

# UKRAINE – THE ENTENTE RELATIONS IN 1917–1918: THE CHOICE NOT TAKEN

Sergey I. DEGTYAREV\*

Vladyslava M. ZAVHORODNIA\*\*

Lyubov G. POLYAKOVA\*\*\*

**Abstract.** *The article considers the attempts at establishing relationships with the Entente states during the periods of the Ukrainian Central Rada and the Ukrainian State. Among the objectives were to receive the world's recognition of Ukrainian statehood and foreign military assistance in its fight against the Bolsheviks. Ukraine's foreign policy towards bringing the state closer to the Entente turned out to be active but unsuccessful because of the long-term ban on Ukraine's establishing of formal contacts with the Entente imposed by the German and Austrian governments, post-World War I territorial disputes with the Entente states, the massive activity of the supporters of the restoration of the Russian Empire, and the attempts of Pavlo Skoropadsky's opponents to discredit the then Ukrainian government in the eyes of the Entente.*

**Keywords:** *Ukrainian State, Hetmanate, Pavlo Skoropadsky, Entente, Quadruple Alliance, international relations, diplomacy.*

## Introduction

International recognition is a prerequisite for the full participation of a state in international relations, for peaceful co-existence and the development of cooperation with other subjects of international law, and for a country's progress in political, economic and cultural life.

Occasionally, the very existence of a state depends on such recognition, especially in case of young states emerging through acts of the self-determination of the nation in times of geopolitical constraints or even crisis.

The support provided by allies in foreign policy can minimise possible or apparent threats and reflect positively on the development of partner states. History offers many such examples. A particularly active foreign policy was shown by a number of the young states that formed in the aftermath of the First World War and that were aiming at finding strong and influential allies, primarily, in the military-political sense. In many respects, such activity determined their futures. The further development of

---

\* Sumy State University, Ukraine; International Network Center for Fundamental and Applied Research, Washington, USA; e-mail: starsergo2014@gmail.com.

\*\* Sumy State University, Ukraine; e-mail: v.zavhorodnia@uabs.sumdu.edu.ua.

\*\*\* International Network Center for Fundamental and Applied Research, Washington, USA; Volgograd State University, Russian Federation; e-mail: polyakoval84@mail.ru.

these states depended on their foreign policy choice between the Entente or the Triple/Quadruple Alliance and their geopolitical locations. In this context, there is a need to perform a historical analysis of Ukraine's cooperation with the other European states in the past, especially in the period of the Ukrainian State (Ukrainska Derzhava).

### **Materials and methods**

In this study, we widely considered results obtained by our predecessors, the memoirs of contemporaries of the events described, and press materials and regulations issued during the period of the Ukrainian State. The research rests on such general academic principles of knowledge as historicism, consistency and objectivity. The principles of historicism and objectivity enabled us to clearly identify and analyse the nature of the issue under study, and to consider the differing opinions of researchers and contemporaries of the events described. The consistency principle was applied in determining the specific nature of the geopolitical position of the Ukrainian State and in defining the relationships of its diplomats and government with those of the Entente and the Triple Alliance. The problem-chronological and legalistic approaches allowed us to reconstruct the relations of Ukraine with the victorious allied nations of the First World War and to perform a historical and legal assessment thereof.

### **Discussions**

To date, there has been no actual fundamental research on the relationship-building between the Ukrainian State and the Entente states. The same applies to the analysis of those factors preventing Ukraine from achieving the desired positive and practical results of the international dialogue then initiated. Previous works, in one way or another, that focused on the issues here under study were written mainly by Ukrainian authors or by contemporaries, often direct participants in the described events. Many other authors have addressed these issues indirectly, only in the context of the studying of Ukraine's foreign policy in 1917–1918. The memoirs penned by both Pavlo Skoropadsky's supporters and opponents also contain a significant amount of information about Ukraine's attempts to move closer to the Entente states, assessments of the political decisions taken by their leaders, etc. First and foremost, these comprise the memoirs of Hetman (High Military Commander) P. Skoropadsky<sup>1</sup> and such contemporaneous political figures as Volodymyr Vinnichenko,<sup>2</sup> Arnold

---

<sup>1</sup> Skoropadsky 2016.

<sup>2</sup> Vinnichenko 1990.

Margolin,<sup>3</sup> Venedikt Miakotin<sup>4</sup> and others. However, among the most informative ones are the memoirs of Dmytro Doroshenko, the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the government of the Ukrainian State.<sup>5</sup> Of modern academics, Ihor Datskiv, who studied the development of Ukrainian diplomacy in the period of the Ukrainian War of Independence (1917–1921), focused on the relations between the Ukrainian State and the Entente states in his several short articles.<sup>6</sup>

A number of works are dedicated to the study of the relationships of Ukraine with various Entente states and the so-called neutral countries. Their analysis allows us not only to recreate the picture of Ukraine's diplomatic activity which was aimed at building bridges with the Triple Alliance members in order to preserve its statehood but also to read the moods prevailing in the highest governmental and diplomatic circles of both Ukraine and the Entente states. In the context of the issue under study, it is important to keep in mind the post-war plans of the states involved in the First World War and, in particular, those of both the victorious countries and the ones that had gained independence after the First World War and that had pending territorial disputes with Ukraine. This enables a more objective understanding of the Ukrainian State's prospects at that time of moving closer to certain states, receiving tangible – primarily military – assistance from them and, to some extent, preserving its statehood. In this regard, in this paper, we address some selected studies of Ukrainian and foreign scholars such as Maksym Gedin,<sup>7</sup> Ihor Datskiv,<sup>8</sup> Sergey Degtyarev,<sup>9</sup> Vladyslava Zavhorodnia,<sup>10</sup> Charles Clark<sup>11</sup> and others. Alongside this, we make use of the press materials of that time that widely covered the developments of the last days of the First World War and the foreign policy plans of the leading European states, the USA and Ukraine's bordering countries. Passing references to these issues are made in studies devoted to the establishment and development of diplomacy in the Ukrainian State.<sup>12</sup>

This paper primarily focuses on the attempts of the Ukrainian State headed by Hetman P. Skoropadsky to build bridges with the Entente states

---

<sup>3</sup> Margolin 1990.

<sup>4</sup> Miakotin 1990.

<sup>5</sup> Doroshenko 2007.

<sup>6</sup> Datskiv 2002; Datskiv 2010, p. 175–237.

<sup>7</sup> Gedin 2012.

<sup>8</sup> Datskiv 2010, p. 175–237; Datskiv 2012.

<sup>9</sup> Degtyarev, Zavhorodnia 2018.

<sup>10</sup> Degtyarev, Zavhorodnia 2019.

<sup>11</sup> Clark 1927.

<sup>12</sup> Hai-Nyzhnyk 2017; Levyk 2017.

in difficult times for the young Ukrainian state. It should be noted that attempts at bringing Ukraine closer to these states had already been made in 1917 by the government of the Ukrainian People's Republic (UNR), which also sought to win the recognition of Ukrainian statehood from the leading world powers of that time. And there had been some advance in that direction: in mid-December 1917, General Georges Tabouis was appointed Commissioner of the French Republic in Ukraine. So, France recognised Ukraine as a sovereign state *de facto*. That, however, did not quite meet the desires of the Ukrainian government, which wanted to receive formal recognition (*de jure*). And on 21 December 1917, France became the first state to recognise the UNR, followed by Great Britain on 23 December.<sup>13</sup>

Ukraine had a similar track record with the USA, whose Consul General Douglas Jenkins visited Kyiv on 20 December 1917. He had instructions from his government not to recognise the UNR and to act very moderately, although the establishment of a US consulate in Kyiv was being discussed. In the last days of 1917 and almost throughout January 1918, the British and French diplomats were actively involved in lobbying the US government with regard to the recognition of the UNR, at least *de facto*. However, these efforts failed.<sup>14</sup>

The foreign policy of P. Skoropadsky's government was differently assessed by his contemporaries, both the hetman's supporters and political opponents. In particular, the supporters of the idea to restore the unified Russian state within the borders of the Russian Empire discouraged the establishment of state entities in the national regions once incorporated into it. Accordingly, they discouraged the existence of the Ukrainian People's Republic during the periods of the Central Rada and the Directory, and of the Ukrainian State under Hetman P. Skoropadsky. The very idea of Ukraine's autonomy was resisted. In an attempt to downplay the importance of P. Skoropadsky's foreign policy, commander-in-chief of the Volunteer Army Anton Denikin noted that "the external relations of Ukraine were also entirely accountable to the Germans" and that all disputed territorial issues related to Western Ukraine, the Crimea, Bessarabia and other regions "were being resolved by the Germans' unilateral will and, moreover, not in its [Ukraine's] favour." However, not all of that was in line with the realities. One of the reasons behind Ukraine's inability to pursue an independent foreign policy was, in the view of A. Denikin, the absence of a national army, given the presence of great military and human resources.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, it was a serious factor that put Ukraine in a

---

<sup>13</sup> Slabchenko 2016, p. 465–466, 469, 472–473.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 466–467, 474–476.

<sup>15</sup> Denikin 1990, p. 144–145.

situation of dependence on some states. In particular, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Ukrainian State D. Doroshenko, describing in his memoirs strained relations with Romania over the so-called Bessarabian issue, pointed out that the issue could be resolved quickly and relatively easily – one had just to wait a little till the Ukrainian army got formed and the Germans withdrew from the territory of Ukraine.<sup>16</sup>

In our opinion, the effectiveness of the foreign policy pursued by the Ukrainian State depended on a number of factors. Thus, it must not be merely reduced to the level of dependency on the German High Command or to the uncertainty over the Ukrainian army issue. The reasons for the successes and failures of the Ukrainian diplomacy of that period should be sought in the general trends of the world politics established before the end of the First World War, in the military and political developments in Ukraine of that time, in the foreign policy legacy inherited by P. Skoropadsky's government from the Central Rada, etc.

The quest for mutual understanding with the Entente of the government of the Ukrainian State began as early as the summer of 1918. The main goal pursued was to win the recognition of Ukraine as a full-fledged subject of international relations.<sup>17</sup>

In their attempts to retain the best long-term impact in Ukraine, the Austro-Hungarian and German command, at first, prevented the Ukrainian government from expanding its representation on the international scene. Nevertheless, in the summer of 1918, Ukraine managed to establish diplomatic relations with Switzerland, Spain, Holland, Sweden, Italy, Denmark and Norway. Although the recognition of the Ukrainian State did not follow, such diplomatic activity facilitated the building of bridges with the Entente and the United States. On 30 August 1918, the Ukrainian press bureau even spread news of the supposed readiness of the US government to formally recognise the independence of Ukraine.<sup>18</sup> On 8 October 1918, the legal acts establishing the diplomatic missions of the Ukrainian State in Switzerland and Finland were passed.<sup>19</sup>

In October 1918, some European print media organs spread the news that the US President Woodrow Wilson was demanding the retreat of Germany from the territories of Western France, Belgium, the Venetian province, Serbia and Montenegro. However, the demand did not apply to the Eastern European territories.<sup>20</sup> That met the desires of the Ukrainian

---

<sup>16</sup> Doroshenko 2007, p. 297.

<sup>17</sup> Datskiv 2010, p. 228.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 229–230; *Soedinennyye Shtaty* 1918, p. 2; *Shveytsarskaya* 1918, p. 2.

<sup>19</sup> *Ukrayins'ka derzhava* 2015, t. 2, p. 306–307.

<sup>20</sup> *Usloviya Vilsona* 1918, p. 2.

government and did not give rise to conflict with the Entente states. Since the United States was the most influential state in the international arena of that time, the Ukrainian State intended to send there a diplomatic mission headed by Ivan Korostovets, after his return from Sweden. That mission was of great importance. In fact, it could have decided the fate of Ukraine.<sup>21</sup>

At the meeting of the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian State held on 15 October 1918, the Minister of Foreign Affairs reported on the urgent need for Ukraine “to comment on the spread of inaccurate information in the Entente countries over Ukraine’s position and its relations to the Central Powers and to Great Russia”. In that regard, the Ukrainian government recognised the need to send special diplomatic missions consisting of authorised representatives and their secretaries to Great Britain, France and the United States. To develop the guidelines for those diplomatic missions, the Council of Ministers scheduled its special session for 17 October 1918. Of note was the fact that such governmental decision gave rise to criticism from some Ukrainian ministers, who accused the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of pursuing foreign policy behind the screen. Despite being followed by a rebuttal made by Fedor Lyzohub, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers,<sup>22</sup> the instance was recorded in the Council minute book, although without the names of the ministers. Presumably, the accusations were brought by the opponents of Ukraine’s moving closer to the Entente states as an independent state. As is known, quite a lot of policymakers in the Ukrainian State were supporting Russian pro-monarchic political forces and rejecting Ukraine’s right to self-determination.

Already in late October 1918, both Austrian and German diplomats started to recommend Minister D. Doroshenko seek protection for Ukraine from the Entente since its victory in the war was evident and Germany was no longer able to help Ukraine to preserve its independence. Even the governmental circles of Germany and Austria-Hungary acknowledged the expediency of such Ukraine–Entente bridge-building and pledged to avoid interfering.<sup>23</sup>

The advance of Entente troops into the Balkans in autumn 1918 was an added incentive for the Ukrainian government to continue their attempts to move closer to the Entente states. I. Korostovets was seconded to Jassy. The French Ambassador Count Auguste-Félix de Sainte-Aulaire, who acted on behalf of the Entente states, was being assured of Ukraine’s neutrality and willingness to cooperate as long as its territories remained unaffected by

---

<sup>21</sup> *Ot'ezd ukrainskoy* 1918, p. 2.

<sup>22</sup> *Ukrayins'ka derzhava* 2015, t. 1, p. 333–334.

<sup>23</sup> *Datskiv* 2010, p. 230–231.

the war. According to A. Denikin, Count de Sainte-Aulaire allegedly mentioned that Ukraine–Entente relations would depend on the level of Ukraine’s assistance to the Allies in restoring order in Russia. The count also expressed the wish that the Hetmanate would change its pro-German policy and support the Allies in their attempt to “restore order in Russia”.<sup>24</sup>

Pro-monarchy forces in Russia were also actively impeding Ukraine’s moving closer to the Alliance. Thus, on 4 November 1918, the day following I. Korostovets’ mission, the members of organisations advocating for the restoration of the Russian Empire held a meeting with British and French diplomats. One feature in the way the leaders of these organisations behaved caught I. Korostovets’ eye, and later he drew the hetman’s attention to it. He noticed that, on the one hand, these leaders were trying to persuade the hetman to form a federation with Russia, which would encourage the Entente to recognise P. Skoropadsky’s power in Ukraine. However, on the other hand, they were scheming and positioning the hetman as a henchman and a mouthpiece of the Germans.<sup>25</sup>

In his memoirs, V. Miakotin, one of the founders of the Popular Socialist Party, paid much attention to the issue of the building of bridges between the Union for the Regeneration of Russia (Soiuz vrozozhdeniia Rossii), of which he was one of the leaders, and the Entente representatives. In early November 1918, the delegation commissioned by the Union was invited to a meeting with these representatives in Jassy. The meeting was initiated by a committee whose members were Stanislav Poklevsky-Kozell, the former envoy to Bucharest, General Dmitrii Shcherbachev, the former commander-in-chief of the Romanian front, and Captain Emile Henno, the French Vice-Consul in Kyiv. The meeting in Jassy was also attended by other supporters of the restoration of Russia, both on their personal initiatives and as delegated from the National Centre, the newly established Council for the National Unification of Russia and other organisations.<sup>26</sup> Thus, among the supporters of the regeneration of Russia at the Jassy conference were Alexander Krivoshein, Manuil Margulies, Alexander Guchkov, Nilolai Khomyakov, Mikhail Braikevich, S [?]. Tretyakov, Pavel Milyukov, Alexander Pilts, Pavel Krupensky and V [?]. Shakhovskoy. Later, the local activists Ilya Fondaminsky (Bunakov) and Vadim Rudnev joined them on their own initiatives. Correspondingly, a group of nine Russian generals, headed by D. Shcherbachev, was also formed in Jassy.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Denikin 1990, p. 152, 164.

<sup>25</sup> Shkilnyk 2016, p. 425.

<sup>26</sup> Miakotin 1990, p. 226–227.

<sup>27</sup> *V Yassab* 1918, p. 2.

It is a known fact that this was not the first attempt made by the supporters of a unified Russia to get closer to the Entente states. Prior to that, Moscow had witnessed an unsuccessful attempt to establish relationships with the representatives of the allied states.<sup>28</sup>

As claimed by V. Miakotin, among the goals pursued by the representatives of those political forces in Jassy was to make the Allies “hear the voice of that part of Russian society who stood up for keeping Russia united” and to turn the Allies against “the fake independent new states”, the Ukrainian State inclusive.<sup>29</sup>

The Union for the Regeneration of Russia was conducting a rather massive amount of subversive activity in Ukraine. The members of its Odessa branch even prepared an appeal to the Entente representatives in case they were to appear on the territory of the Ukrainian State. The text of the appeal identified Ukraine as “the South of Russia” where an artificial government had been installed by the German authorities. The pre-German period of Ukrainian statehood and the period of the Ukrainian People’s Republic were, however, ignored by the authors of the appeal. Further, the document reminded the Entente powers of their commitments to preserve Russia’s territorial integrity and called for the resolute rejection of any requests – here the document referred to P. Skoropadsky’s requests to recognise Ukrainian statehood – to recognise any new state entity created on Russian territory by an external power. Such entities were considered artificial in nature and as having no roots in the masses, who strove for unification with the rest of Russia.<sup>30</sup> The cited text proves the desire of the Union members to gain the support of the Entente at any cost. In fact, by rejecting Ukraine’s right to statehood, they were seeking recognition of their own power as solely legitimate in Ukraine. Considering the fact – also obvious to the Entente leaders – that Russia had already been lost for the supporters of the Union’s ideas and other similar political and military-political public organisations, the Union members might have tried to legitimise themselves in that part of the former Russian Empire still uncontrolled by the Bolsheviks and where the newly established government was not standing on its own two feet yet. Most of the Union members saw A. Denikin as the leader of a restored Russia.

The activity of the Directory members, not yet in power in Ukraine, was also intended to undermine the authority of the Ukrainian government in general and that of Hetman P. Skoropadsky in particular. Thus, the organisation also sent its delegates to Jassy to conduct talks with the

---

<sup>28</sup> Miakotin 1990, p. 227.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 227–228.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 230.

Entente representatives. The delegation headed by Lev Matsievich also included Vyacheslav Prokopovich, Ivan Feshchenko-Chopovsky, Yuriï Sokolovsky, Arnold Margolin and A. Kovalenko. However, later A. Margolin and I. Feshchenko-Chopovsky were given another task and did not travel to Jassy.<sup>31</sup>

The activity of such “ambassadors” was aimed at discrediting the government of P. Skoropadsky in the eyes of the Entente. In particular, they described the hetman as a Germanophile and as not taking care of his people’s welfare. A great many military and political figures were in opposition to the hetman. Among their methods in combating the ruling government was the discrediting of P. Skoropadsky, both in front of the Entente by portraying him as an ardent supporter of Germany, and in the eyes of the German command through complaining of the hetman’s negotiating with the representatives of the Entente states and seeking their support as an alternative to the alliance with Germany. For example, P. Skoropadsky’s memoirs give an account of such intrigues on the part of General Nikolai Shynkar, an ardent supporter of socialist ideas.<sup>32</sup>

Following Russian pro-monarchists and other political forces in opposition to the Ukrainian government, the majority of French, British and American diplomats saw P. Skoropadsky as a Germanophile and Ukraine as a part of Great Russia. Such negativity on the part of the Entente representatives, especially the French, included resentment of the hetman, who wanted to meet with the officials of the Alliance in Kyiv and get a chance to convince them that “only Hetmanship was able to maintain order” in Ukraine. Of course, the hetman realised that such attitude of the Entente had been largely developed under the influence of those Russian political circles whom the Entente believed but who, in fact, understood little.<sup>33</sup>

In the end, even the mission of the experienced diplomat I. Korostovets proved unsuccessful. The Entente was still at war with Germany, and allied Russia, in case of its restoration, was hypothetically seen as a counterbalance to the German forces in Eastern Europe. Consequently, Ukraine was also seen by the Entente representatives as a part of the former Russian Empire with no right to self-determination. For that reason, on 3 November 1918, the French and British diplomats had a private meeting with I. Korostovets, and the Ukrainian note was forwarded to them through the French maritime representative. It was a verbal note, unsigned but sealed, that could be accepted even without presumptions.

---

<sup>31</sup> Margolin 1990, p. 360.

<sup>32</sup> Skoropadsky 2016, p. 89–90.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 311.

As soon as the note was forwarded, and so far there had been no official reaction from the British and French governments, the Entente diplomats expressed their personal opinion on the issue. Regarding Russia as the Entente's ally, they rejected Ukraine's right to statehood or neutrality. In their eyes, Ukraine, being the ally of Germany and Austria, was not trustworthy. Therefore, all the people "compromised through their Germanophile associations" were to be removed from its government. The way to stabilise the situation in Ukraine and Russia the diplomats saw in combining the energies of the Ukrainian authorities and Denikin's Volunteer Army.<sup>34</sup>

Later, the Entente states demanded that the Ukrainian government completely change the country's political trajectory and abandon the idea of absolute independence and to refocus towards federalisation with non-Bolshevik Russia. The Entente even promised, in that case, to send its troops to protect Ukraine from the Bolsheviks.<sup>35</sup> At the same time, there was an urgent need for the German troops' continuing presence on the territory of Ukraine since the Bolsheviks were becoming an increasingly real threat to Ukraine, which did not have its own army. In that regard, P. Skoropadsky submitted to the Entente a formal request for a prolongation of the presence of German troops in Ukraine until it had formed its own national army. On 1 November 1918, the Ambassador of Ukraine to Bulgaria, Alexander Shulhyn, forwarded that request through the Spanish Ambassador in Sofia. Ukraine placed high expectations on the assistance of the neutral states for resolution of the issue. As a result, while signing the armistice between the Entente and Germany on 11 November 1918, the Germans were recommended to leave their troops on the territory of the Ukrainian State for a while. Under consideration was even the idea of "creating a guarding unit in Ukraine as a hybrid force supplied both by the Entente and the Central Powers."<sup>36</sup>

On 12 November 1918, the representatives of the American command visited Kyiv. Unfortunately, we failed to find any detailed accounts on who exactly they met and what issues were discussed. However, it is known that they "met some government officials for talks over the sentiments prevailing in Ukraine". Later that night, they left the Ukrainian capital, supposedly heading for Jassy.<sup>37</sup>

In November 1918, the recently appointed French Vice-Consul in Kyiv, Emil Henno, arrived in Odessa from Jassy. In his telegrams to the

---

<sup>34</sup> Shkilnyk 2016, p. 423–424.

<sup>35</sup> Skoropadsky 2016, p. 314.

<sup>36</sup> Datskiv 2010, p. 232; *K prebyvanyiyu* 1918, p. 2.

<sup>37</sup> *V ozhidanii* 1918, p. 2.

Ukrainian government, E. Henno stated that the Entente states recognised the Ukrainian government headed by the hetman. It is likely that the statement was provisional and a part of his diplomatic game. E. Henno also reported that only after the Entente military forces and officials had arrived in Kyiv would all controversial political and social issues, in particular, that of national self-determination, be addressed.<sup>38</sup> That meeting perhaps could have resolved the territorial disputes between Ukraine and other states as well as determining the future of the Ukrainian State.<sup>39</sup> However, these visions never came to be, and for a number of reasons which also led to the collapse of the Hetmanate.

In his telegrams, E. Henno even promised to suppress any anti-hetman uprisings and not to allow Simon Petliura's troops to enter Kyiv.<sup>40</sup> V. Vinnichenko reported that E. Henno also addressed the leaders of the already established Directory with demands to stop their "hostile operations against Hetman Skoropadsky." Moreover, V. Vinnichenko also acknowledged that when still at the stage of preparing the anti-hetman uprising and before signing the armistice, the Directory had informally interacted with the Entente representatives in Romania, and they in turn, supposedly, had supported it and promised their assistance.<sup>41</sup>

On 15 November 1918, the Ukrainian Minister of Foreign Affairs was assigned to send a message to the Entente representatives in Jassy requesting that they forward a diplomatic representative to Ukraine ("at least as consul general") and two battalions of troops to Kyiv and Odessa.<sup>42</sup> And in late November, the news was spread that in his telegram to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Vladyslav Dashkevich-Gorbatsky had informed of the signing of an agreement between Ukraine and Romania following the meeting of the Romanian government with the Entente representatives in Jassy. In Ukrainian governmental circles, it was seen as a demonstration of sympathy from the Entente, whose representatives planned to arrive in Kyiv on 19 November 1918. However, some had allegedly expressed in Jassy the view that they should wait to render their military assistance to Ukraine until the political struggle in the country had produced some

---

<sup>38</sup> Denikin 1990, p. 168.

<sup>39</sup> Despite the fact that the Entente was strongly focused on the political forces supporting the idea of Russia's restoration, its representatives could not have failed to realise the impossibility of such outcomes in that situation. Therefore, the Ukrainian State, seen as a force able and willing to resist the Bolsheviks, could expect to gain the official recognition and assistance of the Entente states.

<sup>40</sup> Denikin 1990, p. 168.

<sup>41</sup> Vinnichenko 1990, p. 288.

<sup>42</sup> *Ukrayins'ka derzhava* 2015, t. 1, p. 372.

tangible outcomes.<sup>43</sup> A squadron of Entente ships was to arrive in Odessa. The Ukrainian government was actively preparing for the event. It was to comply with all obligations under international maritime law. The Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of the Navy were assigned to meet the Entente representatives. At the meeting, the decision was made to raise the combined naval flag – St Andrew's and Ukrainian – on all Ukrainian military vessels, and the Ukrainian one on all merchant ships.<sup>44</sup>

## Conclusions

In our opinion, under the prevailing military-political conditions, it was impossible for P. Skoropadsky's government to negotiate a favourable agreement with the Entente states. A number of factors impeded Ukraine's moving closer to the Alliance. Among them:

1. The position of the Austro-Hungarian and German command and governments who till the autumn of 1918 had been seeking to maintain their influence on the Ukrainian territories.

2. Pending territorial disputes with states who had joined the First World War on the side of the Entente (primarily, with Romania that, along with the Ukrainian State, was claiming the lands of Bessarabia).

3. The Entente states seeing Ukraine as a territory that had separated from the allied Russia, with self-proclaimed statehood, its government staking their survival on the Austro-German military forces and, thus, actually opposing themselves to the Entente.

4. Massive negotiating activity conducted by the representatives of the pro-Russian military and political forces who supported the restoration of the "unified and indivisible Russia" within the borders of the former Russian Empire, the Entente's ally. Correspondingly, they considered any national government in Ukraine – as in any other region that was once a part of the Empire – illegal and even hostile.

5. Ukrainian political forces in opposition to the Hetman government making attempts to discredit it in the eyes of the Entente representatives.

It should also be taken into account that, pressured by public opinion, the various governments involved and their diplomatic representatives tended to make certain decisions to the utter disadvantage of Ukraine. Immense human losses could not but primarily affect the attitude of the citizens of the Entente states towards the states of the Triple/Quadruple Alliance and their allies.

---

<sup>43</sup> *Soyuzniki i Ukraina* 1918, p. 2; *Soyuzniki* 1918, p. 2.

<sup>44</sup> *Ukrayins'ka derzhava* 2015, t. 1, p. 374.

Ignoring this factor, researchers often denounce foreign policy decisions made by the governments of the Entente states. We assume that to treat such actions as political mistakes may not be correct since they could have been made on the basis of political expediency as well as under the direct influence of public opinion. This problem requires further study.

In our opinion, it was great miscalculation of the Entente leaders to regard the Ukrainian State as a part of the Great Russia of the imperial model, whereas Imperial Russia itself had already passed into history. It led to the wasting of time. In 1918, the representatives of the Entente states should have taken swifter decisions in relation to a Ukraine that would have been able to become a good ally and a buffer between the new Europe and Bolshevik Russia.

In any case, on 16 November 1918, the Ukrainian mass media drew a distinctive line under the chapter of Ukraine's relations with the Entente states. The newspapers reported that I. Korostovets' mission to Jassy to conduct talks with the Entente representatives had not been crowned with success. And I. Korostovets himself gained no recognition as an official representative of the Ukrainian State. The entire diplomatic mission headed by General V. Dashkevich-Gorbatsky also remained unrecognised.<sup>45</sup>

Thus, although the diplomatic activity of the Ukrainian State in the direction of moving closer to the Entente states was quite robust in 1918, for a number of objective and subjective reasons it did not produce the expected political results for Ukraine. However, it was a valuable experience in foreign policy interaction which must be studied, analysed and applied on the way to building bridges with other European countries at the present stage of the development of Ukrainian statehood.

### Bibliographical Abbreviations

- Clark 1927 – Charles Upson Clark, *Bessarabia, Russia and Roumania on the Black Sea*, New York, 1927, [http://depts.washington.edu/cartah/text\\_archive/clark/bc\\_16.shtml](http://depts.washington.edu/cartah/text_archive/clark/bc_16.shtml).
- Datskiv 2002 – I. Datskiv, *Vstanovlennia dyplomatychnykh kontaktiv betmanatu P. Skoropadskoho z krainamy Antanty*, in PHN. *Istoriia*, 22, 2002, p. 37–47.
- Datskiv 2010 – Ihor B. Datskiv, *Dyplomatiia ukrainskykh natsionalnykh uriadiv u zakhysti derzhavnosti 1917-1923 rr.*, PhD thesis, Diplomatic Academy of Ukraine, Kyiv, 2010.
- Datskiv 2012 – I. Datskiv, *Ukraino-anbliiski dyplomatychni zviazky u 1917-1921 rokakh*, in *Naukovi zapysky*, 1, 2012, p. 185–192.

---

<sup>45</sup> *Otnoshenie* 1918, p. 3.

Sergey I. Degtyarev, Vladyslava M. Zavhorodnia, Lyubov G. Polyakova

- Degtyarev, Zavhorodnia 2018 – Sergey I. Degtyarev, Vladyslava M. Zavhorodnia, *The Bessarabian Question in 1917-1918: The Relations of Romania, Bessarabia and Ukraine*, in *Bylye Gody*, 48, 2018, 2, p. 872–879.
- Degtyarev, Zavhorodnia 2019 – Sergey I. Degtyarev, Vladyslava M. Zavhorodnia, *Ukrainsko-rumynskie diplomatscheskie i torgovo-ekonomicheskie otnosheniya na fone Bessarabskoy problemy v 1918 g.*, in *Rusin*, 55, 2019, p. 169–191.
- Denikin 1990 – A. I. Denikin, *Getmanstvo i Direktoriya na Ukraine*, in S. Alexeev, N. Popov (eds), *Revolutsiya na Ukraine po memuarom belykh*, Kyiv, 1990, p. 136–185.
- Doroshenko 2007 – D. Doroshenko, *Moi spomini pro nedavne minule (1914-1920 roky)*, Kyiv, 2007.
- Gedin 2012 – M. Gedin, *Ukrains'ko-rumun's'ki vidnosini naperedodni ta v period get'manuvannya Pavla Skoropads'kogo*, in *Visnyk*, 17, 2012, p. 107–115.
- Hai-Nyzhnyk 2017 – P. Hai-Nyzhnyk, *Zakonodavche ta normatyvno-pravove pidgruntia stanovlennia dyplomatychnoi sluzhby Ukrainskoi Derzhavy za Hetmanatu 1918 r.*, in *Hileya*, 123, 2017, 8, p. 28–36.
- Levyk 2017 – B. Levyk, *Zovnishnopolitychni oryentyry uriadu Pavla Skoropads'koho (za arkhivno-memuarnymy materialamy)*, in *Skhid*, 150, 2017, 4, p. 69–74.
- K prebyvanyiyu* 1918 – *K prebyvanyiyu germanskikh voysk na Ukraine*, in *Luch*, 118, 1918, p. 2.
- Margolin 1990 – A. Margolin, *Ukraina i politika Antanty*, in S. Alexeev, N. Popov (eds), *Revolutsiya na Ukraine po memuarom belykh*, Kyiv, 1990, p. 359–392.
- Miakotin 1990 – V. Miakotin, *Iz nedalekogo proshlogo (Otryivki vspominaniy)*, in S. Alexeev, N. Popov (eds), *Revolutsiya na Ukraine po memuarom belykh*, Kyiv, 1990, p. 222–238.
- Ot'ezd ukrainskoy* 1918 – *Ot'ezd ukrainskoy diplomatskoy missii v Ameriku*, in *Luch*, 105, 1918, p. 2.
- Otnoshenie* 1918 – *Otnoshenie k Ukrainskoy Derzhave*, in *Luch*, 127, 1918, p. 2.
- Shkilnyk 2016 – M. Shkilnyk, *Ukraina u borotbi za derzhavnist v 1917-1921 rr. Spomyny i roz'dumy*, Kyiv, 2016.
- Shveysarskaya* 1918 – *Shveysarskaya diplomatskaya missiya*, in *Luch*, 94, 1918, p. 2.
- Skoropadsky 2016 – Pavlo P. Skoropadsky, *Spobady: kinets 1917 – hruden 1918*, Kyiv, 2016.
- Slabchenko 2016 – Ye. Slabchenko, *Dyplomatychna istoriia Ukrainy*, Kyiv, 2016.
- Soedinennyye Shtaty* 1918 – *Soedinennyye Shtaty i Ukraina*, in *Luch*, 69, 1918, p. 2.
- Soyuzniki* 1918 – *Soyuzniki i ukrainskaya vlast*, in *Luch*, 131, 1918, p. 2.
- Soyuzniki i Ukraina* 1918 – *Soyuzniki i Ukraina*, in *Luch*, 131, 1918, p. 2.
- Vinnichenko 1990 – V. Vinnichenko, *Iz istorii ukrainskoy revolyutsii*, in S. Alexeev, N. Popov (eds), *Revolutsiya na Ukraine po memuarom belykh*, Kyiv, 1990, p. 276–358.
- V ozhidanii* 1918 – *V ozhidanii soyuznikov*, in *Luch*, 127, 1918, p. 3.
- V Yassab* 1918 – *V Yassab*, in *Luch*, 131, 1918, p. 2.
- Ukrayins'ka derzhava* 2015 – *Ukrayins'ka derzhava (kviten'-hruden' 1918 roku). Dokumenty i materialy. U dvoekh tomakh, tr'okh chastynakh*, t. 1–2, Kyiv, 2015.
- Usloviya Vilsona* 1918 – *Usloviya Vilsona i Vostochnaya Evropa*, in *Luch*, 102, 1918, p. 2.

## LISTA ABREVIERILOR DE PERIODICE

- AAH** – Acta Archaeologica Hungarica (actualmente Acta Archaeologica). Budapesta.
- ABLR** – Archäologische Berichte des Landkreises Rotenburg. Wümme.
- ACMI** – Anuarul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice, secția pentru Transilvania. Cluj-Napoca.
- Acta** – Acta (Siculica). Muzeul Național Secuiesc. Sfântu Gheorghe.
- ActaArch** – Acta Archaeologica. Budapesta.
- ActaMN** – Acta Musei Napocensis. Muzeul de Istorie a Transilvaniei. Cluj-Napoca.
- ActaMP** – Acta Musei Porolissensis. Muzeul Județean de Istorie și Artă Zalău.
- Acta Theriologica** – Acta Theriologica. Mammal Research Institute PAS.
- AÉ** – Archaeologiai Értesítő a Magyar régészeti, művészettörténeti és éremtani társulat tudományos folyóirata. Budapesta.
- AIHAI/AIIX** – Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie „A. D. Xenopol” Iași (din 1990 Anuarul Institutului de Istorie „A. D. Xenopol” Iași).
- AIICCMER** – Anuarul Institutului de Investigare a Crimelor Comunismului și Memoria Exilului Românesc. Institutul de Investigare a Crimelor Comunismului și Memoria Exilului Românesc. București.
- AIIGB** – Anuarul Institutului de Istorie „George Barițiu”. Series Historica. Institutul de Istorie „George Barițiu” din Cluj-Napoca.
- AIP** – Arheološki institut Posebna izdanja. Belgrad.
- AISC** – Anuarul Institutului de Studii Clasice. Cluj-Napoca.
- Altertum** – Das Altertum. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.
- Alt-Thüringen** – Alt-Thüringen. Museum of Prehistory and Early History of Thuringia.
- AM** – Arheologia Moldovei. Institutul de Istorie și Arheologie „A. D. Xenopol” Iași.
- AMET** – Anuarul Muzeului Etnografic al Transilvaniei. Muzeul Etnografic al Transilvaniei. Cluj-Napoca.
- AMM** – Acta Moldaviae Meridionalis. Muzeul Județean Vaslui.
- AnA** – Analele Aradului. Societatea Culturală „Asociația Națională Arădeană pentru cultura poporului român”. Arad.

<b>AnB</b>	– Analele Banatului (serie nouă). Muzeul Național al Banatului. Timișoara.
<b>AnBr</b>	– Analele Brăilei. Muzeul Brăilei „Carol I”. Brăila.
<b>AnD</b>	– Analele Dobrogei. Revista Societății Culturale Dobrogene. Constanța (1920-1923). Cernăuți (1924-1938). Din 1995, seria nouă a publicației este editată de Muzeul de Istorie Națională și Arheologie Constanța.
<b>Angustia</b>	– Angustia. Muzeul Carpaților Răsăriteni. Sfântu Gheorghe.
<b>Antiquity</b>	– Antiquity. A Quartely Review of World Archaeology. York.
<b>AO</b>	– Arhivele Olteniei (serie nouă). Institutul de Cercetări Socio-Umane. Craiova.
<b>Apulum</b>	– Apulum. Acta Musei Apulensis. Muzeul Național al Unirii Alba Iulia.
<b>ArcheoSciences</b>	– ArcheoSciences, revue d'archéométrie. Groupe des Méthodes Pluridisciplinaires Contribuant à l'Archéologie.
<b>ArchHist</b>	– Archaeologia historica. Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta. Brno.
<b>Argesis</b>	– Argesis. Studii și comunicări. Seria Istorie. Muzeul Județean Argeș. Pitești.
<b>ArhMed</b>	– Arheologia Medievală. Reșița, Cluj-Napoca.
<b>ArhSom</b>	– Arhiva Someșeană. Muzeul Năsăudean. Năsăud.
<b>ASC</b>	– Archeologie ve středních Čechách. Praga.
<b>Astra Salvensis</b>	– Astra Salvensis. Cercul Salva al ASTRA. Salva.
<b>ASUAIC</b>	– Annales Scientifiques de l'Université „Al. I. Cuza”. Iași.
<b>ATS</b>	– Acta Terrae Septemcastrensis. Sibiu.
<b>AUASH</b>	– Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Historica. Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.
<b>AUASJ</b>	– Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Jurisprudentia. Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.
<b>AUDJG</b>	– Analele Universității „Dunărea de Jos” Galați. Seria Istorie. Universitatea „Dunărea de Jos” Galați.
<b>AVSL</b>	– Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde. Sibiu.
<b>BAM</b>	– Bibliotheca Archaeologica Moldaviae. Iași.
<b>Banatica</b>	– Banatica. Muzeul de Istorie al Județului Caraș-Severin. Reșița.
<b>BAR</b>	– British Archaeological Reports (International Series). Oxford.
<b>BB</b>	– Bibliotheca Brukenthal. Muzeul Național Brukenthal. Sibiu.
<b>BCȘS</b>	– Buletinul Cercurilor Științifice Studentești. Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.

<b>Bergbaukunde</b>	– Bergbaukunde. Leipzig.
<b>BHAUT</b>	– Bibliotheca Historica et Archaeologica Universitatis Timisiensis. Universitatea de Vest. Timișoara.
<b>BMA</b>	– Bibliotheca Musei Apulensis. Muzeul Național al Unirii. Alba Iulia.
<b>BMB</b>	– Berliner Münzblätter. Berlin.
<b>BMJT</b>	– Buletinul Muzeului Județean Teleorman – seria Arheologie. Alexandria.
<b>BMN</b>	– Bibliotheca Musei Napocensis. Muzeul de Istorie a Transilvaniei. Cluj-Napoca.
<b>BMÖ</b>	– Beiträge zur Mittelalterarchäologie in Österreich. Österreichische Gesellschaft für Mittelalterarchäologie. Viena.
<b>BMP</b>	– Bibliotheca Musei Porolissensis. Muzeul Județean de Istorie și Artă Zalău.
<b>BMS</b>	– Bibliotheca Musei Sabesiensis. Muzeul Municipal „Ioan Raica” Sebeș.
<b>Brukenthal</b>	– Brukenthal. Acta Musei. Muzeul Național Brukenthal. Sibiu.
<b>BS</b>	– Bibliotheca Septemcastrensis, Universitatea „Lucian Blaga” din Sibiu.
<b>BSNR</b>	– Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române. București.
<b>BTh</b>	– Bibliotheca Thracologica. Institutul Român de Tracologie. București.
<b>BUA</b>	– Bibliotheca Universitatis Apulensis. Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.
<b>BudRég</b>	– Budapest Régiségei. Budapesti Történeti Múzeum. Budapesta.
<b>Bulletin</b>	– Bulletin de l'Association Pro Aventico. Lausanne.
<b>Bylye Gody</b>	– Bylye Gody. International Network Center for Fundamental and Applied Research. Washington.
<b>CA</b>	– Cercetări arheologice. Muzeul Național de Istorie a României. București.
<b>Caietele ARA</b>	– Caietele ARA: arhitectură, restaurare, arheologie. București.
<b>Caietele CNSAS</b>	– Caietele CNSAS. Consiliul Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității. București.
<b>CAH</b>	– Communicationes Archaeologicae Hungariae. Budapesta.
<b>Carpica</b>	– Carpica. Complexul Muzeal „Iulian Antonescu” Bacău.
<b>Carinthia I</b>	– Carinthia I. Zeitschrift für geschichtliche Landeskunde von Kärnten. Verlag des Geschichtsvereines für Kärnten. Klagenfurt.
<b>CCA</b>	– Cronica cercetărilor arheologice. cIMeC. București.

- Celticum** – Celticum. Supplément à OGAM-Tradition celtique. Rennes.
- CMA** – Concilium mediæ aevi. Zeitschrift für Geschichte, Kunst und Kultur des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit.
- CNRS** – Centre national de la recherche scientifique. Paris.
- CollMed** – Collegium Mediense. Comunicări științifice. Colegiul Tehnic „Mediense” Mediaș.
- Cumania** – Cumania. A Bács-Kiskun Megyei Önkormányzat Múzeumi Szervezetének Évkönyve. Kecskemét.
- Cumidava** – Cumidava. Muzeul Județean de Istorie Brașov.
- Dacia** – Dacia. Recherches et découvertes archéologiques en Roumanie. București, I, (1924) - XII (1948). Nouvelle série: Revue d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne. București.
- Dacia Magazin** – Dacia magazin. Dacia Revival International Society. New York.
- DAMN.SRD** – Din activitatea muzeelor noastre. Studii, referate, documente. Sfatul Popular al Regiunii Ploiești. Muzeul Regional de Istorie Ploiești.
- Danubius** – Danubius. Muzeul de Istorie. Galați.
- DR** – Dacoromania. Institutul de Lingvistică și Istorie Literară „Sextil Pușcariu” din Cluj-Napoca al Academiei Române. Cluj-Napoca
- EJA** – European Journal of Archaeology. European Association of Archaeologists.
- EphNap** – Ephemeris Napocensis. Institutul de Arheologie și Istoria Artei Cluj-Napoca.
- FI** – Fișe de Istorie. Muzeul de Istorie Bistrița (continuată de *Revista Bistriței*).
- FolArch** – Folia Archaeologica. Magyar Történeti Múzeum. Budapesta.
- FVL** – Forschungen zur Volks- und Landeskunde. Sibiu.
- Gând românesc** – Gând românesc. Asociația culturală „Gând Românesc, Gând European”. Alba Iulia.
- Germania** – Germania, Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Frankfurt pe Main.
- Godišnjak** – Godišnjak grada Beograda. Beograd.
- Hierasus** – Hierasus. Muzeul Județean Botoșani.
- Hileya** – Hileya: naukovyy visnyk. Natsional'nyy pedahohichnyy universytet imeni M. P. Drahomanov. Kiev.
- HU** – Historia Urbana. Academia Română. Comisia de Istorie a Orașelor din România. București.

- IJMP** – International Journal of Modern Physics: Conference Series.
- Istros** – Istros. Muzeul Brăilei. Brăila.
- JAS** – Journal of Archaeological Science. Elsevier.
- JASREP** – Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports. Elsevier.
- JKK** – Jahrbuch der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale. Viena.
- JRA** – Journal of Roman Archaeology. Editorial Committee of the Journal of Roman Archaeology.
- JRLS** – Journal of Romanian Literary Studies. ALPHA Institute for Multicultural Studies. Târgu Mureș.
- JSKV** – Jahrbuch des siebenbürgischen Karpathen-Vereins. Hermannstadt (Sibiu), I-XXX (1881-1922).
- JSRI** – Journal for the Study of Religions & Ideologies. The Academic Society for the Research of Religions and Ideologies. Cluj-Napoca.
- Közlemények** – Közlemények az Erdélyi Nemzeti Múzeum Érem - és Régiségtarából. Cluj-Napoca.
- Kühn-Archiv** – Kühn-Archiv. Berlin.
- LIUGC** – Lucrările Institutului de Geografie al Universității din Cluj. Institutul de Geografie al Universității din Cluj. Cluj-Napoca.
- Limba română** – Limba română. Institutul de Lingvistică al Academiei Române „Iorgu Iordan - Al. Rosetti”. București.
- LSCMIB** – Lucrările Stațiunii de Cercetări Marine „prof. Ioan Borcea” Agigea. Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” Iași.
- Marisia** – Marisia. Muzeul Județean Târgu Mureș.
- MAQ** – Medium Aevum Quotidianum. Krems.
- MCA** – Materiale și cercetări arheologice. București.
- MI** – Magazin istoric. București.
- MKKCC** – Mittheilungen der K. K. Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale. Viena.
- Mousaios** – Mousaios. Muzeul Județean Buzău.
- MN** – Muzeul Național. Muzeul Național de Istorie a României. București.
- Münzen Revue** – Münzen Revue. International Coin Trend Journal.
- NAC** – Numismatica e Antichità Classiche - Quaderni Ticinesi. Lugano.
- Naukovi zapysky** – Naukovi zapysky Ternopilskoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu im. V. Hnatiuka. Ser. Istoriia. Ternopil's'kyy natsional'nyy pedahohichnyy universytet imeni V. Hnatiuka. Ternopil'.

<b>NIMPR</b>	– Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms. Elsevier.
<b>Notae Numismatacae</b>	– Notae Numismatacae. Zapiski numizmatyczne. Cracovia.
<b>NZ</b>	– Numismatische Zeitung: Blätter für Münz-, Wappen- und Siegel-Kunde. Weissensee.
<b>ONS</b>	– Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost'. Rossiyskaya Akademiya Nauk. Moscova.
<b>PA</b>	– Patrimonium Apulense. Direcția Județeană pentru Cultură Alba. Alba Iulia.
<b>PB</b>	– Patrimonium Banaticum. Direcția Județeană pentru Cultură Timiș. Timișoara.
<b>Pferdeheilkunde</b>	– Pferdeheilkunde. Equine Medicine. Official Organ of the German Veterinary Association, Section – Equine Medicine. Baden-Baden.
<b>PHN. Istoriia</b>	– Problemy humanitarnykh nauk. Ser. Istoriia. Drohobych State Pedagogical University named after Ivan Franko. Drohobîci.
<b>Plural</b>	– Plural. Revista Departamentului de Istorie și Geografie a Universității Pedagogice de Stat „Ion Creangă” Chișinău.
<b>PRA</b>	– Proceedings of the Romanian Academy, Series A: Mathematics, Physics, Technical Sciences Information Science. Academia Română.
<b>Prilozi</b>	– Prilozi. Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu. Zagreb.
<b>Problemy istorii</b>	– Problemy istorii i istoriografii. Sbornik dokladov mezhvuzovskoy nauchnoy konferentsii. Federal'noye gosudarstvennoye avtonomnoye obrazovatel'noye uchrezhdeniye vysshego obrazovaniya Sankt-Peterburgskiy gosudarstvennyy elektrotekhnicheskiy universitet LETI imeni V. I. Ul'yanova (Lenina). Sankt Petersburg.
<b>QFA</b>	– Quaderni Friulani di Archeologia. Società Friulana di Archeologia onlus. Udine.
<b>RA</b>	– Revista arhivelor. Arhivele Naționale ale României. București.
<b>RAE</b>	– Revue Archéologique de l'Est. Société archéologique de l'Est. Dijon.
<b>RAN</b>	– Revue Archéologique de Narbonnaise. Paris.
<b>RAP</b>	– Revue Archéologique de Picardie. Societe des antiquaires de Picardie.
<b>RB</b>	– Revista Bistriței. Complexul Muzeal Bistrița-Năsăud. Bistrița.

Lista abrevierilor de periodice

<b>REF</b>	– Revista de Etnografie și Folclor. Institutul de Etnografie și Folclor „Constantin Brăiloiu”. Academia Română. București.
<b>RevArh</b>	– Revista Arheologică. Centrul de Arheologie al Institutului Patrimoniului Cultural al Academiei de Științe a Moldovei. Chișinău.
<b>RHSEE/RESEE</b>	– Revue historique du sud-est européen. Academia Română. București, Paris (din 1963 Revue des études sud-est européennes).
<b>RI</b>	– Revista de Istorie (din 1990 Revista istorică). Academia Română. București.
<b>RITL</b>	– Revista de Istorie și Teorie Literară. Academia Română. Institutul de Istorie și Teorie Literară „G. Călinescu”. București.
<b>RJP</b>	– Romanian Journal of Physics. București.
<b>RMNK</b>	– Rocznik Muzeum Narodowego w Kielcach. Kielce.
<b>RMV</b>	– Rad Muzeja Vojvodine. Novi Sad.
<b>RN</b>	– Revue Numismatique. Société française de numismatique. Paris.
<b>ROB</b>	– ROB. Berichten van de Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek. Amersfoort.
<b>RP</b>	– Revista pădurilor. Societatea „Progresul silvic”.
<b>RRH</b>	– Revue Roumaine d’Histoire. Academia Română. București.
<b>RRS</b>	– Revista Română de Sociologie. Institutul de Sociologie al Academiei Române. București.
<b>Rusin</b>	– Rusin. Ob’yednannyya “rus”. Toms’kyy derzhavnyy universytet. Kyshyniv. Tomsk.
<b>SAI</b>	– Studii și articole de istorie. Societatea de Științe Istorice și Filologice a RPR. București.
<b>Sargetia</b>	– Sargetia. Acta Musei Devensis. Muzeul Civilizației Dacice și Romane Deva.
<b>SCA</b>	– Studii și Cercetări de Antropologie. Institutul de Antropologie „Francisc I. Rainer”. Academia Română. București.
<b>SCIV(A)</b>	– Studii și cercetări de istoria veche (din 1974, Studii și cercetări de istorie veche și arheologie). București.
<b>SCN</b>	– Studii și Cercetări de Numismatică. Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan” București.
<b>Skhid</b>	– Skhid. Ukrainian Cultural Centre. Institute of Industrial Economics of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. Institute of Philosophy named after G. S. Skovoroda of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. Zaporizhzhya National University.
<b>SlovArch</b>	– Slovenská Archeológia. Nitra.

- SP** – Studii de Preistorie. Asociația Română de Arheologie. București.
- SprArch** – Sprawozdania Archeologiczne. Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii PAN, Ośrodek Archeologii Gór i Wyzyn w Krakowie. Cracovia.
- SS** – Siebenbürgische Semesterblätter. Arbeitskreis für siebenbürgische Landeskunde. München.
- Studii Clasice** – Studii Clasice. Societatea de Studii Clasice din R.S.R. București.
- ST** – Studii teologice. Revista Facultăților de Teologie din Patriarhia Română. București.
- StComCaransebeș** – Studii și Cercetări de Etnografie și Istorie Caransebeș. Muzeul Județean de Etnografie și al Regimentului de Graniță Caransebeș.
- StComSibiu** – Studii și comunicări. Arheologie-istorie. Muzeul Brukenthal. Sibiu.
- StComSM** – Studii și comunicări. Muzeul Județean Satu Mare.
- SUCSH** – Studia Universitatis Cibiniensis. Series Historica. Universitatea „Lucian Blaga” Sibiu.
- SympThrac** – Symposia Thracologica. Institutul Român de Tracologie. București.
- Terra Sebus** – Terra Sebus. Acta Musei Sabesiensis. Muzeul Municipal „Ioan Raica” Sebeș.
- TMNHN** – Travaux du Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle. Muzeul Național de Istorie Naturală Grigore Antipa. București.
- Transilvania** – Transilvania. Complexul Național Muzeal ASTRA. Sibiu.
- Universul Juridic** – Universul Juridic. Revistă lunară de doctrină și jurisprudență. București.
- VAH** – Varia Archaeologica Hungarica. Budapesta.
- Vestnik Nizhegorodskoy** – Vestnik Nizhegorodskoy akademii Ministerstva vnutrennikh del Rossii. Nizhegorodskaya akademiya Ministerstva vnutrennikh del Rossiyskoy Federatsii. Nizhniy Novgorod.
- Vestnik Voronezhskogo** – Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya Gumanitarnye nauki. Voronezhskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet. Voronej.
- Vestnik Tomskogo** – Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya Istoriya. Tomskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet. Tomsk.
- Vestnik Tverskogo** – Vestnik Tverskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya Istoriya. Tver.
- Veterinarski glasnik Br** – Veterinarski Glasnik Br. University of Belgrade. Belgrad.

Lista abrevierilor de periodice

- Visnyk** – Visnyk Kyyivs'koho natsional'noho linhvistychnoho universytetu. Seriya: Istoriya, ekonomika, filosofiya. Kyyivs'kyy natsional'nyy movnyy universytet. Kiev.
- Vjesnik** – Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku. Arheološki muzej Split.
- VTT** – Veszprémi Történelmi Tá. Veszprém.
- WA** – Wiadomości Archeologiczne. Państwowe Muzeum Archeologiczne w Warszawie. Varşovia.
- ZfAM** – Zeitschrift für Archäologie des Mittelalters. Bonn.
- ZfTZ** – Zeitschrift für Tierzüchtung und Züchtungsbiologie: Organ der Reichsarbeitsgemeinschaft Tierzucht im Forschungsdienst (continuă: Zeitschrift für Züchtung. Reihe B, Tierzüchtung und Züchtungsbiologie). Berlin, Hamburg.
- Ziridava** – Ziridava. Muzeul Judeţean Arad.
- ZISP** – Zhurnal issledovaniy sotsial'noy politiki. Natsional'nyy issledovatel'skiy universitet “Vysshaya shkola ekonomiki”. Moscova.
- ZSL** – Zeitschrift für siebenbürgische Landeskunde. (Arbeitskreis für siebenbürgische Landeskunde). Heidelberg.
- ZVHGL** – Zeitschrift des Vereins für hessische Geschichte und Landeskunde, Neue Folge. Kassel.