

V. Lypyns'kyj's Place in Ukrainian Intellectual History

OMELJAN PRITSAK

I

Intellectual history is understood here as the study of codified and systematized secular thought, expressed within a societal context in theories philosophical and ethical, economic, political, and sociological, as well as in theories concerning literature and art.¹ According to this definition, the work of the churchmen of the Kiev Mohyla Academy (seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) and even the mystic oeuvre of Hryhorij Skovoroda belong to intellectual prehistory, since they were still based on presecular principles. Yet Ukrainian intellectual history proper begins with the last decades of the eighteenth century, when two Western intellectual currents, the Enlightenment and Romanticism,² reached the Russian Empire. Although they came to the Ukraine at approximately the same time,³ they flourished in different parts of Ukrainian territory: the Enlightenment in *Malorossija* (the former Hetman state), and Romanticism in Slobids'ka Ukraine. Also, each was embraced by a different stratum of the Ukrainian nobility: the ideas of the Enlightenment attracted administrators and military men, whereas Romanticism appealed to university students.⁴

¹ See Omeljan Pritsak, "Prolegomena to the National Awakening of the Ukrainians during the Nineteenth Century," *Culture and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Eastern Europe*, ed. Roland Sussex and J. C. Eade (Columbus, Ohio, 1985), pp. 96–110.

² On the Enlightenment, see Ernst Cassirer, *Die Philosophie der Aufklärung* (Tübingen, 1932), translated into English as *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment* (Princeton, 1951); Charles Frankel, *The Faith of Reason: The Idea of Progress in the French Enlightenment* (New York, 1948); Norman Hampson, *The Enlightenment*, Pelican History of European Thought, 4 (London, 1968).

On Romanticism, see Louis Reynaud, *Le Romantisme: Ses origines Anglo-Germaniques* (Paris, 1926); Lascelles Abercrombie, *Romanticism* (London, 1926; new ed., 1963).

³ See Oleksander Ohloblyn, "The American Revolution and Ukrainian Liberation Ideas during the Late Eighteenth Century," *Ukrainian Quarterly* 11, no. 3 (1955): 203–212; L. Kovalenko, *Velyka francuz'ka burżuazna revoljucija i hromads'ki polityčni ruxy na Ukrajinі v kinci XVIII st.* (Kiev, 1973). See also Dmytro Cyževs'kyj, *Narysy z istoriji filosofiji na Ukrajinі* (Prague, 1931), pp. 66–86.

⁴ The precursor of the French Enlightenment in the Ukraine (and Russia) was Jakiv Kozel's'kyj (b. 1729, d. after 1795), an alumnus of the Kiev Mohyla Academy (1744–1750). Son of a *sotnyk* of Kobeljaky (in the Poltava *polk*), he taught at the cadet corps in St. Petersburg (1757–1766) and was later a member of the Imperial Senate there (1766–1770). Upon his return to the Ukraine, he was a member of the governing body then ruling the Ukraine, the Little Russian College (1770–1786). His original philosophical work, *Filosofičeskie*

Put most simply, the Enlightenment was a current of thought originating in England and France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that believed in the interrelation among the concepts of God, reason, nature, and man (considered to be born essentially perfect and equal). The ordering principle for all four was laws developed by the intelligent human mind—hence the Enlightenment's passion for law codices (e.g., the Prussian and Austrian codes, the American Constitution, the Code Napoléon). The economic theory of the Enlightenment was based on the idea of harmony among private interests as well as free competition and governmental non-interference. Its political wisdom was represented by the theory of a balance of powers arranged at international congresses. Its theory of history reflected the idea of mankind's general progress toward perfection. Typical of the Enlightenment were secret societies—among them the German patriotic "Tugendbund" and the English "Freemason Grand Lodge"—where such matters were discussed and codified.⁵

In the years from 1781 to 1802, the Ukrainian Hetmanate (Malorossija) was progressively being integrated into the Russian Empire. Although Peter I had begun forcible Europeanization almost a century earlier, during his reign the imperial elite had remained alienated from European intellectual currents. By the middle of the eighteenth century, however, there had developed a thin stratum of nobles privately taught French and sometimes German who had developed the foundation for an imperial secular literary language (Lomonosov's solution of the Russian "Questione della Lingua").⁶

predloženiya, was published in St. Petersburg in 1768. An admirer of Denis Diderot's *Encyclopedia* (1751–1772), he translated a two-volume selection of that seminal work.

On Kozel's'kyj, see V. Dmytračenko, *Suspil'no-polityčni pohljady Ja. P. Kozel's'koho* (Kiev, 1958); idem, in *Narys istoriji filosofiji na Ukrajinі*, ed. D. Ostrjanyn (Kiev, 1966), pp. 90–99; Ju. Ja. Kogan, *Prosvetitel' XVIII veka Ja. P. Kozel'skij* (Moscow, 1958). See also the first translation of Immanuel Kant's *Metaphysic of Morals*, by Jakiv Ruban: *Kantovo osnovanie dlja metafiziki npravov* (Mykolajiv, 1803).

⁵ See A. N. Pypin, *Obščestvennoe dviženie v Rossii pri Aleksandre I*, 2nd ed. (St. Petersburg, 1885); idem, *Russkoe masonstvo XVII i pervaja čast' XIX v.*, ed. G. V. Vernadskij (Petrograd, 1916); T. Sokolovskaja, *Russkoe masonstvo i ego značenie v istorii obščestvennogo dviženija (XVIII i pervaja četvert' XIX stoletija)* (St. Petersburg [ca. 1908]); V. Orlov, *Russkie prosvetiteli 1790–1800 gg.* (Moscow, 1950); P. N. Berkov, *Istorija russkoj žurnalistiki XVIII v.* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1952).

On the secret societies in the Ukraine, see Serhij Jefremov, "Masonstvo na Ukrajinі," *Naše mynule* (Kiev), 1918, no. 3, pp. 9–13; also Bohdan Krawciw and Oleksander Ohloblyn, "Masonstvo," *Encyklopedija Ukrajinoznavstva: Slovnykova častyna*, ed. Volodymyr Kubiwoyč, vol. 4 (Munich 1962), pp. 1486–88.

⁶ Christopher D. Buck, "The Russian Language Question in the Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1724–1770," *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*, vol. 2: *East Slavic*, ed. Riccardo Picchio and Harvey Goldblatt (New Haven, 1984), pp. 187–233.

After the turn of the century, imperial noblemen-officers were sent to Germany and France to fight in the Napoleonic wars. Apart from diplomats, they became the first group of imperial subjects to come into direct contact with any European intellectual current, specifically, the Enlightenment. Upon their return home, some of these nobles organized patriotic secret societies with the intent of bringing about enlightened reforms in the empire—a constitution and the abolition of serfdom. When such developments did not occur—their hopes that Alexander I would be a reformer had been dashed—the noblemen attempted, upon Alexander I's death in December 1825, to take over the government themselves, only to have this Decembrist revolt fail.⁷

In the Ukraine Freemason lodges were known already in the 1740s, but the first Ukrainian lodges were founded only in 1818; secret societies were known already as early as the 1780s–1790s.⁸ They gained special intensity in 1818, when Tsar Alexander I, while opening the Polish *Sejm* in Warsaw, promised to introduce a constitution for the lands of the Russian Empire. At about the same time Prince Mykola Repnin-Volkons'kyj, the newly appointed governor-general of Malorossija, gave a patriotic speech before the Ukrainian nobility in Poltava. The most important product of the Ukrainian Enlightenment was the tract called *Istorija Rusov*. It is now fairly certain that this political-ideological treatise, disguised as an eighteenth-century Cossack chronicle, was compiled sometime after the Vienna Congress (1814–1815), most probably in connection with the events of 1818; significantly enough, this is also the time (1818–1819) to which all four of the early known manuscripts of *Istorija Rusov* are dated.

⁷ Three general works on the Decembrists are Milica V. Nečkina, *Dviženie dekabristov*, 2 vols. (Moscow, 1955); idem, *Dekabristy* (Moscow, 1982); Marc Raeff, *The Decembrist Movement* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1966). See also the collection of documents *Vosstanie dekabristov: Materialy i dokumenty*, 11 vols. (Moscow, 1925–58), and *Dekabristy i russkaja kul'tura* (Leningrad, 1975). On the Decembrists in the Ukraine, see *Dekabristy na Ukrajinu*, vol. 1, ed. Serhij Jefremov and Volodymyr Mijakovs'kyj (Kiev, 1926), vol. 2, ed. Dmytro Bahalij (Kiev, 1930); D. Bahalij, ed., *Rux Dekabristiv na Ukrajinu* (Kharkiv, 1926); V. Bazylevyč, *Dekabristy'kyj rux na Ukrajinu* (Kiev, 1954); idem, *Povstannja černihiv's'koho polku* (Kiev, 1956); I. Pil'huk, *Ševčenko i dekabristy* (Kiev, 1958); I. Zaslavs'kyj, *Ryljejev i rosij's'ko-ukrajins'ki literaturni vzajemny* (Kiev, 1958); L. Medved's'ka, *Dekabristy na Poltavščyni* (Kharkiv, 1960); idem, *Serhij Ivanovyč Muravjov Apostol* (Kiev, 1961); idem, *Pavlo Ivanovyč Pestel'* (Kiev, 1964); H. Serhijenko, *Dekabristy ta jix revoljucijni tradyciji na Ukrajinu* (Kiev, 1975). See also two bibliographical surveys, M. V. Nečkina: "Ukrainskaja jubilejnaja literatura o dekabristax," *Istoričeskij Marksist* (Moscow), 1927, no. 3, pp. 187–195; and L. Olijnyk, "Dekabristy'kyj rux na Ukrajinu v radjans'kij istoriohrafiji," *Ukrajins'kyj istoričnyj žurnal*, 1965, no. 12, pp. 119–28.

⁸ I have in mind the Novhorod-Sivers'kyj circle studied by Oleksander Ohloblyn, especially in his *Ljudy staroji Ukrajinu* (Munich, 1959), and in his *Berlins'ka misija Kapnista 1791 roku: Istoriografija i metodologija pytannja* (Munich, 1974).

Since there is no trace of any original text, one can speculate whether the manuscript might have been produced at the outset in several exemplars, which were then claimed to be copies of a non-existent original supposedly written some fifty years before.⁹ Scholars have speculated about at least eleven possible authors.¹⁰ Apparently *Istoriya Rusov* was the collective

⁹ Myxajlo Voznjak, *Psevd-Konys'kyj i Psevd-Poletyka: Istoriya Rusov u literaturi i nauci* (Lviv, Kiev, Warsaw, 1939), pp. 5–6.

¹⁰ Candidates for authorship of the *Istoriya Rusov* (followed by the name of the scholar who first proposed him) are: Jurij Konys'kyj (Oleksander von der Brieggen); Hryhorij Poletyka (Volodymyr Ikonnykov); Vasyl' Poletyka (Vasyl' Horlenko); Hryhorij and Vasyl' Poletyka (father and son jointly) (Oleksander Lazarevs'kyj); Oleksander Bezborod'ko (Myxajlo Slabčenko); Opanas Lobysevych (Oleksander Ohloblyn); Prince Mykola Repnin-Volkons'kyj (Myxajlo Maksymovyč); Vasyl' Lukaševyč (Mykola Petrovs'kyj); Arxyp Xudorba (Oleksander Ohloblyn); Vasyl Myk. Xanenko (d. ca. 1799) and/or Oleksander Ivan Xanenko (d. ca. 1803) (Oleksander Ohloblyn).

Literature on *Istoriya Rusov* published since 1920 includes Dmytro Dorošenko, "Istoriya Rusov' jak pamjatka ukrajins'koji polityčnoji dumky druhoji polovyny XVIII stolittja," *Xliborob's'ka Ukrajina*, bk. 3, collections 5 and 6 (Vienna, 1921), pp. 183–98; Mykola Horban', "Kil'ka uvah do pytannja pro avtora 'Istoriji Rusov,'" *Červonyj šljax* (Kharkiv), 1923, no. 6–7, pp. 146–50; Anatolij Jeršov, "Do pytannja pro čas napysannja 'Istorii Rusov,' a počasty j pro avtora jiji," *Juvilejnyj zbirnyk na pošanu akademika Myxajla Serhijevyča Hruševs'koho*, vol. 1 (Kiev, 1928), pp. 186–91; Pavlo Klepac'kyj, "Lystuvannja Oleksandra Andrijevyča Bezborod'ka z svojim bat'kom, jak istoryčne džerelo," *ibid.*, pp. 180–85; L. Kosova, "Ševčenko ta 'Istoriya Rusov,'" in *Ševčenko*, vol. 1 (Kharkiv, 1928), pp. 161–62; Mykola Petrovs'kyj, "Do istoriji deržavnoho ustroju Ukrajinny XVII viku," *Zapysky Nižyns'koho instytutu socijalnoho vyxovannja*, vol. 11 (Nižyn, 1930), p. 90; Andrij Jakovliv (Yakovliv), "Do pytannja pro avtora 'Istoriji Rusov,'" *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenko*, vol. 154 (Lviv, 1937), pp. 71–114; *idem*, "Istoriya Rusov and its Author," *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* (hereafter *Annals*), 3, no. 2 (New York, 1953): 620–69; Voznjak, *Psevd Konys'kyj i Psevd-Poletyka* (see fn. 9, above); *idem*, "I xto ž avtor 'Istoriji Rusov?,'" *Naši dni* (Lviv), 1944, no. 1, pp. 4–5; Oleksander Ohloblyn, "Xto buv avtorom 'Istoriji Rusov?,'" *Naši dni*, 1943, no. 11, pp. 6–7; *idem*, "Psevd-Bezborod'ko proty Lobysevycha," *Naši dni*, 1944, no. 5, p. 11; *idem*, "Opanas Lobysevych (1732–1805)," *Literaturno-naukovyj zbirnyk* (Korigen-Kiel), 3 (1948): 3–10; *idem*, *Xanenky: Storinka z istoriji ukrajins'koho avtonomizmu 18-ho stolittja* (Kiel, 1949); *idem*, "Do pytannja pro avtora 'Istoriji Rusov,'" *Ukrajina* (Paris), 1949, no. 2, pp. 71–75; *idem*, "Perša drukovana zvistka pro 'Istoriju Rusov,'" *Naša kul'tura* (Winnipeg), 1951, no. 2 (167), pp. 28–35; *idem*, "Čudo Dextjarivs'koji Božoji Materi v 'Istoriji Rusov,'" *Naša kul'tura*, 1952, no. 12 (177), pp. 25–28, and no. 1, pp. 25–30; *idem*, "The Ethical and Political Principles of 'Istoriya Rusov,'" *Annals* 2, no. 4 (6) (1952): 388–400; *idem*, "Where was *Istoriya Rusov* Written?," *Annals* 3, no. 2 (8) (1953): 670–95; *idem*, "Spysky 'Istoriji Rusiv,'" *Naukovyj zbirnyk UVU*, vol. 6 (Munich, 1956); introductory essay in *Istoriya Rusiv*, trans. Vjačeslav Davydenko (New York, 1956), pp. v–xxix; *idem*, "Research Studies on 'Istoriya Rusov,'" *Proceedings of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Historical-Philosophical Section*, vol. 2 (Paris [1957]), pp. 32–36; *idem*, "Arxyp Xudorba," in O. Ohloblyn, *Ljudy staroji Ukrajinny* (Munich, 1959), pp. 288–99; *idem*, *Opanas Lobysevych, 1732–1805* (Munich, 1966); Borys Krupnyc'kyj, *Beiträge zur Ideologie der 'Geschichte der Reussen' (Istoria Rusov)* (Berlin, 1945); *idem*, "Les bases ideologiques de la conception du monde de l'auteur de 'l'Histoire des Ruthenes,'" *Proceedings*, vol. 2 (Paris [1957]), pp. 30–32; *idem*, "Do svitohljadu 'Istoriji Rusiv,'" in B. K., *Istoriografijni problemy istoriji Ukrajinny* (Munich, 1959), pp. 70–77; *idem*,

product of a Ukrainian secret society which had two branches—one in the imperial capital of St. Petersburg, among leading bureaucrats of Ukrainian origin, and the other in the northern part of the former Hetmanate, among nobles and educators (especially Ivan Xalans'kyj and Illja Tymkovs'kyj) of the Novhorod-Sivers'kyj (later Černihiv) and Poltava gubernias. Among the society's members were individuals belonging to the prominent Hudo-vyč, Bezborod'ko, Kapnist', Myklaševs'kyj, Poletyka, and Xanenko families.¹¹

Undoubtedly these noblemen had good reason to prepare a special treatise in 1815–1818. At the time many still believed that enlightened liberal reforms were “just around the corner,” especially since Prince Mykola Repnin-Volkons'kyj had recently been appointed governor-general of a resurrected Malorossija. Hence politically-minded Ukrainian nobles considered it vital to assert the status of Malorossija, and the rights and privileges of its people, the Ruthenians or Ukrainians. That circle, which eventually produced *Istorija Rusov*, believed, in the spirit of the age of reason, that it had to have supportive documentation to gain credibility. The nobles and educators decided, now in the spirit of Romanticism, to create a legend about Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj's state archives. Supposedly Bohdan's son, Juras' Xmel'nyčenko, deposited them in a monastery, from which they were transferred to the cathedral monastery in Belorussian Mohyliv. At the supposed time of the *Istorija Rusov*, ca. 1769, a history based on the archives was in the keeping of Archbishop Georgij Konys'kyj (1717–1795), a revered alumnus and professor of the Kiev Mohyla Academy. The irrefutable documents were, according to the legend, selected by Konys'kyj's pupil, the nobleman Hryhorij Poletyka

“‘Istorija Rusiv’ ta ‘Istorija Ukrajiny j ukrajins'kyx kozakiv’ J. X. Engelja (porivnjal’na xarakterystyka),” *ibid.*, pp. 77–87; Il’ko Borščak (Élie Borschak), *La légende historique de l’Ukraine: Istorija Rusov* (Paris, 1949); M. Sadylenko, “Do ‘Istoriji Rusov,’” *Naša kul’tura*, no. 169 (Winnipeg, 1952), pp. 31–32 (on the Poltava copy); Volodymyr Deržavyn, “The History of the Rus,” *Ukrainian Review* (London), 1957, no. 4, pp. 24–31; Mykola Marčenko, “‘Istorija Rusiv’ ta jiji misce v ukrajins'kij istoriohrafiji,” in M. M., *Ukrajins'ka istoriohrafija: Z davnix časiv do seredyny XIX st.* (Kiev, 1959), pp. 102–127; Fedir Ševčenko, “‘Istorija Rusov ili Maloj Rossii’: Do 120-riččja z času vydannja tvorju,” *Ukrajins'kyj istoričnyj žurnal*, 1966, no. 7, pp. 146–49; O. Ohloblyn, “Mij tvorčyj šljax ukrajins'koho istoryka,” *Zbirnyk na pošanu . . . Oleksandra Ohloblyna* (New York, 1977), pp. 40–42; Jurij Ševel’ov (G. Y. Shevelov), “‘Istorija Rusov’ očyma movoznavcja,” *ibid.*, pp. 465–85. Stefan Kozak, *U źródél romantyzmu i nowožytnej myšli społecznej na Ukrainie* (Wrocław, 1978), pp. 71–135; Bohdan Fedenko, “L’élément ukrainien parmi les Décembristes,” in *Le 14 Décembre 1825: Origine et héritage du mouvement des Décembristes* (Paris, 1980), pp. 79–83.

¹¹ See O. Ohloblyn, *Ljudy staroji Ukrajiny* (Munich, 1959).

(1725–1784), a credible (and long deceased) member of Catherine II's Legislative Commission of 1767.¹²

This "documentation" was presented as proof that the Rus' (Ruthenians/Ukrainians) had always been a free European people (or nation), and that they were, in fact, the organizers of the first state in Eastern Europe: "As is well known," states Hetman Mazepa, "we were what the Muscovites are now: government, seniority, and the very name Rus' went over from us to them (Ибо известно, что прежде были мы то, что теперь Московцы: правительство, первенство, и самое название Руси отъ насъ къ нимъ перешли)." ¹³ It was the Tatar invasions that obliged the Rus' to enter, always as a free partner, into a series of alliances, first with Lithuania, later with Poland, and finally with Muscovy—the barbaric "Great Russia."

All these alliances were, according to *Istorija Rusov*, based on bilateral treaties guaranteeing the rights and privileges and territorial integrity of Rus'-Malorossija, which, as an independent partner, had those treaties affirmed by international conventions and by the Holy Roman (German) Emperors.¹⁴

Although *Istorija Rusov*, in the pattern of the true Cossack chronicles of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, focuses on the epoch of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj, it cites in detail from the alleged first treaty between Lithuania and Rus', that is, the Jagiełło Krewo Union of 1386, which was in fact a treaty between Lithuania and Poland.¹⁵ Telescoping three later historical concepts—(1) the slogan "the equal with the equal, and the free with the free" created at the Polish-Lithuanian Lublin Union of 1569, (2) the Polish concept of "Pacta conventa" from 1573, and (3) the triune structure of the Commonwealth (Poland, Lithuania, Rus') as formed at the Hadjač Union of 1658—the *Istorija Rusov* presented them as developing anachronistically, by 1386.¹⁶

To emphasize Malorossija's international importance, *Istorija Rusov* has the Swedish king Charles XII say that he has come to the Ukraine only to honor the treaty that his ancestors had concluded with the Rus' nation and because Muscovy has broken its treaties with Rus'. He swears to restore

¹² *Istorija Rusov ili Maloj Rossii: Sočinenie Georgija Koniskogo, arxiepiskopa Belorusskogo*, ed. Osyp Bodjans'kyj (Moscow, 1846), pp. i–ii.

¹³ *Istorija Rusov*, p. 204a.

¹⁴ *Istorija Rusov*, p. 204a, 148b.

¹⁵ *Istorija Rusov*, p. 7a.

¹⁶ On the Hadjač Treaty, see Andrzej Kamiński, "The Cossack Experiment in *Szlachta* Democracy in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: The Hadiach (Hadziacz) Union," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 1, no. 2 (1977): 178–97.

the independence of the Cossacks or Rus': "клянусь честією своєю королевскою . . . возстановитъ землю сію Козацкую или Рускую въ первобитное ея состояніе самодержавное и ни отъ кого въ свѣтѣ независимое," as set forth in documents he signed with Hetman Mazepa. These rights the leading nations of Europe are willing to guarantee: "а гарантировать ихъ взялись первѣйшія въ Европѣ держави."¹⁷ *Istorija Rusov* stresses the importance of a "balance of power (система равновѣсія державъ)," the concept that was the basic principle of the Congress of Vienna (1814–1815).¹⁸

What is important to us about these passages in the *Istorija Rusov* is that its authors, the enlightened gentry of Malorossija, who were also the first group of secular Ukrainian intellectuals—to use Lypyns'kyj's later terminology, the producers, the enlightened gentry of Malorossija—regarded the past of their native land as that of an independent West European nation, which as a sovereign state had secured its neutrality through political alliances with its neighbors and by international treaties.

The legacy of these noblemen, who as either high imperial bureaucrats in St. Petersburg, high officers in the imperial army, landowners and/or educators in Malorossija, knew contemporary Europe and its politics, is very important in Ukrainian intellectual history. Influenced by the Enlightenment, they recreated a vision of Rus' as an independent nation-state. Alas, their idea would wane and be abandoned by the next generation of the nobility: the first stratum of the imperial intelligentsia. The only exception was Taras Ševčenko, the ingenious national poet, but even he was an "adopted" member of that class.¹⁹

II

The term *intelligentsia* entered the Russian vocabulary in about 1860, although the intelligentsia ("die Sache") itself had begun to form there some three decades earlier, with the university education of noblemen.²⁰ The empire's first five universities of the West European type (at Dorpat, Vilnius, Kharkiv, Moscow, and Kazan) were instituted (or reformed) by

¹⁷ *Istorija Rusov*, p. 210a.

¹⁸ See, for example, *Istorija Rusov*, pp. 122a, 138b.

¹⁹ See my essay "Misce Tarasa Ševčenka v ukrajins'kij intelektual'nij istoriji" (forthcoming in the publications of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, New York).

²⁰ Richard Pipes, *Russia under the Old Regime* (New York, 1974), pp. 249–86. See also Marc Raeff, *Origins of the Russian Intelligentsia: The Eighteenth-Century Nobility* (New York, 1966).

Alexander I in the years 1802–1805.²¹ The structure of the empire was then essentially that of a presecular, patrimonial state, without any clear distinction between ownership (*dominium*) and authority (*iurisdictio*), without the Western tradition of bilateral personal contract (a legacy of feudalism) or rule of law (the Roman tradition, or *habeas corpus*), and without autonomous cities or separation of church from state (indeed, the clergy were state servants). As a result, there were no effective *loci* of power that might challenge the patrimonial ruler and the central structured authority. Western Europe's omnipotent bourgeoisie of the eighteenth to the nineteenth century was completely absent in the Russian Empire.

Soon after their establishment in the empire, the Western-type universities were producing educated young noblemen, who, rather than entering government service or devoting themselves to self-betterment, made intellectual activity their profession, with the aim of benefitting society at large, especially the still enserfed peasantry.

After the abortive coup of young officers in December 1825, the intellectuals lost faith in the evolutionary development of civil liberties in the empire. They came to believe that they must take the place of the missing bourgeoisie and themselves challenge tsarist autocracy. These angry young noblemen-intellectuals alienated themselves from the empire's "decadent" society and many of them became professional revolutionaries. From the beginning their struggle was waged in the name of abstract ideals, exactly in the manner that Burke felt it ought never to be waged.

Since the decadent tsarist state became for them synonymous with the concept of state itself, the intelligentsia's revolutionary struggle in Russia and the Ukraine after the 1840s came to symbolize the struggle against the state per se, regardless of whether the intelligentsia activists were populists, romantics, or socialists. This important point can be illustrated by referring to the views of Kostomarov and Antonovyč (populists), on the one hand, and Drahomanov (a liberal constitutionalist and socialist), on the other.

Romanticism reached the Ukraine via the new imperial universities. The small provincial town of Kharkiv (ca. 10,000 inhabitants in 1804) was destined to house the first university in the Ukraine. Alexander I, upon becoming tsar, gathered around him a group of liberal noblemen-intellectuals, including Prince Adam Czartoryski²² and Nikolaj Novosil'cov, and

²¹ On the introduction of Western-type universities with their *Lehr- und Lernfreiheit* into the Russian Empire and ensuing problems, see Pavel Miljukov, *Očerki po istorii russkoj kul'tury*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1931), pp. 768–873.

²² See Ladislaus Czartoryski, *Alexandre I-er et le Prince [Adam] Czartoryski: Correspondance particulière et conversations, 1801–1823*, with an introduction by Charles de Mazade (Paris, 1865); Jacek Lipski, *Archivum Kuratorii Wileńskiej Ad[ama] Czartoryskiego* (Cracow,

empowered them to reform the imperial educational system. One of these noblemen, the gifted, self-taught young inventor Vasyl' Karazyn, became obsessed with the idea of founding a university in his native Kharkiv.²³ He raised the necessary funds and secured the approval of the emperor. But Alexander had granted Karazyn's wish for his own purposes. The gentry of Malorossija had repeatedly requested that a university be established either in the old cultural capital of Kiev or in one of Malorossija's centers, such as Nižyn or Baturyn. But the imperial government opposed the creation of a university in those cities, so as not to irritate the Poles. Prince Adam Czartoryski, curator of the university at Vilnius as well as a personal friend of Alexander I, developed the idea of maintaining Polish cultural exclusiveness in the Ukraine within historical Poland, united in personal union with Russia. The emperor was fully captivated by the idea. Since Kharkiv was located far to the east and had never been under Polish rule, Czartoryski supported Karazyn's plan by proposing that a university be established there. Soon a galaxy of first-rate scholars was imported from Germany and France, bringing German Romanticism with them. Two German thinkers who had special impact on the transplantation of Western ideas to Kharkiv were Herder and Schelling.

Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744–1803) was born in East Prussia, studied in Königsberg with Immanuel Kant, and later became professor at Jena, a center for poets and philosophers clustered around Johann Wolfgang von Goethe.²⁴ Herder elevated human feeling and imagination in arbitrary opposition to logic and reason. For him the true medium of thought was feeling (*Gefühl*), which he compared to the sense of touch and which he believed possible to express only through the native language. In its ancient "uncivilized" period, the poetry of every nation, he maintained, appears in its greatest purity, power, and uniqueness. On that treasure of national experience and linguistic possibilities later poets should draw for their own creativity. Herder's ideas flourished among the Ukrainians and other Slavs, who had an underdeveloped literary language but a highly developed folk poetry. In the summer of 1769, he set out on a sea voyage from Riga to Nantes, which brought him a deeper understanding of both human history and human destiny. The culmination of Herder's reflections on that trip

²³ A. Sljusarskij, *V. N. Karazin: Ego naučnaja i obščestvennaja dejatel'nost'* (Kharkiv, 1955); Jurij Lavrinenko, *Vasyl' Karazyn: Arxitekt vidrodžennja* (Munich, 1975). See also *Sočinenija, pis'ma i bumagi V. N. Karazina*, ed. Dmytro Bahalij (Kharkiv, 1910).

²⁴ Theodor Litt and F. M. Barnard, *Herder's Social and Political Thought: From Enlightenment to Nationalism* (Oxford, 1965).

was his *Journal of My Voyage in the Year 1769*. There he included this “prophecy” concerning the Ukraine:

The Ukraine will one day become a new Greece; the beautiful climate of this country, the gay disposition of the people, their musical inclination, and the fertile soil will all awaken. From so many small tribes which in the past were Greeks there will rise a great and cultured nation and its boundaries will extend to the Black Sea, and thence into the far-flung world.²⁵

Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling (1775–1854) was a student of Fichte in Tübingen, but whereas the latter made the knowing and willing subject the center of all existence, the former emphasized the self-existence of the objective world. Schelling’s major contribution to philosophy was his idea of the unity of all natural forces and the unity of the humanities and sciences. Such theories paved the way for the idea of evolution. Schelling, however, subordinated nature to mind;²⁶ his ideas enjoyed immense popularity in the Russian Empire.²⁷ Myxajlo Maksymovyč (1804–1873), the first person to develop an analytical method for studying Ukrainian history (and the first rector of the University of Kiev, founded in 1834), was a true follower of Schellingianism.²⁸

Some ten years after the founding of Kharkiv University, most of its professors of the humanities and social studies were venturing out to the villages and countryside to collect the only “true” poetry (according to Herder)—that is, folk songs. Many began to write their own poetry. The resulting literature, referred to as Kharkiv Romanticism, has a special place in the history of modern Ukrainian literature.²⁹ It fostered the development of a new Ukrainian literary language based almost exclusively on modern Left-Bank dialects. This happened because the Kharkiv writers, whether Ukrainian or non-Ukrainian in background, had no attachment to or

²⁵ See Emil Adler, *Herder und die deutsche Aufklärung* (Vienna [1968]), p. 339.

²⁶ On Schelling, see F. Rosenzweig, *Das erste Systemprogramm des deutschen Idealismus* (Heidelberg, 1917); H. Knittermeyer, *Schelling und die romantische Schule* (Munich, 1929); Karl Jaspers, *Schelling: Grösse und Verhängnis* (Munich, 1955). See also Dmytro Čyževs’kyj, “The Influence of the Philosophy of Schelling (1775–1854) in the Ukraine,” *Annals* 5, no. 2, 3 (16–17) (1956): 1128–39.

²⁷ See Wsewolod Setchkareff, *Schelling’s Einfluss in der russischen Literatur der 20er und 30er Jahre des XIX. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1939).

²⁸ On Myxajlo Maksymovyč, see D. Ostrjanyn, “Filosofs’ki pohljady M. O. Maksymovyča,” *Naukovi zapysky Instytutu filosofiji AN URSR* (Kiev), 4 (1958): 86–114; idem, *Svitohljad M. O. Maksymovyča* (Kiev, 1960); P. Markov, *M. O. Maksymovyč—vydatnyj istoryk XIX st.* (Kiev, 1973). See also D. Čyževs’kyj, *Narysy z istoriji filosofiji na Ukrajinu* (Prague, 1931), pp. 76–78.

²⁹ A. Šamraj, *Xarkivs’ka škola romantykiv*, vol. 1 (Kharkiv, 1930). The oeuvre of the Kharkiv Romantics has been collected and published by Stepan Kryžaniv’skyj and Ijeremija Ajzenštok, *Ukrajins’ki poety romantyky 20–40x rokiv XIX st.* (Kiev, 1966).

knowledge of the Ukrainian traditional culture centered in Kiev and in Malorossija. Thus a great breach formed between the Ukrainian literary language of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the new language of the second decade of the nineteenth century. The breach would surely have been avoided had the nineteenth-century renaissance occurred not in the cultural *tabula rasa* of Kharkiv, but in historical Kiev.

The local geographic term *Ukrajina* (an elliptical designation from "Slobids'ka Ukrajina," a term brought to the Kharkiv region in the 1630s from Kievan Ukraine) was now adopted to refer to the new Slavic literary language. *Ukrajina* would soon replace the historical names *Rus'* and *Malorossija*. In the "Sloboda Ukraine" and in Kharkiv no tradition of the Malorossian Hetman state existed. The sophisticated authors of the *Istorija Rusov* had a presentiment that the replacement of the historical and political term designating a state (*Malorossija*) by a geographical term meaning "frontierland" (*Ukrajina*) could have very grave consequences: loss of the concept of a historical, structured state.³⁰ Unfortunately, their fears proved to be well founded.

III

The most important alumnus of Kharkiv University (class of 1837) was the historian Mykola Kostomarov (1817–1885).³¹ The author of many monographs on Ukrainian and Russian history, he also produced the first scholarly treatment of the two "Russian" nationalities—the Ukrainians and the Russians. In Kostomarov's romantic view, the defining feature of the Ukrainian national character is democratism, versus Russian despotism and Polish aristocratism. He maintained that "the South Russians [i.e., Ukrainians] are characterized by the predominance of individual freedom, and the Great Russians, by the predominance of the community." This Ukrainian characteristic survives only in the Ukrainian peasant, however, because the Cossack upper classes have become denationalized. Thus the only subject

³⁰ *Istorija Rusov*, pp. iii–iv.

³¹ On Mykola Kostomarov, see the special issue of *Ukrajina* edited by Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, 1925, no. 3, pp. 1–87; Dmytro Dorošenko, *Mykola Ivanovyč Kostomarov* (Leipzig, 1924); L. Poluxin, *Formuvannja istoričnyx pohljadiv M. I. Kostomarova* (Kiev, 1959); A. Bespalova, "Do pytannja pro suspil'no-polityčni pohljady M. I. Kostomarova: Do 150-riččja M. I. Kostomarova," *Ukrajins'kyj istoričnyj žurnal*, 1967, no. 5, pp. 50–55; Je. Šabliovs'kyj, "Mykola Kostomarov i Ukrajina: Do 150-riččja z dnja narodžennja," *Žovten'* (Lviv), 1967, no. 4, pp. 123–38. See also *Naukovo-publicyčny i polemičny pysannja Kostomarova*, ed. M. Hruševs'kyj (Kiev, 1928).

of Ukrainian history should be that simple peasant, his wishes and desires.³² Kostomarov replaced the concept of the state as the only possible subject of history, as presented in the *Istorija Rusov*, with his own concept of an anthropological *communitas*. It is telling that having decided to write a monograph on Bohdan Xmel'nyč'kyj, Kostomarov, though he contemplated "going to Petersburg to work in the public library [researching its documents]," decided "to remain for a time in Little Russia in order to study the people thoroughly, to visit the places where Xmel'nyč'kyj had been active, and to collect legends that had been preserved about him and his epoch."³³

Kostomarov was a very influential writer. His Ukrainian followers (the majority of whom were of noble origin) elevated the idealization of the Ukrainian peasantry into a single-minded national cause, thereby alienating themselves from their fathers' generation and the generally conservative nobility. Kostomarov's adoration of the peasantry may have sprung from his personal history. He was the illegitimate son of a Russian *dvorjanin* and a Ukrainian serf girl.³⁴ His father died tragically at the hands of his rebellious serfs, and Kostomarov was raised by his serf mother.

Strangely enough, a similar personal history obsessed Kostomarov's younger colleague, Volodymyr Antonovyč (1834–1908).³⁵ The illegitimate son of a Polish gentlewoman and a Hungarian gentleman-musician, he was adopted by his mother's husband—the impoverished Ukrainian squire Bonifatij Antonovyč.³⁶ Until 1860 Volodymyr Antonovyč was active in Polish student organizations. He then left the Polish camp and decided to become Ukrainian, later explaining that decision in his *My Confession*:

³² M. Kostomarov, "Dve russkie narodnosti," *Istoričeskie monografii i issledovanija*, 2nd ed., by D. E. Kožančikov (St. Petersburg, 1872), p. 91.

³³ "Avtobiografija Nikolaja Ivanoviča Kostomarova," ed. V. I. Semevskij and N. Bilozers'ka, appearing in *Russkaja mysl'* (Moscow), 1885, no. 5, pp. 206–207. Refreshing are the critical remarks concerning Kostomarov's political views presented by Osyp Hermajze in his article "M. Kostomarov v svitli avtobiografiji," *Ukrajina*, 1925, no. 3, pp. 79–87.

³⁴ "Proisxoždenie N. I. Kostomarova," *Knižki "Nedeli"* (St. Petersburg), 1898, no. 12, pp. 257–58.

³⁵ On Volodymyr Antonovyč, see Dmytro Bahalij, "V. B. Antonovič," in S. Vengerov, *Kritiko-biografičeskij slovar' russkix pisatelej i učenyx*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1889), pp. 655–66; Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, "Volodymyr Antonovyč: Osnovni ideji joho tvorčosty i dijal'nosti," *Zapysky Ukrajins'koho naukovocho tovarystva* (Kiev), 3 (1909): 5–15; Ivan Stešenko, "Volodymyr Antonovyč jak suspil'nyj dijač," *ibid.*, pp. 29–33; Serhij Jefremov, "Pered sudom vlasnoji sovisty: Hromads'ka j polityčna robota V. B. Antonovyča," *Zapysky Istoryčno-filohičnoho viddilu UAN* (Kiev), 5 (1924): 1–14; Osyp Hermajze, "V. B. Antonovyč v ukrajins'kij istoriohrafiji," *Ukrajina* (Kiev), 1928, no. 5, pp. 17–33; Dmytro Dorošenko, *Volodymyr Antonovyč* (Prague, 1941). See also V. Antonovyč, *Tvory*, vol. 1 (Kiev, 1932).

³⁶ "Memuary," in Antonovyč, *Tvory*, 1: 3–10.

I saw that a man of the Polish gentry living in South Russia had before the court of his conscience but two choices. One was to love the people in whose midst he lived, to be imbued with its interests, to return to the nationality his ancestors once had abandoned, and, as far as possible, by unremitting labor and love to compensate the people for the evil done it . . . and the lack of respect for its religion, customs, morality, and person The second choice . . . was to emigrate to Polish territory . . . in order that there might be one less parasite I, of course, decided upon the first, because no matter how much I was corrupted by gentry education, habits, and dreams, it was easier for me to part with them than with the people in whose midst I had grown up, the people that I knew . . . the people that, in a word, I came to love more than my gentry habits and reveries."³⁷

For Antonovyč, as for Kostomarov, acceptance of Ukrainianism meant cutting his ties with the gentry, for his was an ideology of social renegadism rather than of the Ukrainization of his own class. Antonovyč became the leader of the Ukrainian populist movement ("Hromada") among the intelligentsia during the last three decades of the nineteenth century.

Kostomarov and Antonovyč, the two main ideologists of Ukrainian populism, laid an unfair and damaging charge against the Ukrainian upper classes: they accused them of deserting the Ukrainian people—that is, the idealized peasantry. The accusation of Ukrainian populists of the Kostomarov-Antonovyč brand had grave consequences for the nation, especially during the Revolution of 1917–1920. Their ethnocentric fixation on the exclusive place of the peasants in the Ukrainian social structure significantly contributed to the alienation of the Ukrainian upper classes, as well as the bourgeoisie and the nascent industrial working classes, from the cause of Ukrainian statehood.

Antonovyč was unable to give his anti-structural Ukrainianism of the *communitas* type any political role. In contrast to the thesis of the *Istorija Rusov*, Antonovyč theorized that there exists a peculiar Ukrainian historical process, the characteristic feature of which is the inability to develop its own structure—that is, an elite (due to an overdeveloped democratic instinct), a higher civilization, or a state. For these reasons Ukrainians would remain forever an apolitical nationality within the Russian Empire, although one having its own peasant culture. His arguments ran as follows:

While over the course of the centuries the Great Russian has exerted all his strength to create a strong political organism, the Little Russian not only has not shown any concern for that, but has never manifested an aspiration for political independence. By turns a part of the Lithuanian, Polish, and Russian states, he has acknowledged and respected the authority of each of them.

³⁷ "Moja ispoved'," in Antonovyč, *Tvory*, 1: 113–15.

Not the aspirations of individuals, nor advantageous political circumstances, nor even the consciousness of his strength after a victory have ever moved the Little Russian to seek or even to take advantage of opportunities for an independent political existence. It is enough to remember a few historical examples (Mixail Hlyns'kyj, Xmel'nyč'kyj, Mazepa) in order to convince oneself that the idea of political independence has never found an echo in the temper of the South Russian people. Even the Zaporozhian community located far in the steppe never attempted to become independent. . . . Despite its utter indifference to political independence, despite its complete readiness to acknowledge and respect the authority of a [foreign] supreme state power, the Little Russian people has always stood up very actively for its social ideals with regard to its country's domestic order. . . [consisting] in the following: the equal rights of all before the law, the absence of class distinctiveness, group management of the affairs of the country, freedom of religious conscience, the right to develop and perfect national institutions, and the application of the electoral principle to government. . . .

Little Russian literature has never raised even a hint of political separatism and always has considered this motif as alien.³⁸

Antonovyč thus completely divorced his cultural Ukrainophilism from any political concepts or action. As a result, the politically active Ukrainian youth of the second half of the nineteenth century became attracted to Russian revolutionary slogans and were lost to the Ukrainian nation.

Antonovyč's younger friend, Myxajlo Drahomanov (1841–1895),³⁹ a gentryman from the Left Bank, decisively disassociated himself from

³⁸ "Pohljady ukrajinoofiliv," in Antonovyč, *Tvory*, 1: 245–48.

³⁹ On Myxajlo Drahomanov, see Ivan Franko, "Suspil'no-polityčni pohljady M. Drahomanova," *Literaturno-naukovyj vistnyk* (Lviv), 35 (1906): 226–40; Julijan Oxrymovyč, *Rozvytok ukrajins'koji nacional'no-polityčnoji dumky: Vid počatku XIX stolittja do Myxajla Drahomanova*, ed. Volodymyr Doroženko and F. Fedorciv (Lviv and Kiev, 1922), pp. 88–118; Ahatanhel Kryms'kyj, "M. P. Drahomanov: Nekroloh," in Kryms'kyj's *Rozvidky, statti i zamitky* (Kiev, 1928), pp. 310–67; D. Zaslavskij, *M. P. Dragomanov* (Kiev, 1924; 2nd ed. [censored], Moscow, 1934); Ivan Lysjak Rudnyč'kyj (Ivan L. Rudnytsky), "Drahomanov as a Political Theorist," *Annals* 2, no. 1 (3) (1952): 70–130; D. Zaslavskij and I. Romančenko, *Myxajlo Drahomanov: Žyttja i literaturno-doslidnyč'ka dijal'nist'* (Kiev, 1964); V. Lukerenko, *Svitohljad M. P. Drahomanova* (Kiev, 1965); Jevhen Pyzjur (Eugene Pyziur), "Konstytucijna prohrama i teorija M. Drahomanova," *Lysty do pryjateliv* (New York), 14, nos. 8–10 (160–162) (1966): 1–11; Elżbieta Hornowa, *Ocena działalności Michała Drahomanowa w historiografii ukraińskiej, rosyjskiej i polskiej* (Opole, 1967); Rajisa Ivanova, *Myxajlo Drahomanov u suspil'no-polityčnomu rusi Rosiji ta Ukrainy (II-polovyna XIX st.)* (Kiev, 1971); E. Hornowa, *Problemy polskie w twórczości Michała Drahomanowa* (Wrocław, 1978). See also *Arxiv Myxajla Drahomanova*, vol. 1: *Lystuvannja Kyjivs'koji Hromady z M. Drahomanovom (1870–1895 rr.)* (Warsaw, 1937); *Mykhajlo Drahomanov: A Symposium and Selected Writings* (= *Annals* 2, no. 1 [3] [1952]).

Drahomanov's oeuvre has been published only in part: *Sobranie političeskix sočinenij M. P. Dragomanova: Izdanie redakcii "Osvoboždenie,"* ed. Bohdan Kistjakovs'kyj, 2 vols. (Paris, 1905–1906); *Političeskie sočinenija M. P. Dragomanova*, ed. I. M. Grevs and Bohdan Kistjakovs'kyj (Moscow, 1908); *M. P. Drahomanov, Vybrani tvory: Zbirka polityčnyx tvoriv z prymitkamy*, ed. Pavlo Bohac'kyj, vol. 1 (Prague, 1937); *Myxajlo Petrovyč Drahomanov:*

Antonovyč's apolitical "Ukrainophilism." Drahomanov insisted that all political movements in the Ukraine had to have a Ukrainian national character, and that the Ukrainians—whom he, too, viewed as being exclusively "a plebeian nation"⁴⁰—had a right to complete equality.

The nucleus of Drahomanov's political program was a liberalism of the English type: civil rights and constitutionalism were his political slogans. He opposed revolution as a means of political reform, and insisted that the legal equality of each individual transforms liberalism into a democracy.⁴¹ He took from Proudhon a mistrust of political authority, expressed in the motto "liberty versus government," certainly influenced by his own experience in the autocratic Russian Empire. Rejecting nationalism as a political doctrine, Drahomanov proposed federalism ("Vil'na spilka") and culture as the basis for the functioning of an ideal republican system:⁴²

I acknowledge the right of all groups of men, including nationalities, to self-government. I believe that such self-government brings inestimable advantages to men. But we must not seek the guiding idea for our cultural and political activity in national feelings and interests. To do this would lose us in the jungle of subjective viewpoints and historical traditions. Governing and controlling ideas are to be found in scientific thoughts and in international, universal, human interests. In brief, I do not reject nationalities, but nationalism, particularly nationalism which opposes cosmopolitanism.⁴³

Drahomanov placed the political and social freedom of his people above their achievement of statehood:⁴⁴

The Ukrainians have undoubtedly lost much by the fact that at the time when most of the other European peoples founded national states, they were not in a position to do so. A state of one's own. . . is, after all, a form of social organization suited to defense against foreign attacks and to the regulation of affairs in one's own land. . . [But] a revolution against Austria and Russia, similar to that which the Italians, with the help of France, made for their independence, is an impossibility for us. . . . The Ukrainians will have better prospects if they strive for their political and social freedom within the states in which they live, with the help of the other peoples also subjugated by these states. . . .

Literaturno-publicystyčni praci v dvox tomach, ed. O. Zasenka et al., 2 vols. (Kiev, 1970).

⁴⁰ Note, e.g., the title of Drahomanov's pamphlet: *La litteratura di una nazione plebea* (Geneva, 1881).

⁴¹ Pyzjur, "Konstytucijna prohrama i teorija Drahomanova," pp. 3–10.

⁴² "Draft Constitution for the Ukrainian Society Free Union," in *Annals* 2, no. 1 (3) (1952): 194–205.

⁴³ "Lysty na naddnprjans'ku Ukrajinu," in *Literaturno-publicystyčni praci* (Kiev), 1 (1970): 465–66.

⁴⁴ "Perednje slovo do 'Hromady,'" in *Vybrani tvory*, 1: 111–12.

In identifying the Ukrainian nation with the popular masses (in contrast to the *Istorija Rusov*), Drahomanov concluded that they were more interested in social matters than in their own statehood:

Our nation was closest to statehood at the time of Xmel'nyc'kyj's Cossack revolution in the middle of the seventeenth century. A vast territory on both sides of the Dnieper, from Baturyn on the Muscovite border to Vynnycja in Podillja, was then organized into a Cossack republic, and groups of Cossacks and peasant insurgents were to be found as far as Nadvirna in Galicia. But even then the mass of the people was more interested in economic and social problems than in national ones. Even in the Cossack *dumy*, sung by professional minstrels, we find less about religion, the nation, and the state, than about items such as how "the tax collecting on our rivers and highways is farmed out to Jews"; and in the simple song sung by peasants all over the Ukraine, the statesman Xmel'nyc'kyj is scarcely mentioned, whereas Nečaj, the representative of peasant interests, is widely praised.⁴⁵

IV

The concept of the primacy of Ukrainian statehood as the prerequisite for the existence of the Ukrainian nation was reintroduced into Ukrainian intellectual thought by Vjačeslav Lypyns'kyj (born in 1882).

For Lypyns'kyj the state was the most important phenomenon of human society: "I see nation as being the product of the complex reciprocal relationship between state and society," he wrote. "Nation is the realization of the will to be a nation. When there exists no will expressed in the form of an idea, there exists no nation. But a nation does not exist when this will and idea are present but are not realized in the material form of a state."⁴⁶ He likened the state to the father, the society to the mother, and the nation to the child that is the product of both of them.⁴⁷

A historian trained at the Polish positivist and neoromantic schools at Cracow, Lypyns'kyj brought Ukrainian historiography to a turning point: he showed that Xmel'nyc'kyj was not only a victorious leader of the masses, but a statesman who together with other members of a politically-Polish gentry was erecting a new state in Eastern Europe. Lypyns'kyj overrated the Perejaslav Treaty of 1654 and underrated the Hadjač Union of

⁴⁵ *Rozvidky Myxajla Drahomanova pro ukrajins'ku narodnju slovesnist' i pys'menstvo*, ed. Myxajlo Pavlyk, vol. 3 (Lviv, 1906), introduction; English translation in *Annals* 2, no. 1 (3) (1952): 212-13.

⁴⁶ Vjačeslav Lypyns'kyj, *Lysty do brat'iv-xliborobiv, pro ideju i organizaciju ukrajins'koho monarxizmu* (Vienna, 1926), p. 387.

⁴⁷ Lypyns'kyj, *Lysty do brat'iv-xliborobiv*, p. 382.

1658; the latter is a better example of the nobility's political innovativeness.⁴⁸

As a sociologist and political theorist, Lypyns'kyj developed ideas that not only have great theoretical value, but also important practical implications. Of special importance are his concept of politics as both a science and an art, his classification of political systems, his theories about the aristocracy and the role of monarchy, and his critical evaluation of democracy in action. All these were prolegomena to his main concern, namely, how to rebuild Ukrainian statehood and transform Ukrainians from the status of a "stateless nation."⁴⁹ These aspects of Lypyns'kyj's work and thought will be treated in other essays of this volume, and so I refrain from dwelling on them here. I shall, however, touch briefly on two final points: why Lypyns'kyj was able to reintroduce the concept of statehood, and what Lypyns'kyj's place in Ukrainian intellectual history is today.

There were two reasons for Lypyns'kyj's return to the concept of a Ukrainian state. First, he was not a part of the alienated intelligentsia;⁵⁰ he always maintained that his primary vocation was farming, as did several of the possible authors of the *Istoriija Rusov*. Second, Lypyns'kyj, a legitimate son, had no resentment against the class of his parents. Unlike Antonovyč, he did not seek to abandon his noble status and to desert his class. Instead, he set out to return his peers to the nationality of their ancestors, and to challenge them to serve the Ukrainian peasantry as its upper class.

The concept of statehood was very strongly rooted in Polish national consciousness.⁵¹ Lypyns'kyj, the non-rebel, relied on it to imbue his new fellow-patriots with something very precious which they had lost after the *Istoriija Rusov*—the concept of the unique significance and value of statehood. Fate robbed Lypyns'kyj of seeing his intellectual labor bear fruit. Only two years after his epoch-making collection, *Z dziejów Ukrainy*, was published, World War I broke out.⁵² After a short period of statehood (in which Lypyns'kyj took active part as a prominent diplomat), the Soviet

⁴⁸ V. Lypyns'kyj, *Ukrajina na perelomi 1657–1659* (Vienna, 1920), pp. 27–39. This chapter was translated into English as "The Ukraine at the Turning Point," in *Annals* 3, no. 2 (8): 605–619.

⁴⁹ Lypyns'kyj, *Lysty do bratīv-xliborobiv*, pp. 400–470.

⁵⁰ Lypyns'kyj's criticism of the Ukrainian intelligentsia is presented in *Lysty do bratīv-xliborobiv*, pp. 1–62.

⁵¹ See, e.g., Władysław Smoleński, *Szkoły historyczne w Polsce*, 2nd ed., by Marian H. Serejski (Wrocław, 1952).

⁵² *Z dziejów Ukrainy: Księga pamiątkowa ku czci Włodzimierza Antonowicza, Paulina Święcickiego i Tadeusza Ryłskiego*, ed. Wacław Lipiński (Vjačeslav Lypyns'kyj), (Kiev [printed in Cracow], 1912).

system was imposed on the Ukraine. Lypyns'kyj's works were banned, and he could have no influence on Soviet Ukrainian society.

For a time it seemed that interwar Galicia, with its tradition of sixty years of Austrian constitutional rule, would be a touchstone for some of his political theories. Soon, however, a generation of angry young Ukrainians, who blamed their fathers for failing to maintain the independence of the West Ukrainian Republic, turned to Dmytro Dontsov, a typical representative of the imperial Russian intelligentsia, and became ardent followers of his integral nationalism.

Every rebirth of Ukrainian intellectual life, whether in the diaspora or in the homeland, must look again to Lypyns'kyj, the great continuator—albeit unconsciously—of the concept of statehood formulated in the *Istoriija Rusov*, and build upon his achievements.

Harvard University