

**KUSHNIR Vyacheslav**

***ETHNO-CULTURAL ATTRIBUTION AND CHRONOLOGY PROBLEMS OF  
THE KODYMA REGION WOVEN PRODUCTS***

Woven products in the Kodyma region, the border area with Moldova, are the most representative ethnographic patrimony. They do not reflect only the aesthetic preferences of their makers. The intertwining of Ukrainian and Moldovan traditions shows the high intensity intercultural communication.

However, the theme of home-weaving of the border zone population has not been the subject of a comprehensive study, although some comments, observations, preliminary generalizations appeared on the pages of local history and research works, and has highlighted a number of issues. They particularly relate to cultural attribution and chronology.

Until the mid-twentieth century, in the area there were Ukrainian and Moldovan settlements (the village of Petrivka), mixed Ukrainian-Moldovan settlements (Grabove, Shershentzi, Oleksiivka, Zahnitkiv, Labushna, Timkove and others) whose inhabitants made and use dwoven products in everyday life. However, the question whether they had differences or reflected the specificity of Moldovan and Ukrainian ornamentation is not clear. Therefore, it would be logical and correct to raise the issue of their cultural attribution.

It is the range of product names that we will choose from the possible approaches and methods. As early as the 20th century, the ethnographic collection sent to St. Petersburg from the south-east of the Vinnytsia region consisted of a *naframa* listed as a headdress and a men's belt, *brîu*. In the Kodyma region some woven products are still called *par(l)atary*, *kadrelî*, *nafranyzia* along with Ukrainian *pilka*, *riadno*, *rushnyk* etc.

At least three lexical units, *paratary*, *kadrelî*, *nafranyzia*, are of Moldovan origin. They are used in Transdnistrian villages and not only in those of Ukrainian - Moldovan, but also in Ukrainian ones. However, understanding the difference between some of them, for example between *paratary* and *kadrelî* in our time has disappeared, although some respondents of the older age group point to the differences in ornamentation and the nature of raw materials: *paratary* were produced from wool thread (warp and weft), and *kadrelî* were woven from hemp thread. The patterns of a *paratary* are almost similar to those of a carpet, and the patterns of a *kadrelî* were made of a set of multicolored stripes or squares. The names of these products clearly indicate that Ukrainians borrowed them from Moldovans. In their original form, at the time of borrowing, most likely with the relocation to the left Bank of the Dniester river, the *paratary* were sure to have different ornaments, but as time went on, with the development of communication capabilities, increasing information resources, the transformation of woven products was influenced by at least three traditions: those of Moldovans, Ukrainians from Podillia, and local needlewomen of the Kodyma region.

At least in the first half of the 20th century these information flows, from Moldova, Podillia and the local component, established the specificity of the Kodyma region's woven goods as a product of interaction of different traditions, one of which, a Moldovan, was embedded in the names of some products.

By far the lexical unit "nafranyzia" is Moldovan. Both by its name and its functional purpose, *nafranyzia* also represents a Moldovan tradition that has not undergone significant transformational modifications in the environment of Ukraine.

Another identifying characteristic can be the ornamentation of products. The dominant component in carpet compositions are vegetative patterns and the archaic motif of "The World tree", "The flowerpot". It is present on products of Ukrainians and Moldovans, and it isn't a marker of one of the two above-mentioned traditions. It cannot be a convincing argument in the attribution of cultural products. A lot of products with "The World tree" are labeled with the names of needlewomen, Moldovan and Ukrainian by birth. The differences should be sought in the peculiarities of the ornamental systems of Ukrainians and Moldovans.

We can say that a process of mutual acculturation on the Ukrainian-Moldovan borderline ended much earlier and in the ornamentation of the products of the late 19th – early 20th centuries we record only its effects. Equally topical is the question of chronology of woven products. Since the late 19th century it has been noted that certain dynamics can be observed in the structure of ornaments, in their semantic content.

In the second half of 19th – early 20th centuries there was a gradual transition from the dominant geometrically-ordered vegetative motifs ("The World tree", "The flowerpot") to the realistic motifs of roses, which by the mid-twentieth century had been established for good as the dominant component, the basis of composition. However, the structure of compositions did not experience a major transformation. In the middle part it had one or several motifs, and both the upper and the bottom edges of the product were decorated with strips in the form of "an endless pattern". However, it is noteworthy that in the late 19th – early 20th centuries the edge was made of broken lines and geometrically-ordered patterns of "The World tree" in the center of the composition, although in the first half of the 20th century geometrical lines in the form of zigzag and triangles were replaced with roses. The ornament motif of the edge (e.g. a rose) did not differ from the motif of the middle of the composition.

Dyes indirectly indicated the time of manufacture of woven products. In the late 19th – early 20th centuries the utilization of dyes of natural origin was still quite widespread. Chemical paints were uncommon in rural areas at that time.