1 | 2025

Slovanský přehled

Slavonic Review

Ročník 111 / Založen 1898

1 | 2025

Slovanský přehled

Časopis pro dějiny střední, východní a jihovýchodní Evropy

Slavonic Review

Journal for the History of Central, Eastern and Southeastern Europe

Ročník 111 / Založen 1898

Od roku 2009 jsou abstrakty článků *Slovanského přehledu* uveřejňovány v databázi The Central European Journal of Social Science and Humanities (CEJSH) – http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl společně se jménem autora, adresou zaměstnavatele a e-mailovou adresou. Časopis je také registrován v databázi SCOPUS a European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences (ERIH PLUS).

Since 2009, all abstracts of *Slovanský přehled* are published in The Central European Journal of Social Science and Humanities (CEJSH) – http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/, along with the author's name, institutional affiliation, address and e-mail. *Slovanský přehled* is also registered in SCOPUS and in European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences (ERIH PLUS).

ISSN 0037-6922 (Print)
ISSN 2788-3248 (On-line)

OBSAH | *CONTENTS*

Studie | *Articles*

Zprávy z vědeckého života | *News from Academic Life*

STUDIE / ARTICLE

'Polish Operation' of the NKVD: New Findings with Regard to the Genocidal Repression of the Polish National Minority in the USSR 1937–1938

MACIEJ WYRWA – PAWEŁ LIBERA – ŁUKASZ ADAMSKI

(Mieroszewski Centre – Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History,

Polish Academy of Sciences / Institute of National Remembrance – Mieroszewski Centre)

'Polish Operation' of the NKVD:[1] New Findings with Regard to the Genocidal Repression of the Polish National Minority in the USSR 1937–1938

This article examines the Polish Operation of the NKVD (1937–1938), a lesser-known yet significant chapter of the Great Terror in the USSR. Drawing on newly accessed archival materials, the research reveals the operational mechanisms and bureaucratic procedures employed by Soviet authorities to conduct mass repression against the Polish minority. Special emphasis is placed on the genocidal nature of the operation, executed under NKVD Order No. 00485, which resulted in the arrests, executions and de-

1 The article uses excerpts from three publications accepted for publication at the Mieroszewski Centre, by Siergiej PRUDOWSKI – Maciej WYRWA, eds., *Anatomia zbrodni. „Operacja polska" NKWD 1937–1938. Dokumenty* as well as: Yana PRYMACZENKO – Łukasz ADAMSKI, eds., *W cieniu "operacji polskiej". Represje na sowieckiej Ukrainie 1937–1938 w dokumentach*, and: Paweł LIBERA, ed., *"Operacja polska" NKWD w Związku Sowieckim na tle wydarzeń Wielkiego Terroru w oczach władz polskich (1935–1938). Wybór dokumentów*.

portations of tens of thousands of Poles, primarily in Ukraine, Belarus and Russia. The study traces the decision-making process from Stalin and Yezhov's directives to its execution by NKVD field units, highlighting the legal nihilism of extrajudicial bodies. Furthermore, the article situates the operation within the broader context of Soviet nationality policies and examines Poland's limited response, constrained by scarce information and diplomatic realities. Finally, it evaluates the operation through the lens of international law, arguing for its classification as genocide under the UN Genocide Convention.
Keywords: Polish Operation; Great Terror; Soviet national minorities; genocide studies; Stalinist repression.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union and the "archive revolution", scholars saw the full scale of the Great Terror, in which so-called "mass" and "nationality" operations took centre stage. Historians distinguish thirteen "nationality" operations. However, only in relation to seven ethnic groups did the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union(b) take special decisions, which were then implemented on the basis of operational orders from the NKVD of the USSR. One such group was the Poles.

According to the 1937 census, there were 636,220 Poles living in the USSR: 417,613 in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, 119,881 in the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and 92,078 in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic. In Ukraine, the republic with the largest number of Poles, they were concentrated in the border regions of Kamianets, Zhytomyr and Vinnytsia.[2] It was the Poles whom Stalin regarded as a potential threat to the Soviet regime, serious enough to be eradicated. To this end, on 11 August 1937, the People's Commissar for Internal Affairs of the USSR, Nikolai Yezhov, issued Soviet NKVD Operational Order No. 00485, which launched the "Polish Operation". It provided a kind of template for subsequent operations targeting national minorities living in the Soviet Union.

According to the order, the operation was to begin on 20 August 1937 and be completed within three months. Those to be arrested included active members

2 Nikita PETROV – Arseny ROGINSKIY, "Polskaya Operatsiya NKVD 1937–1938 gg.," in *Repressi protiv poliakov i polskikh grazhdan,* ed. Alexander GURYANOV (Moskva: Zven'ya, 1997), http://old.memo.ru/history/polacy/00485art.htm (accessed 11 April 2023).

of the POW,[3] former prisoners of war of the Polish army remaining in the USSR, fugitives, political émigrés and persons exchanged under the programme for the exchange of political prisoners with Poland, former members of the PPS[4] and other Polish political parties, and the active part of "local anti-Soviet nationalist elements from Polish regions".[5] The operation was to be carried out in two stages. First, the aforementioned "contingents" working for the NKVD, the Red Army, military factories, strategic facilities and transport were to be arrested. Only afterwards was the rest of the target population to be detained.

Special groups of operational officers were organised to conduct the investigations. All arrestees were divided into two categories: the first was punishable by death, and the second by imprisonment or internment in the Gulag for between five and ten years. Lists summarising the investigators' cases – so-called albums – were to be produced every ten days. The classification of the arrested into these categories on the spot was carried out by the People's Commissars of Internal Affairs of the respective Soviet republics, or the heads of the NKVD boards of the regions, together with the prosecutors of the respective republics or regions. The final verdict was approved by the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR and the prosecutor of the USSR (hence the name of this extrajudicial body: the NKVD "dvoika" ['pair']), and was immediately enforceable. Prisoners convicted of "Polish espionage" were also no longer released from prison.[6]

---

3 Polish Military Organisation (Polska Organizacja Wojskowa), POW – a clandestine military organisation created by Józef Piłsudski in Warsaw in 1914 to carry out diversion and intelligence in the rear of the Russian army in the Kingdom of Poland. Contrary to Soviet suspicions, POW was not active after Poland regained its independence and the end of the war with Bolshevik Russia in 1921.

4 Polish Socialist Party (Polska Partia Socjalistyczna), PPS – existed from 1892 to 1948. Its main programme point was the creation of an independent Poland. After the split of the party in 1906, its revolutionary wing was led by Jozef Pilsudski, who organised the PPS fighting units to fight against Russian self-rule. The PPS played a huge role in the creation of independent Poland and remained an influential force in the political life of interwar Poland.

5 Polish national regions were created in the USSR as part of the policy of korienization. From 1925 to 1935, the Polish Julian Marchlewski National District existed in the Ukrainian SSR. The centre of the region was the village of Marchlevsk (now the town of Dovbysh, Zhytomyr Oblast). In 1935, most Poles from the Marchlevsk region were deported to Kazakhstan. In the BSSR, from 1932 to 1937 there was a Polish National District named after Feliks Dzerzhinsky. In 1937 it was liquidated and part of the Polish population was also deported.

6 For the text of the order see: Jerzy BEDNAREK et al., eds., *Polshcha ta Ukraina u tridtsiatykh-sorokovykh rokak XX stolittia: nevidomi dokumenty z arkhiviv special'nykh sluzhb*, vol. 8, *Velykyi Teror. Polska operatsiya 1937–1938*, part 1 (Warsaw – Kyiv: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej, 2010), pp. 256–263.

On 15 September 1938, when the central apparatus of the NKVD could no longer cope with the influx of albums, the right to pronounce final sentences was transferred to the local level. The album procedure was abolished and replaced by a special panel of troikas [‘threes’], which consisted of the first secretary of the regional committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), the head of the relevant NKVD board, and the regional, krai or republican prosecutor. The decision of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) was formalised by NKVD USSR Order No. 00606 of 17th September 1938, On the formation of special troikas for the consideration of cases against detainees in accordance with order No. 00485 et al.[7]

In the USSR, special troikas were created at the regional level. Their remit was to deal with cases of those arrested before 1 August 1938, while cases of those arrested after that date were to be referred to the competent courts (military tribunals, regional courts, the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court). The special troikas were to complete their work within two months.

The deadline was strictly adhered to. The Special Troikas completed their work a few days before the enactment of the decree of the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), *On Arrests, Prosecutorial Supervision and Investigation* of 17 November 1938,[8] which is regarded as marking the end of the Great Terror.

The article presented to readers outlines several conclusions from many years of research conducted by an international team established by the Juliusz Mieroszewski Centre for Dialogue. The team aimed to thoroughly study the operation, including tracing the decision-making process and the mechanisms of the crimes, in which institutions with no legitimacy under either the constitution or legislation of the Soviet Union were used to adjudicate cases.

The acquisition of such a broad source base —from, among others, the Central Archive of the Federal Security Service (CAFSB), the Archive of the FSB Directorate (UFSB) of Russia for the Moscow and Omsk Oblasts, the Archive of the President of the Russian Federation (APRF), the State Archive of the Russian Federation (GARF), and the Sectoral Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine in

7 For the text of the order see: Ibidem, pp. 1488–1491.

8 For the text of the decree see *Lubianka. Stalin and Glavnoye upravleniye gosbezopasnosti NKVD. 1937–1938,* Moscow 2004, pp. 607–611, https://nkvd.tomsk.ru/content/editor/DOCUMENTS/ArhiwnDokuments/SSSR/17-11-38-Postanovlenie-SNK-SSSR-i-CK-VKPb-Ob-arestah-prokurorskom-nadzore-i-vedenii-sledstviya.pdf (accessed 11 April 2023).

Kyiv (HDA SBU)—would not have been possible without the cooperation of the persecuted -in -Russia Association “Memorial”.[9] It is worth noting that most of the documents referenced in the article are no longer accessible to researchers. The authorities of the Russian Federation, contrary to their own legislation, restrict access to archival materials. In doing so, they shield the perpetrators of the crime and prevent the proper commemoration of its victims.[10]

Implementation of the Order

The implementation in the field of the aforementioned order by Yezhov began on 20th August 1937. The first coded reports began to arrive in Moscow. The People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the Kazakh SSR, Lev Zalin, reported that the operation had begun and requested that copies of the order and a secret explanatory note be sent to the regional boards.[11] From Orenburg, it was reported that the operation had commenced and that 216 people had already been arrested,[12] while from Smolensk came information about the arrest of 460 people from the "contingent" of Poles.[13] In Vinnytsia, 804 Poles were arrested, 104 of whom pleaded guilty.[14]

However, the quality of the reporting documents sent raised concerns for Yezhov. In his cyphergram to all UNKVD[15] chiefs, he indicated that the delivery of materials on the Poles was proceeding slowly, the materials submitted were insufficient for sentencing, and the album cards were sloppily prepared. he therefore ordered: "[...] speed up the closure of cases, ensure that cases are properly docu-

9 In 2022, the Russian Memorial Association was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for its work.

10 For more on the subject see, inter alia: Report the International Federation for Human Rights (FIDH) and Memorial *Overcoming the Past : An Overview of Memorial's Transitional Justice Jurisprudence in Russia*, https://www.fidh.org/IMG/pdf/overcoming_the_past_0aan_overview_of_memorial_s_transitional_0ajustice_jurisprudence_in_russia.pdf (accessed 1 February 2024).

11 *Ciphertext of the People's Commissar of the NKVD of the Kazakh SSR on the implementation of order No. 00485*, 20.08.1937, TsAFSB, f. 3, op. 4, d. 2282, k. 839.

12 *Ciphertext of the head of the UNKVD of the Orenburg Region on the commencement of implementation of order No. 00485*, 20.08.1937, TsAFSB, f. 3, op. 4, d. 2282, l. 840.

13 *Ciphertext of the head of the UNKVD of the Smolensk region on the conduct of arrests of Polish contingents*, 21.08.1937, TsAFSB, f. 3, op. 4, d. 2282, k. 969.

14 *Ciphertext of the head of the UNKVD of Vinnitsa Oblast on the arrests of Poles as of 21.08.1937*, TsAFSB, f. 3, op. 4, d. 2282, k. 1003.

15 Administration of the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs (Upravljenye Narodnogo komissariata vnuternikh del), UNKVD.

mented, record [...] in each report the number of persons who have pleaded guilty, [as well as] completed cases."[16]

On the ground, reports began to become more meticulous. From Minsk, it was reported: "During the five days of 10th–15th September, twenty-three people confessed in the Polish section, 207 were re-arrested [...]", and contingent figures were provided.[17] A twelve-page report sent from Moscow detailed the uncovered and liquidated POW cells.[18] The revealed terrorist plot against Stalin and Yezhov was also mentioned: "According to OBUCHOWSKI's testimony, the carrying out of terrorist attacks by the indicated persons (SADOWSKI and ZAREMBA) was planned on the day of the twentieth anniversary of the October Revolution during a solemn meeting in the Grand Theatre, at which, according to their assumptions, they were to be present in the theatre orchestra".[19]

As the deadline for completing the operation approached, Yezhov, dissatisfied with the progress and results, signed a directive on 3rd November ordering, among other things: "Accelerate the operation [against] anti-Soviet elements, Germans, Poles, Harbians, wives of traitors to the fatherland."[20] Thereafter, the deadlines for the completion of "nationality operations", including the "Polish operation", were extended several more times.

Yezhov forwarded what he regarded as the most important reports from the field to Joseph Stalin and other members of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (bolsheviks). for example, a memorandum sent to Stalin and Molotov from Irkutsk referred to the testimony of a university student who claimed he had been a member of the Polish intelligence service since 1924 and named three of its residences in Krasnoyarsk, Irkutsk, and Tayshet.[21] In October, in addition to Stalin and Molotov, copies of similar docu-

16 Ciphertext *of the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR to all heads of the UNKVD on unacceptably slow reporting*, 14.09.1937, TsA FSB, f. 3, op. 4, d. 11, k. 261.

17 *Telegram of the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the BSRS to the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR on the "Polish operation" carried out over a period of five days (10–15.09.1937)*, 17.09.1937, TsAFSB, f. 3, op. 4, d. 107, k. 235.

18 *Report of the Head of the UNKVD of the Moscow Region to the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR on the detection and liquidation of Polish military organisations POW in Moscow and the Moscow Region*, 17.10.1937, TsAFSB, f. 3, op. 4, d. 1129, k. 164–175.

19 *Report of the Head of the UNKVD of the Moscow Region...,* op. cit.

20 *Directive of the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR No. 49721 "On intensification of repression,"* 03.11.1937, TsAFSB, f. 3, op. 4, d. 150, k. 247–248.

21 *Letter from Yezhov to Stalin and Molotov with attached note from Irkutsk on the Irkutsk and Krasnoyarsk residencies of Polish intelligence,* 14.09.1937, TsAFSB, f. 3, op. 1, d. 105, k. 260–262.

ments were also sent to Kliment Voroshilov and Lazar Kaganovich. The scale of informing Politburo members about the course of the "Polish operation" is evidenced by archive documents: between 15th and 19th September 1937, Yezhov sent eight reports with attached interrogation protocols of arrested Polish agents.[22]

In the course of the research conducted by the study team, no regulations were found that outlined the procedure for preparing documents and submitting them for Commission review—perhaps such documents never existed. The former head of the 1st Special Department of the NKVD of the USSR, Isaak Shapiro, testified during a hearing on 19th November 1938: "From the organisational side, the question of the mode of examination of cases within the framework of mass operations was completely unresolved".[23]

Nevertheless, the materials obtained make it possible to establish, with a high degree of probability, the circulation of documents and the procedure for sentencing and execution.

In accordance with Order No. 00485, in the case of completed investigations, the NKVD bodies of the union and autonomous republics, and the NKVD boards of *krais* and regions, prepared lists of the accused, which were sent to Moscow for approval by the NKVD Commission of the USSR and the Prosecutor of the USSR.

There was no single established format for preparing such lists. Alongside the lists, cards not mentioned in Order No. 00485 were also prepared, based on indictments. These cards contained the arrestee's personal details, information about the authority responsible for the arrest, the number of the investigative case, and a description of the investigative and agent material that determined the degree of the arrestee's guilt, including whether they had pleaded guilty and whose testimony implicated them.

As a rule, the cards were signed by the head of the NKVD/UNKVD and the relevant prosecutor, but there were exceptions. For example, some cards prepared by the UNKVD for the Moscow Region were not signed at all.

Lists and cards were stapled into albums—hence the colloquial term for this case-handling process: "album mode". The cover, usually made of bookbinding linen, bore the name of the authority that submitted the album.

22 *Special information from N. Yezhov to J. Stalin, V. Molotov, K. Voroshilov concerning the sending of copies of interrogation protocols*, TsAFSB, f. 3, op. 4, d. 107, k. 11, 12, 152, 154, 155, 303, 305, 306.

23 *Extract from the minutes of the interrogation of Isaac Shapira*, 19.11.1938, TsAFSB, archive-investigation case no. R-41507, k. 149.

The albums were sent to the NKVD of the USSR along with a cover note and were processed there. They were marked with the "sentence": R – shooting (from Russian *rasstrel*, execution by shooting); or 10 (8, 5, 3) years' imprisonment in a correctional labour camp (ITL). As analysis of the documents shows, exile to the Kazakh SSR or expulsion from the USSR was also a possible punishment, although Order No. 00485 did not explicitly provide for this. Cases could also be referred to the Military Council of the Supreme Court or the Military Tribunal, or returned for further investigation.

Given the similarity of accusations noted in the album cards, it is unclear what guided the Chekists in deciding upon a particular sentence.

The review of lists and album cards was not merely automatic—not all proposed punishments were upheld. As a rule, the NKVD/UNKVD recommendations were "corrected"; sentences were often changed to more severe ones.

Once the lists and album cards had been reviewed, protocols were drawn up and signed by Nikolai Yezhov and Andrei Vyshinsky, and occasionally by their deputies—on the NKVD side, Mikhail Frinovsky and Lev Bielski; on the side of the prosecutor's office, Grigory Roginsky and Grigory Leplevsky. The signing procedure was later described by Frinovsky in his testimony: "This list, without any review of the investigative files and card albums in these cases, was signed by Yezhov or by me, [...] on behalf of the Prosecutor's Office, and later the sentence was carried out". (In the testimony, a plural form appears instead of the name of Vyshinsky, who at the time held the post of Vice-Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR.)[24]

Within 30–40 minutes, protocols could be signed for 5,000 or 6,000 people, according to the testimony of Sergei Zubkin, deputy head of the 8th Division of the NKVD GUGB.[25,26] Names were listed in the minutes in alphabetical order under each type of sentence: first those sentenced to death by shooting, followed by those sentenced to terms of imprisonment in gulags, then those marked for exile or expulsion from the USSR. Next came those whose cases were referred to the Military Council or Military Tribunal, and finally, those sent for further investigation.

---

24 *Extract from the minutes of the interrogation of Mikhail Frinovsky*, 07.09.1939, TsAFSB, archive-investigation case no. R-41507, vol. 1, k. 143.

25 Main Directorate of State Security (Glavnoe upravlenyie gosudarstvennoy bezopasnosti), GUGB.

26 *Self-written confessions by arrested Sergei Zubkin*, 11.12.1938, TsAFSB, archive-investigation case no. R-3054, pp. 57–58.

Copies of the protocols were generally returned to the local field authorities the day after signing.

The implementation of death sentences in the field can be illustrated by the example of Moscow. The 8th GUGB department of the NKVD issued dispatches—signed by its chief, Vladimir Tsesarsky—concerning the transfer of prisoners[27] held in Moscow prisons and orders for their execution.[28] Prior to execution, prisoners were transferred from various prisons to a central location, for example, in Moscow, to Butyrka Prison.[29]

In principle, execution orders were addressed to the appropriate NKVD/UNKVD commander. However, it is known that in Moscow, these orders were given to the deputy head of the UNKVD for the Moscow Region—the head of the Moscow Region Workers' and Peasants' Militia Board, Mikhail Semyonov—who carried out the sentences personally.[30]

The execution of those listed on a single warrant could take more than one day. Sometimes, a warrant instructed the execution of convicts from various operations, and individuals listed under a single protocol might be executed on different days.

Before execution, the condemned individual was asked a series of questions to confirm their identity, and their appearance was verified against their photograph.

An excerpt from the execution act was inserted into the criminal case file of the executed person. This excerpt contained only the date of the decision by the NKVD Commission and the Prosecutor of the USSR, as well as the date of the execution. It did not include the protocol number, the location or time of the execution, or the identities of the executioners.[31]

---

27 *Instruction from the head of Department 8 of the GUGB of the NKVD of the USSR to the head of Department 10 of the GUGB of the NKVD of the USSR on the transfer of prisoners to the commander of the NKVD,* 03.12.1937, Archive of the UFSB of Russia for the Omsk Region, f. 6, d. 8250, k. 131.

28 *Order of the head of Department 8 of the GUGB of the NKVD of the USSR to the commander of the NKVD on the execution of death sentences*, 03.12.1937, Archive of the UFSB of Russia for the Omsk region, f. 6, d. 8250, k. 130.

29 *Letter of the head of the 8th Division of the GUGB of the NKVD of the USSR to the head of the UNKVD of the Moscow Oblast on sending copies of protocols No. 3 and 7*, 08.09.1937, Archive of the UFSB of Russia for the Omsk Oblast, f. 6, d. 8221, l. 69.

30 *From the order of the head of the UNKVD of the Moscow Region to the head of the Moscow Region Workers' and Peasants' Militia Board on the execution of 89 persons,* 29.12.1937–15.01.1938, UFSB Archives of Russia for the Moscow Region, f. 2, op. 1. d. 9, k. 69–73.

31 *Extract from the execution protocol of J. Paszkiewicz***,** no earlier than 27.11.1937, GARF, f. 10035, op. 1, d. 52209, k. 100.

After the sentences were carried out, field authorities submitted execution reports. These sometimes included explanations for delays or for executions that had not been carried out.[32]

Special Council under the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR

However, even the perpetrators of these crimes were aware of the legal dubiousness of the decisions made by the NKVD Commission and the Prosecutor of the USSR. To compensate, they adopted a practice of "double sentencing" via the Special Council (*Osoboye soveshchaniye* – OSO) under the NKVD of the USSR.[33]

On 4th September 1937, Nikolai Yezhov and Andrei Vyshinsky sent a letter to Joseph Stalin and Vyacheslav Molotov concerning the anti-Soviet activities of defectors from Poland, former members of the PPS, and others. They stated: "[...] a sentence of imprisonment of 10 years, in cases involving the above category, should be adjudicated by the Special Council under the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR," and further recommended: "[...] to authorise the Special Council under the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR to adjudicate a sentence of imprisonment of up to and including ten years".[34] The following day, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union(b) formally authorised the Special Council to impose this punitive measure.[35]

---

32 *Letter of the head of the UNKVD of the Sverdlovsk Oblast to the head of the 8th Division of the GUGB of the NKVD of the USSR on the course of execution of death sentences on Poles and former residents of Harbin,* 16.11.1937, Archive of the UFSB of Russia for the Omsk Oblast, f. 6, d. 8233, k. 89–91.

33 The Special Council under the NKVD of the USSR was established on 5th November 1934 by a decision of the Central Executive Committee (CIK) and the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR. It punished acts against the Soviet system, i.e. treason against the motherland, desertion, pestering and counter-revolutionary propaganda. The Council sentenced exile, deportation, imprisonment in correctional labour camps for up to 5 years, and expulsion outside the USSR. In April 1937, the powers of the CSO were extended – the term of imprisonment in correctional labour camps could be up to 8 years.

34 *Letter from N. Yezhov, A. Vyshinsky to J. Stalin and V. Molotov on authorising the SPA to sentence to 10 years in cases of Polish refugees, PPS members, etc.,* 04.09.1937, APRF. f. 3, op. 58, d. 254, k. 157.

35 *Extract from Minute No. 51 of the meeting of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union(b) on the authorisation of CSOs to impose 10-year prison sentences in the cases of Polish fugitives, PPS members, etc.,* 05.09.1937, APRF, f. 3, Op. 58, d. 254, k. 156.

Neither in Operational Order No. 00485 nor in the secret letter appended to it is the Special Council mentioned at all. Russian researcher Arseniy Roginsky has observed that the purpose of the SPA's approval of the Commission's provisions was to maintain strict secrecy regarding the very existence of the NKVD Commission and the Prosecutor of the USSR—a body not sanctioned by any legislative act. Individuals who survived the camps would be aware that their sentences had been handed down by the SPA. The Special Council was therefore intended to "legalise" the decisions issued by the NKVD Commission and the Prosecutor of the USSR.

In practice, the procedure functioned as follows. Cards pertaining to individuals sentenced to terms of imprisonment in labour camps (ITL), internal exile, or expulsion from the USSR were removed from the albums. Following the decisions made by the NKVD Commission and the Prosecutor of the USSR, these cards were transferred to the Secretariat of the OSO, where they were handed to Senior Operational Plenipotentiary and Senior Lieutenant of State Security, Klavdiya Grishniat.

Protocols of the Special Council under the NKVD of the USSR were drafted on the basis of these cards. Excerpts from these protocols were then dispatched to the field authorities, while the album cards themselves remained in the SPA Secretariat. Decisions previously ruled upon by the Commission and reviewed in SPA protocols were not included in SPA reporting.[36]

On 8th September 1937, the first album cards concerning individuals sentenced by the NKVD Commission and the Prosecutor of the USSR under NKVD Order No. 00485 (Protocol No. 5 of 31st August 1937) to imprisonment in labour camps were transferred to the SPA Secretariat.[37]

Information specifying the particular gulag to which a convict was to be sent can be found in copies of the protocols preserved in the Central Archives of the Russian FSB in Moscow. Each name in these documents is accompanied by a handwritten note indicating the name of the camp; in some instances, this is accompanied by a stamp.

By comparing the dates on which cases were considered by the NKVD Commission and the Prosecutor of the USSR with the dates of the Special Council protocols, it has been established that:

36 *Annex to NKVD Circular No. 150 on the submission of reports on the breakdown of counter-revolutionary elements*, TsAFSB, f. 66, op. 1, d. 433, k. 106.

37 *Information on the transfer of album cards to the SPA*, Archive of the UFSB of Russia for the Omsk Region, f. 6, d. 3019, k. 106.

(a) The Special Council typically reviewed cases 1–7 days after the Commission's decision. However, there were instances of delays up to 30 days or even 105 days. In certain cases, CSO orders were issued several days prior to the Commission's own meeting.

(b) There were cases in which the same individual signed both the Commission and Special Council protocols on the same day. For example, on 2nd December 1937, Frinovsky signed four Commission protocols related to the "Polish operation" as well as the CSO protocol.

Documents of the CSO thus serve as direct evidence of the "double conviction" of individuals during the nationality operations, including the "Polish operation"—once by the Commission and again by the Special Council. Furthermore, they include album cards related to prisoners sentenced to imprisonment in ITL, which were removed from the albums, reviewed by the dvoikas, and passed on to the SPA Secretariat.

Operation to Victimise the Wives and Children of Traitors to the Motherland

In addition to issuing sentences on the basis of decisions made by the NKVD Commission and the Prosecutor of the USSR, the Special Collegium also handled cases involving the wives and children over the age of fifteen of "traitors to the fatherland". These proceedings were conducted under NKVD Order No. 00486 of 15th August 1937, *On the operation of repression of wives and children of traitors to the motherland*.[38] Notably, in August 1937, a coded dispatch concerning the repression of husbands of traitors to the motherland was drafted, but never dispatched.[39] Most likely, even the Soviet terror apparatus lacked the capacity to target yet another group of victims.

Wives of convicted traitors to the fatherland were subject to imprisonment in labour camps for a minimum of five to eight years, depending on the degree of their "social danger", while children were incarcerated in NKVD camps or correc-

38 *Operational order of the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR No. 00486 "On operations for repression of wives and children of traitors to the fatherland"*, 15.08.1937, TsAFSB. f. 3. op. 4. d. 14. k. 405–416. published: A. KOKURIN – N. PETROV, eds., *GULAG (Glavnoye upravleniye lagerei). 1917–1960* (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnyi fond "Demokratiia", 2000), pp. 106–110.

39 *Ciphertext on the arrest and imprisonment in gulags of husbands of traitors to the motherland,* TsAFSB, f. 3, op. 4, d. 11, k. 218.

tional labour colonies. In the case of younger children, they were placed in special-regime children's homes overseen by the People's Commissariats of Education of the respective republics.

On 2nd October 1937, with Directive No. 928, Nikolai Yezhov extended the scope of Order No. 00486 to include the families of Poles repressed under Order No. 00485.[40] From that date, the cases of family members of those convicted in all "album" operations began to be reviewed by the OSO. Following the OSO's decision, orders were sent to the NKVD/UNKVD to implement the sentence and to notify the convicted individual of the decision and the gulag to which they would be sent.

The placement of children from repressed families into orphanages was handled by the Administrative and Economic Board of the NKVD of the USSR. Siblings were often separated and sent to different institutions.[41]

The arrest of the wives of those convicted in the "Polish operation" and other so-called nationality operations ceased following the issuance of Directive No. S-1450 on 22nd November 1937.[42] This directive required the provision of "data on the number of wives and children subject to deportation" in order to resettle them later in places of exile. After all, witnesses to the crime could not be left at liberty.

Special Troika

Sergei Zubkin, deputy head of the 8th Division of the NKVD's GUGB, stated in his December 1938 testimony: "[...] at the beginning of 1938, in the archive, all the aisles and corners were swamped with files, and yet 300–400 thousand cases were still to be received by the time the mass operations were completed".[43] Faced with the impossibility of examining such an immense number of cases—and thus the

40 *Ciphertext of the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR to all commissars of the Union and Autonomous Republics, heads of the UNKVD of countries and regions and heads of the DTOs of the NKVD on the inclusion of families of Poles in Order No. 00485,* 02.10.1937, TsAFSB, f. 100, op. 1, k. 7.

41 *Ciphertext of the Administrative and Economic Board of the NKVD to the UNKVD for the Kharkiv Region on the referral of children to children's homes*, TsAFSB. f. 3, op. 4, d. 2245, k. 53.

42 *Ciphertext of the Deputy People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR on the inclusion of only families convicted by the Military Council of the Supreme Court in Order No. 00486*, 22.11.1937, TsAFSB, f. 3, op. 5, d. 2. k. 1.

43 *Handwritten testimony of arrested Sergei Zubkin*, 11.12.1938, TsAFSB, d. R-3054, k. 99.

inefficiency of the repressive apparatus—the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (b) on 15th September 1938 approved a draft resolution, submitted by the NKVD, on the establishment of special troikas,[44] to review the cases of individuals arrested under NKVD USSR Orders No. 00485, 00439,[45] and 00593[46] of 1937 and 302[47] and 326[48] of 1938.

The special troikas were to comprise the first secretary of the regional or national committee of the VKP(b) or the Central Committee of the relevant republican Communist Party, the head of the appropriate NKVD board, and the prosecutor of the region, krai, or republic. In the Ukrainian SSR, Kazakh SSR, and the Far Eastern Krai, special troikas were also formed at the oblast level.

These special troikas were granted the authority to impose both first-category (execution) and second-category (five to ten years in a gulag or prison) sentences.

On 17th September 1938, Yezhov signed NKVD USSR order No. 00606, *On the creation of Special Troikas to consider the cases of persons arrested under NKVD USSR orders No. 00485 et al.*[49] The order specified that only cases of persons arrested prior to 1st August 1938 were to be considered, and that separate protocols should be compiled for each "nationality operation". One copy of each

44 *Decree of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union(b) on the creation of special triplets*, 15.09.1938, APRF, f. 3, op. 58, d. 212, k. 195–195. Published inter alia: V. KHAUSTOV – V. NAUMOV – N. PLOTNIKOVA, eds., *Lubianka. Stalin i Glavnoye upravleniye gosbezopasnosti NKVD* (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnyi fond "Demokratiia", 2004), p. 549.

45 *Operational order of the NKVD of the USSR of 25.07.1937. "On the operation to repress German citizens suspected of spying against the USSR".* – so-called German operation.

46 *Operational order of the NKVD of the USSR dated 20.09.1937. "On the operation of repression of former officials of the East China Railway and re-emigrants from Manchukuo"* – the so-called Harbin operation.

47 *Order of the NKVD of the USSR dated 29.01.1938. "On the liquidation of Iranian intelligence activities on the territory of the USSR" No. 202* – the so-called Iranian operation.

48 *Directive of the NKVD of the USSR dated 16.03.1938. "On the liquidation of Afghan intelligence activities on the territory of the USSR".* – The so-called Afghan operation.

49 *USSR NKVD Order No. 00606 "On the Establishment of Special Troikas for the Examination of Cases against Arrested Persons under USSR NKVD Orders No. 00485 et al."*, 17.09.1938, TsAFSB, f. 3, op. 5, d. 2, k. 79–81 and HDA SBU, f. 9, d. 672, k. 161–163. Published inter alia: Jerzy BEDNAREK – Joanna KARBARZ-WILIŃSKA – Serhij KOKIN – Marcin MAJEWSKI – Jurij SZAPOWAŁ, *Wielki Terror. Operacja polska 1937–38*, series: Polska i Ukraina w latach trzydziestych – czterdziestych XX wieku. Nieznane dokumenty z archiwów służb specjalnych, vol. 8 (Warsaw – Kyiv: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej 2010), part 2, p. 1489.

protocol was to be sent to the 1st Special Department of the NKVD of the USSR. The review process was to be completed within two months.

On 21st September, Circular No. 189 was dispatched to field units to clarify the application of Order No. 00606.[50] It stipulated that the order applied to all individuals of Polish, German, Latvian, Estonian, Finnish, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Greek, Romanian, Iranian, Afghan, and Chinese nationality, as well as to "Harbians" and members of white guard organisations (e.g. the Russian All-Military Union, Russian Truth Brotherhood, and Russian Fascist Party),[51] who had been arrested before 1st August 1938 and exposed as members of espionage, sabotage, terrorist, or other anti-Soviet organisations.

The circular detailed which cases fell within the remit of the special troikas, what decisions they were authorised to make, the required structure of the protocols, the accompanying documentation, and the deadlines for submission to the central authorities.

In contrast to the protocols of the NKVD Commission and the Prosecutor of the USSR, those produced by the special troikas contained brief descriptions of the charges. They also included information on the nationality and citizenship of the accused, their party affiliation, and the date of arrest.

After the expiry of the two-month deadline set by Order No. 00606, a resolution of the USSR Council of People's Commissars and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union(b), *On Arrests, Prosecutorial Supervision and Investigation*, was adopted on 17th November 1938. This resolution halted the consideration by Troikas, the Military Tribunal, and the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the USSR of all cases referred to these bodies under special orders or any other simplified procedure. Interestingly, the resolution also acknowledged the system's failings: "[...] the massive operations aimed at breaking up and eradicating hostile elements carried out by the NKVD in 1937–1938 with a simplified mode of investigation and trial must have led to shortcomings and distortions in the work of the NKVD bodies and the prosecutor's office".[52]

---

50 *Circular of the People's Commissar of the NKVD of the USSR with explanation of the application of order No. 00606,* 21.09.1938, TsAFSB, f. 66, op. 1, d. 464, k. 261–263.

51 None of the resolutions of the Politburo, nor any of the orders concerning nationality operations, nor even Order 00606 itself, directly provided for the repression of members of the White Guard organisations.

52 *Resolution of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union(b) "On arrests, prosecutorial supervision and investigation"*,17.11.1938, HDA SBU, f. 9, op. 1, d. 81-sp, k. 203–204.

The resolution of the Politburo and the USSR Council of People's Commissars was binding. Accordingly, on 25th November, Lavrenty Beria, who had succeeded Nikolai Yezhov, submitted to Stalin a draft order *On the mode of implementation of the resolution of the USSR CCL and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union(b) of 17th November 1938*, requesting its approval.[53] The following day, Beria signed the order, which was designated No. 00762.[54] This marked the formal end of the mass repressive operations.

Operation in Belarus

Let us now examine how the operation was implemented on the ground in one of the two main Soviet republics inhabited by the Polish minority. In Belarus, according to the available documents, the wave of anti-Polish repression began to surge as early as July 1937—i.e. even before the promulgation of order No. 00485, which officially launched the "Polish operation." One of the immediate triggers was the publication of an article titled *Excesses of bourgeois nationalists*, which appeared in the newspaper *Pravda* on 17th July 1937. The author of the article, Timofey Gorbunov, *Pravda*'s correspondent in the Belarusian Socialist Soviet Republic (BSSR) and later secretary for ideology of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belarus (b), cited such "excesses" in the activities of the authorities of the Feliks Dzerzhinsky Polish National District—commonly referred to as Dzerzhinshchyna.

On 22nd July 1937, the district committee of the Communist party in Dzerzhinsk convened to discuss the article. Following the discussion, it was decided to abolish the "policy of forced Polonisation," to "finally uproot the enemies of the people," and to "liquidate the consequences of pestilence," among other measures.[55]

---

53 *Journal of the Deputy People's Commissar of the NKVD of the USSR L. Beria to J. Stalin regarding the sending of a draft order of the NKVD on the mode of implementation of the Resolution of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union(b) of 17.11.1938*, 25.11.1938, TsAFSB, f. 3, op. 5, d. 82, l. 423.

54 *Order of the People's Commissar of the NKVD of the USSR on the mode of implementation of the Resolution of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union(b) of 17.11.1938*, 26.11.1938, TsAFSB, f. 66, op. 1, d. 443, k. 258–266. Published inter alia: *Lubianka, Stalin i glavnoye upravleniye gosbezopasnosti NKVD*, op. cit. pp. 612–617.

55 *Resolution of the Bureau of the Dzerzhinsky District Committee of the KP(b)B on the article "Excesses of bourgeois nationalists" published in the daily Pravda*, 22.07.1937, NARB, f. 4p, op. 1, d.

The issue of "Polish spies" was next raised at a plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (b) of Belarus on 29th July 1937. Representatives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (b), Yakov Yakovlev and Georgy Malenkov, were in attendance. The speeches delivered at the plenum included references to "Polish spies," "Polish fascist-spy organisations," and similar threats. In its resolution, the plenum called on party organisations to "quickly and decisively liquidate the consequences of the pestering of Polish spies" and to "finally crush Polish spies, pesters and saboteurs".[56]

In response, on 2nd August 1937, the Central Executive Committee of the BSSR adopted a resolution to abolish Dzerzhinshchyna as a territorial-administrative unit. The liquidation of the district was accompanied by mass arrests, expulsions from the party, replacement of kolkhoz and village council chairmen, and the dismissal of Polish schoolteachers.[57]

At the same time, the process of dismantling Polish state and social institutions began in the BSSR. This commenced with a meeting of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belarus (b) on 5th August 1937, during which the committee discussed "fighting the policy of Polonisation" and decided to dissolve most Polish institutions and organisations, branding them as creations of "Polish spies" designed to conduct "forced Polonisation".[58] As a result, on 10th August, the Council of People's Commissars of the BSSR closed Polish pedagogical and pre-school teaching technical schools in Minsk, Polish community centres, reading rooms, and schools, and banned Polish-language literary broadcasts on the radio. Polish medical, feldsher's, obstetric, and veterinary outlets were also shut down.[59]

Following the dissolution of most Polish state institutions and social organisations, the physical destruction of "Polish spies and saboteurs" began. Results

11193, l. 95–96.

56 *Stenogram of the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)B on the leadership of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)B,* 29.07.1937, NARB, f. 4p, op. 1, d. 10959, l. 158–159.

57 *Order of the Office of the Dzerzhinsky District Committee of the KP(b)B on the liquidation of the Dzerzhinsky district*, 02.08.1937, NARB, f. 4p, op. 6, d. 11193, l. 108.

58 *Minutes of the meeting of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the KP(b)B on the fight against the "policy of Polonisation"*, 05.08.1937, NARB, f. 4p, op. 2, d. 11014, l. 2–4.

59 *Report of the Chairman of the BSSR RKL Daniil Volkovich to the Office of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the implementation of the resolutions of the Office of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union concerning the liquidation of the "fascist policy of Polonisation"*, 26.08.1937, NARB, f. 4p, op. 1, d. 11014, l. 83–86.v

appeared swiftly. For instance, by the end of August 1937, the head of the political department of the Belarusian Railway reported to the Central Committee of the Communist Party (b) of Belarus on the liquidation of POW cells allegedly located in Homel, Mogilev, Kryčaŭ, Slutsk, Asipovičy, Unecha, and at the Zlynkov Railway Sleeper Plant.[60] Around the same time, the POW organisation in Vitebsk was "uncovered" and dismantled.[61]

A particular feature of the operation against Poles in the BSSR was that Belarusians themselves comprised the majority of those convicted. Numerous representatives of the party, state, and social elite—well-known figures in Belarusian cultural life—were arrested as "spies" or "supporters of spies." The "Polish operation," like other forms of repression, served as a pretext for the NKVD of the BSSR to strike at the Belarusian elite. Between 1937 and 1938, almost all activists of the national movement, including members of the pre-revolutionary Belarusian intelligentsia and many Soviet-era intellectuals, were physically eliminated. Writers, artists, painters, members of the Academy of Sciences of the Belarusian SSR, and lecturers at the Belarusian State University were executed as "Polish spies."

The proximity of the Polish border proved tragic for residents of many Belarusian villages, hamlets, and towns in a report dated 20th October 1937 to the Central Committee of the Communist Party (b) of Belarus, Boris Berman, People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the BSSR, claimed that in the border areas—defined as the first belt (7.5 km) and the second belt (30 km)—there were over 41,000 hamlets "littered with kulak and anti-Soviet elements." He stated that the majority of their inhabitants had relatives in Poland and described these hamlets as "a permanent and wide-ranging base for the activities of Polish intelligence organs, residents of diversionary and espionage organisations and insurgencies, which are directed by Polish intelligence".[62]

---

60 *Report of the head of the political department of the Belarusian Railway to the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)B on the activities of the Polish Military Organisation*, 25.08.1937, NARB, f. 4p, op. 1, d. 12089, l. 36–45. The document was first published in: *Ulada i hramadstva BSSR u 1923–1939 hh. U dakumientach Cakretnaha addiela / Asobaha sektara TsK KP(b)B*, selection and preface by I. Ramanava, Minsk 2019, p. 895

61 *Information of the head of the Vitebsk City Department of the NKVD of the BSSR non the "social littering with foreign elements" of party organisations, enterprises and kolkhozes in Vitebsk and the Vitebsk region,* 30.08.1937, NARB, f. 4p, op. 1, d. 12058, l. 147–170.

62 *Report by Boris Berman to the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)B on the damaging sabotage of the implementation of the resolutions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b) and the USSR Central Committee concerning the "incorporation" of hamlets*, 20.10.1937, NARB, f. 4p, op. 1, d. 12055, l. 78–95.

In a further report to the Central Committee of the KP(b)B, Berman stated that, as of 20th October 1937, 1,210 "counter-revolutionaries" in the border regions had been executed on the basis of decisions issued by the NKVD BSSR troika, while 2,066 had been sentenced to varying terms of imprisonment in gulags. At the same time, the People's Commissar expressed concern over the families of the repressed and proposed their resettlement in "remote regions of the USSR".[63]

From the very beginning of the "Polish operation" in the BSSR, citizens who had maintained contact with Polish diplomatic missions were also frequently arrested—even though Nikolai Yezhov did not issue the relevant order until October 1937. In this instance, the NKVD of the BSSR demonstrated a degree of initiative, though fully in keeping with the spirit of order No. 00485.

For the Chekists, the traditional enemy was the Catholic clergy. Among others, priests Jan Borowik, Stanisław Rajko, Piotr Janukowicz, Piotr Awgło, and Konstanty Andrekus were sentenced to death on 25th August 1937 on charges of belonging to POW, spying for Poland, and engaging in anti-Soviet activity.[64]

During the course of the Great Terror, the NKVD also gathered information about public sentiment and attitudes towards the actions of the criminal authorities. The Soviet regime ensured that the repression was accompanied by extensive information and propaganda campaigns. Newspapers regularly published accounts of public court proceedings against "Polish spies," "saboteurs," and other forms of "vermin." These were often accompanied by letters from "working people" who expressed strong support for the NKVD and the prosecutor's office, calling for the harshest measures against "enemies of the people."

However, even intense propaganda could not secure unanimous support for the NKVD's actions. For instance, as early as 10th September 1937, Berman, in a note on public sentiment following the arrests of members of the Polish population—addressed to acting First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b) of Belarus, Alexei Volkov—highlighted the numerous negative assessments directed at NKVD officers and Soviet officials, who were referred to as

63 *Note by the People's Commissar of the Interior of the BSSR Boris Berman to the Central Committee of the C.P.B.(b)B on "espionage and diversionary activities" in the border regions*, October 1937, NARB, f. 4p, op. 1, d. 12055, l. 96–101.

64 For more see, inter alia: Roman DZWONKOWSKI, *Losy duchowieństwa katolickiego w ZSSR 1917–1939. Martyrologium. Martyrologium (*Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1998).

"bandits," "rabid dogs," and "scum." Berman also mentioned widespread panic among political émigrés and refugees from Poland.[65]

The NKVD's "Polish operation" in the Belarusian SSR was marked by a high proportion of death sentences. For example, a report titled *On the results of operations concerning Polish, German and Latvian agents in the BSSR*, conducted between August 1937 and September 1938 based on directives from the NKVD of the USSR and compiled on 12th December 1938, was signed by the deputy head of the 3rd Division of the UGB of the NKVD of the BSSR, Senior Lieutenant Larin. It stated that 21,407 "Polish spies, saboteurs, and members of insurgent organisations" had been arrested in the republic between 24th July 1937 and 1st September 1938. Only 451 were released for "lack of evidence of guilt." During this period, 467 "spy residences," 13,042 "spies," 2,679 "saboteurs," 4,425 "insurgents" affiliated with 522 "insurgent groups," and 11 "branching insurgent organisations" were liquidated.

The report also noted the arrest of 3,088 fugitives, 894 "Polish legionaries" (presumably former prisoners from the Polish–Bolshevik war), 468 political émigrés, 1,024 former smugglers who had crossed into Poland, and 94 former members of Polish political parties.

An analysis of the nationalities of those arrested yields revealing conclusions that contradict the common belief that the victims of the "Polish Operation" were predominantly ethnic Poles. the majority were, in fact, Belarusians—10,120 individuals (48.1 %). Poles constituted the second largest group—9,196 individuals (43.7 %). Jews, Russians, Ukrainians, Germans, Latvians, Lithuanians, and others were also arrested under the "Polish operation".[66]

The same document stated that of the 15,741 individuals arrested up to 1st June 1938, 14,034 (89.2 %) were sentenced to death by the dvoika. After 15th September 1938, the fate of those arrested was decided by the NKVD troika of the BSSR. At that time, 4,650 out of 6,770 arrestees were sentenced to be shot,

65 *Note by the People's Commissar of the Interior of the BSSR to the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)B A on the mood of the population of the BSSR in connection with the mass arrests of Poles*, 10.09.1937, NARB, f. 4p, op. 1, d. 12058, l. 265–272.

66 *Statistical data of the NKVD BSRS on the results of the "Polish", "German" and "Latvian" operations of the NKVD BSRS from August 1937 to September 1938, 12.12.1938,* NARB, f. 4p, op. 1, d. 13231, l. 19–24. The document was first published in: Uladzimir ADAMUSHKA, *Palitychnyia represii 20–50-ykh hadou na Belarusi* (Minsk: Byelarus', 1994).

accounting for 68.7 %. Calculations indicate that, among those covered by these statistics (22,511 individuals), 18,684 (83 %) were executed in the BSSR.[67]

It should be noted that, despite the importance and value of this document, the statistics it contains cannot be considered definitive. They do not cover the entire duration of the NKVD's "Polish operation," and it remains unclear, for example, what criteria the Chekists used to determine the nationality of the repressed. The true number of victims of the Great Terror, including those of the "Polish operation" in the BSSR, can only be ascertained once the archives of the KGB in Belarus and the FSB in Russia are made accessible to researchers.

Victims in Ukraine

The situation in Ukraine differs considerably. The principal archive containing documents of the Soviet security organs—the SBU Archive—is open and welcoming to researchers, including members of the team investigating the Polish Operation. Based on SBU documents compared with Soviet statistics, it is known that Poles were already the dominant group among the victims of the "Polish Operation" in Ukraine, although the proportion of victims from other nationalities was also significant.

According to the 1926 census,[68] 476,435 Poles lived in the Ukrainian SSR, and 782,334 in the USSR as a whole. The 1937 census, conducted shortly before the launch of the "Polish operation" (its results were suppressed and the available, incomplete archival materials were only published in 2007), recorded 636,220 Poles in the USSR, of whom 417,613 lived in Ukraine.[69] However, the subsequent

67 Ibidem.

68 See *Vsesoyuznaya perepis naseleniya 17 dekabria 1926 g. Kratkiye svodki vyp. IV, Narodnost' i rodnoi yazyk naseleniya SSSR* (Moscow: Tsentral'noye statisticheskoye upravleniye SSSR 1928), p. 2.

69 Valentina ZHIROMSKAYA – Yuriy POLAKOV, eds., *Vsesoyuznaya perepis naseleniya 1937 goda. Obshchiye itogi. Sbornik dokumentov i materialov* (Moscow: Rosspen, 2007), pp. 86, 106. The all-union census was conducted on 6th January 1937. The preliminary results of the 1937 census were immediately deemed "damaging", and the workers conducting it were arrested and repressed. The census materials were kept secret until the 1990s. It recorded a decline in the population of the USSR due to the Holodomor in Ukraine, as well as a nationwide famine, which contradicted Soviet propaganda about the benefits of living in a socialist state. See Fëdor LIVSHITS, *Perepis naseleniya 1937 goda*, [in:] *Demograficheskiye procesy v SSSR* (Moscow: Nauka, 1990), pp. 174–203, http://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/2007/0271/arxiv02.php#_FNR_1 (accessed 11 April 2023).

census of 1939 showed a dramatic decline in the Polish population of the USSR, registering only 357,710 Poles in Ukraine (630,097 in the USSR as a whole). These figures were slightly adjusted to obscure the losses caused by Stalinist repression.[70] Thus, within thirteen years, the number of Poles in Ukraine decreased by one quarter.[71] For comparison: the number of Ukrainians in the Ukrainian SSR increased by 2 % between 1926 and 1939, despite the approximately 4 million direct deaths caused by the Holodomor, the majority of whom were ethnic Ukrainians. In contrast, the number of Belarusians in the Belarusian SSR, which did not experience the artificially induced famine, rose by 15 %, while the number of Russians in the RSFSR grew by 22 %.[72] Moreover, between 1937 and 1939 alone, 60,000 Poles disappeared from the official statistics.

Based on internal, incomplete NKVD data, only rough estimates can be made regarding the number of people executed in Ukraine as part of the "Polish operation".[73] Between 1st January 1937 and 1st July 1938—covering most of the operation's duration—33,447 people were executed under order No. 00485 (24,249 in 1937 and 9,198 in the first half of 1938). While NKVD records do not specify the ethnic composition of those executed, they do provide national breakdowns of those arrested. According to these statistics, 54,011 individuals were arrested during the "Polish operation," of whom 39,322 (73 %) were classified as Poles.

The ratio of those executed to the total number of those arrested as part of the "Polish operation" is 62 %. It can be assumed that this proportion also applies to ethnic Poles arrested and executed in the course of the operation. Thus, we arrive at a hypothetical figure of 24,000–25,000 executed ethnic Poles. Based on the data from the 1937 "repressed population census," it can be concluded that between

70 *Chislennost' naseleniya SSSR na 17 yanwaria 1939 g. po rayonam, rayonnym centram, gorodam, rabochim posiolkam i krupnym selskim naselonnym punktam. Po dannym vsesuyuznoj perepisi naseleniya 1939 g.*, Moskva 1941, http://istmat.info/files/uploads/46314/rgae_7971.16.54_naselenie_po_perepisi_1939.pdf (accessed 11 April 2023).

71 Russian State Archive of Economy (hereafter: RPAG FR), f. 1562, op. 336, ed.chr. 966–1001. (Razrabotochnaya tablica f. 15A. Nacionalnyy sostav naseleniya po SSSR, respublikam, oblastiam, rayonam), quoted from www.demoscope.ru (accessed 11 April 2023).

72 O. VOLOVINA – S. PLOKHIJ – N. LEVCHUK – O. RUDNITSKY – A. KOVBASIU – P. SHEVCHUK, "Regionalni vidminnosti vtrat vid hołodu 1932–32 rr. v Ukraini," *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal* 2017, no. 2, pp. 76–116.

73 Calculations based on statistical compilations of the NKVD. See Case No. 35 with data on operational-investigative work from 1st October 1936 to 1st July 1938, Resort State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine (hereinafter: HDA SBU) f. 42, spr. 35, ark. 2–12.

5.5 % and 6 % of the entire Polish population of the USSR was executed during the "Polish operation."

These figures remain incomplete without accounting for the victims from the second half of 1938, as the operation did not conclude until mid-November of that year. According to Statistical reports of the NKVD, 47,327 people were sentenced to death in Ukraine between 25th August 1937 and 15th November 1938.[74] Subtracting the previously mentioned total of 33,447 yields 13,880 individuals sentenced to death between 1st July and 15th November 1938. These estimates indicate that the "Polish operation" was gaining momentum, with The number of victims nearly doubling in its final months. If it is assumed that, during the second half of 1938, the proportion of Poles among those arrested and sentenced to death remained constant at 73 %, this would suggest that approximately 10,000 ethnic Poles were executed in that period. Accordingly, rough estimates indicate that around 34,000–35,000 Ukrainian Poles were victims of the NKVD's "Polish operation".

It is also worth noting that, during other NKVD operations conducted during this period—such as the "kulak operation"—a further 5,781 Poles had been arrested by July 1938, including 1,708 in the first half of that year. Applying the same 62 % execution rate yields an additional 3,500 victims, of whom approximately 1,050 fell in the first half of 1938. When the victims of other operations in the second half of 1938 are added, along with the intensified pace of sentencing in the final months of the "Polish operation," it can be conservatively estimated that the total number of executed Poles was approximately 40,000, or more than 9.5 % of the entire Polish population living in Soviet Ukraine at the time.

An even higher figure—approximately 41,000 Poles executed in the "Polish operation" alone—can be derived through an alternative method.[75] According to NKVD statistics, 55,928 individuals were executed as part of the "Polish operation" throughout the USSR. If 73 % of those arrested and sentenced to death were ethnic Poles, this results in a comparable estimate of the number of ethnic Poles executed, confirming the result via two independent approaches. If we exclude children under the age of 15, who made up 40 % of the Polish population at the time and were generally not subject to repression,[76] then it may be inferred that one in

74 N. PETROV – A. ROGINSKIY, "Polskaya Operatsiya NKVD 1937–1938 gg."

75 N. PETROV – A. ROGINSKIY, "Polskaya Operatsiya NKVD 1937–1938 gg."

76 See *Vsesoyuznaya perepis naseleniya 17 dekabria 1926 g. Kratkiye svodki, vyp. 7: vozrast i gramotnost' naseleniya SSSR*, Moscow 1928.

six or seven adult Poles living in the Ukrainian SSR was killed during the Great Terror.

Of course, the total number of victims of the "Polish operation" also includes those sentenced to imprisonment in correctional labour camps. There were 8,601 such individuals; assuming again that 73 % were ethnic Poles, this would increase the total number of Polish victims of order No. 00485 to approximately 46,000–47,000.

As shown above, 60,000 Ukrainian Poles disappeared between 1937 and 1939. We have already explained where the vast majority of them "disappeared". The question remains open as to where the remaining few thousand missing Poles went. This uncertainty can be explained by the fact that, in 1939, many people concealed their nationality for fear of further repression, and orphans and half-orphans left in the care of relatives or orphanages also "acquired" a different nationality. Deaths resulting from beatings during interrogation in prisons and a decrease in births due to harsh conditions were also not taken into account.

Poland's Reaction

The inquisitive reader will probably ask: what did the pre-war authorities of the Republic of Poland know about this crime committed against compatriots living in the Soviet Union?

The documents of the Polish consular and diplomatic service and intelligence—valuable sources for understanding the state of knowledge of these two administrative divisions of the Polish state—have been preserved only in very incomplete form. Much of the material was dispersed during the Second World War, and what remained was returned to Poland from the Soviet Union in 1948.[77] To this day, it is not known whether the Soviet authorities returned the complete set of seized materials to the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The example of the revindication of archival material from the interwar period suggests that the documents may have been selectively returned.[78] The documents of the MFA headquarters and Polish missions in the USSR have only been partially preserved; many reports are missing,

77 See. correspondence of the Polish and Soviet MFA of February 1948 [in:] Wiesław BALCERAK, ed., *Polsko-radzieckie stosunki kultutalne 1918–1939: dokumenty i materiały* (Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza 1984), pp. 331–332, 334–335.

78 See Jerzy KUMANIECKI (ed.), *P. Wojkow, Tajny raport Wojkowa* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo "Gryf" 1991), p. 171.

and cipher correspondence has been preserved to an even lesser extent. It is therefore unknown what information was contained in the documents that have not survived or remain inaccessible to researchers. For this reason, conclusions should be drawn very cautiously, as the preserved material may offer only a partial picture of what the Polish authorities knew about the situation in the Soviet Union. These materials should be supplemented, as far as possible, by other equally important sources of information used by the Polish authorities during the interwar period.

An analysis of both archival and press sources leads to the conclusion that the Polish authorities made considerable efforts to acquire information about the Soviet Union, primarily due to that state's hostile stance towards Poland. Above all, they sought accurate information regarding the state of the Soviet government, economy, and armed forces. For this reason, the Polish authorities possessed relatively precise knowledge of the increasing terror in the second half of the 1930s. The repressions against the leadership of the VKP(b)[79] and the Soviet armed forces were also analysed in detail. Nor did Warsaw overlook the repression of various religious groups and nationalities that occurred in the late 1930s. Reports described Not only the persecution of large minorities such as the Germans, but also the Russification, deportation, and repression of smaller groups, including the Ingrians.[80] Finally, it should be noted that the Polish authorities closely monitored the activities of Polish Communists and the repression of the Polish Communist Party. Although This information appears only sporadically in diplomatic and intelligence documents, it occurs relatively frequently in the correspondence and analyses of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. It can thus be concluded that the Polish authorities had relatively good information about the political situation in the Soviet Union.

Let us also note that information concerning the situation of the Polish population in the Soviet Union—those who did not choose the option of returning to Poland after the signing of the Riga Treaty in March 1921 and voluntarily remained in the east, often participating in the construction of the Soviet state—was not considered crucial for the security of the Polish state. Nevertheless, the Polish authorities monitored the situation of the Polish population in the Soviet Union and were aware of the repressions to which they were subjected. Jerzy Niezbrzycki, then head of offensive intelligence on Russia, stated in a radio programme in Poland in January 1937: "We state categorically that the one-million-strong

79 All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) (*Vsesoyuznaya kommunisticheskaya partiya (bol'shevikov) – VKP(b)*), VKP(b).
80 Cf. e.g. RGVA, Detachment II of the General Staff of the Polish Army, 308-6-24, k. 18–21.

Polish population in the Soviets is being subjected to humiliation, misery, hunger, displacement from their native homes, religious intolerance and unprecedented exploitation, a hundred times worse than that endured by the other peoples of the Union and a hundred times worse than the Polish people endured during the partition period".[81] Reports were reaching Warsaw concerning the deportation of Poles and the "cleansing" of the border strip of the native population on the Polish–Soviet border, but there was no knowledge of the Polish NKVD operation or of the terrible scale of the repression.[82] This information remained strictly classified and only came to light after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The ability of Polish diplomacy and consular services to assist the Polish population was limited, on the one hand by the provisions of the Riga Treaty, and on the other by the ill will of the Soviet authorities. One may venture the statement that, given the incomplete knowledge of the scale of repression and the crimes committed against Polish citizens, the response of the Polish authorities and their interventions with the Soviet authorities were to some extent proportional to the information they possessed.

Can the "Polish Operation" be Classified as Genocide?

The question remains: what legal qualification should be applied to the "Polish operation"? On 14 July 2009, the Sejm adopted a resolution honouring "the memory of the 150,000 Poles murdered by the NKVD in 1937–1939 as part of the so-called 'Polish operation' during the 'Great Terror'".[83] The Polish parliament recog-

81 RGVA, Detachment II of the General Staff of the Polish Army, sign. 308-3-253a, k. 391–398, Radio broadcast by Ryszard Wraga. Letters "from there", January 1937 (and: Ibidem, Radio broadcast by Ryszard Wraga, The grim truth about Poles in the Soviets, 19 January 1937).

82 See : Sergiusz LEOŃCZYK, "Stosunek władz i społeczeństwa RP do Polonii w RFSRR w okresie międzywojennym," in J. GMITRUK – W. WŁODARKIEWICZ, eds, *Stosunki polityczne, wojskowe i gospodarcze Rzeczpospolitej Polskiej i Związku Radzieckiego w okresie międzywojennym* (Warszawa – Siedlce: Muzeum Historii Polskiego Ruchu Ludowego, Uniwersytet Humanistyczno-Przyrodniczy w Siedlcach, 2012), pp. 301–313; R. KUŚNIERZ, *W świecie stalinowskich zbrodni. Ukraina w latach czystek i terroru (1934–1938) w obserwacjach i analizach MSZ oraz wywiadu wojskowego Drugiej Rzeczypospolitej* (Słupsk: Akademia Pomorska, 2013); Marek KORNAT, *Wacław Grzybowski – ambasador w Moskwie* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2016); R. KUŚNIERZ (ed.), *Nas Polaków nie ma kto bronić Represje wobec Polaków w Związku Sowieckim w latach 1935–1938 w materiałach MSZ i wywiadu wojskowego* (Łomianki: LTW, 2018).

83 Resolution of the Sejm of the Republic of Poland of 14th July 2009 commemorating the victims of crimes committed in the years 1937–1939 against Poles living in the USSR, *Monitor Polski* 2009, No. 46, item 675.

nised this crime as genocide. In 2012, the Sejm reaffirmed this assessment, although the estimated number of Polish victims was revised down from 150,000 to 110,000.[84] Beyond the problematic identification of all victims of the "Polish operation" as ethnic Poles, an equally important issue is the justification for legally qualifying this crime committed by the Soviet authorities as genocide.

The international legal term "genocide" is defined in *The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*, adopted by the UN General Assembly on 9th December 1948.[85] The USSR acceded to the Convention in 1954.[86] This means that, according to the principle of *nullum crimen sine lege poenali anteriori,*[87] functionaries of the Soviet regime cannot be held *criminally* responsible for acts of genocide committed prior to the Soviet Union's ratification of the Convention.

Whether the crimes committed during the "Polish operation" meet the definition of genocide as formulated in the Convention is another matter. The preamble to this treaty, which states that "in all historical periods genocide has inflicted great damage on humanity", makes it clear that this crime is not a new phenomenon. The act itself defines genocide as follows:

"For the purposes of the present Convention, genocide is any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, national, ethnic, racial or religious groups, as such:

(a) the murder of group members,

(b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group,

(c) the deliberate creation for members of a group of living conditions calculated to cause their total or partial physical destruction,

(d) the use of measures to stop births within the group,

84 Resolution of the Sejm of the Republic of Poland of 31st August 2012 on paying tribute to all those murdered and repressed on the territory of the Soviet Union as part of the so-called Polish Operation in 1937–1938, *Monitor Polski* 2012, item 676.

85 See Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/atrocity-crimes/Doc.1_Convention%20on%20the%20Prevention%20and%20Punishment%20of%20the%20Crime%20of%20Genocide.pdf (accessed 2nd December 2019).

86 See United Nations Treaty Series: Treaties and international agreements registered or filed and recorded with the Secretariat of the United Nations, Vol. 190, 1954.

87 The principle of law that the law is not retroactive and does not apply to offences committed before its enactment.

(e) forcibly transferring children of group members to another group".[88]

An analysis of this article, together with the factual evidence of the operation—including the number of victims recorded in statistical reports—clearly shows that the crime against the Poles meets all five criteria of genocide listed above.

The specific nature of this crime—particularly the arrest and execution of a significant portion of the ethnic minority in Ukraine—displays features characteristic of many crimes that have already been recognised as genocide. However, it must be determined whether the Soviet authorities, by issuing order No. 00485, intended to destroy a significant part of the Polish population as such, which would fulfil the legal criteria for genocide, or whether the decision was motivated by other factors, such as political or class-based considerations, which would complicate the application of this legal classification.

In such cases, it is standard procedure to establish the mental state of the perpetrators of the crime—primarily Joseph Stalin himself (i.e. what is defined in criminal law as the subjective element of the crime). Did the Soviet leader intend to exterminate a significant portion of the Poles as such, or was his obsession with the threat of espionage on behalf of Poland the primary motive? It is well known that in interwar Soviet propaganda, Poland was portrayed as a "bourgeois" and hostile state, lying in wait for the right moment to destroy the Soviet Union.

In the judicial practice of international tribunals, such as those for crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia, Cambodia, or Rwanda, it has proved extremely difficult—despite considerable effort—to accurately reconstruct the motives of individuals accused of genocide solely on the basis of their statements. In such cases, context becomes vitally important. For this reason, jurisprudence and legal scholarship have established that the intention to destroy an ethnic or national group should not be equated with the perpetrator's direct personal motivation. The perpetrator may, for example, be pursuing a military or political objective; yet the crime of genocide is still committed if the individual recognises and accepts that the foreseeable consequence of choosing one method over another to achieve that objective will be the destruction of a significant part of an ethnic or national group (i.e. a crime committed with oblique, not direct, intent).[89]

88 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 9th December 1948 (ratified in accordance with the Act of 18th July 1950, Journal of Laws of the Republic of Poland, No. 36, item 325).

89 The reasoning is based on an analysis of the jurisprudential practice of international courts by Ryan Y. PARK, "Proving Genocidal Intent: International Precedent and ECCC Case 002," *Rutgers Law Review* 63 (2010), No. 1.

In this context, the key—and obvious—question is whether Stalin, Yezhov, Uspensky, and the serial executors of their criminal orders in Ukraine understood that the inevitable result of implementing these orders would be the deaths of tens of thousands of innocent members of the Polish community, along with the destruction of the environment in which that community lived and preserved its national customs, language, and faith.

It was not only the leaders of the USSR who understood this. Now that many circumstances surrounding the crime have become well known to researchers, we know that the main executors were aware of it as well. In 1937–1938, NKVD functionaries had to be provided with additional explanations as to why Poles were to be exterminated.[90] The fact that the perpetrators of the "Polish operation" knew exactly what the campaign against "Polish spies" truly entailed is further evidenced by the materials from trials initiated by Lavrentiy Beria, the new head of the Soviet security service, against NKVD officers in 1939–1941 for "violating the socialist rule of law." The purpose of these trials was clear: to purge the ranks of the NKVD of Yezhov's loyalists.[91]

On 22nd August 1939, Alexander Uspensky, the former People's Commissar for Internal Affairs of the Ukrainian SSR and one of the main executors of the "Polish operation", testified during interrogation: "Along with the nationalist part of the Polish population, only by nationality criterion, the Polish population loyal to Soviet power was also arrested".[92] Uspensky himself was soon executed as an "enemy of the people."

In light of all this, there can be no doubt that the NKVD's "Polish operation"—like the Holodomor—was a bureaucratically organised act of Messianic annihilation committed by the totalitarian communist regime of the USSR, and that it meets the legal criteria for genocide. Were the Convention retroactive, the legal consequences would be self-evident. Now, when the perpetrators themselves are no longer alive, one can only hold the Russian Federation accountable for its failure to reckon with the past and its refusal, since 1991, to conduct a thorough investigation into these murders.

90 See N. PETROV – A. ROGINSKIY, "Polskaya Operatsiya NKVD 1937–1938 gg."

91 Valeriy. VASILEV, "'Beriyivska vidlyha' in URSR (kinets 1938–1939 rr.): politychni aspekty," *Z arkhiviv VUChK-GPU-NKVD-KGB* 33 (2009), No 2, pp. 116–135.

92 *Vidlunnia velikoho terroru. Zbirnyk dokumentiv u trioch tomakh*, vol. 3 *Chekisty Stalina w leshchakh "socialistychnoi zakonnosti" Ego-dokumenty 1938–1941 rr* (Kyiv 2019), p. 530.

STUDIE / ARTICLE

In the Signs of the End Days: Eschatological Concerns of the Ruthenian Publisher Francis Skaryna on the Threshold of the Early Modern Period

ULADZIMIR KANANOVICH

L'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales – Centres de Recherches Historiques, Paris, France

In the Signs of the End Days: Eschatological Concerns of the Ruthenian Publisher Francis Skaryna on the Threshold of the Early Modern Period

This article seeks to explain the printing activities of Doctor Francis Skaryna through the prism of the eschatological tensions at the turn of the sixteenth century. By focusing on Skaryna's prints, including the *Ruthenian Bible of Prague* (1517–1519), *Malaia Padarozhnaia Kniha, Liber Viaticus* [The Little Travelling Book] of Vilnius (1521–1522), and the *Apostle of Vilnius* (1525), I examine Francis Skaryna's perceptions concerning the Last Judgement, salvation, and the future fate of humankind, as well as establish possible connections between the Ruthenian printer's ideas and contemporary eschatological perceptions in Europe. To achieve this goal, I place Skaryna's ideas and imagery in a wider European context, with particular emphasis on Southern Germany and the Kingdom of Bohemia

Keywords: Francis Skaryna; *Ruthenian Bible*; Prague; Eschatology; Grand Duchy of Lithuania

Introduction

Francis (Frantsishak) Skaryna is best known today for his printing and publishing activities, first in Prague (1517–1520) and later in Vilnius (1521–1525). His publication of twenty-three books of the Old Testament in Church Slavonic, widely known as the *Ruthenian Bible*, represents the culmination of Skaryna's life and career as a publisher. These texts form part of the shared literary, cultural, and artistic heritage of modern East European nations, in particular Belarusians, Ukrainians, and Lithuanians. Scholarly literature on Skaryna has mostly concentrated on his philosophical, social, and aesthetic ideas, as well as the artistic, literary, and linguistic peculiarities of his works.[1] Unfortunately, with rare exceptions, his worldview and printed works have not been interpreted in the light of Christian eschatology.[2] This omission hinders a fuller understanding of the vicissitudes of Skaryna's life.

To begin with, eschatology was a central and enduring element of Christian thought in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern period, and Skaryna lived during a time of extreme eschatological tension in Europe. Yet medieval and early modern Eastern Europe still plays a surprisingly small role in histories of eschatology. this article therefore seeks, albeit partly, to fill that lacuna. The case of Doctor Skaryna provides a fitting point of departure for discussing pre-modern eschatology in Eastern Europe. my primary aim, then, is to trace the manifestations of Skaryna's personal worldview as it related to Christian eschatology. More precisely, I investigate Skaryna's texts and artworks from the perspective of early sixteenth-century eschatological thought. Finally, I pay particular attention to eschatological symbols and their possible influence on the artforms in the *Ruthenian Bible*.

For the purposes of this paper, I take eschatology (a term derived from the Greek ta *eschata*, meaning 'limit' or 'extreme', coined in the nineteenth century) as a collection of beliefs and expectations related to the End Times. Eschatology, as the study of the last things, played a significant role in medieval and early modern

1 For recent overviews of Skaryna's life and work that may also serve as a starting point for the vast bibliography of scholarship on the subject, see: Evgenii NEMIROVSKII, *Francisk Skorina. Zhizn' i deiatelnost' belorusskogo prosvetitelia*. (Minsk: Belaruskaia litaratura, 1990); Ilya LEMESHKIN, *Portret Frantsiska Skoryny. K 500–letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia knigoizdatela* (Vilnius – Prague: Lietuvių kalbos institutas – Pražský lingvistický kroužek, 2020).

2 Uladzimir KANANOVICH, "Doctor Francis Skaryna and the Heavens: Astrology in the Life of a Sixteenth-Century Book-Printer," *Journal of Belarusian Studies*, vol. 8 (2017), issue 2, pp. 47–68; I. LEMESHKIN, *Portret Frantsiska Skoryny*, pp. 79–82.

culture; it also formed a constituent part of Christian theology. It is also worth emphasising that Christian theology draws a clear distinction between individual or personal eschatology, which concerns the destiny of every human soul after death, and collective eschatology, which focuses on the end of the "world", accompanied by the belief in the Second Glorious Coming of Jesus Christ as the Conqueror of death.[3] As such, eschatology is grounded in the hope of deliverance, since the *eschaton* means, par excellence, resurrection—not only that of Jesus Christ in the first place, but also of the faithful in the last days, in full accordance with Saint Paul, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians (15: 13, 14). Finally, it is necessary to distinguish between eschatology and apocalypticism. Apocalypticism undoubtedly constitutes an essential part of eschatology. Both deal with belief in the End of Time, but with a difference: apocalyptic thinking is based on the imminence of the End of Time, the belief that the Last Things are near or have already arrived.[4]

Living in the *Endzeit*

Skaryna was born into the family of a prosperous merchant in Belarusian Polatsk; his father, Luce, was engaged in the international fur trade in East Central Europe.[5] The identity of Francis's mother is unknown.[6] Luce's family belonged to the Orthodox faith. Some scholars suggest that the future publisher may have converted from Orthodoxy to Catholicism by changing his possibly baptismal name, George, to

3 Veronika WIESER – Vincent ELTSCHINGER, "Introduction: Approaches to Medieval Cultures of Eschatology, vol. I: Medieval Apocalypticism and Eschatology," in *Cultures of Eschatology*, two vols, vol. 1: Empires and Scriptural Authorities in Medieval Christian, Islamic and Buddhist Communities, eds. Veronika WIESER – Vincent ELTSCHINGER – Johann HEISS (Oldenburg: De Gruyter, 2020), pp. 1–22.

4 About the distinctions between eschatology and apocalypticism see especially: Richard LANDES, "Lest be Millennium Be Fulfilled: Apocalyptic Expectations and the Pattern of Western Chronography 1000–800 CE," in *The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle* Ages, *Medievalia Lovaniensia*, vol. I, no. XV, eds. WernerVERBEKE – Daniel VERHELST – Andries WELKENHUYSEN (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988), p. 205.

5 U. KANANOVICH, "Doctor Francis Skaryna and the Heavens," pp. 48–49.

6 At present, scholars speculate that Skaryna's mother may have been an unknow daughter of Duke Alelka Volodymirovich (Alelka Uladzimiravich), Duke of Slutsk, Kapyl and Kyiv, see especially Uladzimir PAŬLOVICH, *Litaraturna-mastatskaja tvorchaść Frantsiska Skaryny. Dzela asvety i vykhavannia moladzi* (Minsk: VARB Publisher, 2019), pp. 108–112.

Francis.[7] Skaryna may have received his initial education in the convent of the Franciscans—Bernardines —in his native town of Polatsk.[8] It was the Bernardines who may have contributed to Francis Skaryna's admission as a student to the Jagiellonian University in Cracow in 1504–1506. Later, in 1512, Francis Skaryna earned a doctoral degree in medicine in Padua.[9] His exact birth date is unknown. It is believed that the future Belarusian publisher and printer was born between 1476 and 1490.[10] Recently, Ilya Lemeshkin, relying on a so-called Skaryna self-portrait from 1517 in the *Ruthenian Bible* and employing the method of semiological analysis, revised previous scholarly conclusions by suggesting that the Ruthenian publisher may have been born in 1470.[11]

During Skaryna's childhood and youth—from the last two decades of the fifteenth century onwards—Christian Europe experienced growing eschatological tension. There was an increasing ferment among Orthodox Christians as the year 1492 approached. This date corresponded to the year 7000 in the Byzantine calendar—the point at which, according to widespread belief in Eastern Europe and particularly in Orthodox countries, the world would come to an end.[12] Apocalyptic expectations for the year 1492 were so strong that Paschal tables (*paschalii*) from the second half of the fifteenth century typically end at this date.[13] In Great Novgorod, the issue divided the official Orthodox church and the so-called Judaizers. Unlike Orthodox writers, who often conceived the end of days as a physical

7 Uladzimir AHIEVICH, *Simvolika hraviury Skaryny* (Minsk: Belaruskaia navuka, 1999), pp. 246–274. However, most contemporary scholars reject that Skaryna's first name was George, accepting that it may have been a scribal error in Latin text, rendering *georgius* instead of *egregius*, that is, venerable, see Henryk ŁOWMIAŃSKI, [recension] Adam STANKEWICZ, *Doktar Franciszak Skaryna perszy drukar bełaruski, 1525–1925* (Wilnja 1924), *Ateneum Wileńskie*, 1925/1926. R. 3, zeszyt 3 (1925/1926), pp. 161–179.

8 E. NEMIROVSKII, *Francisk Skorina*, p. 161; Aleksandr HRUSHA, *Traditsija i ee preodolenie: Rus i Velikoe Kniazhestvo Litovskoe v XII -pervoj treti XVI v.* (Vilnius, EHU Publisher, 2024), pp. 151–152, 172–178. The Franciscans – Observants, also called the Bernardines – who derived their name from Bernard of Siena, who lived and preached in 1380–1444) – have founded the Saint Mary convent and the Saint Francis church in Skaryna's native Polatsk in 1498.

9 Volha SHUTAVA, "Again about Skaryna in Padua: Circumstances," *Belarusian Review* 27 (Spring 2015), no. 1, pp. 23–28.

10 E. NEMIROVSKI, *Francisk Skorina*, pp. 154–156.

11 Ilya LEMESHKIN, "1470 – god rozhdenija F. Skorina," A. HRUSHA, ed., *Frantsysk Skaryna. Novyja dasledavanni* (Minsk: Belaruskaja Navuka, 2019), pp. 23–85.

12 In the Byzantine and post-Byzantine world, the year 1492 as a date from the birth of Jesus Christ corresponded to the year 7000 from the *conditio mundi*. Due to calendar differences, in the Roman-Catholic church, it was the year 1500 that corresponded to the year 7000.

13 Alexei JURGANOV, *Kategorii russkoi srednevekovoi kultury* (Moscow: Miros, 1999), p. 325.

destruction of the world at the close of the seventh millennium, the Judaizers promoted the idea of an evolutionary, non-catastrophic *Endzeit*.[14]

Faced with the steady advance of the Ottomans into Europe and a growing conflict within the Catholic church, Western Europe experienced intensifying eschatological fermentation starting in the last decades of the fifteenth century. One centre of this activity was in southern Germany.[15] The *Pronosticon*, traditionally ascribed to Johannes Lichtenberger, who served for a time as astrologer to Emperor Frederick III, played an outstanding role in the eschatological ferment of the 1480s to 1530s.[16] This work was closely connected with astrology and, to some extent, alchemy; its main point of departure was the nefarious conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in 1484 under the sign of Scorpio and the eclipse of the sun in 1485, which heralded several decades of war, famine, and disease in Europe. In his work, the author discusses the future of the world, including the fate of the Emperor, the Pope, the Turks, and the Jews.[17]

Nuremberg, a prosperous and vibrant merchant centre on the trade route between Flanders and Italy, gradually became an important centre of eschatological ideas and concerns in the Holy Roman empire in the 1490s. It may suffice to mention here just three examples. To begin with, Hartmann Schedel, a native of Nuremberg and a renowned physician (like Skaryna, he defended his doctorate at Padua), published his well-known *Chronica mundi* in 1493. In this work , he left the final leaves blank, so that future readers could record the ultimate events of the age, which were believed to be fast approaching.[18] The book was a complete illustrated history of the world; its woodcuts were widely circulated among readers

---

14 Michael SCHNEIDER, "Judaizers" of Muscovite Russia and Kabbalistic Eschatology," *Jews and Slavs* 24 (2013), pp. 226–227. Their opponents accused the Judaizers rejecting important doctrines of Christianity, including the notion of Holy Trinity and Divine Incarnation, as well as the practice of veneration of icons and the idea of monasticism.

15 Laura SMOLLER-ACKERMAN, "Looking for the End in Late Medieval Germany: Wolfgang Aytinger's Commentary on Pseudo-Methodius," in *Histoire de la fin des temps. Les mutations du discours eschatologique: Moyen Age, Renaissance, Temps modernes*, eds. Édouard MEHL – Christian TROTTMANN (Strasbourg: Presses Universitaires de Strasbourg, 2022), pp. 335–336.

16 Denis CROUZET, "Millennial Eschatologies in Italy, Germany, and France: 1500–1533," *Journal of Millennial Studies* vol. I (1999), issue 2, p. 3.

17 Dietrich KURZE, "Prophecy and History: Lichtenberger's Forecasts of Events to Come (From the Fifteenth to the Twentieth Century). Their Reception and Diffusion," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 21 (1958), no. 1–2, pp. 63–64.

18 Lisa JARDINE, *Worldly Goods. A New History of the Renaissance* (London: Papermack, 1997), pp. 202–203, 319.

across Europe, including in Poland generally and Cracow in particular, where Francis Skaryna began his studies in the early sixteenth century.

Schedel's chronicle undoubtedly had a significant impact on another inhabitant of Nuremberg, a talented young artist of Hungarian descent named Albrecht Dürer (1471–1528). In 1498, Dürer, drawing on the *Book of Revelation by Saint John*—the final book of the *New Testament*—published a series of fifteen woodcuts collected in a single volume under the title the *Apocalypse*, initially in Latin and later also in German. Of all the woodcuts in the *Apocalypse* cycle, the fourth one, the *Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse*, gained the greatest popularity in the society of his era. The four riders depicted in the woodcut symbolise the greatest calamities in the history of humankind.[19] A man on a white horse—the White Rider—carrying a bow and a crown, represents Conquest or Pestilence. A rider on a red horse—the Red Rider—with a sword in his hand, symbolises War. A third equestrian figure, the Black Rider, on a black horse, holding scales in his right hand and dressed as a wealthy merchant, represents Famine or Starvation. Finally, a fourth rider on a pale horse—the Pale Rider—carrying a trident, is none other than Death. For Dürer, wars, famines, and pestilences were signs of the End Days.[20]

Finally, in the southern German city of Ulm in 1499, Johannes Stöffler and Jacob Pflaum published a joint work titled *Almanach*. It was based on the *Ephemerides* of Regiomontanus/Königsberger, a great astronomical work from the third quarter of the fifteenth century. Regiomontanus was the adopted name of the famous fifteenth-century German mathematician and astronomer Johannes Müller (d. 1476), who had also been especially active in Nuremberg during the 1470s.[21] Stöffler and Pflaum prophesied that a conjunction of seven stars in the zodiacal sign of Pisces in February 1524 would produce tremendous alterations in kingdoms, peoples, and laws. Thanks to Printing technology, information about the year 1524 as a potential date for the end of the world spread easily across Europe.[22] There is good reason to believe that the aforementioned works were well known to Francis Skaryna. it is likely that during his student years in Cracow, Skaryna began

19 Martin ANGERER, *Gothic and Renaissance Art in Nuremberg: 1300–1550* (Munich: Prestel-Verlag, 1986), pp. 272–274; Denise Alexandra HARTMANN, "The Apocalypse and Religious Propaganda: Illustrations by Albrecht Dürer and Lucas Cranach the Elder," *Marginalia* (2010), pp. 5–7.

20 D. HARTMANN, "The Apocalypse and Religious Propaganda," pp. 5–8.

21 L. JARDINE, *Worldly Goods*, pp. 198–202, 320.

22 Jonathan GREEN, "Printing and Prophecy. Prognostication and Media Change 1450–1550," *Cultures of Knowledge in Early Modern World* (Ann Arbor, 2012).

to take an interest in this kind of literature. While at Cracow, he may have attended lectures by Jacob Friedel of Kleparz on the philosophical works of John Duns Scotus, the famous Franciscan, which also included eschatological principles and ideas.[23]

Bearing in mind that there were indeed strong cultural connections between Nuremberg and Prague at the turn of the sixteenth century, one can easily suggest that not only people or material goods, but also ideas and representations, could have quickly moved between both centres.[24] In fact, however, eschatological ideas were much older in Prague; the visions of the last things were always strong in the Bohemian capital, at least from the last third of the fourteenth century onwards. Local mendicant friars, particularly the Franciscans, significantly contributed to the spread of these eschatological ideas. The epoch of John Hus (c. 1370–1415) gave a renewed and intensified rise to eschatological expectations in Bohemia.[25] Hus's followers and successors always remained loyal to eschatology.[26] There is no doubt that when Francis Skaryna arrived in Prague in the early sixteenth century, Hussite eschatological ideas still held strong positions there. On the other hand, bearing in mind the close cultural and political relations between the Kingdom of Bohemia and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Ruthenia, and Samogitia in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, Hussite eschatological and apocalyptic ideas may easily have penetrated the realm of the Jagiellonians. In particular, a visit of Jerome of Prague—a close friend and associate of John Hus —to Lithuania's Ruthenian provinces, including Vitsebsk and Polatsk, in 1412–1413, accompanied by the Lithuanian ruler Vytautas (Witold, Vitaut), gave him an excellent opportunity

23 E. NEMIROVSKII, *Frantsisk Skorina*, p. 178.

24 Petr VOIT, "Role Norimberku při utváření české a moravské knižní kultury první poloviny 16. století," *Documenta Pragensia* XXIX (2010), pp. 389–457.

25 Lucie MAZALOVÁ, *Eschatology in the Work of Jan Hus*, (Book Series Europa Sacra, vol. 27) (Brepols, 2022).

26 See especially the recent works by Pavlina Cermanová, Pavlina CERMANOVÁ, "Constructing the Apocalypse: Connections between English and Bohemian Apocalyptic Thinking," in *Europe after Wyclif* (=Fordham Series in Medieval Studies), eds. J. Patrick HORNBECK II – Michael Van DUSSEN (New York: Fordham University Press, 2017), pp. 66–88; Eadem, "The Apocalyptic Background of Hussite Radicalism," in *A Companion to the Hussites*, eds. Michael van DUSSEN – Pavel SOUKUP (Brill's Companion to the Christian Traditions, vol. 90), (Leiden: Brill, 2020), pp. 187–218, Eadem, "The Mediation of God's Word in Hussite. Apocalyptic Exegesis and the Influence of Joachimism," in *Wycliffism and Hussitism: Methods, Impact, Responses*, eds. Kantick GOSH – Pavel SOUKUP (Turnhout: Brepols, 2021), pp. 321–339.

to spread his eschatological teaching among local populations.[27] So, it would be reasonable to suggest that some of Jerome's eschatological and apocalyptic ideas could have taken deep root in the realm of the Jagiellonians. Moreover, as the year 1492 approached, Ruthenian translations from Czech of eschatological content, such as *The Tale of Sybil the Prophetess* and *The Vision of Taudal the Knight*, might have received particular attention in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. A young Francis Skaryna was most likely aware of them. It is the extraordinary astronomical imagery of The *Tale of Sybil* that may have profoundly influenced him.[28] We will later return to this topic.

Skaryna's Eschatology: Iconographical Evidence

Skaryna's sense of mission was undoubtedly to spread God's word and provide care for the souls of believers through the medium of printed sacred texts. As a learned person, he was especially committed to the spread of education and literacy among ordinary people. The publisher seems to have seen his work as a personal redemptive service.[29] This mission was based on recent technical progress, especially the invention of the printing press. Through his publications, Doctor Skaryna intended to reach the bearers of the Ruthenian tongue, whatever their confession might have been—Orthodox, Catholic, or even Protestant. Thus, Skaryna's publishing project was truly ecumenical.[30]

Contemporary scholars agree that it was primarily the growing Ruthenian identity which served as the principal driving force behind Skaryna's publishing activities. Furthermore, he defined Ruthenian identity not in confessional but in

27 Tomasz GRAFF, "The Monarchy of Wladyslaw Jagiello and Jerome of Prague," *Husitský Tábor* 21 (2017), pp. 9–28.

28 Julia VERKHOLANTSEV, *Ruthenica Bohemica: Ruthenian Translations from Czech in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Poland* (=Slavische Sprachgeschichte, vol. 3) (LIT Verlag, 2008), pp. 54–69, 71–84.

29 See also A. HRUSHA, *Preodolenie traditsii*, pp. 67–71.

30 About the Franciscan idea of mission, see, especially, Daniel RANDOLPH, *The Franciscan Concept of Mission in the High Middle Ages* (Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1975). About the Franciscan mission in North America, see Delno WEST, "Medieval Ideas of Apocalyptic Mission, and the Early Franciscans in Mexico," *The Americas*, vol. 45, no. 3 (1989), pp. 293–313.

cultural and ethno-linguistic terms.[31] The publisher saw the intended audience of the Ruthenian Bible as broadly defined as possible. In his preface to the entire Bible, Skaryna especially highlighted: "the Books of the Bible are written openly in that they can be understood by not only by doctors and learned people, but by any simple, ordinary person…".[32]

Thus, he undoubtedly saw his primary mission as bringing the Bible to the vast masses of the Ruthenian people by addressing them in a tongue close to that which they used in everyday communication.[33] One can expect that Doctor Skaryna believed the success or failure of his mission would leave a mark on the key events preceding the Second Coming. So, I argue here that Doctor Skaryna's understanding of his mission was bound to eschatology. It is necessary to emphasise here that the Bible in general, and the Old Testament in particular, are eschatological texts from the very beginning—from the Book of Genesis onwards. In any event, Doctor Skaryna, as a connoisseur of Holy Scripture, was undoubtedly aware of this peculiar feature of the Bible.

The *Ruthenian Bible* produced by Doctor Skaryna in Bohemian Prague in 1517–1519 is a highly decorated artistic chef-d'œuvre. In total, it contains forty engravings, of which twenty-nine are original.[34] As such, the *Ruthenian Bible* holds a distinguished place in European art.[35] For the purposes of this contribution, I argue that the engravings in the *Ruthenian Bible* may carry an eschatological message. However, this message has an extremely implicit character. This may explain why Skaryna's eschatology has not become a topic of scholarly investigation. Here, I am going to consider these images in terms of eschatology. I shall begin with the image of King Solomon in the *Ruthenian Bible* of Prague.

---

31 Serhii PLOKHY, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations. Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 112–114.

32 Translation according to, Arnold MCMILLIN, "Francis Skaryna's Biblical Prefaces and Their Place in Early Belarusian Literature," *Journal of Belarusian Studies* 1 (1988), p. 8.

33 At present, scholars define the language of Francis Skaryna's printings as a Belarusian redaction of the Church Slavonic language, Aliaksandr BULYKA – Arkadź ZHURAŬSKI – Uladzimir SVIAZHYNSKI, *Mova vydanniaŭ Frantsyska Skaryny* (Minsk: Navuka i tekhnika, 1990).

34 Guy PICHURA, "The Engravings of Francis Skaryna in the Biblija Ruska (1517–1519)," *Journal of Belarusian Studies* 1 (1967), no. 3, pp. 156–157.

35 Contemporary scholars consider the engravings of the *Ruthenian Bible* by Francis as a constituent part of the early 16th-century Czech book graphic: PETR VOIT, "Výtvarná složka Skorinovy Bible ruské jako součást české knižní grafiky," *Umění / Art* 4 (LXII) (2014), pp. 334–353.

King Solomon

King Solomon undoubtedly holds a principal place in Doctor Skaryna's biblical visual imagery. For the Ruthenian publisher, as for all Christian believers, King Solomon is an embodiment of a wise and just ruler par excellence, as the engraving *The Judgement of Solomon*—surely one of the finest engravings in the *Ruthenian Bible* from an artistic point of view—emphasises. Another engraving, *Solomon converses with Queen Seba* from the *Book of The Kingdom I*, also contributes to this topic.[36] Furthermore, the engraving *The Anointment of King Solomon* introduces a new aspect of a wise ruler—namely, the ideal of the Anointed of the Lord,[37] who rules by the Grace of God, which has a reference to a future Messiah or Christ. Without doubt, this aspect of Solomon's rulership appears to have been important for the Ruthenian publisher. In general, King Solomon displays all the necessary virtues and individual attributes expected of a future messianic ruler from the seed of David. More importantly, the peaceable ruler (which is the meaning of the name Solomon) prefigured the Son of God, the founder of the Christian Church.

In the iconography of the *Ruthenian Bible*, the theme of Solomon as an ideal ruler and as a model for a future messianic ruler is bound to the central topic of Jerusalem. Jerusalem was first the central city in Judea, where Solomon ruled.[38] In New Testament tradition, Jerusalem is strongly associated with the passion, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ.[39] In the Judeo-Christian eschatological tradition, it is Palestine as the Promised Land —and Jerusalem especially—which was to play a significant role in the final events. In any case, Jerusalem emerges as the central focal point of the eschatological drama of the last days: it is in Jerusalem that the expected messianic ruler will reign, and from whence his power will spread over the entire earth, to the extent that all peoples will recognise his rule.[40]

36 Liavon BARAZNA, ed., *Hraviury Frantsiska* Skaryny (Minsk: Mastatstva, 1972), picture no. 10.

37 The image of the Anointed of the Lord is mentioned exclusively in the Psalms 17 and 18, Marinus De JONGE, "Expectations of the Future in the Psalms of Solomon," *Neotestamentica*. 23 (1989), no. 1, p. 100.

38 Aliaksandr KORSHUNAŬ – Viachaslaŭ CHAMIARYTSKI, eds., *Frantsysk Skaryna. Tvory: Pradmovy, skazanni, pasliasloŭi, akafisty, paskhaliia* (Minsk: Navuka i technika, 1990), p. 23 (Preface to the Book of the Psalms of Solomon).

39 George ATIEH, "Jerusalem in Medieval Christian Thought," *Studies in Comparative Religion* 13 (Summer-Autumn, 1979), no. 3–4, p. 2.

40 M. De JONGE, "Expectations of the Future in the Psalms of Solomon," p. 101–102.

Jerusalem

Jerusalem's imagery holds strongly for Doctor Skaryna. In his prefaces to the Biblical books in the *Ruthenian Bible* and his commentaries on New Testament texts, he often mentions Jerusalem. In addition, Jerusalem holds a significant role in the *Ruthenian Bible*'s iconography. An engraving, *Jeremiah the Prophet of the Lord weeps as he looks over Jerusalem* from the *Book of Lamentations of Jeremiah*, played a significant role in this imagery. This engraving possesses not only a historical but also an eschatological dimension, thus referencing not only the past but also the future.[41] Jeremiah appears in the *Preface to the Lamentation of Jeremiah* as a prophet of God, who prophesied for forty years in Judea regarding the future destruction of Jerusalem under King Sedekia.[42] This prophecy came true when the king of Babylon, Nabuchodonosor, arrived with an immense army, besieged Jerusalem, and eventually conquered the city. The above-mentioned episode in the history of Jerusalem is presented in an engraving, *Nabuchodonosor the King of* the *Babylonians conquers Jerusalem*, from *the Book of Kingdoms IV* in the *Ruthenian Bible*.[43] As a result of the conquest, King Sedekia and the wealthiest citizens of Jerusalem were led into captivity in Babylon; poor people, including Jeremiah himself, were, however, allowed to remain in Jerusalem. Jeremiah, however, prophesied not only the destruction of Jerusalem, but also foretold the future restoration of the city after seventy years of devastation.

Skaryna clearly appreciated the dual nature of Jerusalem—both earthly and heavenly. There is nothing surprising in this appreciation: the dialectical relationship between the earthly and heavenly Jerusalem lay at the very heart of medieval attitudes towards the Holy City. More precisely, in the preface to *the Book of Joshua the Nun*, he explicitly treats the earthly Jerusalem, a geographical and former political centre of the Promised Land which had rejected the Lord's mission of salvation, as the land of the dead.[44] For the publisher, however, this earthly Jerusalem is opposed to a heavenly Jerusalem—God's Kingdom—as the land of the living. In *the Preface to the Book of Moses II*, Skaryna describes, relying on Galatians 4: 26, the heavenly Jerusalem as "the mother of all of us", that is, of all faithful Christians.[45]

41 L. BARAZNA, *Hraviury*, picture no. 32.
42 *Francysk Skaryna. Tvory*, p. 72.
43 L. BARAZNA, *Hraviury*, picture no. 12.
44 A. KORSHUNAŬ – V. CHAMIARYTSKI, eds., *Frantsysk Skaryna. Tvory*, p. 41.
45 Ibidem, p. 65.

The above-mentioned cases, both from Skaryna's prefaces to Biblical texts and from the *Ruthenian Bible*'s iconography, clearly reveal that there is a connection between Jerusalem and eschatology in these sources. There is no doubt that Skaryna was conscious of the eschatological role of Jerusalem. For him, the decline of the earthly Jerusalem concludes a lengthy previous epoch, associated with ancient Israel, to be followed by a celestial Jerusalem.

The *Lamentation of the prophet Jeremiah* also contains eschatological content and meaning.[46] For Skaryna, the lamentation of Jeremiah over the ruins of Jerusalem undoubtedly symbolises the cry of Jesus Christ in Jerusalem, as Jesus knew that the Holy City would not recognise him as the Messiah.[47] In the Preface to Jeremiah, this episode has a clear eschatological meaning: the Lord himself predicted a new destruction of Jerusalem, which was fulfilled under the Roman emperors Titus and Vespasian.[48] Modern scholarship treats some elements of *the Book of the Lamentation of Jeremiah* as eschatological.[49]

The Temple of King Solomon in Jerusalem

Finally, I would like to stress the connection between King Solomon, Jerusalem, and the Temple of Jerusalem. During its long history, the earthly Jerusalem was strongly associated with the Temple. The Temple of Jerusalem, which was initially located on Mount Zion (Temple Mount), was a central holy place in the city; it was at the very heart of Israel.[50]

Doctor Skaryna's attitude towards the Temple of Jerusalem seems to have been quite ambivalent. For him, it was a symbol of faith, a sacred place for both Jews and Christians. As such, the publisher highly appreciated the historical significance of the temple. In addition, Skaryna provided a visualisation of the Temple in the *Ruthenian Bible*. An engraving *King Solomon builds a Temple to the Lord God*

46 About the sources of this engraving, see Olga SHUTOVA, "'And He Wept over Jerusalem': On Possible Sources of Francysk Skaryna's Engraving of Prophet Jeremiah in *Bivlia Ruska*," *Knygotyra* 80 (2023), pp. 43–80.

47 A. KORSHUNAŬ – V. CHAMIARYTSKI, eds., *Frantsysk Skaryna. Tvory*, p. 72.

48 Ibidem, pp. 72–73.

49 Yair HOFFMANN, "Eschatology in the Book of Jeremiah," Kenning Graf Reventlow, ed., *Eschatology in the Bible and in the Jewish and Christian Tradition* (=Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplemental Series 243 (Sheffield, 1997), pp. 75–97.

50 G. ATIEH, "Jerusalem in Medieval Christian Thought," p. 3

in Jerusalem from *the Book of Kings III* depicts the process of constructing the temple.[51] Visibly, the building looks like a Gothic structure. In the engraving *The Temple built by Solomon* from the same Biblical book, one can see the completed church construction.[52] What we see in this engraving is far from medieval Gothic architecture: the Temple displays clear Italianate architectural features.[53] As such, it is depicted as a square, three-storey stone building, with three horizontal balconies. Further, the building has round balustrades and arched windows. Stylistically, it resembles more a fifteenth-century Florentine palazzo than a contemporary church. This vision of the Temple of Jerusalem, Skaryna most likely adopted from Nicholas of Lyra, a well-known French Biblical exegete in the Late Middle Ages. In particular, the depiction of the Temple of Solomon in *the Ruthenian Bible* is similar, albeit not identical, to the Temple of Jerusalem in the *Postilla* commissioned between 1494 and 1497 for king Manuel I of Portugal (1495–1521).[54] King Manuel's Postilla, in turn, may have been influenced by the Scotto and Locatelli *Postilla* printed in Venice in 1489.[55] Future studies will reveal whether there is a connection between the imagery of the Scotto and Locatelli *Postilla* of Venice and *the Skaryna Ruthenian Bible of Prague*.

To summarise, the Temple of Jerusalem as depicted in *the Ruthenian Bible* may have symbolised a Christian church, especially bearing in mind that the Book of Kings III also contains depictions of various Christian liturgical vessels and subjects. In particular, the Temple of Solomon from the Book of Kings III seems to have prophesied the Advent of Jesus Christ. In his comments on the Book of Ruth, Skaryna writes: "Mount Zion – upon which the temple of God has been, and upon which Jesus will ascend, when the days of cleansing are fulfilled".[56] Thus, the establishment of the Lord on Mount Zion would mean a new future, a new period in the history of salvation – God's Kingdom on Earth. This passage is reminiscent of a Christian exegesis concerning the Temple of Jerusalem. It is close to correspond-

51 L. BARAZNA, *Hraviury*, picture no. 14.

52 Ibidem, picture no. 44.

53 On this dichotomy, see Helen ROSENAU, *The Vision of the Temple. The Image of the Temple of Jerusalem in Judaism and Christianity* (London: Oresko Books, 1979), pp. 37–38, 42.

54 Sarah BROMBERG, "Exegetical Imagery for King Manuel I of Portugal. Solomon's Temple in Nicholas of Lyra's Postilla," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte,* vol. 7 (2014), no. 2, pp. 175–198.

55 S. BROMBERG, "Exegetical Imagery for King Manuel I," pp. 183–184. It is the Nuremberg Postilla of Anton Koberger (1481) may have influenced Doctor Skaryna's imagery of the temple.

56 A. KORSHUNAŬ – V. CHAMIARYTSKI, eds., *Frantsysk Skaryna. Tvory*, p. 67.

ing passages from Giles of Viterbo's famous sermon *De Aurea Aetate*, from 1507.[57] So, one may conclude that the image of the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem has a clear eschatological meaning for Doctor Skaryna. Other engravings in *the Ruthenian Bible* may also have carried an eschatological message. In the first lieu, it is the well-known and highly debated Doctor Skaryna's portrait.

The Holy Trinity

Finally, an engraving called *Holy Trinity*, in *the Book of Genesis*, 1519, also has an eschatological meaning.[58] It consists of two parts. In the upper half, one can see a three-faced figure of God depicted sitting on a throne, surrounded by Seraphim and Cherubim. In the lower half, the focus is on three angels, armed with a sword, a spear, and a bow correspondingly, who are struggling against the hosts of Satan. There is an absolute agreement in modern scholarship that the engraving Saint Michael is triumphing over demons from the *Apocalypse* executed by Albrecht Dürer in 1498 must have inspired the lower part of the *Holy Trinity* in the Ruthenian Bible.[59] Skaryna, however, creatively reworked the image by Dürer. The most decisive difference between the depictions in Dürer's *Apocalypse* and Skaryna's *Holy Trinity* is that the figures of the hosts of Satan in the latter's rendition are in black, most likely to emphasise a dramatic moment of the eternal struggle of good with evil. Furthermore, of the four angels in Dürer's engraving, only three remain in Skaryna's work. Finally, depictions of a dragon are absent in the *Holy Trinity* by Skaryna.

57 Compare, S. BROMBERG, "Exegetical Imagery for King Manuel I," p. 192. Giles de Viterbo was one of key speakers at the Fifth Lateran Council, held in Rome in 1512–1517. Doctor Skaryna may have met Giles de Viterbo in Rome in the autumn 1512, where he could have arrived from Padua. Among the participants of the Lateran Council was the contemporary bishop of Lutsk and Brest, Paul Algimont, duke of Halshany, with whom Francis Skaryna seems to have studied at Cracow. Skaryna undoubtedly benefited the occasion to come to Rome from Padua. See Nelson MINNICH, "The Participants at the Fifth Lateran Council," *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 12 (1974), pp. 157–206.

58 L. BARAZNA, Hravuiry.

59 About Dürer's *Apocalypse*, see M. ANGERER, *Gothic and Renaissance Art in Nuremberg*, pp. 272–274.

Skaryna's Self-Portrait in *the Ruthenian Bible*: An Eschatological Message?

Art historians have long been preoccupied with Skaryna's portrait in the *Ruthenian Bible*. There are two self-portraits in the Bible, one in the *Book of Sirach* (1517) and another in the *Fourth Book of Kingdoms* (1518).[60] Scholars have argued that Dürer's engraving, *Der heilige Hieronymus im Gehäus* from 1514, may have been a source of artistic inspiration for Skaryna.[61] The engraving depicts a Renaissance scholar in his study, wearing garments that reveal him to be a physician.[62] The man is standing (or sitting) on the pulpit, which is located on a table. He is engaged in writing in a book, while consulting another book on a special stand to the right of him. Furthermore, the doorway contains two decorated columns. There are various attributes of academic life in the study, including books on the shelves, an astrolabe hung from the ceiling, baskets with plants, and vases.[63] The writing tools and shelves with books depict a learned scholar. The man's countenance is full of serenity, penitence, and sadness. This expression may indicate not only a translator but also a visionary, a dreamer. As such, the engraving evokes an ideal of a contemplative and solitary scholar.

In a recent study of Skaryna's portrait, Ilya Lemeshkin suggests that this picture may have functioned on two levels: both as a Biblical engraving depicting Saint Jerome and as a personal portrait of the Ruthenian physician and publisher.[64] In presenting himself as a disciple of Saint Jerome, Skaryna positioned himself as an erudite scholar among his colleagues.[65] Thus, Skaryna successfully exploited the

60 There is also a portrait of Skaryna in an exemplar of *the Book of Exodus*, which is now in the Saint Petersburg branch of the Russian National Library; other known exemplars of Skaryna's *Book of Exodus* lack the portrait.

61 I. LEMESHKIN, *Portret Frantsiska Skoryny*, pp. 141–144.

62 Medieval and Renaissance art depicted physicians in a manner like Doctor Skaryna in depicted on his portrait. Compare especially the portraits of the fathers of medicine, including Hippocrates, Galen, and Avicenna as depicted in the popular medical treatise *Liber canonis totius medicine* (Paris, 1522), which was an important text for generations of physicians in the Middle Ages and Early Modern period. It is likely that a Doctor of Medicine such as Francis Skaryna would have consulted this book on regular basis in his professional activities.

63 Recently, Ilya Lemeshkin suggested that the vases (or jars) in the portrait are nothing other than vessels for ink: I. LEMESHKIN, *Portret Frantsiska Skoryny*, pp. 149–150.

64 I. LEMESHKIN, P*ortret Frantsishka Skoryny*, pp. 158–159.

65 On the personal appropriation of Saint Jerome's cult among European humanists in contemporary historiography, see, for example, Anja BOŽIČ, "Hieronimus, Patronus meus: Self-Fashioning in Pier Paolo Vergerio's Sermones pro Sancto Hieronymo," *Annals of Medieval Studies at CEU*, vol. 27 (2021), pp. 114–128.

possibilities that the printing press provided for self-imagining and self-fashioning. Saint Jerome was renowned as the translator of Biblical texts from Greek into Latin, the so-called Vulgate. Persons of learning in late medieval and Renaissance Europe especially valued Jerome's erudition, piety, and penitence. In the case of Skaryna, an ethnic factor may have played an additional role: contemporaries often called Saint Jerome an Illyrian, Slav, or even Dalmatian.[66]

However, Saint Jerome was not only a translator of Biblical texts; he, alongside Saint Augustine, was the founder of an extremely influential Christian eschatological tradition. The pronouncements of both Augustine and Jerome served as a basis for medieval eschatological exegesis.[67] Jerome interpreted the future apocalyptic events as a confrontation of the individual with death. Moreover, he considered the events depicted in Biblical books not as mere distant historical facts but in the context of his own day.[68] As such, Jerome's commentaries weave together historical explanation of the text with spiritual (allegorical) interpretation. This ancient exegetical tradition was still alive among the Franciscans in the early sixteenth century. Skaryna was surely aware of the role that Jerome played in Christian eschatological exegesis. Skaryna's choice of Jerome as a model was thus not arbitrary.

I argue that specific objects employed in the portrait may have an eschatological meaning.[69] First, there is an hourglass, which symbolises the transience of

66 Ines IVIĆ, "The "Making" of a National Saint: Reflections on the Formation of the Cult of Saint Jerome in the Eastern Adriatic," *Visualizing Past in a Foreign Country: Schiavoni/Illyrian Confraternities and Colleges in Early Modern Italy in comparative perspective*, eds. Giuseppe CAPRIOTTI – Francesca COLTRINARI – Jasenka GUDELJ (Macerata: Edizioni Università di Macerata, 2018), p. 262.

67 Leah DeVUN, *Prophecy, Alchemy, and the End of Time: John Rupercissa in the Late Middle Ages* (New York-Chichester: Columbia University Press, 2009), p. 40.

68 Thomas SCHECK, trans., *The Fathers of the Church. Saint Jerome Commentary on Matthew* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2008), pp. 24–30. About Saint Jerome's eschatology and his exegetical method see also, John O'CONNELL, *Eschatology of Saint Jerome* (Mundelein Illinois: Saint Mary of the Lake Seminary, 1948). Unfortunately, this rare book was inaccessible during the work on the current article. The monograph of Regis Courtray also constitutes an important contribution to the topic, Regis COURTRAY, "Der Danielkommentar des Hieronymus," in *Die Geschichte der Daniel–Auslegung in Judentum, Christentum und Islam: Studien zur Kommentierung des Danielbuches in Literatur und Kunst* (=Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 371), eds. Katharina BRACHT – David du TOIT (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2007), pp. 123–150.

69 For an analysis of the objects in Skaryna's portrait, albeit without considering their eschatological meaning and importance, see Viktar SHMATAŬ, "Partret Frantsyska Skaryny," *Spadchyna Skaryny. Zbornik materyialaŭ Pershykh Skarynaŭskikh chytanniaŭ*, ed. Adam MALDZIS (Minsk: Navuka i technika, 1989), pp. 167–202, especially pp.184–195.

time. As a symbol of inevitable death, it serves as a reminder that, with every day that passes, the end of either one's own life or of the world draws closer. Likewise, the candlestick or candle (a Paschal candle) on the table has an eschatological connotation: it symbolises the risen Christ and the light of His truth. Furthermore, the scholar is sitting between two lion-like figures. The imagery of the lion, as the most frequently mentioned beast in the Bible,[70] is strongly associated with the Heavenly throne, especially with regard to *the Last Judgement* (Revelation 4:7). Holy Scripture often refers to Jesus Christ Himself as a "Lion of Judah" (Revelation 5:5).[71]

Furthermore, two heraldic devices in *the Ruthenian Bible* may also hold particular significance for a better understanding of Skaryna's eschatological worldview. The first device is a geometrical figure: a trapezoid with two sticks on the upper sides and a cross on top. Some contemporary scholars believe that this emblem represents a tabernacle, decorated with a Calvary Cross, the two sticks being a pole (without a sponge with vinegar) and a lance.[72] The second device in the engraving is a figure that is sometimes interpreted as a Tau cross inscribed in a triangle.[73] In the Middle Ages, artists often depicted the Cross of the Crucifixion as a Tau cross. There was a close association between the Cross of Christ and the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet, the Tau, which often took the shape of a "T". Thus, the Tau cross in Skaryna's engraving may also carry an eschatological meaning, announcing the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. It is a symbol of all those to whom the End Times will bring deliverance (Ezekiel 9:4). Since the time of Francis of Assisi, who strongly believed in the Second Coming and the Last Judgement, the Tau cross has become a central element of Franciscan symbology.

To conclude, the symbols in Skaryna's portrait in the *Ruthenian Bible* appear to reflect his eschatological worldview. In an encoded form, the publisher sends a message to his readers concerning the end of the world, with particular emphasis on the Second Coming of Christ, the resurrection of the righteous, and the Last Judgement. Simultaneously, Skaryna seems to have reminded his audience

---

70 In the Bible, the lion is not only an emblem of power and strength but also a symbol of intellectual excellence.

71 Ford MASSYNGBERDE, *Revelation* (The Anchor Bible 38) (New York: Doubleday, 1975), p. 87.

72 Sergejus TEMČINAS (Sergei Temchin), "Golgofskij krest and verkhozavetnoi skiniei na graviurnom portrete Frantsiska Skoriny," in *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės kalbos, kultūros ir raštijos* tradicijos, eds. Sergejus Temčinas et al. (Vilnius 2009), pp. 152–168.

73 Sergei TEMCHIN, "Tau krest v treugolnike na graviurnom portrete Frantsiska Skoriny," *Francysk Skaryna: asoba, dziejnaść, spadčyna*, ed. Alexander Hrusha (Minsk: Belaruskaja Navuka, 2018), pp. 146–153.

of the transience and vanity of human life on earth, which, like the surrounding world, has an end. Skaryna's portrait in the *Ruthenian Bible* thus forms part of a tradition of sixteenth-century artworks that carried an eschatological message.[74]

Deciphering Skaryna's Emblem

The engravings in the *Ruthenian Bible* are rich in symbolism indeed. Here I shall confine myself to analysing the most important symbol in the *Ruthenian Bible*: an image of the sun and a thin sickle of a waxing moon. What is especially interesting is that the sun and the moon have clear anthropomorphic features; in addition, they are set within a heraldic shield. At present, most scholars agree that this emblem represents Francis Skaryna's personal coat of arms.[75] Other scholars consider that this image may also serve as a printer's logo or an artist's sign.[76]

Other scholars went even further in their interpretations of Skaryna's solar-lunar symbology. For example, Mikola (Mikalai Shchakatsikhin), a famous Belarusian historian of arts in the interwar period, has suggested that he must have been born in March 1486, when a solar eclipse happened in various parts of Europe, including Polatsk. According to Shchakatsikhin, the solar eclipse, which chronologically coincided with Skaryna's early life, strongly impacted Skaryna's imagination, to the extent that he chose this celestial event as his personal emblem or even a coat of arms.[77] This hypothesis is followed by other scholars, including the author of a recent biography on Skaryna, Nikolai Nemirovskii.[78] Shchakatsikhin's suggestion is plausible but highly speculative. However, there is no reliable evidence, either implicit or explicit, that his birth date was chronologically related to the solar eclipse of 1486. This does not mean, however, that this date is not possible. To complete this part of the contribution, it is necessary to mention that, quite recently, Ilya Lemeshkin suggested that the Ruthenian publisher might have been born in 1470.[79] Lemeshkin's approach, which he calls a method of semiological

74 I am especially indebted to Docent Doug SHORT (NCMA, Amsterdam) for sharing his electronic article "Saint Jerome in his Study: A Masterpiece of Eschatology."

75 Aliaksei SHALANDA, *Kod Frantsishka Skaryny, Heraldychnyia materyialy u prazhskikh i vilenskikh vydanniakh belaruskaha pershadrukara* (Minsk: Belaruskaia navuka, 2017), p. 154.

76 P. VOIT, "Skorinovy Bible ruské," p. 348 ; I. LEMESHKIN, *Portret Frantsiska Skoryny*, p. 83.

77 Mikola SHCHAKATSIKHIN, "Kali radziŭsia Frantsishak Skaryna," *Polymia* 5 (1925), p. 148.

78 E. NEMIROVSKII, *Frantsisk Skorina*, pp. 155–156.

79 I. LEMESHKIN, "1470 – god rozhdenija F. Skorina," pp. 23–85.

analysis, is grounded on a detailed study of all elements in Skaryna's portrait in the *Book of Sirach* of 1517. it is a combination of the Slavonic letters MЗ (47) in the portrait, earlier interpreted mostly as a painter's or an artist's signature, which allowed the scholar to conclude that these figures might have meant Skaryna's actual age when he embarked on the printing of the Book of Sirach. Furthermore, a simple calculation must have given Skaryna's date of birth: 1517–47 = 1470.

When considering Skaryna's emblem or sign within a broader European framework, it bears a resemblance to the marks used by late medieval and Renaissance merchants. These included both simple geometric figures and more complicated images, also a celestial body or a combination of celestial signs, related closely to the owner's occupation or worldview. Certain merchants' marks were like coats of arms and served as commercial heraldic symbols. The merchants' marks not only served to identify the owner but also indicated his social status and testified to the quality of a work accomplished. They were utilised for a wide range of business purposes as broadly defined. Merchants' marks identified legal documents, labelled merchandise containers, adorned buildings, and marked private possessions like books. Finally, merchants' marks sometimes bore a special message.[80] As we see, Skaryna's heraldic device ideally fits all the above-mentioned criteria.

Let us, however, return to our main topic. It was Petr Voit who has recently paid attention to the spiritual dimensions of Skaryna's emblem, in its close connection with Dürer's *Apocalypse*.[81] Indeed, there are strong grounds for believing that Skaryna's celestial imagery drew on inspiration from late medieval South German art.[82] More concretely, Voit proposed to discuss Skaryna's emblem from the point of view of Christological learning. In this way, following the Czech scholar, the

80 This part of contribution is grounded on Willliam C. EWING, "Notices of the Norwich Merchant Marks," *Norfolk Archaeology* 3 (1852), pp. 176–225. See also, A. F. GIRLING, *English Merchants' Marks. A Field Survey of Marks Made by Merchants and Tradesmen in England between 1400 and 1700* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), and especially Hugh William DAVIS, *Devices of the Early Printers, 1457–1560: Their History and Development, with a Chapter on Portrait Figures of Printers* (London: Grafton & Company, 1935).

81 P. VOIT, "Skorinovy Bible ruské," p. 348.

82 By contrast, Belarusian historian Oleg Litskevich discusses Doctor Skaryna's main emblem within the frameworks of the East-European Orthodox tradition. He particularly stresses that the emblem may have symbolized special astronomical tables (*skara*), to calculate exact dates of the Paschaliae based on solar and lunar circles: Oleg LITSKEVICH, "Skorina i skara: K voprosu o znachenii emblemy 'solntse i luna,'" *Materyjaly mižnarodnaha Kanhresa 500 hadoŭ belaruskaha knihadrukavannia* (Minsk, 14–15 verasnia). *Nacyjanalnaja biblijateka Belarusi* (Minsk: Nacyjanalnaja biblijateka Belarusi, 2017), pp. 238–242. However, the association of Skaryna's family name with the name of this special astronomical table seems to be highly speculative.

depiction of both celestial bodies on Skaryna's emblem can indicate the victory of the Church of Christ (the Sun) over the Old Testament synagogue (the crescent Moon).[83] Voit concludes that the principal aim of this visual message was to emphasise that both the Old Testament and the New Testament, as grounded on the Old Testament, form two different but closely connected parts of an entire Biblical tradition.

Voit's Christological approach towards Skaryna's emblem undoubtedly marks a serious turn in the study of the symbolism of Skaryna's prints. Relying on Voit's suggestion, we are going to build our argumentation further. My main point here is that Skaryna's solar-lunar emblem is an ambivalent sign that is subject to interpretation on various levels.

Before I elaborate, I would like to offer a summary of solar-lunar symbology in history and art. The tradition of anthropomorphic depictions of celestial bodies appeared for the first time in the region of the Fertile Crescent, and representations of the sun with a human face were especially popular in ancient Mesopotamia. This artistic tradition flourished in Greco-Roman Antiquity and was later incorporated by nascent Christianity.[84] Just like in Antique art, the Sun and the Moon, at least since the ninth century, appear as personified images: the Sun as a man with a crown of rays and the Moon as a woman with a moon crescent.[85] According to Christian exegesis, the sun traditionally symbolises Jesus Christ and the moon means the Church.[86] Sometimes, the moon may have symbolised the Blessed Mary.[87] In this way, in Christian exegesis, the relations between Christ the Sun and the Church the Moon as Bridegroom and Bride were well established.

As for anthropomorphic images of the Sun and the Moon in Christian art, they appeared later: the depiction of the sun as a disk of rays and the moon as a cres-

83 P. VOIT, "Skorinovy Bible ruské," pp. 348–349.

84 Jerzy MIZIOLEK, "'When our Sun is Risen': Observations on the Eschatological Visions in the Art of the First Millennium-I," *Arte Christiana* 82 (1994), no. 763, pp. 246–249.

85 Hannelore SACHS – Ernst BADSTÜBNER – Helga NEUMANN, (eds.), *Christliche Ikonographie in Stichworten* (Munich-Berlin: Koehler and Amelang, 1996), p. 318.

86 Jean-Claude SCHMITT, "Quand la lune nourrissait le temps avec du lait. Le temps du cosmos et des images chez Hildegarde de Bingen," *Traditions et temporalité des images*, eds. Giovanni CARERI – François LISSARRAGUE – Jean-Claude SCHMITT, et al., (Paris : Editions EHESS, 2009), pp. 78–79.

87 Urszula SZULAKOWSKA, *Alchemical Virgin Mary in the Religious and Political Context of the Renaissance* (Cambridge United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 6–9.

cent, each with inscribed faces, dates in Europe from the thirteenth century.[88] In Christian art, the solar–lunar symbology was also related to Jesus Christ's Incarnation. This symbology was especially popular in portrayals of the prophecies of the Sibyl concerning Jesus Christ's Nativity. For example, a famous drawing from the *Speculum humanae salvationis* (*Spiegel menschlicher gesuntheit*), a manuscript codex that was produced in the Southern German lands in the 1420s–1430s, depicts a Sibyl explaining her vision to the emperor Octavianus Augustus; above them is a young, crowned lady with a child in her hands, who is accompanied by an anthropomorphic sun and moon.[89] So, from the very beginning, the solar–lunar symbology had a clear Christological meaning, relating to both His Nativity and His Resurrection.

Gradually, within the fifteenth century, the eschatological role of Christ the Sun was appreciated in medieval Christian society: it was expected that the Saviour would come at the End of Times "like the rising sun".[90] As such, this symbology served to prophesise the future triumph of Christ and His Church. Scholars have noted that a similar solar-lunar symbology, albeit not an identical combination of celestial objects, is an attribute of the *Chronica mundi* by Hartmann Schedel (1493).[91] In this chronicle, it relates to the birth of Alexander the Great. According to the *Chronica mundi*, the celestial signs accompanied the birth of a future emperor: "In these days, when Alexander was born, the Romans were frightened by dreadful signs. For one saw the sun fighting with the moon, and rocks sweated blood. Multiple moons were visible in the daytime sky. The night in large measure yielded to the day. Rocks fell from the clouds; and hail beat the earth for seven days, everywhere, with a mixture of stones, the residue of slate and shells."[92]

This depiction reflects an ancient tradition, when important political and social events, including the birth of a future great emperor, were frequently described metaphorically through cosmic upheavals. Solar and lunar eclipses had a particularly significant role among the celestial signs. What is more important is that Alexander the Great appears here as an eschatological figure. This attitude cer-

88 H. SACHS – E. BADSTÜBNER – H. NEUMANN, *Christliche Ikonographie in Stichworten*, p. 319.

89 See *Spiegel menschlicher gesuntheit*, Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, Cod. Pal. germ. 432, p. 12v, available at: https://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/cpg432 (accessed March 3, 2024).

90 J. MIZIOLEK, "When our Sun is Risen," p. 250.

91 G. PICHURA, "The Engravings of Francis Skaryna," p. 155.

92 As translated in Walter SCHMAUCH et al., eds., *First English edition of the Nuremberg chronicle* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2010), p. LXXI.

tainly reflected both Jewish and Christian traditions about the great emperor who will pave the way for the real Messiah at the End of Times.[93]

By the sixteenth century, a joint combination of the Sun and the Moon had firmly entered Christian art; as such, it appears both in contemporary engravings and in church painting. The images of both celestial bodies, in their anthropomorphic form, are present in Dürer's engraving Crucifixion (1498), intended as an essential part of the master's series of eleven woodcuts known as the Great Passion (1497–1510).[94] This example clearly reveals a Christological meaning of the images of the Sun and the Moon. The Great Passion undoubtedly enjoyed enormous popularity in Germany and beyond, including Bohemia.

What is especially relevant for the purposes of this contribution is that the depictions of the celestial bodies in *the Ruthenian Bible* by Francis Skaryna are close to those depicted in the sixteenth-century German *Flügblätter* (flyers). The *Flügblätter* were intended to warn the local population of unexpected events, like war, fire, disease, or a confrontation with neighbours, etc., such as in the case of the fall of Jerusalem.[95] From a theological point of view, however, the signs on the celestial bodies often indicated the Last Judgement.[96] Bearing in mind that Francis Skaryna might have visited Nuremberg, it is logical to suggest that he might have been aware of such images.[97] If this reasoning is correct, it appears then that the South German *Flügblätter* may have been sources of inspiration for the Ruthenian publisher. In this way, Skaryna used the images throughout *the Ruthenian Bible* to send his eschatological message to the believers. The Bible itself served as evidence—in this case, as proof of the correctness of the message.

Very soon, however, this Christian celestial symbology found its way into another field of human erudite activities. The symbology of a sun and a crescent moon became widespread in late medieval alchemical literature, due to the spread

93 Ory AMITAY, *From Alexander to Jesus* (Berkeley-London: University of California Press, 2010), p. 128.

94 The tradition of depiction of the celestial bodies in the scenes of Crucifixion dates back at least in Germany to the eleventh century, the famous Uta-Evangel (about 1020): H. SACHS – E. BADSTÜBNER – H. NEUMANN, *Christliche Ikonographie in Stichworten*, pp. 318–319.

95 Axel JANECK, ed., *Zeichen am Himmel*, *Flügblätter des 16. Jahrhundert* (=25. Wechselausstellung der Graphischen Sammlung des Germanischen Nationalmuseums Nürnberg, 12. März bis 29. August 1982) (Nuremberg: Germanisches Nationalmuseum, 1982), p. 22.

96 Ibidem, p. 56.

97 Skaryna most likely to have known the flyer called *Der Meteor Eisisheim*, produced by Michael Greyff in South German Reutlingen in November 1492, and accompanied by the text of a famous poet, Sebastian Brandt, *Zeichen am Himmel*, pp. 6–7.

of the influential alchemical text *Epistola solis ad lunam crescendam*. This text was a Latin translation of a famous Arabic treatise, *Risālatu'l-shams ilā al-hilāl* [Letter of the Sun to the New Moon], written by Muhammad ibn Umail al-Tamimi (Senior Zadith).[98] Muhammad ibn Umail was an early Arabic alchemist who lived in tenth-century Spanish Cordoba. Ibn Umail was a very prolific author; his most famous treatise was the *Book of the Silvery Water and the Starry Earth, or Kitāb al-mā' al-waraqī wa-al-arḍ al-najmīyah*, which was known in late medieval Europe under the title *Book of Senior or Tabula Chemica*. In late medieval Europe, the *Epistola solis ad lunam crescendam* was a constituent part of alchemical and hermetical texts, like, for example, the *Rosarium*, widely popular in South Germany.

In a hermetical or alchemical tradition, the sun allegorically represents Sulphur, and the moon symbolises mercury, two primary elements necessary for alchemical work, with mercury generally serving as a dissolvent.[99] A particular combination of these elements in a particular vessel (a crucible) was supposed to lead to the birth of what alchemists called a Philosopher's Stone, *Lapis Philosophorum*, or an elixir. Additionally, the sun and moon personified gold and silver, the most precious metals on earth.[100] Finally, in neo-Platonic philosophy, a sun and a moon often symbolised the soul and the spirit.[101] For later generations of alchemists, two principles interacted within the Philosopher's stone, or otherwise the *Materia Prima*: one solar, hot, and male, known as Sulphur, the other lunar, cold, and female, known as mercury.[102]

Late medieval and early modern thinkers often saw a direct and close connection between the alchemical processes in the crucible and a spiritual transformation in human consciousness. Both processes had the same goal: purification and perfection, either in terms of making precious metals from base elements or in the sense of moral and spiritual development of a believer. Within the framework of this conception, Jesus Christ came to be associated with the Philosopher's Stone. The alchemists saw the successive stages of producing the Philosopher's Stone as paralleling the principal periods of Christ's earthly biography, including His Nati-

98 Joachim TELLE, "Sol et luna, Literar – und alchemiegeschichtliche Studien zu einem altdeutschen Bildgedicht, Mit Text- und Bildanhang," *Schriften zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, eds. Armin GEUS – Guido PRESSLER (Hürtgenwald: Guido Pressler Verlag, 1980), p. 76, 87.

99 J. TELLE, "Sol und luna,", pp. 81–82, 87–88, 92–93.

100 L. DeVUN, *Prophecy, Alchemy, and the End of Time*, p. 104.

101 J. TELLE, "Sol und luna," pp. 76–77.

102 Stanislas KLOSSOWSKI DE ROLA, *Alchemy. The Secret Art* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2013), p. 22.

vity, Crucifixion, and Resurrection. These analogies date back at least to the early fourteenth century; they were based on the works of Petrus Bonus of Ferrara's *Pretiosa margarita novella*, as well as writings attributed to Arnald of Vilanova and Ramón Llull.[103] Later generations of alchemists, including authoritative figures such as the French Franciscan John Rupescissa, widely drew upon Arnald of Vilanova. Furthermore, they often perceived the world's initial and final phases—that is, Creation and the Last Judgement—in terms of alchemical processes.[104] Equating the Philosopher's Stone with the key episodes in the life of Jesus Christ allowed late medieval alchemists to draw parallels between the alchemical process and Christian redemption.

The solar-lunar symbology in Skaryna's prints thus incorporates various meanings. The dichotomy *sol–luna*, "sun–moon", was a convenient tool for conveying various ideas and relations in society and nature. First, Skaryna used this figurative language to allude to Christian mysteries. It is logical to suggest that, in his interpretation of the sun and the moon, Skaryna may have relied on traditional Christian exegesis, according to which a conjunction of the sun and the moon serves as an allegory of a spiritual marriage of Jesus Christ and the Christian Church. The solar-lunar symbology in Skaryna's prints may also have possessed eschatological associations. The sun and the moon on the publisher's device most probably signify the Second Advent of Christ and his reunification with the faithful on Earth. As such, this symbol was carrying a powerful message to the faithful by announcing to them the Second Coming of Jesus Christ and the Last Judgement.

In recent years, scholars have arrived independently at similar suggestions. In his last book, Sergejus Temčinas interprets the symbol of the crescent moon combined with the sun as a clear eschatological sign.[105] It is difficult, however, to say how literally Skaryna may have taken astronomical signs as indicators of an approaching Second Advent. Did he believe, in full accordance with the Old Testament prophets, that the sun and the moon would no longer shine their light at the moment when the Lord comes (Isaiah 24:23)? At least one thing is certain: although Skaryna took a particular interest in cosmic events like solar and lunar

103 L. DeVUN, *Prophecy, Alchemy, and the End of Time*, p. 104, 110.

104 Shanton LINDEN, "Mystical Alchemy, Eschatology, and Seventeenth-Century Religious Poetry," *Pacific Coast Philology* 19 (1984), no. 1–2, p. 80.

105 Sergejus TEMČINAS (Sergei Temchin), *Izdanija Frantsiska Skoriny: Istochniki, interpretatsii, bytovanie* (Editions of Francis Skaryna: Sources, Interpretations and Functioning) (Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas Publisher, 2022), pp. 252–253.

eclipses, he believed that the Lord's Coming would be unexpected, "like a thief in the night".[106]

Second, it is possible that Skaryna may have intended the depiction of the sun and the moon to symbolise an "opération alchémique". This is a more puzzling question to answer and requires further research. Since the scope of the present essay does not allow delving into questions of alchemical practice and alchemical symbology in Early Modern Europe, I will limit myself to a couple of hypotheses. To begin with, I argue that the images in *the Ruthenian Bible* may take on an alchemic aspect. My preliminary research reveals that Skaryna may have interpreted the events described in the Old Testament in diverse ways, including in terms of alchemy. I only briefly mention two examples of such alchemical material in Skaryna's publications. The engraving *Nebuchadnezzar the King of Babylonians Conquers Jerusalem* possesses not only a historical meaning. In alchemical terms, the rival armies struggling before Jerusalem's gates may symbolise the absorption of the metallic Sulphur by Mercury. Another engraving, *Judith the Widow Cuts off the Head of Holofernes the Chief*, also takes on an unexpected aspect when related to alchemy. In this context, the depiction is an allegory of a combat of different chemical bodies in a special crucible or a solvent. A famous engraving from Muhammad ibn Umail's *Book of Senior* may provide a necessary link as a source of Skaryna's allegorical alchemy. This engraving depicts a scholar sitting on a cathedra seat and holding in his hands an open double table (*Tabula chemica*), with anthropomorphic images of a sun and a crescent moon on its frontispiece.[107] This depiction is widely known in scholarship as a portrait of a wise man or a philosopher.[108] The resemblance of the celestial symbols in this engraving to those used by Skaryna is striking. The only essential difference between them is that the sun and the moon in Skaryna's portrait have a personal coat of arms (emblem), according to the norms of late medieval and Renaissance heraldry. Considering that the *Book of Senior* was widely popular in the Holy Roman Empire in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it is quite possible that Skaryna was familiar with it. Late medieval and Renaissance alchemy often had an eschatological aspect. One particular concern of alchemists was the creation of a medicinal elixir that would restore the faithful to perfect health. This task was especially urgent in the light of Christian prophecies concerning the resur-

---

106 A. KORSHUNAŬ – V. CHAMIARYTSKI, eds., *Frantsysk Skaryna. Tvory*, p. 118 (Skaryna's commentary on the Saint Paul's message to the Solonians).

107 J. TELLE, "Sol et luna," pp. 56–57.

108 Ibidem, p. 248 (especially picture no. 69).

rection of physical bodies during the Second Coming of Christ.[109] According to Saint Paul, the resurrected bodies will become incorruptible, to be able to witness the Lord.

Finally, bearing in mind that Renaissance alchemy involved both physical and spiritual aspects, and that the art of a physician had both physical and spiritual dimensions, it is quite probable that Doctor Skaryna may have used the solar-lunar symbology in an additional way: that is, the sun as a symbol of a soul and the moon as a symbol of a body. This imagery also had an eschatological aspect: following Saint Paul, the resurrected and glorified human body at the Last Judgement would be both physical and spiritual.

To conclude, the solar–lunar symbols in *the Ruthenian Bible* have both religious-spiritual and physical-material meaning. I have argued that Skaryna used this imagery to express in allegorical form the mysteries of Christian theology (a spiritual marriage of Christ and the Christian Church), combined with representations borrowed from contemporary alchemical thought (Sulphur and Mercury as principal elements of an alchemical operation).[110] As such, the solar-lunar symbols in Skaryna's prints reveal themselves as a synthesis of Christian and alchemical representations and visual imagery. Skaryna's alchemy, however, gives no impression of an actual alchemical process; it is just a Christian-based alchemical symbolism. Most probably, the sources of Skaryna's solar-lunar allegory lie in an early sixteenth-century redaction of the *Bildgedicht von Sol und Luna*.[111]

Or, perhaps, Skaryna was inspired by the murals in the monastery of the Slavonic Benedictines in Emmaus, Prague.[112] Among all the frescos, it was the pic-

---

109 U. SZULAKOWSKA, *The Alchemical Virgin Mary*, pp. 19–20.

110 About alchemy in the 16th-century Polish Lithuanian Commonwealth, see Rafal PRINKE, "Antemurale Alchimiae: Patrons, Readers, and Practitioners of Alchemy in the Polish Lithuanian Commonwealth," *Early Science and Medicine* 17 (2012), pp. 523–547. About alchemy in the late medieval Kingdom of Bohemia, see Vladimir KARPENKO, "Der Böhmische Alchemist Hynek von Podebrad," *Mitteilungen, Gesellschaft Deutscher Chemiker, Fachgruppe Geschichte der Chemie* 15 (2000), pp. 3–10.

111 See, J. TELLE, "Sol et luna," pp. 159–162. It is especially interesting that the early 16th–century *Bildgedicht* contains a eulogy to Holy Trinity and Saint Mary. On the other hand, Doctor Skaryna usually concludes his prefaces and commentaries to Biblical texts with the laudation to Holy Trinity and Saint Mary. In addition, Skaryna's idea of self-knowledge (*poznanie samogo sebia*) is close to the idea of an extended cognition (*Vornufft*) in the *Bildgedicht*.

112 The Monastery of the Slavonic Benedictines in Emmaus, Prague, was established by Emperor Charles IV (1316–1378), a renown esoteric of his time, in 1347; in the 1360s, it was decorated with a cycle of frescos providing parallels between the Old and New Testament, which comprised about thirty typological groups.

ture of the Tiburtine Sibyl showing Emperor Octavianus Augustus the Virgin and Child standing in the rays of the sun that may have attracted particular attention from the Ruthenian printer. For our current interests, it is indispensable to mention here that in medieval Christian tradition the meaning of the sun was grounded on the notion that the universe is a book in which is inscribed the Word of God; there are therefore two books for the Christian mystic, namely, the Bible and the Universe.[113] Skaryna, both as an adherent of natural philosophy and publisher of the Bible, was undoubtedly aware of the meaning of this symbol. On the other hand, the reference to the Slavs as "the people of the sun", made by the Franciscan friar and Charles's court historian, Giovanni dei Marignolli (Jan Marignola), in his *Cronica Boemorum*, the Czech Chronicle, may have been known to the Ruthenian publisher.[114] Skaryna, as propagator of the written word in Ruthenia, certainly visited the Emmaus monastery in Prague, which was so closely associated with early Slavonic literacy and liturgy. Karel Stejskal also highlighted that the picture of the Virgin and the Child represented a culmination of astrological and alchemical ideas, as well as its far-reaching political conception.[115] So, we have good reason to believe that the frescos in the Emmaus Monastery, especially the picture of the Virgin and the Child standing in the sun, might have provided the Ruthenian publisher with various aspects of solar cult.

Astrological Prognostication and Eschatology

It is quite probable to suggest that Skaryna's eschatological expectations, being implicitly expressed in *the Ruthenian Bible*, were supported by contemporary prognostical literature, including especially Lichtenberger's *Prognosticatio* (this text had at least ten editions and many reprints from 1488 up to 1530) and Alexander Seitz's *Warning of a Deluge* (1521).[116] Astrological forecasts predicted that an ominous conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in Pisces would eventually bring about a deluge, or at least strong storms and flooding on the continent, in February 1524. Many

113 Karel STEJSKAL, "Typological Cycle in the Cloisters of Emmaus. Iconographical Analysis," in *Gothic Mural Paintings in Bohemia and Moravia, 1300–1378*, eds. Vlasta DVOŘÁKOVÁ – Josef KRÁSA – Anežka MERBAUTOVÁ – Karel STEJSKAL (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 72.

114 J. VERKHOLANTSEV, *Ruthenica Bohemica*, p. 30.

115 K. STEJSKAL, "Typological Cycle," p. 75, 78.

116 J. GREEN, *Printing and Prophecy*, pp. 51–53.

educated people in Central and Western Europe of that day, including Martin Luther and other great personalities of the epoch, believed that this then indeed would be the last day, without, however, specifying a concrete form which this event would assume.[117] Even a faraway Muscovy did not escape strong debates concerning the deluge of 1524 in the years preceding the celestial conjunction of February 1524. Even in Muscovy, the court physician of grand prince Vasilii (1505–1533), a native of North German Lübeck, Nicholas Bülow (1490 – c.1548), propagated an enormous flood or even a great deluge. Bülow, in his prognostication, relied on Stöffler's book, albeit in a very free form. The court physician, however, soon found an adversary in the person of a monk, Maxim the Greek, who was an enemy of any form of astrology and astrological prediction.[118] Doctor Skaryna may have been aware of the Bülow-Maxim dispute in Muscovy. *Vice versa*, *the Ruthenian Bible* by Doctor Skaryna was well known in Muscovy.[119] Certain scholars even suggest that he may have visited Muscovy, after the armistice of 1522 between Muscovy and Lithuania, to disseminate there his prints.[120]

In any case, Skaryna seems not to have been completely free of eschatological concerns in the early 1520s. It was in 1522 that Skaryna's second print, the *Little Travelling Book*, *Liber Viaticus*, emerged in the Lithuanian capital Vilnia-Vilnius.[121] *Liber Viaticus* was a kind of literature for people who had to spend much of their time on the road, like Skaryna himself or his brother, John, an international merchant. As for its content, the book included such constituent parts as the *Psalter* and the *Paschaliae*. In particular, the *Paschaliae* provide us with an important piece of information about the eschatological concerns of Francis Skaryna. There is no doubt that it was the *Almanach* of Johannes Stöffler and Jacob Pflaum (published in Ulm in 1499) that may have been the principal source for Skaryna's *Paschaliae*.

117 D, CROUZET "Millennial Eschatologies in Italy, Germany, and France," pp. 4–6.

118 Robert COLLIS, "Maxim the Greek, Astrology and the Great Conjunction of 1524," *Slavonic and East European Review* 88 (October 2010), no. 4, pp. 601–623.

119 Hugh M. OLSTED, Maksim Grek's "David and Goliath" and the Skaryna Bible, Harvard Ukrainian Studies 19 (1995), pp. 451–475, especially 462–465.

120 Symon BRAHA (Tumaš Vitaŭt, pseudonym.), *Doktar Skaryna u Maskve* (Munich-New York: Belaruski Instytut navuki i mastactva, 1963); E. NEMIROVSKII, *Frantsisk Skaryna*, pp. 487–489.

121 Recently Ilya Lemeshkin has seriously revised the Little Travelling Book's chronology, by suggesting that Skaryna may have embarked on this print as early as during his stay in Prague, in 1520–1521. Lemeshkin strongly argues that it would be more correct to stress that Skaryna had completed the Little Travelling book in Vilnius in 1522. See, Ilya LEMESHKIN, "Khronologija 'Maloj Podorožnoj Knihi'," in *Frantsysk Skaryna. Daŭnija fakty-novyja ideji*, ed. Alexander HRUSHA (Minsk: Belaruskaja Navuka, 2021), pp. 117–144.

An example of Stöffler's influence upon Skaryna can be seen in the astronomical prognostication for the year 1524. By relying on Stöffler's *Almanach*, the Ruthenian publisher provides the astronomical details concerning a future celestial conjunction. More concretely, Skaryna, in the *Paschalia*, albeit in a reduced form, speaks of a conjunction of seven stars in the zodiacal sign of Pisces (that corresponds to February 1524), particularly stressing that this celestial combination would mean tremendous transformations concerning kingdoms, laws, human fortunes, and all beings, both on earth and on water, which have never been before. However, Skaryna believes that all this would depend exclusively on the Lord's will.[122] Furthermore, his call for all Christians to be pious is reminiscent of Stöffler's message for the truthful (*Levate igitur viri christianissimi capita vestra*).[123] Finally, what is especially important here is that both Stöffler and Skaryna make no special mention of a forthcoming deluge or even a flood. On the other hand, historians have no evidence of eschatological fermentations or a collective panic in Lithuania-Ruthenia around the year 1524.[124]

Failed Flood and New Eschatological Fears

The year 1524 had passed, and the prediction of a second universal flood failed to materialise. However, eschatological anguish in Europe had not disappeared entirely. The outbreak of the Peasants' War in Germany in the spring of 1525 and the capture of the French king, Francis I, by the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, Charles V, at the battlefield of Pavia in the same year, supported eschatological fears on the continent. Subsequent political events in Europe, such as the capture of Rome by the emperor Charles V (1527) and the sudden march of the Ottoman Turks upon Vienna (1529), only intensified eschatological expectations in European society.

---

122 A. KORSHUNAŬ – V. CHAMIARYTSKI, eds., *Frantsysk Skaryna. Tvory*, p. 96.

123 Compare: Johannes STÖFFLER – Jakob PFLAUM, *Almanach nova plurimis annis venturis inservientia, 1499–1531* (Ulm 1499), available at: http://daten.digitale sammlungen.de/db/002/bsb 00029607/images, (accessed December 17, 2021).

124 Available historical sources mention mostly a cold and frosty winter of 1524 in Poland and in Russia. However, the chronicles also speak of an extremely rainy summer of 1524 in Muscovite Russia, which caused serious inundations, so that significant portions of harvest were lost. See, E. BORISENKOV – V. PASETSKII, *Tysiacheletniaia letopis' ekstremalnykh prirodnykh javlenii* (Leningrad: Gidrometeorologicheskii Institut), p. 308.

In March 1525, Skaryna published in the Lithuanian capital the books of the Apostle. In the Apostle, the publisher concretises various aspects of his eschatological ideas. To begin with, in his preface to the *Epistles of Saint Apostles*, the publisher concerns himself with the signs of the Antichrist's advent and the end of the world. In his comments on the Second church message of Saint Peter, Francis Skaryna especially raises his voice against so-called false teachers, whose aim is to deceive the believers. He especially advises the faithful to avoid such teachers and to read the books of the Fathers of the Church, particularly the writings of Saint Paul. Not only can the reading of Scripture and patristic literature inspire a good life, Skaryna continues, but the fear of the Last Judgement is also able to deter people from doing evil things.[125]

Furthermore, in his comments on the *First Message of Saint Paul to the Thessalonians*, Francis Skaryna focuses on the future Resurrection of the dead. Responding to those of the faithful who frequently ask about the precise year and day of the Second Coming of Christ, Skaryna answers that Christ's advent may occur at any moment and that Christians should always be ready for it. using the imagery of the apostle Paul himself, he compares the future arrival of the Lord with the coming of a robber at night, who usually comes without any summoning, quickly and unexpectedly. To be ready for the Second Coming of Christ, however, the faithful must pray incessantly and help each other.[126]

Skaryna's main concern in his preface to the *Second Message of Apostle Paul to the Thessalonians* is those who call themselves apostles of Christ and who often frighten the faithful by telling them that the end of the world is near. Skaryna instructs believers not to trust such self-proclaimed apostles, because unless the Antichrist comes and the final struggle of Christ with the Antichrist occurs, the end of the world will not come.[127]

Finally, in his preface to the *Second Message of Apostle Paul to Timothy*, Francis Skaryna again focuses on the signs of the end of the world. He addresses his audience, warning them that dreadful times will soon come, when people will be especially inclined towards evil. Skaryna advises his readers to avoid such people and to concentrate on doing good.[128]

---

125 A. KORSHUNAŬ – V. CHAMIARYTSKI, eds., *Frantsysk Skaryna. Tvory*, p. 106.
126 Ibidem, pp. 118–119.
127 Ibidem, p. 119.
128 Ibidem, p. 121.

Francis Skaryna does not focus especially on what a post-apocalyptic society will look like. As noted earlier, the publisher, in his preface to *the Book of* the *prophet Daniel*, only briefly mentions a future kingdom of the Son of God, which will last eternally on earth. Indeed, he does not specify how long this kingdom will exist; he merely uses the vernacular adjective *vechny*, eternal, instead of providing a precise duration for the kingdom of Jesus Christ on earth. Skaryna's reference to an eternal kingdom of Christ seems to reflect a long tradition of Christian prophetical interpretations. It was the idea of a material, literally understood one-thousand-year reign of Christ in a new Jerusalem at the end of times—so strongly supported in Jerome's time by the Jews, "Judaizers", and later by adherents of radical Christian prophecies such as Joachim of Fiore—that was especially rejected by Jerome.[129] This suggestion can be supported by the fact that Doctor Skaryna never uses the term *millennial* in his texts. In a broader sense, one may say that Skaryna tries to follow the tradition of Saint Jerome when interpreting biblical prophecies. As such, his interpretations of future events are strictly Christological—that is, he views the last things on Earth from the perspective of the Second Advent of Christ.

The Apostle of 1525 was the last book Doctor Skaryna published. Scholars continue to speculate as to why he might have ceased his publishing activities. Certain scholars suggest that Skaryna had to focus on the traditional family business; others think that he had lost his investors, such as Jacob Babich, a prosperous merchant of Vilnius, who sponsored the Apostle. The death of his brother and business partner, John, as well as court litigations concerning the immense sums of debt that John had left behind—finally, an imprisonment in the Polish city of Poznań because of his brother's unpaid debts—most likely led to Francis Skaryna's disappointment and fatigue with social reality.[130] All this might have eventually led to Skaryna's decision to leave his native land around 1533. In the subsequent years, we find him as a court gardener (*Wellischer Gartner*) of the king of Bohemia, Ferdinand Habsburg, in Prague. Did Skaryna's seclusion in the royal garden mean an ascetic rejection of the world, in the hope of encountering the end of time in serenity and solitude? In any case, from an eschatological point of view, Bohemia appeared as the final station of pilgrimage on his way to the celestial Jerusalem.

However, questions remain concerning Skaryna's departure from Lithuania. Is there any connection between Doctor Skaryna's departure from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in or around 1533 and contemporary eschatological fears? In-

129 M. GRAVES "Judaizing" Christian Interpretations of the Prophets," pp. 151–152.
130 E. NEMIROVSKII, *Frantsisk Skorina*, pp. 505–506.

deed, this year, as the fifteenth centenary of Christ's Death and His subsequent Resurrection, holds a particular place in the history of European eschatology. In any case, it seems that the year 1533 generated a much stronger eschatological anguish than even the year 1524. It may suffice to mention the movement of the Anabaptists in Münster in 1533–1534 and the conflicts between evangelicals and traditionalists in France.[131] This eschatological anguish was again caused by Stöffler's *Ephemerides*, according to which twenty-six conjunctions of the Moon with Mars and Saturn—malevolent planets—would lead to social, political, and religious changes. In addition, a comet of 1532 further exacerbated contemporary fears. One possible inspirer of this eschatological anguish may have been Michael Stiefel, Luther's friend and Professor of mathematics at Jena. It was Stiefel who, relying on the Book of Daniel, predicted the Second Coming at 8 a.m. on 19 October 1533; he later, however, changed his mind to Michaelmas. This eschatological fervour was shared by Luther, who, however, strongly rebuked Stiefel for his attempts to calculate the timing of the Second Advent in one of his letters.[132] What is especially interesting is that Luther specifically raised his voice against new false prophets, just as Doctor Skaryna had done eight years earlier in his preface to the *Second church message of Saint Peter*.

However, as around the year 1524, there were no visible traces of panic in Lithuania and Poland as the year 1533 approached.[133] More important is the fact that, as we have seen, Skaryna's eschatology was entirely grounded in Holy Scripture, to the extent that neither the great celestial conjunctions nor astrological prognostications can be seen to have been related to his eschatological expectations.

So, it would be reasonable to suggest that Doctor Skaryna's departure from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania around 1533 was independent of the astrological prognostications for that year, and rather a result of his personal desire to embark

131 D. CROUZET "Millennial Eschatologies," p. 6.

132 Winfred VOGEL, "Eschatological Theology of Martin Luther," part I, *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 24 (Autumn 1986), no. 3, p. 257.

133 *Stöffler's Ephemerides*, published by Florian Unger in Cracow in 1532, do not mention any negative influence of celestial constellations: *Ephemeris Anno Christi 1533 Stoeflerini* (Cracow: Florian Unger, 1532?). On the other hand, the summer 1533 was rainy and wet. The Vistula, for example, flooded seven times, between July 17 and August 1. It is however unknown whether an epidemic that ravaged Vilnius in 1530–1533 may have produced eschatological anguish in the city, and to which extent the withdrawal of Franciscan friars from Lithuania capital may have been a result of eschatological fermentation in urban society of Vilnius, see U. KANANOVICH "Doctor Francis Skaryna and the Heavens," p. 62.

upon a new form of activity—preferably in a new place. One cannot exclude the possibility that he may have received a professional or personal proposal that he could not refuse. What did Skaryna's new mission in Prague truly mean? What was hidden behind his new title as a royal gardener at the court of king Ferdinand Habsburg in Prague? There is good reason to believe that Skaryna did not exclusively practise gardening at the royal court in Prague. Furthermore, is there any connection between Skaryna's stay at the court of Ferdinand Habsburg as a gardener and the further incursions of the Ottoman Turks into the heart of the European continent? It may suffice to mention here that, in contemporary eschatological thinking, the Ottoman Turks were regarded either as the Antichrist, or as diabolical auxiliaries of the Antichrist himself.[134]

Conclusions

Though eschatology was not a major theme for Doctor Skaryna, the available sources—albeit implicitly—suggest that the Ruthenian publisher paid close attention to the eschatological concerns of his age. Fundamental Christian ideas about the afterlife of the soul, the resurrection of the dead, and the Last Judgement certainly defined his personal attitudes towards the End Times.

I strongly argue that it was, above all, Holy Scripture that profoundly informed Skaryna's eschatological worldview. Skaryna's personal attitudes towards the End Times undoubtedly developed within the Occidental eschatological tradition. Occidental Biblical exegesis constituted the principal source of his eschatological ideas and representations. Skaryna's journeys and stays in different cities of Western Europe—including Nuremberg, Prague, and Venice—may have played a significant role in the formation of his views on the Last Things.

I believe that Skaryna's heraldry is evidence of his eschatological expectations. His personal coat of arms (publisher's emblem), depicting the sun and a waning moon with clearly facial features, betrays certain eschatological allusions, both in biblical and alchemical terms. I argue here that solar–lunar symbology in *the Ruthenian Bible* may have functioned both as a powerful allegory of the spiritual

134 Miguel GRANADA, "Osiander's Eschatology: from the Nurnberger Ratschlag (1524) to the Coniecturae de ultimis temporibus ac de fine mundi (1544)," Édouard Mehl and Christian Trottmann, eds., *Histoire de la fin des temps. Les mutations du discours eschatologique: Moyen Age, Renaissance, Temps modernes* (Strasbourg: Presses Universitaires de Strasbourg, 2022), pp. 316–320.

marriage of Jesus Christ and His Church, and as an allusion to an alchemical operation leading to the production of a Philosopher's Stone or an Elixir. It is possible that Doctor Skaryna, as an experienced physician-scholar and a person with numerous contacts across Europe, may have been involved—directly or indirectly—in the quest for the Elixir of Life, the *Panacea*, which was intended to strengthen Christian spirits and improve their physical health on the eve of the End Times.

However, there is no evidence that Skaryna believed the Second Coming and the Last Judgement were imminent, even though he most likely viewed his era as the End Times. As a publisher, Skaryna saw his principal responsibility as reminding his Ruthenian-language readers of the Second Coming and the Last Judgement. To withstand the tribulations of the present and the future, he exhorts believers to remain constantly vigilant, by praying incessantly and attentively reading the Holy Scripture.

Finally, Skaryna's eschatological expectations may have had an impact on the peripeties of his own life. As a true Christian and itinerant scholar, he saw his life as a pilgrimage—a pilgrimage as a form of penance—which might have brought him to the goal of such a journey: the contemplation of the heavenly Jerusalem, in full accordance with the eschatological doctrine that this world is not the home of the faithful but only a temporary abode for them. Saint Paul's famous metaphor of the Christians as *pelegrini super terram* (Hebrews 11: 13–16)—that is, strangers travelling through a foreign land in quest of the Promised Land—ideally characterises Skaryna's earthly life, most of which he must have spent abroad, sojourning and working in different countries.[135] inspired by Holy Scripture as well as his personal experience, Skaryna understood himself as a stranger in this world and his life as a pilgrimage towards a clearly defined aim – that is, personal salvation as part of a universal plan of human salvation; this, in turn, may have lent a particular eschatological sense to his extraordinary mobility and multifold activities.

135 Compare, Richard EMERSON – Ronald HERZMAN, "The Canterbury Tales in Eschatological Perspective," in *The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle Ages*, *Medievalia Lovaniensia*, Series I, Studia XV, eds. Werner VERBEKE – Daniel VERHELST – Andries WELKENHUYSEN (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988), pp. 404–424.

SUMMARY

Doctor Francis Skaryna, a native of Belarusian Polatsk (1470s/1480s – c.1551) and a graduate of Cracow (1506), embarked on his printing projects (1517–1525), initially in Prague and later in Vilnia–Vilnius, during a time of extraordinary eschatological tension in Europe, caused largely by an ongoing crisis within the Catholic church and the further advancement of the Ottoman Turks into the depths of the European continent. It is therefore not surprising that contemporary eschatological ideas, albeit mostly in implicit form, found their way into his prints. Skaryna's eschatology developed entirely within the Occidental cultural tradition. In the first place, it was the eschatological ideas widespread in Southern Germany and Bohemia that influenced the Ruthenian publisher's perceptions of the End times. During his brief period of printing activity, from 1517 to 1525, Skaryna's eschatological representations underwent certain transformations. To begin with, in *the Ruthenian Bible* (1517–1519), Skaryna's eschatology had a double source of inspiration. Though the Ruthenian printer derived his eschatological arguments from Scripture (the Prophet Daniel), his eschatological imagery was not entirely free from the influence of astronomy. It was mostly through the anthropomorphic sign of a conjunction of the Sun and the crescent Moon, widely dispersed throughout *the Ruthenian Bible* and interpreted by contemporary scholars as his printing sign or even his personal coat of arms, that Skaryna expressed his vision of the contemporary moment as the End Times. Furthermore, although the Ruthenian publisher referred to the grand conjunction of the planets in February 1524 in the sign of Pisces as eschatological in the *Liber viaticus* (Vilnius, 1521–1522), his eschatology remained grounded in Holy Scripture. Finally, in the Apostle (Vilnius, 1525), Skaryna developed his eschatology exclusively on biblical grounds. In this regard, it is noteworthy that the sign of the overlapping Sun and Moon is absent in Skaryna's prints produced in the Lithuanian capital. Is there a connection between the evolution of the Ruthenian printer's eschatological representations and the imagery of his publications?

STUDIE / ARTICLE

Ruský Čech v Gruzii: Život a dílo pedagoga a diplomata Jaroslava Svatoše

VERONIKA SIDÓ
Ústav české literatury a komparatistiky, Filosofická fakulta, Univerzita Karlova, Praha

A Czech from Russia in Georgia: The Life and Work of Educator and Diplomat Jaroslav Svatoš
This study forms part of a dissertation on Czechoslovak-Georgian diplomatic relations during the existence of the Democratic Republic of Georgia (1918–1921), illustrated through the life and personality of Jaroslav Svatoš, an educator and diplomat, and a prominent representative of the Czechoslovak community living in present-day Georgia between 1894 and 1925. Its aim is to contribute to our understanding of Jaroslav Svatoš's life and his role as one of the key figures in the development of Czechoslovak-Georgian relations. The study is situated within the broader context of social transformations in Tsarist Russia during the second half of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth century—changes that directly influenced Svatoš's activities. In addition to recounting his life story, it also explores the phenomenon of Czech emigration to the Russian Empire and its underlying causes.

Sections devoted to Svatoš's secondary education in Crimea and university studies in Moscow illustrate the transformations of the Russian educational system and student life during that era. Through an examination of

Svatoš's teaching career, the study presents the system of secondary education in Tiflis during the early twentieth century, alongside the region's social conditions and the specificity of the Caucasus as a Russian territory undergoing intensive Russification. The study also considers the brief but significant diplomatic role played by Jaroslav Svatoš following the establishment of independent Czechoslovakia and the Democratic Republic of Georgia in 1918.

The study's primary source is Svatoš's unfinished and as yet unpublished memoir from 1927. This handwritten *egodocument*, a personal source rich in cultural, political, geographical and pedagogical insights, is analysed to shed light on the influence of Tsarist Russia on the formation of Svatoš's identity as both educator and diplomat. In his memoir, which titled *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymnaziálního profesora a ředitele* [Memoirs of a Czech from Russia, a Grammar School Teacher and Principal], Svatoš clearly saw himself as a product of Russian intellectual traditions. Additional sources include archival materials from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic, the Georgian State Archive, Russian documents from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and secondary literature on Svatoš and his environment. Together, these sources aim to contribute not only to research on Czech-Georgian historical relations—an area still largely neglected—but also to a deeper understanding of the broader activities of the so-called Czechoslovak "spiritual army" in Russia, which left an indelible mark on the cultural and educational spheres of the time.
Keywords: Czechoslovak-Georgian diplomatic relations; Caucasus; Georgia; Tiflis; Crimea; Volhynia; Russia; Jaroslav Svatoš

Úvod

V roce 2023 si ČR a Gruzie připomněly třicáté výročí navázání diplomatických vztahů. Jejich kořeny však sahají do doby před více než sto lety, kdy, byť jen velmi krátce, existovala Gruzínská demokratická republika (1918–1921). Počátky československo-gruzínských diplomatických vztahů byly v té době spojeny s přední osobností tamější československé komunity Jaroslavem Svatošem (1871–1932), pedagogem a ředitelem několika typů středních škol na přelomu 19. a 20. století v Tiflisu, který na území Gruzie žil v letech 1894–1925. Československá národní jednota v Tiflisu, které Jaroslav Svatoš předsedal, vznikla v listopadu 1918 a jeho prostřednictvím zastupovala zájmy Čechoslováků, jak ruských státních občanů, tak i občanů bývalého Rakousko-Uherska, v nově vzniklé Gruzínské demokratické republice. Jaroslav Svatoš tak představuje jednoho z celé plejády „vojáků" československé duševní armády na Rusi,[1] která svou činností, pílí a neúnavnou prací vepsala nesmazatelnou stopu do duchovního rozvoje v tehdejším carském Rusku, a později také v nově vzniklé Gruzínské demokratické republice. Jednalo se o skupinu českých emigrantů z Rakousko-Uherska působících v kulturní oblasti, která nabyla vysokoškolské vzdělání buď v Čechách, nebo v Rusku, a věnovala se učitelskému povolání mimo jiné na kavkazských středních školách. Řada z nich dosáhla vynikajícího postavení a uznání své činnosti.[2] Vedle středoškolských učitelů tvořili skupinu českých kulturních pracovníků na Kavkaze hudebníci, profesoři na konzervatoři, dirigenti či vojenští kapelníci. Třetí skupinu, silnou počtem a vynikající svým významem, tvořili sokolové – profesoři tělocviku na kavkazských školách.[3] Česká emigrace na Kavkaze nebyla příliš silná počtem, „vykonala však dosti mnoho drobné práce a českého jména nezhanėla".[4]

Vzpomínky na celou řadu těchto osobností, které spolu s Jaroslavem Svatošem pedagogicky působily na Kavkaze či se kterými se setkal jinde na území carské Rusi, jsou součástí Svatošových pamětí z roku 1927 nazvané samotným autorem *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymnaziálního profesora a ředitele*. Paměti se nyní nacházejí v držení Svatošova vnuka, pana Jindřicha Svatoše. Autorce tohoto příspěvku se podařilo Jindřicha Svatoše kontaktovat a s jeho laskavým svolením paměti zapůjčit a zpracovat. Jedná se o nedokončené paměti sepsané pro syna Jaroslava Svatoše Alexeje, který se narodil v roce 1916 v Tiflisu. Tento 123stránkový tzv. egodokument představuje ručně zaznamenané vzpomínky, ze kterých bylo pro účely další analýzy nutné učinit přepis.

Kromě Čechoslováků zmiňuje Jaroslav Svatoš ve svých vzpomínkách také řadu jmen představitelů kulturního a politického života carského předrevolučního Ruska a přibližuje tak detailně nejen poměry v oblasti vzdělávání, ale vykresluje i tehdejší každodenní život v carském Rusku a později v Tiflisu.

1 Termín „Československá duševní armáda na Rusi" použil ve svém unikátním soupisu stejného názvu cca 700 pedagogických pracovníků působících na Rusi do revoluce v roce 1917 Alois Pospíšil (1851–1929). Sborník byl publikován u příležitosti padesátiletého výročí jeho pedagogické činnosti v časopise *Naše zahraničí*, sborníku Národní rady Československé v letech 1925–1926.

2 Jaroslav SVATOŠ, *Československá emigrace na Kavkaze*, Naše zahraničí 1927, č. 1, s. 19.

3 Idem, *Československá emigrace na Kavkaze*, č. 2. s. 20.

4 Idem, *Československá emigrace na Kavkaze*, č. 3. s. 1.

V Tiflisu Svatoš po ukončení studií v Moskvě v roce 1894 zahájil svou pedagogickou dráhu. Stal se součástí velké skupiny pedagogických pracovníků, které carské Rusko oslovilo. Historicko-filologické fakulty totiž nebyly schopny rychle uspokojit poptávku po učitelích latiny a řečtiny na klasických gymnáziích. Roku 1873 proto ruská vláda pozvala přibližně stovku filologů-Slovanů z Rakousko-Uherska, kteří získali diplom z filologie na pražské či vídeňské univerzitě. Jednalo se převážně o rakousko-uherské Čechy, kteří si v Rusku během jednoho až dvou let měli osvojit ruský jazyk, za což jim bylo přiznáno stipendium.[5] Ruský tisk tuto akci někdy posměšně nazýval „novým vpádem Varjagů do Ruska".[6] Výraz však pochází z obrazného vyjádření Jurije Galabutského (1863–1928), publicisty a učitele ruského jazyka na chlapeckém gymnáziu ve Feodosiji, který Čechy, pozvané v největším počtu, nazývá Varjagy historie klasického gymnázia.[7] Tehdy speciálně vytvořený Institut slovanských stipendistů připravil během 15 let své existence (1866–1880) 175 učitelů klasických jazyků pro ruská gymnázia pocházejících z rakousko-uherské monarchie (z toho cca 86 Čechů, 45 Rusínů, 14 Slovinců, 11 Slováků, 1 Srba a 1 Chorvata).[8] Většina z nich přijala carské poddanství, někteří z nich konvertovali k pravoslaví. Největší odpovědnost za výuku klasických jazyků v prvních letech uvedení nového vzdělávacího směru, tzv. klasicismu,[9] ležela na bedrech Čechů. Někteří z nich dosáhli hodnosti inspektora či ředitele gymnázia. Jedním z nich byl např. Anton Dobiáš, inspektor a profesor historicko-filologického institutu v Něžině.[10] Absolventi tohoto institutu sestavili pro ruské školy více než 40 učebnic, čímž se zasloužili o to, že ruské školy měly k dispozici materiály pro studium gramatiky klasických jazyků, tak jako školy evropské.[11]

Jako předseda Československé národní jednoty, založené komunitou Čechů a Slováků žijících v Tiflisu 18. listopadu 1918,[12] působil Jaroslav Svatoš zprvu jako

5 Světlana Nikolajevna MAKSIMOVA, *Prepodavanije drevnich jazykov v russkoj klassičeskoj gimnazii XIX – načala XX veka*, Moskva 2005, s. 155.

6 Jaroslav SVATOŠ*, Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, 1927, s. 8.

7 Jurij GALABUTSKIJ, *Iz nědavněgo prošlogo našich klassičeskich gimnazij*, Russkaja škola 1902, č. 4, s 95.

8 Andrej Nikolajevič PTICYN, *Rusiny v Institutě slavjanskich stipendiatov (1866–1882 gg.)*, Rossija 2022, č. 70, s. 93.

9 Terminus technicus, nový vzdělávací směr v systému ruského vzdělávání zavedený v roce 1871, dále v textu podrobněji vysvětlen.

10 Alois POSPÍŠIL, *Československá duševní armáda na Rusi*, Naše zahraničí 1925, roč. 6, s. 26.

11 Jekatěrina Jurjevna BASARGINA, *Iz istorii klassičeskogo obrazovanija v Rossii: Učitěl'skij institut slavjanskich stipendiatov*, Indojevropejskoje jazykoznanije i klassičeskaja filologija, s. 102

12 Vojenský ústřední archiv (VÚA Praha), fond Důležité dokumenty 1914–1923, sign. G8, karton 3.

reprezentant nově vzniklého Československa pro celou oblast Zakavkazska, uznaný vládou Gruzínské demokratické republiky jako oficiální představitel Československa v Gruzii.[13] Později byl jmenován vedoucím Honorárního konzulátu Československa při Sovětské gruzínské republice v Tiflisu. Ten byl zřízen Usnesením vlády Československa ze dne 21. července 1921 a Jaroslavu Svatošovi přiznal titul „Plnomocník vlády Republiky Československé v Tiflise“. Současně vykonával funkci vedoucího Československé obchodní mise.[14]

Ke Svatošově pedagogickému a diplomatickému působení v Tiflisu však vedla dlouhá cesta, započatá vystěhováním jeho rodiny v roce 1881 z české Luže v tehdejším Rakousko-Uhersku do Novorossijsku a následně do Simferopolu na Krymu, kde Jaroslav Svatoš získal klasické středoškolské vzdělání, až po následná univerzitní studia v Moskvě na historicko-filologické fakultě Moskevské univerzity.

Vystěhovalectví Čechů na Rus

V 60. letech 19. století mělo Rusko zájem o zalidnění jižní Ukrajiny a Krymu po skončené krymské válce (1853–1856), po níž Tataři houfně odcházeli do Osmanské říše.[15] Právě v 60. letech 19. století se etnická mapa jižních částí carského Ruska významně proměnila příchodem nového národa – Čechů. Jejich přesídlení bylo součástí silného migračního proudu, který ve druhé polovině 19. století a začátkem století 20. směřoval z Čech a Moravy do Ruska. Hromadná emigrace Čechů byla vyvolána především sociálně-ekonomickými důvody. Rusko, které se bouřlivě rozvíjelo, skýtalo imigrantům z přelidněných českých zemí široké možnosti k tomu, aby zde našli práci, získali půdu a rozvinuli různé druhy podnikání. Navíc se českým vystěhovalcům v této slovanské zemi vždy dostávalo vřelého přijetí.[16]

Ze Svatošových pamětí se dozvídáme, že jeho otec byl poměrně dobře finančně situovaný a rodinu by v tehdejším Rakousko-Uhersku zvládl uživit. Nesouhlasil však s rakousko-uherskými pořádky a kromě toho bylo vystěhování na Rus přáním Svatošovy matky, jejíž čtyři bratři a sestra se již do Ruska přestěhovali

13 Idem, sign. G9, karton 3.

14 Archiv Ministerstva zahraničních věcí ČR (AMZV ČR Praha), fond Moskva 1921, č. 102.

15 Pavel HAVRÁNEK, *Češi na Kavkaze. Stručná historie osídlované oblasti*, Národopisná revue, 1/2008, s. 13.

16 Igor Vladimirovič KRJUČKOV – Andrej Nikolajevič PTICYN, *Čeští vystěhovalci na Kavkaze ve druhé polovině 19. století a na začátku 20. století*, Slovanský přehled 98, 2012, č. 3–4, s. 233.

a úspěšně se tam etablovali.[17] Svatošova rodina se nejprve roku 1881 vystěhovala na Krym, ale první rok se usadila v Novorossijsku, kde již jeden z bratrů Svatošovy matky působil jako ředitel zdejší prosperující cementárny. Právě v okolí Novorossijsku vznikaly hlavně v 70. letech 19. století zemědělské osady, jejichž organizátorem byl agronom Bedřich Hejduk, bratr známého básníka Adolfa Heyduka. V ohledu administrativním kolonizaci řídil generál Dmitrij Vasiljevič Pilenko (1830–1895), tehdejší náčelník Černomořského okruhu (později – Černomořské gubernie).[18] V okolí Novorossijska tak vzniklo několik českých osad – Mefodijevka, Kirilovka, Vladimirovka a Gljebovka. V Novorossijsku Svatoš ukončil obecnou školu, na kterou byl z české obecné školy dobře připraven. Potřeboval si však osvojit ruštinu a ruský pravopis. To se mu rychle podařilo, a proto se po ukončení obecné školy v Novorossijsku v roce 1882 mohl stát gymnazistou v Simferopolu na Krymu, kam se s celou rodinou po roce stráveném v Novorossijsku přestěhoval. Svatošův otec měl původně v plánu koupit na Kavkaze hospodářství, nelíbilo se mu tam však, a proto odjíždí na Krym, kde v okolí Simferopolu koupil domek se zahradou a hospodářstvím.[19]

Klasicismus v ruském vzdělávacím systému – Svatoš na Krymu

Jaroslav Svatoš se tak nejprve jako středoškolský student až do poloviny 90. let 19. století stal součástí ruského vzdělávacího systému, který přesně v roce Svatošova narození v roce 1871 přinesl nový vzdělávací směr – klasicismus. Ten se snažil popularizovat myšlenku, že mládež má být vychovávána klasickým směrem při pomoci klasických jazyků – latiny a řečtiny. Předpokládalo se, že odchovanci tohoto směru budou mnohem konzervativnějšího smýšlení, na rozdíl od mládeže 60. let 19. století, která se vyznačovala smýšlením revolučním.[20] Reformy cara Alexandra II. v 60. letech 19. století, včetně zrušení nevolnictví v roce 1861, vyvolávaly rozporuplné reakce, a ruskou společnost, podpořenou rozkvětem publicistiky, aktivizovalo a přineslo myšlenky na revoluci. Ruské revoluční myšlení se sice výrazně inspirovalo v Evropě, reagovalo ovšem na ruské poměry a specifické rysy ruské společnosti. V 60. a 70. letech 19. století dominoval ruskému radikálnímu myšlení po-

17 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 1.
18 Idem, *Československá emigrace na Kavkaze*, Naše zahraničí 8, 1927, č.1, s. 15.
19 Idem, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 4–5.
20 Idem, s. 8.

pulismus. Vyrostl z něj např. i terorismus organizace Narodnaja volja (Vůle lidu či Svoboda lidu, založena 1879) či Zemlja i volja (Země a svoboda, založena 1876).[21]

Novou vzdělávací politiku ve formě klasicismu ztělesňoval ministr národní osvěty, hrabě Dmitrij Andrejevič Tolstoj (1823–1889), pověřený zavedením přísné disciplíny jak studentů, tak učitelů. Měl jim zabránit, aby se vystavili revolučním doktrínám, o kterých se předpokládalo, že se v Ruské říši nebezpečně rozšířily. Prakticky jej v roce 1871 do škol uvedl ruský publicista, zakladatel a předseda Filologické společnosti Alexandr Ivanovič Georgijevskij (1830–1911).[22] Jednalo se o Nařízení o gymnáziích a progymnáziích,[23] kterým byla všechna chlapecká gymnázia převedena na klasická a reálná gymnázia, na kterých klasické jazyky vyučovány nebyly, zrušena. Na základě této reformy tak vznikla klasická bezduchá gymnázia zaměřená na dril a memorování, v nichž byla výchova mládeže přirovnávána k těžké noční můře. Ve studentech vyvolávala gymnázia takovou nenávist, že po jejich ukončení pálili učebnice.[24] Na svá středoškolská studia ostatně ve svých pamětech nevzpomíná rád ani sám Jaroslav Svatoš.

Když se v roce 1882 stal žákem prvního chlapeckého gymnázia v Simferopolu, byl klasicismus v plné síle, a to zvláště na tomto gymnáziu. Na Krymu více než kdekoliv jinde v Rusku bylo možné pozorovat stopy a známky staré řecké kultury. Pobřeží Černého moře bylo ve starověku osídleno řeckými koloniemi. Toto vše dohromady činilo krymským gymnazistům dějiny starověku mnohem bližší, a dokonce v nich vzbuzovalo jistý zájem. Na simferopolském gymnáziu byly snad poprvé v Rusku pořádány turistické výpravy žáků a profesorů.[25]

Pořádky na gymnáziu však byly přísné jako všude, avšak zde z určitých důvodů ještě mnohem přísnější. Tehdejší krymská gymnázia – simferopolské, kerčenské a feodosijské – se totiž v době studií Jaroslava Svatoše netěšila dobré pověsti v ohledu politické spolehlivosti. V roce 1881 byl zavražděn car Alexandr II. Jedním z účastníků atentátu byli revolucionáři a členové teroristické organizace Svoboda lidu Sofia Lvovna Perovskaja (1853–1881), dcera krymského gubernátora ze Simferopolu, a Andrej Ivanovič Željabov (1851–1881), odchovanec kerčenského gym-

21 Zbyněk VYDRA a kol., *Dějiny Ruska*, Praha 2017, s. 226–227.

22 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 8.

23 Polnoje sobranije zakonov Rossijskoj imperii. Sobranije 1825–1881, 46 (1871), č. 49860, s. 85–99, dostupné na: https://nlr.ru/e-res/law_r/search.php, 18. 7. 2024.

24 Larisa GAZGIREJEVA, *Istorija pedagogiki i obrazovanija: gosudarstvennaja pedagogika Rossii* 2-e izd., LitRes, Rusko 2019, s. 84.

25 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele,* s. 13.

názia. Toto bylo zřejmě důvodem toho, že na krymských gymnáziích byla zavedena největší přísnost a vylučování žáků bylo na denním pořádku.[26]

Tehdejší nároky na středoškolskou disciplínu hodnotí Svatoš ve svých vzpomínkách s odstupem skoro padesáti let velice kriticky. Do bytů studentů, kteří nebydleli u svých rodičů, dodávalo gymnázium zvláštní knihu podepsanou ředitelem. Když student vycházel z domu, třeba jen na krátkou dobu, byl povinen zaznamenat s největší přesností, kdy a kam odešel, za jakým účelem a na jakou dobu. Třídní profesoři studentské byty velice často navštěvovali, a pokud někdo nezaprotokoloval svou vycházku z domu s naprostou přesností, byl z gymnázia vyloučen, což se stávalo velice často. Po sedmé hodině v době jarní a podzimní a po šesté v době zimní nesměli studenti vycházet z domu vůbec. Trestu v tomto smyslu neunikl ani Svatoš, když jednoho dne vyzvedl ve čtvrt na sedm u obuvníka spravované boty. Na ulici se setkal se svým strýcem – profesorem a ředitelem gymnázia v Pavlohradě, kam Jaroslav po ukončení tercie ze Simferopolu na jeden rok přestoupil, R. Uličným. Ačkoliv mu předvedl důkaz potvrzující cíl své cesty, byl v neděli zavřen na 12 hodin do tzv. karceru.[27] Tresty za porušení gymnaziálních či univerzitních pravidel byly v carském Rusku poměrně přísné. Případy posuzoval inspektor nebo rektor univerzity, kteří měli právo nejen studenta napomenout či vyloučit z univerzity, ale také provinilého potrestat uzavřením právě do tzv. karceru.

V době Svatošova studia v kvartě gymnázia v Pavlohradě v letech 1886–1887 vydalo ruské ministerstvo národní osvěty oběžník v tisku známý jako *Oběžník o kuchařčiných dětech*.[28] Jedná se o takto přezdívaný oběžník *O omezení gymnaziálního vzdělání*, normativní akt z období protireforem Alexandra III., zveřejněný v červnu 1887. Oběžník doporučoval ředitelům gymnázií, aby při přijímání dětí do výchovných ústavů přihlíželi k možnostem osob, v jejichž péči tyto děti jsou, zajistit pro takové vzdělávání potřebné podmínky. Tímto způsobem měla být gymnázia ušetřena přijímání dětí pocházejících z nižších sociálních vrstev, tedy dětí kuchařů, kočí, pradlenek a podobných lidí, jejichž děti by s výjimkou těch skutečně nadaných neměly o střední či vyšší vzdělání vůbec usilovat. Svatoš považoval uvedené nařízení za velice nešťastně stylizované. Základní myšlenku tohoto nařízení, že

26 Idem, s. 14.

27 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 20

28 Oběžník *O sokraščenii gimnazičeskogo obrazovanija*, nazývaný také *Cirkuljar o kucharkinych dětjach* z roku 1887. Dostupné na: https://web.archive.org/web/20150224184735/http:// xn--d1aml.xn--h1aaridg8g.xn--p1ai/19/tsirkulyar-o-kukharkinykh-detyakh/, 20. 7. 2024.

Rusko potřebuje nejen lidi s teoretickým středoškolským a vysokoškolským vzděláním, nýbrž i se vzděláním praktickým, však považoval za správnou.[29]

Málokteré vládní nařízení bylo v tisku kritizováno s takovým vzrušením jako tento oběžník. Tisk poukazoval na fakt, že příliš mnoho rodičů posílá své děti na střední školy a že záměrem ministerstva je odradit slabší finanční kruhy od střední a vysoké školy tak, aby učení v nich bylo privilegiem jen vyšších a finančně silných tříd. Největší pobouření působilo to, že ředitelství škol se měla zajímat o společenské a finanční poměry žáků. Tisk v tom viděl návod na provádění špionáže v rodinách. Kromě toho poukazoval na to, že Rusko má příliš málo nižších a středních odborných škol, takže ministerstvo by takové školy mělo nejprve zřídit.[30] Zmíněný oběžník byl však od počátku tajný a nebyl určený k publikaci. Oděský vzdělávací okruh z něj však vytvořil nařízení pro ředitele gymnázií a jako takové jej publikoval v Oděském věstníku.[31] Deník *Russkije vědomosti* uvedl,[32] že dokument neodpovídá platné legislativě, neboť zákon ze dne 30. června 1871 zakazoval omezení přístupu ke vzdělání na základě příslušnosti ke stavu či vyznání. Ministr národní osvěty I. D. Děljanov musel znění oběžníku neustále ospravedlňovat a vysvětlovat veřejnosti, že jeho smyslem bylo odradit od gymnaziálního vzdělání ty, kterým se v rodinném prostředí nedostává patřičné podpory k jeho úspěšnému získání, nikoliv omezení vstupu na gymnázium na základě stavovské příslušnosti. Oběžník byl po třinácti letech zrušen.[33]

Po absolvování sexty v Pavlohradě se Jaroslav Svatoš v roce 1887 vrátil zpět na simferopolské gymnázium, v jehož profesorském sboru působil i Čech, klasický filolog, archeolog a malíř Alois Kašpar (1843–1913),[34] který jako profesor klasických jazyků vyučoval nejprve na gymnáziu v Petrohradě, od roku 1874 pak v Simferopolu na Krymu, kde zkoumal antické a skytské archeologické památky. Současně byl i dlouhá léta přítelem Svatošovy rodiny. Pocházel z Chrasti, nedaleko Svatošova rodiště Luže, studoval v Hradci Králové a poté v Praze na bohoslovecké fakultě. Před vysvěcením na kněze však z bohoslovecké fakulty vystoupil a zapsal se na filosofickou fakultu, kde studoval současně s Juliem Zeyerem, se kterým po celý

29 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 21.

30 Ibidem.

31 T. A. MAGSUMOV, *Doklad O sokraščenii gimnazičeskogo obrazovanija 1887 g.*, International Journal of Applied and Fundamental Research 10, 2013, s. 488.

32 Russkie vedomosti, 1887, 27 avgusta.

33 T. A. MAGSUMOV, *Doklad O sokraščenii gimnazial'nogo obrazovanija 1887 g. Meždunarodnyj žurnal prikladnych i fundamental'nych issledovanij* 10, 2013, s. 488–489.

34 Alois POSPÍŠIL, *Československá duševní armáda na Rusi*, Naše zahraničí 4, 1925, sv. 3.

život udržovali přátelství. Zeyer jej také na Krymu několikrát navštívil a na Krym často vzpomínal, byť mu jeho častější návštěvu znemožňoval nedostatek finančních prostředků.[35] Profesor Kašpar učil v Simferopolu řečtinu a latinu syny generála Vasilije Pavloviče Popova (1833–1894). Jejich vychovatel musel z důvodu vysokého věku na odpočinek, proto Popov požádal Kašpara, aby navrhl někoho jiného. Kašpar mu doporučil Zeyera. Zeyer nabídku přijal, ale s výhradami: na rok na zkoušku a slušný plat a na cestu požadoval peníze předem. „Když svůj domov a své pohodlí v šanc dávám, měl bych rád něco za to. Pomni, že se zde vytrhuji ze zcela snesitelných a pohodlných poměr, jedná se mi o to, abych poznal Rusko a několik rublů na pěknou cestu do Orientu si uspořil."[36] Korespondence Julia Zeyera a Aloise Kašpara je považována za jeden z nejdůležitějších životopisných materiálů Julia Zeyera.[37] Na Kavkaz se Zeyer skutečně vydal, a to v roce 1889 společně s architektem a výtvarníkem Jiřím Stibralem (1859–1939).[38] Jednou byl Julius Zeyer hostem profesora Kašpara v Simferopolu delší dobu, asi půl roku. Pobýval s ním i u rodiny Svatošových. V té době byl Svatoš již seznámen s některými jeho díly. Přiznával však, že na něj, jakožto odchovance mohutného vlivu ruské realistické literatury, příliš nezapůsobily.[39]

Simferopolské gymnázium se vyznačovalo určitou národnostní pestrostí, a to nejen v pedagogickém sboru, nýbrž i mezi studentstvem. Ve Svatošově třídě tvořili z 25 žáků většinu Rusové, dále dva Arméni, dva Židé, Tatar, Němec, Karaim (komunita etnických semitských národů ve východní Evropě vyznávající karaitský judaismus), a jediný Čech na celém gymnáziu – Jaroslav Svatoš. Ten vzpomínal, že v národnostním ohledu nikdy mezi studenty nevznikala nedorozumění. Studenti žili ve vzájemném přátelství a podle Svatošových vzpomínek podporovali, pokud mohli, jeden druhého.[40] Národnostní složení Krymu bylo vždy pestré. Přesné údaje o národnostech Krymu v době Jaroslava Svatoše poskytují údaje všeruského sčítání lidu z roku 1897.[41] Kromě Svatošem uváděných národností byl v té době Krym domovem hojného počtu Řeků, Bulharů či Poláků. Migrační procesy na Krymu

35 Julius ZEYER, *Spisy*, Praha 1908, s. 123.
36 Jan VOBORNÍK, *Julius Zeyer*, Praha 1907, s. 115.
37 Idem, s. 289.
38 Kritický měsíčník 4, 1941, s. 273.
39 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 26.
40 Idem, s. 29.
41 Pervaja Vserossijskaja perepis' naselenija 1897. Dostupné na: http://elib.shpl.ru/ru/nodes/12632-pervaya-vseobschaya-perepis-naseleniya-rossiyskoy-imperii-1897-goda-spb-1897-1905?view=list, 19. 7. 2024.

tak přispěly k vytvoření velice různorodého etnokulturního obrazu,[42] ve kterém Jaroslav Svatoš vyrůstal a který jej formoval.

V roce 1890 se Jaroslav Svatoš po osmiletém gymnaziálním studiu podrobil maturitní zkoušce, kterou úspěšně s vyznamenáním stříbrnou medailí složil. A protože vždy cítil zájem o literaturu, filozofii a dějepis, rozhodl se ve studiích pokračovat na historicko-filologické fakultě v Moskvě.

Největší vysokou školou v Rusku byla v té době Moskevská univerzita. Počet jejích posluchačů dosahoval čtyř tisíc. Nejvyšším počtem studentů disponovala právnická fakulta, nejmenším fakulta historicko-filologická. Do prvního semestru této fakulty se společně s Jaroslavem Svatošem v roce 1890 zapsalo jen asi sto posluchačů.[43] Skládala se z katedry filosofie, klasické filologie, srovnávací jazykovědy a sanskrtu, ruského jazyka a literatury, slovanské filologie, geografie a etnografie, obecných dějin, ruských dějin, dějin západoevropské literatury, dějin církve a teorie a historie umění.[44] K dělení fakulty docházelo až od 5. semestru, kdy se posluchač mohl zapsat buď na sekci klasickou, nebo slovansko-ruskou (slovesnou), kterou později zvolil i Jaroslav Svatoš, či na sekci dějepisnou.[45]

Jaroslav Svatoš vzpomíná, že většina studentů pocházela ze středního Ruska, někteří byli však i z nejvzdálenějších končin: z Kavkazu či východní Sibiře. Objevilo se mezi nimi i několik známých jmen – Vasilij Alexejevič Maklakov (1869–1957), později známý politický činitel, poslanec Státní dumy, člen kadetské (konstitučně-demokratické) strany a vyslanec vlády Kerenského v Paříži, a Lev Lvovič Tolstoj (1869–1945), nejstarší syn velkého ruského spisovatele Lva Nikolajeviče Tolstého.[46]

V době Svatošova studia na univerzitě se výuka řídila stanovami z roku 1884.[47] Ty byly, ve srovnání s dřívějšími, méně liberálního rázu. Předchozí stanovy z roku 1863[48] byly nejliberálnějšími ze všech univerzitních listin v předrevolučním Rusku. Univerzitám udělovaly poměrně širokou autonomii. V důsledku zvýšené

42 Enciklopedija narodov Kryma. Simferopol' 2016, Izdatěl'stvo Dolja, s. 16.

43 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 43.

44 Universitětskij Ustav (18 avgusta 1884), Ob učebnych zaveděnijach ministěrstva narodnogo prosveščenija. A. Ob imperatorskich rossijskich universitětach. 3. Ustrojstvo učebnoj časti. A. Prepodavanije. Par. 455. Dostupné na: http://letopis.msu.ru/documents/2761, 1. 8. 2024.

45 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 43.

46 Idem, s. 50.

47 Universitětskij Ustav (18 avgusta 1884), Ob učebnych zaveděnijach ministěrstva narodnogo prosveščenija. Dostupné na: http://letopis.msu.ru/documents/2761, 1. 8. 2024.

48 Universitětskij Ustav (18 ijunja 1863). Obščij ustav imperatorskich rossijskich universitětov. Dostupné na: http://letopis.msu.ru/documents/2760, 1. 8. 2024.

vládní reakce v 80. letech 19. století však byly vydány nové stanovy, které opět autonomii univerzit zrušily, zdvojnásobily školné na středních a vysokých školách, což chudým vrstvám ztěžovalo přístup ke vzdělání. Studujících se tyto stanovy týkaly v několika ohledech. Byli podřízeni nejen univerzitnímu senátu a rektorátu, nýbrž i zvláštní inspekci, sestávající z inspektora univerzity a několika jeho pomocníků, tzv. subinspektorů. Ti měli dozor nad tím, jak se studenti chovají, a mohli studentům udělovat disciplinární tresty.[49]

Podle Jaroslava Svatoše byla během jeho studia poměrně klidná politická situace. Jediným pokusem o jakousi demonstraci byl pokus studentů odsloužit panychidu (zádušní bohoslužbu) za zesnulého spisovatele a publicistu radikálního křídla Nikolaje Vasiljeviče Šelgunova (1824–1891). To se však studentům nepodařilo, neboť policie se o akci dozvěděla a zmařila ji.[50] Studenti se v té době sdružovali spíše v krajanských spolcích (zemljačestva), které sice též nebyly povoleny, avšak byly mezi studentstvem hojně rozšířeny. Úřady o nich dobře věděly, jejich činnosti nicméně aktivně nebránily. V tehdejším Rusku neexistovala vysoká škola, kde by se studenti nesdružovali v krajanských spolcích a to podle gubernií, regionů či zemí, ze kterých pocházeli. Podle názvu krajanského spolku tak bylo možné určit jednotlivé migrační toky tehdejších středoškoláků.[51] Jaroslav Svatoš byl po celou dobu pobytu v Moskvě členem správního výboru Krymského krajanského spolku, který sdružoval abiturienty simferopolského, feodosijského a kerčenského gymnázia. Hlavní snahou těchto spolků byla finanční výpomoc nemajetným členům. Pořádáním nejrůznějších koncertů dovedl spolek ročně vybrat 1000–1500 rublů (6–9 tis. Kč).[52] Kromě toho měly spolky i vzdělávací charakter. Členové na schůzích referovali ohledně různých otázek, které v té době budily zájem, což se týkalo především literatury.[53] Své zkušenosti s působením v krajanském spolku v Moskvě Jaroslav Svatoš vynikajícím způsobem zúročil v pozdějším období, kdy se v roce 1918 stal předsedou krajanského spolku Čechoslováků v Tiflisu.

---

49 Universitětskij Ustav (18 avgusta 1884), Ob učebnych zaveděnijach ministěrstva narodnogo prosveščenija. A. Ob imperatorskich rossijskich universitětach. 1. Upravlenije universitětom. Ž. Ob inspektore studěntov i jego pomoščnikach. Par. 446–452, Dostupné na: http://letopis.msu.ru/documents/2761, 1. 8. 2024.

50 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 57.

51 Anatolij Jevgeněvič IVANOV, *Studěnčeskije zemljačestva v Rossii* (koněc XIX. – načalo XX. v.), s. 138.

52 Přepočet se vztahuje k roku 1927, jak jej uvádí Jaroslav Svastoš ve svých pamětech z roku 1927, což odpovídalo 4 až 6 měsíčním platům tehdejšího úředníka.

53 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 57–58.

Z moskevských Čechů se Svatoš setkával se dvěma. Jedním z nich byl Karel Weger, inspektor moskevského II. gymnázia, druhým Maxmilian Fišer, inspektor moskevské Praktické akademie obchodních věd, vychovávající obchodnický dorost z bohatých rodin. S Maxmilianem Fišerem se Jaroslav Svatoš během svého života setkal později v Tiflisu, kde spolupracovali.[54] Fišer se tam roku 1900 stal ředitelem střední obchodní školy. Dva roky poté byl jmenován obvodním inspektorem všech škol ministerstva financí pro kavkazský a zakaspický obvod. Jeho zásluhou byla zřízena celá řada obchodních škol středních i nižších a obchodních kurzů. Byl svého času nejlepším znalcem obchodního školství v Rusku.[55]

Na Moskevské univerzitě v té době studovali jen dva Češi – Jaroslav Svatoš a jeho přítel Antonín Palice,[56] pocházející z úspěšné hudebnicko-umělecké rodiny Josefa Paliceho, českého kolonisty na Volyni, později houslisty opery v Kyjevě a Státní opery v Moskvě. Právě na Volyni se po zrušení nevolnictví v roce 1861 a po nezdařeném povstání Poláků v lednu roku 1863, kdy polští velkostatkáři levně prodávali velké množství půdy, vytvořily jedny z nejpříznivějších podmínek pro imigraci. Příchod zahraničních imigrantů do tohoto prostoru vítala i carská administrativa, která usilovala o oslabení vlivu zdejší polské šlechty.[57] Požadavkem ruské administrativy bylo vytvořit takové prostředí, které by s ruskou společností postupně splynulo. Vycházela ze zkušenosti s německými kolonisty, kteří sice byli ekonomicky úspěšní, ale vytvářeli uzavřené cizí jazykové ostrovy. Vnitřní ruská kolonizace byla nedostačující, proto ruská administrativa hledala další možnosti v přísunu kolonistů, a to především slovanské. Češi byli vhodní vzhledem k tomu, že byli ekonomicky agilní, se značnými ekonomickými zkušenostmi a na vysoké kulturní úrovni.[58] Podle prvního ruského sčítání lidu v roce 1897 žilo na Volyni 27 670 Čechů.[59] Kromě rolníků a živnostníků přicházeli na Volyň příslušníci české inteligence, zvláště hudebníci a učitelé.[60] Z takové rodiny pocházel i Antonín Palice, výtečný cellista a pianista. Později přestoupil na právnickou fakultu, ale stal se koncertním mistrem opery S. I. Zimina v Moskvě.[61]

54 Idem, s. 63.
55 Alois POSPÍŠIL, *Československá duševní armáda na Rusi*, Naše zahraničí 7, 1926, č. 4, s. 200.
56 Volynští Češi. Palice Antonín, Josef. Dostupné na: https://www.volynaci.cz/volynsti-cesi/19450/, 24. 7. 2024.
57 Jaroslav VACULÍK, *Dějiny volyňských Čechů I. (1868–1914)*, Praha 1997, s. 6.
58 Ibidem, s. 4.
59 Ibidem, s. 13.
60 Ibidem, s. 9.
61 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 62.

Z pamětí Jaroslava Svatoše je zřejmé, že jeho budoucí pedagogickou kariéru významně ovlivnil profesor Vasilij Osipovič Klučevskij (1841–1911), řádný profesor ruských dějin, vynikající učenec a výtečný lektor, který byl v té době nejpopulárnějším profesorem. Jeho přednášek se účastnili i studenti nefilologických fakult, příkladem je např. post-impresionistický malíř Leonid Pasternak, otec spisovatele Borise Pasternaka.[62] Z dalších vyučujících uváděl Jaroslav Svatoš řádného profesora řecké literatury Alexandera Nikolajeviče Švarce (1848–1915), pozdějšího ministra národní osvěty v letech 1908–1910. Velmi populárním byl v době Svatošových studií také profesor Vladimir Ivanovič Gerje (fr. Vladimir Guerrier, 1837–1919). Přednášel na moskevské univerzitě římské dějiny, dějiny reformace a francouzské revoluce. V dějinách ruské osvěty je znám jakožto iniciátor a organizátor Vyšších ženských kurzů, které byly v roce 1872 otevřeny v Moskvě.[63] Jaroslav Svatoš dále vzpomínal na profesora Pavla Gavriloviče Vinohradova (1854–1925), který na moskevské univerzitě přednášel dějiny Řecka a středověku. Zvláštní uznání Svatoš vyjadřoval také tehdejším profesorům filosofie, kterých na Moskevské univerzitě působila celá řada. Nikolaj Jakovlevič Grot (1852-1899), syn známého filologa, reformátora ruského pravopisu, člena ruské akademie věd J. Grota, kníže Sergej Nikolajevič Trubeckoj (1862–1905), a mnoho dalších. Tito profesoři se aktivně účastnili práce ve „Spolku pro filosofii a psychologii“, který vydával svůj časopis *Otázky filosofické a psychologické* pod redakcí Nikolaje Jakovleviče Grota.[64] Psychologická společnost, přidružená k Moskevské carské univerzitě, byla prvním profesním sdružením filosofů a psychologů v Rusku, které existovalo v letech 1885–1922. Časopis *Otázky filosofické a psychologické* se brzy po svém vzniku stal největším ruským filosofickým časopisem. Prostředky na vydávání tohoto časopisu poskytovala rodina Abrikosových, známých moskevských velkoobchodníků a mecenášů, majitelů největší cukrářské firmy v Rusku.[65] Také schůze filosofické společnosti byly hojně navštěvované, hlavně vysokoškoláky.

Jaroslav Svatoš dále vzpomínal na profesory přednášející dějiny ruské literatury Matveje Ivanoviče Sokolova (1855–1906), dějiny západní literatury pod vede-

62 Christopher BARNES, *Boris Pasternak: A Literary Biography*, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press 2004, s. 4.

63 Ilshat GAFUROV – Aydar KALLIMULLIN, *Teaching and teacher education in pre-revolutionary Russia,* in Teacher Education in Russia: Past, Present, and Future, United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis 2021, Part 1, Past.

64 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 47.

65 Boris Vladimirovič JEMELJANOV, *Russkaja filosofija. Slovar‘ personalij*. Russia: LitRes , 2021, s. 231.

ním profesora Nikolaje Iljiče Storoženka (1836–1906), ruského shakespearologa Alexeje Nikolajeviče Veselovského (1843–1918), srovnávacího jazykozpytu Filipa Fjodoroviče Fortunatova (1848–1914), jednoho z nejvýznamnějších lingvistů dorevolučního Ruska, či dokonce profesora sanskrtu, který přednášel profesor Vsevolod Fjodorovič Miller (1848–1913), výtečný znalec osetinské řeči, historie a kultury kavkazských národů. Své gymnaziální znalosti staroslovanštiny zúročil Svatoš během lekcí slavistiky přednášené profesorem Romanem Fjodorovičem Brandtem (1853–1920). Tímto Jaroslav Svatoš svůj výčet osobností, které jej na Moskevské univerzitě formovaly, ukončil. Ve všech uvedených případech se jednalo o respektované odborníky ve svých oborech.

V souvislosti s profesorským sborem na Moskevské univerzitě Jaroslav Svatoš poukazoval na fakt, že na filologické fakultě bylo poměrně mnoho profesorů s německými příjmeními. Domníval se, že se ve většině případů jednalo o potomky německých učenců, které ruský car pozval do Ruska. Všímal si, že se již zcela poruštili a jejich mateřskou řečí byla ruština. Povahou a smýšlením také již byli Rusové.[66] Profesoři s německými příjmeními mohli však stejně tak představovat pobaltské Němce, kteří se stali součástí ruského impéria v důsledku Severní války v letech 1700–1721 spolu s připojením švédských pobaltských provincií. Od samého počátku jejich připojení byli pobaltští Němci aktivně zváni ke službě ve státním aparátu, vojenských silách, často se objevovali mezi představiteli vědy a kultury. Úroveň jejich vzdělání získaná na evropských univerzitách a znalost cizích jazyků z nich učinily odborníky, které si ruské impérium žádalo. Významný počet pobaltských Němců působil také v diplomatických službách či v Akademii věd.[67] Německou kolonizační vlnu v Rusku přinesl o něco později Manifest Kateřiny Veliké z roku 1763, kterým zvala experty z mnoha různých oborů s cílem další modernizace Ruska, a to s příslibem nejrůznějších privilegií, včetně náboženské svobody, odpuštění daňové a branné povinnosti a dalších výhod. Další imigrační vlnu přinesla 60. léta 19. století, kdy se Němci usadili převážně v Povolží.[68] Kateřina Veliká tak navázala na kroky cara Petra I., jehož reformy a modernizační úsilí by se bez zkušeností cizinců, včetně Němců, také neobešlo. Roku 1702 vyšel Manifest Petra I., který do Ruska zval především vojenské specialisty potřebné během Severní války, obchodníky

66 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 50.

67 Natalia ANDREJEVA, *Pribaltijskije němcy v sostave Rossijskoj imperii: ključevye momenty social'noj i političeskoj istorii* (XVIII-načalo XX v.), Žurnal rossijskich i vostočnojevropejskich issledovanij № 1. 2023. S. 16.

68 James CASTEEL, *Russian German History as Global History: Beyond Ethnonational Frames in Russian Germans on Four Continents*, Lexington Books 1992, s. 2.

a řemeslníky. Manifest sliboval evropské životní i pracovní podmínky, vysoké odměny a úspěšnou kariéru.[69]

Svou moskevskou etapu ukončil Jaroslav Svatoš obhajobou disertační práce, jejíž téma mu zadal profesor Roman Fjodorovič Brandt a znělo: *O jazyku českých Alexandreid*.[70] Byla oceněna známkou „velmi dostatečně“, což v tehdejším hodnocení představovalo známku nejvyšší.[71] Před Svatošem se otevřela jeho profesní dráha, jejíž převážnou většinu věnoval výchově a vzdělávání studentů na několika typech tifliských středních škol, a která také předznamenala jeho další životní etapu spojenou s diplomacií a položením základů československo-gruzínských vztahů.

Češi v Tiflisu: působení Jaroslava Svatoše

Jaroslav Svatoš působil v Tiflisu bezmála 30 let. Intenzivně se zajímal o dějiny gruzínského národa a jeho kulturu. V jeho pamětech se dochoval rozsáhlý exkurz do složité gruzínské historie, ze kterého je zřejmé, jak moc jej gruzínský národ nadchl. Uvědomoval si jeho veliký potenciál, který mu nebylo umožněno nezávisle realizovat. Jako představitel národa, který sám snil o svém nezávislém státě, také dobře chápal gruzínskou touhu po vlastním státě. Ze Svatošových pamětí se nedozvídáme, jak přijal vznik Československa v roce 1918, z jeho dalších kroků, z nichž nejvýznamnějším bylo založení Československé národní jednoty, je zřejmé, že „třeba že jsem pobyl v Rusku přes čtyřicet let, studoval jsem tam na střední a vysoké škole, takže jsem prosáknut kulturními vlivy ruskými, což mi nepřekáží zůstati dobrým Čechem.“[72]

Do Tiflisu přijel Jaroslav Svatoš roku 1894, kdy vstoupil do státních služeb. Od tohoto roku působil společně s dalšími českými pedagogy Josefem Drbohlavem, Aloisem Skotákem a Václavem Rakušanem v Tiflisu na I. a II. dívčím gymnáziu. Vyučoval ruštinu, logiku, psychologii, pedagogiku, dějepis a klasické jazyky. V této době byl Tiflis velké město s 250 tisíci obyvateli. Působila zde tři chlapecká

69 Istorija němcev Rossii. Informacionnyj portal rossijskich němcev RusDeutsch. 1.2. Němcy v Rossii v pervoj polovině XVIII veka ot Petra I. do Jekatěriny II. Dostupné na: www.rusdeutsch.ru, 4. 8. 2024.

70 Alexandreis (či Alexandreida) je rozsáhlá epická, světská česky psaná báseň pravděpodobně z konce 13. století či počátku 14. století. Ve své době šlo o velmi oblíbený žánr. Hlavním hrdinou je Alexandr Veliký, který se pro své vojenské schopnosti stal vzorem středověkého rytíře.

71 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 63.

72 Ibidem, s. 9.

gymnázia, čtyři dívčí, institut pro šlechtičny, reálné gymnázium, učitelský ústav či střední bohoslovecká škola. Počet středních škol se za dobu působení Jaroslava Svatoše značně zvětšil. Bylo tam i soukromé gruzínské gymnázium s gruzínštinou jako vyučovacím jazykem. Jeho abiturienti však maturovali na ruském gymnáziu.[73]

V době, kdy do Tiflisu Jaroslav Svatoš přijel, tedy v roce 1894, „námestnictví kavkazské bylo již okolo 15 let zrušeno. Mělo být krokem, který měl přiblížiti splynutí administrace kavkazské s administrací ruskou."[74] Zrušení institutu tzv. kavkazského místokrálovství (kavkazskoje namestničestvo) s centrem v Tiflisu bylo v letech 1881–1882 jedním z projevů snahy carského Ruska o posílení ruské státnosti na svých okrajových územích. Roku 1883 bylo vydáno nařízení „O preobrazovanii upravlenija Kavkazskogo i Zakavkazskogo kraja." Kavkazského místokrále nahradil hlavní vojenský velitel (glavnokomandujuščij). Cílem této reformy bylo co největší přiblížení Kavkazu s „korennym organizmom Imperii." Nový administrativní systém se měl stát efektivnějším nástrojem k provádění politiky „obrusenija", tedy rusifikace Kavkazu.[75] V průběhu následujících dvou desetiletí se kavkazská administrace snažila o úplné sjednocení Kavkazu s dalšími částmi impéria.

Nejlepší zbraní přirozené rusifikace carského Ruska vůči Gruzii byla oblast školství.[76] Systematické vytlačování gruzínštiny ze škol začalo už v 70. letech 19. století a v 80. letech pokračovalo. Reminiscence gruzínské národní elity na někdejší státnost ukončenou koncem 18. století byly potlačovány a v roce 1882 bylo v tisku zakázáno používat výraz „Gruzie".[77] O pedagogické činnosti Jaroslava Svatoše v Tiflisu se dozvídáme nejen z jeho vlastních memoárů, ale především prostřednictvím jeho syna Alexeje Svatoše, který usiloval o zachování památky svého otce. Zasloužil se tak významně o vznik monografie věnované svému otci, jejímž autorem je gruzínský vědec Ivane Čkuaseli. Jeho monografie *Český pedagog Jaroslav Svatoš v Gruzii*[78] vyšla v roce 1962 u příležitosti 30. výročí úmrtí Jaroslava Svatoše a jejím základem jsou především archivní materiály tehdejšího Ústředního archivu Gruzínské socialistické republiky. Z uvedené monografie je zřejmé, že Jaroslav Svatoš byl na svou dobu velice progresivním a především demokratickým pedagogem. Ja-

73 Ibidem, s. 84.

74 Ibidem, s. 90

75 N. N. TUMAKOV, *Pervaja russkaja revoljucija i vosstanovlenije namestničestva na Kavkaze.* Vestnik Rjazanskogo gosudarstvennogo universitěta im. S. A. Jesenina. 2010. № 26.

76 Ivane ČKUASELI*, Čechi pedagogi Jaroslav Svatoši sakartveloši* čes. Český pedagog Jaroslav Svatoš v Gruzii), Tbilisi 1962, s. 30.

77 Z. VYDRA a kol., *Dějiny Ruska*, Praha 2017, s. 232.

78 Ivane ĆKUASELI, *Čechi pedagogi Jaroslav Svatoši Sakartveloši.*

ko rozený pedagog s přirozeným talentem pro vzdělávání a výchovu dokázal zdatně využít veškeré své zkušenosti z vlastního výchovně-vzdělávacího procesu.

Naučit se být učitelem je podle Jaroslava Svatoše nemožné. Dobrým učitelem se podle něj musí člověk narodit. „Pedagogická činnost není ani činností řemeslnou ani vědeckou: je to umění, a hlavní element toho, co uměním je – element tvůrčí – musí se uplatniti i v učitelské činnosti."[79] Takto stručně charakterizuje Jaroslav Svatoš pedagogické umění. Činí tak po více než 30 letech pedagogických zkušeností. A z jeho pedagogického působení je více než zřejmé, že právě tvůrčí element byl vedle řemeslného zvládnutí pedagogické práce a hluboké erudice hlavní součástí jeho umění.

Jaroslav Svatoš se významně zasloužil o rozvoj středního školství na Kavkaze a to jako všestranný a vynikající organizátor několika typů tifliských středních škol, především I. dívčího gymnázia a obchodní akademie, jako mimořádně talentovaný učitel a obětavý vedoucí početných studentských zájmových kroužků. Jeho pedagogická činnost se však vyznačovala i řadou v té době pokrokových politických rysů. V jeho působení jsou zvláště viditelné četné projevy internacionálního cítění, což se velice pozitivně promítlo jak do vytváření a řízení pedagogických sborů jednotlivých škol, tak do výchovy studentů. Svatoš se nemálo zasloužil rovněž o zlepšování třídního složení žactva, zvláště soustavnými různorodými formami materiálních výhod i přímou finanční výpomocí studentům z nemajetných rodin.

Dne 1. září 1909 se Jaroslav Svatoš stal ředitelem I. dívčího gymnázia. V této době měl již patnáctiletou pedagogickou zkušenost. Ústav se postupně, tak jako všechny školy pod Svatošovým vedením, stal jedním z nejlepších v Tiflisu.[80] Škola byla poprvé otevřena 11. dubna 1864, gymnáziem se začala nazývat až od roku 1870. V roce 1871 byla přejmenována na tifliské dívčí gymnázium velkokněžny Olgy Fjodorovny.[81] I. dívčí gymnázium nebylo určeno pro sociálně slabé dívky. Na tomto gymnáziu mohly studovat jen dívky pocházející z rodin s určitou ekonomickou úrovní, což z tohoto typu zařízení činilo zařízení elitářské a aristokratické, neboť zde většinou studovaly šlechtičny. V zařízení studovalo více studentek ruské národnosti než gruzínské. Nesmírně důležité pro Jaroslava Svatoše proto bylo, aby se různé národnosti v zařízení necítily odlišně. Usiloval o to, aby ve škole byli větší mírou zastoupeni gruzínští pedagogové i studenti.

79 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 93.
80 Ivane ČKUASELI, *Čechi pedagogi Jaroslav Svatoši sakartveloši*, s. 27.
81 Ibidem, s. 28.

Revoluční dění na Kavkaze v roce 1905 si vyžádalo změnu stávajících pořádků. Na Kavkaze byl opět zaveden institut místokrále s rozsáhlými pravomocemi a faktickou nezávislostí na jednotlivých ministerstvech podřízený přímo carovi, což bylo v podmínkách revolučního hnutí, které se rozhořelo na Kavkaze, považováno za logický krok.[82] Kavkazské místokrálovství v sobě spojovalo respekt k místním specifikům i vládu cara prostřednictvím místokrále.[83] Do funkce místokrále byl ustanoven hrabě Illarion Ivanovič Voroncov-Daškov (1837–1916), který ve funkci zůstal až do roku 1915. Jeho program obsahoval široké spektrum reforem, nejen v sociálně-ekonomické a politické oblasti života na Kavkaze založených na zdravém rozumu, hlubokých znalostech Kavkazu a jeho lidu a porozumění tamější aktuální situaci.

Revoluční dění roku 1905 a 1917 prožil Jaroslav Svatoš rovněž v Tiflisu. Z jeho vzpomínek se dozvídáme, že v této době působil jako ředitel tamní obchodní akademie a od roku 1909 až do vzniku Gruzínské demokratické republiky v roce 1918 jako ředitel I. dívčího gymnázia. V roce 1917 se carská správa Zakavkazska začala po únorové revoluci hroutit. Dosavadní místokrálovství bylo nahrazeno Zvláštním zakavkazským výborem (OZAKOM, Osobyj Zakavkazskij Kommitět), loajálním nové petrohradské vládě. Když ji v listopadu 1917 svrhli bolševici, většina politických představitelů zakavkazských národů novou bolševickou vládu neuznala a vytvořila Zakavkazský komisariát a Zakavkazský sejm, který v dubnu 1918 vyhlásil nezávislou Zakavkazskou demokratickou federativní republiku. Tento federativní útvar však vzhledem k neshodám mezi politickými představiteli jednotlivých národů přežil pouhý měsíc, aby se rozpadl na tři nezávislé státy – Arménskou demokratickou republiku, Ázerbájdžánskou demokratickou republiku a Gruzínskou demokratickou republiku.[84] O pár měsíců později vzniklo i nezávislé Československo, což Jaroslavu Svatošovi přineslo nové možnosti. Společně s dalšími Čechoslováky na vznik Československa již v listopadu 1918 reagoval založením Československé národní jednoty a stal se jejím předsedou.

---

82 N. N. TUMAKO, *Pervaja russkaja revoljucija i vosstanovlenije namestničestva na Kavkaze.* Vestnik Rjazanskogo gosudarstvennogo universitěta im. S. A. Jesenina. 2010. № 26. Dostupné na: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/pervaya-russkaya-revolyutsiya-i-vosstanovlenie-namestnichestva-na-kavkaze/viewer, 6. 8. 2024.

83 Vincenc KOPEČEK – Libor JELEN, *Jižní Kavkaz – od tradice k modernitě pod vlivem ruského kolonialismu in Prekolonialismus, kolonialismus a postkolonialismus. Impéria a ti ostatní ve východní a jihovýchodní Evropě*, Praha 2015, s. 147.

84 Ibidem, s. 151–152.

Se vznikem Gruzínské demokratické republiky v roce 1918 se situace pro Jaroslava Svatoše radikálně změnila. V rámci nově vzniklého státu bylo zapotřebí posílit národní uvědomění a realizovat celou řadu politických, ekonomických, sociálních či kulturních reforem. Veškeré pozůstatky ruské nadvlády musely být nekompromisně odstraněny. A to se týkalo především oblasti vzdělávání. Vzdělávací proces proto musel probíhat v gruzínštině.[85] Demokratická Gruzie odmítla zastaralý ruský vzdělávací systém a ve svém zájmu a především zájmu budování národní identity upřednostnila reformu celého systému.[86]

V Gruzínském národním archivu se nachází osobní složka Jaroslava Svatoše vedená v období od 5. září 1918 do roku 1919. Složka obsahuje rozhodnutí Ministra školství Gruzínské demokratické republiky Giorgiho Michajloviče Laschišviliho (1866–1931) datované 5. září 1918 a zaslané tehdejšímu řediteli I. dívčího gymnázia v Tiflisu Jaroslavu Svatošovi, kterým mu oznamuje, že od 10. září 1918 bude na tomto ústavu působit nadále jako středoškolský učitel. Byl vyzván, aby veškerou agendu předal svému zástupci a ujal se svých nových povinností. Do roku 1921 zde dále učil historii, logiku a ruský jazyk.[87]

Za dobu Svatošova pedagogického působení prošlo jeho rukama značné množství žáků. Někteří z nich se stali známými nejen v Rusku, ale i za jeho hranicemi. Jedním z nich byl Irakle Georgijevič Cereteli (1881–1959), který sehrál významnou úlohu v politickém životě Kavkazu i celého Ruska. Nejprve jako člen Státní Dumy či ministr pošt Kerenského prozatímní vlády v roce 1917, a později, již jako člen zákonodárného shromáždění nově vzniklé Gruzínské demokratické republiky, významnou roli v diplomatickém působení Jaroslava Svatoše. Jaroslav Svatoš na něj vzpomíná jako na výtečného žáka, který již na gymnáziu vynikal svou ustálenou povahou a autoritou v očích svých spolužáků.[88] Svatošovy styky s ním trvaly i po jeho odchodu z gymnázia, kdy byl již Jaroslav Svatoš předsedou Československé národní jednoty. Právě v tento okamžik jeho bývalý student položil základ československo-gruzínských vztahů. Jaroslav Svatoš se jeho prostřednictvím z titulu předsedy Československé národní jednoty stal pro novou vládu Gruzínské

85 Nato SONGHULASHVILI, *Education in the First Republic of Georgia (1918–1921),* in Bulletin of the Georgian National Academy of Science 14, 2020, č. 1, s. 144.

86 Teona MURGULIA, *Education and Pedagogical Thinking of Georgia in 1918–1921*. An abstract, Kutaisi, 2018, s. 62.

87 Gruzínský národní archiv, osobní složka Jaroslava Svatoše z let 1918–1919, složka č. 318 (sakme N.318), 1935.

88 J. SVATOŠ, *Vzpomínky ruského Čecha, gymn. prof. a ředitele*, s. 119.

demokratické republiky oficiálním představitelem nově vzniklého Československa v demokratické Gruzii.

Gruzínská demokratická republika však neměla dlouhého trvání. V únoru 1921 vstoupila do Tiflisu Rudá armáda. Gruzínská demokratická republika se ocitla pod sovětskou okupací a její území pod sovětskou vládou. Jaroslav Svatoš se snažil o nastavení československo-gruzínských vztahů i v nově vzniklém kontextu sovětské Gruzie. Z pověření československé vlády se stal zástupcem pro obchodní vztahy, ochranu československých občanů i pro repatriaci zajatců.[89] S navázáním diplomatických vztahů se sovětskou Gruzií však československá vláda váhala. Roku 1923 byla činnost honorárního konzulátu v Tiflisu na naléhání sovětské vlády zastavena formálně a Jaroslav Svatoš zůstal v Tiflisu jako soukromá osoba.[90]

Situace Jaroslava Svatoše, jakožto představitele „buržoazního" Československa v sovětské Gruzii, se v roce 1924 stala neudržitelnou. Sovětskou vládou byl z Tiflisu vypovězen[91] a dnem 1. ledna 1925 přeložen do Prahy.[92] Vrátil se i s rodinou do vlasti, kterou před více než 40 lety opustil. Na Ministerstvu zahraničních věcí ČSR, jehož byl v posledních letech v Gruzii Svatoš zaměstnancem, pro něj neměli vhodné místo. Dne 9. listopadu 1925 rozvázalo Ministerstvo zahraničních věcí Československa s Jaroslavem Svatošem služební poměr ke dni 31. prosince 1924,[93] tedy skoro rok zpětně. Pro Benešovo ministerstvo se, zřejmě z důvodů svých kontaktů na bolševické představitele sovětské Gruzie, stal nedůvěryhodnou osobou. V Československu nebyl uznán ani jeho moskevský vysokoškolský diplom, aby mohl učit na gymnáziu. Byl tak nucen vykonat všechny zkoušky i obhajobu své práce znovu. Kvůli svému postavení velice strádal.[94] Pokračoval v pedagogické práci a na ruském gymnáziu pro emigranty ve Strašnicích, kde jej považovali za Čecha z Ruska, vyučoval ruštinu.[95] V Gruzii si přitom v rámci svého působení vydobyl významné postavení, které jej po vzniku Československa předurčilo k roli čelního představitele československé komunity v Tiflisu. Stal se hlavním tvůrcem československo-gruzínských vztahů. V Československu stačil ještě napsat podstatnou část svých pamětí a postavit domek v Praze na Hanspaulce. Zemřel 22. července 1932

89 AMZV Praha, osobní spis Jaroslava Svatoše, č.j.: 22546/pres/21 ze dne 21. července 1921.
90 AMZV Praha, osobní spis Jaroslava Svatoše, čj.: 52.007/V3/23.
91 AMZV Praha, osobní spis Jaroslava Svatoše, čj.: 200.472/II/24.
92 AMZV Praha, osobní spis Jaroslava Svatoše, čj.: 721/I-II/25.
93 AMZV Praha, osobní spis Jaroslava Svatoše, čj.: 159.78/1-2/25.
94 Ivane ČKUASELI, *Čechi pedagogi Jaroslav Svatoši Sakartveloši*, s. 18.
95 Marina DOBUŠEVA – Viktoria KRYMOVA – Anastázie KOPŘIVOVÁ, *Dom v izgnanii. Očerki o russkoj emigracii v Čechoslovakii*, Ruská tradice, Praha 2008, s. 63

ve věku 61 let. Sám by na závěr svého životního příběhu napsal: „Jan Ámos Komenský, který byl vyhnán ze své vlasti, umírá v cizině. Já umírám ve své vlasti, ale cítím se jako emigrant."[96]

Osobnost Jaroslava Svatoše jako budoucího pedagoga a diplomata formovalo carské Rusko. Analýza jeho osobních pamětí dokládá, že i Svatoš se považoval za ruského Čecha v Gruzii, se kterou spojil skoro 30 let svého života. Svatošovy paměti popisují velice turbulentní období kavkazských dějin především druhé poloviny 19. století. Lze tak na nich vysledovat průběh tzv. malých dějin spolu s každodenní realitou představitele české menšiny v carském Rusku, člena intelektuální elity, jehož činnost spoluvytvářela mozaiku tehdejšího multikulturního Tiflisu. Osobnost pedagoga a diplomata Jaroslava Svatoše, jakožto jednoho z hlavních představitelů tzv. československé duševní armády na Rusi, který v kulturní oblasti carského Ruska v uvedeném období a později v československo-gruzínských nejen diplomatických vztazích zanechal nesmazatelnou stopu, zůstávala dlouho nedoceněna. Zdůraznění přínosu Jaroslava Svatoše, jehož bohaté zkušenosti s Kavkazem tehdejší československé Ministerstvo zahraničních věcí nedokázalo či nechtělo využít, je tak skromným příspěvkem k rehabilitaci jeho jména a docenění jeho odkazu.

96 Ivane ČKUASELI, *Čechi pedagogi Jaroslav Svatoši Sakartveloši*, čes. Český pedagog Jaroslav Svatoš v Gruzii), Tbilisi 1962, s. 18

SUMMARY

This paper focuses on the life and legacy of educator and diplomat Jaroslav Svatoš (1871–1932), a representative of the so-called Czechoslovak „spiritual army" in Russia—a group of Czechoslovaks who left an indelible mark on the cultural life of Tsarist Russia, particularly in the second half of the nineteenth century. Against this backdrop, the study traces Svatoš's personal journey and the shaping of his identity, using it to illustrate the broader wave of Czech and Slovak emigration to Crimea, Volhynia, and the Caucasus and its underlying causes. Svatoš's experiences also serve to present the system of secondary and higher education in Russia during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

His later teaching career in Tiflis offers insight into the Caucasian education system and the broader social conditions of the region at the time. His role as Chairman of the Czechoslovak National Unity in Tiflis marks the emergence of Czechoslovak-Georgian diplomatic relations and highlights the significant—albeit brief—part he played in their formation. The study aims to present the influence of Tsarist Russia on the formation of Jaroslav Svatoš's identity as an educator and diplomat.

It draws on the analysis of an *egodocument* in the form of Svatoš's personal memoirs, written in 1927, which reveal that he considered himself a "Russian Czech" in Georgia, where he spent nearly thirty years of his life. These memoirs vividly describe a particularly turbulent period in the history of the Caucasus, especially in the second half of the nineteenth century. Through Svatoš's reflections, the study traces the course of so-called "small histories" alongside the everyday reality of a member of the Czech minority in Tsarist Russia—an intellectual whose work helped shape the cultural mosaic of the multicultural city of Tiflis.

The study highlights the underappreciated contributions of Jaroslav Svatoš, whose deep knowledge of the Caucasus was either overlooked or disregarded by the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs at the time. As such, this paper offers a modest contribution to the rehabilitation of his name and a recognition of his legacy.

STUDIE / ARTICLE

Účast Čechů a rodáků z Čech a Moravy ve vojenských operacích Ukrajinské haličské armády v letech 1918–1923

OLEH STETSYSHYN

Faculty of History, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukraine

Participation of Czechs and Natives of Bohemia and Moravia in Military Operations in Units of the Galician Army between 1918 and 1923

In October and November 1918, Austria-Hungary disintegrated, and on its ruins, new independent states emerged, formed by the nations that had previously been part of the Dual Monarchy. One of the causes of its collapse was defeat on the battlefields of the First World War, accompanied by revolutionary tendencies among its constituent peoples. On 1 November 1918, Ukrainian politicians and military leaders in Lviv proclaimed the Ukrainian state, later known as the West Ukrainian People's Republic. Its armed forces, which came to be known as the Galician Army, began to form. Among their ranks were many former soldiers of non-Ukrainian origin, including Czechs. This article analyses the reasons for the presence of Czechs in the Western Ukrainian army, the legal basis for their recruitment, and the military careers of selected officers.

Keywords: Galicia; Ukrainians; West Ukrainian People's Republic; Galician Army; Czechs; Ukraine; Czechoslovak Republic

Úvod

Historické vazby mezi ukrajinským a českým národem sahají mnoho staletí zpět a jsou široce studovány vědci obou zemí. Méně známá je spolupráce Ukrajinců a Čechů v letech 1917–1923, kdy se Ukrajinci stejně jako ostatní národy střední a východní Evropy pokoušeli realizovat své právo na vlastní státnost. Právě v tomto období byl na ukrajinských územích, která byla součástí Ruské říše a Rakousko-Uherska, vyhlášen ukrajinský stát. Nejdříve vznikla v roce 1917 Ukrajinská lidová republika a o rok později Západoukrajinská lidová republika (ukrajinská zkratka ZUNR). Jednalo se o území východní Haliče a Bukoviny, ke kterému bylo deklarativně, ale nikoli fakticky připojeno sedm komitétů bývalého Uherského království, kde žili Rusíni (Ukrajinci). Jejím vůdcem byl bývalý poslanec rakouského parlamentu Jevhen Petruševyč (1863–1940). Ozbrojenými silami ZUNR byla Ukrajinská haličská armáda (ukrajinská zkratka UHA), kde kromě Ukrajinců sloužili i příslušníci jiných národností.

Účelem našeho článku je vyplnit mezeru v bádání o této problematice, a to popisem vojenské služby Čechů a příslušníků jiných národností spjatých s územím současné České republiky v UHA. Studie uvádí důvody jejich přijetí do UHA, přibližný počet, vojenské hodnosti a specializace atd. Chronologicky začíná naše bádání datem 1. listopadu 1918, kdy ve Lvově převzal moc ukrajinský vojenský personál a politici deklarující státnost, a končí datem 15. března 1923, kdy po rozhodnutí zemí Dohody o východních hranicích Polska přestala exilová vláda ZUNR existovat.

Stav bádání a pramenů

Historiografie problematiky branné povinnosti vojáků českého původu v ukrajinské armádě je bohužel nedostatečná. Vědci se nejvíce zaměřují na formování ozbrojených sil ZUNR, jejich působení na území Ukrajiny, pobyt jednotek UHA v internačních táborech na území dnešního Česka a dalších zemí atd.

Historiografii této problematiky lze rozdělit do dvou období: vědecký výzkum před rokem 1991, kdy Ukrajina vyhlásila nezávislost, a moderní výzkum prováděný po roce 1991. Jednu z prvních aktivit haličské armády v kontextu ukrajinsko-českých vztahů nadnesl známý představitel ukrajinské emigrace v Česku Symon Narižnyj.[1] Shrnul a analyzoval vojenské, politické, kulturní a sportovní aktivity Ukrajinců, kteří žili mezi dvěma světovými válkami mimo Ukrajinu. Velkou pozornost věnoval táborovému životu vojáků UHA, kteří byli v letech 1919–1926 internováni v Německém Jablonném (dnes Jablonné v Podještědí), Josefově a Liberci nebo byli v pracovních táborech na území Československé republiky. Jeho zásluhou je uchování a zveřejnění značného množství tehdejších fotografií a uvedení některých pramenných materiálů do vědeckého oběhu.

Dalším ukrajinským výzkumníkem té doby byl bývalý voják UHA Lev Šankovskyj,[2] který je autorem mnoha studií o událostech prvního ukrajinského osvobozeneckého boje. Ve svých dílech se však většinou věnuje bojové činnosti haličské armády a omezuje se na konstatování přítomnosti vojáků českého původu v jejích řadách, aniž by se pokoušel analyzovat důvody přítomnosti Čechů v ukrajinské armádě nebo prozkoumat jejich počet.

Částečně se tohoto tématu dotýká i pražský ukrajinský historik Bohdan Zilynskyj.[3] Hlavním tématem jeho knihy je obecný rozbor stoletého (1894–1994) období života ukrajinských emigrantů na území dnešní České republiky, přičemž se zároveň věnuje tématu pobytu ukrajinských vojáků v Československu v letech 1919–1926. Stejné odkazy na českou vojenskou službu na západní Ukrajině v UHA se objevují i u dalších autorů, jedná se však především o memoáry, nikoli o specializované historické výzkumy.

Současní historici Ukrajiny, Česka, Slovenska, Polska a dalších zemí věnují mnohem větší pozornost ukrajinsko-českým vztahům v období 1919–1926 a později. Především stojí za zmínku článek ukrajinského vědce a předsedy společnosti Česká beseda ve Lvově Jevhena Topinky.[4] Stal se prvním vědcem, který si z výzkumu vztahu obou národů vybral téma Čechů a osob z Československa sloužících v ozbrojených silách ZUNR. Do vědeckého oběhu uvedl také mnoho málo známých zdrojů. Přestože celkový objem jeho vědecké práce je poměrně malý, stal se referenčním bodem pro další badatele v této problematice.

Významné místo v historiografii našeho tématu zaujímá souborné dílo *Tábor internovaných vojsk Ukrajinské haličské armády v Nimetském Jablonném (Československo) v letech 1919–1920*. Jejími autory jsou ukrajinští vědci Ihor Srybniak,

1 Symon NARIŽNYJ, *Ukraïnska emigratsiia. Kulturna pratsia ukraïnskoï emigratsiï mizh dvoma svitovymy* viïnamy, Praha 1942.

2 Lev ŠANKOVSKYJ, *Ukraïnska Halytska Armiia: woienno-istorychna studiia*, Lviv 1999.

3 Bohdan ZILYNSKYJ. *Ukrajinci v Čechách a na Moravě*, Praha 1995.

4 Jevhen TOPINKA. Chekhy u viiskovykh formuvanniakh Ukraïnskykh sichovykh striltsiv ta Ukraïnskoi Halytskoï armiï, in “*Problemy slovianoznavstva*”, 2002, s. 59–65.

Andrii Kupcov a polský historik Zbigniew Karpus.[5] Autoři velmi podrobně zkoumají zejména předpoklady a důvody příchodu Haličanů do těchto táborů a okolnosti jejich pobytu v nich. Za zmínku stojí především jejich úspěšná práce s archivními dokumenty z té doby a také to, že publikují seznamy internovaných haličských vojáků a doprovázejí je zajímavými osobními informacemi o nich. Jsou tam zmíněni i neukrajinskí vojáci UHA, ale důvody jejich působení v řadách haličské armády se bohužel neuvádějí.

V různé míře upozorňují na historii haličské vojenské přítomnosti na území Československa ve svých výzkumech Roman Tjutenko,[6] Oksana Jamková[7] a Vitalii Vyzdryk.[8] Velkou pozornost věnují průběhu internace a výklad kombinují jednak s historickou retrospektivou a také s popisem činností ukrajinských vojenských, vědeckých, sportovních, kulturních a vzdělávacích center v Československu jak během pobytu jednotek UHA v táborech, tak poté, co tyto instituce zanikly (od roku 1919 do konce 30. let 20. století). Samostatně je zpracován kladný přístup československých orgánů k ukrajinským vojákům, kteří byli nuceni opustit svou vlast.

Toto téma zkoumají i historici z Česka a Slovenska. Dušan Janák[9] a David Svoboda[10] zkoumají přítomnost haličské armády na československém území v širších souvislostech. Analyzují například vliv ukrajinského faktoru na utváření česko-ukrajinských vztahů v předmětném období a v pozdějších dobách. Svoboda zjišťuje, jak přítomnost haličských vojáků ovlivnila situaci na Podkarpatské Rusi a bilaterální vztahy mezi Československem a Polskem, jak se rodila a vyvíjela nacionalistická ideologie mezi ukrajinskou emigrací atd. Vlastimil Ondrák[11] se ve své

5 Zbigniew KARPUS – Andrii KUPTSOV – Ihor SRIBNIAK, *Tabir internovanykh viisk Ukraïnskoï Halytskoï Armiï v Nimetskomu Jablonnomu (Chekhoslovachchyna) u 1919–1920 rr*, Kyiv – Torun 1999.

6 Roman TIUTENKO, *Ukrainska viiskova emihratsiia v mizhvoiennyi period (1919–1939 rr.)*, doktorská dizertace, Ukrainskyi Vilnyi Universytet, Miunkhen 2021.

7 Oksana JAMKOVA, *Kulturno-prosvitnytska diialnist ta natsionalno-patriotychne vykhovannia u taborakh internovanykh ukraintsiv u Chekhoslovachchyni*, Visnyk Kyivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Tarasa Shevchenka. Seriia "Istoria", 2004, s. 74–76, 56–59.

8 Vitalii VYZDRYK, *Internovani chastyny UHA v Chekhoslovachchyni: nadii ta realii*, Visnyк Natsionalnoho universytetu "Lvivska Poloitekhnika" 571, 2006, Derzhava ta armiia, s. 310–313.

9 Dušan JANÁK, *Tragické návraty. Osudy ukrajinských reemigrantů z Československa v SSSR*, *Človek a* spoločnosť 22, 2019, s. 30–43.

10 David SVOBODA, *Boj o cizi duši. Ukrajinství a ukrajinský nacionalismus v české reflexi 1900–1938*, dizertační práce, Fakulta humanitních studií, Univerzita Karlova, Praha 2007.

11 Vlastimil ONDRÁK, *Boje Ukrajinské haličské armády proti maďarským jednotkám na Slovensku a Podkarpatské Rusi roku 1919: realita, či mýtus*, in: Kol. autorů: *Ukraińcy i ich sąsedzi na przestrzeni wieków. Polityka/Gospodarka /Religia/Kultura/Życie codzienne*, Słupsk – Warszawa 2021,

vědecké práci zabývá zajímavým a zároveň málo známým tématem možné účasti vojáků UHA v roce 1919 v bojových operacích na straně československé armády proti maďarské armádě na Slovensku a Podkarpatské Rusi. V. Ondrák v roce 2023 také obhájil disertační práci s názvem *Soud krví a železem* o historii ukrajinského nacionalistického hnutí. Ve své práci hovoří o činnosti ZUNR, polsko-ukrajinském konfliktu o východní Halič v letech 1918–1919 a zkoumá činnost ukrajinských organizací na území Československa v meziválečném období.

Dále mohu zmínit svou monografii *Landsknechty Halytskoi Armii*[12] o vojácích neukrajinského původu, kteří sloužili v řadách UHA. V této práci je téma západoukrajinské vojenské služby Čechů a rodáků z Česka pojednáno komplexně dohromady se službou příslušníků jiných národů v ozbrojených silách ZUNR. Jednou z kapitol této knihy je životopisná esej o jednom z nejlepších důstojníků generálního štábu UHA Wilhelmu Lobkowitzovi.

Ve všech těchto studiích však fakta o přítomnosti Čechů a rodáků z českých zemí v řadách armády ZUNR buď nebyla analyzována, nebo byla zkoumána pouze povrchně. Hlavním úkolem našeho článku je proto shrnout a analyzovat všechny zdrojové informace k tomuto tématu.

Čeští vojáci v armádě Západoukrajinské lidové republiky: důvody, průběh služby, statistiky

Zdroje, které jsme v tomto článku použili, lze rozdělit do tří skupin. První jsou archivní prameny. Jedná se především o materiály Ústředního státního archivu vyšších orgánů a správy Ukrajiny v Kyjevě, kde ve zdroji velmi bohatém na informace – číslo fondu 2188 (Hlavní velitelství haličské armády) – nalezneme seznamy vyšších důstojníků, nižších důstojníků a vojáků UHA. Mimo jiné je zde uvedena i národnost těchto vojáků.

Kromě toho je v pramenném materiálu fondu 2188 národnost toho či onoho haličského vojáka uvedena v dalších dokumentech, jako jsou žádosti o povýšení, osobní dokumenty, příkazy, odvolání atd. Mnohé z těchto dokumentů dosud nebyly uvedeny do vědeckého oběhu a nejsou publikovány. Český původ některých vyš-

s. 429–440; Vlastimil ONDRÁK, *Soud krví a železem. Ukrajinský integrální nacionalismus, „banderovci" a jejich místo v evropských dějinách*, dizertační práce, Filozofická fakulta, Univerzita Karlova, Praha, 2023.

12 Oleh STETSYSHYN, *Landsknechty Halytskoï armiï*, Lviv 2012, s. 480.

ších důstojníků haličské armády, kteří byli po květnu 1919 internováni v československém táboře v Jablonném v Podještědí, lze určit také z tehdejších dokumentů UHA, které jsou uchovávány ve Vojenském historickém archivu ČR. Konkrétně se jedná o seznamy důstojníků UHA, kteří byli v táboře, přijeli tam z Vídně, Prahy či jiných měst, nebo naopak opustili Jablonné. V řadě případů byla zaznamenána národnost těchto vojáků nebo místo jejich narození. Druhou skupinou jsou tištěné zdroje, ať už ukrajinské, polské, rakouské atd., ve kterých lze nalézt osobní údaje účastníků příslušných vojenských akcí. Jsou to jak sbírky dokumentů, tak vzpomínky přímých účastníků událostí. Třetí skupinu pramenů tvoří tištěné materiály z uvedeného období, například denní tisk.

Abychom pochopili důvody, proč čeští vojáci vstoupili do západoukrajinské vojenské služby, je třeba vzít v úvahu historické reálie té doby. Bezprostředně po vyhlášení ukrajinského státu na území západní Ukrajiny 1. listopadu 1918 vyvstala otázka jeho ozbrojené ochrany. Ihned bychom měli poznamenat, že podle tehdy platné legislativy byli povinni sloužit v jeho ozbrojených silách a bránit nezávislost státu pouze etničtí Ukrajinci. O tom se dočteme zejména v jednom z prvních dokumentů parlamentu ZUNR Ukrajinské národní rady. Ve zprávě z 1. listopadu 1918 tento zákonodárný orgán uvedl, že všichni branci „ukrajinského národa“ by měli přijít na obranu mladého státu a „všichni zbrojní ukrajinští lidé“ by měli vytvořit místní vojenské jednotky.[13]

Důraz na ukrajinskou národnost rekrutů, kteří musí být mobilizováni do nově vytvořené haličské armády, je patrný i v dokumentech Vojenského ministerstva ZUNR (Státní sekretariát pro vojenské záležitosti) ze dne 13. listopadu 1918,[14] který odkazuje na usnesení parlamentu, jež bylo vydáno téhož dne. Podle tohoto dokumentu se do řad ozbrojených sil ZUNR měli přihlásit pouze „občané ukrajinské národnosti“. Tímto způsobem byli občané ZUNR jiného než ukrajinského původu de iure osvobozeni od povinnosti jej chránit. Ukrajinské úřady zároveň uvítaly vstup vojáků jiných národností do UHA, neboť ozbrojeným silám chyběli důstojníci a vojenští specialisté (železničáři, lékaři, veterináři atd.). K 21. listopadu 1918 sloužilo v řadách ozbrojených sil ZUNR 4 517 vojáků a celkem 161 důstojníků, tedy jeden důstojník na dvacet osm vojáků. V rotě rakouské armády bylo pět až šest důstojníků, zatímco v podobné ukrajinské jednotce byl jeden nebo dva. Místo požadovaných pěti důstojníků měla baterie polních děl jednoho, maximálně dva

13 „Ukraïnskyi narode“, *Dilo*, Padolyst 5, 1918, s. 1.
14 „IV. Rozporiad“, *Vistnyk Derzhavnoho Sekretariatu Viiskovych Sprav*, 1918, cz. 1, 2–3.

důstojníky. Pro srovnání, polská armáda měla zhruba ve stejné době 572 důstojníků a 4 746 střelců, tedy jednoho důstojníka na osm vojáků.[15]

Nutno podotknout, že etnonymum „Ukrajinec" se v té době nepoužívalo v politickém smyslu, ale ve smyslu úzce národnostním a znamenalo pouze osoby ukrajinské národnosti. Proto se také výrazy „Židé", „Češi" nebo „Němci" používaly pouze pro označení lidí tohoto národnostního původu.

Zároveň neplatil zákaz přijímat do armády osoby jiné národnosti. Na počátku formování armády ZUNR nebylo pro představitele jiného národa těžké stát se ukrajinským důstojníkem. V plukovním archivu 1. pěšího pluku, pojmenovaném po knížeti Lvovi, je uložen rozkaz tehdejšího velitele pluku Mykytky ze začátku listopadu 1918, který se týká zejména bývalých důstojníků rakousko-uherské armády, kteří si přejí vstoupit do ukrajinské armády: „Kdokoli chce vstoupit do naší služby, ať jde jako dobrovolník do plukovní kanceláře, po složení přísahy dostane službu a stipendium." To znamená, že aby dobrovolník dostal funkci a plat, musel pouze prohlásit svou připravenost bránit ZUNR, složit vojenskou přísahu.[16]

Dostupné prameny nám umožňují identifikovat několik možných příčin výskytu Čechů a osob českého původu v haličské armádě. Hlavním důvodem, proč se tito vojáci objevili, byl nábor. Po skončení první světové války a rozpadu Rakouska-Uherska zůstalo mnoho rakouských důstojníků bez práce. Vyhlášení ukrajinského státu v Haliči, Bukovině a Zakarpatí a formování jeho ozbrojených sil (stejně jako vyhlášení nezávislosti dalších států) se shodovalo s objektivními procesy rakousko-uherské armády.

Rozhodující byly události z října 1918, kdy se odstředivé procesy v říši a prudký růst národního vědomí národů staly prakticky nevratnými. Říjnový manifest císaře Karla z 16. října o přeměně Rakouska-Uherska na federativní stát, který měl být společně řízen národními radami jednotlivých etnik, požadavky Maďarské národní rady z 24. října na evakuaci svých vojáků z hlavní italské fronty a okupované Ukrajiny, prohlášení národních rad z 28. a 29. října o vzniku Československa a Státu Slovinců, Chorvatů a Srbů (který záhy zanikl a po spojení se Srbskem bylo místo něj vytvořeno Království Srbů, Chorvatů a Slovinců) fakticky ukončily existenci mnohonárodnostní monarchie a dezorganizovaly její ozbrojené síly. Spouště-

15 Oleksa KUZMA, *Lystopadovi dni 1918 roku*, Lviv 1931, s. 394.

16 Derzhavnyj arkhìv Lvìvskoï oblastì (Státní archiv Lvovské oblasti), f. 257, op. 2, spr. 1474, ark. 13.

čem definitivního rozpadu císařsko-královské armády byla její porážka v bitvě u Vittorio Veneta (25. října – 4. listopadu 1918).[17]

Kromě toho je třeba vzít v úvahu těžkou hospodářskou krizi, inflaci a politickou nestabilitu v Rakousku. V hlavním městě bývalého císařství zavládla atmosféra chaosu a paniky, o čemž svědčí i zprávy tehdejších periodik. „Vídeň. 27. listopadu 1918. Včera ráno začalo rabování vojenských skladů s botami, kůžemi a uniformami. Městská policie tuto situaci nedokázala vyřešit, tak musela použít zbraně. Používaly se ostré náboje, ale střílelo se do vzduchu. Výstřely nikoho nezranily, jen šest lidí – dvě ženy a čtyři děti – zemřely během tlačenice."[18] Myron Tarnavskyj, budoucí vrchní velitel haličské armády, měl z událostí ve Vídni špatný dojem. Později vzpomínal, jak se dlouhé kolony někdejších vojáků – ztrhaných, špinavých, neoholených – táhly ulicemi bývalého císařského hlavního města. Civilisté a vojáci nosili „jakési klacky", strkali se, nadávali, křičeli.[19]

Bývalí vojáci se proto snažili využít jakékoli příležitosti. Byly případy, kdy nedávní poručíci a majorové neváhali provozovat drobné obchody na ulici, aby si vydělali na živobytí pro sebe a své rodiny. Není divu, že v takové situaci se ochotně nechali najímat, aby sloužili v armádě států, které v té době vznikly. Mnozí z nich tedy vstoupili také do armády ZUNR, která se potýkala s nedostatkem důstojníků.

Jedním z důvodů této situace bylo, že vzdělání na tehdejších vojenských akademiích bylo pro haličské a bukovinské Ukrajince, jejichž majetkové poměry většinou nebyly dobré, příliš drahé. Navíc na rozdíl řekněme od Poláků Ukrajinci prakticky neměli ekvivalent šlechtické vrstvy, pro jejíž představitele byla vojenská služba tradičně čestným povoláním. Těch několik málo osob šlechtického původu, které se považovaly za Ukrajince, si většinou nemohlo dovolit zaplatit svému synovi vzdělání v důstojnické škole nebo na vojenské akademii. Zároveň množství polské šlechty bylo mnohem větší a úroveň bohatství výrazně vyšší. To se odrazilo i na počtu ukrajinských a polských kadetů Tereziánské vojenské akademie ve Wiener Neustadt, jednom z nejznámějších vzdělávacích ústavů tohoto druhu v Rakousku-Uhersku. Je známo, že ze 438 kadetů, kteří na této univerzitě studovali v letech 1912–1913, jich jen 33 reprezentovalo Halič a Bukovinu. Zároveň pouze jeden kadet (0,2 % z celkového počtu) ze 438 uvedl jako svůj rodný jazyk ukrajinštinu. Pro srovnání: polsky mluvících kadetů bylo 16 (3,7 %), Čechů a Slováků 28 (6,4 %)

---

17 Michał BACZKOWSKI, The disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian army in 1918, in: *Folia Historica Cracoviensia*, 2019, Tom 25, 2, 134–135.

18 Wieden. *Monitor Polski,* 27. listopada 1918, 4.

19 Volodymyr LASOVSKYI, *Generál Tarnavskyj*, Lviv 1935, s. 96.

a Jihoslovanů (Chorvatů, Srbů a Slovinců) 35 (8 %). Ukrajinská národní reprezentace v kadetském prostředí akademie ve Wiener-Neustadtu byla tedy nejmenší.[20]

Na chronický nedostatek ukrajinského důstojnického personálu měly kromě finančních aspektů negativní vliv také antimilitaristické nálady, které tradičně panovaly v západoukrajinském prostředí, zejména mezi inteligencí. Je známo, že dokonce i kdysi nepopiratelná autorita lidu Haliče a Bukoviny, metropolita řeckokatolické církve Andrej Šeptyckyj, hovořící před duchovenstvem o potřebě ukrajinského národa mít vlastní vojenskou elitu, vyslechl námitky kněží, protože vojenské záležitosti nejsou pro Ukrajince, ale „pro hrabata a knížata".[21]

Dalším důležitým faktorem, který potenciální kadety odrazoval, byl dosti nízký plat rakousko-uherských důstojníků. Na přelomu 19. a 20. století to bylo v průměru o 25 % méně než plat průměrného státního zaměstnance. To samozřejmě dále posílilo zmíněné protivojenské nálady západoukrajinské společnosti. V důsledku toho bylo k roku 1910 ve Společné armádě Rakouska-Uherska (bez rakouského a maďarského Landwehru a Landsturmu) pouze 34 ukrajinských důstojníků, tedy 0,2 % z jejich celkového počtu. Pro srovnání: polských důstojníků bylo dvanáctkrát více, tedy 2,5 %, a to přesto, že celkově byl počet polských a ukrajinských obyvatel říše přibližně stejný: přibližně pět milionů Poláků a čtyři miliony Ukrajinců (Rusínů).[22] To vše vedlo k tomu, že v předvečer první světové války připadali na tisíc důstojníků rakousko-uherské armády jen dva Ukrajinci a sedmadvacet Poláků.[23] Jelikož se haličská armáda začala vytvářet z vojáků bývalé císařsko-královské armády, nemohlo to ovlivnit počet důstojníků ozbrojených sil západoukrajinského státu.

Nutno podotknout, že personálem haličské armády byli převážně etničtí Ukrajinci, kteří tvořili mezi hodnostmi a poddůstojníky naprostou většinu. Důstojnický sbor haličské armády byl národnostně pestřejší. V jejích řadách sloužili kromě ukrajinských důstojníků (z Haliče, Bukoviny a Podněperské Ukrajiny) také Němci, Židé, Poláci, Rusové, Italové a zástupci dalších evropských národů. Byli mezi nimi i Češi.

---

20 István DEÁK, *Beyond Nationalism. A Social and Political History of the Habsburg Officer Corps, 1848–1918*, Oxford – New York – Toronto, 1990, s. 92–93.

21 Sydir JAROSLAVYN, *Vyzvolna borotba na zakhidnoukraïnskykh zemliakh u 1918–1923 rokakh*, Philadelphia 1956, s. 126.

22 I. DEÁK, *Beyond Nationalism, A Social and Political History of the Habsburg Officer Corps,* s. 13, 121, 181.

23 Orest SUBTELNYI, *Ukraïna. Istoriia*, Kyiv: Lybid, 1992, s. 323.

První Češi vstoupili do haličské armády hned v den vyhlášení ukrajinského státu, tedy 1. listopadu 1918. Jak dokládají četné důstojnické seznamy uchovávané v ukrajinských i zahraničních archivech, již toho dne vstoupilo do řad ukrajinské armády několik desítek rakouských důstojníků v různých městech a obcích Haliče a Bukoviny a mimo jiné Češi a Němci narození na územích připadajících nyní nově vzniklému Československu: A. Leier, O. Vilke, O. Girtler, F. Novák, R. Notdurft, A. Pavlů, E. Kraus a další.

Několik českých důstojníků z velení lvovské posádky se 3. listopadu 1918 rozhodlo připojit k Ukrajincům. Stalo se tak po setkání rakouského vojenského velitele města, generála Rudolfa Pfeffera, se třemi zástupci Ukrajinské národní rady v první den ukrajinské revoluce. Generál shromáždil téměř 300 důstojníků, kteří pod jeho velením sloužili ve lvovské vojenské oblasti, a vyzval je k pomoci mladému ukrajinskému státu a obraně jeho nezávislosti. Prohlásil, že říše zanikla, a proto jsou její důstojníci osvobozeni od závazků vůči ní. Po krátkých diskuzích souhlasilo podle různých zdrojů 10 nebo 12 rakouských důstojníků na straně Ukrajinců, mezi nimiž byli dva nebo tři důstojníci českého původu.[24]

Dá se předpokládat, že v touze rakouských důstojníků (včetně Čechů) sloužit v ukrajinské armádě sehrála roli jazyková politika v rámci rakousko-uherské armády, která byla k jazykům národnostních menšin značně tolerantní. Je známo, že pro dosažení lepší interakce se svými podřízenými ze slovanských provincií říše, kteří v době odvodu velmi často nehovořili německy, se důstojníci často sami učili jazyk, kterým mluvila většina vojáků v jejich jednotce. Kromě praktického prospěchu je k tomu nutila pravidla, která v rakousko-uherské armádě existovala. Důstojníci se museli alespoň na elementární úrovni naučit národní jazyk svých vojáků, jinak mohli o své postavení i přijít. Vojáci jiné než německé národnosti se zase museli naučit minimálně osmdesát slov z „velitelské" němčiny, aby se mohli dorozumět s důstojníky.[25]

Podobná situace s používáním ukrajinského jazyka byla u 58. rakouského pěšího pluku. Podle jeho bývalého vojáka Vasyla Rusnaka bylo mnoho vojáků tohoto pluku ukrajinského původu, takže plukovní jazyk (Regimentsprache) byla ukrajinština. „Celý velitelský štáb od poddůstojníků až po velitele roty nás oslovoval a dával rozkazy v ukrajinštině, a když důstojník neuměl dobře ukrajinsky, mluvil

24 Novyny, Dilo, padolyst 5, 1918, s. 1; O. KUZMA, *Lystopadovi dni 1918 roku*, s. 124.

25 Tamara SCHEER, *Die k.u.k. Regimentssprachen: Eine Institutionalisierung der Sprachenvielfalt in der Habsburgermonarchie (1867/8–1914)*, in: Martina Niedhammer – Marek Nekula et al. (Hg.), Sprache, Gesellschaft und Nation in Ostmitteleuropa: Institutionalisierung und Alltagspraxis, Göttingen 2014, s. 79, 82.

na vojáky smíšenou ukrajinsko-polsko-českou řečí. Pouze během cvičení byla němčina používána k vyjádření určitých příkazů."[26]

Po analýze dostupných seznamů důstojníků UHA lze konstatovat, že v západoukrajinské armádě bylo minimálně sedmnáct českých důstojníků (2,2 % všech neukrajinských důstojníků). Jedná se o páté největší národní zastoupení mezi neukrajinskými důstojníky haličské armády po Židech, Němcích, Rakušanech a Rusech. Z těchto Čechů se jeden narodil v Rumunsku, po jednom v Bukovině a na Slovensku, místo narození dalších čtyř důstojníků není známo. Zbytek se narodil na území dnešního Česka. Kromě nich sloužilo v haličské armádě dalších 72 důstojníků, původem Němců, kteří pocházeli z území současné České republiky, nejčastěji z Prahy. Konkrétně víme minimálně o devíti haličských důstojnících z Prahy, dále pocházeli z Těšína, Chebu a Hodonína – po čtyřech, z Opavy, Frýdku-Místku – po třech, Karviné, Šternberka, Terezína a Moravského Berouna – po dvou.[27]

Dostupné prameny nám umožňují identifikovat několik možných příčin výskytu Čechů a osob českého původu v haličské armádě. Hlavním důvodem, proč se tam tito vojáci objevili, byl nábor. Někteří byli bez práce, a proto řada z nich (hlavně Němci, Rakušané, Židé, Češi, Maďaři atd.) vstoupila do armády ZUNR, která trpěla nedostatkem personálu, a nadále sloužila v jejích řadách v následujících letech. Jak již bylo zmíněno, v haličské armádě sloužilo i mnoho vojáků, kteří nebyli etničtí Češi, ale narodili se na českém území. Zpravidla to byli Němci. Prameny nám umožňují zobecnit informace o tom, který vojenský obor měl nejvíce zástupců konkrétního národa. Je například známo, že mezi haličskými vojáky židovské národnosti bylo mnoho zdravotníků (lékařů a záchranářů), mnoho Rusů z bývalé ruské carské armády sloužilo v letectvu UHA, mezi štábními a frontovými důstojníky bylo mnoho Němců, Rakušanů a Čechů.

Jednalo se převážně o mladé důstojníky ve věku 17–28 let (55 % z celkového počtu). Kapitán Robert Beneš, narozený v roce 1856, a plukovník Jaroslav Vosatka, narozený v roce 1863, z nich byli nejstarší. Naprostá většina českých důstojníků a rodáků z Česka (89 %) měla v době přechodu z rakouské armády do UHA hodnost poručíka až kapitána. Z velké části to byli pěšáci (36 %) nebo dělostřelci (28 %), zbytek byli štábní důstojníci, železničáři, strojníci a letci. Etničtí Češi a rodáci z českých zemí stáli v čele velitelství, veleli brigádám, plukům, praporům a ro-

26 Wasyl RUSNAK, *Spomyny*, in Oleksander Dobžanskyi – Volodymyr Staryk, Khochemo do Ukrainy!, Odesa 2008, s. 287.
27 O. STETSYSHYN, *Landsknechty Halytskoï armiï*, s. 314–438.

tám. Někteří z nich zastávali v hierarchii UHA vysoké pozice. Například major generálního štábu rakousko-uherské armády Karel Doležal ze Lhoty pod Libčany získal v haličské armádě hodnost podplukovníka, byl jednou z nejdůvěrnějších osob prezidenta ZUNR Jevhena Petruševyče a vedl jeho vojenskou kancelář.

Čeští důstojníci jsou zmíněni rovněž ve vzpomínkách veteránů haličské armády. Jsou to například důstojníci, kteří veleli velitelstvím různých částí haličské armády: Wilhelm Lobkowitz, Johann Kunisch, Wilhelm Seehorsch, Alois Zimmerman, velitelé brigád a bojových skupin Robert Knittel, Karl Kvapil, Alfons Leier, Leo Redling, Ludwig Schmidt, velitelé dělostřeleckých jednotek Miroslav Kneifel, Franz de Karrara, Franz Skatzel a další. Noviny ZUNR v první polovině roku 1919 publikovaly příběhy o vojenských skutcích jak ukrajinských vojáků, tak „cizinců" v boji za ukrajinskou nezávislost. Jména Němců Kraus a Bizanz a Ukrajinců Mykytka, Dolud a Holynskyi, Čechů Tinkle a Volf byla obklopena hrdinskou svatozáří.

Mnoho českých důstojníků si vysloužilo poděkování ukrajinského velení. Například na jaře 1919 byl jedním z nejlepších velitelů brigád haličské armády velitel 3. berežanské brigády UHA podplukovník Arnold Volf (Wolf) z Prostějova (později získal hodnost plukovníka a generála – četara, první generálské hodnosti v haličské armádě) a major Franz Tinkle z Linhartic, který velel 2. kolomyjské brigádě. Dne 23. dubna 1919 zveřejnily noviny *Republika*, vládní tiskový orgán ZUNR, informační zprávu tiskové služby Hlavního velitelství haličské armády o úspěšných velitelských akcích Wolfa, který sedíc na koni osobně vedl své prapory, a Tinkleho, který ve svých jednotkách ve chvíli kritické pro jeho vojáky energicky obnovil pořádek.[28] O čtyři dny později nazval velitel 2. haličského sboru Myron Tarnavskyj ve stejných novinách tyto dva velitele „nejnovějšími hrdiny naší historie", před nimiž armádní velení sklání hlavu, a šéf západoukrajinské vlády Sydir Holubovyč jim vyjádřil svou vděčnost.[29]

Někteří čeští důstojníci vstoupili do haličské armády, protože byli ženatí s Ukrajinkami a během vyhlášení ukrajinského státu byli umístěni na západní Ukrajině. Mezi takové vyšší důstojníky patřil například mobilizační důstojník Okresního vojenského velitelství v Sambiru Antonín Vimetal (Vymětal?) z Kroměříže. Za první světové války sloužil u 77. pěšího pluku, který se zformoval na území Lvovské oblasti. Poté co Ukrajinci vyhlásili svou státnost, se Vimetal připojil

---

28 *V siohodnishnim zvidomlenniu*, Republika, 23 Kvitnia 1919, č. 68, s. 2.

29 *Do pidpolkovnyka Arnolda Volfa i otamana Franza Tinklia*, Republika, 27 Kvitnia 1919, č. 71, s. 2.

k jejich armádě a byl povýšen do hodnosti majora. Ve druhé polovině roku 1919 byl velitelem Jižní skupiny ukrajinských vojsk, která jako první vstoupila do Kyjeva a vytěsnila odtud ruské bolševiky. Vimetal zemřel na tyfus 1. února 1920 na jihu Ukrajiny nedaleko města Cherson.

V ukrajinské memoárové literatuře 20. a 30. let lze nalézt i zmínky o tom, jak se bývalí rakouští vyšší důstojníci spolu s ukrajinskými důstojníky zabývali výchovou haličských vojáků v ukrajinském vlasteneckém duchu. Jedním z nich byl pražský rodák Ivan (Hans) Ehrlich, který podle svědků přednášel k vojákům projevy o „bezpříkladných výkonech a slávě" haličské armády.[30]

Čeští důstojníci UHA obecně sdíleli osud haličské armády. Mnoho českých důstojníků haličské armády bylo zajato armádami, se kterými UHA bojovala. Je známo, že nejméně šest českých důstojníků bylo během roku 1919 zajato Polskem (jeden z nich zemřel) a stejný počet vojáků stihl stejný osud v dubnu a květnu 1920, kdy se většina haličské armády pokusila sjednotit s armádou Ukrajinské lidové republiky. V posledním případě byli zajatí vojáci drženi v polském zajateckém táboře v Tucholii v severním Polsku, odkud později utekli do Vídně. Bylo tam zastoupení ZUNR, které je nasměrovalo do československých táborů pro internované vojáky UHA.

Zmínky o neukrajinských haličských vojácích vracejících se z bolševického zajetí lze nalézt v objemné sbírce rozkazů ukrajinského shromaždiště ve Vídni, které dosud nebyly uvedeny do vědeckého oběhu. Většina uprchlých vojáků zmíněných v těchto dokumentech byla ukrajinského původu, ale byli tam i vojáci jiných národů. Jsou mezi nimi A. Zimmerman, K. Kvapil, L. Redling, V. Sholz a další důstojníci českého původu.[31] Celkem bylo v táborech UHA Německém Jablonném, Josefově a Liberci asi dvacet důstojníků českého původu, a to jak těch, kteří přišli do Československa po internaci haličských jednotek, tak těch, kterým se podařilo uprchnout z polského zajetí.[32]

Někteří z českých důstojníků byli zajati ruskými bolševiky. Byli například mezi 25 haličskými důstojníky uvězněnými v roce 1920 v táboře ve městě Kozhukhov nedaleko Moskvy. Ze vzpomínek bývalých vězňů tohoto tábora je známo, že

30 Teodor MARITČAK, *Mizh dvoma frontamy*, in: Litopys Chervonoi Kalyny, 1938, ch. 6, 5.

31 Nakazy denni vid 1. 1. 1920 do 16. 11. 1920. Zbirnyk dokumentiv Ukranskoï perekhidnoï stanytsi. Arkhiv Ukrainskoï tserkvy sviatoï Varvary u Vidni.

32 Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy u Lvovi (TsDIAU), f. 581, op. 2, spr. 199, ark. 1–16; Omelian VIŠKA – Ihor SRIBNIAK, *Znakhidka u varshavskii bibliotetsi: spysok polonenykh starshyn UHA v tabori Tukhola (1920–1922)*, in: Visnyk Kyivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Tarasa Ševchenka, Kyiv 7, 2016, s. 56–74.

spolu s Ukrajinci zde byli rodáci z českých zemí R. Beneš, R. Votava, F. Dvoržak, H. Langer a další. Někteří z nich později zemřeli, když se loď převážející zajaté vojáky UHA potopila během bouře v Bílém moři při Rusy organizovaném transportu do Archangelska.[33] Dále můžeme zmínit poručíka-dělostřelce Ernesta Egera z Chebu. Po působení v UHA pokračoval ve službě v armádě Ukrajinské lidové republiky, v roce 1921 se zúčastnil velkého partyzánského výpadu na území Ukrajiny obsazeného ruskými bolševiky. Dne 16. listopadu 1921 byl zajat a 22. listopadu byl poblíž města Bazar v Žytomyrské oblasti zastřelen ruskými komunisty spolu s 358 dalšími ukrajinskými vojáky poté, co vězni odmítli nastoupit do jejich služby.

Nám dostupné informace dávají důvod konstatovat, že při službě v haličské armádě zahynulo v letech 1918–1920 v bojích nebo zemřelo na nemoci nejméně 42 důstojníků jiného než ukrajinského původu včetně sedmi Čechů nebo osob z Československé republiky. Několik dalších byli dezertéři. Musíme však vzít v úvahu, že nám chybí údaje o mnoha jednotlivcích. Konkrétně s jistotou nevíme, kdo z neukrajinských důstojníků UHA zemřel při již zmíněném transportu vězňů do koncentračního tábora v Archangelsku. Uvedená čísla proto mohou být vyšší.

Jedním z českých důstojníků UHA, kteří měli tragický osud, byl Wilhelm Lobkowitz, rodák z Frýdku-Místku. Byl jedním z nejlepších členů štábu haličské armády a autorem řady úspěšných útočných i obranných operací. V roce 1920 uprchl z polského zajetí a připojil se k vojákům haličské armády internovaným v Československu. Brzy se však rozhodl změnit svůj osud: v roce 1921 se přestěhoval do bolševického Ruska a začal pracovat v analytické službě zpravodajského ředitelství Rudé armády (předchůdce ruské vojenské rozvědky GRU). V Moskvě udělal dobrou kariéru, vstoupil do bolševické strany, vydal několik desítek knih o armádách evropských a asijských zemí, analytické články a recenze. Poté se stal učitelem na důstojnických kurzech Rudé armády a působil zde až do svého zatčení. Dne 3. října 1937 byl Lobkowitz zatčen NKVD na základě obvinění ze špionáže pro Německo a 5. února 1938 byl zastřelen.[34]

---

33 Ivan MAKSYMČUK, *Kozhukhiv. Trahichna dolia reshtkiv UHA*, Lviv 1930, s. 80–81.
34 O. STETSYSHYN, *Landsknechty Halytskoï armiï*, s. 183–197, 314–438.

Závěr

Shrneme-li poznatky, ke kterým jsme došli, je třeba poznamenat, že historie vztahů mezi Čechy a Ukrajinci (Rusíny) v době, kdy byly oba národy součástí Rakouska-Uherska, i v době rozpadu tohoto státu a vzniku dvou samostatných států (Československé republiky a Západoukrajinské lidové republiky), je nesmírně zajímavá a plná nejrůznějších akcí. Jejich průběh ovlivňovaly jak objektivní geopolitické procesy, na nichž závisely státní, politické a vojenské struktury obou národů, tak i subjektivní faktory. V důsledku nedostatku důstojníků v haličské armádě přijaly západoukrajinské úřady mnoho vojáků bývalé rakouské armády, mezi nimiž bylo mnoho etnických Čechů a osob narozených na území Československé republiky. Čeští příslušníci spolu s bývalými důstojníky armád Rakouska-Uherska a Ruské říše pomáhali haličské armádě kompenzovat nedostatek důstojníků, který existoval v armádě Západoukrajinské lidové republiky v počáteční fázi její existence. V tomto článku jsme popsali okolnosti vstupu těchto důstojníků do UHA, určili jejich přibližný počet a osud některých z nich. Věřím, že toto téma stojí za to, aby tuto stránku ukrajinsko-českých vztahů znalo co nejvíce lidí.

SUMMARY

In October and November 1918, the nations inhabiting Austria-Hungary began to proclaim their own national states. Among them were the Ukrainians, who declared an independent state on 1 November 1918 in Lviv. The new state was named the West Ukrainian People's Republic (ZUNR), led by Jevhen Petruševyč, a former deputy of the Austrian Parliament (Reichsrat). During the formation of their armed forces—the Galician Army—the Ukrainians faced a shortage of officers and consequently invited foreigners into military service. Among them were ethnic Czechs and Germans born in what is now the Czech Republic. Like other non-Ukrainian officers in the UHA, Czech officers helped address the army's personnel shortage. Contemporary documents and the memoirs of Ukrainian UHA veterans portray them in a positive light.

STUDIE / ARTICLE

K politickej činnosti Antona Beskida

MICHAL FALAT

Krajské múzeum v Prešove, Prešov, Slovensko

On the Political Activity of Anton Beskid

Anton Beskid (1855–1933) was one of the leading Rusyn politicians of the first half of the twentieth century. He influenced political developments not only in eastern Slovakia and Subcarpathian Ruthenia, but also to a significant extent at the nationwide level. Nevertheless, Slovak historiography has paid little attention to his role in social and political life. The present study analyses Anton Beskid's political activity during the interwar period, based on surviving primary sources and contemporary press materials. The contribution is divided into two sections. The first outlines Beskid's political engagement in the interwar years; the second examines his political positions on key issues of public life, which in turn shaped political developments in the rest of the republic.

Keywords: Anton Beskid; Subcarpathian Rus; Czechoslovakia; history; politics; interwar period.

Stručne k Beskidovmu pôvodu

Anton Beskid sa narodil 16. septembra 1855 v šarišských Hanigovciach do národne uvedomelej rusínskej rodiny. Bol synom Juraja (Grigorija) Beskida (1829–1892), gréckokatolíckeho kňaza pôsobiaceho v dedine Legnava v staroľubovnianskom okrese. Otec Juraj sa angažoval v národnom hnutí Rusínov, venoval sa folklóru a dejinám a pod pseudonymom Torisin publikoval v Uhorsku aj Haliči. Jeho dedo Michal Beskid (1796–1879) bol známym etnografom a publicistom, pôsobil v Čertižnom. Patril medzi rusínskych národných buditeľov a spolupracoval s takými velikánmi rusínskych dejín akými bol Alexander Duchnovič, Adolf Dobriansky či Jakov Holovacky. Rodinné prostredie vštiepilo A. Beskidovi rusínske národné povedomie, ktoré sa výraznejšie prejavilo najmä v inoetnickom prostredí. Strednú školu navštevoval v Levoči, Prešove a Užhorode, kde štúdium ukončil maturitnou skúškou. Od roku 1874 navštevoval právnickú fakultu na univerzite v Budapešti, kde obhájil doktorát z práva. Advokátsku prax vykonával do roku 1883 v Budapešti odkiaľ sa presťahoval do Kežmarku. Tu pôsobil v rokoch 1883–1906 a následne po krátkej zastávke v Spišskej Starej Vsi sa v roku 1907 stal advokátom v Prešove kde zastával funkciu právneho poradcu gréckokatolíckeho biskupského úradu.[1]

1. Politická činnosť

Do politického života krajiny sa zapojil v roku 1910. Začiatkom júna sa uskutočnili voľby do Uhorského snemu v ktorých kandidoval za Katolícku ľudovú stranu [Katolikus Néppárt] v okrese Stará Ľubovňa. Anton Beskid pred voľbami obchádzal spolu so slovenským kňazom a neskorším užhorodským županom Ladislavom Moyšom domy v Haligovciach kde agitovali medzi slovenskými a rusínskymi obyvateľmi. Okrem iných navštívili aj slovenského kňaza Vendelína Húsku v Lešniciach. Predvolebná agitácia prebiehala pod drobnohľadom brachiálnej moci. Istý Adolf Goldstein v sprievode dvoch žandárov sledoval počínanie A. Beskida, L. Moyša a miestneho richtára Krišandu. Po tom, čo opustili jeden z domov, žandári zámerne vyvolali potýčku a nastraženými bodákmi sa vyhrážali richtárovi. Po nepríjemnej skúsenosti a s ohľadom na obavy o zdravie predvolebnú agitáciu ukončili, avšak A. Beskidovi sa predsa len podarilo prebojovať do uhorského snemu, kde pôsobil v rokoch 1910–1918.[2]

Pôsobenie A. Beskida v uhorskom parlamente sa po roku 1918 stalo terčom kritiky zo strany jeho politických protivníkov, ktorí ho obviňovali z nečinnosti a oportunizmu. S ohľadom na vnútropolitickú a spoločenskú situáciu v Uhorsku koncom 19. a začiatkom 20. storočia sa javí takáto kritika ako neoprávnená. V roz-

1 Stanislav KONEČNY, *V službach naroda i štatu,* Rusin 2000, č. 5–6, s. 8.
2 *Keď nebohého Beskida volili za poslanca*, Slovenský denník, 18. júna 1933.

hodných momentoch rusínskych dejín sa A. Beskid postavil za „svojich" ľudí. Okolo roku 1915, keď sa maďarské vládne kruhy v Uhorsku snažili nahradiť cirkevnoslovanský jazyk liturgiou v maďarskom jazyku a juliánsky kalendár nahradiť gregoriánskym, A. Beskid protestoval proti tomuto počínaniu. Vidiac v tom zámer pomaďarčiť gréckokatolícku cirkev a s ňou spojenú rusínsku identitu v Uhorsku vystúpil na pôde parlamentu so slovami: „Ako verný syn svojho ľudu, protestujem proti tomuto úmyslu. Slovanská liturgia a slovanský kalendár – to je naše náboženstvo, to nie je vec vonkajšia, je zrastená s naším ‚ja', s naším srdcom."[3] Odmietavé stanovisko zaujal aj voči snahe perzekvovať rusínske obyvateľstvo v Marmarošskej stolici za hromadný prestup do pravoslávnej cirkvi. V súdnom procese v Marmarošskej Sihoti bolo 94 roľníkov obžalovaných z vlastizrady. Dôvodom obvinenia bola skutočnosť, že roľníci masovo vystupovali z gréckokatolíckej cirkvi a prijali ortodoxné vierovyznanie. Prestup na pravoslávie bol vládnymi kruhmi v Budapešti vnímaný ako zbližovanie Rusínov s Ruskou ríšou a v Uhorsku automaticky vyvolával obavy z panslavizmu. Roľníci boli obvinení z vlastizrady a snahy pripojiť Marmarošskú stolicu k Rusku. V skutočnosti sa však snažili zbaviť povinnosti odvádzať feudálnu rentu – tzv. koblinu a rokovinu – gréckokatolíckym kňazom, prestúpením do pravoslávnej cirkvi. Okrem existenčných problémov však Rusínov trápil morálny úpadok kňazov a skutočnosť, že zanevreli na svoj rusínsky pôvod a odovzdali sa do služieb maďarizačnej politiky.[4] Napriek vtedajším tendenciám nemaďarských poslancov zaujať postoj pasívnej rezistencie sa A. Beskid jednoznačne postavil proti týmto politicky motivovaným procesom. Okrem toho naďalej udržiaval blízke vzťahy so slovenskými politikmi a verejnými osobami, akými boli Matúš Dula, Karol Medvecký či Jozef Škultéty, preto obvinenia z nečinnosti nemajú opodstatnenie.[5]

V uhorskom parlamente pôsobil A. Beskid až do rozpadu monarchie koncom roku 1918. V novembri sa po skúsenostiach s uhorským režimom vrátil do Prešova, kde sa angažoval v politickom boji o budúcnosť uhorských Rusínov. Dňa 19. novembra 1919 sa uskutočnilo zhromaždenie približne 200 rusínskych roľní-

---

3 Ibidem, s. 1.; S. KONEČNÝ, *V službach naroda i štatu*, s. 8.

4 Marmarošským procesom venovali pozornosť aj slovenské osobnosti, medzi inými Jozef Gregor Tajovský či Milan Hodža. Hlbšie sa tejto problematike venoval rusínsky publicista Konstantin Beskid. Pozri: Konstantin BESKID, *Obrázky z bývalého maďarského ráje: Monstrosní proces v Marmarošské Sihoti*, Chust 1926, 55 s. Z novších prác môžeme uviesť štúdiu Romana Holeca: Roman HOLEC, *Postoj Čechov a Slovákov k Rusínom v predvečer prvej svetovej vojny*, Československá historická ročenka 1997, Brno 1997, s. 29–35.

5 S. KONEČNÝ, *V službach naroda i štatu*, s. 8.

kov z východoslovenských stolíc, asi 40 národne uvedomelých kňazov a 11 promaďarsky orientovaných kňazov, spolu s celou prešovskou kapitulou s výnimkou biskupa. Zvolené bolo predsedníctvo rady, ktorej predsedom sa stal A. Beskid a tajomníkom Emilian Nevický. Rada žiadala uplatnenie práva pre Rusínov; slobodný národný rozvoj; práva ktoré získajú iné nemaďarské národy v Uhorsku; odmietala rozdelenie Rusínov medzi viacero štátnych útvarov a zároveň sa postavila do úlohy jediného oprávneného reprezentanta rusínskeho ľudu v Uhorsku. Maďari sa snažili o udržanie celistvosti Uhorska a prostredníctvom ministra Oskara Jásiho kontaktovali A. Beskida a pozvali ho na rokovania do Budapešti, ten to však odmietol.[6]

Ruská národná rada sa hneď po svojom vzniku[7] začala zaujímať o československú štátoprávnu orientáciu. Značnú úlohu tu zohrali blízke vzťahy A. Beskida k niektorým slovenským osobnostiam, medzi inými spomínanému L. Moyšovi. Ten ho listom vyzval, aby s ním odcestoval do Martina, kde vtedy prebiehali porady Slovenskej národnej rady. To A. Beskid aj skutočne urobil a koncom novembra navštívil Turčiansky Svätý Martin. Slovenskí predáci podrobili A. Beskida „výsluchu“ hoci za neho ručil samotný L. Moyš. Napriek počiatočnej opatrnosti Slovákov si A. Beskid získal ich dôveru a neskôr pokračoval v rokovaniach v Prahe, odkiaľ odišiel už ako člen česko-slovenskej delegácie na mierovú konferenciu v Paríži.[8] Naďalej udržiaval kontakt so Slovenskou národnou radou v Martine. Jej predstaviteľov upozornil na promaďarskú činnosť Východoslovenskej národnej rady a jej predsedu Viktora Dvorčáka a žiadal ich aby proti tejto činnosti zasiahli. Martin urýchlene reagoval a zaslal do Prešova tzv. *Ohlas rusínskemu ľudu*. Zároveň rada odoslala 500 ks letákov písaných v cyrilike a latinke a 300 ks plagátov za účelom paralyzovať Dvorčákovú agitáciu.[9]

Úzke vzťahy udržiaval A. Beskid aj s Rusínmi z poľskej Lemkovštiny, najmä však rusofilsky orientovanými dejateľmi. Delegácia Najvyššej rady Lemkovštiny navštívila 21. decembra 1918 Prešov a rozšírila rady prešovskej Ruskej národnej rady. Táto kvázi reforma rady sa prejavila v úprave jej názvu na Karpato-ruská národ-

6 *Čo sa robí na východe,* Národnie noviny, 28.11.1918.; Ladislav TAJTÁK, *Národnodemokratická revolúcia na východnom Slovensku v roku 1918*, Bratislava 1927, s. 97.

7 Pôvodne rada vznikla už 8. novembra v Starej Ľubovni a na jej čele stal v tom čase Emanuel Nevický. Po tom čo rada presunula svoje pôsobenie do Prešova, predsedníctvo prevzal A. Beskid. Dňa 21. decembra došlo k jej zlúčeniu s radou Lemkov a zmenou názvu na Karpato-ruská národná rada.

8 Ladislav MOYŠ, *Beskid v Turčianskom Svätom Martine*, Slovenský denník, 24. júna 1933.

9 L. TAJTÁK, *Národnodemokratická revolúcia na východnom Slovensku v roku 1918*, s. 98–99.

ná rada (v Prešove) [Karpato-russkaja Narodnaja Rada]. S ohľadom na nové zloženie orgánu, žiadali jej predstavitelia, aby sa súčasťou Československa stalo aj územie na sever od karpatského oblúka, obývané poľskými Lemkami. Iniciatívu v tomto smere vyvíjal aj sám A. Beskid, ktorý v spolupráci s Dimitrijom Sobinom vypracoval a zaslal memorandum na mierovú konferenciu v Paríži.[10]

1.1 Vznik Centrálnej ruskej národnej rady v Užhorode

Začiatkom januára 1919 navštívil A. Beskid Prahu a následne odcestoval aj s D. Sobinom už ako súčasť česko-slovenskej delegácie na mierovú konferenciu do Paríža. Tam pôsobil ako poradca pre rusínske záležitosti a zaiste mala jeho prítomnosť aj symbolický charakter. Bol jediným zástupcom „domáceho rusínskeho odboja" v česko-slovenskej delegácii (D. Sobin pochádzal z Haliče) a fakticky v ňom zaujal popredné miesto. S ohľadom na jeho politické skúsenosti, široké kontakty so slovenskými a českými dejateľmi a v neposlednom rade vyššiemu veku si získal značnú autoritu. V Paríži sa stretol s Grigorijom Žatkovičom a Júliusom Gardošom, zástupcami (väčšej časti) rusínskej emigrácie v Spojených štátoch amerických. G. Žatkovič bol vedúcou osobnosťou rusínskeho zahraničného odboja. V Paríži po spoločnom rokovaní 13. februára 1919 založili tzv. Ruskú komisiu, ktorú proklamovali za oprávnenú reprezentantku rusínskeho obyvateľstva v (bývalom) Uhorsku. A. Beskid aj G. Žatkovič pôsobili v Paríži ako poradcovia pre rusínske záležitosti a rokovaní sa priamo nezúčastňovali. Tie prebiehali za prítomnosti českých politikov E. Beneša a K. Kramářa. Ruská komisia preto začiatkom marca opustila Paríž a záležitosti spojené so vznikom neskoršej Podkarpatskej Rusi nechala v ich rukách.[11] Ich ďalším cieľom bol „starý kraj", tj. Užhorod so zastávkou v Prahe a Bratislave. Podľa správ uvedených v Amerických rusínskych novinách [Amerikanskij Russkij Věstnik] neboli medzi nimi nezhody. A. Beskid sa v prítomnosti D. Sobina stretol s G. Žatkovičom a J. Gardošom 11. marca v Prahe a vo všetkých otázkach „dosiahli úplnej zhody".[12] Tento harmonický vzťah však netrval dlho. Už na zasadnutí Centrálnej ruskej národnej rady v dňoch 8.–16. mája 1919 sa v pozadí ukázali

10 Anthony BESKID – Dimitri SOBIN, *The Origin of the Lems, Slavs of Danubian Provenance: memorandum to the Peace Conference concerning their national claims*, Prešov 1919, 23 s.

11 Peter ŠVORC, *Krajinská hranica medzi Slovenskom a Podkarpatskou Rusou,* Bratislava 2023, s. 123–124.

12 Bohdan HORBAL, *Łemkowie na terenie Pierwszej Republiki Czechosłowackiej,* in: Helena Duć-Fajfer, Rocznik Ruskiej Bursy, Gorlice 2011, s. 72.

isté rozpory. Podľa spomienok D. Sobina dali americkí Rusíni Lemkom najavo, že si neželajú ich prítomnosť, resp. že odmietajú ich snahu o pripojenie tzv. Lemkovštiny k Československu.[13] S ohľadom na neskorší vývoj možno tomuto svedectvu veriť. Hlavným dôvodom pre odmietnutie snahy „poľských" Lemkov stať sa súčasťou Československa bol československo-poľský konflikt o Tešínsko, ale aj o Kysuce, Oravu a Spiš. Vláda ČSR nechcela pridávať ďalšie trecie plochy vo vzájomných vzťahoch a odmietla pripojiť lemkovské územie k ČSR.[14] Úlohu zohral aj fakt, že Lemkovia, ktorí patrili k Beskidovej Karpatoruskej národnej rade v Prešove boli rusofilskej orientácie a zároveň horliví podporovatelia pravoslávnej viery aj na československom území, najmä Podkarpatskej Rusi. G. Žatkovič pochádzal z rodiny gréckokatolíckeho kňaza, voči pravoslávnym Rusínom sa vyhranil už na pôde Spojených štátov amerických a v starom kraji sa situácia zopakovala. A. Beskid, vychovaný v rusofilskom duchu prirodzene inklinoval k Lemkom. Ešte aj v prvej polovici roku 1919 vyvíjal iniciatívu za pripojenie Lemkovštiny k Československu. To sa však s ohľadom na medzinárodne politické súvislosti nepodarilo.

A. Beskid zároveň stratil pozíciu čelného predstaviteľa v rusínskom hnutí za pripojenie budúcej Podkarpatskej Rusi k Československu. Hoci bol vo svojej neprítomnosti zvolený za predsedu rady, počas záverečného dňa rokovania 16. mája 1919 bol ako kompromis prijatý program rusínskej emigrácie zo zámoria a G. Žatkovič, okrem toho, že sa stal čestným predsedom rady, bol požiadaný, aby sa stal prvým ministrom budúceho „ruského štátu" a aby prevzal úlohu organizácie autonómie. A. Beskid, sa takýmto rozhodnutím cítil ukrivdený. Ako sa o pár mesiacov neskôr ukázalo, proklamovaná jednota Centrálnej ruskej národnej rady bola iba akousi fasádou, ktorá v čase, keď sa rozhodovalo o budúcej mape Európy, mala navonok deklarovať jednotu Rusínov a ich spoločný cieľ. Členská základňa rady bola však spoločensky, konfesionálne a politicky rôznorodá. Jediná myšlienka, ktorá ich navzájom spájala bola myšlienka spojenia s Československom. Keď sa tento cieľ podarilo dosiahnuť, rada sa rozpadla na dve organizácie. Pôvodná organizácia ostala v rukách Rusínov, ktorej časť presadzovala propagovanie (kultivovaného) ruského jazyka a kultúry a v historiografii sa preto často označuje za rusofilské krídlo. Jej

13 Dimitri SOBIN, *Dni svobody na Lemkovščině*, LEMKO, 1. dekabrja 1928.

14 Československo malo s Poľskom viaceré územné spory – Tešínsko, Orava či Spiš. Praha preto odmietla rusínske snahy o územie Lemkovštiny, ktorú Poliaci už tradične považovali za historicky poľské územie. Dimitri Sobin zachádza ešte ďalej, keď tvrdí, že K. Kramář využil plebiscit a žiadosti poľských Lemkov proti poľskej diplomacii. Výmenou za územie Tešínska sa Československo malo vzdať nároku na Lemkovštinu a zároveň malo ututlať poľské perzekúcie voči tamojším rusínskym predákom. Pozri pozn. č. 39.

predsedom zostal A. Beskid. Druhá časť, ktorá odmietala rusofilstvo, akcentovala rusínsku (rozumej ľudovú – pozn. M. F.) kultúru a jazyk, založila novú organizáciu, ktorú nazvala Prvá centrálna ruská národná rada.[15] Vzhľadom na jej akcentovanie ľudovej kultúry a jazyka, ktoré boli blízke ukrajinskej kultúre a jazyku, zaradili sa medzi jej členov aj osoby inklinujúce k ukrajinskej identite. O rozkole pôvodnej organizácie na dve krídla, resp. dve samostatné rady informoval prezidenta Masaryka Augustín Vološin vo svojom liste datovanom 9. októbra 1919.[16]

1.2 K vzniku dočasného direktória

K faktickému rozkolu však došlo o niekoľko mesiacov skôr. Pravdepodobnou príčinou bol – medzi inými – prísľub T. G. Masaryka založiť Ruskú autonómnu komisiu, dnes v historiografii známu ako (dočasné) direktórium. G. Žatkovič pred svojim odchodom do Spojených štátov amerických 12. augusta 1919 požiadal prezidenta T. G. Masaryka o písomné záruky, že Československá republika splní svoje záväzky voči Rusínom, a ktorými by sa mohol preukázať svojim krajanom v zámorí. Zároveň žiadal vytvoriť autonómnu radu, ktorá by organizovala postupné zavádzanie autonómie Podkarpatskej Rusi do praktického života. Prezident odmietol podať písomné záruky na väčšinu jeho požiadaviek, súhlasil však so zriadením direktória. Túto informáciu G. Žatkovič zaslal vtedy ešte jednotnej Centrálnej ruskej národnej rade do Užhorodu, spolu s menami jej budúcich členov. Členmi sa mali stať: Eugen Puza, Július Braščajko, Augustín Vološin a Emanuel Toronský. Predsedom, resp. „prezidentom“ direktória sa mal stať sám G. Žatkovič. Všetci navrhovaní členovia pochádzali z prostredia blízkeho Žatkovičovi. Rusofilské krídlo rady nemalo mať v direktóriu zastúpenie, čo podnietilo vzburu rusofilského krídla, ktoré zvolalo zasadnutie rady bez prítomnosti ukrajinofilov a zvolilo si nové vedenie.[17] Po rozpade rady na dve organizácie vydala Beskidova Centálna ruská národná rada vyhlásenie, v ktorom protestovala proti založeniu direktória bez jej vedomia a exis-

15 Značná časť jej predstaviteľov zastávala názor, že Rusíni sú súčasťou ukrajinského národa, preto je Prvá centrálna ruská národná rada označovaná aj ako ukrajinofilská.

16 Archiv Kanceláře prezidenta republiky, protokol Podkarpatská Rus (ďalej len AKPR, protokol PR), inventárne číslo 18 (ďalej len inv. č.), kartón číslo 1 (ďalej len k. č.). Augustín Vološin – Správa o zasedání rusínske národní rady.

17 Peter ŠVORC, *Zakliata krajina Podkarpatská Rus 1918–1946*, Prešov 1996, s. 44.

tenciu direktória označila za zbytočnú.[18] Dodajme, že v otázke organizácie direktória sa do Žatkovičovho príchodu v polovici októbra neurobili žiadne kroky. Prvé zasadnutie sa konalo až 18. decembra 1919 aj to s pozmenenou členskou základňou. Direktórium však už v polovici januára podalo demisiu s argumentom, že nemá žiadne právomoci a je len akýmsi príveskom šéfa Civilnej správy Jana Brejchu. Jediným reálnym výsledkom celej iniciatívy bol definitívny rozkol rusínskej inteligencie na dva tábory a zároveň zhoršenie vzťahov s Prahou. Rusofilov si Praha odcudzila tým, že prijala Žatkovičov návrh členov, Žatkovičove krídlo zase tým, že direktórium v skutočnosti nemalo žiadnu výkonnú moc a bolo iba poradným orgánom šéfa Civilnej správy.

Koncom roka 1919 sa aj A. Beskid rozhodol – pravdepodobne pod vplyvom Žatkovičovej cesty – navštíviť krajanov v Spojených štátoch amerických. Začiatkom decembra sa v sprievode profesora Dimitrija Verguna zúčastnil agitačnej cesty po Spojených štátoch Amerických. V New Yorku sa 5. decembra stretli s redaktorom Amerických rusínskych novín Nikolajom Pačutom, predstaviteľmi Národnej Obrany a tiež so zástupcami slovenského katolíckeho duchovenstva. Vo svojich vystúpeniach v krajanských spolkoch ostro kritizoval politiku ukrajinských emigrantov a ich stúpencov na Podkarpatskej Rusi. Napriek svojmu kritickému postoju voči Prahe však poukázal aj na to, že Podkarpatská Rus ako súčasť Československa je jedinou zárukou slobodného života „malej čiastky veľkého ruského národa“.[19] S finančnou pomocou amerických Rusínov potom po príchode domov založil Ruskú národnú banku v Užhorode, ktorej riaditeľom bol až do jej zlúčenia s Podkarpatskou bankou v roku 1925.[20]

Ako vyplýva zo zachovaných písomností, G. Žatkovič v zákulisí bojoval za to, aby československé úrady nevydali A. Beskidovi diplomatický pas. Ako tvrdil, vydanie diplomatického pasu by Beskidovi dodalo legitimitu, či aspoň pasívnu podporu československej vlády a varoval, že Beskidova cesta do Spojených štátov amerických spôsobí „obrovské škody“ vzhľadom na jeho politické postoje a názory. Zároveň žiadal vyšetriť, kto bol zodpovedný za vydanie pasu a riešenie celej situácie ponechal na prezidentovi T. G. Masarykovi.[21] List bol odoslaný 12. decembra, teda v čase, keď už bol A. Beskid v Spojených štátoch amerických a jeho cestu nebolo

18 Robert PEJŠA, *Podkarpatská Rus v Československu 1919–1922. Právní a politicko-společenské aspekty připojení Podkarpatské Rusi k Československu*, Praha 2016, s. 72–73.

19 *Dr. A. Beskid v Amerike*, Slovenský východ, 8. 1. 1920.

20 I. POP, *Enciklopedija Podkarpatskoj Rusi*, s. 92.

21 AKPR, protokol PR, inv. č. 69, k. č. 1. Dopis direktoria autonomní Podkarpatské Rusi – podepsán Žatkovič.

možné zastaviť. V konečnom dôsledku nám však nie sú známe žiadne – ako to Žatkovič nazval – obrovské škody. Beskidova cesta prebehla bez problémov a pramene sa nezmieňujú o žiadnych nepríjemných dôsledkoch.

1.3 Založenie Ruskej ľudovej strany

Nehľadiac na vzájomné rozpory medzi rusínskymi predákmi, československá vláda v Prahe sa od počiatku snažila o čo najvčasnejšie usporiadanie pomerov v krajine. Na jar roku 1920 boli pripravené prvé demokratické voľby. Podkarpatská Rus však bola s ohľadom na neusporiadané pomery (nejasné hranice s Maďarskom, rumunské vojsko vo východnej časti Podkarpatskej Rusi a silný maďarský a židovský vplyv v hospodárstve a spoločenskom živote) z prvých volieb vylúčená. Voľby však prebehli na území východného Slovenska odkiaľ A. Beskid pochádzal a kde aj pôsobil väčšinu svojho života. Hoci sa prvé československé voľby na Podkarpatskej Rusi neuskutočnili, predsa len vyvolali aj medzi Rusínmi značný pohyb; začali tu vznikať prvé rusínske politické strany. Iniciatívu vyvinul aj A. Beskid, ktorý stál pri vzniku Ruskej ľudovej strany [Russkaja narodnaja partija]. Bola to jedna z najstarších rusínskych politických strán v medzivojnovom Československu, vznikla už 25. mája 1919 v Prešove. Do istej miery bola strana pobočkou Československej národnodemokratickej strany Karla Kramářa, s ktorou ich spájal podobný politický program.

Medzi zakladajúcich členov patrili okrem A. Beskida aj jeho synovec Mikuláš (Nikolaj) Beskid, Teodor Rojkovič, Viktor Berecký či Štefan Gojdič. Istý čas boli jej členmi, alebo so stranou spolupracovali aj Juraj Lažo, Ivan Židovský či Konstantin Mačik. Vo všeobecnosti bola strana zastúpená najmä svetskou inteligenciou a roľníkmi z východného Slovenska, čo neskôr potvrdili aj slabé volebné výsledky na území Podkarpatskej Rusi.[22]

Ruská ľudová strana sa opierala najmä o voličov z územia východného Slovenska, odkiaľ pochádzala väčšina straníkov. Z toho vyplýval aj program strany, ktorý sa sústredil najmä na obhajobu záujmov Rusínov na východnom Slovensku. Tí na rozdiel od svojich príbuzných na Podkarpatskej Rusi, tvorili iba národnostnú

---

22 Štátny archív Košice, fond Košická župa (ďalej len ŠA KE, fond KŽ), č. j. 9698/1925, k. č. 91. Prípravné komité spojených ruských strán; S. KONEČNÝ, P*olitické strany v národnom hnutí Rusínov*, in: Kvetoslava Koporova (ed.), Studium Carpato-Ruthenorum 2011, Študiji z karpatorusynistiki, Prjašiv 2011, s. 12.

menšinu, nie štátotvorný národ. Prvoradým poslaním strany bola snaha zabrániť asimilácii rusínskeho obyvateľstva na slovenskom území. V súvislosti s tým tu bola od začiatku prítomná požiadavka, aby rusínske obyvateľstvo žilo v jednom politickom celku. Vzhľadom na to žiadali predstavitelia strany posunúť slovensko-podkarpatoruskú hranicu na západ, a to tak, aby územie na sever a východ od rieky Torysy stalo sa súčasťou Podkarpatskej Rusi. Strana v počiatkoch podporovala začlenenie územia haličských (poľských) Lemkov do Československa, čo však nebolo možné vzhľadom na medzinárodnú situáciu a od tejto myšlienky neskôr upustila.

Ruská ľudová strana zastávala rusofilskú orientáciu, podporovala zavedenie ruského jazyka do (vyšších) škôl a šírenie ruskej kultúry, najmä literatúry v rusínskom prostredí. Prirodzene, strana odmietala ukrajinské hnutie, ktoré považovala za separatizmus a oslabovanie ruského národa. Hoci priznávala určitú špecifickosť rusínskeho obyvateľstva, odmietala snahu o vytvorenie osobitého rusínskeho (a samozrejme aj ukrajinského) národa, považovala takúto snahu za škodlivý separatizmus oslabujúci ruský národ.

Vedenie strany dôrazne žiadalo československú vládu splniť záväzky, ktoré na seba prevzala podpisom Saintgermainskej mierovej zmluvy. Podpredseda strany a najvýznamnejší rusínsky historik prvej polovice 20. storočia Nikolaj Beskid vydal v 20. rokoch niekoľko kritických diel v ktorých obhajoval autochtónnosť rusínskeho (v pôvodine ruského – M. F.) osídlenia v Karpatskej kotline a jeho nárok na autonómiu. V roku 1921 dokonca vypracoval spolu s ďalšími členmi strany memorandum adresované Spoločnosti národov so žiadosťou, aby táto vyslala do Československa komisiu, ktorá by zorganizovala plebiscit na východnom Slovensku, uskutočnila voľby do snemu, zabezpečila splnenie práv uvedených v mierovej zmluve a aby zabezpečila krajanom žijúcim za hranicami návrat do vlasti.[23]

Strana na seba opätovne upozornila v jeseni 1921. V proteste adresovanom ministerskému predsedovi E. Benešovi vedenie strany (A. Beskid, Viktor Berecký, Teodor Rojkovič) opätovne kritizovali rozdelenie Rusínov do dvoch politických celkov – Slovenska a Podkarpatskej Rusi, čo v tom čase označili za najvážnejší problém. Druhým zásadným nedostatkom bolo z ich pohľadu bezohľadné zaobchádzanie československých úradníkov na východnom Slovensku s rusínskym obyvateľstvom, ktorému zakazovali politicky sa organizovať, úrady v rusínskom etnic-

23 Memorandum karpato-russkago naroda, prinadležaščago dovremenno k Slovakii, napravlen k vp. deržavnym delegatam Sojuza Narodov, sobravščichsja v konferencii v Janove, dnja 10-go Aprelja g. 1922. Prjašev, 1921, 8 s. Archív Múzea rusínskej kultúry v Prešove (ďalej len AMRK). Fotokópie archívneho materiálu sú doposiaľ neinventarizované.

kom priestore obsadzovali Slovákmi a Čechmi a do škôl zavádzali slovenský jazyk. V závere svojho protestu voči týmto praktikám žiadali: ustanoviť spravodlivú hranicu medzi Slovákmi a Rusínmi, slobodu zhromažďovania, nové sčítanie obyvateľstva na východnom Slovensku, zastúpenie v Národnom zhromaždení v Prahe, rusínskych úradníkov a učiteľov do rusínskeho prostredia, rusínskych školských inšpektorov, zníženie daní na absolútne minimum, vypísanie volieb do snemu, zníženie počtu úradníkov, odvolanie stanného práva a nakoniec žiadali splnenie všetkých sľubov, ktoré im dali v minulosti československí predstavitelia.[24]

Začiatkom 20. rokov sa politická situácia na Podkarpatskej Rusi (a sčasti aj na východnom Slovensku) radikalizovala. Rusíni, nespokojní s nečinnosťou Prahy – ktorá zdržiavala organizáciu autonómie Podkarpatskej Rusi a odmietala posunúť hranicu so Slovenskom viac na západ – postavili sa do opozície voči Prahe a časť z nich sa neváhala obrátiť na Spoločnosť národov s požiadavkou o prešetrenie situácie priamo na mieste. Napriek tomu, že československá vláda si vždy dokázala obhájiť svoje kroky pred medzinárodnou verejnosťou, predsa len s obavami vnímala rusínsku opozičnú politiku. V snahe vyhnúť sa do budúcna podobným problémom, pricestoval na Podkarpatskú Rus vtedajší ministerský predseda E. Beneš a zvolal spoločné zasadnutie karpatoruských (rusínskych) politických strán. Cieľom rokovaní bolo nakloniť si rusínske politické strany a nadviazať užšiu spoluprácu s celoštátnymi politickými stranami čím by sa dosiahlo zmiernenie opozičného postoja. Snaha o vytvorenie kvázi „aktivistického“ bloku rusínskych politických strán mala len čiastočný úspech a čoskoro sa blok roľníckych strán začal trieštiť. Pre A. Beskida však mala táto iniciatíva prínos v tom zmysle, že v dôsledku rokovaní a vzájomnej dohody s agrárnou stranou sa neskôr stal druhým guvernérom Podkarpatskej Rusi.

1.4 V pozícii guvernéra Podkarpatskej Rusi

Československá vláda v Prahe si uvedomovala svoje záväzky vyplývajúce zo znenia mierovej zmluvy ako aj sľubov, ktoré vyslovila pred rusínskymi politikmi v predošlých rokoch. Napriek tomu, že navonok bola zrejmá zdržanlivosť Prahy, neistota v organizácii autonómie a neochota prenechať riadenie Podkarpatskej Rusi v rukách miestnej rusínskej inteligencie, zachované archívne písomnosti zo zákulisia prezrádzajú, že československá vláda rokovala o postupných krokoch vedúcich k prevodu politickej moci do rusínskych rúk. Táto iniciatíva sa s oneskorením pre-

24 AMRK, neinventarizované. Protest vláde Československé republiky v Praze.

javila aj navonok. Začiatkom roka 1922 bola zrušená vojenská diktatúra na území Podkarpatskej Rusi. V nasledujúcom roku boli naplánované a neskôr uskutočnené obecné voľby, de facto prvé voľby na území Podkarpatskej Rusi a v roku 1924 sa uskutočnili aj doplňujúce voľby do pražského Národného zhromaždenia.[25] Vzhľadom na to, že miesto guvernéra Podkarpatskej Rusi bolo od rezignácie G. Žatkoviča neobsadené, prebiehali v zákulisí rokovania o tom, kto by mohol zaujať túto pozíciu. Jedným z kandidátov, navrhnutým Republikánskou stranou poľnohospodárskeho a maloroľníckeho ľudu (ďalej len agrárna strana) bol A. Beskid; protikandidátom, užhorodský župan Viktor Želtvaj.

Jaromír Nečas, v tom čase odborový rada kancelárie prezidenta pre záležitosti Podkarpatskej Rusi, vypracoval hodnotenie oboch kandidátov adresované prezidentovi republiky, v ktorom uprednostnil V. Želtvaja ako vhodnejšieho kandidáta. A. Beskidovi vyčítal jeho rusofilskú orientáciu a údajnú nerozhodnosť; obával sa, že by úrady obsadil svojimi početnými rodinnými príslušníkmi a predpokladal, že by jeho menovanie spôsobilo zhoršenie politickej situácie na Podkarpatskej Rusi. V osobnom hodnotení mu vyčítal, že je človekom váhavým a oportunistickým, ktorému chýba vlastná iniciatíva. V konečnom dôsledku ho však považoval za človeka poctivého.[26]

Stanovisko sa navonok vyznačuje značnou dávkou subjektivity, čo s ohľadom na Nečasovu politickú orientáciu nijako zvlášť neprekvapuje. J. Nečas sa sám označoval za ukrajinofila a veľkého priateľa ukrajinského ľudu, vo svojich publicistických výstupoch venoval veľkú pozornosť problémom ukrajinského národa. Angažoval sa v podpore ukrajinského hnutia na Podkarpatskej Rusi a bol členom Československej sociálnodemokratickej strany, ktorá rovnako podporovala ukrajinskú orientáciu. Bol blízkym spolupracovníkom G. Žatkoviča a prostredníctvom neho aj A. Vološina či Michala Braščajka. Obaja menovaní patrili k Ruskej roľníckej (poľnohospodárskej) strane [Ruska chliborobska zemledilska partija]; po roku 1925 Kresťansko-ľudová strana [Christiansko-narodnaja partija. Členom strany – ktorá okrem iného spolupracovala so sociálnymi demokratmi – bol aj spomínaný V. Želtvaj.

Napriek Nečasovej podpore V. Želtvaja, druhým guvernérom Podkarpatskej Rusi sa nakoniec stal A. Beskid. Rozhodujúcu úlohu zohrala agrárna strana,

25 Archív Ústavu Tomáše G. Masaryka (ďalej len AÚTGM). Fond Edvard Beneš I (ďalej len fond EB I), sign. 137/4, k. č. 70. Protokol o schůzi ministerské rady, konané v pondělí, dne 9. ledna 1922 o 3. hod. odpoledne na hradě.

26 AÚTGM, fond Tomáš G. Masaryk – Podkarpatská Rus (ďalej len fond TGM – PR), k. č. 402. Obsazení místa guvernéra na Podkarpatské Rusi – Jaromír Nečas.

ktorá v obecných voľbách na Podkarpatskej Rusi jasne zvíťazila a na post guvernéra presadila A. Beskida. Do Užhorodu dorazil 26. novembra 1923 pol hodinu pred poludním. Privítal ho tu starosta Užhorodu Edmund Bačinský spolu so svojím úradníctvom, študujúca mládež, vojsko, najvyšší duchovní predstavitelia a členovia miestneho skautského spolku. A. Beskid sa prítomným poďakoval za vrelé privítanie a vyhlásil, že podkarpatský ľud je oddaný Československej republike, čím de facto naznačil smerovanie svojej politiky. Po tom, čo mu viceguvernér odovzdal úrad a predstavil úradníkov, prijal nový guvernér deputáciu z rodnej obce, spolu s miestnym učiteľstvom a zástupcov Karpatoruskej roľníckej strany. Vo večerných hodinách sa uskutočnil koncert na jeho počesť organizovaný rusínskymi kultúrno-osvetovými spolkami.[27]

Nový guvernér ešte pred nástupom do úradu predstavil svoju víziu do budúcnosti. Hlavným cieľom, s ktorým prišiel do Užhorodu, bolo zjednotenie všetkých slovanských síl na Podkarpatskej Rusi k spoločnej práci a šírenie priaznivého vzťahu k Československej republike. Verejnosť ubezpečil, že nemá záujem pôsobiť ako diktátor, bude dodržiavať zásady parlamentnej demokracie a vyslovil presvedčenie, že v súčinnosti s pražskou vládou sa mu podarí začať novú éru na Podkarpatskej Rusi. Za svoju prvoradú úlohu považoval prípravu krajiny na blížiace sa parlamentné voľby hoci sám zastával názor, že by sa mohli uskutočniť aj hneď. Opatrnejší postoj však zaujal v otázke volieb do autonómneho snemu Podkarpatskej Rusi. Tieto voľby naďalej ostávali medzi realisticky zmýšľajúcimi politikmi veľkou otázkou. Okrem toho si A. Beskid naďalej uvedomoval potrebu spolupracovať so Slovákmi, s ktorými ich spájali spoločné ciele. Jeho prvá pracovná cesta bola naplánovaná do Bratislavy, kde sa stretol s vtedajším ministrom pre správu Slovenska Jozefom Kállayom.[28]

Za zjednotením (rusínskej) politickej scény sa skrývala najmä snaha presadiť zmeny v slovensko-podkarpatoruskej hranici a zavedenie autonómie do života. To si však vyžadovalo zjednotenie Rusínov na jednej strane a dosiahnutie dohody so Slovákmi na strane druhej. Hoci tu pred voľbami vznikali rôzne účelové spojenectvá rusínskych politických strán, nepodarilo sa prekonať názorové rozdiely v ich jazykovo-kultúrnej orientácii a osobné ambície ich predstaviteľov. V konečnom dôsledku tieto kvázi koalície nemali dlhú trvácnosť. Spoločnú reč našli rusínski politici len v otázke úpravy hraníc so Slovenskom avšak zjednotenie politickej scény sa neuskutočnilo aj napriek tomu, že z Beskidovej strany je možné badať istú snahu

27 *Guvernér Dr. Beskid nastúpil svoj úrad*, Slovenský denník, 27. 11. 1923.
28 *Program guvernéra Podkarpatskej Rusi*, Slovenský denník, 16. 11. 1923.

o zmierenie. Keď sa v decembri 1924 obrátil na prezidenta listom, v ktorom žiadal vytvorenie zmiešanej slovensko-rusínskej komisie, ktorá by rokovala o zmene hraníc, z rusínskej strany navrhol 5 delegátov – Augustína Vološina, Jozefa Kaminského, Nikolaja Beskida, Teodora Rojkoviča a Juraja Laža. Odpoveď prezidenta nie je známa, je však zrejmé, že táto požiadavka nebola prijatá.[29] A. Beskid navrhol do komisie aj A. Vološina, hoci ten protestoval proti jeho menovaniu do pozície guvernéra a mal blízko k jeho bývalému protivníkovi G. Žatkovičovi.[30] Snahu o akési zmierenie politického tábora možno nepriamo vyvodiť aj z jeho negatívnej reakcie na činnosť niektorých radikálnych Rusínov, najmä A. Gagatka, haličského rusofila a v prvých rokoch republiky jeho blízkeho spolupracovníka. Toho Beskid kritizoval ešte v roku 1921 keď mu vyčítal jeho agresívnu agitáciu medzi pospolitým rusínskym ľudom a jeho nelojálny postoj voči Československej republike. Podľa redaktora Slovenského denníka ho A. Beskid označil za politického avanturistu.[31] Okrem toho mal výhrady aj voči samotnému Jozefovi Kaminskému, ktorý bol podozrievaný z činnosti mierenej proti republike a spolčovaniu s maďarským živlom na Podkarpatskej Rusi. Hoci sa A. Beskid snažil o spoluprácu rusínskych politikov a vyzýval aj tých, ktorí mu neboli vždy sympatickí, táto jeho snaha sa nestretla s výraznejším úspechom z viacerých príčin. Jednalo sa najmä o osobné ambície politikov ale nemalú úlohu zohrávala aj jazykovo-kultúrna orientácia jednotlivých politikov.

Okrem Rusínov tu boli ešte Slováci, ktorí boli v podobnej východiskovej situácii a mali aj podobný cieľ – autonómiu v rámci ČSR. Prehnané nároky rusínskych politikov na značnú časť východného Slovenska (či v krajnom prípade celé východné Slovensko) však zlikvidovali akúkoľvek šancu na úspešnú spoluprácu. Voči rusínskym nárokom ostro vystúpili viacerí slovenskí predstavitelia. Známy je najmä spor zemplínskeho župana Michala Slávika s G. Žatkovičom, v ktorom sa župan nešťastne vyjadril v tom zmysle, ako by na Slovensku žiadni Rusíni nežili. Ale protestné hlasy zaznievali aj od iných osobností a namierené boli aj voči iným popredným Rusínom. Takým bol aj Slovák Michal Sinčák-Cibavský, rodák z Tibavy v Sobraneckom okrese, člen Katolíckej jednoty a autor krátkej brožúrky pod náz-

29 Jan RYCHLÍK – Magdaléna RYCHLÍKOVÁ, *Podkarpatská Rus v dějinách Československa 1918–1946*, Praha 2016, s. 60.

30 *Nový režim v Podkarpatskej Rusi*, Slovenská otčina, 15. decembra 1923.

31 *Karpatoruská opozícia. Pohľad do politického života Podkarpatskej Rusi V*, Slovenský denník, 5. januára 1923.; Ihor LICHTEJ, *Pidkarpatska Rus u skladi Čechoslovaččyny: osoblivosti suspilno-polityčnoho rozvitku 1919 – 1929 rokiv*, Užhorod 2018, s. 128.

vom *Za Slovenský Východ alebo Celistvosť Slovenska*.[32] Na približne tridsiatich stranách venuje pozornosť domácej tlači prinášajúcej zvesti týkajúce sa slovensko-rusínskych vzťahov, najmä však otázke spoločnej hranice. Viackrát sa novinové príspevky zmieňujú o politických cieľoch A. Beskida, ktorého obviňujú z uzurpovania slovenského územia. Slovenská liga a najmä rodáci z východného Slovenska stavali sa proti snahe o pričlenenie okrajových území k Podkarpatskej Rusi. Ba naopak, niektorí požadovali pripojenie (v pôvodine navrátenie – pozn. M. F.) Užhorodu Slovákom, pretože v sčítaní obyvateľstva bolo tu napočítaných viac Slovákov než Rusínov (pre úplnosť, najvýraznejšie bolo zastúpené maďarské obyvateľstvo – pozn. M. F.). Veľmi citlivo tiež reagovali Slováci na rusínske požiadavky na pozadí nedávno stratených oblastí severnej Oravy a Spiša: „Čuj, svete! Ešte sú nám líca mokré, rana nezahojená za Spiš a Oravu a už nová operácia na slovenskom tele! [...] a pán zahr[aničný] minister E. Beneš, na púhu žiadosť slovenského odrodilca Žatkoviča, pririekne mu číro-čisté a ešte viac prisľúbi! Už sme vami oklamaní, pane Beneš, o mesto Užhorod, ktoré vždy bolo naše, ba ešte i teraz pod Ruskou kontrolou pri poslednom sčítaniu vykazovalo dvakrát viac Slovákov ako Rusínov a preto voláme na Vás, dajte nám Užhorod nazpäť!“[33] Ako sa v závere publikácie uvádza, autor sa domnieval (a iste nebol jediný), že Podkarpatská Rus je súčasťou Československa iba dočasne a v budúcnosti sa jej územie stane súčasťou Ruska. Z toho vyplývala aj obava o stratu územia východného Slovenska, ktorá sa stala podnetom pre ráznu kritiku A. Beskida ale aj ďalších rusínskych predákov.

Po tom, čo v obecných voľbách na Podkarpatskej Rusi roku 1923 zvíťazila agrárna strana (resp. jej podkarpatoruská odbočka), odhodlala sa československá vláda uskutočniť v nasledujúcom roku doplňujúce voľby do Národného zhromaždenia s predpokladom, že agrárna strana obháji svoje prvenstvo. To sa však nestalo. Víťazom volieb uskutočnených 16. marca 1924 sa stala Komunistická strana Československa so ziskom takmer 40 % všetkých hlasov. Vládu v Prahe to iste prekvapilo a vyvolalo obavy o politickú situáciu na Podkarpatskej Rusi. Následné celoštátne voľby do parlamentu v roku 1925 sa síce uskutočnili aj na Podkarpatskej Rusi, k vyhláseniu volieb do autonómneho snemu však vláda nemienila pristúpiť. V tomto smere našla podporu aj medzi rusínskymi politikmi, medzi inými aj A. Beskidom. Opatrný postoj k zvolaniu snemu zaujal už pred nástupom do úradu guvernéra, no tento svoj postoj nezmenil ani neskôr. V internej správe zo začiatku 30. rokov

32 Michal SINČÁK-CIBAVSKÝ, *Za Slovenský Východ alebo Celistvosť Slovenska*, Pittsburg 1924, 31 s.

33 Ibidem, s. 27.

sa uvádza, že nežiadal zvolanie snemu, ani ho nepovažoval za potrebné. Žiadal iba rozšíriť právomoci guvernéra a posilniť jeho agendu v oblasti vzdelania a cirkvi pričom ostatnú agendu bol ochotný prenechať v rukách viceguvernéra, ktorým bol vždy český úradník. A. Beskid si bol vedomý, tak ako aj jeho predchodca G. Žatkovič, že rusínsky ľud ešte nie je v stave pristúpiť k voľbám do autonómneho snemu. Obával sa uchopenia moci maďarským a židovským obyvateľstvom, ktoré držalo vo svojich rukách hospodársky a spoločenský život na Podkarpatskej Rusi a veľmi ľahko dokázalo ovplyvniť pospolité rusínske obyvateľstvo.[34]

Počas svojho pôsobenia v pozícii guvernéra výraznejšie vystúpil aj v otázke krajinskej organizácie v Československu. A. Beskid vyjadril odmietavé stanovisko k pripravovanej reforme. K tejto otázke zaujali kritické stanovisko aj rusínski poslanci v Národnom zhromaždení A. Gagatko a A. Vološin. Rusínom bolo jasné, že s ustanovením jednotnej podkarpatoruskej krajiny by došlo k opätovnému potvrdeniu hraníc so Slovenskom pozdĺž rieky Uh a akákoľvek snaha o jej posunutie smerom na západ by bola stále menej reálnou. Okrem toho stál na čele krajiny krajinský prezident. To vnímal A. Beskid ako krivdu, pretože všetka právomoc by prešla do rúk krajinského prezidenta.[35] Prakticky sa tak opakovala situácia z predošlých rokov, keď všetku právomoc mal v rukách viceguvernér a guvernér zastával iba symbolickú funkciu. A. Beskid viackrát protestoval priamo v Prahe, dokonca sa vyhrážal žalobou adresovanou Spoločnosti národov avšak zvýšiť autoritu a právomoc jeho funkcie sa mu nepodarilo. V pozícii guvernéra napriek tomu pôsobil až do svojej smrti v júni 1933.

Obavy, ktoré J. Nečas vyjadril vo svojom stanovisku z roku 1923 sa napokon nepotvrdili. Ustanovenie A. Beskida do pozície guvernéra nijako výraznejšie neroztrieštilo podkarpatoruskú politickú scénu. Tá bola atomizovaná už počas vzniku ČSR a k vyostrovaniu vzťahov dochádzalo pod vplyvom iných okolností. Nepotvrdila sa ani domnienka, že nový guvernér obsadí významné pozície svojimi rodinnými príslušníkmi. Alexander Beskid síce pôsobil ako referent školského referátu civilnej správy v Užhorode a neskôr referátu kultúry ale miesto získal ešte v roku 1920, teda v čase keď A. Beskid bol ešte v opozícii. Okrem toho bol vo verejnosti známy ako umiernený a pracovitý človek. Rovnako jeho brat Michal Beskid, ktorý pôsobil v administratívnych orgánoch v Košiciach svoje miesto získal ešte v roku 1920. Azda jediným rodinným príslušníkom, ktorý mohol mať nepriamo úžitok

34 AÚTGM, fond TGM – PR, k. č. 402. Obsazení místa guvernéra na Podkarpatské Rusi – Jaromír Nečas.

35 *Na Podkarpatskej Rusi 1. U gevernéra Dr. A. Beskida*, Slovák, 8. december 1932.

z funkcie guvernéra bol Konstantin Beskid, ktorý krátky čas pôsobil na sekretariáte agrárnej strany v Chuste ako redaktor časopisu *Karpatorusskij věstnik*. Počiatkom 30. rokov však sklamaný z politiky strany opustil Chust a vrátil sa do Prešova. Po druhej svetovej vojne sa viac v politike neangažoval.[36]

J. Nečas vyčítal A. Beskidovi tiež to, že je vraj nerozhodný a málo energický vo svojom vystupovaní. Ťažko posúdiť jeho rozhodnosť; pravdou však je, že A. Beskid nevystupoval zďaleka tak energicky ako niektorí iní rusínski politici, čo však možno pripísať jeho vysokému veku a jeho aktivistickej politike voči Prahe, ktorý si na rozdiel od opozičného postoja vyžaduje značnú dávku taktu a rozvahy. Na záver jeho pôsobenia v pozícii guvernéra možno konštatovať, že navrátiť vážnosť tomuto úradu sa mu nepodarilo, čo však bolo dôsledkom objektívnych skutočností (najmä postoja Prahy k problematickej situácii na Podkarpatskej Rusi) než Beskidovou nečinnosťou či snáď neschopnosťou.

2. Osobné postoje vo vybraných otázkach politického života

Anton Beskid patril k staršej generácii rusínskych politikov, vychovaných a vzdelaných v maďarskom prostredí. Hoci pochádzal z národne uvedomelej rusínskej rodiny, vzdelanie nadobudol vo vyšších školách nachádzajúcich sa v mestských centrách, kde koncom 19. storočia prevládala maďarská kultúra. Nebolo to špecifickou záležitosťou A. Beskida, táto skutočnosť sa dotýkala všetkých rusínskych inteligentov. Zároveň bola príčinou vysokej asimilácie rusínskej inteligencie, ktorá prijímala maďarskú identitu a zanevrela na svoje rusínske korene. A. Beskid síce patril k tej menšine rusínskej inteligencie, ktorá si svoj rusínsky pôvod zachovala, napriek tomu bol vplyv maďarskej kultúry a vzdelania značný, čo si azda ani sám neuvedomoval. Prejavovalo sa to rôzne. Spomínaný J. Nečas o Beskidovi tvrdil, že je veľmi vzdialený potrebám pospolitého ľudu, podobne ako väčšina rusínskej inteligencie.[37] Podobná kritika na adresu rusínskych politikov zaznievala z rôznych strán – od českých úradníkov pôsobiacich na Podkarpatskej Rusi, od slovenských úradníkov na východnom Slovensku[38] ba aj od

36 Ivan POP, *Podkarpatská Rus: osobnosti její historie, vědy a kultury*, Praha 2008, s. 31–33.

37 AÚTGM, fond Tomáš G. Masaryk – Podkarpatská Rus (ďalej len fond TGM – PR), šk. 402. Obsazení místa guvernéra na Podkarpatské Rusi – Jaromír Nečas.

38 AKPR, protokol (fond) PR, inv. č. 13, šk. č. 1. Ministr pro správu Slovenska – zřízení správy rusínske krajiny.

samotných Rusínov.[39] Okrem toho, samotný Beskid ani len neovládal rusínsku reč (resp. dialekty – pozn. M. F.). Podľa svedectva J. Nečasa vedel bezchybne po maďarsky, ovládal ruský jazyk a v súkromí používal „prešovské" nárečie (rozumej slovenské šarišské nárečie – pozn. M. F.) do ktorého primiešaval ruské a cirkevnoslovanské slová. V závere svojho posudku nepriamo obviňuje Beskida z prospechárstva, keď navrhuje aby bolo Beskidovi zaistené dobre platené miesto s argumentom, že s vhodným finančným zabezpečením by sa Beskid a jeho strana vzdali opozičnej politiky a snáď aj ašpirácií na miesto guvernéra. A. Beskid sa nakoniec po dohode s agrárnou stranou stal druhým guvernérom Podkarpatskej Rusi aj napriek odmietavému stanovisku J. Nečasa. Do istej miery mal Nečas pravdu a Beskid po dosiahnutí funkcie zmiernil svoju opozičnú politiku. Tu však treba poukázať na fakt, že snaha získať vhodnú funkciu bola charakteristická pre väčšinu rusínskej (aj nerusínskej) inteligencie. Koniec koncov je to prirodzené; tak ako roľník potrebuje pôdu pre svoje prežitie, inteligent potrebuje pre svoje uplatnenie úrad, resp. funkciu.

2.1 Rusíni, Rusi či Ukrajinci

Omnoho zaujímavejším a zaiste aj dôležitejším bol Beskidov pohľad na otázku rusínskej identity, jej minulosti a budúcnosti. Je viac než zrejmé, že rozhodujúcu úlohu zohralo rodinné prostredie a výchova. Ako potomok význačných rusínskych dejateľov z polovice 19. storočia aj A. Beskid zastával rusofilskú orientáciu. Rusínov vnímal ako súčasť veľkého ruského národa od Popradu až po Vladivostok a odmietal akékoľvek názory o samostatnom rusínskom (resp. karpatoruskom) národe. V tomto duchu samozrejme odmietal aj ukrajinské národné hnutie ako niečo neprijateľné a v končenom dôsledku nežiaduce. Jasne to vyjadril v polemike s ukrajinským profesorom Nikolajom Čajkovským ale tiež českými publicistami J. Nečasom a Aloisom Horom. V rozsiahlej stati, adresovanej ukrajinskému profesorovi hneď v úvode odmietol stanovisko Petrohradskej univerzity, podľa ktorého je ukrajinčina samostatným jazykom. A. Beskid ironizuje, že ukrajinský profesor sa vo svojej argumentácii opiera o stanovisko ruskej univerzity: „V republice této pan obránce nově objeveného slovanského národa a jazyka – ukrajinského totiž, shrnul tolik věčných nespravností [...]. [...] a musel se proto uchýliti o pomoc až do nenáviděného carského Petrohradu k tamější Akademii nauk, která prý v roce 1904 zaprotestovala

39 ŠA KE, fond KŽ, č. j. 2871/25, k. č. 91. Prípravné komité spojených ruských strán; oznámenie ruského nacionálneho kongresu.

proti nasilnému vnucování velikoruského jazyka – malorusum a výslovne prý prohlásila, že jazyk ruský a jazyk maloruský jsou dva zvláštní jazyky." A. Beskid podotýka, že v stanovisku sa hovorí o maloruskom, nie ukrajinskom jazyku a že pojem Ukrajina je pojmom z historického hľadiska geografickým, nie etnickým. Sémantický (významový) posun do roviny etnickej sa mal uskutočniť až v roku 1917 na mierovej konferencii v Brest-Litovsku a to pod vplyvom nemeckého generála Maximiliána Hoffmanna. Zároveň dodáva, že zmieňované stanovisko nebolo dielom samotnej akadémie ale len časti profesorov, pôvodom Nemcov, členov matematicko-fyzikálnych odborov nie však ruských slavistov či odborníkov slovesného oddelenia. Vtedajší ruskí slavisti, vrátane Alexeja Sobolevského či Vladimíra Lamanského vraj v komisii neboli zastúpení a proti tomuto stanovisku verejne protestovali
A. Beskid ďalej vysvetľuje, že všetko to čo sa dnes (t.j. v roku 1919 – pozn. M. F.) vysvetľuje pojmom ukrajinský/á/é sa v českých krajinách a všade v slovanskom svete poznalo pod pojmom maloruský/á/é. Zároveň sa dostáva aj k problematike rusínskej identity: „Pan profesor [...] stěžuje si na to, že ukrajinská literatura byla dosud Čechum málo známa. Má v tom úplne pravdu, ale jen z té příčiny, že všetko to, co vyznavači politického učení generála Hoffmanna vydávají za ukrajinství, je známo Čechům i ostatním Slovanům jako plody jazyka a písemnosti maloruské; a my Karpatští Rusové uherští jsme větví maloruského kmene a také naše nářečí patří ke skupine maloruské. My však nechceme podle německého návodu (divide et impera) budovati nejakou extra národnost, extra jazyk a literaturu, nýbrž známe se s chloubou k velikému národu a jazyku ruskému, jazyku, který dal světu nejmohutnější literaturu [...]. Proto nechceme my Karpatští Rusové dopustiti, aby veliký a mohutný náš jazyk ruský byl hanoben ukrajinskými umělými zkaženinami fonetickými, a aby vyrváno bylo ze živého ústrojí národní a osvětové pospolitosti ruského národa 40 mil. duší, které Ukrajinci reklamují pro svůj protiruský státní novotvar nemecké provenience a konstrukce, neboť oblast Ukrajiny ruské jest nejenom nejúrodnější půdou celého Ruska, nýbrž lidová osvěta i řeč maloruská, písně, zvyky a obyčeje maloruské patří k nejskvostnějším plodům ruské a slovanské osvěty národní a my právě nechceme, aby o tyto skvosty byl ruský národ oloupen a ochuzen [...] A poněvadž jedná se o spor ruských kmenů mezi sebou, musíme my uherští Rusové žádati, aby se naši čeští pobratimové do tohto našeho vnitřního kmenového sporu nemíchali a do neho rušivě nezasahovali ani na prospech jedné ani druhé strany. Je to spor Rusů mezi sebou [...]"

A. Beskid zároveň odmieta tradičnú protiruskú rétoriku, ktorá obviňovala Moskvu zo zaostalosti a útlaku: „Dokud řádila v Rusku bezhlavá a zlotřilá byrokracie, která utiskovala maloruský jazyk i svobodu lidu, mohla ukrajinská iredenta a ukrajinský separatizmus docházeti vysvetlení a jakéhosi subjektivního oprávnění. Dnes však, kdy carismus jako zosobnění libovlády jest odstraněn, kdy jest potřeba, aby celý ruský národ semknul se k obraně a jednotě proti svým svéřepým škůdcům a ničitelům, jest šíření Ukrajinství jako protiruského státního, národního, kultúrního i jazykového rozvratu přímo zločinným anachronismem."

V závere sa A. Beskid vyjadruje k útokom voči jeho osobe, v ktorých ho obviňujú z oportunistickej vládnej politiky v uhorskom sneme pred rokom 1918. Odmieta tieto tvrdenia s argumentom, že sa postavil proti politickým procesom v Marmarošskej Sihoti, že interpeloval v parlamente proti podvratnej činnosti agenta Arnolda Duliškoviča a že odmietol návrh na ministerskú pozíciu ponúknutú Kolomanom Tisom. Útoky voči jeho osobe preto nepovažuje za nič viac ako nevedomosť alebo v horšom prípade hanenie jeho cti.[40]

Napriek rusofilskej pozícii a Beskidom proklamovanej politike jednotného Ruska, uvedomoval si špecifickosť a odlišnosť tak uhorských (resp. československých) Rusínov a Ukrajincov voči ruskému národu ako aj voči sebe navzájom. Tak ako odmietal ukrajinský „separatizmus", odmietal aj snahu pestovať samostatný rusínsky národ. Istú úlohu tu zohral aj fakt, že Ukrajinci často poukazovali na to, že Rusín je len archaickým pomenovaním (etnonymom) v minulosti používaným aj pre predkov Ukrajincov a teda niet rozdielu medzi uhorskými Rusínmi a Ukrajincami. Z ich pohľadu to bol jeden a ten istý národ. Tak ako Beskid neuznával samostatný ukrajinský národ, z rovnakých dôvodov nemohol akceptovať ani samostatný rusínsky národ, preto sa prirodzene pridržiava termínu Karpatorus. Ukrajincov považoval Beskid, ako to vyplýva z vyššie uvedeného citátu za kmeň (veľko-)ruského národa.

V kontexte uvedeného je zaujímavé stanovisko Dimitrija Sobina. K 10. výročiu vzniku Československej republiky publikoval v časopise LEMKO svoje spomienky na udalosti z prelomu rokov 1918 a 1919. V čase písania state bola Lemkovština súčasťou Poľska a nik už nepochyboval, že to tak ostane. D. Sobin, ktorý v roku 1918 bojoval za jej pripojenie k Československu mal ťažké srdce na českých politikov, najmä K. Kramářa, ale tiež na Beskida a G. Žatkoviča. A. Beskidovi vyčítal, že keď navštívil Rusínov z poľskej Lemkovštiny tak vyhlásil, že bude bojovať aj za ich práva a za to, aby boli súčasťou Československa. Beskid podľa neho nedokázal, alebo nechcel pochopiť, že rozdeľovanie na našich a vašich, resp. na uhorských

40 Nikolaj BESKID, *Karpatskaja Rus s priloženiem kartiny Karpato-russkago etnosa*, Prjašev 1920, s. 92–95.

a poľských Lemkov nie je na mieste, pretože Rusíni na oboch stranách Karpát sú jedným a tým istým národom.[41]

Pre úplnosť konštatujeme, že A. Beskid napriek svojmu rusofilskému postoju nepatril medzi podporovateľov boľševizmu, práve naopak. Hoci si myšlienky boľševickej revolúcie získali sympatie chudobnejšej časti rusínskeho obyvateľstva, najmä však rusínskych legionárov prichádzajúcich z Ruska, medzi inteligenciou dominovalo odmietavé stanovisko. V prípade A. Beskida to došlo tak ďaleko, že v liste žiadal K. Kramářa o to, aby československé vojsko obsadilo Budapešť a nadobro vypudilo boľševizmus z Karpatskej kotliny, ktorý ohrozoval východné Slovensko a Podkarpatskú Rus.[42]

2.2 Slováci, východní Slováci a Rusíni

Východní Slováci, resp. územie východného Slovenska zohrávalo v rusínskej politike významné miesto. Samotný A. Beskid pochádzal zo šarišských Hanigoviec, preto otázka príslušnosti východného Slovenska mala pre neho zaiste aj osobný rozmer. Keď vo februári 1919 pricestoval do Paríža ako súčasť česko-slovenskej delegácie a poradca pre rusínske záležitosti, priniesol so sebou aj mapu, v ktorej bolo vyznačené územie kam mala siahať Karpatská Rus a tiež územie, kde sa mal vykonať plebiscit a obyvatelia mali vyjadriť svoju vôľu patriť k Slovensku alebo Podkarpatskej Rusi.[43] Pôvodná mapa prešovskej Karpatoruskej národnej rady viac-menej rešpektovala etnickú hranicu medzi Slovákmi a Rusínmi, hoci zahŕňala aj niektoré slovenské územia. V polovici roku 1919 však už A. Beskid prišiel s novým stanoviskom. V liste adresovanom ministerskému predsedovi Karlovi Kramářovi ho žiadal, aby sa zabezpečil o to, že súčasťou autonómnej Podkarpatskej Rusi bude aj Staroľubovniansky okres a celá Šarišská a Zemplínska župa, pričom tieto svoje požiadavky označil za minimálne.[44] K tomuto radikálnemu posunu názoru dospel pod vplyvom rozhodnutia mierovej konferencie a česko-slovenskej delegácie, ktorá si nepriala začlenenie poľskej Lemkovštiny do Československa. Pôvodný návrh hraníc Karpatoruskej národnej rady sa tak stal bezpredmetným, pretože územie Podkar-

41 *Dni Svobody na Lemkovščinĕ*, LEMKO, 1. dekabrja 1928.
42 Archiv Národního muzea Praha (ďalej len ANMP). Fond Karel Kramář (ďalej len Fond K. K.), inv. č. 115, k. č. 6. Anton Beskid – osobní korespondence.
43 Mapa je otlačená vo viacerých publikáciách venovaných dejinám Podkarpatskej Rusi. Pozri: P. ŠVORC, *Krajinská hranica...*, s. 123.
44 ANMP. Fond K. K., inv. č. 115, šk. č. 6. Anton Beskid – osobní korespondence.

patskej Rusi by vo svojej západnej časti bolo (bez poľskej časti) obmedzené na úzky pohraničný pás neschopný samostatnej existencie. Vzhľadom na to sa A. Beskid vo svojich neskorších žiadostiach o začlenenie východného Slovenska do Podkarpatskej Rusi odvolával na nevyhnutnosť takéhoto kroku argumentom, že mestá ako Prešov, Humenné či Nové mesto pod Šiatrom (Sátoraljaújhely) sú hospodárskym, kultúrnym a administratívnym centrom kraja.[45]

Ako sme na to už poukázali v predošlom, Slováci museli na takéto požiadavky zareagovať. Zo slovenskej strany tu bola ochota rokovať. Rokovania skutočne prebehli ale vzhľadom na prehnané nároky rusínskych predákov nedospeli k žiadnemu výsledku. Na slovenskú stranu sa postavili aj českí politici, ktorí si jednako uvedomovali reálnu situáciu na východnom Slovensku a jednako aj tu jestvovali úvahy o tom, že Podkarpatská Rus je iba dočasnou súčasťou Československa a prípadná strata Podkarpatskej Rusi s celým východným Slovenskom nebola v záujme republiky. Koniec koncov Československo by nemohlo existovať bez účasti Slovákov preto Praha prijala pragmatické riešenie a zvyčajne podporila slovenskú stranu.[46]

V snahe pričleniť východné Slovensko k Podkarpatskej Rusi rusínska inteligencia využívala aj argument o historickom práve. Tvrdila, že východné Slovensko bolo súčasťou „historickej Karpatskej (Kyjevskej) Rusi“, ktorej hranice siahali až k prameňu rieky Hron, kde susedila s Veľkomoravskou ríšou a na juhu s ríšou bulharskou. Takto interpretoval historický vývoj na neskoršom východnom Slovensku a Podkarpatskej Rusi Beskidov synovec – Mikuláš (Nikolaj) Beskid. V rozsiahlom diele, v ktorom okrem iného odmietal názory o neosídlení Šarišskej župy pred 13. storočím, dokazoval prítomnosť rusínskeho elementu v tomto priestore už v ranom stredoveku a tiež existenciu feudálneho ruského štátu. Odmietal dovtedajšie tvrdenia niektorých historikov o tom, že Slováci sú potomkami a zároveň amalgámom slovanských imigrantov prichádzajúcich z okolitých štátov v neskorom stredoveku. Obhajoval autochtónnosť tunajšej populácie, zároveň však odmietal jej slovenskú identitu a východných Slovákov považoval za poslovenčených, resp. polatinčených Rusínov. Najpresvedčivejším dôkazom tejto skutočnosti mala byť podľa jeho názoru gréckokatolícka viera (hojne rozšírená medzi východnými Slovákmi), ich kostoly a samozrejme reč.[47]

---

45 ANMP. Fond K.K., inv. č. 115, k. č. 6. Anton Beskid – osobní korespondence.
46 P. ŠVORC, *Krajinská hranica...*, s. 154.
47 Nikolaj BESKID, *Karpatorusskaja pravda s sem kartami*, Homestead 1932, s. 71–118.

Dielo v čase a mieste svojho vzniku vynikalo svojím rozsahom aj hĺbkou analyzovanej problematiky. Monografia dokazuje na základe analýzy písomných prameňov osídlenie územia Šarišskej župy už pred jej vznikom a zaujatím uhorským štátom v 12. storočí. O niekoľko desaťročí neskôr, sľubne rozvíjajúca „socialistická" archeológia na Slovensku potvrdila oprávnenosť Beskidovho záveru o preduhorskom slovanskom osídlení východného Slovenska. Zároveň však vyvrátila Beskidovu tézu o existencii historickej karpatskej Rusi, keď archeológovia a historici dokázali, že toto územie bolo integrálnou súčasťou Veľkej Moravy a že kontinuita osídlenia pretrvala bez vážnejších zásahov aj po vzniku Uhorského kráľovstva. V druhej polovici 20. storočia objavili sa aj jazykovedné výskumy, ktoré jednoznačne potvrdili príbuznosť východoslovenských nárečí k západným a stredoslovenským nárečiam, resp. ich príslušnosť k západoslovanskému jazykovému areálu. Práve jazykovedná časť Beskidovej publikácie vykazuje značne nevedecký prístup, keď autor pri výklade miestnych názvov (toponým a hydroným) podlieha tzv. ľudovej etymológii a teda nemožno jeho závery akceptovať.

Autochtónnosť Slovákov na území východného Slovenska je dnes, takmer storočie neskôr, už akceptovaným faktom. Nehľadiac na súčasný stav poznania však zohrala Beskidova historická práca významnú úlohu pri koncepcii rusínskej politiky 20. storočia a napriek niektorým prekonaným záverom sa M. Beskid nemýlil, ak obhajoval autochtónnosť slovanského obyvateľstva na východnom Slovensku. Je viac než zrejmé, že s rovnakou koncepciou pristupoval k problému východného Slovenska aj jeho strýko A. Beskid. V jednom zo svojich listov adresovaných K. Kramářovi v polovici roku 1919 žiadal: „1. abyste, pane ministerský předsedo, nařídil na základě našich pařížských jednání, aby mezi Slovenskem a naším územím – ještě než učiněna budou o našich záležitostech konečná rozhodnutí a Vy se vrátite – upraveny byly co nejdříve dočasné naše hranice a aby nám odevzdáno bylo imperium, t. j. vláda a samospráva našeho území; 2. račte se, pane ministerský předsedo, postarati o to (aby – pozn. M. F.) na východ od Tater na území přiděleném k slovenské administrativní části, kde obývá docela odlišný lid jak ze stanoviska etnografického tak i ze stanoviska linguistického /východní Slováci stěží rozumí západnímu Slovákovi/ zavedená byla lepší administrace než dosud, aby rozhořčení tohto lidu vzalo za své a aby lid tento byl vychován v lásce a spravedlnosti, a ne jako dosud s přezíráním a útiskem."[48]

Pohľad na východných Slovákov ako na špecifickú etnickú skupinu, odlišnú od tej (západo-)slovenskej sa až príliš podobal politike maďarských vládnucich kru-

48 ANM P. Fond K.K., inv. č. 115, k. č. 6. Anton Beskid – osobní korespondence.

hov v Uhorsku, ktoré sa snažili o kultiváciu tzv. slovjackej identity na východe Slovenska.[49] Predpokladom takejto politiky bol špecifický historický vývoj na východnom Slovensku a cieľom jeho začlenenie do Uhorska, resp. v prípade A. Beskida do Podkarpatskej Rusi. Jednako však možno konštatovať, že A. Beskid vždy veľmi dôsledne odmietal akékoľvek maďarské nároky na rusínske (resp. československé) územie a aj napriek vyhrážkam podaním žaloby k Spoločnosti národov vždy zastával lojálne stanovisko voči Československej republike, preto ho nemožno podozrievať z promaďarského postoja.

Záver

Anton Beskid vyrastal v národne uvedomelej rusínskej rodine gréckokatolíckych kňazov. Patril medzi staršiu generáciu konzervatívnej inteligencie, vychovanej v duchu slovanskej vzájomnosti a rusofilstva. V súlade s tým sa spočiatku snažil o to, aby boli Rusíni zjednotení v jednom politickom útvare, ktorý – pokiaľ to bude možné – bude súčasťou ruského štátu. Tento cieľ však od počiatku narážal na neprekonateľné prekážky. Ruská ríša sa zmietala v občianskej vojne, takže táto alternatíva sa nemohla uskutočniť. Vznik samostatnej Ukrajiny nemal podporu medzinárodnej verejnosti a aj sám Beskid bol proti vzniku samostatnej ukrajinskej národnosti a štátu. S Poliakmi mali zlé skúsenosti najmä haličskí Rusíni (Lemkovia), no a existencia v rámci uhorského, resp. od roku 1918 maďarského štátu neprichádzala do úvahy. Vzhľadom na to, že východné Slovensko odkiaľ Beskid pochádzal, bolo už koncom roka 1918 pod kontrolou československého vojska, nadviazala prešovská Karpatoruská národná rada kontakt s Turčianskym Svätým Martinom a následne Prahou v snahe začleniť Rusínov do Československa. Hoci sa rusofili okolo A. Beskida vzdali myšlienky spojenia s Ruskom, naďalej tu pretrvávala snaha združiť Rusínov v jednom politickom útvare – Karpatskej Rusi. Aj tu však narazili na vážne prekážky. Územie Lemkovštiny nebolo pre Československo zaujímavé a Praha si neželala ďalší spor s Poľskom o chudobné pohraničné územie; Rumunsko bolo potencionálnym spojencom Československa, preto Praha nebola ochotná viesť politické zápasy o najvýchodnejší cíp Marmarošskej župy (vrátane Marmarošskej Sihoti). No a na

49 K problematike tzv. slovjackej identity publikoval viacero štúdií Ladislav Tajták. Pozri: Ladislav TAJTÁK, *Naša zastava – Nástroj politiky maďarských vládnucich tried*, in: Imrich Sedlák (ed.), Nové obzory 8, Prešov 1966, s. 78–107; Idem, *Východné Slovensko ako regionálny fenomén*, Historický časopis 49, 2001, č. 2, s. 307–329.

východnom Slovensku mali najpočetnejšie zastúpenie Slováci, u ktorých nehrozilo, že by sa jedného dňa chceli stať súčasťou iného štátu. Okrem toho, hranice Československa s okolitými štátmi boli vytýčené na mierovej konferencii v Paríži, čo znamenalo, že na zmenu medzištátnych hraníc bol potrebný súhlas mocností, na čo Rusíni nemali prakticky žiaden dosah. Keď sa nádej na pripojenie Rusínmi osídleného územia na severe Karpát a v Rumunsku pomaly strácala, snažil sa Beskid kompenzovať túto skutočnosť pripojením celého východného Slovenska k Podkarpatskej Rusi. Slovensko-podkarpatoruská hranica bola totiž vnútroštátna hranica a na jej zmenu nebol potrebný súhlas medzinárodného spoločenstva, ale len dohoda medzi Slovákmi a Rusínmi. Posunúť hranicu až k rieke Poprad sa im však nepodarilo.

A. Beskid bol pri vzniku Československa jediným rusínskym inteligentom s politickými skúsenosťami z uhorského parlamentu. Zároveň sa Karpatoruská národná rada pod jeho predsedníctvom ako prvá vyslovila za pripojenie neskoršej Podkarpatskej Rusi k Československu. Vzhľadom na to, ako aj na fakt, že bol v tom čase človekom vo vyššom veku, potomkom význačných rusínskych osobností, predpokladáme, že sa považoval za najvýznamnejšieho rusínskeho politika tej doby a zároveň očakával tomu prislúchajúce spoločenské a politické postavenie. Keď jeho ambície ostali po menovaní direktória a neskôr prvého guvernéra Podkarpatskej Rusi nenaplnené, začal presadzovať opozičnú politiku. Začiatkom 20. rokov na to reagoval vtedajší ministerský predseda E. Beneš, ktorý vycestoval na Podkarpatskú Rus. Jedným z výsledkov jeho iniciatívy bolo rozhodnutie o vymenovaní A. Beskida za – v poradí druhého – guvernéra Podkarpatskej Rusi a Beskid na oplátku upustil od opozičnej politiky. Hoci sa mu nepodarilo zvýšiť právomoci a prestíž úradu guvernéra, pôsobil v tejto pozícii až do svojej smrti v roku 1933. Postupom času zároveň ubral zo svojich požiadaviek a uspokojil sa s obmedzenou autonómiu, ak by to znamenalo, že bude naďalej guvernérom. Ako prezradil začiatkom 30. rokov, medzi jeho priority patrilo zabezpečenie autonómnej správy v záležitostiach cirkevných a školských. Všetky ostatné záležitosti bol ochotný ponechať viceguvernérovi.

A. Beskidovi sa nakoniec väčšinu politických cieľov nepodarilo naplniť. Bránili tomu objektívne skutočnosti, akými boli záujmy mocností a jednotlivých stredoeurópskych štátov, resp. nízke národné vedomie rusínskeho obyvateľstva a s tým spojená existencia viacerých kultúrno-jazykových smerov (identít), zamieňanie etnickej identity s gréckokatolíckym vierovyznaním ale aj geografické okolnosti, v ktorých Rusíni žili. Rusíni, rozdrobení do viacerých politických útvarov pred rokom 1918, rozdelení Karpatským oblúkom a postihnutí značnou hospodárskou a kultúrnou zaostalosťou neboli pripravení na vlastnú štátnosť, čo rusínska inteligencia a medzi ňou ani A. Beskid nedokázala alebo nechcela pochopiť. Okrem objektívnych príčin tu jestvovali aj tie subjektívne. Azda najzásadnejším nedostatkom A. Beskida boli jeho rusofilské tendencie. Myšlienky jednotného ruského národa a odmietanie existencie ukrajinskej nácie bolo v 20. rokoch 20. storočia anachronizmom. Hoci otázka rusínskej identity ešte nebola vyriešená, existencia ukrajinského národa už bola viac-menej skutočnosťou. Zotrvávaním na rusofilskej pozícii si A. Beskid znepriatelil značnú časť rusínskej inteligencie a posilnil tým odstredivé sily vo vnútri rusínskej spoločnosti. Zároveň sám spôsobil, že Praha sa spočiatku rozhodla podporiť G. Žatkoviča, ktorý stál na pozícii samostatného rusínskeho národa, odlišného od ruského aj ukrajinského.

Úplne na záver možno konštatovať, že A. Beskid patril medzi najvýznamnejších rusínskych politikov v medzivojnovom Československu. Hoci sa mu mnohé z jeho cieľov nepodarilo splniť, jednako patril medzi tú schopnejšiu časť rusínskej politickej reprezentácie. Patrí mu veľká zásluha za začlenenie Podkarpatskej Rusi do Československa a aj napriek krátkemu obdobiu opozičnej politiky vždy zastával voči Československu lojálne stanovisko. Tak ako u iných rusínskych inteligentov aj u A. Beskida je vidieť snahu o nadobudnutie postavenia a osobný prospech, avšak aj úprimný záujem o rusínsky ľud. Na rozdiel od mnohých iných popredných rusínskych politikov sa s osobou A. Beskida nespája žiaden škandál, policajné vyšetrovanie či súdny proces. Možno teda povedať, že ho J. Nečas sčasti správne odhadol ako ctižiadostivého ale predsa len čestného rusínskeho politika.

SUMMARY

Anton Beskid came from a nationally conscious Rusyn family of Greek Catholic priests and was raised in the spirit of Russophile traditions. After the dissolution of Austria-Hungary, he became involved in the political struggle over the future of the Hungarian Rusyns. As a convinced Russophile and conservative politician, he sought to unite the Rusyn-inhabited territories with the Russian Empire—an effort that ultimately failed given the circumstances of the time. Following the occupation of eastern Slovakia by the Czechoslovak army, he advocated for the incorporation of the disputed territory into Czechoslovakia. During the interwar period, he promoted the introduction of the Russian language in higher education and the dissemination of Russian culture among Rusyns. At lower levels of schooling, he supported the use of local dialects. Although he was aware of the differences between Rusyns and the Russian nation, in keeping with his upbringing he regarded the Rusyns (and the closely related Ukrainians) not as a distinct nation, but merely as a branch of the Russian people. He considered eastern Slovakia—his native region—to be originally Rusyn territory and worked to have it joined with Subcarpathian Ruthenia. During his tenure as governor of Subcarpathian Ruthenia, he sought to elevate the prestige of this office and expand its powers. His ability to achieve these goals was hindered both by objective circumstances and by his own subjective—Russophile—understanding of Rusyn identity. Nevertheless, Anton Beskid may be regarded as one of the most capable Rusyn politicians of the first half of the twentieth century: an ambitious, to some extent opportunistic figure, but also an honourable man—an often rare quality in politics.

STUDIE / ARTICLE

'The Singer of Old Rus':[1] General Pyotr Nikolayevich Krasnov and His Political Ideas through the Prism of His Literary Work.[2]

ANEŽKA KOTOUČOVÁ

Institute of Historical Sciences, Faculty of Arts and Philosophy, University of Pardubice

'The Singer of Old Rus': General Pyotr Nikolayevich Krasnov and His Political Ideas through the Prism of His Literary Work

The aim of the study is an attempt at a biographical analysis of an interesting personality of the Russian interwar right-wing emigration, General Pyotr Nikolayevich Krasnov. At the same time, the study contains an analysis of part of his literary work, especially with regard to his far-right political views. Based on the study of two of Krasnov's key works, the novels *From the Double-Headed Eagle to the Red Flag* and *Behind the Thistle*, the intention is to point out the right-wing ideas of the White Army general and graphoma-

1 The study was funded by the Czech Science Foundation (GAČR), project No. 20-09721S, "Russian Radical Right in Exile, 1918–1945", University of Pardubice, Faculty of Arts and Philosophy, 2020–2023.

2 The title comes from a review of Krasnov's book, see Anna Aleksandrovna REVIAKINA, "'Liubite Rossiiu!'– General P. N. Krasnov (Literaturnaia deiatel'nost' v emigratsii)," in: *Russkoe zarubez'e* 2015, p. 181.

niac, and to capture, using Krasnov's example, the ideas that the Russian right-wing emigration in the interwar period was concerned with.
Key words: Pyotr Nikolayevich Krasnov; Russian right-wing emigration; literature; army; White-Guard

Pyotr Nikolayevich Krasnov (1869–1947) was undoubtedly one of the most interesting Russian interwar right-wing émigré personalities. This White-Guard (Belaya gvardiya) general was a very prolific literary author and graphomaniac whose work aptly reflects the views of the Russian right, as well as the atmosphere of Russia at the turn of two significant historical epochs, the Imperial and the Soviet ones. At the same time, Krasnov's personality has not yet been much reflected by historians, despite his extremely rich, engaging, and dynamic life full of great extremes. Krasnov was an author of fiction, scholarly and historical treatises, and a great traveller through the eastern parts of the Russian Empire. He took part in the Russo-Japanese War and the First World War and, as a leading White commander, also in the Civil War in south Russia. Finally, he was an active participant in the White Guard émigré life. Fighting against the Soviet regime, he eventually did not shy away from collaboration with Nazi Germany. The following study aims to present both a biographical probe and, at the same time, an analysis of Krasnov's literary work, which is now somewhat forgotten, especially regarding his far-right political thinking.

Pyotr Nikolayevich Krasnov was born on 10/22 September 1869 in Saint Petersburg into an old and wealthy noble family of the Don Cossacks.[3] The Krasnovs had been one of the most famous dynasties of the Don Cossacks since the time of Catherine II, and their family had a strong military tradition mixed with extraordinary artistic talents. Krasnov's grandfather, Ivan Ivanovich, fought in the Russo-Turkish War of 1828–1829 and the Crimean War, and was at the same time a distinguished writer, author of poetry, and of historical and ethnographic works about the Cossacks. Ivan Krasnov was an educated man who wrote letters in verse, breaking the somewhat entrenched stereotype of the "anti-Renaissance" nature of the military profession. Pyotr Nikolayevich's father, Nikolai Ivanovich, was a member of the Russian General Staff, a Cossack from the Karginskaya station, and a defender of Sevastopol in the Crimean War. He was one of the founders of Russian

3 Several sources indicate that Krasnov was born not in September, but in July, e.g. Oleg MIKHAILOV, "P. N. Krasnov i ego roman o Ekaterine II," in *P. N. Krasnov, Ekaterina Velikaia* (Moskva: Raritet 1994), p. 3.

statistics, the author of biographies of prominent Don atamans, and a number of studies on Cossack subjects. Pyotr Nikolayevich's older brother, Platon, was a mathematician, translator, poet, critic, and publicist.[4] Platon Krasnov's wife, the writer Ekaterina Andreevna Beketova-Krasnova, was an aunt of Alexander Blok, the famous poet of the Russian Silver Age. Another brother, Andrei Krasnov, was a prominent traveller, botanist, geographer, and translator.[5] During his travels, he visited North America, Japan, and Ceylon. As can be seen, even though it was a traditional Cossack family, there was no purely military imperative, and the Krasnov siblings' aptitudes other than those for the military profession were encouraged. We can thus conclude that Pyotr Krasnov had a solid and traditional background, combining somewhat incompatible spheres of military and literary work.

In 1880, Pyotr Krasnov entered the 1st Saint Petersburg Gymnasium, and from there, he advanced to the Alexander Cadet Corps. He subsequently studied at the 1st Pavel (Pavlovsk) Military School, regarded as the second most prestigious military educational institution in the Russian Empire after the Page Corps. He graduated from the school with honours in 1888. In August 1889, he joined the Don Cossacks, namely the Ataman Guards regiment. In 1892, he briefly studied at the General Staff Academy but returned to his regiment at his request.[6] In 1893, he was promoted to Sotnik. In 1901, he led a convoy on a diplomatic mission to Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. That same year, he was sent on a mission as military minister to Central Asia to learn about life in Manchuria, China, Japan, and India, completing his round-the-world tour.[7] These travels greatly influenced Krasnov as a writer in later years, as he described Central Asia in some of his works.[8]

Alongside his military service, Krasnov had been writing literary non-fiction works from the early 1890s. He specifically wrote treatises on military theory. His first article appeared in the magazine *Russkii Invalid*, the official periodical of the Tsarist army, as early as 1891. However, it should be mentioned that his father's and grandfather's great literary authority helped him to get his texts onto the pages

---

4 A. A. REVIAKINA, "'Liubite Rossiiu!'," pp. 174–175.

5 Aleksandr SMIRNOV, *Ataman Krasnov* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo AST – Sankt-Peterburg: Terra Fantanstica, 2003), pp. 19–22.

6 S. P. POLONSKII, Preface, in: P. N. Krasnov. *Za veru, tsaria i otechestvo*, (Moskva: "Lestvica" – "Artos-Media", 2005), p. 3.

7 Ibidem, p. 4.

8 Bakhmeteff Archive of Russian and East European Culture, Columbia University (BAR), Voitsekhovskii Papers, Box 6, Pyotr Krasnov, biographical essay.

of periodicals.[9] At the time of the Boxer Rebellion and the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–1905, Krasnov's talents in the field of combat made him a military correspondent for some Saint Petersburg periodicals.[10] From the 1890s, he worked with such newspapers as *Russkii Invalid*, *Razvedchik*, and *Vestnik Russkoi Konnitsy*. In 1896, he married Lidia Fyodorovna Bakmanson, a Russian mezzo-soprano and soloist of German origin, at the Bolshoi Theatre. Their long marriage was happy, although it remained childless.[11]

Krasnov appeared in the diary of Tsar Nicholas II in an entry dated 3 January 1905: "I received Ataman Krasnov, who arrived from Manchuria; he told us many interesting things about the war. He writes articles about it for the Russkii Invalid".[12] In 1909, Krasnov graduated from the Officers' Cavalry School, and in 1910, he was promoted to the rank of Commander of the Cossack detachment of the same school and worked there as a teacher. In March 1910, he was appointed Colonel. From June 1911, he led the 1st Siberian Cossack Regiment of Yermak Timofeyevich on the border with China, which became one of the best regiments of the Russian army under his command.[13] From 1913, he commanded General Lukovkin's 10th Don Cossack Regiment, which was on the border with Austria-Hungary. With this regiment, Krasnov took part in the fighting in the First World War.

In 1914, he was promoted to Major General and transferred to the 1st brigade of the 1st Don Cossack Division. In 1915, he was awarded the Order of St George of the 4th degree, the Order of St Vladimir of the 3rd degree, the Order of St Anne of the 1st degree, and the Order of St Stanislaus of the 1st degree. At the end of May 1916, Krasnov's division was among the first to launch the Brusilov Offensive. During this operation, he was severely wounded by a bullet in the leg the same month.[14] However, within his biographical medallion, published in the *Russkie novosti* after his death, it is suggested that his combat morale during the First World War was questionable. Cossacks allegedly accused him of senselessly shedding Cossack blood.[15]

9 A. SMIRNOV, *Ataman Krasnov*, pp. 24–25.
10 BAR, Lampe Papers, Box 24, Sud'ba gen. P. N. Krasnova, Shkuro i ikh spodvizhnikov, *Russkie novosti*, 24 January 1947, No. 89.
11 A. SMIRNOV, *Ataman Krasnov*, p. 26.
12 *Dnevniki imperatora Nikolaia II,* K. F. SHATSILLO (ed.) (Moskva: Orbita, 1991), p. 245.
13 S. P. POLONSKII, Preface, in: P. N. Krasnov, p. 4.
14 Ibidem, p. 5.
15 BAR, Lampe Papers, Box 24, "Sud'ba gen. P. N. Krasnova, Shkuro i ikh spodvizhnikov," *Russkie novosti*, 24 January 1947, No. 89.

After the February Revolution of 1917, Krasnov remained in the Army and was appointed commander of the 1st Kuban Cossack Division. He was briefly arrested for participating in the Kornilov putsch and then played a major role during the October Revolution in Petrograd. At that time, on the orders of the Prime Minister of the Provisional Government, Alexander Kerensky, he led 700 soldiers to the capital. He was one of the first to fight against the Bolshevik regime. His troops occupied Gatchina and Tsarskoye Selo, but due to a lack of reinforcements and the reluctance of the Cossacks to continue fighting, the offensive failed.[16] Krasnov was arrested and, after a short period of detention, placed under house arrest, while the Bolshevik regime considered how to deal with him further. Krasnov escaped from his apartment two hours before the Cheka's arrival and left the capital. In May 1918, he was elected Ataman by the Don Cossack Host. Under his command, the Cossack troops established trade relations with Germany and did not submit to the central leadership of the White Guards, headed by General Anton Ivanovich Denikin. Krasnov abolished the decrees of the new Bolshevik and the previous Provisional governments, creating the so-called Don Republic (Donskaya Respublika) as a separate state entity. The Don Cossack Assembly appointed Krasnov general of cavalry, but at the same time also limited his powers. Nevertheless, the Don Republic, headed by Krasnov, became one of the primary challengers to the young Soviet regime.

Having become the head of the Don Republic, Krasnov actively promoted the development of its infrastructure and economy. The hierarchy and structure of the Don Army were considerably refined. The so-called Young Army was formed from Cossacks born in 1899–1900. According to Krasnov, it was intended to constitute the core of the Don regiments. Mobilisation and military courts were established. The Ataman also laid the foundations of the Don military industry.[17] Krasnov unsuccessfully tried to become a mediator between Ukraine, under the rule of Hetman Pavlo Skoropadskyi, and the White Army of General Denikin.[18] The army included former imperial officers and residents from other regions. Krasnov declared that the Don Republic was not in a state of war with Germany, which, in turn, recognised the regime and began a food-for-arms exchange with the Cossacks. The Don Republic also had neutral relations with Ukraine and Poland.

16 Laura ENGELSTEIN, *Russia in Flames. War, Revolution, Civil War 1914–1921* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 190, 192; Orlando FIGES, *A People's Tragedy. The Russian Revolution 1891–1924* (New York: Penguin Books, 1998), pp. 497–498.

17 BAR, Voitsekhovskii Papers, Box 6, Petr Krasnov, biographical essay, p. 3.

18 Ibidem.

However, Krasnov's pro-German leanings did not sit well with the White Army leadership in southwest Russia, since General Denikin remained a loyal ally of the Entente. Therefore, when Germany ultimately lost the war, the fragile foundations of the Don Republic began to crumble, and Krasnov was forced to agree to the incorporation of the Don Army into the White Army led by Denikin, now formally called the Armed Forces of South Russia. Then, in February 1919, under pressure from Denikin, Krasnov resigned as Ataman and was succeeded by the Cossack Afrikan Petrovich Bogaevsky. Krasnov subsequently left Russia and fled to Germany through the Baltic states.[19]

As an emigrant, Krasnov first lived in Germany near Munich, and from 1926, at the invitation of Grand Duke Nikolai Nikolayevich Romanov, he moved to France, where he settled in the suburbs of Paris.[20] He continued to be very politically active, becoming the closest political associate of the Grand Duke in Paris. In addition, he was in close contact with the Russian All-Military Union (ROVS) and other White Guard and anti-Bolshevik organisations in exile. Krasnov's authority remained relatively strong even in exile, aided by the failures of the white generals Denikin and Wrangel in Russia. Russian émigrés, therefore, praised the order and calm organisation of the Don Republic under Krasnov, presenting it as a counterbalance to what they saw as the chaotic administration of the White Army, which ultimately led to its defeat. Krasnov continued his resistance and struggle against the Soviet regime and avidly supported the monarchy.[21] He aimed to restore the Russian Empire to its pre-revolutionary state. To achieve this, an intensive struggle against communism was to be waged on the territory of Russia through terrorist acts, anti-communist propaganda, sabotage, and local uprisings. With such ideas, Krasnov joined a secret White Guard political organisation called the Brotherhood of Russian Truth (Bratstvo Russkoi Pravdy) as one of its founders.[22] The Brotherhood was an anti-communist monarchist nationalist group that Krasnov and other members of the White Guard movement founded in 1921 in France, aiming to overthrow Bolshevism in Russia. The organisation's name was based on the so-called Russian Truth (Russkaya Pravda), an early medieval set of

19 Peter KENEZ, *Civil War in South Russia, 1919–1920,* (University of California Press, 1977), pp. 120–121, 128–129.

20 A. A. REVIAKINA, "'Liubite Rossiiu!', " p. 175.

21 BAR, Lampe Papers, "Box 24, Sud'ba gen. P. N. Krasnova, Shkuro i ikh spodvizhnikov," *Russkie novosti*, 24 January 1947, No. 89.

22 BAR. Voitsekhovskii Papers, Box 6, Petr Krasnov, biographical essay, p. 6.

the oldest Rus' norms and laws, and its goal was to create a network of anti-revolutionary cells in the Soviet Union.

Krasnov's most intensive literary activity also falls into the period of emigration. In the 1920s, he wrote more than twenty historical novels and memoirs, subsequently translated into English, French, German, and fourteen other languages.[23] The number of Krasnov's works written at this time is truly staggering if we consider that he was also an active contributor to the monthly literary and military periodical *Russkii Invalid* in the Paris exile, where he also served as a literary critic. He also contributed to the Russian White Guard émigré magazine *Chasovoi* [Watchman].[24] Notably, in 1926, academician Vladimir Andreevich Frantsev nominated Krasnov for the Nobel Prize in literature. In 1936, after Grand Duke Nikolai Nikolayevich had died and the activities of the Brotherhood of Russian Truth were disrupted from within by Soviet agents, Krasnov returned to Germany, becoming its national. He was financially secure thanks to his prolific literary activity, and his authority in Russian monarchist and Cossack circles remained strong.[25] Throughout his life, he did not recognise the Soviet regime and considered it illegitimate. In the 1930s, following his pro-German views, he began to sympathise with the Nazi regime, which he hoped would prevail in the fight against Bolshevism.

In the first years of World War II, Krasnov was not publicly active. He even resisted the pressure exerted on him by Alfred Rosenberg, Minister for the Occupied Eastern Territories, to issue a statement regarding German policy in Russia. However, his attitude changed with Operation Barbarossa, when German troops entered the Don territories. At the same time, a centre of separatist Cossacks was established in Prague, aiming to create a separate Cossack state independent of Russia. This centre published the magazine *Kazachii Vestnik*, which, despite opposing any relations between Russians and independent Cossacks, was published in Russian. Some of the Cossacks disagreed with the activities of the Prague separatist centre, and they began to persuade Krasnov to stop being passive, to take their lead, and to declare himself a Nazi. After all, the general fully supported the closest possible relations between the Cossacks and the Russian state, and the return of the old monarchist order.

23 S. P. POLONSKII, Preface, in: *P. N. Krasnov*, p. 6.

24 BAR, Aleksei P. Arkhangelskii Collection, Box 1, Krasnov to Aleksei P. Arkhangelskii, 31. 8. 1938.

25 BAR, Voitsekhovskii Papers, Box 6, Petr Krasnov, biographical essay, p. 6.

Krasnov entered into negotiations with representatives of the German regime, undertaking to speak only on behalf of the Cossacks, not the entire Russian emigration.[26] He was enthusiastic about the fact that the German struggle against the USSR marked the beginning of the end of the Soviet regime, and that Hitler could destroy Russian "Judeo-Bolshevism". He approached Joseph Goebbels, the Reich Minister of Propaganda, who allowed Krasnov to appear regularly on Russian broadcasts on Radio Berlin. During these, Krasnov made strongly anti-Semitic speeches, referring to the Soviet government as "Judeo-Bolsheviks" and the German troops as liberators. He also maintained close contact with Alfred Ernst Rosenberg, who was regarded within the NSDAP as one of the leading experts on the Soviet Union. In January 1943, Rosenberg appointed Krasnov the chief person responsible for contact and work with the Cossacks within the activities of the Ministry for the Eastern Territories. This appointment was due not so much to the Nazis' willingness to cooperate with Krasnov, but rather to a pragmatic reason, i.e. the series of military failures of the Germans on the Eastern Front. In November 1943, the Nazi government recognised the Cossacks as an independent nation and guaranteed their independence.[27] In the spring, the first issue of the periodical *Na kazatskom postu* appeared, in which Krasnov wrote, among other things: "Join the German army, go to them and do not forget that in the New Europe of Adolf Hitler, there will be a place only for those who were with him and with the German people in the terrible and decisive hour of the last battle".[28] Krasnov hoped that with the help of the Nazis, everything that had been created under the Soviet regime would be eradicated in Russia, that the Germans would establish a protectorate over the Cossack territories, and that the Russian Liberation Army (Russkaya osvoboditel'naya armiya), or Vlasovites, would be incorporated into the German army: "The general victory of Adolf Hitler's Europe over the Bolshevik regime [is necessary], for only this victory will bring the Cossacks home and return them freedom and their native land. Without this victory, there will be nothing".[29]

With these goals, he came into conflict with another prominent Russian figure in the Nazi service, General Andrey Andreyevich Vlasov, who, on the contrary, held that the order established under the Soviet regime should be preserved

26 Ibidem, p. 8.

27 Ibidem, p. 9.

28 Leonid MLECHIN, *Nozh v spinu. Iz zhizni posobnikov i predatelei* (Moskva: Argumenty nedeli, 2019), p. 384.

29 BAR, Lampe Papers, Box 24, Vse dlia pobedy. Obrashchenie K kazakam P. N. Krasnova, in: *Dvinskii Vestnik*, sine dato.

and that mutually equal relations should be maintained with Germany.[30] Krasnov was involved in forming the Cossack Camp organisation, which brought Cossacks into the ranks of the Wehrmacht and participated in the publication of *Za rodinu*, a Russian-language collaborationist magazine in Germany. In March 1944, he was appointed head of the Main Administration of the Cossack Troops at the German Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories, which included the mentioned Cossack Camp.[31] This organisation was in charge of all Cossacks from the territory of the USSR, and it aimed to lead all Cossacks, for example, in German captivity, working in the Reich, or working in various parts of the Wehrmacht, to the Cossack branch of the Wehrmacht. In addition, the Main Administration of the Cossack Troops' goal was to replenish officers and educate youth to be loyal to the German regime.[32] When Adolf Hitler survived an assassination attempt in July 1944, Krasnov sent him a telegram mixing Russian exaltation with Nazi fanaticism: "Führer! The Cossack troops serving on the side of Germany and fighting with it against world Jewry and Bolshevism have learned with deep sadness about the vile and dastardly attempt on your life. In your miraculous rescue, they see the great grace of Almighty God to Germany and the Cossacks..."[33] General Vlasov formed the Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia in the autumn of 1944, against which Krasnov strongly objected and refused to swear allegiance to Vlasov, since the Cossacks had already sworn to Adolf Hitler.[34] Krasnov thus became the only influential and important Ataman who did not cooperate with General Vlasov and always tried to bypass him. He did not intend to incorporate Cossack troops into the Russian Liberation Army. In the end, this happened just before the end of the war, but it was no longer important to the Cossacks or Krasnov. During 1944, Krasnov's influence on Russian emigration waned considerably. This was because even those sections of the Russian emigration who believed in the necessity of supporting Nazi Germany in its fight against communism felt that Krasnov had gone too far in his support and concessions to Hitler's regime. Thus, the general gradually lost even his close friends from the monarchist emigration.[35]

30 Petr KRIKUNOV, *Kazaki, Mezhdu Gitlerom i Stalinym. Krestovyi pokhod protiv bolshevizma* (Moskva: Iauza, 2005), p. 608.
31 See e. g. BAR, Lampe Papers, Box 24 circular of 21 September 1943, Berlin.
32 P. KRIKUNOV, *Kazaki,* p. 63.
33 Oleg Gennad'evich GONCHARENKO, *Beloemigranty mezhdu zvezdoi i svastikoi*, (Moskva: Veche, 2005), p. 352.
34 P. KRIKUNOV, *Kazaki,* p. 70.
35 BAR, Voitsekhovskii Papers, Box 6, Petr Krasnov, biographical essay, p. 11.

By the beginning of 1945, Krasnov was already physically and mentally exhausted by the experience of World War II. He therefore resigned from his post as the head of the Main Administration of the Cossack Troops. He went to Trieste, where he created a Cossack Centre, which was no longer a military but a social organisation aimed at helping Cossacks and their families in a difficult situation due to German defeats.[36]

In May 1945, at the end of the war, Krasnov, along with the Cossack troops, stayed in the Austrian city of Lienz in the British occupation zone. There, on 28 May 1945, he and several thousand Cossack officers were handed over to the Soviet administration and transported to Moscow under the terms of the Yalta Conference. In Lienz, Cossack troops were handed over to the Soviets, which entailed several acts of violence, including suicides or murders of Cossacks. The Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the Soviet Union sentenced Krasnov, along with other military officials, to death for terrorist activities against the Soviet Union as "agents of German intelligence". The execution was carried out on 16 January 1947 in the notorious Lefortovo Prison in Moscow.[37] In his last words before his death, Krasnov pleaded guilty, which he justified with his endless love for Russia.[38]

Pyotr Nikolayevich Krasnov was an extraordinarily controversial and contradictory figure of the Russian interwar emigration. For example, one of his contemporaries wrote in 1947: "Pyotr Nikolayevich always stubbornly (and sometimes even against logic) believed in what he wanted to believe in! But he wanted to believe only in what could lead him to play the first role always and in everything".[39] It was this alleged vanity of Krasnov, as well as a specific under-appreciation complex, that lay behind the general's profound disagreements with other similar authorities, such as the White general Anton Ivanovich Denikin or, conversely, the Red general Andrey Andreyevich Vlasov. It is not easy to assess Krasnov's personality. He was an opportunist and adventurer, an avid soldier, as well as a gifted and prolific writer whose work would undoubtedly have been celebrated to some extent had it not been for his later collaborations and apparent fascination with the Nazi regime. Under this influence, strong anti-Semitic and fascist tones permeate the general's texts, compatibly combined with a constant and passionate patriotism

---

36 Ibidem, p. 12.

37 BAR, Lampe Papers, Box 24, "Sud'ba gen. P. N. Krasnova, Shkuro i ikh spodvizhnikov," *Russkie novosti* dated 24 January 1947, No. 89.

38 A. A. REVIAKINA, "'Liubite Rossiiu!'," p. 174.

39 BAR, Lampe Papers, Box 24, letter of 14 September 1947, Paris.

and love for the motherland. It can be stated that Krasnov's inclination towards the far right in the form of Nazism was due to pragmatic reasons and the general's immense dream to restore the monarchy in Russia, rather than his inner convictions and belief in National Socialism.

Moving on to the analysis of Krasnov's literary activity, we should mention that he began writing at a young age in the early 1890s. According to some sources, from the age of twelve, he wrote fairy tales for his magazine *Iunost* [Youth], for which he did all the work himself.[40] His first works were primarily published in the official journals of the Russian Imperial Army. They included both fiction, such as his first collection of short stories, for example, *On the Lake*, or *Wagram,* and military-historical texts.[41] Krasnov's style of writing is marked by a certain "professional deformation", i.e. his military profession that was reflected in his work. Thus, Krasnov's texts are known for their emphasis on facts and drawing on credible documentary sources. In particular, his works from the military setting are almost newslike, credible, well-supported, and objective.

The first texts were published in the magazines *Russkij Invalid* and *Peterburgskii Listok*, as well as in the periodicals *Birzhevye Vedomosti*, *Peterburgskaia Gazeta*, and the magazines *Otdych*, *Niva*, and *Voennyi sbornik*.[42] At this time, his talent as a novice writer and military historian was already resonating in the Don region, which was, after all, the main subject of Krasnov's work in both genres throughout his life. Thus, the *Donskie voiskovye Vedomosti* regularly printed texts by the "Saint Petersburg Cossack" Krasnov on its pages.[43] In this context, we can mention his minor works from the 1890s, such as *Donskie kazach'i polki sto let nazad* [Don Cossack Regiments One Hundred Years Ago], *Atamanskaia pamiatka* [Ataman's Memento], and other texts. The Cossack theme is the subject of the books of short stories *Na ozere* [On the Lake], *Dontsy: Rasskazy iz kazach'ei zhizni* [People of Don: Tales from the Cossack Life], the historical novel *Ataman Platov*, or *Kazaki v nachale XIX veka* [Cossacks in the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century]. At the turn of the century, he also published texts influenced by his travels in the Far East, such as *Liubov' Abissinki* [Love of an Abyssinian Woman], *Po Azii: ocherki Manchzhurii, Dal'nego Vostoka, Kitaia, Iaponii i Indii* [Around Asia: Essays

40 S. P. POLONSKII, Preface, in: P. N. Krasnov, p. 6.

41 In the 1990s, we can name, for example, the treatise *The Don Cossack Regiment at the beginning of the 19th century*, A. SMIRNOV, *Ataman Krasnov*, p. 25.

42 S. P. POLONSKII, Preface, in: P. N. Krasnov, p. 6.

43 A. SMIRNOV, *Ataman Krasnov*, p. 25.

on Manchuria, Far East, China, Japan and India], and more.[44] In 1898, he completed his book of memoirs, *Kazaki v Abissinii* [Cossacks in Abyssinia], which describes his observations from the journey at the end of the century as a convoy commander of the Russian Imperial mission.[45] From 1891 to 1903, Krasnov almost continuously published texts describing the daily life of the Cossack troops. Most often, he wrote for the aforementioned magazine *Russkii Invalid* under the pseudonym "Gr. A. D"., which refers to Krasnov's faithful horse, Grad, and simultaneously symbolises the author's contempt for modern means of transportation. Krasnov was an accomplished graphomaniac; he contributed countless articles to the periodical, and the editors internally nicknamed him the "prima donna".[46] The Russo-Japanese War is the subject of his 1909 book, *The Year of War*, which elaborates on his experience of this unfortunate and unnecessary conflict.

During the interwar period in exile, Krasnov was most prolific, writing a series of four historical novels – *Ot dvuglavogo orla k krasnomu znameni* [From the Double-Headed Eagle to the Red Flag], *Opavshie list'ia* [Fallen Leaves], *Poniat'-prostit'* [Understand, Forgive], and *Edinaia nedelimaia* [The Only Indivisible]. Other novels include *Amazonka pustyni* [The Amazon of the Desert], *Za chertopolokhom* [Behind the Thistle], *Vse prokhodit* [Everything Passes], or, for example, a three-volume epic novel about the Russian intelligentsia in 1910–1920 and the vision of the revolution: *Largo*, *Vypash'* [Broken Ground], and *Podvig* [Heroic Deed]. The novel's title, *Largo,* refers to the magnificent period before the revolution and the slow and calm passage of time in that era, while *Vypash'* deals with the Civil War and the life of soldiers in emigration. The last part of the trilogy describes the fate of the Russian middle class, its flirtation with revolutionary ideas, and its future in exile. The novel ends with a utopian conclusion about the country's liberation from the Bolsheviks.

Krasnov also wrote the novels *Belaia svitka* [White Overcoat], a utopian novel about Moscow in the seventeenth century, *S nami Bog* [God with Us], *Nenavist'* [Hatred], and historical works such as *Tsesarevna*, about the reign of Empress Elizabeth of Russia, continued by *Tsarevna Ekaterina Velikaia* [Tsarina Catherine the Great], and *Tsareubiitsy* [Regicides], set in the time of Alexander II. In the novel *Nenavist'*, Krasnov vividly depicts the tragic fates of the Zhiltsov bourgeois family, whose members gradually perish under the cruel Bolshevik government,

44 S. P. POLONSKII, Preface, in: P. N. Krasnov, p. 7.
45 O. MIKHAILOV, *P. N. Krasnov,* p. 3.
46 A. A. REVIAKINA, "'Liubite Rossiiu!'," p. 178.

which also symbolises the eponymous hatred. Here, Krasnov portrays Bolshevism as a monstrous and devilish movement that destroys families and relationships. Among the historical novels, *Tsareubiitsy* enjoyed great popularity among the émigré society and was published multiple times. The novel's main characters are revolutionaries who carry out what their literary predecessors from Dostoevsky's *The Possessed* only dreamed of. The text follows three generations of the Razgil'diaev family, the life of Saint Petersburg society, the Serbo-Turkish War in the 1870s, and, finally, the death of Tsar Alexander II. the main character, Vera Ishimskaya,[47] originally an orphan growing up in the Razgil'diaev family, embarks on the path of terrorism and revolutionary activity. In the spirit of Krasnov's ideology, Alexander II is portrayed as a liberator and martyr who fell victim to his love for the Russian people. Given Krasnov's pro-German sentiments, it is unsurprising that he devoted considerable attention in his historical works to Catherine II, originally a German princess. In the novel *Tsarevna Ekaterina Velikaia,* the author focuses primarily on the German princess's powerful love for the Russian empire. Krasnov liked to express patriotism and to return to the glorious moments of Russian history, which he consistently highlighted—and the epoch of Catherine the Great was undoubtedly one of them.[48]

The novel *Pogibelnyi Kavkaz* [Deadly Caucasus] remained unpublished; the books *V zhiteiskom more* [On the Sea of Life] and *Mezhdu zhizn'iu i iskusstvom* [Between Life and Art] were published posthumously.[49] In *V Zhiteiskoe more*, where the sea symbolises human life, the writer follows the fates of three friends and officers. Krasnov's literary texts were also published in many magazines and newspapers of the Russian emigration. Between 1921 and 1943, this very prolific author published more than forty books.[50] Krasnov's literary works were more than enthusiastically received by the Russian emigration, and he had a reputation as a hero of the Civil War, especially among the Cossack émigrés.[51] The novelist and poet Ivan Alekseevich Bunin, after reading Krasnov's *S nami Bog* [God with Us], wrote in his diary: "I didn't expect him to be so capable, so knowledgeable, and so

47 In her name, we recognize the nomen omen, in translation Vera – Faith, referring to the search for faith that her character is struggling with.

48 See P. N. KRASNOV, *Ekaterina Velikaia* (Moskva, 1994).

49 S. P. POLONSKII, Preface, in: P. N. Krasnov, p. 6.

50 O. MIKHAILOV, *P. N. Krasnov,* p. 4.

51 Marina APTEKMAN, "Forward to the Past, or Two Radical Views on the Russian Nationalist Future. Pyotr Krasnov's Behind the Thistle and Vladimir Sorokins Day of a Oprichnik," in *The Slavic and East European Journal* 53 (Summer 2009), no. 2, p. 245.

engaging.".[52] It should be noted that, on the contrary, today—especially outside Russia—Krasnov's work is almost completely forgotten, perhaps with the exception of the seminal *From the Double-Headed Eagle to the Red Flag*. This is not the case in Russia, where Krasnov's work still retains a degree of interest.[53]

As we can see, the main subjects of Krasnov's texts were the everyday life of the Don Cossacks, the history of Cossack military actions, the history of the eighteenth century, observations from his travels to the Far East and Africa, Military Psychology, and various memoirs. Even then, literary critics noted clear weaknesses in Krasnov's texts, such as narrative naivety or insufficient character development. Still, he was praised for his plausible depiction of the everyday life of the Russian imperial army. It can be stated that, at least in the first years after the revolution, Pyotr Nikolayevich Krasnov was the most popular Russian author in exile, and his works were the most widely read in Russian libraries abroad.[54] Later on, his popularity somewhat declined, as he continued to write only about the past and tended to repeat himself in his new novels. Then, with the onset of World War II, his popularity grew once again. The Nazi regime, however, sought to suppress this, as Krasnov's apologia for the former tsarist regime conflicted with Hitler's political vision for Russia. Thus, the distribution of Krasnov's works in Germany, particularly the novel *From the Double-Headed Eagle to the Red Flag*, was banned by the Nazi Ministry of Propaganda, despite Krasnov's far-right views and his appeal to Nazism. Some literary historians have tried to draw a clear distinction between Krasnov's works and his political leanings and tendencies, but this approach is, in our opinion, erroneous.[55] It is evident that Krasnov's ideology is clearly reflected in his literary works, especially those of the 1920s and 1930s, and is inextricably linked to them. When we speak of Krasnov, it is necessary to complement the analysis of his literary work, since the ideas and literary texts are interconnected vessels.

Krasnov's most famous and extensive novel, or rather novel -epic, *From the Double-Headed Eagle to the Red Flag,* reflects the most important events of the reign of the last Romanov, Nicholas II, and the first revolutionary years. As an ardent supporter of the restoration of the monarchy, Krasnov presents an expansive portrayal of the final years of the Russian empire as an exalted apologia for the bright days of Russia under the Tsar, in contrast to the darkness of the Bolshevik

52 Cit. ex Ivan Igorevich SHLIGIN, "Vershiteli revoliutsii v romane 'Ot Dvuglavogo Orla k krasnomu znameni' P. N. Krasnova," in *Rema*, 2010, p. 22.

53 See e. g. the publication of his complete works in ten volumes in 2012.

54 BAR, Voitsekhovskii Papers, Box 6, Petr Krasnov, biographical essay, p. 5.

55 See e.g. O. MIKHAILOV, *P. N. Krasnov,* p. 4.

regime. The monumental four-part, or two-volume, historical novel does not conceal the inspiration drawn from Leo Tolstoy's magnum opus *War and Peace*. Still, qualitatively, the two are very far apart. The work on the novel was accompanied by the author's passionate fervour, hectic writing, and intense emotionality—verging on fury, as Krasnov himself put it.[56] He began work on the novel as early as 1917; it was first published in 1921 in Munich and was received more or less enthusiastically by critics. The second edition, published in 1922, was revised in several places. Between 1921 and 1939, the novel was translated into twenty world languages and published in many editions. The work secured Krasnov a certain literary fame, financial stability, and personal independence.[57]

From the Double-Headed Eagle to the Red Flag presents us with an extensive epic chronicle describing Russia at the end of its imperial era, from the First Russian Revolution of 1905 to the period of the Civil War. The book thus covers three wars and three revolutions, with the major part devoted to World War I. The revolutionary movement is presented clearly from the "white side". Krasnov conceived the work as the first in a series of books describing the life of individual classes of Russia: "I decided to depict the life of different classes of Russian society, and this work was extended to four novels. In the first one – *From the Double-Headed Eagle to the Red Flag* – I depict life before the war, how people from high society fought and experienced Time of Troubles (*smuta*)".[58] "In the second and third ones – *Fallen Leaves and Understand, Forgive* – this is the intelligentsia, the middle-class family of the Kuskovs and the family of the poor clerk Lisenko; in the novel *The Only Indivisible* I depict the life of a south Russian peasant. Here, I'm trying to find ways for Russia to escape the bloody impasse. All four novels are interconnected in their main features: the unity of time – the last historical epoch of Imperial Russia, war and time of troubles; the unity of place – Saint Petersburg and southern Russia; and the unity of setting – the Russian military and peacetime environment".[59] In the last quoted words, we can again note Krasnov's declared inspiration for his main novel in the work of Leo Tolstoy. This is reminiscent of Krasnov's work and a certain polyphony of many characters, their narratives, and perspectives. Yet the period chronicle *From the Double-Headed Eagle to the Red Flag* has its unifying protagonist, Alexander Sablin, a fearless nobleman and guard colonel, who is some-

56 I. I. SHLIGIN, *Vershiteli revoliutsii*, p. 23.
57 A. SMIRNOV, *Ataman Krasnov*, pp. 197–198.
58 Krasnov traditionally uses the term for the chaotic period between the Rurik and Romanov dynasties in the early 17th century to refer to the era of the Bolshevik regime.
59 Cit. ex A. A. REVIAKINA, "'Liubite Rossiiu!'," p. 176.

what pathetically compared here to the first Christian martyrs.[60] Sablin experiences the key events of the last days of the empire, trying to understand them and their meaning. Although he has no desire to dwell on the political and philosophical issues of the time, the dynamic course of events forces him to reflect on them. Sablin questions the meaning of the war and contemplates the essence of patriotism and his relationship to the motherland and the nation. The protagonist's loyalty to the monarchy is severely shaken when his son falls in the war, and his wife's virtue is dishonoured by Grigori Yefimovich Rasputin.

Krasnov's main novel lacks the sophisticated psychology of the characters and is distinctive for the rather descriptive nature of an enormous number of events and characters. Krasnov also uses a somewhat black-and-white assessment of the characters, and his entire novel is built on a dichotomous system of antithesis. Thus, on the one hand, we have heroes serving God, the Tsar, and the Fatherland; on the other hand, those who succumbed to evil are against them. One of the cornerstones of Krasnov's novel is precisely the dialectics of these two groups. Thus, Krasnov builds his novel epic not on psychological clarity or character traits but on the mutual polarisation of protagonists and antagonists. In this regard, it should be noted that all the dialogues in the novel are not constructive; they only aim to affect the polarisation of their actors. It is also important to note that Krasnov does not care much about his characters. His priority is Russia and its tragedy. Even judging by the narrative style, he only sees characters distant to him as part of a broader process. In this, in addition to literary qualities, lies the main difference between his novel and *War and Peace* by Leo Tolstoy. While Tolstoy emphasises psychological sophistication and closeness to the character, Krasnov is only interested in more superficially portrayed actors if they make sense in his story of the great tragedy of the Russian state and nation. It is clear, however, that Krasnov had studied Tolstoy's work in detail, and references to the great novelist appear in his novel.[61]

The protagonist, Sablin, belongs to the group of positive characters. At the novel's beginning, he is a young, noble, and beautiful virgin, an almost unrealistic embodiment of purity and perfection. Herein lies one of the weaknesses of Krasnov's work. His characters are one-sided, either perfect or diabolical. The negative ones include, for example, characters of non-Russian origin, intelligentsia, demo-

60 Ibidem.

61 E.g. Petr Nikolayevich KRASNOV, *Od carského orla k rudému praporu,* vol. 1, (Prague: Šolc a Šimáček, 1930), p. 48.

crats, atheists, or, on the contrary, mystics, but evil in general takes many forms and manifests itself in various ways in the novel. Negative characters are primarily responsible for the outbreak of the revolution and the destruction of the empire. Krasnov focuses more on the lower-class figures and their stories than on the high-ranking leaders of the revolution. One of the novel's central ideas is that these characters fell for the devil instead of serving God. Their negative character is mainly due not to their actions, but to their knowledge, especially "secret" knowledge. Here, Krasnov openly criticises various closed secret societies and associations of the Russian intelligentsia, the most famous of which are the traditional Russian Masonic lodges. One such character, Vertsinsky, is portrayed as a man of Mephistophelean properties, a diabolical and yet charming man with attractive "demons". Vertsinsky's contradictions and ambivalence point to how Krasnov perceived the Russian intelligentsia. According to the author, the intelligentsia constantly experienced a kind of painful reflection of events while always placing any blame for the circumstances on someone else, the Tsar, or God. The figure of Vertsinsky and his dialogues with Sablin also resemble certain features of Fyodor Dostoevsky's work, particularly his anarchist novel *The Possessed*. The degree of evil, represented by the "red flag" from the novel's title, ultimately leads to the disillusionment of simple heroes, awakening, and returning from revolutionary ideals to the spiritual-moral values of the Russian people. The absolute ideal is devotion to the Tsar and the Empire, and the conviction that the monarchical order is intrinsic to the country: "Russia cannot be otherwise".[62] As in Krasnov's other works, his typical arrangement of characters appears here, i.e. a protagonist defending the interests of Orthodox Russia – an antagonist representing anti-Christian tendencies – a beautiful female character, understood as an allegory of Russia itself. In the fairy-tale plot, the hero defeats the negative character and "liberates" the young girl. Somewhat superficially, Krasnov portrays negative characters belonging to the forces of evil as persons with an abnormal or specifically unlikeable appearance. The description of the atmosphere of the space also gives a more detailed characterisation. Krasnov's relatively strong attention to detail and naturalism in depicting war scenes evoke a sense of disillusionment and loss of his hero's ideals. The key element of Krasnov's novels is the perception of the characters through their Orthodox faith. Orthodoxy is the defining value in Krasnov's work, which determines the traits of characters.

62 P. N. KRASNOV, *Od carského orla,* vol. 1, p. 47.

Krasnov described his authorial intention in the preface to the second edition of the novel: "I hastened, while I was alive, before I would be shot, to describe the great love we had for the Motherland and the Army, the beautiful life filled with symbols that we lived before the revolution, the valour of the Russian soldier and officer that I had to observe in the war".[63] For Krasnov, work on this novel was a form of personal therapy, in which he tried to come to terms with the memories of the past and the irrevocable glory of the imperial era, as well as with the tragic fate of the Russian empire. What is remarkable is that the novel self-reflexively points out the ambiguity of this tragedy when it comes to the culprit: "Let the future officers and soldiers know that Kerensky and Lenin are not alone to blame for Kerensky's regime and Bolshevism, but that there is also our – officers' and soldiers' – share of the blame".[64] In the same period when Krasnov's life's work was being written, the author also wrote a smaller, forgotten, but even more remarkable utopian novel *Za chertopolokhom* [Behind the Thistle], in which he reflects, perhaps most clearly in his entire literary work, his view of what an ideal Russian monarchy should look like. The novel was written in two stages: in 1921, immediately after the experience of the Russian Civil War and while serving as the Don Cossack Ataman, and then in 1928. *Behind the Thistle* is a conservative utopia, describing an authoritarian state strikingly reminiscent of the Russia of Ivan IV's time. It is also the first Russian publication to provide a comprehensive picture of Russia's future, with its political, economic, and cultural aspects.[65] Unlike *From the Double-Headed Eagle to the Red Flag*, this novel did not receive such a warm reception, and even in Russian conservative and reactionary émigré circles, it went relatively unnoticed. Nevertheless, we discuss it here since *Behind the Thistle* has essential explanatory value in analysing Krasnov's ideology.

This novel has a somewhat catastrophic beginning, explaining that Bolshevik Russia is ruined and dead in the nineteen seventies because the Bolsheviks, in their desire to wage war on Europe, accidentally destroyed their own country and population, which was subsequently decimated by the plague. Entry into Russia is now impossible because of the huge thistles the size of trees that have grown up on its borders, forming a kind of impenetrable iron curtain that has isolated the country from its surroundings. Europe believes that Russia no longer exists as such. However, Europe is not doing well either. Socialist governments and avant-garde

63 Cit. ex I. I. SHLYGIN, *Vershiteli revoliutsii,* p. 23.
64 Ibidem.
65 A. A. REVIAKINA, "'Liubite Rossiiu!'," p. 184.

art have brought these countries into a state of degradation and total decline. Despite doubts and obstructions, a young Russian émigré artist, Petr Konstantinovich Korenev, and a group of others dare to go beyond the "Thistle Curtain". What they find there, however, is entirely at odds with their assumptions about the destroyed no-man's -land. Krasnov describes the disastrous state of the country before the return of the monarchy: "For six years the turmoil lasted, for six years they (the Bolsheviks) fought for the land, took it, seized it, but were afraid to cultivate it because they felt that the land was not theirs. And the land did not give itself into their hands and produced nothing. People were choking on the soil and were starving to death. The state's situation, if only the Soviet Union could be called a state, was desperate. The people, who had forgotten God, who were wild, dark, uneducated, had become so unravelled that they had become a danger to the power itself".[66] Thanks to more than forty years of its separation from the outside world, Russia gradually overcame the plague epidemic and poverty and now has a monarchist government based on the principles of pre-Petrine Russia. A young Tsar from the Romanov family, a great monarch, has returned to the country. This ideal state was achieved at the cost of using cruel practices not unlike those of the reign of Ivan IV or Peter I. In the novel, one of the characters meets a man who disobeys the orders of the new government and refuses to do farm work. This man was detained and returned home with a black stump instead of a tongue.[67] Krasnov defends the violent practices in the novel as absolutely necessary and right for establishing the dream regime, but they do not go beyond certain ideological necessities. At the same time, violence is not depicted in any explicit and realistic way; we learn only the didactic and educational effects of violent acts. Violence is thus an essential part of Krasnov's literary world. Still, it is not put on display in any way, and what is necessary is correcting an individual after punishment. Here, the points of view of the novel's narrator and the author coincide, and we can conclude that Krasnov himself had a similar idea of violence in his thinking.

After the Bolshevik chaos and decline, the country has reverted to its traditions adapted to modern times, with men and women wearing ancient Russian clothing. Protecting national traditions is essential for the ideal functioning of society. The Church is crucial to the minds and spirits of the population. Russia lives by the principle of Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality, or in "love for the

66 Pyotr Nikolayevich KRASNOV, *Za chertopolokhom*, (Moskva: Izdatel'skij dom "FAVOR-XXI", 2002), pp. 144–145.
67 Ibidem, p. 133.

motherland, obedience to the Tsar and the Christian faith".[68] The country has become "Russia for Russians, Russian Russia, the old Russia, not sold out to foreigners and Masons".[69] Traditional Russian singers are listened to, Russian folk dances are danced, and Russian dramas are watched. The quintessential Russian symbol and patron, Saint George, is used by Krasnov as the subject of the dream of the protagonist Korenev. He sees a beautiful young girl he must save from a monstrous three-headed firedrake.[70] We subsequently learn that the beautiful girl represents Russia, while the firedrake is an allegory for liberalism and democracy, which, as a decadent Western relic, wants to destroy the country. This allegory also materialises in the novel when the protagonist Korenev kills the man who wanted to bomb the Tsar's daughter, Radost' (Joy) Mikhailovna (sic), with whom Korenev is in love.[71] Krasnov also attempts to style the very form of narration in the novel *Behind the Thistle* as quintessentially Russian and folk, as the protagonist learns about the transformation of the country after the fall of the Bolshevik regime through the so-called *skaz*, or folk narrative.

There are no political parties, only one "family of brothers and sisters in Christ".[72] Society is strictly hierarchical and patriarchal; the extended family is the basic unit of society. Thanks to the revival of the sixteenth-century Domostroy Code, the country has once again an essentially despotic domestic system in which the woman has a clearly defined position. Women can attend schools separately from men and with a different curriculum.[73] Of course, neither emancipation nor feminism have a voice here. The death penalty is abolished, and censorship is in place. The emphasis is on a harmonious peasant life in devotion to God and the Tsar. Krasnov thus depicts his utopian pastoral vision of Russia as a perfect contrast to the majority working-class, urban, and atheistic society of the real Soviet Union.[74] For Krasnov, this book describing an idyllic order was a kind of therapy from the knowledge of how significantly different the reality in his beloved homeland was.

The country, isolated from the supposedly degrading West, is now thriving technologically. This feature has its real basis in the fact that Imperial Russia of the

68 Ibidem, p. 136.
69 Ibidem, p. 139.
70 Ibidem, pp. 69–70.
71 Ibidem, pp. 323–324.
72 P. N. KRASNOV, *Za chertopolokhom*, p. 137.
73 Ibidem.
74 The first thing travellers see in the country behind the thistles is the natural scenery and men engaged in farming. P. N. KRASNOV, *Za chertopolokhom*, p. 110.

first two decades of the twentieth century did indeed experience technological progress.[75] Deserts are artificially irrigated by underground canals and rivers. The whole country has a highly developed infrastructure. All cities and villages are connected by high-speed trains that run on rails or fly in the air. Agriculture, culture, and journalism are booming. Every home has a radio, a telephone, and an invention similar to the latest televisions, which broadcast only news and the Tsar's daily speeches. There is even a laser beam.[76] Russia has a strict separation of power and property. The person who possesses property cannot have the ability; the one who rules has no property, and everything around him is the state's property. In this way, corruption and deprivation are eliminated in Krasnov's utopian society. Education is compulsory and fee-based, yet accessible to all without distinction, with a particular appreciation for talent. There are no passports here; people can travel and move as they please. There are no private banking houses, only the Russian State Bank. Krasnov's Russia is "one, indivisible and great", a traditional principle recognised by right-wing monarchists. However, it has autonomous regions, which automatically leads to the mention of the restoration of the Cossack troops' lands with all the previous privileges. For the Cossack author, such a feature of the ideal monarchy is quite logical. By a strange irony of fate, at the end of his life, Pyotr Nikolayevich Krasnov, like his hero Korenev, also "overcame the wall of thistles", only to be executed shortly afterwards in a country that was far from the utopian dream from his book.

In the novel, Krasnov does not even try to distinguish the opinion of his narrator from that of himself as an author. The book clearly expresses his neo-traditionalist idea, according to which the monarchy of the times of the Rurikids' Muscovy would be the most suitable form of government for the modern Russian soul. In this, the novel is not so utopian, for the desire for the return of the Romanov dynasty in émigré circles in the 1920s was quite strong, albeit naïve. The idea of isolating the resurrected Russia from Europe, with Russia thriving from the isolation and even surpassing Europe in development, derives from Slavophile thinking, which often developed into an apparent antipathy to Western peoples and xenophobia.[77] In this connection, there is a traditional phenomenon for Russia of the late imperial period and then the Soviet era, namely anti-Semitism. Jews are al-

75 The first tank, diesel tractor and many other things were built in Russia in 1911, see P. N. KRASNOV, *Za chertopolokhom*, preface, p. 55.

76 Ibidem, p. 139.

77 P. N. KRASNOV, *Za chertopolokhom,* p. 248.

lowed to live in the utopian land beyond the thistle, but "they no longer rule us, nor can they hide under false Russian names to infiltrate our government".[78] According to the author, Russia should completely break away from the corrupt democratic West and unite with other eastern states. In this regard, the novel *Behind the Thistle* can be seen as a satire on Western democratic institutions. In Russia, democratic attempts were short-lived: "At best, democratic institutions were going round in circles; but usually, they were destroying things. Bound by the party, the leaders had no free will; born in the cramped conditions and poverty of the working-class neighbourhoods, the leaders of the nation's fate did not have a broad flight of thought [...] There always stood the crowd behind them, which bound them in their decisions..."[79] Based on this quotation, we can conclude that Krasnov either hated the institution of democracy completely, so that he overlooked its real positives, or he completely misunderstood it. According to Krasnov, Western democracy contributed to total anarchy, when "freedom led to a decline in morals, economic disruption, poverty, high mortality and reduced birth rates".[80] Thus, while the reader initially assumes that the decline occurred in Russia, the real chaos, in Krasnov's view, is instead in the West.

The idea of unification with the eastern states reflects another ideological cornerstone of Krasnov's literary work, i.e. the concept of nationalistic Eurasianism. This ideology had its foundations in Petrine Russia and was very popular in émigré circles of the 1920s, where our Cossack commander moved. Moreover, this ideology, known as neo-Eurasianism, is still quite topical, since the foreign policy of contemporary Putin's Russia is partly based on it. According to this idea, Russia should instead unite with the non-Slavic peoples of the East; thus, it was a certain antithesis to Panslavism. According to Eurasianists, adherence to liberalism leads to mutual alienation, individualism, and the abandonment of mystical national identity. In none of his other numerous works does Krasnov so clearly express his desire to return to the conservative Uvarov triad "Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality" of the mid-nineteenth century. After all, inspiration from Russian history, ancient or not so ancient, is, in fact, Krasnov's strong point throughout his literary work. The significance of the author's "alternative history" is evidenced by the fact that, despite the cold reception, the expression "beyond the thistle" was widely used by Russian émigré circles in France and Germany as a label for Soviet Russia.

78 Ibidem, p. 113.
79 Ibidem, p. 141.
80 Ibidem, p. 140.

In this sense, Krasnov's expression also appears in several authors of the 1920s and 1930s, such as the émigré novelist and poet Nina Berberova and the memoirist Nina Krivosheina.[81] At the same time, the thistle in the novel can be seen as a kind of Russian talisman against the evil of the corrupt West. Thistle also has a semantic meaning, since one of the species of thistles was used in Russia as a remedy against various plagues and diseases.[82]

In the novel *Behind the Thistle*, virtually all the features of Krasnov's far-right ideology – i.e. ultra-nationalism, Great Russian chauvinism, anti-communism, an inclination towards authoritarianism and opposition to democracy and decadence, xenophobia, and racism – are very clearly portrayed. Krasnov also advocates the use of violence, which is necessary to establish an ideal state in the country. The author was truly and fundamentally convinced that restrictions on freedom of speech, censorship, compulsory ideological education of children, or the necessary use of violence serve the well-being and prosperity of the nation, culture, craft, science, industry, or the army. The novel *Behind the Thistle* is perhaps the most interesting of Krasnov's works, which, in its content and the unusual form of its message, surpasses the author's famous magnum opus and reflects his thinking and ideology most comprehensively of all his books.

It can be summarised from the above that Krasnov's extensive and multi-genre work is of only average literary quality. Krasnov was primarily a soldier, and he certainly could not reach the qualitative level of the great Russian writers, although he was engaged in literary work for most of his life and had considerable experience. Critics of his work accuse him of being too descriptive, sentimental, and pathetic, note the lack of psychological detail in the characters and the connection between the characters and their actions, and mention many fabrications, especially in the description of revolutionaries, whose milieu Krasnov did not know, frequent and clumsy inspiration from Leo Tolstoy and Fyodor Dostoevsky and their works, and, last but not least, anti-Semitism. On the other hand, it is necessary to appreciate Krasnov's deep knowledge of the military, especially the Cossack milieu, and his travelogues. In particular, the texts describing the military environment of the time are genuinely authentic and offer insight into several blind spots, such as homosexuality in the army.[83] It is not without interest that Krasnov's texts inspired later authors such as Mikhail Bulgakov and Boris Pasternak, who drew on

81 M. APTEKMAN, *Forward to the Past,* p. 246.
82 A. A. REVIAKINA, "'Liubite Rossiiu!'," p. 185.
83 E. g. P. N. KRASNOV, *Od carského orla k rudému praporu,* vol. 1, p. 52.

his authentic experiences as a direct witness to revolutionary events.[84] Predominantly, however, Krasnov's texts served ideological purposes, and above all, the lesser-known utopian novel *Behind the Thistle* is a concise summary of his entirely far-right ideology. We can conclude that the ideological intention in Krasnov's works significantly prevails over the artistic value. Krasnov prioritised his enthusiasm for a particular ideology over his interest in human beings and their stories, making him different from other authors of his time. In his view, only a strong centralised government, along with faith in God and love for the motherland, could tame the exuberant Russian nature. According to Krasnov, the Orthodox monarchy was able to awaken the best in Russians – love for one's neighbour, the ability to sacrifice for others, selflessness, and heroic deeds. Such an attitude and view of Russian society was more than naive and unrealistic.

Krasnov loved Russia above all and had no difficulty in being in the service of a criminal Nazi regime because of this love for his country, notwithstanding the paradoxical fact that, in doing so, he desired to eliminate an equally criminal regime. A reviewer of one of his books describes Krasnov's patriotic enthusiasm: "He worshipped the imperial, resplendent greatness of Russia everywhere: in regal Saint Petersburg and the Siberian outskirts of the Russian state, infinitely far from the capital. For each place, he found appropriate colours and enthusiastic words. The book is full of Russian people's filial admiration for their homeland, its power, grandeur, and spatial immensity".[85] For Krasnov, the work was a form of therapy in which he reminisced about the glorious imperial period and, at the same time, tried to create utopian visions of the return of the Russian monarchy. The ideal state for Krasnov was, therefore, a restored tsarist regime in the medieval style, based on love and devotion to Orthodoxy, self-reliance, and the nation, which used violent methods when necessary. The message of Krasnov's work can be summed up in his own words: "I will be happy [...] if the reader understands where that one indivisible Russia is concealed, united by brotherly love, which [...] will illuminate the peoples of the West who are perishing in materialism with the holy doctrine of Christ [...] When that Quiet Light will shine over Russia again, that was over it in the days of its glory, when we feared God and honoured the Tsar, then Russia will rise again – Great, One and Indivisible".[86]

---

84 A. A. REVIAKINA, "'Liubite Rossiiu!'," p. 182.
85 Ibidem, p. 181.
86 A. A. REVIAKINA, "'Liubite Rossiiu!'," p. 176.

SUMMARY

Petr Nikolayevich Krasnov was a controversial and contradictory figure in the Russian interwar emigration. He was an opportunist, adventurer, ardent patriot, soldier, and productive writer. Krasnov's tendency towards the far right in the form of Nazism was driven more by pragmatic reasons and the general's grand dream of restoring the monarchy in Russia than by inner convictions or faith in National Socialism. His extensive and multi-genre work was of only average literary quality. Critics criticise his work in particular for being overly descriptive, sentimental, and pathetic, for lacking psychological depth in the characters, and for frequent manifestations of anti-Semitism. Krasnov's texts served ideological purposes, and in particular, the lesser-known utopian novel *Behind the Thistle* is an interesting and highly concise summary of his complete far-right ideology. For Krasnov, the ideal state was a restored tsarist regime in the medieval style, based on love and devotion to Orthodoxy, the autocracy, and the nation, aided by violent methods if necessary.

STUDIE / ARTICLE

The Influence of Soviet Ideology on the Culture of Small Nations of European Russia (on the Example of Permian Komi Literature)

MIHAIL CEROPITA

Independent researcher, Chișinău, Republic of Moldova

The Influence of Soviet ideology on the Culture of Small Nations of European Russia (on the Example of Permian Komi Literature)

This article discusses the development of national and Soviet discourses in Permian Komi literature from 1920 to 1980. It examines in detail the main milestones of the dominance of either national or Soviet discourses in Permian Komi literature and establishes the pattern of alternating domination. By the end of the 1920s, when Permian Komi literature was emerging, it was dominated by a national discourse, reinforced by the state policy of indigenization. The situation changed after the political purges and the Great Terror of 1937–1938, which resulted in the arrest and execution of writers Andrei Zubov, Mikhail Likhachev, and other representatives of the local elite. All this shocked Permian Komi intellectuals, who, under pressure from Moscow, began to promote a pro-Soviet, internationalist discourse. The national discourse revived again in the wake of the Khrushchev Thaw, but the early 1970s saw its decline. However, the Soviet discourse that attempted to replace it was also very weak in terms of its influence on Permian

Komi literature and worsened the situation. This crisis became especially noticeable during perestroika.
Keywords: Komi; Permian Komi; Sovietization; Indigenisation; Soviet ideology; nation-building

In Russia, the history of the literature of many ethnic groups during the Soviet period remains rather poorly studied to this day. Only the history of large nations (Tatars, Bashkirs, Yakuts, etc.) has been studied in more or less detail. However, the literary traditions of small ethnographic groups have remained in the shadows for a long time. This is especially visible in the history of the Finno-Ugric literary traditions of small ethnographic groups, which included the tradition of the Permian Komis inhabiting Komi-Permyak Okrug of modern Perm Krai.

The bibliography on the history of Permian Komi literature is relatively small. The reason for this is, firstly, the relatively young age of the national literary tradition, which is essentially a product of the Soviet policy of indigenization of the 1920s. Secondly, an important role in the study of Permian Komi literature was played by the Stalinist repressions of the 1930s, when many representatives of the local elite were shot or sent to concentration camps. Their rehabilitation after the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956 opened access to some works written in the late 1920s–1930s. It was then that the first articles about Permian Komi literature began to appear. However, all of them were more ideological than scientific in nature.

Since the 1970s, Vera Vasilievna Pakhorukova has analysed Permian Komi literature in a more or less academic manner. A graduate of Kudymkar Pedagogical Institute, Pakhorukova connected all her subsequent activities with Komi Pedagogical Institute in Syktyvkar, where she began writing about each Permian Komi author separately.[1] Of course, these articles were ideologically oriented, although the author provided quite a lot of factual data. Perestroika freed Pakhorukova from the censorship of ideological shackles, and she published information that had not been available before. At the same time, Pakhorukova began her work on the first general history of Permian Komi literature. At this time, she wrote her lecture

1 Vera PAKHORUKOVA. "Komi-permyak yaslön medvoddza s'ylys': M. P. Likhachev chuzhan lunsyan' 70 vo," *Voyvyv kodzuv* 10 (1971), pp. 60–62.

course on Permian Komi literature.[2] From a factual point of view, this work is quite strong. However, on the whole, it is a rather generalising work, which provides a superficial analysis of Permian Komi prose.

Otherwise, the study of Permian Komi literature is currently at a rather poor level. In historical works of subsequent years, Permian Komi literature is mentioned only in passing. The materials of the Likhachev Local History Research Conference (periodically organised in Kudymkar by representatives of Permian Komi intellectuals and local volunteers) could provide some help, but its participants are primarily focused on studying the life and work of Mikhail Likhachev, overlooking many works by other Permian Komi authors.

This gap is especially noticeable in descriptions of the events of the 1920s–30s, when the Permian Komi political and cultural elite was formed during the early years of Soviet power in the Perm region. representatives of this local elite generation began to timidly write about their activities in the Stalin era only after 1956, when Andrei Zubov and Mikhail Likhachev, executed in 1937, were rehabilitated following the 20th CPSU Congress. However, their memoirs were rather fragmentary, which made it difficult to study the Stalinist period in Permian Komi history in detail. The situation is no better with the writers of the Khrushchev and Brezhnev eras (Ivan Minin, Vasiliy Klimov, Spiridon Mozhaev, and others). Philological and historical literature contains no relevant analysis of their activities in the context of historical events in the USSR and Perm oblast in the mid-1950s–1980s, against the background of which this generation of Permian Komi intellectuals was formed. All these factors hinder a detailed assessment of the rich inner world of Permian Komi literature, which, as a result, is largely deprived of attention. This is especially evident when considering the topic of national identity in the context of contacts with both the culture of the peoples of the USSR (primarily Russian) and representatives of other countries.

This article attempts to answer two questions. The first is how the national identity of writers is revealed in Permian Komi literature. The second concerns the perception of Soviet ideology by local authors. In this article, we aim to determine how strongly the image of the Soviet Land is represented in Permian Komi literature and how deeply local authors associate themselves with it.

To analyse these issues, let us consider currently known books published in the Permian Komi language between 1923 and 1990. The first date is associated

2 Eadem, *In‘va yylís‘ s‘ylankyv. Komi-permyatsköy literatura 20–80 goddezö* (Kudymkar: Komi-permyatskoye knizhnoye izdatel‘stvo, 1989).

with the publication of the first book with texts in the modern Permian Komi language — *Goradzul* [Globeflower], a collection of poems. The second relates to the publication of the non-fiction collection of articles *Miyan Shog* [Our Pain], which draws a line under the era of perestroika in Komi-Permyak Autonomous Okrug (and under the Soviet history of the Permian Komis in general). During the Soviet period (1923–1990), Permian Komi authors wrote approximately one hundred and fifty books of original fiction. Of course, we will not consider all these publications, but we will refer only to those whose influence on Permian Komi literature, in our opinion, was particularly significant.[3]

In some cases, where no published materials are available, we will use archival materials from the main newspaper of the Komi-Permyak national (since 1977 – autonomous) okrug *Along the Leninist Path* (Permian Komi *Lenin Tuj vylet*, Russian *Po Leninskomu Puti,* since 1991 – *Parma*). This newspaper includes a section dedicated to the publication of fiction and non-fiction literature. We will also refer to materials from writers' personal collections stored in the *Komi-Permyak District State Archive* (*Komi-Permyackij Okruzhnoj Gosudarstvennyj Arhiv, KPOGA*). This is particularly important for providing short biographical information about various Permian Komi authors from the Perm region.

Situation of the Permian Komi authors in pre-revolutionary Russia

To understand what national discourse means in the works of Permian Komis during the Soviet period, we must first ask: when did literary activity actually begin in that region? What was the nature of the first works by Permian Komis? And how was national identity manifested in these pre-Soviet works?

At present, the number of books and texts written by Permian Komis before 1917 can essentially be counted on one hand. The reason for this is that the region remained distant from large trade and cultural centres for a long time, which hindered its comprehensive development. Of course, many preserved folklore mate-

3 Komi intellectuals both in Kudymkar and Syktyvkar made several attempts to compile a bibliography of all publications published in the Permian Komi language. We refer to the most complete list made by *The Finno-Ugric Laboratory for Support of the Electronic Representation of Regional Languages* (komi *Finn-yögra kyv"yasly informatika otsög kuzya regionakostsa laboratorii*), http://wiki.komikyv.org/ (accessed February 10, 2025), sections *Perym komi nebög 1921–1937* and *Perym komi nebög 1938–2015*.

rials exist among the local Komis, but under such conditions, the works of specific authors were not created until the nineteenth century.

The situation began to change in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, when members of a family of local industrialists, the Counts Stroganov, who owned large estates in the Komi Perm region, required literate people among the locals to develop their industries. it was at that time that the first Permian Komi authors emerged. two important writers must be highlighted among them. The first was the Stroganovs' estate manager and former serf, Fedot Alexeyevich Volegov (Olösh Pedöt, 1790–1856),[4] who published an article titled *Permyaki* in *Permskie Gubernskie Vedomosti* in 1854.[5] In his text, Volegov summarised what he considered to be the characteristic features of the Permian Komis and accompanied the article with *Samples of Permyak words*. The article is written in Russian and does not clearly focus on "local patriotism", but it is invaluable as a starting point for a Permian Komi author's reflection on a small homeland.

In the first half of the 1830s, Fedot Volegov compiled two handwritten dictionaries: *Permian-Russian dictionary* (1833) and *A dictionary containing Russian, Permian, Zyryan, Votyak and Chuvash words* (1835). For many years, these manuscripts were kept in the Antal Reguli Fund in the archive of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. In 1968, the *Komi–Permian– Russian–German dictionary, compiled from data by F. A. Volegov*, was published in Budapest. This was followed in 1977 by the publication of *A dictionary containing Russian, Permian....* Volegov's dictionaries contain information valuable to linguists studying the history and evolution of the languages of peoples from the Volga and Ural regions.[6]

The next Permian Komi author who wrote in Russian appeared only towards the end of the nineteenth century. This was Ivan Yakovlevich Krivoshchekov (1854–1916), the chief forester of a local Count Stroganov manor. While performing his duties, he was able to travel extensively around the region. These trips

---

4 For information about Fedot Volegov's life, see Aleksandr DMITRIYEV, "Fedot Alekseevich Volegov: ocherk jego zhizni i perepiska," in *Permskii Krai: sbornik svedenij o Permskoj gubernii*. T. 3. (Perm: Permskiy gubernskiy statisticheskiy komitet, 1895), pp. 122–149.

5 Fedot A. VOLEGOV, "Permjaki", *Permskije Gubernskije Vedomosti*, chast' neofitsial'naya, 4 (1854), Part unofficial, pp. 1–4.

6 Karoly REDEI, *Permjakiches Worterverzeichnis aus dem Jahre 1833 auf Grund der Aufzeichnungen F. A. Wolegows*, (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó 1968); Andrey ALEKSEYEV, "F. A. Volegov i yego 'Svod nekotorykh slov russkikh, permyatskikh, zyryanskikh, votyatskikh i chuvashskikh,'" in *Voprosy istorii i grammatiki chuvashskogo yazyka* (Cheboksary: Nauchno-issledovatel'skiy institut yazyka, literatury, istorii i ekonomiki pri Sovete Ministrov Chuvashskoy ASSR, 1977), pp. 133–145.

produced numerous handwritten notes and journalistic texts in which Krivoshchekov described the situation in local Permian Komi settlements. Unfortunately, many of Krivoshchekov's notes and thoughts about the Permian Komis remained unpublished, including his *Chronicle of Kudymkar.*[7] Despite being an active supporter of the development of Permian Komi education (and thus national identity),[8] this trend is barely visible in many of his works. His ethnographic reflections are written in a rather detached and brief manner, essentially comprising short references to the geographical maps he published at the time.

The Permian Komis had a strong desire to be educated in their native language. Ermolai Evdokimovich Popov, a schoolteacher from Kudymkar, was one of the authors who sought to promote education in the Komi language. He came from the village of Kekur (now Kudymkarsky rayon) and graduated from a Kudymkar parochial school. Popov served at the Kudymkar two-class boys' school as a teacher and Director of Studies. At the same time, he was responsible for literacy instruction at the Peshnigortskaya school.

Ermolai Popov was the first to publish his works in the local Komi language.[9] His writings were printed in the annexes to the Address Calendar and the 1894 Reference Book for Clerical Perm Dioceses. In 1904, another of Popov's works was published in Kazan: an ABC book, the first reading book for Perm schools.[10]

Teacher Kondratiy Mikhailovich Moshegov (1881–1965) was one of the last pre-revolutionary authors to support the development of the Permian Komi language. Born in the village of Durovo, Cherdyn uyezd, Perm Governorate, he was a native speaker of the Kochev dialect of the Permian Komi language. In 1901, Moshegov graduated from the Kazan Teacher Seminary in the Old Tatar Sloboda, after which he worked as a teacher in the village of Chazevo. From 1910 to 1913, he taught in the village of Yukseev (at the Yukseevsky elementary school). After the 1917 Revolution, he continued teaching in educational institutions in the Ko-

---

7 Ivan KRIVOSHCHEKOV, *Materialy dlja istorii sela Kudymkora Solikamskogo uezda Permskoj gubernii*, (Perm, 1899); Komi-Permyak Okrug State Archive (Komi-permyackij okruzhnoj gosudarstvennyj arhiv – KPOGA), Kudymkar, Fond Ivana Krivoshchekova, doc. 6, I. KRIVOSHCHEKOV, *Letopis' sela Kudymkara. Hronologicheskie zapisi do 1897 goda*. Kopija, (1897).

8 Boris VISHNEVSKIJ, *Geograf-kraeved I. Ya. Krivoshchekov* (Perm': Permskoye knizhnoye izdatel'stvo, 1961).

9 Yermolai POPOV, *"Vyddem" Permyak-Ponda* (Perm': Tipografiya P. F. Kamenskogo, 1894).

10 Idem, *Azbuka i pervaya kniga dlya chteniya (Vyddem "komi otir" chelyad' ponda)* (Kazan': Tipolitografiya Imperatorskogo universiteta, 1904).

chevsky district and headed the Kosinsky District Department of Public Education (RONO). He also engaged in ethnographic and archaeological research.

In 1906, Moshegov published *The Initial Russian Language Textbook for Cherdyn Permians*,[11] and two years later, *A Basic Reader for Permian Children* (in the Cherdyn dialect), the latter co-authored with P. V. Shchapov.[12] He translated Krylov's fables and A. S. Pushkin's *The Tale of the Fisherman and the Fish*, as well as the book *Prevention and Treatment of Diseases in Farm Animals*, into the Permian Komi language.

In general, looking at the pre-Soviet period of Permian Komi culture, we see a rather weak development of literature in the native language. First of all, this can be explained by the fact that the Permian Komi language did not have a well-established written basis. It is also worth noting that the Permian Komi population was mostly illiterate, especially in Perm province. However, even being disadvantaged, the Komi population produced Komi authors who were interested in and supported the development of their native culture.[13]

As we see, at the time of Tsarist Russia, Permian Komi self-awareness in written literature was still at an embryonic level. Low literacy and the lack of a unified written standard of the Komi language played an important role here. However, the ideological policy of Tsarist Russia, which did not favour publications in any languages other than Russian, also had a strong influence. It should be admitted that the 1905–1907 Revolution revealed the first Komi personalities who appealed to national feeling, but this was not enough for the development of self-awareness on the scale of an entire nation. A powerful catalyst was needed to open up the possibility for fundamental changes in the current situation among the Permian Komis.

11 Kondratiy MOSHEGOV, *Nachal'nyy uchebnik russkogo yazyka dlya Cherdynskikh Permyakov* (Kazan': Tipo-litografiya Imperatorskogo universiteta, 1906).

12 Idem, *Bukvar' dlya permyackih detej (na cherdynskom narechii)* (Kazan': Tipo-litografiya Imperatorskogo universiteta, 1908).

13 Avgusta KRIVOSHCHEKOVA. *Ocherki po istorii komi-permyatskoy shkoly* (Molotov: Molotovskoye knizhnoye izdatel'stvo, 1956).

National identity in Permian Komi literature during the first years of Komi-Permyak National Okrug, 1923–1936

The revolutionary events in 1917 influenced the development of self-awareness in the Permian Komis. Moreover, this applies both to the supporters of the Soviet regime and the representatives of the White movement. Ignatii Moshegov was the most famous among the latter. A native of the small village of Durovo, Perm Governorate, and a participant in the civil war (both on the side of the Red Army and on the side of the Kolchak army), Moshegov fled first to Estonia in 1920 and then to Finland, where he got a job as a salesman in a small bookstore.[14] There, he published a series of books of memoir and journalistic nature, in which he described the difficult situation of the Permian Komi people, first under Tsarist and then under Soviet rule.[15] In those works, Moshegov is perceived as an ardent supporter of the development of a Permian Komi identity unrelated to Russian culture. A follower of the idea of cultural unity for all Finno-Ugric peoples, Moshegov found wide support among Finnish, Baltic, and even Polish interwar intellectual elites.

Censorship did not allow Moshegov's ideas into Soviet Russia, where, however, even without his participation, rather rapid (compared to the previous period) Komi nation-defining processes took place in Perm governorate. In the 1920s, a standard for the Permian Komi language (based on the Inva-Kudymkar dialect) was developed. This contributed to the development of Permian Komi literature. Permian Komi literature originated from the Kudymkar Literature Club, which emerged in early 1922. Club members composed songs, ditties on hot topics, and short stories in their native language. The leader of the club was Fyodor Tarakanov (Gavriv Pedor) (1900–1997), who played a significant role in the formation of

14 More about Moshegov, see Anatoliy KON'SHIN, *Ignatij Moshegov (Mössheg): neprostaya pravda istorii* (Yekaterinburg: URA-IVENT, 2020).

15 I. MÕSSHEG, *Totuus bolshevismista: heimokansalaisen, puna-armeijasta Suomeen paenneen syrjäänin kuvaus kokemuksistaan* (Helsinki, 1922); Idem, *Idän hiidenkattilassa: erään syrjääniläisen muistelmat* (Jyväskylä, 1924); Idem, *Hätähuuto kansojen vankilasta I.* (Helsinki, 1930); Idem, *Hätähuuto kansojen vankilasta II: Komikansan menneisyys ja sen nykyiset olot*. (Helsinki, 1931); J. O. MOSSEG, *Tunnetteko salaperäistä Venäjää? 1. Ovatko mainehikkaat bjarmialaiset kuolleet?* (Helsinki, 1939); J. O. M., *Sankari Pera: (syrjääniläinen tarina)* (Helsinki, 1939).

Komi-Permyak Autonomous Okrug.[16] for about a decade after the October Revolution, Tarakanov continued cultural and educational activities in the Okrug.[17]

The Kudymkar Literary Club made a huge contribution to the development of Permian Komi poetry, as can be seen in the publication of the poetry collection *Goradzul* [Globeflower] in 1923.[18] This collection is interesting to us for two reasons. Firstly, being published in Syktyvkar, *Goradzul* contained works by Komi authors from both Kudymkar and Syktyvkar itself. Komi folklore also occupies a significant place there. Secondly, despite the fact that the collection was published after the Revolution, the topic of Soviet power was practically untouched. The book starts with *The Internationale*, translated by a Kudymkar teacher, Vasily Deryabin, but otherwise, the collection does not contain any communist ideology. One might even say that a number of texts dedicated to the Komi people give the *Goradzul* collection a slightly nationalistic character.

After 1923, the publication of new poetry collections stalled for several years, which raises quite a few questions. In our opinion, there can be two working hypotheses here. The early 1920s was a time of evolution for the Permian Komi language, based on the Inven dialect (which is still spoken in Kudymkar today), and the local intellectual elite were mainly focused on the development of grammatical and lexical rules.[19] The second point was that, given the experience of publishing the *Goradzul* collection, the Soviet ideological authorities wanted Komi authors to be more focused on the glorification of socialist construction and to

16 KPOGA, Fond Fedora Tarakanova, doc. 15, Tarakanov F. G. *Komi-permjackaja trudovaja kommuna, mashinopis, (*1956–1972); doc. 16, F. G. Tarakanov, *Borba za okrug (vospominanija o formirovanii Komi-permjackogo avtonomnogo okruga), mashinopis, (*1956–1972).

17 Tarakanov's further life was primarily connected with the Komi Republic (see in more detail KPOGA, Fond Fedora Tarakanova, doc. 21, *F. G. Tarakanov, Pochemu ya v 1928 godu okazalsya v g. Syktyvkare (Vospominaniya), (*1972). Repressed in 1937 on charges of counter-revolutionary activities, he was rehabilitated only in 1956, when the Khrushchev destalinization started. He would later publish small memoirs about his activities during the organization of Komi-Permyak National District, see Fedor TARAKANOV, *Bor'ba za okrug*, (Kudymkar: Komi-permyatskoye Otdeleniye Permskogo Knizhnogo Izdatel'stva, 1990). A full text of Tarakanov's memoirs about the time of his imprisonment was preserved in Kudymkar Archive: KPOGA, Fond Fedora Tarakanova, d. 51–56., F. G. TARAKANOV, *Proizvol (vospominaniya o godah repressii 1937–1946 g. g.). Rukopis', (1937–1946).*

18 *Gora-zul (Zvonkij shar). Injvadoryg Komi jözvö* (Syktyvkar: Komi Kniga vez'ân in, 1923).

19 Ya. N. KUDYMOV – F. Ye. ZUBOV, *Vyddis'ny-gizhny vev'tchan. In'va dorvanis' komi yözvö* (Syktyvkar: Komi Kniga vez'ân in, 1921); Mikhail P. LIKACHOV, *Vil' Ovan'van'* (Kudymkar: Vserossiyskaya chrezvychaynaya komissiya po likvidatsii negramotnosti pri glavpolitprosvete, 1925); Pit'u ÖŃÖ, *I stupenya shkolayn velötchis'lö komi grammatika*. *Odzza yukön*. (Moskua: SSSR-ja Jozeslon Shoris-niga Lezz'ân In, 1928).

place less emphasis on the unity of the inhabitants in Komi-Permyak Okrug and the Komi Republic. Thirdly, the founding and maintenance of the main district newspaper *Lenin tui vylöt* required the mobilisation of all the writing forces in the region, which again did not contribute to any extraneous literary activity not related to the newspaper.

The end of the 1920s brought independent collections by Komi authors, including Andrei Zubov (Pit'u Öńö),[20] Mikhail Likhachev,[21] Stepan Karavaev (Ivu Stepko),[22] and Nikolai Popov (Vasil Mikov).[23] Their fate in the pre-war years was largely similar. Born in poor peasant villages in the Komi -Perm area, they studied at Perm University and later improved their professional skills at different times in Moscow. After that, they worked in the education system of Komi-Permyak Okrug, where they wrote didactic materials and sometimes carried out teaching activities.

It was their background that gave rise to their first artistic works. First of all, these were poems (and small stories) for school-age children.[24] These stories were purely didactic in nature and had no national overtones.

20 KPOGA, Fond Stepana Karavayeva, doc. 12, Chernovye zapisi o Zubove Andree Nikiforoviche, (1962); Ibidem, doc. 14, Stihi. Rukopis' A. N. Zubova na komi-permyackom yazyke, (1929–1935); Fond Tarakanova, doc. 23, F. G. TARAKANOV, *Pityu On'o (o Zubove A. N., poete, uchitele, obshchestvennom deyatele). Rukopis'*, (1975); Fond Vasiliya Klimova, doc. 179, Vasiliy KLIMOV, *O zhizni i deyatel'nosti A. N. Zubova.* Stat'ya. Mashinopis' s avtografom avtora, (1975); ibid., doc. 204, V. KLIMOV. *Spravka o zhizni i deyatel'nosti A. N. Zubova. Bibliograficheskaya spravka o trudah A. N. Zubova*, Rukopis', (1975).

21 Mariya OZHEGOVA, "M. P. Lihachjov: chuzhan lunsjan' 60 god kezhö," *In'va: literaturno-hudozhestvennyj sbornik* (Kudymkar: Komi-Permâcköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, 1961), pp. 107–112; "Gora-gyma kad syylötis'," *In'va: literaturno-hudozhestvennyj sbornik* (Kudymkar: Permskoye knizhnoye izdatel'stvo. Komi-Permyatskoye otdeleniye, 1976), pp. 56–58; Vladimir CHERNENKO, "Raspahnutye okna: ocherk o M. P. Lihachjove," *Po leninskomu puti*, September 12, 1974, p. 2; September 13, 1974, p. 4; September 14, 1974, p. 4; September 17, 1974, p. 3; September 18, 1974, p. 3; Fyodor ISTOMIN, "Rasstreljan v den' rozhdenija," *Parma,* November 2, 1996, pp. 2–3.

22 KPOGA, Fond Stepana Karavayeva, doc. 33, Avtobiografija, rukopis', (1958–1969); "Karavayev Stepan Ivanovich: biogafiya," in *Pisateli Permskoy oblasti: biobibliograficheskiy spravochnik*, ed. L. P. VERSHININA – S. D. SHIROKOVA (Perm': Permskoye knizhnoye izdatel'stvo, 1962), pp. 62–70.

23 M. N. OZHEGOVA, "Pisatel', perevodchik, redaktor: K 60-letiju N. V. Popova," *Parma: literaturno-hudozhetvennyi sbornik* (Kudymkar: Komi-Permâcköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, 1962), pp. 105–114.

24 Mikhail LIKHACHEV, *Pioner, rasskazy i stihi*, (Moskua: SSRS-sa yozeslon Shchorsa kniga lez-z'yan in, 1929); Idem, *Uccittek udarnikkezz* (Moskva: SSRS-sya otirrezlon Shoris' kniga lez'yanin, 1931); Idem, *Cheljadle* (Moskva: OGIZ Tom gvardija, 1933). Idem, *Cheljadj saddyn* (Kudymkar: Okrizdat, 1934). Stepan Karavaev wrote less for children at that time: Stepan I. KARAVAEV, *Velotchem ponda* (Moskva: OGIZ Tom gvardija, 1933).

Poetry for an adult reader is a completely different matter. At this time, we see that folklore motifs can be clearly traced in the works of Permian Komi authors. For example, the collection of poems by Andrei Zubov (Pityu Önö), *Ondzha* [Something],[25] which had an anti-clerical and pro-national character, contained many poems written in the format of folk songs.[26] We see similar folklore motifs in Mikhail Likhachev's poetry, dedicated to his native village (and his native land as a whole).[27]

Another significant layer of poetic creativity by Permian Komi authors is devoted to Soviet aspects of social life. These poems glorify the Soviet lifestyle, which brought with it political changes during the Civil War of 1917–1922.[28] Despite the fact that the national narrative in these works is rather weakly expressed, they are all written in the spirit of Komi folk songs and talk primarily about rural and collective farm life.[29]

A special place is occupied by poems and short prose stories dedicated to Komi women.[30] The most famous work in the Permian Komi language on this topic is the collection *Go Forward, Komi Woman*, published in Kudymkar in 1935.[31] Here, the Komi woman is presented both as a victim of social oppression and outlived orders, and as an active fighter for a "bright socialist future".[32]

---

25 Pit'u ÖŃÖ, *Őnja: komi-mortos gazhotan, Shogso sylas vasotan* (Moskua: SSRS-sa yozeslon Shchorsa kniga lezz'yan in, 1929).

26 For ex. see Pityu ÖNÖ, "Olat-Vylat Kommiez," *Őnja*, pp. 4–14; Idem, "Talun Masjljenicha," ibidem, pp. 9–20; Idem, "Oj djerrevnja menam," ibidem, pp. 24–25.

27 M. P. LIKHACHEV, "Mezhatom yb doryn," *Mezhatom yb doryn* (Moskva: GIXL, 1932), pp. 3–5; M. P. LIKHACHEV, "Komi mu," *Ibidem*, pp. 93–94; M. P. LIKHACHEV, "Parmayn," *Ibidem*, pp. 95–96.

28 M. P. LIKHACHEV, "Gord Partjizan," in *Meddozzja pettasjez* (Moskva: Tsentrizdat, 1930), pp. 7–10; Ivu STEPKO [S. I. KARAVAEV], "Komi okrugle," in Ivu STEPKO, *Kyvburrez* (Moskva: GIXL, 1932), pp. 21–26; Vasil MIKOV, "Maj 1-le lun," in *Tulas zorigaga: kvburçuk* (Kudamkar: Okrizdat, 1935), pp. 26–29.

29 I. STEPKO, "Kolhoznoj sylankyv," in Idem, *Kyvburrez* (Moskva: GIXL, 1932), pp. 21–26; M. P. LIXAÇOV, "kolhoznoj tulys", in M. P. LIXAÇOV, *Bydmam i jonam* (Kudymkar: Komi Okrizdat, 1932), pp. 14–15. Vasil MIKOV, "Traktoristan syllankyv", in Vasil MIKOV, *Tulas zorigaga: kvburçuk*) (Kudamkar: Okrizdat, 1935), pp. 42–43.

30 M. P. LIXAÇOV, *Kozintog (Bez predannnogo)* (Moskua: SSRS-sa yozeslon Shchorsa kniga lezz'yan in, 1930); M. P. LIXAÇOV, *Krestom (Bezkrestnaja)* (Moskua: SSRS-sa yozeslon Shchorsa kniga lezz'yan in, 1930); Pit'u ÖŃÖ, *Vil' tuj vylet* (Moskva, 1933).

31 *Komi injka ozjzjan*, ed. Onton PEDOR (Moskva–Leningrad: OGIZ–GIXL, 1934).

32 For example, see M. P. LIKHACHEV "Delegatka," in *Gord Dorapas* (Moskua: SSRS-sa yozeslon Shchorsa kniga lezz'yan in, 1930), pp. 22–30.

Prose in the Permian Komi language in the 1920s–1930s developed at a rather slow pace. This was due to several reasons. However, the main one was the lack of a Permian Komi literary standard. In fact, the first literary works helped develop and cement this language standard. However, a high percentage of illiterate people among the Permian Komi population was a huge barrier to the development of literature. The main goal of the first schoolteachers of the Permian Komi language in the region (trained under the Soviet system) was to teach reading, writing, and understanding simple stories that could somehow develop language skills.

It was precisely this purpose that the first fiction prose texts of the Permian Komis primarily served. Of course, poetic works were also used in education. However, first of all, the poems of the Permian Komis were used in propaganda work during demonstrations, various literary evenings in cultural centres, etc. All Permian Komi prose works, small in volume, were short stories that were either straightforwardly moralising (primarily children's works) or ideological in nature.[33] However, the need to create a larger work in the Permian Komi language did not fade away.

Mikhail Likhachev began this work. He worked on his text throughout the first half of the 1930s, until finally, in 1936, the first major work in prose in the Permian Komi language, the story *Menam Zon* [My Son], saw the light.[34] This story has a fairly standard plot for that time: the formation of a Bolshevik revolutionary. Right from his childhood, a peasant, Mirosh, the illegitimate son of a peasant woman, Aikul, experiences the harshness of a world where he is not accepted because of his origin. The red thread in the work is the conflict between Mirosh (and other peasants) and the Zemstvo Administration and representatives of local authorities. The main character, who wants to change the order, joins the Bolshevik Party and then fights on the side of the Reds during the Civil War. A parallel thread in the plot tells us about Mirosh's love relationship with his girlfriend, a fellow villager, Marish, but this storyline takes a back seat to the ideological one and is more of a contour character.

33 To this day, only the prewar short prose by Mikhail Likhachev has survived, see M. LIXAÇOV, "Oz Jagodk," in *Pioner*, pp. 3–8; "Suv sotny," ibidem, pp. 9–10; "Keros-doryn," ibidem, pp. 11–13; "Pionerskej Klubyn," ibidem, pp. 20–21; M. P. LIKHACHEV, *Gord Dorapas* (Moskua: SSRS-sa yozeslon Shchorsa kniga lezz'yan in, 1930); M. P. LIXAÇOV, *Krestom (bezkrestnaja)* (Moskua: SSRS-sa yozeslon Shchorsa kniga lezz'yan in, 1930); M. P. LIKHACHEV, *Uccittek udarnikkezz* (Moskva: SSRS-sya otirrezlon Shoris' kniga lez'yanin, 1931).

34 Idem, *Menam zon* (Kudymkar: Komigiz, 1936).

Of course, this story looked quite banal even for the mid-1930s. However, the story has a number of advantages that we can confidently attribute to the national discourse. We are talking here about a kind of lyrical digression. First of all, these small sketches give descriptions of nature, which were inspired by Permian Komi folklore songs collected during Likhachev's time. Secondly, small sketches show the everyday life and leisure of the inhabitants of a Komi village. These descriptions are essentially a kind of poems in prose, which, if desired, can be considered as independent works. It is not without reason that it is Komi poets who primarily pay tribute to Likhachev.[35]

Permian Komi literature during the apogee of Stalin's repressions and suppression of manifestations of national identity (1937–1957)

Having existed for a short time (roughly seven years), Permian Komi literature faced a problem – a change in government policy, which moved away from indigenisation and "support for national voices in culture" to almost universal russification. This process was accompanied by the growing machinery of Stalin's repressions, which ultimately affected the local Permian Komi intellectuals. As a result of the 1937 trials, Fyodor Tarakanov was imprisoned in a concentration camp, and Mikhail Likhachev and Andrei Zubov, groundlessly accused of "espionage for Finland", were executed.[36]

All these events hit the development of Komi literature in Komi-Permyak Okrug very hard. Writers produced far fewer works. For example, Stepan Karavaev could write only one poem in 1936–1938 ("A Letter from Komi Pioneers to Spanish Children"), which was published in a poetry collection in 1938.[37]

The nature of the works also changed. The works no longer had any hint of Komi national identity. This is especially noticeable in the work of Nikolai Popov. The poems written in 1937–1939 glorified the Soviet regime and Stalin's person-

35 See for example Stepan I. KARAVAYEV, "Mikhail Likhachovlö," in *Menam rassez* (Kudymkar: Permsköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, Komi-permâcköj otdelennë, 1968), pp. 86–88.

36 O. RADOSTEVA, "Orotom olanlon govk," *Parma*, November, 14, 1997, p. 3; "A mymda edz esty vystavny," *Parma, Komi Govk*, November 15, 2001, p. 3.

37 S. I. KARAVAEV,"Ispanskey chelyad'le komi pionerlen pis'mo," in *Kyvburrez* (Kudymkar: Komipermgiz, 1938), pp. 28–31.

ality.[38] Popov also wrote works glorifying representatives of Russian classical literature, which was an integral part of Stalinist propaganda about the "leading role of the Russian nation in the family of Soviet peoples".[39]

However, that was the time when other authors mercilessly exploited the theme of Soviet internationalism. Ivan Gagarin (Mitju Vanja) (1916–1942) was among them. Gagarin accurately repeated the Soviet ideological narrative in his pre-war poems.[40] Inspired by Stalinist propaganda, Gagarin's lyrical hero seemed to discard his national origin and try on the image of a "proud Soviet citizen".

The attack by Nazi Germany on the USSR did little to change the rules established in Permian Komi literature after the 1937 repressions. On the contrary, the call to cultural icons to stand up for the Motherland essentially pushed the Komi issue even further into the background. The Permian Komi authors collected and processed front-line stories about various war heroes and published them on the pages of *On the Lenin Path* newspaper.[41] However, all these essays were written according to a standard template, and their only difference from other analogues is language.[42]

The relationship between the Komi and Soviet discourses in the poetry of the Permian Komis of that period appears to be partly different. Of course, a large part of the poetry of the Permian Komis was written in the spirit of socialist realism.[43] But during this period, poems that described the everyday life of a soldier and poems that appealed to Permian Komi identity were also written.[44,45]

---

38 Nikolai POPOV, "Velikoj vozhd ilys kyv," in *Kyvburrez* (Kudymkar: Komipermgiz, 1939), pp. 7–9; "Pervomaj," ibidem, pp. 18–19; "Sylatam schastlivoj olom," ibidem, p. 31.

39 Nikolai POPOV, "Pushkinlo," ibidem, pp. 45–50; "Narodlon zon," ibidem, pp. 51–53; "Dobroljubov," ibidem, pp. 54–56.

40 Ivan GAGARIN, "Rodina," in *Stihhez* (Kudymkar: Komipermgiz, 1946), pp. 5–8; "Tshoktas kor strana," ibidem, p. 11; "Kolkhoznoj ybbezz doryn," ibidem, pp. 28–29.

41 In 1943 these articles were published in a single volume: Nadezhda SPOROVA – Zinaida TETYUYEVA, *Frontovöy raskazzez* (Kudymkar: Komipermgiz, 1943).

42 Valentin KATAYEV. *Voyennyye rasskazy* (Moskva: Sovetskiy pisatel', 1942); Nikolay TIHONOV, *Frontovyje rasskazy*, (Moskva–Leningrad, 1943); *Komsomol'tsy-frontoviki v boyakh za Rodinu*. (Moskva: Molodaya gvardiya, 1943).

43 N. V. POPOV, "Rodinalo – Slava," in *Gymalan goddez* (Kudymkar: Komipermgiz, 1945), pp. 3–4; I. D. GAGARIN, "Rossia Matushka lebtisis," in *Stihhez*, pp. 19–20.

44 In general, we can refer here to Nikolai Popov's collection "Frontline Poems" (with rare exceptions): N. V. POPOV, *Frontovöy stikhkhez* (Kudymkar: Komipermgiz, 1942); Ivan Gagarin also wrote similar poems, for example, see I. D. Gagarin, "Voyennoy sestra," in *Stihhez*, p. 19.

45 I. D. GAGARIN, "Komi zon patriot," in *Stihhez*, pp. 15–16.

A similar trend can be seen in the post-war literature of the Permian Komi authors. Of course, some glimpses of the Permian Komi national theme can be traced in poetry. For example, at that time Stepan Karavaev wrote the poem *Kur Munys Voyna* [When the War Was Going On].[46] Ponderous ideological clichés inherent in the Second World War poetry of the Stalinist period express personal and sometimes lyrical and melancholy reflections of the Permian Komi author about the war in general and their small Motherland in particular. However, in other respects, the Permian Komi prose and poetry of that period followed a strict framework of socialist realism, thereby losing some of their unique features. The stories and essays by Ivan Shadrin were a striking example of strict adherence to the canons established from above.[47] He described the life of forest industry workers, which was completely culturally alienated from the traditions of the Komi people inhabiting the region. The situation is similar among the surviving plays of that time,[48] for example, *Gord oboz* [The Red Convoy] and *Kyk drug* [Two Friends],[49] written by actor and journalist Nikolai Makarovich Bormotov (1918–2002).[50]

46 S. I. KARAVAYEV, "Kur Munys Voyna," in *Miyan asyv* (Kudymkar: Komipermgiz, 1948), pp. 37–92.

47 Ivan SHADRIN, *Zelonöy zoloto* (Kudymkar: Komi-Permyatskoye gosudarstvennoye izdatel'stvo, 1952); *Unazhyk vör kommunizm stroykaezlö: vörzaptomyn peredovikkez opytís'* (Kudymkar: Komi-Permyatskoye gosudarstvennoye izdatel'stvo, 1952).

48 The problem for studying the theater of Komi-Permyak district is that not all plays of the Stalinist period have survived to this day. This is due to Stalin's repressions. Thus, the manuscript of a play *Pemyt oy pyryot* (*Through the Darkness*) written for a Sverdlovsk cultural festival in June 1937 was burned during the arrest of Zubov and Likhachev. Also many theatrical performances were short improvisations on a folklore theme and were not recorded on paper.

49 Nikolai BORMOTOV, "Gord oboz," in *Miyan lunnezo* (Kudymkar: Komi-Permâcköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, 1954), pp. 38–55. N. M. BORMOTOV, "Kyk drug," *In'va, literaturno-khudozhestvennoy sbornik* (Kudymkar: Komi-Permâcköj knižnöj izdatel'éstvo, 1955), pp. 8–25

50 Nikolai Bormotov graduated from Verkh Yusva School of Peasant Youth. At the age of 16, he began working as a teacher at Yagodinskaya Elementary School in Kudymkar district. Advised by an actor Ilya Karavaev and a poet Stepan Karavaev, Bormotov began to work at Kudymkar Drama Theatre in 1938. Being a participant of Khalkhin Gol battles and a veteran of World War II, Bormotov was demobilized in 1946 and returned to Kudymkar theatre, where he was appointed the Artistic Director after advanced training courses at VGIK and an internship at Lenin Komsomol Theatre. For more details see Aida ZAMYSHLYAYEVA, "Ot derevenskikh korney," *Parma*, December 19, 1998, p. 7; Yuriy OREKHOV, "Makarych," in *Nash gorod – eto my* (Kudymkar, 2007), pp. 117–119.

Situation in Permian Komi literature at its peak (1958–1975)

Stalin's death did not bring immediate changes. Many cultural processes and phenomena (particularly in the provinces) inertially ran their course. The 20th CPSU Congress and the condemnation of Stalin's personality cult opened the way to the partial rehabilitation of political and cultural figures who were at the forefront of national indigenisation in the 1920s–1930s.

These processes led to the rehabilitation of the repressed Permian Komi writers, including Fyodor Tarakanov, Andrei Zubov, and Mikhail Likhachev. This allowed their poetry and prose to be published again,[51] which were then included in the local school curriculum.[52] The Permian Komi periodicals published their reflections on the literature of the 1920s–1930s, which had not yet fallen under the canon of Stalinist socialist realism.

One of these articles was written by Spiridon Mozhaev (1906–1989), an employee of Kudymkar Drama Theatre.[53] In the wake of the 20th CPSU Congress, Mozhaev, no longer young by that time, with his background in local politics and pedagogy,[54] decided to invest his strength in writing the first multi-act play in the Permian Komi language.

However, the first Permian Komi play written by Mozhaev was a 1958 one-act *Yugdan Odzyn* [At Sunrise].[55] The above-mentioned Mikhail Vavilin played a huge role in its popularisation. Vavilin believed that only active support would

51 M. LIKHACHOV, "Shochchisikö," in *Gazha ryttez*, ed. Mikhail D. VAVILIN (Kudymkar: Komi-Permâcköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, 1958), pp. 29–31; Pityu ÖN'Ö, "Pemyt oyön," in *Komi pesnya*. ed. M. D. VAVILIN (Kudymkar, 1959), pp. 37–38; Idem, "Komi nylöy," ibidem, p. 39; Idem, "Gortöm kök," ibidem, p. 40; Gavriv PODOR, "Yöktötan pesnya," ibidem, p. 52; Idem, „Öu-vö, öu-vö,"ibidem, pp. 52–53.

52 E. A. KAZANTSEVA, *Metodichesköy razrabotkaez M. P. Likhachev proizvedennoez s'örtí* (Kudymkar: Komi-Permâcköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, 1962).

53 Spiridon A. MOZHAYEV, "Oktyabr'ön zorötöm literatura," *In'va, literaturno-khudozhestvennoj sbornik* (Kudymkar: Komi-Permâcköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, 1958), pp. 79–84.

54 A native of the village of Artamonovo (now in Yusvinsky rayon, Perm krai), he graduated from Cherdyn Pedagogical College in 1929, and later, in absentia, from the Institute of Party Activism of All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks in Sverdlovsk. After the second world war, he studied at Theater Studies Department of A. V. Lunacharsky Moscow State Institute of Theater Arts, which helped him to begin a work as a head of the Literary Department and director of Komi-Permyak District Drama Theater. For more details see his autobiography KPOGA, Fond Spiridona Mozhayeva, doc. 11, *Avtobiografiya*, rukopis' (1962).

55 Spiridon MOZHAEV, *Yugdan olzyn* (Kudymkar: Komi-Permâcköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, 1958). pp. 39–48.

help the dramaturgy of the Perm Komi to revive after the difficult years of pressure from Stalin's censorship. *Yugdan Odzyn* was written in a rather weak student style compared to Mozhaev's other works. It retells a rather clichéd story for Soviet literature about the life of a village under the pressure of the orders of Tsarist Russia, from which they were later liberated by the Soviet government. However, for Mozhaev, this play was the first serious test of his pen as an author of original plays (before that he was known only for translating plays by Russian playwrights into Komi). Inspired by the modest but still success of the *Yugdan Odzyn*, Mozhaev continued to work on his multi-act play, which he completed by the spring of 1959.

In 1959, Kudymkar Drama Theatre staged Mozhaev's recently written first multi-act play *Kymura Tulys* [Cloudy Spring].[56] A six-act play, *Kymura Tulys* takes place before the First World War in a Komi-Permyak village, where a young worker from the Motovilikha plant, Vilesov, arrives to the village to agitate for the revolutionary struggle. There he meets not only supporters among the poor, but also fierce opponents from the rich peasantry and local officials. The play was immediately written in the native language; it differs from the other translated plays in its figurative folk speech. This feature emphasised the truthfulness, ease, and national flavour in its performance.

However, the rehabilitation in the Thaw era was important not only for stimulating the development of the Permian Komi theatrical art. This decision once again revived an interest among the creative elite of the Permian Komis in folklore analysis and understanding of folk traditions. The process started in 1960 when the book *Komi-Permyak folk oral poetry* by a writer and correspondent at Kudymkar Radio, Vasily Klimov,[57] was published in the Komi language.[58] This book paved the way for other Russian and Komi publications (written by Klimov himself or other authors) about the literature and language of the local Komis in Kudymkar.[59]

This primarily influenced the poetry of the Permian Komis at that time. The most striking example is the poems written by a representative of the post-war

56 S. A. MOZHAEV, "Kymura tulys," in *Borjom* (Kudymkar: Komi-Permyatskiy etnokul'turnyy tsentr, 2016), pp. 36–81.

57 For more details about his life and work see KPOGA, Fond Vasilya Klimova, doc. 69, Avtobiografiya, mashinopis'.

58 V. V. KLIMOV, *Komi-permyatsköy narodnöy ustnöy poetichesköy tvorchestvo (Komi-permyatsköy narodnöy legendaez, skazkaez, chastushkaez, poslovitsaez, pogovorkaez)* (Kudymkar, 1960).

59 M. N. OZHEGOVA, *Ustno-poeticheskoye tvorchestvo komi-permyatskogo naroda* (Kudymkar, 1961); *Sizimok: skazkaez, legendaez da priskazkaez*, ed. V. V. KLIMOV (Kudymkar, 1965).

generation of writers, Ivan Alekseevich Minin (1926–1990). His poetry of the 1960s clearly shows the theme of nature and, in particular, a reverent attitude towards the forest (which the Komi folklore has always described as a special, almost magical place).[60] However, one should not dismiss the influence of the Soviet literary tradition. In particular, the stories and tales of the Soviet prose writer Vitaly Bianki, which were widely published in the USSR, including translated into Permian Komi,[61] played a very strong role in Minin's work. However, this influence does not so much replace the national Komi discourse as complement it in every possible way. Bianki's prose, glorifying the beauty of the surrounding nature, fit very well into the worldview of Komi culture, where the deification of natural phenomena is quite widespread.

The Komi national motifs also penetrate ideological poetry about the Civil War. This is most clearly noticeable in the work of Stepan Karavaev, who wrote two large epic poems *Anna Khomyakova* (1966–1967)[62] and *Alexei Dobrynin* (1969–1970) in the 1960s.[63] These poems describe the story of Anna Khomyakova, an agitator and a member of the Bolshevik Party, and Alexei Dobrynin, her close friend, a security officer. The plot of this dilogy is quite formulaic and represents a typical description of the struggle (at the cost of their own lives) of young Bolsheviks to establish Soviet power in a Komi Perm village. In many ways, these poems pay homage to the already mentioned story *My Son* by Mikhail Likhachev. This is noticeable not only in similar plot development (the path of a peasant to the Bolshevik party), but also in the artistic and figurative content which mixes the Soviet ideological component and the cultural component in the description of everyday customs and natural phenomena.

The return of interest in Komi folklore revived national children's literature. This applied to both children's poetic literature and literature written in prose.[64,65]

60 See for ex: Ivan MININ, *Divya* (Kudymkar: Permsköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, Komi-permâcköj otdelennë, 1967).

61 See for ex: Vitaly V. BIANKI, *Vör kerkuokkez: skazkaez da rasskazzez* (Kudymkar: Komipermgiz, 1949).

62 KPOGA, Fond Karavayeva, doc. 3, Poema "Anna Homyakova" na komi-permyackom yazyke (1967).

63 KPOGA, Fond Karavayeva, doc. 5, Poema "Aleksej Dobrynin" na komi-permyackom yazyke (1971).

64 I. A. MININ, *Miyö bydmam: kyvburyas* (Kudymkar: Komi-Permâcköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, 1959).

65 Vasiliy ISAYEV, *Vöryn i yu doryn: chelyad' ponda rasskazzez* (Kudymkar: Komi-Permâcköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, 1962).

However, Vasily Klimov's story *Gavkalön bed'* [Gavka's Mace] was the most famous work for children in the Permian Komi language in the 1960s.[66] This story described summer days of an 11-year-old boy, Petya, in a small Komi village during the Second World War. We could see the world around him through his eyes. A special role is attached to various stories that the elders (primarily Petya's grandfather, Yegor) shared with the young protagonist. Having heard one of these stories – a story about a magical precious club of the hero Gavka – Petya got excited about finding a valuable artefact and using the proceeds to send help to the Soviet soldiers. Generally speaking, the life of the inhabitants of the Komi village in the story can hardly be called socialist. Yes, there are all the attributes of the Soviet system (a state farm, village council, labour standards, etc.). However, in many aspects (this is especially evident in the older generation), the Komis remained devoted to their old customs and beliefs. They appeased the house spirit and brownies, they believed that the forest was inhabited by various spirits and, finally, that mythical Chud people lived in ancient times, and that was a golden age on earth.

Of course, the development of Permian Komi children's literature was an important step in the culture of the local population. The problem, however, was that there was no novelistic prose in the Permian Komi language. Writer and local journalist Valerian Batalov (1926–1998) made an attempt to fill in this gap. Throughout the second half of the 1960s and the first half of the 1970s, Batalov worked on the historical novel *Yugdíkö*,[67] which was published in two books: the first book was published in 1970,[68] and a sequel with the subtitle *Tulyssya Petassez* [Spring Shoots] was published in 1975.[69]

This plot is divided into two parts, which are not related to the division into books. The first part describes the fate of a peasant, Timofey Lunegov, and other residents of the village of Nalimashor. The village government had to send one of the village residents to military service (this was practised in tsarist times). Despite the fact that it was the village headman's son's turn to "join the army", the village administration decided to delegate Timofey to the army. The protagonist's shock was aggravated by the position of his father, who supported this decision. Dissatis-

66 V. V. KLIMOV, *Gavkalön bed'* (Kudymkar: Permsköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, Komi-permâcköj otdelennë, 1968).

67 *Yugdíkö* is the Komi name for a bear that has not hibernated in winter.

68 Valerian BATALOV, *Yugdíkö: Kn. 1*, (Kudymkar: Permsköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, Komi-permâcköj otdelennë, 1970).

69 Idem, *Yugdíkö Kn. 2: Tulyssya petassez* (Kudymkar: Permsköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, Komi-permâcköj otdelennë, 1975).

fied and angry, Timofey ran with his dog into the forest, where he started settling down. Soon he is joined by his childhood friend Anfisa (soon they start a family), and then by other Nalimashor residents seduced by the stories about the wealth of new places.

The second part of the book is devoted to the years of Revolution and Civil War. Declining fur trade forces the aged Timofey and the rest of the residents in the village of Gorlastaya to move to a new village. There they face the maelstrom of the Civil War, and Timofey and his grown-up son Foma take the side of the Red Army. After Timofey's death in one of the skirmishes with Kolchak's units, the book turns its attention to his son Foma, who defeats detachments of whites and local bandits with the help of his fellow villagers and establishes a peasant labour commune.

In terms of their artistic characteristics, the pre-revolutionary and Soviet parts of the novel are quite different. The pre-revolutionary part, dedicated primarily to the fate of Timofey Lunegov, is written in a rather vivid artistic language. It is filled with bright mythological images of the spirits inhabiting the forest, stories about the treasures of ancient shamans, as well as legends about the mythical Komi ancestors. The most striking moments of this part are Timofey Lunegov's survival in the forest, his fight with a bear, and the construction of his first hut in a deep thicket. The description of life in the village of Nalimashor does not lag behind in its brightness and imagery. We see descriptions of various dwellings of the Komi peasants, where we observe both their work and celebrations.

The part devoted to the establishment of Soviet power is much weaker in both plot and artistic execution. This part is full of various plot clichés of the Soviet ideological canon dedicated to the events of the Civil War in Russia. Here we see ideologically savvy soldiers of the Red Army and Bolsheviks who care for their "bright communist future". They are opposed by supporters of the white movement, rich peasants, and ordinary robbers who have no idea in their souls, but only a strong desire to make money. In the "Soviet" part of the novel, we see neither magnificent descriptions of nature nor any mythological or folklore references, which creates a rather strong dissonance with what we read at the beginning of the novel.

Valerian Batalov's *Yugdíkö* is a rather controversial phenomenon. The first novel written in the Permian Komi language is certainly a milestone in the history of the local literary tradition. Never before had an original text of such a large size been written in the Permian Komi language. On the other hand, the aforementioned contradictory artistic features of the novel played a cruel joke. The novel by Valerian Batalov is an example of how, quite abruptly and without explanation, the national Komi discourse (present both in the plot and in the figurative solutions) ends mid-sentence and gives way to the stylistic solution of a work typical for the era of Brezhnev socialist realism. It seems quite difficult to explain this phenomenon. The historical-revolutionary theme, which did not become a source of inspiration or arouse any sincere interest among the local Komi authors—neither during the Brezhnev stagnation nor even more so after the collapse of the USSR—did not make the novel popular.

Crisis of Soviet ideology and Permian Komi literature (1975–1990)

The publication of Valerian Batalov's novel *Yugdíkö* was the last major event in Permian Komi literature in subsequent years. The more time passed, the more obvious the crisis in Permian Komi literature became. This crisis also referred to the works written both in the "national" and in the "Soviet" discourse. We can give several reasons for this phenomenon.

The problem of the "Soviet" in Permian Komi literature is in many ways a derivative of the crisis of Soviet ideology during the era of Brezhnev's stagnation as a whole. In the 1970s, Soviet ideology no longer found a wide response both in Soviet society and even among the political and cultural elite. The Soviet leadership's propaganda referred to the ideologies of the 1920s and 1930s, which caused a smile in society by the mid-1970s. Attempts to ideologically adapt to the realities of that time (including the term "developed socialism") did not improve the situation.[70]

The tragedy of the situation with the Permian Komis, however, was that the fading interest in Soviet ideology did not provide much chance for the development of a national ideology. Several factors played an important role here. Firstly, the growing Russification of the Komi district did not spark a heightened interest in the study of the Komi language and, therefore, the Komi culture. This process resulted in the fact that the works translated from different languages into the Per-

70 For more information see for ex. Alfred B. EVANS, Jr., *Soviet Marxism–Leninism: The Decline of an Ideology* (Westport, Con.: Praeger, 1993).

mian Komi language ceased to be published after 1961.[71] The number of educational and other methodological publications also significantly decreased. This could be explained by the depressed economic situation in Komi-Permyak Autonomous Okrug, which always relied only on wood processing. Consequently, the population outflowed to Perm and other cities of Russia, and the Komi culture actually eroded in the region.[72]

However, Permian Komi literature continued to be published on a small scale. First of all, we are talking about poetry. So, in 1976, a poetry collection *Gora pölyan* was published.[73] It introduced readers to the names of young Permian Komi poets who later worked both in local journalism and in the local school system – Fyodor Istomin (b. 1954), Galina Bacheva (1952–2012), Nina Isaeva (b. 1955), and others.[74] These poems describe the small joys of the lyrical heroes. They are removed from both Soviet and local discourses as far as possible. The most prominent of these authors is Galina Bacheva, who in her poems used the lyrics of the early Marina Tsvetaeva, as can be seen in the example of Bacheva's first collection of poems.[75] Tsvetaeva's motifs can be traced in the next two collections of poems.[76]

With Gorbachev coming to power, the country experienced gradual political changes. These transformations had a certain impact on the political and cultural situation in Komi-Permyak Autonomous Okrug. First of all, they manifested themselves in attempts to revive the national discourse (free from the shackles of socialist realism) among local Komi authors. At this moment, there were some attempts to revive the Permian Komi folklore.

71 The last translations from Russian were published in 1961. These were translations of stories by Leo Tolstoy and Dmitry Mamin-Sibiryak: D. N. MAMIN-SIBIRYAK, *Oshpiyanok* (Kudymkar: Komi-Permâcköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, 1961); L. N. TOLSTOY, *Rasskazzez* (Kudymkar: Komi-Permâcköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, 1961).

72 Vasily Klimov wrote more about the crisis of the Permian Komi literature and its causes: KPOGA, Fond Vasiliya Klimova, doc. 224, V. V. KLIMOV. *Komi-permjackaia literatura pervoj poloviny vosmidesatych godov i ee problemy. Statya. Mashinopis s pometkami avtora*. (1987).

73 *Gora pölyan*, ed. V. V. KLIMOV (Kudymkar: Permsköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, Komi-permâcköj otdelennë, 1976).

74 For ex. see F. S. ISTOMIN, "Te ne tol'ko menym kolan," in *Gora pölyan*, pp. 8–9; Galina M. BACHEVA, "Os'kala gazha vidz vylöt, s'ölömö menam rad...," ibidem, pp. 19–21; Nina ISAYEVA, "Kyyö mamö polovikkez," ibidem, pp. 30–31.

75 Galina BACHEVA, *Tsvetitö ryabina* (Kudymkar: Permsköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, Komi-permâcköj otdelennë, 1983).

76 Eadem, *As'ya zarni* (Kudymkar: Permsköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, Komi-permâcköj otdelennë, 1988); Eadem, *Tölísya ryttez* (Kudymkar: Permsköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, Komi-permâcköj otdelennë, 1992).

Perestroika brought the search for other Komi folklore embodiments. So at this time Vasily Klimov began writing his libretto for the first Permian Komi ballet about Kudym-Osh.[77] In this ballet, Klimov tried to combine both elements of classical ballet and folk dances that were common among the Permian Komi. The fate of this project was quite complicated because the author's desperate attempts did not result in a full-fledged production. However, we can evaluate his preparatory materials published in 1992.[78]

Let us look at the example of the *In'va* collection from 1987 and the *Miyan* Shog collection from 1990. The In'va collection is a child of its time. It is an attempt to return to the roots and sing the praises of the "primordial and immaculate ideals of socialism". This is reflected in a series of essays about the residents of Komi Okrug who fought for the Red Army during the Civil War, as well as in the reprinted poems of authors who began their literary journeys before the Second World War.[79,80]

The *Miyan Shog* collection also developed the theme of the community of the Komi population in the Komi Republic and Komi-Permyak Autonomous Okrug. This topic was not strictly prohibited in previous years, but it aroused great suspicions of disloyalty among the Soviet authorities. In 1987, *In'va* opened up this topic and presented works by authors from the Komi Republic.[81]

Miyan Shog draws a kind of line under the development of Permian Komi literature of the Soviet period. It was a journalistic response to the main challenges that Komi Okrug faced at that time. In its linguistic and figurative manner, *Miyan Shog* is reminiscent of many similar collections published during the era of perestroika.

The journalistic collection consists of several parts. The first part is devoted to the construction of a nuclear power plant planned at that time in Komi-Permyak

77 Kudym-osh (lit. *The Bear from the Ku(va) river*) is a legendary hero, character of the Permian Komi national epic, as well as a leader and priest endowed with supernatural powers. For a more detailed analysis of legends about Kudym-Osh, see M. N. OZHEGOVA, *Komi-permyatskiye predaniya o Kudym-Oshe i Pere-Bogatyre*. (Perm': Permskoye knizhnoye izdatel'stvo, 1984).

78 V. V. KLIMOV, "Kudym-Osh yylís' vis't: komi epos podula baletly libretto," *In'va* (Kudymkar: Permsköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, Komi-permâcköj otdelennë, 1992), pp. 132–143.

79 "Geroi grazhdanskoj vojny," *In'va* (Kudymkar: Permsköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, Komi-permâcköj otdelennë, 1987), pp. 90–95.

80 N. POPOV, "Leninskoye znamya," ibidem, p. 10.

81 "Komi poeziya," ibidem, pp. 120–124.

Autonomous Okrug.[82] According to the authorities, the nuclear power plant was supposed to give impetus to the development of an economically backward region. The station had been planned since the early 1980s, but the disaster at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant changed these plans. This accident aroused fears in both Perm and Kudymkar that the newly built nuclear power plant (its design resembled that of the Chernobyl plant) would be unsafe and could cause a similar accident. We can see these fears in the articles in this collection. Residents of Komi-Permyak Okrug also feared that a potential accident would contribute to the departure of the Komis from the region and thereby to the disappearance of their material and spiritual culture.

The second section of the book is devoted to the problem of Permian Komi identity.[83] These articles (albeit in a brief form) raise some difficult questions. The articles refer to Stalinist repressions, including repressions against Tarakanov, Zubov, and Likhachev. Of course, they were rehabilitated in 1956, but nothing was said about their fate after 1937. The second aspect that is spoken about by the authors in the texts is the preservation of Permian Komi national traditions and their language. The third problem that worries the authors of the articles is the relationship between the Komis and the Permian Komi authors. Can we talk about a common cultural tradition, or are the differences between these groups quite significant?

And finally, the third topic that the authors of the collection raise is the problem of nature as a whole.[84] These articles appeared together with the all-Union growth of the environmental movement. Just like in many other environmental works of that time, the main target of criticism is human economic activity –

82 Vasiliy KAZANTSEV, "Bolevaya zona," in *Miyan Shog* (Kudymkar: Permsköj knižnöj izdatel'stvo, Komi-permâcköj otdelennë, 1990), pp. 9–15; Antonina SOROKINA, "Nezdorovaya ecologiya," ibidem, pp. 16–29; Semyon FEDOSEEV, "Bantam Veskyt," ibidem, pp. 29–41; Mikhail MOSHEGOV, "'Bogma' protiv dogmy," ibidem, pp. 41–55; Leonid ZLOBIN, "Nuzhen referendum," ibidem, pp. 55–65; Timofey FADEEV, "Bud'te bditel'ny, komi-permyaki!," ibidem, pp. 65–98.

83 Albert NICHIPEROVICH, "Razmytyye korni," ibidem, pp. 101–125; V. V. KLIMOV, "Mortas portony zybka dorsyan," ibidem, pp. 126–138; F. S. ISTOMIN, "Chuzhombanon chuzhaninlan," ibidem, pp. 139–159; Raisa NADYMOVA, "Kinnez miyo?," ibidem, pp. 160–168; Galina NECHAEVA. "In Velötny uchsyan," ibidem, pp. 169–175; Anna DOLDINA, "Kytön te, chövpan?," ibidem, pp. 176–196.

84 Leonid NADYMOV, "Gde teryali oleni roga...," ibidem, pp. 199–214; Timofey FADEEV, "O chem molchit pashnya," ibidem, pp. 215–254; Alevtina CHEBOTKOVA, "Priroda – nash dom," ibidem, pp. 255–271.

ploughing arable lands, deforestation, and industrial pollution. These problems also influence the lifestyle of the Komi people and their traditions.

The *Miyan Shog* collection is, to a certain extent, a breakthrough for journalism in Komi-Permyak Autonomous Okrug. For the first time, quite cutting-edge articles were published in the Russian and Perm Komi languages. These articles raise uncomfortable questions for local authorities regarding the management of the region. Unfortunately, this collection became an isolated example of a place for journalism and did not give rise to an entire tradition, remaining instead a local monument of perestroika.

Conclusions

Permian Komi literature is, without exaggeration, a child of the twentieth century. Of course, there were some attempts by Komi authors from the Perm province to write before, but they were very rare and could not have any strong influence on the culture of the nation. Therefore, we can only talk about the emergence of the Permian Komi literary tradition in the context of the indigenisation policy in the 1920s, when the local literary standard of the Komi language was derived from the Inven (or Kudymkar) dialect.

Throughout the Soviet period, Permian Komi literature manifested its internal rivalry of two divergent discourses. The first of them, conventionally called "Soviet-statist" by us, described the life of the Komis as the life of ordinary Soviet people, which is no different from the life in any other part of the country. The second discourse, "national Komi", drew attention to the differences and characteristics of the Komis and reflected on their relationship to the peoples around them (primarily, we mean the Russians). Local folklore played a huge role in the formation of this discourse.

The history of Permian Komi literature fits into the struggle between Soviet and national discourses. The first evolutionary period of Permian Komi literature (1921–1936) represents the era of literary and linguistic standardisation. During this period, the first literary works (primarily poetic) were dominant in the national discourse. The first Permian Komi authors in the Perm region took their inspiration from folklore. This inspiration, with the indigenisation policy in the background, contributed to a stronger local national identity.

The second period in the history of the Permian Komi literature, which lasted the next 20 years (1937–1957), is a period of Soviet discourse dominance.

The execution of Mikhail Likhachev and Andrei Zubov, as well as the imprisonment of Fyodor Tarakanov, dealt an irreparable blow not only to the quantity of published literature, but also to its content. Frightened by political repression, the Komi authors avoided any mention of folklore or national themes. All these factors left the literary works of the Permian Komis overflowing with soulless ideological clichés. Of course, the Second World War led to weaker censorship and the appearance of works where the Komi theme was touched upon in one way or another, but in general they did not radically change the situation.

The next period in the history of the literature, 1958–1975, is a period of reviving interest in Komi themes. This period coincided with the Khrushchev Thaw and contributed to the weakening of ideological shackles. The first studies on Komi folklore and culture appeared in Kudymkar. All these aspects gave inspiration to local Komi authors for writing fiction. The works of *Village Prose* also played an important role in the evolution of Permian Komi prose and poetry. This new "spirit of the times" played a huge role in shaping the worldview of such authors as Valerian Batalov, Vasily Klimov, or the playwright Spiridon Mozhaev.

The 1975–1990 period is a time of decline of both "Soviet" and "national" discourses in Permian Komi literature. This can be explained by several reasons. First of all, the Soviet system was in a state of stagnation; various layers of intellectuals (including among the Permian Komis) could be characterised by escapist sentiments and desires either not to touch upon the Soviet topic at all or mention it only in passing. at the same time, this period could be described as one of erosion and fading of the national theme in Permian Komi literature. This was facilitated by both objective reasons (the number of native speakers of the Komi language was steadily declining throughout Soviet times, and their Russification intensified) and subjective reasons (the small number of topics which Komi literature covered no longer gave the desire or inspiration to write). It became possible to write about these reasons only during the era of perestroika. However, neither journalistic articles in newspapers nor the *Miyan Shog* collection – although they wrote about the crisis in literature (and in Komi-Permyak Autonomous Okrug as a whole) caused by the general lack of funding for the region – managed to induce local society to make any changes. Permian Komi literature entered the post-communist period in a state of complete prostration, and its fate seemed uncertain.

STUDIE / ARTICLE

Hašek in the Balkans, the Balkans in Hašek: Jaroslav Hašek's Balkan Wanderings and a Contextual Reading of Balkan Themes in His Writings

PAVOL SZÁZ

Department of Hungarian Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Comenius University, Bratislava, Slovakia

Hašek in the Balkans, the Balkans in Hašek. Jaroslav Hašek's Balkan Wanderings and a Contextual Reading of Balkan Themes in His Writings

The paper discusses the emergence of Balkan references in Jaroslav Hašek's oeuvre, placing them in a historical-political context. It examines the question of whether Hašek visited the Balkans in light of the author's biography. In terms of fact and biographical mystification, it explores his alleged involvement in the so-called Ilinden Uprising of 1903 against the Turks in present-day northern Macedonia, As well as his travelogue on the Bulgarian section of the Danube, written at this time. The following section focuses on texts in his oeuvre that deal with the situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the youngest province of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Among these are several humorous texts and short stories based on specific political contexts or events of the time, which, in the author's characteristically satirical manner, criticise the oppressive and irrational policies of the imperial regime

from the perspective of the common man. The paper analyses these writings by interpreting the relevant references.
Keywords: Czech prose; Jaroslav Hašek; political satire; Balkans; Bosnia-Herzegovina; Macedonia

1. Hašek is Gone from Prague

Writer and humourist Jaroslav Hašek (1883–1923) is one of the most important figures in Czech and twentieth-century world literature, best known as the author of *The Good Soldier Švejk and His Fortunes in The World War*. Besides this novel cycle, however, the author also wrote many short stories, mostly humorous sketches, many of which deal with his travels or are political satires, some of which mock the political situation in the Balkans. Although South Slavic contacts have been studied from a linguistic point of view, to my knowledge, this is the first study to address Balkan aspects in Hašek's oeuvre.

Of inestimable importance for Hašek's career as a writer and journalist were his journeys—better described as wanderings or vagrancies—repeated annually from 1900 to 1905.[1] He drew on these experiences in many of his humorous essays and short stories well into his later years. These narratives were collected by Zdena Ančík and František Daneš in the first volume of the second *Spisy Jaroslava Haška* series, though later volumes also contain writings about foreign landscapes and travels.[2]

The most puzzling question in Hašek's biography concerns where he wandered as a young writer for four months, from June to September 1903. A possible answer might also resolve another question: whether he had ever been to the Balkans. In other words, did he cross the borders of the Austro-Hungarian Empire to the south of the Sava and the Danube rivers—into Serbia, Bulgaria, European Turkey, or even Bosnia and Herzegovina, the latter being part of the Empire since 1878?

1 Radko PYTLÍK, *Toulavé house: život Jaroslava Haška autora Osudů dobrého vojáka Švejka* (Praha: XYZ, 2012), pp. 72–110.

2 Jaroslav HAŠEK, *Črty, povídky a humoresky z cest* (Praha: Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury, hudby a umění, 1955).

Hašek's contacts with South Slavs began very early, thanks to the Croatian and Serbian students he encountered in Prague.[3] Tracing the scattered and contradictory remarks in memoirs about Hašek, an unprovable suspicion emerges—perhaps truth, perhaps biographical legend—namely, that it was in this early year of 1903 that he visited the Balkans. According to one of the most reliable memoirists, Ladislav Hájek: "He did not like the life of an official. Jarda was a bohemian in the proper sense of the word. He only wanted to be a writer or a journalist. There were some riots in the Balkans, I'm not sure what kind. Hašek was very excited, he kept saying that he would go there – and therefore no one was surprised when one day Hašek did not come to the bank again, they did not know where he was at home and Hašek disappeared from Prague. Somewhere he said he was going to the Balkans."[4]

According to other memoirs, he went to Turkey, to the south of present-day North Macedonia, and to Bulgaria to support the anti-Turkish uprising with his friend Jan Klimeš – who tried to recruit volunteers in Prague for the noble cause of Slavic solidarity.[5] The biographical legend of this Balkan adventure is inspired by the genius of the fabulist Hašek himself, in some of his satires in *Political and social history of the Party of Moderate Progress within the Bounds of the Law*, in which he calls Jan Klimeš a "Macedonian prince".

In *Makedonský vévoda Klimeš* [Klimeš, the Macedonian Prince], the extradiegetic narrator tells a story about meeting Klimeš in Sofia during the spring, where he worked in a sofa factory, and from where they went to the aid of Macedonian rebel troops. After being emboldened by a few rakis, they were armed and led by the rebels to the foot of Mount Garvan, where, after coming face to face with Ottoman forces, they dropped their weapons and allowed themselves to be captured by the Turks. "There was a great battle by Mount Garvan, which Prince Klimeš told me of

3 Antonín MEŠŤAN, "Jihoslované v životě a díle Jaroslava Haška," *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 33 (1987), No. 1, pp. 123–128.

4 Orig.: "Nelíbil se mu však život úřednický. Jarda byl vyslovený bohém. Chtěl býti jenom literátem nebo žurnalistou. Na Balkáně povstaly nějaké nepokoje, nevím už určitě jaké. Haška to velmi vzrušilo, stále říkal, že se tam vypraví – a nepřekvapilo proto ani nikoho, když kteréhosi dne Hašek do banky zase nepřišel, doma nevěděli kde je a Hašek z Prahy zmizel. Kdesi řekl, že jde na Balkán." Ladislav HÁJEK, *Z mých vzpomínek na Jaroslava Haška autora "Dobrého vojáka Švejka" a výborného českého humoristy* (Praha: Čechia, 1925), p. 35.

5 Radko PYTLÍK, *Toulavé house*..., pp. 90–91; Václav MENGER, *Jaroslav Hašek doma* (Praha: Sfinx, Bohumil Janda, 1935), p. 262.

in Prague, where we defeated 2,580 Turks."[6] And in the sequel, Klimeš, the intradiegetic narrator, tells of his further exploits—how he and his men rushed to liberate Manastir (Bitola) from the overpowering Ottoman Nizam-i Djedid Army. True, in terms of realism, the extradiegetic narrator is much more convincing than Klimeš, the Baron Munchausen-like intradiegetic narrator. But knowing Hašek—the notorious legend-maker and master of fiction—there had to be "something" in all this: at least a hint of reality. what exactly that "something" was may remain a secret forever, as may the question of whether Hašek was involved in what is referred to as the Ilinden anti-Ottoman uprising of the time.

Those who knew Hašek knew better than to believe his stories hook, line, and sinker. The writer Eduard Bass published an article on 17 April 1919, in which he wrote that Hašek, whose death had been announced at home in Prague, was alive and well, and was enjoying his own death in the far-off Soviet Union. Bass gives several examples of Hašek's mystifications. For example, Hašek once claimed that he had died at the front, and at other times that he had been executed in Siberia. And he might have made similar jokes even before the war. The beginning of the article is worth quoting: "Jaroslav Hašek built his popularity largely on mystification. It started years ago, when he spread the news that he had been killed in the battle of Mount Garvan..."[7]

Had Hašek ever been at Mount Garvan? Indeed, had he been to Sofia at all? In other words, to what extent can the narrators of the *Political and social history of the Party of Moderate Progress within the Bounds of the Law* be identified with real figures? In any case, the following letter should be mentioned in connection with the facts: "Dear Mr Hašek, you did not appear at the office on May 30, and we have learned that you have left Prague, and your whereabouts are unknown, as is the date of your return. For such a flagrant breach of your duties, you are dismissed from service as of today, and we will not comment on this further. June 3, 1903".[8]

---

6 Orig.: "To byla ta velká bitva na hoře Garvan, o které v Praze vykládal Klimeš, vejvoda makedonský, že jsme tam pobili 2580 Turků." Jaroslav HAŠEK, *Politické a sociální dějiny strany mírného pokroku v mezích zákona* (Praha: Československý spisovatel, 1977), p. 28.

7 "Jaroslav Hašek založil valnou část své popularity na mystifikaci. Začalo to již před lety, kdy rozšířil zprávu, že padl v bitvě na hoře Garvan." Eduard BASS, "Vrchol mystifikace," in *Čtení o Jaroslavu Haškovi. Ohledávání 1919–1948*, ed. Luboš MERHAUT (Praha: Institut pro studium literatury, 2014), pp. 13–14, here p. 13.

8 "Pane Hašku, 30. května nedostavil jste se do kanceláře a na poptávku naši dozvěděli jsme se, že jste vůbec z Prahy odejel a že ani Váš pobyt, ani Váš návrat znám není. Následkem tohoto hrubého porušení povinnosti úřednické propouštíme Vás." Radko PYTLÍK, *Toulavé house*..., p. 19.

It is certain, then, that Hašek left Prague in late May or early June 1903. The next factual information about Hašek is contained in a letter sent from the Krakow police to Prague on 28 July, the purpose of which was to establish the permanent residence of Jaroslav Hašek, who had been arrested for vagrancy at the foot of Wawel Castle in Krakow (on the corner of Podzamcze and Kanonicza street), as he did not have his identity papers with him. One way or another, the situation was likely resolved. The next factual clue came from the Prague police archives on 6 October, when Hašek was brought in for a minor offence: “At quarter to nine in the evening, J. H. was arrested and brought before the police for drunkenly relieving himself in front of the police headquarters building on Poštovní Street (now Eliška Krásnohorská Street). The perpetrator was found in his mother’s house at 195 Vinohrady Street. ‘He had soiled the pavement in front of the police station, thereby contaminating the pavement at the place in question (which caused a strong outcry among passers-by’ – this part was later deleted)”.[9]

Until May 1903, the young Hašek worked at the Slávia bank, but it was here, immediately after completing his studies at the commercial academy, that it became clear that the developing writer did not want to, and perhaps could not, conform to the bourgeois order of normal life. Ladislav Hájek, one of Hašek’s most reliable memoirists, says the following: It was a beautiful early spring evening. The moon was shining. Hašek mentioned how beautiful Slovakia is in the spring: “We arrived at the Old Town Square. [...] But on Týnská Street, Jarda suddenly stopped, looked up at the sky, pondered the moon, and said, ‘You know, I’m not coming to see you today, I don’t want to stare at St Peter with his finger raised in warning. I’m not going home either. I picked up my overtime pay today, I have money for the trip, so I’m going to Slovakia tonight! I’m not going back to the bank! Everything there makes me sad, and in Slovakia this spring, in the pastures, everything will be beautiful, the sun will shine, it will be beautiful, I’m going there!’”.[10]

---

9 “Ve tři čtvrtě na deset večer byl J. H. zadržen a předveden, neboť v opilosti vykonal před budovou policejního ředitelství v Poštovní ulici (dnes Elišky Krásnohorské) malou tělesnou potřebu. Zjištěno bylo: zadržený je bytem Vinohrady 195, u matky. ‘Pokropil dlažbu před policejním komisařstvím, čímž dlažba na dotčeném míste byla znečištěna (což mezi chodci vyvolalo silné rozhořčení’ – tato část později škrtnuta).” Ibidem, p. 21.

10 “Byl krásný předjarní večer. Měsíc svítil. Hašek vzpomínal jak asi bude nyní na jaře na Slovensku krásně. Došli jsme na Staroměstské náměstí. [...] V Týnské ulici však Jarda náhle zastavil, zadíval se k nebi na měsíc a řekl: ‘A víš, já tobě dnes nepůjdu. Nechci se zase dívati na sv. Petra, jak na nás hrozí prstem. A domů také nepůjdu. Bral jsem dnes za předčas, mám peníze na cestu, pojedu teď v noci na Slovensko! Nepůjdu už do banky! Mrzí mne tam všechno, a na Slovensku teď na jaře, na

The trips that lured Hašek away after he left his job are reconstructed by the great Hašek scholar Radko Pytlík in his book *Toulavé house* [The Wandering Goose].[11] According to his recent book,[12] Hašek went to the Slovak -populated regions of Northern Hungary, to Detva, then to Žilina to visit Dr Makovický, from where he probably went to Vrútky and then to Budapest, and from there he continued by train. Pytlík calls attention to the realistic nature of the description of Budapest and of the neighbourhood of the railway station from *Švejk*, and claims that Hašek then went to Sofia, following Klimeš.[13] Pytlík draws the subsequent events from the narrative of the *Political and social history of the Party of Moderate Progress within the Bounds of the Law*, extracted above. There is, however, no factual evidence that Hašek visited the Macedonian countryside. Nor is there any evidence for his visits to Sofia or Budapest, and although they are more realistic than Mount Garvan, it can only be assumed that he visited these cities.

Nota bene: Hašek wrote to Dr Řezníček shortly after the above-mentioned minor breach of public order in front of the gendarmerie building, on 24 October, applying for a job, in the following fashion: "I quit Slávia bank because I wanted to travel to the Balkans".[14]

2. The Case of the Macedonian Rebels and the Danube Voyage

According to one of Hašek's monographers, Jiří Hájek, there is definitely no posturing or irony in the Balkan adventure. He interprets the whole failed mission as proof of Hašek's sincere romantic fervour for the good cause that Klimeš stood for. "Hašek's falling for him was, of course, helped by the National Socialist MP Václav Klofáč, who, in his travelogue of his trip to the Balkans, published in *Světozor*, portrayed Klimeš as a hero who 'fights for the Macedonian people with a rifle in hand'."[15] Hašek was certainly familiar with Klofáč, and his figure is also mentioned

pastvách, bude krásně, slunce bude svítiti; pěkně tam bude, pojedu tam!'", Ladislav HÁJEK, *Z mých vspomínek...*, pp. 19–20.

11 Radko PYTLÍK, *Toulavé house...*, pp. 89–98.

12 Radko PYTLÍK, *Jaroslav Hašek: Data – fakta – dokumenty* (Praha: Emporius [Věra Dyková], 2013).

13 Ibidem, p. 20.

14 ""Z banky Slávie jsem vystoupil, poněvadž jsem chtěl procestovat Balkán." Ibidem, p. 21.

15 "Že mu Hašek naletěl, k tomu přispěl ovšem i národně sociální poslanec Václav Klofáč, který Klimeše ve svých vzpomínkách z cesty po Balkánu, uveřejňovaných ve Světlozoru, vylíčil opravdu

in the *Political and social history of the Party of Moderate Progress within the Bounds of the Law*. Klofáč visited Belgrade and Sofia in the spring of 1903, where he inquired into Austro–Hungarian political intrigues, and later came into contact with the rebels in the Blagoevgrad and Dupnica areas. On his return home, he published a series of articles drawing attention to the Ottoman oppression of the Slavs, and on 9 June he interpellated the Imperial Council on the matter of aid for the insurrection – unsuccessfully.[16]

However, in addition to Klofáč's writings, Klimeš's later reports should also be mentioned. As Radko Pytlík noted: "In a series of reports published in *Nová Omladina* in 1906, Klimeš reports on the fighting at Mount Garvan in 1902". The manuscript of the report was maintained by Hašek and later distributed in restaurants, together with a photograph of the Macedonian "hero".[17]

Did disillusionment follow the failure of Hašek's sincerely heroic endeavour, as Jiří Hájek claims? Or, more simply: was he duped by Klimeš? Judging from the narrator's account of the *Political and social history of the Party of Moderate Progress* and the figure of the pompous, boastful Klimeš, it is easy to imagine that the caricaturisation of the figure may have been motivated by the need to expose Klimeš. However, it is worth asking not only how much truth there is in Hašek's fiction, but also how much truth there might be in Klimeš's accounts and reports of his exploits. As Jiří Hájek writes in his monograph: "Hašek's narrative of how he and Klimeš rather fearfully had themselves captured and how the Turkish officer to whom they were taken did not take them seriously at all and had them sent back to the Bulgarian border, believing them to be young men gone astray – all this may be true, of course, and a literary stylisation to some extent, but it is undoubtedly a hundred times closer to the truth than Klimeš's grandiose account of his exploits at the Battle of Mount Garvan, published in the anarchist paper *Omladina*".[18]

---

jako hrdinu 's puškou v ruce bije se za lid macedonský'." Jiří HÁJEK, *Jaroslav Hašek* (Praha: Melantrich, 1983), p. 39.

16 Ctibor NEČAS, "Václav Klofáč a makedonská otázka," in in: Makedonsko-češka naučna konferencia (Skopje, 1998), ed. Mito MIOVSKI, pp. 111–120. also Radko PYTLÍK, *Jaroslav Hašek...*, p. 22.

17 "V reportážním seriálu, otištěném v Nové Omladině 1906, podává Klimeš zprávu o bojích na hoře Garvan z roku 1902." Ibidem, p. 20.

18 "Haškovo vyprávění o tom, jak se s Klimešem ze strachu raději dali zajmout a jak je turecký důstojík, k němuž byli předvedeni, vůbec nebral vážně a dal je jako poblázněné mladíky pouze dopravit zpět na bulharské hranice, může ovšem být v určité míře jen literární stylizací, ale je nepochybně stokrát blíž pravdě než Klimešovo velkohubné vyprávění o jeho hrdinských činech v bitvě u hory Garvan, které otiskl v anarchistické Omladině." Jiří HÁJEK, *Jaroslav Hašek...*, p. 39.

In this biographical context, it is interesting to read Hašek's travelogue of his Danube voyage, *Z Nikopole na Rusčuk* [From Nikopol to Ruse], which was published with the subtitle *Vzpomínky z cesty* [Memories of the Journey] on 14 October 1904. Zdeněk Hrbata, in his paper on Hašek's travel narratives, describes it as a travel report (*cestopisná reportáž*) because of its realistic tone.[19]

Radko Pytlík, in his biographical reconstruction of the year 1903, in his book *Toulavé house* [The Wandering Goose], writes further that Hašek, returning from his Macedonian adventure, must have travelled from Sofia to Čerkovica, just before the town of Nikopol, where the railway terminated. (Pytlík's assumption may be somewhat contradicted by the fact that the narrative also mentions the events leading up to the Danube voyage, the towns of Lom and Viddin, indicating that the narrator was on the steamer before he reached Čerkovica…) He continued by steamboat as far as Ruse, from where, according to Pytlík, Hašek took a train to Giurgiu on the Romanian side and continued his journey northwards through Transylvania, and perhaps across the Tisza river to Krakow.[20]

Zdeněk Hrbata draws attention to a typical literary device of Hašek's in the context of *From Nikopol to Ruse*, notably, the way in which Hašek intersperses descriptive passages with comic figures and anecdotal situations.[21] In the case of Schwarz, the Berlin insurance agent, the comic episode is based on a dramaturgy of misunderstandings, and the author includes his social criticism in the stereotype he uses – a Westerner in the Balkans.[22] Schwarz wants to learn Bulgarian out of interest, rather than for fun, but as his words make clear: "[…] in half an hour we will be in Nikopol, and I only know a few words of Bulgarian. How am I going to get locals to sign up for insurance for life and death?"[23]

In this tableau, Schwarz is a caricature and a critique of modern capitalism, of the Westerner whose colonial gaze sees the Balkans as a territory not conquered by the market, whose inbred culture is seen in dark colours, creating negative stereotypes: "We bid him a fond farewell, and I am convinced that as soon as Mr.

19 Zdeněk HRBATA, "Haškovy cestovní povídky," in *Fikce Jaroslava Haška*, ed. F. A. PODHAJSKÝ (Praha: Ústav pro českou literaturu Akademie věd České republiky, 2016), pp. 49–78, here p. 73.

20 Radko PYTLÍK, *Toulavé house*…, p. 95.

21 Zdeněk HRBATA, "Haškovy cestovní povídky," p. 73.

22 Božidar JEZERNIK, *Wild Europe: The Balkans in the gaze of western travellers* (London: Saqui and The Bosnian Institute, 2004)

23 "[…] za půl hodiny jsme v Nikopoli a já z bulharčiny znám jenom pár slov, jak jen budu pojišťovat lidi na život a na smrt?", Jaroslav HAŠEK, *Črty, povídky*…, p. 190.

Schwarz returns to his home in Berlin, he will talk among his acquaintances about how terrible it is there in Bulgaria, how many terrible adventures he has had, how they tried to trap him to get his life, and the like, which Germans repeat like parrots about the Balkans".[24]

The theme of misrepresentation and projection, as we colloquially call fiction, is not only present in Hrbata's work in relation to Schwarz's figure. In a later episode, the narrative traveller also meets a stranger, a foreigner, on board. By coincidence, Mr. W. had also come from Berlin and, as a war correspondent for a major daily newspaper, was supposedly visiting the Macedonian rebels. He brags about his exploits to his compatriots with his head bandaged, until a Bulgarian officer appears and the whole story comes to light, namely, that he was injured on the stairs of a restaurant after drinking too much raki. The Bulgarian officer says: "He drank too much raki and I happened to be there when he hit his head on the way to the hotel. And now, as he told me, he's taking a detour through Romania on his way home to make it look like he's been on the road for a long time. He has never been to Macedonia, of course".[25]

Pytlík's hypothesis regarding the return home via Romania could be seen as a biographical element, and the figure of the boastful war correspondent was most probably inspired by the real Klimeš. Both the narrator Schwarz and the boastful war correspondent point to a wider social problem, namely, that of the press, where fiction (misrepresentation and projection) has a completely different weight and value.

3. Bohemian Sympathies for the South Slavs

At one point at the Danube estuary of the river Jantra in *From Nikopol to Ruse*, the travelling narrator remarks: "The Jantra is a river to remember. During the Russo–

24 "Rozloučili jsme se srdečně, a jsem přesvědčen, že pan Schwarz, až se navrátí domů, do Berlína, v kruhu známých bude vypravovat, jak je to v té Bulharii strašně, kolik hrozných dobrodružství ho potkalo, jak mu strojili úklady o život a podobně, stále totéž, co Němci o Balkánu papouškují.", Ibidem, p. 192.

25 "Vypil víc rakije, náhodou byl jsem při tom, a potlouk se na hlavě, když šel do hotelu, nyní, jak se nám svěřil, jede oklikou přes Rumunsko domů, aby se zdálo, že byl dlouho na cestách. V Macedonii jaktěživ nebyl." Ibidem, p. 197.

Turkish War, much Slavic blood flowed down the Jantra into the Danube".[26] This is a reference to the 1877 war, specifically the Battle of Shipka Pass, north of which is where the Jantra originates, and near which the Russian troops advancing south were victorious.[27] The Macedonian uprising (in which Hašek may have taken part) mentioned in the narrative is set in the context of these historical events, which preceded the narrative by thirty years.

The Ilinden Uprising (whose name includes a reference to the Orthodox holiday of Elijah's Day), which took place in the summer and autumn of 1903, was an organised rebellion against Ottoman rule, mainly in the Vilayet of Manastir, but also in the southern part of present-day Bulgaria and the area around Edirne. After minor successes, the rebels declared a republic in the town of Kruševo on 12 August, led by Nikola Karev, and captured the town of Smilevo, but were forced to surrender ten days later due to being outnumbered. A series of uprisings spreading eastwards ended in similar failure, with the proclaimed state formations being similarly short-lived (such as the uprising around Edirne, the Preobrazhenie Uprising, the Strandzha Republic, and the Rodopi Uprising).[28] The Czech press did not remain indifferent to the events, and "stood unequivocally on the side of the insurgents, condemned the brutality of the Ottoman army, and called upon readers to send in financial contributions to support the Macedonian rebels. There were even a few Czech volunteers who went to join the insurgent forces (Jan Klimeš, [...])".[29]

In this context, it is necessary to interpret Hašek's lines from his travelogue *From Nikopol to Ruse*: "One is overcome by strange impressions. In the south of Bulgaria and in the Bulgarian-inhabited regions south of Bulgaria, the Turkish government burns villages and kills Bulgarians, while the West reads the news of the uprising with longing. Newspapers send correspondents to Macedonia, and what is

---

26 "Jantra jest památná řeka. Za rusko-turecké války teklo do Dunaje Jantrou mnoho krve slovanské." Ibidem, p. 196.

27 Alexander STATIEV, "The Thorns of the Wild Rose: Russian Ordeals at the Shipka Pass During the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878," *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 32 (2019), No. 3, pp. 367–387; also Alexander STATIEV, "A Hitch on the Path to Glory: The Breakthrough Across the Balkan Ridge During the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78," *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 32 (2019), No. 4, 507–525.

28 Michael PALAIRET, *Macedonia: A Voyage through History*, Vol. 2, *From the Fifteenth Century to the Present* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015) pp. 143–153; also Risto STEFOV, *Macedonian Struggle For Independence* (Toronto: Risto Stefov Publications, 2008), pp. 129–146.

29 Petr STEHLÍK, „Czech-Macedonian relations," in *Czech Relations with the Nations and Countries of Southern Europe*, ed. Ladislav HLADKÝ (Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2019), pp. 165–188, here pp. 172–173.

the result? The press release reads, 'New atrocities in Macedonia.' 'The Turks killed 150 people in the village of Z'".[30]

Jiří Hájek may have been right about Hašek's sincere determination to support the rebels, for such is the sense we get from the words of his narrator of *From Nikopol to Ruse*: not only solidarity with the subordinate, but also an understanding stemming from common Slavic roots that Westerners ('Germans') cannot understand.[31] Sympathy with the southern Slavic nations under Ottoman rule had strong nineteenth-century roots in public discourse in Czech culture, developing within the framework of the Habsburg state, reaching an awakening of the nation. Towards the end of the century, in 1875, Bohumil Havlasa, for example, published reports from the camps of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian rebels against the Ottoman regime, but he also used these inspirations in his fiction. At the turn of the century, Prokop Chocholoušek and, later, Josef Holeček appropriated the theme of the Montenegrins' struggle against the Ottomans and depicted it in romantic colours, while Vítězslav Hálek's work is set in the Serbian milieu. Eliška Krásnohorská, Svatopluk Čech, and Jaroslav Vrchlický similarly supported the struggle of the brotherly south Slavs.[32]

But the context of Hašek's oeuvre itself also needs to be looked at more closely, since Slavic solidarity is most often filtered through his experiences of wandering in the Slovak countryside: he depicted Magyarisation and the oppressive Hungarian system in several narratives.[33] In one humorous essay, he recalled the 1909 Zagreb treason trial against the Serbian Independence Party representatives, the political aim of which was to discredit the Croat–Serb coalition of the war – and in which, incidentally, T.G. Masaryk represented the defence (*Velezrádná aféra v Chorvatsku* [A Treasonous Affair in Croatia]).[34]

30 "Zvláštní dojmy se člověka zmocní. Na jihu Bulharie a na jih od Bulharie, v krajinách osídlených Bulhary, vláda turecká pálí jim vesnice, vraždí Bulhary a západ čte s dychtivostí zprávy o povstání, vysílají se zpravodajové novin do Macedonie a výsledek toho novinářská zpráva: 'Nové ukrutnosti v Macedonii.', 'Turci povraždili 150 osob ve vesnici Z.'" Jaroslav HAŠEK, *Črty, povídky*..., p. 198.

31 Jiří HÁJEK, *Jaroslav Hašek*..., p. 39.

32 František ŠÍSTEK, *Junáci, horalé a lenoši: Obraz Černé Hory a Černohorců v české společnosti 1830–2006*. (Praha: Historický ústav, 2011) also Ladislav Hladký (ed.), *Czech Relations with the Nations and Countries of Southern Europe*, (Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2019)

33 Hašek and his oeuvre's Hungarian relations, references to Hungary and the critique of Hungarianization analyses: László DOBOSSY, *Hašek világa* (Budapest: Európa, 1970).

34 Jaroslav HAŠEK, *Dobrý voják Švejk před válkou a jiné podivné historky* (Praha: Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury, hudby a umění, 1957), pp. 216–221.

But let us stick to the Balkan and South Slavic connections. As for Hašek's wanderings, we are not aware of his presence in the Balkans in later years. Although he visited Slavonia and the Prekmurje region in the summer of 1905, this trip cannot be counted as Balkan, since he never set foot outside the Austro–Hungarian Empire. Some memoirs, however, mention Kosovo and Bosnia as Hašek's destinations, although there is no solid evidence to support such a Balkan adventure. A short note from Hašek himself, signed jointly with his travelling companion Viktor Janota on 20 September 1902, from Banská Štiavnica, has survived, which reads as follows: "Dear Mother, I greet you from Banská Štiavnica. We are on our way home. I will arrive in Brodské on September 27. And if the money is not there, we will walk to Bosnia and Herzegovina, and then south to Greece and Turkey".[35] However, it is doubtful that his joking threat regarding pocket money to be sent to the Hungarian–Austrian (now Slovak–Czech) border settlement had been carried out.

Bosnia and Herzegovina, however, appears several times in Hašek's works, and a contextual reading of these narratives and humorous sketches makes it clear that Hašek was indeed troubled by the oppression of the southern Slavic nations: in the case of Bosnia, however, it is not the Ottoman but the Austro–Hungarian Empire that is oppressing, as in the case of the countries of the Czech crown.

4. The Imperial and Royal Land of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Hašek's Writings

Under the terms of the Berlin Agreement of 1878, which ended the Russo–Turkish war and redefined relations in the Balkans, the Austro–Hungarian Empire occupied Bosnia and Herzegovina, which had been part of the Ottoman Empire, together with the Sandžak, and this in the face of local resistance and uprisings. The operation was portrayed in the mainstream press of the time as a heroic struggle, and the occupation as a civilising mission: the new power would establish a "European" administration, develop infrastructure, build railways and bridges, introduce a civil school system, and support scientific exploration of the land. The external and internal antagonisms lurking beneath the veneer and exterior were strained to

35 "Milá matičko! Pozdrav ze Štiavnice! Vracíme se domů. Do Brodského přijdem 27. 9. a když tam nebudou peníze, půjdeme pěšky do Bosny a Hercegoviny, potom na jih do Řecka a Turecka!", Radko PYTLÍK, *Jaroslav Hašek*..., p. 15.

the breaking point during the annexation crisis of 1908, which finally came with the rifle shot of seven bullets in Sarajevo, as Hašek mentioned,[36] so the assassination fired in Sarajevo in 1914.

For Hašek, the great satirist of Austro–Hungarian relations, who delighted in making a fool of the stupidity of the authorities' regulations, the topic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, distant yet familiar, was an opportunity almost too good to be true. Bosnia and Herzegovina is mentioned in the opening passages of perhaps the most iconic place in twentieth-century Central European literature and most translated Czech fiction text, *The Good Soldier Švejk and His Fortunes in the World War*. After the assassination attempt on the Crown Prince is reported by Mrs Milerová, a.k.a. Mrs Müller, Švejk says the following:

"'Jesus Maria!' exclaimed Švejk. 'What a grand job! And where did it happen to His Imperial Highness?'

'They bumped him off at Sarajevo, sir […]'

'That's in Bosnia, Mrs Müller. I expect the Turks did it. You know, we never ought to have taken Bosnia and Herzegovina from them. And so you see, Mrs Müller. His Imperial Highness now rests with the angels'".[37]

One episode later, Švejk explains the same view in the pub U Kalicha (At the Chalice) to Bretschneider, the plainclothes secret policeman who arrests him for treason, similarly to the phlegmatic bartender Palivec, who said nothing but that he served in Bosnia (i.e. during the occupation that began in 1878).

In one place, Radko Pytlík explores Hašek's anti-militarism in *Švejk* and, in relation to the context of his oeuvre, notes that the anti-militarist theme is already frequent in his early satirical narratives. "They depict the military nature of Austrian international politics, the invasion of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the so-called sovereignty or treason trials, the parody of military bureaucracy, and the satirical persiflage of veteran nostalgia".[38] Pytlík quotes here, among other things, from the *Oslí historie z Bosny* [Bosnian Donkey Story], which we should examine more

36 "Seven pips like at Sarajevo." Jaroslav HAŠEK, *The Good Solider Švejk and His Fortunes in The World War. In a new and unabridged translation form Czech by Cecil PARROTT, with the original illustrations by Josef Lada* (London: William Heinemann in association with Penguin Books, 1974), p. 17.

37 Ibidem, p. 4.

38 "Líčí se v nich vojenský charakter rakouské mezinárodní politiky, zábor Bosny a Hercegoviny, příprava tzv. velezradných procesů, parodie na vojenský byrokratismus a satirická persifláž veteránské nostalgie." Radko PYTLÍK, *Kniha o Švejkovi* (Praha: Československý spisovatel, 1983), p. 131.

closely and which deals with a Bosnian theme.[39] All in all, this also shows that *Švejk* can really be understood from the perspective of these early writings.

5. The Annexation Crisis, or What Must Not be Talked About

As in Švejk, the military bureaucracy of the Imperial and Royal army of the Austro–Hungarian Empire appears in the satirical narrative *Bosnian Donkey Story*, set in an Austrian garrison on the Serbian border. Crna Bara is a fictitious place, but its meaning speaks volumes about Hašek's linguistic competence, alongside the other South Slavic terms used in the text: it could be translated as Black March or Black Bog into English. The carnivalesque grotesqueness of border situations and the wild anomaly of power represented by bureaucracy are also present here, as in the case of the short stories *Řádný učitel* [A Proper Teacher], *Jak se stal Jura Ogárko Maďarem* [How Jura Ogárko Became Hungarian], *Zpověď z Maďárie* [A Confession from Magyaria]. In this short story, animal motifs play a leading role: after the donkey and the rooster guarding the border, the accused in the treason case is a goat. The goat is the property of Branko Nušić, a character whose name may have been inspired by the celebrated Serbian writer of the turn of the century, whose satirical social dramas and other works were beginning to be translated into Czech at this time.

The goat that flees to Serbia, however, does not only bring trouble to Nušić, but also triggers a chain of arrests for high treason. One of Hašek's characteristic and favourite motifs is the depiction of absurd situations of paranoid power haunting the individual.

The narrative, which caricatures Habsburg power in Bosnia, is in many respects similar to the events described above in the pub "To the Chalice". There, too, accusations of treason are made, and there, too, things are said "o čem se nesmí mluvit" ["that should not be spoken of"], as explained to the Frenchman in the *Bosnian Donkey Story*.

The short story, published in the 27 October 1908 issue of *České slovo*, must be read in the context of the times: the so-called annexation crisis broke out at the beginning of October 1908, when, taking advantage of the changes in the power situation, the Young Turk revolution, and the declaration of independence in Bulgaria, the Austro–Hungarian Empire annexed occupied Bosnia and Herzegovina

39 Jaroslav HAŠEK, *Dobrý voják*..., pp. 27–33.

on 6 October, without consulting with other powers. This strained relations not only between the Austro–Hungarian Empire and Turkey (which were later resolved by the cession of the Novipazar province to Turkey), but especially between the Austro–Hungarian Empire and the Kingdom of Serbia. Relations had already been strained earlier, after the accession of the Karađorđević dynasty (1903) and the Customs War (1906) – the Austro–Hungarian Empire hoped that its customs policy against Serbia would succeed in setting back the young kingdom's economy, but this remained a mere wish.[40] It is to the customs war, by the way, that the short story's punning reference to the goat on the Serbian side refers: "[...] the Bosnian government prohibits and severely punishes the import of live animals from Serbia".[41]

The annexation of Bosnia and the change in its legal status as a state caused a great trauma for the ideology of Greater Serbian power, whose political goal was to unite all Serbs (including those from Bosnia and Herzegovina) in one state. Despite the considerable tension, official Serbian policy, at least in appearance, kept its cool.

Due to the tense situation on the Serbian and Montenegrin borders, on 22 October, garrisons were reinforced against "gangs" entering the country, and the export of military goods and ammunition, as well as of horses and four-legged carriers, was banned. Public institutions, above all the gendarmerie and the customs and finance police, were called upon to assist the offices of the armed forces. Hašek's short story, placed in its contemporary context, can be read as a farce of power at play with the individual, as an expression of the paranoid zeal of the authorities. The animal motifs serve the traditional means of the principle of humorous degradation: something becomes comical through the trivialisation of the situation. In any case, the chewing up of the larch tree planted to commemorate the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina – carried out by the donkey of the garrison – was regarded as an open provocation in this tense situation, and obviously a Serbian provocation at that!

Incidentally, Hašek ridiculed the post-annexation provisions in his humorous essay published in *Lid* on 17 December, entitled *Events in Bosnia and Herzegovina* (*K bosensko-hercegovským událostem*).[42] A few months later, in March, the

40 Gyula Károly GYULA, "Az annexiós válság és az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia balkáni politikája," *Acta Historica 20* (1965) (Szeged: Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae).

41 "[...] bosenská vláda zakazuje a přísně trestá přechod živých zvířat ze Srbska." Jaroslav HAŠEK, *Dobrý voják...,* p. 30.

42 Ibidem, pp. 131–133.

stand-off with Serbia led to a state of military readiness. It is not by chance that many historians consider the annexation crisis to be a direct precursor to the First World War.

The Czech public, moreover, was critical of the annexation: "Most Czech politicians condemned the manner in which the annexation of Bosnia was carried out – it took place without the approval of the other great powers…".[43] T. G. Masaryk, along with Czech liberal, Slavic-oriented politicians had long criticised the Austro–Hungarian Empire's policy on Bosnia, which emphasised the absolutist policies of the land's administration: "the Austro-Hungarian finance minister Benjamin Kállay, who on the one hand supported the economic growth of underdeveloped Bosnia and Herzegovina, yet on the other hand, for practical reasons, fought to counter the increasing Serbian and Croatian national activities there."[44]

6. The Emperor's Visit

It is worth reading other instances of the Bosnian theme in Hašek's works placed in the context of the times. The complications of "high treason", a typical theme for Hašek – and thus the harassment of the local population by the authorities and paranoid power – unfold in his short story *Výzkumná cesta* [The Scout Trip], which appeared in the 20 June 1910 issue of *Karikatury*.[45]

This short story is also in many ways reminiscent of Švejk and the Bretschneider episode in the scene at the pub "To the Chalice". Here, too, the scene is set in a pub, though this time not in Prague but in Bosnia, in the fictitious town of Šibak on the Bosanski Brod–Mostar railway line. As in the case of Bretschneider, the undercover policeman is a local, Vojović, who dresses in folk costume to investigate the views of the town's opposition mayor, the Serb Božetić. He tries to get the mayor drunk and accuse him of some misconduct or disloyalty, putting phrases in his mouth ("víš, máme bratry v Srbsku" ["...you know, we have brothers in Serbia..."]), but as it turns out, he has nothing to accuse him of: Božetić has no brothers in Serbia and feels no reciprocity with the country. "'Vojovic was silent for a moment. "But they say we in Bosnia and Herzegovina are supposedly one body,

43 Ladislav HLADKÝ – Adin LJUCA, "Czech–Bosnian relations," in Ladislav HLADKÝ (ed.), *Czech Relations with the Nations and Countries of Southern Europe* (Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2019), pp. 83–108, here: 95.

44 Ibidem, pp. 94–95.

45 Jaroslav HAŠEK, *Črty, povídky*…, pp. 403–404.

one soul, one language with the Serbs." "What do you mean one language," says Božetić, "Serbs don't say *čo, ča*, but *što, šta*, and instead of *d*, they say *dž*. You're a fool. Our brothers and sisters are Swabians. They built the railway; they introduced goat breeding'".[46]

Vojović failed to catch Božetić, who spouted propagandistic phrases about the Austro–Hungarian Empire's civilising activities in Bosnia and was eventually dismissed from his post in the secret police. I will not discuss Hašek's competence in South Slavic languages, traces of which can be found in the aforementioned *Bosnian Donkey Story* as well as in his Slavonic and Prekmurje stories. It should be noted, however, that the passage quoted above is of interest from the point of view of contemporary language policy (rather than of dialectology), which was determined by Béni Kállay's idea of a policy of isolating Bosnia from neighbouring Croats and Serbs. As a result, the use of a codified 'Bosnian language' (*bosanski jezik*) was promoted in schools and offices during the years of occupation.[47]

The humorous short story in question, as is clear from its opening, takes its plot from the preparations for the visit of Emperor Franz Joseph to Sarajevo and Mostar, which took place almost three weeks before the text was published. The elderly monarch visited the occupied provinces for the first time between 30 May and 4 June 1910. The event attracted a great deal of media attention, and the trip was accompanied by the propaganda of the day, with festive expectations, lavish receptions, welcoming speeches, and eulogistic poems. Prior to the trip – and this is where Hašek draws his inspiration – serious security measures were taken. Suspicious characters and anarchists were arrested and detained. The presence of the secret police was reinforced, and masses of police were deployed to Bosnia from Vienna, Pest, Prague, and Trieste.[48]

Šibak, the scene of Hašek's caricature, is a fictional village, but it is based on reality: the emperor stopped in several major towns on the railway line on his way to Sarajevo and Mostar (in Bosanski Brod, Doboj, Zavidovići, Zenica, Visoko, as

46 "Vojović na chvíli umlkl. 'Ale, prý říkají, že my u nás Hercegovině i Bosně jedno tělo a duše, jedna řeč se Srbjáky.' Jakápak jedna řeč,' odpovídá Božetić. 'Srbijáci neříkají čo, ča, ale šta nebo što a pak mají *dž* místo *d*. Ty jsi hlupák. Našimi bratry jsou Švábi. Vystavěli nám železnice, zavedli sem kozy.'" Ibidem.

47 Anida SOKOL, "The Austro-Hungarian Language Policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina," In *Empires and Nations from the Eighteenth to the Twentieth Century*, Vol 1, ed. Antonello BIAGINI – Giovanna MOTTA (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016).

48 Zijad ŠEHIĆ, *U mojoj Bosni: Povodom stogodišnjice posjete cara Franje Josipa i Bosni i Hercegovini od 30. maja do 4. juna 1910* (Sarajevo: Dobra knjiga, 2013), p. 28.

well as Konjic and Jablanica). Securing the emperor's visit to the troubled province was not without problems, and the authorities had been informed of a threat of assassination, so precautions were above average, as Hašek's short story shows.

7. The Border Situation in the Balkans

Hašek's interest in the Balkans can be traced through political parodies and humorous sketches from the early 1910s. In his witty reflections on the political events of these war years, he reacts to the Italian–Turkish war, the first and second Balkan wars, and the Albanian crisis. The most interesting of these, however, is the short story *Srbský pop Bogumirov a koza od muftiho Isrima* [The Serbian Priest Bogumirov and the Goat of Mufti Isrim]. It does not seem to be linked to contemporary political events, as the Upper and Lower Karadžinac in the story are fictional places. The story was first published in the left-wing daily *Právo lidu* in the supplement *Dělnická besídka* [The Conversing Worker] in 1912.

It is true that Upper and Lower Karadžinac could be located anywhere on the Turkish–Serbian border. So this is the border between Serbia and... which region? Perhaps the border with Sandžak, which was occupied by the Austro–Hungarian Empire and then, after the annexation crisis, returned to Turkey, or with Kosovo, or with the Macedonian lands. Or even the Muslim–Orthodox conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina could be an inspiration. The Serbian–Turkish border, however, changed precisely as a result of the first Balkan war in 1912. During the war, Serbia occupied the Ottoman territories just mentioned, almost doubling its territory.

Neither the Pope nor the Mufti is portrayed by Hašek as a more sympathetic or virtuous character. After the start of the conversation, which comes from both sides of the border (river) and which is mutually mocking, abusive, and scolding, they light a pipe and chat amicably about goat herding. The plot essentially ends with Bogumirov's victory: he lures his goat from Mufti Isrim and baptises it in the mountain spring at the conclusion of the story. The last sentence is triumphal: "This goat could in no way remain a Muslim!" ("Ta koza nesměla zůstat musulmanská!").[49]

Once again, the narrative is driven by an animal factor, which, as so often in Hašek's work, is based on typification – namely, the stereotype of sectarian opposi-

49 Jaroslav HAŠEK, *Črty, povídky*..., p. 514.

tion. The whole Balkan situation is manifested in an allegory of incomprehension despite linguistic identity, of disagreement because of sectarian differences. This makes the message of the short story, regardless of the historical context – if I may use big words – eternal. And if it is eternal, it can be updated again and again for the present. For example, it is difficult for today's reader to read about the short story's border situation without thinking of the internal division of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In conclusion, a comprehensive evaluation of Jaroslav Hašek's interactions with the Balkan region raises intriguing, albeit unresolved, biographical questions. The current research leaves us uncertain about whether Hašek ever set foot in what we today define as the Balkans. Evidence leans toward the possibility of his presence in both Bulgarian and potentially Macedonian territories, yet his involvement in the Ilinden uprising remains speculative and unsubstantiated. Notably, his travelogue – perhaps the closest we have to a genuine travel narrative within his body of work – hints at participation in a Danube cruise yet offers scant confirmation beyond that. As for Bosnia-Herzegovina, despite its occasional and ambiguous appearances in Hašek's references and memoirs, concrete evidence of his presence there is absent. The nature and extent of his Balkan connections thus continue to be enshrouded in mystery, inviting further scholarly exploration.

Jaroslav Hašek's humorous essays, sketches, and short stories set in Bosnia and Herzegovina are best appreciated within the genre of political satire, reflecting the socio-political climate of his era. These works suggest that Bosnia served as a canvas for Hašek to artistically critique and lampoon the monarchy's regime, using humour and irony to expose its flaws. Rather than being drawn from personal experiences, his depictions likely rely heavily on contemporary media accounts, offering a satirical commentary on the absurdity and paranoia inherent in imperialist power structures. The characters populating his narratives – such as the ludicrous and trivial officials, soldiers, and policemen – embody the ridiculous nature of the imperial regime. In the geographically remote and politically occupied Bosnian province, Hašek masterfully highlights the absurdities and senseless paranoia of the imperialist forces, leaving a lasting imprint of political satire rich with wit and critical examination.

SUMMARY

This study investigates the Balkan dimensions of Jaroslav Hašek's biography and literary works. Due to a paucity of biographical information, the research primarily relies on Hašek's own writings and the accounts of contemporary memoirists to explore the possibility of his travels to the Balkans. Given the fictional nature of Hašek's texts and his penchant for mystification, definitive conclusions remain elusive. However, it is most probable that he visited Bulgaria and participated in a Danube cruise. While the evidence regarding his possible visit to Bosnia is inconclusive, several works in his corpus do pertain to Bosnia-Herzegovina. The analysis contextualises these narratives – ranging from short stories to humorous sketches – within the political climate of his era, highlighting how they reflect contemporary issues such as the annexation of Bosnia and the visit of Franz Joseph, while also illustrating the paranoia of the Monarchy as perceived by the common populace.

DOKUMENTY A MATERIÁLY / DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS

The Last Phase of Czechoslovakia's Independence in 1938: Latvian Diplomatic Documents about the Polish Factor

ĒRIKS JĖKABSONS – LUBOŠ ŠVEC

Faculty of Humanities, University of Latvia, Latvia / Faculty of Political Science and Journalism, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin, Poland – Institute of International Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

The Last Phase of Czechoslovakia's Independence in 1938: Latvian Diplomatic Documents about the Polish Factor
The documents presented contain conversations between Latvian diplomats and Polish representatives, the Czechoslovak envoy Jaroslav Slávik, and various diplomats in Warsaw during the intensification of Nazi Germany's hostile campaign against Czechoslovakia in 1938. The documents come from the Latvian State Historical Archives and the Hoover Institution Archives at Stanford. Five reports from the Latvian legation in Warsaw, sent to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Latvia in Riga between the beginning of May and the end of October 1938, provide insight into the Polish position towards Czechoslovakia and its territorial claims. The final report, covering a conversation with Foreign Minister Józef Beck from the end of October, includes, among other things, an expression of support for the Polish action by the Latvian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Vilhelms Munters.

The sixth document contains a report by the Latvian envoy Mārtiņš Nukša, accredited to Prague, concerning conversations with Czechoslovak diplomats and the Soviet envoy Sergei Alexandrovsky on the state of Czechoslovak–Polish relations and the issue of Transcarpathian Ukraine at the beginning of December 1938.

Key words: Latvian diplomacy; reports of Latvian diplomats from Warsaw and Prague, 1938; Polish policy towards Czechoslovakia; Munich Crisis 1938.

Latvia was one of the nation-states (border states) created after the First World War in the former western borderlands of the tsarist empire. Since the early 1920s, Latvian foreign policy in the region had been based on efforts to create a regional military–political union that would provide security guarantees to participating states and help stabilise the region.[1] Of the two proposed variants—narrower, with Estonia and Lithuania, and broader, with Poland, Estonia, and Finland—only a partial, largely ineffective bilateral military alliance with Estonia materialised. Efforts to create a broader regional alliance failed due to various factors, primarily the interest of the Soviet Union and Germany in preventing regional stabilisation. Both powers skilfully exploited mutual disagreements and rivalries among the Baltic states to hinder the strengthening of their security and independence through a regional pact, bilateral relations, the search for guarantees from the great powers, and a waning hope for collective security within the League of Nations in the late 1930s also failed to produce improved security outcomes. As a result, the concept of neutrality prevailed in Latvian diplomatic decision-making, as a strategy by which Latvia and the other Baltic states, as well as the Nordic states, sought to avoid being drawn into war.

Only in 1934 was the Baltic Entente formed by aligning Lithuania with Estonia and Latvia. The Baltic Entente was created as a consultative diplomatic alliance. Despite regular meetings of foreign ministers, this alliance never advanced to the stage of military cooperation.[2] By the end of the 1930s, the situation in Europe—and consequently in the Baltic Sea region—was becoming increasingly

1 Marko LEHTI, *A Baltic League a Construct of the New Europe* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang 1999), pp. 521–525.

2 Inesis FELDMANIS – Aivars STRANGA, *The Destiny of the Baltic Entente 1934–1940* (Riga: Latvian Institute of International Affairs 1994), pp. 84–93.

tense, and the Latvian government monitored the development of Czechoslovak–German and Czechoslovak–Polish relations with growing concern. Like other governments, it hoped for a peaceful resolution of disputes.

Czechoslovak–Polish relations in the interwar period were certainly difficult to describe as good neighbourly relations.[3] These relations deteriorated after the establishment of the authoritarian regime of Marshal Józef Piłsudski, and especially following the appointment of his close associate, Colonel Józef Beck, as Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1932. Czechoslovakia was among the four key points in Beck's review of Polish foreign relations, which he considered priority issues requiring resolution.[4]

Relations with Czechoslovakia had been deteriorating since the mid-1930s, when the non-aggression declaration of January 1934 stabilised Polish-German relations. The normalisation of German-Polish relations allowed Polish foreign policy to focus its attention and power ambitions in another direction. Polish ruling circles and the press instrumentalised the question of the Polish minority in the Czechoslovak part of Těšínsko (Těšín Silesia/Cieszyn Silesia/Teschen Silesia), divided in July 1920 as a result of the arbitration of the Committee of Ambassadors of the Treaty. The two states, with different foreign policy and security priorities, were unable to agree mutually to oppose German revisionism or the threat posed by the Soviet Union. In 1938, as the Nazis escalated tensions between Germany and Czechoslovakia over the Sudetenland, Polish diplomacy de facto joined the anti-Czechoslovak campaign with the goals of annexing Czech Těšínsko (Záolší) to Poland, achieving a common border with Hungary at Czechoslovakia's expense, and eliminating Soviet influence on European development.

By contrast, Latvian-Polish interwar relations had a different character. Since 1919, Poland, as the strongest of the countries in the region promoting the independence of Latvia, had been Latvia's cooperation partner in the political, military, and also economic spheres. In 1920, Poland provided very important military assistance to Latvia during the liberation of the territory from the Red Army. Moreover, the two countries were connected by a 104-kilometre- long common border. It is true that the mentioned relationship can be called a "cautious friendship", especially on the part of Latvia, which never completely overcame its suspicion regarding the goals and power intentions of Poland's foreign policy to-

3 Jiří FRIEDL et al., *Dějiny Polska* (Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny 2016), pp. 605–607.
4 Piotr ŁOSSOWSKI, red., *Historia dyplomacji polskiej*, IV (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN 1995, p. 442.

wards neighbouring countries.[5] However, Latvian-Polish relations were very intense, and the legations were constantly active in both capitals, with both countries regularly reporting on the development of foreign and internal politics.

Relations between Latvia and Czechoslovakia were relatively good, although not nearly as intense as in the case of Poland. Trade exchange culminated in the second half of the 1920s. For Czechoslovak diplomacy, Riga was primarily a centre for monitoring Russia and its western neighbours and, at the same time, a centre for Czechoslovak political and economic interests in the Baltics.[6]

Czechoslovak-Latvian relations were at first marked by the initially restrained attitude of the Czechoslovak political representation. The establishment of diplomatic relations and de jure recognition of Latvia and the other Baltic states were inextricably linked to the resolution of the Russian question after the civil war.[7]

In addition, the order issued by the Czechoslovak Ministry of Defence on 18th August 1919 in Prague to appoint legionary lieutenant Václav Plocek as the head of the repatriation centre for Czech and Slovak soldiers in Riga should be considered the first official contact between the two states. A few weeks later, he also arrived in the capital of Latvia and, on 26th September, he asked the Latvian government for help with the repatriation of Czechoslovak citizens (prisoners of war, etc.) who had arrived in Latvia from Russia to return to their homeland. In 1919–1920, he headed the repatriation office and represented Czechoslovak interests. However, Plocek worked in Riga for only a short time.

At its meeting on 16th March 1921, however, the Czechoslovak government preferred the legionnaire Josef Košek to take over the consular office.[8] Only vice-consuls were sent as representatives to neighbouring Estonia and Lithuania. The establishment of the consulate testified to the importance of Riga for Czechoslovakia's primary economic plans. After initial hesitation, the Czechoslovak government approved the de jure recognition of Latvia and the other Baltic states

5 Ēriks JĒKABSONS, *Piesardzīgā draudzība: Latvijas un Polijas attiecības 1919. un 1920. gadā (*Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 2007); Rihards TREIS, *Latvijas diplomātija un diplomāti* (Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 2003), pp. 207–217.

6 Luboš ŠVEC, *Československo a pobaltské státy 1918–1939* (Praha: Nakladatelství Karolinum, 2001).

7 Luboš ŠVEC, "Ruská otázka a problém uznání nezávislosti pobaltských států v československé zahraniční politice v letech 1918–1921," *Český časopis historický / Czech Historical Review* 94 (1996), pp. 303–338.

8 Karel KONEČNÝ, "Úloha Josefa Koška v počátcích československo-lotyšských vztahů," *Slovanský přehled / Slavonic Review* 78 (1992), No 2, pp. 354–366.

at its final meeting on 29th December 1921. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs sent the note of recognition to all the Baltic states at the beginning of 1922.[9]

In April 1921, Wilhelm Schreiner, the Latvian envoy to Berlin, arrived in Czechoslovakia as a diplomatic representative with special tasks of the mission.

At the same time, another Latvian representative began his activities there. As early as October 1920, the Latvian engineer Eduards Krasts performed the duties of career consul in Prague (consul general 1927–1930).[10] Then, from 1923 to 1930, the consulate (from 1927 the consulate general) was subordinated to the Latvian legation in Warsaw, which was headed by Mārtiņš Nukša during the 1920s. From August 1930, a residential Latvian legation was established in the capital of Czechoslovakia. It was first headed by the envoy Kārlis Ducmanis, but from August 1933 to March 1939 (officially) by the aforementioned Mārtiņš Nukša, who was also accredited in Yugoslavia and Romania in addition to Czechoslovakia.[11]

Josef Košek worked in Riga between 1921 and 1928. In 1927, the Czechoslovak legation in Latvia was established by the transformation of the consulate. The legation was headed by Václav Girsa until 1935, although the envoy's residence was in Warsaw and, in addition to Poland, he was also accredited in Latvia, Estonia, and Finland. The consulate, transformed into a legation in 1927, was administered by Josef Košek as chargé d'affaires until the summer of 1928, when he was replaced by Čeněk Vrabec (1928–1932), and then as chargé d'affaires and, from 1935, envoy Jaroslav Lípa (1932–1938). In the summer of 1938, he was replaced by Pavel Baráček-Jacquier, who managed the office until the demise of Czechoslovakia.[12]

Czechoslovak diplomacy, in connection with the establishment of the Baltic Entente in September 1934 and negotiations concerning a regional collective security pact, increased its interest in Latvia, which it expressed by establishing a legation with a residential envoy for Latvia and Estonia permanently based in Riga. The last Czechoslovak diplomat, Pavel Baráček-Jacquier, assumed the office in the Latvian capital for less than a year from the summer of 1938; his reports provide

9 Luboš ŠVEC, "Česko-lotyšské kontakty během první světové války a navázání diplomatických vztahů," in *Zkušenosti a vztahy. Lotyšská a česká společnost ve 20. století*, ed. Pavel ŠTOLL (Praha: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy 2013), pp. 19–39.

10 Luboš ŠVEC, "Eduard Krasts: zapomenutý muž v soukolí politiky," *Oriens Aliter* 1 (2021), pp. 11–35.

11 Ēriks JĒKABSONS – Valters ŠČERBINSKIS, *Latvijas ārlietu dienesta darbinieki* (Rīga: Zinātne 2003).

12 Biographies of Czechoslovak diplomats in Jindřich DEJMEK, *Diplomacie Československa, Díl II. Biografický slovník československých diplomatů (1918–1992)*(Praha: Academia 2013).

remarkable testimony about the perception of the Czechoslovak crisis by leading Latvian politicians, publicists, and the public, as well as the influence of the fatal changes in European politics on Latvian diplomacy.[13]

With the culmination of the crisis in Central Europe in 1938, Latvia, like other smaller countries in the region, declared its absolute neutrality. Amid the escalation of conflicts, and in the absence of any international alliance guaranteeing national security in the event of an armed conflict, neutrality represented for them, in fact, a way out of the existing circumstances.[14]

The Anschluss of Austria and the Polish ultimatum to Lithuania demanding the establishment of diplomatic relations in March 1938, as well as the subsequent crises in relations between Czechoslovakia and Germany, and also between Czechoslovakia and Poland, caused deep concern in Latvia. The Baltic states, located in the space between Germany, the Soviet Union, and Poland, could become a battleground and therefore tried to avoid being drawn into any armed conflict. Latvian diplomats closely followed the positions of actors and relevant great powers. Latvia was in a difficult situation and, like the Nordic states, the great powers were retreating from the principles of mandatory aid to any attacked member of the League of Nations.[15]

At the same time, Latvian Minister of Foreign Affairs Vilhelm Munters was a member of the Council of the League of Nations during this critical period, 1936–1938, and presided over the tenth meeting of the League of Nations in Geneva in May 1938.[16]

The reports of Latvian diplomatic representatives from Prague and Warsaw in the summer and autumn months of 1938 can be considered relatively neutral. Published documents from the Latvian National Archives and the Hoover Institution Archives at Stanford University in the United States contain reports from Latvian diplomats from Warsaw and Prague from May, late August, September, October, and December 1938, when the Munich crisis and events so fatal for the continued existence of Czechoslovakia culminated.

---

13 Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia, 1918–1939, PZ (Political reports) – Riga 1938, 1939.

14 Inesis FELDMANIS – Aivars STRANGA – Jānis TAURĖNS – Antonijs ZUNDA, *Latvijas ārpolitika un diplomātija 20. gadsimtā*, 1. sējums (Rīga: Jumava 2016), pp. 416-419.

15 Ibidem, pp. 352–353.

16 Ibidem, pp. 413–416; more on Munter's opinions Inesis FELDMANIS – Aivars STRANGA – Martiņš VIRSIS, *Latvijas ārpolitika un starptautiskais stāvoklis* (Rīga: Latvijas Ārpolitikas institūts 1993), pp. 157–162.

They capture the attitudes of Warsaw and Polish participation in the breakup of Czechoslovakia. These documents reflect the views of Polish statesmen and other foreign representatives, including the Czechoslovak envoy to Poland, Juraj Slávik, on developments and the general mood in Warsaw.[17] The December report, on the other hand, reflects the vision of the Latvian envoy to Czechoslovakia, Mārtiņš Nukša, regarding the situation in Prague, based on his personal meetings with Ivan Krno, Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia, and other foreign representatives in the Czechoslovak capital.

Editorial

Published excerpts from secret reports of Latvian diplomatic service employees to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Riga, from the legations in Prague and Warsaw, held in the Latvian State Historical Archive's Representations Abroad Collection and the Latvian Legation in Stockholm Collection at the Hoover Institution Archives, have been selected and prepared for publication. The publication preserves the style of the authors of the reports as much as possible, providing necessary explanations and comments. Omissions in the text have been made in cases where the content contained no relevant information, in which case square brackets with polynomials have been used.

Document No. 1

Report of Latvian Envoy, Miķelis Valters,[18] to Latvian Acting Foreign Minister, Alfrēds Bērziņš,[19] on the 5th May 1938 conversation with Czechoslovak Envoy, Juraj Slávik,[20] in Warsaw

Today, I had a longer conversation with Czechoslovak Envoy Dr Slávik, during which I tried to clarify several issues of interest to our Ministry of Foreign Affairs

17 Detailed assessment of Juraj Slávik's activities in Warsaw in the role of the envoy in the context of Czechoslovak-Polish relations in Jindřich DEJMEK, "Československý vyslanec v Polsku," in: Slavomír MICHÁLEK et al., *Juraj Slávik Neresnický* (Bratislava: Prodama 2006), pp. 176–200.

18 Miķelis Valters (1874–1968) – Latvian politician, diplomat, 1934–1937 Envoy to Poland.

19 Alfrēds Bērziņš (1899–1977) – Latvian politician, 1934–1937 Minister of the Interior, 1937–1940 Minister of Public Affairs.

20 Juraj Slávik (1890–1955) – Czechoslovak diplomat, 1936–1939 Envoy to Poland.

and for which relevant requests had been received. In yesterday's conversation between the Czechoslovak envoy and Minister Beck,[21] which had lasted more than an hour, relations between Poland and Czechoslovakia were discussed.[22] Dr Slávik informed Beck of the intentions of various Czechoslovak authorities to intensify economic relations between the two countries. For the first time, the Poznań International Fair had witnessed large-scale participation by Czechoslovakia; representatives of business institutions, the chamber of commerce, and other members of society had taken part in the opening ceremony. This had been the first step in the new direction. The Czechoslovak guests had travelled from Poznań to Gdynia, where they received a friendly welcome. In Poznań, Dr Slávik had met with the Polish Minister of Industry and Trade, Roman,[23] and they had discussed the further development of economic relations between the two countries. Slávik had told Beck that larger business delegations would arrive in Poland in mid-June. Beck had reacted very favourably to Slávik's announcement. Further, Slávik had informed Beck that Czechoslovakia would henceforth be more attentive to Polish cultural interests and would seek to improve strained relations. Beck had replied that he was pleased to hear such a clear position on the Polish minority for the first time. Their conversation also covered Beck's interview with Ward Price,[24] in which Beck allegedly mentioned that 250,000 Poles were living in Czechoslovakia. Slávik had pointed out that the figure was exaggerated, to which Beck had responded that he had not given any numbers to Ward Price but had only spoken of the principle itself. In addition, Slávik had told Beck that Czechoslovakia was willing to allow Polish air traffic to Budapest and Vienna to cross Czechoslovak territory, and, for its part, proposed to establish an air route from Czechoslovakia – Brno or Moravská Ostrava – across Poland to Riga. For years there had been attempts to establish air traffic from Warsaw across Czechoslovakia, but these had failed. Newspapers have just reported that Hungary had agreed with Czechoslovakia to establish air traffic between Budapest and Prague. Dr Slávik added that this air traffic would be linked

21 Józef Beck (1894–1944) – Polish military officer, statesman, 1932–1939 Minister of Foreign Affairs.

22 J. Slávik reported immediately by telegraph about his meeting with J. Bek on May 4, 1938, see: Jindřich DEJMEK ed.., *Československá zahraniční politika v roce 1938*, Vol. I (Praha: Ústav mezinárodních vztahů 2000), Document no. 255, p. 395. He provided more details in a report dated 9/5/1938. Ibidem, Document no. 267, pp. 413–416.

23 Antoni Roman (1892–1951) – Polish diplomat and statesman, from 1934 Envoy to Sweden, 1936–1939 Minister of Trade and Industry.

24 George Ward Price (1886–1961) – leading journalist (newspaper *Daily Mail*) in the United Kingdom.

to the existing network, and thus they would probably be able, already later this year, to arrange air traffic across Czechoslovakia and from Czechoslovakia across Poland. They also discussed the Polish press, which was still quite hostile. Beck had promised to speak with the press in the hope of reducing its ongoing hostility. When we discussed the Polish press, we concluded that part of it was already noticeably trying to change its rhetoric concerning Czechoslovakia. Poland's concerns about the enormously growing German power could be felt quite clearly in this segment of the Polish press. The atmosphere is definitely beginning to improve, and Prague is hopeful that the relationship will continue to settle.

Dr Slávik had not yet seen the newly arrived French Ambassador Noël,[25] and therefore did not know what Beck had said to Noël during their meeting yesterday, which took place shortly after Beck's meeting with Dr Slávik. From earlier conversations, Dr Slávik described to me the instructions Ambassador Noël had received from Paul-Boncour.[26] during a meeting in Paris with Noël and the envoys to the Little Entente countries, Paul-Boncour had requested that they find out what actions the various countries would be prepared to take in the event of a German attack on Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia had objected to the question being formulated in that way, and Bonnet had instructed that a different question be asked—[27] namely, how a country would act towards France should France decide to help Czechoslovakia. Moreover, Bonnet had ordered the question to be framed in such a way that no evasive answer would be possible. France wanted to avoid uncertain responses that might seek to evade the core of the issue by referring either to the provisions of the League of Nations or to other matters.

Slávik did not know whether Ambassador Noël had already managed to ask Beck this question. He thought it might have already taken place.

As for London's point of view, Czechoslovakia was well aware that Chamberlain would go no further than his speech in Parliament;[28] Czechoslovakia had merely hoped to see evidence of British interest, knowing full well that Anglo-French mediation would encourage both countries to intervene to a sufficient de-

25 Léon Noël (1888–1986) – French diplomat, 1932–1935 Envoy to Czechoslovakia, 1935–1939 Ambassador to Poland.

26 Augustin Alfred Joseph Paul-Boncour (1873–1972) – French diplomat and statesman, from 1932 to 1936 representative in the League of Nations, in 1932 Minister of War, 1932 to 1933 Prime Minister, 1932–1934, 1936. Jan.– June and March 1938, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

27 Georges-Étienne Bonnet (1889–1973) – French statesman, 1938–1939 Minister of Foreign Affairs.

28 Arthur Neville Chamberlain (1869–1940) – British statesman, 1937–1940 Prime Minister.

gree in the event of a conflict, or should the situation deteriorate in a way that could lead to such a conflict. Ambassador Kennard was said to have received instructions from London to try to influence Beck to improve relations between Poland and Czechoslovakia.[29] Kennard had already spoken to Beck in this spirit and advised him to meet with the Czechoslovak envoy in the coming days. Without delay, Beck contacted Slávik and told him that he wanted to see him. For my part, I was able to inform Slávik of my own conversation with Beck, during which Beck had said he was convinced that Czechoslovakia was not currently threatened by German aggression, though the situation remained rather serious. Slávik confirmed that Prague agreed with this assessment. Prague tended more towards the idea that Germany wished to leave the Sudeten Germans within Czechoslovakia, perhaps in order to weaken the country as a whole and, in particular, to undermine and shift its foreign policy.

At the end of our conversation, we also considered everything we had heard about a declaration that Litvinov had allegedly received through the Polish Ambassador in Moscow,[30] Grzybowski,[31] during the period of the Polish ultimatum. We found that nothing about such a declaration was known in local diplomatic circles. The discussions in question had taken place in Moscow during the days of the ultimatum, while no action had been undertaken by the Russians locally. We also determined that the Russian Chargé d'Affaires, Listopad,[32] had visited the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs only once during those days, and only to hand over Litvinov's interview along with a diplomatic note. All other reports suggesting that the Russians had intervened here in Warsaw turned out to be rumours. The Russian action had taken place in Moscow, which is understandable, as their chargé d'affaires in Warsaw is apparently not entrusted with significant matters. He handles routine business and is closely associated with the Soviet Military Attaché, Rybalko,[33] who should be considered the leading figure at the Russian Embassy in Poland. During his conversation with Beck, Slávik had also heard from him that

29 Sir Howard William Kennard (1878–1955) – British diplomat, 1935–1939 Ambassador to Poland.

30 Maksim Litvinov (1876–1951) – Soviet statesman, 1930-1939 People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs.

31 Wacław Grzybowski (1887–1959) – Polish politician and philosopher, 1927–1935 Envoy to Czechoslovakia, 1936–1939 Ambassador to Soviet Union.

32 Pavel Listopad (1904–after 1940) – Soviet diplomat, 1937–1939 Charge d'affaires to Poland.

33 Pavel Rybalko (1892–1948) – Soviet Army Colonel, 1937–1939 Military Attaché to Poland, later Marshal.

Beck wished to see him again in the coming days to discuss other matters concerning the European political situation.

Source: LVVA, collection No. 2575, inventory No. 7, file No. 2379, pp. 110–112.

Document No. 2

Report of Latvian Envoy Miķelis Valters to Latvian Foreign Minister Vilhelms Munters,[34] Warsaw, 31 August 1938

During farewell visits to various ambassadors and envoys here, I was able to gather insights into the current situation. Yesterday, in a conversation with Italian Ambassador di Valentino,[35] we discussed how the situation was becoming increasingly complicated; the Ambassador stated that Italy considered the present circumstances to be very serious. [...] He asked me to explain the cause of Poland's current nervousness. According to him, Poland views all matters—even the most distant—with apprehension, always fearing that even the remotest developments might affect its interests. I was very surprised by this question. I could find nothing in the press that would explain the ambassador's concern. I tried to inquire further, but the ambassador merely repeated what he had already said.

In today's conversation with Lithuanian Envoy Škirpa,[36] I found an explanation that might partly account for the Italian ambassador's question. In this discussion with Škirpa, after reviewing impressions from the press and from conversations with Polish representatives, we concluded that Poland was beginning to adopt a more reserved stance towards both Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. Envoy Škirpa even spoke of a complete change—this was the impression he had gathered from his conversation yesterday with Minister Beck. Beck had explained various matters at length and clarified Poland's position: Poland had nothing against Czechoslovakia, but it had observed that the Czechs had sought to establish a fully centralised state under their influence, whereas in the early years of the country, there had been discussion about a Czech-Slovak arrangement.

There was no doubt that the efforts of various nationalities within Czechoslovakia towards national self-determination had intensified. It was difficult to de-

34 Vilhelms Munters (1898–1967) – Latvian statesman, 1936–1940 Minister of Foreign Affairs.

35 Pietro Arone di Valentino (1882–after 1939) – Italian diplomat, 1936–1939 Ambassador to Poland.

36 Kazys Škirpa (1895–1979) – Lithuanian military officer and diplomat, in 1938 Envoy to Poland.

termine How far the Czechoslovak government should now go to accommodate these aspirations. According to Beck, The Czechoslovak government had made a major mistake by signing a treaty with the Soviet Union. This treaty had shocked Germany and had provided it with a propaganda weapon. Poland had followed a different course, signing the Soviet-Polish Non-Aggression Pact. Poland would adhere to this agreement, and Beck particularly emphasised that there was no reason for Poland to take any direct or indirect action against the USSR. Škirpa paid close attention to this statement and believed it expressed the direction Polish policy would take. This shift was evident in the current Polish press, which in the past had published sharp criticisms.

Beck had also said that he would do nothing to exacerbate Czechoslovakia's difficulties. Turning to Poland's position with respect to the League of Nations, Beck told Škirpa that Poland would not take the initiative to abolish Article 16,[37] and in general would refrain from doing so unless other countries—such as the Oslo group—[38]were to raise the issue.

The position of Poland is similar to that of Lithuania in relation to Article 16. The real issue is the practical application of Article 16, not the provision itself. Škirpa had informed Beck that Lithuania indeed treated the Article in this way, recognising it as a general rule and legal foundation of unlimited scope, but one whose application in specific cases was subject to context. In practice, the article had become a basis for a certain degree of opportunism; it might even be said to have become practically optional without losing its legal force. Beck largely agreed with this interpretation and tried to persuade Škirpa that there was no real difference of opinion between the two countries. Škirpa did not fully agree, although he admitted that Beck's views on the League of Nations had changed—Škirpa believed this was linked to the current situation. The conflict in Danzig had escalated

37 Article 16 of the Covenant of the League of Nations: "Should any Member of the League resort to war [...] it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other Members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a Member of the League or not. [...]."

38 The Oslo Accords, or Convention on Economic Rapprochement, of December 22, 1930, were originally a regional response to the global economic crisis. The participating states of the Benelux and Nordic bloc pledged not to raise tariffs on each other's trade. In 1938, the Oslo Group states, in order to avoid being drawn into war, challenged Article 16 of the League of Nations on the obligation to assist victims of aggression.

and German agitation had intensified; Škirpa reported that German refugees from Poland were forming legions in Marienburg,[39] and that two regiments had already been formed. There had been no further information about the strength of these regiments. According to Škirpa, the situation suggested that Poland anticipated a potential German threat, which could explain Beck's modified position. The same threat was now forcing Poland to adopt a more attentive approach toward the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and the League of Nations. Poland now saw that larger joint actions might be initiated by England, France, and even the United States, and could no longer afford to maintain its previous, more aggressive stance. When I relayed my conversation with di Valentino to Škirpa, he immediately suggested that Italy had probably noticed a shift in Polish policy and was displeased, as Poland had previously stood firmly on the Italian side. According to information gathered from various sources, there existed some kind of agreement between Poland and Italy in anticipation of potential conflict. These arrangements were said to be far-reaching. the Estonian Envoy, Markus,[40] reported that, According to his sources, Poland wanted a free corridor to Hungary in order to establish an Italy-aligned policy. Italy would then become the main pillar of this southern configuration. Thus, Italy's sense of alienation from Poland could explain the dissatisfaction I had encountered in my conversation with di Valentino.

In my meeting with Envoy Markus, we again discussed the same issues—primarily Czechoslovakia. Markus had spoken with local contacts and with English visitors to Warsaw. His impression was that the English firmly supported Czechoslovakia and were preparing for the worst, recognising that Germany aimed to destroy Czechoslovakia as a means of pushing further east. In a conversation, the American Military Attaché in Warsaw had expressed his strongest hostility towards Germany and stated that America would immediately support England.[41] In a recent conversation with Markus, Beck admitted that he might have been overly optimistic about a common, proactive stance in support of Czechoslovakia. Encouraged by this expectation, Czechoslovakia was emboldened in its resistance, thereby worsening the overall situation. Beck emphasised again that he did not want to harm Czechoslovakia, but Markus had the impression that Beck's words were not entirely sincere; he sensed something twisted, and still fundamentally hostile, in

39 Marienburg, a city in West Prussia, now Malbork in Poland.
40 Hans Markus (1884–1969) – Estonian diplomat, 1935–1939 Envoy to Poland.
41 Major William H. Colbern (1895–1959) – American military officer, 1938–1939 US Military Attaché in Poland.

Poland's attitude toward Czechoslovakia. Beck continued to place high hopes on the Slovaks, as he always had. He hoped to use their support to advance his strategy—particularly with a view to reaching Hungary and eventually establishing a border with Italy. With respect to Germany, Beck told Markus the same thing he had told Škirpa the day before: Hitler was not contemplating war and had distanced himself from the views expressed in *Mein Kampf*. [42,43] Hitler had already demonstrated this change by concluding an agreement with Poland. Markus warned Beck that, should Czechoslovakia collapse, Poland would face a longer shared border with Germany and its strategic position would become more vulnerable. Beck avoided continuing this discussion and reiterated his belief that Hitler had become more cautious and less aggressive than in the past. [...]

Source: LVVA, collection No. 2575, inventory No. 7, file No. 2379, pp. 177– 180.

Document No. 3

Confidential Report from Ludvigs Ēķis, Latvian Envoy,[44] to Latvian Acting Foreign Minister Alfrēds Bērziņš, Warsaw, 20th September, 1938

As I am leaving early tomorrow for Budapest, I remained in constant contact with several sources of information throughout the day. The Polish attitude toward Central Europe is becoming increasingly determined by the day, even by the hour. On Saturday,[45] Polish representatives in Paris, London, Rome, and Berlin undertook diplomatic efforts to ensure that, alongside the settlement of the German question regarding the Sudetenland, Poland's claim to a small slice of the Czechoslovak "cake"—now in the process of being divided—would not be overlooked. Should the Czechs and the Western powers prove unwilling to return Cieszyn / Těšín and Czech Silesia to Poland in light of the current circumstances, Poland would not hesitate to take it by force. This is supported by reports of Polish military activity—some of which are even openly published in the press. The Czechoslovak envoy at-

42 Adolf Hitler (1889–1945) – German statesman, 1933–1945 Chancellor.

43 *Mein Kampf* (in German) – My Struggle. The name of Hitler's book.

44 Ludvigs Ēķis (1892–1943) – Latvian statesman and diplomat. From 1920 held various positions in the Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1925–1928 Head of the Administrative and Protocol Division of the Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1928–1931 First Secretary at Latvian Legation in London, 1931–1934 Head of Western Division, Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1934 Envoy to Lithuania, 1934–1938 Minister of Finance, 1938–1939 Envoy to Poland.

45 17th September, 1938.

tempted to protest both the Polish actions and the demonstrations organised against the Czechs in Katowice and elsewhere. Foreign Minister Beck, however, was so "busy" that he had taken a long weekend trip (this was the stated reason for not receiving the Czechoslovak envoy). Today, Beck was in Warsaw and met with the French ambassador. The Czechoslovak envoy was instead received by Arciszewski,[46] who attempted to assure him that Polish behaviour toward Czechoslovakia was not even slightly unfriendly. Poland, he said, merely sought equal treatment for its minority, so that it would not be treated less favourably than, for example, the Germans.[47] The Czechoslovak envoy received no further clarification regarding the demonstrations, military preparations, or other activities, as Arciszewski claimed he was unaware of any of these developments.

The Polish press is filled with demands from society and various organisations to rectify the wrongs of 1920, using rather sharp language to insist upon the return of Cieszyn / Těšín. The information I relayed in my earlier written and telephoned reports is now confirmed by other sources—namely, that Poland will in any case take the territory it claims from Czechoslovakia, but only if the Czechs are left to confront their main adversary, Germany, alone. This is confirmed by all the reliable news I received today from highly credible sources. However, should the situation escalate and compel France to intervene militarily, Poland would probably refrain from launching an armed invasion of Czechoslovakia.

The atmosphere and how the Czechs are currently feeling became vividly clear to me during a visit to my Czechoslovak colleague, Dr Slávik, whom I had last visited approximately twelve days ago. Today, it was difficult to recognise the once cheerful and smiling man. Now he appeared despondent and grim, perhaps even thinner, nervously smoking one cigarette after another. He told me that he had never personally experienced such deep disappointment in allies as he had in the politics of the present day—and that every Czechoslovak patriot felt the same.

Source: LVVA, collection No. 2575, inventory No. 7, file No. 2379, pp. 158–159.

---

46 Mirosław Arciszewski (1892–1963) – Polish diplomat, 1938–1939 Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs.

47 Telegraphic message of Envoy J. Slávik dated 17th September, 1938*, Československá zahraniční politika v roce 1938 Vol. II,* ed. Jindřich DEJMEK (Praha: Ústav mezinárodních vztahů, 2000), Document no. 618, pp. 312–313.

Document No. 4

Confidential Report of Latvian Chargé d'Affaires *ad interim*, N. Āboltiņš,[48] to Latvian Acting Foreign Minister Alfrēds Bērziņš, Warsaw, 22nd September, 1938

I am honoured to inform you that the atmosphere in Poland is growing more heated with each passing day. Yesterday evening, demonstrations were held outside the Hungarian and Czechoslovak Legations. Radio broadcasts covered public meetings in which demands were issued—followed by loud ovations—declaring, "Now the government is speaking, but if necessary, the army will speak". This evening at 5:30 p.m., the Relief Society for Poles Abroad has scheduled a large meeting in Warsaw. This morning's newspapers are filled with appeals from various organisations calling for the return of the Cieszyn / Těšín region. [...] Meetings are being held across the country, passing drastic resolutions. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has issued an official statement, a translation of which is attached. It states that Czechoslovakia has never respected agreements and treaties concerning the Polish minority. Regrettably, Anglo-French consultations had also failed to take Polish claims into account, prompting Polish representatives to file a protest against this policy. Poland has denounced the minority protection treaty with Czechoslovakia, arguing that the treaty no longer corresponds to the current situation. The crisis in Central Europe, the statement asserts, cannot be resolved without the involvement of all countries with longstanding rights and responsibilities in the region. The Polish Government will act with due regard for Polish interests.[49]

Another government-aligned newspaper, Express Poranny, attacks France in its editorial [...]. The article claims that the Little Entente has become ineffective, that France has abandoned Czechoslovakia to its fate, and that French foreign policy demonstrates no understanding of Poland's position on the Cieszyn / Těšín issue. It concludes that Poland should reconsider some of its traditional political alignments. In light of recent developments, Polish public opinion increasingly sees the need to draw new conclusions from the evolving European situation. Newspapers with bold headlines report that Germany and Italy are categorically demanding that the Anglo-French plan be revised. The "Allied" French press, op-

48 Nikolajs Āboltiņš (1895–1982) – Latvian diplomat, 1934–1939 1st secretary of Legation in Poland.

49 Envoy J. Slávik telegraphed about the Polish position on the situation in Czechoslovakia and Polish and Hungarian demands on 23rd September, 1938, *Československá zahraniční politika v roce 1938, Vol. II,* ed. J. DEJMEK, Document no. 687, p. 374.

posing Poland's position, is widely quoted: *Le Temps* reports that the active involvement of Poland and Hungary is causing great concern; the *Petit Parisien* describes the demands of these countries as, to put it mildly, highly undesirable; and L'Époque has published an article by de Kérillis,[50] which describes Poland as a country that "has lost the ability to see clearly and is criminal". Newspapers also report that Poland will retain reservists called up for manoeuvres and will not discharge troops whose terms of service are set to expire.

Yesterday, The President himself visited the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to hear Beck's report on the international situation. This unprecedented event underscores the extraordinary seriousness of the current moment.

Today I was at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on business. In a friendly conversation regarding the current situation, a well-informed staff member told me that he was confident Poland would obtain Cieszyn / Těšín without the use of force. However, if, contrary to all expectations, the situation in Europe were to escalate to the point of inevitable armed conflict, the possibility of Poland fighting on the German side should be completely ruled out. no one in Poland, he said, would agree to such a course.

While An international treaty—if undoubtedly very beneficial—could still be concluded even against public opinion, mobilisation would require full consensus and a powerful upswing in public sentiment in that direction. And it would never be possible to gain such support in Poland in favour of Germany. Beck's policy is highly delicate, and it is impossible to predict precisely what he might be willing to do at any given time. His goal is to persuade France that Poland is its true partner in Eastern Europe. Britain has already come to this conclusion, and France is beginning to do so as well. France's greatest mistake, the official said, had been its reliance on the Little Entente and Russia—both of which have now proven ineffective.

Source: LVVA, collection No. 2575, inventory No. 7, file No. 2379, pp. 174–176.

50 Henri de Kérillis (1889–1958) – French aviator, reporter, writer, politician.

Document No. 5

Confidential Report of Latvian Envoy Ludvigs Ēķis to Latvian Foreign Minister Vilhelms Munters on a Conversation with Polish Foreign Minister Józef Beck, Warsaw, 29th October, 1938

Last night, I had an audience with Foreign Minister Beck that lasted more than an hour. Most of the conversation revolved around Central Europe and European politics in general. Beck extensively explained Poland's past actions. He told me that, last summer,[51] he had had the opportunity to share many of his insights with our President and with you personally. Due to the political mistakes of Versailles and the post-war powers, we have come to a point where foreign policy has, in many cases and in many countries, lost its earlier forms and has become brutal and crude. Apparently, until recently, many countries—including the Czechs—had not recognised the emergence and development of new European forces that had gradually evolved and now begun rapidly implementing this brutal and crude approach to foreign policy. Czechoslovakia, he said, finds itself in this situation because it was founded on a structure of artificial post-war combinations without any real foundation. An Underestimation of power and circumstances has resulted in consequences now visible to all. Poland, by contrast, has always remained calm and never lost its decisiveness. As far as Poland is concerned, its former disputes with the Czechs have now been settled, and Poland will pursue a friendly policy towards Czechoslovakia. Negotiations on the finalisation of the border between Poland and Czechoslovakia are still ongoing, and all circumstances and indications suggest that Polish-Czech differences will be resolved amicably.

At this point, I fulfilled your task by relaying your sentiments that we fully understand and support Polish actions. I also added, on my own initiative, that it is undoubtedly in our best interest to have a strong Poland that consistently succeeds in its endeavours, as Poland's strength and independence also reinforce our own sense of security and independence. I congratulated Beck on receiving the Order of the White Eagle, Poland's highest honour, and on having been awarded an honorary doctorate by the University of Kraków the previous evening.

Speaking next about the Slovaks and Carpathian Ruthenia, Beck repeated almost word-for-word what I had heard the day before from Political Director

51 Minister Beck visited Latvia in July 1938.

Kobylański.[52] One nuance is worth noting: Poland did not want to influence the Slovaks. The Slovaks are friends of Poland, and it is in Poland's interest that they determine their own fate and affiliations. The Slovaks might be able to live peacefully with the Czechs, and Hungarian aspirations in this area should not always be taken into account, although Hungarians have long been, still are, and will remain friends of Poland.

Beck's recent initiative in Southeastern European politics aimed to foster an understanding (*détente*) between Hungarians and Romanians. Improved understanding and cooperation between these two nations could, one day, benefit anyone with interests in the region. [...]

Carpathian Ruthenia is a separate issue. After the Great War, it was incorporated into Czechoslovakia with the hidden intention that the territory might serve as a foothold for Greater Russia in Central Europe. There is a certain parallel with the mindset of the Versailles politicians concerning the Baltic region: as we may recall, the gentlemen of Versailles hesitated to make definitive decisions while there was still hope for the restoration of the former Russian Empire. For Carpathian Ruthenia, affiliation with Hungary would be a natural solution. The Minister said he would refrain from making an immediate judgement as to whether or not this could be achieved. It is not a matter of Poland's existence either, and even if the issue remains unresolved or only partially settled, it is only a matter of time before it will erupt again: '*Il va craquer une autre fois*'.[53] Hungarian-Czech issues will likely be resolved with the advice of Berlin and Rome, and it is more probable that direct talks between the Czechs and Hungarians will occur, rather than arbitration, as had recently been discussed. Poland has also been invited to participate in the eventual arbitration; although it has not refused, Beck does not place much faith in this process.

The overall impression from this talk is that Beck was not quite sure whether his viewpoint might lead to a favourable outcome and, as I wrote yesterday, Berlin holds the key to resolving the Hungarian-Czech-Slovak-Carpatho-Russian case,[54] while the spare key is in Rome.

Source: LVVA, collection No. 2575, inventory No. 7, file No. 2379, pp. 200–203.

52 Tadeusz Kobylański (1895–1970), Polish military officer, diplomat, 1936–1939 Director of Political Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

53 *Il va craquer une autre fois* (French) – it will break another time.

54 Carpatho-Russians – i.e. Ukrainians.

Document No. 6

Report of Latvian Envoy to Czechoslovakia, Mārtiņš Ņukša,[55] to Latvian Acting Foreign Minister Alfrēds Bērziņš, Prague, 7th December, 1938

The Polish-Soviet declaration has attracted considerable attention in Prague's political circles, despite the fact that it essentially does not go beyond the Non-Aggression Pact concluded between the two countries in 1932, and that the new additions contain very little of substance. It is not so much the content as the timing of the declaration that has been noted.

In recent days, I have had the opportunity to discuss this matter with several Czech politicians, including Dr Krno,[56] Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Dr Krno noted that he was not authorised to express the official views of the Ministry, as no formal position had yet been adopted, and thus he could only share his personal reflections. In summary, he expressed the following thoughts: Poland has finally opened its eyes and realised that it is in equal danger. It is unfortunate that this realisation came so late. We do not believe there is much left to be done at this point. We have always believed, and still assert, that Czechoslovakia and Poland share common interests, but Poland has never wished to acknowledge this. The wave struck us first; now it will reach Poland. Poland is now forced to conclude that pursuing its interests in Central Europe is not straightforward. We see this in the case of Carpathian Ruthenia. Romania was the first to object to Beck's plan for a common Polish-Hungarian border. Germany, as well as Italy, are not entirely aligned with the direction envisaged by Warsaw and Budapest. Hitler has always claimed that the principle of nationality should determine national borders. Germany and Italy have consistently argued that the system and borders established by the treaties of Versailles and Trianon—particularly in Central Europe—are inadequate and unjust. Both countries have pledged to establish a more lasting and appropriate arrangement. Together with Hungary, we solemnly and in writing accepted the Vienna Arbitration; after the decision was announced, we all formally confirmed it. How can Germany now allow this "good" arbitration agreement to last only twenty days, while the 'bad' system of Versailles was allowed

55 Mārtiņš Nukša (1878–1942) – Latvian diplomat, 1933–1938 Envoy to Czechoslovakia.

56 Ivan Krno (1891–1961 or 1968) – Czechoslovak diplomat, 1934–April, 1938 Envoy to Netherlands, 1938–1939 Krno was appointed director of the Political Section of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in May 1938 and soon became the formal representative of Foreign Minister K. Krofta. Sources differ on year of death (1961 or 1968).

to stand for twenty years? Neither Germany nor Italy should tolerate this, not least for reasons of prestige. If Germany's insistence on this matter also aligns with its broader intentions and interests, so much the better for Germany—it will be less inclined to demonstrate willingness to support Poland and Hungary. I do not know and do not wish to speculate whether Germany has any such broader intentions. I do believe, however, that this German position has discouraged Hungary from placing too much hope in Poland's plans. What has Poland achieved? Suspicion from Romania, resistance from Ruthenians, and a changed perception among the Slovaks. The latter is particularly telling. I am a Slovak myself, so I know it well. The Slovaks had high hopes for Poland. But Poland's conduct in the process of drawing the border was so arrogant, insulting and unjust—demanding land to which it had absolutely no right—that Slovak friendship has now turned into open hostility. From Prague, we feel compelled to urge the Slovaks to moderate their anger toward the Poles.

Dr Krno further added that the Hungarians, while pleased with their acquisitions, are also quite concerned. Firstly, because they have inherited more minorities; and secondly —and above all—because the issue of land and social reform will inevitably resurface. It will be one of two outcomes: either to dispossess those who benefitted from land reform in Czechoslovakia, or to introduce similar reforms throughout Hungary.

Dr Krno seemed unwilling to discuss the circumstances surrounding the Polish-Soviet declaration. Generally speaking, Prague's political and diplomatic circles viewed these circumstances in much the same way as all other political centres: this step was seen, firstly, as an attempt to counterbalance Germany's excessive influence in the east; and secondly, as an expression of Poland's and Soviet Russia's shared interest in the Ukrainian issue—an issue that is becoming relevant for Czechoslovakia as well, now that Hungary has failed to subdue Carpathian Ruthenia. If Carpathian Ruthenia were to be annexed by Hungary, its autonomy would be lost. As it stands, however, autonomy has been secured under Czechoslovakia, and Prague now sees renewed prospects for direct and unimpeded contact with Ukraine and Russia. Carpathian Ruthenia could easily become a base for a general Ukrainian national unity and independence movement—possibly even with the blessing and support of Germany.

Attempts have already been made to prevent this from materialising. The Soviet envoy in Prague, Alexandrovsky,[57] said to me: "There are no commitments and promises; all are old things that remain valid. But still, in declaring this, we wanted some to keep in mind that there are others in the world, that there are other possibilities. This has a certain meaning in the present time."

There is little doubt in Prague that the Ukrainian question will soon be raised. Carpathian Russia—or Carpathian Ruthenia, as others call it—will remain autonomous and within Czechoslovakia, because that is Germany's wish, and there is presently no one capable of taking an active stand against that wish. Poland wanted to object but could not. The Czechs are absolutely convinced that Carpathian Ruthenia no longer faces any serious threat, either from Poland or from Hungary. The remaining question is whether Germany already has a concrete plan regarding the broader Ukrainian issue, and whether it is already considering its implementation. Suspicion certainly exists, and in this context—as has already been said—it is entirely possible that autonomous Carpathian Ruthenia could become the starting point for a Ukrainian national independence movement. There is no denying that Germany is paying close attention to Carpathian Ruthenia. The secretary from the German Legation in Prague, Hofmann,[58] together with representatives from the German Legation in Bucharest, recently toured the region on an official visit. He was lauded by the local authorities and welcomed with such exaggerated ceremony that it was, at times, almost comical. The effect on neighbouring states was striking and only served to reinforce their suspicions.

Prague's political circles believe that contact between Warsaw and Moscow was not established recently but rather during the summer. At that time, Foreign Minister Dr Krofta noted that,[59] according to his information, Grzybowski had begun to adopt a different, more conciliatory tone in his dealings with the Russians. The Czechs had initially been tempted to interpret this shift as a sign that Poland was moving closer to the position of Czechoslovakia and Soviet Russia. Now, however, they are asking themselves whether this change in the tone of Polish-Russian relations may have influenced Russia's conduct during the Czecho-

57 Sergey Alexandrovsky (1889–1945) – Soviet diplomat, 1934–1939 Envoy to Czechoslovakia.

58 Hamilkar Hoffman – German diplomat, secretary at Legation in Czechoslovakia.

59 Kamil Krofta (1876–1945) – Czechoslovak statesman, February, 1936 – October, 1938 Minister of Foreign Affairs.

slovak crisis—specifically, whether it contributed to Moscow's inaction in supporting the Czechs.

Soviet envoy Alexandrovsky added that nothing of great consequence would change—for example, the press skirmishes would likely continue, albeit with somewhat reduced intensity, as they were rooted in an old tradition that could not easily be abandoned.

Source: Hoover Institution Archives, Latvian Embassy in Stockholm, box No. 1.

RECENZE / BOOK REVIEWS

Andrej Alexandrovič IVANOV,
Vožď černoj reakcii. Nikolaj Jevgeněvič Markov,
Sankt-Petěrburg: Vladimir Daľ, 2023, 639 s.,
ISBN 978-5-93615-350-1.

Emigrace z ruského impéria po roce 1917, známá též jako emigrace první vlny, představuje mimořádný jev. Vzhledem k mnohonárodnostnímu složení hraje různě významnou roli v národních historiografiích a svým globálním rozšířením je důležitá i pro mezinárodní a transnacionální historiografii. Emigrace byla výjimečná v mnoha ohledech; z hlediska politických dějin je na ní fascinující široké spektrum stran, hnutí a ideových proudů navazujících na předrevoluční politiku nebo vzniklých až v exilu jako reakce na revoluci a realitu emigrace. V emigraci byly zastoupeny antibolševické skupiny od radikálních socialistů přes liberály a konzervativce až po monarchistickou krajní pravici, nově se formující fašistické skupiny a různé alternativní originální směry typu eurasijců. Do tábora krajní pravice patřil též Nikolaj Jevgeněvič Markov (1866–1945), jehož biografii sepsal ruský historik Andrej Ivanov. Jedná se o vůbec první vědecký životopis jednoho z hlavních vůdců předrevolučního Svazu ruského lidu a významného představitele ruské krajní pravice v emigraci.

Andrej Alexandrovič Ivanov (narozen 1978) patří k postsovětské generaci historiků, pro něž jsou dějiny krajní pravice a dějiny emigrace naprosto přirozeným výzkumným polem. Ivanov vyučoval na Ruské státní pedagogické univerzitě (2004–2016) a od roku 2016 působí na Petrohradské státní univerzitě. Dlouhodobě se zabývá politickými dějinami pozdně-carského Ruska a ruskou emigrací 1. vlny, přičemž se zaměřuje na krajní pravici. Kromě šesti monografií,[1] nepočítá-

1 Andrej A. IVANOV, *Poslednije zaščitniki monarchii. Frakcija pravych IV Gosudarstvennoj dumy v gody Pervoj mirovoj vojny (1914 – fevraľ 1917),* Sankt-Petěrburg 2006; Idem, *Vladimir Puriškevič: Opyt biografii pravogo politika (1870–1920),* Moskva – Sankt-Petěrburg, 2011; Idem, *Pravy-*

me-li zde recenzovanou knihu, editoval několik sborníků,[2] napsal mnoho studií a intenzivně se věnuje popularizaci historie monarchistického hnutí. Většina jeho textů snese kritické měřítko, i když na počátku akademické dráhy napsal řadu hesel do tendenční *Encyklopedie černé sotně*, vydané nacionalistickým, krajně pravicovým *Institutem ruské civilizace* vedeným Olegem A. Platonovem.[3] Z pohledu západní liberální historiografie se Ivanovovy texty mohou jevit jako sympatizující s krajní pravicí (např. monografie Puriškeviče), doma Ivanov představuje střední proud vyznačující se převážně názorovou neutralitou. V ruském akademickém světě panují odlišné poměry a texty, nad kterými zahraniční historici zvedají obočí a kroutí hlavou kvůli ideologické angažovanosti a stranění krajní pravici, jsou v Rusku brány jako legitimní část historického výzkumu a vyjádření autentického ruského národního světonázoru.

Jméno Nikolaje Markova je dnes povědomé patrně pouze specialistům na dějiny Ruska první poloviny 20. století. Ve své době, v čemž souhlasím s Ivanovem, se Markov vyrovnal proslulostí dalším politikům jako byli Miljukov, Gučkov či Kerenskij. Pro své konzervativní a zpátečnické názory přezdívaný „kurský zubr" a svou vnější podobu s carem Petrem I. Velikým „bronzový jezdec", Markov nechával málokoho lhostejným. Ivanov rovnoměrně představuje všechny etapy Markovovy čtyřicetileté politické činnosti (1905–1945), názory a publicistickou činnost v Rusku a v emigraci. Díky rozsáhlému korpusu pramenů, z nichž mnoho

je v russkom parlamente: ot krizisa k krachu (1914–1917), Moskva – Sankt-Petěrburg, 2013; Idem, *Vyzov nacionalizma: lozung „Rossija dlja russkich" v dorevoljucionnoj obščestvennoj mysli,* Sankt-Petěrburg, 2016; Idem, *„Dělo česti": deputáty Gosudarstvennoj dumy i duelnyje skandály (1906–1917),* Sankt-Petěrburg 2018; Idem, *Plamennyj reakcioněr Vladimir Mitrofanovič Puriškevič,* Sankt-Petěrburg 2020.

2 A. A. IVANOV – A. D. STĚPANOV (eds.), *Voinstvo svjatogo Georgija. Žizněopisanija russkich monarchistov načala XX veka,* Sankt-Petěrburg, 2006; A. A. IVANOV (ed.), *Vernaja gvardija. Russkaja smuta glazami oficerov-monarchistov,* Moskva 2008; A. A. IVANOV – A. V. REPNIKOV (eds.), *Konservatory: velikije razočarovanija i velikije uroki,* Moskva 2014; A. A. IVANOV – A. D. STĚPANOV (eds.), *Pravaja Rossija: Žizněopisanija russkich monarchistov načala XX veka,* Sankt-Petěrburg, 2015.

3 *Černaja sotnja. Istoričeskaja enciklopedija 1900–1917,* Oleg A. Platonov (ed.), Sankt Petěrburg, 2008. *Institut ruské civilizace* byl založen Olegem Platonovem v Moskvě v roce 1993 za podpory Ruské pravoslavné církve. Institut mimo nové literární produkce vydává systematicky díla tzv. národních autorů a myslitelů 19.–20. století, mezi nimiž jsou konzervativně-pravoslavné, slavjanofilské a panslovanské, nacionalistické, krajně pravicové a antisemitské texty. Sám Platonov je velice plodným autorem, se zvláštním důrazem na „židozednářskou tématiku". Srov. Oleg A. PLATONOV, *Tajna bezzakonija. Iudaizm i masonstvo protiv christianskoj civilizacii,* Moskva 2004; Idem, *Tajnoje mirovoje praviteľstvo,* Moskva 2006.

je nových nebo jen velmi málo použitých, vytvořil ucelený obraz Markovova života.

Markovova biografie dobře zapadá do Ivanovovy předchozí tvorby a rezonuje v ní jistý trend ruské historiografie, která se v posledních dvou, třech desetiletích systematicky zabývá ruskou meziválečnou emigrací, krajní pravicí a obecněji politickým konzervatismem. Zájem o konzervativní tradici je nyní výraznější než výzkum ruského liberalismu. V případě emigrace první vlny byla napsána řada dílčích monografií a bezpočet drobných studií. Výzkum se intenzivně rozvíjí na regionálních ruských univerzitách a výzkumných centrech, což činí aktuální historiografickou produkci téměř nepřehlednou.

Nemalá část knihy byla otištěna v několika předchozích letech formou řady menších studií. Platí to zejména pro exilové období Markovova života. Například kapitola o vztahu Markova k vojenskému exilu a speciálně generálu baronu Petru N. Wrangelovi je prakticky shodná se starší studií.[4] Odráží se v tom jeden z rysů současné ruské (a asi nejen ruské) historiografie, jímž je vysoká frekvence publikací vedoucí v důsledku k recyklování textů na stejná nebo příbuzná témata. Akademický prostor je mnohdy zaplevelen desítkami a stovkami drobných statí s malou přidanou hodnotou. Čtenář seznámený s Ivanovovými staršími články se tedy nedozví nic zásadně nového; výhodou je samozřejmě koncentrování všech informací o Markovovi do jednoho svazku.

Ivanov se vydal tradiční cestou chronologicky uspořádaného vyprávění a napsal primárně politickou biografii, v niž osobní život Markova hraje podružnou roli. O politické činnosti a myšlení Markova se naopak čtenář dozví vše podstatné včetně kontextualizace s obecnými politickými dějinami Ruska a ruské porevoluční emigrace. Ivanov se opírá především o archivní prameny (ruské na prvním místě, ale také dva fondy z Bachmetěvova archívu na Kolumbijské univerzitě v New Yorku), vydané prameny a tisk. Z literatury využívá takřka výlučně domácí produkci, což je škoda, neboť existuje několik vysoce kvalitních zahraničních publikací o ruské krajní pravici.[5] Pro ruské historiky (naštěstí ne všechny) je podobný přístup čas-

4 Andrej A. IVANOV, *Vožď černoj sotni i „černyj baron". O vzaimootnošenijach N. E. Markova i P. N. Vragelja v 1920-e gg.*, Novoje prošloje 2023, č. 3, s. 125–140.

5 Pro období před revolucí jsou to zejména: George GILBERT, *The Radical Right in Late Imperial Russia. Dreams of a True Fatherland?,* London 2016; Don C. RAWSON, *Rightists and the Revolution of 1905,* New York 1995. Pro období emigrace především monografie: Johannes BAUR, *Die russische Kolonie in München 1900–1945. Deutsch-russische Beziehungen im 20. Jahrhundert,* Wiesbaden 1998; Michael KELLOGG, *The Russian Roots of Nazism. White Émigrés and the making of National Socialism 1917–1945,* Cambridge 2005.

tý; soustředí se na prameny a domácí literaturu a zahraniční historiografii z různých důvodů přehlíží, i kdyby byla pro dané téma přínosná. I přes tento deficit, určitě největší v celé knize, je biografie Markova významným přínosem k bádání o ruské krajní pravici a emigraci.

V porevolučním exilu se ocitla řada ruských politiků různé ideové orientace. Markov však nebyl řadovým politikem. Patřil k lídrům monarchistické krajní pravice a svými vystoupeními v Státní dumě vešel v široké povědomí. Byť názorově silně konzervativní, v jistém ohledu byl politikem pro moderní dobu. Markov pocházel z provinční šlechty, jeho rodina patřila k starým rodům v kurské gubernii. Markov začal své veřejné působení v kurské samosprávě a do vysoké politiky vstoupil během revoluce v roce 1905. Stanul v čele Kurské lidové strany pořádku, která později splynula s hlavní stranou krajní pravice, Svazem ruského lidu. Markov byl zvolen poslancem do III. Státní dumy, dostal se do čela pravé frakce a zůstal její klíčovou figurou až do únorové revoluce 1917. Markov vyhledával střety a vyvolával kontroverze, ostře útočil na politické oponenty a proslul antisemitskými výpady. Když se Svaz ruského lidu začal štěpit, Markov se postavil proti jeho zakladateli Alexandru Dubrovinovi a protlačil se do čela strany. Podobně vůdčí roli se Markov snažil hrát i v exilu. Z Ruska emigroval v roce 1920 poté, co se zapojil do občanské války na strany bílých a snažil se rozvíjet ilegální činnost proti bolševikům. Exil prožil střídavě v Německu a Francii. Českou stopu v knize nenajdeme. Jakkoli významná byla ruská emigrace v meziválečném Československu, monarchistická krajní pravice se zde nijak výrazně neusadila a své aktivity soustředila do jiných zemí.

Ve 20. letech Markov patřil k nejaktivnějším politikům monarchistického a krajně-pravicového tábora. Hrál důležitou roli na monarchistickém sjezdu v Bad Reichenhallu v květnu 1921 a stál v čele Nejvyšší monarchistické rady (1921–1926), snažící se o sjednocení monarchistického exilu. Neuspěl; vzhledem k svým krajním postojům v minulosti i současnosti nebyl osobností, která by rozdělený exil dokázala integrovat. Plně se projevilo během Ruského zahraničního sjezdu v Paříži v roce 1926. Ivanov sice upozorňuje na „umírněnost“ Markova v letech 1921–1926, kdy se snažil o politickou alianci napříč monarchistickým táborem a tudíž tlumil i svůj antisemitismus, je však zřejmé, že se jednalo pouze o taktiku. Markov se nezměnil a po ztrátě pozice předsedy Nejvyšší monarchistické rady odhodil veškeré zábrany a vrátil se ke své podstatě – nekompromisně útočit na všechny a všechno odporující jeho vidění světa.

Stárnoucí Markov postupem let ztrácel vliv a ocitl se na okraji exilové politiky, což v něm posilovalo fanatický antisemitismus, jehož prostřednictvím vysvětloval všechny ruské tragédie. Projevilo se to v jeho knize *Vojny temnych sil*[6] a dále ve 30. letech spoluprací s nacisty v Německu. Vedl ruskou sekci informační agentury Welt-Dienst a pro její bulletin psal antisemitské a antisovětské texty až do samého konce války. V červenci 1941 publikoval otevřený dopis ruské emigraci, v němž schválil německý útok proti SSSR (tento dokument Ivanov necituje).[7] Markov zemřel v dubnu 1945 a pohřben byl ve Wiesbadenu.

Bylo by snadné mávnout nad Markovem rukou jako nad jedním z mnoha emigrantských politiků, uzavřených v exilové bublině. Markov si přesto naši pozornost zasluhuje z několika důvodů. Lze na něm demonstrovat kontinuitu předrevoluční ruské politiky a konzervativního a krajně pravicového myšlení i v podmínkách exilu. Jak Ivanov zcela správně dokazuje, Markov byl ve svých názorech konzistentní a myšlenkové paradigma krajní pravice zůstávalo základem jeho světonázoru až do konce života. Na Markovovi zároveň vidíme ambivalenci postavení krajní pravice v emigraci. Ruští exulanti chtěli spolupracovat s mezinárodní krajní pravicí, chovali sympatie k fašismu a nacionálnímu socialismu a doufali, že s pomocí nových ideologií a režimů dokážou svrhnout sovětský režim a vrátit se do obrozeného Ruska. V praxi ale nedokázali opustit svůj národní ruský svět; Markov zůstával monarchistou a moderní „-ismy" chápal pouze jako pomocný nástroj pro obnovu samoděržavné pravoslavné ruské monarchie, nikoli jako ideologie, jež by ji měly nahradit.

Ivanov předkládá neutrální pohled na Markova, nemůže se nicméně vyhnout hodnocení finálních let jeho veřejného působení, která vyplnila propagandistická práce pro nacistickou Třetí říši. Na rozdíl od biografického hesla *„Markov"* v *Encyklopedii černé sotně* (jehož byl Ivanov spoluautorem), které konstatuje (bez patřičných důkazů), že Markov ukončil s nacisty spolupráci po útoku na SSSR v červnu 1941, Ivanov nyní přiznává, že spolupráce trvala až do konce války. V tom se opravdu nemýlí. Markov opakoval teze německé propagandy a antisemitské texty pro německý tisk psal ještě v lednu 1945. Ivanov nicméně vidí v Markovovi ruského vlastence, který nikdy neusiloval o osobní prospěch a neochvějně sloužil ideji samoděržavné monarchie. Pravoslavně-monarchistické pojetí patriotismu jej dovedlo k chybným rozhodnutím, aniž by primárním cílem bylo škodit ruské vlasti. Zní to jako pokus Markova trochu rehabilitovat? Možná. Markov zůstane pro rus-

6 Kniha, vydaná poprvé v Paříži roku 1927 v nakladatelství knížete Gorčakova *Doloj zlo,* se postsovětském Rusku dočkala několika vydání. Srov. Nikolaj Je. MARKOV, *Vojny temnych sil*, Moskva 2008; Idem, *Dumskije reči. Vojny temnych sil,* Moskva 2011.

7 N. Je. MARKOV, Obraščenije k russkim ljudjam za granicej, in: Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Abdank-Kossovskii Papers, Reel 6 (Box 21, file 1940–1942).

ké historiky problematickou postavou. Jeho chvála německého útoku na SSSR nemůže být v ruské historiografii akceptovatelná.

Markov nebyl typem kosmopolitního Rusa a ani nedisponoval vlastnostmi potřebnými pro široce uznávaného vůdce. Filosof Ivan Iljin konstatoval v polovině 20. let, že „kurský zubr“ v sobě koncentruje ty nejhorší znaky předrevoluční krajní pravice: intelektuální omezenost („nezná nic mimo svět pravoslaví“), hrubost a vysvětlování světa skrze antisemitské konspirační teorie. „Posedlost mánií antisemitismu“, jak se vyjádřil Iljin, nebyla pouze rysem Markova, u něho nicméně představovala pevný pilíř politického a ideologického uvažování. Neochvějná víra v „temné síly“ židozednářství vedla Markova k spolupráci s nacisty. Na Markovovi vskutku nelze najít mnoho pozitivního, s čím by se dalo ztotožnit. Markov nemůže být kladným hrdinou, každopádně díky Ivanovově knize o něm víme výrazně víc než dřív.

Zbyněk Vydra

Krešimir MIĆANOVIĆ,
Vlast i pravopis,
Zagreb: Matica hrvatska 2024, 355 s.,
ISBN 978-953-341-262-7.

Krešimir Mićanović (*1968) působí na Katedře chorvatského spisovného jazyka Ústavu kroatistiky Filozofické fakulty Univerzity v Záhřebu, kde se věnuje otázkám jazykové politiky a standardologie. Mezi českými kroatisty je znám nejen jako jeden z největších odborníků na dějiny standardizace spisovné chorvatštiny a spoluautor dodnes užívané příručky chorvatského pravopisu (Lada Badurina – Ivan Marković – Krešimir Mićanović: *Hrvatski pravopis*, Zagreb: Matica hrvatska 2007, 662 s.), ale také jako opakovaný host Ústavu slavistiky FF MU v Brně, kde přednášel již několika generacím tamních kroatistů a balkanistů, kterým se rovněž v minulosti představil jako prozaik.[1]

Pod lapidárním titulem Mićanovićovy poslední knihy *Vlast i pravopis* (Moc a pravopis) vydané na sklonku roku 2024 se skrývá objemná syntetizující studie, která na základě důsledného pramenného výzkumu předestírá, doplňuje a koriguje

1 Autorovo zatím poslední hostování se uskutečnilo v roce 2024 v rámci IX. kroatistických setkání v Brně (dostupné na: https://www.kroatistikabrno.cz/web/ix-ks.html, 18. 5. 2025). Ukázky z prozaické tvorby Krešimira Mićanoviće vyšly v českém překladu v *Revolver Revue* (60/2005).

dějiny chorvatského pravopisu od poloviny 19. století do roku 1990. V centru autorova zájmu se nachází jazyková politika, jíž ve vztahu k pravopisu uplatňovaly různé vlády, a to od prvních snah úředně stanovit ortografickou normu v Bánském Chorvatsku až do konce jugoslávského období standardizace chorvatštiny. Mićanović tak nejenom podrobně charakterizuje specifika, okolnosti vzniku a recepci jednotlivých pravopisných příruček, jež tvoří milníky v historickém vývoji chorvatské ortografie, ale především zachycuje, jak na celý sledovaný proces působily mnohotvárné mocenské vlivy. Od běžných úředních předpisů a zákonných nařízení, přes ideologické cíle prosazované dobovými politiky či osobních ambicí filologických autorit, které byly pověřovány vypracováním pravopisné normy, až po nekompromisní zákazy a likvidace pravopisných příruček, jež padly za oběť četným politickým zvratům, jimiž chorvatský a šíře jugoslávský prostor procházel během 20. století. Před čtenářem se tak odvíjí komplikovaný příběh plný pozoruhodných peripetií, ale též skrytých a dosud neprobádaných zákoutí.

Zásadní přínos Mićanovićovy knihy je dvojího druhu. Jednak podává ucelený a detailní obraz dějin chorvatské ortografie v prvních takřka 150 letech její odborné standardizace, jednak doplňuje cenná zjištění o jednotlivých epizodách jejího vývoje, přičemž koriguje nepřesná tvrzení konvenčně přejímaná ze starší literatury. Činí tak zejména na základě širokého spektra archivních i vydaných pramenů (bibliografie čítá úctyhodných 41 tiskových stran!), jejichž jádro tvoří samotné pravopisné příručky a nejrůznější zákonná opatření, úřední předpisy a vyhlášky o pravopisu. Chronologický výčet obojího i faksimile titulních stran rozebíraných pravopisných publikací jsou obsaženy v přílohách. Pramennou základnu doplňují početné články z chorvatského, srbského a jugoslávského tisku, stenografické záznamy z jednání relevantních institucí a komisí nebo memoárové zápisky zúčastněných filologů a dalších aktérů zkoumaného procesu. Budiž kvitováno, že autorův krajně věcný styl výkladu, postavený na „řeči“ rozebíraných a hojně citovaných pramenů, příkře kontrastuje s vypjatostí popisovaných jazykových polemik.

Recenzovaná kniha názorně ukazuje, že otázka pravopisu v chorvatském prostředí představovala prvotřídní politikum. Zatímco za časů habsburské monarchie se i na půdě chorvatského sněmu vedly vášnivé disputace mezi stoupenci etymologického a fonetického pravopisu, jugoslávské epoše vévodil chorvatsko-srbský spor, který se týkal míry unifikace pravopisu, respektive společného spisovného jazyka, jenž byl tehdy nejčastěji nazýván srbochorvatštinou. Obecně lze říci, že zatímco srbští jazykovědci byli zpravidla zastánci a proponenty sbližování srbské a chorvatské jazykové normy, jejich chorvatské protějšky se principiálně nebránily vzájemné spolupráci, ale trvale hájily svou pozici rovnoprávného subjektu a autonomního aktéra standardizace spisovného jazyka. Nutno podotknout, že proměny jazykové politiky v královské i socialistické Jugoslávii věrně odrážely jednotlivé fáze ve vývoji státu a jugoslávského projektu jako takového. Ten se přitom nesl ve znamení periodického střídání období zesílených integračních a dezintegračních tendencí. Mićanović tuto historickou sinusoidu důkladně zmapoval na příkladu přístupů k pravopisu, přičemž při její závěrečné oscilaci konstatuje, že „[n]a rozdíl od srbských filologů mezi chorvatskými filology po turbulentním období let 1965–1971 už nebyli tací, kteří by se byli připraveni podílet na vytvoření/dotvoření jednoho společného pravopisu, jednoho společného slovníku a jedné společné terminologie." (s. 254). Vývoj jazykové standardizace tak kopíroval rozklad soudržnosti Jugoslávie v éře pozdního socialismu. Kniha Krešimira Mićanoviće *Vlast i pravopis* nám v této souvislosti skýtá minuciózní a poučný vhled do důležitého segmentu jugoslávské kulturní politiky. Jako taková si nepochybně zaslouží pozornost nejen filologů, ale také kulturních historiků.

Petr Stehlík

Lukáš RYBÁR,
Cisár a šáh verzus sultán. Habsbursko-safijovská diplomacia a protiosmanská aliancia. Bratislava: VEDA, 2024, 304 s.,
ISBN 978-80-224-2076-1.

Vědecká monografie slovenského historika Lukáše Rybára, který se dlouhodobě věnuje výzkumu obchodních a diplomatických vztahů mezi Evropou a Asií, respektive Orientem,[1] představuje v rámci české a slovenské historiografie zatím nejrozsáhlejší, a tím i jedinečnou, analýzu kontaktů habsburských panovníků s jejich safíovskými protějšky v 16. a 17. století. Autor v publikaci zúročil dlouholeté zkušenosti se zpracováváním této problematiky a na zhruba 250 stranách postupně rozplétá spletité předivo diplomatických vztahů dvou odlišných světů. Habsburky a Safíovce svedla dohromady snaha vypořádat se se společným nepřítelem, jímž byla Osmanská říše. Kniha v této souvislosti nastoluje zásadní otázku, a sice zda měly pokusy o vytvoření habsbursko-safíovské protiosmanské aliance šanci na úspěch a mohl-li být projekt tohoto spojenectví vůbec uskutečnitelný.

---

1 Srov. např. Lukáš RYBÁR, *Širván a jeho postavenie v európskom obchode (16. a 17. storočie)*, Bratislava 2014.

Při hledání odpovědí postupuje Lukáš Rybár systematicky, logicky a kriticky. Ve své monografii využívá úctyhodné množství historických pramenů, přičemž je třeba vyzdvihnout jejich široký záběr. Autor pracoval s dokumenty z italských, rakouských, českých i ruských archivů a mezi vydanými prameny nechybí ani íránské edice dobových textů. Podobně působivý je i seznam odborné literatury, který nevynechává žádnou z dotčených národních historiografií. Klíčový je v tomto směru především fakt, že autorova jazyková vybavenost mu dovoluje odkrývat íránskou vědeckou perspektivu (s. 27), neboť Rybár část výzkumu realizoval mimo jiné v Teheránu (s. 13–14).

Problematika diplomatických kontaktů habsburské monarchie se safíovskou Persií ve sledovaném období je představena v jedenácti kapitolách, do nichž je započítán i závěr, nebo lépe řečeno kapitola, která celý výklad sumarizuje a vyhodnocuje „namísto závěru" (s. 235–256).

Text začíná přiblížením prvních diplomatických kontaktů římsko-německého císaře a perského šáha na počátku 16. století a dále se v souladu s časovou osou propracovává často komplikovaným budováním vzájemných vztahů mezi oběma aktéry. Pozornost je věnována detailnímu vykreslení všech relevantních skutečností vstupujících do procesu diplomatické komunikace s akcentem na obsahovou i chronologickou koherenci. Tam, kde je nutné linii výkladu rozdělit, se autor snaží přerušené části opětovně srozumitelně propojovat, což se však vzhledem k velkému množství prezentovaných faktů a jmen daří se střídavým úspěchem. Kniha je proto určena spíše pozornému, a do jisté míry poučenému, čtenáři a svoje využití tak zřejmě najde především v rámci vědecké komunity či v řadách vysokoškolských studentů.

Zájemce o problematiku dějin východní Evropy upoutá kapitola nazvaná *Cisár, cár a šáh verzus sultán* (s. 107), jež otevírá téma zapojení ruského panovníka do habsbursko-safíovských jednání, a to v roli jejich zprostředkovatele. Díky zevrubnému výzkumu archivních i vydaných pramenů Lukáš Rybár doplňuje a rozšiřuje závěry ruských historiků, zejména I. V. Magiliny. Monografie tímto způsobem tematicky propojuje prostor střední Evropy nejen s Persií, ale také s Moskevským carstvím,[2] a barvitě líčí podoby politického pragmatismu, který byl ve východoevropském kontextu reprezentován Borisem Godunovem.

2 Autor v knize zvolil termín *„Moskevské carství"* a zároveň v úvodní redakční poznámce správně upozornil na pluralitu názorů ohledně pojmenování ruského státu v 16. a 17. století v současné historiografii (s. 36). K této diskuzi viz Anna Leonidovna CHOROŠKEVIČ, *Simvoly russkoj gosudarstvennosti*, Moskva 1993, s. 40; Sigurd Ottovič ŠMIDT, *Rossija Ivana Groznogo*, Moskva 1999, s. 255–301.

Detailně vystavěná analýza a interpretace diplomatických kontaktů je ozvláštněna pasážemi o špionážní činnosti, která podle autorova tvrzení dosud nebyla v rámci současné evropské i mimoevropské historiografie dostatečně reflektována jako jedno z důležitých hledisek navazování dobového diplomatického spojení (s. 245). Za pozornost stojí mimo jiné postava habsburského špióna v Konstantinopoli a Persii z poloviny 16. století Michala Černoviće a lze jen litovat, že se jí v textu nedostalo většího prostoru. Jak je však uvedeno v poznámkovém aparátu, autor se aktivitám Černoviće podrobně věnuje v jiné studii (pozn. 309 a 313 na s. 80–81).

Z chronologického pohledu je monografie uzavřena popisem závěrečného pokusu o alianci Habsburků se Safíovci proti Osmanům z 80. let 17. století, přičemž syntetické uchopení všech poznatků o zkoumaném tématu je obsaženo v již zmíněné závěrečné kapitole. Právě samotný závěr publikace pojmenovává a vysvětluje jednotlivé překážky při snahách o navázání habsbursko-safíovského spojenectví a přehledně osvětluje příčiny jejich neúspěchu. Text „závěru" je nejen citelně čtenářsky přívětivější než místy faktograficky nabité, byť poněkud jednotvárné popisy diplomatických misí (což však z hlediska kvality výzkumu nemůže být bráno jako negativum), ale také naplno odhaluje autorovu erudici a schopnost konstruování logického výkladového rámce včetně formulování hodnotících stanovisek. Důvody krachu všech analyzovaných misí jsou navíc doplněny o poznatky historicko-antropologické povahy a přináší velmi zajímavé podněty, které si zaslouží hlubší rozbor. Příkladem může být pasáž věnovaná odlišné diplomatické etiketě a v ní představený perský pojem *ta'árof*, jenž reprezentuje „určitou formu etikety a chování typického pro Peršany" a zahrnuje „zásadní rituální a symbolickou zdvořilost ve vzájemné komunikaci, která vypovídá o rozdílném (většinou sociálním) statusu interagujících stran" (s. 250). Autor sice upozorňuje, že se jedná o součást kulturního kódu spojovaného spíše se současnou íránskou společností, avšak z kontextu všech prezentovaných skutečností je zřejmé, že jde o nosný koncept i při pohledu do íránské, respektive perské historie. Nezbývá než doufat, že načrtnuté obrysy výzkumu ohledně dobové komunikace a její symbolické roviny budou rozvedeny v dalších Rybárových textech.

Publikace *Cisár a šáh verzus sultán. Habsbursko-safijovská diplomacia a protiosmanská aliancia* je výsledkem důkladné heuristiky, kritické analýzy a historiografické interpretace, jež vedle mnoha nových údajů a informací ukazuje i konkrétní limity výzkumu. Mezi ty nejzásadnější patří pochopitelně fakt, že se množství klíčových dokumentů nedochovalo. Zmíněna je i potřeba dalšího autorova studia, aby bylo možné se co nejvíce přiblížit dešifrování některých nastíněných aspektů habsbursko-safíovských diplomatických vztahů (s. 254–256).

Monografie Lukáše Rybára je hodnotným příspěvkem ke sledovanému tématu, který svým obsahovým i formálním zpracováním překračuje vědecké hranice střední Evropy. Text sice místy působí monotónně a chybí mu jistá stylistická lehkost, ale to může být v budoucnu jemně korigováno v rámci případných překladů knihy či jejích podstatných částí do anglického, a třeba i perského jazyka. Takto by autorova „historiografická mise" mohla slavit úspěch na evropsko-íránském odborném poli a navázat na mezikulturní dialog, o němž slovenský historik ve své zdařilé publikaci píše.

Taťána Součková

ZPRÁVY / BOOK REPORTS

Petr JANYŠKA, ***Polsko vejpůl. Rozhovory***,
Praha: Novela bohemika, 2023, 259 s.,
ISBN 978-80-88322-45-0

Vývoj v Polsku u nás v posledních letech přitahuje značnou pozornost. Nejčastěji se mluví o schopnosti Poláků efektivněji využít evropské peníze k výstavbě páteřní sítě dálnic a o celkově značném hospodářském vzestupu. Méně se však už ví, že i Polsko procházelo a stále prochází obdobím značného politického rozdělení. Ostatně název anotované knihy je v tomto směru velmi výstižný.

Bývalý diplomat a znalec Polska Petr Janyška se pokusil prostřednictvím rozhovorů představit pohled na Polsko před volbami v říjnu 2023, které nakonec ukončily osm let trvající vládu strany Právo a spravedlnost Jarosława Kaczyńského. V tu chvíli to však nikdo z jedenácti Poláků, s nimiž Janyška hovořil, netušil a výsledek voleb si ani netroufal odhadnout (u mnohých je patrná jistá skepse). Všichni respondenti patří k respektovaným osobnostem polského společenského a politického života (Lech Wałęsa, Agnieszka Holland, Dariusz Stola, Agnieszka Wiśniewska, Aleksander Hall, Marta Lempart, Eugeniusz Smolar, Adam Bodnar, Alfred Wierzbicki, Adam Michnik) s výjimkou studentky sociologie na Varšavské univerzitě Basi Andrzejewské, kterou si Janiška vybral jako reprezentanta nejmladšího pokolení. Jejím prostřednictvím chtěl přiblížit náhled mladé generace, pro niž je většinou typický odklon od katolické církve. Ta se pod palbou silné kritiky ostatně ocitá na více místech knihy. Nejvíce od žen, které byly spjaty s hnutím bojujícím proti přísným potratovým zákonům (zejména Marta Lempart). Janiška přitom nehovořil jen s liberálně založenými respondenty. Dal slovo i těm, kteří byli vůči režimu nastoleném Jarosławem Kaczyńským kritičtí, ale zároveň patří ke konzervativně smýšlející části společnosti – Aleksander Hall či Alfred Wierzbicki. A právě posledně jmenovaný charakterizoval stranu Právo a spravedlnost nikoli jako konzervativní, ale populistickou. „V Polsku žádnou konzervativní stranu nemáme, tady není co konzervovat," konstatuje Werzbicki.

Pro historika je velmi zajímavý rozhovor s Dariuszem Stolou – předním polským odborníkem na dějiny migrací a polsko-židovské vztahy. Historická politika praktikovaná stranou Právo a spravedlnost odmítající jakýkoli kaz na moderních polských dějinách se projevovala mimo jiné i tím, že se snažila ovládnout klíčové paměťové instituce v Polsku. Na mušce byly zejména ty, které podporovaly otevřenou diskusi o ožehavých tématech moderní polské historie. Na vlastní kůži to zažil právě i D. Stola jako ředitel varšavského muzea Polin věnované-ho historii Židů v Polsku. I když zvítězil v konkursu na ředitele na druhé funkční období, ministr kultury Piotr Gliński ho odmítl jmenovat. V této souvislosti Stola zmiňuje i případ Muzea druhé světové války, jehož vedení v čele s Pawłem Machcewiczem (v knize uveden chybně jako Pavel Maksjevič – s. 67) bylo odvolání po účelovém vytvoření Muzea Westerplatte, s nímž bylo následně Muzeum druhé světové války sloučeno (recenzi Machcewiczovy knihy na toto téma viz *Slovanský přehled* 106, 2020, č. 2, s. 377–381). Tím vznikla nová organizace s novým statutem a novým vedením. „Byl to právnický trik a podvod," konstatuje D. Stola.

Kniha rozhovorů je nesmírně zajímavým čtením. V budoucnu se stane dobrým pramenem pro historiky, až budou toto období polských dějin zkoumat. Rozhodně však neuškodí, pokud si ji přečtou už nyní.

Jiří Friedl

Lutz C. KLEVEMAN,
Lvov. Zapomenutý střed Evropy
Praha: ARGO, 2023, 384 s.,
ISBN 978-80-257-4103-0.

Německý investigativní novinář Lutz C. Kleveman, absolvent oborů francouzské literatury a mezinárodní historie, ve své knize *Lvov. Zapomenutý střed Evropy* rozebírá historii tohoto města ve středoevropském kontextu od konce 18. století až po současnost. Zkoumá rozmanité kulturní dědictví Lvova, jeho místo v bouřlivých i klidných etapách středoevropské historie a jeho současnou situaci jako součásti Ukrajiny.

Autor se opírá zejména o vlastní návštěvu Lvova v létě 2014 (na samém počátku konfliktu na východní Ukrajině, v jehož kontextu dílo otevírá i uzavírá), která sestávala ze sběru podkladů a práce se zdroji místních vědeckých pracovišť, což doplňuje autentickým popisem místního prostředí, charakteru a ducha města a poznatky z vlastního výzkumu, ke kterým přidává obsáhlé komentáře o jejich historickém kontextu. Kromě toho Kleveman také využívá rozhovory, stejně jako historický výzkum a analýzy, za účelem vytvoření komplexního obrazu historie Lvova a jeho místa ve střední Evropě.

Nastiňuje události v haličské oblasti v době dělení Polska a její začlenění do habsburského státu. Následně při popisu situace v 19. století balancuje mezi nostalgií po „starém Rakousku", jehož východní části byl Lvov centrem, jako doby pokoje a rozkvětu města a relativní svobody Poláků v rakouském záboru na straně jedné (zde se třeba odvolává na paměti polského spisovatele Józefa Wittlina, původem ze Lvovska, opěvující krásu a noblesu města v té době), na straně druhé pak kritikou tohoto úseku dějin jako doby výrazných a rostoucích národnostních sporů a neřešených sociálních otázek. Po rozboru situace města za první světové války se přesouvá ke Lvovu meziválečnému a jeho bohaté kultuře, pestrému národnostnímu složení a zejména jeho intelektuálnímu a uměleckému životu. Zaměřuje se na lvovskou modernu, u jejích představitelů podává informace nejen o jejich vlivu v měřítku polském i evropském, ale představuje i jejich místa setkávání, která byla i centry kulturního dění (jako je například kavárna Atlas, kterou Kleveman navštívil a její proměny v čase analyzoval).

Těžištěm této práce je ovšem druhá polovina 20. století, resp. jeho 40.–90. léta. Po připojení Lvova k Sovětskému svazu v roce 1939 a v následujícím bouřlivém desetiletí se předválečná struktura obyvatelstva dramaticky změnila – zde Kleveman ani tak nerozebírá události velkého měřítka, ale soustředí se na dílčí okolnosti a situace ve městě nastalé, jako například německý zajatecký tábor a osudy vojáků v něm (právě táboru Stalag 328 umístěnému ve lvovské citadele je v závěru díla věnován zvláštní zřetel) či lvovské židovské ghetto a jeho likvidaci, která spolu s předešlými pogromy prováděnými SS a Banderovou OUN pohřbila místní židovskou populaci, jenž doposud tvořila přes čtvrtinu obyvatelstva; za sovětské správy Lvov nebyl ušetřen operací NKVD. Na těchto událostech a na na ně navazujícím poválečném vysídlení zbývajících Poláků Kleveman demonstruje ztrátu historické paměti – Lvov po 40. letech byl již zcela jiným městem, než byl před nimi, a tudíž vztah obyvatel města k městu samotnému či historická vazba na něj zde přestala existovat. Jak autor popisuje, po několika dekádách pak logicky nedochází k obnovování starých vazeb, ale formování nových, zcela jiných – „nových Lvovanů" k „novému Lvovu", a také rozebírá, jakou toto hrálo úlohu v Ukrajině 90. let po rozpadu Sovětského svazu. Dílo končí tím, že se se v popisu a analýze historických událostí dostává až do současnosti svého vzniku, tj. doba bezprostředně po Euromajdanu a vypuknutí konfliktu na Donbase, a hodnotí úlohu Lvova jako ukrajinského města, zvláště pak jako centra západní Ukrajiny (a jakou významnou roli hrál v ukrajinské krizi), přičemž v tomto kontextu znovu hodnotí a zdůrazňuje úlohu historické paměti.

Kniha je členěná do jedenácti kapitol, z nichž každá rozebírá historický úsek či konkrétní téma, přičemž je zpravidla otevřena stylem publicistickým či až výpravným, který pak postupně přechází do stylu odborného (ovšem aniž by se od dvou předchozích zcela odpoutal). Dějinami Lvova prochází velmi dynamickým a čtivým způsobem a má co nabídnout čtenářům této tématiky znalým, zrovna tak jako těm zcela nezasvěceným. Pro celé toto dílo jsou charakteristické dva hlavní motivy: líčení osudů jednotlivých osob či vymezených skupin v kontextu dějin Lvova a střední Evropy, a upozorňování na problematiku historické paměti – ta byla ve Lvově turbulentními událostmi v polovině 20. století vyvražděním či přesídlením naprosté většiny původního obyvatelstva silně narušena, respektive v mnoha ohledech zcela ztracena.

Ondřej Šulc

Cristian CIULICĂ
În trupul războiului: Povestea luptătorilor din Transnistria prin interviuri,
Chișinău, Polisalm 2024, 120 s.
ISBN: 978-997-536-509-3.

Navzdory tomu, že knihy o podněsterském konfliktu vycházely v Moldavsku a Rumunsku poměrně dlouho, mnohé z nich byly obvykle povrchního charakteru, aniž by zacházely do konkrétních podrobností. Nejčastěji tyto knihy psali buď moldavští novináři a publicisté, nebo (pokud mluvíme o memoárech) důstojníci moldavské armády a policie, kteří byli na velitelství během událostí roku 1992 a přímo se neúčastnili nepřátelských akcí. Mezi memoárovou literaturou však dlouho nebylo dostatek vzpomínek obyčejných vojáků, kteří na jaře a v létě 1992 přímo bojovali v Podněstří.

Tuto mezeru by měla vyplnit malá knížka moldavského novináře Cristiana Ciulică. Anotovaná kniha je souborem 7 rozhovorů s vojáky Republikánské gardy Moldavska (která se stala základem moldavské armády vytvořené na podzim roku 1992) a dobrovolníky, kteří na jaře a v létě 1992 bojovali na straně Kišiněva. V rozhovorech můžeme číst popis každodenního života armády v bojových podmínkách. Dozvídáme se, jak bojovaly moldavské vojenské jednotky, co měly a co jim chybělo, jaká byla morálka vojáků – toho všeho se tak či onak autor v rozhovorech s vojáky dotknul. Příběhy vojáků doplňují fotografie válečného zpravodaje Nicolae Pojogy, který zachytil nejintenzivnější bitvy jara a léta 1992.

Tato kniha samozřejmě není bez nedostatků. Kniha Cristiana Ciulică obsahuje pouze 7 rozhovorů, což je pro získání relevantní představy o zákopovém životě moldavského vojáka docela málo. Nelze si však nevšimnout autorovy snahy, i přes malý počet zpovídaných, ukázat události roku 1992 z nové perspektivy. Proto lze tuto sbírku doporučit jak specialistům na dějiny a politiku východní Evropy, tak širokému okruhu čtenářů.

Mihail Ceropita

ZPRÁVY Z VĚDECKÉHO ŽIVOTA / NEWS FROM ACADEMIC LIFE

Sté výročí založení Slovanské knihovny

V průběhu roku 2024 si několika akcemi připomněla sté výročí svého vzniku pražská Slovanská knihovna, vědecká knihovna specializující se na slavistiku. Založena byla v listopadu 1924 pod správou ministerstva zahraničních věcí s cílem představovat informační základnu tehdy se formujícího Slovanského ústavu a poskytovat zázemí pro odbornou práci početné komunitě ruských, ukrajinských a běloruských uprchlíků z bývalého Ruského impéria, kteří v hojném počtu našli zázemí v nově ustavené Československé republice. Roku 1958 patřila Slovanská knihovna mezi instituce, jejichž spojením vznikla Státní knihovna Československa, nynější Národní knihovna České republiky. Její součástí je jako samostatný odbor dodnes.

Dnešní Slovanská knihovna spravuje fond čítající 900 000 svazků slavistické literatury a několik desítek tzv. sbírek speciálních dokumentů – materiálů listinné, obrazové nebo výtvarné povahy. Každoročně se rozrůstá průměrně o 8000 nových titulů. Knihovna se aktivně zapojuje do mezinárodního slavistického dění, participuje na odborných projektech slavistického knihovnictví, podílí se na několika programech digitalizace fondu. Slavistickou vědní disciplínu podporuje vydavatelskou, pořadatelskou a výstavní činností.

Století knihovny předznamenal Knihovnický kalendář na rok 2024, který pro potřeby českých knihoven pravidelně připravuje Národní knihovna ČR a jehož tématem byla právě Slovanská knihovna.

Samotné oslavy jubilea zahájil slavnostní koncert Ondřeje Havelky, který pro pracovníky, partnery, příznivce a přátele Slovanské knihovny vystoupil se skupinou Melody Makers dne 11. dubna 2024 v Zrcadlové kapli Klementina.

Výročí byly věnovány celkem tři odborné knihy svým obsahem spjaté se Slovanskou knihovnou. Česko-anglická monografie Lukáše Babky *Slovanská knihovna 1924–2024: (Průvodce po dějinách, fondech a službách)* přibližuje vývoj knihovny a představuje jednotlivé části knihovního fondu. Bibliografie Terezy Rejdové *Slovanská knihovna v tisku a dalších médiích: bibliografie za léta 1979–2023* navázala na podobně koncipovanou bibliografii *Slovanská knihovna a slavistika* z roku 1979, která obsahovala soupis publikací o knihovně vydaných od jejího vzniku do roku 1979. Katalog Jana Hanouska *Sbírka dokumentů k dějinám Slovanské knihovny (1924–2024). Inventář* zpřístupnil rozsáhlou kolekci materiálů se vztahem k činnosti knihovny, která zásadně rozšiřuje možnost odborného výzkumu jejích dějin. Výročí připomnělo také několik časopiseckých článků a vystoupení ve sdělovacích prostředcích.

S jubileem knihovny souvisí i virtuální sbírka Práce Slovanské knihovny vytvořená v roce 2004 v rámci Národní digitální knihovny (https://www.ndk.cz), která zpřístupňuje digitální kopie všech knih vydaných knihovnou za dobu její existence.

Vyvrcholením aktivit vztahujících se k jubileu byl slavnostní společenský večer spojený se zahájením výstavy *Sto let Slovanské knihovny (1924–2024)*, který se uskutečnil ve čtvrtek 5. září na Révovém nádvoří Klementina. Akce se zúčastnil ministr kultury Martin Baxa, náměstek ministra zahraničních věcí Jan Marian, první místopředsedkyně Poslanecké sněmovny PČR Věra Kovářová, tři bývalí ředitelé Národní knihovny, ředitelé několika ústavů Akademie věd ČR a řada dalších hostů. Byla mezi nimi také skupina sedmi zahraničních slavistických knihovníků, kteří se v dopoledních hodinách téhož dne zúčastnili mezinárodního sympozia *Slavic Studies Librarianship and its Influence on Contemporary Public Education* připraveného rovněž u příležitosti výročí Slovanské knihovny. Zahajovaná výstava definovala klíčové momenty dějin knihovny, představila výrazné osobnosti z řad pracovníků a přiblížila cenné části knihovní sbírky. Po své pražské instalaci se s obsahem výstavy mohli seznámit i studenti Filozofické fakulty Ostravské univerzity, v jejíž budově byla přístupná na sklonku roku.

Součástí programu slavnostního zářijového večera bylo dále předání Ceny Rudolfa Medka pro rok 2024, kterou udělují společně Slovanská knihovna a spolek Ruská tradice. Cena byla předána již po šestnácté a jejím nositelem se stal historik Vratislav Doubek.

Století knihovny připomněli její pracovníci i na odborných akcích. V dubnu promluvil o knihovně L. Babka v rámci Odborného fóra pořádaného Ústavem informačních studií a knihovnictví Filozofické fakulty Univerzity Karlovy, v červnu pak přednesl jubilejní referát na výroční konferenci organizace COSEELIS (Council for Slavonic and East European Library and Information Services), která se konala v britském Oxfordu. Shrnující příspěvek připravil pro 48. celostátní seminář knihovníků muzeí a galerií (Knihovnická komise AMG), který se konal v polovině září v Brně. Rita Lyons Kindlerová představila dějiny a činnost Slovanské knihovny na konferenci *Výzvy a aktuální otázky českých slavistických bádání: jazyk – literatura – historie – archeologie – dějiny umění*, která se uskutečnila koncem září v Praze.

Pomyslné zakončení oslav představovala účast L. Babka a R. Lyons Kindlerové na 56. kongresu ASEEES (Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies) v listopadu 2024 v americkém Bostonu. Referát *The Slavonic Library (Prague) and Its Transformations: 1924–2024* byl součástí panelu *Celebrating Three Historic Slavic Collections On Their Anniversary Year: New York, Prague, and Helsinki*. Pozitivně hodnocené byly také další dva referáty se vztahem k jubileu, které byly částmi programu kulatého stolu *New Initiatives in the Digital Humanities in Libraries, Archives, and Museums* a panelu *National Awakeners in Carpathian Rus*.

Závěrem stojí za to připomenout, že Slovanská knihovna je institucí veřejně přístupnou, studovat v ní může každý registrovaný uživatel Národní knihovny České republiky. Nezbytné je pouze registrovat se v Hale služeb v přízemí Klementina a poté vystoupat do jeho podkrovních prostor, v nichž se nacházejí půjčovna a studovna Slovanské knihovny. I přes protahující se provizorní dislokaci obou prostor způsobenou dosud nedokončenou rekonstrukcí Klementina zde lze najít komfortní badatelské zázemí. Zájemce se může věnovat buď odborné práci, nebo jen nezávazně prolistovat rozsáhlou nabídkou novinek odborné a beletristické literatury v knihovním fondu a hledat tak inspiraci pro další odborný výzkum.

Lukáš Babka

Zemřel historik doc. PhDr. Pavel Boček, CSc. (1955–2025)

Počátkem dubna tohoto roku se rozšířila mezi historiky v Brně smutná zpráva. Ve věku nedožitých 70 let nečekaně skonal dlouholetý učitel Filozofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity a přední odborník na dějiny východní a jihovýchodní Evropy, zejména na dějiny středověkého Ruska, ruské církve, pravoslaví a Byzance, docent Pavel Boček. Kolega Boček byl řadu let členem redakční rady *Slovanského přehledu*, proto cítíme povinnost věnovat tomuto vynikajícímu historikovi, blízkému spolupracovníkovi a příteli alespoň krátkou vzpomínku.

Pavel Boček se narodil na Vysočině. Pocházel z Rovečného, ze vsi nedaleko od Vírské přehrady. Jeho otec byl v Rovečném varhaníkem v tamějším kostele. Odtud pramenil také úzký vztah P. Bočka ke křesťanství a církvi. Po absolvování gymnázia v Bystřici nad Pernštejnem odešel do Brna na filozofickou fakultu, kde studoval ve druhé polovině 70. let historii a archivnictví. Již jako student se vyznačoval silným zájmem o dějiny a charakteristickou hloubavostí. Tehdejší vedoucí katedry dějin střední, východní a jihovýchodní Evropy na filozofické fakultě profesor František Hejl, pokračovatel východoevropského bádání v Brně v duchu tradic profesora Josefa Macůrka, si vybral talentovaného Pavla Bočka jako posilu pro svůj tým věnující se ruským dějinám. Mladý adept historie se měl specializovat na historii Ruska v období středověku. (Vedle F. Hejla ovlivnili P. Bočka v Brně i další „macůrkovci" – Ctibor Nečas, Richard Pražák, Josef Kolejka, Lubomír E. Havlík aj.) Vysokoškolské studium zakončil P. Boček v roce 1979 diplomovou prací na téma *Heretická hnutí v Rusku ve 14. a 15. století*. Shodnou problematiku zpracoval také v roce 1982 ve své kandidátské disertaci, jež mu umožnila stát se na filozofické fakultě odborným asistentem.

V následujících více než čtyřech desetiletích působil Pavel Boček na filozofické fakultě v Brně jako velmi pracovitý, zodpovědný vysokoškolský učitel, jenž dále rozšiřoval a prohluboval pole svého odborného zájmu. Vedle ruských středověkých a církevních dějin se zaměřoval také na středověkou a raně novověkou historii polsko-litevského státu, Pobaltí, střední Evropy, Byzantské říše a slovanských států na Balkáně. Své studenty a kolegy udivoval nejenom neobyčejně rozsáhlými faktografickými znalostmi o zkoumaném areálu, ale také zevrubným promýšlením rozličných názorových proudů a dobových ideologií (státně-politických, náboženských, filozofických) studovaného prostoru. Za integrální součást areálového studia vždy pokládal také dobrou znalost historiografie národů střední, východní a jihovýchodní Evropy. Impozantní odborný záběr P. Bočka dosvědčují desítky fundovaně napsaných studií a článků publikovaných v domácích i zahraničních (zejména ruských a polských) časopisech.

Docentem se Pavel Boček stal v roce 1998, kdy na Filozofické fakultě MU v Brně obhájil habilitační práci s názvem *Země v očekávání: k názorům a představám o panovnické moci a odpovědnosti na Rusi poloviny 16. století*. V tomto pojednání rozvinul své dřívější poznatky a úvahy o podstatě vladařské moci (samoděržaví) v Rusku, jež několik let předtím zanalyzoval v monografii *Stát a církev v Rusku na přelomu XV. a XVI. století* (Brno 1995).

Zřejmě nejrozsáhlejší odbornou publikací, kterou P. Boček odborně zaštiťoval a které dopomohl na svět, byla kolektivní monografie *Moskva – Třetí Řím: od ideje k symbolu*, jež přinesla soubor 14 studií o politických a církevních dějinách Ruska ve 14.–19. století a dobovém výtvarném umění napsaný skupinou českých a ruských historiků a kulturologů. Tuto rozsáhlou publikaci vydalo v roce 2019 v Praze Nakladatelství Lidových novin.

Docent Boček zaujímal mezi historiky zabývajícími se církevními dějinami zvláštní pozici. Ač sám západní křesťan, intenzivně se zajímal i o východní křesťanství a spiritualismus. Obrazně řečeno, byl velmi dobře – po ideové i odborné stránce – rozkročen mezi evropským Západem a Východem. Projevovalo se to mj. tím, že měl značný počet kolegů a známých jak mezi katolickými a evangelickými, tak pravoslavnými církevními intelektuály. Do České republiky, konkrétně na Moravu, se mu počátkem nového tisíciletí podařilo pozvat na přednáškové turné např. blízkého spolupracovníka papeže Jana Pavla II. kardinála Tomáše Špidlíka, vynikajícího teologa a znalce dějin náboženství. Na druhé straně se P. Boček sám několikrát zúčastnil prestižních nábožensko-církevních disputací v Rusku (tzv. Makarijevskije čtěnija), kde o něm tamější kolegové prohlašovali, že byl zasvěcen do řady problémů ruského středověku hlouběji než mnozí domácí účastníci.

Pavel Boček byl nejenom dobrý historik – specialista, ale také vynikající učitel. Na webových stránkách Národní knihovny ČR lze v rámci Souborného katalogu nalézt vedle jeho vlastních knih, také několik desítek jím vedených studentských kvalifikačních prací – bakalářských, magisterských i doktorských. Udiví přitom jak jejich množství, tak jejich tematická pestrost (práce s ruskou, polskou, českou i balkánskou tematikou). Většina studentů vzpomíná na P. Bočka jako na učitele, jenž je dokázal nejenom odborně zaujmout, ale také si je získat svou příznačnou lidskostí a laskavostí.

Zádušní mše za doc. Pavla Bočka se uskutečnila v Brně, v Husově sboru v Králově Poli, 29. dubna 2025. Charakteristické bylo, že nejpočetnější skupinu mezi smutečními hosty tvořili právě studenti, kteří se přišli rozloučit se svým milým učitelem. P. Boček si toto – symbolické – uznání zasloužil plným právem. Všichni jeho studenti a kolegové na něj budou vzpomínat jen v dobrém!

Ladislav Hladký

SEZNAM AUTORŮ / CONTRIBUTORS

Łukasz Adamski, Ph. D.
The Mieroszewski Centre
14/16A Jasna Street, 00-041 Warsaw, Poland
kontakt@mieroszewski.pl

Mgr. Mihail Ceropita, Ph. D.
Independent researcher, Chișinău, Republic of Moldova
ceropita@seznam.cz

Mgr. Michal Falat, Ph. D.
Krajské múzeum v Prešove, Prešov, Slovensko
Obrancov mieru 4686/9, 080 01 Prešov, Slovensko
michalfalat@hotmail.com

Prof. Dr. Ēriks Jėkabsons
Faculty of History and Philosophy, University of Latvia, Latvia
Aspazijas bulvāris 5, Rīga, LV-1050, Latvia
Eriks.Jekabsons@lu.lv

Prof. Uladzimir Kananovich
L'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales,
Centres de Recherches Historiques, Paris, France
54, boulevard Raspail, 75006 Paris, Prance
ukananovich@gmail.com

Mgr. et Mgr. Anežka Kotoučová
Institute of Historical Sciences, Faculty of Arts and Philosophy,
University of Pardubice
Studentská 95, 532 10 Pardubice, Czech Republic
HrebikovaAnezka@seznam.cz

Dr. Paweł Libera, Ph. D.
Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History, Polish Academy of Sciences
Rynek Starego Miasta 31, 00-272 Warszaw, Poland
The Historical research Office, The Institute of National Remembrance
ul. Wołoska 7, 02-675 Warsaw, Poland
pawel.libera@interia.pl

Mgr. Veronika Sidó
Ústav české literatury a komparatistiky, Filosofická fakulta,
Univerzita Karlova, Praha
náměstí Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Praha 1
dovlatova11@gmail.com

Oleh Stetsyshyn
Faculty of History, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukraine
Universitetska Street 1, 79 000 Lviv, Ukraine
olehstecyshyn@gmail.com

doc. Mgr. Art. Pavol Száz, Ph. D.
Department of Hungarian Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts,
Comenius University, Bratislava, Slovakia
Gondova 2, 811 02 Bratislava, Slovakia
szaz2@uniba.sk

doc. PhDr. Luboš Švec, CSc.
Institute of International Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences,
Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic,
U Kříže 8, 158 00 Praha-Jinonice, Czech Republic
lubos.svec@fsv.cuni.cz

Maciej Wyrwa, Ph. D.
The Mieroszewski Centre
14/16A Jasna Street, 00-041 Warsaw, Poland
kontakt@mieroszewski.pl

SLOVANSKÝ PŘEHLED | *SLAVONIC REVIEW*

Journal for the History of Central, Eastern and Southeastern Europe

Vydává Historický ústav AV ČR, v. v. i. / *Published by the Institute of History of AS CR, v. v. i.*
Časopis vychází dvakrát ročně / The journal is published twice a year
Adresa / Address: Prosecká 76, 190 00 Praha 9 – Nový Prosek
Tel.: +420 532 290 509; E-mail: slovanskyprehled@hiu.cas.cz
http://www.hiu.cas.cz/cs/nakladatelstvi/periodika/slovansky-prehled.ep/
http://www.hiu.cas.cz/en/institute-of-history-publishing/journals-and-periodicals/slavonic-review.ep/

Pokyny pro autory / Submission Guideliness for Authors:
http://www.hiu.cas.cz/nakladatelstvi/periodika/slovansky-prehled.ep
https://www.hiu.cas.cz/user_uploads/vydavatelska_cinnost/periodika/slovansky_prehled/sp_periodikum/guidelines_for_the_authors_sp_2024.pdf

ISSN: 0037-6922 (Print)
2788-3248 (On-line)

Slovanský přehled, ročník 111.

Distribuci předplatitelům zajišťuje jménem vydavatele společnost SEND Předplatné spol. s r. o.
Předplatné lze objednat prostřednictvím webového formuláře https://send.cz/casopis/10534/slovansky-prehled, telefonicky na číslech 225 985 225 a 777 333 370, emailem na adrese send@send.cz, písemně na adrese SEND Předplatné, Ve Žlíbku 1800/77, 193 0 Praha 9.

Objednávky přijímá též:
Suweco CZ, s. r. o. (www.suweco.cz)
Kosmas, s. r. o. (www.kosmas.cz)
Jednotlivá čísla je možné koupit též v Knihkupectví Academia nebo přímo v Historickém ústavu AV ČR, v. v. i., Prosecká 76, 190 00 Praha 9, tel. +420 225 443 233
e-mail: eshop@hiu.cas.cz

Výrobu zajišťuje tiskárna
SERIFA, s. r. o., Drtinova 557/10, 150 00 Praha 5

SCOPUS (https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21000)
ERIH PLUS (https://dbh.nsd.uib.no/publiseringskanaler/erihplus/periodical/info.action?id=481689)
H-Soz-Kult (https://www.hsozkult.de/journals/id/zeitschriften-747)
Recenzio.net (https://www.recensio.net/rezensionen/zeitschriften/slovansky-prehled/slovansky-prehled)
CEJSH (http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.3111a42d-c41b-3f03-8867-b741b7917dba)
EBSCO (https://www.ebscohost.com/titleLists/30h-coverage.htm)
FACEBOOK (https://www.facebook.com/slovanskyprehled/)
Academia.edu (http://independent.academia.edu/Slovanskýpřehled)

ISSN 0037-6922