

Mariia PARAKHINA,
 orcid.org/0000-0002-0736-5235
 PhD (History), Senior Researcher,
 Personnel Member of Research Department,
 Faculty of History, Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National
 University (Ukraine, Kyiv)
 marishka8791@ukr.net

THE PROBLEM OF RETRIEVAL OF UKRAINE'S CULTURAL PROPERTY IN THE UKRAINIAN-RUSSIAN MUTUAL RELATIONS: ON THE PROBLEMS HISTORY

In the article the historical retrospective concerning the question of returning of Ukraine's cultural property from the Russian Federation is clarified. The right of any people to its cultural properties takes a special place in international relations, as cultural values play the most important role in the restoration of historical memory and revival of national culture, which process has a direct influence on the development of an independent state. On the basis of the analysis of archival documents, a chain of conclusions are drawn on the reasons and historical circumstances which have brought about one of the most acute problems in Ukrainian-Russian mutual relations, namely, the definition of the fate of Ukrainian cultural values in Russia.

Key words: Ukraine, the Russian Federation, culture, property, values, international relations.

Марія ПАРАХІНА,
 кандидат історичних наук, старший науковий співробітник,
 науковий співробітник науково-дослідної частини
 історичного факультету Київського національного
 університету імені Тараса Шевченка (Україна, Київ)
 marishka8791@ukr.net

ПРОБЛЕМА ПОВЕРНЕННЯ КУЛЬТУРНОГО НАДБАННЯ УКРАЇНИ В УКРАЇНСЬКО-РОСІЙСЬКИХ ВЗАЄМВІДНОСИНАХ: З ІСТОРІЇ ПРОБЛЕМИ

У статті висвітлена історична ретроспектива, пов'язана з питанням повернення культурного надбання України з Російської Федерації. Право народу на культурні надбання посідає особливе місце у міжнародних відносинах, адже саме культурні цінності відіграють надважливу роль у відновленні історичної пам'яті та відродженні національної культури, що має безпосередній вплив для розбудови незалежної держави. На підставі аналізу архівних документів зроблено висновки про причини та історичні обставини, що призвели до виникнення однієї з найбільш гострих проблем в українсько-російських взаєминах – визначення долі українських культурних цінностей в Росії.

Ключові слова: Україна, Російська Федерація, культура, надбання, цінності, міжнародні відносини.

Марія ПАРАХІНА,
 кандидат исторических наук, старший научный сотрудник,
 научный сотрудник научно-исследовательской части
 исторического факультета Киевского национального
 университета имени Тараса Шевченко (Украина, Киев)
 marishka8791@ukr.net

ПРОБЛЕМА ВОЗВРАЩЕНИЯ КУЛЬТУРНОГО НАСЛЕДИЯ УКРАИНЫ В УКРАИНСКО-РОССИЙСКИХ ВЗАИМООТНОШЕНИЯХ: ИЗ ИСТОРИИ ПРОБЛЕМЫ

В статье освещена историческая ретроспектива, связанная с вопросом возвращения культурного наследия Украины из Российской Федерации. Право народа на культурное достояние занимает особое место

в международных отношениях, ведь именно культурные ценности играют важнейшую роль в восстановлении исторической памяти и возрождении национальной культуры, имеют непосредственное влияние для развития независимого государства. На основании анализа архивных документов сделаны выводы о причинах и исторических обстоятельствах, которые привели к возникновению одной из самых острых проблем в украинско-российских отношениях – определении судьбы украинских культурных ценностей в России.

Ключевые слова: Украина, Российская Федерация, культура, достояние, ценности, международные отношения.

Problem statement. The matter of returning of cultural values to their historical country of origin remains one of topical problems in Ukrainian-Russian relations. As in the time of the Russian empire, so also in the time of the Soviet Union the imperial administration / the USSR Center, otherwise – the Russians, all the same, pursued a policy of centralisation of cultural monuments, tending to concentrate them in the museums of Moscow and St Petersburg (later Leningrad and now again Petersburg). In particular, the originals of chronicles of Kievan Rus' period, frescos and mosaics from Ukrainian cathedrals, Cossack symbols of authority, and even the most famous or, rather, most notorious originals of the so-called «March articles» written by Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, probably – already in summer 1991 (?), as well as hundreds, if not thousands, «archive-criminal» and other archival documents from the funds of the former KGB of the Ukrainian SSR, concerning the struggle of the Soviet regime against the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), have been taken out from Ukraine at different times.

All the aforementioned objects and many more other have been withdrawn either as military trophies, as finds throughout archaeological and ethnographic expeditions, or as usual execution of orders issued by the imperial/all-Union power.

The analysis of researches. Of the domestic scientific historians who take up the issue of returning of our people's cultural properties from abroad the name of Ph D (History) S. I. Kot primarily deserve mentioning (Kot, 1993; Kot, 1994; Kot, 1996; Kot, 2009). In his work «Ukrainian Cultural Values In Russia. The Problem of Their Retrieval In the Context of History and Law» for the first time in the national historiography the reasons and historical circumstances which brought about one of the most acute problems in Ukrainian-Russian mutual relations, specifically, the determination of the fate of Ukrainian cultural values in Russia, are analyzed

Under the editorship of O. Reient and O. Lysenko in 1997 the «Historical Writing-books. (A review of publications by Institute of History of Ukraine during the last 10 years)» has been published. The worthiness of this work consists in the fact, that it presents the toolkit for the activity of Ukrainian diplomatic bodies concerning the retrieval of spiritual treasures to Ukraine (Reient, Lysenko, 1997).

This theme also appears in the works of V. Akulenko, V. Lenchenko, Yu. Savchuk, V. Serhiychuk, O. Fedoruk, a. o. (Akulenko, 1991; Lenchenko, 1989; Lenchenko, 1990; Savchuk, 2000; Savchuk, Turek, 2000; Serhiychuk, 1990; Fedoruk, 1996; Fedoruk, 1998). O. Nestulia and S. Nestulia have jointly published a collection of documents on the preparatory stage of negotiations between Ukraine and Russia concerning the return of cultural values (Nestulia, Nestulia, 2006). The explication of negotiations concerning the retrieval of cultural values, according to the data of the sources found out in Russian archives, is presented in D. Het'man's research (Het'man, 2007).

The article's purpose is to shed light on historical preconditions due to which one of most acute problems in Ukrainian-Russian interrelations, namely, the problem of returning of cultural values from the Russian Federation to the historical country of origin came about

The statement of the basic material. the national (semi-colonial and fully colonial) position of the Ukrainian lands within the Romanovs' empire brought about, among other consequences, a mass and systemic removal of the monuments of Ukrainian history and culture into Russian museums and private collections. Under the aegis of administrative and financial support of the state, the Hermitage, Russian museum in St Petersburg, Armory Museum, Rumiantsev museum, Historical museum, and the Tretyakov gallery in Moscow concentrated (as a matter of fact, appropriated) in their funds a great many invaluable relics of the Scythian period, antiquity, of «the Great Migration of peoples'» time, of Kievan Rus', and Cossack time, which represent the basic landmarks of the historical, cultural and art evolution

of the Ukrainian lands, spiritual sources and achievements of the Ukrainian people (Nestulia, Nestulia, 2006: 7).

By the Russian imperial decrees and orders of the central establishments of the Romanovs' empire in an administrative way the accurate system of pumping cultural values from the imperial periphery to the metropolis' capitals alias St Petersburg and Moscow. Thus, for example, tsar Peter I's decree on withdrawal of guns, captured «in battles from Turkish sultans and Polish and Swedish kings», from the arsenals of Kiev and Baturyn, which had to have been placed in Moscow «in the newly built armoury for commemoration and eternal glory» is well-known. The accumulation of outstanding monuments of cultures in Moscow and St Petersburg was also promoted by many other decrees of the tsar of Muscovy, such as *On the Delivery of Ancient Artifacts to Commandants*, dd. February, 13th, 1718; «*On Collecting of Old Chronicles in Eparchies*» dd. February, 16th, 1722, etc. Among later decrees, such can be mentioned: the decree of the Synod «*On the Search of Ancient Annals in Churches and Monasteries and their Departure to the Society of History and Ancient Russian Artifacts*», dd. June, 6th. 1804 (Moscow) (Kot, 1996: 27).

The removal of historical and cultural values from Ukraine to the capital centres of Russian metropolis became of systematic and regular character already in the end of the XVIII century, whilst it grew much more in scope and intensity in the XIX century. It was in the second half the XVIII century that the attention of the public and scientists of the empire was drawn to the treasures of Scythian barrows, old Slavonic and old Rus' historic artifacts.

Thus, for example, in 1763, by the order of the governor-general of New Russia Territory (Novorossiyskiy Krai) O. Melgunov, the Scythian barrow Red (or: Cast) Grave, a unique Scythian imperial barrow of the second half of the VII century AD in the northern Black Sea zone was dugged up in a predatory manner (Prydyk, 1911; Polin, 2009: 596, 597). The findings revealed in it, which later became to be known as «Melgunov's treasure» (it included a gold diadem, a binding of the handle and sheath of a sword, golden decorations of the clothes of the time at the break of the VII and VI centuries AD), were presented to empresses Catherine II and soon were entered in the imperial Hermitage, which she had founded. Also, after the discovery in 1830 of the Kul'-Oba barrow near Kerch and its investigation by P. Diubriuks, resulting in sending of the Scythian gold from it to the Hermitage (a golden diadem, a neck gryvnia of 461 grammes of weight, with figures of horsemen-Scythians on it) (Polin, 2008: 476, 477), by the government's directive the period of excavation of tumuli began. The found artefacts were inevitably sent to St Petersburg's Hermitage, wherein a new «specialized» room called the «Hall for Kerch ancient artifacts» was assigned. On the contrary, in the founded by the beginning of the XIX century in Southern Ukraine (Feodosiya, Odessa, Kerch) only those artefacts, which were of minor, secondary importance, character and value, were left. By the way, yet in 1804 the curator of Kharkiv University count S. Pototskyi was intend to open a museum where cultural values from all southern Ukraine (including the Crimea and Kerch) would have been concentrated, but, however, that plan appeared non-realised.

The Imperial Archaeological Commission, which had been created in 1859 and, afterwards, turned into the main centre of organisation of archaeological researches on the territories of the Romanovs' empires, only accelerated the process of draining away of the archeological finds of the Ukrainian lands and determined the destiny of the found treasures and casual finds. Its statute provided, that «The most valuable of the artifacts found by the the Commission, or ones that are sent to it, are represented to the discretion to His Majesty Emperor and – by the command of His Imperial Majesty – should be stored in the Imperial Hermitage museum or other sites decreed by His Majesty» (Kot, 1996: 28). However, no such «other sites» for keeping and exhibiting of the revealed in Ukraine most sensational finds of the XIX – beginning of the XX centuries were found on its territory (it is very probably that neither emperor Alexander II nor his successors were in the know about them).

Consequently, all the most valuable ancient artifacts of the Scythian, old Slavic and of Kievan Rus' periods found in Kiev, Poltava, Ekaterinoslav, Chernihiv lands and in other regions of Ukraine got to the Hermitage, the Russian museum in St Petersburg, the Armoury Museum and the Historical museum in Moscow. Among such finds, in particular, the treasures of Chortomlyk, a large Scythian kurhan (near modern Nikopil in Dnipropetrovske oblast) should be notified, which best item is the far-famed silver amphora with a depiction of Scythians as tamers of wild horses. In 1912 – 1913 in the territory of modern

Zaporizhia region (alias oblast) an «imperial» Scythian kurhan Solokha was dugged up, which artefacts became, without exaggeration, the world sensation. It suffice here to mention only a golden comb, a golden phial and a quiver decorated with a silver plate. The richest treasure in the history of the Russian empire and, in due course, of the USSR, was found in 1912 near the village of Mala Pereshchepyna in Poltava land, which consisted of golden (almost 25 kg) and silver (almost 50 kg) artifacts, such as dishes, vases, cups, an amphora, a drinking horn, a bowl, Byzantian coins of the VII century, bracelets, rings, a necklace or gryvnia, and a sword in a gold sheath (Prykhodniuk, 2009: 478). The fate of Pereshchepyna (Malopereshchepyna) treasures became a subject of rigid and long polemic between the representatives of art criticism and museum experts in the Ukr.SSR and their Russian colleagues during the 1930 May sessions of the Parity commission on the exchange of museum values between museums of the Russian Federation and the Ukr.SSR in Leningrad. The deputy director of scientific work (1927 – 1930) of the State Tretyakov gallery Nikolai Georgievich Mashkovtsev (1887 – 1962) was an opponent to his Ukrainian colleague Mykhailo Fedorovych Boltenko (1888 – 1959), deputy director of Odessa archaeological museum. Thus, for example, in the Commission's report of May, 15th, 1930 such a statement is written down: «M. F. Boltenko characterizes the worth of [Pereshchepyna] treasure for Ukraine as a unique complex of monuments of the nomadic population of Ukraine, as a monument of a junction and a contact of Ukraine with various peoples. N. G. Mashkovtsev ascertains the difficulty of the settlement of this question, coming about due to the fact that the withdrawal of this treasure from the Hermitage the latter's world renown will suffer a doubtless damage. It is necessary that both the scientific and educational importance of the Hermitage collections should be properly treated in full and act in a way which would prevent making any damage to scientific progress and wide educational work [...]. M. F. Boltenko: ««I bring this question in such a connection, that the world value of the Hermitage after its acquisition of this treasure, which indeed has an exclusive significance in the world culture, has not changed, and, after all, its withdrawal will not cause any damage to the world value of the Hermitage, though, however, this collection is of a very much great value [...]» (Nestulia, Nestulia, 2006: 214, 243, 244).

Thank to the persisting – but flexible – position of the Ukrainian expert, the most valuable part of Pereshchepyna treasure came then back to Ukraine. On June, 15th, 1930, the Kiev newspaper «Proletarska pravdat», in particular, informed this: «The rich in gold and of world renown Pereshchepyna treasure from the Poltava land with its Byzantian and Sassanid golden ware of the VI – VII century, with its unique silver plate on which the Persian tsar Sapor (Sahpuhri) II is depicted on lions, is transferred to Ukraine, as well as a number of other finds of the times of the Great Migration of peoples» (Obmin naukovyimi tsinnostyamy / An Exchange of Scientific Values, 1930: 5). All these outstanding monuments since then and – to a great extent – to this day are kept in the funds of Petersburg's Hermitage. The like fate is shared by an overwhelming majority of the old Rus' treasures found in Kiev. In particular, it concerns the treasures of (in accordance with their discovery time) 1827, 1876, 1880, 1885, 1894, 1910, and 1912, which, soon after being discovered, were operatively taken out to Moscow and St Petersburg (Kot, 1996: 29).

Along with archeological finds, to Moscow and to Petersburg a deep river of Ukrainian annals and old printings, numerous archives of secular and religious institutions, personal archives of outstanding cultural-educational figures and statesmen flowed. So, for example, in Saltykov-Shchedrin Russian national library in St Petersburg the original of an outstanding monument of Ukrainian history of Cossack time, namely – the chronicle of Samiylo Velychko, elucidating the events of Ukrainian history from mid XVII to the beginning of the XVIII centuries (one of the work's copy is kept in the Institute of Manuscripts of V. I. Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine) (Sas, 2003: 472–473).

A considerable outflow of Ukrainian cultural values was tightly linked with the actions of private persons. The trade in old artifacts was since long considered a profitable business. Thus, for example, as not much early as since the XVI – XVII centuries professional robberies of kurhans alias «mounding» (today this not at all honorary employment has been inherited by the so-called by «black archeologists»). Since the XIX century, ancient artifacts, manuscripts and books began to arrive in the «black market» of the Russian empire as a solid stream. A significant amount of historical and cultural monuments were asquired by private Russian collectors in Ukraine (Aisfeld, 2014: 40, 54). Thus, for example, in Ukraine, the well-known Russian statesman and patron of art Nikolai Petrovich Rumiantsev (1754 – 1826)

extremely actively bought ancient Ukrainian artifacts, and it was by his efforts that the outstanding museum of old artifacts (later called «Rumiantsev's museum») was created, its most estimated exhibit being the collection of manuscripts and old printed books. A whole lot of monuments have been presented to the Petersburg and Moscow museums by researchers who worked in Ukraine. In 1929 sculptor Konstantin Buldin, later an émigré to Argentina, so summed up the Russian imperial politics of «transfer of cultural values»: «Let's recall, that imperial Russia was a spider that throughout centuries sucked out and dragged into its cobwebs-capitals cultural values not only from the empire's provibces, but also from the whole world» (Buldin, 1929: 5).

Naturally enough, after the purging of Ukraine firstly from the power of Russian tsarism and – in due course – from the Soviet regime the domestic scientific and art elite was induced to formulate distinct requirements concerning the retrieval of cultural values to their historic motherland. The need for their returning to the legitimate owner every year becomes more and more pressing and each action, directed at finding out of the actual location of an art object or at proving of the proprietary right to it, is extremely important (Kot, 2010: 370). As the first President of the lately revived Ukrainian state L. M. Kravchuk remarked in 1996, the Ukrainian cultural treasures were taken out to Russia along several centuries and, thus, «nourished the Russian history and culture, gaining the international recognition to Russian storehouses of cultural values». In addition, Leonid Makarovych [Kravchuk] underlined the following: «It is already for several generations of Ukrainians that they have been trying to retrieve the lost relics. Moreover, the very first steps of the Ukrainian state construction in time of the Tsentralna Rada (Central Council), UNR, and the Ukrainian State in 1917 – 1918 certified that this issue was granted a real state importance» (Nestulia, Nestulia, 2006: 6).

The conclusions. With the restoration of Ukraine's independence Ukraine and Russia became confronted by the challenges concerning: a) the determination in a civilised way of the fate of Ukrainian cultural values, illegally removed from Ukrainian territory to that of Russia in times of the tsarism and its communistic successors, and also those lost during evacuations in the years of World War II (the «Great Patriotic war»); b) the search for the objects of art and history which had been carried away by the nazi invaders from the territory of the Ukrainian SSR and retrieved to the USSR, but are still kept in the Russian, not in Ukrainian, storehouses or private collections (founded – at least partially – thanks to the «trophies» captured by the officer and command staff of the Red army in the «liberated» territory of east-central Europe or directly in Germany).

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ І ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

Айсфельд, 2014 – Айсфельд О. Коллекция Петра Маврогордато: пути античных артефактов из Причерноморья в зарубежные музейные и частные собрания // Вісник Одеського історико-краєзнавчого музею: Науковий збірник. Одеса, 2014. № 13. С. 40–54.

Акуленко, 1991 – Акуленко В. І. Охорона пам'яток культури в Україні. 1917 – 1990. Київ, 1991. 274 с.

Бульдін, 1929 – Бульдін К. Деякі питання культурної роботи та огляд Київської картинної галереї // Літературна газета. 1929. 1 квітня. № 7 (49).

Гетьман, 2007 – Гетьман Д. Взаємообмін музейними цінностями між РРФСР та УСРР в 1931 – 1936 рр. // Пам'ять століть. 2007. № 1. С. 211–229.

Кот, 1993 – Кот С. І Чи повернуться наші клейноди? // Українська культура. 1993. № 1. С. 20–21.

Кот, 1994 – Кот С. І. Реституція чи конфронтація? // Політика і час. 1994. № 6. С. 27–35.

Кот, 1996 – Кот С. І. Українські культурні цінності в Росії: Проблема повернення в контексті історії та права: монографія. Київ, 1996. 91 с.

Кот, 2009 – Кот С. І. Реліквії козацтва в контексті українсько-російських переговорів щодо їх повернення (1920 – 1930-ті рр.) // Український історичний журнал. 2009. № 1. С. 129–143.

Кот, 2010 – Кот С. І. З історії формування організаційних засад державної політики повернення та реституції культурних цінностей в незалежній Україні // Історія України: Маловідомі імена, події, факти: Збірник статей. Київ, 2010. Вип. 36. С. 361–371.

Ленченко, 1989 – Ленченко В. До повернення національних реліквій // Пам'ятки України. 1989. № 4. С. 28–29.

Ленченко, 1990 – Ленченко В. Клейноди Війська Запорозького // Пам'ятки України. 1990. № 2. С. 56–57.

Нестуля, Нестуля, 2002 – Нестуля О., Нестуля С. Українські культурні цінності в Росії: На шляху до діалогу: 1926 – 1930: [Збірник документів]. Полтава: РВВ ПУСКУ, 2006. 333 с.

- Обмін, 1930 – Обмін науковими цінностями між УСРР й РСФРР // Пролетарська правда, 1930. 15 червня. № 136 (2651).
- Полін, 2008 – Полін С. В. Куль-Оба – одне з найбільших скіфських поховань другої половини 4 ст. до н. е. // Енциклопедія історії України: У 10 т. / НАН України. Інститут історії України; редкол.: В. А. Смолій (голова) та ін. Київ, Наукова думка, 2008. Т. 5: Кон-Кю. С. 476–477.
- Полін, 2009 – Полін С. В. Мельгунівський курган (Лита Могила) // Енциклопедія історії України: У 10 т. / НАН України. Інститут історії України; редкол.: В. А. Смолій (голова) та ін. Київ, Наукова думка, 2009. Т. 6: Ла-Мі. С. 596–597.
- Придик, 1911 – Придик Е. Мельгуновский клад 1763 г. // Материалы по археологии России. Санкт-Петербург, 1911. № 31. 24 с.
- Приходнюк, 2009 – Приходнюк О. М. Малоперещепинський скарб // Енциклопедія історії України: У 10 т. / НАН України. Інститут історії України; редкол.: В. А. Смолій (голова) та ін. Київ, Наукова думка, 2009. Т. 6: Ла-Мі. С. 478.
- Реєнт, Лисенко, 1997 – Реєнт О. П., Лисенко О. Є. Історичні зошити. Огляд видань Інституту історії України НАНУ за останні 10 років. Київ, 1997. С. 101–103.
- Савчук, 2000 – Савчук Ю. Особисті речі Б. Хмельницького у колекціях музеїв Європи // Україна в Центральній-Східній Європі: Студії з історії XI–XVIII ст. Київ, 2000. С. 293–313.
- Савчук, Турек, 2000 – Савчук Ю., Турек Є. Прапор Б. Хмельницького з Державної трофейної колекції Військового музею у Стокгольмі // Українська козацька держава: витоки та шляхи історичного розвитку. Вип. 7. 2000. С. 312–324.
- Сас, 2003 – Сас П. М. Величко Самійло (Самойл) Васильович та його літопис // Енциклопедія історії України: В 5 т. / НАН України. Інститут історії України; редкол.: В. А. Смолій (голова) та ін. Київ, Наукова думка, 2003. Т. 1: А–В. С. 472–473.
- Сергійчук, 1990 – Сергійчук В. І. Доля української національної символіки: монографія. Київ, Знання, 1990. 48 с.
- Федорук, 1996 – Федорук О. Повернення в Україну втрачених культурних цінностей в контексті державотворчого та духовного відродження // Повернення культурного надбання України: проблеми, завдання, перспективи. 1996. Вип. 6. С. 22–24.
- Федорук, 1998 – Федорук О. Україна і Росія: діалоги у сфері переміщених культурних цінностей // Українсько-російські відносини: гуманітарний вимір: Науковий збірник. Київ, НІУРВ. 1998. С. 97–107.

REFERENCES

- Aysfeld, 2014 – Aysfeld O. Kolleksiya Petra Mavrogordato: puti antichnykh artefaktov iz Prichernomor'ya v zarubezhnye muzeynye i chastnye sobraniya [Collection of Peter Mavrogordato: the ways of antique artifacts from the Black Sea region to foreign museum and private collections] // Visnik Odeskogo istoriko-kraeznavchogo muzeju: Naukoviy zbirnik. – Bulletin of the Odessa Historical and Local History Museum. Odessa, 2014. № 13. S. 40–54 [in Ukrainian].
- Akulenko, 1991 – Akulenko V. I. Okhorona pam'iatok kultury v Ukraini. 1917 – 1990. [Protection of cultural monuments in Ukraine. 1917 – 1990]. Kyiv, 1991. 274 s. [in Ukrainian].
- Buldin, 1929 – Buldin K. Deiaki pytannia kulturnoi roboty ta ohliad Kyivskoi kartynnoi halerei [Some issues of cultural work and an overview of the Kiev art gallery] // Literaturna hazeta. 1929. 1 kvitnia. № 7 (49). [in Ukrainian].
- Hetman, 2007 – Hetman D. Vzaiemoobmin muzeinymy tsinnostiamy mizh RRFSSR ta USRR v 1931 – 1936 rr. [Mutual exchange of museum values between the RFSFR and the Ukrainian SSR in 1931–1936.] // Pam'iat stolit. 2007. № 1. S. 211–229. [in Ukrainian].
- Kot, 1993 – Kot S. I Chy povernutsia nashi kleinydy? [Will our flywheels come back?] // Ukrainska kultura. 1993. № 1. S. 20–21. [in Ukrainian].
- Kot, 1994 – Kot S. I. Restytutsiia chy konfrontatsiia? [Restitution or confrontation?] // Polityka i chas. 1994. № 6. S. 27–35. [in Ukrainian].
- Kot, 1996 – Kot S. I. Ukrainski kulturni tsinnosti v Rosii: Problema povernennia v konteksti istorii ta prava: monohrafiia. [Ukrainian cultural values in Russia: the problem of return in the context of history and law]. Kyiv, 1996. 91 s. [in Ukrainian].
- Kot, 2009 – Kot S. I. Relikvii kozatstva v konteksti ukrainsko-rosiiskykh perehovoriv shchodo yikh povernennia (1920 – 1930-ti rr.) [Relics of the Cossacks in the context of the Ukrainian-Russian talks on their return (1920 – 1930's)] // Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal. 2009. № 1. S. 129–143. [in Ukrainian].
- Kot, 2010 – Kot S. I. Z istorii formuvannia orhanizatsiinykh zasad derzhavnoi polityky povernennia ta restytutsii kulturnykh tsinnostei v nezalezhnii Ukraini [From the history of the formation of organizational principles of

state policy of return and restitution of cultural property in independent Ukraine] // *Istoriia Ukrainy: Malovidomi imena, podii, fakty: Zbirnyk statei*. Kyiv, 2010. Vyp. 36. S. 361–371. [in Ukrainian].

Lenchenko, 1989 – Lenchenko V. Do povnennia natsionalnykh relikvii [Before the return of national relics] // *Pam'iatky Ukrainy*. 1989. № 4. S. 28–29 [in Ukrainian].

Lenchenko, 1990 – Lenchenko V. Kleinody Viiska Zaporozkoho [Kleinods of the Zaporozhian Army] // *Pam'iatky Ukrainy*. 1990. № 2. S. 56–57 [in Ukrainian].

Nestulia, Nestulia, 2002 – Nestulia O., Nestulia S. Ukrainski kulturni tsinnosti v Rosii: Na shliakhu do dialohu: 1926 – 1930: [Zbirnyk dokumentiv]. [Ukrainian Cultural Values in Russia: On the Way to Dialogue: 1926 – 1930: [Collection of Documents]]. Poltava: RVV PUSKU, 2006. 333 s. [in Ukrainian].

Obmin, 1930 – Obmin naukovy tsinnostiamy mizh USRR i RSFRR [Exchange of scientific values between the Ukrainian SSR and the RSFSR] // *Proletarska pravda*. 1930. 15 chervnia. № 136 (2651). [in Ukrainian].

Polin, 2008 – Polin S. V. Kul-Oba – odne z naibilshykh skifskykh pokhovan druhoi polovyny 4 st. do n. e. [Kul-Oba – one of the largest Scythian graves of the second half of the 4th century. until is.] // *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy: U 10 t. / NAN Ukrainy*. Instytut istorii Ukrainy; redkol.: V. A. Smolii (holova) ta in. Kyiv, Naukova dumka, 2008. T. 5: Kon–Kiu. S. 476–477. [in Ukrainian].

Polin, 2009 – Polin S. V. Melhunivskiy kurhan (Lyta Mohyla) [Melguniv Hill (Litva Mohyla)] // *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy: U 10 t. / NAN Ukrainy*. Instytut istorii Ukrainy; redkol.: V. A. Smolii (holova) ta in. Kyiv, Naukova dumka, 2009. T. 6: La–Mi. S. 596–597. [in Ukrainian].

Pridik, 1911 – Pridik Ye. Melgunovskiy klad 1763 g. [Melgun's Treasure in 1763] // *Materialy po arkheologii Rossii*. Sankt-Peterburg, 1911. № 31. 24 s. [in Russian].

Prykhodniuk, 2009 – Prykhodniuk O. M. Malopereshchepynskiy skarb [Little Treasbing Treasure] // *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy: U 10 t. / NAN Ukrainy*. Instytut istorii Ukrainy; redkol.: V. A. Smolii (holova) ta in. Kyiv, Naukova dumka, 2009. T. 6: La–Mi. S. 478. [in Ukrainian].

Reient, Lysenko, 1997 – Reient O.P., Lysenko O.Ie. Istorychni zoshyty. Ohliad vydan Instytutu istorii Ukrainy NANU za ostanni 10 rokov. [Historical notebooks. Review of the publications of the Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences for the last 10 years]. Kyiv, 1997. S. 101–103. [in Ukrainian].

Savchuk, 2000 – Savchuk Iu. Osobysti rechi B. Khmelnytskoho u kolektsiakh muzeiv Yevropy [B. Khmelnytsky's personal belongings in the collections of European museums] // *Ukraina v Tsentralno-Skhidnii Yevropi: Studii z istorii XI–XVIII st.* Kyiv, 2000. S. 293–313. [in Ukrainian].

Savchuk, Turek, 2000 – Savchuk Iu., Turek Ie. Prapor B. Khmelnytskoho z Derzhavnoi trofeinoi kolektsii Viiskovoho muzeiu u Stokholmi [Flag of B. Khmelnytsky from the State trophy collection of the Museum of Military in Stockholm] // *Ukrainska kozatska derzhava: vytoky ta shliakhy istorychnoho rozvytku*. 2000. Vyp. 7. S. 312–324. [in Ukrainian].

Sas, 2003 – Sas P. M. Velychko Samiilo (Samoil) Vasylovych ta yoho litopys [Velichko Samillo (Samoil) Vasilyevich and his chronicle] // *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy: V 5 t. / NAN Ukrainy*. Instytut istorii Ukrainy; redkol.: V. A. Smolii (holova) ta in. Kyiv, Naukova dumka, 2003. T. 1: A–V. S. 472–473. [in Ukrainian].

Serhiichuk, 1990 – Serhiichuk V. I. Dolia ukrainskoi natsionalnoi symboliky: monohrafiia. [The fate of Ukrainian national symbols: a monograph]. Kyiv, Znannia, 1990. 48 s. [in Ukrainian].

Fedoruk, 1996 – Fedoruk O. Povnennia v Ukrainu vtrachenykh kulturnykh tsinnosti v konteksti derzhavotvorchoho ta dukhovnoho vidrodzhennia [Return to Ukraine of lost cultural values in the context of state-building and spiritual revival] // *Povnennia kulturnoho nadbannia Ukrainy: problemy, zavdannia, perspektyvy*. 1996. Vyp. 6. S. 22–24. [in Ukrainian].

Fedoruk, 1998 – Fedoruk O. Ukraina i Rosiia: dialohy u sferi peremishchenykh kulturnykh tsinnosti [Ukraine and Russia: Dialogues in the Sphere of Moved Cultural Values] // *Ukrainsko-rosiiskii vidnosyny: humanitarnyi vymir: Naukovi zbirnyk*. Kyiv, NIURV, 1998. S. 97–107. [in Ukrainian].

Стаття надійшла до редакції 10.02.2018 р.