

THE ANNALS
of the
UKRAINIAN ACADEMY
of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.

VOL. I

FALL, 1951

No. 2

CONTENTS

Ukrainian Chronicles of the 17th and 18th Centuries <i>Dmytro Dorošenko</i>	79
Notes on Weaving in the Trypillian Culture of the Ukraine <i>Neonila Kordysh</i>	98
Ivan Vyšenskyj <i>Dmitry Čiževsky</i>	113
Western Europe and the Ukrainian Baroque <i>Oleksander Ohloblyn</i>	127
What Is a Species? <i>Serhij Paramonov</i>	138
NOTES	
A New Fragment of Sappho? <i>Ihor Ševčenko</i>	150
A Hoard of Roman Gold Medallions <i>Valentine Shuhayevsky</i>	153
REVIEW ARTICLES	
A New Comparative Grammar of Slavic Languages <i>Jury Šerech</i>	157
Soviet Interpretation of a Ukrainian Classic <i>Petro Odarčenko</i>	164
Book Reviews	169
Obituaries	182
Chronicle	185

Published by

THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
IN THE U. S., Inc.



EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

DMITRY ČIŽEVSKY

Harvard University

OLEKSANDER GRANOVSKY

University of Minnesota

ROMAN SMAL STOCKI

Marquette University

VOLODYMYR P. TIMOSHENKO

Stanford University

EDITOR

MICHAEL VETUKHIV

New York City

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

GEORGE LUCKYJ

New York City

The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S. are published semi-annually by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S., Inc. Special issues will appear twice a year.

For annual subscription rates see inside back cover.

All correspondence orders, and remittances should be sent to
The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S.

16 East 23rd St., New York 10, N. Y.

SINGLE COPY: \$1.50

Copyright 1951, by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences
in the U. S., Inc.

**THE ANNALS OF THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY OF
ARTS AND SCIENCES IN THE U. S., INC.**

FALL 1951

CONTENTS

	<i>page</i>
Ukrainian Chronicles of the 17th and 18th Centuries <i>Dmytro Dorošenko</i>	79
Notes on Weaving in the Trypillian Culture of the Ukraine <i>Neonila Kordysh</i>	98
Ivan Vyšenskyj <i>Dmitry Čiževsky</i>	113
Western Europe and the Ukrainian Baroque <i>Oleksander Ohloblyn</i>	127
What Is a Species? <i>Serhij Paramonov</i>	138
NOTES	
A New Fragment of Sappho? <i>Ihor Ševčenko</i>	150
A Hoard of Roman Gold Medallions <i>Valentine Shuhayevsky</i>	153
REVIEW ARTICLES	
A New Comparative Grammar of Slavic Languages <i>Jury Šerech</i>	157
Soviet Interpretation of a Ukrainian Classic <i>Petro Odarčenko</i>	164
BOOK REVIEWS	
Theodore Shabad, <i>Geography of the U.S.S.R.</i> <i>Vasyl Gvozdetsky</i>	169
<i>Encyclopaedia Britannica</i> (article <i>Ukraine</i> and <i>White Rus-</i> <i>sia</i>) <i>Roman Smal Stocki</i>	172
W. K. Matthews, <i>Languages of the U.S.S.R.</i> <i>Jaroslav Rudnyčkyj</i>	175
<i>The Soviet Union</i> (ed. Waldemar Gurian) <i>John S. Reshetar</i>	177
Volodymyr Dorošenko, <i>Ohnyšče ukraïns'koï nauky</i> (The Center of Ukrainian Science) <i>Damian Horniatkevych</i>	179
OBITUARIES	
Dmytro Dorošenko	182
Mykyta Kekalo	183
CHRONICLE	185
A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION	188
CONTRIBUTORS	189

UKRAINIAN CHRONICLES OF THE 17th AND 18th CENTURIES*

DMYTRO DOROŠENKO

The translation of the following study by the late Professor D. Dorošenko comprises two chapters from his *Ohljad unkrainśkoï istoriohrafiï* (*A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography*, Prague, 1923) entitled "The Ukrainian Chronicles of the Seventeenth Century; The Cossack Chronicles," and "The Cossack Chroniclers." Additional footnotes have been supplied by Professor O. Ohloblyn.

I

The writing of chronicles in the Ukraine continued throughout the Lithuanian and Polish periods, and as in the times of the ancient Kiev state, the chronicles were written for the most part in the monasteries. This type of history writing reached its peak in the seventeenth century when it also transcended the narrow bonds of dry records and assumed the form of pragmatic history with some attempts at a synthesis. The writing of the chronicles at the same time ceased to be the exclusive preoccupation of the clergy and friars; there appeared the so-called "Cossack chronicles," written by layman, often members of the Cossack Host, who took an active part in or were witnesses of the events they described. As a result of the greatly increased national consciousness which reached its climax during the times of Hetman Chmelnyčkyj, nearly all the historical works of the seventeenth century were imbued with ardent patriotism. The following are the most important works of that period:

Litopyscy Volyni i Ukraïny, is an early seventeenth century collection which once belonged to the son of the Kiev mayor, Bohdan Balyka, and later to the monk Ilja Koščakovśkyj. Today it is preserved in the Ossolineum Library in Lviv.¹ It contains a compilation

* This is the second in the series of translations of Ukrainian source materials (v. *The Annals*, No. 1.).

¹ After the Second World War the Ossolineum Library was moved to Krakow; the fate of its separate collections is not known.

of old Ukrainian and Lithuanian chronicles, notes on the Moscow war of 1612 by B. Balyka, biographies of the Metropolitans of K̄iev from 988 to 1590, a Ukrainian translation of Opalinski's Diary of the Chotyn war, and various other notes

Hustynśkyj Litopys, covers the period from the beginning of the Kiev state to 1597. When it was re-copied and completed in 1670 by the hieromonach Mychajlo Losyćkyj of the Hustynśkyj Prylućkyj Monastyr, this compilation of Ukrainian and Polish chronicles was entitled *Krojniķa*. It begins with the Chronicle of Nestor and contains the Halyč-Volhynian Chronicle recounting the relations of Ukrainian lands with Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Muscovy, Crimea, and Turkey. It extends to the year 1597 and ends with a chapter *O načale kozakōv*, based on works by Sarnicki² and Bielski.³ Losyćkyj's original contribution begins with the chapter on the early Cossack period, which is followed by chapters on the new calendar,⁴ the church union, and on polemical defense of the Orthodox faith and Ukrainian nationhood. The main inspiration of the whole work is love of one's country which is held to be innate in everyone, drawing all toward it like a magnet. Hence the author of the chronicle expresses the hope that the historical past may not be hidden from the Ukrainian people.

Mezyhorśkyj Ruķopys, dating from the seventeenth century, contains the chronicles of Kiev and Volhynian lands (1393-1611 and 1612-1620 years), and also the chronicle of the Mezyhorśkyj Monastyr (near Kiev) from 1608-1700, which is very important for any historian of the city of Kiev or of the Cossack period and is written in an engaging style. Both chronicles were published by V. Antonovyč (*Sborniķ letopisej otnossjaščychsja k̄ istorii Juźnoj i Zapadnoj Rossii*, Kiev, 1888).

Lvivśkyj Litopys (so called by the Galician scholar, D. Zubryćkyj,

² Stanislaw Sarnicki, born 1530, a Calvinist preacher in Krakow, was the author of *Descriptio veteris et novae Poloniae* (1595) and *Annales sive de origine et rebus gestis polonorum et lithuanorum*, libri VIII, (1587).

³ Marcin Bielski, the author of *Kroniķa ŗwiata*; his son, Joachim, continued in his father's work and wrote *Kroniķa Polska* which terminated with the year 1599 and contained one chapter entitled *O kozakach*.

⁴ The Gregorian Calendar (New Style) was founded in 1582 by Pope Gregory XIII.

since it was found in Lviv) from 1498 to 1649, records events from 1498 to 1626 very briefly; but beginning with 1630, the annual entries are much more detailed and deal with events in the Kievan lands, Podolia, and Galicia. The author, a Podolian, studied in Medžybož in 1621, lived in Kiev 1626, and became a monk of the Mežyhorškyj Monastyr. Kuliš assumed that he was a Galician. The *Litopys* has been printed several times (e.g. in *Naukovy Sbornik*, Lviv, 1867).

Chmelnyčkyj Litopys, from 1636 to 1650, is most valuable for any study of the history of the early period of Chmelnyčkyj because of the information it contains about the destruction of the country during the wars. It was printed as a supplement to the *Litopys* of Samovydec', Kiev, 1878.

A *Podil'skyj Litopys* also existed, but it has not been preserved.

Apart from these chronicles we still have also many complete or fragmentary monasterial chronicles, containing general as well as specific information about life in the neighborhood of the monasteries:

Hustyn'skyj Litopys (1600-1641).

Mhar'skyj Litopys (of the Mhar'skyj Monastyr near Lubni in the province of Poltava) contains fragments dated between 1682 and 1775. The story "About the Building of the Stone Church of the Transfiguration in the Mhar Monastery" is most valuable because it provides us with very important information about the construction of stone churches in the Ukraine in the second half of the seventeenth century. It was printed in the *Kievskaja Starina*, 1889, IV-VI, with a preface by O. Lazarev'skyj.

Chronicle of the Motronyn'skyj Monastyr (Čyhyryn district) from 1516 to 1749. Fragments from it were published by Mykola Bilozerskyj in *Južnorussikija Letopisi*, Kiev, 1854.

The Chronicle of the Satanov'skyj Monastyr (in Podolia), was written in Polish, and copied by the Uniate abbot, Modest Sylnyčkyj between 1770 and 1793. It is preserved in the Ossolineum Library in Lviv.

The Chronicle of the Pidhorečkyj Monastyr (in Galicia, near Brody), from 1659 to 1715, entitled *Sinopsis ili kratkoje sobranie*

istorij. It gives details about Dorošenko's expeditions in alliance with the Turks in 1672 and in later years. Excerpts from it were published by Ivan Franko in *Kievskaja Starina*, 1890, VII.

Krojnika monastyrja sv. Mychajla cerkve Zolotoverchoho of the second half of the sixteenth century was based chiefly on the Polish chronicle of M. Bielski.

The church chronicle of Dobromil (in Galicia), covers the period 1648-1700, and was printed by V. Antonovyč in *Sbornik Letopisej*, Kiev, 1888.

Even in the second half of the sixteenth century the older type of chronicles (*Litopysy*) were yielding to a new kind (*Kroniky*), composed, according to the Polish tradition, in the form of pragmatic treatises, although at the same time preserving the general character of compilations from various older and foreign sources. The composition of such chronicles had become very widespread in the seventeenth century, especially during the second half, in connection with the great national and political movement at that time which, after Chmelnýckyj's attempts to re-establish an independent Ukrainian state, led to the creation of the Hetman State on the left bank ⁵ of the Dnieper. The authors of such chronicles, which also bear the names of "histories" and "synopses" were mostly clerics. Among the more important works in that group are the chronicles of T. Safonovyč, P. Kochanovskýj, I. Gizel, and L. Bobolynskýj.

Theodosius Safonovyč was the abbot of the St. Michael Zolotoverchij Monastery in Kiev between the years 1655 and 1672. In 1672 he wrote a work entitled *Krojnika z letopyscov starodavnych*. The Polish source chiefly used was the work of M. Strykowski. ⁶ The main purpose of Safonovyč's work was to provide every Ukrainian with a survey of the nation's history so that he might be able to answer questions about his country, since people who do not know their national origin, are regarded as fools. The author

⁵ Left-bank Ukraine — that part of the Ukraine on the left bank of the Dnieper.

⁶ Maciej Strykowski, a Polish historian of the sixteenth century. Author of *Opisanie Sarmacyi europejskiej* and *Kronika Polska, Zmudska, Litewska i wszystkiej Rusi* (Krolewicz, 1582).

openly acknowledged his debt to foreign sources, saying that he wrote down all he could find in various Ruthenian (ruśkyj) and Polish chronicles.

The central theme of Safonovyč's chronicle is the unity (*sobornost*) of all Ukrainian lands; he is just as much concerned with the history of Galicia as he is with the history of Kiev and Volhynia. He attempts to point to those factors in history which led to the creation of the Cossack state in the Ukraine. Although lacking literary talent, the author shows in this work great and sincere love for his country and genuine patriotism. His chronicle has not come down to us in the original; it exists only in copies. An edition of it was prepared by Professor S. Holubjev in the publications of the Kiev Archeographical Commission.⁷

The chronicle of the hieromonach Pantelejmon Kochanovśkyj, the administrator of the Pečerskyj Monastery, written between 1681 and 1682 under the title *Obšyrnyj sinopsys Ruskyj*, is really a compilation of source material from Ukrainian and Polish chronicles.

Inokentij Gizel, of German descent, was a pupil of Petro Mohyla, and was sent to study at foreign universities. Later he was put in charge of the Pečerskyj Monastery's printing press, was a professor and dean of the College and in 1656 became the archimandrite of the Pečerskyj Monastery. He died in 1683. Gizel was one of the defenders of the independence of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church from the Moscow Patriarch. His main work is *Sinopsis or a Short Collection*, the first edition of which was published in 1674 in Kiev. The second edition appeared in 1678, and the third in 1680. Among the sources used by Gizel were the works of Strykowski, Kromer,⁸ Bielski, Guagnini,⁹ Dlugosz,¹⁰ Nestor, and several other foreign chroniclers.

⁷ The events of 1917-20 and the death of Professor Holubjev were responsible for the abandonment of this publication.

⁸ Marcin Kromer (1512-1589), author of *De origine et rebus gestis Polonorum*.

⁹ Alessandro Guagnini (1538-1614), an Italian who served in the Polish army. Author of *Sarmatae Europaeae descriptio* (1581) and *Rerum Polonicarum tomi tres* (Frankfurt, 1584). A Polish translation of his first work containing a chapter on the Cossacks appeared in 1611. A Ukrainian translation was circulated in manuscript form.

¹⁰ Jan Dlugosz (1514-1580), famous Polish historian, author of *Annales seu cronicae inclity regni Poloniae opera* in 12 volumes, first published in Leipzig in 1711.

The material is arranged in the following order. The narration begins with an account of the origin of the Slavs who are regarded as descendants of Japhet, Mosoch, and other patriarchs. The genealogy of the Tsars is traced back to Augustus. The narrative takes us from accounts of the first Princes, and of the destruction of Kiev by the Tartars, directly to the expedition of Mamaj and to the battle on the Don between him and the Muscovite Prince Dmitry Ivanovič. There follows a description of the fate of Kiev under Lithuanian rule, and, immediately after it we learn of the establishment of the Patriarchate in Moscow. After a list of Kiev *vojevodas* and an account of the joining of the Ukraine to Muscovy, the book ends (in the second edition) with the Čyhyryn war of 1677. "Although," writes Ikonnikov, "the *Synopsis* does not omit Northern Russia, in fact it is nothing else except a history of the Kiev Principality, not of all Ruś" (*Opyt russkoj istoriografii*, II, p. 1556). The *Synopsis* became the most popular textbook of history in the Ukraine, and even more so in Muscovy, where it was reprinted in many editions until the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Leontij Bobolynśkyj, the hieromonach of the Troiickýj Monastyr in Černyhiv wrote in 1699 the chronicle *Litopysec*. The whole work comprises 636 folios, of which the first 350 contain an account of world history up to the capture of Constantinople by the Turks. It is followed by a description of "the Turkish states, how they were created, and multiplied into these eastern lands," and by accounts of Lithuanian and Polish history up to the time of Stefan Batory. The chronicle ends with chapters on Ukrainian history, the message of Isaija Kopinśkyj to Jeremi Wiśniowiecki, and a description of the Čyhyryn campaigns of 1677 and 1678. Bobolynśkyj's chronicle which is written in beautiful Ukrainian, close to popular speech, was first published in 1854 as an appendix to Hrabjanka's Chronicle (Archeographical Commission in Kiev), and there are several editions of it.¹¹

¹¹ This comprised only a part of Bobolynśkyj's chronicle; the complete work has never been published.

II

The period of Chmelnyćkyj and the unprecedented eruption of national and spiritual energy caused by it were recorded in a rather special category of historical works, the so-called "Cossack Chronicles," which began to be written in the second half of the seventeenth century, although the versions that have come down to us date only from the eighteenth century. The central theme of all of them is the age of Chmelnyćkyj, and some of them are devoted to it entirely, while others relate other events only by way of introduction. "All of them," writes Ikonnikov, "represent history, since the arrangement of events and especially the interpretation of facts are not devoid of some artifice, subjectivity, and even fantasy" (*Opytrusskoj istoriografii*, II. pp. 1560-61). Their sources include not only old Ukrainian, Polish and other foreign chronicles, but also official documents, diaries, journals and log-books (which were kept in the Hetman's Chancellery) and even works of poetry. The most characteristic examples of the "Cossack Chronicles" which are at the same time very important works in the field of Ukrainian historiography, are the chronicles of Samovydeć, Velyćko, and Hrabjanka.

An unknown writer, who was later given the name of "Samovydeć" (Eyewitness), was the author of the book *O počatku i pryćynach vojny Chmelnyćkoho* (Origin and Cause of Chmelnyćkyj's War) which deals with the period from 1648 up to 1702. The author came from Western Ukraine; during the "Ruin" (*Ruina*) he moved to Siveria, where he wrote his work. The actual writing was not begun before 1672, although preparation for it must have started earlier. It is very likely that the author came from a family of small gentry and was a Chancellery clerk, which made it possible for him to be well acquainted with the world of diplomacy. He describes the sieges of Smolensk in 1654 and of Riga in 1655, of which he was an eyewitness. He was present at the conference in Čyhyryn in 1657, took part in the diplomatic mission during the time of Jurij Chmelnyćkyj in 1660, and was one of the supporters of Somko. He also gives us an eyewitness account of the election of Mnohohrišnyj in 1669, and we can

assume that he must have lived for some time at Starodub, since from 1676 onwards he describes events around that town in great detail.

Samovydeč is critical of Hetman Samojlovyč (pp. 169-171), yet he is friendly to Mazepa, emphasizing his descent from "old Ukrainian gentry renowned in military history" (p. 171). He praises Somko and the Chief of Staff (*košovyj*) Sirko, and for various reasons dislikes Brjuchovečkyj, Vyhovskij, Dorošenko, and Samojlovyč. As a devout Christian he does not approve of the alliance between Dorošenko and the Turks. A convinced monarchist, he shows great loyalty to Polish King and Moscow Tsar alike. Referring to the oath of allegiance to the latter, he writes that "throughout the Ukraine, the people were eager to take it and there was a great joy among them" (p. 36). At the same time Samovydeč is a champion of the nobles and the gentry; all his sympathies are on the side of the Cossacks living in townships and not with those on the Sič. He is a great believer in enlightenment and science.

Samovydeč is as well acquainted with European affairs as he is with Ukrainian; this is manifest in his references to the war between Austro-Hungary and Turkey in 1683-1691. He is given to moralizing and likes to appraise historical personages and their actions from the viewpoint of his own religious, social, and political convictions. His Chronicle is written in beautiful Ukrainian showing marked affinity with the vernacular. It was first published by O. Bodjański in *Čtenija* of the Moscow Society of History and Antiquities; it appeared also as a separate book in Moscow in 1846, edited by P. Kuliš. A second edition was prepared by Orest Levyčkyj (Kiev, 1878) based on several copies of the chronicle, with a very valuable introduction by the editor.¹²

¹² During recent decades the Chronicle of Samovydeč has been the subject of many studies by Ukrainian historians. At first the question of authorship attracted the scholars. On the basis of research conducted by V. Modzalevskij into the life of the Deputy General Treasurer Roman Rakuška, a prominent public figure in eighteenth century Ukraine (cf. Modzalevskij, "Roman Rakuška, odin iz dejatelej Ruiny," *Trudy Černigovskoj Gubernskoj Komissii*, X, 1913) several historians came to accept Rakuška as the author of this chronicle. This supposition was also strongly supported by the monograph on Samovydeč's Chronicle

The most interesting among the Cossack Chroniclers is undoubtedly Samijlo Velyčko, the secretary of the Zaporožian Host. We know that he began his career late in life by enrolling in the service of the Secretary General, Vasyl Leontievyč Kočubej. On various occasions he was entrusted with important official missions. In 1702 he took part in the campaign of the Ukrainian corps which was despatched to Poland to help Peter's ally, King August. Around 1704 he came to be employed permanently by the General Chancellery, where, as he himself puts it, he "was not the worst of those engaged in secretarial duties." At the end of 1708 Velyčko was dismissed from his post because of his close association with V. Kočubej, whom he always praises as "a kind, wise, and godfearing man," in contrast to Mazepa whom he calls a "Machiavelli," and "a sly fox." Later, after the Swedish war, Velyčko found shelter in the home of the Kočubejs in Dykanka, and lived there until his death, devoting himself to teaching and writing. Before his death, which occurred when he was very old, he became blind.

Velyčko was a well educated man and knew Latin, Polish, and German. After completing his main historical work in 1720, he translated from the German into Ukrainian an extensive *Cosmography* (886 pp.), which was completed in Dykanka from his dictation in 1728. This translation was signed by Velyčko, who described himself as "a true son of Little Russia, of Chazar descent, and of all servants of the Zaporožian Host the humblest." An excerpt from this *Cosmography*, dealing with the boundaries of the Muscovite state, was printed by O. Levyčkyj in *Ukraïna* in 1914.

Velyčko's main work which has earned him a distinguished place in Ukrainian historiography is known as *Škazanije o vojne*

by M. Petrovskyj (*Narysy z istorii Ukraïny*, I, *Doślidy nad Litopysom Samovydecja*, Kharkiv, 1930), and was finally approved by Michael Hruševskyj.

However, in the 1930's Lev Okinševyč expressed the opinion that the author of Samovydeč's Chronicle was Ivan Bychoveč ("Do pytannja pro avtora litopysu Samovydecja," *Narysy z socio-ekono mičnoj istorii Ukraïny*, UAN, (Kiev, 1932) pp. 1-26, while M. Voznjak ("Chtož avtor t.zv. Litopysu Samovydecja?" *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenka*, CLIII) tried to prove that the author was a Korsun Colonel, Fedir Kandyba.

The most important contribution to the study of this chronicle, apart from M. Petrovskyj's work, is the article by M. Hruševskyj: "Samovycec "Ruiny" i jevo pozdnejsie otrazenija," *Trudy Instytutu Slavjanovedenija Akademii Nauk SSSR*, I, 1932, pp. 157-193.

Kozackoj (or in full: *The Tale of the Cossack War against the Poles Begun by Zynovij Bohdan Chmelnyćkyj, the Hetman of the Zaporozhian Host, Lasting for Eight Years, and for the Poles and other States for Twelve Years. How he, Chmelnyćkyj, with the Help of Almighty God, Broke Loose with the Cossacks and Tartars from the Polish Yoke and willingly Placed himself under the Rule of the Most Illustrious Russian Monarch, Alekšej Michajlovič. Based on Works of the German Author, Samuel Pufendorf*¹³ *the Cossack Author Samuil Zorka, and the Pole, Samuel Twardowski,*¹⁴ *who Described this War in Polish Verse in his Work Entitled "Wojna Domowa," this Account is Related now in the Historical Style and in Little Russian Speech as Composed by Samijlo Velyćko, Former Secretary of the Zaporozhian General Chancellery, in the Village of Żuky in Poltava District, in the Year 1720).*

This sizable work of Velyćko has not come down to us complete; there are gaps for the periods 1649-52, and 1700-1723. Apart from the sources mentioned by Velyćko in the title, Kromer and Guagnini are also cited. The author is well acquainted with contemporary Polish and Ukrainian literature; he quotes poems, satirical verses, panegyrics, epitaphia, Gizel's *Synopsis*, and the works of Galjatovśkyj. He is also familiar with the constitution of the Polish Sejm and speeches delivered in the Sejm which were printed in Krakow in 1677, and he illustrates his work frequently with the help of quotations from poetry, epitaphs, and orations.

The manuscript begins with the continuation of the diary of Matvij Tytlovśkyj about the Chotyn war of 1620. There follows the "universal" proclamation by Ostrjanycja of 1638, a translation of Okolski's diary, a biography of Chmelnyćkyj and an excerpt

¹³ Samuel Pufendorf (1632-1694), a well known German historian and jurist. Author of *Commentariorum de rebus Suecicis libri XXVI*, (Utrecht, 1686), and *De rebus a Carolo Gustavo Sueciae rege gestis commentariorum libri VIII*, (Nuremberg, 1696).

¹⁴ Samuel Twardowski (1600-1660), Polish writer, participant in the Cossack wars. Wrote a poem *Wojna domowa z kozaki i Tatory, potym Szwedami i z Wegrzy*, published in 1681. The hero of this poem is Prince J. Wiśniowiecki and the Polish King, Jan Casimir. On the whole objective in its treatment of events, the poem was very popular among the Ukrainians. There were two Ukrainian translations of it, one by S. Velyćko, another by the secretary of the Lubni Regiment, Stefan Savyćkyj.

from Pufendorf's account of the causes of the Polish-Ukrainian wars. The narrative goes on to describe the period of Chmelnyčkyj (with an omission for 1649-1652), the war between Poland and Sweden, and the times of "Ruin," and ends with the year 1700.

The author's point of view and his political and national orientation are best expressed in his preface where he reveals the motives which prompted him to write his work and sets out his views on the task of a Ukrainian historian:

Is there anything so pleasant, kind reader, and so satisfying to the curious disposition of man, apart from his physical satisfactions, as the study of books and the knowledge of past events and human actions? I myself learned this when, being worried, I devoted myself to reading, and having learned of various human mishaps and tribulations, I have come to bear my own troubles with patience in accordance with the precept of the Bible. Moreover, having perused chronicles and histories of foreign nations, I saw in them a luminous glory unnoticed by me before.

The chivalrous and heroic deeds of our Sarmatian Cossack ancestors which equal those of foreign nations, have been left unrecorded by our writers and have been covered with a mantle of oblivion. And even if a Cossack writer wrote anything worthy, to preserve what he saw in his own time, he did this for the most part for his own use, in a few scanty words, without mentioning the causes or the results of what happened. If, in the writing of this old Cossack ancestor of ours there is anything praiseworthy, then it comes not only from our own lazy historians, but from foreign, Greek, Latin, German, and Polish historians who are difficult to translate into the Cossack language, and also impossible to obtain in Little Russia . . .

Hence, not because of idleness, but because I could not help following the old writers, I had not dared to write about the past glories of famous Cossack war leaders.

However, in the years when the mighty Swedish army was in Poland and Saxony . . . together with auxiliary Little Russian troops despatched by the Poles against the Swedes, traversing the Little Russian Ukraine from Korsun and Bila Cerkva to Volyn and into the Ruś Principalities as far as Lviv, Zamost, and Brody, I saw many towns and castles empty and deserted, and the walls constructed once by men to resemble hills, now serving as the home and refuge for wild beasts. The city walls such as I saw then in Čolnansk, Konstantyniv, Berdyčiv, Zbaraž, and Sokal, as we passed them on our way, were but little populated, some of them

quite abandoned, ruined, levelled to the ground and overgrown with weeds, only housing snakes, reptiles, and worms.

Having looked once more I saw the wide Ukrainian fields and valleys, forests and orchards, the oak groves and the ponds and lakes overgrown with moss and wild bush. Not in vain, however, did the Poles, regretting the loss of the Ukraine, call this country a paradise, because before the war of Chmelnyćkyj it was like another promised land, flowing with milk and honey.

There I saw in various places many human bones, dry and bare under the naked sky and I asked myself: Whose bones are these? My answer was: the bones of all those who died in these wastes. My heart and spirits were oppressed, since our beautiful land—the Little Russian Ukraine, which was before so full in the blessings of the world has now been turned by God's will into a desert, and our own famous forefathers have been forgotten. I have asked many old people why this has happened, for what reasons and by whom was this land of ours turned into ruin, but their replies were different and contradictory. Therefore, I found it impossible to learn from these various explanations the true reason for the downfall and destruction of our country.

In order to find an answer to these painful questions about the bitter fate of his country, Velyćko turned to the historical works of Samuel Twardowski (*Wojna Domowa*, Kališ, 1681), to Samuel Pufendorf (in Russian translation published in St. Petersburg in 1718), and to the diary of Samijlo Zorka, the secretary to Bohdan Chmelnyćkyj,¹⁵ as well as “to the annals and records of the Cossacks,” and used them as his main source of Ukrainian history. He thought his work very imperfect and at the end of his preface asked his readers to excuse and to amend the errors in his book.

Velyćko's work shows a serious attempt to combine the writing of a pragmatic history with an artistic purpose. While depicting the destruction of Lviv's surroundings by the Tartars in 1670, he borrows the description directly from Tasso's *The Liberated Jerusalem*. Equally artistic is his description of the devastation of the right-bank Ukraine under the rule of Dorošenko: “and the Ukraine fell like Babylon.” In the opinion of Ikonnikov, the work of

¹⁵ The question of the authenticity of Zorka's Diary was hotly debated by Ukrainian historians in the 1920's. While P. Klepaćkyj defended the diary as being authentic, M. Petrovskýj declared it to be forged by Velyćko. Professor Dorošenko accepts the authenticity of Zorka's work.

Velyčko is a scholarly and well systematized history of the Ukraine. Professor V. Antonovyč has stressed the fact that the inclusion of many documents from the Cossack Chancellery and archives, such as *hramoty*, proclamations, letters, treaties, adds special value to this work of scholarship. The most characteristic features of Velyčko's style are his great sincerity, his deep feeling for artistic effects, and his sense of humor. The deep patriotism of Velyčko places him with the Ukrainian chroniclers of the Kiev Period, who also lamented the destruction of the Ukraine by the Mongols.

Velyčko's Chronicle was published in 1848-1864 by the Kiev Archeographical Commission, under the title *Letopis sobytij v jugo zapadnoj Rossii v 17 v.* Sostavil Samoil Velyčko, b. kancelaryst Vojska Zaporožskogo. 1720. Izdana Vremennoj Komissiej dla roz-bora drevnich aktov. Vol. I. Kiev, 1848, pp. 454-51 — XXXVIII; Vol. II. Kiev, 1851, pp. 612 — XVII; Vol. III. Kiev, 1855, pp. XII — 568; Vol. IV. Kiev 1864, pp. XI — 407.

The text of this edition was based on the copy belonging to M. Pogodin, which, it can be assumed, corresponded with the original. Later, another copy of the Chronicle, which had belonged to H. Poletyka, was found in the library of M. Sudijenko. Ten miniature portraits of the Hetmans were added to the published edition which was edited by M. Rigelman and I. Samčevskij. The author's preface was followed immediately by the *Skazanije* and not the introductory chapters which were printed in an appendix to Vol. IV. Like Samovydeč, Velyčko wrote in good Ukrainian which he called either "the Cossack language," or "the Little-Russian speech."¹⁶

Another prominent Cossack chronicler is Hryhorij Hrabjanka, who also devotes the greater part of his work to the period of Chmelnyčkyj. Hrabjanka came from Hadjač; in 1687 he was made the regimental justice, and in 1723 he went with Polubotok to St. Petersburg and was imprisoned there. In 1729, owing to the intervention of Hetman Apostol, Hrabjanka was appointed colonel

¹⁶ The Archeographic Commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, under the chairmanship of M. Hruševskij, published Velyčko's Chronicle, I, (Kiev, 1926) as the first volume of *Monumenta Litterarum Ucrainicarum*.

at Hadjač. He lost his life in the campaign against the Tartars in 1738.

Hrabjanka was a well-read man, and had a good knowledge of foreign literature. His work is entitled *Dejstvija prezelnj brani* (or in full: *The Events of the Most Bitter War of Bohdan Chmelnyčkyj, Zaporožian Hetman, against the Poles at the Time of the Most Illustrious Polish Kings, Vladyslav and Casimir, Begun in 1648 and Not Ended Ten Years after Chmelnyčkyj's Death Composed from Many Chronicles, a Diary Written during that War and Eyewitness Accounts by Hryhorij Hrabjanka in Hadjač in 1710*).

Hrabjanka's main sources, as he himself lists them, are the following: (1) "A diary of our soldiers, written in the camp," (2) "Church and lay chronicles," (3) Gizel's *Synopsis*, works of Kromer, Bielski, Strykowski, Guagnini, Kochowski,¹⁷ Twardowski, Pufendorf, and Hibner, (4) official documents (privileges, letters, treaties, lists of Hetmans and colonels, and verses).

There are two editions of Hrabjanka's work: (a) the earlier, rich in Church Slavisms and full of verses, published by the Kiev Archeographical Commission; (b) the later, containing many russicisms, without any verses, published by Tumanškyj in 1793. The popularity of Hrabjanka's work can be seen from the fact that about twenty copies of it have been preserved.

The Events of the Most Bitter War is primarily a monograph on Chmelnyčkyj, although it contains the history of the Ukraine from the earliest times to the election of Hetman Skoropadškyj in 1708. However, the period of Chmelnyčkyj is treated in great detail, while the events preceding it are summarized in an introductory chapter, entitled *The Origin of the Name of the Cossacks and a Short Summary of their Earliest History*. In attempting to explain the origin and the name of the Cossacks, Hrabjanka polemizes with the Polish writers on the question of the name "Cossack." He disputes Kochowski's claim that the word is derived

¹⁷ Wespazjan Kochowski (1633-1699), participated in the Vienna campaign of 1683. Author of *Annalium Poloniae ab obitu Vladislavi IV Climacteres* where he deals with the events of 1648-1676.

from "koza" (goat), "since they (the Cossacks) were first occupied with the care of goats and later showed goat-like swiftness in battle." He also objects to Strykowski's assumption that "the word derives from the name of an ancient leader, Kozak, who defeated the Tartars on many occasions." Hrabjanka's own explanation is that "the word "Cossack" comes from "Kozar," an ancient Scythian tribe, which descended from Homer, the first son of Japhet." According to Hrabjanka, the Mongols, after having destroyed the Chazar Empire, began to call the "Kozars"—"Cossacks."

The early history of Kiev Ruś occupies a very short space (14 pages). It is followed by an account of the Cossacks' retreat behind the Dnieper rapids, as a result of Polish pressure. The Church Union, the Polish oppression of Ukrainians and the injustice done to Chmelnyćkyj by Czaplinski are given as the causes of the Cossack rebellions. The events of 1648-1655 are divided into twelve sections, which form the main part of the work. After Chmelnyćkyj's death, events are described only sketchily and become a mere chronological list. The ideal and the hero of the whole work is Bohdan Chmelnyćkyj.

An edition of Hrabjanka's work appeared in 1854, published by the Kiev Archeographical Commission and prepared on the basis of six different copies, one of which used to belong to H. Poletyka. Several pages depicting the dissatisfaction of the Ukrainians with the Moscow rule during the times of Brjuchovećkyj were deleted by the censorship. They were printed in 1894 by O. Lazarevśkyj in *Kievskaja Starina* (XI). Lazarevśkyj expressed doubt as to the authenticity of Hrabjanka's Chronicle, but when a new copy of it dating from 1756 was discovered in Soročynci, he accepted Hrabjanka's authorship (*Kievskaja Starina*, 1897, III).¹⁸

The writing, copying and compiling of chronicles was very widely spread in the left-bank Ukraine in the first decades of the eighteenth century. It was encouraged by the Cossack elders (staršyna) who were intensely interested in the past. Such chronicles

¹⁸ Hrabjanka's Chronicle was the subject of several studies in the 1930's. The most valuable of them is the posthumous article by M. Hruševśkyj ("Ob ukrainskoj istoriografii XVIII v. Neskolko soobraženij," *Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 1934, No. 3, pp. 215-223).

were often written or compiled by men in high office. Apart from Colonel Hrabjanka's Chronicle we also have a *Kronička* (1452-1715) written by Pavlo Polubotok,¹⁹ which was included in his diary by Jakiv Markovyč.

In the thirties of the eighteenth century there appeared a *Short Description of Little Russia* which is considered to be an attempt to change Hrabjanka's Chronicle into a didactic history of the Ukraine. Apparently with this aim in mind, the author of this chronicle tries to link the Kiev period with the Cossack period of Ukrainian history.²⁰ His style is clear and simple, free from Hrabjanka's rhetoric. In the language there are no traces of Church Slavic or Polish, although foreign words are very numerous and there is considerable Russian influence. Ukrainian is mostly manifest in phonetics. The *Short Description* was a very popular work, and Hetman Rozumov'skyj ordered a copy of it to be made and given to the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences. It was first published by V. Ruban in 1777 (*Kratkaja Letopis Malaja Rossij s 1506 po 1776 god*, St. Petersburg, 1777), under the editorship of the former Kiev colonel, Secretary Bezborodko, who added to it his own account of the events from 1734-1776, supplied an "explanation of actual methods of government of Little Russia" and appended a list of the Hetmans and high ranking Cossack officers. The *Short Description* enjoyed its greatest popularity in the second half of the eighteenth century.

It also provided the material for another historical work compiled in 1742, *Letopisec ili kratkoje opysanije* (or in full: *Chronicle or a Short Description of Important Events, and what Happened, and in what Year in the Little Russian Ukraine, on Both Banks of the Dnieper, and who the Hetman actually Was, and at what Time*). The narrative continues as far as 1737. The author belonged to the Cossack *staršyna* who were elevated after the Swedish war. He has no love for Mazepa and writes that "Mazepa perished in Bendery, in the ninetieth year of his wicked life." Similarly, in his opinion, "the memory of the perjurer and traitor, Orlyk, has faded." How-

¹⁹ Pavlo Polubotok, appointed Hetman of the Ukraine from 1722 to 1724.

²⁰ The *Kratkoje Opysanije* terminates with entries for 1734.

ever, he remembers with sorrow the fate of Baturyn, and he is very dissatisfied with the establishment of the Little Russian Board. "This Board (Kolegija)", he writes, "existed until 1728. Many worthy men were murdered and all kinds of levies were imposed and the poor people suffered from usurious practices. Such trickery was used by the members of the Board, and no record was kept of bribes accepted in cash; they milked Little Russia thoroughly" (in Antonovyč's edition, p. 55).

The author, a well educated man, knew Latin, and his language, although full of russicisms, is close to the spoken language. In his book he is reserved and modest; however, he does not like the Zaporožians, whom he accuses of robberies committed in 1663 and apparently condoned by Brjuchovečkyj. His work was published by Mykola Bilozerškyj (*Južnorusskija letopisi*, Kiev, 1856); a second edition, based on a different version was edited by V. Antonovyč (*Sbornik letopisej*, Kiev, 1888).

Of the later Cossack chronicles, all dating from the middle of the eighteenth century, the following deserve to be mentioned:

Povest (or in full: *A Tale of what Happened in the Ukraine, how it Came under Lithuanian Rule, until the Death of the Hetman of the Zaporožian Host, Bohdan Chmelnyčkyj*). It was edited and published by O. Bodjańskij in Moscow (1847).

Letopisec (or in full: *A Chronicle of Ruthenian and Polish Lands; what Happened in what Year*). This work is divided into two parts: the first, written on the right-bank Ukraine, deals with the period from 1587 to 1691; the second, written in Černyhiv, encompasses the period between 1692 and 1750. The first part is the more important for a historian. This chronicle which, in all probability, was written by three authors, is characterized by its very pure language. The general tone is objective, with very few reflections. Somko and his comrades are referred to as "martyrs." It contains many interesting details, such as the circumstances of Vyhovškyj's death, and the Turkish attack on the Krechiv Monastyr in Galicia in 1672. This chronicle has been edited several times. The first edition was prepared in 1856 by M. Bilozerškyj (*Južnorusskija letopisi*) who named the chronicle "Černyhiv" after the place in

which it was found. The second edition prepared by O. Lazarevskyj, included the part covering the period 1703-1725, which must have been written by one of the Hetman's secretaries who was an eye-witness of Polubotok's arrest.

Soon after the abolition of the Hetmanate in the Ukraine in 1764, there appeared other historical works which summarize, as it were, the periods of the independent, and later, autonomous Cossack Ukraine.

The author of the first of them is Petro Ivanovyč Symonovskýj, the staff companion (*bunčukovyj tovaryš*). He was born in 1710 or 1711, graduated from the Mohyla Academy in Kiev, and studied in Warsaw, Koenigsberg, Halle, Leipzig, and Paris. After returning home he wrote in 1765 *A Short Description of the Cossack Little Russian People and of its Military Exploits, Compiled from Various Foreign Sources: German — Büsching, Latin — Bezoldi, French — Chevalier*;²¹ and *Ruthenian Manuscripts by the Staff Companion, Petro Symonovskýj in 1765*.

Apart from the sources mentioned, Symonovskýj also used Hrabjanka's Chronicle. His work begins with the chapter on the "Explanation of the name 'Cossack'" in which he gives a brief history of the Ukraine compressed into three pages, mentions the Cossack sea-faring expedition and cites the letter of Sirko to the Sultan as a proof of the Cossack bravery. The other chapters deal with the first Hetman, Prince Ružynskýj, Hetman Pidkova, Hetman Nalyvajko, Hetman Chmelnyčkyj and other Hetmans. The chronicle ends with the description of the election of Hetman Rozumovskýj in Hluchiv on 22 February, 1750. It is obvious that the author was not pleased with the abolition of the Hetmanate, since he believed "that the termination of the Hetman government was harmful to Little Russia."

Symonovskýj's Chronicle was edited by O. Bodjanskyj in *Čtenija*, No. 2. Moscow, 1847, and also appeared separately.

Another writer of that period, Stefan Lukomskýj, was a little

²¹ Pierre Chevalier, *Histoire de la guerre des Cosaques contre la Pologne, avec un discours de leur origine, payes, moers, gouvernement et religion* (Paris, 1663). An English translation of this work appeared in London in 1672.

older than Symonovśkyj. He was born in 1701 in Uman. His father, Vasyl, fought in the ranks of Palij's army and then went over to the left-bank Ukraine. Stefan graduated from the Kiev Academy in 1730. In 1731, on orders from Hetman Apostol, he was given a post in the office of the General Chancellery; later he became the Colonel Quartermaster of the Pryluky regiment.

While still a captain at Pryluky, Lukomśkyj translated from the Polish the diary of Okolski *Of the war between Ostrjanycja and the Poles*, supplementing it with his own account of the events between 1639-1648. Later he translated from the Polish the notes on the Polish-Turkish war of 1620-21 by Tytlowski, again adding to them much of his own material. Lukomśkyj designed both these translations as an introduction to his translation of Twardowski's poem *Wojna Domowa*. At the end of his life, in 1770, when already in retirement, he wrote *Sobranije istoričeskoje (A historical Compilation from the Works of Guagnini and Ancient Chronicles)*. It comprises the period from the time of Gedymin to the end of the sixteenth century. It was printed in 1878 as an appendix to the Chronicle of Samovydeć. Lukomśkyj's translations were published earlier (1864) in the fourth volume of Velyčko's Chronicle. His autobiography was published by Orest Levyćkyj in *Kievśkaja Starina*, IX, 1890.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following list can serve only as a guide to the literature of Ukrainian chronicles of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. A complete bibliography will be found in the new edition of D. Dorośenko's *Survey of Ukrainian Historiography*, now in preparation.

- V. Antonovyč, Preface to *Sbornik letopisej odnosjaščychsja k istorii Južnoj i Zapadnoj Rossii* (Kiev, 1888).
- D. Bahalij, *Narys urkraińśkoï istoriohrafii*, II, *Kozaćki litopysy* (Kiev, 1925).
- D. Dorośenko and O. Ohloblyn, "Džerela j istoriohrafija, *Encyklopedija Ukraїnoznavstva*, II, (Munich-New York, 1950).
- M. Hruśevśkyj, *Istorija Ukraїny-Rusy*, Vol. VIII, Part 2, (Kiev-Vienna, 1922).
- V. Ikonnikov, *Opyt russkoj istoriografii*, Vol. II, Part 2, (Kiev, 1908).
- M. Maksymovyč, *Sobranie soćinenij*, I, (Kiev, 1876).

NOTES ON WEAVING IN THE TRYPILLYAN CULTURE¹ OF THE UKRAINE

NEONILA KORDYSH

Of all the products of prehistoric society, we know least about its methods of textile production because it is almost impossible to study it directly, through actual samples; instead, one is confined to the use of those materials which in one way or another reflect that industry. On the other hand, so many actual examples have been preserved of the prehistoric stone, ceramic, and bone products that it is sometimes possible to follow the process through in its entirety.

In the Soviet Union not a single study has, up to the present, been devoted entirely to the question of weaving in prehistoric society, if one excepts a brief article by A. Sidorov.² At the same time, the archaeological literature of Western Europe and America contains many works devoted to the questions of spinning and weaving in prehistoric society, based on the study of both archaeological and ethnographic materials.³

The existence of spinning and weaving in prehistoric society is made clear by the discovery of spindle-whorls, weaving weights, and also of cord designs on clay vessels. The most ancient and unique finds that give us an idea of neolithic textile production in the Trypillian culture in the territory of the Ukraine, are examples of cloth preserved until today solely in the form of imprints on the bases of vessels. After being molded and before being fired, the

¹ Trypillian Culture (III - II millennium B.C.) is one of the oldest agricultural civilizations of prehistoric Europe. Its name is derived from Trypillja, a town in the Ukraine where the first excavations of this neolithic culture were made.

² A. Sidorov, "O vitie voloknistych veščestv," *Izvestija GAIMK*, t. VI, vyp. V, (Leningrad, 1930).

³ A. Goetze, *Das Spinnen mit Spindel und Wirtel, Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*, 1896.

Emil Vogt, *Geflechte und Gewebe der Steinzeit*, (Basel, 1937).

W. La Baume, "Der stehende Webstuhl," *Prähistorische Zeitschrift*, XXIV, 1933.

Karl Brandt, "Neuerkenntnisse zu vor- und frühgeschichtlichen Webstühlen," *Prähistorische Zeitschrift*, XXVI, 1935.

O. M. Mason, *Woman's Share in Primitive Culture*, (Macmillan, 1895).

vessels were evidently placed on spread-out material to dry; as a result, after being fired, they retained the imprints of the material.

Such markings were found during excavations in the following villages: in Petreny, ⁴ near the city of Bjelcy; in Stina, ⁵ near Tulčyn, in Vynnycja province; in Romanivka ⁶ near Bila Cerkva in Kiev province; in Nezvyško, ⁷ in Horodenka district, and Bilče Zolote, ⁸ in Zališyky district, both in the province of Stanyslaviv, and also in burial mound No. 8 in the village of Kolodyste, in the province of Kiev.

These imprints make it possible for us to become acquainted with the character of the weave, the compactness of the fabric, the fineness and even quality of the thread and, in some cases, to observe the direction in which the thread was twisted. The cord designs on the walls of vases allow us to observe also the technique both of the spinning of the fibre and the inter-twisting of the threads.

In this particular article we set ourselves the task of examining textile production as it appeared in Trypillian culture. We have, therefore, limited ourselves to the study of materials that concern only this culture. In our work we have also used existing studies concerned with the various techniques of fibre spinning.¹⁰

According to the observation of A. Sidorov, there existed two methods of fibre-spinning — the manual, in the direction in which one turns a screw, i.e., away from oneself, and “mechanized” spinning with the help of a spindle which is done in the opposite

W. H. Holmes, “Prehistoric Textile Art of Eastern United States,” *Thirteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institute*, 1891-92.

Charles C. Willoughby, “Textile Fabrics from the Burial Mounds of the Great Earthwork Builders of Ohio,” *The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly*, XLVII (October, 1938).

4 E. Štern, “Dobrečeskaja kultura na jube Rossii,” (in the Proceedings of the Third Archaeological Congress in Katerinoslav in 1905) I, Moscow, 1906.

5 Excavated by S. Hamčenko (Historical Museum in Kiev).

6 Excavated by V. Kozlovška (Museum in Bila Cerkva).

7 State Historical Museum in Lviv.

8 Archaeological Museum of the Academy of Sciences in Krakow. I am deeply indebted to Professor Jaroslav Pasternak for permission to use the photograph of fabric imprints from Nezvyško and Bilče Zolote.

9 A. Spycyn, “Raskopki kurganov bliz Kolodistogo” IAK, vyp. 12, (Materials are found in the Historical Museum in Kiev).

10 A. Sidorov, *op. cit.*

direction, toward oneself. In systematizing his observations, Sidorov established the following terminology: the manual method of fibre-spinning is called the First Type, while spinning with the help of a spindle is the Second Type. In the First Type the twisted yarn or fibre slants to the right, while in the Second Type, it slants in reverse, or to the left. Spinning, that is, the ordinary twisting of the single fibre is called spinning of the First Class; twisting single threads into one thread is called spinning of the Second Class, while the spinning of a cord that consists of several double threads makes up spinning of the Third Class.

Through observation one can ascertain that if the spun thread of the First Class twists with a slant to the right, then the thread of the Second Class, made of two threads of the preceding, or the First Class, will twist with a slant to the left, inasmuch as the cord will be twisted in a direction opposite to that of the spinning of the yarns of which it consists.

Since the direction of the spinning changes to the opposite direction with every succeeding method of spinning, all the odd numbered classes of spinning (1, 3, etc.), will slant in one direction, while all the even classes (2, 4, etc.,) will slant in the other direction, with the result that in Classes I, III, etc., of the First Type of spinning, the threads will slant to the right, and contrariwise, the threads in Classes I, III, etc., of the Second Type of spinning will slant to the left. But in classes II and IV the thread will slant to the right.

It is necessary to mention that the slant of the twisted, spun threads or cords—when imprinted on the clay vases—appears in the direction opposite to that which it took in reality. For example, in spinning of the First Type, Second Class, the thread twists to the left but its clay imprint will slant in the opposite direction, to the right. It is, therefore, necessary, when studying the fabrics and cords through their imprints on clay, to make plasticine impressions or other casts, in order to get a raised image of the threads and fabrics.

Pottery of the Trypillian culture ornamented with cord designs is to be found only in the settlements of this culture's later period. Thus, in the old Trypillian settlement near the village of Jevmynka,

near Oster in the province of Černyhiv, there were to be found — together with painted pottery — vases decorated with cord designs in which there predominates spinning of the Second Type, Second Class, that is, spinning with the help of a spindle, particularly when the design resulted from the application of a single cord. Spinning of the First Type, Second Class occurred here much less frequently, in fact only in those cases where the design resulted from the application of two cords which had been twisted each in the opposite direction, forming a design somewhat like a pine tree and encircling the vase.

The same design may be observed in the materials from the villages of Buhaiivka and Bortnyči, in the province of Černyhiv, where the predominating design was made by a single cord of the Second Type, Second Class. Among these designs there are only a few examples of spinning of the First Type, Second Class, together with spinning of the Second Type, Second Class, in which case the imprints of the slant go in opposite directions.

Vessels from the village of Horodsk, in the province of Žytomir, are also ornamented with designs made from cords of the Second Type, Second Class, although one also came across single cord designs of the first type of spinning. The same type was also observed on cord-ornamented pottery from the village of Rajky, near Berdyčiv.

The predominance of spinning of the Second Type, Second Class, as well as the presence of a large number of spindle-whorls in all the above mentioned places indicates the following: (1) spinning with the help of a spindle, (2) the use of spinning of the First Type only occasionally, as the decoration of vessels necessitated it.

The fineness of the cords varied in all the places mentioned from 1.1mm to 3.9mm. The twist of the thread also varied — from an angle of 29 to 34 degrees. The materials from which the cords were made were generally fibrous plants, which made clear imprints on clay, even when it came to the separate strands.

Turning to the study of fabric samples, we will use the same method of examining the threads as we did in the examination of the pottery with cord designs.

All the fabric samples that have been preserved in the form of imprints on the bases of the vessels found in the ancient settlements of the Trypillian culture, consist of the simplest weave, the so-called "linen weave," in which the threads of the warp and the woof alternate as in linen or broadcloth.

Plasticine casts of the fabric samples gave us an opportunity to observe the direction in which the threads were twisted, the fineness and evenness of the yarn, and also the compactness of the fabric. Excavations in the settlement near the village of Stina, in the Vynnycja province have yielded six examples of fabric imprints on the bases of vessels.

Examination of Sample 1 (Table I), through a magnifying glass enabled us to observe in certain places the threads of the warp and the woof, which were twisted from two strands. The direction of the twist is to the right. It was not possible to observe the direction of each individual strand of the thread, but all the previous observation made on the materials in the Trypillian settlements, as well as the conclusions reached by Sidorov, make it possible to assume that the twist of the yarn in the First Class was in the opposite direction, that is, to the left.

The fineness and evenness of the threads in the warp varied from 0.7mm. to 1.6mm., in the woof from 0.7mm. to 1.3mm. The compactness of the fabric in the warp was 5-6 threads to one centimeter. Thus we have before us a sample of a rather rough fabric of the simplest weave, with an even distribution of threads in the warp and the woof. The distance between threads varied from 0.5mm. to 1.5mm., and therefore the fabric appeared loose in texture. Three other very similar samples were discovered.

Fabric Sample 2 (Table I), also consists of the simplest, alternating weave of warp and woof, but the texture of the material has a somewhat different appearance, because of the uneven distribution of the threads of the warp and the woof — i.e. three threads of the warp to one centimeter, and from six to eight threads of the woof to one centimeter, which lends this sample the appearance of a ribbed fabric, somewhat like rep. The fineness and evenness of the threads in the warp and woof varies from 0.8 to 1.5mm. The distance between the threads of the warp varies from 3 to



Table I



Table II



Table III

3.5mm., while the distance between the threads of the woof only from 0.6 to 1.1mm. The threads of the woof are distributed unevenly, sometimes being pushed together very closely and at other times very far apart; in the latter case it is possible to see the threads of the warp very distinctly. The twist of the threads is of the Second Type, Second Class.

Two other samples similar to Sample 2, one of them from the village of Petreny, near Bjelcy, in the province of Odessa, are also preserved.

In fabric Sample 3 (Table I), also from the village of Petreny, we find the impression of a "linen" weave fabric of a very coarse finish. The threads are adjusted very unevenly, in some places very close together, and in others quite far apart. The fineness and evenness of the threads of the warp changed from 0.7 to 1.2mm., and in some places as far as 1.5mm. The fineness and evenness of the threads in the woof varied between 1.4 and 1.5mm. The compactness of the fabric in the warp was from 4 to 5 threads per centimeter, in the woof from 5 to 7 threads. The twist of the threads was of the Second Type, Second Class.

The imprint of fabric Sample 4 (Table I), from the excavations of the ancient Trypillian settlement of a late period in the village of Romanivka, near the city of Bila Cerkva, has also been preserved on the base of a small bowl (Table II). In this case we again have a fabric of a linen weave, but of much better finish than in the preceding samples. The fabric is finer, the threads are more even, and they are more evenly distributed and adjusted closely to one another. The fineness and evenness of the threads in the warp vary from 0.5 to 0.6mm., in the woof from 0.6 to 0.7mm. The density of the fabric consists of 8 threads per centimeter in the warp, and 10 threads per centimeter in the woof. The direction in which the threads were twisted could not be ascertained.

Not unlike Sample 4 are two other samples, one from the excavations near the village of Nezvyśko, the other from the village Bilče Zolote, both in the province of Stanyslaviv. Judging from the accuracy of the imprints the raw materials for the manufacture of these fabrics were plant fibres, possibly hemp.

The only sample of a woolen fabric, Sample 5 (Table III), is furnished by an imprint on the base of a vessel of the late Trypillian period from the excavation of mound No. 8 near the village of Kolodyste, in Kiev province. Here the interweaving of the threads of the warp and the woof also alternates but differs from the rest in that, during the making of the fabric simultaneous use was made of two woofs. Thus one woof caught the thread of the warp from one side, while the other woof caught the thread of the warp from the opposite side, after which — having come together — they crossed and in the same way caught the next thread of the warp, forming, so to speak, a figure eight interwoven with the warp. It was impossible to examine the direction of the twist of the yarn. Experience convinced us that it is very difficult to make distinct imprints of a woolen thread on clay, as its nap evens out the divisions between the turns of the thread and so makes it seem loosely twisted. The fineness and evenness of the warp proved almost impossible to examine except in two places in which it varied from 0.8 to 0.9mm. The thinness and evenness of the woof varied from 1.3 to 1.6. The compactness of the fabric varied from 4 threads to a centimeter in the warp, to 4 to 5 threads per centimeter in the woof. The threads of the warp and the woof were distributed evenly, and the fabric seemed closely woven.

Several studies have been devoted to an examination of the techniques required for making fabrics of this kind.¹¹ A. Goetze while studying samples of Stone Age textiles in the Robenhausen excavations in Switzerland, concluded after a whole series of experiments that the most convenient method would be with the help of a little board, the so-called "Brettchenweberei." At both ends of this little board were openings that went all the way through, and through which were pulled both ends of the woof, which were in turn slightly lowered by weights. A hook was used to catch and pull through the freely hanging threads of the warp. The little

¹¹ M. Lehmann-Filhés, *Über Brettchenweberei*, (Berlin, 1901).

A. Goetze, "Brettchenweberei in Altertum," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, Jahrgang 40, Heft IV, 1908.

board could be turned to a 90 degrees angle, and the threads of the woof would, in crossing, catch the thread of the warp.

Objections to Goetze's assumptions have been voiced by M. Kimakowicz-Winnicki,¹² who has pointed out that in this method of weaving with the help of the little board, lower ends of the warp threads are not weighted, and that therefore every movement which would pull at the woof would also cause the warp threads to move after the woof threads, thus in reality making weaving impossible. In spite of its imperfections, however, the method of weaving with the help of the little board — experimentally tested by Goetze — is perfectly possible when it comes to the manufacture of the type of fabric we have in Sample 5.

Thus we see that all the samples of fabrics from the ancient Trypillian settlements, with the exception of one, are of the simplest, the so-called "linen" weave, which results from the interlacing of the woof with every other thread of the warp. The fabrics are frequently made of spun threads, that is, of threads which have been twisted from two spun strands with the help of a spindle. Notwithstanding the unequal thickness and evenness of the threads, and sometimes the insufficient compactness of the fabric, threads of the woof are distributed evenly in relation to each other and to the threads of the warp. This could be achieved only with the help of a special device, which will be discussed later. Let us now turn to an examination of other tools connected with spinning and weaving.

Examining the imprints on the vessels in order to see the direction in which the threads were twisted in the fabric and cords, led to the conclusion that the spinning of the thread was done with a spindle. The comparatively large number of spindle-whorls found near the excavations of Trypillian settlements confirmed these observations.

¹² M. von Kimakowicz-Winnicki, *Spinn- und Webwerkzeuge*, Mannus Bibliothek No. 2. (Leipzig, 1930).

The purpose of the spindle-whorl is to weight the spindle and at the same time to help it to turn more easily. The circular movement of the spindle is transferred also to the thread.

The spindle consists of a small wooden stick about 25-35 centimeters long, sharpened at both ends and thicker in the middle, and the whorl which forms the lower part of this small stick.

The process of spinning has been examined and described by W. La Baume,¹³ A. Goetze,¹⁴ and A. V. Cohausen,¹⁵ and their observations coincide with those that we were able to make.

Spinning, that is the transformation of wool or plant fibre into threads, occurred in the following way: the prepared combed-out fibres of flax, hemp, or wool were tied together and then attached to a fairly small stick which the spinner held under her left armpit, stuck into her belt, or attached to a chair, thus leaving both her hands free for work.

In preparation for the spinning, several fibres were pulled out of the tow, assorted according to length, and twisted together with the fingers. The resultant thread was attached to the top end of the spindle, the lower end of which was weighted by means of the whorl. Then the spindle was allowed to hang on the thread which was in the left hand of the spinner, while the right thumb and middle finger or the right thumb and the index finger of the spinner started the spindle turning.



A Spindle-Whorl
according to
W. La Baume

¹³ W. La Baume, "Das Spinnen mit der Handspindel in vorgeschichtlicher Zeit," *Blätter für deutsche Vorgeschichte*, Heft 6, 1929.

¹⁴ A. Goetze, *op. cit.*

¹⁵ A. V. Cohausen, "Das Spinnen und Weben bei den Alten," *Annalen des Vereins für Nassauische Altertumskunde*, 1879, XV.

While the spindle turned, the thread passed between the index finger and the thumb of the right hand. Meanwhile the left hand continued to pick fibres out of the tow. While the spindle turned, the fibres moved from the left hand to the right hand, passing between the right thumb and index finger, and, thanks to the circular motion of the spindle, were twisted into a single thread which was continually lengthening. As soon as the spindle and the thread reached the ground, the spinner would stop, the thread would be detached from the upper end of the spindle and would be wound around it, and then another thread would be tied to the top of the spindle which would start turning anew, and so on. The thread was attached to the top of the spindle by means of a loop which could be made with one hand, which held securely, and which could also be easily untied. It was only necessary to make sure that the upper part of the thread lay under the lower thread. The further up the spindle the thread was attached, the gentler was the spindle's turning.

One could spin sitting down, but in that case the thread came down to the ground more quickly, making it necessary to wind the thread on the spindle frequently. It was better to spin standing up. Ancient drawings show both standing and sitting spinners.

The lighter the spindle, the more essential was the whorl. If, however, many threads were wound on the spindle, then the whorl was usually removed, as the spindle, which hung on one thread, became heavier, thus increasing the risk of breaking that thread. Therefore, when the spindle was filled with thread, the whorl would be removed and placed on the next spindle.

The whorls took varying forms. Sometimes they were discs with a hole running all the way through; sometimes they were round, cone-shaped, bi-coned, onion-shaped, and so on.

A not infrequent discovery among the ancient Trypillian settlements were clay weights of different shapes and sizes with holes all the way through; there were round ones with narrow holes; round, rather flat ones with fairly large holes; cone-like shapes with holes in the narrow top part; pear-like shapes with a drilled narrow top part. The size of the weights varied from 5 to 10 centimeters in diameter. Such weights could be used both on fishing nets and

on weaving looms. There were also some groups of weights which were obviously unsuited for the rôle of fishing weights because of their inadequate firing or unsuitable material.¹⁶

M. Kimakowicz-Winnicki has examined some cone-like weights and came to the conclusion that they must have been not weighing weights but stands used in the unwinding of the threads from the spindle. According to him, during this process the ends of the spindle were placed in the horizontal holes of two such clay cones — standing at a distance from each other — allowing the spindle to turn freely while the thread was unwound. Such an assumption is permissible. In the collection of objects from the excavations of Trypillian culture at the Central Historical Museum at Kiev, there is a cone-shaped, clay weight from the excavations made by V. Chvojko, which fully confirms the opinion of Kimakowicz-Winnicki.

In the ancient Trypillian settlements there was without doubt a need for stands in which the spindle could be placed during the process of unwinding the threads. We know this through our observations of the threads of the fabrics as well as of the threads and cords as we have seen them in imprints on the sides of vases, which have shown that the fabrics, threads and cords consisted not only of spun but also of twisted threads, i.e., of two spun threads twisted together to form a double thread of the Second Class.

The process of the twisting of such a thread took place in just the same way as did its spinning, i.e., with the help of a spindle but with this difference that, in the process of making such a twisted thread, the raw material was not the combed-out wool, flax or hemp but two finished, spun threads, which were unwound from two spindles. The ends of the spindles were placed, for example, in the holes of the cone-shaped stands, while the threads were twisted together with the help of a spindle in the hands of the spinner. During this process the spindle turned, just as it did during the original spinning of the single thread.

Vessels with handles could also have been used for the unwinding of thread from the spindles. The ends of the spindles could have

¹⁶ N. Kordysh, *Rybalstvo trypiliskoi kultury*, (*Trypiliska kultura na Ukraïni*, Zbirnyk II, 2. UVAN), (Augsburg, 1949).

been placed in the handles, and the vessels filled with earth for greater sturdiness.

According to the Egyptian wall-paintings, the twisting of threads took place from threads wound into balls lying in vases for ease in unwinding.

Going on now to the question of weaving looms in the Trypillian culture, we can say that the diversity of weaving weights in the Trypillian settlements allows us to speak of a vertical weaving loom, which is more primitive than the horizontal loom, on which all the manipulations were much more complicated.

The most ancient drawing of a vertical loom is to be found in the Egyptian wall-paintings in Thebes and Beni-Hassan. The reproduction of a weaving loom with weights on a vase from Ödenburg in Hungary (Hallstatt culture) is equally famous. Also well-known are the reproduction of a weaving loom on a Greek scyphus from Chiusi, known as "Penelope's Loom," and the picture on a Boeotian vase of the fifth century B.C. of the so-called "loom of Circe," known by that name because Circe and Ulysses appear on it. Ancient German women, as well as ancient Roman women in Italy, wove on vertical looms. These looms remained in use in later times for the weaving of special clothes for festive occasions.

As for the construction of the ancient vertical looms, this is a subject occasioning considerable controversy and doubt, upon which — in this article — we will not have time to dwell.

A vertical weaving loom with stone weights from Faroern can be found in the Museum at Copenhagen. In many places in Iceland vertical weaving looms with weights were still in use during the last century, while in Norway they were preserved in many areas until 1865 and, according to the research of Emilie von Walterstorff exist up to this day in the northern part of the Scandinavian peninsula, near Lyngensfiord. Such a loom is to be found in the Museum in Stockholm where there is also a loom from Bergenhus in Norway.¹⁷

The loom of Lyngensfiord is similar to the one from Bergenhus

¹⁷ La Baume, "Der stehende Webstuhl," *Prähistorische Zeitschrift*, XXIV, 1933.

but is made of lighter wood. It consists of two posts the tops of which are notched. Across the tops of these posts lies a rotating crossbeam to which are attached the threads of the warp, which are weighted at the ends. These weights stretch the threads out and weigh them down.

In order to simplify the passage of the threads of the woof, the threads of the warp are divided into even and odd, and are pushed apart according to this division, in this way forming an opening between them, through which the thread of the woof is then passed.

On the looms found in the Museum at Stockholm the opening is formed in the following way: the even and odd threads are divided with the help of a stick, to which the even threads are tied. Such a stick is called a Schlingenstab. By pulling this stick toward herself, the weaver forms a division between the even and odd threads. Another division can be made quite differently and very simply. The odd threads are hung not quite straight but at a slight slant, and fall on a somewhat protruding cross bar, the Trennstab. If the Schlingenstab is allowed to hang freely, the even threads tied to it will return to their original vertical position, thanks to the weights which pull them down, and in this way the second opening is formed. A reconstruction of such a loom can be found in Breslau, in the Museum of Prehistoric Antiquities.

It is difficult to say how complicated in its structure the loom of the ancient Trypillian culture actually was. It is probable that it was primitive in its construction and similar to those which have been described above.

We have seen that the threads of the woof on our given samples of fabric have been adjusted to each other evenly and comparatively closely. There can also be no doubt that the warp threads, stretched out into a vertical position with the help of weights, were in addition attached to a crosswise thread passed through them, which prevented them from shifting and tangling. Such an improvement must have developed immediately after the first use of a weaving loom with a warp stretched out with the help of weights, that is, after the shifting and tangling of the warp threads which followed this process.

The presence of the weights in itself speaks of the primitive con-

struction of the vertical weaving loom and of the difficulties — for the man of that time — of creating certain details of construction which were essential in the course of the pulling on of the warp threads onto the frame of the loom. The problem lay in this: during the process of weaving, during the interweaving of the warp and woof threads, the warp threads shorten slightly, because of a slight contraction which takes place in them during their interweaving with the woof threads. The stretching out of the warp threads with the help of weights does not in any way hinder the shortening of the warp threads. On the contrary, the warp threads — stretched out on the frame — cannot make the essential shortening without the help of a special device in the shape of a “weaver’s beam” with the assistance of which it is possible from time to time to slacken the stretched-out threads of the warp.

The upper, rotating cross beam on which the threads of the warp hang is used for the rolling up of the finished fabric, at the same time lifting the warp to a height convenient for work, as usually the warp threads hang down to the ground.

It is difficult to say what was the appearance in ancient times of the instrument which was used to draw through the threads of the woof. Was it in the form of a needle or was it some other device with a spool perhaps from which was unwound the thread of the woof? Or was it simply a spindle on which the woof thread had been wound? It was passed by hand.

It is possible to assume that weaving and spinning in the Trypillian culture, which was a society of an agricultural character, were taken up when the agricultural work was over, or in other words, during the winter. The vertical construction of the loom was much more economical in terms of space than the horizontal loom, especially in the inadequate space of the Trypillian dwellings.

From an analysis of all the fabric samples which we have, as well as the weaving tools, the following conclusions can be drawn: (1) in the settlements of the Trypillian culture which existed in the third and second millennia B.C. we find primitive weaving which has nevertheless already reached a certain stage of development. We find spinning and the twisting of thread with the help of a manual spindle, and weaving carried on with the help of a vertical weaving

loom with its adaptation for the passing through of the woof thread between the warp threads, and the compressing of the woof. (2) The weaving of fabrics from cultivated plant fibres appears to be closely related to the agricultural character of society in the Trypillian culture, and points to an important variety of plant cultivation — hemp or flax, which was grown at that time. Imprints of hemp seeds were found in the clay layer of floors of Trypillian dwellings.¹⁸ (3) The absence of woollen fabrics among the discoveries made in the Trypillian settlements, with the exception of one sample from a grave of the later Trypillian period, testifies to the fact that the use of wool from domestic animals was not widespread among the people of Trypillian culture and that only later, with the increase of livestock and raw material (i.e. wool), did the production of wool fabrics gain wider acceptance. (4) The quality of the fabrics improved gradually, and at the same time there appeared a more complicated method of manufacture of materials, the so-called Brettchenweberei, the interlacing of the warp threads with a double woof aided by a little board with two openings.

Only further research will enable us to gain deeper insight into the life and culture of the people of the ancient Trypillja.

¹⁸ S. Hamčenko, "Sposterežennja nad danymy doslidiv Trypilśkoï kultury," *Trypilśka kultura na Ukraïni*, (Kiev, 1926).

IVAN VYSEŇSKYJ

DMITRY ČIŽEVSKY

1.

The turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was a difficult but productive time for the Ukraine. It is clear that the attempts at a union of the Roman Catholic and the Greek Orthodox Churches divided the people into two warring factions, since these attempts did not bring a lasting union. However, the conflicts arising from the problems of Church politics contributed considerably to intellectual life. The new Ukrainian literature began at the end of the sixteenth century chiefly with the polemical writings of both factions, the Catholics and Uniates on the one hand, and the Orthodox on the other. This abundant literature is particularly copious in comparison with that of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which left us very few original works after the flowering of the thirteenth century. During this period some collections comprising revisions of older literature were made, somewhat similar to the compilations made in the west during the late Middle Ages. The attacks by the Crimean Tartars in the sixteenth century upon many Ukrainian cities and monasteries are partly to blame for the loss of manuscripts. In part, literary works of the Ukraine were lost only after the popularity of printing, that is, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when old manuscripts were no longer considered to be very valuable. This was the time of the reshaping of the literary language: the Church Slavic of Ukrainian redaction now accepted numerous elements of the Ukrainian vernacular. It became necessary, consequently, to revise older literary works thoroughly so that they would be understood by a large circle of readers. This probably occurred in many instances. The Church Slavic-Ukrainian dictionaries which were published at that time bear out this fact (Lavrentij Zyzanij in 1596; Pamvo Berynda in 1627).¹

¹ *Ukrainian Literature* by C. A. Manning (New York, 1944) does not contain a description of this period. Hence I must refer to Ukrainian works, especially to the unfinished history of Ukrainian literature by M. Hruševskij, v. 5 (1929), and to my own *History of Ukrainian Literature*, Vol. 2 (Prague, 1942).

2.

The outstanding author of this period, Ivan Vyšenskyj, is certainly one of the most important Ukrainian prose-writers of all times. Nevertheless, very little scholarly work has been published about him.² His works are in remote and inaccessible places and not always edited correctly as far as details are concerned.³ The most important factor, his basic point of view, has not received sufficient attention in all these works. He is regarded rather as an opponent of the Union and the quotations which are used to substantiate this interpretation are always the same ones, containing a sharp criticism of the life of his spiritual and secular contemporaries. In this short essay I wish to emphasize the main features of his Weltanschauung only, in order to point out that he was a mystic and that his criticism of contemporary conditions was only an expression of his opinions about the "true Church." I can only mention in passing that he approached the views and the literary style of some of his western contemporaries as well as of earlier authors.

We know almost nothing about the life of Vyšenskyj. Neither the date of his birth nor that of his death is known. Supposedly, he was born about the middle of the sixteenth century. It is possible that he came from Galicia from a village called Vyšnja, but since several villages with that name exist, we cannot even determine his birthplace with any degree of certainty. At the end of the century we meet him as a monk on Mount Athos; his first writings stem from the last years of the century. They are epistles to his compatriots. Of course, one can suppose that he had already been on

² Besides the book by Hruševskyj, which was cited above, there is only one other book which deals with Ivan Vyšenskyj. It is Ivan Franko's *Ivan Vyšenskyj* (Lviv, 1895) which treats biographical and bibliographical questions mainly. An analysis of his style is still lacking, except for two essays by V. Peretc in *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva Imeni Ševčenka v Kyjevi* (Kiev, 1924) and in his *Issledovanija i Materialy po Istorii Starinnoj Ukraïnskoj Literatury XVI-XVIII Vekov* (*Sbornik Otdelenija Russkogo Jazyka i Slovesnosti*) *Akademii Nauk*, v. 101, 2 (Leningrad, 1928). Nor has the ideological aspect of his writings yet been investigated sufficiently (neither by Hruševskyj nor Franko). It is mentioned briefly in G. Florovskij, *Puti Russkogo Bogoslovija* (Paris-Belgrade, 1937).

³ The works of Ivan Vyšenskyj appeared in the following: *Akty Jugo-zapadnoj Rossii*, v. 2; *Arhiv Jugo-zapadnoj Rossii*, v. 7; as a supplement to the first volume of S. Golubev's book *Petr Mogila* (Kiev, 1883); *Monumenta Confraternitatis Stauropigiensis Leopoliensis*, v. 1 (Lviv, 1895); *Kievskaja Starina*, 1889, no. 4, and 1890, no. 6. I am now preparing an edition of his works on the basis of the older publications, with textual emendations.

Mount Athos for some time, but we cannot be certain, since even as a young man he could have developed his literary talent and temperament. In any event, the monks of Athos entrusted him with the composition of a letter written in their name to one of the leading Orthodox princes, Ostrožskýj. This is the only one of his works which was printed. All others circulated in copies and some of them even penetrated into the Moscow state, which had no particular interest in the Ukrainian fight for union.

Around 1606 he came to the Ukraine, but it seems this visit did not change his point of view and we can assume that he did not find any close intellectual allies at home. Otherwise it would be difficult to explain his return to the monastery on Mount Athos.⁴ There he lived for several years more, for we still hear of him in 1621. We do not know when he died, but by 1630 he is no longer among the living.

The polemicists of the time composed their apologies and their attacks in a rather unskillful way, focusing their attention mainly on secondary questions and only occasionally posing questions of primary significance concerning the conflict between Greek Orthodoxy and Catholicism. But Vyšenskýj differed from all his contemporaries in the same way as heaven from the earth. In spite of the fact that in some degree he was related to the polemicists by his style and by his themes, he differed from all of them profoundly because he was a poet by God's grace. He is the only one of his contemporaries who has not been forgotten. His popularity in a much later period was increased by the poem of Ivan Franko.

3.

Vyšenskýj had the inspiration of a true prophet. Even when treating secondary problems he was able to fit the arguments around them into a definite whole, to imbue them with a powerful spirit of biblical pathos which made his reader feel immediately that he was

⁴ Ivan Franko, the author of the only monograph about Vyšenskýj in book form, and himself an outstanding poet, gave a poetic explanation for Vyšenskýj's return which is not psychologically convincing. Franko believed that he succumbed to the temptation of continuing his mystical life. However, mystics, once they find a soil for the fight for their ideals, do not part with it so easily.

not speaking about trifles, but about the ultimate and most vital questions which confront mankind. But it was not only stylistically that Vyšenskyj rose above his contemporaries. At times he left concrete details in polemics aside, because they had already been treated by others and brought up such principles, such fundamental problems as place his polemics entirely above his own time and country. Thus, for example, he posed the question of the Christian ideal of the Church — that of the true church, not the ruling church like the Catholic one, but the persecuted and suffering church like that of the early Christians. Such a basic method of investigation refreshed and enlivened the arguments to a high degree. (Literary historians in some strange way have seen in these instances an evasion of the “main issues” of the religious conflict by Vyšenskyj).

In a peculiar way Vyšenskyj reminds us of his contemporaries to some extent by his style. These contemporaries were his opponents, although he far exceeded them in literary skill, regardless of whether this “skill” originated in inspiration or in a literary tradition. The main feature which he shared with his contemporaries was the rhetorical method, not in any negative meaning of the term, but in the sense of a definite literary form which clothed all thoughts in the form of an appeal, turning to the reader, calling out, reproaching, demanding; occasionally he also used the dialogue form, although not very often (see below regarding the “Conviction of the Devil”). However, where we might admit the influence of Latin rhetoric of the Latin school upon the polemicists from Ostroh or from Lviv, Vyšenskyj’s style, in contrast, is not all “Ciceronian,” for his opinions on Roman culture were too negative. We cannot search for sources of his literary technique in ancient rhetoric. Although his pathos was “biblical,” stylistically he does not remind us very much of the prophets of the Old Testament. Most probably he learnt something from the sermons of the Church Fathers, perhaps most of all from John Chrysostom, but even here the similarity is not very striking.

However, Vyšenskyj is distinct from his contemporaries in one aspect. It may be that he was dependent on his period and closely linked with it intellectually (the usual statements about the small degree of his education are unfounded). Yet the Renaissance as well

as the Reformation were for him merely expressions of a decline and a disintegration, of the "temptation" of Antichrist. He wished to return to the Byzantine tradition, to antiquity. Even if he belonged to the Ukrainian "Renaissance," he represented a Savonarola within the movement, one who would not hesitate, perhaps, to annihilate all the values of the new culture.⁵ Vyšenskyj did not develop his positive ideal and did not expound it thoroughly. Perhaps we might find there not only the true antiquity but also some elements of the later Byzantine mysticism which had found refuge on Mount Athos (the Hesychasts), where he spent the greater part of his life and from whence he addressed his contemporaries and compatriots. It is not by chance that of all the works of Vyšenskyj only one was printed during his lifetime — the one in which he appears as the defender of the monks of Athos, the "Athonites." The polemicists in the Ukraine did not by any means set themselves the highest aims possible, such as Vyšenskyj had envisioned. They only wanted to defend the Orthodox church from attacks, but he definitely envisioned the victory of true Orthodox Christianity over all other "sects and faiths" (a radical point of view which we later find expressed also by the foreigner Bronewski in his *Apokrysis* 1598 and in the *Perestoroha* 1605). The Ukrainian people accomplished a certain synthesis of western and eastern culture (the Ostroh school) and from year to year drew more heavily upon the treasury of the west, but Vyšenskyj did not accept anything which originated in the west. In the Ukraine there was an attempt to create those conditions in which the Orthodox church would be able to exist within the framework of the contemporary state and of the social order; but Vyšenskyj, starting from the ideals of early Christian asceticism, developed such a radical, negative criticism of the political and social conditions that its positive counterpart could only be a program of the "Kingdom of God on Earth." Not one of his contemporaries could imagine the transformation of the Polish republic (*Rzecz Pospolita*) into the kingdom of God, and if he had found real and

⁵ Savonarola was not unknown on Mount Athos, as the testimony of an earlier Greek author in Moscow, Maxim the Greek, proves to us. Maxim the Greek, however, became acquainted with Savonarola in Italy. From Italy Maxim came to Athos, where he certainly must have spoken about this man whom he admired. Perhaps his memory was preserved until Vyšenskyj's time (Maxim left Athos in 1518).

active followers, he would have become a dangerous person to his Ukrainian contemporaries. However, he did not find them, primarily because he did not propose any concrete program. His contemporaries (mistakenly) regarded him as their ally. Therefore his works were read and copied (but not printed) and it is also for this reason that they have come down to us.

4.

One of the most characteristic works of Vyšenskyj, stylistically, is also one of his earliest writings, the "Epistle to all people in the Polish land." We know of nineteen works, counting the letter of the "Athonites," already mentioned. In the "Epistle" he turns, in fact not to the Orthodox alone, but: "To you, the people of the land which is called Polish, to the living people of every age, status, and faith, to the Russian, Lithuanian, and Polish people, of separate sects and faiths, may this voice reach your ears. I announce to you, that the land upon which you tread with your feet and upon which you were brought into this life through the process of birth, and which you now inhabit, weeps before God against you, it groans and cries out, begging the Creator to send the sickle of death... to destroy you and root you out..."⁶ "Where is religion now in the Polish land? Where is hope? Where is love? Where is truth and justice in the court? Where is obedience? Where are the commandments of the Gospel? Where are the sermons of the apostles? Where are the laws of the saints? ... Let the bishops, archimandrites, and abbots be cursed who let the monasteries be ruined. They have formed for themselves estates from the holy places and together with their servants and friends lead a bestial life of fleshly, bodily pleasure. In the places where saints lie, they collect money. From their income... they give their daughters dowry (marriage-portion). They clothe their sons, they adorn their wives. They increase their servants, they acquire adornments. They enrich their friends. They build carriages. The coachmen want for nothing and harness horses which are matched. In a pagan way they display their luxury."

⁶ A motif we find already in Serapion of Vladimir (before 1274); it goes back to John Chrysostom.

“There is not a place left which is free of the disease of sin, all is an ulcer, all a wound, a swelling, all is putrefying, all is hell-fire, all is sickness, all is sin, all is a lie, all is deceit, all is cunning, all is treachery, all is guile, all is falsehood, all is illusion, all is a dream, all is vapor, all is smoke, all is bustle, all is vanity, all is delusion. Repent for the sake of the Lord, repent while you still have time for repentance! Perform your work, lead a clean life, perform deeds pleasing to God.” This, it is true, may be a most “rhetorical” quotation of Vyšenskýj’s style. On the whole, he adhered to this style during his whole life, for later he wrote mostly sermons. The main ones are: “A Council,” “Epistle to the Runaway Bishops” (1597-1598), the “Short Answer by Theodulos,” “Začapka” (“Captious Objection”), “The Conviction of the Devil, the Ruler of the World,” “Sermon about the Lie,” and finally (around 1614), “The Spiritual Theatre.”

In his literary work Vyšenskýj touched upon actual problems of the religious conflict as well (“Epistle to the Runaway Bishops”) but his writings went further than that. He spoke, just as in the passages which have been quoted, about questions which were acute then, but which in reality are problems of all times.

5.

To sum up—the ecclesiastical program as Vyšenskýj presented it to us in all his works is simple. He wanted to preserve the old ways: “Go to the general meeting of the community, follow the church canons, not adding to everything from one’s own imagination, nor subtracting; do not separate according to your opinion.” Vyšenskýj, however, even stood for the preservation of the antiquated methods. “Do not, in church, during the liturgy, pervert the Gospel and the Acts of the apostles with the common language.” Yet he still permitted sermons in the vernacular: “so that the people may understand, speak and explain simply,” but all books according to his opinion, were to be printed in the “Church Slavic” language (he put Church Slavic above Greek and Latin). He even asked, “whether it is not better for you to learn the Prayer-Book (Horologium-Časolovec), the Psalter, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Gospel and to be a simpleton who is pleasing to God, and to gain

eternal life, than to know Aristotle and Plato and to call yourself a wise philosopher in this life and go to hell? Think this over!" For him any consideration of Union was quite superfluous; he rejected it just because it was something new (playing with the words *unija*, "Union," and *junaja*, "young").

Actually he did not sound the call to battle, although he advised—"do not accept" priests who are ordained against the "rules laid down by the Church Fathers." Rome was Babylon in his eyes, the king, insofar as he supported the Union, was Nebuchadnezzar. He expected, however, salvation for every individual who followed the "old rules." Although these rules may be even "lesser rules," let "the Orthodox sit at home in truth beside their lesser rules, let them, at home, with their lesser rules respect the truth, let those at home be saved by these lesser rules, for they will certainly save them. But you, with the great rules of Skarga, do whatever you please." This is a philosophy not of battle, but rather of passive resistance.

6.

Vyšenskyj stood for the old times and conditions, for the Apostolic Acts and the Gospel and against "Aristotle and Plato," for the books in Slavic but against their "perversion" "by means of the vernacular." He put like demands in a similar way before the school; he still recognized grammar (Greek or Slavic), but further "instead of the deceitful dialectic," he proposed the *Časoslovec*, instead of logic and rhetoric—the Psalms which are pleasing to God, instead of philosophy—the "Octoechos" (*Osmoglasnyk*); he even suggested both "the sermons of the Gospel and of the apostles" which were to be studied with "a simple, not a cunning interpretation." "The philosophy of the Orthodox Peter and Paul, not of the pagan teacher Aristotle." In later years he even elaborated a plan for the printing of an "Anthology" (*Sbornik*), a collection or compilation exclusively of the words of Christ, the apostles, and the Holy Fathers, a plan which P. Velyčkovskyj only realized one hundred and fifty years later. It is not surprising that Vyšenskyj, who came to the Ukraine in the years 1605-1606, as we know from his letters, was very unfavorably impressed by the cultural westernizing movement which began at that time. In one of his last works (on a concrete

basis), he simply accused his contemporaries of a leaning towards the Latin patterns. It is true that at that time, prior to 1621, an attempt was made in the Ukraine to extend an invitation to Vyšenskyj, but it is highly improbable that he would have been satisfied with the cultural conditions of his native land if he had seen it then. It would seem that Vyšenskyj took a more conciliatory view of the new western education in his last works. We do not know his motives, and besides, a decision as to possible change must be connected with the very difficult question of dating his writings, which cannot concern us here.

7.

Actually problems of spiritual culture were not as frequent in Vyšenskyj as were themes concerning material culture and social conditions. One can see the tremendous change which the Renaissance had produced on daily life in Poland. This change was also transmitted to the Ukrainian nobility and in part took hold on the Ukrainian clergy as well. The decline of the Ukrainian clergy before the unification is well-known, but it is quite possible that this fact was exaggerated in the polemics, that it was represented as applicable to the entire clergy, although it was only characteristic of a small group. (We know that in Germany the decline of the Catholic clergy of Luther's time and the Reformation was largely a thing of the past. Yet this did not prevent that decline from playing a tremendous role in the literature of the Reformation). In any case, Vyšenskyj attacked the real crimes of "particular" persons only in the "Epistle to the Runaway Bishops." In other letters he painted a picture of the life of the clergy as a whole. This picture was perhaps true for individual cases, but individual cases did not play any significant part for Vyšenskyj; his picture was general. Yet, as we see from some of his works, the life of the laity also aroused his indignation. Generally, his ideal was beyond the range of the possible; it was a monastery for all mankind. The non-objective, hyperbolic picture painted by him is extremely interesting from the literary point of view, since it was the first attempt made in Ukrainian literature to give descriptions of everyday life, and these pictures were painted broadly and colorfully. These passages

are known and have been often quoted. We shall cite one example: Vyšenskýj was defending a monk who did not know how to carry on a worldly conversation, because he was not expert in "those many bowls, plates, the black and grey side-dishes, in red and white soups, in the many glasses and chalices, in Muscatel wines, in Malvasia, Alicante, Rovigno wines, in meads and beers," that in the "statutes, constitutions, laws, methods, and quarrels . . . he cannot discern and find room for thoughts about eternal life . . . and is never able to see the thought of eternal life in the laughter, swearing and empty chatter, redundancy, jokes, foolishness, and knavery." In accusing the bishops it was, of course, natural for Vyšenskýj to say: "You and your servants feed yourselves by the servants' labor and bloody sweat; lying down and sitting, laughing and playing, you devour your food; you distil schnapps, brew three kinds of selected beer, and you pour it into the abyss of insatiable entrails . . . Your sacks, full of their sweat, you stuff full of golden coins, thalers, half-thalers, groschen, quarters, and small coins, and you add money in strong-boxes . . . And that poor trash has no money to buy salt." "Those poor boys eat soup or borshch out of the same dish and we eat from half a dozen different dishes decked out with tasty viands." In numerous similar instances, some people have wanted to see "social protest"—actually, this was a Christian ascetic protest, as well as a protest not so much against the "yoke," as against the entire contemporary society and culture. Only at times did Vyšenskýj mention intellectual culture, but it is identical for him with "Malvasia" and "side-dishes." He was against "constitutions" and "comedies" and against carols and Christmas carols. All this, together with logic, rhetoric, Plato, and Aristotle, was outside the limits of ascetic, monastic culture.

8.

It was in the "Conviction of the Devil" that Vyšenskýj expressed his views on "the world" in a most general way, with emphasis on principles. This is a dialogue between the Devil and the "Poor Pilgrim" who represents Vyšenskýj himself. In a way it finds its parallel in the "Labyrinth of the World" by Komensky (Comenius), except that Vyšenskýj did not describe to the reader all the spheres

of the worldly life, but limited himself to depicting Christ's temptation by the Devil. From this picture of the Devil, it appears that he is the almighty ruler of all spheres of the world. "I give you all the worldly graces, glory, luxury, and wealth... If you want to be a cleric of superior rank ask me, please me and forget God... and I shall give it to you immediately. If you want to be a bishop, fall down and bow to me... If you wish to be the pope, fall down before me, bow to me, and I shall grant it to you... If you wish to be a military man, an official or a judge, falling down, bow to me and I shall grant it to you... If you want to be a commander-in-chief or a secretary... serve me conscientiously and I shall grant it to you. If you want to be a king, promise me to be my hostage in the eternal fire of hell and I will give you a kingdom. If you want to be a skilful master and craftsman, and to exceed others in skill so that you would be glorified by your neighbors and make money, come and bow before me and I shall make you wise, teach, instruct you and guide your thoughts to the perfection of all your desires. If you want to be content with bodily pleasure and be called the master of the house, the woods, and the land, come, bow before me and I shall fulfill your will. I shall bring you a wife, I shall give you a house, I shall make you a present of land... only seek me and long for me and bow to me, then I shall give you all these things." The Pilgrim answers the Devil in the name of all mankind: "What profits me this gift, if I accept this distinction from you, the Devil, who was cast down from heaven for your pride, and not from the Lord above? What profits me this ecclesiastic power when I, a serf, a slave, am tied down forever with a sin for which I shall go to hell eternally? What profit is there in this small luxury when I shall fry and bake for all time in the fire? What profit from the worldly title, if I forfeit the title to the heavenly kingdom? What profit from a kingdom, the office of a secretary, or even the rank of a general, if I forfeit the privilege of being a son of God, an immortal title? What profit shall I have from the glory and respect of my neighbor if I am not glorified among those who have pleased God? What advantage shall I obtain from the many houses and ornaments of the house if I do not look upon the beautiful courts of New Jerusalem... What good will a wife be to me

if I am not able to see Christ, the bridegroom in the chamber of my heart, to calm and rest himself there? What benefit shall I have from that small piece of earth and ground if I do not receive rewards a hundredfold in the heavenly kingdom which Christ has promised to those who forsake earthly possessions, and if I am not the heir and successor to eternal life? Know, therefore, Satan, that I do not desire from you a wife, a house, and a transitory piece of land. I do not want to bow down before you; I shall worship only the Lord God and him alone will I serve."

To be a "wanderer," a "pilgrim" (a word which Vyšenskyj used frequently) this was the only possible attitude of the Christian on this earth. Vyšenskyj would have liked to say about himself the same thing which Skovoroda said: "The world seized me but it did not catch me." The world, according to Vyšenskyj, not only "lies in sin," but is in the complete and total power of the Devil. This short dialogue shows us his attitude toward the "world" most clearly, indeed towards worldly culture in general.

9.

Vyšenskyj's Christian ideal was certainly high. The attitude he proposed towards one's neighbor shows this best. Here again, scholars have attempted to see "social protest"; yet he did not require any rules, "statutes," for the lowest classes, but a Christian brotherhood of all. "Good! Let him be a serf, a tanner, a saddler, and a shoemaker! But remember that he is like you, just like a brother in all things . . . because he was christened in the same name of the Holy Trinity, in the same way as you . . . and marked with the seal of the Holy Ghost for Christianity." It is true that Vyšenskyj sought to eliminate the differences, but he wanted to establish other, new ones: "Through his effort and by means of an active faith the tanner can be better and more valuable than you." "There is no great difference between a serf and a nobleman. Who is a serf and slave? Only he who serves this world like a muzhik, a serf and a hireling, like a slave." "Who then is a nobleman? He who turns from the slavery of the world towards God and lifts himself up to become a relative of the Holy Ghost."

The only nobility Vyšenskýj recognized was nobility of the spirit, of the soul; a mystic nobility of self-purification and enlightenment, just as the "Hesychasts" on Mount Athos discovered it in the tradition of ancient mysticism. The mystic "cleansed his soul-bearing origin and washed his spiritual vessel with tears, and polished it by fasting, prayers, mourning, miseries, labor, and effort, and sowed the new seed of theology." Purification leads to the "enlightenment of the mind, through which in turn the body becomes bright . . . after which an ineffable joy comes upon those who have become perfect, a consolation, peace, glory, celebration and triumph, as it does upon the angels." Without a doubt the ideal type of human being for Vyšenskýj was the man who had become "perfect," that is, the mystic.

"Social injustice" and "the higher learning," both are obstacles which the nobleman must overcome to achieve inner perfection. Therefore Vyšenskýj fought against them. It is unfair to portray him in each case only as a social radical and a cultural reactionary. The "radicalism" as well as the "conservatism" originated in deeper motives, the only important ones for Vyšenskýj himself, that is, from a mystical ascetism.

10.

In giving quotations to illustrate Vyšenskýj's Weltanschauung, we have simultaneously presented materials which characterize his style. He had the same rhetorical style as his contemporaries, the other polemicists. Only — we find in him considerably greater ornament. He gathered epithets, comparisons, questions, appeals. His great linguistic skill causes these accumulations to strike us in no unpleasant manner. The nouns and verbs which Vyšenskýj used are always adequate, colorful, pithy. His language is extraordinarily near to the "simple" speech. It has been pointed out already that this rhetorical quality is part of the tradition of the spiritual literature of the Renaissance. Vyšenskýj is close not only to his Ukrainian contemporaries, but also to the Polish preachers Rej, Wujek, and Skarga. Some places, moreover, remind us almost word for word of the writings of the Czech Protestant Havel Žalansky and even

more instances are stylistically similar to the works of Komensky.⁷ Yet the problem of how Vyšenskýj with his attitude of complete negation of all modern phenomena, especially of secular science, could yet be so much a part of his time, and could approach the rhetorical style of the Renaissance and Reformation, still remains. For he says quite clearly: "Let us leave Latin altogether... and let us not listen to their science! Let us not learn their devices for our refinement! Let us, before their very eyes, according to the Gospel, be — simple, witless, and peaceable!"

The spirit of the time seemingly conquered Vyšenskýj, at least as a stylist. But he is for us one of the best examples of a writer who could surpass his time, the limits of the style of his age, and his own personal outlook on the world. By the splendor of his style, by his originality, by the combination of verbosity and lightness, he typifies the best in the baroque.

⁷ Cf. the two essays by V. Peretc mentioned in footnote 2 about the likeness of Vyšenskýj's style to that of the Polish theological writers. Concerning Žalansky and Komensky cf. my note in *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* XVIII, 1943, *Lesefrucht* no. 82, pp. 382-384.

WESTERN EUROPE AND THE UKRAINIAN BAROQUE

AN ASPECT OF CULTURAL INFLUENCES AT THE TIME OF
HETMAN IVAN MAZEPA

OLEKSANDER OHLOBLYN

Ukrainian Baroque architecture of Mazepa's period has been extensively studied. Although outstanding monographs are lacking, numerous works by such Ukrainian scholars as H. Pavlučkyj, K. Šyročkyj, F. Ernst, D. Antonovyč, V. Zaloziečkyj, and V. Sičynškyj have established the main features of this architecture, have shown both Ukrainian and European origins of it, and have made some studies of individual monuments. The place of this "Cossack-Hetman" architecture in the history of art, together with its genesis and development, has been clearly defined. Hence a kind of scholarly canon has been set up, and all further work in this field conforms carefully to it, only elaborating details of the main outline. Practically no attempt has been made to return again to the source material, in part because almost all the monuments of the Ukrainian Baroque period have been destroyed, and little interest is shown in new methods of research into what has become familiar.

However, the latest researches into the times of Mazepa have raised many new problems in the fields of history and culture, and especially in architecture. The modern historian of that period is now attracted not only to further exploration of the different trends within the Ukrainian culture, but primarily to the elucidation of the reciprocal cultural influences between Western Europe and the Ukraine. This new interest has not, as yet, led to any special comparative studies and has been somewhat hampered by the inaccessibility of the sources. The following pages represent an attempt to make some small contribution to this most interesting subject by indicating some aspects of it which would repay further study.

First of all, it is necessary to define more precisely what is meant by the "times of Hetman Mazepa" and when they actually begin. Modern Ukrainian historians have rejected the view of M.

Kostomarov who placed the period of Mazepa's predecessor, Hetman Ivan Samojlovyč (1672-1687) in the epoch of "Ruin," although towards the end of it he noticed some signs of recovery. The most recent studies in the field of late seventeenth century Ukrainian economics, industry, law (especially government law) and culture (especially architecture) provide sufficient evidence for believing that the period of those achievements usually associated with the name of Hetman Mazepa, actually began much earlier, in the second half of Samojlovyč's rule, in the 1680's.

It was then that the ravaging wars in the Ukraine between Muscovy, Poland, and the Ottoman Empire came to an end. This was followed by a revival of the traditional trade relations between the Ukraine and the Baltic lands, the growth of industry, the population of the lands of the Hetman State (largely through an influx of settlers from the right-bank Ukraine) and a general stabilization of economic and social conditions. At the same time the powers of the Hetman State became more firmly established, and the tendency to create a "Cossack aristocracy" coupled with definite monarchist and dynastic views among the ruling class, became quite evident.

As was to be expected, the development of culture and art at that period reflected these social and political changes. In the opinion of V. Modzalevskyj, Hetman Samojlovyč "is one of the first initiators of new ideas in our art."¹ The most important fact, however, was that Samojlovyč was not alone in this. Modzalevskyj and several other scholars mention several facts which show that this Hetman in his approach to culture and art had the support of such prominent government and church leaders as Černyhiv Colonel (later Quatermaster General) Vasyl Dunin-Borkovskýj, the Archbishop of Černyhiv, Lazar Baranovyč² and the Prior of the Mharškyj Monastyr in Lubni, Makarij Rusynovyč.³ We can also assume

1. V. Modzalevskyj, "Buduvannja cerkviv v Lubenškomu Mharškomu monystiri v r.r. 1682-1701," *Naše Mynule*, III, 1918, p. 52.

2. V. Zalozieckyj, "Die Barockarchitektur Osteuropas mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Ukraine," *Abhandlungen des Ukrainischen Wissenschaftlichen Instituts in Berlin*, II, 1929, p. 83.

3. Modzalevskyj, *op. cit.* p. 52.

that among them was one of the Hetman's closest assistants and advisers, the General Osaul, Ivan Mazepa, the future Hetman.

It would also be misleading to think that the cultural flowering of the age of Mazepa came to an end in 1708-1709. It survived not only the Poltava disaster and the death of its patron, but also all the ravages of the Muscovite occupation of the Ukraine after the battle of Poltava. In the first quarter of the eighteenth century, during the times of the Hetmans Ivan Skoropadśkyj (1708-1722) and Pavlo Polubotok (1722-1724), the Ukraine lived on the heritage of Mazepa's age.

The two greatest and finest examples of Ukrainian Baroque architecture were the famous Kiev Cathedrals of St. Nicholas (of the Pustynno Mykolaïvśkyj Monastyr) or the so-called "Great Nicholas," and the Cathedral of the Epiphany, both of which were built on the initiative and under the sponsorship and guidance of Hetman Ivan Mazepa.⁴ They are most representative of the Ukrainian Baroque of the Hetman era and give it a definite stamp of artistic originality. They were built in the same city, the capital of the Ukraine, at the same time (first half of the 1690's), according to an identical architectural plan, and both met the same end—destruction in the 1930's by Soviet vandals.

The problem as to who was their architect is still being debated today, most scholars ascribing them to the Moscow architect of unknown origin, Osip Dmitrievič Starcev. In support of this they cite Mazepa's letter of May 22, 1693, to the Tsars Ivan and Peter which says that "a Muscovite stone-mason, Osip Dmitriev, has been commissioned to build two stone churches in Kiev, one of the Monastery of the Epiphany, the other in the Pustynny Monastyr of St. Nicholas, the worker of miracles."⁵ In a letter of October 12th, of the same year, the Tsars notified Mazepa that they ordered Osip Starcev to return from Moscow to the Ukraine and place himself at the Hetman's disposal.⁶

4. M. Voznjak, "Benderśka komisija po smerti Mazepy," *Mazepa*, Zbirnyk I, (Warsaw, 1938), p. 130.

5. M. Andrusjak, "Hetman Ivan Mazepa jak kulturnyj dijač," *Mazepa*, Zbirnyk II, (Warsaw, 1939), p. 78.

6. *Ibid.* p. 78.

It is impossible to ascertain whether Osip Dimitrievič Starcev was a Russian and a native of Moscow, or whether he was a Ukrainian from Kiev (perhaps originally Osyp Starčenko), who only worked in Moscow and was therefore called a Muscovite. It is equally uncertain whether he was the real creator of the two Kiev Cathedrals.⁷ D. Antonovyč has admitted the possibility that someone else, not Starcev, was their architect.⁸ V. Zaloziečkyj considered Starcev the builder (Erbauer) of the Kiev churches, but emphasized that "he was not the creator of this architectural conception (Bauidee)."⁹ The studies of Professors D. Antonovyč and V. Zaloziečkyj are of particular importance, since they established that the two Kiev churches "were undoubtedly patterned on the Mharškyj Monastyr,"¹⁰ or rather the Spaso-Preobraženskyj Cathedral of that monastery, which according to Zaloziečkyj, "occupies an outstanding place in Ukrainian architecture."¹¹ The Mharškyj Monastyr Cathedral was built by the architect Ivan Baptysta, who was thus the creator of a new Baroque style in church architecture in the Ukraine "which caused a complete revolution in style (Stilumschwung) in the Ukrainian Baroque architecture."¹²

The person of Ivan Baptysta is therefore of great interest. Unfortunately, very little is known about him and no Ukrainian literature on the period sheds any light on that question, not even the documentary historical study of the churches of the Mharškyj Monastyr in the seventeenth century by V. Modzalevskyj.¹³ All we know is that sometime at the end of the 1670's or at the beginning of the 1680's Ivan Baptysta worked in Vilno and that from there on the invitation of the Černyhiv Colonel, the well-known patron of the arts, Vasył Dunin-Borkovskij, he went to Černyhiv to re-

7. *Ibid.* p. 78.

8. D. Antonovyč, *Škoročenyj kurs ukraїnśkoho mystectva*, (Prague, 1923), quoted in *Mazeпа*, II, p. 78.

9. Zaloziečkyj, *op. cit.* p. 102.

10. *Ibid.* p. 101-102.

11. *Ibid.* p. 97.

12. *Ibid.* p. 96.

13. Modzalevskyj, pp. 49-80.

build the Cathedral of the Černyhiv Troičkyj Monastyr.¹⁴ It is possible that Ivan Baptisty was invited to Černyhiv on the recommendation of either the Černyhiv Archbishop, Lazar Baranovyč who knew Vilno well or of the prior Dmytro Tuptalo, who was at that time on a preaching tour in Vilno and Byelorussia.

It is a most significant fact that the Western European Baroque came to the Ukraine from Vilno. This was not accidental, since Vilno has been described by Paul Weber as "the city of the Baroque."¹⁵ Vilno also transmitted to the Ukraine other cultural influences from Western Europe, such as the art of engraving. One of the most outstanding engravers of Mazepa's period, Leontij Tarasevyč, a pupil of the well-known brothers Kilians in Augsburg (1680's), worked first in Vilno, going later to Černyhiv (1688) and Kiev (1703).¹⁶ Ivan (Inokentij) Ščyrskyj, another famous Ukrainian etcher of the same period, also moved from Vilno to Černyhiv (1683) and Kiev (1691).¹⁷ The cultural intercourse between Vilno and the left-bank Ukraine was very lively during the first half of Mazepa's rule (up till 1700). It was in Vilno, too, that Pylyp Orlyk, the future Hetman of the Ukraine, published his panegyric, *Alcides Rossijski, triumfalnym laurem ukoronowany*, in honor of Hetman Mazepa, on the occasion of the latter's victories over the Turks. It is also worthy of note that Hetman Mazepa donated "an altar (probably a silver one) to a church in Vilno," supposedly at the cost of 10,000 gold coins (zlotys).¹⁸ The role of cultural mediator which Vilno played during the periods of Hetmans Samojlovyč and Mazepa was only a continuation of a relationship of long standing.

It can be assumed that Ivan Baptisty had given satisfaction by his works in Černyhiv, since in 1684 Dunin-Borkovskýj recommended him as an experienced architect to Hetman Samojlovyč who was at that time looking all over the Ukraine and Byelorussia for someone to build the Cathedral at Mharskýj Monastyr.

14. *Ibid.* p. 53.

15. P. Weber, *Wilna, eine vergessene Kunststätte*, (Wilna, 1917), p. 33.

16. V. Sičynskyj, "Gravjurny Mazepy," *Mazepa*, I. p. 136.

17. *Ibid.* p. 136.

18. *Mazepa*, I. p. 130-131.

Samojlovyč accepted this recommendation and in the same year (1684) he entrusted Ivan Baptysta with the projected building.¹⁹ Professor Zaloziečkyj emphasizes that "the Baroque style (Gestaltung) of the Mharśkyj Monastyr is undoubtedly the result of Ivan Baptysta's designing,"²⁰ and that there exists "a great similarity between the general outline (Grundrissposition) of the Trinity Church in Černyhiv and the Church of Mharśkyj Monastyr."²¹ We know from Samojlovyč's letter to the Prior of Mhar, Makarij Rusynovyč, dated January 12th, 1684, that Ivan Baptysta showed to the Hetman in Baturyn the "outline of a Černyhiv church,"²² as a model for the future construction, although neither Modzalevśkyj nor Zaloziečkyj thought that Baptysta was the builder of the Černyhiv prototype.²³ This plan, with a few changes, was approved by Hetman Samojlovyč and *ihumen* Rusynovyč.²⁴

The building of the Mharśkyj Cathedral was started in the spring of 1684 and on April 23 the foundation stone was laid amid celebrations attended by the Hetman's sons, Semen and Jakiv Samojlovyč, and by many high dignitaries of state and church. The Hetman himself paid great attention to the progress of this edifice and assisted it with money and supplies. The building was finally completed after the election of the new Hetman, Ivan Mazepa (1687-1709). The exact date of its completion is unknown; Zaloziečkyj suggests that it was 1701²⁵ and M. Andrusjak thinks that it was even later than 1701.²⁶ Another and more probable estimate comes from V. Sičynśkyj, who suggests 1687-1688.²⁷ The Chronicle of the Mharśkyj Monastyr has the following entry for the year 1687: "On the 27th day of October the stone construction of the (Mhar) church was finished . . . all remaining work was peacefully com-

19 Modzalevśkyj, p. 54.

20. Zaloziečkyj, p. 97.

21. *Ibid.* p. 97, n. 2.

22 Modzalevśkyj, pp. 54, 71-72.

23. *Ibid.* p. 54. Also: Zaloziečkyj, p. 97.

24. Modzalevśkyj, pp. 54, 56-57.

25. Zaloziečkyj, p. 97.

26. *Mazepa*, II, p. 77.

27 V. Sičynśkyj, *Ivan Mazepa* (Philadelphia, 1951), p. 36.

pleted in the winter of 1687.”²⁸ Therefore, there can be little doubt that the construction of the Cathedral was fully accomplished before 1692 when it received the remains of St. Athanasius Patellarius, the Patriarch of Constantinople who died (1654) and had been buried in the Mharśkyj Monastery.²⁹

In the summer of 1688 a new work of construction was started at Mhar; this time a stone gate and the wooden Church of St. Michael were built, again under the direction of Ivan Baptysta. Although the date of completion of these two buildings is unknown, it can be assumed that their erection did not take a long time.³⁰ The last work of Baptysta in Mharśkyj Monastery was the building of the Refectory together with a church erected in place of an earlier church which had been destroyed by fire on June 24, 1695. From the chronicle we learn that “the master of stone building, Ivan Baptysta, a German, died” in 1700 before the Refectory was finished.³¹

It is, of course, impossible to prove that Ivan Baptysta was the architect of the Kiev cathedrals. Yet this is not unlikely; we would say it is very probable. It is obvious that Ivan Baptysta was in the service of, and at the disposal of, the Hetman.³² Although nothing is known of his whereabouts at the time the two Kiev cathedrals were constructed, his presence at Mhar was not required at that time. It is also very unlikely that Hetman Mazepa would not have consulted Baptysta on the plan of the proposed building. The most important fact, however, is that both Kiev cathedrals were modelled on Baptysta's Mharśkyj Monastery Church. What is even more interesting is that they were not exact copies of the Cathedral at Mhar, but

28. “Otryvki yz letopisi Mgarskogo monasty:ja (1682-1775),” *Kievskaja Starina*, 1889.

29. Ep. Sylvester (Hajevśkyj), “Sv. Afanazij,” *Pravoslavnyj Kalendar na rik 1949*, (Stuttgart, 1949), p. 81.

30. Modzalevśkyj, p. 65. Although the times were not very favorable for construction, it is unlikely that the building of a small church could have taken so long. According to Modzalevśkyj, the painting of the church was begun in 1689.

31. Modzalevśkyj, p. 67.

32. Such was the custom even during the rule of Hetman Samojlovych. On August 23, 1684, for instance, the Hetman commanded that Ivan Baptysta be sent immediately to Baturyn, since he was needed to supervise the erection of the church at Hluchiv. (Modzalevśkyj, p. 75).

showed some new details, which were more "Baroque" in style.³³ They show, therefore, a development of those architectural concepts which first manifested themselves in Baptysta's Mharśkyj Cathedral. Not only have they no Muscovite traces, but their entire composition and artistic beauty reflect the individuality of Ivan Baptysta. Even if he were not the actual builder of the two Kiev cathedrals, he was certainly their creator. More specific studies are needed, however, before the problem of the authorship of the Kiev masterpieces can be solved. This is all the more difficult since neither of the buildings exists today.

Professor Zaloziećkyj pointed out the similarity between the Mharśkyj Cathedral and some Baroque churches in Vilno, especially the Church of SS. Peter and Paul in the suburb of Antokol, which was built in 1668-1684 on orders of the Lithuanian Hetman, Michael Pac.³⁴ According to Zaloziećkyj this type of Baroque church architecture which he describes as "der Typus einer barocken langgestreckten Zentralkuppelanlage," was modelled on the famous Roman basilicas of Il Gesu (1584) and San Ignazio (1621-1623), and was introduced into the Ukraine by Ivan Baptysta by way of Vilno.³⁵

It is difficult to establish either the ethnic origin or the full name of Ivan Baptysta. The documents cited by Modzalevśkyj refer to him as "a German," or "of German descent."³⁶ Yet this must not be taken literally. It is not impossible that he was mistaken for a German, perhaps because he came to Vilno from Germany or because he came from Northern Italy (possibly Milan) which was then under German or rather Austrian rule. Some Italian architects of the eighteenth century who worked in the Ukraine, such as Meretini in Lviv, are even today sometimes described as Germans. What is important, however, is that Ivan Baptysta brought with him not the German but the Italian Baroque, although modified by various influences in Vilno.

33. Zaloziećkyj, p. 102.

34. Zaloziećkyj, p. 98, also P. Weber, *op. cit.* pp. 62-67.

35. Zaloziećkyj, p. 97.

36. Modzalevśkyj, pp. 53, 67.

Among the architects of the Church of SS. Peter and Paul in Vilno were two Italians, Giovanni Galli and Pietro Peretti, both from Milan.³⁷ It is not impossible that Ivan Baptysta and Giovanni Galli were the same person.

The participation of Italian architects and artists in the development of Ukrainian architecture had a long history. Petrus Italus from Lugano built the Assumption Church in Lviv in 1559. Another Italian, Petrus Crassovski Italus built the Chapel of the Three Saints in Lviv in 1578. The Italian architect Paolo Dominici, from Rome and therefore called Paolo Romano, built in 1580 the famous Kornjakt house in Lviv and was also the creator of the new Assumption Church in Lviv.³⁸ In Kiev an Italian, Sebastiano Bracci, rebuilt the Uspenskyj Sobor in Podol in 1613.³⁹ These were only a few of the many Italian artists who worked in the Ukraine at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries.

It is also known that some Italian *maestros* were attached to the court of Hetman Mazepa. The French diplomat, Jean Baluze, who visited Baturyn in 1704, wrote that Hetman Mazepa "spoke in Italian with several Italian artists who live in his residence."⁴⁰ It is most likely that these artists were architects, and we also know that Mazepa, an accomplished linguist, spoke in German to his German physicians. Although all this happened after the death of Ivan Baptysta, it is likely that these Italians at Baturyn were his pupils.

The defeat of the combined forces of Charles XII of Sweden and Mazepa at Poltava in 1709, for some time interrupted the development of art, especially ecclesiastical architecture in the Ukraine. The destruction of Baturyn and the plunder of the city's churches by the Muscovites⁴¹ did not augur a bright future for the Italian artists in the Cossack land then occupied by Muscovite armies, and

37. P. Weber, pp. 67, 125.

38. W. Losinski, *Sztuka lwowska w XVI i XVII w.* (Lwow, 1901). D. Antonovyč, *Chto buv budivnyčym Bratskoj cerkvy u Lvovi*, (Prague, 1925).

39. Zaloziečkyj, p. 85.

40. I. Borščak, "Mazepa, ljudyna i istoryčnyj dijač," *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenka*, CLII, 1933, pp. 29-30.

41. A. Lazarevskij, *Opisanie staroj Malorossii*, II, (Kiev, 1893), p. 257.

they were forced to leave the Ukraine for Western Europe. It is very likely that some of them stayed for a time in Lviv on their way back to Germany and Italy. In this connection it is interesting to note that the movement westwards, apart from the actual exodus of Mazepa's followers, did not include foreigners only. Young Mykola Chanenko, for instance, the future Ukrainian statesman, writer and author of the well-known diary, was forced to continue his studies at Lviv.⁴²

In the early 1720's two Italian architects, the brothers Giovanni Battista (or Johann Baptist) and Sebastiano Allio (or de Alio) appeared in Upper Austria and later in Bavaria. In the years 1720-1722 they worked on the reconstruction and Baroque ornamentation of the Benedictine Abbey Niederalteich on the Danube in Lower Bavaria. Their pupil was the Austrian architect Franz Joseph Holzinger who in 1722-1724 helped to ornament the famous Benedictine Abbey at Metten in Lower Bavaria, and later became the architect of many churches in Lower Bavaria and Upper Austria.

The churches built by Giovanni Battista and Sebastiano Allio have been preserved and, apart from small peculiarities dictated by different local traditions, they are very reminiscent of the Mharśkyj Cathedral and its Vilno prototypes.⁴³ They are the works of the same school, perhaps even creations of the same family of architects (Giovanni Galli—Ivan Baptysta—Giovanni Battista and Sebastiano Allio).

The historians of Ukrainian art agree that the Baroque of the age of Mazepa reflects a synthesis of the Western Baroque with the local traditional style of the older Ukrainian stone churches and the contemporary wooden church architecture. The Ukrainian Baroque embraces the pre-Mongolian churches in Kiev and Černyhiv, reconstructed during Mazepa's time, as well as newly built churches like Mharśkyj Cathedral or the two cathedrals in Kiev.

However, one cannot agree with Modzalevśkyj's contention that the Baroque style was "alien to the traditional national trends of

42. See my *Chanenky*, (Kiel, 1949), pp. 2, 4.

43 *Zaloziećkyj*, pp. 98-99.

Ukrainian architecture.”⁴⁴ Zaloziečkyj’s appraisal of the role of the Baroque in Ukrainian art is more acceptable. Commenting on the conclusions reached by Ernst and D. Antonovyč, he wrote that “the Baroque buildings in the Ukraine did not represent imported foreign forms, but were assimilated by the old Byzantine architecture in the Ukraine on the basis of common historical archetypes.”⁴⁵ While fully agreeing with this opinion, it is yet impossible to leave the problem of cultural influences there. Is it not rather short-sighted to regard these cultural influences only in terms of borrowings and prototypes?

A study of what one might call “epitypes” also seems necessary, since the Ukrainian Baroque was not self-contained, nor did it spend itself in the Ukraine alone. “The Ukraine,” according to Zaloziečkyj, “played (at that time) the main, if not the decisive part in the Europeanization of Eastern Europe.”⁴⁶ After receiving Western influences, Ukrainian art and architecture passed them on. If “the cultural development of the Ukraine is to be regarded as a component element in the all-European culture,”⁴⁷ then surely the later influences of the Ukrainian Baroque should be sought in Western Europe to which they contributed their Ukrainian share of what was but the common European heritage.

44. Modzalevškyj, p. 52.

45. Zaloziečkyj, pp. 99-100.

46. *Ibid.* p. 116.

47. D. Čyževsky, *Kulturno istoryčni epochy*, (Augsburg, 1948), p. 9.

WHAT IS A SPECIES?

The essence, the extent, and the definition of the species concept.

SERHIJ PARAMONOV

I. The diversity of opinion in the interpretation of the term “species” in biology, and the absence of a definition of “species” which could satisfy the majority of biologists, are easily understood and explained by its extraordinarily rich and diverse content.

As a rule, biologists who seek a single exact definition of “species” consider only one or a few aspects of this problem; their definitions are therefore incomplete and imperfect, and cannot satisfy the majority of biologists.

II. The term “species” can be considered from the following points of view:

1. The species *as a unit of nomenclature*, i.e. simply as name, a label (see below, IV).
2. The species *as a unit of classification*, i.e. as a standard unit in the construction of the system, a pigeon-hole (see below, V).
3. The species *as a unit of taxonomy*, i.e. as a concrete unit of measurement of similarity and consanguinity (see below, VI).
4. The species *as a biological phenomenon* — a reflection of the discontinuity in the chain of living organisms (see below, XII).
5. The species *as a biological entity*, with its own peculiar inherent characters and an existence isolated from the other species and having its own history (see below XIII).

6. The species *as a process*, i.e. as a biological, changeable unit, which in time attains to new characters and loses old ones; it either changes gradually or buds off new isolated parts, or splits into isolated parts, each part evolving into a separate species (see below, XIV).
 7. The species *as a concept*, i.e. it may be considered either as a reality or pure abstraction (see below, XV).
- III. A complete and true conception of the term "species" can be reached only after the analysis of the above-mentioned aspects of the problem, followed by a complete synthesis. It is clear that a short definition can not reflect the richness of this concept. Therefore all attempts at short definitions are vain.
- IV. The species as a unit of nomenclature is a recording formula consisting, according to the international rules, of two parts: the first consisting always of one word, the name of the genus to which the species belongs; and the second also of one word (very rarely two) which acts as the species name proper. In this manner the name of a species is binominal or binary (which is the same)—a formula for purposes of recording.
- V. The species is the basic unit of the classification, a unit which may be broken down into lower taxonomic units on the one hand and serves to build higher systematic units (or categories) on the other. Some tacitly assume that the species, as units of classification, are all of equal status (like mechanical units), but in fact this is not the case. Different species are in different stages in the process of divergence and isolation from the other species.
- VI. The species is moreover a unit of taxonomy, but its content in comparison with that in classification is defined. In classification the species plays only an abstract, merely a technical, or formal part—in taxonomy it receives definite

and concrete extent and content, based on theoretical and practical principles. From the theoretical point of view the species must be a natural (i.e. an objective) independent unit having a real existence. From the practical point of view it must be a simple, easily recognizable, convenient, unit for a practical worker (see below, VII-XI).

This is of very great importance: both sides of the problem must be solved satisfactorily or our basic unit will not be practical or have a real existence.

VII. The objective existence of the species is based on:

1. The possession of a unique combination of characters (morphological, chemical, biochemical, physiological, ecological, etc.); this totality of characters is not to be repeated in the future, nor has been in the past.
2. The presence of morphological, physiological and chorological¹ boundaries between one species and another.
3. The historical unity of consanguineous organisms under the same conditions of life and the same area.

The practical requirements of the species concept, as the basic systematic unit, are that it should be easily and exactly determinable and should reflect the details of its structure and evolutionary status in order to provide a basis for solving the very important and complicated problems that arise in practice.

Such a content for the concept of species we find in the so-called "linneon";² however we must conceive this linneon as a system of well-defined subordinate taxonomic units (see below, VII-XI).

VIII. There are two competing biological schools as regards the scope of the species: the "Lumpers" and the "Splitters." The first regard the species as a linneon; the second use

¹ Chorology — a term of Ernst Haeckel: horizontal and vertical distribution.

² A term of De Vries.

for "species" a category equivalent in extent to the subspecies of the "lumpers," or even a lower category. The first consider the species synthetically, the second analytically. In a sense both schools are right: in fact the species is a complicated system, which consists of lower, less separated and less independent units, i.e. groups of new species "*in statu nascendi*," nevertheless it presents at the present time a totality and integrity. It is necessary to reflect in our concept of species both of these aspects of the problem.

IX. In favour of the linneon the following considerations may be adduced:

1. As a rule there is an absence of morphological transitions between linneons.
2. The linneons are isolated physiologically, as a result of which crossing between two species does not occur, or if it does the offspring differ from the parents morphologically or physiologically (low fertility, constitutional weakness, etc.)
3. The areas of distribution of two linneons are independent: one can occur in the same area side by side with another, showing objectively that all that was common to the two has been lost.
4. The linneon, which develops as a complicated, but integral, historical unit, represents a certain completed stage of evolution, but, just as it becomes itself separated from its parent-linneon as a result of evolution, so it separates in due course into constituent parts; these parts diverge further and further towards ultimate separation in their turn from their own parent linneon.

The concept of the linneon as a system of subordinate units (sub-linneons) represents the evolutionary point of view: these subunits are in a certain interaction and mutual connection one with another, as is reflected by the system of trinominal nomenclature.

5. The linneons are more easily comparable than the sublinneons because the former present the completed stage of evolution, while the latter are only the preliminary phases of this process.
 6. From the practical point of view the linneons are preferable because they are more easily determined. Furthermore, the number of linneons being much smaller than the sublinneons, our memory is not taxed by too many names.
- X. The following arguments against the recognition of the sublinneons (subspecies or lower taxonomic units) as the basic unit in taxonomy are offered:
1. As a rule the sublinneons (even the subspecies) are connected by intergrading forms. Therefore difference of opinion among authors is greater when the sublinneon rather than the linneon is recognised as the basic unit. Yet it is necessary that the basic unit should be as indisputable as possible.
 2. The sublinneons are not independent units, but only parts of a certain unity, as is demonstrated by the chorological vicarity; (their distribution ranges do not overlap) two parts of one thing cannot occupy an identical position in space and, similarly, two subspecies cannot exist in the same area.
 3. The recognition of the sublinneon as the basic unit results from a mistaken search for a simple, primary unit, capable of no further subdivision. Each supposedly primary, invisible unit in fact can be divided into other smaller units. This searching for a single basic and naturally static unit is illusory and cannot give positive results: the species has a complicated structure and represents a dynamic rather than a static phenomenon.

4. If one accepts the sublinneon as the basic unit and gives it specific rank, one must use the binominal system of nomenclature. In this case the name of the species is merely pure denomination, and does not include data concerning its historical relations with other members of its consanguineous group.

Using the linneon as the "species" we use the trinominal system, which enables us to indicate the position of a sublinneon among the other sublinneons in the "system" of the species. The use of trinominal (and also polynominal) systems of nomenclature is now a *conditio sine qua non* for the modern systematist; this system is evolutionary and more discriminating than the system of the "Splitters."

5. The recognition of the sublinneon as the species sweeps away the objectively existing difference between old, invariable species and young species (*in statu nascendi*) therefore quantitative comparisons of genera with different number of species become useless.

XI. Summarizing the above points: we must accept the linneon as the basic unit, the "species." This use of "species" (with binominal nomenclature) is recommended for ordinary systematics, general biology, school textbooks and general practice.

For special systematics it is necessary to use the linneon as a complex of subspecies (with trinominal nomenclature). There are, however, particular problems in theory and practice which demand the use of still finer taxonomic units. These lower taxonomic units, denoted by a polynominal system, must always be regarded as integral parts of the linneon.³

³ A new system of lower taxonomic units can be found in my paper: "Ein neues System der niederen taxonomischen Einheiten in Form einer Bestimmungstabelle" in "Arbeiten über morphologische und taxonomische Entomologie," XI (1944), 33-40.

- XII. The species as a biological phenomenon is a constant reminder that there are breaks in the chain of living organisms, a lack of continuity in the stream of life. The organic world is not merely an undifferentiated mass, but is composed of complexes of organisms, which have an isolated existence. This circumstance demarcates the species, so to speak, from without, and serves as evidence of its objectivity.
- XIII. Being a historically-developed, natural totality of consanguineous organisms and having its own inherent characters, the species is thereby demarcated, so to speak, from within (see the definition of the species below, XVIII), and represents by itself a biological fact.
- XIV. The species is a biological process, which embraces an enormous number of generations and, although separated from the other similar processes, is regulated by the same or similar laws in consequence of the consanguinity. This process is an integral and complicated system, progressing by its own peculiarly devious ways, but finally coming to a stop. This is a consequence of either the natural elimination of the individuals composing it, or the differentiation of its component parts, which always tend to become completely separated. The process is based, on the one hand, on the physical and chemical laws of its material substance, and, on the other, on the changeable reciprocal relations between the organism and the environment. It requires time, space and various environmental conditions, and progresses irreversibly.

It is based on the existence of different potentialities of development, which can be realised in different ways under different environmental conditions. There is evidence that progression is not maintained at a regular rate, but that there are, so to speak, sudden increases in velocity which produce a new character based on the quantitative development of old characters. This is the moment of the creation of the

“new species,” so that in this respect both Darwin and De Vries are right.

XV. The species concept can be regarded:

- (1) as a sum of all the individuals belonging to the species,
- (2) as a totality of characters, which we arrive at by abstraction from the natural complex of individuals—the so-called diagnosis of the species, and

(3) as a logically based category, the species “in general.” In the first case it is a reality, like an oak forest, which represents a totality of oaks; it is purely a utilitarian concept, comprising all the individuals existing at a given time; it is really a collective unit. This understanding of the species is not common and is rarely used.

In the second case, it is a certain sum of characters abstracted from one natural totality of organisms. The sum of the characters is, therefore, based on grounds provided by nature itself and not on data invented by our intellect. It is an abstraction from individuals which really exist in nature and, therefore, the species is at the same time abstract and real. The precise sense of the concept depends on the exact connotation of the words “abstract” and “real,” and is accordingly too philosophical a problem to be discussed here.

In the third case it is an abstract concept, which is based on the two already mentioned concepts (XV, 1, 2). The logical solidity of this conception is not very great, because the grounds are not sufficiently equivalent in species belonging to different groups of organisms (Protozoa, Insecta, Mammalia).

We can not use this “species in general” as a single, logically based category, but merely as a formula for practical use, showing that in the chain of living beings there are certain ranks of similarity and consanguinity, which are analogous, but not equivalent in different groups.

XVI. It seems necessary to discuss certain fallacies regarding the species concept which are widely held by some biologists:

1. In a given group of specimens one systematist may recognize a single species, while another may claim that ten species are represented. This, of course, should not be a sufficient reason for the view that the reality of the concept of species is in doubt and that the diagnosis of a species varies according to taste.

The cause of differing opinions of this kind has already been partly explained: the "Splitters" and "Lumpers" do not agree that the species concept has the same extent. Therefore, on the one hand, the given specimens are regarded by the "Lumpers" as belonging to one species with ten subspecies, while, on the other hand, the "Splitters" regard them as ten separate species. In both instances, the number of systematic units recognized is the same, but this difference of opinion, however, is mostly caused by our insufficient knowledge of the specimens concerned; the better these are known, the less is the difference in opinion. The critic regards this temporary lack of knowledge as a permanent state of ignorance.

2. The fact that a given species having a certain complex of characters may exist for thousands of years and the transition from one species to a new species may often be quite subtle, is another reason for scepticism. An analogy from chemistry may make the point clearer. In spite of the existence of a number of intergrading forms in different chemical substances, such as isotopes, isomers, polymers, mechanical mixtures, alloys etc., the existence of separate chemicals having these varying forms is never in doubt.

The demand for a clear line of demarcation in all cases between an old species and new species is quite illogical. Since the species is a continuous historical process, with flux as an essential feature, intermediate

forms must be present as "*conditio sine qua non*." An analogy may be drawn with the ontogeny of the individual.

Thus although some organisms exist in sharply differentiated states (e.g. egg, larva, pupa, imago), there are others in which no sharp differentiation can be distinguished and development is gradual. It would be strange indeed if intergrading forms could not be found in the evolution of species. A given species can be created suddenly, *ex abrupto*, as Pallas Athene arose from the head of Zeus.

XVII. Having critically examined the different definitions of the species concept by old and new authors, the following conclusions may be reached:

1. An absolute definition of the term "species" which would satisfy the logician is impossible, because species in different groups are not equivalent and they occur at different stages in their evolution.
2. From the point of view of the evolutionary biologist the definition of "species" must reflect the dynamic nature and complicated structure of its being.
3. A definition cannot afford to be too generalised. The definition of "species" must clarify its basic features as a unit of systematics. An abbreviated definition is quite inadequate, for often the brevity of a definition is in direct proportion to its lack of content.
4. The definition of "species" should not be constructed only from the point of view of a specialized branch of biology (e.g. genetics); such a definition would be one-sided and because of the technical terminology involved would be quite incomprehensible to the non-specialist; it would also be quite impracticable since we cannot wait for genetic experiments before setting up new species.

5. The definition must apply equally to organisms with sexual and asexual multiplication.

XVIII. Summarizing all of the above points, we can propose the following definition of the species:

The species is a natural and historically-evolved totality of a series of generations, having a particular complex of hereditary morphological, physiological, biochemical, and other characters and reactions to different environmental factors, and occupying a specific area.

It differs from other similar totalities (species) by the above-mentioned characters and by virtual reproductive isolation, by its history, its tendency to further evolution, and by the area it occupies.

It is connected historically (and partly also at the present time), with its ancestral and associated totalities by intermediate forms which have no essential influence upon it at the present time. This totality is not homogeneous, but represents a complicated system of component parts — the subspecies and other lower taxonomic units. The various parts of the system are related reciprocally and always tend to separate and become isolated. Nevertheless, at the same time the totality represents a unity.

Under the influence of changeable environmental conditions, governed by physical and chemical laws, the various parts of the structure are liable to change at different rates, depending on the available time and space. Sooner or later the totality as such may disappear entirely under the influence of different biotic and abiotic factors (extinction), or be transformed into new species.

In organisms which reproduce sexually, the separation of one totality from the ancestral and associated totalities is attained when a cross fails to produce normal, homogeneous, healthy and fertile offspring, similar to the parents.

In the case of organisms that reproduce asexually, the specific complex of characters is determined more conventionally

and is based mostly on the hereditary reactions of the organisms to different factors of the environment. In both cases the specific change is irreversible and the intermediate forms have no influence on the complex of characters mentioned. If this latter condition does not apply, we are dealing not with a species, but with one of its component parts.

NOTES

A NEW FRAGMENT OF SAPPHO?

IHOR ŠEVČENKO

The unpublished *logos* on Culture¹ by Theodore Metochites is avowedly written by a minister who, drowned as he was in the turmoil of politics and in family troubles, wanted nevertheless to express his nostalgic attachment to the love of his youth—literature. In his lengthy lucubration, he points to the danger inherent in theological speculations; he entertains us with the virtues of monastic life, which, however, seem to him reserved for a chosen few. His justification of political activity has the odor of a plea *pro domo sua*. His caustic remarks directed against literary fakers jealous of a truly cultivated man allow us to make definite guesses about the intrigues going on at the court of Andronicus II.² But the bulk of his essay is concerned with the praise of intellectual activity, the advantages to be gained from intercourse with the great spirits of the past, and ways of achieving peace of mind amidst the general instability of his times. The subject lends itself to a display of erudition³—a pleasure in which Metochites indulged certainly no less than any other contemporary intellectual. In a passage on Wisdom, the true riches of man, the author asserts un-Platonically that wisdom enables us to do good to our friends and harm

1 Ἠθικός ἢ περὶ παιδείας, *Vind. Phil. Gr.* 95, fols. 189-233v.

2 The fact of the animosity between Metochites and another literary inclined minister, Nicephorus Chumnos, having been once established, (cf. I. Ševčenko, "Le sens et la date du traité 'Anepigraphos' de Nicéphore Chumnos," *Bulletin de l'Académie royale de Belgique* (Classe des Lettres), 5^e Série, XXXV (1949), 473-488) many polemical passages in Metochites' writings become more understandable.

3 Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen*, I, p. 293, has shown that some valuable information may be preserved in Metochites' ostentatious learning. Many of his historical tidbits come from Plutarch. The source of others is difficult to ascertain. To give two examples taken from *Logos* 10, we read (fol. 204^v):

καὶ Χαθρίας, ἑκατὸν μὲν ναυσὶ
τρίτος στρατηγὸς Αἴγυπτον ἀφίστη τοῦ βασιλέως· δυοκαί-
δεκα δὲ μόνος αὐτοκράτωρ, Χίους ἐπολιόρκει. Καὶ Ἰφικρά-
της ἔβδομος παραπλησίως εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ αὐτοκράτωρ
τρισὶ ναυσὶ Σηστόν παρεστῆσατο.

I do not know the source from which Metochites has taken the details of his Chabrias story. The τρίτος στρατηγὸς may be an inference from Diodorus, XV, 92, 2.3, or Plut., *Ages.*, 37. I know of no text describing Iphicrates' occupation of Sestos with three ships. If Metochites' information goes back to a lost source, it must refer to the year 356, when Iphicrates, together with Chares and Timotheos, and perhaps other generals, was in the Hellespont. (Cf. Diodorus, XV, 21, 3) The unfavorable weather conditions made a naval battle at Embata impossible. It is conceivable that Iphicrates made an independent raid on

to our enemies. Indeed, according to one saying, you cannot cause more trouble to your enemies than by having become *kalos* (and Metochites would add "and wise"). Nobody can plot against you since you live in the company of this most beautiful acquisition, superior to all others, and realizing the pure ease of life. If in addition you utilize external goods well, your existence is so much the better adorned; if not, it is still rich in the possession of this most important quality. Indeed Sappho says "Happy is he whom the Muses love," a true and irrefutable statement. Here is the relevant passage in Greek:

κᾶν μὲν ἄρα καὶ τοῖς ἔξωθεν εὖ χρῆ καὶ τοῖς ἐνταῦθα
 τοῦτοις, εὐπραγεῖς κατὰ τὸν βίον, κἀνταῦθα μάλιστα ἐπαν-
 θοῦντα τούτῳ τε καὶ κεκοσμημένον· εἰ δὲ μὴ, μὴ δ' οὕτω
 παντάσῃ πενόμενον, μῆδ' ἀτυχούντα τῶν βελτίστων, ἀλλὰ
 τῷ μεγίστῳ καὶ καλλίστῳ τῷδε μέρει πλουτοῦντα· ὄλθιος
 γὰρ αἰεὶ, ὃν Μοῖσαι φιλέοντι, φησὶν ἡ Σαπφῶ· ἀληθῆς ὁ Λό-
 γος, καὶ οὐποτ' ἐλέγχεται. ⁴

What can we make of this quotation? Theodore Metochites' writings have yielded some fragments of Simonides ⁵ and Pindar. ⁶ Wilamowitz, in a note dedicated to Metochites' Pindaric fragments ⁷ expresses the opinion that our Byzantine's source of inspiration is to be sought in a yet undiscovered moralistic collection which helped him to interlard his treatises with poetic scraps. This may also have been the source of our supposed Sapphic fragment. There are however reasons to believe that it is supposititious.

A passage of Aelius Aristides ⁸ reads: οἴμαι δέ σε καὶ Σαπφοῦς ἀκεκρῆναι . . . μεγαλαυχουμένης καὶ λεγούσης ὡς αὐτὴν αἱ Μοῦσαι τῷ ὄντι ὄλθιαν καὶ ζηλωτὴν ἐποίησαν . . .

Sestos, an unfriendly city, which was to be taken and punished by Chares three years later (cf. Diodorus, XVI, 34, 3.) W. Judeich, *Kleinasiatische Studien* (1892), pp. 288, 294, who of course does not know our passage, thinks that one of the reasons for the Athenian fleet's course toward Hellespont in 356 may have been the rebellion of Sestos. We should not attribute too much importance to Iphicrates' being called **αὐτοκράτωρ** by Metochites; this may mean that Iphicrates made the raid alone. The expression comes most probably from Plutarch.

Another explanation of this passage would be that Metochides fused Iphicrates with Chares. Still, the precise information about the three ships remains to be explained.

⁴ *Vind. Phil. Gr.* 95, fol. 232.^v

⁵ fr. 77 Bergk.

⁶ *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*, ed. A. Turyn, (Cracoviae, 1948); fr. 263-266; cf. fr. 256, to which might be added Th. Metochites, *Logos* 10, *Vind. Phil. Gr.* 95, fol. 196:

καὶ περὶ πάντα τὸν βίον ἐλπίσι συνοῦσα
 (sc. ἀρετῇ) . . . πιστὴ γηροτρόφος καὶ εὐμενῆς εἰς τέ-
 λος παραμείνασα καὶ μεταλλαττόντων οὐκ ἔλιπεν . . .

⁷ *Lesefrüchte* XCVIII, *Hermes* XL (1905), 129-130.

⁸ *Or.* 28, 51, p. 158, 12-16, ed. Keil.

Already Bergk⁹ has drawn attention to this passage in Aristides and compared with it the fragments 32 and 68 of Sappho. Diehl¹⁰ has followed his example. It seems probable that Metochites has "reconstructed" his Sapphic verse from the text of Aristides. His familiarity with the rhetorician went beyond what might be expected from a Byzantine man of letters. For Metochites was the author of an essay comparing the respective skills of Demosthenes and Aristides.¹¹ His ability to write in fantastic Aeolic and in Doric has been amply proved by his own poetical attempts.¹²

⁹ PGL, 4 ad fragm. 10.

¹⁰ Anthologia Lyrica, ad fragm. 10.

¹¹ Ἐπιστάσια καὶ κρίσις τῆς τῶν δῶα ρητόρων εὐδοκιμῆσεως, τοῦ τε Δημοσθένους καὶ Ἀριστείδου, *Vind. Phil. Gr.* 95, fols. 356-364.

¹² Cf. p. ex., M. Treu, *Dichtungen des Grosslogotheten Th. Metochites*, Gymnasialprogramm Potsdam, 1895. For full information on the manuscript tradition and literature concerning Metochites' poems, cf. I. Ševčenko, "Observations sur les recueils des discours et des Poèmes de Th. Metochite," to appear in *Scriptorium*, 1951.

A HOARD OF ROMAN GOLD MEDALLIONS AND SILVER OBJECTS DATING FROM THE "MIGRATION OF PEOPLES" FOUND IN VOLHYNIA IN 1610

VALENTINE SHUHAYEVSKY

I.

The problem of the influence of Roman culture in Eastern Europe, particularly in the Ukraine, is almost untouched in Russian and Ukrainian scientific literature. Very important material, accumulated up to the present time, consisting of large quantities of finds of Roman coins and archival information referring to them, as well as numerous collections of articles of Roman life, taken from the so-called "burial fields," remains of towns and of villages of the period, supplemented also by accidental finds—all this material has hardly been studied. But little has been done towards clarifying the causes of the movement of Roman culture towards the east of Europe and its definite territorial distribution. The material has not yet been studied in a systematic way. Such study requires the preliminary, systematic publication of the materials. So far only sporadic attempts at publication of the material have been made. Such publications though far from complete are valuable since they may serve as a basis for future complete publication, for they usually state the facts about finds and indicate where data on them can be found.

Among such publications are preliminary reports regarding excavations where Roman household objects were discovered (for instance, V. V. Chvojko's excavations of burial fields in the region of middle Dnieper); corresponding references in the "Records" of the former Imperial Archaeological Commission; some publications and records of museums and scientific societies; and finally archaeological maps of separate gubernias in the pre-revolutionary Ukraine. There are also materials of similar nature published by such archaeologists as Beljaševskij, Antonovyč, Secinskij, Danilevič, Orlov, and others. Information given in all these publications is general, summary, mostly either a mention or an enumeration of some finds and discoveries. This fact, i.e., the absence of substantial, systematized publications of necessary materials—primary sources—explains, in the main, the general lack of study of the general problem of the influence of Roman culture in Eastern Europe, and the failure of the separate attempts to solve one aspect of this problem, namely the appearance in the Ukraine of enormous quantities of Roman silver coins of the first to third centuries A.D. These attempts were more or less failures since they were based on superficial impressions rather than on a close study of the evidence. There remain to be studied not only large

hoards of Roman coins belonging to the first to third centuries A.D., but also scattered finds of coins and household objects of a later period, the third to fourth centuries A.D.

Of particular interest are the combined finds of relics of Roman culture and relics of a non-Roman culture. These non-Roman articles may give help in the determination of how and why Roman culture came to the Eastern European plain. Some mixed finds of this kind, because of the character of the objects and their combination, supply the investigators with material for fixing dates and solving various problems. It would be expedient to publish first of all such finds as basic materials for study.

The work of which a summary appears below is an attempt in this direction. It aims to establish the Roman origin of the numismatic part of an extremely important hoard of numismatic and archaeological relics, which was found in Volhynia at the beginning of the seventeenth century. This work also tries to explain and classify this find as far as this can be done from documents. Because of its value the find became the object of a prolonged judicial proceeding in the first quarter of the seventeenth century. As a result a whole series of documents was accumulated, which supplied adequate description of all the objects. This description is sufficient to enable one to explain in the main some of these objects and to assign to them and to the whole find a definite place among the cultural objects found in the Ukraine. The systematic study of the numismatic relics of this find yields important conclusions which have a bearing on the whole question of Roman coins found in the Ukraine. The find, as a whole, confirms the fact of the meeting, which was only indicated before, in the Ukraine and the establishment of definite relationships between Roman culture and the outlying branches of a culture of another, probably Germanic, origin.

Although this find has been published previously, it was then presented in such an inaccurate and distorted way that another study was necessary to correct the errors of the first publication.

II.

A peasant serf working on the land of Michael Voino-Oranśkyj Las-kovo village, Vladimir district, Volhynia, in the Polish Ukraine in 1610 found in the earth a hoard which consisted of eighteen gold and silver objects. According to the description given in two documents contemporary with the time of the discovery of the hoard and pertaining to it, the objectives were as follows: (1) Silver cup (goblet); (2) two silver objects, resembling crayfish, bound with a thin gold layer and adorned with garnets; (3) Four silver gold-plated plates; (4) Four silver crosses; (5) Four large gold coins with eyelets, each weighing twelve ducats; (6) Two gold coins, also with eyelets, each weighing eight ducats; (7) One gold coin with a small eyelet,

weighing four ducats, which resembled the "Head of St. John" (that was the popular name given by the Ukrainians and Poles to the Roman denarii of the first to third centuries.)

This hoard was purchased from the finder by a local man, but was taken from him by Misevskyj, the burgraff of Vladimir, from whom it was taken later by the prince Januš Ostrožskyj, who was the starosta of the place. Voino-Oranśkyj prosecuted Misevskyj by law, regarding the return of the treasure, appraising it at one thousand Polish "zlotys." The latter however presented the receipt of the prince Ostrožskyj to the effect that he had received the treasure, and the court freed Misevskyj from any responsibility. What the fate of the hoard was is unknown, though it seems to have remained for a time in the possession of the prince Ostrožskyj. Mrs. E. I. De Vitte, a historian, after she discovered in the Central Kiev Archives of Ancient Acts a number of documents referring to the court proceedings, studied them and tried from the descriptions of the objects in the hoard to establish what kind of things they were, and to what time they belonged. Since she did not possess sufficient archaeological and numismatic knowledge she was unable to solve the problem satisfactorily. She refused to try to identify the large and medium gold coins, and she considered that they must have formed part of a rich princely necklace of the twelfth to thirteenth centuries A.D. As to the



Gold Medallion of Emperor Flavius Julius Constans (d.350)
Found in the Ukraine

smaller coin, she thought it might have been Roman, "of the time of the Emperors," without indicating which ones. The objects resembling crayfish were, perhaps, Gothic fibulae of the first to second centuries A.D. Here De Vitte only repeated the opinions of such scholar-archaeologists as Professor Spicin and Countess Uvarov. The silver plates she thought might have been originally "rezana," i.e., equal to one-fiftieth of the ancient Russian "grivna," the silver ingot with the monetary function, which later received a different name. The whole hoard consisted, therefore, according to Mrs. De Vitte, partly of ancient Roman and Gothic objects, and partly of ancient Russian ones dating from the eleventh to thirteenth centuries A.D.

The author of this article believes that the definitions given by Mrs. De Vitte as well as her general conclusions are quite unacceptable. He has submitted the descriptions found of the principal objects, namely those resembling crayfish, and the gold coins, to a thorough archaeological and numismatic analysis. He has considered also the whole question of such finds. He has come to the following conclusions:

(1) The articles resembling crayfish, ornamented with garnets, are fibulae of the so-called Gothic type, the kind found in 1873 near the town of Nižyn, Černyhiv gubernja, in the Ukraine, in the hoard with the Roman denarii of the first to the third centuries, or similar to those in the famous hoard of Szilagysomlyo in Hungary. The time to which these fibulae belong is not before the end of the third century, or more likely the fourth century, A.D.

(2) The gold coins of all three sizes are Roman gold medallions of three denominations, of three, six, and nine solidi, belonging to the time of Constantine I and his sons, perhaps even to the later years of the fourth century.

(3) The other objects can not be so exactly defined, but the fact that they were found together with fibulae and Roman gold medallions completely harmonizes with the general composition of the barbaric hoards of Eastern Europe of the last decades of the fourth century.

This hoard, especially when considered in connection with other finds in the same area, is of the greatest interest to historians of Eastern Europe. It helps to establish the migratory routes of barbaric tribes in Eastern Europe.

The author takes this opportunity to reproduce the gold medallion of nine solidi of Constans (323-350) which was in Kiev in the possession of some private person at the beginning of the twentieth century; its whereabouts at present is unknown. The author supposes that it had been found somewhere in the Ukraine, possibly on one of the properties of the Kiev-Pečersky Lavra, and that later as a part of its "Skarb" (the monastery's treasury) it was stolen and sold to a private person.

A NEW COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES

JURY ŠERECH

[André Vaillant, *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*, Tome I. Phonétique. Lyon and Paris: Edition IAC, 1950, 320 pp.]

A study in comparative grammar nearly always represents the result of research over a long period of time aimed at a new synthesis of methodological as well as factual findings. The first monumental work in comparative grammar of the Slavic languages was by F. Miklosich and it represented the early research of the so-called Neogrammarian school of Slavic philology which concentrated on gathering the facts without much regard for theory and generalization. The second outstanding comparative grammar of Slavic, that by W. Vondrak, represented the final stage of development of Neogrammarianism, when so many facts had been gathered that some sort of generalization was imperative, although scholars were on the whole reluctant to attempt it. Since the appearance of Vondrak's grammar many new linguistic facts have been established, and many new theories and schools of thought have arisen. It is enough to mention the pragmatist approach of L. Bloomfield, the Prague phonological school of N. Trubeckoj and R. Jakobson, and the group of scholars like V. Brondal and L. Hjelmslev in Copenhagen. They all prepared the ground for a new comparative grammar of Slavic languages.

The first volume of A. Vaillant's work, published last year, and dealing with phonology, could not have appeared in its present form twenty years ago. It owes much to the latest developments in Slavic philology and general linguistics. However, the author is not uncritical of new theories; on the contrary, he is extremely cautious in accepting them and often prefers to remain on the side of the old, although somewhat outdated theories. In spite of the author's conservatism, his book is different from the grammars of Miklosich, Vondrak, or Mikkola.

For reasons of space it is impossible here to consider Vaillant's comprehensive, and, in some respects, original work in detail. We shall limit ourselves, therefore, to a consideration of some of his main conclusions as well as to his use and interpretation of Ukrainian.

For the first time in a comparative grammar of Slavic languages, the languages are not considered by Vaillant separately, as self-contained entities, but in their mutual relationship, as component parts "dans l'ensemble du système linguistique" (p.20). This approach shifts the main interest from the hypothetical reconstruction of a common proto-language to historical

and more recent characteristics of languages: "La grammaire comparée n'a d'ailleurs pas comme tâche unique, ni principale, de remonter au plus profond dans le passé et l'histoire récente des développements parallèles des langues slaves, sur laquelle on est bien mieux renseigné, est tout aussi intéressante, et plus instructive, que celle de leurs lointaines origines." (p. 12).

This also entails a decision to regard sound changes not as purely physiological phenomena, i.e. merely as changes produced by the organs of speech, but as part of the historical development of the nations and their cultures.

At the present state of linguistic research it is difficult to apply these principles consistently. Thus, for instance, the change of *g* into *h* in Czech, Slovak, Upper-Lusatian, Ukrainian, and White Ruthenian is explained by Vaillant as a result of systematic alternations of consonants; following the pattern, of *ch:š*, *g:ž* became *h:ž*. This did not happen in Polish, since there *g:dz* was not parallel with *ch:š* (P. 33). This shrewd explanation, however, does not suffice when we consider that in North Russian, Serbian, and Bulgarian *g* did not become *h*, although there, too, on the one hand there is the alternation *ch:š* and on the other *g:ž*. Sometimes, while giving several possible explanations of such sound changes, Vaillant cautiously prefers to avoid a definite conclusion (e.g. the explanation of the origin of *i*, *u*¹ in Slavic — p. 126). At other times, however, the author, contrary to his own method, is prepared to accept purely physiological explanations, ignoring the system of a language. Thus the phenomena of *cokanje* and *masurism* are explained simply as results of difficulties which speakers find in differentiating the three sibilants *c é, ě* (p. 41). On another occasion the author maintains that closed vowels are *en principe* shorter than open vowels (p. 125). Ease of pronunciation (p. 210) becomes for him an important factor in the development of a language.

Yet, as is well known, the ability to pronounce a language is a matter of habit. A series of sounds which are very difficult for the speakers of another language to pronounce does not present any difficulty to those speakers who are accustomed to them. Even if one agrees with the author as to the rôle these factors play, then surely they remain constant, and a constant factor cannot explain developments and changes. Finally, for each of these factors one can find examples in contradiction. One example will suffice. Vaillant maintains that "l'assimilation de sourde à sonore et inversement est spontanée" (p. 101). However, this assimilation is often unknown in some languages, or of two possible cases of it only one is taken. Thus, Ukrainian assimilates a voiceless sound to a voiced one which follows it (*prošba* — *prožba*), but not vice versa (*ķnyžka*, never **ķnyška*). The direction of an assimilation can differ and is conditioned by the system of a language, not by some universal law.

Hesitation in matter of principle is evident also in the analysis of the

¹ The two Slavic reduced vowels are for technical reasons reproduced here as *i*, *u*.

historical development of Slavic languages. Let us take, for instance, the problem of the classification of Slav languages. Following the old tradition, Vaillant divides them into three groups: Eastern (or russe), Western, and Southern. He writes "cette division en trois groupes est nette; dans son développement historique et même dans son état actuel, le polonais est beaucoup plus proche du tchèque que du russe avec lequel il voisine; la parenté des trois langues du groupe russe est étroite, comme celle de trois dialectes d'une même langue, et leurs dissemblances bien petites en comparaison de l'énorme étendue qu'elles occupent" (p. 18). Yet further he cites the historical facts of tribal migrations between these three groups, assumes the Polish origin of the East Slavic tribes of Radymyči and Vjatyči (which is highly doubtful, in spite of the opinion of the Chronicler), and accepts the original union of the Serbs and the Lusatians-Sorbs, as well as the participation of Croatian tribes in the formation of the Czechs, Poles, and Russians (as a matter of fact, of Ukrainians). Here one might also mention the influx of Du(d)liby into the Czechs and Ukrainians, and the part played by these tribes in the development of Eastern and South Slavic peoples (cf. G. Vernadsky, *Ancient Russia*, p. 310).

These historical facts alone make the traditional tri-partition of the Slav peoples difficult to accept. Many of the common features of each group are derived not from the prehistoric divisions, but from cultural relationships during the course of history. For instance, the features common to the Balkan group are now well known; the common features of Polish and Czech can be explained in great part by the fact that these languages were within the Central European community of languages. Many of the peculiarities of Ukrainian and White Ruthenian which set those languages apart from Russian also arise from their participation in this Central European sphere, although only peripherally.

The problem of lingual unions and their consequences to the languages concerned is not totally ignored. The author notices, for instance, the similarity of sound change development in Czech and in German (p. 122). However, the problems of relationships and ties between languages during the course of historical development, the creation and dissolution of lingual unions and regional contacts are, on the whole, as untouched by Professor Vaillant as they were by the Neogrammarians. Thus the author seems to ignore the presence of features of one group of languages in another, for example West-Slavic characteristics in Ukrainian. Both Ukrainian and White Ruthenian develop groupings *ij uj* into *yj(ij)*, in contrast to Russian which has the corresponding *oj, cj*. In order to demonstrate the unity of the Eastern Slavic group, Vaillant puts forward the completely unfounded contention that the Russian forms *drugoj* were recreated in place of *drugyj*—*drugij* on the model of *drugoje* (neutr.); on the other hand he ascribes to Ukrainian *i*-stems only the ending *-ej* (*nočej*), while many western Ukrainian dialects have *yj*, (*nočyj*) (p. 139). While discussing the correspondence of the suffix *-ěnu* in West and South

Slavic languages to the suffix *-jan* in East Slavic (p. 147) the author does not mention the presence of both these suffixes in Ukrainian (e.g. *kamjanyj* and *kaminnyj*). Because of the loss of the initial *i*, Ukrainian approaches the West Slavic group (*imja*, but *maju*) (p. 140); the common development of the (*u*)*l*, (*i*)*l* group into *ol* in East Slavic languages (p. 176) can be questioned, because of the early change of *l* to *u* in the group of dialects which formed Ukrainian (e.g. *vovk*, *dovhyj*), certainly before the disappearance of weak reduced vowels or even before the borrowing of the word *polk*, in which in Ukrainian and in White Ruthenian alike, *l* does not change to *v(w)*. Such examples, from nearly all the Slavic languages, could be multiplied. The rigid adherence on the part of the author to the tri-partite division of Slavic languages simplifies the general picture of their development. At the same time, however, it does not cast any light on the interpenetrating relations and influences between these languages and leads in the end to such strange conclusions as those which seemingly postulate common general tendencies in the development of all Slavic languages (p. 100), whereas the history of this development shows that in a comparatively short time all the Slavic languages diverged very far from their common origin and formed their own independent systems.

Another feature of Vaillant's book which places it in the same category as the work of the Neogrammarians is the recognition of Church Slavic as the oldest of all Slavic languages and closest to the Proto-Slavic. The author regards Church Slavic as "état de transition entre le système du slave commun et ceux des langues slaves modernes" (pp. 104-105). This is an old misunderstanding. The fact that Church Slavic came to be recorded earlier than all the other Slavic languages does not prove at all that it is structurally the oldest. Yet according to Vaillant himself, the White Ruthenian and Russian *aķannja* is an older characteristic and does not appear in Church Slavic. In almost every Slavic language one could find individual archaic features or even larger elements which were lost by old Church Slavic.

In particular the author's treatment of the origin and age of the Ukrainian language is not very satisfactory. In opposition to Vondrak, and supported by the earlier work of Miklosich, he places Ukrainian as a separate language and devotes considerable space to it, though perhaps not enough to show its complete development. In some instances the Ukrainian material is used erroneously. While giving the correct pronunciation of *hora*, Vaillant supposes that this word is written *gora* (p. 33) which may be true in the Russian alphabet, but not in Ukrainian. Some transliterations of Ukrainian words are inaccurate: *rosti* (158), *ogoń* (187), *gulja* (195) instead of *rosty*, *ohoń*, *hulja*. Sometimes non-existent or illiterate forms of words are given, such as *loķoť* (159), prefix *riz-* parallel with *roz-* (159); *ķol* (173), *ķrastī* besides *ķrasty* (234) instead of *liķoť*, *roz-ķlo*, *ķrasty*. Dialectal forms are often not distinguished from literary ones: *čelen* (157) *veremja* (250). The Ukrainian word *cholop* does not mean "paysan" (p. 165). The words *sereda*, *polon*

(154, 164) do not represent, as is claimed, Russian equivalents, since literary Russian knows only *sreda*, *plen*. Equally erroneous is the contention that Ukrainian pronouns in the third person drop *n*- after prepositions. This is only true of the central Dnieper Ukrainian dialects. The final mute consonants in the word *došć* cannot be explained as "finale assourdie" (p. 209), since this is foreign to the Ukrainian literary language as well as to most Ukrainian dialects. The form *od* of the preposition *vid* in an unaccented position is to be explained as the influence of Northern Ukrainian dialects (cf. V. Hancov, *Zapysky istorično — filolohičnoho viddilju*, UAN, IV p. 132), and not as a polonism (p. 306).

Some parts of Vaillant's book could have been given much greater force if the supporting material available in Ukrainian were properly used. Apart from the Russian redaction of Church Slavic, the Ukrainian Orthodox (up to the eighteenth century) and the contemporary Greek Catholic editions (p. 20) might also have been mentioned. In the survey of the evolution of *e* (p. 117) the very characteristic North Ukrainian development is not mentioned. Not only Church Slavic (p. 219), but Ukrainian also shows the ending *-ši* in the second person sing. pres. of verbs, otherwise in modern Ukrainian we would have **beriš*, **dajiš*, and not *berěš*, *daješ*. The linguistic phenomena of Ukrainian also make it imperative to revise the theory of intonation of the ending of nom, acc. du. held by the author (p. 248) in common with the French Slavists Tesnière and Unbegaun, especially when the views of van Wijk and Bulachovskij are taken into account. While saying that the Slavic verb preserves well the alternation *o:a* (p. 300) it would be as well to mention that in Ukrainian it has almost disappeared except for a few words like *dopomohty-dopomahaty*. Ukrainian, however, preserves the old alternation *šveč-ševcja* (p. 306), and the stress in the Ukrainian verb *hovoryty* is the same as in Serbo-Croatian (p. 307).

It would be unjust, however, to attach any blame for these inaccuracies and omissions to the author. On the contrary, he should be congratulated for including so much Ukrainian material. The real reason for the neglect of Ukrainian in modern Slavic philological studies is surely the lack of any authoritative work on the Ukrainian language, its history, and its dialects in a language which would make it accessible to all Slavists. The only study of such a kind, the *Grammatik der ruthenischen (ukrainischen) Sprache* by S. Smal Stočkyj and Th. Gartner is now almost completely out of date. Until such a work appears, the responsibility for the inadequacy of the treatment of Ukrainian in comparative Slavic grammar must fall chiefly on Ukrainian scientific institutions which ought to have published a scientific grammar of Ukrainian in one of the world's main languages. In the prevailing state of affairs it can be said that Vaillant is, on the whole, well acquainted with Ukrainian.

In his book there appears one basic problem upon the solution of which many answers concerning the Russian and White Ruthenian languages (the

latter is sadly neglected by the author) depend. The problem is, how old is the Ukrainian language? We do not propose to solve this problem here, yet the inconsistencies which are revealed in Vaillant's treatment of this question must be pointed out.

At first he writes that Ukrainian crystallized as a language soon after the twelfth century. "Les premiers textes à traits vieux-russes de Kiev et de Novgorod notent des parlers *d'une même langue qui se divise ensuite en ukrainien et grand-russe*" (p. 21, my italics). This view corresponds with the traditional opinion of most Russian Slavists, and is now officially accepted in the U.S.S.R. Yet it is being disputed by those theories of the phonetic development of the Slavic languages which Vaillant for the first time sets out in his book. Hence the question is reduced to the following alternatives: either Vaillant's theories are mistaken, or else he must revise his view of the time of origin of Ukrainian and place it in an earlier period.

This inconsistency is chiefly obvious in the section dealing with *aķannja*. It is generally agreed that the theories about the origin of *aķannja* in Russian and White Ruthenian, advanced by such scholars as Šachmatov, Durnovo, and Avanesov, are not convincing, and therefore some scholars (e.g. Bulachovskýj) cautiously avoided any discussion of this problem. According to Vaillant, *aķannja* is not an innovation, but a preservation of an old Balto-Slavic feature, though only in an unaccented position. This is a daring view which might help toward the solution of the weaknesses of all theories of *aķannja* which postulate its late origin. Without attempting to discuss Vaillant's view in detail, we should like to point out that no Ukrainian document shows traces of *aķannja*. This would mean that, if *aķannja* is an old feature, Ukrainian dialects out of which the later Ukrainian language emerged, had lost their *aķannja* in prehistoric times; that is, even at that time their phonological system differed basically from Russian. Therefore one must either reject Vaillant's theory of the origin of *aķannja* or else his view of the late formation of the Ukrainian language (cf. pp. 107, 109, 234).

Such a conclusion is dictated also by other considerations. Closely connected with this supposition of Vaillant's is the appearance in Ukrainian of *v* before *o* (e.g. *vohon'*) which links Ukrainian to Czech, Lusatian, Polabian, and White Ruthenian (p. 187), but sets it apart from Russian. We have already mentioned the change of *l* into *v* (*w*) after *u*. The lengthening of *o* as seen in the Leka dialect, which appears in many Russian dialects (pp. 265-266) but is unknown in Ukrainian, is not of late origin. It is common knowledge that full-vocalism is typical of all East Slavic languages, but the word (Russ: *serebro*; Ukr: *sriblo*) which Vaillant chooses as his example (p. 166) shows the different characteristics of full-vocalism in the eleventh century. This cannot be dissociated from the so-called Second Full-vocalism which is typical for the oldest texts from Russian lands, but is absent in the texts which come from Ukrainian territory. If one accepts Vaillant's view that in Russian Full-vocalism of the type *torot* developed from *trot* by insertion of a

vowel before *r*, then in Ukrainian, contrary to Vaillant's contention, the original type would be *torot* with insertion of a vowel after *r*, which although giving the same result (*torot*) in the end, shows two different processes of arriving at it. This is the only possible explanation of the fact that in Ukrainian the second vowel was shorter and did not therefore change to *i* (*moroz*, not **moriz*, but *dorih*). It is true that Vaillant, in order to prove the uniformity of this development in all the East Slavic languages, puts forth a hypothesis that "le développement de cette voyelle nouvelle a rendu plus brève la voyelle suivante" (p.166), yet there is no evidence for such an explanation which could possibly apply only to single syllables. Here, once more, the author's theories are at odds with his view of the late origin of Ukrainian.

Finally, we should like to devote a little space to a discussion of contractions in the Ukrainian language. It is agreed that contractions are more consistently applied the further west the respective Slavic language is found. There are contractions in the middle of Czech words (*bati se, pas / bojati se, pojasu; zna, wa, meho, dve/dvoje*). In Russian there are none of these contractions. Polish is closer to Czech, but in the numeral the uncontracted form (*dwoje*) is found. In Ukrainian there is a partial contraction in the verb and pronoun (*zna* besides *znaje; moho* besides *mojoho*; but always *tvoja*). Although Vaillant points out contraction in adjectives (*nova*), it is not quite clear whether this is a contracted form, or the result of the influence of the pronominal declension (*ta*), not unlike the influence of the adjective on the pronoun—resulting in forms like *taja, cjaja*. Contractions in Ukrainian are comparatively recent phenomena and give no clue as to the origin of Ukrainian; yet they stress its position between the East and West Slavic languages.

There is no greater hindrance to the proper study of Russian, than an inability to separate the linguistic facts of Russian from Ukrainian and White Ruthenian. They were at one time confused by the Russian scholar A. Sobolevskij (*Lekcii po istorii russkogo jazyka*) who was perhaps influenced by political tendencies. Since then not a single Russian Slavist has had the courage to separate these facts; although attempts to do this for the later period made by Unbegaun (sixteenth century) and Bulachovskij (seventeenth century) have been quite successful. As a result of this, the history of the Russian language is overloaded with facts which have no place there. This naturally makes any comparative study of the Slavic languages all the more difficult, as we have seen in Vaillant's book.

We have tried to discuss very briefly some controversial material in this work. At the same time we should like to pay tribute to the French Slavist, whose study is rich in illustrative material, contains new and often brilliant theories, and is characterized by freshness and originality of approach. It is undoubtedly the most valuable work produced in this field in recent years and therefore deserves serious and fundamental criticism.

SOVIET INTERPRETATION OF A UKRAINIAN CLASSIC

PETRO ODARČENKO

[*Lesja Ukraïnka*. Sobranie sočinenij v trech tomach. Perevod s ukraïnskogo (Collected Works of Lesja Ukraïnka in three volumes). Edited by M. Ryl'skyj, N. Braun, and A. Dejč. Moscow, 1950, 3 Vols.]

The first impression, on a cursory examination of this edition of the selected works of Lesja Ukraïnka in Russian translation, is favorable. These three beautifully bound volumes leave little to be desired in their outward appearance. Among the editorial staff we find the names of most distinguished scholars who have provided long introductions and extensive notes to each volume. The actual translation was undertaken by an equally prominent group of Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev poets who, according to the preface "have set themselves the task of transmitting the union of deep poetic feeling and high artistic form" of the original. It must be said that some of the translators have acquitted themselves well in this difficult task. Perhaps the best is the translation of *Izolda Biloruča* by P. Antokolskij; the translations by M. Komissarova and N. Ušakov also reach a high standard. It would be too abstruse to attempt to discuss here the merits of these Russian translations of Lesja Ukraïnka since an analysis of that kind would have to be based on concrete examples which cannot be reproduced in English. However, apart from some reservations as to the purely poetic effects of these translations, there is an obvious attempt to manipulate the translation for political purposes. One example of such a "free" translation will suffice. A literal English translation of one of the stanzas from *Robert Bruce* would read:

If you'll defend the freedom
And independence of your people,
(*volju i samostijmist narodu svoho*)
We shall forever esteem you
And love you as our friend.
(*i ljubyty jak druha svoho.*)

In Russian translation this stanza reads:

If you will defend the freedom
 And unity of the fatherland,
 (*jedinstvo rodimoj strany*)
 We shall forever esteem you
 As sons of a beloved father.
 (*kaķ otca dorogogo syny.*)

By such a simple trick Lesja Ukraïnka's ideal of an independent Ukraine, which permeates *Robert Bruce*, has been changed to the Soviet imperialist ideal of the "unity of the fatherland" with "a beloved father" at its helm.

Most interesting in this respect, and revealing of the Soviet method of literary falsification, is the third volume of the collected edition which contains the poetess' correspondence. Here many letters have been printed in a truncated form, while many others have been omitted altogether. Among the latter are some of Lesja Ukraïnka's most important letters which reveal most clearly her political and social outlook. There are, for instance, none of her letters to M. Drahomanov, whose ideas had a great influence on her intellectual development. Comparing some of the letters included in this Russian edition with their Ukrainian originals which had been published previously, one can find numerous examples of falsification and tendentious omissions. In the original letter to M. P. Kosač (1889) we read, "Nemolovskýj told me . . ." but in the Russian translation of it we find "One told me . . ." Apparently Nemolovskýj, who was a friend of the Kosač family and later became a prominent Ukrainian Social Revolutionary, has been condemned to oblivion by the Soviets. In another letter to M. P. Kosač (Nov. 26-28, 1890) Lesja Ukraïnka made a list of works intended for translation into Ukrainian. Amongst others, the works of Slowacki are listed. However, while in the original we read "Slowacki's poems and his *Mazepa*," in the Russian translation this passage is rendered "Slowacki's poems." The name of *Mazepa* does not appear. Another omission is the name of the Ukrainian poet Oleś in Lesja Ukraïnka's letter to her mother, dated Nov. 10, 1907, for the Soviets regard that poet as a Ukrainian nationalist.

However, the most revealing omission is that of a letter in which Ukraïnka expressed her opinion of Karl Marx. There is no doubt that the editors of the Russian edition knew this letter, since a reference to it may be found in A. Hozenpud's *Teatr Lesi Ukraïnky* (1946). On p. 11 of that book we read that "in 1897 she (Lesja Ukraïnka) first acquainted herself with Marx's *Capital* (letter to her sister, Olha, dated Aug. 30, 1897)." However, Hozenpud did not dare to quote from that letter, and in the present edition there is no reference to it at all. The real reason for this

silence is the fact that in that letter Lesja Ukraïнка not only disclosed her first acquaintance with Marx but also expressed her frank opinion of his work. She simply stated that she "did not like this new gospel."

The Soviet attempt to misinterpret the work and ideas of this outstanding Ukrainian writer can be seen in similar crude falsifications evident in the selection of the works. The first volume contains lyrical and descriptive poems. It might seem that at least in this volume the editors would be able to preserve scholarly objectivity. However, following the clear controlling pattern of the latest Party directives, they have carefully omitted all poems which either refer to the liberation of the Ukraine from Muscovite rule (*Slavus Sclavus, Hebrew Melodies, Jeremiah's Lament, Israel in Egypt*) or else are "cosmopolitan" in content (*Sappho, The Last Song of Mary Stuart, Iphigenia on Tauris*). The uncompromising attitude of the editors can be seen when they left out a lyrical verse entitled *To Lady L. W.*, not so much because of its content but because of the sinister sounding title.

A selection of Lesja Ukraïнка's dramatic works makes up the second volume. Two dramatic poems dealing with the Babylonian captivity (*Babylonian Captivity, On the Ruins*) are excluded since they are allegories on the Muscovite rule in the Ukraine. *The Orgy*, a similar work has also been omitted. *The Noblewoman* which delivers the sharpest attack on Muscovite despotism and brands as traitors all who try to co-operate and compromise with the tyrants, has met with a similar fate. From the introduction to the second volume by A. Dejč it would seem that he is not even aware of the existence of this work. His analysis of another of Lesja Ukraïнка's works *In the Wilderness* is on the same barren level. According to Dejč, Godvinson, the hero of this play, is "an ancestor of the present American obscurantists, the upholders of the same reactionary theories of the bourgeoisie at the time of its disintegration and moral decay." In fact, however, the hero and the theme of the work pose a different problem, which, curiously enough, is very close to the present Soviet reality. The problem is that of the freedom of art in society, and the conflict between Richard Iron and the community may well be compared to the conflicts which some Soviet writers have with the Party.

The whole preface is centered on two points: (1) a complete disregard of Lesja Ukraïнка's debt to Western European literature; (2) an endeavor to show her dependence upon the Russian writers. While following this dictated "Ždanov line," the author of the preface achieves some of his worst distortions.

Having ignored the influences of Heine, Maeterlinck, Ibsen, and Hauptmann on Lesja Ukraïнка, A. Dejč does his best to show the beneficent influences of Russian literature. "In her poetic search," he writes, "the poetess was guided by the best examples of Russian classical poetry." Puškin, Lermontov, and Nekrasov are cited as her teachers. For Gorky, however, is

reserved the role of her mentor. Not only Lesja Ukraïнка's lyric poem *My Longing Has Gathered into a Black Cloud* but also her *Butterfly* are traced back to Gorky's *Song about the Falcon*. The one fact which A. Dejč seems to have forgotten is the date of the *Butterfly*; it was written in 1889, and published in 1890, that is five years before Gorky wrote *Song about the Falcon*.

It is sufficient to read the letters which appear in their censored version in the third volume to realize that, contrary to Soviet claims, Lesja Ukraïнка found her inspiration primarily in Western European literature. She was not only thoroughly acquainted with German, French, English, and Italian literature which she read in the original, but was deeply interested in Western intellectual life. In a letter to her brother Michael (3rd vol. 151-157) she draws up a list of works intended for translation into the Ukrainian. In it we find that the Russian works are far outnumbered by Western European authors.

Turning to the letters which do not appear in the present edition, we can find even greater evidence that Lesja Ukraïнка's opinion of Russian literature was not very high. In a letter to M. Drahomanov (March 17, 1891) she writes that she is "bored by translating Tolstoy and Uspenskij." In the same letter she complains that "our Ukrainian community is far too dependent on the Russian press and therefore does not see the outside world," and notes with satisfaction that "there are some young people here who have come under the spell of "westernism" and begin to learn French, German, English, and Italian, in order to be able to read these literatures." The more Lesja Ukraïнка saw of Western Europe the less she liked Russia. "We Ukrainians, are always unhappy in Muscovy," she wrote to M. Drahomanov on March 9, 1890, and in another letter to I. Franko (3rd vol. p. 269) she confessed that "she esteemed Puškin's *Onegin* although she did not like it." Her favorite Russian authors were Nadson, Garšin, and Korolenko, but nowhere in her correspondence do we find any mention of Gorky—surely a sign that she was not captivated by him.

One could multiply these instances of perverted Soviet interpretation and show without great difficulty how utterly false is the prefabricated picture of Lesja Ukraïнка which emerges from the Russian edition. While no one can charge the Soviets with actual suppression of Ukrainian classics, this latest falsification of Lesja Ukraïнка points to a far greater danger. For the last three decades the Soviets have tried consistently to reinterpret Ukrainian literature of the past centuries. They have created their own Soviet versions of Ševčenko, Franko, and Kociubynskyj. The present attempt to misrepresent Lesja Ukraïнка reveals, however, on the one hand the crude method of censorship, and on the other hand the stiffening rigidity of the Communist doctrine of the superiority of Russian culture. While every vestige of that national feeling which permeates all Ukrainian classics is being eradi-

cated, at the same time the European heritage of Ukrainian literature is now assailed and distorted, and the non-existent "Russian influences" repeated *ad nauseam*.

Readers in the Soviet Ukraine have to rely entirely on such Soviet editions of their greatest writers. Soon they may be told that these Ukrainian writers were not only inspired by Russian authors, but actually were Russians who wrote under Ukrainian pseudonyms.

BOOK REVIEWS

Theodore Shabad, *Geography of the U.S.S.R. A Regional Survey*.
New York: Columbia University Press, 1951, 584 pp.

In spite of the several handbooks of the geography of the U.S.S.R. now available to American students, there is no single work on the subject which could be called entirely satisfactory. In view of this, the recent book by T. Shabad assumes a greater importance. It differs from its predecessors in its emphasis on the political and economic factors in Soviet geography. It also contains many new data, especially on the growth of Soviet industrial centers.

The author uses the Soviet sources with criticism and caution, yet at the same time he is at their mercy. It is no wonder, therefore, that this objective book shows some traces of dependence on Soviet propaganda. The impossibility of obtaining any information on such items of Soviet economy as labor or population further hinders the work of a Western geographer of the U.S.S.R. Therefore, the estimated population figures and the labor statistics, which do not take into account forced labor, must be viewed as approximate.

The author stresses the dynamic qualities of Soviet geography and economics. "The rapid progress of industrialization," "the altering of the physical landscape," are phrases frequently used, reminiscent of Soviet publications. The Soviet "dynamic developments" embrace also the annihilation of whole autonomous republics, the deportation of population on a gigantic scale and unknown losses in human lives.

The "dynamic" measures during the forced collectivization in the Ukraine cost millions of Ukrainian lives. It may be said, of course, that since there are no figures for these losses, they cannot be included in any scientific books. They should at least be mentioned; to ignore the human element is, after all, also unscientific.

The author pays much attention to Soviet planning, but he fails to see that in the totalitarian state planning is often a disguise for violence or a propaganda ruse. The author's excursions into history are too brief to be truly informative. He writes that "in the very first days of the revolution of 1917, the national autonomous units were the first to herald the present administrative structure. The Russian S.F.S.R. and the Ukrainian S.S.R. were first proclaimed in 1917: . . . in December, 1922, the Russian and the Transcaucasian S.F.S.R. and the Ukrainian and the Belorussian S.S.R. joined the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . ." (p. 44) It is not clear from this which revolution is meant: the democratic revolution of February 1917, or the Bolshevik Revolution of October, 1917. The national republics were proclaimed in the wake of the first revolution. The Bolshevik Revolution in

1917 found little support in the non-Russian republics and imposed its rule on them by force after a long and bitter war. One simply cannot discuss these events in terms of "organization," or "federation." These are euphemisms invented by Soviet historians which disguise the true history of Bolshevik conquest. The facts are available to any careful student of history.

Shabad's work consists of two parts: (1) General Survey, and (2) Regional Survey. Part one deals concisely but completely adequately with location, boundaries, seas and coasts, geologic history, structure and relief, and mineral resources. The absence of a geological map is most noticeable; the maps on pp. 16 and 17 are not very satisfactory.

In Chapter Two the author discusses the reasons for the great instability of the administrative structure of the U.S.S.R. attributing it to the dynamic Soviet planning. But political factors, and the changes of the Party line are equally responsible for this instability. The chapter on toponomy is in this respect very revealing of Soviet policy, and contains some interesting material.

In discussing the agriculture of the U.S.S.R., the author once more devotes too much space to grandiose Soviet projects and neglects the data on the actual state of Soviet agriculture. The livestock figures are missing in this chapter. The survey of agricultural regions, based on Baransky, is also far from complete.

The more detailed chapter on Soviet industry is followed by a survey of the Soviet transportation system. The author, with some enthusiasm, points out that "under the Soviets, which inherited a network of 36,300 miles, the rail transportation pattern underwent a drastic change" (p. 83).

In fact, however the figure 36,300 miles refers to the year 1913. During the war years the Tsarist government built an additional 2,900 miles, and hence in 1917 the railroad network was 39,200 miles. Moreover, once the comparison with pre-Soviet times is made, it should be followed up. It would show that the annual rate of railroad construction has not changed since the Revolution of 1917. The Tsarist government's record of seventy-four years (since the first railroad in Russia was built in 1843) shows that 700 miles of railroads were built every year. During the thirty-two years of the Soviet era, the annual figure has been approximately the same. In the period of the most intensive development of industry in Tsarist Russia (1868-1874) 7,000 miles of railroads were built, or approximately 1,200 miles annually. During the period of 1926-1937 the Soviets built 5,800 miles, which compares very unfavorably with the pre-revolutionary figures. Similarly, the Soviet goal of constructing 7,000 miles of railroads during the Second Five Year Plan remained unfulfilled; instead 2,500 were built.

Having ignored such comparisons the author goes on to make the following statement: "Realizing the importance of the railroads in the industrialization of the country, the Russians adopted an ambitious construction pro-

gram which raised the railroad mileage to 67,000 at the eve of the Second World War" (p. 83).

Although it is not quite clear what year he has in mind when writing about "the eve of the Second World War," the statistics cited on railroads are for 1941 and include the railroad net which the U.S.S.R. acquired after 1939 which, in modern history, is usually regarded as the beginning of World War II. The increase of Soviet railroads, which the author ascribes to the "ambitious construction program," is in fact therefore largely the result of Soviet aggression and occupation of the Baltic states, the Western Ukraine, Western Byelorussia, Bukowina, and Bessarabia in 1939.

The second part of the book, devoted to a regional survey of the U.S.S.R., consists of twenty-one chapters dealing with separate Soviet Republics and areas. It is based largely on the Soviet textbook by Baransky. The wealth of material is quite impressive and the exposition quite clear. The only drawback, it seems, is a tendency to repetition. Thus, on p. 75 (General Survey) we read: "The postwar Five-Year Plan saw the construction of . . . pipe lines for natural gas connecting Dashava (Drogobych oblast, Ukrainian S.S.R. with Kiev. . . ." On p. 443 (Ukrainian S.S.R., General Survey): "During the current plan, a natural gas pipe line was laid from Dashava (in the oil field) to Kiev." On p. 446 (Kiev Oblast Survey): "A natural gas pipe line for industrial and domestic use was laid in the post war period from Dashava." And finally on p. 461 (Drogobych Oblast Survey): "From the gas wells of Dashava, just north-east of the city, a pipe line has been laid to Kiev during the postwar Five Year Plan." Yet nowhere is the exact date of the construction of the pipe line given, and in the index under Dashava we find only one reference: p. 446.

Among some very debatable statements in this section we find the repetition of Baransky's contention that collectivization prevented the further impoverishment of the chernozem, by "the destruction of the boundary field strips, which not only reduced the potential cultivated area to a considerable extent, but served also as hotbeds of weeds and pernicious insects" (p. 128).

However, in spite of all its weaknesses, Shabad's book is a most valuable contribution in its field. It is the first book on the geography of the U.S.S.R. in the English language which follows the national divisions of the Soviet Union. Table 4 (Major Ethnic Groups of the USSR and Their Autonomous Political Divisions) is especially useful in this connection. Perhaps the most valuable facts are contained in the data on modern Soviet cities and Soviet industry. The book deserves to be used widely in colleges and universities.

Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1950 edition, article *Ukraine* (Vol. 22, pp.667-672) and *White-Russia* (Vol. 23. p.578).

In 1945 the Ukraine and Byelorussia became members of the United Nations. The authoritative *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is an important source of information for journalists, teachers and even scholars about these two countries and peoples. To review the information on these subjects in the latest edition of the famous encyclopaedia produced "with the editorial advice and consultation of the faculties of the University of Chicago, "must therefore be regarded as a serious task.

The article on the Ukraine states that "the Ukraine, a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R," was "recognized by the Soviet government in Dec. 1920, when a treaty was signed defining the relations between the Ukraine and the Union of the Socialist Republics." However, anyone can verify, in the same encyclopaedia, that the Soviet Union did not exist at that time. The Moldavian Republic, after six years as a Union Republic, is still listed as an Autonomous Republic within the Ukraine. The geographical, geological and climatic surveys are well done, but the section on archaeology should be more detailed, taking into account the fundamental importance of the Ukraine in this field.

The article dealing with Ukrainian history is chaotic and the information it contains is often unco-ordinated with the data on the Ukraine found in other articles in the same encyclopaedia. The importance of this territory for research on the Proto-Slavic home and on the Gothic Empire which had a broad cultural influence on the Slavs especially on the Antes, the ancestors of the Ukrainians, is not even mentioned. The Kievan Ruś state is misleadingly called "Russian" in spite of the fact that even Soviet scholars call it Ruś in order to avoid terminological confusions (cf. Academician B.D. Grekov, *The Culture of Kiev Ruś*, Moscow, 1947). There is no mention of the fact that the term "Ukraine" existed simultaneously with the term "Ruś" and no semantic explanation of either of these terms is offered. Then "Ruthene" immigrants are introduced into the Ukraine, and the reader looking for information about this new term is told that the Ukrainians were so called in the Austrian Empire. Yet there is no note of the fact that before World War I the term "Ruthenes" was generally supplanted by the name "Ukrainians." Looking up "Ruthenia" or "Carpathian Ruthenia" the reader is informed that the Ruthenians are "a Slav people, closely related to the Ukrainians."

There is almost no information on the period of the West-Ukrainian (Galician-Volhynian) State, on the Lithuano-Ruthenian Empire, and finally on the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in which the Ukraine participated (King Sobieski even used the title *Rex Poloniae, Magnus Dux Lithuaniae et Ukraine*). The emergence and organization of the Cossack Host is limited

to the sentence that refugees escaped and "formed free democratic communities and came to be known as Cossacks, (q.v)." The reader looking up "Cossacks" will find no word about the Ukrainian Cossack Host of that period, but only superficial accounts of the Don, Kuban, Terek, Astrachan, and Ural Cossacks. The entire history of the Ukrainian Cossacks, their rôle in the fight of Europe against the Turkish advance, the national and social revolution at the time of Bohdan Chmelnyčkyj who established an independent Cossack state, and finally the treaty of Perejaslav in 1654 is presented in the following way: "The whole Ukraine formed a part of the Polish-Lithuanian empire until 1667, when the portion east of the Dnieper was ceded to Russia by the treaty of Andrussovo." The political conception of Hetman Vyhovškyj (construction of a tripartite commonwealth of the Ukraine, Lithuania, and Poland), of Hetman Dorošenko (protectorate of Turkey), of Hetman Mazepa (alliance with Sweden) are not even mentioned in this history of the Ukraine. There is no word on the activity of the Mazepist emigration under the leadership of Orlyk, nor on the fate of the Hetmans (from Skoropadškyj to Rozumovškyj) under Russian domination.

Support is given to the biased Panrussian point of view that "the Great Russians regarded the Ukrainians as belonging to the Russian nation and their language as a mere dialect," silencing the considered judgement pronounced by the Imperial Academy of Sciences in the year 1906 (the special commission included F. E. Korš, A. S. Faminyn, V. V. Zelenskij, F. F. Fortunatov, A. A. Šachmatov, A. S. Lappo-Danilevskij, and S. F. Oldenburg) to the effect that the Ukrainian language is a separate Slavic language.

Having thus completely disregarded the Ukrainian Cossack state and its traditions, the author of the article discovers in the middle of the nineteenth century a "separatist movement" in the Ukraine, "associated with the Ruthene scholar Kostomarov and the poet Ševčenko, of which the political ideal was the Union of all Ruthenes, including those of Galicia, in a Ukrainian nation." Again there is no mention of all the persecutions of the Cyrillo Methodian Brotherhood by the Tsars; of the political and cultural achievements of the Ukrainians in Galicia and Bukovina under Austrian rule; of the revolution of 1905 and the first Duma with its club of Autonomists; of the political emigration, and the formation of the Union for the Liberation of the Ukraine; of the fight of the Ukrainian Legion against Russia during World War I. Only after the collapse of the Russian Empire in 1917 do we find some information about the proclamation of the independent Ukrainian People's Republic and the treaty of Brest Litovsk.

On p. 735 (Vol. 19) under the heading "Soviet Union," it is erroneously recorded that "the so-called Independent Government of Ukraine had already signed a separate treaty admitting German suzerainty." Information on the events of 1917 and 1918 is utterly confused. Petljura, the leader of the Ukrainian national movement appears (on p. 765, Vol. 19) as "Hetman of

Ukraine." The account of the alliance between Poland and the Ukraine, headed by Pilsudski and Petljura, is unsatisfactory. The war of the Ukrainians and the Poles against Russian Communism is described as "Polish imperialism," and there is no mention of the Warsaw treaty and the participation of the Ukrainian army in the war.

The exodus of the Ukrainian democratic forces from the Ukraine; the activity of the exiled government and the political emigration outside the Soviet Union; the history of the Soviet Ukraine and its Communist Party together with the dramatic suicides of Skrypnyk and Lubčenko; the national opposition to the Soviet rule in the Ukraine; the trial of the members of the Union for the Liberation of the Ukraine—all these most significant events of the last decades are completely ignored.

Under the entry for Kiev there is no up-to-date information on that city. According to the author, the capital of the Ukraine is still Kharkiv, in spite of the fact that the capital was transferred to Kiev in 1934. A whole series of monuments (like the Monastery of St. Michael, the Decimal Church, the Bratsky Monastery) are recorded in spite of the fact that they were destroyed by the Soviets.

Ukrainian literature is discussed only up to World War I. The Ukrainian language is listed according to the old Tsarist Panrussian terminology under "Russian language," in an article which begins with the following nonsensical statement: "The Russian language is the Slavonic language of Russia . . ." All the communist "reforms" in accordance with Marr's theory are ignored. The bibliography of the articles is at least a quarter of a century out of date.

Byelorussia, listed as "White Russia," is treated in a similar fashion. The emergence of the national group around the nucleus of the Krivian tribe is not discussed, while its history under the Lithuanian Empire and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth is presented superficially. Modern history, especially the anti-communist activity inside Byelorussia, is ignored. The information on Byelorussian language and literature is very scanty indeed.

The articles on the Ukraine and Byelorussia should be rewritten. The article on the Ukraine should combine all the historical information given under the headings "Ukraine," "Ruthenians," and "Kiev." In its present form neither article adds any laurels to American Slavic scholarship.

W. K. Matthews, *Languages of the U.S.S.R.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951, 179 pp.

Most studies of East European and North Asiatic languages have been written in Russian and German. A concise book about the languages of the U.S.S.R. in English has been an urgent need of our time. Thus, the recent study of these languages by Professor W. K. Matthews of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies at the University of London is undoubtedly an important step forward in the field of linguistics.

The plan of the book is indicated by the chapter headings; after a list of illustrations (text-figures and maps) and a preface, there are the following seven chapters: I. The Linguistic Pattern (1-2); II. Paleoasiatic Languages (3-13); III. Uralian Languages (14-51); IV. Altaic Languages (52-85); North Caucasian Languages (86-96); South Caucasian Languages (97-101); Indo-European Languages (102-120). There are also three appendices in the book: a tabular summary of the language stocks (122-124); statistics of the number of speakers of each language (125-127); bibliography (128-155); an index of languages and dialects (156-158); a list of symbols and phonetic values (159-160) as well as a general index.

One's estimate of such a volume depends upon the purpose for which it is compiled. There is no doubt that Professor Matthew's book was intended as an informative handbook for those interested in the language mosaic of the Soviet Union. The author limits his interpretation of the material to generally accepted opinions. The rich terminology reflects sometimes the Russian spelling of the respective language (e.g. "Kirgiz" instead of "Kirghiz"; "Uigur" instead of "Uyur,"). The extensive bibliography with exact references to modern works is very useful. The pre-war statistics (mostly those of 1926) have, in some places, more historical than contemporary value.

The author's point of view is strictly scholarly. The political background and the recent "linguistic controversies" in the Soviet Union are omitted. Obviously, in such a brief volume there must be great compression and careful selection of the presented facts, and this—we consider—the author has done excellently. The book contains a truly impressive wealth of data about the Uralian, Altaic, Caucasian, and Indo-European languages and their dialects in the U.S.S.R. and can be recommended as a good and reliable source of information.

Our special attention is given to the paragraphs on the Indo-European languages and particularly the East Slavic group of them: Russian, White Ruthenian, and Ukrainian. The author's data on the East Slavic languages are acceptable in general. He offers a brief sketch of the historical development of each language indicating the dialectal basis of literary Russian and White Ruthenian. The most important characteristics of each language are given and the interlingual relations between Russian, Ukrainian, and White

Ruthenian are mentioned. So, for instance, we read on p. 119: "In common with Russian and White Russian, Ukrainian exhibits the irregular and mobile accentuation characteristic of East Slavonic as well as other East Slavonic features, like initial *o* for *je/e* (cf. *ozero* "lake" with O.C.S. *jezero*), pleophony or "full voweling" (e.g. *horod* "town" for O.C.S. *grad*), and the absence of vowel length . . ."

The following, in our opinion, is debatable:

(1) The author states that "East Slavonic consists of three varieties, whose effective separation goes back to approximately the fourteenth century . . ." (p. 115). We know, however, that both Russian and Ukrainian had shown some individual characteristics even in the eleventh century. The latest period for the disintegration of the so-called "East-Slavic lingual unity" is set at 1164-1283 by Russian linguists (e.g. Trubeckoj) and in the Proto-Slavic period by Ukrainian linguists (e.g. S. Smal Stočkyj). The author himself also states that literary Russian had its beginning in the eleventh century (p. 116) and that "Ukrainian derives from the eleventh-century East Slavonic dialect of the Velynjane and Duleby . . ." (p. 118).

(2) As far as the old Ruś tribes are concerned, the White Ruthenians are linguistically the descendants not only of the Dregovici, but also of the Kryviči, the Poločane, the Ulyči, the Tiverci, and the Siverjane. There seems no reason to repeat the Pogodin—Sobolevskij theory about the original Russian population in Eastern Ukraine before the Tartar invasion.

(3) Some mistakes should be corrected: Hladkyj instead of Chladkyj (p. 154), and Kurylo's *Uvahy* (fourth edition, Krakiv-Lviv, 1942) instead of (third edition, Kiev, 1925).

(4) Some recent publications should be added to the bibliography, e.g. *Lehrbuch der türkischen Sprache* by H. Jansky (Leipzig, 1947); *Krivian (White Ruthenian) Grammar* by J. Stankevič (Regensburg, 1947); *Hramatyka ukraïnskoï movy* by O. Panejko (Augsburg, 1950).

These remarks do not attempt to question the fundamental value of Professor Matthew's book. It contains very useful material and will certainly serve as a convenient handbook. This first study of the languages and dialects of the U.S.S.R. in English appeals to layman and specialist alike and must be considered a brilliant beginning in a field as rich, interesting and important as it has hitherto been neglected in the Western hemisphere.

The Soviet Union: Background, Ideology, Reality. A Symposium edited by Waldemar Gurian. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1951, 216 pp.

The eight rather diverse papers which make up this useful volume on various aspects of Communist rule were originally presented at a symposium sponsored by the Committee on International Relations of the University of Notre Dame.

Professor Gurian, in the introductory paper, reviews the theoretical bases and fundamental unity of Soviet policy. He demonstrates that the policies and methods of Lenin and Stalin have not been basically at variance. While this is undoubtedly a valid contention it is significant that innumerable younger refugees from the Soviet Union, including recent post-war defectors, do make a distinction by associating Lenin with the relatively relaxed N.E.P. Period and attributing the dictatorship and all of its repressive practices to Stalin.

Professor Michael Karpovich in his stimulating chapter on the historical development of Soviet thought control presents some sage observations pointing out that the Soviet regime is in many ways unique; he warns against oversimplified historical analogies and argues, quite correctly, that the controls of the Imperial period were mild in comparison with those of the Soviets. Professor Karpovich advances the thesis that the totalitarianism which had existed within the Party prior to 1917 was extended into the life of the whole country. As a participant in Russian political life prior to the advent of the Soviet regime, Professor Karpovich, who himself stood with the defeated liberal elements, finds it difficult to accept the thesis that Soviet thought control is a manifestation of Russian national tradition. While the evidence which he presents in opposition to this latter thesis is impressive, it nevertheless does not demonstrate that the Soviet regime is entirely alien to the Russian people.

The comprehensive essay by Naum Jasny on the results of the Five Year Plans stresses the seamy side of the Soviet economy and includes a forthright discussion of difficulties which students of the Soviet economy encounter. Jasny, unlike many specialists in the field, does not hesitate to argue that Soviet statistics cannot always be taken at face value because of the marked upward bias resulting from monetary inflation, especially in consumer's goods. He lucidly spells out the economy of scarcity which results from the decision to produce guns instead of butter for a third decade.

Professor Philip E. Mosely, the director of Columbia University's Russian Institute, drawing upon his wartime experiences in negotiating with Soviet representatives, analyzes the methods by which the Soviet Union has ruthlessly utilized conflicting national claims and sentiments in pursuing its policy of expansion. He reviews Soviet policy toward the Oder-Neisse frontier, Trieste,

Western Thrace, Transylvania as well as other claims and points out that the Soviet Union has not developed any lasting solution to these conflicting national claims.

The method by which the Soviets have seized power in Eastern Europe and integrated the area with their own system, a topic closely related to that of Professor Mosely's paper, is ably described and analyzed by Stephen Kertesz, former Hungarian minister to Italy and now professor of political science at Notre Dame. This trenchant analysis is well documented and contains a great deal of information as well as detailed bibliographical footnotes.

The Soviet terrorism which the peoples of the satellite states are now experiencing is an all-pervading phenomenon but one which has defied systematic analysis. What is needed is a study of the secret police as a political institution. While Vladimir Petrov, a former victim of this system of terrorism, has not prepared such a study his paper does throw some light on some of its workings. Although Petrov, a Russian, consistently refers to the territories of the Soviet Union with the archaic generic term "Russia," he does not neglect to point out that the famine of 1931-33 occurred largely in Ukraine and that resistance to collectivization was greatest there.

The question of church-state relations is dealt with by Professors Nicholas Timasheff and Francis Dvornik. The former has prepared a dispassionately objective and well detailed study of the uneasy compromise which has arisen between the Orthodox Patriarchate of Moscow and the Kremlin, and from which the Church obtained certain benefits but also became a helpless instrument of the state and a mouthpiece for Soviet propaganda. One brief mention is made of the millions of Moslems and their relations with the Soviet government — another indication of our unfortunate neglect of Turkestan. Professor Dvornik has not prepared a similar analysis of the post-war developments in church-state relations in Central Europe. He chose instead to deal with some of the historical roots of the problem. In adhering to this approach he probably over-stresses at times the relationship between certain contemporary events and occurrences out of the remote past. For instance, he argues, in passing, that the Soviet attitude toward Ukrainian claims to independence as treachery originated with the "ecclesiastical chroniclers during the period of the dismemberment of Kievan Russia" (p. 199). This is a doubtful causal relationship, and in addition Professor Dvornik assumes that contemporary Russia can be equated with Kievan Rus— an assumption which Ukrainians deny. However, his paper does contain a number of provocative theses.

JOHN S. RESHETAR

Volodymyr Dorošenko, *Ohnyšče ukraїnškoї nauky: Naukove Tovarystvo im. T. Ševčenka* (Center of Ukrainian Science: The Ševčenko Scientific Society). New York, 1951, 116 pp.

Volodymyr Dorošenko, who for forty years was the librarian of the Ševčenko Scientific Society in Lviv, recounts in his last book the history of this distinguished Ukrainian institution of learning. It is obvious that the author must have been seriously handicapped by the paucity of documents and reports of the Society and had to recreate many details from memory. As a result of this the chronological account is somewhat uneven. The period which preceded the founding of the Society and the first decades of its existence are not given as much space as they deserve. The second period of the Society's existence (1894 — 1914) is given the greatest prominence, while the third period (1914 — 1939) is merely summarized. The author devotes most attention to the history of the Society's library and regards the publishing activity of the Society as secondary. Only half a page is devoted to the description of the Society's Museum which surely merited a fuller account. This omission is all the more regrettable since the author could have consulted in this matter Professor Jaroslav Pasternak, the former director of the Museum, who is now in Canada.

Yet in spite of these shortcomings, the book succeeds in outlining the history of the Ševčenko Society which is of sufficient interest to Slavic scholars to be recalled here very briefly.

The Ševčenko Scientific Society was founded on December 11th, 1873, in Lviv, by Ukrainian scholars, mostly refugees from that part of the Ukraine which was at that time under Russian rule. Among them the most outstanding were O. Konyškyj, M. Drahomanov, D. Pylčykyv, and M. Žučenko. The purpose of the new institution was to provide a center of Ukrainian scholarship in Western Ukraine which enjoyed a great degree of freedom under Austrian rule, and thus to counter the Tsarist policy of suppression of Ukrainian culture. It is significant that the Society was founded ten years after a secret decree banning the printing of virtually all Ukrainian books had been issued in 1863 by the Russian Minister of the Interior, Peter Valujev.

Founded primarily as a literary society, the Ševčenko Society soon developed into a learned institution where all Ukrainian scholars of the day found an opportunity to carry on their work. Even in its early days the Society started to publish many volumes under the editorship of the historian Oleksander Barviňskyj, the founder of the so-called "Historical Library."

With the arrival in 1894 of Professor Michael Hruševskyj, a new and most memorable period in the Society's history began. Having become its president in 1897, Hruševskyj did everything possible to transform the Society into an Academy of Sciences. The Society consisted then of three sections: historical-philosophical; philological; and a mathematics and natural sciences section;

these in turn were subdivided into several subsections. Setting an example to others by his tireless work, Professor Hruševskyj became the driving force of the Society. It was at that time that the first volumes of his own monumental history of the Ukraine — Ruś, and his history of Ukrainian literature began to appear in Lviv. He was ably assisted by Ivan Franko, and it was through the energies of these two scholars that the publications of the Society continued to increase. Among the many publications the most valuable are the Society's Proceedings (*Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenka*) which constitute one of the finest collections of Ukrainian scholarly studies. It is also significant that, during the time in which Michael Hruševskyj was in charge of the publications, one hundred and seven volumes of the Proceedings were published. Four volumes appeared before his time, and after he left Lviv in 1914 only forty volumes were published up to 1939. The Proceedings contained not only original contributions from scholars in all parts of the Ukraine, but also extensive book and periodical reviews and bibliographical indexes. Somewhat smaller in size, though equally valuable were the *Ethnographical Collection* (thirty eight volumes), the *Collection of the Section of Mathematics and Natural Sciences* (thirty two volumes), the *Collection of the Philological Section* (twenty three volumes), *Materials for Ukrainian Anthropology and Ethnology* (twenty volumes), and the *Collection of the Historical and Philosophical Section* (sixteen volumes). Altogether up to 1939 the Ševčenko Society had published five hundred and ninety one volumes of scholarly works. This extensive program of publication and research would have been impossible without the continuous support of Ukrainian patrons from all parts of the Ukraine.

After leaving Lviv, Hruševskyj continued his work in Kiev where he had founded the Ukrainian Scientific Society. Taking advantage of the temporary relaxation of Tsarist controls following the Russo-Japanese war, Hruševskyj organized the Ukrainian intelligentsia and scholars in a united effort to enlighten the masses of the Ukrainian people. He initiated many newspapers and publications and helped to establish bookstores and libraries.

The death of Ivan Franko in 1916 was another serious loss for the Ševčenko Society. However, even during the war it continued its activity; in 1914 it published an edition of Ševčenko's *Kobzar* and a valuable monograph by O. Novyčkyj, *Ševčenko, the Painter*. Though the long-cherished hopes for the creation of an independent Ukraine were not realized, Hruševskyj returned to Kiev from Vienna and continued his work in the newly established Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Once more he gathered around him Ukrainian men of learning, and it was largely due to his initiative and perseverance that over two thousand most valuable volumes of scholarly works were published by the Academy in the 1918-1929 period. The Soviet purge of the Ukrainian Academy which began in 1929 and lasted well into the 1930's included Michael Hruševskyj. It was only after his death in 1935 that the Soviets gained complete control of the Ukrainian Academy.

The fate of the Ševčenko Society from 1919 to 1939 was largely determined by Polish policy towards the Ukrainians. The Polish government refused to grant the Society the status of a Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences and was, on the whole, hostile to the development of Ukrainian learning. It did not keep its promise to create a Ukrainian University of Lviv, and therefore the Ukrainians attended what was, in fact, a secret Ukrainian university. It is all the more remarkable, therefore, that the Ševčenko Society continued to develop in these unfavorable circumstances. Its publications were continued and a series of institutes and sections were established.

During the Soviet occupation of Western Ukraine in 1939, the Ševčenko Society was made into a branch of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. The first director of this branch, appointed by the Soviets, was a Party candidate, Jakiv Zajkin, who was more interested in personal commercial transactions than in scholarship. Professor Dorošenko records in his book many incidents from that period which reveal the utter incompetence of Soviet administrators.

The German occupation of the Ukraine in 1941 put an abrupt end to the activity of the Society. However, in 1945, Ukrainian scholars in Germany began to organize their activities. First, the Free Ukrainian Academy was re-established in Augsburg in 1945. The Ševčenko Society was reactivated in 1947, due to the initiative of Professor V. Kubijovyč. Both these institutions are now continuing their work in Europe and in this country.

Professor Dorošenko's book admirably fulfills an important function, that of sketching in brief outline the long and meritorious history of the Ševčenko Scientific Society. It will be welcomed especially by those Slavic scholars who are interested in the development of Ukrainian scholarship in the past hundred years. It tells a moving story of determination and courage on the part of Ukrainian scholars who, following in the footsteps of Hruševskyj and Franko, have struggled to preserve the right to an independent and objective search for truth.

OBITUARIES

Dmytro Dorošenko

The President of the Ukrainian Free Academy, Professor Dmytro Ivanovyč Dorošenko, died in Munich on March 19th, 1951. He was not only one of the greatest Ukrainian scholars of all time, but a great Ukrainian who symbolized for many the spirit of his country. Like a man of the Renaissance, whom he resembled in so many respects, Dmytro Dorošenko will long be remembered both for his versatility and for his brilliance.

He was born on April 8th, 1882, in Vilno, a descendant of Hetman Petro Dorošenko. After attending school at Vilno, he enrolled as a student at Warsaw University and a year later transferred to the University of St. Petersburg. While still in Vilno he frequently visited his old family seat in Hluchiv, in the Ukraine. His deep patriotism and his interest in the future of the Ukraine became apparent very early. St. Petersburg held many Ukrainian memories for him. Later he wrote that "across the Neva was the Petro-Pavlian Fortress where the Ukrainian Hetman Polubotok had died and in which Ševčenko, Kostomarov, Kuliš, and other members of the Brotherhood of St. Cyril and Methodius were imprisoned. Further on there was the Academy of Fine Arts at which Ševčenko had been a student. . . . The capital was built on the bones of the Ukrainian Cossacks and was closely tied to the fate of the Ukrainian national movement. Here Kotljarevskyj's *Aeneid* was published in 1798 . . ."

It was in St. Petersburg that young Dorošenko found a circle of Ukrainian friends with whom to share his ideas. In 1903 he was elected President of the Ukrainian Students Society. In 1904 he visited Lviv, where he attended lectures by Professors Hruševskyj, Franko, Studynskyj, and Vovk. After returning to St. Petersburg he witnessed the 1905 disturbances when he took an active part in student demonstrations. After the closing of St. Petersburg University, D. Dorošenko went to Vilno, then to Poltava, and finally to Germany. In 1906 he returned to Kiev where he worked on Ukrainian newspapers. In the same year he married the well known actress, Natalia Vasylenko.

In 1907 D. Dorošenko became secretary to the editorial board of the journal *Ukraïna*, a continuation of *Kievskaja Starina*. From that time on he devoted most of his life to the study of Ukrainian history, contributing many articles to Ukrainian periodicals. In 1909 he received a Ph.D. in history from Kiev University, and afterwards taught history at a commercial school at Katerynoslav. He remained there until 1913 traveling a great deal in the neighboring countryside and conducting a great campaign of national and cultural enlightenment through village *Prošvitas*. In 1913 D. Dorošenko moved to a new post — that of history teacher at a school in Kiev. At that time he collaborated closely with M. Hruševskyj and the *Literaturno Nau-*

kovyj Vistnyk. The outbreak of the First World War surprised him in Switzerland.

In 1917 the first Ukrainian Parliament, the Centralna Rada, was set up in Kiev, and D. Dorošenko became a member of it and a deputy of the Kiev commissar. He was then made Governor of Galicia and Bukovina and while holding that office did much to alleviate the sufferings of Ukrainian prisoners of war and to safeguard the rights of Ukrainian institutions in Western Ukraine. Upon his return to Kiev, D. Dorošenko was made Foreign Minister in the government of Hetman Skoropadskyj, but was finally ousted from this post by pro-Russian elements. With the establishment of the Petljura government, D. Dorošenko was appointed Professor of history at the University in Kamjaneč Podilskyj. After the occupation of the Ukraine by the Red Army in 1920, he was forced to emigrate, finally settling in Prague where he became a Professor at the Ukrainian Free University and the Charles University.

From then on he devoted himself entirely to teaching and writing. Some of his articles were printed in the London *Slavonic Review*. From 1926 to 1930 D. Dorošenko was the Director of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Berlin, and from 1930 to 1939 he taught in the Theological Faculty of the University of Warsaw. In 1939 he returned to Prague and worked for a time at the Ukrainian Free University. In 1945 he was elected the first President of the Ukrainian Free Academy. Two years later, in 1947, he went to Canada at the invitation of St. Andrew's College in Winnipeg, but in 1950 he was on his way back to Europe. After a visit to Paris, he went to Munich, Germany where he finally succumbed to an illness from which he had long been suffering.

The following works by D. Dorošenko are his chief contribution to Ukrainian and Slavic scholarship, although they represent but a small percentage of his total output:

Po ridnomu kraju (Kiev, 1919); *Mykola Ivanovyč Kostomarov* (Kiev, 1920); *Slovjanskij svit v joho mynulomu j sučasnomu* (Berlin, 1922); *Ohljad ukraïnskoi istoriohrafii* (Prague, 1923); *Pantelejmon Kuliš* (Leipzig, 1923); *Istorija Ukraïny 1917-1923 rokiv*, Užhorod, Vol. II. 1930, Vol. I. 1932.; *Narys istorii Ukraïny* (Warsaw, 1932); *Taras Shevchenko, Bard of Ukraine* (Prague, 1936); *History of the Ukraine* (Edmonton, 1939); *Pravoslavna Cerkvva v mynulomu j sučasnomu žytti ukraïnskoho narodu* (Berlin, 1940); *Istorija Ukraïny* (Krakiv-Lviv, 1942); *Volodymyr Antonovyč* (Prague, 1942).

Mykyta Kekalo

Mykyta Vasylovyč Kekalo, Treasurer of the Academy and an economist, died suddenly in New York on March 16th, 1951.

He was born on April 16, 1890, in the Poltava district of Cossack descent. In his youth he worked at the locomotive factory in Kharkiv. Ever since 1910 he was very active in the circle of Ukrainian youth headed by M. Michnov-

škyj. After graduating from high school he became a student at the Kharkiv Commercial Institute, completing his course after the Revolution. In 1917 he was energetically engaged in cultural activities, lending his experience and enthusiasm to the newly established Ukrainian state. His attention was chiefly devoted to the organization of the Ukrainian Autocephalic Church and to the strengthening of the Ukrainian Co-operatives.

After the occupation of the Ukraine by the Bolsheviks, M. Kekalo continued to work for many Ukrainian institutions, primarily for Ukrainian banks and schools, and was for a time with the *Ruch* Publishing Company in Kharkiv. Mykyta Vasylovyč was one of the first victims of the Red purge in the Ukraine. In March 1928 he was arrested by the Soviets and deported to the Solovki Islands where he remained until 1931. As a result of a fall into ice cold water while at work there he became an invalid for the rest of his life. From 1931 to 1934 he lived in exile in the far North, returning later to the Ukraine.

During the Second World War and immediately after it Mykyta Kekalo worked tirelessly to aid Ukrainian cultural institutions. He came to this country in 1949, becoming one of the most active members of the executive of the Ukrainian Academy. It was chiefly due to his untiring labor and devotion that the Academy survived the first two years of its existence in the United States. Mykyta Vasylovyč was not only the treasurer of the Academy, but its real pillar of strength. He organized the collection of money, was in charge of correspondence, and helped a great deal in the publication of the first issue of the *Annals*. He did all this without any kind of remuneration, and on various occasions his personal sacrifices for the general good were an inspiration to other members. His valuable memoirs have been bequeathed to the Academy.

The death of Mykyta Kekalo, a man of great humility and a devoted worker in the field of Ukrainian culture, was felt by everyone to be a most serious loss.

CHRONICLE

The past eight months have shown a steady development in the activities of the Academy. A most grievous loss was the death of the Academy's President, Professor Dmytro Ivanovyč Dorošenko on March 19th, 1951. Three days earlier the Academy's Treasurer, Mykyta Kekalo, had died.

During the last six months the following full members of the Academy have arrived in this country: Professors Valeria Kozlovśka, Oleksander Ohloblyn, and Mykola Velychkivśkyj. Member correspondent, Professor Svitozar Mychailovyč Drahomanov is also now in the United States.

The Annual Meeting of the Executive was held on April 22, 1951. The new Executive Council, elected after a secret ballot by the full members, consists of Professor Michael Vetukhiv (President), Professor Damian Horniatkevych (Vice-President), Professor Volodymyr Porśkyj (Secretary and Treasurer), Professors Granovsky, Kosenko, Shlemkevych and Timoshenko (members). Messrs. L. Bykovśkyj and G. Luckyj have been elected assistant secretaries and the members of the Auditing Committee are: Professors L. Chykalenko, I. Rozhin, and R. Smal Stocki.

In May 1951 the Ford Foundation assigned, through the Free Russia Fund, Inc., a grant of \$5,000 towards the cost of publication of the *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S.*

The following lectures were delivered before the members of the Academy and invited guests:

14 January — Professor P. Odarčenko: *The Function of Prepositions in Ukrainian Language.*

28 January — Professor L. Chykalenko: *The Graphic Art of the Mizyn Settlement.*

29 June — Professor R. Smal Stocki: *Contemporary American Scholarship.*

Three scholarly conferences were held to commemorate special occasions:

10 February — Inaugural Conference devoted to the past year's work of the Academy and its future plans.

— Guest speaker: Professor Philip E. Mosely, Director of the Russian Institute, Columbia University: *Co-operation between American and Ukrainian Science.*

— Professor Michael Vetukhiv: *The Aims of the Academy.*

— Professor Volodymyr Porśkyj: *The Decembrists in the Ukraine.*

11 March — Memorial Conference in Honor of Taras Ŗevčenko.

— Professor L. Chykalenko: *The World-outlook of Taras Ŗevčenko.*

— Professor D. Horniatkevych: *The St. Petersburg Academy of Arts during Ŗevčenko's Studies.*

— Professor V. Porškyj: *A Legend Connected with the Name of Ševčenko.*

6 May — Conference in Memory of the Late President of the Academy, Professor D. Dorošenko.

Another series of lectures, entitled *The Ukraine and Her Neighbors* was initiated by the Academy and thus far has included the following lectures:

1 April — Professor Michael Karpovich (Harvard University): *The Problem of Russian-Ukrainian Historical Relations.*

6 April — Professor Oskar Halecki (Fordham University): *The Historical Background of Polish-Ukrainian Relations.*

20 May — Professor J. Stankevich: *The Ukraine and Byelorussia.*

The following lectures and discussions were held under the auspices of the separate sections of the Academy which are meeting regularly:

LITERARY AND PHILOLOGICAL SECTION

28 April — A. Orel: *A Dictionary of Foreign Words.*

NATURAL SCIENCES SECTION

14 January — Professor M. Vetukhiv: *Western and Soviet Views of Phenogenetics.*

17 February — Mrs. N. Osadcha-Yanata: *The Use of Medicinal Herbs in the Ukraine.*

ETHNOGRAPHIC SECTION

17 June — P. Odarčenko: *Drahmanov as an Ethnographer.*

— D. Horniatkevych: *Ukrainian Life in Polish Paintings.*

— L. Chykalenko: *Ukrainian Ornaments.*

ECONOMICS SECTION

22 July — Professor M. Velychkivskyj: *Agriculture in the Soviet Ukraine.*

The Museum and Library of the Academy, under the management of Professor V. Porškyj, has continued to collect old and current Ukrainian literature. The support of the Free Russia Fund, Inc. has made it possible to compile a bibliography of Ukrainian periodicals.

Manuscripts and works of modern Ukrainian writers are preserved in the Literary Archives. A special commission has been set up to preserve the

literary remains of Volodymyr Vynnyčenko who died in France in March 1951. A special trust has also been set up for Jurij Klen's collection. One meeting was devoted to the poet O. Olžyč.

The Art Curator, Professor D. Horniatkevych, reports many new acquisitions, among them a collection of photographs donated by S. Lytvynenko, a gift of special value.

Next year it is planned to expand the *Annals* to a quarterly publication. Two special issues (Winter, Summer) will each consist of a single work, while two others (Spring, Fall) will retain the form of a scholarly journal.

The two forthcoming special issues will be devoted to a Symposium on Drahomanov and to a new and revised edition of D. Dorošenko's *Survey of Ukrainian Historiography*. Among Ukrainian publications now in preparation is a Symposium in memory of D. Dorošenko.

A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

The following "international" system is used in the transliteration of Ukrainian. Approximate English equivalents are given in parentheses.

а	а	(a)			м	m	(m)
б	б	(b)			н	n	(n)
в	в	(v)			о	o	(o)
г	г	(h)			п	p	(p)
г	г	(g)			р	r	(r)
д	д	(d)			с	s	(s)
е	е	(e)			т	t	(t)
е	є	(ye)			у	u	(u)
ж	ж	(zh)			ф	f	(f)
з	з	(z)			х	ch	(kh)
и	и	(y)			ц	с	(ts)
і	і	(i)			ч	с	(ch)
ї	ї	(yi)			ш	ш	(sh)
й	й	(y)			щ	шч	(shch)
к	к	(k)			ю	ju	(yu)
л	л	(l)			я	ja	(ya)
					ь	,	

The spelling of proper names, place names, and special terms generally accepted in English usage will retain that accepted form (e.g. Kiev, Kharkiv, Dnieper, chernozem). Russian and Polish proper names will retain their respective forms (e.g. Trubeckoj, Zaleski), but Ukrainian proper names and place names will keep their Ukrainian form even if occurring in Russian or Polish sources (e.g. Bila Cerkva, not Biala Cerkiew).

Some unavoidable inconsistencies in the transliteration of names will occur as a result of retaining the customary spelling of such names. Handicapped by the lack of a satisfactory transliteration system for Slavic, the editors hope to develop a more streamlined version in later issues of the *Annals*.

CONTRIBUTORS

- Dmytro Dorošenko, Ukrainian historian and the Academy's late President.
- Neonila Kordysh, formerly member of the Institute of Archaeology of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev and of the Kiev Central Historical Museum; took part in several archaeological expeditions; now lives in this country.
- Dmitry Čiževsky, Lecturer in Slavic at Harvard University; author of many books on Ukrainian literature and philosophy.
- Oleksander Ohloblyn, historian, formerly Professor at Kiev University and the Ukrainian Free University in Munich; now in the United States.
- Serhij Paramonov, zoologist, formerly Professor at Kiev University, now employed in the Division of Entomology, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, Canberra, Australia.
- Ihor Ševčenko, specialist in Byzantine history, formerly Fellow at Harvard University's Research Center at Dumbarton Oaks, now in Berkeley, Cal.
- Valentine Shuhayevsky, numismatist, formerly Professor at the Institute of Archaeology in Kiev; at present in New York.
- Jury Šerech, philologist, literary historian and critic; at present on the staff of the Slavic Dept. Lund University, Sweden.
- Petro Odarčenko, formerly reader and lecturer at the Institutes of Nižyn and Kursk; now living in Brooklyn, New York.
- Vasyl Gvozdetsky, soil scientist and geographer, formerly Professor at Kiev University and member of the Quaternary Commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev; now teaching at the University of Utah.

Roman Smal Stocki, philologist, Professor and Director of the Slavic Institute at Marquette University.

Jaroslav Rudnyćkyj, philologist, Chairman of the Slavic Dept. University of Manitoba, Canada.

John S. Reshetar, Lecturer, Dept. of Politics at Princeton University; author of forthcoming book on the Ukrainian Revolution.

Damian Horniatkevych, historian of art, author of several works on Ukrainian art.

An Invitation

Next year the *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S.* will enter the second year of publication. Apart from the two regular (Spring, Fall) issues, the following special (Winter, Summer) issues will appear as separate volumes:

MYCHAJLO DRAHOMANOV

A Selection of Drahomanov's writings in English translation and a series of articles on his life and work.

(appr. 300 pp.)

Compiled by S. Drahomanov and I. Lysiak-Rudnytsky

A SURVEY OF UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

by Dmytro Dorošenko and Oleksander Ohloblyn

(appr. 275 pp.)

To libraries, institutions, and individual subscribers ordering the *Annals* in advance, the subscription will be \$8.00 for one year.

Subscription for 1952 (includes two regular and two special issues): \$10.00 (foreign, including Canada): \$12.

The price of single copies will be announced on publication.

