

first publication

## Introduction

<sup>1</sup> Ragin, Charles C.: *Constructing Social Research: The Unity and Diversity of Method*. Thousand Oaks/Cal.: Pine Forge Pr. 1994, pp. 98-101

<sup>2</sup> Bialasiewicz, Luiza: *Another Europe: Remembering Habsburg Galicja*. In: *Cultural Geographies* 10 (2003), pp. 21-44, here p. 21.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

The transition from the Soviet Union to an array of independent states has released numerous tensions that imply different ways of involvement with the collective and individual past. The transition being a case of abrupt social and cultural change for the post-Soviet states has released opportunities for the public articulation of connections between specific regions and places and their past that previous regimes precluded. Western Ukraine can serve as a case-study of patterns of relating to one such past. Such patterns stem from the significant relationship that public intellectuals and writers enter as they articulate their link to sites of individual or collective memory. Using the strategy of theoretical sampling<sup>1</sup> I will show how the consideration of specific post-independence trajectories that three Ukrainian writers and intellectuals have followed sharpens an understanding of the post-communist transition as a situated phenomenon. Contrasted comparisons of the situation in the field of Ukrainian literature at the heyday of the Soviet Union and in the 1990's will help clarify the nature of the change that contemporary Ukrainian writers and intellectuals were challenged to cope with as they were laying claims to their position in their rapidly changing society.

The three Ukrainian intellectuals whose social trajectories I will broadly map are Iurii Vynnychuk, Iurii Andrukhovych and Mykola Riabchuk. Over more than a decade since Ukraine's independence, these intellectuals have revisited Western Ukraine as a site of collective memory by means of fictional works and prose narratives. I chose these authors for their representation of three different initial positions within the post-communist field of cultural production in Ukraine. I assume them to have followed representative trajectories within the field of opportunities that the fall of communism opened. Attention to their current positions relative to each other can yield insights into continuities and changes in the composition of Ukrainian cultural elites.

One further reason for choosing these authors is their treatment of Western Ukraine as a site of collective memory that they have in common. This memory refers to the lands that at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century were governed as a single province of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The region, also known in Ukrainian as *Halychyna*, was part of the Habsburg province of Galicia that comprised contemporary lands of Western Ukraine and Eastern Poland, the pertinent Polish name for the latter being *Galicja*.<sup>2</sup> Lemberg, being a regional urban centre of the province, has an important place in the nationalist narratives of the Ukrainian and Polish peoples, where the city is called L'viv and Lwów respectively. As the Soviet Union and the communist bloc fell apart, articulations by newly independent Eastern European states of their collective identity vis-à-vis Europe as a space of belonging took recourse to sites of collective memory. Galicia, being one such site, is divided by state borders that Eastern Europe has inherited. Negotiations of European belonging by the neighboring Polish and Ukrainian states hinge on articulations of continuities and ruptures that elites on both sides of the border enlist.<sup>3</sup> More prominent agents of such articulations are writers and intellectuals who addressed collective memory and identity in the post-communist situation. Tracing the trajectories three different writers and intellectuals followed within the Ukrainian field of cultural production can sharpen an understanding of what model of relation to collective memory prevails at the dominant versus the dominated sector of the field.

## Part I

Though the selected writers are not exclusive in dealing with collective memory, as numerous articles on the pages of Ukrainian newspapers and periodicals attest, they have attained visibility within the field of Ukrainian literature and within the Ukrainian public sphere. The choices they have made in engaging with public discourse are reflective of the mode of transition that the Ukrainian literary field has undergone since the collapse of communism. It is borne out in their differential inclusion into the ranks of nationally consecrated writers that they are implicated in not only dealing with such a site of collective memory as Western Ukraine or its record of relationships with successive regimes on its territory but also with the composition of and changes in Ukrainian cultural elites.

4 Bourdieu, Pierre: *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Cambridge, New York: Polity Pr., Columbia UP 1993, p. 30 [italics in original]

5 Rainow, Peter: Book Review of *Politics and Society in Ukraine* by Paul D'Anieri, Robert Kravchuk, and Taras Kuzio. In: *Slavic Review* 59 (2000), p. 901f., here p. 901.

6 Pavlyshyn, Marko: *Demystifying High Culture? ›Young Ukrainian Poetry and Prose in the 1990s*. In: Armstrong, Todd Patrick (Ed.): *Perspectives on Modern Central and East European Literature: Quests for Identity*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, New York: Palgrave 2001, pp. xvii-159, here p. 10.

7 Swoboda, Victor: *The Party Guidance of a Soviet Literature: The Case of the Ukraine*. In: *East European Literature: Selected Papers from the Second World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies* (ed. by Evelyn Bristol) [Berkeley: Berkeley Slavic Specialities] (1982), pp. 85-106, here p. 85.

8 Zuidervaart, Lambert: *The Social Significance of Autonomous Art: Adorno and Burger*. In: *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 48 (1990), pp. 61-77.

9 Motyl, Alexander J.: *Structural Constraints and Starting Points: The Logic of Systemic Change in Ukraine and Russia*. In: *Comparative Politics* 29 (1997), pp. 433-447, here p. 435.

The hypothesis that I propose for my subsequent analysis of the texts is that a modification of the field of cultural production in Ukraine has led to a change in the stakes and forms of recognition that contemporary intellectuals are compelled to pursue. However, as strategies of the treatment of Western Ukraine as a site of collective memory by each author will show, the exogenous impact of post-communism on the Ukrainian literary field bears on their dealing with the collective past in ways that point to important differences in positions that each author takes up vis-à-vis Western Ukraine's European and Soviet past. Though the fall of Soviet Union is associated with gains for human and civil rights in the region, the challenges that Ukrainian elites have faced split into three major categories: those of re-imagining Ukraine and its territory in nationalist terms, those of articulating cultural relations with its national neighbors, and those of engaging in dialogue with globally dominant discourses on power and knowledge.

For each type of challenge I take as an instance of theoretical sampling Iurii Vynnychuk, Iurii Andrukhovych and Mykola Riabchuk respectively. As I will argue, the modified field of cultural production that they have inherited has opened the field of possibilities that the social and cultural resources of each writer have enabled them to realize. Since a field of literature is the segment of a more general field of cultural production I will be referring to these interchangeably both because the field of literature is the one from which I draw my theoretical sample and because Pierre Bourdieu's theories on logic and the functioning of fields apply in equal measure to one as to the other:

The *space of literary or artistic position-takings*, i.e. the structured set of the manifestations of the social agents involved in the field – literary or artistic works, of course, but also political acts or pronouncements, manifestos or polemics, etc. – is inseparable from the *space of literary or artistic positions* defined by possession of a determinate quantity of specific capital (recognition) and, at the same time, by occupation of a determinate position in the structure of the distribution of this specific capital.<sup>4</sup>

The discourse on continuities in the post-communist transition of Ukraine, referred to as the »Soviet legacy«,<sup>5</sup> encompasses the cultural field as much as it does the society at large. This indicates that an important generative structure for both positions and position-taking within the literary field is the Soviet past. Therefore, attention to the social trajectory of contemporary cultural producers represents an inquiry into the position-takings that each writer's position in the literary field elicited as strategies of adjustment. Within the history of the field of Ukrainian literature, these authors are situated in the decade that was transitional for the whole of the Soviet Union – the 1980's. At that time, a new generation of men and women of letters had come into public view to be in an exceptional position to gain from liberalization and the eventual fall of Soviet regime. These

[...] poets and writers [...] born in the late 1950s and early 1960s [...] came into public view before and during the years of glasnost'. [They] [...] share a literary education probably more sophisticated and specialized than that of any preceding generation.<sup>6</sup>

The extent of change that these intellectuals have had to deal with as they were making the transition to post-communism can be gauged by looking at how the Soviet Ukrainian literary field functioned in the decades immediately prior to the transitional 1980's. In the late 1960's to mid-1970's

[...] the majority of Soviet writers are [Communist] Party members themselves, while those writers whose works are regularly and extensively printed are practically all Party members. [...] What is more, six well-known writers – Markov, Sholokhov, Chakovskii, Gribachev, Honchar, and Simonov – belong to the highest governing bodies of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, while another forty-five occupy similar positions in the Party leadership at the level of the Union Republics.<sup>7</sup>

In contrast to the Western liberal democracies, where literary fields are accorded institutional autonomy,<sup>8</sup> the Communist Party, indistinguishable from the state, through its agencies »effectively controlled all nonstate activity in the society, economy and culture«. <sup>9</sup> The high degree of integration of Soviet Ukrainian writers in the Party shows the literary field to have been offering positions in the hegemonic elite of the USSR. The way the frequent failure



10 Swoboda 1982.

11 Subtelny, Orest: *Ukraine: a History*. Toronto, Buffalo: Toronto UP 2000, p. 581.

12 Rigby, T.H.: *New Top Elites for Old in Russian Politics*. In: *British Journal of Political Science* 29 (1999), pp. 323-343, here p. 326.

13 *Ibid.*, p. 324.

14 *Ibid.*, p. 326.

15 Motyl 1997, p. 439.

of the Soviet control apparatus to repress the dissenting voices of Ukrainian writers and intellectuals before their deviation from the »party line« is lambasted in the press<sup>10</sup> can be seen as an outcome of the overlapping operation of the Soviet Union's and Soviet Ukrainian social structures. That the tight control over positions in the Soviet society was meeting with resistance and dissent are proved by the instances of harsh punishment of imprisonment and exile that the party-state was applying to regulate the position-taking strategies by those who eventually were taking up positions in the Soviet Ukrainian literary field. The active party control exercised over the contents and style of all the literary works that reached the public by official means can thus be construed as power struggles within the party's own ranks among its elite membership as much as among those aspiring to join it.

Given that this situation stayed in effect virtually unchanged right up to the fall of communism, there was a strong expectation that Ukrainian writers and intellectuals who belong to the generation of the 1980's would be reacting to the radically new situation of national independence with responses that are predicated on the sweeping changes in the literary field, the positions within which were previously secured by the party-controlled social system. Therefore, the responses of the Ukrainian writers to the post-communist transition into the demise of the Soviet party nomenklatura system have more to do with the changes in the elite structures in Ukraine than with the formal ban of the Communist Party,<sup>11</sup> which took place merely five days after the proclamation of independence on August 29, 1991:

The cataclysms of 1989-91 swept away certain key elite structures (crucially the apparatus of the Communist Party and its youth wing, the Komsomol), transformed others (notably the state administration, political journalism, autonomous political parties, private banks). Whole categories of political roles disappeared as new ones emerged. At most levels, many individuals contrived privilege- and status-preserving leaps from the former to the latter.<sup>12</sup>

In Soviet times, a writer could be expelled from the Party for not toeing the official line on matters of style and content effective at the point of either its publication or criticism, while keeping intact the position of the Ukrainian literary field within the more general field of power. The transitional situation has removed a vast number of intellectuals, among them writers, who belonged to the large party-supported and controlled *nomenklatura*,<sup>13</sup> from their positions of social power and more than nominal influence. For members of the Ukrainian power elite controlling the state, »private trade, production and particularly finance«<sup>14</sup> the transition to independence was accompanied by a change in the ranks of the *nomenklatura* deriving from contradictions within the former Party apparatus and the re-negotiation of their mutual relationships with the aim of maintaining their social dominance. However, Ukrainian writers suddenly found themselves outside of the ranks of the newly constituting power elites rent by the warring »factions based on regional loyalties, personal ties, functional roles, and generational differences«.<sup>15</sup>

## Part II

The following represents a situated analysis of the social trajectory of a cultural producer that I take as representative of the processes that characterize the dominated faction of the field of cultural production in Ukraine. Moreover, Vynnychuk's prose provides an opening for the inquiry into the manner in which the past has been visited in Ukrainian contemporary writing. Vynnychuk's 1992 short novel *Divy nochi* [*Maidens of the Night*] deals with Western Ukraine's Soviet past by fashioning his protagonist Iurii Vynnychuk as a Western Ukrainian who wrote down his adventures as he confronted the underworld, foreign and Russophone visitors of Lemberg, the regional center of historical Galicia and largest city of Western Ukraine.

A reconstruction of Iurii Vynnychuk's social trajectory in the post-independence literary field of Ukraine has to take into account the sharp reduction in size that the literary market for Ukrainian literature has gone through in the course of the 1990's. While the first print run of Vynnychuk's prose was published for the mass market numbered in tens of thousands of copies, the publication of his stories in the year 2000 was made on the order of several hundreds.<sup>16</sup> On one hand, such a sharp decrease in expectations of market success for the author who was receiving contracts for large-scale publications in the past can be explained

16 Vynnychuk, Iurii: »Pro vse tse tiazhko rozkazaty...«. In: *Potyah 76* (2004) (ed. by Iurii Andrukhovych and Lesia Stovpchak) [L'viv], <http://www.potyah76.org.ua/potyah/?t=28>

17 Ibid.

18 Donchyk, Vitali/Hryhori Iovych: *Istoriia ukrains'koï literatury XX stolittia: u dvokh knyhakh*. Kyiv: »Lybid« 1998.

19 Marsh, Rosalind: *The Death of Soviet Literature: Can Russian Literature Survive?* In: *Europe-Asia Studies* 45 (1993), pp. 115-139, here p. 129.

20 Naydan, Michael M.: Introduction. In: Naydan, M.M. (Ed.): *The Windows of Time Frozen and other Stories*. Lviv: *Klasyka* 2000, pp. 6-10.

21 Vynnychuk, I.: *Knaipy L'vova*. L'viv: *Vyd-vo »Spolom«* 2000.

by a change in his positioning from the higher prestige and less remunerative position of intellectual, less accessible fiction to the lower prestige but more profitable sector of the literary field.<sup>17</sup>

Vynnychuk follows the logic of making a virtue of the necessity to follow the logic of the market in situation when the Ukrainian field of cultural production lost state support in the post-Soviet period. While he exhibits in his interviews a knowledge of the international and Ukrainian literary canons and histories, the place in the literary field that he willfully assumes is at its dominated pole, where literary production objectively corresponds to the popular literary taste. That such positioning is liable to bring about a lack of recognition by the Ukrainian critical establishment, as institutionalized by Ukraine's national literature institute,<sup>18</sup> owes to the apparent persistence of hierarchies of literary value inherited from the Soviet Union. To ascertain where in terms of critical recognition the literary genres in which Vynnychuk has established a reputation for himself are positioned, one can turn to post-communist Russian literature. Though differently positioned than Ukrainian literature among other Soviet literatures, it provides an insight into how the Soviet literary field was adjusting to the post-Soviet situation. Drawing on research by Rosalind Marsh, one can say that black humor and erotic prose have become by-words for market-oriented literary works with which no or little literary value is associated by the critical and literary establishment of Russia:

In 1991 Toporov claimed that a »regulated market economy of a mixed type« already existed in publishing; both state and cooperative publishing houses asked their authors to produce works which responded to consumer demand, »that is «black prose« and porn« [...] Similarly, Latynina has defined the situation in Russia as »this savage period of primitive accumulation« [...] Latynina's apprehension is shared by other writers and intellectuals: she cites the writer Naum Korzhavin as saying: »It turns out that innovation in art is now serving mediocrities. They very quickly figure out what is »good« and what is »bad«, what is »new« and what is »old«.« The market system promotes kitsch and leaves no room for »an artist who is incapable of attaching himself to any group or movement that acts as a market mafia.«<sup>19</sup>

Such an unmediated impact of the transition to market economy accounts for a change in the institutions that previously played a gate-keeping role in regard to cultural producers willing to gather symbolic and economic profits from their activity. While the post-Soviet economic crisis has wiped the state support for these institutions' effective operation, the commercialized literary market in Ukraine began to exercise an unrestrained control over literary production. This abrupt change from the Soviet period could account for corresponding transformation of the structure of symbolic and economic profits that each position in the field wins for its occupier. Given that over the course of the 1990's the accessibility of Vynnychuk's writing did not change, his dominated position within the literary field must have remained stable within its structure. Moreover, as writers and literary critics, along with other representatives of the impoverished *intelligentsia*, are excluded from the ranks of the consolidated social elites in Ukraine in the post-communist period, Vynnychuk will have suffered from the double effects of within the literary field symbolic, and within the society at large social, domination.

Accordingly, his name is not included in the roster of Ukrainian writers of the period canonized in university readers. As a prolific writer, who consistently orients himself by the mass market with his adventure, black humor, and phantasmagorical novels, he is never mentioned in the same breath with such writers as Iurii Andrukhovych or Oksana Zabuzhko who are rising to dominant positions, having received a consistently high amount of attention in the Ukrainian metropolitan and regional press. Even Vynnychuk's 1999 short story *Vyshyvanyj svit* [*Embroidered World*] that represents his attempt at more serious prose, which a translation by a Ukrainian publisher classifies as »philosophical«,<sup>20</sup> retains most of the features of accessibility that compromise his aspirations to high literary form.

As he continues to reach for a mass readership with his fairy tale collections, urban myths anthologies and topical overviews,<sup>21</sup> he consistently exhibits the willingness and ability to abide by the market forces. The literary market alone, while providing economic profits, does not afford a place in the literary hierarchy that would accord critical recognition. Critical attention by the literary establishment conveyed by mutual recognition by other writers that thereby maintain limited access to their ranks as cultural producers is an indicator of a high amount of cultural capital. A publication by the Ukrainian national academy of sciences carried out by the state institute of literary research does not spare a word of mention for

22 Donchyk/Iovych 1998.

23 Grabowicz, George G.: Literaturne istoriopyssannia ta joho konteksty. In: *Krytyka* (2001), pp. 11-15.

24 Swoboda 1982, p. 99.

25 Ibid., p. 98.

26 Vynnychuk 2004.

Iurii Vynnychuk in what actually amounts to a mainstream representation of the history of Ukrainian literature in the latter half of the twentieth century.<sup>22</sup> Regardless of the fairly abbreviated introduction that a vast array of Ukrainian writers from this period received from a numerous body of contributions by recognized Ukrainian professors and researchers in the field, the publication not only holds effective powers of recognition of who is and who is not a writer worthy of inclusion in the canon of national literature, but it also consecrates those who receive a separate entry in this virtual encyclopedia of Ukrainian literature and who garner critical praise, as did, to some extent, Iurii Andrukhovych.

The fact that Vynnychuk does not receive any recognition, let alone acclaim, from the Ukrainian establishment of literary critics and historians, against which the Harvard-based editor of *Krytyka* [*Criticism*], local review on literature, culture, and society, George Grabowicz has voiced his arguments,<sup>23</sup> can be explained with the structural transformations that the Ukrainian literary field has undergone. Such transformations were taking place against the background of the disintegration of distribution networks and the disruption of production lines of major publishing houses. The latter supplied the book market with publications and literary journals. This situation, commonly referred to in the press as an effect of the economic crisis that took place in Ukraine as in other former Soviet republics, should have ridden previously existing positions in the literary field of their meanings as sources of economic capital in the form of substantial income or employment. To the extent that Ukrainian book and literary journal publishing has never regained the positions it had before the collapse of the Soviet Union, the outcome of the economic transition to market economy in the form of the exogenous impact on its literary field can be considered long-lasting.

*Divy nochi*, submitted for publication in August 1992, a year after the Communist Party was struck down in Ukraine, is a collection of essays that trace the adventures of its protagonist, Iurii Vynnychuk, in the social underworld of L'viv. That the author's name is identical to the fictional character's makes one think of the Communist Party encouraging its writers to take to »[t]he genre of »journalistic essay«, as opposed to fiction«. <sup>24</sup> However, in the absence of the hegemonic presence of the Communist Party, the »journalistic essay« technique is being put to uses that have in mind the popular fiction market rather than the audience of ideological critics. The significant feature of this prose piece is it being set in the 1970's, exactly the decade when

[...] a major onslaught was started [...] against Ukrainian dissidents and *samizdat*; several writers and critics were among those who fell victim to that wave of arrests [...] The most important deviation scored by the Party was enthusiasm or nostalgia for the Cossack era, with its associations to past, glory, freedom, national independence, and resentment for their loss.<sup>25</sup>

The repeal of the restrictions on speech and creativity combined with a virtual reversal of priorities from those of collectivism and class struggle to those of nationalism could in itself be sufficient pull factor for the outpouring of publications of works by previously proscribed and repressed authors. However, the narrative featuring as its subject the social underworld populated with prostitutes, pimps, smugglers, thugs, and corrupt officials could have been related not just to the 1970's – the decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century where the book is ostensibly set. Moreover, despite Vynnychuk's choice to give to the short novel's character his own name, the author has subsequently claimed that the events in the novel are purely fictional.<sup>26</sup>

His interviews and introduction to translations of his stories and texts state that he drew on his rich experience that he acquired in the L'viv demimonde in the 1970's, before he became a recognized literary critic in the eighties. Given that the former apparatchiks were renegotiating their entry into the socially dominant establishment from their positions in politics, industry, and media, he among other Ukrainian writers was summarily excluded from the power elites. Abiding by the market forces was one of the few avenues of social advancement that the post-Soviet transition has opened for this Ukrainian writer.

With a print run of 40.000 at a major metropolitan publishing house, Vynnychuk was openly catering to the mass readership. As a better educated and informed member of his society he was aware of the directions that the post-independence developments were taking. A déclassé member of the formerly dominant *intelligentsia*, to which he belonged through his literary critical activity and his income guaranteed by the communist regime, he was caught in the process of rapid social and economic polarization. In the 1990's, only

27 Subtelny 2000, p. 625.

28 In: potyah76.org.ua (2004).

29 Naydan 2000.

[a]bout 10% of the population managed to acquire some of the features of a Western middle class: they were small businesspeople, managers and directors – in short, people who profited, in a modest fashion, from the market economy. [...] The vast bulk, about 75%, of the population, however, experienced an unmitigated socioeconomic disaster. This formerly secure Soviet middle class was abruptly plunged into a bitter struggle for survival. It was, first of all, bereft of money. Hyperinflation wiped out its savings, the economic crisis meant that salaries were not paid or were postponed, rising prices put goods out of reach, and unemployment or underemployment grew steadily.<sup>27</sup>

This transition experience provided incentives that Vynnychuk was responding to as he assumed the position of opportunity-seeking *litterateur* who over the decade has tried his hand in black humor prose, science fiction, short stories, children's books and historical prose for the consumer market.<sup>28</sup> His mastery of twisted plotline and ability to give a comical turn to the description of events come in the novel side by side with the treatment of the Soviet Ukrainian past that exceeds the characterization as juvenile literature.<sup>29</sup> Rather, the literary voice of the book can be interpreted as reflecting the push and pull pressures that on the one hand compelled him to succeed in the mass literary market and on the other to seek patronage of the new generation of elites that could be expected to be effecting the reversal of the debunked Communist Party line. In other words, the expectations could run high that »party line« was to be replaced by »nationalist line« to serve as a means of securing patronage of the post-communist establishment. Mixed results of such positioning strategy both in the field of literature and in the wider society shed light on how the relation of Western Ukraine to its past and present plays out on the chances of Ukrainian intellectuals from that region to enter the literary and social establishment.

### Part III

Before turning to Iurii Andrukhovych's treatment of the past of L'viv and Western Ukraine, it is important to highlight that L'viv, as the region's major city, represents a site of historical memory that is in many social and historical respects in sharp contrast to that of other parts of Ukraine. While one could compare it with numerous other regional centers or Kyiv, Ukraine's capital, a series of contrasts with Donetsk, a city from the east of the country, will bring out L'viv's characteristic features:

While L'viv is the regional centre of the historically more Western-oriented but also less industrialized and more rural part of the country, Donetsk lies in a heavily industrialized and urbanized but also ›Sovietized‹ part of Ukraine. While contemporary L'viv is relatively homogeneous from an ethnic point of view, the composition of the population of Donetsk is mixed, hence leading to a more ›blurred‹ sense of identity among its residents. Importantly, considering L'viv, most of these changes occurred in connection with the war and during the post-war period. Before World War II Polish Lwów was the historical city of Poles and Jews, only to a lesser extent a city of ethnic Ukrainians.<sup>30</sup>

Consequently, Vynnychuk in his *Divy noch* treats Western Ukraine as a term of antagonistic relationship that, situated in L'viv, positions the main character through a series of encounters at the second, dominated, pole of binary oppositions of Russian-Ukrainian, dominant-dominated and communist-nationalist. This represents L'viv as a subject of oppositional discourse. The opposition, as formulated by Vynnychuk is against communist, Russophone dominance. The protagonist of this pulp fiction work is represented to be helpless in the face of Soviet domination, surreal in its pervasiveness.<sup>31</sup>

Andrukhovych's novel *Rekreatsiji* spells out a similarly oppositional discourse. First published in 1992 in the periodical *Suchasnist'*, it follows several characters' adventures in a Western Ukrainian town. In contrast to Vynnychuk, who traces conflicts between the Ukrainian intellectual and Russian-speakers in L'viv's underworld, Andrukhovych abandons the consistent narration from a single character's perspective in favor of shifting ones. However, Andrukhovych's reader gets an insight only into the internal monologues of either Ukrainian intellectuals or persons in intimate relations with them. *Komsomol* activists, *nouveau riche* criminals, and émigré visitors to Ukraine are presented through the streams of consciousness of those characters, who occupy positions in society that are equivalent to that of Andrukhovych, or positions that are complimentary, such as that of a wife's or courtesan's. At the same time

30 Aberg, Martin: Putnam's Social Capital Theory Goes East: A Case Study of Western Ukraine and L'viv. In: Europe-Asia Studies 52 (2000), pp. 295-317, p. 300.

31 Vynnychuk, I.: Divy noch: Pryhodnyts'ka povist'. Opovidannia. Kyiv: Ukraïns'kyj pys'mennyk 1992, p. 116f.

32 Ieshkiliiev, Volodymyr (Ed.):  
Pleroma 2000: mala ukrains'ka  
entsyklopediia aktual'noi literatury:  
proekt povnennia demiurhiv-2.  
Ivano-Frankivs'k: Vyd-vo »Lileia-NV«  
2000.

33 Vynnychuk, I.: The Windows of  
Time Frozen and other Stories. Ed. by  
Oksana Tatsyak. Lviv: Klasyka 2000,  
p. 272ff.

as Andrukhovych shares Vynnychuk's oppositional discourse, which posits Western Ukraine as a cultural, social and historical alternative to the course followed by the rest of the Soviet Union or Ukraine, Andrukhovych's positioning differs significantly from that of Vynnychuk.

This difference not only expresses itself in their respective texts, where the former creates a largely fictional location that he populates with equally fictional characters who play out their positions and dispositions with regard to collective memory as it distinguishes Western Ukraine from other places on the stage of the narrative space, but also is present in the distance between these two author's positions in the literary field of Ukraine. Andrukhovych receives ample critical attention in scholarly journals, literary magazines and in the press that, despite its ranging from scathing criticism to praise, has assured him literary acclaim. In contrast, Vynnychuk, despite his more prolific output as writer, editor and publicist is yet to receive serious critical attention.

While an argument of marginalization can be proffered as explanation for the lack of critical limelight lavished on Vynnychuk, the apparent success of Andrukhovych makes it more plausible that the cause of contrasting positioning of these two authors is in the divergent position-taking strategies they followed. Vynnychuk in the above interview with him indicates that he straightforwardly applies the book market approach to the literary field. He points to opportunities that he has followed as a natural response of a cultural producer to existing demand for certain kinds of prose. This positions him as a writer of industrial prose in so far as the representation of the literary field that he offers is that of an industry. By marked contrast, Andrukhovych strives to produce pure literature that defies talk of artifice or market forces. Moreover, Andrukhovych has effected a transition to the genre of prose after firmly establishing himself as eminent poet with a new and original poetic voice. Therefore, the cultural capital in the form of literary and critical recognition that Andrukhovych has brought to his debut as a novel-writer has positioned him at the dominant pole of the Ukrainian literary field, while Vynnychuk's beginnings as run-of-the-mill literary critic have predisposed him to the role of writer of industrial literature.

No less important to understanding the eventual trajectories of these two writers in the post-Soviet literary field of Ukraine is the change of position of the field as a whole from the dominant to the dominated pole of the larger society. As shown above, in the Soviet Union the field of literature has been offering positions for its members that allowed entry into the dominant social class of the country – *nomenklatura*. In the late 1980's, the *nomenklatura* as a class underwent professionalization. From the Soviet Union-wide upper class numbering tens of millions of members in managerial and executive positions of all organizations in the country, it shrunk to those occupying purely political positions in the order of several millions. An infrastructure that formerly provided means for total control by the party-state, the *nomenklatura* became differentiated from within, which found its reflection in both material remuneration and in amount of actual social power held. The literary field of Ukraine that previously provided positions that led to entry into the socially dominant in-group of *nomenklatura* became devoid of its social power at the same time as post-Soviet hyperinflation wiped out the economic returns from positions in the field.

Consequently, the audience Andrukhovych has in mind seems to be far more international than local. This conclusion is supported by Vynnychuk's 1999 essay *Vyshyvanyi svit*, published in the collection *Pleroma*.<sup>32</sup> Andrukhovych, as one of the editors of the collection, is not only classified as a member of a more contemporary generation of writers but also establishes his distinction from Vynnychuk by publishing a poem, which carries higher cultural weight than other literary genres, and an erudite literary essay that, by sporting connotations to major works of world literature, parodies stereotypes of Ukrainian historical and literary traditions. The latter lets Andrukhovych not only claim mastery of fashionably post-modern literary techniques and sensibilities, but also to provide a contrast to Vynnychuk's prose. The narration of Vynnychuk's story partakes of the tradition of oral history or testimonial writing that gives voice to marginalized groups and individuals through the first-person narrative. While within the field of Ukrainian literature, the story inscribes Vynnychuk into the oppositional discourse revolving around Western Ukraine as a site of collective memory, its translation into English<sup>33</sup> fails to convey the linguistic markers of alterity that articulate marginality of the narrator.

Contrastingly, Andrukhovych's claims for dominant positioning in the Ukrainian literary field are expressed in terms of international cultural reference. While Vynnychuk focuses on the reconstruction of inter-personal interaction as work of memory, Andrukhovych targets

34 Bondar-Tereshchenko, Ihor: Buria u skliantsi z bidoiu. In: Literatura Plius [Kyiv] (1998), <http://www.aup.iatp.org.ua/litplus/liiz.php>

35 Kokotiukha, Andrii: Derzhavna premiiia chy derzhavna podachka? In: proUA.com: Gazeta dlia professionalov [Kyiv] (2005), <http://ua.proua.com/accnt/2005/02/23/135310.html>

36 Riabchuk, Mykola: Dvi Ukraïny: real'ni mezhi, virtual'ni viiny. Kyïv: Krytyka 2003.

37 Riabchuk, M.: Deinde, til'ky ne tut: ta inshi opovidannia. L'viv: VNTL-Klasyka 2002, back cover.

38 Riabchuk, M.: Vid Malorosii do Ukraïny: paradoksy zapizniloho natsiietvorennia. Kyïv: »Krytyka« 2000.

39 Ibid.

40 Riabchuk 2003.

41 Ibid., pp. 195-245.

42 Andrukhovych, Iurii: Rekreatsiji. In: Suchasnist' (1991), pp. 27-85.

43 Andrukhovych, I.: Dezorientatsiia na mistsevosti: Sproby. Ivano-Frankivs'k: »Lileia-NV« 1999.

44 Riabchuk 2002, pp. 27-33.

45 Riabchuk 2003, pp. 195-245.

relations between collectivities both in his 1992 *Rekreatsiji* and in 1999 *Dezorientatsiia na mistsevosti* [*Disorientation on a Location*]. While *Rekreatsiji* reconstructs an elaborate map of sites of collective memory through narrating memories of deportations and mass graves, memories of the Austro-Hungarian domination of pre-WWI Galician cities and towns, and memories of Soviet displacement, the second book expands its discursive space towards inter-cultural dialogue with a stress on co-existence rather than collective memory. If the first book lends itself to interpretation as a work of discursive mourning after a long-lost past, *Dezorientatsiia* bears the features of melancholic visitation of the past as evidence of the successful completion of the work of mourning. Looking at Ukraine's social elites as they reappraise the record of inter-ethnic and international relations with other states, there appears to be a commonality in the dispositions of Andrukhovych and of the Ukrainian political elites in that for both finding a *modus vivendi* with Ukraine's European neighbors is desirable.

This commonality of interests is proved by Andrukhovych's short-listing for the Ukrainian state literary prize in 1997.<sup>34</sup> His refusal to run in the competition for the prize<sup>35</sup> owes to the temporary configuration of political forces in the country that over-determined Andrukhovych's response to the invitation as an oppositional intellectual.

Despite the durable concurrence of interests of the ascendant cultural and political elites of Ukraine, the three researched intellectuals belong to this group in very different ways although they share their oppositional construction of and identification with the discourse on Western Ukraine. This difference is exemplified in the positions of those cultural producers who are situated between the dominant and dominated poles of the field. Representative in this respect is Mykola Riabchuk's writing on Western Ukraine. The cover to his book *Dvi Ukraïny: real'ni mezhi, virtual'ni viiny* [*Two Ukraines: Real Borders, Virtual Wars*]<sup>36</sup> indicates that he is positioned neither at the dominated pole of the Ukrainian field of cultural production nor at the dominant. That is indicated in a string of research and affiliate positions that he holds in academic institutes, research centers and editorial boards.<sup>37</sup> At the same time, his collections of essays,<sup>38</sup> prose,<sup>39</sup> and analytical articles<sup>40</sup> do not aim at the mass literary market, which re-inforces his positioning at a distance from the dominated pole of the field.

This combination of low level of cultural capital specific to the literary field with high level of symbolic capital, as his affiliation with academic and press institutions show, informs Mykola Riabchuk's dispositions as articulator of the heteronomous principle of domination of the social field over the cultural. In his position, the field of cultural production does not re-assert its autonomy in the adherence of its occupiers to either pure science or pure art, but articulates the interests of ascending social elites. In Riabchuk's position of mediator between the field of production of knowledge in the form of discourse on society and culture and the field of power, the autonomous principle of cultural production fails to assert itself over the responsiveness to the temporal struggles in the field of politics. Therefore his 2003 narrative on Western Ukraine<sup>41</sup> is expressive of the principle of heteronomy that informs his discursive dispositions. The discourse on Western Ukraine and L'viv that Riabchuk represents is overtly political in that it both takes a stand on politically divisive issues of collective identity and easily lends itself to policy-making. As opposed to Andrukhovych who maintains a purely literary and artistic attitude to collective memory and collective identity as he does in his novel<sup>42</sup> and essays<sup>43</sup>, Riabchuk eschews the principles of the abstract approach staking its autonomy in the field of cultural production in favor of discursive strategies that take as their context the current political and social situation.

Indication of the latter is his short story *Lysty aviaposhtoiu v provintsiiu* [*Letters by Airmail into a Province*]<sup>44</sup> that with its descriptive attention to daily life in L'viv, where the story's loose plot unfurls, is close to the technique of urban ethnography. Terse descriptions, recorded dialogues and shifts in the angle of observation give the story the documentary quality that renounces the qualities of pure literariness, as it situates the story within the time, 1970's, and place, a city in Western Ukraine. Such crossover from literary towards scholarly is evident in his essay *Halychyna mizh Skhodom i Zakhodom: perspektyvyievroregionu* [*Western Ukraine between East and West: Euroregion Perspectives*].<sup>45</sup> A similarly heteronomous, as opposed to purely scholarly, principle of discursive operation is evident in the latter essay. Riabchuk realizes the full potential of his position between the dominant and dominated poles of the field of cultural production by fashioning in the essay a statement that speaks to the current social and political situation more than it does to the scholarly community. By combining journalistic prose that stops short of elevating terms of its discourse to the level of scholarly

46 Ibid., p. 200.

47 Hrabovs'ka, Iryna: Chy korysno ukraïntsiam khodyty po lezu brytyvy? In: Suchasnist' 457-460 (1999), pp. 79-85 1999; Hrabovs'kyi, Serhii: Kraïna doniv, abo Pislamova do rozhepanykh iliuzii. In: Suchasnist' 457-460 (2000), pp. 52-60; Hrabovs'kyi, S.: Politychna situatsiia v Ukraïni: sproba kontseptual'noho analizu. In: Suchasnist' 457-460 (1999), 62-71; Kanak, Fedir: Suverenitet narodu i ioho dostup do vlady: inteligetsiia i elita mizh narodom i uriadom. In: Suchasnist' 465-468 (2000), pp. 68-88; Kaspruk, Viktor: Ukraïna v poshukakh vtrachenoho maibutn'oho. In: Suchasnist' 457-460 (1999), pp. 66-78; Moskalets', Kostiantyn: Liudyna na kryzhyni: literaturna krytyka ta esečistyka. Kyiv: Krytyka 1999, p. 125; Shumylov, Oleksandr: Femomen 31 zhovtnia. Vnutrishnii »Karfahen«. In: Suchasnist' 465-468 (2000), pp. 45-51.

48 Riabchuk 2003, p. 237f.

concepts and by extensively quoting from a range of sources that run from statistical surveys to scholarly works, polemical prose and fiction, he performs a role of public intellectual rather than academic scholar.<sup>46</sup>

The fact that Riabchuk takes L'viv as linchpin of an oppositional discourse in order to produce public policy recommendations apparently aimed at the political establishment of Ukraine is accounted by his position in the field of cultural production. While the field of cultural production is at the dominated pole of Ukrainian society, as numerous representations by Ukrainian intellectuals of their position in the society attest,<sup>47</sup> the congruence between the dispositions of the occupants of the positions in the field of cultural production is larger for positions that are farther from its dominant pole. Therefore, Andrukhovych articulates the discourse on Western Ukraine in most independent terms of either consummate artist or pure intellectual. His high amount of cultural capital allows Iurii Andrukhovych to be objectively aligned with the alternative social elites of Ukraine that seek larger integration with Europe as opposed to the establishment circles rooted in the Soviet-times nomenklatura.

Although espousing a vision of Western Ukraine in distinctly counter-hegemonic terms, Vynnychuk's dispositions distance him from the ascendant social elites. His reputation of producer of popular, industrial literature while contributing towards his marginalization towards the dominated position in the literary field is not in itself the cause of his distance from the dominant pole of the social field at large. Rather, the fact that he closely follows the dictate of the book market not only objectively corresponds to positions with low amount of cultural capital but also does not endow him with authority specific to the field of cultural production. A comparison with Andrukhovych's position shows that at the same time as both of them do not have the cultural authority as he does, Riabchuk, in contrast to Vynnychuk, can muster enough authority to lend legitimizing support to contending Ukrainian elites.<sup>48</sup>

## Conclusion

Ukraine's transition to independence being predicated on formerly communist elites entering »into *de facto* coalitions with nationalists«,<sup>49</sup> the cultural elites, given the radical changes in the field of power, were bound to negotiate the new power elites' expropriation of the nationalist discourse within the hierarchies of domination internal to the field of cultural production. As representative cases from dominated, dominant and in-between fractions of the field of cultural production, Vynnychuk, Andrukhovych and Riabchuk and their ways of dealing with sites of collective memory are in differently situated positions to contest or subscribe to the dominant terms of nationalist discourse. Yuri Vynnychuk's book *Divy nochi*, published in 1992, and his short story *Vyshyvanyj svit*, which first appeared in 1998 in a reader supplement to the *Pleroma* anthology of literary, philosophical and cultural criticism, provide a means for establishing the trajectory that he followed in the post-independence decade. Comparable point-estimates for the literary trajectory of Iurii Andrukhovych within the Ukrainian literary field are his publication of the novel *Rekreatsiji* in January 1992, one month after the referendum endorsing Ukraine's independence was held, and his 1999 collection of essays *Dezorijentatsija na mistsevosti: Sproby*. Mykola Riabchuk's trajectory of transition from literature to prose on political and social topics is traced by his retrospective publication of short stories written in the 1970's and 1980's, *Deinde til'ky ne tut* (2002), and by his 2003 collection of polemical essays *Dvi Ukraïny: Real'ni mezhi, virtual'ni vijny*.

As theories on collective memory point out,<sup>50</sup> a single site kept in memory by means of narrative representation can give rise to alternative versions of collective memory. This is not only true for same sites but also for the same historical experiences. Each of these intellectuals' individual position with regard to Western Ukraine as site of collective memory is situated in a different segment of the field of cultural production. Their representations of Western Ukraine correlate with their positions in the literary field relative to the field of power. The situation of the field of cultural production at the dominated section of the dominant class is expected to draw cultural producers closer to the socially dominant classes through their dispositions. That is the case for dominant cultural producers, while the dominated cultural producers are rather at odds with the dominant dispositions. In this case, the literary field can claim a greater degree of cultural dissent at the expense of dependence on the demands of popular market. As Pierre Bourdieu points out:

49 Motyl 1997, p. 436.

50 Klein, Kerwin Lee: On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse. In: Representations (Winter 2000), pp. 127-150; Olick, Jeffrey K.: Introduction: Memory and the Nation: Continuities, Conflicts, and Transformations. In: Social Science History 22 (Winter 1998), pp. 377-387; Olick, J.K./Robbins, Joyce: Social Memory Studies: from »Collective Memory« to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices. In: Annual Review of Sociology 24 (1998), pp. 105-140; Olick, J.K.: Collective Memory: The Two Cultures. In: Sociological Theory 17 (Nov. 1999), pp. 333-348.

51 Bourdieu 1993, p. 45.

52 Ibid., p. 46.

It [such dynamics, PM] results from the correspondence between the space of the producers, and therefore of the products offered, and the space of the consumers, which is brought about, on the basis of homology between the two spaces, only through the competition between the producers and through the strategies imposed by the correspondence between the space of possible position-takings and the space of positions. In other words, by obeying the logic of the objective competition between mutually exclusive positions within the field, the various categories of producers tend to supply products adjusted to the expectations of the various positions in the field of power, but without any conscious striving for such adjustment.<sup>51</sup>

The position of the public intellectuals who are neither subject to the forces of the mass literary market nor in possession of sufficient cultural capital to earn recognition among other consecrated cultural producers is expected to articulate a collective memory of a bourgeois audience with enough sophistication to avow literary and intellectual interests above the mass cultural market and sufficiently numerous to provide a basis for support that intermediary cultural producers, such as public intellectuals, can rely on without compromising their reputation. For Ukraine, the transition from a party-state imposed social structure to a field of power where interest and struggles can be pursued with a higher degree of freedom and transparency is realised by cultural producers from each described segment of the field of cultural production as described by their social trajectory within it.

The forces of the literary market, the way of dealing with the literary hierarchies and cultural elites that Ukraine has inherited from that part of the Soviet Union that became designated as a domain of its statehood, entered into this comparative research based on theoretical sampling through the logic of fields where each player's position is necessarily defined in relation to other positions that constitute the field of cultural production. The struggles by each of these writers and intellectuals to take the positions that they eventually did reveals as much about the post-Soviet literary field of Ukraine as about how each of those positions presupposes the other in order to claim its place in the field. The dominant positions in the field of literature, and cultural discourse in general, rely on the dominated ones for the production of cultural distinctions between the high and the low genres or between the arcane literary works, which are not likely to meet their reader during the artist's lifetime, and the popular ones that enjoy instant success and have little hope to enter into the purview of serious critical attention:

Thus, within the sub-field of production-for-producers, which recognizes only the specific principle of legitimacy, those who are assured of the recognition of a certain fraction of the other producers, a presumed index of posthumous recognition, are opposed to those who, again from the standpoint of the specific criteria, are relegated to an inferior position and who, in accordance with the model of heresy, contest the legitimation principle dominant within the autonomous sub-field, either in the name of a new legitimation principle or in the name of a return to an old one. Likewise, at the other pole of the field, that of the market and of economic profit, authors who manage to secure ›high-society‹ successes and bourgeois consecration are opposed to those who are condemned to so-called ›popular‹ success – the authors of rural novels, music-hall artists, chansonniers, etc.<sup>52</sup>

For the autonomous principle of domination within the literary field at its most essential, defined by recognition by other cultural producers, to impose oneself in literature, one may have to align oneself with the dominant social classes of society. While the latter statement may seem controversial in view of the autonomy that fields of art and literature have been able to achieve in the late bourgeois and late capitalist societies, this condition is not necessarily the case for comparable fields in other societies. This is all the more so when we think of the relations between the field of literature and arts and the field of power in the former Soviet Union, where the control of the Communist party-state was total. Therefore, rather than pursuing macro-social explanations to the post-communist transitions, such as supplied by bringing into the analytical picture of civil society, a more contextualized approach is attainable by reconstructing a pattern from the strategies pursued by agents positioned in particular junctions of a given social structure to maintain their relative positioning when the social structure undergoes rapid change. The transition from speaking in terms of civil society as a floating signifier to, for example, strategies of accumulation and conversion of cultural capital into social capital and back, can give, in Ragin's terms, a better fix on the implications of the post-communist transition for the Ukrainian literary field.

53 Ibid., p. 65.

54 Ibid., p. 68.

Similarly, the conditions for and changes in rates of mutual conversion of social and economic capital as a hallmark of the composition of the post-communist social elites can give important insights into the possible trajectories of macro-social transformations in Ukraine. Even though the transition processes in Russia can importantly differ from those in Ukraine or other former Soviet republics, the point of departure for their transitions to capitalism being a single overarching social order and relative paucity of comprehensive theorizations of Ukraine's transition as it bears on its field of cultural production open the way for use of theoretical sampling as a technique able to advance the understanding of relations between larger social processes and literary field through strategies of its individual agents. Therefore a conceptual elaboration on the major points and concepts of Bourdieu's theory of fields of cultural production is in order. Rather than aiming at making a definitive statement on the subject of Ukrainian literary field this instance of research into Western Ukraine as site of collective memory as treated in fictional and prose narratives of the three selected figures from the literary field invites debate and dialogue. Discussion over the use of data and concepts that this research intends to spark is seen as an anticipated source of, respectively, specification and clarification of both. Such an analytical strategy appears to me to follow Bourdieu's proposition that

[i]t follows as a point of method that one cannot give a full account of the relationship obtaining at a given moment between the space of positions and the space of dispositions, and, therefore, of the set of social trajectories (or constructed biographies), unless one establishes the configuration, at the moment, and at the various critical turning-points in each career, of the space of available possibilities (in particular, the economic and symbolic hierarchy of the genres, schools, styles, manners, subjects, etc.), the social value attached to each of them, and also the meaning and value they received for the different agents or classes of agents in terms of the socially constituted categories of perception and appreciation they applied to them.<sup>53</sup>

On this methodological ground, one can observe that historical accounts of Ukraine's post-communist transition or literary critical articles and interviews with writers frequently run the risk of directly relating the developments in the field of cultural production in Ukraine to the period in which they take place. Sources of secondary income or independent wealth that can free cultural producers to pursue pure art or pure literature in disregard of popular taste or market demands bring into complicit relationship the bearers of temporal power, such as power elites in post-communist societies came to have, and the bearers of atemporal power of cultural authority who have an objective basis for their claim to adherence to transcendent laws of literature, art, or truth in the alignment of dominant poles of field of cultural production with the socially dominant field of power. Public intellectuals, as it were, mediating between the dominant intellectual discourse and the bourgeois audiences pursue stakes that put them at a relatively disadvantaged position within the field of cultural production where they lack the cultural capital to compete for positions. Cultural capital adheres to the dominant principle of domination through the process of its accumulation and its composition, the literary field thereby granting high cultural status. At the same time, within the general field of power intellectuals, usually lack social capital to reach socially dominant positions in it.

The sense of investment seems to be one of the dispositions most closely linked to social and geographical origin, and, consequently, through the associated social capital, one of the mediations through which the effects of the opposition between Parisian and provincial origin make themselves felt in the logic of the field. Thus we find that as a rule those in richest in the economic, cultural and social capital are the first to move into the new positions (and this seems to be true in all fields: economic, scientific, etc.).<sup>54</sup>

The post-Soviet transition saw many Ukrainian cultural producers successfully take elite positions within the field of power. The transition not only features a lack of oppositional politics preceding the state-formation, with evolutionary continuity prevailing as a result, but it also opens new positions at the fringes of the field of power within the novel framework of relationships with Europe and the West for those up-and-coming intellectuals who, while engaging in trafficking in Western discourses of knowledge, politics, history and culture, articulate a collective memory in tune with the dispositions of dominant and emerging social



55 Ragin 1994, p. 98.

56 Ibid., p. 99.

57 Denzin, Norman K.: *Sociological Methods: a Sourcebook*. New York: McGraw-Hill 1978.

58 Ragin 1994, p. 100.

classes of Ukraine. Rather than articulating the cooptation by the post-Soviet power elites of the support of intellectuals who can grant endorsement to a particular social or political vision, which for post-Soviet as well as post-colonial states may mean a dubious marriage of neo-liberalist policies with nepotism, their visitations of sites of collective memory inscribes the collective identity of audiences bearing affinities with them into his or her individual version of collectively remembering history and of imagining national territory vis-à-vis contemporary national and international contradictions.

While Ukraine's transition to post-communism may be treated as a single case of a sociological case-study, I compare the three Ukrainian intellectuals' social trajectories among each other as an instance of application of theoretical sampling technique. The methodology behind the technique is developed by »Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss (1967) to describe the process of choosing new research sites or cases to compare with one that has already been studied« as Charles Ragin explains:<sup>55</sup>

The goal of theoretical sampling is not to sample in a way that captures all possible variations, rather in one that aids the development of concepts and deepens the understanding of research subjects.<sup>56</sup>

While theoretical samplings as a technique refers to taking few cases for detailed comparison, the process of their analytical construction in terms of different theories and analytical approaches is conveyed with the help of data triangulation.<sup>57</sup> According to Ragin, the latter technique »can be understood as a way of using independent pieces of information to get a better fix on something that is only partially known or understood«. <sup>58</sup> The field of Ukrainian literature and of cultural production in Ukraine in general can be taken as exactly such a case that is both understood only partially and in need of additional research into what transformations it underwent in the post-communist period. The existing scholarly publications that address social, political and economic transformations in Ukraine are approached for their contribution to an understanding of the Ukrainian literary field and of Western Ukraine as a site of memory together with the role that its treatment by Ukrainian intellectuals and writers plays in their positioning within the field. As such, the use of notions of field, capital and positioning works toward sharpening our understanding of the processes under way in the field of cultural production in Ukraine. At the same time the data triangulation, in the process of which indicators for changes and condition of literary field, types of capital of each person and their relative positioning vis-à-vis each other are presented, the data and the concepts illuminate their interrelationships.

---

**Pablo Markin** is a doctoral student at the Dept. for Modern Languages and Cultural Studies of the Univ. of Alberta. MA in Sociology and European Studies at the Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem in 2003. 1998: Summer Ukrainian Research Institute at Harvard University . His research experience includes assistantship at the Educational Department of the Jewish Agency for Israel at its Jerusalem headquarters from 2001 to 2003. Currently he works towards a thesis on international art exhibitions at the intersections of diasporic practices and urban spectacle.  
Contact: pbmarkin@gmail.com