

This article was downloaded by: [Ryerson University]

On: 30 September 2014, At: 04:13

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number:

1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street,  
London W1T 3JH, UK



## East European Jewish Affairs

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/feej20>

### In search of a lost people: Jews in present-day Ukrainian historiography

Yohanan Petrovsky-Shtern <sup>a b c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Associate Fellow at the Davis Center for Russian Studies , Harvard University ,

<sup>b</sup> Teaches Slavic and Judaic Studies , Tufts University ,

<sup>c</sup> Jewish History , Hebrew College , Boston  
Published online: 19 Jun 2008.

To cite this article: Yohanan Petrovsky-Shtern (2003) In search of a lost people: Jews in present-day Ukrainian historiography, *East European Jewish Affairs*, 33:1, 67-82, DOI: [10.1080/13501670308577989](https://doi.org/10.1080/13501670308577989)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13501670308577989>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and

should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

## In Search of a Lost People: Jews in Present-day Ukrainian Historiography

Though Jews claim some seven to ten centuries of uninterrupted presence in Ukraine, Ukrainian historians have traditionally perceived them as aliens – culturally, religiously, economically and ethnically – and neither Ukrainian historiography nor the popular imagination has identified them as natives. Omeljan Pritsak's unique hypothesis on the Khazarian origins of Kievan Rus with its unavoidable Judaic implications<sup>1</sup> has been frowned on in Ukrainian historiography and is rarely referred to, proving only too well one and the same rule – that for Ukrainians, Jews were either subservient serfs of the Polish *szlachta* or no less obedient clerks of the Russian Bolsheviks. Metaphorically, Jews either represented *lyakhy* – Poles – or *moskali* – Russians. They have never been *Ukrainian Jews*.

The Soviet period of Ukrainian historiography contributed to the deepening of popular myths, biases and misunderstandings.<sup>2</sup> Jewish and Ukrainian functionaries, active on the Ukrainian political scene between 1917 and 1920, made courageous efforts to eliminate Jewish ukrainophobia and Ukrainian anti-Semitism but their writings were excluded from scholarly circulation.<sup>3</sup> In the 1960s–70s Ukrainian and Jewish dissidents established brand-new intellectual and spiritual standards for the mutual rapprochement of the two peoples, but had no opportunity to incorporate these standards into any significant scholarship.<sup>4</sup>

Only in the late 1980s and especially after 1991, with the re-establishment of Ukrainian statehood, has this tendency been reversed, triggering the rise of a new Ukrainian historiography and, at least officially, breaking down the old prejudices. This new historiography has, it must be admitted, not yet produced anything resembling the writings of Simon Dubnow (1860–1941) or Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi (1866–1934). It has only taken its first steps. Rather than point out its all-too-clear inconsistencies, inadequate scholarly level, and inability to contextualise, a much more important task is to examine the tendencies within it. Hence this article looks at the initial results of overcoming inherited stereotypes and fashioning new patterns of thought which fit modern geopolitical circumstances and reflect new Jewish and

Ukrainian sensibilities. In a word, it explores the treatment of a national minority in a post-colonial scholarship.<sup>5</sup>

### **Jews as new Hebrews**

The events of 1991–93 had a major impact on Jewish and Ukrainian intellectuals alike. It could hardly have been otherwise. In spring 1991 the *Narodnyi Rukh Ukrainy* (the National Movement of Ukraine, usually known as *Rukh*), the most influential Ukrainian national liberal–democratic party opposing the communist regime, organised and led mass demonstrations of solidarity with Ukrainian Jews in response to rumours about forthcoming pogroms.<sup>6</sup> On 10 September 1991, less than a month after the ‘velvet revolution’ which led to the demise of the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian government declared its intention to commemorate nationally the 50th anniversary of the Baby Yar massacre, acknowledging the share of the Ukrainian people in the guilt concerning the Holocaust in Ukraine.<sup>7</sup> On 12 September 1991 Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk held talks with Edgar Bronfman of the World Jewish Congress and, on the following day, with representatives of leading Israeli companies. Both meetings bolstered state and public contacts on many levels. On 25 December 1991 Israel recognised Ukrainian independence – one of the first Western countries to do so – and on 26 December the two countries established diplomatic relations. Yuri Shcherbak, a prominent Ukrainian writer and philosemite, was appointed the first Ukrainian ambassador to Israel. President Kravchuk’s address to the International Conference on Anti-Semitism in Brussels on 7 July 1992 reiterated the Ukrainian government’s determination to promote the development of Jewish life in Ukraine and to combat anti-Semitism.<sup>8</sup> Less than a year after the establishment of diplomatic relations, on 1 September 2002, Israel welcomed a Ukrainian parliamentary delegation and, in the same month, Israeli Prime Minister Yitshak Shamir met President Kravchuk.<sup>9</sup> Since 1991 Ukrainian–Israeli conferences, featuring the cream of the Ukrainian and Jewish intellectual elites, have become a part of modern Ukrainian cultural discourse.<sup>10</sup>

To leading Ukrainian figures it was clear even before 1991 that the Israeli experience of promoting its political image and spawning its statehood was a pivotal example to Ukraine.<sup>11</sup> In its attempts to revive Ukrainian culture and statehood, Ukraine could not overlook the fact that in the 40 years of its existence Israel had revived the Hebrew language and culture, built up an efficient agriculture and a strong economy, and achieved a per capita GDP higher than such developed European countries as Spain. Larysa Skoryk, the President of the Ukraine–Israel International Society, argued that, in a new geopolitical context, ‘the modern history of the re-established Israel is for the young Ukrainian state an eloquent example of how to strive for, gain, build up, and preserve state independence – the prerequisite for the greatness,

freedom and indestructibility of the nation.’<sup>12</sup> This geopolitical development encouraged Ukrainian poets and writers such as Dmytro Pavlychko to pull unpublished philosemitic writings out of their drawers for the purpose of publication. At the same time, scholars attempted to place Ukrainian–Jewish relations in a scheme beyond that of ‘an alien people in an alien land’.

The post-1991 Ukrainian mentality re-visited Jews as Israelis – a friendly people in an alien land. Ukrainian scholars cast their new narratives in the mould of the political, diplomatic and cultural rapprochement between Ukraine and Israel. Slogans proclaiming similarities between the historical destinies of both peoples and countries seemed to displace the vexing motto ‘Ukraine and Russia are inseparable sisters’. These slogans informed to a great extent the new Ukrainian–Jewish *modus vivendi*. Suffice it to mention the 1992 demonstrations by Rukh against the alleged preparation of anti-Jewish pogroms. No less important than these slogans was an unparalleled attempt to transform them into a search for historically relevant paradigms for the Ukrainian–Jewish rapprochement.

Unexpectedly, tracing parallels between the historical destinies of Ukrainians and Jews – from the teleological perspective of regained Ukrainian and Israeli statehoods – became for a good many Ukrainian scholars a task of critical importance, if not necessarily constituting a part of their new national identity. These parallels were the essence of the Ukrainian–Jewish dialogue. In the field of social sciences, for example, Stepan Zlupko from L’viv State University, and Taras Bohdanovych from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, published a monograph comparing public institutions in Ukraine and Israel. Portraying affinities and differences between the two countries, Zlupko and Bohdanovych plausibly concluded that Ukraine might ‘heavily rely on half-a-century of Israeli experience’.<sup>13</sup> In the field of national self-identification, Ivan Dziuba, at the time of writing the Minister of Culture of Ukraine, defined Jews and Ukrainians as ‘two victims of history and of regimes which suppressed freedom’, whereas Martin Feller, the head of the editorial board of the *Ukrainian–Jewish Encyclopedia*, claimed that similarities between Jews and Ukrainians should lead to the establishment of *ukraino-iudaika*, a branch of humanities aiming at the study of centuries-old Ukrainian–Jewish intellectual contacts.<sup>14</sup> In the heavily charged field of Ukrainian linguistics, Orest Tkachenko, a leading linguist from the Potebnia Institute of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, offered in his voluminous research on the phenomenon of ‘linguistic firmness’, which was based on dozens of East European languages and ethnic groups (primarily Finno-Hungarian and Slavic), a profound analysis of the survival of the Hebrew language. He presented Hebrew – ranging from the Biblical to the present-day Eliezer ben Yehuda version – as an example of the ‘linguistic firmness’ *par excellence* that cemented the preservation of the

Jewish tradition. Astonishingly, Hebrew-language history brought Tkachenko to far-reaching conclusions indispensable for the revival of the Ukrainian language in heavily Russified Ukraine.<sup>15</sup>

The rethinking of political theories of the past went even further. Quite unexpectedly, the name of Ze'ev Zhabotinsky (Vladimir Jabotinsky), a renowned Russian Jewish writer and journalist and critic of Jewish assimilation and Russian chauvinism, was placed at the forefront of the Ukrainian–Jewish public discourse. Due to his active support of Ukrainian statehood and his genuine concern for the fate of the Ukrainian language and culture – and, of course, his unabashed Jewish nationalism – Zhabotinsky's name was considered classified for some 70 years of Ukrainian Soviet historiography, but in the late 1980s–early 1990s it was appropriated by a good many Ukrainian politicians. It would be no exaggeration to say that nowadays Zhabotinsky's popularity in Ukraine exceeds his fame in Israel, where his hardline stance towards Palestinian Arabs has made him an awkward and unpopular figure among the liberal-minded intelligentsia. On the contrary, in Ukraine, Zhabotinsky's legacy has to a great extent shaped the modern Ukrainian–Jewish dialogue.

Ukrainian Jews saw in Zhabotinsky a fine example of an assimilated Jew who sacrificed his brilliant career in Russian *belles-lettres* for the sake of joining the Jewish Legion of the British army fighting in Palestine. The Ukrainian side, inspired by Zhabotinsky's unrestricted support for Ukrainian independence and Ukrainian culture, presented him as a Jewish politician so grievously lacking on the modern Ukrainian political scene. In Ukrainian political discourse, Zhabotinsky was re-imagined as an independent knight, bravely struggling against leftists and rightists, Marxists and Zionists – a sort of champion of the utmost national striving. Ukrainian scholars described him as 'a great friend of the Ukrainian people' (Ivan Dziuba), dubbing him 'Apostle of the Nation' and comparing him to Viacheslav Lypyns'kyi (1882–1931), a prominent Ukrainian political thinker and historian and contemporary of Zhabotinsky.<sup>16</sup> The fact that Zhabotinsky was at odds with the Zionist establishment did not scare off his Ukrainian admirers. Even more impressive was that they gave him preference over Ahad Ha-Am (1856–1927), another Odessa-based Zionist and harbinger of the spriritual revival of diaspora Jewry.

The reason for this choice is significant. In an attempt to combine the greatest achievements of European civilisation with the immediate needs of European Jews, Zhabotinsky sought 'the universal in the frame of the national', though perhaps without attempting to make this idea central in his political programme. However, for post-1991 Ukrainians stuck between the necessity of Ukrainisation and the desire to remain within the democratic European society, this particular paradoxical idea of Zhabotinsky acquired

critical importance.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, Ukrainian historiography associated Zhabotinsky with the *Yishuv* in Palestine rather than with the Jews in the Pale of Settlement. As such, he represented Israeli, not Ukrainian Jewry. Ukrainians perceived him as a distant friend and not as a close relative or neighbour. The author of the article on Zhabotinsky in 'An Encyclopedia of State and Ethnic Sciences' writes correctly: 'Most world Jewish politicians in Israel or beyond have not learnt the lessons of Vladymyr Zhabotyns'kyi.'<sup>18</sup> Paradoxically, one of the lessons that Jewish scholars have to learn from Zhabotinsky's popularity in modern Ukraine is that it hardly manifests a desire to incorporate Ukrainian Jews into the Ukrainian mentality. Nevertheless, this and other references to Ukrainian-Israeli similarities have had important repercussions.

### **Jews as a political entity**

Since 1991 Ukrainian historiography has, understandably, almost overwhelmingly presented the history of Ukraine as that of a political entity. Subsequently, it has rethought the Ukrainian past as a road leading straight to state independence. Very often political historians undertook this rethinking at the expense of other historical aspects, both socio-cultural and ethnic. Modern Ukrainian scholars who consider themselves political historians have adopted the following logic: if post-1991 Ukraine is an independent political entity, its tenth- or sixteenth-century history should also be depicted as such.<sup>19</sup> Therefore, a reading of modern Ukrainian historiography gives the impression that Ukrainians alone, and nobody else, were privileged to foster Ukrainian statehood. Poles, Russians and Jews did not foster it – they repressed it. Neither the governing forms of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, nor the Jewish urban infrastructure in the *shtetlekh*, and certainly not the Bolshevik forms of Ukrainian republican government, contributed to Ukraine's rise. The role of a creative power which in previous historiography belonged to the Communist Party was now re-attributed to Ukrainian statehood. Ukrainian scholars probably considered this approach a new way of emancipating Ukrainian history from its Russian – Imperial and Soviet – legacy and making it genuinely Ukrainian. Yet their approach has followed a very Soviet-like pattern of thinking. It has matched the Ukrainian national agenda only on the surface. In fact, those who preferred to see fourteenth- or eighteenth-century Ukraine as a political entity misread both Ukrainian and Jewish-Ukrainian history.

Notwithstanding the diversities of modern Ukrainian historiography, there has been a strong tendency towards a common variety of research among authors. The less Ukrainians could be said to be responsible for Jewish catastrophes, the more extensive have been the descriptions of these catastrophes. The opposite holds true too: the greater has been the purported

Ukrainian involvement in historical calamities victimising Jews, the less Jews and Jewish issues have been covered in Ukrainian scholarship. For example, ‘A New View of the History of Ukraine’, a textbook recommended by the Ukrainian Ministry of Education, contains three references to Jews. First, it refers briefly to the eve of the 1648–49 Cossack revolution when the lessees, ‘among whom were many Jews’, oppressed the local Ukrainian population in the most ‘offensive and cynical’ manner. Second, it depicts in one paragraph the rapid urbanisation of Jews in the Ukrainian part of the Pale of Settlement throughout the nineteenth century. Third, it provides a lengthy and sympathetic description of the ‘anti-cosmopolitan’ campaign in the last years of the Stalin regime and lists major Jewish figures arrested and shot during this campaign.<sup>20</sup>

What is wrong with these references is that the textbook provides no context with which to explain the Jewish ‘colonisation’ of the Ukrainian lands in the late fourteenth–sixteenth centuries, or to describe the predominantly Jewish urban areas in seventeenth-century Ukraine (Eastern Poland), and to elaborate on the entire financial–trade–economic infrastructure, also mainly Jewish, which preceded the Cossack 1648 revolution. The reader who has heard at least something about the massacres of Jews perpetrated by Khmelnit’skyi’s followers and who has read this textbook would definitely place the blame on Jews, who ‘offensively and cynically’ exploited the local population. For the 1881 pogroms or 1948 atrocities against Jews, one should indeed blame the Russian imperial authorities and Stalin’s Bolshevik regime, and not Ukrainians – the authors therefore condescended to some cautious contextualisation. But as to 1648, they provide no additional background and thus remain silent over the slaughter of some 12,000–14,000 Jews.

The political histories of Ukraine introduce a Jewish theme to inform a particular perception of Jews and Judaism. This is the case with ‘The History of Ukraine: From Earliest Times to 2000’, issued as yet another textbook and recommended by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine.<sup>21</sup> The monograph devotes one of its first chapters to the Khazar state as the first feudal entity in Eastern Europe, soundly underscoring the critical role of Judaism in its formation. Kormych and Bahats’kyi, the authors of the textbook, distort the history of Khazaria in every way possible.<sup>22</sup> The Khazarian *kagan* (ruler) Bulan did not adopt Judaism, so becoming King Joseph – rather, a coup plotted by Jews and headed by a certain Obadia was responsible for the Judaisation of the Khazarian state and its court! The Khazars were not a nomadic tribe – they exploited eastern Slavs, collecting heavy tributes, producing nothing, and engaging in speculative trade! They did not establish any towns on their Western border – Slavic towns emerged in the struggle against Khazar dominion! To complete this picture, Khazaria was not a multi-ethnic entity, but Judaic through and through! The authors’

message is self-evident: the Slavic state, the future Ukraine as the state, emerged from the persistent struggle of local Kievan counts against Judaic oppression. Indeed, to propel this shocking concept further, the authors refer to tenth-century Arabic and twentieth-century Soviet sources such as al-Masoudi or Mikhail Artamonov, but not to Omeljan Pritsak, the best-known authority on the subject and the founder of the Ukrainian Institute at Harvard University and of the Institute of Oriental Studies at the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. Pritsak's portrayal of Khazaria has nothing to do with the concoction of Kormych and Bahalii.<sup>23</sup> Their bypassing of the eminent scholar is particularly illuminating if one takes into account the fact that there is almost no further mention of Jews in the other 474 pages of the book.

Political history not only limits the scope of college textbooks, it also creates insurmountable obstacles for local historians.<sup>24</sup> It is enlightening to examine the history of a Ukrainian town. 'A History of Korets and Korets Region' is characteristic of politicised Ukrainian 'local historians'. By the end of the nineteenth century Jews constituted some 75 per cent of the Korets population. Their share of the town's early modern economy and trade, especially its unique branches such as the famous porcelain plant and belt factory, was overwhelming. Jews built major brick houses in the central street of the town and purchased from the Czartoryskis, the owners of the town, the right to establish and run local mills, the basis of the town's early economy. Culturally and religiously, the town was of great significance: in the 1770s Rabbi Pinechas from Korets established there the first East European Jewish typography. The first Hasidic book to introduce the wisdom of the Ba'al Shem Tov was published in Korets too (*Toldot Yakov Yosef*, 1779). However, based on 444 sources listed in the bibliography, the book on Korets is limited to a single reference to the town in the 1920s as a 'predominantly Jewish' *shtetl*. It is silent about any Jewish contribution to the town's architecture (stone synagogues, factories, urban mansions), trade and economy. Reference to the Holocaust too is limited to an oblique reference to a local ghetto.<sup>25</sup> The rest of the narrative follows the style of the notorious inscriptions on Soviet monuments: 'Here the fascists murdered this and that number of peaceful Soviet citizens.' The two-volume proceedings of the Seventh and Eighth All-Ukrainian conferences on Local History and Culture, containing almost zero information on the Jewish contribution among their 400 reports – not even an oblique reference to such a major Jewish contribution to the economic development of Ukraine as beet sugar production – is a gloomy consequence of the politicisation of local historiography that followed the intellectually sterile 25-volume history 'Towns and Villages of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic' (1967–74).<sup>26</sup>

With minor exceptions, Ukrainian political historians avoid Jewish themes. At the Ukrainian–German conference *The Individual and Society as*

a *Problem of Modern History*, the only Ukrainian scholar to mention Jews was Yaroslav Hrytsak, who pointed not without regret to the negative perception of Ukraine by Ukrainian Jews.<sup>27</sup> Symptomatically, the only person at the International Conference on Ukrainian Historical Didactics to refer to Jews was Anton de Betz from Groningen University (Holland), and not a scholar from Ukraine.<sup>28</sup> Oleksandr Boyko's textbook on modern Ukrainian history vividly illustrates what becomes of Jews in Ukrainian political historiography. In the first edition of his book, Boiko mentions the Holocaust, referring to a number of ghettos for 'individuals of Jewish descent'. However, in a later edition of the book which is approved by the Ministry of Education, even this modest reference disappears, while the entire paragraph remains mostly unchanged.<sup>29</sup> For political historians of Ukraine, Jews remain aliens – except in minor cases when they performed the role of passive victims of someone else's history.

### **Jews as a national minority**

Producing 'political history' was probably the easiest way to displace the bias and clichés of Soviet historiography: it was sufficient to expand the information suppressed in the Soviet histories of Ukraine, changing the assessment of most events from positive to negative, and vice versa. Whoever preferred a different approach – not political but ethno-political or cultural – produced more sophisticated scholarship and had necessarily to cope with Jewish issues. No wonder that among those rare, but outstanding historians who consider Ukrainian Jews part of Ukrainian history is Yuri Shapoval, a leading scholar from the Institute of Political, Ethnic and National Research of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. In his 'Twentieth-Century Ukraine: Personalities and Events in the Context of Difficult Times', Shapoval repeatedly turned to Jewish themes, demonstrating the ambiguity of the Jewish impact on Ukrainian history. Jews emerge from his monograph as both victims and executioners. Shapoval finds a delicate balance between portraying Jews who unwillingly collaborated and those who simply worked for the Soviet state security apparatus and were personally responsible for the persecution of the Ukrainian (and Jewish) intelligentsia and peasantry.

Unlike some historians who did not hesitate to place the blame for the 1932 famine on 'individuals of Jewish descent' such as Lazar Kaganovich,<sup>30</sup> Shapoval does not resort to shallow accusations, albeit he has perhaps seen a good many Jewish names in the lists of those who carried out the confiscation of grain from peasants.<sup>31</sup> Instead, he painstakingly analyses the system of terror that did not distinguish between executioners and victims, swallowing them alive one after another. However, Shapoval's sympathy for Jewish intellectuals – those who believed in the regime and those who suppressed their doubts about it – is undeniable. With his admirable archival expertise, he

unmasks the anti-Semitic character of the anti-Zionist campaign of the 1920s and the 'anti-cosmopolitan' campaign of the 1940s, presenting them as inherent features of Soviet politics. Here too, his approach is objective, rational and balanced.<sup>32</sup> Unlike political historians, Shapoval is in no hurry to announce his final verdict: he argues that scholarship does not yet know enough about Ukrainian and Jewish history to provide a summing up.<sup>33</sup>

For Ukrainian scholars who, like Shapoval, sought to prove that the Ukrainian political agenda has not contradicted the interests of Ukrainian national minorities, the brief period between 1917 and 1920, when Jews found themselves between the hammer and anvil of Bolshevik Russia and independent Ukraine, has acquired particular significance. In his heavily documented study of Simon Petliura's (1879–1926) attitudes towards Jews and his purported endorsement of anti-Jewish atrocities, Volodymyr Serhiichuk from Kyiv University made a number of curious statements based on impressive archival evidence. Following the groundbreaking research of Taras Hunchak,<sup>34</sup> Serhiichuk claimed that Petliura was a philo-Semite, that he did his best to suppress pogromist activity, and that Ukrainian independent governments of the late 1910s were in no way to blame for the wave of anti-Jewish atrocities. He also argued that the responsibility for the pogroms should be placed on those Jews who supported the Bolsheviks and on the Bolsheviks who did their best to trigger Ukrainian–Jewish tensions with the aim of creating social instability, as an excellent prerequisite tactic for taking power. However, Serhiichuk did not hesitate to shuffle inconvenient sources and radically reinterpret others.<sup>35</sup> It was more important for him to recreate the 'pristine' – that is, philo-Semitic image – of Petliura<sup>36</sup> than to investigate the contradictions and complexities of Petliura's stance on Jewish issues and on the anti-Semitism of his regimental warlords (*otamany*). For Serhiichuk, Petliura was a genuine part of Ukrainian history, whereas Jews remained somewhere in the background as a disturbing metaphysical entity that obscured Petliura's hagiography. The real Jewish masses who inhabited Ukraine in 1919 are simply not in the book. Indeed, philo-Semitic revisionism is always better than anti-Semitic pamphleteering, but only as a transitory approach – unless a broader and more sophisticated research replaces both old and new historiographic stereotypes.

As with political history, local history has provided radically different results once it opened itself up to ethnic and cultural explorations. This can be seen in the book on Medzhybizh that comprises a collection of articles on local history and covers important aspects of the Jewish presence in the town.<sup>37</sup> Yet the monograph 'The Necropolis of Chernivtsi' is unique among modern Ukrainian local histories. Written by Ukrainians (no Jewish names are among its five authors), it devotes two of its three chapters to the Jewish cemeteries in Chernivtsi (Chernovits), the main city of Bukovyna. Ironically,

this is probably the best Ukrainian source on Jewish culture and history published in the post-1991 period. In addition to the accurate description of Judaic funeral rites, the book gives a detailed – and highly sympathetic – portrayal of the structure of, among other things, the traditional Jewish community, its major functions, the system of philanthropy, and the contents of liturgy. It proceeds from a description of the gravesites to a detailed explanation of the role of Jews in the local culture, ranging from their impact on the economy, legal system, medicine and city government to the emergence of Jewish secular and traditional socio-cultural trends.<sup>38</sup>

Ethnic and cultural contexts reconsidered by Ukrainian historians have changed the place and role of Jews. Among the textbooks by Ukrainian scholars, the 'History of Ukraine' edited by Yuri Zaitsev together with such prominent Western Ukrainian scholars (and philo-Semites) as Jaroslav Hrytsak and Jaroslav Isaievych, features the Jews extensively. Jews are accurately described as part of the Polish heritage transferred to Russia following the late eighteenth-century partitions of Poland. They appeared in Ukraine as bound to the Pale of Settlement and concentrated in the urban centres and townlets. They were victims of the 1919 'tragic pogroms', for which the 'old bias of a portion of Ukrainians', the guerilla warriors of the Ukrainian National Army, and Red Army commissars should bear responsibility. They became victims once again in the era of the Holocaust – albeit on a par with Ukrainians. And they become victims once more during the 'anti-cosmopolitan' campaign of the 1940s. Jewish names also appear among the human rights activists the KGB targeted during the repressions of the 1960s–80s (for example, Iosyf Zisels and Semen Hluzman).<sup>39</sup>

This treatment of Jewish themes, unheard of in many basic histories of Ukraine, is illuminating. Particularly important is the fact that Judaism and Khazaria do not emerge as a significant factor in Kievan Rus in the ninth–eleventh centuries; there are no Jews – pioneers of fourteenth–fifteenth-century Polish colonisation of Ukraine – mentioned in the book. The fact that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, long before the establishment of the Pale of Settlement, Jews constituted the lion's share of the urban areas of right-bank Ukraine, is also not mentioned. Ukrainian scholars are more than reluctant to articulate what has become common knowledge among their Western colleagues, that Ukrainian towns in the sixteenth–eighteenth centuries were Polish–Jewish and, in the nineteenth century, Russian–Jewish, and not Ukrainian. In addition, when in the late-eighteenth century Jews do appear in the book almost for the first time – together with the Russian Empire and the Pale – they are listed as representing some 3.5 per cent of the population (110,000 people) and not ten times more – namely, 900,000–1,200,000 – as most scholars argue. With due deference to the sympathetic portrayal of Jews in ethno-political historiography in general

and in this book in particular, one might surmise that here, too, Jews remain aliens. To be more precise, resident aliens.

### Conclusions

Despite considerable changes and serious attempts to include Jewish issues in modern Ukrainian ethno-politics, Jews basically remain outside Ukrainian scholarship. Recent editions of the history of Ukraine bypass Jewish topics, as if the Jews had never inhabited Ukraine and had no impact on local culture, politics and economy. The most recent 'History of Ukraine' on CD-rom that targets college students contains no reference to the Jewish factor in Ukraine.<sup>40</sup> Participants in the conference Ukrainian Historical Science on the Threshold of the Twenty-first Century, published in four volumes, hardly mention any Jewish issues. When they do, they demonstrate more illiteracy than experience or benevolence.<sup>41</sup> When they do not, they totally misrepresent the topic.<sup>42</sup> Indeed, with the Jewish historical context absent, and the question of how and why Jews ended up in Ukraine unresolved, why bother oneself covering Jewish issues?

At best, Ukrainian historiography tends to avoid Jewish themes, leaving to Jewish historians the discussion of Polish–Jewish relations in seventeenth–eighteenth-century Ukraine, the events of 1881, 1905 and 1919, and the Holocaust. Indeed, the fact that a researcher of the history of Ukrainian culture quoted the pro-Ukrainian Zhabotinsky and philo-Semitic Vinnychenko could hardly change the general outlook of the *Judenfrei* history of Ukraine.<sup>43</sup> Ukrainian historiography mechanically replaced the pattern of Kievan Rus–Imperial Russia with that of Kievan Rus–Independent Ukraine without making any attempt to examine the history of Ukraine as a poly-ethnic process, in which the dominant role did not always, or necessarily, belong to Ukrainians. As a result, Jews found themselves banished from Ukrainian historiography. Indeed, Western scholars – Patricia Herlichy, Robert Paul Magosci, Roman Shporliuk, Orest Subtelny – demonstrate a much more dynamic and complex picture of what Ukraine was in terms of its motley ethnic composition. Those Ukrainian scholars who based their research on extensive archival evidence have also created a multifaceted profile of Ukrainian modern history. It is incumbent upon Jewish and Ukrainian scholars to incorporate their research – or, at least, to subject it to criticism.

The reluctance to discuss East European Jewish history as part of Ukrainian history belongs to a more general dominant approach in Ukrainian scholarship that avoids the integration of Ukrainian history into the poly-ethnic East European context.<sup>44</sup> The inclusion of the Jews – as well as Poles and Russians – into the historical context as groups that contributed to the rise of Ukraine is an obstacle that Ukrainian historiography must overcome in order to escape inherited Soviet patterns of thinking. What must be done to

find a way out was soundly articulated by Magdalena Telus from the Ekkert Institute (Germany): ‘overcome the immanent patterns of the dominant discourse through dialogue’.<sup>45</sup> If Ukrainian historiography does not undertake this interactive effort to understand one of the most important ethnic groups that inhabited Ukraine over at least 600 to 700 years, it will drastically impoverish itself. Moreover, it will become the norm that provincial scholars lacking access to large libraries and the internet will refer to such epoch-making episodes of Ukrainian Jewish history as Ukrainian Hasidism by resorting to the Soviet ‘Atheist Guide’, claiming that Baal Shem Tov, the founder of the movement, was a ‘religious reformer, *poet and composer*’ (emphasis added).<sup>46</sup>

Ukrainian Jewish history is not only about Jews in Ukraine, it is about Ukraine too. Likewise, Jewish history is not only about Jews – it has long been a part of modern Western history. Recent research, however, testifies to the very modest intent of Ukrainian scholars to integrate Ukrainian historiography into a modern Western one. For scholarship born ten years after the establishment of independence, that is understandable. But for the intellectual tradition that claims ten centuries of previous history, it is not.

#### NOTES

- 1 Omeljan Pritsak, ‘The Pre-Ashkenazic Jews of Eastern Europe in Relation to Khazars, the Rus’ and the Lithuanians’, in P. Potychnyi (ed.), *Ukrainian–Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, 1990), 3–22.
- 2 Paradoxically, the understanding of Jews as aliens was as common to Soviet as it was to national-minded scholars. Among the former were such individuals as the vociferously anti-Semitic Tymofii Kychko, a pillar of Soviet judeophobia, and Matvii Shestopal, an anti-communist and blatant anti-Semite. Kychko’s monograph *Judaizm bez prykras* (Judaism Without Embellishment) (Kyiv: Akademii Nauk URSR, 1963) was so radically anti-Jewish that it came under criticism by Communist Party bureaucrats for its excesses. See Mordechai Altshuler, ‘Soviet Jewry – A Community in Turmoil’, in Robert Wistrich, *Terms of Survival: The Jewish World since 1945* (London, New York: Routledge, 1995), 195–230. Shestopal’s book was published by Vasyl Iaremenko, a Kyiv University professor who presented the author as seeking ‘mutual understanding and support between the two peoples’. Suffice it to say that no one but Kychko is Shestopal’s highest authority on Judaism. See Matvii Shestopal, *Ievrei na Ukraini (istorychna dovidka)* (Historical Information on Jews in Ukraine) (Kyiv: Oriany, 1999), 21, 22, 43, 115, 176, 185.
- 3 For an analysis of this historiography in connection with the Ukrainian–Jewish rapprochement during the Directory and Central Rada periods, see Henry Abramson, *A Prayer for the Government: Ukrainians and Jews in Revolutionary Times, 1917–1920* (Harvard University Press for the Ukrainian Research Institute and Center for Jewish Studies at Harvard University, 1999), 169–78.
- 4 For the best examples of this rapprochement, see *Ostrivky pryiazni: zbirnyk spohady i statei pro ukrains’ko-zhydivs’ky stosunky* (Islands of Empathy: A Collection of Memoirs and Articles on Jewish–Ukrainian Relations) (Munich: Ukrains’ke vydavnyts’vo, 1983); Myroslav Marynovych, Semen Hluzman, Zynovii Antoniuk, *Lysty z voli* (Letters from Places of Freedom) (Kyiv: Sfera, 1999); Iurii Vudka, ‘Spohady pro druziv’ (Remembering My Friends), *Yehupets*, No. 4, 1998, 154–60; ‘Nash Ar’ie: interv’iu z Yevhenom Sverstiukom (Our Arye: An

Interview with Yevhen Sverstiuk) *Yehupets*, No. 9, 2001, 353–60.

- 5 A no less important theme – Ukraine in modern Jewish-Ukrainian scholarship – will be discussed in a separate article.
- 6 These demonstrations were conducted under Ukrainian national and Israeli flags. But even before the 1991 events, Rukh demonstrated its determination to recognise Ukrainian Jewry as a positive force in Ukrainian national endeavours. Though the issue ‘Jews and the Ukrainian national movement’ requires additional research and separate discussion, preliminary observations on Rukh’s benevolent attitudes towards Jews may be drawn from a number of fundamental documents of the movement. See, for instance, the collection *Tysiacha rokiv Ukrain’s’koi suspil’no-politychnoi dumky* (A Millennium of Ukrainian Political and Social Thought), 9 vols. (Kyiv: Dnipro, 2001), Vol. 9, 74–77, 82, 98.
- 7 This event must be contrasted with the 1966 and 1972 events, when the state security organs even arrested participants in the Baby Yar meetings. See the publication of historically relevant documents in Ivan Dziuba, ‘U 25-ti rokovyny rozstriliv u Babynomu Iaru’ (On the 25th Anniversary of the Baby Yar Massacre), *Yehupets*, No. 1, 1995, 4–10.
- 8 For the text of the presentation, see *Tysiacha rokiv Ukrain’s’koi suspil’no-politychnoi dumky*, Vol. 9, 275–80.
- 9 See N. Baranovs’ka, V. Lytvyn *et al.* (eds.), *Ukraina: utverdzhennia nezaleznoi derzhavy, 1991–2001* (Ukraine: the Making of an Independent State) (Kyiv: Alternatyvy, 2001), 386–87.
- 10 For further details on the post-1991 Jewish–Ukrainian and Ukrainian–Israeli intellectual rapprochement, see Yohanan Petrovsky-Shtern, ‘Jewish Culture in Ukraine’, forthcoming in Glenda Abramson (ed.), *Companion to Modern Jewish Culture* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004); on the role of local Jewish organisations in this rapprochement, see Idem., ‘The Revival of Academic Studies of Judaica in Independent Ukraine’, in Zvi Gitelman, Musya Glants and Marshal Goldman (eds.), *Jewish Life After the USSR* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), 152–72. For examples of the Ukrainian philosemitic discourse, see an analysis of Vadym Skuratovsky’s stance in Idem., ‘Contextualising the Mystery: Three Approaches to the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*’, forthcoming in *KRYTIKA*, No.2, 2003.
- 11 For an extensive comparison of the destinies of the Ukrainian and Jewish peoples from the perspective of Ukrainian–Israeli relations, see *Ukraina – Izrail’: sfery vzaiemnykh interesiv. Materialy kruhoho stolu. 21 chervnia 1994 r.* (Ukraine–Israel: Spheres of Mutual Interests. Proceedings of Round Table Discussion of 21 June 1994) (Kyiv, Institute of Oriental Studies, 1994). Alexander Motyl, formerly Associate Director of the Harriman Institute at Columbia University, points out the strategic ramifications of the rapprochement between Israel, Ukraine and the USA in his report ‘Novi mizhnarodni ta politychni realii: Izrail’–Ukraina–Spolucheni Shtaty Ameriky’ (New International and Political Realities: Israel, Ukraine and the USA), in *Novi realii Ukrainy: stenohrama diskusii, initsiovanii Amerykans’kym Ievreis’kym Komitetom ta Posol’stvom Ukrainy v SShA* (New Realities of Ukraine: Stenographic Report of Discussion held by the American Jewish Committee and the Ukrainian Embassy in the USA) (Kyiv: Instytut iudaiky, 1997), 43–47.
- 12 Larysa Skoryk, ‘Heopolitychne znachennia rozvytku vzaiemyn mizh Ukrainoiu ta Izrailem’, *Ievrei Ukrainy ta derzhava Izrail’* (The Geopolitical Significance of the Development of Ukrainian–Israeli Relations), in ‘The Jews of Ukraine and the State of Israel’ (Kyiv: Ievreis’kyi fond Ukrainy, 1998), 7.
- 13 S. M. Zlupko, T. B. Tokars’kyi, *Ukraina ta Izrail’: zayniatist’ i sotsial’nyi zakhyst naseleennia* (Ukraine and Israel: Employment System and Social Protection of the Population) (L’viv: Vil’na Ukraina, 1999), 129.
- 14 For further details, see Marten Feller, *Poshuky, rozdumy i spohady ievreia, iakyyi pam’ataie svoikh didiv, pro ievreis’ko-ukrains’ki vzaiemyny, osoblyvo zh pro movy i stavlennia do nykh* (Searches, Thoughts and Memoirs of a Jew Who Remembers His Grandparents on Jewish–Ukrainian Relations, Especially on Languages and How We Deal with Them) (Drohobych: Vidrodzhennia, 1994).
- 15 O. B. Tkachenko, *Mova i natsional’na mental’nist* (Language and National Mentality), submitted for publication to *Tovarystvo im. T. H. Shevchenka*, New York; Idem., *Ukrains’ka mova i movne zhyttia svitu* (The Ukrainian Language and the Linguistic Environment of the World), forthcoming in Kyiv: Spalakh.

- 16 See the preface by Ivan Dziuba in Volodymyr Zhabotyns'kyi, *Vybrani stat'ci z natsional'noho pytannia* (Selected Articles on the National Problem), ed. by Izrail Kleiner (Kyiv: Respublikans'ka asotsiatsiia ukrainoznavstiv, 1991), 5–6.
- 17 See reports presented at the conference Spadshchyna Volodymyra (Zeieva) Zhabotyns'koho ta protsesy derzhavotvorennia v Ukraini. Materialy naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii (The Legacy of Vladimir (Ze'ev) Zhabotynsky and State-Building Processes in Ukraine) (Kyiv: Politychna dumka, 1996).
- 18 'Vladymyr Zhabotyn'styi iak prykhil'nyk Ukrain'skoi natsional'noi spravy' (Vladimir Jabotinsky as an Adept of the Ukrainian National Cause), in *Mala Entsyklopedia derzhavoznavstva* (Kyiv: Heneza, 1996), 669–71.
- 19 Ukrainian historiography as a whole and Ukrainian–Jewish historiography in particular followed the schemes of Russian historiographers, who argued that Russia was a continuation of Kievan Rus, whereas Ukraine simply 'joined' it in the second half of the seventeenth century. In this sense, both Ukrainian and Jewish historians need to overcome the same obstacle: emancipating national historiographies from a Russian chauvinistic and Soviet bias. Zenon Kohut articulates this agenda as the necessity to return to Hrushevs'kyi's legacy, warning against the 'statist' approach that ignores complexities in the development of Ukrainian statehood and arguing that it is inaccurate to perceive the ten-century-long development of Ukraine from Kievan Rus through independent Ukraine within the same state framework. See his *History as a Battleground: Russian–Ukrainian Relations and Historical Consciousness in Contemporary Ukraine* (Saskatchewan: Heritage Press, 2001), 11–13.
- 20 V. F. Verstiuk, O. V. Haran, O. I. Hurdzhii, V. A. Smolii (eds.), *Istoriia Ukrainy: nove bachennia. Navchal'nyi posibnyk* (The History of Ukraine: A New Perspective. A Primer) (Kyiv: Alternatyvy, 2000), 89, 254–55, 358.
- 21 L. I. Komych, V. V. Bahats'kyi, *Istoriia Ukrainy vid naidavnishykh chasiv i do 2000 roku. Navchal'nyi posibnyk* (The History of Ukraine from Earliest Times to 2000: A Primer) (Kharkiv: Odyssei, 2000).
- 22 *Ibid.*, 57–64.
- 23 The 'local history' of A. P. Motsia, *Khazary* (The Khazars) (Nikolaev: Vozmozhnosti Kimmerii, 1997) follows the same politicised Khazar–Slavic pattern.
- 24 One manifestation of these obstacles is that the most benevolent gesture of Ukrainian historians towards Jews is to devote space in local histories to analysing the Holocaust as part of political history, but to avoid mentioning the Jewish contribution to local culture, economy and architecture, as in the case of Poltava. See *Arkhivnyi zbirnyk na posviatu 90-richchiu Poltavs'koi Vchenoi Arkhivnoi komisii* (Ninety Years of the Poltava Scholarly Archival Commission: A Collection of Articles) (Poltava: Poltava, 1993), 225–30.
- 25 Oleksandr Panasenko, Liudmyla Yakubets, *Korets i Korechchyna: istoriia* (Luts'k: Volyn'ska oblasna drukarnia, 2000), 57, 62, 73.
- 26 Cf. *Istorychne kraieznavstvo i kul'tura (naukovi dopovidi ta povidomlennia). VIII vseukrains'ka naukova konferentsiia* (Local Historiography and Culture (Scholarly Presentations), Eighth All-Ukrainian Scholarly Conference) (Kharkiv: Ridnyi krai, 1997); *Istorychne kraieznavstvo v Ukraini: tradytsii i suchasnist. VII vseukrains'ka naukova konferentsiia* (Local Historiography in Ukraine: Tradition and Modernity. Seventh All-Union Scholarly Conference), 2 vols. (Kyiv: Ridnyi krai, 1995). Here the only report on Jewish themes covers the twentieth-century biographies of Jewish critics and writers born in Zhitomir district – see *ibid.*, 334–36.
- 27 Yaroslav Hrytsak, 'Yak vykladaty istoriu Ukrainy pislia 1991 roku?' (How Do You Teach Ukrainian History after 1991?), in M. Telus and Iu. Shapoval (eds.), *Ukrains'ka istorychna dydaktyka: mizhnarodnyi dialoh* (Teaching Ukrainian History: An International Dialogue) (Kyiv: Heneza, 2000), 63–75. The quote appears on page 69 and is followed by a reference to Zvi Gitelman, 'Perceptions of Ukrainians by Soviet Jewish Emigrants: Some Empirical Observations', *Soviet Jewish Affairs*, No. 3, 1987, 3–24.
- 28 The reference is to the dissident movement of the 1970s and the commemoration of the Holocaust in post-1991 Ukraine. See Anton de Betz, 'Navchal'ni prohramy z istorii ta tsenzura pidruchnykiv' (The History Curriculum and the Censorship of Textbooks), in M. Telus, Iu. Shapoval (eds.), *Ukrains'ka istorychna dydaktyka: mizhnarodnyi dialoh* (Kyiv: Heneza, 2000),

- 174–209.
- 29 O. Boiko, *Istoriia Ukrainu u XX stolitti (navchal'nyi posibnyk dlia studentiv)* (The History of Ukraine in the Twentieth Century: A Primer for Students) (Nizhyn: Styl, 1994), 141. Cf. O. Boiko, *Istoriia Ukrainy, Posibnyk dlia studentiv* (The History of Ukraine: A Primer for Students) (Kyiv: Akademiia, 1999), 402.
  - 30 Unfortunately, an excellent in-depth study of the famine in Ukraine randomly resorts to this kind of accusation. See O. M. Veselova, V. I. Marochko, M. O. Movchan, *Holodomory v Ukraini, 1921–1923, 1932–1933, 1946–1947: zlochyny proty narodu* (The Years of Famine in Ukraine: Crimes Against the People) (Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy, 2000), 98–99, 232–33.
  - 31 Yurii Shapoval, *Ukraina XX stolittia: Osoby ta podii v konteksti vazhkoï istorii* (Kyiv: Heneza, 2001).
  - 32 On anti-Semitism as part of Soviet policy, see Shapoval, *Ukraina*, 45; on the similarities of Soviet persecution of Jewish and Ukrainian nationalists, see *Ibid.*, 47, 271; on the suppression of vibrant Zionist organisations in Ukraine, see *Ibid.*, 72–92; on Jews and Ukrainian censorship, see *Ibid.*, 160; for the names of Soviet bureaucrats of Jewish descent who suppressed Ukrainian culture, see *Ibid.*, 166, 199, 390–91; for an extensive description of Kyiv archival documents on the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee and the campaign against ‘rootless cosmopolitans’, see *Ibid.*, 208–51.
  - 33 Yuri Shapoval is not alone in his praiseworthy intention to include Jewish themes in Ukrainian ethno-politics. The younger generation, unhampered by the dominant patterns, freely includes Jewish themes in the discussion. Thus, for instance, Anatolii Boiko in his monograph ‘Southern Ukraine in the Last Quarter of the Eighteenth Century: An Analysis of the Sources’ praises one of the previous researchers of the subject, among other things, for giving attention to the issue of Jewish colonisation of the region. See Anatolii Boiko, *Pivdenna Ukraina ostannioi chverti XVIII stolittia: analiz dzherel* (Sources on the History of Southern Ukraine in the Last Quarter of the Eighteenth Century) (Kyiv, Instytut ukrains'koiï arkhieohrafiï ta dzereloznavstva im. M.S. Hrushevs'koho NAN Ukrainy, 2000), 31–32. Transcarpathia has traditionally been friendly to Jews, and the monograph of Serhii Fedaka from Uzhhorod University is evidence of this. In his ‘Political History of Ukraine–Rus at the Time of the Transformation of Rurik’s Empire’, he does not hesitate to include the discussion of the Jewish presence or impact on socio-economic developments of Vladimir Monomakh’s Kievan Rus. See his *Politychna istoriia Ukrainy-Rusi doby transformatsii imperii Riurikovychiv (XII stolittia)* (The Political History of Ukraine in the Epoch of Transformation of the Rurik Dynasty in the Twelfth Century) (Uzhhorod: V. Padiaka, 2000), 106–07, 190.
  - 34 Taras Hunchak, *Symon Petliura ta ievrei* (Simon Petliura and the Jews) (Kyiv: Lybid, 1993).
  - 35 For instance, Serhiichuk dismisses any scholarly criticism of Petliura and his government, condemning it as anti-Ukrainian. Pogromists in Ukraine, according to him, perpetrated atrocities first and foremost because they were misled by Russian Bolshevik slogans. According to Serhiichuk, Ukrainians are exempt from any guilt, since it was the Russian Tsarist army (before 1917), voluntary army (after 1917), and Bolsheviks (in 1919–20), who orchestrated anti-Jewish pogroms. Serhiichuk also accuses Jews of not consistently supporting Ukrainian nationhood – as if Ukrainians themselves were unanimous in supporting it in 1917–20 and as if Jewish non-consistency justified anti-Jewish atrocities. See Volodymyr Serhiichuk, *Symon Petliura i ievreïstvo* (Simon Petliura and the Jews) (Kyiv: Biblioteka ukraint'sia, 1999), 9, 10, 16, 43–44, 75.
  - 36 Serhiichuk, *Symon Petliura*, 86.
  - 37 See, for example, the description of the impact of Hasidism, the significance of the Baal Shem Tov, the description of the art ornaments on Jewish tombstones, and the role of Proskuriv Jewish councils in *Medzhybizh: 850 rokiv istorii: Materialy naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii* (Medzhybizh: 850 Years of History: Proceedings of a Scholarly Conference) (Medzhybizh, 1996), 92–101.
  - 38 V. Shupenia *et al.*, *Chernivets'ki nekropoli* (Chernivtsi: Misto, 2000), 56–93. It should be mentioned that the history of the town is linked with such illustrious figures as Eliezer Steinberg (1880–1932), the poet and fable-writer, Israel Friedman (1797–1851), the *tsaddik* from Ruzhin, and Yakov Pistiner (1882–1930), the head of the Social Democratic Party of Bukovyna. Whether because of the fact that such prominent poets as Paul Celan or Moisei

- Fishbein and the Ukrainian Jewish leader Yosyf Zisels were born and lived in Chernivtsi, this Bukovyna city has been particularly attentive to its Jewish culture. For example, a number of Germans, Ukrainians and Jews shared amazing personal insights into the town's history. See the German and Ukrainian bilingual publication *Kolys' Chernivtsi buly ievreis'kim mistom: svidchennia ochevydstiv* (Chernivtsi Was Once a Jewish Town), trans. by Petro Rykhlo (Chernivtsi: Molodyi bukovynets', 1998).
- 39 V. Baran, Ia. Hrytsak, O. Zaitsev *et al.* (eds.), *Istoria Ukrainy* (L'viv: Svit, 1996), 167–68, 238, 305–06, 339, 367–70, 387. It may be a minor, if significant detail that this book was 'permitted' by the Ukrainian Ministry of Education, whereas other books were 'recommended'.
- 40 L. F. Haidukov, V. Iu. Krushins'kyi, *Istoriia Ukrainy* (Kyiv: Atlantik, 2002).
- 41 See, for example, the rather arbitrary list of books on the history of Jews in Ukraine quoted in Svitlana Shulha's presentation 'Problemy natsional'nykh menshyn u doslidzhenniakh z istorii Volyni' (Problems of National Minorities in Research on the History of Volhyn), in *Ukrains'ka istorychna nauka na porozi XXI st.*, 4 vols. (Chernivtsi: Ruta, 2001), Vol. 1, 330.
- 42 *Ibid.*, 27.
- 43 For example, Valentyn Tomylets discusses relations between Ukrainians and Moldavian merchants in the early nineteenth century. He depicts the intensive trade and economic links between Ukrainian and Moldavians, completely ignoring the overwhelming Jewish factor in this trade. The only names of merchants he mentions are Jewish (Taube, Tsitlin), which renders his research problematic. See 'Rol' bessarabskikh i ukrainskikh kuptsov v razvitii torgovykh svyazei Bessarabii s ukrainskimi guberniiami v pervoi treti XIX veka', *Ukrains'ka istorychna nauka na porozi XXI st.*, 4 vols. (Chernivtsi: Ruta, 2001), Vol. 4, 83–91.
- 44 V. M. Sheiko, *Istoriia Ukrains'koi kul'tury* (The History of Ukrainian Culture) (Kharkiv: KhDAK, 2001), 85, 93.
- 45 M. Telus and Iu. Shapoval (eds.), *Ukrains'ka istorychna dydaktyka: mizhnarodnyi dialoh* (Teaching Ukrainian History: An International Dialogue) (Kyiv: Heneza, 2000), 27.
- 46 T. Sys, 'Diisnist i mify Medzhibozha u XVIII st' (Medzhybizh in the Eighteenth Century: Realities and Myths), in *Medzhybizh: 850 rokiv istorii: Materialy naukovo-praktychnoi konferntsii* (Medzhybizh, 1996), 94–95, 41 (emphasis added).