

# The Russian Imperial Authorities and Yevhen Chykalenko's *Rozmovy pro selske khoziaistvo*

David Saunders

Yevhen Chykalenko (1861–1929), agricultural innovator and cultural patron, was a leading Ukrainian awakener of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Although specialists have long been familiar with his career,<sup>1</sup> and although his name has reached a wider public in post-Soviet Ukraine,<sup>2</sup> journalists who attended the first showing of a short documentary film about Chykalenko at a festival in Donetsk towards the end of 2005 still professed ignorance of him.<sup>3</sup> Discussion of his life and work therefore looks set to continue.

The present essay details the attitude of a number of agencies of the tsarist government—the censors, the Ministry of Agriculture, and the Ministry of Education—to Chukalenko's most famous publication, a series of pamphlets that came out in Odessa and St. Petersburg between 1897 and 1903 under the collective title *Rozmovy pro selske khoziaistvo*

---

<sup>1</sup> Especially owing to the publication of Dmytro Doroshenko, *Yevhen Chykalenko: Yoho zhyttia i hromadska diialnist* (Prague: Vydannia Fondu imeny Ye. Chykalenka pry Ukrainskomu akademichnomu komiteti, 1934); and Yevhen Chykalenko, *Spohady (1861–1907)* (New York: Ukrainska vilna akademiia nauk u SSha, 1955).

<sup>2</sup> Chykalenko's memoirs have been reprinted in editions by both Valerii Shevchuk (Kyiv: Tempora, 2003) and M. I. Tsymbaliuk (Kyiv: Rada, 1903). Inna Starovoitenko has edited two volumes of his correspondence: *Lysty Yevhena Chykalenka z emihratsii do Serhiia Yefremova (1923–1928 rr.)* and *Lysty Leonida Zhebunova do Yevhena Chykalenka, 1907–1919 roky* (Kyiv: Instytut ukrainskoi arkhheohrafii ta dzhereloznavstva im. M. S. Hrushevskoho NAN Ukrainy, 2003, 2005). Three volumes of his diaries, titled *Shchodennyk*, have come out: the first two, for 1907–17 and 1918–19, were edited by I. Davydko (Kyiv: Tempora, 2004), and the third, on 1919–20, was edited by Vladyslav Verstiuk and Marko Antonovych (Kyiv and New York: Olena Teliha, 2005). He and his family are the subject of a chapter in Yurii Khorunzhy, *Ukrainski metsenaty: Dobrochynnist—nasha rysa* (Kyiv: KM Akademiia, 2001), 55–86. Journal articles about him include idem, "Plekach zeren dukhovnykh," *Dzerkalo tyzhnia*, 9–15 December 2000; Volodymyr Panchenko, "Ukrainskyi Don Kykhot: 'Holovnyi tkach' materialnoi tkanyny nashoi istorii," *Den*, 20 January 2001; idem, "Yevhen Chykalenko, onuk metsenata," *Den*, 9 November 2002; and Nataliia Hamolia, "Sponsor ukrainskoi spravy," *Kontrakty*, 21 July 2003.

<sup>3</sup> Ihor Siundiukov, "Shchob Ukraina bula Ukrainoiu: Vidbulas premiera dokumentalnoho filmu pro Yevhena Chykalenka," *Den*, 8 November 2005.

(Conversations about Farming). Ostensibly the pamphlets were innocuous, for they dealt with crop rotation, livestock, plants (particularly fodder grasses, corn, and beets), viticulture, and market gardening. Because, however, their author was thought to be politically unreliable, because their subject matter was in the public eye as a result of the famine of 1891–92, because they were cheap and attracted a wide readership, and above all because they were in Ukrainian, the *Rozmovy* came to the special attention of the regime.

Chykalenko became an agricultural expert by a roundabout route. On being expelled from the natural-science section of Kharkiv University in 1883 for Ukrainophilism, he was banned from university towns and other large cities, and in 1885 went to live at his place of birth, an estate called Pereshory in the northwestern part of Kherson gubernia, in Ananiv county not far east of the modern boundary between Ukraine and Transnistria. There, he became a sort of Ukrainian version of Aleksandr Engelgardt, the Russian political dissident who, having been banned from cities in 1871, lived at Batishchevo in Smolensk gubernia and wrote celebrated “letters from the countryside” for a well-known “thick journal.”<sup>4</sup>

Pereshory was located in what Halford Mackinder in 1904 called “The Geographical Pivot of History.”<sup>5</sup> Struck by the fact that after thousands of years as a land of nomadic pastoralists southern Ukraine had come under the plough, Mackinder drew attention to the geostrategic significance of a shift that had significantly increased the power of the Russian Empire. Chykalenko’s interest was less world-historical. Having grasped that the soil of the steppe was fertile but local water supplies were uncertain, with the result that record harvests could be succeeded by dearth, he began employing new agricultural techniques. On account of his new practices, Pereshory came through relatively unscathed when drought led to crop failure over large tracts of the southern Russian Empire in the early 1890s.<sup>6</sup> In his *Rozmovy* Chykalenko offered his methods to the public. The pamphlets were part of an extensive debate in the later Russian Empire about how to regularize the agricultural yields of the lands immediately north of the Black Sea.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Cathy A. Frierson, trans. and ed., *Aleksandr Nikolaevich Engelgardt's Letters from the Country, 1872–1887* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

<sup>5</sup> H. J. Mackinder, “The Geographical Pivot of History,” *Geographical Journal* 23 (1904), 421–37. Paul Kennedy recently called this publication “one of the most remarkable articles on international affairs that has appeared in modern times” (“Mission Impossible,” *New York Review of Books*, 10 June 2004, 16).

<sup>6</sup> Unreferenced claims by Chykalenko are substantiated later in the article.

<sup>7</sup> The wider debates in which Chykalenko’s pamphlets signify come to life in David Moon, “The Environmental History of the Russian Steppes: Vasilii Dokuchaev and the

The way Chykalenko publicized his work was almost certainly more important than the work itself. Unlike Engelgardt at Batishchevo, he did not write about his experience of the countryside in letters to highbrow Russian-language magazines. Or rather, he did so only once, in a Russian-language article for the journal of the Kherson zemstvo, and he quickly understood that it would not reach the readers he had in mind. Instead, he wrote cheap pamphlets for a wider public. When they were first published, the *Rozmovy* cost between six and ten kopecks,<sup>8</sup> which at the contemporary exchange rate was one to two American cents. Although these were not quite rock-bottom prices by the standards of the later Russian Empire,<sup>9</sup> they nonetheless ensured that Chykalenko would have an extensive readership.

The success of Chykalenko's pamphlets was all the greater on account of the language in which he wrote. By the late 1890s the Ukrainian inhabitants of the Russian Empire had been short of reading matter in their native tongue for several decades, for the imperial authorities had maintained a near-blanket ban on Ukrainian-language publications since 1863.<sup>10</sup> The authorities' major concern had been preventing the publication of the very thing Chykalenko wrote—cheap literature in Ukrainian for the masses.<sup>11</sup> How, then, did the Ananiv landowner get around the government's ban? He swrote in his memoirs that he did not find it easy.<sup>12</sup> The archival record both confirms his assertion up to a point and also complicates the early history of his *Rozmovy*.

Chykalenko certainly did not find it easy to publish the first of the pamphlets.<sup>13</sup> In November 1896 censors in Odesa passed his request for

Harvest Failure of 1891," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th ser., 15 (2005): 149–74.

<sup>8</sup> St. Petersburg, Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv (hereafter RGIA), fond 382, desc. 2, file 1844, fols. 11 and 74 (price of the first and last of the "Rozmovy").

<sup>9</sup> Jeffrey Brooks has written about the enormously popular early twentieth-century Russian-language newspapers that cost only a kopeck. in *When Russia Learned to Read: Literacy and Popular literature, 1861–1917* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 130–35.

<sup>10</sup> On the proscription of Ukrainian-language publishing in the Russian Empire between 1863 and 1905, see especially A. I. Miller, "*Ukrainskii vopros*" v politike vlastei i ruskom obshchestvennom mnenii (vtoraia polovina XIX v.) (St. Petersburg: Aleteiia, 2000), and Fedir Savchenko, *Zaborona ukrainstva 1876r.* (Kyiv and Kharkiv: VUAN, 1930, repr. Munich: Wilhem Fink, 1970).

<sup>11</sup> This is the main argument of my article "Russia's Ukrainian Policy (1847–1905): A Demographic Approach," *European History Quarterly* 25 (1995): 181–208.

<sup>12</sup> Chykalenko's own account of the *Rozmovy* can be found in his *Spohady* (1955), 186–90.

<sup>13</sup> Except where otherwise stated, the following story of the censorship of the first of

clearance to the Chief Administration for Publishing Affairs (Glavnoe upravlenie po delam pechati) in St. Petersburg, which in turn gave the pamphlet to the St. Petersburg Censorship Committee for a report.<sup>14</sup> On 10 January 1897 the head of that committee, Smaragd Ignatevich Kossovich,<sup>15</sup> reported to the Chief Administration that although the manuscript contained nothing harmful, it had to be banned because the key anti-Ukrainian edict of 18/30 May 1876 (the “Ems Ukase”) prohibited all work in Ukrainian other than belles-lettres and historical documents. Five days later M. P. Soloviev, the head of the Chief Administration, informed Odesa of this conclusion.

On 24 January 1897 Chykalenko wrote a long letter of protest to the Chief Administration.<sup>16</sup> “Since 1891,” he wrote, “I have been conducting large-scale experiments on my estate of about two thousand desiatines [5,400 acres] in combatting drought by cultivating the fields in accordance with a method to which I was led by the writings of Professor P. A. Kostychev.”<sup>17</sup> Since the results had been good, he had explained to the local peasants what he was doing. Those “who experimented in cultivating their fields in accordance with my instructions harvested an excellent crop in the dry year 1896,” but those who went on using traditional methods “need loans for food and seed.” Chykalenko went on: “This circumstance was noted by the chairman of the Agriculture Department of the Kherson zemstvo in his report on the journey he made to places where the harvest had been poor.” In the hope of persuading a larger number of peasants of the validity of his methods, he had written a brochure about them in Ukrainian. On 26 October 1896 he had submitted it to the censorship office in Odesa. The Chief Administration had turned it down without giving a reason, but the reason, he felt, could only have been the language in which it was written, for “My manuscript addresses a specialist, highly technical issue and contains nothing blameworthy.” The need for disseminating such work in Ukrainian was clear. Having already published a popular Russian-language article on his methods in the jour-

---

Chykalenko's *Rozmovy* is taken from RGIA, fond 776, desc. 21, pt. 1, 1896, file 31, ll. 202, 209, 256, 258, 266–67, 271a-b-c, 272–73.

<sup>14</sup> “The secret ‘Ems ukaz’ of 1876 ... required all Ukrainian works of permitted categories to be censored twice—locally and in St. Petersburg” (I. P. Foote, “The St. Petersburg Censorship Committee, 1828–1905,” *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, n.s., 24 (1991): 93).

<sup>15</sup> A “true cynic,” according to a memoir in N. G. Patrusheva, comp., *Tsenzura v Rossii v kontse XIX—nachale XX veka: Sbornik vospominanii* (St. Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2003), 216.

<sup>16</sup> RGIA, 776/21/1/1896/31, ll. 266–67, the source of all the quotations in this paragraph.

<sup>17</sup> On Kostychev, see I. A. Krupenikov, *Pavel Andreevich Kostychev, 1845–1895* (Moscow: Nauka, 1987).

nal of the Kherson zemstvo, Chykalenko had satisfied himself “that the local peasant population did not understand this article and would not learn anything from it.” He therefore wrote his Ukrainian brochure in precisely the way he conversed with peasants, in the same language and even using the same phrases. He concluded by asking the Chief Administration to review its decision in the light of his explanation.

Remarkably, Chykalenko won his case. Censor V. S. Adikaevsky<sup>18</sup> drew up a memorandum for the Chief Administration on official exceptions to the ban on Ukrainian-language publications, and Chykalenko's pamphlet appeared on the list. On 5 February 1897 the Chief Administration informed both the Odesa censors and the author that it had changed its mind.

Exceptions to the ban on publication in Ukrainian were rare.<sup>19</sup> What exactly brought about the happy outcome in respect of Chykalenko's first pamphlet is unclear. He said in his memoirs that he had friends in high places (including the Minister of Agriculture, A. S. Ermolov, who had himself written on the problem of the cultivation of the steppe),<sup>20</sup> but in imperial censorship files there is no evidence of pressure from such people. One is tempted to conclude that in this instance the censors, when pressed, sensed no threat from a work so apparently unpolitical and of such obvious practical worth.

The censors' moderation in 1897 did not stop them from obliging Chykalenko to press them again when he wanted to release a second edition of the first of his *Rozmovy* in 1900. Perhaps sensing that the pamphlet remained controversial, the author submitted the new edition to censors in both Odesa and Moscow.<sup>21</sup> All of them rejected it.<sup>22</sup> This time Chykalenko wrote to the minister of internal affairs.<sup>23</sup> After saying that by now he had been employing the anti-drought methods of Professor Kostychev for several years, that peasants adjacent to his estates in both Kherson and Poltava had imitated his example, and that the results of employing the methods had been good, he pointed out that the first of

<sup>18</sup> A “living archive” of the Chief Administration (Patrusheva, *Tsensura*, 195).

<sup>19</sup> For a list drawn up in 1900 of Ukrainian-language works that had been permitted, see RGIA, 776/21/I/1900/404, ll. 450–56. Figures on the number and type of Ukrainian works that had been submitted and banned in the previous two years, including figures on exceptions, are to be found in *ibid.*, ll. 457–61.

<sup>20</sup> Moon, “Environmental History,” 162.

<sup>21</sup> RGIA, 776/21/I/1900/404, ll. 59 and 103.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 153 and 379.

<sup>23</sup> On 29 August 1900 (*ibid.*, 776/21/I/1900/402, ll. 114–16, from which most of the rest of this paragraph is taken).

his *Rozmovy* had been cleared by the censorship in 1897, approved on publication by the Academic Committee of the Ministry of Agriculture, admitted to libraries run by the Ministry of Education, and awarded a silver medal by the Kharkiv Agricultural Society. He now wanted to print a second edition. Since it hardly differed from the first, he could only assume that permission to publish had been denied because the work was in Ukrainian. The work's usefulness, however, was wholly dependent on the "comprehensibility of [its] language" to peasants. "If I had composed the brochure in the Russian language it would have remained incomprehensible to the peasants of southern Russia [Ukraine], since in school [where tuition was exclusively in Russian] they learn only to read, not to understand what they have read." In view of the importance of popularizing ways to cope with drought, Chykalenko believed brochures such as his ought to be published not only in Ukrainian, but also in the German of Ukraine's German colonists, Bulgarian, and Romanian. By issuing a translation of his work, the Bessarabia zemstvo had recognized the value of popularization in Romanian.<sup>24</sup> If the minister were to read his brochure, he would see that it was not harmful but useful. Even the manager of the Kherson Peasant Bank distributed it among his borrowers as "an essential handbook." The second and third *Rozmovy* were already in print, having been sanctioned by the Chief Administration "on the basis of a report about them by the Academic Committee of the Ministry of Agriculture." A second edition of Part 1 ought therefore to be permitted.

Once again Chykalenko won his case. On 11 September 1900, less than two weeks after his letter of protest, he received permission via Odesa for the publication of a second edition of the first of his *Rozmovy*.<sup>25</sup> It was beginning to look as if the imperial authorities were really not very troubled by this instance of writing in Ukrainian. Since, as Chykalenko said himself, the second and third of his *Rozmovy* had already received official approval, and since archival records do not indicate particular hostility on the part of the censors to any of the pamphlets other than the first,<sup>26</sup> one is tempted to argue that the description he pro-

<sup>24</sup> The Romanian-language edition of the first of Chykalenko's *Rozmovy* appeared in 1899. See Krupenikov, *Kostychev*, 177.

<sup>25</sup> RGIA, 776/21/1/1900/402, ll. 117–18.

<sup>26</sup> Other references to the censorship of Chykalenko's *Rozmovy* include RGIA, 776/21/1/1898/284, ll. 110, 145, 158, 259, and 264–65 and 776/21/1/1902/551, l. 48 (the pamphlet on livestock, 23 February–31 July 1898 and March 1902); 776/21/1/1899/343, ll. 69, 76, 107–108, 125, 350, and 371–72, 776/21/1/1900/404, ll. 269, 298, 366, and 372, and 776/21/1/1902/551, l. 53 (the pamphlet on plants, 23 March–30 November 1899, 27 September–26 November 1900, March 1902); 776/21/1/1901/479, ll. 2 and 7 and 776/21/1/1903/626, ll. 288–89 (the pamphlet on viticulture, 13–19 January 1901 and Au-

vides in his memoirs of obstacles in the path of the *Rozmovy* is rather overblown. Such a conclusion, however, would be hasty, for the censorship administration was only one of the departments of the tsarist government that reviewed the *Rozmovy*. Whereas censors expressed their opinion about them before they were published, other departments took a look at them once they had reached the public domain.

The pamphlets proved popular. A reviewer of the first of them in the journal of the Kherson zemstvo said that, because it was so clear, landowners would read it even if they were already familiar with the work of Chykalenko's mentor, Professor Kostychev. "As for the peasants," he said, "this booklet is their only guide, for all others are inaccessible to them by virtue of their exposition, their language, and their price."<sup>27</sup> Citing this accolade and others, an official of the Ministry of Agriculture said in June 1897 that the first pamphlet "had received very positive reviews in many South Russian periodical publications," that it had virtually sold out within a few months of publication (via the zemstvos), and that the author was preparing a new edition.<sup>28</sup> Not unnaturally, Chykalenko sought to maximize dissemination of his work. His enthusiasm brought him into contact with the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Education. Unlike the censors, and despite some signs to the contrary, these bodies tended, over time, to become more rather than less mistrustful of the pamphlets.

On 12 April 1897 Chykalenko wrote to the minister of agriculture from Pereshory to ask him to submit the first of the *Rozmovy* to the Academic Committee of his ministry so that it could be considered for use in the ministry's educational institutions.<sup>29</sup> The Academic Committee commissioned a report from P. S. Kossovich, a teacher at the St. Petersburg Forestry Institute.<sup>30</sup> The report described how Chykalenko had realized ten years previously in Kherson that "it was necessary to change the cultivation of fallow and also to introduce, apart from eared grains, sowings of grasses, maize, and beets. Thanks to these innovations, he got through the dearth years of 1891 and 1892 more easily than his neighbors, and in

---

gust 1903); and 776/21/1/1902/551, ll. 87 and 94 (the pamphlet on market-gardening, late March–early April 1902).

<sup>27</sup> P. Kondratsky, "Selsko-khoziaistvennaia zametka (Po povodu knigi E. Kh. Chikalenko 'Rozmova pro selske khoziaistvo')," *Sbornik Khersonskago zemstva* 5 (1897): 174.

<sup>28</sup> RGIA 382/2/1844, l. 6, specifying, apart from the review cited in the preceding note, reviews in *Poltavskii gubernskii vedomosti*, 1897, no. 69; *Yuzhnoe obozrenie*, 1897, no. 91; *Odesskii listok*, no. 124; *Zemledelie*, 1897, no. 14; and *Khoziain*, 1897, no. 12.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, l. 1; quotations in the rest of this paragraph come from *ibid.*, ll. 4, 7, 11.

<sup>30</sup> Not to be confused with the censor S. I. Kossovich.



general his estate began to make a profit." The official mentioned above who spoke of the pamphlet's popularity added that it had the further merit of being accessible to the common people, the very consideration that usually prompted censors to place Ukrainian publications on the negative rather than the positive side of the ledger. When committee chairman I. P. Arkhipov also expressed approval of the pamphlet, a favorable response to Chykalenko's letter was certain. The committee duly approved the pamphlet for use in "lower agricultural schools" in gubernias where the peasants spoke Ukrainian. It also decided to inform the Ministry of Education that the pamphlet might be useful in state-run primary schools in those provinces. When, in due course, the primary-schools section of the ministry wrote back to say that it was going "to admit the aforesaid brochure into the libraries of the teachers' seminaries, teachers' libraries of primary schools, and free public libraries and reading rooms of those gubernias where the local peasant population speak in the Little Russian dialect," the first of Chykalenko's pamphlets received yet another fillip.

The Ministry of Agriculture went on to solicit and receive the censors' blessing for the Romanian edition of the first of Chykalenko's *Rozmovy*, to treat the second pamphlet equally generously in April 1899, and to approve the reprint of the first of the series in 1901.<sup>31</sup> In 1900, however, some members of the ministry's Academic Committee expressed doubts about the third of Chykalenko's pamphlets. A. A. Shults "observed that in view of the relatively limited dissemination of the Little Russian dialect in the Empire, he felt it would be sufficient to limit permission for Mr Chykalenko's brochure to the lower agricultural schools of those gubernias where the peasant population spoke the said dialect" (i.e., to exclude them from schools run by the Ministry of Education).<sup>32</sup> Everyone agreed with Shults except a certain V. I. Filipev, who held that "the dissemination or non-dissemination of this or that dialect ought not to play a part in the question of judging the merits of a work." In Filipev's opinion, the third pamphlet should be treated in exactly the same way as the first two, "to which," he said, "it is in no way inferior from the point of view of quality." It deserved not only approval for use in lower schools run by the Ministry of Agriculture "in the southern strip of Russia," but also recommendation by the ministry as useful "for the primary schools of the Ministry of Education located in the gubernias of the empire where the local peasant population speaks the Little Russian dialect." But Filipev failed to persuade his colleagues. In its conclusion, the Academic Com-

<sup>31</sup> RGIA, 776/21/1/1899/343, ll. 14–15 (January 1899); 382/2/1844, ll. 13–37, 52–53, 60–62.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, l. 48.



mittee explicitly adopted Shults's position: it decided not to recommend Chykalenko's third pamphlet for use in primary schools run by the Ministry of Education but merely to inform the other ministry that it was going to sanction the pamphlet for use in its own schools.<sup>33</sup> In other words, it sought to impose certain limits on the circulation of Chykalenko's work. Furthermore, it seems to have acted in this way solely because of the language in which Chykalenko was writing, for in expressing a certain doubt about the pamphlet Shults said nothing whatever about its content.

On the other hand, Chykalenko's next pamphlet—the fourth, on viticulture—did attract criticism at the Ministry of Agriculture on the grounds of content. M. K. Ballas said that he found it rather difficult to recommend the pamphlet for use in primary schools throughout the empire's "Little Russian" gubernias because viticulture was not feasible in the majority of them. In Kyiv, Poltava, and other gubernias located at around 50°N, viticulture could be practiced only in circumstances unsuitable for general adoption. Even where it was generally appropriate, Chykalenko had failed to spell out the particular sorts of locale in which it could be introduced. Although Ballas thought the brochure perfectly satisfactory as far as it went and, despite his doubts, was willing to have it admitted to the libraries of the lower schools of the Ministry of Agriculture in the empire's Ukrainian gubernias, the ministry's Academic Committee decided to give this fourth pamphlet only the same lower degree of approval that its immediate antecedent had received.<sup>34</sup>

In 1903 the Ministry of Education joined the Ministry of Agriculture in expressing some doubts about Chykalenko's work. On January 10 the Primary Schools Department told the Academic Committee of the Ministry of Agriculture that, having received the latter's reports on two of Chykalenko's pamphlets—the fourth and the second edition of the first—it was not going to make either of them available in its free public reading rooms.<sup>35</sup> Thus official opinion seemed to be turning against Chykalenko. Although, in February 1905, the Academic Committee received a very favorable report on the fifth pamphlet from a teacher at the Uman school of market-gardening and agriculture,<sup>36</sup> it gave it only the same lower degree of approval that the third and the fourth pamphlets had received.<sup>37</sup> Certain imperial agencies appeared to be toughening their

---

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 48.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, II. 66–68 (March 1902).

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 72.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 78.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 79.

attitude to Ukrainian-language publications just as pressure was mounting on the tsarist regime to abandon its negative treatment of Ukrainian culture.

The Russian authorities' handling of Chykalenko's *Rozmovy* may not seem unduly harsh. Unlike, for example, Nikolai Turgenev's *La Russie et les Russes* of 1847, Alexander Herzen's *Kolokol* of the 1850s and 1860s, and Sergius (Serhii) Stepniak's *Russia under the Tzars* of 1885, the pamphlets did not have to be published in western Europe; and, unlike Mykhailo Hrushevsky's *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, they did not have to be published in a part of Ukraine beyond the reach of the tsar. They were cleared by the tsarist regime for publication, sometimes sanctioned for use in government-run schools, and always sanctioned for inclusion on the shelves of certain government-funded libraries. Yet the detailed scrutiny to which the authorities subjected them, the hiccups in the censorship process that prompted Chykalenko's letters of protest, and the apparent downturn in some agencies' enthusiasm for the pamphlets after about 1900 illustrate the problems of publishing and distributing Ukrainian-language material in the Russian Empire in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. If even Chykalenko's relatively uncontentious pamphlets could give rise to the volume of archival material on which this sketch has depended, it is easy to understand the lengths to which the tsarist regime was prepared to go to keep Ukrainians at bay. To judge by the fact that, on 8 January 1905, Chykalenko added his name to those of many others at the end of a petition calling on the Ministry of Internal Affairs to remove the constraints on publishing in Ukrainian,<sup>38</sup> officials had not succeeded in buying him off by the way in which they treated his *Rozmovy*. He surely agreed with the opinion of his friend Serhii Yefremov that allowing the publication of Ukrainian-language pamphlets on "market-gardening, for example, in belletristic form" represented only a very small concession on the part of the tsarist authorities to Ukrainians' needs.<sup>39</sup> In February 1905 Yefremov quoted Chykalenko at length on the way in which denying Ukrainians the right to publish in their native language greatly impaired Ukraine's chances of practical development.<sup>40</sup> Chykalenko was not a red-hot radical. He did not believe, for example, that Ukraine would be best served if the majority of its representatives in the first Russian State Duma of 1906 came from the peas-

<sup>38</sup> RGIA, 776/21/1/1905/759, ll. 8–10.

<sup>39</sup> Serhii Yefremov, "Vne zakona: k istorii tsenzury v Rossii," in his *Literaturno-krytychni statii* (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1993), 31 (originally published in January 1905).

<sup>40</sup> Sergei Efremov [Serhii Yefremov], "Zametki na tekushchie temy," *Kievskaiia starina*, 1905, no. 2: 176.

ant estate.<sup>41</sup> But he did believe that reading matter for Ukrainian peasants should be in their own language. A regime that found this position difficult to accept was not well adapted to the needs of its subjects.

---

<sup>41</sup> A. A. Konik, "Ukrainskie krestiane na vyborakh v I Gosudarstvennuiu dumu," *Otechestvennaia istoriia*, 2006, no. 3: 106.

is the author of over 250 published works, including *Państwo i kościół na Rusi w XI wieku* (1968), Mykhailo Hrushevsky's *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 1, *From Prehistory to the Eleventh Century* (co-editor, 1997), and "The Christianization and Ecclesiastical Structure of Kyivan Rus to 1300," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 21 (1997): 311–92.

**MOSHE (MURRAY JAY) ROSMAN** is a professor of Jewish history at Bar-Ilan University, Israel, and the author of *The Lords' Jews: Magnate-Jewish Relations in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the Eighteenth Century* (1990), *Founder of Hasidism: A Quest for the Historical Ba'al Shem Tov* (1996), and *How Jewish Is Jewish History?* (2007).

**DAVID SAUNDERS** is a professor of Russian imperial history at Newcastle University, England, and the author of *The Ukrainian Impact on Russian Culture, 1750–1850* (1985) and *Russia in the Age of Reaction and Reform, 1801–1881* (1992).

**FRANCES SWYRIPA** is a professor of Canadian history at the University of Alberta. She has written widely on Ukrainians in Canada, including *Wedded to the Cause: Ukrainian-Canadian Women and Ethnic Identity, 1891–1991* (1993). Her *Storied Landscapes: Aspects of Ethno-Religious Identity on the Canadian Prairies* will be published in 2010.

**ROMAN SZPORLUK** is the Mykhailo Hrushevsky Professor Emeritus of Ukrainian History at Harvard University. His publications include *The Political Thought of Thomas G. Masaryk* (1981), *Communism and Nationalism: Karl Marx versus Friedrich List* (1988), *Russia, Ukraine, and the Breakup of the Soviet Union* (2000), and *Imperium, komunizm i narody: Wybór esejów* (2003).

**TATIANA TAIROVA-YAKOVLEVA** is a professor and the director of the Ukrainian Studies Center at St. Petersburg State University. A specialist in the history of early modern Ukraine, she is author of *Hetmanshchyna v druhii polovyni 50-kh rokiv XVII stolittia: Prychyny i pochatok Ruiny* (1998), *Ruina Hetmanshchyny: Vid Pereiaslavskoi rady-2 do Andrusivskoi uhody (1659–1667 rr.)* (2003), *Getman Ivan Mazepa: Dokumenty iz arkhivnykh sobranii Sankt-Peterburga* (editor, 2007), and *Mazepa* (2007). Having discovered a significant archive belonging to Mazepa among the papers of Aleksandr Menshikov, she has promoted the need for a thorough reassessment of Mazepa's role and interpretation and of lingering imperial Russian and Soviet stereotypes.

**OLEKSIY TOLOCHKO** is the director of the Center for the Study of Kyivan Rus' History at the Institute of the History of Ukraine, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, and a professor at the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy National University. He is the author of *Kniaz v Drevnei Rusi: Vlast, sobstvennost, ideologiya* (2002), "Istoriia Rossiiskaia" *Vasiliia Tatishcheva: Istochniki i izvestiia* (2005),

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.