A Brief Outline of the History of the Treatment of Ukrainian Literature by the Russian Censorship Laws[1]

Nik. Fabrikant (aka Ivan Krevets'kyi)

Translated from Russian by Richard Hantula

I. Two hundred fifty years have passed since Little Russia was annexed to the Tsardom of Muscovy according to the Treaty of Pereiaslav. The year 1903 was a sad anniversary for Ukraine because forty years had passed since the issuance of the official decree proclaiming the persecution of Ukrainian literature in Russia. This decree of 1863 announced, in essence, that "there has not been, is not, and cannot be any Little Russian literature."

The history of censorship in Russia is unusually sad. But Ukraine would still be comparatively fortunate if only the censorship laws were applied to it to the same degree as in Great Russia, or as in Poland or Finland. Special censorship laws for Ukraine have always been promulgated in Russia, and they have been applied with draconian cruelty, unlike the case for the other nationalities. I therefore think it will be interesting and useful to acquaint my readers, if only briefly, with the more or less striking features marking the history of the treatment of Ukrainian literature by the Russian censorship laws, a survey of which is the object of the present article.

The history of book printing in Russia is altogether unlike its history in Western Europe. Printing in the West resulted from an organic need together with the growth of education. The beginning of book printing in Western Europe coincided with a time of spiritual awakening, with the epoch of the Renaissance and the beginning of the Reformation. All classes of the population there accepted book printing with enthusiasm, and King Louis XII himself called it "rather a divine than a human invention." From the very beginning, book printing in the West found itself in secular hands. It was made use of by university scholarship, by dramaturgy, and by the governmental administration. Book printing in the West was not an exclusive privilege of

[1] A revision of the article "Ne bylo, net i byt' ne mozhet nikakoi malorossiiskoi literatury" ("There Has Not Been, Is Not, and Cannot Be Any Little Russian Literature") in the Ukrainian journal *Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk* (*Literary and Scientific Herald*). [Revised article published in *Russkaia mysl'* (*Russian Thought*), 1905, vol. 3, pp. 127–46.]

Volume IV, No. 2 (2017) DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.21226/T2HD04

government and court but proved to be a general auxiliary and cultural force of the people. Afterwards, as book printing developed, a struggle arose over it between the private press, the government, and the church.

The situation was entirely different in Muscovy. The illiterate and uncultured people of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Russia not only found nothing of interest in secular learning and felt no need of independent thought but looked on printing as devilry, as the work of heretics. According to Giles Fletcher, who wrote a history of the reign of Boris Godunov, the ignorant bishops of Muscovy were at pains to see to it that enlightenment did not spread among the people lest their extreme ignorance and their shady deeds be revealed. They made efforts to prove to the tsar that all new learning aroused curiosity among the people, drew their attention to affairs of governance, and provoked a desire for novelty and change—all of which would not be without danger for the tsar.

Prince Andrei Kurbskii tells of the Muscovite bishops instructing young people in the harmfulness of learning: "this one lost his mind from books, and that one fell into heresy."

Under such circumstances, book printing received a most unfriendly response from all classes of Muscovy. Although Moscow's first press was set up at the initiative of the tsar himself, a crowd attacked the building where the press was located, burned it down, and smashed up and destroyed the press. To be sure, it was later restored, but the printing of books was carried out in secret. From this it is clear that printing in Moscow was an institution of the tsar; it later passed into the hands of the clergy, which printed exclusively ecclesiastical books. It goes without saying that under these circumstances there was no need for censorship. Restrictions on printing could arise only when besides the tsar's press, private presses were founded as well. But this occurred after the annexation of Ukraine to Moscow. In Little Russia private presses appeared as early as the sixteenth century in the church brotherhoods, which had the aim of correcting book texts and freeing them of any Latin or Uniate admixtures. In addition, secular literature was printed there.

The Muscovite clergy regarded the Kyivan theologians very mistrustfully, suspecting them of leanings toward Catholicism and all manner of heresy. After the annexation of Ukraine, Moscow took a very hostile attitude to the private Ukrainian presses, which had appeared first in Kyiv and Chernihiv. In consequence of this mistrust and suspicion, *censorship appeared* in Muscovy for the first time, *and it was chiefly for Ukraine*.

As early as the epoch of Peter and Catherine, the censorship and decrees of the Synod came out against a "special dialect," that is, against the Ukrainian language and literature. In order to replace it with the Muscovite dialect and in time to bring about, in the expression of one of the decrees, the "literary unification" of Ukraine with Muscovy, Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich already strove to subject the above-mentioned private Ukrainian presses to his authority, and

Peter I subordinated them to the Muscovite Synod by a decree of 5 October 1720:

> His Tsarist Majesty, the Great Sovereign, has learned that the Kyiv and Chernihiv presses are printing books that are not in agreement with the Great Russian ones and that are quite contrary to the Eastern Church. To wit: in Chernihiv there are learners' horologions that follow the Old Believers' preference. This was discovered through an interrogation of Erast Kadmin, a resident of Kaluga. In past years he has repeatedly printed horologions through his machinations and sold them at fairs. In the *Bogomyslie* (*Divine Meditation*) printed at the Holy Trinity-Elijah press in 1710 there was much Lutheran contrariness. In the menalogion published in 1718 on the 27th of January and printed at the press of the Kyivan Cave Monastery, it was alleged on the title page that the book had been printed by a monastery under the direct control of the universal patriarch of Constantinople. This should not have been printed, for many years ago the Kyivan Cave Monastery was subordinated to the patriarchs of all Russia and removed from the patriarchs of Constantinople. His Tsarist Majesty has therefore decreed that in all books the Kyivan Cave Monastery and the Chernihiv should be called monasteries subordinate to the patriarchs of all Russia and not the patriarchs of Constantinople. In addition, the monasteries are to print no books other than previous ecclesiastical publications. To ensure their complete agreement with the Great Russian editions, before being printed these old ecclesiastical books are to be compared with the Great Russian editions *in order that there be no differences and that no special dialect appear in them*. No other books, neither works published previously nor new ones, are to be printed in those monasteries unless they are declared to the Ecclesiastical College and permission is received from it lest there appear in such books contrariness to the Eastern Church or discrepancies with Great Russian editions.[2]

And so, since 1720, the Muscovite Ecclesiastical College has seen to it that in Ukrainian literature there be "no differences and that no special dialect appear." Decrees of the same kind were issued to that end on 25 January and 20 March 1720. This decree was a great blow to Ukraine because it destroyed the weak beginnings of Ukrainian literature that had only just appeared.

It should be noted that the attitude of the Russian censorship to Ukrainian literature at that time was completely different from what it is now. Thus, for example, if we compare the edition of Ivan Kotliarevs'kyi's *Eneida* (Travestied *Aeneid*) of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries with the manuscript text that is now banned, we come to the conclusion that at the end of the eighteenth century the censorship was much more liberal than at the beginning of the twentieth century.

[2] See the collection of instructions and decrees on the censorship from 1720 to 1862 published by the Ministry of Public Education.

II. The Russian government's literary and national persecution of Ukraine became particularly serious at the time of the rebirth of the Slavic nationalities, and especially in the second half of the 1840s. At that time the censorship conducted itself with particular severity. Hryhorii Kvitka-Osnov''ianenko was already subject to its disfavour: his history of Ukraine and Bible for the people could not be published because they were written in Little Russian.

In 1847 in Kyiv the storm broke over the "Cyrillo-Methodian" Brotherhood, and there followed the arrest of Mykola Kostomarov, Taras Shevchenko, and Panteleimon Kulish. The minister of internal affairs, Count Lev Perovskii, announced in printed instructions that "by special order" the following works *were banned and withdrawn from sale:* Shevchenko's *Kobzar* (*Minstrel*), Kulish's *Povest' ob ukrainskom narode* (*Story of the Ukrainian People*), *Ukraina* (*Ukraine*), *Mikhailo Charnyshenko*, and Kostomarov's *Ukrains'ki balady* (*Ukrainian Ballads*) and *Vitka* (*Branch*).

In addition, the minister of public education ordered the "censorship department" at that time not to permit the reprinting of the above-mentioned works in new editions. One cannot help mentioning here the curious fate of Kulish's *Story of the Ukrainian People*. It was first published in Aleksandra Ishimova's children's magazine *Zvezdochka* (*Starlet*), and then it appeared in a separate edition. The censor of *Zvezdochka* was Ivanovskii, while that of the separate edition was Kutorga. When the instructions mentioned above were issued, both censors were called to account for passing such dangerous books. Kutorga was imprisoned in a fortress, while Ivanovskii got off with a light "imperial reprimand," the justification being: "as a consequence of the censor's insufficient vigilance and unwarranted trust of the magazine containing the article, and as a consequence of particular esteem for the censor, he is to be rendered a reprimand without it being entered in his service record."

After the Kyivan disaster, relates Kostomarov, all the works of the accused were banned. The censorship intensified its surveillance of Ukrainian literature and was not fastidious about its choice of means in preventing propaganda. It made use of various methods in the form of spying and denunciations to pursue its goal. Not only were the printing of ordinary Ukrainian books and the writing of scholarly articles about Ukraine in Russian forbidden, but even the very words *Ukraine*, *Little Russia*, and *Hetmanate* were now considered illegal. If Ukrainian books made their way into the world from time to time, it was with great difficulty. Amvrosii Metlyns'kyi's quite innocent collection of Ukrainian folk songs, *Iuzhno-russkie narodnye pesni* (*South Russian Folk Songs*), for example, was held up by the censorship for seven whole years (from 1847 to 1854). Another collection of Metlyns'kyi's, *Al'manakh* (*Almanac*), consisting of works by various Ukrainian authors, spent two or three years at the censors' and was returned altogether mutilated; nearly half the text was crossed out because the censor mercilessly struck out all phrases that contained such a

word as, for example, "freedom" ("*volia*"), even if it was said that a horse was ambling "freely" ("*na vole*").

In 1853 the Kyiv central committee and the chairman of the Temporary Commission for the Examination of Old Documents began to quarrel regarding Hryhorii Hrab''ianka's chronicle. The commission wanted to publish the chronicle in book form and sent the manuscript of the chronicle to the Kyiv censor Matskevich. The censor decided to strike from the text passages that, in his opinion, displayed partiality toward the Ukrainian nationality. When the chairman objected to this and spoke against such corrections of a historical monument, the Chief Administration for Press Affairs, allegedly following a "secret Imperial Command," still removed certain passages from the chronicle, the justification being that the "Imperial Command" directed the censors to keep careful watch for passages in Ukrainian books where the Ukrainian nationality and language were discussed lest Ukrainians give preference *to love of their motherland over their fatherland*.

To be sure, Russian literature also suffered from censorship in the years 1848-55 to such an extent that this period in the history of Russian literature is called "the epoch of censorship terror." The reasons, however, for the censorship's persecution of Russian and Ukrainian literature were different. With the accession to the throne of Alexander II, a liberal period began for the cultural life of Russia. A certain relaxation came for Ukraine and Ukrainian literature. In 1862 Teofan Lebedyntsev, the editor of the *Kievskie vedomosti* (*Kyivan News*), entered into a polemic with the publisher of the St. Petersburg weekly *Domashniaia beseda* (*Home Talk*), Viktor Askochens'kyi. Lebedyntsev defended the Ukrainian idiom and argued the utility of a Ukrainian translation of the Bible. Askochens'kyi was himself a Ukrainian by birth, and during the Crimean-Turkish campaign of 1854-56, along with Petro Hulak-Artemovs'kyi, he even wrote Ukrainian verse of a military and patriotic nature. Askochens'kyi now, however, attacked the Ukrainian movement with fervour, chiefly because such a way of thinking agreed with the new trend in the government. Not long before, educational and instructional literature had begun to develop in Ukrainian, and all the serious Russian journals and newspapers (*Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti* [*St. Petersburg News*], *Vestnik Evropy* [*European Herald*], articles by Aleksandr Pypin and others) took a favourable attitude toward it. The Moscow Slavophiles were sympathetic to it. Although they polemicized with the journal *Osnova* (*The Foundation*) on the significance of Ukrainian literature, they nonetheless responded in *Russkaia beseda* (*Russian Talk*) with praise of Father Vasyl' Hrechulevych's "sermons." The Ukrainian translation of the Gospel, thanks to the efforts of "St. Petersburg society," was even approved by the Academy of Sciences. Mikhail Katkov himself in his *Moskovskie vedomosti* (*Moscow News*) collected money received in response to an appeal by Kostomarov in the form of donations for the publication of Ukrainian books. And generally at that time the educational activity of

Ukrainian writers encountered a sympathetic attitude not only in the Russian press but even in official spheres. The ministry allocated 500 rubles for the publication of Ukrainian textbooks for public schools, and a portion of the money was spent on printing Leonid Hlibov's fables. Certain members of Ukrainian society who had contacts with the government in St. Petersburg began to plead in the Ministry of Public Education to have Ukrainian be recognized as a legitimate subject of paramount importance in Ukrainian schools. Bilingual (Ukrainian and Russian) periodicals such as *Osnova* appeared. Sunday schools were founded where the teaching was in Ukrainian. Many Ukrainian textbooks were published. A Ukrainian theatre was permitted, and even the playbills were printed in Ukrainian. True, the St. Petersburg censor crossed out entire pages of the *Kobzar*, but still it seemed that the Russian government had abandoned its idea of completely eliminating the Ukrainian question. Unfortunately, this only appeared to be so.

The Poles, who were then preparing for an uprising, were the first to oppose the national enlightenment of the Ukrainian people, which they hoped in time to subject to themselves. They were the first to rise against Ukrainian enlightenment and against the Ukrainian movement in general. After them followed the Slavophiles, and certain zealots of governmental centralization raised a cry against Ukrainian "separatism." The first violin in this separatist orchestra was played by Katkov with his *Moskovskie vedomosti*, which not long before had gathered money for Ukrainian publications. Katkov wrote at this time that,

> because of the indulgence of the Russian censorship, the Ukrainian movement in 1863 went so far that the government nearly recognized the rude and undeveloped Ukrainian dialect of the common people as a legitimate literary language for general use. One more moment and the government would have committed itself to permitting teaching in the rude tongue in schools throughout the length and breadth of Ukraine. The people would have begun to read even the Gospel, and the government's laws would finally have begun to be promulgated in Ukraine in the idiom of the common people.

As much as the Russian government had earlier encouraged Ukrainian literature, it now took a hostile attitude to that literature. The first secret decree interdicting Ukrainian literature in Russia was issued in 1863. The text of the decree follows:

> *By Imperial Command.* Secret memorandum of the minister of internal affairs to the minister of public education, 8 July, No. 394.
>
> The possibility of the existence of an independent Little Russian literature has long been the subject of debate in our press. This controversy was occasioned by the works of certain writers distinguished more or less by remarkable

talent or originality. The question of Little Russian literature has recently taken on a different character as a consequence of circumstances that are purely political and have no relation to strictly literary interests.

Previous works in the Little Russian language were meant only for the educated classes of South Russia. The adherents of the Little Russian nationality have now aimed their sights at the unenlightened mass of the people. And those partisans who aspire to the implementation of their political ideas have undertaken the publication of books for elementary reading, primers, grammars, geographies, etc. under the pretext of spreading literacy and enlightenment. The criminal actions of many of these individuals have been the subject of an investigation by the special commission. In St. Petersburg donations are being collected for the publication of inexpensive books in the South Russian dialect. Many of these books already have been received by the St. Petersburg censorship committee for examination. The committee has found it particularly difficult to pass the above-mentioned works in view of the following circumstances. In all schools without exception instruction is conducted in the common Russian language; nowhere is the use of the Little Russian language permitted in the schools. The very question of the benefit and possibility of using that dialect in the schools has not been resolved, but even the raising of the question was received by the majority of Little Russians with indignation, which was often voiced in the press. They demonstrate very thoroughly that there has not been, is not, and cannot be any Little Russian language, and that their dialect, used by the common people, is the selfsame Russian that has merely been corrupted by the influence of Poland. They prove as well that the Russian language is just as understandable to Little Russians as to Great Russians. Indeed, it is much more understandable than the so-called Ukrainian language that certain Little Russians and, in particular, Poles are now creating for them. The members of the circle that is endeavouring to prove the opposite will be reproached by most of the Little Russians themselves for separatist ideas that are inimical to Russia and ruinous for Little Russia. This phenomenon is the more deplorable and deserving of attention in that it coincides with the Poles' political schemes and virtually owes its origins to them, judging by the manuscripts that have been received by the censorship and by the fact that the greater part of Little Russian works are actually submitted by Poles. Finally, the governor general of Kyiv also finds dangerous and harmful the publication of the Little Russian translation of the New Testament that is now being examined by the ecclesiastical censorship. On the one hand, taking into account the present uneasy state of society agitated by political events, and on the other hand, bearing in mind that the question of the teaching of reading and writing in the local dialects has not yet been finally decided legislatively, the minister of internal affairs has deemed it necessary, pending agreement with the minister of public education, the minister of church affairs, and the chief of gendarmes regarding the printing of books in the Little Russian language, to instruct the censorship department to authorize for printing solely works in that language that belong to the sphere of belles lettres. *The approval of books in the Little Russian language of a spiritual nature or of educational content in general that*

> *are intended for elementary reading by the people* is to cease. The matter of these instructions was brought to the attention of His Majesty the Emperor, and *His Majesty was pleased to award them His Monarchal favour*. (Secret Memorandum)

This decree, supplemented by still others, has now hung over Ukrainian literature in Russia for forty years. To be sure, a small part of Ukrainian literature was not yet forbidden, but the censorship treated even it cruelly. The works prepared by Kostomarov remained unpublished, just as did the Ukrainian translation of the Gospel approved by the Academy of Sciences. At just that time the Holy Synod made payment to the press for Stefan Opatovych's second issue, which already had been printed with the approval of the censorship, on condition that the press not release the already printed books for sale. It is understandable why in the course of ten years not one Ukrainian book appeared in Ukraine (from 1863 only one book was published in Ukrainian—*O russkikh sudebnykh reformakh* [*On the Russian Court Reforms*], in Ekaterinoslav). The result of such persecution by the government was that Ukrainians in Russia turned to Galicia. There, beginning in 1867, their efforts led to the appearance of the monthly journal *Pravda* (*Truth*) and several books. In general the Russian censorship did not let Ukrainian books through, but *Pravda* nonetheless made its way into Russia with many excisions.

III. The years 1873-76 saw a notable relaxation of censorship. And the Ukrainians in Russia availed themselves of this brief interlude. They published many pamphlets—educational popularizations—for the people to read (for example, stories by Osyp Fed'kovych with a preface by Mykhailo Drahomanov, on "Russo-Galician Literature," and even a translation of Russian criminal laws under the title *Nakazaniia, nalagaemye mirovymi sud'iami* [*Penalties Imposed by Justices of the Peace*]). They published about twenty volumes of ethnographic material of great scientific interest and thereby raised Ukrainian scholars high in the opinion of Western Europe. Ralston, a reviewer of Volodymyr Antonovych's and Drahomanov's *Istoricheskie pesni malorusskogo naroda* (*Historical Songs of the Little Russian People*) wrote, after news of the Russian government's persecution of Ukrainian literature and scholarship spread in Europe: "Let us hope that neither envy nor governmental short-sightedness will hold back the progress of Ukrainian literature, which should be regarded as an object of national pride." Drahomanov was forced to publish the succeeding volumes of *Istoricheskie ukrainskie pesni* (*Ukrainian Historical Songs*) abroad, in Geneva.

The Ukrainian public was quite sympathetic and encouraged the publication of Ukrainian books. "The public in the south," wrote the *Moskovskie vedomosti*, "has been infected with Ukrainomania and is paying 15 rubles for

[Dmitrii] Kozhanchikov's edition of the *Kobzar*." What a muzzle the censorship was for Ukrainian literature is evident from the fact that during its three-year relaxation the number of Ukrainian publications in Kyiv alone rose from 4 percent (in 1872-73) of all local publications to 23 percent (1874-75). But this did not last long. When the Southwestern Section of the Russian Geographical Society in Kyiv, the majority of which consisted of Ukrainians, began to occupy itself energetically with Ukrainian ethnography, a group of Russifiers headed by Mykhailo Iuzefovych raised a fearful cry in the official Russian press and began to send denunciation after denunciation to St. Petersburg to the effect that people unreliable with regard to the state and nourishing political ambitions had gathered there, in Kyiv, under the guise of the geographical society. The government then disbanded the Southwestern Section of the Geographical Society, dispersing its members throughout the state, and intensified censorship pressures on Ukrainian literature. The corresponding decree follows.

M. I. A.

Chief Administration for Press Affairs

Secret

5 June 1876, no. 3158.

His Majesty the Emperor was pleased to command on the 18th (30th of the past May 1876):

1. No books or pamphlets published in the Little Russian dialect are to be permitted to be imported into the bounds of the Empire without special permission from the Chief Administration for Press Affairs.
2. The printing and publishing in the Empire of original works and translations in the said dialect *is to be forbidden*, with the sole exception:

a) of historical documents and monuments, and

b) of works of belles lettres. In the printing of historical works, the orthography of the original is to be unconditionally retained, but in works of *belles* lettres *no deviations* from the commonly accepted *Russian* orthography *are to be allowed*. Permission for the printing of works of belles lettres is to be given only after examination in the Chief Administration for Press Affairs.

3. Various *theatrical* presentations and readings in the *Little Russian* dialect are also to be *forbidden*, as is the *printing in it of texts to music*.

Thus the enemies of the spiritual development of Ukraine achieved success: twenty-five million people had their lips sealed shut. The "Russifying" policy triumphed. This sad occurrence was especially disturbing for Galicia, where there lived very many Little Russian intellectuals who were particularly interested in the affairs of Ukraine in Russia. The decree made a very painful

impression on the Ruthenians living in Lviv. There, in the journal *Pravda*, regret and sorrow were expressed regarding the decree's prohibiting the importation into Russia of various books and pamphlets in Ukrainian, prohibiting not only printing and translating in Ukrainian (with the exception of belles lettres) but even the writing in Ukrainian of texts to music and the staging of plays. The journal writes further in this connection:

> If such coercion seems outrageous in the eyes of others, in the eyes of disinterested people, from a universal human point of view, then how it must outrage the heart, consciousness, and dignity of every Ruthenian who has suffered from it directly! After all, it is sound practice to ban only the evil and dangerous. But to consider a language or a dialect such is impossible for the simple reason that they are not artifacts of human production. A language and a dialect are the work of nature itself and of human spirit. Consequently, they do not require any justification of their existence, for the legitimacy and expedience of their being is acknowledged by nature itself. To engage in acts of coercion against a language is to sin against nature, and every sin against nature is avenged by it.

The journal further points out a whole series of logical and political errors in the decree, which reduce to the following points. First, prohibiting the printing of books and pamphlets in the Ukrainian dialect without regard to content cannot be justified either by logic or by political tact. Second, the censors possess sufficient power to obviate any political danger. Third, even were there a political threat in their content, then in order to avoid that one ought to begin by interdicting the Great Russian language, for revolutionary books directed against the Russian government are published in it. Fourth, the issuance of the decree apparently saw danger in the very enlightenment of the Ukrainian people. Fifth, to all appearances, the decree served as a supplement by the minister, Count Dmitrii Tolstoi, to his dissemination of the classical system in the schools. The journal goes on to point out the antiquity of the origins of the Ukrainian language (about a thousand years). Ukrainian was the basis for the rise of the contemporary Great Russian language, which absorbed a great deal of Ukrainian spiritual and creative strength. For greater consistency of the government's logic, the decree, in order to prevent political infection, should have interdicted the Russian language as well, with the exception of the official chancellery idiom. Moreover, along with the language, Count Tolstoi and Aleksandr Timashev should have deemed the Ukrainian people itself dangerous and revolutionary; consequently, when they imposed a ban on the language, they ought to have "interdicted" the very existence of the people as well.

In 1875, reports Drahomanov, N., one of the most honoured professors in Kyiv University, was dismissed from his position. He was renowned for his ethnographic research, and at the same time he criticized in print the classical

system of the minister of public education. Wishing to take revenge, Count Tolstoi made a denunciation of the professor to the sovereign, with the result that a special commission was formed to discuss the question of the situation of Ukrainian literature. The commission was composed of the following individuals: the chief of the gendarmes and secret police, General Aleksandr Potapov; the minister of public education, Count Tolstoi; and the privy councillor, Mykhailo Iuzefovych. The commission proposed to the sovereign that the Kyiv Geographical Society be disbanded, its members expelled from Ukraine, and the two most eminent members of the section, Drahomanov and Pavlo Chubyns'kyi, be forbidden entry into the capitals.

And so, by virtue of this decree, which is in effect even now in a Christian, Russian state, the Ukrainian translation of even such a work as the Holy Gospel, common to all Christians in the world, is forbidden. And where is that going on? In a Christian state where the Holy Gospel is permitted in seventy languages, including Vogul, Votiak, Zyrian, Hebrew, and Ossetian. And in this state it is precisely the Slavo-Ukrainian population of twenty-five million that is forbidden to read the Gospel in its native tongue.

Moreover, the censorship has forbidden the printing of Ukrainian translations of Russian and foreign classics. As a consequence of this, translations of Shakespeare's dramas (by Kulish), of Homer's *Odyssey* and *Iliad* (by Stepan Rudans'kyi), of Dante's *Divine Comedy* (by Syven'kyi [Volodymyr Samiilenko]), of Schiller, and so on have now been printed in Galicia. It is forbidden to print in Ukrainian any scientific popularizations, pedagogical works, practical books for the household, or even fiction if the subject is drawn from the distant Ukrainian past or from the life of the contemporary Ukrainian intelligentsia. Only original fiction and poetry on subjects from present-day folk life are permitted. It is therefore not surprising that book publishing activity in Ukraine and literature in general have come to a standstill. The censorship has acquired broad latitude for abuse, which continues to the present day.

Lest we be suspected of lack of substantiation, we shall pass on to individual facts in order to better characterize and more vividly illustrate the ways of the censorship, ways that became established because of the aforesaid decree.

Pelahiia Lytvynova's adaptation of *Le médecin malgré lui* (*The Doctor in Spite of Himself* by Molière) was rejected by the censorship because the "conjugal mystery" was allegedly depicted in it. The well-known Ukrainian composer Mykola Lysenko submitted his opera *Chornomortsi* (*Black Sea Cossacks*), the libretto for which had been printed earlier, but the censorship allowed him to print only the music—the text and table of contents were rejected. The same thing happened to the composer Petro Sokal's'kyi. At first the censorship authorized the printing of the libretto for his [Lysenko's] opera *Taras Bul'ba*, but when the author petitioned for the printing of the opera itself with the text, he was refused this by the censorship. Its strictness finally

reached the point that the publication of a collection of ordinary Ukrainian songs was forbidden, and the censorship permitted the music to be printed only after the Ukrainian text of the songs was replaced by a French one. The censors mercilessly struck Ukrainian words out of Russian stories about Ukrainian life and replaced them with Russian ones. Finally, the production of Ukrainian plays, as has already been mentioned, was completely forbidden. This was the form in which the censorship terror continued for four years.

IV. The censorship's oppression was eased in the eighties. Senator Aleksandr Polovtsev conducted an inspection of the Kyiv and Chernihiv gubernias and, under the impression of this inspection, formed a more liberal view of Ukrainian literature than his predecessors. Nonetheless, the relaxation of the censorship was extremely slight. That precisely this was the case is evidenced by the following. In 1880 the Ukrainian translation of Job was burned. In the following year, 1881, the minister of internal affairs, Count Nikolai Ignat'ev, distributed the following secret memorandum to all governors:

Memorandum to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, 1881

With the approval of His Majesty, restrictive rules regarding the use of the Little Russian dialect were established in 1876. These rules, which were communicated to the Messrs. heads of gubernias by the memorandum of 26 June 1876, no. 357, contain the three following enactments:

His Majesty the Emperor has now been pleased to command:

1) Point 2 of the rules is to be supplemented by the explanation that dictionaries have been added to the category of works that may be printed in the Little Russian dialect. In printing dictionaries, the *common Russian* orthography or the orthography used in Little Russia no later than the eighteenth century must be maintained.
2) Point 3 is to be so interpreted that dramatic plays, scenes, and short humorous or satirical songs in the Little Russian dialect previously approved for presentation by the drama censorship, as well as those newly authorized by the Chief Administration for Press Affairs, may be performed on stage. In every case, the special permission of the governor general or, in localities not subject to a governor general, the permission of the governor is required. The authorization of the printing in the Little Russian dialect of texts to music, provided that the commonly accepted orthography is observed, is to be left to the Chief Administration for Press Affairs.
3) *The organization of special Little Russian theatres* and the formation of troupes for the performance of plays and scenes *exclusively in the Little Russian dialect is to be completely interdicted*.

In the eighties a strong literary movement arose in Ukraine. Several Ukrainian-Galician journals were allowed into Russia. The censorship allowed in some books and pamphlets of an educational and popularizing nature that were earlier forbidden. Ivan Franko wrote in his biography of Mykhailo Staryts'kyi on the Russian censorship's treatment of Ukrainian literature in the late seventies and early eighties:

> The decree of 1876, which prohibited the Ukrainian translation of the best classic writers, was as if directed chiefly against Staryts'kyi, a talented translator of Nekrasov, Lermontov, Krylov, Andersen, and the Serbian folk epos. But no matter how difficult it was to work under these censorship conditions, Staryts'kyi still did not lay down his arms. In 1881 he proposed to Oleksandr Konys'kyi the publishing of the literary collection *Luna* (*Moon*) and his personal collection *Z davn'oho zshytku* (*From an Old Notebook*), in which, in spite of the decree, he included translations of Byron, Heine, Mickiewicz, and Serbian songs. In 1882 he published his translation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* as a separate book, and in 1883 a second volume of *From an Old Notebook*, where the greatest space was given, *horribile dictu*, to translations of Russian poets.

However, lest one form an exaggerated idea of the indulgence and "liberalism" of the Russian censorship of that time, it should be taken into account that the only reliable pilots for avoiding the most dangerous underwater rocks that studded the censorship's rapids were "credit rubles." A censor was even to be found (I would not want to disturb his name) to whom Ukrainian authors would submit a hundred-ruble note instead of covers on their manuscript, and the manuscript would be approved. But this freethinking tendency on the part of the censorship did not last long. By 1883 it already began to rage as before. Kulish's translations of Shakespeare's dramas lay for about twenty years without moving, and only recently were they printed in Galicia. Petro Nishchyns'kyi was forbidden to print a Ukrainian translation of Homer's *Odyssey* despite the fact that, according to the censorship laws, translations of the classics did not require preliminary censorship. When a printed copy of the work was sent from Lviv for admittance into Ukraine, the censor returned it uncut to the translator. When Marko Kropyvnyts'kyi submitted a collection of his dramatic works to the censorship, it banned one play because "intellectuals" in it spoke Ukrainian. The censor wrote in this connection: "There is no Ukrainian intelligentsia; there are no intellectuals who speak Ukrainian; there is only a 'separatist' such as Kropyvnyts'kyi who invents all this." On one collection of Ukrainian children's stories the Chief Administration for Press Affairs wrote the following inscription: "Written apparently for children. But they should study in Russian. Forbid."

Usually the local censors send all Ukrainian manuscripts to the Chief Administration for Press Affairs, and only with its agreement do they make a

decision. Four to eight months pass while this is done. The censors do not inform the authors of the banning of a manuscript, and in case of a "harmful tendency" manuscripts are forwarded directly to the gendarmes' board. A Ukrainian grammar in the Russian language was submitted to the censorship and not approved, the censor determining that "it would be naive to hope for permission to print a grammar of a language *that should not exist*." But this is nothing; the censor personally added a kind of philosophical and cabalistic explanation: "The censor forbids not that which is forbidden by the law and permits not that which the law permits, for everything presentable to him is permitted by law, even that which is left up to his administrative discretion to permit or forbid." A consequence of such broad discretion was that a book was passed freely in one year by the same censor who forbade it in another year. Thus, for example, in *Iuzhno-russkie narodnye skazki* (*South Russian Folk Tales*), Ivan Rudchenko printed the folk tale "Bidnyi vovk" ("Poor Wolf") in 1869, and in 1885 the tale appeared as a separate booklet. But in 1889, in the collection *Kazky ta opovidannia* (*Tales and Stories*), published in Kyiv in 1890, it was no longer allowed by the censor. The same thing occurred with the story "Iaitse raitse" ("The Cosmic Egg") by the same author.

Dits'ki pisni, kazky i zahadky (*Children's Songs, Tales, and Riddles*) was authorized in the censorship of 1876, forbidden in 1880, and again authorized in 1891. The very same thing was repeated with the works of Chaichenko [pseudonym of Borys Hrinchenko], which were approved and forbidden several times.

V. Ukrainian theatrical literature fared no better. According to the testimony of Staryts'kyi at the first All-Russian Congress of Theatre People in Moscow in 1897 (*Trudy s''ezda* 260), besides the persecution of the general theatrical censorship, the Ukrainian theatre also suffers a special Ukrainian persecution—it provokes hostility and suspicion in the Russian administration and censorship. Particularly because of the official decree of Alexander III in 1881, the Ukrainian theatre fell into disfavour and began to be victimized by governmental memoranda.

In 1889 the censorship began to forbid the depiction in drama of the life of the intelligentsia, merchants, and even the daily life of the lower urban middle class wherever any character in a frock coat made his appearance. Even plays formerly permitted by the censorship were removed from the repertoire, for example, *Doky sontse ziide,* [*rosa ochi vyist'*] (*By the Time the Sun Rises*, [*the Dew Will Devour the Eyes*]) and *Hlytai* (*The Profiteer*) by Kropyvnyts'kyi. Further, "historical" plays and plays "of historical life" were banned.

According to the explanation by the head of the Administration for Press Affairs, Staryts'kyi's dramas *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi* and *Rozbyte sertse* (*The Broken Heart*) were banned *not because of their content or tendency* but

exclusively because of their *Little Russian* dialect. Kropyvnyts'kyi's drama *Tytarivna* (*The Sexton's Daughter*), Ivan Karpenko-Karyi's [Ivan Tobilevych] dramas *Roman Volokh, Serbyn* (*The Serb*), and *Shcho bulo, to mokhom poroslo* (*That Which Was Is Covered with Moss*), Konys'kyi's drama *Ol'ha Nosachivna* and his comedy *Porvalas' nytka* (*The Thread Broke*) were banned for the same reason.

Now and then historical plays and plays from the milieu of the intelligentsia slipped safely through the strict censorship, but they were such poor works that one would not dare to stage them. The plays of the authors mentioned above, even if they were about everyday life, were banned merely if they were modelled upon Russian or European plays of genuine literary value. Because of this the horizon of Ukrainian dramatic literature narrowed and was limited to the "farm and cottage," inasmuch as it was forbidden to treat the life of the people in the round. It was permitted to depict stereotyped love and purely familial joys and griefs. As a result, the repertoire of the Ukrainian theatre became monotonous and tiresome, and was thereby condemned to starvation.

But certain Ukrainian writers resorted to a method possible only in Russia in order to avoid such starvation. According to Liudmyla Staryts'ka-Cherniakhivs'ka, the difficult and unequal struggle with the censorship reached the point that dramatists resorted to cunning. Taking advantage of the censors' ignorance, they unearthed somewhere among the "lists of plays unconditionally permitted for performance" old plays under the titles of which they wrote new ones, while preserving the same character names. An example of such a play used for the falsification of new plays was a Little Russian drama in five acts by Bondarenko, *Vasyl' i Halia* (*Vasyl' and Halia*). As a matter of fact, the forgers used only the cover and the list of characters from this play. No one knew the value of the original play or the name of the author; nonetheless, it rendered a great service to Ukrainian dramatists. Many forbidden plays appeared under the title *Vasyl' and Halia*. A large number of the plays previously rejected by the censor are now permitted to be published under their own titles; many plays have already discarded the formerly prevalent title *Vasyl' and Halia*.

VI. We noted above that the Ukrainian translation of Holy Scripture is absolutely forbidden in Russia.[3]

In 1881 Professor Ivan Puliui (of Prague) petitioned the Chief Administration for Press Affairs to permit a Ukrainian translation of the New Testament in Ukraine. The Chief Administration, however, found the petition "not satisfiable." This was late in the nineteenth century. This dream of

3. While this was being printed, news was received that the Committee of Ministers had approved this translation. [Ed.]

Ukrainians has not been realized in the twentieth century either. The hope of the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg has not been justified. Having acquired a fine Ukrainian translation of the Gospel, which was found among Pylyp Morachevs'kyi's posthumous works, the academy gave it to Academician Fedor Korsh for examination in the winter of 1900. The academy intended to print up and publish the translation, and for that purpose it entered into discussions with the Holy Synod and the metropolitan of St. Petersburg. But the latter categorically opposed the printing of the translation despite the fact that in the given instance the academy was pursuing purely philological aims. Although the metropolitan did not wish to explain officially the reason for his ban, the academicians learned privately that the metropolitan perceived a "Polish intrigue" in their enterprise. Thereafter, in the eighties and nineties, Professor Puliui of Prague repeatedly appealed to the good offices of the Academy of Sciences and requested permission from the Chief Administration for Press Affairs to import into Russia the Ukrainian translation of Holy Scripture that had already been printed in Vienna. Oleksandra Kulish separately petitioned the empress herself about this. Moreover, in 1893 the Chernihiv gubernia executive board, arguing the Ukrainian population's imperative need for such a translation, petitioned in official spheres for the publication of the Gospel. Despite all these solicitations, the government, which once had allotted 1,500 rubles for this purpose, still found the requests "not satisfiable."

In his petition Professor Puliui cited the following grounds. First, in Russia the translation of Holy Scripture is permitted into thirty-six languages, among which are various nationalities: Slavic, Mohammedan, Judaic, and Asian non-Russians. Yet in European Russia they represent merely a small handful as compared with the twenty-five million Little Russians.

Second, by its ban of the Ukrainian translation of Holy Scripture the Russian government has denied its brotherly people the satisfaction of its dearest spiritual need. This is the people that two hundred fifty years ago helped Russia free itself of Polish oppression, and it is the people that joined Russia voluntarily in spite of the fact that Russia had stood aloof and not offered aid in years that were difficult for Ukraine. Since that time Ukraine has done no injury to the Russian state, and Ukraine's sons have shed their blood for Russia without demur, augmenting Russia's glory and majesty in every possible way.

Third, while developing in detail the arguments and reasons for his solicitations, which continued with interruptions for almost twenty years, Professor Puliui appealed in the name of the multi-million Ukrainian people to the Chief Administration for Press Affairs with ardent and plaintive supplications for the satisfaction of his solicitation. In this connection, he pointed out the beneficial spiritual and socio-economic consequences that would ensue for Ukrainians with the abrogation of the law of 1876.

VII. Although the Russian censorship permitted certain Moscow publishers to print books for the people and collections of Ukrainian folk songs, this permission fell to the lot of collections that were poorly edited, while better collections, such as *Lirnyk i pisni* (*Lyrist and Songs*), which was submitted for censorship in 1887 and 1889, were not approved for printing. And in 1894, although the publishing of such a collection of songs under the title of *Zhyvi struny* (*Living Strings*) was allowed, several songs were removed from it even though they had already been printed earlier in various ethnographic collections and song books. Any unbiased reader can satisfy himself from the texts how innocent was the content of the songs forbidden by the censors and how much mockery and caviling there was in this ban by the censorship.

At the beginning of 1894 two manuscripts were presented to the censorship: *Krynychka* (*The Little Well*)—stories and poems that had been printed previously *with the permission of the censorship*, and *Zerniatky* (*Little Seeds*)—stories and poems—by P. Z. R-a. The censor banned them in the same year. The author submitted a complaint to the Chief Administration. A year later, at the end of 1895, an inquiry was made. The censorship answered that the manuscripts were being gone over anew. Not until 1896, that is, two years later, did the censorship pass them, but in mutilated form. The stories "Chornomortsi u nevoli" ("Black Sea Cossacks in Captivity"), "Iak chelovik konem buv" ("How a Man Was a Horse"), and "Puhach" ("Screech Owl") were eliminated from *Little Seeds*. All of them had been printed long before with the approval of the censorship (the first one separately, the second one in the second issue of *Skladka* [*Collection*], the third in the book *Iak treba zhyty* [How One Should Live], Moscow, 1894).

Completely removed by the censor from the works of Ievhen Hrebinka was "Tsap" ("Billy-Goat") (the censor's comment: "a translation from Krylov") and, from the works of Trokhym Zin'kivs'kyi, "Myshachi pryhody z kotom" ("The Adventures of the Mouse with the Cat"), as well as "Iachmin'" ("Barley").

If all the comments and notes made by the censors on the banned manuscripts of Ukrainian authors were to be collected, then, without exaggeration, one could compile an entire volume of the humorous and at the same time tragic curiosities attending the fate of the unfortunate Ukrainian manuscripts victimized by the omniscient Russian censors. Through these manuscripts they endeavoured to prove their talent both in the field of criticism and literature and in that of psychology and philosophy.

Let us pick at random at least a few such censors' remarks. On the original of Hrebinka's innocent fable "Sontse ta khmary" ("The Sun and the Clouds"), the censor wrote: "An allegory capable of provoking various interpretations," and with regard to Metlyns'kyi's poem "V''iazon'ko" ("Little Elm") the censor wrote: "There is a political allusion in the last line." On the original of Iurii Fed'kovych's poem "Brat i Sestra" ("Brother and Sister") the censor wrote "Galicia and Little Russia," despite the fact that there was absolutely no allegory at all in the poem.

On other poems there were the following inscriptions: "A call for unity," "of a patriotic nature," etc. The following note was made on Hulak-Artemovs'kyi's fable "Pan ta sobaka" ("The Landowner and the Dog"): "An allegory on the cruelty and injustice of landowners who spend their nights in debauchery and gambling." To another fable by Hrebinka, which concluded with the stanza "The devil take him. I am afraid I shall anger the commissar," the censor added: "Here, perhaps, there is an allusion to someone who is a bit higher than a commissar."

In 1896 Hrinchenko submitted to the censorship a translation of Schiller's tragedy *Mary Stuart*. The Odesa censor did not pass it. The translator complained to the Chief Administration for Press Affairs. There followed the answer that the manuscript had been banned "because of special instructions given by the censorship administration according to Article 113 of the statute on censorship and the press." But Article 113 states: "In censoring *articles concerning the following departments: military, judicial, financial, subjects under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Internal Affairs*, censors are obliged to follow specially issued instructions."

The translator complained to the minister of internal affairs. His justification for his complaint was that a *drama is not an article*; that the sixteenth century, in which the action of the tragedy took place, was not the nineteenth century; that neither Mary Stuart nor Queen Elizabeth of England could in any way have any connection with the laws and articles of the Russian government; and, finally, that the works of Schiller were permitted in Russia both in the original and in translation. The minister replied (1897) that it was impossible to abrogate the censorship's ban "in view of such an action's incompatibility with the rules in force regarding the censorship," but he did not indicate what rules.

The translator then complained about the minister *to the Senate*. In his complaint he provided a characterization of the situation of Ukrainian literature in Russia, where it has been removed from the general law and subjected to the discretion of unknown official instructions. But to this day he has not received an answer from the Senate.

The Russian censorship sometimes resorted to *cunning*. In order to prove its "liberalism" and the absence of talent in Ukraine, it sometimes, despite the censorship prohibition, passed mediocre plays, such as, for example, *Iatrivka* (*The Brother-in-Law's Wife*), which no one bought.

The censorship forbade *Ukrainians* to be called by their own name and applied to them the word *Russian*, or at best *South Russian* or *Little Russian*, avoiding the word *Ukraine* in all possible ways. Thus once, when in no. 31 of the collection *Kolosky* (*Little Ears of Grain*) the censorship could not reject this word without changing the meaning of a phrase, it nevertheless rejected the word *our* from the two words "Our Ukraine." In exactly the same way it crossed out the words *Cossack, Sich, Zaporizhia, Zaporozhian*, and so on.

Also well-known is the Kyiv censorship's feat of forbidding a Kyivan edition of a series of Ukrainian stories (as the first series of the Vydavnycha Spilka [Publishers' Union]) to be called "The Ukrainian Library." The publishers' petition that the name "Our Library" be used instead of "The Ukrainian Library" was answered in similar fashion with a refusal on the pretext that such a name hints at a periodical character of the publication.

Moreover, although the censors did not know Ukrainian, they allowed themselves *to correct* Ukrainian manuscripts or to forbid them on the pretext that they were written in incorrect Ukrainian. Thus, for example, the censor did not pass a collection of poems by the talented poet Samiilenko because he found many *neologisms* in them.

A truly comic phenomenon: Ukrainian writers and philologists before the court of the Russian censor! And this seems yet more strange because one of the paragraphs of the censorship laws prohibits the censors from touching the literary side of the manuscripts they receive for examination. We shall not enter into a detailed examination of all the people who were rejected by the Russian censorship in their applications to publish Ukrainian journals and newspapers of various kinds in the eighties and nineties of the past century. Mention should be made, however, of the sad fact that the censorship imposed its ban on those periodicals and would not allow them to be published regardless of their tendency, content, or even title. That is why the Ukrainian population of many millions was deprived of the opportunity to read in its own language and receive information in the most necessary branches of practical life, such as, for example, agriculture, which life itself brings to the forefront in the South Russian farming gubernias.

VIII. Passing on to an examination of the Russian censorship's treatment of Ukrainian literature in the most recent period, it should be pointed out that in 1900 out of 45 Ukrainian manuscripts 22 were not approved for printing, that is, 49 percent. They included such loyal ones as, for example, Oleksandr Potebnia's *Bukvar* (*Primer*), Kulish's *Sviati Kyrylo i Metodii* (*Saints Cyril and Methodius*), and Stryzhevs'kyi's *Iak zhyve tilo liuds'ke* (*How the Human Body Lives*). Moreover, books previously published were not approved for printing by the censorship, for example, Ivan Nechui-Levyts'kyi's *Khmary* (*Clouds*) (in Kyiv, 1874) and Kulish's "Choho stoit' Shevchenko, iako poet narodnyi" ("Why Shevchenko Is a Poet of Our People") (published previously in *Osnova*).

In the following year the censorship forbade: Mariupolets''s [Stryzhevs'kyi's] *How the Human Body Lives* (popular physiology, disallowed by the censorship for the fourth time), Stepovyk's *Pro komakh* (*On Insects*), *Bondarivna* (*The Cooper's Daughter*), and *Pro vul'kany* (*On Volcanoes*). In 1902 the censorship forbade Hrinchenko's *Velykyi voiovnyk* (*The Great Warrior*; about Alexander the Great), Mykola Cherniakhivs'kyi's *Pro vesnu* (*On Spring*),

and Franko's "Do svitla" ("Toward the Light"; a Russian translation was permitted). Also disallowed was a third edition of *De-shcho pro svit Bozhyi* (*Something about God's World*; astronomy), whereas it immediately appeared in Russian translation and was even approved by the minister of public education for libraries in public schools. Although the book ran into eight editions in translation, it still was not passed by the censorship in the original.

The same fate befell the following books: Stepovyk's *Opovidannia pro komakh* (*The Story of Insects*), Shevchenko's *Naimychka* (*The Hired Woman*), A. Ivanov's *Rozmova pro nebo ta zemliu* (*Conversation About the Sky and the Earth*) and *Rozmova pro zemni syly* (*Conversation About the Earthly Forces*), and Ievhen Chykalenko's *Rozmovy pro sel's'ke khoziaistvo* (*Conversations About Farming*). The latter was approved not only by the press but by the ministries of public education and state domains, and an edition of ten thousand copies was quickly sold out (in rural libraries and reading rooms). Despite the book's success in Russian translation, a second edition was not permitted by the Odesa censor.

Besides the Ukrainian books in literature and various branches of knowledge just enumerated, we could point out many more such works in Ukrainian that were banned by the Russian censorship, but I think that those cited above illustrate and characterize sufficiently clearly the censorship's tendency regarding Ukrainian literature.

It therefore is not surprising, given such a state of affairs, that the secret importation of Ukrainian books into Russia from Galicia, where during the past several decades the literature has developed at a great rate, has become a common phenomenon, especially in the last years of the past century. Particular success has been enjoyed by Ukrainian periodicals that have already managed to prove their worth in a scientific and literary regard. Thus, for example, the journals *Dzvinok* (*Bell*), *Zoria* (*Star*), *Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk* (*Literary Scientific Herald*), and others safely crossed (and, perhaps, cross to this day) the Russian border in dozens and hundreds of copies not only for individual chance readers but even (alas) for *regular readers* who, in spite of the constant struggle with the frontier gendarmes, number several hundred for each journal.

Works Cited

Central Administration for the Censorship Department. *Secret Memorandum of the Minister of Internal Affairs to the Minister of Public Education*. No. 188, 1863.

Trudy s''ezda. 1900.