

UKRAINIAN FREE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES  
SLAVISTICA No. 19

---

JOHN P. SYDORUK

**IDEOLOGY OF CYRILLO-METHODIANS  
AND ITS ORIGIN**



Winnipeg

1954

Chicago

---

Published by the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences

SLAVISTICA

XIX

**SLAVISTICA**  
Праці Інституту Слов'янознавства  
**УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ВІЛЬНОЇ АКАДЕМІЇ НАУК**  
За редакцією Я. Б. Рудницького  
Ч. 19

---

**І. П. СИДОРУК**

**Ідеологія Кирило-Методіївців  
та її походження**

**Вінніпер**

**1954**

**Шікаго**

---

**Видання УВАН, з добровільних датків  
українців міста Шікаго.**

**SLAVISTICA**  
PROCEEDINGS OF THE INSTITUTE OF SLAVISTICS  
OF THE UKRAINIAN FREE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES  
Editor-in-chief J. B. Rudnyc'kyj  
No. 19

---

**JOHN P. SYDORUK**

**IDEOLOGY OF CYRILLO-METHODIANS  
AND ITS ORIGIN**

**diasporiana.org.ua**

**Winnipeg**

**1954**

**Chicago**

---

Published by the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences  
From donations of the Ukrainians in Chicago

The essence of this essay was read at the 8th annual meeting of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, Wayne University, Detroit, Mich., Dec 29, 1951. A summary of it appeared in the Bulletin of the AATSEEL, Vol IX/3, March 15, 1952, p. 53.

Cf. also "Publications of the Modern Language Association of America", April 1953, Vol. LXVIII/2, p. 181.

*To my Dear Teacher,*

*Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki*

*for the 40th anniversary  
of his scholarly activity  
(1914\*—1954)*

---

\*Cf. his first essay: "Beitraege zur ukrainischen Wortforschung",  
AfS1Ph, ed. by V. Jagic', Vol. 35, Berlin, 1914, p. 349/255.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

*Sincere thanks to Miss La Verne R. Matus, student of Northwestern University, for her unselfish help in the preparation of this work.*

*My deep appreciation to the authors: Nicholas D. Chubaty, Hans Kohn and Clarence A. Manning, as well as to the publishers: Alfred A. Knopf (30,112), The Mac-Millan Co., University of Notre Dame Press (Director John P. Defant), The Ukrainian Quarterly, Ukrainian National Association, Yale University Press, for their courtesy and kind permission to quote their works.*

*The first part of my work — "IDEOLOGY" — is based mainly upon the Ukrainian books: of M. VOZNYAK, *The Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood*, Lviv, 1921, and M. KOSTOMARIV, *The Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People*, Augsburg, 1947, ed. by V. Miyakovsky (UVAN). The second — "ORIGIN" — upon the works of: Voznyak, Chubaty, Manning, Biletsky, Chizhevsky and others.*

*The last part of my essay: "Romantic Pan-Slavism" is chiefly based upon the very objective and excellent book: Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, (University of Notre Dame Press, 1953). The quotations from it are marked with the figure 28, as: (28,1). Financial difficulties force me to use parenthesis in order to save space and therefore printing cost. So I deeply regret that I was unable to state the full title in each footnote after every quotation.*

*Figures in parenthesis (1,79) mean: ordinal number of the "Bibliography" list and the page on which the work is quoted.*

*My gratitude to the Donators, listed at the end, without whose generous contributions this essay would never have appeared.*

John P. Sydoruk

Chicago, January 6, 1954

## INTRODUCTION

Motto of the Cyrillo-Methodians:  
*"Ye shall know the truth, and  
the truth shall make you free."*  
John 8, 32

Over one century ago, January 6, 1846, in the time of the despotic reign of Tsar Nicholas I (1825-1855), a group of young enthusiasts and idealists founded in Kiev the first modern secret political organization of the Ukrainian patriots and democrats "the Society of Saints Cyril and Methodius," later called by Shevchenko "Brotherhood"<sup>1</sup> (1, 79), which term passed to Ukrainian and Slavic literature and history and since that it is known as "the Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood."

The idea of this Brotherhood was born from the discussions between Mykola Kostomariv (1817-1885), a scholar who later became a professor of the Kiev University and of Mykola Hulak (1822-1899)<sup>2</sup>, a young lawyer, graduate of the German Dorpat University and brilliant erudite, who since 1845 had worked in the office of the Russian General-Governor Bibikov, of Kiev, Podillya and Volynia. In his autobiography Kostomariv says: "Our friendly discourses chiefly played with the idea of Slavic unity. . . . The reciprocity of the Slavic peoples was not limited in our imagination only to the sphere of culture and poetry, but it began to sketch in wider pictures which—we believed—should be incarnated in future history." . . . (1, 71).

Besides the co-founders of the Brotherhood, such as Kostomariv, Hulak, and a little later Bilozersky and Markovych, the following members joined them: students Navrocky, Tulub, Andrusky, Posyada, teacher Pyl'chykiv, the best propagator of the Brotherhood's ideas among youth,

---

<sup>1</sup>This term implies the old Ukrainian church and Kozak traditions.

Figures in text in parenthesis mean: the first number refers to the work in the bibliography list and the second to the page; e.g.: (1, 79): M. Voznyak, *The Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood*, Lviv, 1921, page 79.

<sup>2</sup>H. Kohn in his excellent book (28, 61) has erroneously named Shevchenko as the founder of the Brotherhood.



nobleman Savych, a graduate of the Paris University (he wanted to present Shevchenko's "Kobzar" and "Caucasus" to Mickiewicz!) and many others.

The most prominent Ukrainians of that time: Taras Shevchenko (1814-1861), an artist and the greatest poet of Ukraine, who with his fiery, patriotic poetry gave a new, revolutionary spirit to his countrymen<sup>3</sup>, and Panteleymon Kulish (1819-1897), a Ukrainian Walter Scott, a historian and an ardent folklorist, denied their membership before the gendarmes. Later Kulish said in his "Historic Tale": "Both of us were not admitted to the secret society because we had already worked for Slavic and Ukrainian liberty, and in the meantime, in case of persecution, nobody could attack us" (1, 79). But M. Voznyak insists that Shevchenko was a member of the Brotherhood and says that Kostomariiv implied this in his memoirs, it was also heard by Konys'ky from Pyl'chykiv. Shevchenko himself in his letter to Kostomariiv on Feb. 14, 1847, calling Kostomariiv his "great friend," wrote: "About the Brotherhood I shall not write, because there is nothing to write. If we see one another we will speak enough" (1, 79).

However I see no reason not to trust Kulish, because the fear of persecution came true a year later. Before the Brotherhood could develop its real activity, A. Petrov, a student (who lived in a room close to Hulak) denounced its members on Feb. 28, 1847. In spite of the fact that there was no list of the members of the secret society, they all were arrested, brought to St. Petersburg and on June 12, 1847 were sentenced. . . . After the arrests there appeared on one street in Kiev, April 16, 1847, the following anonymous proclamation: "Brothers! It is highest time to erase the disgrace done to our ancestors, to our beloved Ukraine by the cruel hand of our age-old enemies. Who among us will not rise up? God is with us and all good people, forever faithful sons of Ukraine, the enemies of Russians!" Of course the police prevented any insurrection. (1, 149).

Shevchenko received the most severe punishment, although he was not found to be a member of the Society. The executioner of the Brotherhood, Count A. Orlov, the chief of the gendarmes, reported to Tsar Nicholas I, that "Gendarme of Europe," the following: "Shevchenko . . . composed verses in the Ukrainian language of the most re-

---

<sup>3</sup>Cf. his "Testament" (1845): ". . . Rise up, break your shackles, and with hostile, raging blood bless your freedom,"

(Translated by La Verne R. Matus)

volting character. In them he expressed lamentation for the so-called enslavement and misery of Ukraine, proclaimed the glory of the old Hetman rule and the former freedom of the Kozaks. . . . With his poems which were beloved in Ukraine there could be sowed and consequently take root thoughts of the so-called happiness of the times of the Hetmanate and the possibility of Ukraine existing as a separate country". (7, 22). For this and for "slanders and bile on the persons of the Imperial House", he was sent as a private to the Orenburg Separate Corps and spent seven years there "under the strictest supervision with a prohibition of writing and sketching", as specified personally by the Tsar. (Could there be a more cruel punishment for a poet and artist?) Hulak stoically took the whole blame upon himself, and was therefore imprisoned in the fortress of Schlusselfurg for three years, Kostomariw—one year, and Kulish was sent for government service in Vologda with a prohibition of writing. All the others were sent for government service outside of Ukraine.

The sentence and deportation from Ukraine of the best people of that time was a terrible catastrophe for the further development of the Ukrainian national life and especially for the literature.

Later Kostomariw wrote in his letter to the liberal Russian editor of the "Kolokol" (The Bell) in London, A. Hertz: "After the Brotherhood's case censorship and espionage hailed their wild triumph against Ukraine. Not only were Ukrainian books forbidden, but also the scientific essays in Russian about Ukraine were examined severely. The terms: Ukraine, Little Russia and Hetmanate were regarded as unloyal" (1, 217).

But the highest point of Russian chauvinism and intolerance against the Ukrainians was reached when, on June 21, 1863, the Minister of the Interior, Count P. Valuev, issued an order in which he stated angrily that "a Ukrainian nationality never has existed, does not exist and cannot exist" (26, 304). (Why then did he issue an order against something that never existed? Where is the common logic?) In Ems, on May 18, 1876, Tsar Alexander II issued an order strictly forbidding the use of the Ukrainian language in literature. Later, however, in 1905, the Russian Academy of St. Petersburg officially recognized Ukrainian as a separate language, which in itself implies recognition of a distinct nationality (38, 6).

But the existence of a distinct nationality does not require a special permit from any foreign Academy, as long as

the people themselves recognize their own individuality and want their own statehood<sup>4</sup>. The Ukrainian people always wanted, want and will continue to want to be regarded as a separate nationality and have an independent state. Even for the Asiatic peoples "the colonial era is now past"<sup>5</sup>—said Gen. MacArthur in his farewell to the U. S. Congress, April 19, 1951, and it is all the more valid for the European peoples! "When once a nation begins to think, it is impossible to stop it"—said Voltaire (61, 221). And the Ukrainian people began to think about their independence already in 1648, when the Kozak Hetman Khmelnytsky decided to "free the entire people of Ukraine" (33, 284), with sword. Since that time the Ukrainians never gave up the hope of their freedom and the struggle for their independence.

---

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Rousseau's idea of the sovereign will of the people; the U. S. Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776: "Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed"; and President Wilson's "self-determination"—proclamation of January 1918.

<sup>5</sup>Chicago Daily Tribune, Vol. CX/95, April 20, 1951, page 1.

## IDEOLOGY

### A. Ideological Writings.

The ideology of the Cyrillo-Methodians was laid down in six points in "The Statute of the Slavic Society of Saints Cyril and Methodius", in "Chief Ideas", written by Kostomariv or maybe even by Hulak: "We believe that: 1. The spiritual and political union of the Slavic peoples is their real destination, toward which they should aim. 2. In the union each Slavic tribe must have its independence, and in such tribes we include: Ukrainians, Russians with Byelorussians, Poles, Czechs with Slovaks, Luzitians, Illyro-Serbs with Croats, and Bulgars. 3. Each tribe must have a national government and maintain full equality of the citizens, concerning their social position, Christian religion and economic status. 4. Government, legislation and right of possession and education of all Slavs should be based upon the holy religion of our Lord Jesus Christ. 5. Under such equality, education and pure morals were required of all persons who wished to participate in the administration. 6. There should exist a General Slavic Congress of the representatives of all tribes" (1, 81f and 2, 29f).

About the details of this Slavic Union, Kostomariv says in his biography: "We began to imagine all Slavic peoples united among themselves in a federation like the ancient Greek cities or United States of America, living in close contact but, without exception, keeping their full autonomy.

. . . We could not explain the exact picture, in which our imaginative, federative state should appear. That picture we left for future history to create" (1, 82). "In all parts of the federation, there were suggested the same cardinal laws and rights, equal weight, measure, currency, the abolishment of custom, free trade, general abolishment of serfdom and slavery in every form, the abolishment of the death penalty and corporal punishment, one central government with competence in foreign affairs, army and navy, but full self-government of each state about interior affairs, interior administration, courts and national education" (1, 83). General parliament should have two houses, the senate, and the house of representatives, which should meet every four years, or more frequently if need be. Each state should

have its own parliament (meetings each year) and its own president. Central authority should be carried on and represented by the federal president, chosen for four years, and two ministers: of foreign and interior affairs. To defend the federation, there should be a not-too-large army, because each state should have its own militia, and all citizens must be trained to defend the country in time of need.

Because the Slavic nations were not equal in population, there was also a suggestion to divide Russia proper into 10 states, Ukraine in 2, and Byelorussia, Poland etc. were supposed to have one state for each nation. This division could be changed if need be. The capital of Ukraine—Kiev was not supposed to belong to any state, but was to be a free city, where there could be a central government and federal parliament (1, 84).

“The Cardinal Rules of the Society” (11 points) also partially explain the ideology, but they chiefly regulated the life of the Society. The ideology of the Brotherhood was to be spread by the education of youth, by literature, and by increasing the number of members. The Brothers adopted as a patron the Slavic apostles Saints Cyril and Methodius, and on the seal they used as their motto the words from St. John’s Gospel 8, 32: “Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free”. The members wore a ring with the initials: “K M.” from the names of the patrons in the Ukrainian spelling. Every member had to take an oath to use his talent, effort, property and social connections for the aims of the Brotherhood, and in case of persecution, even under torture he should not denounce his ideas or his brothers. The Brotherhood had to support the family of an arrested member. All members were supposed to act according to Christian love, tenderness and patience; the Machiavellian doctrine (“reason of state”)—that unscrupulous means may be justifiably employed by a state was declared as a godless doctrine. The Brotherhood wanted to annihilate all tribal and religious hatred and propaganda, create an understanding between all religions, and abolish illiteracy and social ranks.

Besides the “Statute” and “Rules” Kostomarov wrote a proclamation: “To the Brother Ukrainians”, in which he, repeating the Brotherhood’s chief ideas in simple words, asked all the people for their opinion on whether to accept them or not. “This we give for your consideration, brother Ukrainians of both banks of the Dnieper River. Read them carefully and everyone should concentrate on how to

achieve them and on ways to improve them. There is a saying, the more heads, the more brains. When you begin to think about this, then in the proper time, when you actually speak about them, our Dear Lord will help you to understand fully." (2, 26).

With great power of expression and religious pathos, Kostomariv also drafted a proclamation to the historical enemies of Ukraine, calling them: "Brother Russians and Poles! Ukraine speaks this to you, your poor sister whom you lacerated and crucified. She does not bear ill will, and is sorry about your disaster and is ready to spill her children's blood for your freedom. Read this fraternal epistle, consider the important matter of your common salvation, and arise from your sleep and somnolence. Annihilate in your hearts, the blind hatred toward each other, instigated by tsars and nobility for the common destruction of your liberty, be ashamed of the yoke, pressing down upon your shoulders, be ashamed of your own corruption, damn the sacriligious names of the earthly tsar and lord, banish from your minds the spirit of infidelity brought to you by Germanic and Romanic peoples, and the spirit of obduracy, brought by the Tartars. Array yourselves in natural Slavic love toward humanity. Remember also your brothers languishing in German, silk chains, and in Turkish clutches. And this should be the life and activity's goal of everyone of you: the Slavic union, general equality, brotherhood, peace and love of our Lord Jesus Christ, Amen." (2, 27f).

But the most important and interesting work of the Brotherhood was so-called by the members themselves "God's Law" or as it was named later by P. Kulish' "The Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People", which is supposed to be a political Bible for the Ukrainian nation. This ideological work will be the topic of the next chapter.

Regarding the ideology of the Brotherhood, I would like to stress the great idealism, fervent patriotism, high moral and deep Christian spirit of the members. Kostomariv himself was a very religious man who knew many parts of the Bible from memory, and had a divine service at his home every day. Vasylyl' Bilozersky (1825-1899), one of the leading

---

'Kulish was the first who in his memoirs about Kostomariv (in "Nov' ", 1885, No. 13, page 67) said: "Kostomariv wrote in Ukrainian the so-called "Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People", imitating the known work of Mickiewicz". V. Semevsky repeated it and P. Zaytsev first published this work under the above mentioned title in 1918. (Information from V. Miyakovsky).

members wrote in his papers: "The Christian religion has brought to the world a new moral spirit, which hitherto has been absent. The Savior has revealed to humanity: love, peace, and liberty, equality for all, and brotherhood of all peoples, which are new goals shown to people in order to achieve the great idea of human unity." (1, 87). However those who had the power to introduce these ideas in life, did not fulfill the hope of the masses. Many centuries have passed, and "people are still suffering from lies and being oppressed; happy are those who are conscious of their nationality to such a degree that no outside power is able to break their moral strength; then the nation is able to keep its independence and progress. That is the goal for which every nation should struggle, because woe to those who are in yoke."

There are hardly any people who have suffered more from an evil pagan regime than the Slavs, for whom the great German thinker, Herder, prophesied a better future if they would free themselves from their slave's chains<sup>2</sup>.

---

"Johann Gottfried Herder said in 1784 about the Slavs: "They were charitable and hospitable to excess, lovers of pastoral freedom but submissive and obedient, enemies of robbery and plundering. All this did not preserve them from oppression; on the contrary contributed to it. For as they were never ambitious for sovereignty, had among them no hereditary princes addicted to war, and thought little of paying tribute, so they could but enjoy their lands in peace; many nations, chiefly of German origin, injuriously oppressed them. Already under Charlemagne oppressive wars were carried on, the object of which was evidently commercial advantages, though the Christian religion was their pretext. . . . What the Franks began, the Saxons completed: in whole provinces the Slavs were extirpated, or made bondsmen, and their lands divided among bishops and nobles. Northern Germans ruined their commerce on the Baltic; the Danes brought their Vineta to a melancholy end; and their remains in Germany were reduced to that state, to which the Peruvians were subjected by the Spaniards. . . . Unfortunately their situation brought them so near to the Germans on the one side, and on the other left them exposed in the East to the attacks of the Tartars, from whom, particularly from the Mongols, they had much to suffer and endure.

The wheel of changing Time, however, revolves without ceasing; and as these nations inhabit for the most part the finest country of Europe, if it were completely cultivated and its trade opened: it is impossible to think other than sometime in Europe the legislation and policy must and will promote more and more quiet diligence and calm exchange between the people instead of a military spirit: so you will be also, so deeply submerged now, once industrious and happy people (the Slavs) finally awake from your long indolent sleep, shake off your slave chains, use as your property your beautiful regions: from the Adriatic Sea to the Carpathian Mountains, from the Danube to the Moldau and celebrate on them their ancient festivals of peaceful trade and industry." ("Ideen

"What a horrible condition our beloved Ukraine is in—a country deserving permanent respect for her bitter suffering and struggle for truth. She made an alliance with Muscovy (at Pereyaslav 1654) of her own will, and now she is suffering like a slave unjustly. Her rights are forgotten, and now she is treated, not like a sister nation of the same religion, but like a slave, she has to suffer a most tragic life. . . . We are now, O my God, like foreigners in our native country, in our own fatherland! If this condition persists, Ukraine will lose her national, age-old culture and be completely assimilated. Is this God's will? No! But we will deserve it, if we stay inactive, if we quietly watch the enemies killing before our eyes the greatest divine gift—national life with its spirit, idea, with its purpose toward which it should progress. . . . We must fight for God's rights in our fatherland, for liberty, for brotherly love and national prosperity, for independent development of this idea, which the Creator put in the nature of our people." (1, 89).

For Bilozersky the principle of life was "a law, drafted by God's hand in human hearts" (67, 110). Markovych believed in "the strength of the soul created by God, which He warms, feeds and cares for" (67, 110). Navrotsky left in his letters his romantic view of esthetics: "Nothing cleanses our soul and all our moral as well as poetry—power of life. I never liked people who had no sense for poetry; I think such people never could be good. Beauty is not only delight and pleasure; it bears in itself the deep roots of goodness and truth; human life would be sad without it" . . . "To write from inner need is the greatest, secret delight; at least for a time you live in a world created by yourself . . ." (67, 110).

---

zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit", Riga-Leipzig, 1791, book 16, chapt. 4 ("Slavische Voelker"), page 667-670).

Cf. also: K. Bittner, "Herders Geschichtsphilosophie und die Slaven", Reichenberg, 1929, page 97ff. and R. Schierenberg, "Der politische Herder", Graz, 1932, 51ff.

It is worth it to mention here, what Herder wrote also about Ukraine in his "Journal of my journey in 1769": "One day Ukraine will become a new Greece; the beautiful climate of this country, the gay mood of the people, their musical talent, their fertile soil, will once awake; like from so many, little, wild tribes, whom once also the Greeks were, there will arise a cultured nation and her boundaries will reach the Black Sea and from there the wide world". (Journal meiner Reise im Jahre 1769", ed. by A. Gillies, Oxford, 1947, page 61).

Even an enemy of the Ukrainian statehood, B. Pares, said: "The folk song of Ukraine, deeper than the German and more melodious than the Great-Russian, is probably the most beautiful in the world". ("Russia", New York, 1943, page 4).



History — according to Hulak and Kostomariv — is “the guide of truth, obtained from life by the experience of many centuries as an indicator of the great path of Providence” (67, 112).

Pan-Slavism and social reformation of Bilozersky is closely connected with Christian ideas. For him “Pan-Slavism was a union of all Slavic tribes in one common family which was inspired by the love of humanity and had to develop in itself Christian feelings, and in this way contribute a new element and so to say stimulate anew universal action” . . . The task of Slavdom—“as before was to extend the agrar—peaceful culture, a humanity of moral ideas so now” the Slavs should “soften the troubled peoples’ souls by a solution of social problems, and by a return of blessings, illustrated by our Savior” (67, 112).

The Pan-Slavic feeling of Kostomraiv is well expressed in his novel “The Young Gentleman Natalych”: all the Slavic peoples should “appear before the Judge with unburied talents.” “When all the Slavic peoples would awake from their slumber, stop the harmful division, abolish every tribal hatred, the strong take the weak in arms—the free, noble-minded, inspired by the love of Christ (—the only King and Teacher), Slavs would unite—then the pious will rejoice and the treacherous will tremble. Truth and equality will triumph” (67,112).

Kostomariv tried to convince Kulish that “a real Christian should lay not too great stress upon any folk-customs . . . upon that which is called nationality,” but Kulish was flatly combining Ukrainian nationality with Christianity, saying: “Our Ukrainian is a Christian as long as he preserves all his customs and all his folk-lore” (67, 111). He was connecting also the national movement with the religious Renaissance: “There will come a time for temple buildings, in which other peoples will pray also; there will come a time for the prophets, liberators of many” (67, 111).

Kulish also wrote similarly in his “Historic Tale”: “We were as fascinated by Christian love as the first followers of Jesus Christ. . . . We knew, inasmuch, that not one good deed will be forgotten by God, and that our sowing in the great field of life would certainly yield fruits at the proper time. We did not only want to free our own nation from decay, but we wished to see our people free from serfdom, enlightened and noble, as according to our principle: ‘Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.’ We knew that in England it was not a law or order that abolished serfdom, but the culture.” (1,76).

The Brotherhood, as Kulish testifies, wanted "to preach among the enlightened Ukrainian nobility the emancipation of the serfs by the dissemination of Christian and scientific knowledge. First of all the pious Kievan youths wanted to inspire with their spirit of love ('Love thy neighbor as thyself') and kindness the better people among the noble families,—and together with them enlighten with the new light of knowledge the peasants who indeed were submerged in deadly and profound darkness" (67, 111).

About Russia one has to keep in mind that as a tsar's will was the first and highest law for his subjects, so a lord's wish was practically the only law for the unhappy peasants. Therefore the fate of the serfs was just terrible<sup>3</sup>. Hence Shevchenko, the son of a serf, was a fearless enemy of serfdom; he tried to arouse the public's conscience and win sympathy for the oppressed serfs, e.g.:

". . . For the ills you don't notice?  
When you cannot hear how the people do weep?  
Then look and look well! . . . in mud and filth  
The child soon is bloated,—from hunger it dies,  
Its mother is reaping the wheat at forced labor.  
Do you see it?"

"The Dream", 1844 (7, 133).

Later, his bitter protest continued in prose Mariya Markovych (pseudonym Marko Vovchok), wife of a leading member of the Brotherhood. Her short, heart-rending "Tales of the Common People", 1857, from the serf's life, appealing to all humanity (like Harriet Beecher Stowe's "Uncle Tom's Cabin"), were translated into many languages (in Russian by the great novelist I. Turgenev, 1859) and some of them, like "Marusya" (also called "The Kozak's Daughter") became a lecture topic in French schools.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>B. Pares says that in the enlightened 18th century, with Voltaire in France, the peasants in Russia really became the property of their masters. Families were broken up, husband was separated from wife, and the serfs were sold like cattle in auctions. They were traded for horses and hunting dogs, and used as stakes in drunken card games. The masters beat the serfs unmercifully and the only limitation was that they were not expected to kill them. For the peasants, the master was the judge, the tax-collector, the police and recruiting officer. He could send serfs to Siberia and to the army as a punishment. The serfs had practically no property, they had to work six days a week for the master and could not travel. ("Russia", New York, 1943, page 36f).

No wonder that for all these abuses the peasants got their cruel, bloody revenge in the Russian Revolution of 1917.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. P. Cundy, Marko Vovchok, Ukr. Quart. III-2, New York 1947, page 116ff.

"Even the ox under the yoke will bellow; why then should a Christian soul suffer all kinds of abuse and indignity and not cry out," says one of Vovchok's characters. (ibid.).

It was a significant fact, that people from all social ranks belonged to the Brotherhood, and all of them were great enthusiasts of the Christian romanticism and progressive ideas.

The Brotherhood took special care of Ukrainian literature and language, and greatly encouraged Shevchenko's poetical talent. In June 1846 Kulish wrote of Shevchenko to O. Bodiansky the following: "He is doing wonders with the Ukrainian language. . . . The task is—to raise Ukrainian to a perfect literary language. . . . People admire Shevchenko immensely. He wrote the poem "Ivan Hus" and many others, which the Ukrainians know by heart already" (1, 94). In "Historic Tale" Kulish mentioned how Shevchenko, speaking about his poem "Ivan Hus", was sorry that he did not study enough "about the time and the character of the Czech prophet of the German reformation. In this conversation our poet looked longingly from time to time beyond the boundry, which separates the Russian Empire from the free nations and I, alone, understood all his words" (1, 94f). It was a silent comparison of the conditions of the cultural life of the Ukraine and the Western Slavic countries. We have proof of that and an allusion to the Russification of the Ukrainians in the author's preface to the new edition of Shevchenko's "Kobzar" (the national minstrel): "Why did not Karadjich, Shafarik and the others become Germans, (they had a better opportunity to do that), but they remained Slavs, the faithful sons of their people, and gained a good fame? Woe for us! Well, brothers, don't fall into grief, but pray to God and work wisely in the name of our unfortunate mother-Ukraine". (1, 95).

"Upon Shevchenko—writes Kulish—the Brotherhood looked as on a celestial light and it was a righteous opinion. Looking back, we can say without a sacrilege about his great, although sometimes depressed spirit: 'He was a light which was burning and shining.' Shevchenko appeared among us as proof of a visible inspiration from above." (67, 109). "Shevchenko's muse—says Kostomariv—was tearing the curtain of national life. It was terrifying and sweet, painful and wonderful to look in! . . . Taras' muse broke an underground rivet which was locked by many locks, sealed by many seals for several ages." (67, 109).

Knowing well the benefits of public education, the Brotherhood planned many popular books, especially a history of the Ukrainian people, written in good literary language. Regarding this point Hulak wrote to Markovych: "Our literature has already passed the period of epical development. We do not have a Homer, but our folk and historical songs

are real Homeric rhapsodies. Natural and gradual development of language demands now, that poetry should pass into prose, folk-songs into historical tale. We had Homeroids, now Herodot should appear among us. . . ." (1,95). Such a Herodot would have written:

**B. "The Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People."**

This is a popular, historiosophical tale of mankind in the style of Moses' "Genesis", with special attention to the Slavic and Ukrainian people, and their mission. It was a "profession de fois" of the Brotherhood, written by Mykola Kostomariv in 104 paragraphs.<sup>1</sup> Still in Kharkiv, 1837, when Kostomariv studied the ethnography and history under the influence of I. Sreznevsky<sup>2</sup>, he was puzzled by this question: "Why in all history books was there told about important statesmen, sometimes about law and institutions, but nothing about the life of the common people? It seems the poor peasants and farmers do not exist for history. Why does not history say anything about their manners and customs, their spiritual life, their feelings and expression of joys and sorrows?" (1, 45). Therefore, the people's fate was the contents of his "Books of Genesis, . . .", the summary of them are as follows:

God created the world: the heaven and the earth and made man keeper of every living thing on it, and told him to multiply his kind and divide it into peoples and nations, and gave them lands to live, so they could seek and worship God and be happy. But mankind forgot God and submitted himself to Satan, and every people and nation invented its own gods (idols) and tsars (kings) and started to fight for them and pour blood upon its land. And over the whole world were spread sorrow, poverty, disease, misfortune and confusion. And God punished people with flood, wars, starvation, and the worst of all—slavery. As their gods were false so were their tsars, because a tsar (one who rules over all) should be the wisest and most just of all men. But the wisest and most just of all is only God, and tsars have passions and lusts; so God the Father did not rule over the

---

<sup>1</sup>There was a disagreement about the authorship of this work (Hulak, Kostomariv, Kulish or Shevchenko?). But now Kostomariv is generally accepted as the author, and Shevchenko inspired the work (15, 86f).

<sup>2</sup>Izmail Sreznevsky (1812-1880) was a professor of Kharkiv University, historian and ethnographer, author of the "Zaporozhian Antiquity" (1833), Ukrainophil (of Russian descent!) and Pan-Slavist, the central figure of the Ukrainian Romanticists of Kharkiv (1, 43 and 59, 754).

people, but the devil, the father of passions and lusts and men's murderer.

And the tsars, to strengthen themselves, took the strongest, the richest and the most useful of the people and called them lords, and the others they made slaves. Consequently through this, sorrow and misfortune increased still more.

Two peoples were wiser in the world: the Jews and the Greeks. God chose the Jewish people, sent them Moses and gave them law: All people should be equal and they should not have a king<sup>3</sup>, because there is only one king—God; and the judges chosen by the people should keep order.

But the Jews did not follow God's law and chose a king. And then God gave them to understand that they were wrong, throwing their King David into sin. David became a wanton person: he took his neighbor's wife; Solomon, being an autocrat, became an idolator and harem keeper. By this, God showed that when even the wisest person becomes an autocrat, he becomes a fool. When the Jews forgot the real God, they lost their country and were taken into Chaldean captivity.

The Greeks said: We do not want any king; we want to be free and equal! And the Greeks became the most enlightened among all peoples and in Greece there flourished the best philosophy, science and art. But they did not recognize the true God, and so they fell into idolatry and tolerated slavery. "They did not have a king, but lords, which is the same as if they had many kings. And God punished them: the Greeks were fighting amongst themselves until they came into Macedonian and later into Roman captivity."

By this example God punished all mankind, because the most enlightened part of humanity "was brought into subjection to the Roman lords and then to the Roman Emperor. And the Roman Emperor became a king over the peoples and called himself a god. Then the devil triumphed and all hell with him, saying: "Now it is our kingdom; a man retreated so far from God, that he declared himself as a god and king in one person."

But the Creator took pity on mankind and sent His Son to the earth, to show the people the real God, King and Lord. "And God's Son came to the earth to reveal the truth

---

<sup>3</sup>In the original text the old Slavic word "tsar" (from Caesar) is used. But now "tsar" means a sovereign of Russia (since Ivan III, "the Tsar of All the Russias", 1472); therefore I substituted the word "king" for the non-Russian rulers.

to the people, so that this truth should make mankind free." And this truth was: "all peoples are brothers and neighbors, everyone should love first the Creator and then one another. One who dies for his friends will be especially respected by God. And he who wants to be first among men should be a servant to all. And Jesus Christ showed Himself as an example: He was the wisest and most just of all men, that is the King and the Lord and appeared on the earth not as an earthly king or lord, but He was born in a crib, lived in poverty, took disciples not from the gentry, not from the philosophers, but from the common fishers." And the people began to see the truth . . .

Then the Emperor's men, lords and priests became afraid that truth was spreading and that later would come liberty. . . . They sentenced Christ and crucified Him, and He shed His blood for the liberty of mankind, and rose on the third day and became the King of heaven and earth. His disciples—poor fishers, went everywhere and preached the truth, love and liberty. . . . The first Christians lived in a brotherhood and shared their belongings with each other. Noblemen and servants, philosophers and common men, being like brothers created one community. They had chosen elders and they were the servants of all, because our Lord said: "Whoever wants to be first should be a servant to all".

. . . Roman Emperors, lords and men of rank, their servants and philosophers rose up against Christians to destroy Christianity by bloody terror, and when they did not succeed they tried to falsify it, just in order to keep the leadership in their own hands. Adopting Christianity, they misinterpreted the Lord's and apostle's words and kept the old pagan injustice and satan's pride. But it is not enough to call ourselves Christians—it is our deeds that are important. . . . Christ said, whatever belongs to God, give to God, and the apostle Paul said, all authority is from God.

According to our author—Christ expressed Himself so, because, "He did not want to have insurrections and disagreements among the people, but He wished that faith and liberty should be spread peacefully and agreeably" (2,10), and the emperor, being a Christian, would be a servant to all and there would be only one King—Jesus Christ. It is true, that authority, government and order on the earth are from God. The ruler and officials should be chosen by the people and they must obey the law, made by parliament, because even Christ ordered us to obtain justice from an assembly. As the ruler and the officials are the first, they should be servants to all and should not do what they want, but only that which is decided by all the people.

They should not boast, display pomp and be glorified, but they should live simply and work hard for the people, because the authority is from God, but they are as sinful as others and they should be the last ones, because they are servants to all. And still the worst lie is that God established, that some people should rule and become rich and that others should live in slavery and be poor. This would never occur if the people would believe honestly in Christ's teaching. Then the nobility would free their poor serfs and become their brothers and the rich people would help the poor and the poor would improve their position too. If there would be a sincere Christian love in human hearts, then surely it would be like this, because if a person loves someone he would like to make the other person happy as well as himself. But kings, lords and philosophers warped the Christian freedom and adjusted it to their own use and benefit.

Rome and Byzantium, Romanic (Latin) and Germanic (Teutonic) peoples, acquiring such a warped Christianity, could not develop real freedom and enlightenment. "The Greeks, accepting God's grace, soiled it, keeping the emperors, nobility, tsar's pride and slavery" and through that they incurred upon themselves God's punishment and were taken into Turkish captivity. The Romanic people made a mistake too, by keeping the kings and nobles and then they spoiled the democratic church's order, "inventing a head of Christianity—a Pope".<sup>4</sup> "The Germanic people corrected this mistake through Luther, but kept social slavery, kings and nobles—and the worst—allowed them to rule over the church, instead of bishops. . . . Besides, in order to turn people away from Christ, the kings invented modern idols like: national honor, gold, mammon, material goods (like tea, tobacco, wine and lands), business and egotism. . . . The stomach became their god!

And philosophers preached: it is nonsense to believe in God's Son; there is no hell, no paradise; let us all believe only in egotism and business. As God's punishment, came the bloody French Revolution with its high slogans: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, and its horrible massacres. Without God's Spirit their liberation's efforts and revolutions were

---

<sup>4</sup>The Orthodox Church had its mistakes also, but it was impossible to criticize it in the Russia of Nicholas I.

Mickiewicz did this however in Paris, saying: "In Russia the emperor is the head of the church, and what he orders the people to believe in, they have to believe" (3, 151).

in vain; they were shouting about liberty, but they did not have it, because "there is no liberty without Christian faith."

The Slavic peoples had no kings or lords in the beginning, but they all were equal, and order was kept by the eldest in the community. They praised one God Creator (a tale by Procopius, Byzantine historian of the 6th century, 15, 18) even before Christianity, which was brought to them in the 9th century by two Greek brothers Cyril and Methodius, the Slavic apostles, who invented the Slavic alphabet, translated the Holy Scriptures and established the church service in the Slavic vernacular so that all people could understand. This was not done by the Romanic and Germanic peoples.

But the Slavs had two evils: they lived in constant discord<sup>5</sup>, and they imitated the German social order (kings, gentry, etc.) and therefore they were taken into captivity by their neighbors.

Poland, Lithuania (including Ukraine with White-Ruthenia) and Muscovy still kept their independence. But the Poles spoiled their free Slavic social order by introducing nobility, who "without any law used to hang and kill their serfs." So also the free and democratic Republic of Novgorod was decayed by adopting nobility. And "Muscovite people felt distracted", because they fell into modern idolatry, calling their tsar a god, and regarding all his orders as right—so the Tsar Ivan (IV the Terrible) choked and drowned thousands of innocent people of Novgorod and a Muscovite annalist reporting this fact called him "a God-loving sovereign".<sup>6</sup> And their tsar came to power "bowing to Tartars and kissing the Khan's feet, a Mussulman who helped him keep the Christian Muscovite people in slavery."

But the Ukrainians kept their old Slavic social order, purifying and enlightening it by Christianity. "Ukraine did

---

<sup>5</sup>In my opinion the real evil of the Slavs is the lack of harmony between the brain and heart. With the Slavs in most cases, it is the heart that decides. Many of their tragedies come from this source!

<sup>6</sup>Even the great Russophile Sir Bernard Pares (A History of Russia, 5th ed. by A. Knopf, New York 1949, p. 112), a White- and Red-Russia worshipper wrote: Ivan IV the Terrible "marched on the city (Novgorod) in January, 1570, ravaging all the country and killing right and left in the city. Whole families were thrown into the river, and men in boats pushed them under; these horrors lasted for five weeks. Ivan then addressed the chief citizens who remained: "Men of Novgorod who are left alive," he said, "pray God for our religious sovereign power, for victory over all visible and invisible



not like a tsar or lord, but she composed her Kozakhhood, e.g., the real brotherhood, in which everyone was a brother, regardless if he had been a nobleman or a serf as long as he was a Christian. All the Kozaks were equal and the eldest were chosen at meetings and they served all according to Christ's words: "Whoever wants to be first should be a servant to all". There was no pomp, no titles" (2, 18). The Kozaks protected the holy Christian faith, liberated their neighbors from Mussulman slavery without reward, because they shed their blood for faith and for their neighbors and served God, and not a golden idol.

The Kozakhhood was increasing from day to day and there was the hope that pretty soon all people in the Ukraine would be free and equal and "the same could happen later in Poland and other Slavic countries."

The Ukrainian people lived according to God's law and foreigners visiting Ukraine admired their sincere faith, family love and their respect to parents and elders.<sup>7</sup> When the Jesuits tried to win Ukraine to the Pope—the people established brotherhoods, like those of the first Christians, in order to protect their Greek-Orthodox faith, to take care of the schools, charities, etc.

But the Polish magnates (lords) who ruled at that time over Ukraine were against the Ukrainian way of life and they forbade their serfs to join the Kozak's ranks. They persecuted them, tortured them ("cut strips of skin from living people, threw children into boiling water, forced

---

foes." **Many of his punishments were too horrible to be described.** In 1569 he killed his cousin Prince Vladimir. . . . and in 1570—the metropolitan Philip. In 1581 he burst into the apartment of his son's wife and treated her with brutal violence, when his son protested Ivan struck him with the pointed stick which he always carried with him, and the wound proved fatal. . . . "And later", writes a contemporary, "broke the repose of his **good heart**. . . ."

All the outstanding rulers of Russia had the same "good heart", especially: Peter I, Catharine II, Nicholas I, Lenin, Stalin! Russian history called them "Greats", because in a similar way (like Ivan the Terrible!) they enlarged Russia "from the Duchy of Muscovy to a vast empire" (Mr. Acheson's statement of June 23, 1951) in 500 years. Doubtlessly they were "Great" for Russian history, but criminals against humanity! (Cf.: Wl. Backowski *Toward an Understanding of Russia*, Jerusalem 1947, and Jan Kucharzewski, *The Origin of Modern Russia*, New York, 1948).

<sup>7</sup>Cf. V. Sichynsky, *Foreign Voices on Ukraine*, 2nd ed., Prague, 1942.

mothers to nurse dogs at their breasts", 2, 20), and turned the Ukrainian churches over to the Jewish administration in order to wound their human and Christian dignity. The Kozaks could not tolerate it any more, and they rose up (1648) and with them all the Ukrainian people, and they defeated the Polish magnates and Ukraine became an independent Kozak's land, where all were free and equal. But the Polish magnates did not give up their desire to possess Ukraine. Then Ukraine made a union with the Muscovite tsar (at Pereyaslav 1654), but pretty soon she saw that she had come into a still worse slavery, because "the Muscovite tsar was an idol and tormentor". The Ukrainians wanted to live with the Poles and Russians in peace, but their neighbors did not want it and decided to divide Ukraine along the Dnieper River. (Agreement at Andrusovo, 1667). Ukraine was fighting desperately about fifty years and it was the most holy war for liberty and freedom, and the dividing of Ukraine was the worst deed in history. Ukraine lost her strength and the Kozaks on the right bank of the Dnieper River fell into slavery to the Polish magnates, and on the left bank of the Dnieper to the Muscovite tsar and later to the Petersburg's emperor (since Peter the Great, 1721), who built his capital upon the bones of the once free Kozaks. And the Tsarina Catherina II (the Great), wanton and godless woman and her husband's murderer, finished the Kozakhhood, making from its officers nobility, and from the majority of them—just serfs.<sup>8</sup> It seemed that Ukraine was lost, but it just seemed so.

Ukraine is in a political tomb, but she is not dead, because her protesting voice is heard throughout the whole world. A despot, hangman is ruling over Ukraine, but "he cannot do anything . . . , because Ukraine's voice will not be quieted". Ukraine will rise from her tomb and will call all peoples to freedom and justice against those who oppress them. . . .

"And Ukraine will be an independent Republic in the Slavic Union. Then all people will say as they point to the place on the map that embraces Ukraine: "That is a stone, which was disregarded by builders, but it became a cornerstone". (Psalm 118, 22).

---

<sup>8</sup>Cf. B. Pares, New York 1943, p. 38; "Catherine II exempted the gentry from taxation, made colossal grants of crown peasants to them, thus plunging more free men into serfdom, and **extended the serf system to Ukraine where it had not existed**". (1783).

Such is the end of Kostomariv's philosophy of the history of mankind, written (1846) from the Christian democratic point of view . . . and strongly influenced by the contemporary political movements. "The Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People" was supposed to be the political Bible for the Ukrainian nation, its declaration of rights, and a loud protest against any kind of slavery. L. Biletsky (15, 83ff) sees here such cardinal ideas: 1. God decided that mankind should be divided into peoples (nations); 2. every people (nation) received a country (land); 3. every nation should organize its own state—a democratic republic and live there happy and free according to God's and natural law<sup>9</sup>; 4. there should be neither kings nor tsars, neither nobility nor slaves, but all should be equal; 5. God is the only King or Tsar of heaven and earth; 6. the Christian religion and morals should be the basic law for every nation and its republic; 7. all Slavic peoples should establish their own republics with the moral help of Ukraine (15, 88), and I would add—because the Ukrainian people throughout their whole history followed God's path, living peacefully in their own, ancient territory, and never tried to subject other peoples. "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth" (Matthew 5, 5) or: "The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner" (Psalm 118, 22). According to the belief of the Cyrillo-Methodians Ukraine will be a cornerstone of the new, just, Christian order in Eastern Europe.

"The Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People" by Kostomariv were influenced by Adam Mickiewicz, Shevchenko's and Kostomariv's most beloved Polish author. His "Books of the Polish People" (1833) gave Kostomariv an inspiration, some parallels and borrowings, especially the Biblical form and Messianic coloring. Mickiewicz's book was in turn written under the influence of the French work, "Books of the People" ("Le livre du peuple"), by F. R. de Lamennais. But with a borrowed scheme, the Ukrainian author wrote a deeper work, more democratic, more corresponding to historical truth<sup>10</sup> and entirely reflecting the Ukrainian reality and inexorably defeating autocracy, serfdom, political and social slavery (1, 108f).

---

<sup>9</sup>L. Biletsky sees here an influence of St Thomas' (of Aquin) teaching about divine and natural law (15, 89).

<sup>10</sup>The nobleman Mickiewicz was not much bothered by the Polish intolerance of the Orthodox church and by serfdom or social injustice in Poland. He idealized also Christian kings: "From kings descended liberty to big lords, and these being free granted it to nobility, the nobility to the cities" . . . etc. (3, 152f).

About Kostomariv's book B. Yanivsky says: "This work excites the contemporary reader also by its high prophecy, deep inspiration and sense of the universal truth, which appeals to us from the first till the last word" (2, 60).

"The Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People" were discovered in the tsar's secret archives after the revolution of 1905 by the Russian historian V. Semevsky and first published by him in the hist. journal "The Voice of the Past", Vol. 10-12, 1918. The full text of it became known on the Ukrainian soil in 1918 also, first published by Shevchenkologist P. Zaytsev ("Our Past", Vol. I).

Although the Brotherhood was crushed by the tsar's gen-darmes, its works were confiscated and isolated from the Ukrainian people, but its ideology did not die. The dreams of the Brotherhood and the prophecy of Shevchenko<sup>11</sup> had succeeded seventy two years later, on January 22, 1918, when the Ukrainian Central Council, a representative organ of the Ukrainian people in its Fourth Universal proclaimed the Ukrainian National Republic, "the Independent, Free, Sovereign State of the Ukrainian People" at Kiev.

Although three years later the hordes of the Bolsheviks, these new autocrats of the Russian Empire overran it, they did not dare to cross the will of the Ukrainian people for their own statehood, but they substituted it by an "independent" Ukrainian Soviet Republic and even introduced it into the United Nations (1945) as a separate country. But the Ukrainian people, like all peoples behind the Iron Curtain, hope sincerely that one day they will substitute the puppet appointees of the Kremlin with the true Ukrainian government, elected by the free Ukrainian people! "And Ukraine will be an independent Republic", but not only "in the Slavic Union"—as the Cyrillo-Methodians believed one century ago,—but in the European—or maybe even—in the World Union of the Free, Happy and Democratic Nations.

---

<sup>11</sup>"Ukraine will arise, break the darkness of slavery,  
The light of truth will shine and the enslaved children  
will pray in freedom!"

"Subotiv", 1845.

## ORIGIN

**A. Ukrainian Sources.** The origin of these ideas have native and foreign sources. Of the native, the most important are Ukrainian folk and historical songs, Kozak's tradition in general, but especially "Istoriya Rusiv" and then the highly patriotic, inspiring Shevchenko's muse.

All the educated Ukrainians of that time read with enthusiasm the "Istoriya Rusiv" (A History of the Rus' People)—an anonymous Ukrainian historico-political work, written about 1770, probably by the Mohylovian archbishop Yuri Konisky (18, 234) or more likely (1, 6) by a Kozak gentleman Hrihory Poletyka (1725-1784)<sup>1</sup>. The author was a Ukrainian patriot, autonomist and Kozak's republican, a confessor of the French rationalism, who was—as Chubaty said—"strictly opposed to the prevailing tendency of Russia to deny the Ukraine the very right to exist as a separate nation; and stresses throughout his work that the Ukrainian people are an entity quite apart from the Russian and Polish peoples and that they possess all the rights to be an independent nation and talent enough to become the leading nation in Eastern Europe.

The author traced the sources of the political traditions of Ukraine to the dawn of history in Eastern Europe to the Kievan State, which in the 9th century A.D. was known as Rus'<sup>2</sup>. Hence the title of the book. Poland was considered totally foreign to Ukraine, as well as the absolute and culturally inferior Muscovy. These two neighbors throughout the centuries sought to deprive Ukraine of her

---

<sup>1</sup>The contemporary researchers, A. Yakovliv, regards O. Bezborod'ko as the author, and O. Ohloblyn regards O. Lobysevych as the author of the "Istoriya Rusiv".

However Chizhevsky still mentions Poletyka in the Ukr. Encyclop. (59, 751).

<sup>2</sup>Unfortunately the Western peoples have only one term "Russia" (German—"Russland") for "Rus" and "Rossiya", which is historically and factually incorrect. "Rus", founded by the Normans in the 9th century, was the old Kievan State of the Ukrainian people and had the European tradition. "Rossiya" (a Greek form of the word "Rus") is a new name for the Russian Duchy of Muscovy (beginning in the 13th century!), renamed so in 1713 by Peter I with the political goal to unite all the Eastern Slavs, has a Finnish-Mongolian tradition (39, 351). The Poles e.g. even now call the Ukrainians—"Rusini", and the Russians—"Rosjanie", or "Moskale", and make a strict distinction between "Rus'" and "Rosja".

freedom. If they, each in its turn, did succeed in their aims, it was chiefly because Ukraine found herself enfeebled by the inroads of Asiatic barbarians. But in spite of everything the Ukrainians continued to fight incessantly for the preservation of their natural right to be free and independent. The author held that Muscovy had trampled underfoot the Treaty of Pereyaslav of 1654, by means of which Ukraine had voluntarily become united with her. For that reason, it was maintained, the tsar lost all moral right to hold Ukraine.

Having established the principle that Ukraine has the right to be an independent nation, the author employed the argument of the existing rationalistic school, which became the ideologic foundation of the American Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution. At times it appears as if the author were freely quoting the American Declaration of 1776.

The author of the "Istoriya Rusiv" continually emphasized that truth and justice cannot be disjoined and must unequivocally become the foundation of a moral order not only among individuals but also among peoples. These truths he based not only on reason, as did the rationalists, but makes them issue, in fact, out of his profound religious sense. Every people has the right to live an independent life. He who infringes upon that right must of necessity meet with a harsh reaction on the part of an oppressed people. The consequence is an armed uprising aiming at a restoration of the people's freedom.

'Every creature,' wrote the author in the preface, 'has the right to defend its life, property and liberty.' This idea of resistance to evil prevades the entire "Istoriya Rusiv". In another place the author utters the same thought in somewhat different words: 'All the people which lived on the earth always defended and will always continue to defend their **life, liberty, and property.**'

Now let us compare this with the famous text in the American Declaration of Independence: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are **life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.**'

The author of the "Istoriya Rusiv" lived in the most powerful monarchy in the world at that time—Russia. He experienced the evils of an absolutist government, and for that reason he was a republican and a democrat. He was an enemy of all types of tyranny, and believed that all rule

by violence must eventually crash to the ground. He was a typical representative of **Ukrainian individualism** which he confronted with the **collective and servile tendencies of the Russians**. He was convinced that this attribute chiefly distinguishes the Ukrainians from the Muscovites. His opinion regarding the natural characteristics of the Russian people he put in the mouth of Colonel Bohun, who was the most sympathetic and heroic figure of the times of Bohdan Khmel'nitsky: 'Among the Russian people,' says Colonel Bohun, 'there exists the most implacable servitude and slavery in the highest degree, because among them, besides that which is God's and tsar's, there exists nothing which they themselves own or can own.'<sup>3</sup> According to their conviction, the people are brought into this world to possess nothing.' The author sees the source of Russian despotism in the Asiatic-Mongolian influences which prevailed among the Russians for centuries. Typical representatives of that Muscovite tyranny are the Russian tsars, especially Peter I and his successors, who finally deprived the Ukrainian people of their natural right to be free, according to the author.

Although in many places the "Istoriya Rusiv" reveals false views which are today historically unfounded and are for that reason rejected by historians, the main ideas became the political ideology of the Ukrainian intelligentsia at the time of the American and French Revolutions. In addition, it had an influence on the Ukrainian national rebirth in the first half of the nineteenth century." (18, 235f).

The "Istoriya Rusiv" influenced greatly not only Shevchenko, Kostomarov, and all the members of the Brotherhood, but also the Russian writers like Pushkin (the autonomous struggle of the Ukrainians in his poem "Poltava"), Ryleyev (poem "Voynarovsky"), N. Gogol-Hohol (hist. novel "Taras Bulba"), and then the historian and ethnographer I. Sreznevsky, the editor of the "Zaporozhian Antiquity". (1, 7).

The Ukrainian folk- and historical songs preserved the Kozak's tradition. Collecting them and analyzing the folk-rites and customs, the Ukrainians studied the many differences that existed between them and the Russians, which awoke still more the national spirit, patriotism and self-consciousness. In the 19th century, in the Age of Romanticism,

---

<sup>3</sup>Now in Soviet Russia everything is state property or according to the Communist phraseology "people's property". Amusing similarity!

the Ukrainian nation, oppressed by Russia, began to revive with all its elemental power. Although outwardly the times were unfavorable for Ukraine, the piercing eye of an observer could notice that a modern nation was taking rise in Ukraine. The German geographer and traveller Johann Georg Kohl wrote about Ukraine as follows: "There is not the slightest doubt that one day the gigantic body of the Russian Empire will fall apart and **Ukraine will again become a free and independent nation**. That time is approaching slowly but inevitably. The Ukrainians are a nation possessing their innate language, culture and historical tradition. For the moment Ukraine remains torn apart by her neighbors, but the material for the construction of a Ukrainian state lies in readiness. If not today, then tomorrow will appear a master-builder who will use these materials to erect a great independent Ukrainian state".<sup>4</sup>

But the greatest contribution to the rebirth of the Ukrainian nation and to the ideology of the Cyrillo-Methodians was made by **Taras Shevchenko**. In his early political poems, published in a volume "The Kobzar" (bard), 1840, Shevchenko called upon his brother Ukrainians to awaken:

"Plays the Kobzar and he's singing,  
Telling in his stories  
How the Poles, the Horde, the Moskals  
Struggled 'gainst the Kozaks;

\* \* \*

Yet the former Kozak glory  
We are ne'er forgetting!  
Ukraina, Ukraina!  
My dear heart! My darling!  
When I tell of your misfortune,  
Then my heart starts weeping!  
What has happened to the Kozaks  
With their crimson tunics?  
Where are vanished our old freedom,  
Standards, and the Hetmans?  
What has happened? . . ."

"The Night of Taras", 1838, (7, 84).

Shevchenko's political poems such as "The Ransacked Grave" (1843), "The Great Tomb" (1845), "The Dream" (1844) and "The Caucasus" (1845) were well known in all Ukraine and the Brotherhood used the ideas expressed therein in their political program. In "The Great Tomb" Shevchenko analyzes the main faults in Ukrainian history and character, and accuses Russia of being Ukraine's greatest

---

<sup>4</sup>J. G. Kohl, Die Ukraine, Kleinrussland, 1841, p. 27. (18, 237).



enemy. Contrary to the author of "Istoriya Rusiv" he blames Hetman Khmel'nitsky for signing an alliance with Muscovy and accepting the tsar's protectorate at Pereyaslav in 1654, which was the beginning of the political enslavement of Ukraine. In "The Ransacked Grave" Shevchenko called Khmel'nitsky with the lips of Mother-Ukraine her "unwise son", whom she "should have choked still in the cradle" in order to save Ukraine from the Russian enslavement. Then he reminds his compatriots of the fate of the Hetman Mazepa's capital, Baturyn, which was cut to the ground and its inhabitants slaughtered by Russian troops in the most savage manner (1708).<sup>5</sup>

In "The Dream" when Shevchenko sees the statue of Peter I, erected by Catherine II, the two great Russian monarchs who had ruined Ukraine, the poet says about them:

"It is the first who crucified  
Our own Ukraina;  
The second stabbed with savage blow  
The widow spent and poor.  
Oh hangman! Foes of human kind!  
You both have had your fill,  
You've stolen much! What did you take  
Unto that world with you?  
What have you done with the Kozaks?  
You have filled the marshes  
With their skeletons so noble!  
You have built a city  
On their dead and buried bodies!" (7, 140f).

The Russians, were called in the Ukrainian vernacular "Moskals" (from the word "Moscow"), and regarded as foreigners to the Ukrainians, hence Shevchenko warned "the black-browed maidens" not to love the Moskals.

"For the Moskals — they are strangers,  
And they treat you foully."  
"Katerina", 1838, (7, 89).

---

<sup>5</sup>Chubaty called Baturyn's massacre "the Ukrainian Lidice of 1708" (17, 343), but Rudnyč'kyj is of the opinion that Czechs should call their Lidice massacre "a Czech Baturyn of 1942". Anyhow the Baturyn's tragedy is one of the worst slaughters of men, women and children in history (cf. 51, 19).

O. Ohloblyn cites a contemporary description of the tragedy of Baturyn: "Menshikov struck the defenseless citizens . . . and killed all of them, without regard for sex or age, even infants. . . . The men were cut in four parts, put on the torture wheel or pointed posts" (51, 19).

In the poem "The Caucasus", 1845, Shevchenko defends the ideal of human freedom. He condemns imperialistic Russia for having destroyed the liberty of the Caucasian peoples. He forecasts, though, that the despotism and traditional expansion of Russian imperialism will perish, and freedom will see its triumph and victory (17, 343):

"Struggle on — and you will conquer  
God is helping you!  
On your side is truth and glory  
And the sacred freedom!" (7, 167).

Already in his historical epic "Haydamaki", 1841, Shevchenko asks the Ukrainians and Poles to forget the bloody mistakes of the past and pleads for a better future, for a "fraternization" between these two old enemies, because as he said: "We all are Slavs, children of one mother" (1, 41).

Shevchenko's Slavophil poem "The Heretic or Ivan Hus", 1845, dedicated to Shafarik<sup>6</sup> glorifies the great Czech reformer, the "heretic" Jan Hus and expresses Shevchenko's dream of a Slavic Union, in which all Slavs would be truly free and equal. The preface of this poem is a direct answer to Pushkin's poem, "To the Slanderers of Russia" (meaning chiefly the Polish poet A. Mickiewicz!), in which Pushkin expressed his hope that all Slavic rivers will flow into the Russian Sea. On the contrary, Shevchenko's Slavophilism had no imperialistic tendencies at all, just fraternal and cultural elements. He ended his poem praising "the wise man Shafarik, Czech and Slav together" as he in his works "called into one ocean all the Slavic rivers" and with a sincere prayer:

" . . . I will humbly  
Pray to God Almighty  
That the Slavs may be hereafter  
Worthy friends and brothers,  
Sons of that same light of truth,  
Heretics forever,  
Like that noble heretic,  
Who at Constance suffered!  
May they give true peace to mortals,  
Glory too forever!" (7, 147).

---

<sup>6</sup>Pavel J. Shafarik (1795-1861), a great Slovak philologist writing in Czech, published a "History of the Slavic Languages and Literatures", Novi Sad, 1826, and a very valuable work on "Slavonic Antiquities", Vols 1-2, Prague 1837/8; so his name was well known to the Ukrainian idealists at Kiev. He was also one of the brilliant leaders of the movement for a Slavic brotherhood, initiated by Jan Kollar, a Slovak Protestant pastor and poet of Slavic reciprocity (60, 662).

However in "The Epistle" to the fellow-countrymen, 1845, Shevchenko's political and social testament, he "attacks all those who seek a closer union between Ukraine and Russia than between Ukraine and the other Slavs. As he expressed later in the preface to the edition of the Kobzar prepared in 1847, the Ukrainians have the same rights as the Russians, Czechs, Poles, etc. They equally deserve consideration as a part of the Slavic world." (7, 171).

Shevchenko was not uncritical about Slavs and their unruly character. In the drama "Mykyta Hayday" he wrote: "Slavs, unfortunate Slavs! So much and so inconsiderately your blood was shed by sword of the fraternal dissention. Is it really your fate to be a toy of strangers? Will there come an hour of salvation? Will you have a wise leader among you to extinguish the fire of discord and with love and fraternity unite the mighty family?" (1, IV, 81).

The desire of such a leader and American liberty for Ukraine he expressed in his later poem "Yurodyvy", 1857, asking:

". . . When

Will we have a Washington  
With a new and righteous law?  
But we will have him yet one day!"

Still before the crystallization of the Brotherhood's ideology, Ukrainian patriots thought about the liberation of their subjugated nation and tried to win Western Europe for their cause. In 1791, a representative of the Ukrainian gentry, Count V. Kapnist, asked the Prussian Minister Hertzberg for support in case of a Ukrainian Kozak revolt against "the tyranny of the Russian government and of Prince Potemkin" (33, 475). The Ukrainians also established contact with revolutionary France. As a result, Boissy d'Anglas, a deputy of the National Convention of France, rose to speak in that Assembly in defense of Ukraine and of other peoples subjugated by Russia.<sup>9</sup>

Reformative movement, Bible and masonic lodges, and secret political societies were very popular in Ukraine after the French Revolution (1789), and especially after the Napoleonic Wars (1814), when the huge Russian armies, which included Ukrainians also, got in touch with Western Europe. Soldiers, conquerors, came home as revolutionists.<sup>9</sup> On

---

<sup>9</sup>Translated by LaVerne R. Matus.

<sup>9</sup>Revue des Etudes Napoleoniennes 1922; Vol XIX, p. 27.

<sup>9</sup>Shchurat reports how one Ukrainian officer once exclaimed: "Long live the Ukrainian Republic!" (Information from R. Smal-Stocki).

December 26, 1825 the Russian Decembrist Rising started and aimed to change Russia to a constitutional monarchy, to abolish serfdom, introduce a communal possession of land and reduce the clergy. There were also single voices proposing autonomy for subjugated nations within their ethnical borders. The head of the "Northern Society" Nikita Muravyev in his second project of a constitution suggested to establish a Ukrainian Federal Republic (1, 28).

But the small Decembrist Rising was easily liquidated by Nicholas I, who held down any liberal trend with an iron hand and only left these slogans to his subjects "Russian Autocracy, Russian Orthodoxy, and Russian Nationality", so that Shevchenko sarcastically said about that time in Russia:

"From the Moldavian to Finn  
On every tongue there is a seal.  
For — there is happiness! . . ."

"The Caucasus", 1845, (7, 168).

## B. Western European Sources.

The members of the Brotherhood knew of the Polish and Russian liberal, secret organizations, but the real inspiration for their activity came from occidental Romanticism and romantic Nationalism (including Pan-Slavism in Western Slavic version). Ukraine was never isolated from Western ideas, even though these ideas came there a little later as well as to all the Slavs.

"Spiritual life of the Slavic peoples—says Chizhevsky (67, 107f.)—was developing almost through the entire 19th century under the considerable influence of Western Europe. But this influence was not a simple borrowing of the ideas and dispositions." They were carefully "selected by the Slavs" and the borrowing was "reproduced and transformed so that sometimes it is difficult to identify the same phenomena in the West and among the Slavs." Besides, "the different 'influences' from Western Europe were not coming to the Slavs immediately"—but they were often belated and contaminated already with the new and more modern Western cultural phenomena. "So Romanticism among the Slavs continued its existence together with the influences of political and social radicalism of the 40's of the 19th century" . . . "One can say that the so-called 'Western influences' were causing and solving their own and independent creations, which was often not only an echo but also an answer to the West.

Such an answer was the ideology of the Cyrillo-Methodians in which were crossed and joined the moments of: (i) the

romantic tradition which in the West at that time was already dying, but among the Slavs it remained alive much longer; (2) the radicalism of the 40's, for which in the West there were some preliminary social conditions (germ of the labor movement), which was absent among the Slavs (except for the serfdom problem! J. S.), where the social radicalism substituted the national-political movement; then (3) the religious element in the specific form of Eastern Christianity, the Greek Orthodoxy, which added to some elements of the ideology, the eschatological coloring, causing the belief in the possibility and inevitable necessity of the rebuilding of the whole human life and society based on the principle of the Christian faith" (67, 108).

An important inspirator of the Romantic-Christian dispositions among the Cyrillo-Methodians—according to Chizhevsky (67, 110)—was a Russian Peter S. Avsenev (later archimandrite Theofan 1810-1852). As a popular professor of the Kievan Academy (1836-1850) and the Kievan University (1838-1844) he disseminated among the academic youth the interest to the Romantic psychology under the influence of Schelling, Schubert and Karus. The German Romanticists—Novalis, Schubert, Burdach could be the immediate source of the same type.

Romantic fine literature—so beloved by the Ukrainian intellectuals—awoke the great interest to the Ukrainian past, song and language. But it was the follower of Schelling's "Philosophy of Nature" (1797)—Mykhaylo Maksymovych (1804-1873), the first rector of the Kievan University, the Ukrainian literary historian and ethnographer who through his first great collection "Ukrainian Songs" (1827) contributed greatly to the awakening of the national consciousness, love for the Ukrainian past, and the interest in Romantic nationalism.

But let us look to Western Europe, where all these ideas originated.

The 18th century was an age of reason and enlightenment. Men were looking for the solution of all human problems through intellect. Gathering all knowledge about the universe into one set (the French Encyclopedists—Diderot, Voltaire, Rousseau, etc.) they were especially interested in languages, literature, and ethnography of the world. All this awoke great interest in the common man, his life, fortune and even his vernacular language. In Ukraine it was I. Kotlarevsky who wrote his "Eneida", 1798, in the vernacular Ukrainian, introducing it to fine literature, instead of the traditional Old-Church-Slavic, mixed with Ukrainian words.

The ideas of Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) like the individualistic point of view in religion, philosophy, and politics; a return to primitive feeling and to the state of nature ('Back to Nature'.) and especially his teaching that **all authority resides in the sovereign will of the people** and that **the right of the people to assemble for the purpose of confirming, altering and abrogating all authority in the state** (62, 504) were popular in all of Europe and also had partly an influence upon the American Revolution, 1775, with its inspiring Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776, and the solemn and dignified statement "that **all men are created equal**, that they are endowed by their Creator with **certain unalienable Rights**, that among these are **Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness**. That to secure these rights, **Governments** are instituted among Men, **deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed**. That when any Form of Government becomes **destructive** of these ends it is the **Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government**, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness . . ."

The success of "the American Revolution occasioned a great deal of republican and democratic propaganda. The ringing phrases of the Declaration of Independence on liberty, equality, and the rights of man woke echoes in France and elsewhere. . . . When the American states and eventually the United States (1787) developed new constitutions, these documents were eagerly read and discussed by intellectual circles in France. Here was republicanism in practice. Here were the rights of man guaranteed. Here was human equality being written into law. It is not too much to say that the success of the American revolution was a decisive blow both at divine-right monarchy and at aristocratic privilege" (32, 684).

After the establishment of the Republic of the United States, the French Revolution followed (1789) with its slogan of **Liberty, Equality and Fraternity**. Europe was in a turmoil. New political ideals were involved and a new hope was born in the souls of the great masses of men. The French Revolution and the era of Napoleon spread the ideas of democratic rule, social equality, and religious toleration in Europe. Although briefly experienced, they were not forgotten.

"Of all the lessons France taught Europe between 1789 and 1815, the most impressive was **nationalism**, and so well

and so fast did Europe learn it, that **nationalism has been a major and rapidly growing force in European life down to the present day.** The soldiers of Napoleon who bore the tricolor flag of France from Naples to Moscow, and from Lisbon to Berlin, were effective messengers of the new nationalist gospel—the **nation** bound together by ties of language and culture and history, the nation one and indivisible, the nation as the regenerator of human society, the nation above any class or religion, the nation as the supreme object of human devotion and sacrifice, the nation with a ‘mission’.

“Wherever they went the French aroused nationalism in two ways—**positive** and **negative**. Positively, they showed the peoples of Europe what nationalism was and what a nation in arms could do. Negatively, by their conquests, they made themselves hated as oppressors and roused a fierce national patriotism in **opposition** to French nationalism” (32, 724).

After 1815 the old conservative regime came back to Europe. The reactionary period 1815-1848 is usually called the “Era of Metternich”. In spite of all, liberalism and nationalism brought once to life by revolutionary France was at work. With nationalism was closely related romanticism. “Nationalism was romantic, and most romanticism was nationalistic. Everywhere, devotees of romanticism displayed patriotic emotions and sentiments. Usually they extolled the common people of their respective nationalities. Frequently they ransacked historical records to find evidence of their nation’s glorious deeds in the past. As heirs to the fervor engendered in the Revolutionary and Napoleonic eras, the patriotic romanticists glorified the nation, its language, its culture, its folk songs, its past, with an ardent and often poetic emotionalism. In those countries that were already national states, romantic nationalism strengthened patriotic devotion to the fatherland. Not infrequently, political and religious conservatives were just as patriotic and romantically nationalistic as the liberals or the radicals. In lands still divided into various states, like Italy and Germany, or subject to foreign rule, like Poland and Bohemia and Slovakia, romantic nationalism led to intense and often revolutionary movements for unification and liberation” (32, 749).

Paris was a “Campus Martius” of the new ideas and a center of all liberal movements. Polish, German, Hungarian, Italian revolutionists were preparing a European revolution, which was planned to begin in 1830, then 1833 and which actually started in 1848. All the oppressed nations hoped to free themselves from the pressure of the reactionary

“Holy Alliance” of 1815 and to start a new life under the liberal, socially just, democratic principles. In the years 1830-1840 there were established already the cardinal social-political ideals of France of the 19th century. They were based chiefly upon the religious foundation as a reaction against the materialistic and rationalistic movements of the Bourgeoisie (Middle Class). Saint-Simon, Pierre Leroux built their socialism like a new Christianity; a priest, Felicite Robert de Lamennais (1782-1854), sorry for the people's fate, left the official Catholic church (1834) and created a new religion, based upon a new criterion of truth, namely the verdict of the collective reason (*raison sociale*),—the universal consent of mankind (62, 605).

Before 1830 Lamennais appeared as the champion of orthodox Christianity and traditionalism (in his “*Essai sur l'indifference . . .*”) and in 1830 he began to write in the new journal “*l'Avenir*,” which advocated freedom of conscience, freedom of the press, the separation of church and state, rescinding of the Concordat, and proclaimed the coming triumph of democracy and the abolition of hereditary monarchy. These views of course provoked an opposition which led to conflict with Pope Gregory XVI (1832) and resulted in Lamennais' break with the Catholic church (1834).

In his greatest constructive work “*Esquisse d'une philosophie*” (1841) Lamennais appeared as a synthetic philosopher. He added here to his earlier traditionalism an element of Neo-Platonic mysticism, mixed with a strange form of rationalism (the identity of the supernatural with the natural order of truth; the Trinity is an object of philosophical speculation) and an element of pantheism (while there are two classes of being—finite and infinite, there is but one substance,—God), teaching that “tradition is to be supplemented by faith, that God is the first object of philosophy, and that the finite is to be known by means of the infinite” (62, 605).

The Cyrillo-Methodians might have tried to find in Lamennais' “*Le livre du peuple*”—known among the Poles (Mickiewicz) and Russians (“*Petrashkevtsy*”)—the synthesis of the Christianity with social and national radicalism, because national and social oppression—was the worst evil of the Ukrainian reality.

Together with politics and science proceeded art. Romanticism glorified the Middle Ages and sought its heroes in those courageous individuals who, with unlimited bravery defied the smug sentiment of their own days. It was the time of Schiller and Byron, of Schiller who pictured the liberty-loving heroes of the past, such as: Wilhelm Tell



(1804), proclaiming proudly "Rather death than to live in slavery", and of Byron<sup>10</sup> who pitted his stirring and rebellious poems against society and the world, and met death in the Greek struggle for independence in 1824. Still stronger was the social protest of Victor Hugo.

### C. Romantic Pan-Slavism.

Obviously all these ideas and "admiration for the great days of the past and ardent hope for the future" (19, 208) affected all the Slavic peoples as well, especially those who did not have their own independent states. The small Western Slavic peoples in the Austro-Hungarian Empire like the Slovaks and Czechs inspired by the romantic German nationalism (Hegel's philosophy and Herder's prophecies that the epoch of Slavdom was at hand) originated idealistic Pan-Slavism\*, a cultural-political movement, aiming at co-operation and association of the Slavic speaking peoples, regarding themselves as members of the same family in order to resist the reactionary Austria of Metternich, Germanization and the Hungarian social and political oppression. It raised the hopes of the Southern Slavs against Turkish tyranny. In this or another way—every Slavic nation was impressed by Pan-Slavism.

Speaking about Slavic unity some scholars like Lednicki (27, 809) mention already Thucydides' thoughts about Scythians; all of them take as a forerunner of Slavic co-operation the enthusiastic Croat Catholic priest Yuray Krizhanich (1618-1683) who, in 1659, went to Moscow to "Tsar of my race" and deplored the domination of Slav life by German and Greek influences.<sup>11</sup> But the real godparent of modern Pan-Slavism was the leader of the German school of historic romanticism, the philosopher and poet, Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803) who regarded the national language, the mother tongue as a determining factor of men's loyalty and as a bearer of national culture.

"But Herder—says Kohn—did more for the rising Slavic consciousness than to emphasize the vernacular as the only true foundation of civilization. In the few pages of the fourth chapter of the sixteenth book of his 'Ideas for the Philosophy of the History of Mankind' (1784) he gave the Slavs the consciousness of a unity based upon the com-

---

<sup>10</sup>He wrote a poem from Ukrainian history, called "Mazeppa".

\*Term first used by J. Herkel in his "Elementa universalis linguae slavicae", 1826, (cf. Pan-Germanism).

<sup>11</sup>The mistrusting Tsar Alexis sent him into exile to Siberia for 15 years from where he later escaped.

munity of high morality and glorious destiny. He proclaimed the Slavs the coming leaders of Europe. A disciple of Rousseau, he compared favorably the rural and backward Slavs with the highly civilized Romance and Germanic peoples, whose very degree of civilization implied their alienation from the state of nature and therefore their approaching decadence. The proud Germans with their aristocratic warrior tradition had from Charlemagne on oppressed and humbled the Slavs, who with their primitive democratic organization and their natural disposition towards peace had cultivated music and poetry instead of war. Herder was convinced that the nineteenth century would bring the vindication and the leadership of the Slavs. He admired and collected their folk-lore and folksongs, and admonished their few intellectuals to develop the native tongues instead of abandoning them for German and French. These words of the great German writer were balm for the often-hurt pride of the Slavic intellectuals. Their civilizations, backward in the eyes of Europe, were praised and extolled by one who had been the teacher of Goethe." (28, 1).

Herder taught that "a people, and especially a non-civilized one, has nothing dearer than the language of its fathers. Its whole spiritual wealth of tradition, history, religion, and all the fulness of life, all its heart and soul, live in it. To deprive such a people of its language or to minimize it, means to deprive it of its own immortal possession, transmitted from parents to children." (28, 2). Herder started also the taste for popular poetry and folklore. He believed that as Homer was greater because of his naturalness than was Vergil, so the poetry of the more undeveloped peoples was better than that of the courts and highly cultured society. ("Natur- und Kunst-poesie"). Herder and German romanticists, under the influence of Rousseau, emphasized the advantage of the village communities over the industrial society and praised primitive folk songs, natural, genuine poetry (Homer, Ossian, Bible), folk culture (the myths, ballads, proverbs, dances, customs), art, religion, legal system, political and economic organization as true manifestations of a national individualism of a "Volksgeist"— people's spirit.

The Slavic intellectuals were proud of their folk culture, which was appreciated even by their haughty adversaries, the Germans. They believed that there would come a time when the youthful and uncorrupted Slavs would fulfill

their great mission in the service of mankind, while the overcivilized Latin and Germanic peoples had reached their zenith and would soon be on the decline. These dreams inspired Jan Kollar (1793-1852), a Slovak Protestant pastor and poet, writing in Czech, who participated in 1817 in Jena at a German students' demonstration of the "Tugendbund" (League of Virtue), to write a series of sonnets "Slavy Dcera" ("The Daughter of Slava") in 1824, with the hope of arousing interest in an ideal Pan-Slavism, especially among the Western Slavs. Kollar proclaimed Slavic unity in his book "On the Literary Reciprocity between the Various Groups and Dialects of the Slav Nation," 1837, but all that he demanded was the literary and cultural solidarity of the Slavs. As Kollar was the first poet, so another Lutheran Slovak, writing in Czech, Pavel Josef Shafarik (1795-1861), was the first scholar of early Pan-Slavism. They both are regarded as the fathers of this movement; both were under the influence of romantic nationalism and did not show in their writings the sobriety of the Czech Catholic Abbe Josef Dobrovsky (1753-1829), the enlightened scholar, and a founder of comparative Slavic studies. Shafarik's research and his many publications about the Slavic language, literature, ethnography, and antiquities fertilized Czech and Southern Slavic scholarship, was well known to the Ukrainian Cyrillo-Methodians and much praised by Shevchenko. The universities at Kharkiv and Kiev especially became the centers of the Slavic thought in Ukraine.

It is true what Kohn says about the fathers of Slavic linguistic and cultural unity (28, 17ff). Their appeal for a revival of Pan-Slavic literary creativeness really did not produce a big effect. If some Slavic literatures flowered in the next century it was not due so much to the merit of Slavic solidarity, (which nota bene existed only on paper!) but chiefly to Romanticism, based upon Western civilization. Still the vision of a great future for the united Slavs awoke the national consciousness of their intellectuals and stimulated their activity to cultivate the mother tongue, to study the past of their own people with a new feeling of pride. They awoke the peasants to aspirations and demands of freedom.

I do not agree with Kohn however that in Central and Eastern Europe the poet, the philologist, and the historian "created the nationalities" (28, 18). They created literary works in folk idiom, heightened vernacular to the degree of a literary language and brought proofs of the historical rights of a given nationality. But nationality itself, as the Cyrillo-Methodians believed, was created by God, or as we

say now by natural and historical conditions. The people themselves already saw and felt that they were different from their neighbors and the intellectuals just helped to define their distinctions and in this way supported the consciousness of the people's individuality. But the poet, the philologist and the historian were the only defenders and ambassadors of the stateless nations.

But Kohn is right in saying: "The two Slovak spokesmen of Pan-Slavism found a willing echo in all the Slavic peoples. For they expressed, in the familiar mood of the period, a general belief in historical progress, in a bright future, in the advent of some great spiritual manifestation, of a new era for mankind which would establish for ever the basis of liberty, peace and happiness. The Slavs seemed young, untouched by all the dissensions and conflicts ravaging the older nations: were they not destined to be the messengers of the new age? What they needed was only an assurance of their strength which, except for the Russians, was only a promise of the future. This promise was brought to them by Shafarik and Kollar." (23, 18f).

I am mentioning here just the most prominent authors and scholars who underwent the romantic Pan-Slavic influences such as the Czech philologist V. Hanka (who in 1817/18 "discovered" the ancient Koeniginhofer and Gruenberger manuscripts prepared in the romantic spirit, glorifying unknown rulers of the Czech early history), historian F. Palacky (the confessor of Austro-Slavism and leader of the first Pan-Slav congress at Prague, 1848), journalist K. Havlicek, Croat L. Gaj, the real father of Illyrism (Illyria, 1809-1814,—the united Southern Slavic autonomic provinces on the Adriatic Sea, created by Napoleon), the father of Serbian language and literature—Vuk Stefanich Karadjich (rather more Serbian nationalist than Pan-Slavist), who by publishing his "Narodne Srpske Pjesme" ("Serbian Folk Songs"), 1833, showed the unmatched beauty freshness of Serbian folk epos (beloved in Ukraine), the great Slovene and Catholic scholar B. Kopitar, the Slovak poet Jan Holly (1785-1845) who wrote "Cyrillo-Methodiada" in 1835, praising in fine verse the Slavic apostles and others. Studying the past and present of their nations, poets and scholars well documented their demands and asked for the Slavs all these blessings which other people had already received or were still fighting for.

This agitation for Slavic rights in a broad sense was weakest in Russia and in Poland for contradictory reasons.

In Russia, even the liberals were influenced by the imperialistic theory of the Third Rome<sup>12</sup> and the unity of the Russian Empire. The victory over Napoleon made the Russians conscious of their might and power as never before. On March 31, 1814 Russian troops entered Paris in triumph, the capital of the West, and their Emperor, Alexander I, was regarded as "Europe's liberator" from Napoleon. Still more powerful seemed to be Russia under Nicholas I, who quelled the revolt in Hungary, 1849, and was eager to suppress all revolution in Europe. When the comic play about Nicholas I was prepared in Paris, the tsar threatened in his letter that if they needed spectators, he could send a million (soldiers)—that cancelled the play. The West looked upon Russia with fear, hatred and reluctant respect.

Only after the Napoleonic wars the European ideas began to penetrate more deeply into the Russian elite class. The thoughts of free Europe were received with an astonishing eagerness; masterpieces of foreign literature were translated, science and knowledge popularized, and Russian literature in the 19th century surpassed all Slavic ones and became part of the world literature. But the majority of the population was primitive and lived in terrible serfdom. The peasants and tradesmen looked on the European way of life as the work of the devil. Some leading authors, (Chaadayev, Herzen, Gogol, Turgenyev) exposed the backwardness, ruthlessness and brutality of the Russian state and society. Yet the leaders of the liberals, even among the Decembrists did not want to listen to any of the complaints of the subject peoples and sought to introduce the desired reforms and still keep complete unity of the country or de-centralize it along lines which ignored the various nationalities in the land. Mighty Russia primarily did not even want to see their brothers in the small Slavic nations.

---

<sup>12</sup>After the fall of Constantinople (1453), the capital of the Orthodox Church, the Grand Duke of Muscovy Ivan III in 1472 married Sophia, the niece of the last Byzantine (Greek) Emperor Constantine Paleologus, accepted his insignia (double eagle), the title "tsar" (from Caesar) and so regarded himself as the successor of the Greek emperors and the champion of the Orthodox Church.

Further, at the end of the 15th century there was spread an idea of the "Third Rome" by the Russian monk Philotheus. He claimed, Moscow is "a third and last Rome", after the real Rome and Constantinople had both fallen through "heresies". "The third Rome, Moscow, stands, and a fourth there will not be".

According to Hildegard Schaefer ("Moscow, the Third Rome", Hamburg, 1929), the origin of it is connected with the ideology of the first Bulgarian Empire.

Later, looking for the future direction of Russia's destiny, the leading thinkers of Russia formed two antagonistic schools of thought: the Slavophiles, who looked toward the "Slavic Soul" for the salvation of Russia, and the Westernizers—toward Western methods. Both groups differed in their political aims and had in common a love of Russia and their dependence on Europe's philosophy. Hume, Voltaire, Saint-Simon, Lamennais, Charles Fourier, Chateaubriand, Proudhon and the great German philosophers and writers such as Kant, Goethe and Schiller, and especially Schelling, Hegel, Fichte, Schlegel, Feurbach, Stirner and later Karl Marx gave direction to Russian thoughts, either in conformity or in opposition to these philosophers.

I agree with Kohn that Russian Slavophiles or as he says: "Russian nationalists, without due acknowledgement, borrowed their concepts from Europe to idealize and mobilize Russia against Europe." (28, 108). The Slavophiles understood how to serve the interests of imperialistic Russia as well as their Tsar Nicholas I, who hated every liberal trend, even the Slavophiles and Westernizers. Count Uvarov (since 1833 minister of education) suggested to Nicholas I, in December, 1832, to base the education upon the "truly Russian and conservative principles of Orthodoxy, autocracy and narodnost' (nationality) . . . the last anchor of our salvation and the most secure guarantee of the strength and greatness of our fatherland." (28, 111). These slogans and hatred against the West became in time the contents of the Russian Slavophilism as it was later formulated by Khomyakov, Aksakovs and a Moscow historian Pogodin. So, the originally romantic, liberal, progressive and democratic Pan-Slavism of the Western Slavs who wanted to abolish any humiliation of man by man, and hoped to get a support in their liberations' struggle from the "big Russian brother" became in Russia an instrument of imperialism and of a total Russianism, even in our days. The Russians did not hesitate to Russianize and bitterly persecute the Slavic Poles, Ukrainians and Byelorussians, especially after the Polish November Insurrection of 1830/31, when even so tender a poet like Pushkin declared arrogantly in his poem "Klevnikam Rossii" (To the Slanderers of Russia), August 2, 1831, to all liberal Europe that "all the Slavic Rivers will flow into the Russian Sea".

Another lyrical poet, Fedor I. Tyutchev (1802-1875), who represented the religious Orthodoxy of Khomyakov and the political Pan-Slavism of Pogodin, prophesied the future inevitable conflict between a victorious Slavdom headed

by Orthodox autocratic Russia and a Western revolutionary conspiracy always eager to destroy Russia. The Western Slavs hoped that Revolution of 1848 would bring a better future for Europe and full integration of Slavdom with it; Tyutchev saw in it the end of liberal Europe, because the revolution rejected Christianity and accepted a fraternity based upon the fear of the sovereign people. Russia was to him "above all the Christian Empire". The moral of the Russian "Christ-bearing people" was founded not only on the Orthodoxy, but also upon the "ability of renunciation and sacrifice". Tyutchev (like Dante) dreamt about a universal empire, of which Palacky was so afraid. Russia had the mission to build that empire and reunite the churches on a Greco-Slavic basis (28, 122f).

Of all the Slavs Tyutchev had no use for "the seditiously Catholic Poland, a fanatical partisan of the Occident and always a traitor to its own race". Understandably, therefore, the Poles were the one Slav people whom the Europeans loved. 'Only our Judas is honored by their kiss', Tyutchev wrote in one of his poems" (28, 125).

As an answer to the above, there could be a remark about Russians made by a Pole, 1867: "When the Russians behave like Tartars, can they complain if they are despised? If Russia is really our Slav brother, she is as Cain to Abel" (29, 231). The Ukrainians have also full right to confirm this remark!

Speaking about this over-emotionalized national question, I like to quote Herzen, the only man free from any Russian chauvinism, who wrote in his "Kolokol" on January 15, 1859: "If Poland does not wish this alliance (with Russia) we can be chagrined by it, but we could not refuse her complete liberty without denying our fundamental convictions. . . . And if the Ukraine wishes to be neither Polish nor Russian? The solution seems to me simple:

We have then to recognize the Ukraine as a free and independent nation. In the Ukraine there live people whom serfdom has crushed but whom the government and land-owners have not broken to the point of making them lose their sentiment of nationality" (28, 136). Kohn says, further: "Few Russian or Polish liberals had then the courage to see the Ukrainian question in the light of liberty. Both sides appealed to historical rights or to other 'superior' considerations. None wished to renounce what had historically 'belonged' to them. On each side, reactionaries and liberals, monarchists and republicans, were alike willing

and eager to oppress other Slavs. Herzen stood almost alone" (28, 137).\*

Anyhow, the Russian Slavophiles understood by Pan-Slavism "a Pan-Russianism, the acceptance of the Russian language and of the Orthodox faith by all other Slavs, a Russification of the Austro-Hungarian and Balkan Slavs similar to the process which then operated within the Russian borders in the Russification of the Ukrainians and the Poles" (28, 142). It became evident especially during the second Pan-Slavic Congress in Moscow of 1867.

In Poland, where national independence had been lost almost a quarter of century (1795) this romantic Slavic movement revived hopes of a successful revolt against their conquerors, but at the same time it led to an isolationism which culminated in the November Uprising of 1830/131 (19, 209).

Although Stanislaw Staszic (1755-1826) already in 1815, called the Poles "the elder brothers of Russians", who are "unable to be Russian slaves but are ready to be their brothers", and he declared that "the union of Slavs within the Russian Empire will cause a United States of Europe, the war will disappear and on this continent there will be permanent peace", promising the Poles the chief civilizing mission (25, 73)—nevertheless the majority of the Polish intelligentsia was against Pan-Slavism. A philosopher, Bronislaw Trentowski (1809-1869), welcomed the national awakening of Czechs, Croats, etc., but remarked with typical Polish pride: "What has Slavdom especially to show us? Only now does it begin to think of that whereas we have worked for centuries" (25, 145). The Polish elite was proud of their almost thousand year uninterrupted state tradition and of their membership in the Western Catholic Church and so regarded especially the Orthodox East as barbaric, whereas the Polish majority, peasants, suffered the same terrible serfdom and primitive life as the Russian masses. Trentowski presented "the Polish idea of a Pan-Slav federation" against the tsar's Pan-Slavism and was sharply against the Polish dissolution in a Slavic Sea. Later, Trentowski saw, in the year 1848, a new age for mankind when

---

\*Only "in 1848 Bakunin demanded also the independence of the Ukrainians whom he regarded as more genuinely Slavic than the Russians" (28, 76).

In our days I know only one Russian, Georgi Alexandrov, who proves the true democratic traditions of Herzen and Solovyev among the Russians. Alexandrov's sincere desire is to see Russia "not necessarily great and powerful, but free, just and democratic. . . ." (46, 415).



the Congress of the Peoples will solve all political problems. "He called upon the Poles to regard their patriotism in the new light of democracy, of a universal liberty and equality of the peoples. The new principles will bring to the Poles a free fatherland, though not along the old historical frontiers. 'Our judgment tells us that we should rather follow a new principle and should seek our rebirth with its help than that we should cling stubbornly to the past.' For the Slavs are called to help build the future. 'Your history', he told the Slavs, 'will start simultaneously with the third era of world history'. Ancient history was determined by the Romans; the Middle Ages which are now coming to their end, were determined by the Germans; the Slavs will determine the future." (28, 35). However his compatriots never wanted to break with the past.

Some Poles (Lelewel, Mickiewicz and the Polish Democratic Society) dreamt of a Slavic federation under Polish leadership, and primarily for the sake of Poland's restoration from the Russian, Austrian and Prussian occupations, of course only in its historical borders from 1772, from the Baltic to the Black Sea, including in such a Poland, Ukraine and Byelo-Russia against the will of their populations.

The Slavic idea was unpopular among the Poles chiefly because of their permanent struggle with Russia. Mickiewicz emphasized this in his first lecture at College de France: "Everywhere the Russian eagle clashes with the Polish; always echoes the Russian 'hurrah' between the Polish war-cry, and if we strain our ear, listening in the far future, so the echo of the same struggle will sound toward us continually" (25, 145). The nation was for Mickiewicz in the first place a spiritual individuality and Poland was for him an "embodiment of an idea opposite to Russia." Slowacki was a decided opponent of Pan-Slavism; for Krasinski the conceptions: "Moscow" and "hell" were identical; Russia was for him a symbol of "all evils". He believed, on the contrary, in the Polish Slavism and prophesized for Poland: "You will arise as a queen of the Slavic plains" (25, 146).

More popular and typical for Poles was "the Polish messianic Slavism with its metaphysical dreamlands, its poetical grandiloquence and its noble delusions" (28, 31). Being without a state of their own they dreamt about the great past, when Poland was united with the mighty Lithuanian and Ruthenian (Ukraine and Byelorussia) lands under the Lithuanian dynasty of Jagiello as "a pre-nationalist aristocratic commonwealth". But in the 19th century, when the

Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Whiteruthenians under the influence of romantic nationalism awakened, like the Poles themselves, to the full national consciousness, "the Poles, similar therein to the German nationalists, continued to regard themselves as mandated by history with a civilizing mission in the vast expanses of the East. They insisted on the restoration of **the historical boundaries** of the pre-nationalist commonwealth as a **Polish national state in the age of nationalism**" (28, 31).

By chance, it seems the Poles and Russians do not want to understand such a simple matter until now, that every nation in its ethnographical boundaries has a holy right to its own independent state.<sup>13</sup> They both are claiming Ukrainian lands as their "historical heritage". Hitler presented similar "historical rights" to Ukraine, as to the former "Gothic lands", because in the 3rd and 4th century the Germanic tribe of Goths mastered Ukraine!

Merely by applying historical boundaries, Europe will never find peace! Besides, it is not too difficult to find a time when Warsaw was not Polish, and Moscow not Russian.

"In their attitude the Polish messianists resembled most closely the Russian Slavophiles of the same period. Men of great gifts and high purpose, they burned with a similar religious fervor put into the service of nationalist exaltation. They read into history a universal mission mystically and gloriously centered in their own nationality. This messianic Slav poetry and theurgy did not sound strange in the Europe of the 1830's and 1840's, the Europe of Lamennais, Michelet and Mazzini" (28, 31). As the Polish historian W. Feldman stated, the Polish elite abroad "felt then like a leader of freedom, although in the social-political aspect it was only a true child of its time" (25, 94). Working with concept of Polish Messianism were the philosophers Hoene-Wronski, Cieszkowski, Trentowski, historian Lelewel, poet Brodzinski, but esp. the greatest poet Adam Mickiewicz (1789-1855), who saw Poland crucified as the "Christ of the nations". After the tragic November Uprising, Mickiewicz composed in Dresden, 1832, the grandiose dramatic poem "Dziady" (Forefather's Eve), Part III, based upon his life in Wilna and his exile to Russia, but treated, as Noyes says, "with such unique power that he made his poem the finest

---

<sup>13</sup>From the 13th point of Wilson's famous proclamation (1918): "Establishment of an independent Poland with all territories inhabited by indisputably Polish population and access to the sea" in the Polish history books there was always omitted this part: "with all territories inhabited by indisputably Polish population".

expression in literature of the age-long antipathy between Russia and Poland and of the agony of Poland's martyrdom" (28, 39). In this poem Father Peter has a mystic vision, seeing the Polish people upon the cross.<sup>14</sup> Mickiewicz dealt also with Poland's martyrdom and mission in his pseudo-biblical prose work, "The Books of the Polish Nation and of the Polish Pilgrims", Paris, 1833, influenced by the Hebrew prophets (idea of the "chosen people")\*, Lammenais, mysticism of Jacob Boehme, Saint Martin. In this work he portrayed a short Polish history in the midst of a treacherous and idolatrous world. Because Poland was devoted to the liberty and brotherhood of all peoples, it was murdered. The other nations could not tolerate this ideal. "But the Polish Nation did not die". It "will rise again and make free all peoples of Europe from slavery" . . . "And as after the resurrection of Christ, blood sacrifices stopped in a'l the world, so after the resurrection of the Polish Nation, war shall stop in all Christendom" (3, 161 and 28, 40).

"Meanwhile, the Pole is called a Pilgrim, because he has made a vow to journey to the Holy Land, the free Fatherland, he has vowed to journey until he shall find it" (3, 162).

Both of these works greatly influenced the Ukrainian author, Kostomarov.

In 1840 Mickiewicz met his countryman from Lithuania, Andrzej Towianski (1799-1878), an enthusiast of a mystical Christianity and Napoleonic legend. "Towianski regarded Napoleon as God's envoy sent to establish social justice on earth and himself as his successor. Thanks to Napoleon, the hero of the Revolution, the French had become the second Israel and carried on the mission of world leadership along the road traced by God. The Slavs, however, were to fulfil the mission and thus became the third Israel". (28, 41). Mickiewicz became his ardent follower and accepted his fantastic religious dogma based on the Catholic mysticism, Polish messianism and Napoleonic revolutionism. In 1849, in his "La Tribune des Peuples", Mickiewicz wrote: "The political welfare of France as well as that of her sister nations, depends on the union of the Napoleonic idea with the

---

<sup>14</sup>M. Kridl says: "Our relationship to Russia and the Russians was largely determined by part III of 'Forefather's Eve'. . . . The spirit of Mickiewicz continues to rule over us." (28, 266).

Nota bene the Polish relationship to Ukraine and the Ukrainians is determined by "With Fire and Sword" by Henryk Sienkiewicz, as J. Pilsudski once state to S. Petlyura.

\*Kohn says that the mother (probably) and wife (certainly) of Mickiewicz were of Jewish descent, hence he "tied the Slav messianism with Israel" (28, 45).

socialist idea. . . . The Napoleonic idea must be understood as the personification of the French principle in its conflict with Russian principle: both principles tend to spread throughout Europe" (28, 41).

The Polish Messianism started by Towianski and Mickiewicz in exile, 1841, had for its source the religious mystic ecstasy of the chosen persons, who believed in the supernatural understanding of their souls with God. They believed also, Poland, because of her suffering, would arise and would become a Christ-Messiah for humanity and would bring among the subjected and humiliated people the gospel of love, liberty and equality. Through Poland and the Slavs, whom Poland would unite by the word of love, mankind would be reborn and revived in Christ's spirit and then the Lord's Kingdom will come upon the earth (1, 35).

The literary romanticism, based upon the Polish colorful past, caused a rich development. Some of the Polish romanticists took the themes from the time of Poland's domination over Ukraine, creating a "Ukrainian School" in Polish literature (Malczewski, Goszczynski, Zaleski, Slowacki, Grabowski—a friend of Kulish, Czaykowski and others). "Yet they never forgot the difference between themselves and the Ukrainians and used the stories of the Kozaks and the rich scenery of Ukraine as a background for their own tales" (19, 210).

It should be mentioned here that it was a Pole, Michal Czaykowski, who wanted to see Kiev as the capital of all Slavic peoples, although he would have been glad to have it within the frontiers of a restored Poland. The Russian reactionary Slavophil Alexey Khomyakov was also in favor of Kiev as the capital of all Slavs, because "Kiev could do much better than Moscow or Petersburg as the capital because it lies on the border of two different worlds" (1, 36). "It was a natural thing for the Ukrainians—says Chubaty—to be still more proud and look upon their capital as if it were the national Mecca of Ukraine" (17, 34<sup>2</sup>).

\* \* \*

How did all this affect the Ukrainians? The successful Ukrainian Revolution of 1648 started against Poland by Khmel'nitsky led through the hard fights with the Poles to the fatal alliance at Pereyaslav, 1654 with the Muscovite Tsar Alexis, who theoretically recognized Ukraine "as an independent and autonomous state, bound to Muscovy only through the person of the tsar" (32, 296). But Muscovy, by its sly and insidious politics, abolished in 1764 the Hetman authority, destroyed in 1775 Zaporozhian Sich, introduced

in 1783 serfdom, abrogated all Ukrainian liberties and privileges, changing Ukraine slowly but surely into the "Little Russian" province. There was no possibility for any legal movement as in Bohemia or for any formal political agitation for the Ukrainian rights. "Politics in the Western sense was utterly taboo in the Russian Empire where the tsar and the bureaucracy with the aid of the police maintained an iron control of the population, whether it was Russian or Ukrainian or anything else" (19,210).

But the Ukrainian tradition lived on in the folk songs, in the memories of the peasant serfs and of the wandering bards—"kobzars", who—as Manning says—"sang the tales of Kozak heroism and who recalled the old days when the Kozaks in their light boats dared to raid the suburbs of Constantinople and rescue Christian prisoners from their prisons in the outskirts of the Sultan's capital" (19,210).

"Europe wanted tales of heroic adventure. Ukraine had them in abundance, for during the great heroic age of the late 16th century the Zaporozhian Kozaks had been doing on land and on the Black Sea exactly what the seadogs of England and the conquistadores of Spain had been doing on the Atlantic Ocean and in the New World" (19,211).

The Kozak's fights with Tartars, Turks, Poles and Russians was the appropriate theme for a romanticist, which Shevchenko used so masterly. But the old Romantic Kozak life passed forever and there was just the brutal present with its social cruelty and national oppression. Poland was no longer the menace to Ukraine but Russia!

In the meantime there came into Russia and Ukraine the ideas of Kollar and Shafarik on Slavic solidarity. . . . In 1845 when Shevchenko returned from Petersburg back to Ukraine as a graduate of the Academy of Arts, he found in Kiev "a group of young men who under the leadership of Prof. Maksymovych were studying scientifically the folk songs and rummaging in the archives and libraries for all those old histories of Ukraine which detailed the slow but persistent whittling away of all of those rights and privileges guaranteed by Tsar Alexis at the moment when he made the treaty with Khmel'nitsky. It was a scientific confirmation of his own impressions" (19,212).

At that time there lived in Kiev Kulish and Kostomariiv, the most active members of the young group. Shevchenko was already a famous poet. A self-made man and once a serf, he attracted everyone who came into contact with him.

Shevchenko had plans for the social emancipation of the Ukrainian peasants and for the political liberation of the Ukrainian people from Moscow. But his plans like "rise up, break your shackles" seemed too revolutionary to that group and in the end won the evolutional Christian-romantic ideas of Kostomarov and Kulish that found expression in the ideology of the Cyrillo-Methodians and in the "Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People".

The significance of the Society of Saints Cyril and Methodius—says Manning—"did not lie in its immediate political and military potentialities but in the philosophy that lay at its roots and that could not be reached by any aggressive action of the police of Nicholas I" (19, 207). "It represented for Ukraine that union of all the threads of rejuvenation. Into its spiritual content went the Romanticism of literature (with the urgent hope in Pan-Slavic brotherhood and solidarity), the idealistic dreams of the Golden Age of the past and the certainty that the dead bones of a free Ukraine might once again be restored to life. There came the products of the ethnographical school which had searched out in the highways and byways the survivals of Ukrainian folklore and village customs. There came the writings of the historians who had by painstaking effort reconstructed from written documents the sad tale of the downfall of the Kozak Host, who had worked out the glorious days of Kiev, and who in simple language were trying to tell the story of their people. . . . The young men were filled with enthusiasm. They proudly declared that in the ideal Slavic world of the future, in that United States of Slavia which was going to rise as the next step in the free association of brother peoples, Ukraine would have its own respected place. They prepared a banner for Ukraine in the great republic of the future. They indulged in solemn vows and promises. . . . They still believed that right would triumph and that with the aid of their brothers, the new order would be introduced" (19, 212f).

Their ideology was influenced by the humanitarian, Western Pan-Slavism of Slovak and Czech origin, connected with Western liberalism, and based upon Christian morals. In contrast to other Pan-Slavist dreamers, the Cyrillo-Methodians had a concrete plan for the re-organization of Eastern and Central Europe. They wanted to see free Ukraine in the Pan-Slavic federation of all the Slavic peoples on the basis of full equality. Their messianism, even if of a foreign origin, had typical Ukrainian modesty and a deep Christian content: "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the

earth" (Matthew 5,5) or: "The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner" (Psalm 118,22).

The confessors of this ideology wanted to build the social and political life of the people upon the Christian moral.

## CONCLUSION

Although 108 years have passed since the proclamation of the ideals of the Cyrillo-Methodians, their ideas are still stimulating and valid, not only to the Ukrainians and Slavs—to whom they were primarily directed—but to all the peoples, and especially to those who are now behind the Iron Curtain.

The well understood Christian faith, truth, moral, love and tolerance, the divine and natural law of men, the dignity of the human being and freedom from fear of tsars and other tyrants, real democracy, freedom and equality among all men, the will to arise against those who oppress—are the slogans, important to all the subjugated and oppressed in the world.

In the inaugural address of President Eisenhower<sup>1</sup> on January 20, 1953, we read the solemn statement: "We, the people, elect leaders not to rule but to serve", which is so similar to our Brotherhood's principle: "And so, as the official and ruler are the first—they should be servants to all" (2, 11). So, we see that these ideas still live.

An American author W. H. Chamberlin said about the ideology of the Cyrillo-Methodians: "This idea, in broad outline, may still be considered a very hopeful solution for the difficulties of the Central and Eastern European regions which are inhabited by people of many nationalities" (34, 30).

I dare to say, these ideas would also be useful for future United Europe, in which Ukraine should take her proper place too, because she was always a vanguard of Western European civilization in the east of Europe.<sup>2</sup> The Ukrainian people today, like the Cyrillo-Methodians one century ago, want to see their country free and independent in a great family of equally free and democratic nations. . . .

However there are some misconceptions in the Cyrillo-Methodians' ideology:

---

<sup>1</sup>Chicago Daily Tribune, Jan. 21, 1953, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Yuri Lypa, *The Destination of Ukraine*, Lviv, 1938.

In 1323, Pope John XXII, in his letter to the Polish King Wladyslaw Lokietek, called the Ukrainian Halich-Volynian Dukes, Andrew and Lev II, a "*scutum et antemurale Christianitatis*" (a shield and bulwark of Christianity) for their stubborn struggle with the cruel Tartars. ("Ukraine between Poland and Russia", by Nicholas D. Chubaty, *Review of Politics*, Vol. VIII, No. 3, p. 337).



The Brotherhood always emphasized that neither the Russian nor the Polish peoples, as such, were responsible for the historical injustices toward the Ukrainian people, and for the enslavement of Ukraine. They held merely that Russian tsars and Polish nobility were responsible for that. The people themselves would come to an understanding, and be able to solve their own political differences and quarrels peaceably.

“But the Revolution of 1917 taught the Ukrainians another lesson. The tsars and the nobility have gone, yet there is no freedom for the Ukrainians. The socialist government of Alexander Kerensky and the communist dictatorship of Lenin-Stalin did not hesitate to enslave Ukraine again”.

Newly-reborn Poland also did not follow the great precepts propounded by Mickiewicz in his “Books of the Polish People” (Poland—a “Christ of Nations!”) but like Lenin’s Russia, went into war against the Ukrainian Republic” (17, 347).

“So the right of all peoples to select their nationhood was thrown over by her (Polish) leaders”—stated the British Prime-Minister Lloyd George in his Memoirs of the Peace Conference of 1918 (50, 59).

The result was a second Andrusovo, but this time made in Riga, 1921, and the dividing line was not the Dnieper River, but the Zbruch River. Now the Russian and Polish “democratic” leaders in exile are making propaganda already for their third Andrusovo, claiming their “historical rights” to the Ukrainian lands (Cf. their slogans: “Polish” Lwow and “Russian” Kiev!)<sup>3</sup>, eager to sacrifice a nation of 40 million people for their nationalistic and imperialistic ambitions in order to secure them “a living space”.

Is this done from a love of truth or a love for the Ukrainian Slavic people? No! Their goal is the same as Hitler’s—Ukraine, the “granary of Europe”.

“Ukraine—said Simpson—is an important factor in the European situation because of the extent of its territory, the richness of its resources, the size of its population (40,000,000), and its strategic position with reference to the Black Sea” (37, 9). This is the reason they are so eager to have her in spite of any moral law or any justice.

---

<sup>3</sup>Cf. St. Skrzypek, *The problem of Eastern Galicia*, London, 1948 (with Polish imperialistic tendency!), and the prophecy made by the Russian journalist “Argus” (in “Ruskoye Novoye Slovo”, New York) that Ukrainian independence—“is something which did not exist, does not exist, and will never exist” (56, 40). A modern Russian Valuev!

Moreover, the “democratic” Poland of 1918-1939 tried to Polonize the 6 million Ukrainians by police methods (pacifications, etc.), and in 1938 the “Christian” Polish government with the support of the Polish Catholic clergy seized over a hundred Ukrainian Orthodox churches, demolished and burned 148 of them in Kholmnia (35, 112).\*

Soviet Russia, after the short-lived concessions to Ukrainian culture, started a new Russification, centralization and colonial exploitation of the country’s resources without regard for the need of the Ukrainian people, which led a Ukrainian writer, M. Khvylovy (1893-1933), to proclaim the slogan: “Away from Moscow”! As an answer to that, on April 26, 1926, Stalin wrote to Kaganovich, (a new Russian “governor” of Ukraine): “. . . Whereas the proletarians of Western Europe and their Communist parties are full of sympathy for ‘Moscow’, the citadel of the international revolutionary movement . . . , the Ukrainian Communist Khvylovy has nothing better to say for ‘Moscow’ than to appeal to Ukrainian public men to get away from ‘Moscow as quickly as possible!’ And this is called internationalism” (49, 219).

But the same “internationalist” Stalin, evidently forgot his statement about Russian chauvinism, made in 1923: “Great Power chauvinism is growing in our country daily and hourly—Great Power chauvinism, the rankest kind of nationalism, which strives to obliterate all that is not Russian, to gather together all the threads of **administration into the hands of Russians and to crush everything that is not Russian.**” (28, 181). Now this situation is even worse!

After World War II, Stalin returned fully to the traditional Russian nationalism, chauvinism and imperialism, Under his direction D. Zaslavsky wrote in the “Literaturnaya Gazeta” of Jan. 1, 1950: “The Russian language is the first world language of international significance. . . . Nobody can regard himself as educated in the full and true sense of the word, if he does not understand Russian and cannot read the creations of the Russian mind in the original language” (28, 245). The non-Russian nationalities of the Soviet Union, (54%), have to praise “the great and unique Russian people” (—a new master race!)—that “elder

---

\*In order to minimize the number of the Ukrainian population in Poland, Polish government divided it into: Ukrainians, Rusins, Boykis, Lemkis and “tutejsi” (—natives). In Polissya there were forbidden Ukrainian schools, papers, and even the church calendar in Ukrainian language was regarded as “subversive.”

brother", Russian history, culture, patriotism, etc., but the patriotism of the non-Russians is labeled as "the bourgeois nationalism and cosmopolitanism" and mercilessly persecuted, so that a sentimental and patriotic poem "Love Ukraine", 1944, by V. Sosyura was sharply criticized and forbidden in 1951 (28,247).

Still in 1930 the true Ukrainian cultural life was suppressed. The peasantry, opposing the forcible collectivisation, was broken during 1932-33, when Moscow's planned requisition resulted in death by starvation of 6,000,000 Ukrainian peasants. In Vinnytsia — that "Ukrainian Katyn" — 20,000 Ukrainian workers, peasants and intellectuals were liquidated in 1937-38 (52, 238ff). The Ukrainians are reduced in number by deportation, concentration camps and mass murders (genocide!) and the Russians are increasing in Ukraine, even according to Soviet statistics (56, 15ff). The Ukrainians are forced to silent opposition (in forest and mountain regions there still exists armed resistance!) and are only waiting for an opportunity to free themselves from the most inhuman and hated "big Russian brother's" occupation. . . . Such is the Pan-Slavic brotherhood in reality!

In order to secure Russian rule over Ukraine, the Russian "democratic" immigrants and their friends in America are still employing such old tsarist propaganda tricks against Ukraine, as saying that the Ukrainian problem is only an Austrian or German intrigue, in spite of the fact that Ukraine is already a lawful member of the United Nations. The Russian Menshevik imperialist, David J. Dallin, a "leading world authority" on Russia insinuated, in 1951, that the Ukrainian struggle for self-determination (as embodied in the American Declaration of Independence, 1776) is only Hitler's invention (47, 339).<sup>4</sup> Recently, the Russian Orthodox Church in America published an incredible pamphlet: "Ukraine, the Greatest Hoax of the 20th Century".

All their attempts and argumentations are simply ridiculous in the light of the Cyrillo-Methodian ideology.

No wonder that a rally of the "DOBRUS" (Democratic Association of Ukrainians Formerly Oppressed in the Soviet Union) adopted on October 20, 1951, at New York the following resolution:

"The Ukrainian political thought from the time of Khmel-

---

<sup>4</sup>Cf. the chapter: "The German Solution of the Problem" in his book "The New Soviet Empire", Yale University Press, 1951.

nitsky, through the Cyrillo-Methodians, Drahomaniv, pre-revolutionary Ukrainian Social Revolutionists and Social Democrats, through the Hetmanate of 1918, and finally to the Ukrainian idealist Communists was always struggling for the federalistic rebuilding of the under-Russian East. Tsars and their successors betrayed and trampled the Pereyaslav agreement (1654), broke up the Cyrillo-Methodians (with the applause of even such progressive Russians as Belinsky), incited Drahomaniv, deported and shot Ukrainian Socialists (even socialist Kerensky's government!), defeated Hetman-Federalists and finally totally liquidated the Ukrainian Federalist-Communists. Could the Ukrainian people silently overlook such a terrible experience of the Ukrainian old federalist movement with Russian total centralism of all colors? Clearly no, and the Ukrainians made their last conclusion: only by force, by great revolution, by uncompromised struggle in holy alliance with other subjected peoples to defeat the hateful old Russian prison of nations, to establish independent national states, and in this way, once and for all, abolish the anti-human Russian centralism, imperialism, conquest, and cruel trampling of the free will of other nations. A federalism of equally independent nations, all on the same level—the type of federalism which is now popular in Western Europe, will always be on our freedom-loving flags. . . . And therefore we are for an independent Ukraine, for an independent Russia within her ethnical borders, Georgia, Byelorussia, and independent states of all other nations of Eastern Europe, because only free nations which have the same rights can make a federation.” (56, 54f).

The Russians are only willing to give some freedom to the subjected nations as long as they are weak. Proofs: the years 1905, 1917, 1941. They took every privilege back as soon as their trouble had passed, although in the Constitution they had even allowed “the right of secession from the Soviet Union for every Soviet republic”.

Pan-Slavism is now completely unpopular among all the Slavs (except the Russians) after they fell under Soviet-Russian control and terror after World War II. and learned by practical experience that Communist Slavic Russia (at least according to her language)<sup>5</sup> is the worst oppressor in the world. Since Russia gained control of Pan-Slavism in

---

<sup>5</sup>Many French and Polish writers in the 19th century regarded the Russians racially not as Slavs and Europeans, but Turanians and Asiatics (28, 91). The French historian Jules Michelet, 1963, protested against the subordination of Slavs to “la tribu finno-

1867, this originally Western, romantic, liberal, and democratic movement was changed into a reactionary one, which became an instrument of Russian imperialism—a total Pan-Russianism. At the Pan-Slavic Congress in Belgrad, 1946, it intimately fused with world Communism (23, 239).

It is justified when the great Czech philosopher and statesman Thomas Masaryk (like Palacky and Havlichek before) opposed the Russian Slavophilism and Pan-Slavism, writing to Karel Chapek: "I am by education a European. I want to tell you that the culture of Europe and America is spiritually adequate for me. I say this to those Slavophiles who see something in Russia and the Slavs which is above Europeanism. The best Russians are also admirers of the Occident." (28, 9).

Anyhow, the ideology of the Cyrillo-Methodians is not only a document of the time. It was a solemn manifestation of the Ukrainian spirit, based upon deep Christian faith, and sincere belief in the triumph of the truth, justice and brotherhood among the peoples over the dark forces, which stop progress in history. It is a certificate of good will of the Ukrainian people to live peacefully with their neighbors. The Cyrillo-Methodians believed in the possibility of building a political and social order among men upon Christian principles, but if the peoples are Christian only on paper (hypocrites), it was not their fault. It is not their fault either that Ukraine's neighbors always prefer the jungle law or the right of the stronger in politics, rather than the principle of self-determination of the people.

The Brotherhood's ideas are a fine contribution of the Ukrainian spirit to the progress of mankind, and as such, they live eternally, because as W. Humboldt said: "Ideas alone really last in life."

---

tatare, le Kremlin byzantino-mongol" (28, 278).

Some Russians, like K. N. Leontev thought that Russia's future is more "Turanian" than "European". In 1920 N. S. Trubetsky started the 'Eurasian movement', regarding Muscovy as a successor of the Tartar Empire and stressing her close relationship with the Turanian nomads. (28, 278).

A Ukrainian anthropologist, V. Scherbakivsky, regards the Russians and Germans as war-like peoples in contrary to the peaceful Slavs (39, 364).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Figures in text (in parenthesis) mean: ordinal number of this list and the page on which the work is quoted).

1. M. Voznyak, *The Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood*, Lviv, 1921, (in Ukrainian language).
2. M. Kostomarov, *The Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People*, ed. by UFAS, expl. by B. Yanivsky, Augsburg, 1947, (Ukr.).
3. A. Mickiewicz, *The Books of the Polish People, Works*, Vol. 5, Chicago, 1943, (Pol.).
4. Gibson *The Abbe de Lamennais and the Liberal Catholic Movement in France*, London, 1896.
5. Moliere et Duine, *Lamennais, sa vie, ses idees*, Lyons, 1898.
6. J. G. Herder, *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man*, transl. by T. Churchill, London, 1800, p. 482-4.
7. C. A. Manning, *Taras Shevchenko, the Poet of Ukraine, Selected Poems*, translated with an introduction, Jersey City, 1945.
8. C. A. Manning, *Taras Shevchenko as a World Poet*, *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Vol. 1/2, p. 105ff, New York, 1945.
9. V. Semevsky, *The Cyrillo-Methodian Society, "The Voice of the Past"*, Vol. 10-12, 1918, (Russ.).
10. P. Zaytsev, "The Books of Genesis . . ." as a Document and Work, "Our Past", Vol. I, 1918, (Ukr.).
11. Bahaliy, *Shevchenko and the Cyrillomethodians*, Kharkiv, 1925, (Ukr.).
12. V. Shchurat, *Shevchenko's Connections with Poles*, Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, in Lviv, Vol. 119-120, p. 287-9, (Ukr.).
13. M. Markovsky, *Shevchenko in the Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood*, Notes of the Hist.-Philol. Dept. of the All-Ukr. Academy of Sciences, Kiev, 1924, Book 4, p. 50ff, (Ukr.).
14. J. Golabek "The Books of the Polish People . . ." by A. Mickiewicz and "The Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People" by M. Kostomarov. *Symposium of the Works of the Philologist, Slav Congress at Prague, 1929*, Vol. II, p. 55, Prague, 1932, (Pol. & Czech).
15. L. Biletsky, "The Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People" as a Declaration of the Rights of the Ukrainian Nation, *Scientific Symposium of the Ukrainian Free University at Prague*, Vol. III, 1942, (Ukr.).
16. I. Pilhuk, *The Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood and the Literary Process of the 40-60 years, "Fatherland"*, Kiev, 1946, 1, (Ukr.).
17. N. Chubaty, *The Ukrainian Plan for the Organization of Europe One Hundred Years Ago*, UQ 11/4, 1946, p. 3.9ff.
18. N. Chubaty, *The Ukrainian Movement at the Time of the American Revolution*, UQ V/3, 1949, p. 226ff.
19. C. A. Manning, *Ukraine and the 1848 Year*, UQ III/3, 1947, p. 205ff.
20. C. A. Manning, *Panslavism, Its Use and Abuse*, UQ 1/3, 1945, p. 216ff.

21. C. A. Manning, *The Myth of Slav Unity*, UQ VI/2, 1950, p. 107ff.
22. W. Dushnyck, *Stalin's Pan-Slavism in the United States*, UQ IV/1, 1948, p. 67ff.
23. A. N. Pipin, *Panslavism in the Past and Present*, St. Petersburg, 1913, (Rus.).
24. A. Fischel, *Der Panslavismus bis zum Weltkrieg*, Berlin, 1916.
25. W. Feldman, *Geschichte der politischen Ideen in Polen*, Muenchen-Berlin, 1917, (sp. chapter IV: "Der Glaube an die Voelker (1831-1848)).
26. T. G. Masaryk, *The Spirit of Russia*, New York, 1919.
27. W. Lednicki, *Panslavism*, chapt. XXII, p. 805ff. in "European Ideologies" ed. by F. Gross, New York, 1948.
28. H. Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*, University of Notre Dame Press, 1953.
29. B. H. Sumner, *A Short History of Russia*, New York, 1943, esp. chapt. 3. *The Ukrainian Question*, p. 211-225, and chapt. 4. *Panslavism*, p. 225-238
30. Pares, *A History of Russia*, 5th ed., New York, 1945. pub. by Alfred A. Knopf.
31. O. Ohloblyn, *The Moscovian Theory of the Third Rome*, Munich, 1951, (Ukr.).
32. Hayes, Baldwin, Cole, *History of Europe*, New York, 1950. pub. by The MacMillan Co.
33. M Hrushevsky, *A History of Ukraine*, ed. by O. J. Frederiksen, pref. by G. Vernadsky, Yale Univ. Press, 3rd ed., New Haven, 1948.
34. W. H. Chamberlin, *The Ukraine—a Submerged Nation*, New York, 1944. pub. by The MacMillan Co.
35. C. A. Manning, *Twentieth Century Ukraine*, New York, 1951.
36. J. S. Reshetar, *The Ukrainian Revolution*, Princeton Univ. Press, 1952.
37. G. W. Simpson, *Ukraine, an Atlas of its History and Geography*, pub. by Oxford Univ. Press, 1941, 3rd ed. Augsburg, 1946.
38. G. W. Simpson, *The Names Rus', Russia, Ukraine and Their Historical Background*, Slavistica X, Winnipeg, 1951.
39. N. Chubaty, *The Meaning of "Russia and Ukraine"*, UQ 1/4, 1945, p. 351ff.
40. N. Chubaty, *The Ukrainian and Russian Conceptions of the History of Eastern Europe*, Proceedings of Shevchenko Scient. Society, Hist.-Philos. Sect. Vol. I, p. 10-25, New York---Paris, 1951.
41. B. Halaychuk, *The Treaty of Pereyaslav in the Light of International Law*, Proceedings as under No. 40, p. 102ff.
42. S. Ivanytsky, *The Juridical Aspect of the Treaty of Pereyaslav (Concluded in 1654 between Russia and Ukraine)*, *ibid.*, p. 106ff.
43. W. H. Chamberlin, *The Ukraine and Soviet Nationality Policy*, UQ I/1, 1944, p. 11ff.
44. V. Korostovetz, *Religion and Nationality as Political Factors in Eastern Europe*, UQ VII/2, 1951, p. 127ff.
45. F. Znaniecki, *Modern Nationalities*, Urbana, 1952, esp. p. 76f. & p. 136f.
46. R. Smal-Stocki, *The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union and Russian Communist Imperialism*, Milwaukee, 1952.
47. R. Smal-Stocki, *From Bolshevik Stalin to Menshevik Dallin*, UQ VII/4, 1951, p. 337ff.

48. R. Smal-Stocki, Russian Imperialism or Communist Aggression, UQ VII/4, 1951, p. 373ff.
49. M. Pap, Soviet Difficulties in Ukraine, "The Review of Politics", Vol. 14/4, p. 204-232, Notre Dame University Press, April 1952.
50. M. Pap, The Ukrainian Problem, in "Soviet Imperialism Its Origins and Tactics", ed. by W. Gurian, Notre Dame Press, 1953.
51. O. Ohloblyn, The Tragedy of Baturyn (Nov. 13, 1708), The Herald (Four Freedoms for Ukraine), VII/4-5, p. 19ff, New York, 1953.
52. M. Seleshko, Vinnytsya—the Katyn of Ukraine, UQ V/3, 1949, p. 238ff.
53. UCCA, Massacre in Vinnytsya, New York, 1953.
54. M. Verbytsky, The Worst Crime of the Kremlin, London, 1952, (Ukr.).
55. J. F. Stewart, Tortured but Unconquerable Ukraine, Edinburgh, 1953.
56. V. I. Hryshko, Two Russian Actions—One Ukrainian Retort, "DOBRUS", New York, 1951.
57. C. A. Manning, The Democratic Trend of Ukrainian Literature, UQ I/1, 1944, p. 40ff.
58. C. H. Andrusyshen, Ukrainian Literature—a Mirror of the Common Man, UQ IV/1, 1948, p. 44ff.
59. Encyklopedia of Ukraine, ed. by SSS (V. Kubyovych & Z. Kuzelya), Munich-New York, 1949.
60. Slavonic Encyklopaedia, ed. by J. S. Roucek, New York, 1949.
61. W. Durant, The Story of Philosophy, New York, 1926.
62. W. Turner, History of Philosophy, Boston . . . , 1929.
63. N. Prychodko, The Famine in 1932/3 in Ukraine, UQ IX/3, 1953, p. 213ff.
64. D. Snovyd, Spirit of Ukraine (Ukrainian Contributions to World's Culture), New York, 1935.
65. A. Yakovliv, Treaty of Pereyaslav between Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky and Tsar Alexey Mikhaylovich, 1654, (1654-1954), New York, 1954.
66. V. Miyakovsky, Men of the 40's, ("In hundred years," Vol. II, Kiev, 1929)—correspondence of Cyrillo-Methodians (Ukr.).
67. Dm. Chizhevsky, Cyrillo-Methodians, in "Sketches from the History of the Philosophy in Ukraine," Prague, 1931, p. 107-136, (Ukr.).



## DONATORS

to the "Slavistica" Fund—whose generosity made the publication of this work possible:

- \$25.00—Duzhansky John.  
\$20.00—"DOBRUS" — Chicago Branch (Rostun VasyI).  
\$10.00—Basilian Fathers (Very Rev. Gavlich Volodymyr), Nychay Volodymyr, "St. Pokrova" Parish, Veterinaries Ass'n. (Pomirko Volodymyr), Smuk John.  
\$5.00—Ivaschuk VasyI, Ostrovsky Matey, Sambirsky Stephen, Ukrainian Hetman Organ. (4) of Chicago.  
\$3.00—Sydoruk La Verne R., Turchmanovych Ivan.  
\$2.00—"Fortuna", Hikavy Mykhaylo, Levkovych Stefan, Maksymuk Dmytro, Novytsky-Korchak Andriy, Orysko Stefan, Pasika Mykola, Rudavsky Ivan, Semkovych Olena, Shkrehts Hryhory, Shpikula Taras, Stefanytsya St., Stelmaschuk Iury, Mozolyuk Kozma.  
\$1.50—Bereznytsky I. Kravets D., Lahodyuk V., Paslavsky Y., Rak D., Zalusky R.  
\$1.25—Bzenko I., Karaseychuk I., Lavrin I.  
\$1.10..Pruc E., Vyun Y.  
\$1.05..DARDA Jerry (an American of Czech descent), Ivasyutyn V., Kovaliv S., Maksymyk J., Maslanko I., Pankiv M., Rohachuk St., Tovstopyat M., Tykhy Sp.  
\$1.00—Bahriy, Balaban, Baran, Bartsaba, Basaraba, Biletsky, Bilyk, Bohatyuk, Boyko P., Byaly, Chabanivsky, Chaykovsky, Dachyshyn, Deneka, Dumych, Firischak, Furchak, Gayetsky, Grudzinsky, Havdyo, Holovaty, Ivanchak, Ivaniv A., Ivaniv B., Kekish, Kharuk, Kobyletsky, Kocherha, Komarynsky, Konoval, Kraus, Kraynyk, Kryklyvets, Kryvokulsky, Kryvovyz, Kurpita, Kusyk, Lapka, Lelyk, Lulyuk, Lushpynsky, "Lydia" Bakery, Lykhnyuk L. T., Mak, Maksymonko, Myroshnychenko, Nohach, Olishkevych, Osovsky, Pakholak, Pash, Semchyshyn, Semkiv, Shkrabets, Skibitsky, Stanley, Stepaniv, Stercho, Stetsko, Struts A., Struts V., Sylka, Tkachenko, Tkachuk Trusevych, Vasylovsky, Vlasenko, Vitkovsky, Yaloveha, Yashko, Yaremko, Yastremska, Zabrosky, Zakharyvasevych, Zapukhlak Zarytsky, Horodysky, Potyuk.  
\$ .50—Borachuk, Bunyovsky, Chyzho, Danylyshyn, Datskiv, Dohan, Drahanchuk, Fedorenko, Fil, Foka, Frankiv, Holovach, Kalynetsky, Kishakevych, Khlypnaych, Kobryn, Kornyliv, Krasovsky, Kutsan, Kuzhil, Lupo, Lykolsky, Lyubynets, Peredery, Petryk, Popiel, Prokopchuk, Rybakova, Scheblovsky, Selenko, Sereznyova, Shakh, Shakh, Shpak, Skrobach, Struts, Tsimura, Turula, Turyansky, Vasylenko, Vasyliv, Volhayeva, Yanchykiv.  
\$ .35—L. D.   \$ .30—Petriy.  
\$ .25—Andrushko, Apostolyuk, Babiy, Berezyuk, Bohun, Boyko, Buchko, Butriy, Dubovyk, Dzyubynsky, Golembiovsky, Hlukhanyuk, Holovaty, Horbovy, Kitral, Kvasytnyk, Malanchuk, Martynytsiv, Melnyk, Musiy, Nahnit, Novoshytsky N. N., Pisot-sky, Pochynsky, Prytotsky, Sikachovsky, Snitkovsky, Varenyka.  
\$ .20—Kulyk.   \$ .19—Rudenko M.   \$ .16—Rudenko.



# SLAVISTICA

Appears Three Times A Year

A series relating to Slavic languages, literatures, cultures, ethnography, archeology etc., with special attention to the problems of Eastern Slavic world.

- No. I — **The Tasks of Slavic Philology and Ukrainian Slavistics**, by S. Smal-Stoc'kyj and J. B. Rudnyc'kyj, Augsburg, 1948.
- No. II — V. Chaplenko: **Ukrainianisms in the Language of M. Hohol (N. Gogol)**, Augsburg, 1948.
- No. III — J. P. Sydoruk: **The Problem of the Ukrainian White-Ruthenian Lingual Boundary**, (2 maps), Augsburg, 1948.
- No. IV — J. B. Rudnyc'kyj: **Slavic and Baltic Universities in Exile**, Winnipeg, 1949.
- No. V — J. Byrych: **A Page from Czech-Ukrainian Relations**, Winnipeg, 1949.
- No. VI — R. Smal-Stoc'kyj: **The Origin of the Word "Rus'"**, Winnipeg, 1949.
- No. VII — V. Chaplenko: **The Language of "Slovo o Polku Ihorevi"**, Winnipeg, 1950.
- No. VIII — I. Mirtschuk: **Das Daemonische bei den Russen und den Ukrainern**, Augsburg, 1950.
- No. IX — J. B. Rudnyc'kyj: **Slavistica Canadiana A. D.—MCML**, Winnipeg, 1950.
- No. X — G. W. Simpson: **The Names Rus', Russia, Ukraine and Their Historical Background**, Winnipeg, 1951.
- No. XI — Metr. I. Ohienko: **An Early 17th Cent. Ukrainian Russian Dictionary**, Winnipeg, 1951.
- No. XII — V. J. Kaye: **Slavic Groups in Canada**, Winnipeg, 1951.
- No. XIII — P. Fylypovych: **Hohol's (Gogol's) Ukrainian Background**, Winnipeg, 1952.
- No. XIV — W. Kirkconnell: **Common English Loanwords in East European Languages**, Winnipeg, 1952.
- No. XV — J. B. Rudnyc'kyj: **Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1951**, Winnipeg, 1952.
- No. XVI — J. Sherekh: **Participium Universale im Slavischen**, Winnipeg, 1953.
- No. XVII — G. M. Lucyk: **Old-Church-Slavic as a Religious Cult Language**, Winnipeg, 1953.
- No. XVIII — J. B. Rudnyc'kyj: **Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1952**, Winnipeg, 1953.
- No. XIX — J. P. Sydoruk: **Ideology of Cyrillo-Methodians and Its Origin**, Chicago, 1954.

Price: \$0.50 per copy. Obtainable at:

UVAN, P.O. Box 3597, Station B., Winnipeg, Man., Canada.