieważalny
impertinent	зухва́лий	безчи́льний	bezczelny
inconvenient	незру́чний	неви́гідний, недого́дний, недогі́дний	niedogodny
incredible	неймо́вірний	невірогі́дний	niewarygodny
indiscreet	нескро́мний	недискре́тний	niewarygodny
impertinent	зухва́лий	безчи́льний	bezczelny
likely	імо́вірний	правопо́дібний	prawdopodobny
naked	го́лий	нагі́й	nagi
rather	кра́ще, шви́дше	ра́дше	raczej
revolting, vile	оги́дний	паску́дний	paskudny
separate	окре́мий	відді́льний	oddzielny
skilful	хисткі́й	бі́глий ³¹	biegły
slack (loose)	ві́льний	лю́жний	luźny
soluble	розчи́нний	розпуска́льний	rozpuszczalny
spoil (child)	зіпсо́ваний	розпе́шений	rozpieszczony
stiff	негну́чкий	шти́вний	sztwywny
stray (adj.)	бродя́чий	зблү́каний	zabłąkany
unfriendly	недру́жний	недри́язний	nieprzyjazny
United States	Сполу́чені Шта́ти	З'є́днані Шта́ти/Ста́ни	Stany Zjednoczone
unkind	нелю́бий	неми́лий ³²	niemiły
vigilant	пи́льний ³³	чу́йний	czujny

³¹ As well as Pan-Ukrainian *умілий* and *вправний*.

³² A false friend meaning 'unloved; disliked' in Eastern Ukrainian.

³³ Both adjectives here are false cognates: *чу́йний* in Eastern Ukrainian means 'discreet, considerate'; Western Ukrainian *пи́льний* means 'diligent, industrious'.

1) Verbs

English	Standard Ukr.	Western Ukr.	Polish
to back chat	наха́бно відпові́дати	пискува́ти	pyskować
to breed	розво́дити/розве́сти	вигодо́вувати/виго́дувати	wy/hodować
to cash (a cheque)	за/інкасува́ти	з/реалізува́ти	z/realizować
to change (clothes)	переодяга́тися/ переоднягну́тися	перебира́тися/ перебра́тися	przebierać się/przebrać się
to deal, trade	торгува́ти	гандлюва́ти	handlować
to depress	засму́чувати/ засму́тити	пригно́блювати/ пригно́бити	przygnębiać/przygnębić
to enclose (insert)	укладáти/укла́сти	залучáти/залучíти	załączać/ załączyć
to enrol	за/реєструва́ти	записува́ти/записа́ти	zapisywać/zapisać
to honk (a horn)	по/гудíти	за/трубíти	za/trąbić
to humiliate	прині́жувати/прині́жити	упокóрювати/упокóрити	upokarzać/upokorzyć
to impoverish	збіднювати/збідніти	зубóжувати/зубóжити	zubożać/zubożyć
to include	включáти/включíти	обійма́ти/обійня́ти	obejmować/objąć
to interrogate	допíтувати/допита́ти	переслу́хувати/переслу́хати	przesłuchiwać/ przesłuchać
to irrigate	зро́шувати/зросíти	наводнювати/наводніти	obejmować/objąć
to jerk	смі́кати/смікну́ти	ша́рпати/шарпну́ти	szarpać/szarpnąć
to nod (in assent)	кива́ти/кивну́ти голово́ю	прита́кувати/притакну́ти	prztykawać/prztyknąć
to omit	пропусkáти/пропусти́ти	помина́ти/помину́ти	pomijać/pominać
to peck	клюва́ти/клюну́ти	дзьоба́ти/дзьобну́ти	dziobać/dziobnąć
to prattle	лепетáти	папля́ти	paplać
to prune	обріза́ти/обріза́ти	обтина́ти/обтя́ти	przycinać/przyciąć
to ramble on	говорíти нев'язно	розво́дитися	rozwódzić się
to record (sound)	записува́ти/записа́ти	награвáти/награ́ти	zapisywać/zapisać
to rely on	полкладáтися на	поляга́ти на	polegać na
to restrict	обме́жувати/обме́жити	огранича́ти/ограни́чити	ograniczać/ograniczyć
to retreat	відступáти/відступи́ти	цо́фати/цо́фнути	wycofywać/wycofać
to retrieve	поверта́ти/поверну́ти собі	відзіскувати/відзіскати	odzyskiwać/odzyskać
to roar	ре́вти, реві́ти/ревну́ти	рича́ти, рика́ти/рикну́ти	za/ryczeć
to scrub	по/чи́стити щіткою	ві́/шурува́ти	wy/szorować
to shine (shoes)	по/чи́стити	ві́/глянсува́ти	wy/głansować
to shrink (vi.)	зсіда́тися	скорчува́тися/скóрчитися, сичáвати	s/kurczyc się
to smear	по/масти́ти	розсмарóвувати/ розсмарува́ти	rozsmarowywać/ rozsmarować
to spend (money)	ві́тратити/ві́тратити	видава́ти/ві́дати	wydawać/wydać
to sue	переслі́дувати	позивáти/позва́ти	pozywać/pozwać
to switch off	вимика́ти/вимкну́ти	вилу́чувати/влучíти	wyłączać/wyłączyć
to take (medicine)	пі́ти/випи́ти, бра́ти/взя́ти	бра́ти/взя́ти, заживáти/зажі́ти	brać/wziąć, zażywać/zażyć
to tighten	стіскувати/стіска́ти	затісню́ти/затісні́ти	zacieśniać/zacieśnić
to type(write)	ві́/друкува́ти на машинці	на/писа́ти на машині	na/pisać na maszynie
to undress	роздяга́ти/роздягті́	розбира́ти/розібра́ти	rozbierać/rozebrać
to unwind	розмотóувати/розмотáти	розвивáти/розвіну́ти ³⁴	rozwiązać/rozwinąć

³⁴ In Eastern Ukrainian this verb is used only in the figurative sense of 'to develop, evolve'.

Conclusion

Our three surveys to date have cumulatively identified more than 3,000 cases of lexical polymorphism in Ukrainian, each of which invites further investigation on the chronological, geographical and social planes. The task ahead, most appropriate for linguists working on the ground in Ukraine itself, is to test this data against the reality of current speech patterns along the sociolinguistic spectrum in the western provinces of the country, and to report on the current synchronic realities. Comparing the retention rates of idiosyncratic and Polonoid vocabulary in the home territories with the conservative lexical inventory of the diaspora in Australia, the Americas and elsewhere will make an important contribution to the study of the recent and current evolution of the Ukrainian language.

REFERENCES

- Andrusyshen, Constantine Henry and James N. Krett (1955, 1957). *Українсько-англійський словник. Ukrainian-English Dictionary*. Saskatoon: The Gospel Press, and Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Antonenko-Davydovych, Borys (1979). *Як ми говоримо*. New York, Baltimore and Toronto: V. Symonenko Smoloskyp.
- Bilaniuk, Laada (1997). 'Speaking of *Surzhyk*: Ideologies and Mixed Languages'. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies XXI* (1/2), 47-78.
- Busela, V.T. (2001). *Словник: англійсько-український, українсько-англійський: Dictionary: English Ukrainian, Ukrainian-English*. Kyiv: Irpin'.
- Dejko, Maria (1979). *Українсько-англійський словник широкого вжитку. Ukrainian-English Dictionary for Popular Use*. (Vol. I) London and Melbourne: 'Our Language/Ridna Mova' Publishing.

- (1979). *Англійсько-український словник широкого вжитку. English-Ukrainian Dictionary for Popular Use*. (Vol. II) London and Melbourne: 'Our Language/Ridna Mova' Publishing.
- Holova red. kolehii ak. I. K. Bilodid (1970-1980). *Словник української мови*. Vydavnytstvo 'Naukova Dumka', Akademia Nauk Ukr. RSR, Kyiv. 11 vols.
- Holoskevych, Hryhorii (1930; 8th ed. 1955). *Правописний словник*. New York: A. Bilous.
- Holovashchuk, S. I, M. M. Peshchak, V. M. Rusanivskyi and O. O. Taranenko (1994, 1999). *Орфографічний словник української мови*. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo 'Dovira'.
- Hull, Geoffrey and Halyna Koscharsky (2006). 'Contours and Consequences of the Lexical Divide in Ukrainian'. *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies*, 20 (1-2), 139-172.
- (2014a) *Western Ukrainian and Standard Ukrainian: A Learner's Guide to Lexical Differences*. Kyiv: Vydavnychi Dim Kyievo-Mohylianska Akademia.
- (2014b) 'Towards a description of pre-war Galician Ukrainian'. *Journal of Language, Literature and Culture*, 61 (3), Leeds : Maney Publishing, 177-191.
- Khobzej, Natalia, Sinovych, Ksenia, Jastremska, Tetiana and Dydyk-Meush, Hanna (2009). *Лексикон львівський: Поважно і на жарт*. L'viv: Natsionalna Akademia Nauk Ukraïny, Instytut Ukrajinoznnavstva im. I. Kryp'yakevycha.
- Koscharsky, Halyna and Geoffrey Hull (2009). 'Maintaining the Standard Ukrainian Language: A Challenge for Teachers in Australia'. *Review of European Studies*, 1 (1), Toronto: Canadian Center of Science and Education, 16-22.

POLISH LEXICAL ELEMENT IN WESTERN UKRAINIAN

- Kurzowa, Zofia (1983). *Polszczyzna Lwowa i Kresów Południowo-Wschodnich do 1939 roku*. Warsaw: Państwowe wydawn. Naukowe.
- Lew, Wasyl and Iwan Werbianyj (1947). *Англійсько-український та українсько-англійський словник: An English-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-English Dictionary*. 2 vols. Nuremberg: Newspaper 'Czas' and Bayreuth: Cooperatives 'Pracia' and 'Plast'.
- Luckyj, George (1971). *Between Gogol and Ševčenko: Polarity in Literary Ukraine 1798-1847*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Martel, Antoine (1938). *La langue polonaise dans les pays ruthènes: Ukraine et Russie Blanche 1569-1667*. Lille: Travaux et mémoires de l'Université de Lille, Nouvelle série, Droit et lettres, 20.
- Matviias, I. H ed. (1984, 1988, 1992). *Атлас української мови [AUM]* 3 vols. Kyiv: Naukova dumka (Akademia nauk ukraïns'koï RSR, Instytut movoznavstva im. O. O. Potebni, Instytut suspil'nykh nauk).
- Miuller, V, M. Zubkov and V. Fedienko. *Сучасний словник англо-український українсько-англійський* (2017). Kyiv: Shkola Vydavnychyj Dim.
- Niniows'kyi, Wasyl (1985). *Ukrainian-English and English-Ukrainian Dictionary*. Edmonton: Ukrainian Bookstore.
- Podvez'ko, Mykhailo (1957). *Українсько-англійський словник*. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo 'Radians'ka shkola'.
- Podvez'ko, Mykhailo and Mykhailo Balla (1974). *Англо-український словник*. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo 'Radians'ka shkola'.
- Richhardt, Rosemarie (1957). *Polnische Lehnwörter im Ukrainischen*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Rudnyckyj, Jaroslav B. (1966). *An Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language*. Winnipeg: Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences.

- (1978). *Українська мова: її початки, історія й говори*. (5th ed.). Sydney/Canberra: Ukrainian Studies Foundation in Australia.
- Ruszel, Ryszard (1992). *Wesoła gwara lwowska*. Warsaw: Wydawn. 'Pagina'.
- Sherekh, Yuri (1949). *Галичина в формуванні нової української літературної мови*. Munich; rpt. Department of Slavic Languages, University of Alberta, n.d.
- Shevelov, George Y. [Yuri Sherekh] (1989). *The Ukrainian Language in the First Half of the Twentieth Century (1900-1941): Its State and Status*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- (1965). *A Prehistory of Slavic: The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- (1966). *Die Ukrainische Schriftsprache 1798-1965: Ihre Entwicklung unter dem Einfluß der Dialekte*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- (1980). 'Ukrainian'. In Alexander M. Schenker and Edward Stankiewicz (eds.). *The Slavic Literary Languages: Formation and Development*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies, pp. 143-160.
- (1993). 'Ukrainian'. In Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett (eds.). *The Slavonic Languages*. London: Routledge, pp. 947-998.
- Shevchenko, L. I., D. V. Derhach and I. V. Shmatko (2013). *Сучасний англо-український українсько-англійський словник*. Kyiv: Arii.
- Shymkiw, Anna (2004). *English-Ukrainian Explanatory Dictionary of Economic Terms/Англо-український тлумачний словник економічної лексики*. Kyiv: Mohyla Academy Publishing House.

POLISH LEXICAL ELEMENT IN WESTERN UKRAINIAN

- Simovyč, V. and Rudnyckyj, J.B (1982). 'The History of Ukrainian Orthography'. In Volodymyr Kubijovyč (ed.). *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopædia, Vol. 1*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp. 517–18.
- Strikha, Maksym (2001). 'Language and Language Policy in Ukraine'. *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, 26 (1-2), 239-248.
- Subtelny, Orest (1988). *Ukraine: A History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Zacharkiw, V. (1945). *Українсько-англійський словник*. Regensburg: Mykhailo Borets'kyj.
- Zhluktenko, Jurii O., H. M. Bykhovets', A. V. Shvants (1982). *Українсько-англійський словник*. Kyiv: 'Radians'ka Shkola'.
- Zhluktenko, Jurii O. (1984). *Англо-український словник*. Kyiv: 'Radians'ka Shkola'.

KATYA JORDAN

A CROCHET NEEDLE VERSUS A QUILL PEN:
NEGOTIATING FASHION AND EDUCATION IN THE
NINETEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIAN WOMEN'S PRESS

“A grand piano used as furniture indicates that a woman only needs to pass time, whereas a sewing machine indicates that the woman has a desire to bring serious benefit to her family” (‘Fel’eton. Slova dva o shveinykh mashinakh’ 1869, 322).¹ This observation, published in a women’s magazine at the height of the Era of Great Reforms, was symptomatic of socio-political and cultural developments that were taking place in Russia in the late 1860s - early 1870s. At this time, debates surrounding women’s rights naturally spilled onto the pages of women’s periodicals that, in addition to providing a written record of the changes transpiring in Russian society, to a large extent drove these changes. One such magazine, *The Vase* (*Vaza*), which was founded by Elizaveta Safonova in 1832 and published regularly for over fifty years (the first forty of which it was run exclusively by women), constitutes a unique case of early women’s journalism and entrepreneurship in Imperial Russia. However, despite a recent increase in scholarly interest towards Russian women’s early journalistic efforts, the place of *The Vase* in nineteenth-century public discourse has thus far been largely overlooked.² The purpose of this paper is to place *The Vase* within a larger context of the Russian fashion press. To that end, I will first trace the evolution of *The*

¹ All translations from Russian are mine except where noted.

² *An Improper Profession: Women, Gender, and Journalism in Late Imperial Russia* by Norton and Gheith (2001) constitutes an important milestone in women and journalism studies; nevertheless, *The Vase* is mentioned in this edited volume only in passing.

KATYA JORDAN

Vase from a series of fashion plates to a well established, multifaceted, and widely circulated periodical addressing women's private, as well as public concerns. Secondly, I will examine an episode in the history of *The Vase* that illustrates the magazine's engagement in public polemics surrounding the question of women's education and, thirdly, show how early feminist expression in Russia sought to reframe gender relations within an accepted family structure while also reconciling such values as fashionable dress and the right to education. To that end, I will draw on evidence found in *The Vase* and other periodicals from the 1860s-70s, as well as memoirs and official correspondence from the same period.

Fashion and Social Reform Under Peter I and Catherine II

Russian feminism, Jehanne Gheith argues, is "something that has proven difficult for most Western researchers of Russia's women" (Gheith 2001, 5). Particularly in the nineteenth century, this attempt to perceive a woman's role in a new way exhibited some unique characteristics conditioned by Russia's national culture. Gheith (ibid., 5-6) explains:

While a number of the women [...] may be 'feminist' in (some) present-day Western definitions, it is also true that most of these women emphatically refused the term for themselves. This disjuncture is partly due to a difference in interpretation: Russians usually considered feminism to be a narrow movement, a Western import that necessarily built barriers between men and women, and [...] deflected energy from the larger cause of transforming Russian society.

19TH-CENTURY RUSSIAN WOMEN'S PRESS

At the same time, journalistic communication too is subject to “different national manifestations” and “variations in form” (Sims 2009, 9).³ In Russia specifically, in the words of Robert Maguire, journalism was one of “the principal means” by which the country “has discovered, defined, and shaped itself” (Maguire 1997, 2), and within this important trade, Christine Ruane identifies the fashion press as an instrument not only for changing how the Russians thought about the clothes that they wore but also for “providing a forum for a serious cultural debate about the place of Russia in the modern world” (Ruane 2001, 74). Thus, both Russian journalism and Russian women’s studies may benefit from a focused cultural approach.⁴

Women’s sartorial fashion began to play a serious role in the transformation of Russian society in the late 1600s, when a young Peter I ascended the throne. The new political institutions that Peter established were meant to bring the country out of obscurity and transform the archaic Muscovite system of government into a semblance of a modern bureaucratic state. As part of his large-scale modernisation project for Russia, Peter intended to Westernise the service élites. In order to staff the new system, he had to either find or make ‘new kinds of individuals’ — both men and women (Engel 2004, 5). This step required women to leave the confines of women’s quarters, or *terem*, and begin attending public events, alongside their male counterparts. To that end, in 1701 Peter issued law No. 1887 that required both women and men to wear German footwear and dress (see *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii* 1830, 182). This law explicitly established a strong connection between one’s presence in the public sphere and the style of her or his clothes. This requirement affected Russian noblewomen more than noblemen, because women had to not only assume new looks

³ On historical and cultural aspects of the development of journalism, see Chalaby (1996).

⁴ For more on the ‘domestic vs. international dichotomy’ in Russian gender studies, see Temkina and Zdravomyslova (2003) and Grünell (1998).

but also engage in new behaviours in a new space. Engel explains: “Revealing their flesh in Western-style clothing, enjoying the pleasures of mixed society, rearing their sons in the appropriate Petrine spirit, élite women would serve the state as men did, but in a different fashion” (ibid., 5-6). The young emperor’s attempts at creating a new socio-political order in Russia essentially reshaped both the personal and the public lives of Russian noblewomen.

While attending plays and assemblies in Western-style clothing made women’s bodies more visible, to make their voices more audible, Russia’s journalistic practices had to evolve. Catherine II, who purported to continue Peter’s enlightened reforms, herself dabbled in writing and publishing works for a general audience. However, not until 1779, when Nikolay Novikov began publishing his *Fashionable Monthly, or the Library for Women’s Dress* (*Modnyi zhurnal, ili biblioteka dlia damskogo tualeta*), were Russian women formally invited to enter public discourse (Sokol’skaia 2006, 19-20). Novikov expressed the hope that “our Ladies [would] devote a few minutes, minutes something idle during their *toilettes*, to read our pages” (quoted in Hammarberg 2007, 84); he also invited his readers to submit their work for publication in his magazine. Novikov embraced both meanings of the word ‘fashionable’: while certain sections of the magazine were devoted to the latest fashions in clothing and in literature, he also hoped that ladies in his audience would make the very process of reading fashionable as well.

Evolution of *The Vase*

Although *Fashionable Monthly* shut down after one year, it spearheaded the process of turning Russian women into readers. Novikov’s lead was followed by other short-lived projects of a similar kind. Between 1779 and the 1890s, approximately forty

19TH-CENTURY RUSSIAN WOMEN'S PRESS

magazines of those published in Russia were addressed to women.⁵ Most of these magazines focused either on literature or on fashion. They were printed in Moscow or St. Petersburg and sold by subscription, both locally and in the provinces. As a general rule, none of these periodicals remained in print for more than three years, making *The Vase* a truly unique case of journalistic longevity. Published from 1832 to 1884, it became the only magazine for women that stayed on the market for over fifty years, outlasting all of its competitors.⁶ To a large extent, this success may be explained by the editors' ability to combine literary and fashionable content under one cover.

Initially *The Vase* was simply a collection of Parisian fashion plates. Its founder and the first publisher-editor, Elizaveta Safonova, was a government clerk's widow from Moscow who turned to the publishing business seeking means of financial support for herself and her children.⁷ If Catherine's publishing ventures from the previous century are not taken into account (after all, as an Empress she had few constraints), Safonova can be considered the first female publisher in Russia.

Intending to help educated women to become better homemakers on all fronts, in 1847 Safonova widened the scope of *The Vase* to include fashion news columns,

⁵ For comparison, in the USA the number was much higher. According to Amy Beth Aronson, "[b]y the 1820s, women's magazines appeared in virtually every city or town large enough to have a printing press [...] Between 1790 and 1830, 24 women's magazines appeared in Philadelphia alone; 20 in New York, 38 in New England, 14 in the South; and 16 in the Western territories. Compare that with American magazine production overall: in 1800, about 12 magazines were in print; by 1810, the figure was up to 40; and by 1825, there were just more than 100 magazines total in the young country" (2002, 2).

⁶ Lisovskii (1915, 77) gives 1831 as a start date but Safonova (1868, 701) herself mentions 1832 in a letter to her readers.

⁷ Safonova was also a sister-in-law of the famous Russian historian, translator, and editor N.A. Polevoi, which may partially explain her familiarity with the publishing business. However, there is no direct evidence that she received help from any of her relatives. See Golitsyn (1889, 221) and Polevoi (1888, 659).

KATYA JORDAN

needlepoint instructions and patterns, and household tips on how to buff floors, make ink, store lamps for the summer, and so forth.⁸ After relocating from Moscow to St. Petersburg, Safonova continued to publish and edit *The Vase* until 1869, at which point Zhozefina Gedeonova became a new publisher and editor. After four decades of comparative stability, in 1873 Stanislav Okreits became the publisher of *The Vase* for a few months. Later the same year he was replaced by B.I. Sestrzhentsevich-Bogush, who was the sole publisher from 1873 to 1882, after which he shared his responsibilities with S. Lepkovskaia. Gedeonova continued editing the magazine until 1879, even after stepping down as publisher (Lisovskii 1915, 77).

Early issues of the magazine contained no advertisements, except for a semi-annual announcement of an open subscription to *The Vase*. Relying on subscription revenue alone was a calculated risk, for most Russian noblewomen could sew, having learned the craft either at home or at a finishing school. In an effort to train girls to become not only enlightened citizens, but also mothers and household managers, Catherine the Great made sewing a mandatory class for all students regardless of their parents' rank when in 1764 she founded the first educational institution and finishing school for girls, the Smolny Institute (Ruane 2004, 52; Engel 2004, 16). In her view, sewing was a trade that would enable a woman to either make clothes for her family or to provide her with employment and a source of income, however unlikely such a scenario would have been in actuality. This tradition, nevertheless, once started by Catherine, was followed for decades until a century later it was justified by yet another consideration. As David Doughan explains, with the emergence of lower middle classes in the nineteenth century, women felt the desire to “act as their own dressmak-

⁸ Safonova's intended audience included 'educated women' from a wide variety of socio-economic groups: gentry, merchants' wives and daughters, as well as *raznochintsy* (people of diverse ranks) — anyone who had the means, the interest, and the necessity to dress fashionably. See, for example, 'Vaza, zhurnal shit'ia, vyshivan'ia i domashnei ekonomii, na 1853 god', 1853, 2.

19TH-CENTURY RUSSIAN WOMEN'S PRESS

er” in order “to go beyond rustic simplicity or urban drabness”, in the hope of attaining “as much of the elegance and sophistication of upper-class life as was possible” with a limited budget (Doughan 1987, 262).⁹

Yet, as permutations of the magazine’s subtitle indicate, sewing was not the only concern of *The Vase*. The official name of Safonova’s magazine never changed in the course of its entire half-century existence, but its self-concept was in flux almost constantly. It started simply as *The Vase: A Periodical*, but two decades later, in 1851, it became *The Vase: A Magazine of Sewing, Embroidery, Rural and Urban Economy*. After three years, the topic of agriculture was dropped, making it *A Magazine of Ladies’ Crafts, Fashions and Home Economy*. In 1853 ‘ladies’ crafts’ turned into specifically ‘sewing and embroidery’, and in 1858 ‘literature’, ‘art’, and ‘news’ were added to the front end of the title, turning *The Vase* into a *Literary and Art Magazine of Secular News, Fashions, Home Economics, and Crafts*. In the 1860s, its gender specialisation became explicitly stated, turning *The Vase* into *Ladies’ Magazine, Devoted to Fashions, Crafts, Literature, Art, and Home Economics*. In the same decade, its simple logo, which used to contain only the magazine’s name in stylised letters, was replaced with a more elaborate one, featuring several women of various ages, some doing needlework and others reading intently. After a few changes, in 1881 the logo assumed its most sophisticated version: it consisted of a laurel wreath that surrounded the magazine’s name, behind which a large crochet needle and a quill pen formed an X. Underneath the wreath, on the left, a smartly dressed couple and a young girl were handing issues of *The Vase* to each other, and on the right, another woman and a girl were showing the magazine to an elderly woman knitting what

⁹ Doughan draws this conclusion after studying the rise of British women’s periodicals. Although Russia’s economic reforms followed a different timeline than Britain’s, the principle that Doughan observes is applicable in both contexts.

looks like a stocking (fig. 1). This mix of ages and genders signalled the all-encompassing nature of *The Vase*: it offered something for everyone, appealing to women of all ages (without excluding men) and catering equally to those who liked to read and those who preferred to craft.



Fig. 1. *The Vase*. 1 April 1881, cover.

Inside the magazine, pictures of models became more elaborate over time, as well. If in earlier issues an isolated young female model was shown against a white background, with time models of various ages could be seen in a living room, an assembly hall, a wild landscape, a train station or a ship deck. Women were becoming more numerous, more mobile and more visible; at least on the pages of fashion magazines they were coming out of the figurative *terem* that they had been confined to.¹⁰

¹⁰ More than mere dress illustrations, these images, taken from the best European magazines, exposed Russian readers to a rapidly changing European lifestyle. Whereas affluent Russian nobles travelled abroad and partook of European lifestyle firsthand, for provincial gentry of more modest means magazines like *The Vase* were a primary

19TH-CENTURY RUSSIAN WOMEN'S PRESS

Yet *The Vase* went beyond simply showing a pretty picture of social alternatives to its readers. It drew women's attention to the tools necessary for making a brighter future possible, and it suggested that the best tool for this purpose was a sewing machine.¹¹

With the arrival of Zhozefina Gedeonova and a new editorial board in January, 1869, *The Vase* became open to external advertisements, and the first one featured in the magazine was devoted to a sewing machine. Thereafter, nearly every issue contained at least one advertisement of 'authentic American', 'improved' and 'silent' machines. An essay that was essentially a covert advertisement, published later the same year, stated that "today sewing machines present a rather indispensable item for every woman, whether she lives for her family or engages in needlework as a job" ('Fel'eton' 1869, 321).¹² The anonymous essayist asserted that "[t]ime and health is the capital and the sole possession" for most people, including members of the upper class, because "people of means too have reasons to save their time, to say nothing of health" (ibid., 321). Therefore, a sewing machine had become indispensable for members of any class, more so than an expensive and impractical grand piano: "If we take into account the small number of women who are truly skilled at playing music and a ubiquitous presence of useless and expensive grand pianos that function as furniture, then we can boldly advise you to replace a grand piano serving as a furniture item with a dandy sewing machine as a furniture item" (ibid., 322). Most importantly,

source of news. Dmitrii Pisarev observed in 1867: 'Most of the public reads only journals; this is a fact which is obvious to anyone who has lived in the provinces and has moved in the society of some district towns' (cited in Stites 1978, 37, fn. 17).

¹¹ Around this time, sewing as a form of respectable employment outside the home and indeed a liberating endeavor was examined in Nikolai Chernyshevsky's novel *What is to be Done?* (1862), in which the heroine, Vera Pavlovna Rozal'skaia, opens a sewing commune that allows her and other young women to engage in honest work, splitting the profit equally among themselves (Chernyshevskii 1986).

¹² For more on the role of covert advertising in homologous structuration of women's magazines, see McCracken (1993, 38-50).

however, the sewing machine was presented as a facilitator of intellectual development for its owner and identified as “the benefactress of the female sex” that could lighten and shorten the labour one expended in order to meet the most pressing personal needs (‘Blagodetel’nitsa zhenskago roda’ 1865, 29). *The Vase* was not alone in this approach, because it echoed another magazine which at some point asserted that the invention of a sewing machine had created a pathway to women’s intellectual growth: the machine “has a tremendous significance in life, because it leaves more free time for intellectual labour, for education and development. And the more accessible this tool is for the masses, the wider it spreads, the broader and more palpable will be its benefit” (‘Shveinye mashiny’ 1863, 193).

The Vase and The Woman Question

When, after running *The Vase* for thirty-six years, Safonova announced her resignation, caused by “only sickness and age”, she introduced Gedeonova as a new “trustworthy” editor who was prepared “to do everything for the development and improvement” of the magazine (Safonova 1868, 703).¹³ Immediately, a subtle but important change in the magazine’s direction became apparent when, in addition to the regular fashion and literary content, essays devoted to women’s education began to appear on the magazine’s pages quite regularly.¹⁴ On February 1, 1869, *The Vase* pub-

¹³ Safonova and Gedeonova may not have entirely agreed in their vision for *The Vase*, because only three years after leaving the magazine, in 1872, Safonova started another publication, *Zhenskie raboty*, whose format looked strikingly similar to what *The Vase* used to be before Gedeonova’s arrival; however, Safonova’s new magazine focused exclusively on sewing.

¹⁴ Some of the titles for 1869 included ‘An Emancipated Persian Woman’ (2: 32), obituaries of Vissarion Belinsky (7: 101-105) and Nikolay Dobroliubov (9:133-135), and such critical overviews as ‘Women in History’ (18: 290-293) and ‘The Subjection of Women According to Comte and Mill’ (19: 306-308). Additionally, commercial advertisements increased in number. Besides sewing machines, *The Vase* began to advertise subscriptions to other periodicals, such as *Russian Thought* (*Russkaia mysl’*), *Russian Invalid* (*Russkii invalid*), *Affair* (*Delo*), *Grainfield*

19TH-CENTURY RUSSIAN WOMEN'S PRESS

lished an essay titled 'The Woman Question' ('Zhenskii vopros'), signed by N.S.P., where the following thought was expressed:

Development and education of women in any country indisputably always have been and will be one of the most important questions of public life [...] To this day, we have had many educational institutions, but in most of them [...] little attention has been paid to the development, to the creation of an adult woman out of a woman-child; this has negatively affected the very process of learning. (33)

Such "underdeveloped wards" of boarding schools studied only to pass an exam, but were unprepared to encounter real life outside the school; they had "no ideas, no strivings, no thoughts about, nor understanding of the role of a woman" (ibid.). This lack of understanding led to emptiness, frivolity, apathy, idleness and lifelessness that negatively affected their husbands, children and whole societies (ibid.). As a result, a woman was regarded not as a human being, but rather as a beautiful and expensive toy: she was cared for and protected, but not respected as a thinking and independent human being (ibid., 33-34). N.S.P. concludes, 'There is no [...] logical reason to lessen anyone's rights if they are not being misused or abused [...] Give women full rights and they will become real people' (ibid., 34).¹⁵ To illustrate this point, in

(*Niva*), and many others, sometimes twenty or thirty in one issue. This increase in interest from other periodicals (most of which were completely unrelated to sewing, fashion or the woman question) indicated that *The Vase* had begun to enjoy the wide reach that other publishers attempted to capture. The frequency of the magazine's publications also increased steadily (up to four issues per month in 1874). For more on the 'crucial effect' that advertisements produced on 'commercial women's magazines', see Doughan 1987, 264.

¹⁵ In the same essay, speaking of professional training for women, N.S.P. states: "A female doctor is the first necessity of life; how many tragic outcomes could have been avoided in families and hospitals if we had female doctors. How many women could gain a source of income and fill an empty and idle life. We already have a

KATYA JORDAN

later issues Gedeonova reported on the opening of technical schools for women in Germany, on women's appearance in the legal and medical professions in the USA, on the success of women's suffrage movement in Utah and Wyoming, and so on. Gedeonova treated seriously her loyal readers' interest in fashion and crafts; yet she also pushed their expectations: she expressed her commitment to "the basic idea and program for the magazine", yet promised to "try to enliven the magazine and make it more interesting, diverse and useful" (Gedeonova 1870, 1). She explained:

In addition to articles that concern the woman question and pedagogy we will publish scientific articles on natural science and history. *It is necessary for women in the present day to be up to par in learning and development regarding social questions: women must conscientiously and seriously fulfil their natural obligations of a mother and a wife and, most importantly, enjoy the full rights of an equal member of human society. All this is possible only with due preparation and with the help of a teacher. The assistance rendered by our magazine, we suppose, will not be completely useless.* (Ibid., 1-2, emphasis added)

Gedeonova hoped to find support among the Russian women "who up to this point have many times declared how seriously they regarded their present position in society and their future public existence"; she relied on this support while making "the change in the usual direction kept by all other ladies' magazines in our country" (ibid.,

female doctor of medicine, Kashevarova. [...] In America the number of female doctors increases with each passing day" (N.S.P. 1869, 35). After all, "Development and education do not interfere with anything, but only better direct any occupation" (ibid., 36).

19TH-CENTURY RUSSIAN WOMEN'S PRESS

2).¹⁶ In another letter from the editor, published in January 1871, Gedeonova clarified her intentions: “We will always speak of the necessity for our mothers, wives and daughters to have equal rights to educate their minds and to work. But we will not get distracted by the extremes, nor will we start preaching theories that are completely impossible in practice’ (Gedeonova 1871, 1). Utopian dreams, Gedeonova stated, were offered to the public by two types of people: “either the light-minded ones who are always enticed by new things” or those “who peddle in liberalism and who lure in the public by advertising new ideas to them” (ibid.). The trouble with the latter group was that “peddlers never believe in what they offer; they never sincerely love the object that they undertake [or] they would have never been able to treat it with such carelessness” (ibid.). She emphasised:

We candidly and decisively declare that in our eyes any occupation of a woman is honourable: the bringing up of children, working around the house, attending lectures, working in a government office, and so on. We only disapprove of the life that is exceptionally empty: materially, when one lives off someone else's means, and morally when she lives off someone else's intellect. (ibid.)

One of Gedeonova's ideological opponents was Prince Meshchersky, a journalist with ties to the royal court and an editor of a conservative magazine-newspaper, *The Citizen (Grazhdanin)*. Early in 1872, Meshchersky published an essay titled ‘Our Woman Question’, in which he shared a heartbreaking account of the life of an old forester who lived in a remote Russian province with a twenty-five-year-old daughter. His wife and two of his sons had died. The third son, a university graduate, convinced

¹⁶ Incidentally, the text of Gedeonova's letter was placed on the issue's front page, wrapped around a portrait of Charles Darwin. An essay devoted to his work *On the Origin of Species* followed on the next page.

KATYA JORDAN

his sister to leave the father, to go to St. Petersburg, and to get a paying job in the city because that would be the most rational thing to do. Unwilling at first, the young woman allowed herself to be persuaded and left her father in the care of a nurse. Meshchersky used this account as a case in point, arguing that modern ideas are not only dangerous, but downright immoral and anti-Russian:

Come up closer to these free and independent women-doers (*samosto-iatel'nyim zhenshchinam-deiateliam*), look closely, and immediately you will understand what they lack and what causes this lust for freedom and for strife [...] They lack only one trifle — love! Lacking that which constitutes the moral essence of a woman and her strength, these women are no longer women, their being is at war with nature itself. (Meshcherskii 1876, 6)

He insisted that the woman question was alien to Russian women and was merely a product of western zeitgeist. Those who followed the latest fashion lacked in the essentials that uniquely qualified them to care for and to teach family members. Indeed, the most fundamental question in Meshchersky's opinion was: "Do we need mothers, housekeepers, wives, daughters, sisters, nannies, teachers, nurses, or do we need women-professors, women-government officials, women-doctors, women-members of councils, women-attorneys?" (ibid., 13). His conclusion was that "a woman in whom reason is developed to the detriment of the heart stops being a woman" (ibid., 19).

Having read Meshchersky's essay, another woman, Baronness Maria Korf, questioned his logic in her own essay, published in *The Herald of Europe* (*Vestnik Evropy*):

19TH-CENTURY RUSSIAN WOMEN'S PRESS

Why would a woman become a worse mother and wife if she studies biology? Will she take worse care of her children if she learns physiology? If that is the case, then an ideal mother and daughter is an ignorant peasant woman, who has never met a student in her life, who for sure has never cut open a frog, who has kept her heart in all of its primeval purity. (Korf 1872, 5: 454)

Korf questioned the truthfulness of the old forester story and asserted that one daughter's lack of affection towards her parents had nothing to do with the woman question, neither did the proverbial bobbed hair and blue-tinted glasses that Meshchersky had identified in his essay as a fashionable attribute adopted by nihilists. Korf asserted: "We fervently desire liberty, but not in the sense in which you understand it; we demand the right, that simple right to be a *human being* and not a *doll*" (ibid., emphasis in the original). She also pointed out that happy families in which spouses were equal partners were rare because of inequality in education: while husbands sought intellectual fulfilment outside the home, wives could not help but feel lonely and degraded. Not wishing to be liberated from family, they merely wanted to occupy an honourable position within it. If a woman's calling was to nurture and educate, then she herself needed to be educated (ibid.). To Meshchersky's question whether Russian society needed housewives or female professionals, Korf retorted by asking why anyone up to that point had not thought of depriving men of their education for fear of them turning into "dry specialists" thus depriving the human race of "husbands, fathers, sons and brothers"; she concluded, "[e]ither this fear makes no sense or it threatens men as much as women" (ibid.).

Undeterred, in September of the same year Prince Meshchersky responded to Korf in *The Citizen*, stating that while he supported the idea of education for women as a form of refinement, he vehemently opposed "modern learning" that took place at

KATYA JORDAN

the expense of “femininity” (Meshcheerskii 1872, 34). By nature, learning and femininity could not co-exist in the same woman, because a woman was created differently from man physically, morally and intellectually. Possessing a greater sensitivity of the heart, a woman could teach as a mother, but she could not educate as a professor. She could instil in the children a love towards everything that the child must love in order to become a true Russian citizen. Learned women, however, would forget to teach their children religion and other essentials. Finally, Meshchersky accused Korf of expressing an opinion of an urban noblewoman and, therefore, failing to consider the views of provincial Russian women.

The Vase published a provincial woman’s response to Meshchersky’s accusation in December 1872. K. Sokolovskaia, of the village of Soimino, refuted Meshchersky’s position as ungrounded, echoing N.S.P.’s essay from an earlier issue and stating that “[w]ith certainty one can say that both a midwife and a doctor will remain, first and foremost, women; they will be true helpers of their husbands and will be able to bring up healthier children and future workers for the benefit of the state” (Sokolovskaia 1872, 1). On the account of fashionable attributes that caused Meshchersky’s deep distrust, Sokolovskaia affirmed that he was focusing on extreme cases that were “manifestations of weaknesses that come from immaturity and a desire to appear more than one actually is”, weaknesses which were too general and too superfluous to be taken seriously (ibid.). Sokolovskaia also blamed “the appearance of both women-nihilists and learned women who denounce marriage and family” on the men who, comfortable in their own idea of superiority, “relied too much” on notions of “an inferior composition of the female brain” (ibid.). Gedeonova published Sokolovskaia’s letter in its entirety, but she took advantage of her own position as an editor and prefaced it with her own thoughts on the matter:

19TH-CENTURY RUSSIAN WOMEN'S PRESS

The esteemed Prince is terribly wrong; his views are especially incorrect because the strength of a family union does not at all depend on such an extraneous condition as how the means of material support are obtained, whether only a husband obtains them or if both a husband and a wife work together. A family union is founded on a much more respectful and sturdy foundation. The most important link in the social order — a union of husband and wife — is a purely moral and spiritual union in its essence. [...] Material independence of a woman cannot interfere with her femininity. (Ibid.)

Fashion, Education and Conspicuous Consumption

Thorsten Veblen's work *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899), in which the notion of conspicuous consumption is introduced, offers a productive lens for examining the journalistic exchange between Prince Meshchersky and his female opponents as outlined above.¹⁷ Veblen defines conspicuous consumption as “specialized consumption of goods as an evidence of pecuniary strength” and traces it back to the early period of predatory culture when it was men's privilege to consume the results of women's labour (Veblen 1973, 60). He argues that unproductive and wasteful activities that resulted in consumption of the fruits of someone else's labour were at one point “honorable” and served “primarily as a mark of prowess and a perquisite of human dignity” (ibid., 61). Therefore, the best food and the rarest embellishments were taboo for women and children, and those women who found themselves close to men in power were treated, in essence, as a status emblem. With time, “obviously productive labor”

¹⁷ Veblen's work on conspicuous consumption, as any pioneering theory, is not without its critics. See, for example, Mason (1981), Wilson (2003) and Todorova (2013). Christine Ruane, a careful scholar of Russian women's history, refers to Veblen in her discussion of shopping habits of Russian women in the 1800s (Ruane 1995, 770). My interest in Veblen's theory is dictated by the connection he draws between fashion and education.

KATYA JORDAN

was viewed beneath the dignity of “respectable women”, which caused the creation of clothing that signalled the wearer’s inability to “habitually engage in useful work” (ibid., 126). As a result, Veblen argues, the fundamentally patriarchal social system made it “the woman’s function” to “put in evidence her household’s ability to pay”, and such material elements of a woman’s dress as high heels, full skirts, ‘the impracticable bonnet’, excessively long hair, and especially the corset, accompanied by “the general disregard of the wearer’s comfort which is an obvious feature of all civilized women’s apparel”, began to serve as indisputable evidence of the fact that, despite all other social achievements, the woman remained “the economic dependent of the man” or “in a highly idealized sense [...] the man’s chattel” (ibid., 121, 127).

Assuming that Veblen’s characterisation is accurate, women became especially vulnerable from the 1850s. At this time, as Ruane shows in her study of Russia’s consumer culture, with the development of commercial advertising, marketing forces specifically targeted women, encouraging them to increase spending. As larger numbers of women “attempted to partake in the shopping ritual”, it quickly became perceived as a “‘woman’s’ occupation” (Ruane 1995, 770). Under these circumstances, women’s overtly expensive and impractical clothing indicated and indeed enhanced their husbands’ social status while simultaneously further limiting women’s opportunities (ibid.).¹⁸

The external changes that Meshchersky observed, which consisted of women starting to wear bobbed hair and tinted glasses, were alarming to him because, in a way, they were a sign of women emulating a wrong set of values. These attributes

¹⁸ In this regard, Veblen takes in a different direction John Stuart Mill’s idea that fashion is essentially an outcome of women’s subservient status. In his *Subjection of Women* Mill writes that “women’s passion for personal beauty, and dress and display”, as well as “all the evils that flow from it” were symptoms of a hunger for power, which hunger came as a result of a lack of liberty, and the only means of overcoming this conundrum was “respect for liberty in the personal concerns” of each individual (Mill 1988, 105).

19TH-CENTURY RUSSIAN WOMEN'S PRESS

were especially prevalent in the 1860s-1870s among young Russian female nihilists (*nigilistki*) who, while rejecting all authority, developed a particular 'ethos' that manifested itself through "a set of behavioural affects, [...] manners, dress, friendship patterns" (Stites 1978, 100). Alexander Skabichevsky, an eyewitness of nihilist escapades testified that, typical of any sect, adherents of nihilism strove to set themselves apart from the rest through clothing:

Plaid wraps and knotty clubs, cut hair [of women] and shoulder-length manes [of men], blue-tinted glasses, Fra Diavolo hats and square caps, — heavens, in what poetic halo all of this was depicted back then and how it forced young hearts to beat. One should keep in mind that all of this was worn not only out of rational concerns or one's desire to simplify one's dress, but defiantly, in order to openly expose one's belonging to a flock of chosen ones. (See Egorov 1996, 264)

Meshchersky feared that his female compatriots were falling under a spell of ideas that were non-Russian and anti-family. In Veblenian terms, such emulation was the chief motive lying "at the root of ownership": when an individual attempts to emulate fashionable habits of a representative from another group, he or she in essence signals to the world and to him- or herself the desire to belong to that (in some regard superior) group (Veblen 1973, 35). For many women, however, the desire for emulation ran parallel to their defiance directed against the image of a prim young lady (*kiseinaia baryshnia*) fostered in many finishing schools, which often called for a "pampered, helpless creature who was prepared exclusively for attracting a desirable husband and who was trained at school to wear *décolletée* even before she had anything to reveal" (Stites 1978, 103). By discarding the flowers and feathers, lace and ribbons, as well as complex and time-consuming coiffures — all of which "gracefully

KATYA JORDAN

underlined the leisure values of the society, the lady's inability to work, and a sweet, sheltered femininity" — young *nigilistki* manifested their "repugnance for the day-to-day existence" of a so-called "superfluous woman" (ibid.).

However, not all progressive Russian women were nihilistic in their convictions. Overlooking Russia's historical reality, Meshchersky forgot that the first significant instance of Russian interest in western fashion occurred not in the early 1870s, but with Peter I's dress reform of 1701. At that point, women's ability to dress and act like European ladies was used in reforming and strengthening the Russian State. What by the 1870s was considered a traditional dress style for a Russian noblewoman used to be a radical innovation, introduced for the benefit of the Empire. For this reason, the presence or the absence of chignons and hooped skirts did not have to interfere with women's attempts to participate more fully and meaningfully in intellectual pursuits available to their male counterparts and to strengthen Russian society as a whole. A related and far more serious concern for Meshchersky was the novel idea of women receiving a higher education. Again, Veblen explains that although "no line of consumption affords a more apt illustration than expenditure on dress", education too for a long time was a leisure-class prerogative (Veblen 1973, 242). He writes:

It is felt that the woman should, in all propriety, acquire only such knowledge as may be classed under one or the other of two heads: (1) such knowledge as conduces immediately to a better performance of domestic service — the domestic sphere; (2) such accomplishments and dexterity, quasi-scholarly and quasi-artistic, as plainly come in under the head of a performance of vicarious leisure. (Ibid., 243)

19TH-CENTURY RUSSIAN WOMEN'S PRESS

Women like Gedeonova and her subscribers desired access to a different kind of education. Wishing to make themselves not only equal to their male counterparts, but also more useful to their families, they often were critical of the *nigilistki* on ideological grounds. They felt that the provocative behaviour of *nigilistki* discredited the entire women's movement, lessening their chances to gain access to education and further isolating them (Stites 1978, 76).¹⁹ Besides, by bringing up the topic of women's education on the pages of *The Vase*, Gedeonova was drawing attention to a new economic reality for many women in the wake of the Great Reforms. E. Nekrasova, who had graduated from the Women's Medical Courses in St. Petersburg and became a medical doctor, explained this point in her memoirs:

Economic conditions of Russian life and the social upheaval that took place on February 19, 1861 [the abolition of serfdom in Russia], forced a woman to fight for her existence and required her to participate in the labour force. Constrained by necessity and not fashion — unlike what it seemed to many — she declared her readiness to obtain the right to knowledge and labour equal to that of a man, declared a necessity of higher education. (See Iukina 2007, 60-61)

At the time of Meshchersky's writing, opportunities for women to gain formal education beyond finishing school or any serious professional training were dismal. The first Higher Courses for Women and Courses for Learned Midwives were opened

¹⁹ While some progressive women did encourage and even require that their female associates would wear simple dress, emphasizing the fact that "'real' values in life had nothing to do with fashion", Pyotr Kropotkin, the revolutionary, was reported to have said on behalf of older female activists, "We shall wear our velvet dresses and chignons, because we have to deal with fools who see in a velvet dress and a chignon the tokens of 'political reliability', but you revolutionary girls, remain free in your tastes and inclinations" (Stites 1978, 80).

in Moscow and St. Petersburg, respectively, in 1872. In an environment of widespread illiteracy among women, additional courses for midwives and teachers were authorised in other cities, increasing the number of female students from 145 to 2,457 by 1878 (Dudgeon 1982, 7).²⁰ Nevertheless, these measures on the part of the Russian Imperial government were designed not so much to give women a pathway to education and economic independence as to “stem the flow of women abroad”, increasing their number in the more traditionally acceptable teaching profession (ibid.).²¹ Even so, Meshchersky continued to express his severe disapproval of the very idea of women’s professional education. “[T]he torture,” he wrote in a letter to Alexander II, “is in the fact that I am always alone in the battle, and no one here supports the one who stands against camouflaged hotbeds of anarchy and nihilism”, which in Meshchersky’s view these courses positively were (2018, 86).²²

Conclusion

According to Veblen, conspicuous consumption in women’s fashion was caused by inequality within a social system and was driven by the idea of emulation of a superior group’s practices. Like clothing, education also can be perceived as a status symbol,

²⁰ The illiteracy rate was especially high among female peasants. “While compulsory education tended to equalise the literacy rates of European men and women, significant differences persisted in Tsarist Russia. According to the 1897 Imperial Russian Census, 18 million men but only 8 million women were literate” (Hutton 2001, 49).

²¹ After 1881, following the assassination of Alexander II, many women’s courses in Russia were shut down. “By 1889-90 only the Bestuzhev Courses remained in truncated form with an enrollment of only 144 students compared with 990 in 1881-82. Enrollment in foreign universities, which had declined to less than 10 at the beginning of the 1880s, increased to over 200 (107 in Paris alone) by the end of the decade as Russian women again went abroad to seek what was denied to them at home” (Dudgeon 1982, 7).

²² In reality, Meshchersky was not alone in his rejection of the idea of professional training for women. The editors of several other periodicals, such as *Daybreak (Zaria)* and *Russian Herald (Russkii Vestnik)*, shared his apprehensions. See Sivozhelezova 2018, 39-43.

19TH-CENTURY RUSSIAN WOMEN'S PRESS

which explains why women's access to it was for a long time restricted. Veblen's theory is key to understanding Meshchersky's unease regarding the prospect of Russian women gaining higher education. Essentially, Meshchersky accused all progressive Russian women of emulating fashionable and dangerous ideas in an attempt to appear as equals in European society, instead of focusing on native Russian values. Yet women's desire for education came as a result of objective socio-economic reasons. As editors of *The Vase*, Safonova and Gedeonova, as well as women like Sokolovskaia, Nekrasova, and even Baroness Korf, had to adapt themselves to the new economic reality, because the old model of marrying a landowner and drawing quitrents no longer worked.

Beginning with Gedeonova and her associates, who recognised that they would be directly affected by the outcome of the debates, *The Vase* became a platform for public discourse on the subject of women's rights in general and women's education in particular. The apparent frivolity of the fashion press notwithstanding, the readers of *The Vase* were given the tools necessary to pursue goals other than making stylish dresses. Where Meshchersky saw a binary opposition between Russian patriarchal values and foreign anti-family values, *The Vase* under Gedeonova's watch gave a third alternative, suggesting that a woman could be educated without compromising either femininity in the dress or a commitment to the family. If Safonova, the founder of *The Vase*, encouraged industriousness and frugality, achievable by making one's own clothes instead of spending a large portion of a family's budget on the latest Parisian fashion, Gedeonova took the matter a step further. She turned her readers' attention to the possibility of personal growth through engagement in intellectual pursuits. The merit of Gedeonova's approach was proven by a steady increase in the frequency of publications, in a variety of external advertisements, and in the magazine's longevity. For a reader of *The Vase*, the freedom to fashion her own dress was a precursor to

KATYA JORDAN

the freedom to fashion her own intellectual and socioeconomic growth, which in turn would enable her to strengthen the family and society.

REFERENCES

- Aronson, Amy Beth, 2002: *Taking Liberties: Early American Women's Magazines and Their Readers*, Westport, CT: Praeger.
- 'Blagodetel'nitsa zhenskago roda', 1865: *Vaza*, 2: 29-30.
- Chalaby, Jean K., 1996: 'Journalism as an Anglo-American Invention: a Comparison of the Development of French and Anglo-American Journalism, 1830s-1920s', *European Journal of Communication*, 11/3, 303-326.
- Chernyshevskii, N. G., 1986: *What is to be Done?*, Ann Arbor: Ardis.
- Doughan, David T.J., 1987: 'Periodicals by, for, and about Women in Britain,' *Women's Studies Int. Forum*, 10(3), 261-273.
- Dudgeon, Ruth A., 1982: 'The Forgotten Minority: Women Students in Imperial Russia, 1872-1917', *Russian History*, 9/1, 1-26.
- Egorov, B. F., 1996: 'Russkie utopii', in *Iz istorii russkoj kul'tury*, 5 vols., Koshelev, A. D. and Egorov, B. F. (eds.), Moskva: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, vol. 5, pp. 225-276.
- Engel, Barbara Alpern, 2004: *Women in Russia, 1700-2000*, Cambridge: Cambridge U.P.
- 'Fel'eton. Slova dva o shveinykh mashinakh', 1869: *Vaza*, 19, 321-322.
- Gedeonova, 1870: '1 Ianvaria 1870', *Vaza*, 1, 1-2.
- Gedeonova, 1871: 'S.-Peterburg, 1 ianvaria 1871', *Vaza*, 1, 1-2.

19TH-CENTURY RUSSIAN WOMEN'S PRESS

- Gheith, Jehanne M., 2001: 'Introduction', in *An Improper Profession: Women, Gender, and Journalism in Late Imperial Russia*, Norton, Barbara T. and Gheith, Jehanne M. (eds.), Durham, NC: Duke U.P., pp.1-25.
- Golitsyn, N. N., 1889: *Bibliograficheskii slovar' russkikh pisatel'nits*, Sankt-Peterburg, Tipografia V. S. Balashina.
- Grünell, Marianne, 1998: 'Women's Studies in Russia', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 5/3-4, 499-512.
- Hammarberg, Gitta, 2007: 'The First Russian Women's Journals and the Construction of the Reader', in *Women in Russian Culture and Society, 1700-1825*, Rosslyn, Wendy and Tosi, Alessandra (eds.), Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 83-104.
- Hutton, Marcelline J., 2001: *Russian and West European Women, 1860-1939: Dreams, Struggles, and Nightmares*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Iukina, Irina, 2007: *Russkii feminizm kak vyzov sovremennosti*, Sankt-Peterburg: Al-eteia.
- Korf, Maria, 1872: 'Mrachnyi publitsist zhenskago voprosa,' *Vestnik Evropy*, 5, 449-454.
- Lisovskii, N. M., 1915: *Bibliografiia russkoi periodicheskoi pechati 1703-1900 gg. (materialy dlia istorii russkoi zhurnalistiki)*, 2 vols., Petrograd: Tipografiia Akts. Obshch. Tip. Dela, vol. 1.
- Maguire, Robert A., 1997: 'Introduction', in *Literary Journals in Imperial Russia*, Martinsen, Deborah A. (ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., pp. 1-10.
- Mason, Roger S., 1981: *Conspicuous Consumption: A Study of Exceptional Consumer Behavior*, Westmead: Gower Publishing Company, Ltd.
- McCracken, Ellen, 1993: *Decoding Women's Magazines: From 'Mademoiselle' to 'Ms.'*, New York: St. Martin's Press.

KATYA JORDAN

- Meshcherskii, V., 1872: 'Eshche o zhenskom voprose. Otvet Baronesse Korf', *Gra-zhdanin*, 19, 33-35.
- Meshcherskii, V., 1876: *Rechi Konservatora*, 2 vols., Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. i lit. V. Obolenskogo, vol. 2.
- Meshcherskii, V. P., 2018: *Pis'ma k imperatoru Aleksandru III, 1881-1894*, Chernikova, N. V. (ed.), Moskva: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie.
- Mill, John Stuart, 1988: *The Subjection of Women*, Okin, Susan Moller (ed.), Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Norton, Barbara T. and Gheith, Jehanne M. (eds.), 2001: *An Improper Profession: Women, Gender, and Journalism in Late Imperial Russia*, Durham, NC: Duke U.P.
- N.S.P., 1869: 'Zhenskii vopros', *Vaza*, 3, 33-36.
- Polevoi, P. N., 1888: 'Dnevnik N. A. Polevogo (1838-1845)', *Istoricheskii Vestnik: Istoriko-literaturnyi zhurnal*, 31, 654-674.
- Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1649 goda* (1830), 55 vols., Tipografiia II otdeleniia sobstvennoi ego imperatorskogo velichiia kantseliarii, vol. 4.
- Ruane, Christine, 1995: 'Clothes Shopping in Imperial Russia: the Development of a Consumer Culture,' *Journal of Social History*, 28/4, 765-782.
- Ruane, Christine, 2001: 'The Development of a Fashion Press in Late Imperial Russia. "Moda: Zhurnal dlia svetskikh liudei"', in *An Improper Profession: Women, Gender, and Journalism in Late Imperial Russia*, Norton, Barbara T. and Gheith, Jehanne M. (eds.), Durham, NC: Duke U.P., pp. 74-92.
- Ruane, Christine, 2004: 'Women and the Market in Imperial Russia, 1700-1917', *Bulletin: Anthropology, Minorities, Multiculturalism*, 5, 50-55.
- Safonova, E., 1868: 'Pis'mo k podpischikam', *Vaza*, 36, 701-704.
- 'Shveinye mashiny', 1863: *Modnyi Magazin*, 16, 193-196.

19TH-CENTURY RUSSIAN WOMEN'S PRESS

- Sims, Norman, 2009: 'The Problem and the Promise of Literary Journalism Studies', *Literary Journalism Studies*, 1/1, 7-16.
- Sivozhelezova, Angelina, 2018: 'Vopros o zhenskom professional'nom obrazovanii v kontekste razvitiia konservativnoi obshchestvennoi mysli Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XIX veka', *Materialy konferentsii GNII 'Natsrazvitie'*, April, 39-43.
- Sokolovskaia, K., 1872: 'Po zhenskomu voprosu', *Literaturnoe pribavlenie k No. 24 zhenskogo zhurnala 'Vaza'*, 1-2.
- Sokol'skaia, Lesia Vasil'evna, 2006: 'Pervye zhenskie zhurnaly dlia rossiiskikh chitatel'nits (konets XVIII – pervaiia polovina XIX veka', *Bibliosfera*, 2, 18-22.
- Stites, Richard, 1978: *The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia: Feminism, Nihilism, and Bolshevism, 1860-1930*, Princeton: Princeton U.P.
- Temkina, Anna and Zdravomyslova, Elena, 2003: 'Gender Studies in Post-Soviet Society: Western Frames and Cultural Differences', *Studies in East European Thought*, 55, 51-61.
- Todorova, Zdravka, 2013: 'Conspicuous Consumption as Routine Expenditure and its Place in the Social Provisioning Process', *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 72/5, 1183-1204.
- 'Vaza, zhurnal shit'ia, vyshivan'ia i domashnei ekonomii, na 1853 god', 1853: *Al'bom damskikh rabot dlia nachinaiushchikh zanimat'sia rukodeliiami, izdavaemyi pri zhurnale Vaza*, 1, 2-3.
- Veblen, Thorstein, 1973: *The Theory of The Leisure Class*. Trans. John Kenneth Galbraith, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Wilson, Elizabeth, 2003: *Adorned in Dreams: Fashion and Modernity*, New Brunswick: Rutgers U.P.

JOHN COOK

PERFORMATIVITY AND THE SCOPE OF BAKHTIN'S CHRONOTOPE

1. Brief introduction: symptoms and issues

Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin (1895-1975) was a Soviet thinker who masked his philosophical notions and concepts under the guise of literary theory. Three of the most prominent of those concepts were dialogue, carnival and the chronotope. This article examines the last of these in the light of selected 20th-century thinkers in the domains of ordinary language and identity.

By far the largest proportion of Bakhtin's references to the chronotope is contained in his essay *Forms of time and of the chronotope in the novel (FTC)*, with most of the balance occurring in those documents associated with his analysis of the *Bildungsroman*.¹ The remaining references are scattered sparsely throughout Volumes 3, 4-1, 4-2, 5 and 6 of Bakhtin's *Collected Works*.

FTC is essentially an episodic review of the development of Bakhtin's concept of the chronotope in literature (Bakhtin 1981, Бахтин 2012). Its introduction and Sections I-IX were written from 1937-1939, but in the 1970s Bakhtin's publisher requested that he write a conclusion, and Section X was completed in 1973. At the beginning of this section, Bakhtin explicitly undertakes to sum up the previous sections, adding no substantive new material. However, by the end of the 'Concluding remarks', this

¹ I have followed the naming conventions for *translations* of Bakhtin texts established by Carol Adlam and David Shepherd in *The Annotated Bakhtin Bibliography*, xi-xii. *DN*, *FTC* and *PND* refer to *Discourse in the Novel*, *Forms of time and of the chronotope in the novel*, and *From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse* respectively (all in Bakhtin 1981); *RW* refers to *Rabelais and his World* (in Bakhtin 1984); *BSHR* and *PSG* refer to *The Bildungsroman and its significance for the history of realism* and *The Problem of Speech Genres* respectively (both in Bakhtin 1986); *TPA* refers to *Towards a Philosophy of the Act* (in Bakhtin 1993).

undertaking is comprehensively breached by a shift that expands the objects of chronotopic analysis from those of art and literature to include lived experience as well (noted in Wall 2001). This breach can be characterised as a performative shift (see Yurchak 2006, 26), and has been briefly described in my earlier piece on the chronotope of the castle (Cook 2014, especially 53-55).

In the present article I wish to explore further this misdirection² as symptomatic of the nexus between Bakhtin's performance of self in his writing, his process of theory-building and issues with the nature of the theory in question — the chronotope. However, it is necessary first to explore the nature of performativity through the lenses of two 20th-century thinkers, as well as Bakhtin himself.

2. Facets of performativity

The linguistic aspects of Bakhtin's philosophy, although detailed, are not comprehensive, and other theoretical tools are required to apply these aspects to the theory of the chronotope. This requires reconstructing the context and establishing productive parallels. Two of the most important theorists and philosophers of language for understanding Bakhtin's theory are John Langshaw Austin and Judith Butler. The concept that they both employ — performativity — can provide new perspectives for the understanding of Bakhtin's work in the area of the chronotope. Of course, these theories could not have had any direct impact on Bakhtin's work. Butler comfortably post-dates Bakhtin and there is absolutely no evidence of Bakhtin's interest in Austin. However, Speech Act Theory — despite its bruising at the hands of Derrida³ — provides a sound basis for a discussion of performativity.

² In the sense of “The distraction of a person's attention by a conjuror” (retrieved from *OED online*, 22 January, 2019).

³ Derrida 1977.

BAKHTIN AND PERFORMATIVITY

* * *

Performativity is the linguistic concept evolved by the Oxford philosopher J. L. Austin⁴ in the 1950s to differentiate between those utterances which only *state* and those which *do* as well.⁵ Performativity initially constituted an essential part of the Speech Act Theory developed by Austin, whose initial distinction was between *constative* utterances (where it is appropriate to appraise their truth) and *performative* utterances (where only other forms of appraisal are appropriate).⁶ Austin also proposed in this initial distinction that *constatives* refer to utterances that make statements, whereas *performatives* (as their names suggests) are intimately involved with the performance of an act (Longworth 2012, 24). As Austin says about performative utterances in *How to Do Things with Words*, “the issuing of the [performative] utterance *is* the performing of an action” (Austin 1975, 6 [emphasis added]). This strongly resonates with a passage in *C&P* when Bakhtin explicitly connects performativity to heteroglossia: “Каждым своим литературно-словесным выступлением оно активно ориентируется в разноречии, занимает в нем позицию, выбирает ‘язык’”⁷

⁴ Most notably in a series of lectures at Harvard in the mid-1950s, with subsequent refinements until his death in 1960.

⁵ In this context, however, what performativity *is not* is just as important as what it *is*. As Butler asserts, “performativity is neither free play nor theatrical self-presentation; nor can it simply be equated with performance” (Butler 2014, 95).

⁶ Longworth 2012, 23.

⁷ “With each literary-verbal performance, consciousness must actively orient itself amidst heteroglossia, it must move in and occupy a position for itself within it, it chooses, in other words, a ‘language’”. (Bakhtin [DN] 1981, 295).

(Бахтин 2012 [СвР], 48).⁸ Thus, performativity adopts the role of a major theoretical support⁹ for thinking in ‘non-essentialist’ terms (Pennycook 2004, 8).

A contractual example of a performative would be: “I promise to pay you back tomorrow.” So, whereas constatives are judged on a binary scale of truth or falsehood, performatives are judged according to their ‘felicity’ or ‘infelicity’ (Austin 1975, 14). If that promise were honoured, the example above was deemed by Austin to be felicitous. However, rather like Tolstoy’s description of the unhappiness of families,¹⁰ infelicity can take many forms. Those identified by Austin were: *nullity* (where the performer was not in a position to honour the contract), *abuse* or *insincerity* (where the performer had no intention of honouring the contract) and *breach of commitment* (where, whatever the performer’s situation or intention, the contract was not honoured).¹¹

In one of his last papers, Austin articulates the concept of performativity even further: in contrast to the constative, or descriptive utterance, “the performative utterance ... can never be either [true or false]: it has its own special job, it is used to perform an action” (Austin 1963, 22). In considering truth values in relation to performativity, Austin’s argument about the truth value of the statement “France is hexagonal”

⁸ The following abbreviations refer to texts contained in Bakhtin’s *Collected Works* (Бахтин 1997-2012). The references cite abbreviation, full title, volume number and [corresponding translation code] as follows: *КФП*, *К философии поступка*, 1 [ТРА]; *СвР*, *Слово в романе*, 3 [DN]; *Фехр*, *Формы времени и хронотопа в романе*, 3 [FTС]; *КРв*, *К «роману воспитания»*, 3 [BSHR]; *КВТР*, *К вопросам теории романа*, 3 [—]; *ИПРС*, *Из предистории романного слова*, 3 [PND]; *РкЛЖ*, *Роман как литературный жанр*, 3 [—]; *ФРИР*, *Франсуа Рабле в истории реализма*, 4-1 [RHR]; *ТФР*, *Творчество Франсуа Рабле и народная культура средневековья и Ренессанса*, 4-2 [RW]; *Сат*, *Сатира*, 5 [—]; and *ПРЖ*, *Проблема речевых жанров*, 5 [PSG]. If the translations have no corresponding code, they have been translated by the author of this article.

⁹ As Ol’khov observes, the “Bakhtinian word is voluminosely effectual, ‘performative’ ...” (Ol’khov 2014, 13).

¹⁰ “All happy families are alike; each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.” Tolstoy 2003, 1.

¹¹ Austin 1963, 24.

BAKHTIN AND PERFORMATIVITY

provides an entry point into this analysis. As Austin notes: “The truth or falsity of a statement depends not merely on the meanings of words but on what act you were performing in what circumstances”.¹² He goes on to say that in a *constative* utterance the illocutionary and perlocutionary¹³ aspects are de-emphasised with the stress laid on the locutionary¹⁴ aspects. The converse is true with a *performative* utterance, where “we attend as much as possible to the illocutionary force of the utterance, and abstract from the dimension of correspondence with facts” (Austin 1975, 145).

* * *

Using Austin’s Speech Act Theory as a basis, Butler’s performative approach to gender and identity provides a useful prism through which to view and analyse Bakhtin’s theory-building. From this viewpoint a number of themes can be identified: theatricality, embodiment, and the nature of the self.

Judith Butler’s approach is conditioned not only by the Speech Act theory and its critique by Derrida, but also exposure to the theorising of Slavoj Žižek (Butler & Salih 2004, 91 and Butler 2014, 20-21, respectively). Whilst being aware of Austin’s work on performativity, she nonetheless approaches the concept from a completely different direction. Sara Salih’s introduction to the extract from *Gender Trouble* devoted to ‘Bodily Inscriptions, Performative Subversions’ in the Butler reader indicates

¹² Austin 1975 (*Lecture XI*), 145; and even more succinctly: “Reference depends on knowledge at the time of utterance” (144).

¹³ *Illocutionary*: “Of or designating an act such as ordering, warning, undertaking, performed in saying something.” *Perlocutionary*: “Of or designating an act of speaking or writing that is intended to persuade or convince” (both retrieved from *OED online*, 13 July, 2018)

¹⁴ Austin defines ‘locutionary’ as “the act of ‘saying something’ ... with a certain sense and a certain reference” (Austin 1975, 94).

that Butler positions performativity on a spectrum that encompasses both the linguistic and the theatrical. This is done in such a way that “the speech act is at once performed (and thus theatrical, presented to an audience, subject to interpretation), and linguistic, inducing a set of effects through its implied relation to linguistic conventions” (Butler & Salih 2004, 102).

But this is just the tip of the theoretical iceberg. Two other conditions must be met: firstly, that the anticipation of what Butler characterises as the ‘gendered essence’ actually produces this essence, and secondly, that the performativity necessary to perpetuate this gender is a repetitive ritual, which is naturalised in relation to the individual’s body (Butler & Salih 2004, 94), constituting “a stylized set of acts” (Butler & Salih 2004, 95). As Butler indicates: “performativity must be understood not as a singular or deliberate ‘act’, but, rather, as the reiterative and citational practice by which discourse produces the effects that it names” (Butler 2014, 2). This reiteration produces a “ritualized production ... reiterated under and through constraint ... compelling the shape of the production, but not ... determining it fully in advance” (Butler 2014, 95). The citationality referred to by Butler is drawn from her critical engagement with Žižek’s theory (Butler 2014, 21).

Carnival as a temporary inversion of the normal order (for example ‘развенчание’ (‘dethronement’)) during the people’s feast-days is one of Bakhtin’s signature concepts. In refining it, he drew on two other terms: ‘оболочка’ (‘shell’) and ‘маска’ (‘mask’), deriving an aspect of the concept of mask as transformation: ‘travesty’.¹⁵ This aspect participates in the notion of ‘burlesque’¹⁶ and includes the ide-

¹⁵ *Travesty*: in the sense of “An alteration of dress or appearance; a disguise, *spec.* (dressing in) the attire of the opposite sex” (*OED Online*, retrieved 1 September, 2014).

¹⁶ *Burlesque*: “Grotesque imitation of what is, or is intended to be, dignified or pathetic, in action, speech, or manner; *concr.* an action or performance which casts ridicule on that which it imitates, or is itself ridiculous as an unsuccessful attempt at serious impressiveness; a mockery” (*OED Online*, retrieved 14 April, 2015).

as of both dressing up and disguise.¹⁷ For the purposes of this section of the paper, I have focused on ‘травестия’ because the complex, value-laden nature of that term meshes so neatly with Butler’s theorising on gender. The discussion of ‘drag’ in *Gender Trouble* is offered by Butler as an explanation of “the constructed and performative dimension of gender” (Butler & Salih 2004, 99).

Bakhtin uses the term ‘травестия’ in four senses. His main use is in conjunction with parody, either as a compound (‘пародийно-травестирующий’),¹⁸ or as a pair or terms coupled together (‘пародия и травестия’),¹⁹ or as a term qualified by the adjective ‘parodic’ (‘пародийная травестия’).²⁰ In all these instances ‘parodic’ and ‘travesty’ or ‘travestising’²¹ are mutually supportive terms, augmenting the sense of the companion element. In its second sense, ‘travesty’ is used in its lexical sense²² as a literal caricature (i.e. Бахтин 2012 [ПКЛЖ], 625). In yet another sense, Bakhtin employs the word in an implicitly theatrical manner, indicating a form of disguise which clothes a certain form of discourse. And finally, there is the sense of disguised sexual ambivalence mediated by an association with explicit references to the phallus²³ and, hence, part of the connotative framework supporting the term.

¹⁷ Bakhtin refers to the ‘king’ of the carnival as being ‘disguised, “froked up” in the Jester’s motley’: «его переодевают, “травестируют” в шутовской наряд» (Бахтин 2010 [ТФР], 214).

¹⁸ For example, Бахтин 2012 [ИПРС], 523 ff.

¹⁹ For example, Бахтин 2012 [КВТР], 603.

²⁰ For example, Бахтин 2012 [ИПРС], 527.

²¹ *Travestize*, v. “To practise travesty.” (*OED Online*, retrieved 25 March, 2016).

²² *Travesty*: “A literary composition which aims at exciting laughter by burlesque and ludicrous treatment of a serious work; literary composition of this kind; hence, a grotesque or debased imitation or likeness; a caricature” (*OED Online*, retrieved 1 September, 2014).

²³ “Аналогичные сочетания образов действительности с пародиями и травестиями, с непристойностями и бранью в формах импровизированного диалога или полу-диалога имели место и в представлениях, которые давали по всей Греции дейкеласты и фаллофоры (о них мы узнаем у Афиняя)” (Бахтин 1997 [Сам],

In respect of the last sense, ‘травестия’ expands the notions of burlesque and disguise to involve a number of other ingredients that make the term much more sexually confronting. The element of cross-dressing implicit in the concept of ‘travesty’ involves notions of covert sexuality and sexual ambivalence that could be perceived as an offence against nature and, thus, both shocking and threatening. While this practice of androgynous disguise was hallowed in Classical Greece²⁴ and the Middle Ages (Bullough & Brundage 1996) and even in the Renaissance (with the theatrical convention of boys playing female parts),²⁵ later epochs felt distinctly uncomfortable with this sexual ambivalence. This sexual inversion was perceived as perversion and, ultimately, subversion, much in line with Bakhtin’s notion of carnival. All these overlays of this last cross-dressing sense of ‘травестия’ are always present.

The terms ‘маска’ and ‘травестия’ rarely coincide in the same passage. This would seem to indicate that ‘травестия’ represents a special instance of ‘маска’. Paralleling the life-affirming aspects of the mask in a carnival setting, Bakhtin’s notion of ‘травестия’ embraces both matters which are “‘high” and “‘holy””, as well as those which include “‘images of the material-bodily fundament (urine, erotic and festival travesties)””.²⁶ Bakhtin supports this reading of Rabelais by interpreting the latter’s preoccupation with defecation in the light of a parodic travesty of the Thomist doc-

19-20); “Analogous combinations of images of reality with parodies and travesties, with obscenities and abuse in the forms of extempore dialogue or poly-dialogue occurred even in the performances which *deikelasti* and *phallophori* gave all over Greece (we learn about them from Athenaeus).”

²⁴ An example is Dionysus’ androgynous garb.

²⁵ Mamujee 2014.

²⁶ “Это — игра “высокими” и “священными” вещами, которые сочетаются здесь с образами материально-телесного низа (моча, эротические и пиршественные травестии). ... неофициальные элементы речи и ... профанация священного, органически вплетаются в эту игру и задают ей направление и тон” (Бахтин 2008 [*ФРИР*], 180).

BAKHTIN AND PERFORMATIVITY

trine of Bliss, “one of the most fundamental doctrines of Christianity”.²⁷ Bakhtin locates the origin of Bliss in the fundament, and his path of the soul’s ascent is “*from the back passage via the rectum to the heart and brain*”, hence “all of the spiritual topography is turned upside down”.²⁸ Bakhtin’s interpretation here supports productive embodiment.

Such occasions as those of the ‘Festival of Fools’ were instances of carnival and Bakhtin expresses their fundamental nature thus: “... носили характер пародийной трагедии официального культа, сопровождалась переодеваниями и маскировками.”²⁹ Masquerades such as Rabelais described³⁰ provided a vehicle for him to catalogue “these highly liberated travesties of the sacred names and of their functions”.³¹

Bakhtin also observes that Goethe had a profound insight into the nature of carnival, both in Weimar and in Rome (see Бахтин 2010 [ТФР], 115-116, 264). Bakhtin summarises these festivities as being permeated with the forms of parody and inversion that typify this type of festival: “... народно-праздничные площадные формы, формы осмеяния старой правды и старой власти со всей их системой

²⁷ “томистическое учение о блаженстве ... один из самых основных учений христианства” (Бахтин 2008 [ФРИР], 387).

²⁸ “от заднего прохода через прямую кишку к сердцу и мозгу ... перевернута и вся духовная топография” (Бахтин 2008 [ФРИР], 387).

²⁹ “... they bore a character of parodic burlesque of the official religion, accompanied by changing clothes and disguise” (Бахтин 2010 [ТФР], 86).

³⁰ See the reference to ‘Janotus’ in Бахтин 2010 [ТФР], 232-233 and ‘Таррескуе’ in Бахтин 2010 [ТФР], 288.

³¹ “те весьма вольные трагедии имен святых и их функций” (Бахтин 2008 [ФРИР], 179).

травестий (маскарадных переодеваний), иерархических перестановок (выворачиваний наизнанку), развенчаний и снижений”.³²

One term that Bakhtin often uses in conjunction with travesty is ‘allusion’ (‘аллюзия’) in the sense that the travesty refers back to a previous template or model. Bakhtin distinguishes between a ‘full travesty’ and a ‘travestising allusion’ as if the latter is a mere echo of the previous reference (e.g. Бахтин 2008 [ФРИП], 179, (footnote 102)). According to Bakhtin, Rabelais uses such an allusion when he describes the drowning of the 260,418 people (‘not counting women and children’) in Gargantua’s urine, which is an echoed reference to the pericope of the miracle of the ‘Feeding of the Five Thousand’ by five loaves and two fishes.³³

This article proposes two connections between Butler’s theories and those of Bakhtin: firstly, that the style of performativity which underwrites gender in Butler’s work is also present in Bakhtin’s theorising on the self, particularly those aspects relating to his notions of ‘оболочка’ and ‘маска’. Secondly — and more specifically — Butler’s discussion of drag is analogous to, and has clear links with, Bakhtin’s analysis of ‘травестия’ (‘travesty’) in its sense of cross-dressing and consequent sexual ambiguity. Butler makes the point that drag brings the categories of gender into question, and hence the reality of gender is questioned as a consequence (Butler & Salih 2004, 100). A naturalised view of gender, like Bakhtin’s view of the self in *I-for-the-Other*, thus becomes “a changeable and revisable reality” (Butler & Salih 2004, 100).

³² “...popular-festive, vulgar forms, forms of ridicule of ancient truth and ancient authority with their entire system of ‘travesty’ (masquerading disguises), hierarchical transpositions (inversions inside out), dethronements and demotions” (Бахтин 2010 [ТФР], 290).

³³ Бахтин 2008 [ФРИП], 179. Bakhtin notes another case of this trope in Бахтин 2008 [ФРИП], 390.

BAKHTIN AND PERFORMATIVITY

One of Butler's conclusions from this and other examples is that "acts, gestures, enactments, generally construed, are *performative* in the sense that the essence or identity that they otherwise purport to express are *fabrications* manufactured and sustained through corporeal signs and other discursive means" (Butler & Salih 2004, 110 [*emphasis in original*]). A corollary of this conclusion is that it is inappropriate to apply a true/false binary to gender (Butler & Salih 2004, 111).³⁴ Other threads that are drawn out from this conclusion include those of inversion (a quality of Bakhtin's concept of carnival) and parody (one of Bakhtin's favourite tropes).³⁵

Butler sums up by defining the "abiding gendered self [as being] structured by repeated acts that seek to approximate the ideal of a substantial ground of identity, but which, in their occasional discontinuity, reveal the temporal and contingent groundlessness of this 'ground'" (Butler & Salih 2004, 115).

* * *

Like Austin and Butler, in his theoretical discussions on the topic, Bakhtin stresses the concrete nature of the use of language in the form of utterances,³⁶ anchored to a firm (spatio-temporal) position in lived experience.³⁷ Bakhtin draws several consequences from this concreteness and particularity of utterances: the *first* is that

³⁴ It may be that we should follow Austin in applying the binary of felicitous/infelicitous to this performativity.

³⁵ Butler & Salih 2004, 112-113.

³⁶ "Использование языка осуществляется в форме единичных конкретных высказываний (устных или письменных) участников той или иной области человеческой деятельности" (Бахтин 1997 [ИПЖ], 159; Bakhtin 1986 *PSG*, 60).

³⁷ "Каждое высказывание полно отзвуков и отголосков других высказываний, с которыми оно связано общностью сферы речевого общения" (Бахтин 1997 [ИПЖ], 195). "Therefore, each utterance is filled with various kinds of responsive reactions to other utterances of the given sphere of speech communication" (Bakhtin 1986 *PSG*, 91).

utterances are never neutral;³⁸ *secondly*, language is an activity that combines elements of rule and instantiation in its “referentially semantic content”,³⁹ both of which are necessary conditions for a language-game; and *thirdly*, this game involves an active response (Bakhtin 1986 *PSG*, 71; see Бахтин 1997 [*ЛРЖ*], 172-173), resulting in a complex chain of utterances,⁴⁰ looking back to previous uses,⁴¹ and forward to its eventual addressee,⁴² somewhat Janus-like. All of these elements have performative aspects, thus firmly embedding the notion of performativity into the concept of the utterance.

Bakhtin links this ideological nature of the utterance to genres through his exploration of the nature of speech genres (Bakhtin 1986 *PSG*, *passim*). And this link can be extended to the notion of the chronotope, illustrated by Fish’s concept of interpretive communities (Fish 1976 and 1978 *passim*). Similar connections can be made through Bakhtin’s application of the characteristics of stability, flexibility and bounding.⁴³

* * *

³⁸ “абсолютно нейтральное высказывание невозможно” (Бахтин 1997 [*ЛРЖ*], 188; Bakhtin 1986 *PSG*, 84).

³⁹ “предметно-смысловое содержание” (Бахтин 1997 [*ЛРЖ*], 196; Bakhtin 1986 *PSG*, 84).

⁴⁰ “Каждое высказывание — это звено в очень сложно организованной цепи других высказываний” (Бахтин 1997 [*ЛРЖ*], 170; Bakhtin 1986 *PSG*, 69).

⁴¹ “... оно их опровергает, подтверждает, дополняет, опирается на них, предполагает их известными, как-то считается с ними ...” (Бахтин 1997 [*ЛРЖ*], 196; Bakhtin 1986 *PSG*, 91).

⁴² “Существенным (конститутивным) признаком высказывания является его обращенность к кому-либо, его *адресованность*» (Бахтин 1997 [*ЛРЖ*], 200; Bakhtin 1986 *PSG*, 95).

⁴³ “Как ни различны высказывания по своему объему, по своему содержанию, по своему композиционному построению, они обладают, как единицы речевого общения, общими структурными особенностями, и прежде всего совершенно четкими *границами*» (Бахтин 1997 [*ЛРЖ*], 172; Bakhtin 1986 *PSG*, 71; supported by Fish 1976 481, 485).

BAKHTIN AND PERFORMATIVITY

However, the link between Bakhtin and performativity is not confined to the domain of theory. Bakhtin theorised as he lived, and he lived in a performative universe where reinvention was necessitated by the revolutionary environment in which he moved. Evidence of this reinvention — with ambiguous or uncertain consequences — occurs regularly throughout accounts of Bakhtin’s life,⁴⁴ with the consequence that his biography appears to be unfinalisable.

In order to find an explanatory framework that accounts for the uncertainties and ambiguities that emanate from Bakhtin’s dissimulation about certain aspects of his life, and to understand a strategy for life that might be mirrored in his work, I have employed that concept of reinvention introduced in Sheila Fitzpatrick’s book *Tear off the Masks!* (Fitzpatrick 2005) and the article on which her book was, in part, based: ‘Making a Self for the Times: Impersonation and Imposture in 20th-Century Russia’ (Fitzpatrick 2001). Fitzpatrick asserts that reinvention is central to revolutions and in the article and book she maps the forms that these reinventions take in the Russian Revolution.⁴⁵ All of these forms are performative in a sense consistent with Austin’s and Butler’s theorising.

* * *

⁴⁴ These include a discrepancy between Bakhtin’s account of his family’s noble origins (together with the banking activities of Bakhtin’s immediate antecedents) and historical records (Конкин 1994a, Конкин 1994b); Bakhtin’s account of his secondary and tertiary education, which is at variance with the school and university records (Паньков 1993); the degree to which Bakhtin’s ‘legendary erudition’ is real or a product of insufficient citation, editorial excisions or omissions, or even plagiarism, according to some scholars (Berrong 1986, Poole 1998, Hirschkop 2015); and the uncertainty of the authorship of some of the ‘Bakhtin school’ works, reinforced by some mutually contradictory statements that Bakhtin is reported to have made. The lack of clarity surrounding the status of these works allows different interpretations of Bakhtin’s stance vis-à-vis Marxism and religion.

⁴⁵ This term is understood by Fitzpatrick to incorporate the “process of political and social transformation beginning in 1917 and continuing through the 1920s and 1930s” (Fitzpatrick 2001, 469).

Just as Bakhtin's theoretical frameworks and lived experience align with each other, so does his writing style, which is also performative. As mentioned in the introduction to this paper, in Section X of *FTC* Bakhtin explicitly undertakes to sum up the previous sections, adding no substantive new material. By the end of the 'Concluding Remarks' this undertaking is comprehensively breached by a shift that expands the objects of chronotopic analysis from those of art and literature to include lived experience as well (Wall 2001). This textual event can be characterised as a 'performative shift' defined in a late Soviet context by Alexei Yurchak as:

[a] general shift at the level of concrete ritualised forms of discourse, in which the performative dimension's importance grows, while the constative dimension opens up to new meanings ... (Yurchak 2006, 24).

In Bakhtin's case the 'ritualised form of discourse' consists of the text in the second paragraph of Section X (*Concluding Remarks*) of *Фехр*: "Здесь же, в конце нашей работы, мы только назовем и едва коснемся некоторых хронотопических ценностей разных степеней и объемов."⁴⁶ The importance of the performative dimension grows because Bakhtin's conclusion (as Wall astutely notes) rather than summing up the previous sections, introduces a totally new conception of the chronotope, "one that could, at the very best, be said to exist *in nuce* in all the various other texts ... that he had written much, much earlier ..." (Wall 2001, 140). This 'new conception' is not confined to literature, deriving from a reflexive 'meta-theoretical' view of the chronotope by Bakhtin himself. It thus signals a change in the constative di-

⁴⁶ Бахтин 2012 [*Фехр*], 489; "As we draw our essay to a close we will *simply list*, and *merely touch upon*, certain chronotopic values having varying degrees and scopes" (Bakhtin [*FTC*] 1981, 243, emphasis not in original, but added to translation).

BAKHTIN AND PERFORMATIVITY

mension, opening up a new meaning (which Wall identifies as the “chronotope of the author-creator”).⁴⁷ This situation also reflects the element of reciprocity that can be found in a typical performative utterance, in which the world fits the words as well as the converse.⁴⁸

One view of this performative shift is that the breach is one of commitment (the undertaking was breached, whatever Bakhtin’s intention). However, in view of Bakhtin’s record (discussed briefly above), it appears far more likely to be a more conscious breach (where Bakhtin had no intention of honouring the undertaking). This leads to an ambiguous and confusing series of utterances that, looking both backwards and forwards, manifest themselves performatively. The Janus-like nature of these utterances parallel the directionality of ‘word with a backward glance’ and ‘word with a loophole’ respectively (Cook 2018). Bakhtin’s method of employing this performative shift is also closely aligned to Austin’s mode of argument as described by Fish using the Derridean term “writing ‘under erasure’ which simultaneously uses and calls into question a vocabulary and a set of concepts” (Fish 1982, 717). This particular example of performativity is not only tied back to the expressive nature of the utterance, but it also looks forward to the referentiality of deixis (Benveniste 1971, Chapters 18, 19, 21, & 22).

In both contexts the ‘performance’ appears to represent a concrete example of a deliberate strategy by Bakhtin. This approach meshes closely with Butler’s view of gender: “Consider gender, for instance, as *a corporeal style*, an ‘act’, as it were, which is both intentional and performative, where *‘performative’* suggests a dramatic and

⁴⁷ Wall 2001, 141.

⁴⁸ “[while] the words of a performative do in some sense ‘fit’ the world, conforming to the conventions that govern their success, they also constitute it, so that by their very utterance the world is also made to fit the words” (Hall 2000 ‘*Performativity*’, 185).

contingent construction of meaning” (Butler & Salih 2004, 113). All of these scholars assist our understanding by alternately concentrating and fleshing out Bakhtin’s writings on interdiscursivity, reinforcing Austin’s performative perspective.⁴⁹

* * *

In summary, Bakhtin and Butler have a lot in common (the latter building on Austin’s earlier work). They regard language as both concrete and contextualised.⁵⁰ They all believe that utterances involve positions, acts and ideologies.⁵¹ Style and genre also prove to be significant in the integration of their approaches.

3. Links between the chronotope and performativity

Whilst these thinkers provide a series of vectors on the theme of performativity, the connection between the chronotope and performativity is not immediately clear. To clarify this Bakhtin’s notion of the chronotope must be examined closely.

In Bakhtin’s own work, the chronotope evades exact description, largely because of the way in which Bakhtin constructs his arguments in his major works about the novel in the late 1930s. In the Introduction to *FTC* Bakhtin formulates the concept: “Существенную взаимосвязь временных и пространственных отношений,

⁴⁹ For example, Bauman 2005, 149-150 (the section of the article on ‘Bakhtin and Linguistic Anthropology’) and Pennycook 2004, 15-16 (specifically the latter’s comment: “[Bakhtin’s] view of language ... opens up significant possibilities for understanding agentive action in the refashioning of language and identity. Language performance, from this point of view, can be viewed not as the incompetencies of the real world but as the site where language and identity are made”).

⁵⁰ Austin 1961, 182, Bakhtin 1986 *PSG*, 62. Butler (Butler & Salih 2004, 94) expresses context in a more theatrical way: “the context of a body, understood, in part, as a culturally sustained temporal duration.”

⁵¹ Austin 1963, 1975 *passim*; Bakhtin 1986 *PSG*, 84, 91; Butler expresses ideology in terms of “political regulations and disciplinary practices” (Butler & Salih 2004, 111).

BAKHTIN AND PERFORMATIVITY

художественно освоенных в литературе, мы будем называть *хронотопом* ...” (Бахтин 2012 [*Фехр*], 341).⁵² Holquist’s summary of this concept — “particular combinations of time and space as they have resulted in historically manifested narrative forms” (Holquist 2004, 109) — provides a not dissimilar view to that of Bakhtin. However, Bakhtin proceeds to qualify his own definition somewhat evasively: “Для нас не важен тот специальный смысл, который он имеет в теории относительности, мы перенесем его сюда — в литературоведение — *почти как метафору (почти, но не совсем)* ...” (Бахтин 2012 [*Фехр*], 341; emphasis added to the original).⁵³ The words in the original that I have emphasised indicate that this concept is being accorded the same treatment that Bakhtin applied to those problematic issues in his life identified briefly above. In other words, Bakhtin performs in his theory the reinvention that he has perpetuated in his life (with its consequent ambiguities). However, in the next paragraph, Bakhtin does amplify his initial statement, albeit not analytically:

В литературно-художественном хронотопе имеет место слияние пространственных и временных примет в осмысленном и конкретном целом. Время здесь сгущается, уплотняется, становится художественно-зримым; пространство же интенсифицируется, втягивается в движение времени, сюжета, истории. Приметы времени раскрываются в пространстве, и пространство осмысливается и измеряется временем. Этим

⁵² “We will give the name *chronotope* ... to the intrinsic interconnectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically assimilated in literature” (Bakhtin 1981 *FTC*, 84).

⁵³ “The special meaning it has in relativity theory is not important for our purposes; we shall transfer it to literary criticism *almost as a metaphor (almost, but not entirely)*” (Bakhtin 1981 *FTC*, 84; emphasis added to the translation).

JOHN COOK

пересечением рядов и слиянием примет характеризуется художественный хронотоп (Бахтин 2012 [*Фвхр*], 341).⁵⁴

This combination of science and metaphor makes it difficult for the reader to pin down the notion of the chronotope.

The connection between Bakhtin's chronotope and performativity is dependent on a number of intermediate links. The link between the performative aspects of language and self, and the utterance have already been established in detail in Section 2 above. What remains to close the loop between performativity and the chronotope are, firstly, establishing a link between the utterance and genre, and, secondly, establishing a link between genre and the chronotope. Once these theoretical links have been established, it remains to demonstrate how this plays out in Bakhtin's text (in Section 4 below), and what the implications of this 'performance' are (in Section 5 below).

It has been established earlier in this paper that Bakhtin, in the tradition of Ordinary Language Philosophy, considered the utterance to be performative. The link between genre and the utterance is also explicit in 'Problems of Speech Genres' when Bakhtin writes "... *природа высказывания должна быть раскрыта и определена путем анализа и того и другого вида [речевых жанров]*" (Бахтин 1997 [*ПРЖ*], 161).⁵⁵ A final link is established by Bakhtin's persistent statements regarding the

⁵⁴ "In the literary artistic chronotope, spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out, concrete whole. Time here, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; space, however, becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history. The indicators of time are revealed in space, and space is comprehended and measured by time. This intersection of axes and fusion of indicators characterizes the artistic chronotope" (Bakhtin 1981 *FTC*, 84).

⁵⁵ "... *the nature of the utterance should be revealed and defined through analysis of both types [of speech genres]*" (Bakhtin 1986 *PSG*, 62).

close bonds (but not equivalence) which exist between the chronotope and genre in *FTC*. Bakhtin establishes a definite, albeit not clearly articulated, link between the chronotope and genre: “Можно прямо сказать, что жанр и жанровые разновидности определяются именно хронотопом ...” (Бахтин 2012 [*Фехр*], 341-342).⁵⁶ Whilst this quotation is applied to literature in this context, Bakhtin makes it quite clear in *PSG* that the utterance embraces both oral and written forms when he writes “Использование языка осуществляется в форме единичных конкретных высказываний (устных или письменных) участников той или иной области человеческой деятельности” (Бахтин 1997 [*ПРЖ*], 159).⁵⁷ Hence, genres also apply to all texts, both oral and written and, by implication, so do chronotopes.

This loop is closed in Section X of *FTC* when he writes: “Из реальных хронотопов этого изображающего мира и выходят отраженные и *созданные* хронотопы изображенного в произведении (в тексте) мира” (Бахтин 2012 [*Фехр*], 499; *emphasis in the original*).⁵⁸ This chronotope-genre-utterance-performativity tetralogy is an essential part of Bakhtin’s dissolution of the theoretical boundaries between the ‘real’ and the ‘fictional’.

⁵⁶ “it is precisely the chronotope that defines genre and generic distinctions” (Bakhtin 1981 *FTC*, 85).

⁵⁷ “The utilization of language is realized in the form of individual concrete utterances (oral or written) by participants in the various areas of human activity” (Bakhtin 1986 *PSG*, 60).

⁵⁸ “Out of the actual chronotopes of our world (which serves as the source of representation) emerge the reflected and *created* chronotopes of the world represented in the work (in the text)” (Bakhtin 1981 *FTC*, 253).

4. Analysis of the symptoms presenting in Section X of *FTC*

As has been mentioned in an earlier article (Cook 2014, 55), tensions exist between, on the one hand, the organic, relatively predictable, exploration of the development of the chronotope in Sections I-IX of *FTC* and, on the other, the subtle but nonetheless real paradigm shift (Wall 2001, 139) in Section X. These tensions become palpable when the reader suddenly realises that the performative breach has occurred, and that what follows it is a re-evaluation of Sections I-IX. Rather than ‘merely listing’ what has gone before, Bakhtin proceeds to enlarge the scope of the chronotope dramatically in the paragraphs of Section X that follow.

Both the tensions created, and the paradigm shift itself, are manifestations of performativity and, as such, are indicators that something significant has occurred. In establishing precisely what has occurred, one has to examine the direction of change, and the key to that direction lies in the nature of the chronotope itself. For the chronotope has been expanded to take in lived experience as well as literary fiction, thus embracing all narrative.

In the earlier paper cited above (Cook 2014), the chronotope of the castle was dealt with in detail, as was the application of the chronotope to all narrative, including history. In part, this article focuses briefly on a paper by Lawson covering the fiction/history divide and its application to narrating the ‘truth’ of a heteroglot Canadian past (Lawson 2011). Using the chronotope as a basis, Lawson theorises not one, but many, connections between the ‘real world’ and narrative, each one of which will have a different truth claim associated with it. Lawson works through the types of truth claims made by “indigenous ‘traditional knowledge’” (Lawson 2011, 400), their complications and responses, all in the context of dispossession of the indigenes’ land and resources by the dominant group(s).

BAKHTIN AND PERFORMATIVITY

This perspective can be tied back to the relationships of Speech Acts to truth. Initially, Austin ties utterances firmly to binaries: constatives to true/false and performatives to felicity/infelicity (Austin 1975). However, the distinctions and the correspondences become less certain in a later paper in which Austin argues that constatives are also liable to infelicity (Austin 1963, 29), concluding that truth is “not a simple quality or relation, not indeed one anything, but rather a whole dimension of criticism” (Austin 1963, 33). As outlined above, this dimension of criticism applies to the scope of the chronotope.

5. Conclusions

In the introduction to this article, I expressed the intention to explore the mechanics of the anomaly created by Bakhtin’s misdirection in Section X of *FTC*. As Judith Butler observed when discussing performativity: “The demand for lucidity forgets the ruses that motor the ostensibly ‘clear’ view ... What does ‘transparency’ keep obscure?” (Butler & Salih 2004, 97-98). I proposed to explore these mechanics as symptomatic of both Bakhtin’s representation of himself within his writing and also issues with the very nature of the chronotope.

I have used the concept of performativity in a purely linguistic (Austin) as well as a theatrical (Butler) sense. I have grounded these approaches in the theory of the utterance (Bakhtin), harnessing the concept of revolutionary reinvention (Fitzpatrick) as performance. On this theoretical substrate Bakhtin’s representation of his personal circumstances have been juxtaposed with his written ‘performance’, showing their alignment. The stylistic result of this alignment is deliberate misdirection, very much in the spirit of ‘carnival’.

A number of links between performativity and the chronotope have been established, tracing multiple connections through genre and the utterance. This per-

JOHN COOK

formativity-utterance-chronotope link has been established not only by literary texts, but also by lived experience, both mediated through ideology and genre. This appears to have considerable implications for how we treat the rather porous borders between lived experience and fiction.

Platonically based binaries — true/false, history/fiction, lived/imagined experience — have often been unquestioningly accepted in the Western tradition. New literary genres — as exemplified by Svetlana Alexievich's *Secondhand Time* (Alexievich 2016) — are joining indigenous views of what constitutes history to dissolve these binaries and open up a vista that embraces this area of narrative theory as a continuum, rather than a divide. Bakhtin has played a felicitous part in this dissolution through his performative misdirection.

REFERENCES

IN ENGLISH

- Adlam, C., and D. Shepherd. 2000. *The Annotated Bakhtin Bibliography* (Maney Publishing for the Modern Humanities Research Association: Leeds, UK).
- Aleksievich, S. 2016. *Secondhand Time: the Last of the Soviets* (Random House: New York, NY).
- Austin, J. L. 1961. *Philosophical Papers* (OUP [Clarendon Press]: Oxford, UK).
- Austin, J. L. 1963. 'Performative-Constatative.' In: C. E. Caton (ed.), *Philosophy and Ordinary Language* (University of Illinois Press: Urbana, IL).
- Austin, J. L. 1975. *How to Do Things with Words* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA).
- Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination* (University of Texas Press: Austin, TX).

BAKHTIN AND PERFORMATIVITY

- Bakhtin, M. M. 1984. *Rabelais and His World* (Indiana University Press: Bloomington, IL).
- Bakhtin, M. M. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (University of Texas Press: Austin, TX).
- Bakhtin, M. M. 1993. *Towards a Philosophy of the Act* (University of Texas Press: Austin, TX).
- Benveniste, É. 1971. *Problems in General Linguistics* (University of Miami Press: Coral Gables, FL).
- Bauman, R. 2005. 'Commentary: Indirect Indexicality, Identity, Performance: Dialogic Observations', *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15: 145-50.
- Berrong, R. M. 1986. *Rabelais and Bakhtin: Popular Culture in Gargantua and Pantagruel* (University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, NE).
- Bullough, V. L., and J. A. Brundage. 1996. *Handbook of Medieval Sexuality* (Garland: New York).
- Butler, J. 2014. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. Retrieved on 13 July, 2018 from ProQuest Ebook Central, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/unimelb/> (Taylor & Francis Group: Florence, UK).
- Butler, J., and S. Salih. 2004. *The Judith Butler Reader* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.).
- Cook, J. 2014. 'Events Set in Amber: Bakhtin's 'Chronotope of the Castle' as Solidified Space-Time', *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies*, 28: 51-70.
- Cook, J. 2018. 'Glances & loopholes: Bakhtin's view of Dostoevsky's linguistic microcosm', *The Dostoevsky Journal: A Comparative Literature Review*, 19: 47-71.

JOHN COOK

- Derrida, J. 1977. 'Signature Event Context.' Chapter 8 [pp. 172-197] in: *Glyph* (Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, MD).
- Fish, S. E. 1976. 'Interpreting the "Variorum"', *Critical Inquiry*, 2: 465-85.
- Fish, S. E. 1978. 'Normal Circumstances, Literal Language, Direct Speech Acts, the Ordinary, the Everyday, the Obvious, What Goes without Saying, and Other Special Cases', *Critical Inquiry*, 4: 625-44.
- Fish, S. E. 1982. 'With the Compliments of the Author: Reflections on Austin and Derrida', *Critical Inquiry*, 8: 693-721.
- Fitzpatrick, S. 2001. 'Making a Self for the Times: Impersonation and Imposture in 20th-Century Russia', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 2: 469-87.
- Fitzpatrick, S. 2005. *Tear off the Masks! Identity and Imposture in Twentieth-Century Russia* (Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ).
- Hall, K. 2000. 'Performativity', *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 9: 184-87.
- Hirschkop, K. 2015. 'Editing history: on the publication of Bakhtin's *Sobranie sočinenij*, 1996-2012', *Studies in East European Thought*, 67: 129-44.
- Holquist, M. 2004. *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World* (Routledge: London, UK).
- Lawson, J. 2011. 'Chronotope, Story, and Historical Geography: Mikhail Bakhtin and the Space-Time of Narratives', *Antipode*, 43: 384-412.
- Longworth, G. 2012. "John Langshaw Austin." In: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by E. N. Zalta, 1-73. Stanford, CA: Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.
- Mamujee, S. 2014. 'To serve us in that behalf when our pleasure is to call for them: performing boys in Renaissance England', *Renaissance Studies*, 28: 714-30.
- Ol'khov, P. 2014. 'The Old New Bakhtin', *Russian Studies in Literature*, 50: 9-15.

BAKHTIN AND PERFORMATIVITY

- Pennycook, A. 2004. 'Performativity and Language Studies', *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal*, 1: 1-19.
- Poole, B. 1998. 'Bakhtin and Cassirer: The Philosophical Origins of Bakhtin's Carnival Messianism', *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 97: 537-78.
- Tolstoy, L. 2003. *Anna Karenina* (Penguin Books: London, UK).
- Wall, A. 2001. 'Loopholes in a 'Theory' of Time and History', *Dialogism*, 5/6: 134-47.
- Yurchak, A. 2006. *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ).

IN RUSSIAN

- Бахтин, М.М. 1997. *Собрание сочинений в семи томах. Том 5.* ed. by С.Г. Бочаров & Гоготишвили, П.А. ("Русские словари": Москва, РФ).
- Бахтин, М.М. 2008. *Собрание сочинений в семи томах. Том 4-1.* ed. by С.Г. Бочаров & Кожин, В.В. ("Языки славянских культур": Москва, РФ).
- Бахтин, М.М. 2010. *Собрание сочинений в семи томах. Том 4-2.* ed. by С.Н. Зенкин & Хализев, В.Е. ("Языки славянских культур": Москва, РФ).
- Бахтин, М.М. 2012. *Собрание сочинений в семи томах. Том 3.* ed. by С.Г. Бочаров & Кожин, В.В. ("Языки славянских культур": Москва, РФ).
- Конкин, С.С. 1994a. 'Пора закрыть вопрос о родословной М.М. Бахтина', *Диалог. Карнавал. Хронотоп*, 1994: 119-23.
- Конкин, С.С. 1994b. 'Послесловие к статье "Пора закрыть вопрос о родословной М. М.Бахтина"', *Диалог. Карнавал. Хронотоп*, 1994: 135-37.
- Паньков, Н.А. 1993. 'Загадки раннего периода (ещё несколько штрихов к "Биографии М. М. Бахтина"', *Диалог. Карнавал. Хронотоп*, 1993: 74-89.

PAVEL KREISINGER

**TO THE CZECHOSLOVAK OR THE AUSTRALIAN ARMY?
AN UNKNOWN CHAPTER OF CZECHOSLOVAK-AUSTRALIAN RELATIONS
DURING THE SECOND WORLD WAR¹**

Introduction. The Czechoslovak anti-Nazi resistance abroad²

The journey of Czech and Slovak people to exile was itself an act of resistance to begin with, often dramatic and dangerous. The first wave of emigration started after the Munich Agreement³ and the second wave followed the Nazi occupation of the Czech Lands (Bohemia and Moravia) on 15 March 1939. The activities of the Czechoslovak (CS) resistance abroad developed along two lines: military (General Sergej Ingr and Colonel František Moravec) and political (Edvard Beneš – former CS president; Jan Masaryk, former MP and son of the first CS president and founder of Czechoslovakia T. G. Masaryk). After March 1939, the three main centres of military exile formed in Poland (Kraków – September 1939, 1,000 men at arms), France (Paris, Agde – June 1940, 13,000 men at arms) and Great Britain (London).

London played a rather specific role as of 1939, being the location of the CS Military Intelligence, which cooperated with the British Secret Intelligence Service

¹ This article came into existence with the support of the Ministry of Education of the Czech Republic to the Palacký University in Olomouc (IGA_FF_2018_006 a IGA_FF_2019_011, Společnost v historickém vývoji od pravěku a středověku po moderní věk IV.-V.)

² Unless otherwise indicated, summarised according to Gebhart, Jan, Czechoslovakia in the years after the Munich Agreement and in the Second World War (1938–1945). *A History of the Czech Lands. Second Edition* (Eds.: Pánek, Jaroslav – Tůma, Oldřich et alii) Prague: Karolinum Press 2018, pp. 481-508.

³ Rosenbaum, Anna: 'Czechoslovakia 1938 – the Australian Response.' In: *Československo a krize demokracie ve střední Evropě ve 30. a 40. letech XX. století. Hledání východisek*. (Eds.: Němeček, Jan – Šedivý, Ivan). Praha, 2010, pp. 179–188.

(MI-6) and later the Special Operations Executive.⁴ In cooperation with Major Harold Gibson (in 1934–1939 head of the Prague station of MI-6), CS Colonel František Moravec flew to Great Britain on 14 March 1939, together with a group of 11 intelligence officers. These men were among the very first members of the CS military forces to escape abroad.⁵ The British recognised the CS government in exile, led by President Edvard Beneš and Prime Minister Jan Šrámek, several months later, in summer 1940.⁶ At the same time, Czech and Slovak airmen were engaged in the Battle of Britain.⁷ The connection between the CS government in exile in London and the occupied homeland would not be possible without the BBC, which started regular broadcasts in the Protectorate on 8 September 1939 (one 15-minute broadcast a day, later two 15-minute programmes).⁸

Recruitment of countrymen to the CS Army within the British Dominion

After the fall of France in June 1940, recruitment of new members to the military crisis units began in the CS foreign resistance. ‘Only’ 5,000 men from the original 13,000 were evacuated from France to Great Britain. It began to be quite difficult to obtain new volunteers on the European continent with regard to the assumed progress of the war; future enrolment was estimated to be on an individual basis. Military au-

⁴ Straka, Karel; Tomek, Prokop; Bandžuch, Tomáš, *Serving the Republic. 100 Years Since the Establishment of Czechoslovak Military Intelligence*. Praha, 2018, pp. 76, 111-129.

⁵ Jeffery, Keith, *MI6. The History of the Secret Intelligence Service, 1909-1949*, London: Bloomsbury, 2011, pp. 307-308, 411-412.

⁶ Raška, Francis D., *The Czechoslovak Exile Government in London and the Sudeten German Issue*, Prague: Karolinum Press, 2002.

⁷ Kudrna, Ladislav, ‘We Fight to Rebuild. Airmen’s Contribution to Recognition of the Government in Exile’, *Bic – Behind the Iron Curtain*, 2016/4, 30-41.

⁸ Koutek, Ondřej, ‘The Overseas Resistance on the Airwaves of the BBC. Czechoslovak Broadcast from London 1939-1945’, *Bic – Behind the Iron Curtain*, 2014/3, 8-23.

CZECHOSLOVAK-AUSTRALIAN RELATIONS DURING WORLD WAR II

thorities therefore decided to focus their attention on the North American continent, where a large community of compatriots was based. Canada was the first subject of interest; although it had the status of an autonomous dominion, it was in a state of war against Germany, just like Great Britain, and unlike the United States of America, which had remained neutral for the time being.

The CS military mission, led by Colonel General Čeněk Kudláček (1869–1967), was sent to Canada. The mission operated in the country between 1941 and 1943. The commander then transferred to Brazil, where he remained until 1945.⁹ A CS mission composed of three members was also prepared to travel to the USA; it never left, presumably because of economic reasons.¹⁰ Nevertheless, CS Military Diplomat Colonel General Oldřich Španiel worked tirelessly to recruit individuals in the United States.¹¹

Unlike Canada, Australia remained on the sidelines in this respect. The Czechoslovak community on the other side of the world – in Australia – was smaller in one sense, but to transport CS volunteers together with the Australian Army to the Middle East could be as demanding as transporting Czech Canadians to Great Britain. After the CS military mission's (lack of) success in Canada, the CS Ministry of National Defence in London concentrated its recruitment efforts on Latin American countries, where the number of countrymen was also high.¹²

⁹ Jiránek, Tomáš, *Šéf štábu Obrany národa. Neklidný život divizního generála Čenka Kudláčka*, Prague: Academia, 2015.

¹⁰ Jiránek, Tomáš, 'Československá vojenská mise v Kanadě za 2. světové války – předhistorie', *Theatrum historiae*, 6, 2010, pp. 163-164.

¹¹ Jiránek, Tomáš, 'V Americe za války "před válkou". Působení plk. gšt. Oldřicha Španiela v USA v letech 1939–1941', *Theatrum historiae*, 15, 2014, 271-295.

¹² Nálevka, Vladimír, *Československo a Latinská Amerika v letech druhé světové války*, Prague, 1972.

Unlike the situation in the United States, since there was no CS military diplomat in Australia between 1918 and 1938 and the CS government-in-exile never sent one over the course of the entire war, recruitment on the fifth continent faced great organisational challenges. The main and sole organiser and recruitment facilitator, apart from Czech countrymen and emigrants, was the CS Consulate General in Sydney, led by Vice-Consul and former ‘Russian’ legionnaire PhDr. Adolf Solanský as of 15 March 1939.

Only partial references can be found in the available literature about recruitment to CS units in Australia.¹³ Out of all the Czech historians, only Zdenko Maršálek briefly mentions the arrival of volunteers from Australia joining the CS Army in the Middle East (without any numerical data) in 1941.¹⁴ He suggests that “[I]t was especially workers from export and engineering companies coming from Australia, who had set out before the war had begun or even after, while groups of Jews had arrived from Mauritius and Shanghai, who were fleeing from their homeland in the face of racial persecution.”¹⁵ Partial information can be found on some individuals in several other works cited below.¹⁶

This article, based on the results of archival research carried out in Czech, Slovak as well as Australian archives (Canberra, Sydney), has several goals; firstly, to describe each recruitment process and outline the war and post-war fates of all its protagonists. The current state of research allows for a comparison of recruitment results

¹³ Cigler, Michael, *The Czechs in Australia*. AE Press, Melbourne, 1983.

¹⁴ Maršálek, Zdenko, “Česká”, nebo “československá” armáda? *Národnostní složení československých vojenských jednotek v zahraničí v letech 1939–1945*. Unpublished dissertation, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague, 2014, p. 414.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 410.

¹⁶ Leach, Daniel, ‘The Other Allies: Military Security, National Allegiance, and the Enlistment of “Friendly Aliens” in the Australian Armed Forces, 1939–45’, *War and Society*, 32/1, 2013, 26–48.

CZECHOSLOVAK-AUSTRALIAN RELATIONS DURING WORLD WAR II

with recruitment in other parts of the British Empire as well as other countries in North and Latin America. It also includes a comparison with the number of volunteers, who came to the CS legion through the Australian Army during the previous war.

Czechoslovaks in Australia at the beginning of the Second World War

The originally small community of Czechoslovaks in Australia began to grow slowly thanks to the establishment of official ties between the two young states. Inhabitants of interwar Czechoslovakia had enough information about the life and work conditions in Australia, and based on this, some decided to emigrate.¹⁷ In the 1930s, the compatriot community numbered about 600 people, with more than twice as many after the Second World War. Czechoslovaks settled in all six Australian states and two territories, as is evidenced by the following table based on the results of the Australian national censuses.

Census year	1921	1933	1947
New South Wales	107	308	800
Victoria	46	146	485
Queensland	56	84	86
South Australia	15	19	34
Western Australia	36	47	68
Tasmania	4	5	8
Northern Territory	0	1	2
ACT	0	0	1
Total	264	610	1,484
Total men	202	491	926
Total women	62	119	558

Table 1. Number of people born in Czechoslovakia according to the Australian national censuses (1921–1947)¹⁸

¹⁷ Burešová, Jana, 'Vystěhovaectví z Československa do Austrálie v podmínkách světové hospodářské krize (1929–1932)', *Moderní dějiny*, 21/2, 2013, 81-100.

¹⁸ *Census of the Commonwealth of Australia: April 1921, June 1933, June 1947*. Available online at <http://www.abs.gov.au> [last accessed 21 July 2015].

PAVEL KREISINGER

Vice-Consul PhDr. Adolf Solanský (1892–1968) became the head of the emerging CS resistance in Australia in March 1939 and eventually saved the main CS representational office from its demise. His superior, Consul General František Květoň (1881–1976), had decided to transfer the office to his Nazi German counterpart, Dr. jur. et Dr. phil. Rudolf Asmis (1879–1945).¹⁹ Although he himself was a member of the first CS resistance in France, Květoň, referring to the instructions from Czech Minister Chvalkovský and as a result of the illness of his relatives in the protectorate and for fear of their possible persecution, decided to return to his Nazi-occupied homeland. With the consent of the Australian Minister of Foreign Affairs ‘Billy’ Hughes, Solanský led the consulate from 6 April 1939, albeit on makeshift premises, until the British finalised their recognition of the Provisional Government of Czechoslovakia in London. On 22 November 1940, the Australian Federal Government also accepted the Czechoslovak government-in-exile, and so the CS Consulate General could be fully re-established. In August 1941 Solanský was officially appointed the consul general,²⁰ although he had been actually carrying out the office since 31 March 1939, when he had obtained an important answer from Edvard Beneš in Chicago in response to his telegram: “If it is possible, in agreement with the [Australian] authorities, keep working. Otherwise, organise the community. We are preparing the resistance as in the last war.”²¹

The compatriots in Sydney had been acquainted with the results of Solanský’s efforts since 8 April 1939, when the widely conceived ‘Compatriot Association’ was

¹⁹ Tampke, Jürgen, *The Germans in Australia*. Cambridge: CUP, 2006, pp. 130-131.

²⁰ Němeček, Jan, *Soumrak a úsvit československé diplomacie. 15. březen 1939 a československé zastupitelské úřady*. Prague: Academia, 2008, pp. 100-103.

²¹ Archiv ministerstva zahraničních věcí (AMZV) Praha, f. Londýnský archiv – obyčejný (LA-O), kart. 167, Diplomatický sbor ZÚ Čsl. (Sydney–Teheran), Sydney, složka Různé, *Australie a Nový Zéland v našem druhém odboji*, 1 September 1943, p. 2.

CZECHOSLOVAK-AUSTRALIAN RELATIONS DURING WORLD WAR II

established. It had only one main objective: “to support the liberation initiated by the President of the Republic Dr. E. Beneš.”²² Between 1938 and 1940, the compatriot community grew by approximately 400 Czech-Jewish emigrants to almost 1,000.²³ The most accurate numerical data probably come from the Australian Statistical Office, which, upon the request of the CS consul, stated that “at the end of 1940 there were 937 Czechoslovak citizens in Australia, of whom 603 were male and 334 were female.”²⁴

The situation of the emerging CS resistance in Australia improved considerably in September 1939, when the Australian Union declared war on Nazi Germany in order to help the British motherland as in the previous war. The German Consulate General in Sydney was closed and the interests of Germans on the fifth continent could only be addressed by neutral Switzerland, with most Germans interned in prison camps as enemy aliens.²⁵

At the beginning of 1940, with the help of the Australians, Dr. Solanský founded the *Australian Committee for Aid to CS Military Forces in France* and soon became the delegate of the Czechoslovak Red Cross for Australia and New Zealand. According to a later report by one of the six future volunteers, Ing. Jan Čapek, the Czechoslovaks were greatly interested in service in the CS foreign army right at the start of the war, where “40 Czechoslovaks volunteered to join our foreign army.”²⁶ Vice-Consul Solanský did not have any means, however, of sending the CS volun-

²² Ibid.

²³ Kreisinger, Pavel, ‘Českoslovenští Židé v australské emigraci za druhé světové války’, *Acta Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Šafarikianae: Studia historica*, 86, 2016, 111-123.

²⁴ AMZV Praha, f. LA-O, kart. 167, Sydney, složka Krajanská péče, Přípis Dr. Solanského, 8 March 1941.

²⁵ Tampke, Jürgen, *The Germans in Australia*. Cambridge: CUP, 2006, pp. 132-133.

²⁶ Národní archiv Praha (NA), f. Ministerstvo průmyslu obchodu a živností – Londýn (MPOŽ–L), karton 77, sign. Z 94 (Australie), Zpráva Ing. Čapka, *Australie: Hospodářské poměry a vztahy s ČSR*, 27 June 1943, pp. 5-6.

teers to France at the time. The situation did not change even after the fall of France since the CS government-in-exile in London was not officially recognised by Australia until the end of November 1940. A former active officer of the CS interwar army, Capt. Felix Süssländ, who came to Australia after a complicated journey in March 1940, sought to improve the situation. After becoming familiar with the new environment, he sent a three-page handwritten letter to the CS Ministry of National Defence in London where he mentioned his efforts to enter into the CS foreign army, as well as his unsuccessful negotiations with the Australian Ministry of Defence. He also sent information about the relationships between potential volunteers: “[...] my only endeavour is to enter our legion and to make available all our knowledge to fight against our enemy. I have found that although there are few Czechs and Slovaks in Sydney, there are a great number of specialists among them, such as pilots, artillerymen, doctors, etc., who would be happy to face any challenge and report to our troops.”²⁷

Recruitment in Australia (1940–1941)

Once Australia, as one of the last of all the British dominions, recognised the CS government-in-exile in London,²⁸ Vice-Consul Solanský turned to the CS compatriots on 4 December 1940 with the following call to enlist in the CS Army voluntarily:

COUNTRYMEN! We have achieved a new success. Our government has been recognised by the Australian government and in these days the recruitment of volunteers to the Czechoslovak Army has begun. A

²⁷ Vojenský ústřední archiv – Vojenský historický archiv Praha (VÚA–VHA), Sbíрка (Sb.) 20, sign. 20-3-58/73-74, Süssländův dopis, došlo na MNO do Londýna, 17 September 1940.

²⁸ Němeček, Jan a kol. (Eds.), *Od uznání československé prozatímní vlády do vyhlášení válečného stavu Německu 1940–1941. Svazek I, Dokument č. 55*, Prague, 2006.

CZECHOSLOVAK-AUSTRALIAN RELATIONS DURING WORLD WAR II

number of countrymen have already enlisted [...] The government of the republic now has the ability to order the mobilisation of all Czechoslovaks in Australia who are able to fight, but it has not done so because it is convinced that those who are able to be of service to the military will do so voluntarily. I am sure that Czechoslovak Australia will not disappoint this expectation!”²⁹

The text went on to say that volunteers should report to the provisional address of the CS Consulate General in Sydney, and that the wives of all CS volunteers would be financially secure in the same way as British wives were. The call was posted in CS compatriot clubs in the capitals of the two most populous Australian states – in Sydney and Melbourne. CS compatriot associations did not exist in the other states of the Australian union; for this reason, Solanský personally sent out “this call by post to all countrymen, who could be considered fitting volunteers due to their age.”³⁰ The remaining compatriots could have learned about the recruitment from the Australian press or through the CS honorary consulates. It should be noted, however, that some CS honorary consuls did not support the resistance and remained passive throughout the entire course of the war. The consul in Brisbane even went so far as to transfer his office, out of lack of knowledge, to the Germans on 15 March 1939, and was later removed from office by the President of the Republic Edvard Beneš at the suggestion of Solanský. The consul in Perth, Western Australia, was passive in a similar way, where compatriots organised their activities themselves rather than relying on his support. The foreign resistance was, therefore, only actively supported by Czech consuls in

²⁹ AMZV, f. LA-O, kart. 506 (Vojenství 1939–1945), Provolání Dr. Solanského, 4 December 1940.

³⁰ VÚA–VHA, Sb. 20, sign. 20-31-7/18-20, Zpráva generálního konzulátu adresovaná MZV v Londýně, 20 December 1940.

PAVEL KREISINGER

Melbourne and Adelaide, where, however, the compatriot communities were not as numerous as in Sydney.³¹

Despite the maximum possible efforts that Consul Solanský made, there was little interest among the compatriots. The results of recruitment organised by the CS consul were exactly the opposite of what was expected. He perhaps already suspected that obtaining volunteers in Australia would be difficult when he was drafting his call. His phrase “a number of countrymen have already enlisted” was, in fact, untrue. The only person interested in serving in the CS Army was Officer Süssland (born 1898); however, he had just narrowly exceeded the age limit (18-40 years of age) required by the CS Ministry of National Defence in London.³² At the time of the call to CS compatriots, Solanský had only one signed application for entry to the CS Army on his table – from Jan Toman, who had signed it on 2 December 1940. For the sake of promotion, he was photographed during the signing and the picture was then published with a short commentary on 4 December 1940 in a prominent Sydney newspaper.³³ The report was soon printed with the headline *CZECH. PREPARES TO FIGHT* by a newspaper in Newcastle, followed by a newspaper in the neighbouring state of Queensland.³⁴ Ironically, however, Toman did not end up travelling to the Middle East with the rest of the volunteers because “he lost his job during the eight-month wait before deployment to the Middle East and found himself without any resources. He then enlisted in the Australian Army and was accepted.”³⁵ In December, after their medical examinations, which were conducted at no cost by the military physician

³¹ Kreisinger, Pavel, *Češi a Slováci v Austrálii v 1. polovině 20. století a jejich účast ve světových válkách*. Prague: Academia, 2018, pp. 218-260.

³² VÚA–VHA, Sb. 37, sign. 37-18-44 (dobrovolníci).

³³ *The Sun* (Sydney, NSW: 1910–1954) Wednesday 4 December, 1940, p. 2.

³⁴ *Daily Mercury* (Mackay, Qld.: 1906–1954) Thursday 19 December, 1940, p. 7.

³⁵ VÚA–VHA, Sb. 20, sign. 20-31-7/73, Najímání dobrovolníků v Australii, Londýn, 9 February, 1942.

CZECHOSLOVAK-AUSTRALIAN RELATIONS DURING WORLD WAR II

of the Australian Army – Major Dr. Sidney Solomon Rosebery (1889–1946), the Czech Ing. Václav Čapek and Slovak Milan Gašinec submitted their applications at the Consulate General in Sydney. On the basis of the press release, only 12 men volunteered by mid-March, seven of whom were Jews, four Czechs and one Slovak. The group soon dwindled, however, to a mere six people: while František Wiener (born 1917) did not pass the medical examination, another three men – Richard Kraus (born 1888), Pavel Luftschtiz (born 1888) and Antonín Nettel (born 1896) – exceeded the required age limit of forty years, and so they could not be accepted for purely formal reasons.³⁶ Unlike the formerly active Officer Süssland, they did not counter this decision and remained in Australia.

Toman's financial troubles, as a result of which he finally chose the Australian Army, have already been mentioned. The veterinary reserve officer MVDr. Rudolf Farkaš, who had been working in South Australia at the time and who showed an interest in enlisting in January 1941, was another man who decided to delay his application for the time being in April 1941. Farkaš wanted to know if he would be able to serve as a ranked officer in the CS foreign army; the Consulate General in Sydney sent a telegram to the CS Ministry of Foreign Affairs in London and the message was forwarded to the Ministry of National Defence. With regard to the surplus of officers, however, the Ministry did not consider his request individually. The Minister of National Defence, General Sergej Ingr, was uncompromising in these issues, and a clear answer was sent to Farkaš through Solanský: "If dr. Farkas [sic] wishes to take up military service as a volunteer, he must sign a reverse charge that he will possibly

³⁶ VÚA–VHA, Sb. 20, sign. 20-31-7/18-20, Zpráva generálního konzulátu adresovaná MZV v Londýně, 20 December, 1940.

PAVEL KREISINGER

serve as a member of a crew.”³⁷ Captain Süssland also had to accept this condition; he was later accepted even though he had already reached the age limit of 40 years.³⁸

Out of the final six volunteers, four men applied through the Consulate General in Sydney (December 1940 until March 1941) and two through the CS honorary consulate in Melbourne (January 1941).³⁹

Lengthy negotiations followed between the CS consulate in Sydney and Australian military authorities, between the CS Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of National Defence in London, but also with the British War Office. Lt. Col. Josef Kalla, CS military and air attaché, was responsible for leading the negotiations with this entity.⁴⁰ The negotiations were accompanied by a variety of organisational difficulties. The Australians were curious to know, for example, who would pay the bill,⁴¹ and the CS Ministry of National Defence consequently insisted that volunteers obtained from all recruitment calls be transported on British vessels. In April 1941, uniforms were given to CS volunteers living in Sydney,⁴² however, other volunteers were coming from Victoria and South Australia (before Farkaš had withdrawn his application), and the governments of these states also had to express their consent with

³⁷ Ibid., Sb. 37, sign. 37-18-44/ 347, Australie, 7. 8. 1941; Sb. 24, čj. 2600/41, dr. Farkas čs. dobrovolník v Austrálii, 4 April, 1941.

³⁸ Ibid., čj. 14229/41, Odpověď gen. Ingra na Süsslandův dopis, 15 September, 1940.

³⁹ National Archives of Australia (NAA) Canberra: A1608, F45/1/11; Enlistment of Czech Nationals in Czech Army.

⁴⁰ Archiv bezpečnostních složek Praha (ABS), f. 305, sign. 305-542-3, Deník pplk. Kally č. 3, rok 1941, záznamy Australští čs. dobrovolci, Dobrovolci v Australii apod.

⁴¹ Leach, Daniel, ‘The Other Allies: Military Security, National Allegiance, and the Enlistment of “Friendly Aliens” in the Australian Armed Forces, 1939–45: *War and Society*, 32/1, 2013, 40.

⁴² Australian War Memorial (AWM) Canberra: AWM61, S12/1/285, Approval for Uniform – Czechoslovak Volunteers – Transport from Australia to Palestine.

CZECHOSLOVAK-AUSTRALIAN RELATIONS DURING WORLD WAR II

the volunteers' deployment.⁴³ The issue of transport by sea for CS volunteers was addressed along with the Belgian- and French-Australian volunteers, who wanted to join de Gaulle's French Free Forces.⁴⁴ Only after everything had been arranged and volunteers from Melbourne had been transported to Sydney did the Czechoslovaks receive their complete outfits from the Australians. The research centre at the Australian War Memorial in Canberra has retained complete lists of clothing and equipment given to each of the six CS volunteers. There are a total of 33 items, including the renowned Australian Akubra hat, three pairs of socks made from Australian wool for each person, etc. There was also a coat, helmet and gas mask, all at a total price of 84 Australian pounds and 3 shillings.⁴⁵ In his study, Australian historian Daniel Leach comments that CS volunteers were dressed in outdated battledress without any markings, and they were planned to be handed over in Palestine.⁴⁶ After the farewell dinner organised by Consul Solanský, the 'Australian' volunteers of different nationalities finally boarded the British ship *HMS Queen Elizabeth* at the end of August 1941, and on 31 August 1941 sailed to the Middle East. That same day Dr. Solanský sent the following encrypted message to the CS Ministry of Foreign Affairs: "Today, these volunteers are heading to Palestine: Klausner, Reiser, Süssland, Čapek, Gašinec, Wostrý, equipped with Australian outfits, just like the Australian soldiers. The first three are married. Transmit in turn support for their wives for the rest of the year. Toman is in the Australian Army. Dr. Solanský 1130."⁴⁷ Before we come to the description of the war stories of the selected men, each of them evolving considerably

⁴³ NAA Canberra: A1608, F45/1/11; Enlistment of Czech Nationals in the Czech Army.

⁴⁴ NAA Sydney: SP1048/7, S9/1/22; Pay / Free French Forces; Czechoslovak Volunteers in Sydney.

⁴⁵ AWM Canberra: AWM61, S12/1/531, Czechoslovak Volunteers in Sydney.

⁴⁶ Leach, Daniel, 'The Other Allies: Military Security, National Allegiance, and the Enlistment of "Friendly Aliens" in the Australian Armed Forces, 1939–45', *War and Society*, 32/1, 2013, 40.

⁴⁷ AMZV, f. LA-O, kart. 506 (Vojenství 1939–1945), Depeše došlé, Telegram – důvěrné, 31 August 1941.

differently (which is why they will be described in separate biographies), we will attempt to analyse why the consulate's organised recruitment was not successful, and compare it to other recruitment calls, whether in Australia or other CS compatriot communities.

Causes of the success and failure of recruitment

According to Consul Solanský, who evaluated the failure of recruitment in his summary report about the CS resistance in Australia, there were three main causes of failure:

- 1) anti-Czech (anti-Czechoslovak) agitation among Slovaks;
- 2) compatriot dissatisfaction with the fact that no general mobilisation of foreign Czechoslovaks was announced, as was the case in France;
- 3) uncertainty of volunteers – when they were supposed to leave Australia and join the CS unit, hampered by the fact that the Australian military authorities did not support recruitment – and were not discreet about it.⁴⁸

These points will now be broken down in greater detail.

During the interwar period, there were more Slovaks settled in Australia than Czechs. Agitation by selected individuals began immediately after the declaration of the Slovak State; the main organiser and speaker was the Italian-born Slovak Remo Jan (John) Cicutto, who was born on 6 December 1909 in the inland town of Toppo (Province of Udine). His father was the Italian Anton Cicutto and his mother was Slovak. Cicutto arrived on the shores of Australia on 4 August 1926. He settled in Annandale, a suburb of Sydney, and worked as a plasterer. After five years of residence,

⁴⁸ AMZV Prague, f. LA-O, kart. 167, Diplomatický sbor ZÚ Čsl. (Sydney–Teheran), Sydney, složka Různé, *Australie a Nový Zéland v našem druhém odboji*, 1. 9. 1943, p. 5, bod. č. IV. *Nábor pro čs. zahraniční armádu*.

CZECHOSLOVAK-AUSTRALIAN RELATIONS DURING WORLD WAR II

he was naturalised (in 1931).⁴⁹ In March 1939 he wrote to Vice-Consul Solanský that “the Slovak State does not seek the involvement of foreign Slovaks in associations working to rebuild the previous state [...] at home, they are satisfied with an independent Slovakia and we have no right to fight against our people.”⁵⁰

The second point can be summed up with the *laissez-faire* phrase “We will go once the others go.”⁵¹

Solanský clarified the third point in a separate letter addressed to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in London:

Australia continues to send an increasing number of its troops to the overseas fronts, and is expanding its military industry. That is why the military authorities are willing to accept the help of foreigners, primarily amicable foreigners such as the Czechoslovaks.⁵²

Let us attempt to illustrate Solanský’s claim with specific numbers. If we divide the author’s list of Czechoslovaks involved in the Second World War in the Australian Army⁵³ according to the years in which the individuals joined the army, we reach the number 15 in the years 1940–1941 (when recruitment to the CS Army took place). There were four men in 1940 and 11 persons in 1941 (one of whom was the aforementioned Jan Toman). The greatest number of Czechoslovaks entered the Australian

⁴⁹ NAA Canberra: A1, 1931/9147; R J Cicutto – Application for certificate of naturalisation.

⁵⁰ AMZV, f. LA-O, kart. 167, Diplomatický sbor ZÚ Čsl. (Sydney–Teheran), Sydney, složka Různé, *Australie a Nový Zéland v našem druhém odboji*, 1 September 1943, p. 3.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁵² VÚA-VHA, Sb. sign. 20-31-7/32, *Přijímání čsl. státních občanů do australských vojenských útvarů*, 21 April 1941.

⁵³ Kreisinger, Pavel (Ed.), *Čechoslováci v australské armádě za druhé světové války* – list of names available online at <http://czechoslovaks-in-australia-ww2.info/cz/names/view/1> [downloaded on 2 January, 2019].

Army in 1942, when war events in Malaysia and Singapore developed to mobilise all ‘friendly aliens’. Most of them then served in the Australian labour brigades. Later on, several women volunteered who served in the women’s auxiliary units.⁵⁴

Final evaluation: did the recruitment make sense?

If we are to evaluate the success or failure of the recruitment to the CS Army in Australia in 1940–1941, we can either dismiss it by saying that this effort is an insignificant chapter of CS foreign resistance history, or we can attempt a comparison. If, for example, we compare the situation of the CS compatriot community in Australia with the Australian French who supported de Gaulle’s movement and who were nearly twice as large in number, we come to a clear conclusion. In his study, French historian Teiva Roe notes that from the point of view of the French foreign resistance, there is almost no recruitment to speak of. Although he does not specify any numbers, in his opinion, it must have been shocking that the French Free Forces in Australia, who were men of battle age, only spoke, held meetings or held charitable bazaars. The fault especially lay in the unresolved issue of propaganda.⁵⁵

Colonel General Čeněk Kudláček also knew about recruitment difficulties. Since the summer of 1941 he had worked with his team in Canada, and in 1942 he wrote to General Ingr at the Ministry of National Defence: “Call us back soon. It is better to fight a real war in England than to recruit in Canada!”⁵⁶ Between 1941 and 1943, 147 men travelled to Great Britain in a total of five transports. Approximately

⁵⁴ Kreisinger, Pavel, *Češi a Slováci v Austrálii v 1. polovině 20. století a jejich účast ve světových válkách*, Prague: Academia, 2018, pp. 317-337.

⁵⁵ Roe, Teiva, ‘Les Français d’Australie et la France libre (1940–1944)’, in: *Outre-mers*, 96/360-361, 2 semester, 2008, pp. 209–222.

⁵⁶ Jiránek, Tomáš, *Šéf štábu Obrany národa. Neklidný život divizního generála Čenka Kudláčka*, Prague: Academia 2015, p. 308.

CZECHOSLOVAK-AUSTRALIAN RELATIONS DURING WORLD WAR II

2,000 Czechoslovaks served in the Canadian Army.⁵⁷ The situation was similar in the USA, where the recruitment effort before America entered the war was organised by Colonel Oldřich Španiel. By the end of 1941, he managed to send ‘only’ eight volunteers to the United Kingdom, a number comparable to the Australian group of six. The table below shows the results of organised and spontaneous recruitment in different parts of the world in 1941:

Country	Approx. number of compatriots ⁵⁸	Number interested in entering the CS Army or enlisted	Number deployed to Great Britain (GB) or Middle East (ME)
Australia	1,000	12	6 (ME)
Argentina	50,000	69	10 – 12 (GB)
Brazil	1,000 – 4,800	?	3 (GB)
Dominican Republic (San Domingo)	?	?	3 (GB)
Haiti	?	?	1 (GB)
Chile	400 – 600 ⁵⁹	7 (5 from the Baťa works)	1 (GB)
India	1 000	13 (all from the Baťa works)	? (ME)
Canada	30,000 – 35,000	375 (by 8 Dec 1941)	42 (GB)
New Zealand	100	0	0 (ME)
Shanghai	343 ⁶⁰	?	17 (ME)
USA	750,000	186	8 (GB)
Venezuela	?	?	1 (GB)

Table 2: Recruitment to the CS foreign army around the world in 1941

⁵⁷ Ibid., pp. 260, 298.

⁵⁸ Unless otherwise indicated, assembled on the basis of the author’s research (Australia, New Zealand) and: Folprecht, Josef, *Naši krajané v cizině*, Prague, 1940; Nálevka, Vladimír, *Československo a Latinská Amerika v letech druhé světové války*, Prague, 1972; Španiel, Oldřich, *Československá armáda druhého odboje*, Chicago, 1941.

⁵⁹ Jiránek, Jiří; Barteček, Ivo, *Češi a Slováci v Chile ve 20. století*. Second edited and supplemented edition. Palacký University Olomouc 2013.

⁶⁰ Procházka, Ivan, ‘Krajané na Dálném východě během 2. světové války’, *Historie a vojenství*, 45/6, 1996, 119–133.

PAVEL KREISINGER

If one compares the success of Australian recruitment with the results of other recruitment efforts, and if one takes into account the size of the compatriot community as well as the specifics of the Australian environment (the reluctance of Australian military authorities, easy admission to the Australian Army, the absence of a CS military diplomat in Australia who could have had a better position negotiating with Australian military authorities than the CS consul, etc.), it can be declared a success. It is true that during the Great War, eight people from Australia entered the CS legions in France, i.e. two more men than in the Second World War. It should be noted, however, that seven of them were previously interned in a camp as hostile aliens.⁶¹

The biographies of CS volunteers provide a conclusion to this not widely known aspect of Czechoslovak–Australian relations, which General Consul Solanský later described as follows: “It would be better to leave out the chapter about volunteers from Australia, but it would not explain why there were only six volunteers (Václav Čapek, Milan Gašinec, Leo Klausner, Axel Reiser, Felix Süssland, Heřman Wostrý)”.⁶² Out of the six men, three have been selected: the Czech Václav Čapek, who did not survive the war, the Slovak Milan Gašinec and the Czechoslovak Jew – Felix Süssland, who was an officer of the CS Army and – apart from the consul – was the main promoter of Australian recruitment efforts.⁶³

⁶¹ Kreisinger, Pavel, ‘Přes australskou armádu do československých legií ve Francii. Příspěvek k účasti Čechoslováků v australské armádě za Velké války (1914–1918)’, *Historie a vojenství*, 65/1, 2016, 4–20.

⁶² AMZV, f. LA-O, kart. 167, Diplomatický sbor ZÚ Čsl. (Sydney–Teheran), Sydney, složka Různé, strojopis čs. generálního konzula v Sydney Dr. Adolfa Solanského *Austrálie a Nový Zéland v našem druhém odboji*, 1 September 1943, p. 5, bod č. IV. *Nábor pro čs. zahraniční armádu*.

⁶³ For the biographies of the three other individuals, see Kreisinger, Pavel, ‘Do australské nebo československé armády? K okolnostem (ne)úspěšného náboru mezi čs. krajanskou komunitou v Austrálii za druhé světové války’, *HaV* 65, 2016, no. 4, pp. 15–19.

CZECHOSLOVAK-AUSTRALIAN RELATIONS DURING WORLD WAR II

Ing. Václav Čapek (1915–1944)

Václav Čapek was born on 28 December 1915 in Paměťice near Písek. He passed his secondary school leaving exam with honours in Písek in 1933 and then began studying at the University of Economics in Prague. It is here that he took his second state examination in June 1938 (passing with honours) and was able to start using the title ‘Engineer’ (Ing.). Already during his studies he worked in various positions (accountant, correspondent, foreign exchange officer) and travelled extensively around Europe. He visited Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia and Yugoslavia. He had a talent for languages. Not only did he master the languages of all these countries, “but if need be, he [could] learn any European language or any special knowledge in just a few months.” After completing his studies, he also enrolled at the Faculty of Law at Charles University in Prague, where he was able to complete three semesters and was planning to pass his first state examination in February 1939. At the time of the Munich crisis, he applied to the CS Ministry of Propaganda, where he was interested in the position of an administrative officer.⁶⁴ Probably as a result of the situation in Munich, he did not end up getting the job, but he did find a position as a representative of the CS export institute, and, thanks to his language skills, was sent to Australia in February 1939. On 23 March 1939, he arrived in Sydney aboard the *Orama*.⁶⁵ He immediately joined the CS compatriot movement. Among other things, he used his inter-war contacts in the ranks of the Social Democrats. From 1939–1940 he was in constant communication with other participants of the CS foreign resistance not only in France, but also in the USA. He communicated, for example, with the executive secretary of the Czechoslovak National Council in America, Josef Martínek, who had

⁶⁴ NA Praha, f. 225, sign. 225-1438-3/5, Žádost Ing. V. Čapka s životopisem, 29 September 1938.

⁶⁵ NAA Canberra: A15508, 21/697; CAPEK Vaclav.

PAVEL KREISINGER

flown to Chicago just before the occupation,⁶⁶ or the Slovak diplomat JUDr. Alexander Kunoši, who operated within the compatriot community in Paris.⁶⁷ Thanks to this information, it is known that the highly educated Čapek was employed by one of his compatriots in Australia in 1940 producing grinding wheels, while studying at the University of Sydney at the same time.⁶⁸ After completing his studies, he had the chance to find a decent job in Australia, however, at the end of 1940, he decided to enlist in the CS foreign army. After being deployed to the Middle East with five other volunteers, and being presented in Agami, Egypt on 26 September 1941, their ways parted. In October 1942, Čapek successfully completed a course for infantry officers in reserve and was soon transferred to the CS Air Force in Great Britain, together with Axel Reiser and other volunteers from the ranks of the CS battalion. His commander at the time, Staff Captain General Jan Bernas (code name Borský), gave him the following evaluation: “1) Extremely disciplined and keen, utterly reliable, persistent, tenacious. 2) Honest, intelligent, bright, broad-minded.”⁶⁹ With regards to his tragic death, his further fate at the 311th Bomber Squadron has already been described.⁷⁰ One can only conclude that after training to be a radiotelegraphist-shooter, he joined the RAF in April 1944 with the rank of Sergeant. He was killed in the Liberator crash together with the entire crew of nine; on 13 July 1944 at 1:15 PM, when returning from

⁶⁶ The University of Chicago Library, Joseph Regenstein Library, Archives of Czechs and Slovaks Abroad (ACASA), karton 87, Korespondence Československé národní rady v Chicagu s čs. krajany v Austrálii (1941–1945), nezpracováno, zpráva J. Martínka, 9 September 1940.

⁶⁷ NA, f. Archiv Huberta Ripky, sign 1-26-1-1, ČSNV – Austrálie, Ing. Václav Čapek.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Military History Archives (VHA), Sb. kmen. listů, Ing. Jan Čapek, Posudek velitele roty šcpt. gšt. Borský – 2 October 1942.

⁷⁰ Rajlich, Jirí, *Na nebi hrdého Albionu. Válečný deník československých letců ve službách britského letectva 1940-1945. 5. část. (1944)*, Cheb: Svět křídel, 2003, pp. 411–416.

CZECHOSLOVAK-AUSTRALIAN RELATIONS DURING WORLD WAR II

an operational flight, the pilot crashed into a “hill in Marlborough Village near the Bold Head airport in the county of Devon” while performing an approaching manoeuvre causing the entire plane to burn up.⁷¹ He received the Czechoslovak Medal of Merit of the First Grade in memoriam. He was also promoted to the rank of Air Force Second Lieutenant and soon after promoted to Air Force Reserve Lieutenant. After the war, Axel Reiser, as well as the CS consul general in Sydney, Adolf Solanský, the main organiser of recruitment, were made aware of Čapek’s death. Solanský still had custody of Čapek’s three suitcases in February 1946.⁷²

Milan Gašinec (1922–1951)

Milan Gašinec was born on 4 February 1922 in the town of Liptovská Lužná (Ružomberok district) into the Roman Catholic family of the Slovak labourer Štefan Gašinec and his wife Antonie (née Serafinová). Milan’s father Štefan (born 20 October 1896) left for the United States of America in order to find work in 1913 and settled in Pennsylvania. After the USA declared war against Germany, he joined the Czechoslovak compatriot movement, and on 29 November 1917 he joined the ranks of Czechoslovak legions, soon being deployed to France, where he was assigned to the 22nd Rifle Regiment. He returned to his hometown in Slovakia at the end of 1919. He then took a forestry course and worked as a forester in Liptovská Lužná.⁷³ His three children were born here: Milan, Jaroslav and Vladimír. The oldest, Milan, completed four years of basic schooling and four years of higher primary schooling in his homeland. When he was 16, he moved to Australia, where his uncle František (Frank)

⁷¹ Rajlich, Jiří, *Na nebi hrdého Albionu. Černá kronika československého letectva v RAF 1940-1945. 7. Část*, Cheb: Svět křídel 2004, pp. 694–696.

⁷² VHA, Sb. kmen. listů, Ing. Jan Čapek – zjištění úmrtí, 8 February 1946.

⁷³ E-mail correspondence between the author and Mgr. Daša Korytářová Lofajová, Ph.D., dated 14 February 2018.

PAVEL KREISINGER

Serafin (born 26 January 1908, Liptovská Lužná) had been a successful farmer for nine years at the time.⁷⁴ He travelled to Australia via Southampton, England, on the *Moreton Bay* and landed in Sydney on 8 July 1938.⁷⁵ In February 1940 Gašinec reached the age of maturity and immediately signed up as a volunteer to the Australian Army. He was refused, as he was not a citizen of the British Empire.⁷⁶ In December of the same year he responded to the call of the CS consulate in Sydney regarding recruitment to the army. He completed the application on 6 December 1940, and on 19 December signed a pledge of enlistment as a volunteer of the Czechoslovak Army.⁷⁷ Together with another five CS volunteers, he arrived in the Middle East at the end of September 1941 after a month-long voyage. He was presented here, and after another pledge of entering into the CS Army, he was assigned to the training troops. He took the oath as a soldier on 4 October 1941, but was sent to the CS 11th Infantry Battalion in Tobruk (East) at the end of January 1942, and so he never actually encountered the enemy troops. Immediately afterwards, he took part in the transfer from Tobruk to Palestine, and after the restructuring of the unit to the CS 200th Anti-Aircraft Regiment (East) he was promoted to lance corporal on 28 October 1942. He spent the end of 1942 and beginning of 1943 in hospital due to a case of tuberculosis, and consequently was not sent with the rest of the unit to Great Britain. He stayed in the Middle East until the war ended.⁷⁸ Owing to his prolonged illness, he was reviewed on 7 March 1944. A post-war document states: “Open TB of the lung. To be

⁷⁴ NAA Canberra: A261, 1938/1849; Applicant - SERAFIN Frank; Nominee - SERAFIN Ludvik; GASINEC Milan; nationality Czechoslovakian.

⁷⁵ NAA Canberra: A12508, 13/21; GASINEC Milan born 4 November 1922; NAA Sydney: SP11/2, CZECHOSLOVAKIAN/GASINEC M.

⁷⁶ NAA Canberra: A435, 1949/4/2725; GASINEC Milan; Statutory declaration, 8 November 1948.

⁷⁷ VÚA-VHA Praha, sb. 24, sign. 24-8-5.

⁷⁸ Vojenský archiv – Centrálná registratura Trnava, Sb. kmenových listů, Milan Gašinec.

CZECHOSLOVAK-AUSTRALIAN RELATIONS DURING WORLD WAR II

released from armed power. The illness did not arise as a result of military service, but rather aggravated it. I hereby allocate a health disorder allowance in the amount of £ 12 [...].”⁷⁹ He was discharged on 15 March 1944 and transferred to the care of the CS Consulate General in Jerusalem. He received the following awards for his service: Czechoslovak Commemorative Medal, Africa Star, Star 1939-1945, Czechoslovak Medal of Merit of the Second Degree (the original decree is in the family’s keeping). After his recovery, he started studying agriculture at the British Institute of Engineering Technology in Palestine. At the end of 1946, he boarded the *Moreton Bay* in an Egyptian port – coincidentally, it was the same vessel that brought him to Australia in 1938. In November 1946 he landed on Australian shores for the second time.⁸⁰ He went on to study in Sydney at the local Institute of Engineering Technology and then found a job as a laboratory assistant at the Veterinary Research Station in the Agriculture Department in Glenfield, a suburb of Sydney. His Slovak compatriot – Dr. Rudolf Farkaš, who had worked there since 1944 – probably helped him secure this position. On 8 November 1947 Gašinec married a Slovak compatriot, Alžběta née Droppová (1923-2005) in Wentworthville (a suburb of Sydney). On 14 June 1947 he applied for naturalisation. His application was finally assessed favourably, and the length of his stay in Australia included his military service in the CS Army in the Middle East. Gašinec became naturalised in November 1948, and in 1950, a daughter – Violeta (1950-1990) – was born to the Gašinec couple. Her father died, however, on 3 January 1951 as a result of prolonged illness. For the sake of completeness, Gašinec’s uncle Frank Serafin, who had obtained Australian citizenship in February 1938, served as a soldier in the Australian Army from 1942-1945. Between 1942 and 1944 he served on

⁷⁹ VÚA-VHA Praha, sb. 24, sign. 24-8-5, Gašinec oznámení o superarbitraci, 19 December 1946.

⁸⁰ NAA Sydney: SP1121/1, GASINEC, MILAN.

PAVEL KREISINGER

the island of New Guinea, where Australians were fighting the Japanese.⁸¹ After the Communist coup that took place in Czechoslovakia in February 1948, the youngest of the Gašinec brothers – Vladimír (1926-2012) – left for Australia to join his brother Milan. Vladimír was taken away to the CS Army on 22 March 1948, where he was to carry out the mandatory 24-month military service. Sources relate, however, that on 1 October 1948 he did not report when he was supposed to enter the service at the 35th Infantry Regiment, and as a result, he was “declared a defector for disobeying the call-up papers.”⁸² Vladimír later settled in New Zealand, where he died in 2012.⁸³

Felix Süssland (Sládek) (1898–?)

Felix Israel Süssland was born on 31 December 1898 in a Jewish family in Prague. From 1912 to 1916, he studied at the German Academy of Economics in Liberec. Immediately after his leaving exam, he was drafted to the Austro-Hungarian Army in May 1916 and was deployed to the Italian battlefield, where he served as platoon leader and deputy company commander. He returned to the homeland after the war as lieutenant-in-reserve and joined the emerging CS Army in November 1918. Süssland participated in the mobilisation in 1921, but was released from the army in November of the same year. He was recalled to the army, however, in January 1922 to become a financial officer. He worked in this capacity in the pre-Munich army continuously between 1922 and September 1938. He was consistently ranked by the highest possible degree as an excellent regiment economist. During the mobilisation, he worked in the rank of captain as the economist of the replacement battalion of the 22nd Infantry Regiment in Jičín. After the occupation of Bohemia and Moravia, he was sent on vaca-

⁸¹ NAA Canberra: B883, NX190274; SERAFIN FRANK.

⁸² Vojenský historický archiv – Cenrálná registratura Trnava, Sb. Kmenových listů, Vladimír Gašinec.

⁸³ E-mail correspondence between the author and Mgr. Daša Korytářová Lofajová, Ph.D., dated 14 February 2018.

CZECHOSLOVAK-AUSTRALIAN RELATIONS DURING WORLD WAR II

tion.⁸⁴ Like many other former active officers, he soon decided to go abroad and enter the emerging CS Army. Out of fear of racial persecution, he left the country with his wife Olga. Since the Süssländs wanted to leave the protectorate legally, thereby protecting Felix's aging mother against possible persecution, they decided to emigrate to Australia. Felix's brother-in-law lived here, and it was he who promptly helped them to obtain the necessary landing permit. After many delays by the Prague Gestapo (after three application procedures, Süssländ succeeded in obtaining legal permission to leave, and before leaving, had to declare that he would not enter any army abroad), the Süssländs left the protectorate in January 1940 and headed for Italy.⁸⁵ Sailing on the *Viminale*, they arrived on the shores of Australia on 4 March 1940, where they landed in Sydney.⁸⁶ As already mentioned, Süssländ ranked among the main organisers of the CS Army recruitment in Australia. After failing with the Australian military authorities, he did not hesitate to turn to the CS Minister of National Defence in London. With the help of the CS consul general in Sydney, his efforts were successful and by the end of August 1941, he was able to leave for the Middle East with another five volunteers. Since he had gone through military training, he was immediately included in the CS unit unlike the other volunteers. Between October 1941 and April 1942, he stayed in Tobruk, which was under hostile siege until December 1941.

After the reorganisation of the 11th Infantry Battalion (East) to the 200th Czechoslovak Anti-Aircraft Regiment (East), Süssländ held the position of the entire regiment's economist. On 7 March 1942, he was promoted to staff captain.⁸⁷ He held

⁸⁴ VÚA-VHA, Sb. kval. listin, Felix Süssländ.

⁸⁵ VÚA-VHA, Sb. 20, sign 20-3-58/73-74, Süssländův dopis, došlo na MNO do Londýna, 17 September 1940.

⁸⁶ NAA Canberra: A12508, 21/4297; Süssländ Felix Israel.

⁸⁷ VÚA-VHA, kartotéka „Západ“, Karta F. Süsslända.

PAVEL KREISINGER

the highest officer rank of all the CS Jewish soldiers in the Middle East at that time.⁸⁸ In the meantime, his wife Olga was also active in Australia, and she was also receiving financial support from the CS consulate. In the summer of 1942 she became the main organiser of a benefit concert that she held together with Polish women in Sydney. The proceeds of the event were sent to support the Czechoslovak and Polish men fighting in the Middle East. The leading Australian women's magazine, *Australian Women's Weekly*, reported on the event.⁸⁹

After the defeat of the Axis troops in North Africa, Staff Captain Süssland was not sent with the rest of the men to Great Britain, but was transported with eight other CS officers led by Lieutenant Colonel Střelka to the CS unit in the Soviet Union, where officers were few. In July 1943, with respect to his qualification as a financial officer, he was appointed intendant to the CS independent brigade.⁹⁰ The first CS independent brigade in the USSR was located in Novokhopyorsk at the time. It was here that Staff Captain Süssland replaced Lieutenant Beran, an officer from Svoboda's 'Oran Group'. He did not take the change well and Süssland, who preferred to use the Czech version of his name – Sládek, was even supposed to stand before the field court as a criminal complaint was filed against him for financial scheming and military usury, all of which was based on pure jealousy. Officers from the Middle East were generally looked upon with considerable mistrust and found themselves under surveillance. Other officers were often irritated that their peers could bring luxury items and great amounts of "daily necessities that were in short supply in Russia, and were seen as a luxury"⁹¹ with them to the USSR. Staff Captain Sládek actually tried to use his

⁸⁸ Kulka, Erich, *Židé v československém vojsku na Západě*, Prague: Naše vojsko, 1992, p. 107.

⁸⁹ *INTIMATE Gottings*. In: *The Australian Women's Weekly (1933 - 1982) Saturday 22 August 1942* p. 20.

⁹⁰ Kulka, Erich, *Židé v Československé Svobodové armádě*. Prague: Naše vojsko, 1990, p. 259.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 266.

CZECHOSLOVAK-AUSTRALIAN RELATIONS DURING WORLD WAR II

position to improve meals for ordinary soldiers. He found out that most men “[were] not eating the rationed dried fish and that soldiers [were] throwing them away or selling them illicitly. Using his position, he organised a mass sale of the unwanted fish at a local market. He created a black fund from the proceeds, so the commissariat could source more appropriate foods.”⁹² Beran, the former financial manager of the unit, took advantage of this opportunity and together with some others, arranged for Sládek’s suspension, so that he could return to his original position. After being suspended from his position by Colonel Ludvík Svoboda on 18 August 1943, Felix Sládek/Süssland was not sent to the front with the others; he was to stay in Buzuluk and wait for the field trial. The trial did not take place until 1944 in Sagadur. In an allegedly manipulated process, Sládek/Süssland was sentenced to one-year penal servitude. He decided to appeal, however, in London, where he sent his extensive defence.⁹³ Further development of his case is not clear from the investigated sources. Nevertheless, it is apparent that after the war, Sládek/Süssland returned to Prague for some time, where he was of interest to the communist-controlled defence intelligence service.⁹⁴ This probably occurred as a result of the fact that one of the perpetrators of his sentence (Colonel Ludvík Svoboda at the time) became Minister of Defence in the liberated republic. Süssland consequently decided to return to his wife in Australia instead of her coming back to join him. He finally arrived in Australia at the beginning of 1947, travelling by air via the United States and New Zealand.⁹⁵ He applied

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Ibid., p. 286, note 310. See also VÚA-VHA Praha, Sbirka osobních spisů důstojníků z povolání, Felix Sládek (Süssland).

⁹⁴ ABS Praha, f. 302, sign. 302-155-3/3, Kontrola transportu UNRRA – hlášení, 13 February 1946.

⁹⁵ NAA Sydney: SP11/2, CZECHOSLOVAKIAN/SUSSLAND F; NAA Canberra: A435, 1949/4/3842, SUSSLAND Felix.

PAVEL KREISINGER

for naturalisation after February 1948, and after the CS consul general confirmed his military service under British command in the Middle East, he was granted it.⁹⁶

⁹⁶ NAA Canberra: A435, 1949/4/3842, SUSSLAND Felix.

REVIEWS

Tatiana Smoliarova, *Three Metaphors for Life: Derzhavin's Late Poetry*, translated by Ronald Meyer with Nancy Workmann and Tatiana Smoliarova, edited by Nancy Workman, Boston: Liber Primus, 2018, 318 p., ISBN 978-1-61811573-7

One of the most famous episodes in Russian literary history is the occasion in January 1815 when the seventy-one-year-old doyen of Russian letters Gavriila Derzhavin attended the public examinations at the lyceum in Tsarskoe Selo and listened entranced as the teenaged Alexander Pushkin recited his poem 'Vospominaniia v Tsarskom Sele', which concluded with two stanzas in tribute to the older poet. If Pushkin was to become the pre-eminent voice of the emerging discourse of Russian romanticism, Derzhavin was certainly the most important figure of the previous generation. Yet though Derzhavin is best known for his political odes of the 1780s, he refused to confine himself to the established forms of Russian classicism, and in some of his later works foreshadows the focus on self characteristic of European pre-romanticism. The present volume, a revised translation of the author's *Zrimaia lirika* (Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe obozrenie, 2011), concentrates on Derzhavin's writing after his retirement from government service in 1803 and the turn towards personal reflection which that encapsulated.

Smoliarova concentrates her book on key metaphors which emphasise and exemplify the highly visual focus of the eighteenth-century literary imagination. These metaphors – of projection, refraction and reflection – are approached through extended commentaries on three key texts from Derzhavin's late writing. The first of these is the 1803 or 1804 poem 'Fonar', which presents the world as a series of transient acts of creation as projected on to a screen from a magic lantern show. The second is

REVIEWS

'Raduga' from 1806, in which Smoliarova sees the use of the meteorological image of the rainbow as an instrument to engage more specifically in discussion of issues about the process of poetic representation. The third is the rather longer 'Evgeniiu. Zhizn' zvskaia', which Derzhavin wrote in 1807 and which constitutes an ode in praise of the secluded charms of the rural estate at Zvanka to which he had retired.

In discussing these works, Smoliarova situates them clearly in the literary and cultural context of the time. Although Derzhavin himself was not a great linguist, he was clearly exposed if not at first hand then through translations or accounts prepared by his Russian contemporaries to a huge range of influences from western Europe. English sources receive particular attention. For example, Evgenii Bolkhovitonov's 1788 translation of Mark Akenside's *Pleasures of Imagination* is identified as an important source for the poetic combination of the imaginative and the scientific which is exemplified in Derzhavin's 'Raduga'. In discussing Derzhavin's attitude to his Zvanka estate, Smoliarova draws extended parallels both with Horace's paean to his 'Sabine farm' and to Alexander Pope's house and grotto at Twickenham, which the English poet consciously established as a shrine to poetic creativity and the transcendent role of the poet.

Boxed texts provide further detail on some of the cultural phenomena alluded to in Smoliarova's main argument. The book is also generously illustrated with pictorial images from a wide range of contemporary sources, which complement the discussion and further extend its scope. A brief concluding section offers some reflections on the renewed interest in Derzhavin that came with the hundredth anniversary of his death in 1916, and notably reflections of his work in Mandelstam, Zabolotskii and Pasternak.

Much of eighteenth-century Russian literature is not easily accessible to an anglophone audience, partly because many of its concerns depend on specifically

REVIEWS

Russian historical and linguistic contexts and partly because its values were largely rejected by the discourse of romanticism which has dominated Russian criticism since the early nineteenth century. By focussing on Derzhavin's connections to the west European Enlightenment, and on his affinity for visual metaphors, Stoliarova offers an accessible and stimulating introduction to a vital and strongly influential period in Russian literary history.

David Wells
Curtin University

Christina Lodder, ed., *Celebrating Suprematism: New Approaches to the Art of Kazimir Malevich*, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 308 pp.

It is an exciting time to be a scholar of the Russian avant-garde. It was only after the bulk of Natalia Goncharova's pre-revolutionary work had been returned to Moscow's Tretyakov Gallery from Paris in 1992, thirty years after her death, for example, that her legacy could begin to be properly reassessed. The publications and major retrospectives which have followed in Russia and abroad now place her as a central figure in the European modern movement; witness the £6,425,250 paid for one of her paintings at an auction in London in 2010, then the highest price ever paid for a work by a female artist. Of her contemporaries, only Kazimir Malevich is worth more: one of his paintings sold in 2018 in New York for \$85.8 million, in belated recognition of his importance not just to modernism, but to the history of art. Owing to the vicissitudes of politics, however, our understanding of Malevich's life and work is also still far

REVIEWS

from complete; hence, publications such as the volume under review are eagerly awaited.

The story of Malevich research in the twentieth century reads in part like a thriller, with a plot more sensational than that of *Red Square*, Martin Cruz Smith's best-selling crime novel (whose title also refers to an early Suprematist masterpiece). Following his death in 1935 at the height of Stalinism, the artist who proclaimed back in 1916 that he had transformed himself in the “zero of form” was transformed into a zero of being by the Soviet state: his works disappeared into the vaults and were not spoken about. Malevich's friend Nikolai Khardzhiev saved a large number of his paintings, drawings and writings for posterity, but when he emigrated in 1994 at the age of 90 to Holland, part of his extraordinary collection was confiscated at Moscow's Sheremetevo airport. The materials were placed in the Russian State Archives of Literature and Art, under embargo (at least to Western scholars) until 2019. Once complete, the projected three volumes of the *Arkhiv N. I. Khardzhiev. Russkii avangard: materialy i dokumenty iz sobraniya RGALI* (vol. 1 appeared in 2017, vol. 2 in 2018) are bound to open up vital new avenues of research, but the field of Malevich studies is already vibrant, thanks to a proliferation of high-quality recent publications and international exhibitions, most notably *Kazimir Malevich and the Russian Avant-Garde*, shown at the Stedelijk Museum in 2013 and at Tate Modern in 2014. So rapid have been the advances in research in recent decades that Charlotte Douglas and Christina Lodder, co-editors of *Rethinking Malevich* (2007), the proceedings of a 2005 conference, include both a survey of primary materials hitherto published, and a history of Malevich scholarship. Both have been leading figures in the New York-based Malevich Society, which is dedicated to “advancing knowledge about [the artist] and his works”. The large number of new publications since 2007, and the felicitous occasion of the centenary of Malevich's still influential Suprematist movement in 2015,

REVIEWS

prompted the Malevich Society to support another conference, leading to this new volume.

Superbly edited by Christina Lodder, the thirteen wide-ranging articles by leading American, Russian and European scholars represent the latest research into Suprematism and its “aesthetic, philosophical and theoretical ramifications”, focusing in particular on the movement’s early stages. Irina Vakar, for example, reports on the recent forensic examination of the canvas of the original 1915 ‘Black Square’, whose revelation of two underlying paintings may possibly represent Malevich’s first Suprematist experiments. Charlotte Douglas concentrates on the foundation of Suprematism in the latter half of 1915, noting that Malevich adopted it straight away as a philosophy, not just after the Bolshevik Revolution. Malevich also tried organising a Suprematist group straightaway, but was only able to establish ‘Unovis’ in November 1919 in Vitebsk, where he was invited to teach: Alexander Lisov discusses how Malevich attempted to extend Unovis beyond Vitebsk, to Moscow in particular, while achieving more success in Smolensk and Orenburg. Eva Forgács traces the impact of Suprematism in Eastern Europe in the 1920s.

Other rewarding articles explore Suprematism’s concrete expression in architecture (Samuel Johnson), porcelain (Yulia Karpova), and textiles (Julia Tulovsky), as well its relationship to a possible ‘fourth dimension’ (Linda Dalrymple Henderson). There are also discussions of Malevich’s searching enquiries into materiality and immateriality in the context of contemporary science and technology (Alexander Bouras, Maria Kokkori and Irina Karasik), the work of his pupil Lazar Khidekel (Regina Khidekel), while Tatiana Goriacheva introduces part of the important early article about collective creativity from the Vitebsk years that she has located in the Kharzhevich papers. Christina Lodder herself contributes a valuable comparative study of

REVIEWS

Suprematism and the equally radical, but divergent rival artistic movement of Constructivism, in which she reveals subtle affinities.

The contributions are distinguished by a scholarly rigour Malevich would have applauded, and bristle with important new information that has led to some surprising new developments. Take, for example, the exhibition ‘Pioneers of Suprematism: Verbóvka – 100 Project’ which opened in St. Petersburg in September 2019, featuring 50 exquisitely produced modern recreations of Suprematist textiles produced by an international team of 32 volunteer embroiderers. Neither the items themselves, nor Anna Tolstikova’s fascinating catalogue, would have been possible without the research completed into the collaboration between Natalya Davydova’s Ukrainian peasant woman embroidery cooperative and Suprematist artists between 1915 and 1917, by Julia Tulovskaya and others. The present volume is attractively produced, and includes numerous rare photographs and illustrations, some in colour. It adds significantly both to our knowledge of Malevich and the seminal movement he created.

Rosamund Bartlett

Oxford

Bowers, K., C. Doak, and K. Holland (eds.). 2018. *A Dostoevskii Companion: Texts and Contexts* (Academic Studies Press: Boston, MA). xx + 535 pages.

The explicit aim of this book is “to help students and readers navigate the writer’s fiction and his world, to better understand the cultural and sociopolitical milieu in which Dostoevskii lived and wrote” (rear cover). In order to achieve this goal, the edi-

REVIEWS

tors have assembled a large number of small extracts from contemporary documents (Dostoevskii's letters and journalism, as well as literary criticism) combined with modern appreciations of, and insights into, his works. This builds up an emergent and comprehensive picture — almost pointillist in nature — comprised of short, easily assimilable pieces, most of which are considerably less than ten pages. This allows the reader to move effortlessly on from one piece to another, with the effect of encouraging students to dig deeper than they otherwise might have done if confronted by more obviously substantial chapters.

The structure of the book also assists the reader to assimilate the textual, paratextual and contextual information. The prelims include a helpful section on 'How to use this book' and a 'Timeline of Dostoevskii's life and works'. The body matter is divided into three parts: Biography and Context, Poetics, and Themes. The ten chapters are spread across these parts, with each chapter containing a number of extracts, prefaced by a helpful introduction and a bibliography for further reading. The initial chapter ('The Early Dostoevskii') includes selected sources that the author drew on for his early works and excerpts from his acclaimed first novel *Poor Folk*, published in 1844. The chapter is rounded out by extracts from documents relating to Dostoevskii's trial in 1849 for his membership of the Petrashevsky Circle. The second chapter broadens the context, starting with reactions to *The Double*, and working through Dostoevskii's relationships with both Turgenev and Tolstoy using letters, reviews and caricatures in his novels.

Part Two ('Poetics') is divided into four chapters: Aesthetics, Characters, The Novel, and From Journalism to Fiction. I found the chapter on aesthetics to be a necessary ingredient for the Dostoevskii scholar, but less compelling than the other three that compose this part of the Companion. The chapter on characters selects extracts from nine pieces, each devoted to a different character and traversing a wide range of

REVIEWS

scholarly approaches ranging from a 1963 piece by Bakhtin on the Underground Man to a 2009 piece by Carol Apollonio on Makar Devushkin. These approaches complement each other nicely and provide a basis for a rounded view of Dostoevskii's characters. The chapter on the novel starts with two extracts relating to *The Adolescent* (sometimes translated as *A Raw Youth*), followed by commentary on generic issues such as the Noble Family Novel, the nature of Dostoevskii's heroes and 'Chronicle Time'. Other areas of focus include an examination of the narrator of *The Idiot*, an interesting exploration of the concept of 'sideshadowing' (similar to the Quantum principle of 'superposition'), with particular application to *Demons*, and an analysis of the plot of *Crime and Punishment*). Again, with the exception of the two contemporary extracts relating to *The Adolescent*, the other components of this chapter cover a wide range of modern scholarship from 1963 to 2016.

However, the largest — and most absorbing — chapter in the part devoted to poetics is the last: 'From Journalism to Fiction'. This section of the book cleverly weaves together Dostoevskii's journalistic pieces and his fiction, starting with his feuilletons of 1847. The editors then proceed to map the relationship between Dostoevskii's notebooks and the final text of *The Idiot*, moving effortlessly to excerpts from Dostoevskii's *A Writer's Diary*. These extracts are well selected, including a brief excerpt from 'The Meek One' and the complete text of 'The Dream of a Ridiculous Man'. Interpolated between the 1876 and 1877 excerpts from the *Diary* are two pieces of modern scholarship, one analysing the last quarter of 1876 and the other looking at the significance of the *Diary* as a whole.

The final part is devoted to 'Themes', of which there are four: Captivity, Free Will and Utopia; Dostoevskii's Others; Russia; God. The chapter on Captivity, Free Will and Utopia contains material that is central to Dostoevskii's lived experience and manifested itself not only in *Notes from the House of the Dead*, but percolates through

REVIEWS

all his writing after 1857, whether fiction, feuilletons or diaries. The experience of his trial, conviction, mock execution and *katorga* (penal servitude) imprinted itself indelibly on to both Dostoevskii's psyche and physical health (specifically his epilepsy). Excerpts from letters, *Notes from the House of the Dead*, and Frank's analysis of Dostoevskii's correspondence with the censors contextualise the aspect of captivity succinctly. The aspects of free will and utopia are introduced by an extract from Chernyshevsky's *What is to be done?* followed by excerpts from *Notes from Underground* and *The Brothers Karamazov*, and 'Notes on His Wife's Death' — all contemporary texts. Interspersed between these pieces are extracts from modern critical pieces that illuminate the nineteenth-century texts.

The chapter on Dostoevskii's Others focuses on the author's attitudes to Jews, Muslims and women. By most accounts, his attitude to Jews was ambivalent in the extreme, evidenced by his specific language. His characterisation of Muslims in the excerpts from *Notes from the House of the Dead* is particularly positive, and parts of both *Demons* and *The Idiot* show a familiarity with some Koranic motifs. However, I found the most interesting readings in this chapter were those on women, appearing at the end of the chapter. Two were sourced from *A Writer's Diary* in 1876 and two were pieces of modern criticism that covered the position of women in *Crime and Punishment* and *The Brothers Karamazov*. I was fascinated by the counterpoint between the original texts and the criticism, and by the critics' unpacking of Dostoevskii's complex attitudes to, and delineations of, women.

The penultimate chapter on Russia, composed mainly of texts by Dostoevskii on Russia's relations with the West and with her own *narod*. The chapter introduction quite rightly observes that, whilst "Dostoevskii's writings on Russia often reveal a darker and more unpalatable side to the writer than can be found even in his novels and serve as a window onto a nationalism that makes modern readers in the West un-

REVIEWS

easy, they are also central to understanding the historical and social circumstances that underlie his fiction” (p. 430). The chapter includes two important pieces: ‘The Peasant Marei’ from *A Writer’s Diary* in 1876 and the famous Pushkin Speech of 1880.

Unsurprisingly — in view of Dostoevskii’s profound and complex religiosity — the last chapter is entitled God. The chapter is prefaced by two contemporary extracts: one from a letter to Natal’ia Fonvizina and the other from *The Idiot*. The editors then astutely interpolate two early twentieth century pieces of commentary; one by Lev Shestov on Dostoevskii’s religious thought and the other by Nikolai Berdiaev on the Grand Inquisitor. These are followed by modern analyses of hagiographic influences and Koranic motifs in Dostoevskii’s work. The chapter concludes with an extract from Steven Cassedy’s book on Dostoevskii’s religion.

I found this book both eminently readable and a comprehensive and invaluable resource for Dostoevskii scholars, no matter at what level they research. The Anglo-Canadian editorial team of Katherine Bowers, Connor Doak and Kate Holland are to be congratulated on assembling a rich textual and contextual feast that repays detailed study.

John Cook
University of Melbourne

Neil Robinson, *Contemporary Russian Politics. An Introduction*, Polity, Cambridge, 2018, 289 pp.

Neil Robinson, a well-credentialed Russian specialist from the University of Limerick, has written a very solid textbook on contemporary Russian politics. The ‘contemporary’ in the title refers to the post-Soviet period, although there are chapters on the Soviet period and perestroika. They are preceded by an introductory chapter outlining

REVIEWS

the very broad features of Russian history and the author's preferred approach to analysing them. They are followed by two chapters outlining the key developments in the Yeltsin and Putin periods. They are followed in turn by six chapters in which specific aspects of the contemporary Russian system, covering both the Yeltsin and Putin periods, are examined in detail. As befits a politics textbook, most are on political issues: presidency and parliaments, federalism, parties and opposition, and elections and voters. There are also single chapters on the economy and Russia and the world. In a final chapter, 'What kind of polity is Russia?', some key conceptual approaches to understanding the Russian system are described and a choice made between them.

The author's preferred approach to analysing the polity as set out in the first chapter is to differentiate between state and regime. A regime is a set of rules of behaviour devised by élite groups to facilitate their retention of power, including through arriving at arrangements to manage competition between themselves. The state is a set of institutions or agencies with the capacity and 'organisational integrity' required to meet the welfare and security needs of society. States and regimes exist for different purposes, so the relationship between them can be complex and mutually destructive, something which the author believes to be the case in contemporary Russia. The approach is not a constant in the book, but it appears often enough to serve as a useful reference point. Robinson has a sufficiently sophisticated understanding of Russia to know that the journalistic view that Russian politics is all and only about regime maintenance is not and cannot be true. But he notes that the pressure for it to be dominant creates a systemic problem for Russian state development.

Interestingly, in the introductory chapter the author also devotes considerable attention to what he describes as the 'geography is fate' approach to understanding social development (citing Heraclitus). The author of this review has a particular in-

REVIEWS

terest in the influence of geography on Russian development and, therefore, was disappointed that it did not reappear in the book.

In the final chapter Robinson briefly reprises his state-regime argument before asking what sort of polity Russia is. He puts forward a ‘hybrid system’ as the ‘most common’ classification, that is, having elements of both democracy and authoritarianism, and then proceeds to show why such a classification is inadequate. He then argues in favour of neo-patrimonialism. Without having done a statistical analysis, I would suggest that, in fact, neo-patrimonial or related classifications are the ‘most common’. It is not the way I would approach either the structure or content of the conceptual component of a textbook – having it at the end makes it seem tacked on, particularly as a different approach was adopted in the first chapter, and institutionalist approaches are relatively neglected. But, as far as it goes, the conceptual discussion is useful and probably not too far from the way things really are.

The core empirical chapters, particularly the political ones, are highly detailed and, as far as this reviewer can tell, accurate and comprehensive. They are a dour read, conveying little of the drama of the events and times being described. But any student mastering them would have a very solid knowledge base, and the book would even be a useful reference volume for established specialists. In agreeing with Gerard Easter’s cover blurb that this is “a welcome alternative to the usual fare of shrill and shallow, Putin-obsessed texts”, one notes that the cover features a classic representation of Putin wearing his ‘hard man’ sunglasses and sporting one of his infamously expensive watches. The book is certainly more sophisticated, if less entertaining, than that.

Stephen Fortescue

University of New South Wales & The Australian National University

REVIEWS

John Besemeres, *A Difficult Neighbourhood: Essays on Russia and East-Central Europe Since World War II*. Acton ACT: Australian National University Press, 2016. xiii + 525 pp.

This large and excellent book combines two intellectual virtues rarely encountered side-by-side in writing for readers seeking reliable information about geopolitical issues likely to affect them and their descendants: detailed, authoritative and balanced presentation of facts and their contexts; and explicit articulation of the author's political stance. Besemeres's ideal world – more particularly, his ideal post-Soviet world – is a place where electoral representative democracy is real, not feigned; where markets operate freely, not corruptly, their excesses held in check by laws; where nation-states exercise their sovereignty for the benefit of their citizens, and do not threaten the sovereignty of their neighbours; and where the post-Second World War international order stably prevails. By such criteria all of the subjects of Besemeres's observations – the Russian Federation, almost all of the independent successor states of the USSR, and the former Soviet satellites in East and Central Europe – are found wanting, some more egregiously so than others.

A Difficult Neighbourhood comprises 34 essays published between 2010 and 2016. The great majority of them had previously appeared on the *Inside Story* website. Poland and that country's relationship with Russia are the focus of the first two of five parts, Russia and its neighbours to the West, Belarus and, especially, Ukraine, of Parts 3 and 4. The fifth and by far the largest is dedicated to the efflorescence of Putinism as the new norm of Russia's domestic and international behaviour. Surveys in some of the longer articles of the politics and economics of the region as a whole guide readers through the realities of countries even less frequently under Western gaze than Poland or Ukraine: the Baltic States, Moldova, Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. All of

REVIEWS

these sketches attest simultaneously to the uniqueness of each of these countries' circumstances and to their shared predicament: they are small states within the force-field of a resurgent Russia; in their various ways, they are seeking to involve a reluctant European Union and an only slightly less reluctant United States in the protection of their vital interests.

As an anthology of essays presented to media outlets, rather than an integrated treatise, the book is constrained at times to cover the same or similar ground. This disadvantage, however, is outweighed by the fact that the presentation of the essays in full and in their original form serves to create an internal narrative of the author's growing alarm over the foreign policy ambitions of Vladimir Putin. The earlier essays in the anthology readily acknowledge conciliatory, as well as aggressive, dimensions in Putin's dealings with neighbouring states and the West; later ones discover no grounds for such optimism. "Since Putin's return to the presidency in 2012," Besemeres wrote in 2014, "Russia was rapidly becoming a police state with increasingly fascist as well as neo-Soviet characteristics. Putin has become even more the Mussolini-style strongman with slightly flabby but much-exposed pectorals, heading what is essentially a one-party state; a rubber-stamp parliament, with grotesque stooge parties on the sidelines, has passed reams of repressive legislation while chorusing anti-Western slogans; all the human rights gains of the 1990s have been eliminated; Stalin and Stalinism have been restored to a place of public respect; and a uniform view of history and the world has been imposed on the media and the education system" (p. 358).

As concerning to Besemeres as the authoritarian degeneration of the Russian Federation under Putin is the weakness and indecision of Western actors in responding to Russia's efforts to restore its hegemony over its neighbours and, through new forms of propaganda, to influence the very internal politics of Europe and North

REVIEWS

America. Particularly troubling for Besemeres is the position of those in Western political, media and scholarly spheres whose forbearing attitude toward Putinism he judges as tantamount to appeasement.

A Difficult Neighbourhood is masterfully, often sardonically, written, and is peppered with memorable aperçus (e.g., “Putin wants to reverse the outcome of the Cold War. Western absent-mindedness and pusillanimity have helped him significantly in his endeavour thus far, and could yet come to his aid again” [p. 302]; “Putin’s neo-Soviet yet postmodern modus operandi” [p. 357]; “Some academic strategists [who believe that the Russian Federation has a right to determine the internal policies of its neighbours] “seek [...] to explain why certain victims have to be victims and certain bullies have to be bullies” [p. 362]). The book’s usefulness is enhanced by an extensive bibliography (separate from a “Further Reading” guide to sources in English), as well as a detailed index.

Besemeres’s book is as much a reflection on the vulnerability of Western liberal democratic values as it is a guide to the state of affairs in Russia and Europe. It makes for illuminating and morally challenging reading, whether for the area specialist or the concerned global citizen.

Marko Pavlyshyn
Monash University

REVIEWS

Edin Hajdarasic, *Whose Bosnia? Nationalism and Political Imagination in the Balkans, 1840-1914*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2015 ISBN 978-0-8014-5371-7. xii + 271 pp.

Bosnia is a favourite laboratory for scholars of nation-building. In the course of the nineteenth century a population divided along religious lines (but without a great deal of hostility between the main three religious groups: Orthodox, Catholic, Muslim) gave way to three nations: Serbian, Croatian and Bosniac, who finally embarked on a bloody civil war in the 1990s. As Hajdarasic writes in his introduction: “By the end of the nineteenth century [...] patriotism had become a ubiquitous point of reference for everything” (p. 1) – though perhaps here one should say *nationalism* rather than *patriotism*.

Edin Hajdarasic, himself a refugee from the wars of the 1990s, now living in the USA and working at Loyola University in Chicago, sees nation-building projects as open-ended, which sets him apart both from nation-building élites themselves and from most academic accounts of nation-building. Thus, some writers see the wars of the Yugoslavian succession in the 1990s as a sort of ‘final solution’ (my term – *PMH*) to the Bosnian problem. Hajdarasic does not share this view: “this book strives to reopen those critical situations where different kinds of national tensions take place [...]. Far from ‘solving’ such questions in the Yugoslav space, the violence of the twentieth century has only intensified and reinvented them for new post-1990s generations’ (p. 14).

Hajdarasic describes his point of departure as Claudio Lomnitz’s ‘grounded theory’, ‘grounded’ because it “works through a vast and dense set of facts and grounded because it has to confront, and hopefully to transgress, an order of confinement to its provincial locale. It is at the same time theoretical since it seeks to identify

REVIEWS

and interpret the underlying assumptions and relationships that constitute nationalist politics in a given historical context” (p. 5) (although one would assume that any theory is grounded in empirical facts). Certainly this book is rich in empirical facts, not only from secondary sources but also from archives around the world in different languages (although not, apparently, including Turkey). As Hajdarpasic puts it, “I return to the groundwork of South Slavic national activists – ethnographers, insurgents, teachers, academics, poets, politicians, and other actors often grouped together as ‘intellectuals’ [...]. In substantial part, this study is thus a contribution to understanding the cultural and intellectual production of nationalism” (p. 5).

The structure of the book is partly chronological, partly thematic. Thus, after the Introduction (‘Whose Bosnia?’) there follow five long chapters: ‘The Land of the People’; ‘The Land of Suffering’ (both centred on *topoi* in ethnography and artistic literature – ‘the People’ and ‘Suffering Bosnia’); ‘Nationalization and its Discontents’ (nationalisation not, of course, in today’s common sense, but rather that of turning nationally indifferent peasants into nationally conscious ones – a very difficult task, as the nationalists discovered to their great frustration). Chapter 4 is entitled ‘Year X, or 1914?’ and deals with revolutionary youth movements leading up to the assassination of 1914. Chapter 5, ‘Another Problem’, is about attempts by the Ottomans and later Habsburg Monarchy to present Bosnia in a positive light and even to encourage tourism. It is based on a quotation from George Polya: “What is the best you can do for a problem? *Leave it alone and invent another problem...* Faced with mounting political pressures in their imperial domains, Ottoman and Habsburg state officials not only tried to repress the emerging forces of nationalism, but also began to adopt many of the basic forms, idioms, and strategies of nationalist movements” (p. 163).

Hajdarpasic offers us this conclusion: “Crucially, this approach [grounded theory] has led me to conceptualize nationalism differently from most scholarly

REVIEWS

accounts, understanding it not as a finite movement that ends in some momentous achievement (the establishment of a state, the partition of territories and populations, etc.), but as a political project that is fundamentally open-ended and impossible to complete“ (p. 201).

Hajdarpasic uses the expressions *nation-formation*, *nation-making* and *nation-building* apparently interchangeably; certainly he does not actually explicate any of those terms. As a non-native speaker Hajdarpasic can be excused for making grammatical and lexical mistakes, but the same does not, presumably, apply to his proof-readers.

When dealing with this topic, Hajdarpasic often quotes Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian sources. Sometimes he gives us the original, but not always. In particular, on p. 202, he deals with the entry on *brat* ‘brother’ in Vuk Karadžić's dictionary. Here it would have been particularly helpful if he had quoted the Serbian original as well, as I am not sure that I agree with his translations.

The book contains many interesting illustrations. There are no footnotes, only end-notes, and there is no bibliography: the references are hidden in the end-notes, and if you overlook one of them – bad luck! If you are looking for a reference, you might have to spend half an hour checking every previous end-note.

Despite these minor annoyances, there is no doubt that this is a groundbreaking book which cannot be ignored by anyone studying Bosnia or nationalism.

Peter M. Hill

The Australian National University

REVIEWS

A New Rival State? Australia in Tsarist Diplomatic Communications, (ed. Massov, A., M. Pollard, and K. Windle) Canberra: ANU Press, 2018, xiii + 353 pp.

A New Rival State? Australia in Tsarist Diplomatic Communications is an edited collection of consular dispatches written by eight consuls representing the tsarist Russian Empire. The collection is preceded by an editorial note and an introduction. The former provides general information regarding the dispatches, such as their sources, dates, transcription and translations; while the latter presents a historian's perspective on the sixty-year period from 1857-1917 covered in the documents. A plate section contains photographs of the consuls and other officials mentioned in the book.

The collection presents both the short biographies and the dispatches of Russian consuls in Australia. Thus, besides the documents, the reader is provided with a vivid portrayal of the authors of the dispatches: their biographical data, as well as their personality and character traits. Moreover, with the development of Russian consular service in Australia, the reader can trace the change in the type of people who were chosen as consuls: from English-born citizens with an interest in (Edmund Paul) or love for (James Damyon) Russia to consuls of Russian descent (Alexis Poutiata, Nikolai Passek, Mikhail Ustinov, among others). The style of writing also differs from consul to consul. For instance, Paul had quite an extensive workload besides his diplomatic responsibilities, which resulted in his short, factual and infrequent dispatches; while Poutiata, the first permanent consul in Melbourne, is described as a very amiable person who was liked by everyone who he met; his dispatches are lengthy and quite frequent, providing a very detailed account of events, as well as his own opinion on what was happening. Poutiata's correspondence, in particular, provides information on negotiations for establishing trade relations between Russia and Australia (p. 114) and of a disrespectful attitude to Russia with regard to Tsar Alexander III's

REVIEWS

death (pp. 116-117). Furthermore, the first Russian consul expresses his opinion on how Australia found itself in an economic depression in the late nineteenth century and why, according to Poutiata, strong labour unions were to blame for unemployment. Alongside critical remarks, he approves of the Parliament's solution of the problem by promoting village settlements and thus breaking up the workers' unions.

In contrast to Poutiata's style of dispatches, Robert Ungern-Sternberg's letters contain a lot of factual information regarding possible trade between Russia and Australia. He provides a detailed account of the state of the supply of kerosene in Australia and of the number of Russian and Finnish ships arriving at Australian ports. Ungern-Sternberg also describes his defense of a Russian national in court (p. 163). Having investigated the matter, the consul concluded that the sentence of hard labour was unfair and tried to have the charge dropped.

Regarding other consuls' major contributions, Passek continued an enterprise initiated by Poutiata – the foundation of an Orthodox church. Ultimately, he could not receive any funding from the Embassy, and the church was founded using the community's contributions. In one of his concluding dispatches Mikhail Ustinov pointed out that Russians preferred to assimilate to Australian culture and lifestyle and did not keep connections with the homeland. Therefore, in his opinion, a Russian Consulate was not needed in Australia (p. 200), since it served as “an observation post in a remote and unusual land” (about the consulate in Melbourne, p. 202). As a result of this view, for two years after Ustinov, the Russian Consulate was governed by the French Consul (p. 203).

Matvei Hedenstrom, by contrast, suggested appointing a Consul in each Australian state, because it was documented that Russian nationals lived in all of them (p. 209). He highlighted the fact that there was not a strong trade relationship between Russia and Australia; however, the Australians were interested in the political sphere

REVIEWS

of Russia. Moreover, Hedenstrom compares socialism in Australia and in Europe and points to some underlying features, such as “innate respect for the law” (p. 226) in Australia, unlike in Europe. He also makes an interesting observation of Australia’s climatic and economic conditions which “foster the desire to enjoy oneself” and do not encourage labour and working (p. 230). Finally, Hedenstrom argued in his dispatches that owing to the lack of trade representatives from Russia, trade with Russia was weak, compared to trade with other countries, such as Germany and USA.

The last Russian consul appointed in tsarist Russia was Alexander Abaza who did a lot for the Russian community and for the promotion of Russian culture and language, in particular. Under Abaza, the first Russian-Australian Commerce and Information Bureau was established, and fifty Australians started studying Russian in Melbourne (April 1917) at “inaugurate courses in the language under its (Bureau’s) auspices” (p. 327).

The present collection of dispatches will be of great interest to historians of Russian-Australian relations, as well as to the general reader.

Natalia Batova
University of Melbourne

S. Kulchytsky, *The Famine of 1932-1933 in Ukraine: An Anatomy of the Holodomor*. Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, Edmonton, Toronto, 2018.

This is a book written by one of the leading Ukrainian academic proponents of the claim that the Ukrainian famine of 1932/33 was a genocide, in which he presents his case and argues against some of his critics. To be fair, I must admit that I have known

REVIEWS

Professor Kulchytsky for about 40 years (from Soviet times), that I am grateful for his continued long-term friendship and help, but that I have disagreed with him over this genocide issue for about 30 years. In early 1990 we had been planning to write a joint article on the scale of mortality in the famine until I withdrew because of his insistence on using this term.

This book will be of particular use to the non-Russian or Ukrainian speaking reader, in bringing together Kulchytsky's reasoning 'evidentiary basis' (p. xx) for his arguments. It is less useful and accurate in its characterisation of the position of his critics.

Kulchytsky tries to fit Soviet history into a simple pattern with the major and sometimes sole explanatory factors being the Bolshevik intention on forcibly socialising the economy, and Stalin's ruthless ambition to remain leader. The first Bolshevik attempt was under Lenin in 1917-21 – 'the first onslaught' (Chapter 2) and the second under Stalin in 1929-32 – 'the great break' (Chapter 3). Kulchytsky, like Robert Conquest (*The Harvest of Sorrow*, Hutchinson, 1986) and Anne Appelbaum (*Red Famine: Stalin's War on Ukraine, Collectivization & the Terror Famine*, Allen Lane, 2017) sees no economic reason for these onslaughts, which they all interpret as coming simply from ideological desire of the Bolshevik leaders. In this, they differ from the detailed works of M. Lewin, E. H. Carr and R. W. Davies, who have analysed the procurement campaigns in great detail. (M. Lewin, *Russian Peasants and Soviet Power: A Study of Collectivization*, George Allen & Unwin, 1968; E. H. Carr & R.W. Davies, *Foundations of a Planned Economy, 1926-9*, Macmillan, 1969; R. W. Davies, *The Socialist Offensive, 1929-30*, Palgrave, 1980; R. W. Davies & Stephen G. Wheatcroft, *The Years of Hunger: Soviet Agriculture, 1931-1933*, Palgrave, 2004).

Kulchytsky tries to distinguish between two different types of famine: a) "The all-Union famine of the early 1930s (including the famine in Ukraine in the first half

REVIEWS

of 1932)” which he sees as “the most noticeable sign of the crisis induced by the communist onslaught that Stalin led in 1929” (p. xxv), and b) the Holodomor in Ukraine, the North Caucasus and the Lower Volga from the last two months of 1932 through the first half of 1933. According to Kulchytsky, this second famine — the Holodomor — was caused by Stalin’s ‘crushing blow’ against the peasants in these regions which was aimed at killing them, and terrorising other peasants into working on the collective farms. He states that “the ‘precipitate’ comes down to one thing only — Stalin’s ambition to remain in power at the cost of the death of millions of Soviet citizens” (p. xxvi).

Kulchytsky admits that there is no direct evidence of an organised attempt to kill Ukrainians, but infers that such a plan existed from a number of actions that took place including: 1) a systematic bias against Ukraine, 2) Stalin’s call to the party active to crush saboteurs and wreckers mercilessly within the collective farm system; 3) orders to ensure fulfilment of grain procurement targets in Ukraine; 4) orders to prevent migration from affected regions; 5) the resulting high mortality in Ukraine and North Caucasus. I do not have space to cover all of these points and, therefore, will limit myself to the first and last points, in which I have a personal interest.

Kulchytsky argues that Davies & Wheatcroft ignore the bias against Ukrainians in the 1930 grain procurements when 7.7 million tons of grain was collected from Ukraine, which was more than the 7.4 million tons collected from the four other main producer regions (Central Black Earth, Lower Volga, Central Volga and North Caucasus). He states that “Never — not in the years of NEP, nor before the revolution – had Ukraine produced as much grain as those four other regions [...] put together” (p. 47). And that this then set up the situation for the future famines. But this is simply not true. For most of the late nineteenth century, the pre-revolutionary years of the 20th century, and as recently as 1927, Ukraine had normally produced more commercial

REVIEWS

grain than the other four regions. Its level of grain production was normally slightly lower than in the other four regions, its population was much lower, and this normally resulted in much higher levels of commodity grain, as measured by transport data or procurements.

Furthermore, if we were interested in looking at the relative proportion of Ukrainian to the other four regions as a factor in the famines, surely we should look at the proportions in 1931/2 and 1932/3 when the Ukrainian share was distinctly lower: 13% lower in 1931/2 and 39% lower in 1932/3. In 1932/3 the initial plan was for Ukrainian peasants to supply 5.8 million tons (11% less than in the four other main regions). This was reduced to 3.8 million tons on January 12, 1933, when it represented 34% less than in the four other main regions). (Davies & Wheatcroft, p. 478).

Ukraine, did indeed experience extremely high mortality in the first half of 1933, but this was not located in the areas of major central grain collection procurement activity, as Kulchytsky implies. The highest mortality was in Kiev and Kharkov oblasts where decentralised grain collections were necessary to supply the major cities, which were not adequately provided with grain by central collections.

Overall, this book is a useful indication of the arguments that are used to justify the claim that the famine in Ukraine in 1932-1933 should be treated as genocide, but it is not very convincing. While Stalin cannot be absolved from responsibility for the famine, a detailed study of the circumstances around the famine has convinced even Robert Conquest that the famine was not caused on purpose by Stalin (Davies & Wheatcroft, 2004, p. 411), and, if the famine was not caused on purpose, it is hard to see how it qualifies as genocide.

S. G. Wheatcroft

Deakin University and University of Melbourne

REVIEWS

Zuzanna Bogumił. *Gulag Memories: The Rediscovery and Commemoration of Russia's Repressive Past*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2018. 302 pp.

The story of how the Gulag became (or failed to become) part of the memory landscape in Russia is almost as diverse and fragmented as the Archipelago itself. *Gulag Memories* by Zuzanna Bogumił is an important development in prison camp anthropology – for, although there are quite a few books and articles dedicated to particular former Gulag sites and their post-Stalin and post-Soviet history, this is the first book to take a systemic (and well researched) approach to the memorialisation of the Gulag.

The book studies four islands of the Gulag Archipelago –

- a) The Solovetsky Islands with their rich Russian Orthodox history and the famous monastery (it had been used as a prison by the Russian Empire long before the Soviet regime chose it as a site for its Solovetsky Special Purpose Camp). These islands became firstly the site of an exceptionally friendly memorialising collaboration between the secular Memorial Society and the Russian Orthodox Church, and, subsequently, the site of a bitter rivalry between the two organisations, with the Church winning the battle, becoming the sole narrator, and re-orienting the prison camp part of the Solovetsky Islands story towards the Church's 'new martyrs'.
- b) The Komi Republic, where the history of the regional cities and industries is often synonymous with the history of the local labour camps and quite a few iconic monuments and structures happen to be built by *zeks*. Here the local museums and memorial sites frequently manage to portray simultaneously the prison camp inmates as victims of the state and as heroic pioneering ancestors triumphing over the wilderness.

REVIEWS

- c) The Perm Region which contains various memorial locations including the famous Perm-36 Museum of the History of Political Repression. An ideological conflict developed between the museum and the local and central authorities which the authorities happened to win on an administrative level, while, apparently, failing to remake the museum into a pro-Soviet one.
- d) Kolyma – “Auschwitz without the ovens”, as Shalamov expressed it – where both the discussion and memorialisation work focused not as much on the politics, as on constructing local identity. The ambiguous results of that process are “visually expressed in a swathe of the local landscape: the Mask of Sorrow on Krutaya Hill [a monument to all who had died in the camps *E.M.*] is within viewing range of the Eduard Berzin Monument [the controversial head of Dalstroy *E.M.*]” (p. 183).

The book also discusses the related memorial sites at Sandarmokh and Butovo (where mass executions were carried out and mass graves were located, later to become symbolic cemeteries), and the history and fate of the special ‘memory markers’, the Solovetsky stones “scattered across the European part of the Russian Federation” (p. 49).

Bogumił’s approach is both spatial and temporal, covering the process from the moment the memory of the Gulag begins to take physical shape. Firstly, it is shaped through the ‘carnival of memory’ of the late eighties and nineties, where multiple memory strategies were born, memory languages were developed, giant memorial projects were conceived and temporary markers (like the above-mentioned stones) were raised on the spots where future monuments were to be erected, supposedly creating a cohesive symbolic landscape. Secondly, it is shaped by a period of stabilisation where a lack of resources and a shift in political will makes many of those temporary markers permanent and the heterogenous nature of memorial narrations becomes obvious and comes to shape the texture of memory. Finally, it is shaped by the current

REVIEWS

period where both the state and the generation of post-memory are taking a more active part.

This twin approach creates a persuasive cross-section of memory actors: Russian Orthodox Church, NGOs, local activists and museums and, to a degree, the Russian government, and their strategies – and the resulting memorial landscape. *Gulag Memories* is based on field work and, thus, every single suggestion has detailed research behind it.

The theoretical framework Bogumił uses is based partly on Maurice Halbwach's *Legendary Topography of the Gospel in the Holy Land*, with its mechanisms of memory-building and the idea that “sacred places do not so much commemorate facts supported by historical testimonies as the beliefs that formed around them” (p. 3). This is amply illustrated throughout the book (e.g. the Solovetsky Special Purpose Camp which is widely considered to be the first prison camp in the Soviet state – and is systemically museified and memorialised as such – had been predated by the camps in Kholmogory and Pertominsk). This framework is complemented by Jan Assman's concept of cultural memory, the Bakhtinian carnival of memory and Foucauldian concepts of discourse and counter-history.

This set of tools allows Zuzanna Bogumił to determine who the memory makers were and what agendas they were pursuing. The tools further enable conclusions as to why the ‘carnival of memory’ failed to produce a unified concept of the repressions or a unified set of memory practices (and that despite the fact that successful memory strategies were copied over and replanted in other regions), and why those successful strategies might prove to be extremely resilient even in the face of a hostile governmental takeover (including the case of the Perm-36 museum where the sheer weight of the collected material and its organisation so far has by itself sabotaged all the efforts of the local authorities to change the museum's tenor).

REVIEWS

Using the examples of the Russian Orthodox Church which managed to work its Gulag experience into the centuries-long story of the Church as an institution; the local memorial sites of the Komi Republic (where, for example, the drive to produce a recognisable and complete history for the region would prompt the museum creators to start the story with the emergence of the local biotopes and then continue with the Gulag); and the famous Memorial Society, whose original purpose was to preserve the memory of the repressions as such, taken separately, Bogumił manages to demonstrate that there was a massive popular demand in Russia for a meaning-production system that would make the prison camp experience a scalable, understandable part of the country's history. As a corollary, she demonstrates that the Russian Orthodox Church was the only institution which has satisfied that demand to a degree – thus becoming the most powerful memory player in the field.

She also shows that the comprehensiveness and cohesiveness of the overall narration appear to matter more to the audience than the facts of the case – and more than the very tradition that narration happens to be based on. For example, while describing the Stations of the Cross procession of the 2007, where the 'Solovetsky' memorial cross was delivered along the *zek*-built river canals from the Solovetsky monastery (where many Orthodox priests and believers had been imprisoned or killed) to a mass execution site in Butovo, Bogumił writes: "In fact, the Stations of the Cross can be seen to exhibit a kind of 'anti-behaviour', as defined by Boris Uspensky. For example, rather than travelling by land, the cross sailed to Butovo, and rather than sailing down the river, it sailed upstream. It was dedicated to *zeks* who had died for their faith, yet, while they were alive, these same *zeks* not only built the canals along which the cross was sailing all those years later, but also the *lagpunkts* where the Stations of the Cross pilgrims were taking breaks and praying." (p. 80)

REVIEWS

This is a stunning observation, because, within the Russian tradition, anti-behaviour is associated with pagan rituals, if not outright devilry – and so a procedure actualising such a behaviour is supposed to be utterly unthinkable for the Russian Orthodox Church and abhorrent to its extremely ritual-minded core audience. Yet, the Stations of the Cross procession proved to be an utter success both in terms of a religious event and in terms of shaping the memorial landscape, establishing a firm connection between the Solovetsky Islands and Butovo as two places of Orthodox martyrdom. The power of these observations would be appreciated by any researcher.

One of the book's few drawbacks is that *Gulag Memories*, being a re-worked English translation of the earlier 2012 book (Bogumił, Zuzanna. 2012. *PAMIĘĆ GULagu*. Krakow, Poland: Wydawnictwo Universitas), is mainly based on Bogumił's fieldwork conducted between 2006-2008. Thus, the post-2012 developments are given a more cursory treatment, with some of them being omitted completely. For example, Bogumił does not mention the affair that has gradually developed into a new focal point of the memory controversy in Russia – the Sandarmokh/Dmitriev case. Since 2015 the Karelian authorities and their allies have tried to revise the story behind the mass graves at Sandarmokh and claim that at least some of the dead there were the Soviet POWs executed by the Finns during the Second World War. This attempt literally to physically re-mark and reclaim the burial site for the Soviet regime (that included unlicensed excavations and bringing trumped-up criminal charges against the archaeologists who had initially discovered the site) falls perfectly within Bogumił's framework and merits further research.

Elena Mikhailik
University of New South Wales

BOOKS RECEIVED / PUBLICATIONS NOTED

Owing to the fact that for each issue of ASEES we receive more books than we can review, a list of books which we have received or about which we have been notified is provided, so that readers become aware of these titles and can follow up their bibliographic details. Communications can be directed to: john.cook@unimelb.edu.au

Schönle, A., A. Zorin, A. Evstratov (eds.), *The Europeanized Elite in Russia 1762-1825: Public Role and Subjective Self*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2016. ISBN 978-0875807478. 420 pages.

Miller, P. and C. Morelon (eds.), *Embers of Empire: Continuity and Rupture in the Habsburg Successor States after 1918*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books, 2018. ISBN 978-1-78920-022-5. 366 pages.

Morgan, W. J., I. N. Trofimova, G. A. Kliucharev, *Civil Society, Social Change and a New Popular Education in Russia*. London, UK: Routledge, 2018. ISBN 978-0415709132. 188 pages.

Gullotta, A., *Intellectual Life and Literature at Solovki 1923-1930: The Paris of the Northern Concentration Camps*. Oxford, UK: Legenda, 2018. ISBN 978-1-781886-91-5. 370 pages.

Monaghan, A., *Dealing with the Russians*. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2019. ISBN 978-1-5095-2761-8. 160 pages.

Sakwa, R., *Russia's Futures*. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2019. ISBN 978-1-5095-2423-5. xii + 267 pages.

John Cook, Reviews Editor

Notes on Contributors

John Cook is an Honorary Fellow in the School of Languages and Linguistics, University of Melbourne. He is the Reviews Editor for *ASEES* and has recently assumed the role of Secretary-Treasurer of *ANZSA*. He completed his D. Phil. at the University of Oxford in 2016. His dissertation focused on Bakhtin's self-fashioning and its implications for this author's work. Since then he has published on Bakhtinian theory in several journals, including *Critical Theory* and *The Dostoevsky Journal*. Projects planned for the future include a comparison of aspects of Ordinary Language Philosophy common to both South Asian and Western traditions.

Geoffrey Hull (BA, PhD Sydney; NAATI 3 in 9 languages) retired as an associate professor from the University of Western Sydney after an academic career lecturing at the Universities of Sydney, Melbourne and Wollongong. Specialising in historical and comparative linguistics, in 2001 he was the founder and research director of the National Institute of Linguistics in Dili and Professor of Tetum at the University of East Timor, charged with the task of describing and standardising the fifteen ethnic languages of the new nation. He has authored numerous books and articles in different areas of Romance, Slavonic, Semitic and Austronesian linguistics and dialectology. He is currently Honorary Associate Professor in the Department of International Studies, Faculty of Arts at Macquarie University.

Katya Jordan is Assistant Professor of Russian at Brigham Young University, Provo. She has published on cultural underpinnings of silence in Russian literature as reflected in the works of Pushkin, Dostoevsky, Mamin-Sibiriak and Ilichevsky. Her

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

research interests also include Dostoevsky's journalism, the woman question and national identity.

Halyna Koscharsky holds a BA, Dip Ed (Monash) and an MA in Linguistics and PhD in Ukrainian Literature (Macquarie). She has retired and is now Honorary Senior Lecturer in the Department of International Studies, Faculty of Arts at Macquarie University. She was Head of the Department of Slavonic Studies (1989-1997), Head of Ukrainian Studies (1987-2009), member of University Senate (1991-93) and Chief Examiner, Ukrainian HSC examination (2009-2018). She was also President of the Ukrainian Studies Association in Australia (1998-2013) and is a Fellow of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Her publications include two monographs (one co-edited), several edited and co-edited volumes and numerous articles in refereed journals.

Pavel Kreisinger studied modern history at Masaryk University in Brno. He completed his PhD in the area of Czech History at Palacký University in Olomouc, where he presently works as a lecturer in the History of the Twentieth Century Section. His specialisation includes the first and second Czechoslovak resistance, Czechoslovak-Australian relations in the twentieth century, and the Gestapo in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia. He is the author of two monographs: *Brigádní generál Josef Bartík (Brigade General Josef Bartík, Prague, 2011)* and *Češi a Slováci v Australii v 1. polovině 20. století a jejich účast ve světových válkách (Czechs and Slovaks in Australia During the First Half of the Twentieth Century and their Participation in the First and Second World Wars, Prague, 2018)*.